

Harvard Semitic Museum
Harvard Semitic Monographs

Edited by

Frank Moore Cross, Jr.

The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch
A Discussion of an Early Revision of
the LXX of Jeremiah 29-52 and Baruch 1:1-3:8

by

Emanuel Tov

Number 8

The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch
A Discussion of an Early Revision of
the LXX of Jeremiah 29-52 and Baruch 1:1-3:8

by

Emanuel Tov

Published by
SCHOLARS PRESS
for

Harvard Semitic Museum

SCHOLARS PRESS
Missoula, Montana

Distributed by

SCHOLARS PRESS
University of Montana
Missoula, Montana 59801

The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch

A Discussion of an Early Revision of
the LXX of Jeremiah 29-52 and Baruch 1:1-3:8

by

Emanuel Tov

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Tov, Emanuel
The Septuagint translation of Jeremiah and Baruch.

(Harvard Semitic monographs ; no. 8)

A revision of the author's thesis, Hebrew University,
1973.

Bibliography: p.

Includes indexes.

I. Bible. O.T. Jeremiah. Greek. Septuagint—
Criticism, Textual. 2. Bible. O.T. Apocrypha. Baruch.
Greek. Septuagint—Criticism, Textual. I. Title.

II. Series.

BS1524.G7S45 1975 224'.2'06 75-43872

ISBN 0-89130-070-8

To Lika

To Ophirah, Ariel and Amitay

Copyright © 1976

by

The President and Fellows of Harvard College



Printed in United States of America
1 2 3 4 5

EDWARDS BROTHERS, INC.
ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN 48104

PREFACE

Old Testament textual criticism has become a highly specialized branch of research. Therefore I need not apologize for presenting this study which illuminates, hopefully, merely a corner of Septuagint research.

The present monograph grew out of my doctoral dissertation of the same title. Some sections of the dissertation were omitted, others rewritten, while little new material was added in its revised form.

The bulk of the research for my dissertation was performed during the years 1967-69 at Harvard University. The dissertation was submitted to the Hebrew University in January 1973 and accepted in July of the same year. The manuscript of this book was completed in the summer of 1973, while some alterations were inserted in the summer of 1975. At that time I also added some bibliographical references.

It is a very pleasant duty to express my thanks to all those who guided my research, criticized my work and helped me in other ways. First of all, the two mentors of my thesis, Prof. S. Talmon of the Hebrew University and Prof. F. M. Cross, Jr., of Harvard University criticized my argumentation and formulations and in this way helped me to crystallize my thoughts in a better way. Some scholars were kind enough to read earlier drafts of this book and to comment on matters of detail. I am grateful to Prof. J. Strugnell of Harvard University, Prof. I. Soisalon-Soininen of Helsinki, Dr. M. Stone of the Hebrew University and Mrs. S. Ory of the Hebrew University Bible Project.

I should like to thank Prof. I. L. Seeligmann and Prof. M. Coshen-Gottstein of the Hebrew University for the many methodological insights I learned from them in the course of the years.

Prof. F. M. Cross, Jr. was kind enough to suggest this monograph for publication to the Scholars Press. I am grateful to the director, Prof. R. W. Funk, to the production manager, and to the manuscript typist, Joann Burnich, for their efforts and fine work.

C O N T E N T S

I dedicate this book to my dear wife and children. They made it easier for me to perform the research and to write this book by creating an atmosphere in which it was pleasant to live and work.

September 1975
Jerusalem, Sukkot 5736

	Page
CHAPTER I	
INTRODUCTION	1
1. A Review of the History of Research into the LXX of Jer	1
2. The Purpose and Content of the Present Study	4
3. Some Introductory Remarks	11
4. Explanation of Symbols Employed in the Discussion	13
CHAPTER II	
IMPORTANT SIMILARITIES BETWEEN JER A' AND JER B'	19
1. Unique and Rare Renditions Common to Jer a' and b'	24
2. Rare Greek Words Common to Jer a' and b'	32
CHAPTER III	
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN JER A' AND B' PROBABLY RESULTING FROM JER-R'S REVISIONS IN JER B'	41
1. More Precise Renditions	46
2. Corrections of Erroneous Renditions	52
3. Stereotyped (literal) Replacing Non-stereotyped (free) Renditions	55
4. Renditions Reflecting the Heb in a More Consistent Way	69
5. Other Changes	74
Appendix 1: Is Jer a', and not Jer b', in the nature of a revision?	77
Appendix 2: Chapter 52 = Jer. Y' ?	79

CHAPTER IV

ADDITIONAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN JER A' AND B'
 ("SYNONYMOUS RENDITIONS") 93
 Appendix: The exact dividing line between Jer
 a' and b' 105

CHAPTER V

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN BARUCH AND JER-LXX 111
 1. Bar = Jer-R in Quotations from Jer b' 114
 2. Bar = Jer-R Outside Quotations from Jer b' 115
 3. Bar = Jer a'b' 120
 4. Bar ≠ Jer b' 120
 5. Bar ≠ Jer a' 121
 6. Conclusions 121
 Appendix: The Hebrew *Vorlage* of Bar 1:1-3:8 127

CHAPTER VI

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE LXX OF JER, EZ AND
 THE MP 135
 1. Jer and the MP 136
 2. Jer and Ez 142
 3. Jer a', the MP and Ez 145
 4. Conclusions 149

CHAPTER VII

SOME CONCLUSIONS 157
 1. A Characterization of Jer-R 157
 Appendix: Jer-R and the "three" 161
 2. Why is Jer-R's Revision Preserved Only in Jer b'? 162
 3. The Date of Jer-R's Revision 165

4. Some Criteria for the Reconstruction of the
 OG of Jer b' 167
 5. Some Implications of the Present Study for the
 Understanding and Use of the "LXX" 168

BIBLIOGRAPHY 179

GREEK AND HEBREW INDEXES 187

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

1. *A Review of the History of Research
into the LXX of Jer*

The Septuagint translation of Jeremiah (Jer-LXX) is best known for its many differences from the Masoretic Text (MT), both in length and in arrangement of the text. In fact, it is the classical example for differences of this kind, and the problem of its relationship to MT has therefore been much discussed by scholars. It is our understanding that the majority of the LXX's differences from MT in length and arrangement reflect a Hebrew *Vorlage* different from MT. Recently this view was defended by J. G. Janzen as well as by the present writer.¹ The present study, however, will not deal with the mentioned discrepancies between MT and the LXX.

In addition to the problem of the relationship between Jer-LXX and MT, the Greek translation offers the scholar a certain amount of inner-Greek problems, i. e., problems which have no direct bearing on the question of which Hebrew text the translator used. The most important inner-Greek problem is that of the relationship between the different sections of the book. For it has been recognized that lexical differences between chapters 1-28 and 29-52 exist, and, as a result, it has been assumed practically unanimously that two different translators participated in the Greek translation of Jer. The aim of the present study is to question the scholarly consensus on this matter and at the same time to propose a new way of understanding the relationship between the two parts of the book. Firstly, however, it is necessary to summarize the various opinions which have been expressed on the problem at issue:

The two-translator theory of the Septuagint version of Jeremiah is connected with the name of H. St. J. Thackeray, who, at the beginning of this century, was the first scholar to develop an elaborate theory on the problem in question. He had, however, not started *ex nihilo*. The literature preceding him contained various statements on the special character of this

translation. In fact, all the scholars who had seriously investigated Jer-LXX, with the exception of Köhl,² noted its peculiarities. Spohn, for example, realized as early as 1794 that several Hebrew words were "inconsistently" reproduced in Greek; e.g., both the recurring phrase 'הַמֶּלֶךְ הַגָּדוֹל and הַגָּדוֹל are represented in Jer-LXX by various translations. The first phrase, for example, was rendered 61 times by τὸς λέγει κύριος and 72 times by οὗτος εἶπε κύριος (for precise details concerning 'הַמֶּלֶךְ הַגָּדוֹל, see chapter III, example 18 and for הַגָּדוֹל, see III 48). Spohn mentioned the possibility that the lexical variation resulted from the occasional insertion in the manuscripts of Jer-LXX of readings culled from "another translation."⁴ Although he did not elaborate on this assumption, he probably referred to Aquila, Symmachus or Theodotion.

Frankl⁵ appears to have been the first scholar to hypothesize seriously multiple authorship for Jer-LXX. His assumption was based on the various renditions of מְלִיכֵי בְּרִי (III 16) and of לְמַלְכֵי (III 13). Workman,⁶ Streane⁷ and Kneucker⁸ later expressed the same theory.

Even though some scattered remarks on multiple authorship had been made, no one had attempted to analyze the situation in depth. Thackeray was the first scholar to do so. In 1903 he found that a substantial number of Hebrew words were rendered in the first part of Jer differently from their regular equivalent in the second part.⁹ This discovery led him to assume that two different translators (named by him Jer. α' and Jer. β') were responsible for Jer 1-28 and 29-51 (following the LXX sequence of chapters) and also to suggest that chapter 52 was rendered by yet a third translator (Jer. γ'). Only few data could justify the assumption of a third translator, but Thackeray was able to draw up a rather impressive list of differences between the first and second translators. Thackeray recognized that Jer. α' and β' did not work in complete isolation, since he found a certain amount of agreement between them. Thackeray made two additional suggestions: He proposed that Jer. α', the Minor Prophets and Ezekiel (or part of that book) were translated by one translator. Furthermore, he discovered that the second translator of Jer was also responsible for the

translation of the first part of the apocryphal book of Baruch (1:1-3:8).¹⁰

In his subsequent publications,¹¹ Thackeray elaborated upon his own views on Jer-LXX and introduced various major and minor changes. He also developed similar theories of multiple authorship for the Septuagint versions of Ezekiel and 1-4 Reigns.¹² Indeed, Thackeray is the "father" of theories of multiple authorship for the individual books of the LXX since he was the first scholar to demarcate precisely the boundaries of each translation unit in a given book. For each book Thackeray provided lists of lexical differences between its individual sections and he also discussed the relationship between each section and other books of the LXX. It is natural that a theory such as Thackeray's would be applied by scholars to other books as well. Indeed, the bibliography on this topic is extensive, so that it may suffice merely to indicate the books for which a theory of multiple authorship has been suggested: the Pentateuch as a whole as well as Genesis and Numbers, Joshua, 1-4 Reigns, Psalms, the Minor Prophets as a whole as well as Amos, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Baruch, Ezekiel and Daniel.

Since the days of Thackeray, it has been taken for granted that differences in vocabulary between two or more sections of a book suffice to prove multiple authorship. However, the rationale behind the theories of multiple authorship has never been proven. Epiphanius' testimony about the thirty-six pairs of translators translating the whole Bible into Greek¹³ at best supports a theory that books were rendered by pairs or small groups of translators who cooperated. Certainly it cannot be taken to support a theory of the bisection of books for purposes of translation; it should, in fact, be stressed that we lack any external evidence supporting theories of multiple authorship. Therefore, opponents of such theories naturally turned to the very data on which these were based. Discussion has especially centered on the books of the Prophets and 1-4 Reigns, which make the best "case" for multiple authorship.

While Thackeray's theory on 1-4 Reigns has been strongly questioned and his views on Ezekiel have been undermined,¹⁴ the LXX of Jeremiah has not been restudied. The reason the problem of the multiple authorship of Jeremiah has never been

reinvestigated is the fact that, of all the books for which theories of multiple authorship have been suggested, the case is probably strongest for Jeremiah.¹⁵ But although the problem has not been studied as a whole, important contributions have been made by several scholars who studied some of Thackeray's criteria for the distinction between Jer α' and Jer β' and deduced new ones. Such work was done by Redpath,¹⁶ Köhler,¹⁷ Daudissin,¹⁸ Ziegler,¹⁹ Martin,²⁰ Soisalon-Soininen,²¹ and Walters.²² Other scholars merely expressed their agreement with Thackeray's views without studying the evidence independently.²³ Only Baudissin²⁴ and Soisalon-Soininen²⁵ raised doubts about the correctness of Thackeray's views, but both were aware of the very limited scope of the investigations leading to their criticism.

2. *The Purpose and Content of the Present Study*

Thackeray's main contribution to the research on Jer-LXX was the discovery of a pattern which accounted for the distribution of differing renditions of the same Hebrew word within Jer-LXX. Furthermore, his list of examples is impressive, and in recent decades some evidence has been published (see notes 16-22) which seems to corroborate his views. Only one hesitantly dissident remark of Ziegler, well concealed in a footnote, questions the validity of Thackeray's thesis as a whole:

"Mann muss Thack. zustimmen; nur müsste noch genauer untersucht werden, ob wirklich zwei Übersetzer beteiligt waren oder bloss ein Redaktor am Werk war, der den einen Teil nur überarbeitete. Es kann nämlich beobachtet werden, dass sich in der ganzen Ier.-LXX einheitliche Züge finden, die sie von anderen Büchern abheben" (Ziegler, "Eingleitung," 128, n. 1).

While not agreeing with the details of Ziegler's proposal, the present writer concurs with Ziegler in the observation that similarities between the two parts of Jer considerably weaken Thackeray's thesis. Thackeray recognized only a few of these important similarities, and it was probably because of this

fact that he attributed them to secondary factors. At different times he provided different explanations:

1. Jer. β' imitated Jer. α' ("Gr.Tr.Jer.", 253-4).
2. Later redactors or scribes were responsible for "a certain amount of mixture of the two styles" (*ib.*, 254).
3. The similarities resulted from "imperfect collaboration of two workers, the second of whom only partially followed the lead of the first" (*Septuagint*, 35).

In chapter II we shall discuss these suggestions in detail. It seems to us that Thackeray's explanations of the agreements cannot be sustained. Moreover, it is very questionable methodology to assign important agreements between two sections of one and the same book to a secondary factor. Rather, they bear witness to a first translation of Jer. After all, the most obvious explanation of idiosyncracies common to two parts of the same book is that they stem from the original translator. Furthermore, the nature of many of the similarities is such that they cannot have arisen secondarily. If we succeed in demonstrating the incorrectness of Thackeray's explanations, it seems to us that the following alternative view should be considered correct by implication:

Since there exist important similarities between the two sections of Jer which distinguish them from the remainder of the LXX, it may be suggested that these renditions point to the first translation, to be called the Old Greek (OG) translation of Jer. If this assumption be correct, the present differences between the two sections of the book can only be accounted for by postulating a revision of the OG, now preserved only in part. The revisional character of many renditions in the second part of Jer (chapters 29-52) suggests that it is this section which has been retouched. The assumed revision aimed at a more precise and consistent rendering of the Hebrew.

A working hypothesis designed to account for the special character of Jer-LXX is outlined in the next paragraphs. This hypothesis will be substantiated, step by step, in chapters II-VI:

One translator was responsible for the Old Greek translation of the book of Jer and apparently also of Bar 1:1-3:8. This OG translation is preserved in its original form in Jer 1-28 (Jer a'), but it has been lost in chapters 29-52 (Jer b').

At a later time, the OG of Jer²⁶ was reworked by an unknown reviser to be designated Jer-R.²⁷ This revision probably included the whole of the OG version, but is now extant only for Jer b'. Interestingly enough, the first part of the Greek translation of the apocryphal book of Baruch (1:1-3:8) was submitted to the same revision.²⁸

Important agreements between Jer a' and b' indicate some of the elements of the lost OG of Jer b' which have not been touched by the reviser. In other words, the present form of Jer b' is composed of two strata: a substratum (the lost OG) which may sometimes be recognized, and a second stratum consisting of the revisional elements inserted by Jer-R.

In the process of proving the validity of the working hypothesis, a certain amount of circular reasoning cannot be avoided. However, some of the assumptions utilized from the very beginning will be substantiated further on in this study.²⁹

The reader will note that the suggestions set forth in the working hypothesis meet with some difficulties: (1) The question of what may be expected from a revision of the LXX; (2) the inconsistency of Jer-R's revision; (3) the question of why the revision of Jer-R has been preserved only in Jer b'. Questions (1) and (2) are discussed on pp. 21-22 and question (3) on p. 23.

Our explanations of these difficulties may or may not be correct. In any event, we prefer the uneasy assumption outlined above over the "easy" two-translator theory suggested by Thackeray: It seems to us that the agreements between the two sections of Jer (chapter II) are of such a nature that the two-translator theory cannot be sustained.

We shall now outline the contents of chapters II-VII:

Several important similarities between Jer a' and b' distinguish both sections from the remainder of the LXX. These similarities are listed in ch. II under two headings:

(1) unique and rare *renditions*, (2) rare Greek *words*. While

recognizing a few of the striking agreements between Jer a' and b', Thackeray contended that they resulted from a secondary factor, such as imperfect collaboration between the translators Jer. α' and Jer. β'. However, owing to both methodological considerations and to unacceptable presuppositions by Thackeray, this assumption cannot be sustained. The evidence can only be accounted for by assuming that similarities between Jer a' and b' point to the existence of a complete OG translation for Jer, which is preserved in Jer a' in its pure form and is recognizable as the substratum of Jer b'.

Differences between Jer a' and b' in the translation of the same Hebrew word are the subject of chapters III and IV.

Chapter III deals with different renditions of the same Hebrew word, which relate to each other as an original (i.e., the rendition found in Jer a') to its revision (i.e., the rendition found in Jer b'). It is postulated that the renditions in Jer b' replaced earlier renditions identical to those now found in Jer a'. Jer-R and the underlying OG text in Jer b' therefore probably related to each other as Jer b' to Jer a'.

That Jer-R was related to Jer-OG as a reviser to the original translation is made probable by a discussion of the following tendencies of Jer-R:

1. Jer-R replaced some renditions of Jer-OG with renditions which, in his opinion, better expressed the meaning of the Hebrew.
 2. Jer-R corrected some erroneous renditions of Jer-OG.
 3. Jer-R tended to prefer certain stereotyped (literal) renditions rather than the non-stereotyped (free) ones of Jer-OG.
 4. Jer-R replaced some earlier renditions of Jer-OG with renditions which were meant to reflect the Hebrew in a more consistent fashion.
 5. Jer-R revised Jer-OG in other ways.
- Appendix 1 to ch. III discusses the alternative hypothesis that Jer a', and not Jer b', embodies a revision, although of a different character. Appendix 2 deals with Thackeray's

tentative proposal that ch. 52 incorporates a third translation unit (Jer. y').

While chapter III deals with renditions of Jer a' and Jer b' which show a basically different treatment of the Hebrew *Vorlage*, chapter IV lists examples of different renditions in Jer a' and b' which do not differ in tendency. Since the listed renditions are also found concurrently in the LXX, without any discernible grammatical or contextual factor determining the occurrence of one rather than the other, we suggest calling them "synonymous renditions". From a translator's point of view, they are synonymous representations of the same Hebrew word.

While the examples of chapter III are supposed to demonstrate that Jer b' has been revised, the examples of chapter IV can also be taken as proof of a two-translator theory. However, since the revisers of the LXX are also known to have replaced earlier renditions with synonymous ones, the data provided in this chapter can be accommodated to our working hypothesis.

An appendix to this chapter uses the data collected in chapters III and IV in order to pinpoint the exact dividing line between Jer a' and b', between chapters 28 and 29 of the Greek.

Chapter V deals exclusively with one section of Jer b', viz. the Greek translation of the underlying Hebrew of Bar 1:1-3:8. This chapter is intended to prove one of the presuppositions on which some of the examples of chapters II-IV were partially based, namely, that Bar 1:1-3:8 was revised by Jer-R.

The classification of the relevant data is rather complicated since several facts and assumptions must be considered. For example, one notes immediately that Jer-LXX and Bar share many peculiar renditions which distinguish both from the remainder of the LXX. Explanation of this phenomenon is complicated by the fact that the Hebrew *Vorlage* of Bar very frequently quoted the Hebrew text of Jer, so that secondary influences of the text of Jer-LXX on Bar such as revisional harmonization and imitation cannot be precluded. But such assumptions must be rejected after a closer look at the similarities between

Jer-LXX (always Jer b'!) and Bar which are found both within and outside quotations from Jer b'. Since the latter group is the larger one, later revisional activity becomes highly improbable. It is further recognized that all the similarities between Bar and Jer-LXX are confined to Jer b', both in isolated renderings in Jer b' and Bar and in recurring renditions which distinguish Jer b' as a whole from Jer a' (and the remainder of the LXX). The possibility that Bar imitated only Jer b' and not Jer a' cannot be justified nor can any form of secondary influence emanating from Jer b' on Bar be substantiated.

As a result, there cannot remain much doubt that Jer-R also retouched Bar 1:1-3:8. This assumption is further corroborated by the fact that Bar, even when quoting from Jer a', concurs with Jer-R, whenever the latter's vocabulary differs from Jer-OG (Jer a').

Chapter VI deals with peculiar renditions and rare words which distinguish Jer a', Ez and the Minor Prophets (MP) from the remainder of the LXX. The nature and number of the examples adduced leads to the assumption that Jer a', Ez and the MP were translated by one individual or else by one group. Since he (they) produced a translation which we describe as the OG, it follows by implication that the extant translations of Ez and the MP also exhibit the OG version.³⁰ One should be aware of the tentative character of the conclusions drawn in ch. VI, since they are based on similarities between Jer a', Ez and the MP which were met in the course of the study of Jer-LXX only.³¹

That the similarities between Jer a', Ez and the MP, as a rule, are not found in Jer b' must probably be attributed to Jer-R's replacement or elimination of these renditions in Jer b'. Indeed, in several instances we can successfully trace the renditions with which Jer-R replaced earlier renditions which were common to the OG of Jer, Ez and the MP. This conclusion, in turn, provides some support for our hypothesis about the relationship between Jer a' and Jer b'. Since in these cases the renditions in Jer b' are revisional, the evidence supplied by Ez and the MP supports our hypothesis more than that of Thackeray.

Chapter VII contains some conclusions based on data, which admittedly are not very extensive.

Firstly, an attempt is made to characterize Jer-R's revision. Jer-R presumably had serious intentions of making Jer-OG conform to his idea of a more literal and consistent translation. However, several pieces of evidence show that he did not persist in carrying out his plans.

An excursus to this section touches on a few renditions common to Jer-R and the "Three".

The next problem is the question of the preservation of Jer-R's revision in Jer b' only. Our tentative solution is that the person responsible for the archetype of our MSS used two scrolls of a different text type (OG in Jer a' and Jer-R in Jer b').

Chapter VII also deals with the assumed date of Jer-R's revision, with some criteria for the reconstruction of the lost OG of Jer b' and with some implications of the present study for the understanding and use of the "LXX".

A bibliography, which at the same time serves as a list of abbreviations, is found at the end, as well as Greek and Hebrew indexes of the words and renditions discussed in chapters II-VII.

We shall attempt to prove the validity of our working hypothesis with evidence taken from the LXX of Jer only. However, since we question Thackeray's hypothesis of multiple authorship, it is of relevance to mention here the fate of similar theories of multiple authorship suggested for other books of the LXX:

Some of the theories of multiple authorship suggested by Thackeray and others have been strengthened by scholars, but more have been questioned strongly (a good example of the latter is Ziegler's fine study of the *MP*³²). It seems to us that, except for Jer, the best cases for multiple authorship are 1-4 Reigns, Is, and Ez, but even these have been questioned recently.

Thackeray's theory for 1-4 Reigns has--in our opinion--convincingly been replaced by Barthélemy with a translator-

reviser theory.³³ Although much discussion is still going on regarding many aspects of Barthélemy's views,³⁴ it seems that his theory that certain parts of the "LXX" of 1-4 Reigns contain an early revision is gaining acceptance.

The problem of the character of the translations of Is and Ez has not yet been solved. For Ez, both two-translator theories and translator-reviser theories have been suggested.³⁵ The evidence in favor of multiple authorship of Is is less clear, but nevertheless for this book also a two-translator theory has been suggested by some scholars while others have mentioned the possibility of a partial revision of the book.³⁶

If theories of multiple authorship cannot be held for 1-4 Reigns and Jer, there remain only the ambiguous cases of Ez and Is. In view of important agreements recognized between the various assumed translation units,³⁷ the whole assumption of multiple authorship of books of the LXX is in need of serious reinvestigation. Probably this reinvestigation will result in a trend towards translator-reviser theories.

3. Some Introductory Remarks

a. The text of Jer-LXX is quoted from Ziegler's edition.³⁸ The numbering of chapters and verses follows the LXX; the corresponding numbers of MT are added in brackets.

Ziegler's eclectic text constitutes a deliberate attempt to restore the archetype of Jer-LXX,³⁹ best represented by MSS ABS.⁴⁰ Since we shall discuss only those renditions included in the assumed archetype of all known MSS of Jer as well as renditions belonging to a postulated earlier stage, variants which developed after the time of the assumed archetype have little bearing on the issue. It would not be correct, however, to list in our discussion only one reading, while excluding presumably later variants since any one of the variants may have belonged to the assumed archetype. Thus we always indicate variants for the renditions listed in the course of our discussion; but, in order not to burden the notation with manifold details, only the variants of uncial MSS (including the group C) are referred to, while the variants found in minuscules are listed only when they are the sole witness for a

significant reading.⁴¹ In a few cases the apparatus of Ziegler is quoted in full.

b. The basic tools used in the preparation of chapters II-VII were the concordances to the Hebrew⁴² and Greek⁴³ Bible. It should be kept in mind that HR lists only variants from manuscripts A, B, S and the Sixtine edition (1587) and excludes, among other things, words originating from emendations, such as ἐπιχρῆσα in Jer 29:11 (49:10) (cf. III 4).⁴⁴ Thus the full evidence relating to the problems under discussion is partially unobtainable.

Since HR does not register the probable *Varlage* of the Greek of Bar, we have used our own Greek-Hebrew and Hebrew-Greek concordance of Bar 1:1-3:8 based on the Hebrew reconstruction of Bar appended to ch. V.⁴⁵

Concordances to O, L, Sym and Th, all non-existent, would undoubtedly have contributed to the issues under investigation. Despite its defects,⁴⁶ Reider-Turner's *Index to Aquila*⁴⁷ is a useful tool for the student of LXX revisions.

c. Many of the examples listed in chapters II-VI were previously mentioned by scholars (especially Thackeray), as indicated in footnotes in the beginning of each chapter.⁴⁸ But upon comparison one notes that the majority of the common examples are presented below in a manner different from that of previous discussions. Such differences result not only from the fact that previously scholars have been trying to prove multiple authorship for Jer-LXX, while we hope to establish a different theory; variation in detail may also derive from differing opinions on the extent or form of the difference between Jer a' and b' (one word/two words; word/root; word/meaning, etc.). In order not to burden the discussion, no attempt is made here to analyze all previous presentations or to refute alleged oppositions (between Jer a' and b') which, in our opinion, do not exist.

d. When referring to sub-divisions of books of the LXX other than Jer-LXX, we use the divisions suggested by some

scholars, without intending to imply that their assumptions are considered proved or even likely.

The subdivision of 1-4 Reigns follows Thackeray, "Kings", that of Is follows Baumgärtel in Herrmann-Baumgärtel, *Beiträge* and that of Ez corresponds with Thackeray, "Ezekiel".

e. Greek words are accented, unless quoted as variants from MSS.

f. A notation such as "not found elsewhere in the LXX" relates only to the canonical and apocryphal books which were translated from Hebrew and Aramaic into Greek and whose *Vorlagen* are listed in HR.

g. Within each section, examples are arranged according to their assumed persuasion.

4. *Explanation of Symbols Employed in the Discussion.*

- Jer-LXX - The LXX of Jer in its present form.
 Jer a' - Chapters 1-28 of Jer-LXX.
 Jer b' - Chapters 29-52 of Jer-LXX together with Bar 1:1-3:8.
 Jer-OG - The Old Greek translation of Jer; often used to denote the translator of Jer a'.⁴⁹
 Jer-R - The reviser of the OG translation of Jer b', now lost.
 Bar - The Greek translation of the Hebrew text of Baruch, now lost.
 Dan-LXX - The LXX translation of Daniel.
 Dan-Th - Theodotion's (Th) revision of Daniel.
 MP - The Minor Prophets.
 The "Three" - Aquila (Aq), Symmachus (Sym) and Theodotion (Th).
 (the) Heb - The Hebrew word/root/phrase reflected in Greek by...
 Gk 1, Gk 2 - The (two) main rendition(s) of the Heb.
 * - The Greek *word* occurs only in the following verses, e.g. only in Jer-LXX or Jer a'.
 † - The mentioned *rendition* occurs only in the following verses, e.g. only in Jer-LXX or Jer a'.

- >
- The Hebrew word is further rendered with the following renditions (occurring in Jer-LXX or in the whole LXX, as indicated).
 - The two renditions occur in two parallel verses (see p. 23).

parall

NOTES

CHAPTER I

1. J. G. Janzen, *Studies in the Text of Jeremiah*, Harvard Semitic Monographs 6 (Cambridge, Mass. 1973); E. Tov, "L'incidence de la critique textuelle sur la critique littéraire dans le livre de Jérémie," #B 79 (1972) 189-199; *id.*, "The Contribution of Textual Criticism to the Literary Criticism and Exegesis of Jeremiah: Some Remarks on the Hebrew Vorlage of the LXX of Chapter 27," *Snaton* 1 (1975) 139-156.
2. E. Kühl, *Das Verhältniss der Massora zur Septuaginta in Jeremia* (Halle 1882) 8 stated explicitly that one person was responsible for the Greek translation of Jeremiah.
3. M.G.L. Spohn, *Jeremias Vates e Versione Indaeorum Alexandrinorum* (Lipsiae 1794-1824) 9-10, 17, 20.
4. *ib.*, 17, 20.
5. P. F. Frankl, "Studien über die Septuaginta und Peschito zu Jeremia," *MGMJ* 21 (1872) 448-449.
6. C. Workman, *The Text of Jeremiah* (Edinburgh 1889) XXVII.
7. A. W. Streane, *The Double Text of Jeremiah* (Cambridge 1896) 1, n. 1. In fact, the examples mentioned by Streane do not justify his assumption.
8. J. J. Kneucker, *Das Buch Baruch* (Leipzig 1897) 83, n. 8.
9. H. St. J. Thackeray, "The Greek Translators of Jeremiah," *JThSt* 4 (1903) 245-266; henceforth: Thackeray, "Gr.Tr. Jer."
10. For further details concerning Thackeray's views, see "Gr.Tr. Jer."
11. *A Grammar of the OT in Greek* (Cambridge 1909) 11ff.; *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship*, *Schweich Lectures 1920* (London 1921) 29-37, 116-117. See also his commentary on Bar *apud* C. Gore (ed.), *A New Commentary on Holy Scripture* (London 1928) II, 105.
12. "The Greek Translators of Ezekiel," *JThSt* 4 (1902-1903) 398-411; see also "The Greek Translators of the Prophetic Books," *ib.*, 578-585; "The Greek Translators of the Four Books of Kings," *JThSt* 8 (1906-1907) 262-278.
13. Epiphanius, *De Mensuris et Ponderibus*, 3ff.
14. For bibliographical references to the theories on 1-4 Reigns, Is and Ez, see Ch. VII, notes 25-40.

15. Thus I. L. Seeligmann, *JEOL* 7 (1940) 373; Bickerman, "Transmission," 161, n. 43; E. Würthwein, *Der Text des AT⁴* (Stuttgart 1973) 54, n. 1.

16. H. A. Redpath, *JThSt* 7 (1906) 608-9 mentions the rendering listed below as III 37.

17. L. Köhler, "Beobachtungen am hebräischen und griechischen Text von Jeremia Kap 1-9," *ZAW* 29 (1909) 1-39, esp. 5, n. 4; 9, n. 3; 12-13, 25.

18. W. W. Graf von Baudissin, *Kyríos als Gottesname im Judentum und seine Stelle in der Religionsgeschichte* (Giessen 1929) I, 191, n. 1.

19. The importance of Ziegler's contribution to the study of Jer-LXX cannot be overstated. As for the two-translator theory, see his *Beiträge zur Jeremias-Septuaginta*, *NAWG, Phil.-Hist. Kl.* 1958, 2 (Göttingen 1958) *passim*, and the remark quoted below (p. 113, n. 1). In his *Beiträge*, Ziegler frequently referred to previously recognized differences between "Ier.I" and "Ier.II" and he also mentioned some new criteria for the distinction between the two.

20. R. A. Martin, *The Syntax of the Greek of Jeremiah, Part I: The Noun, Pronouns and Prepositions in their Case Constructions*, unpubl. diss. Princeton Theol. Sem. (Princeton, N.J. 1957); subsequent volumes have not been written. Martin's study frequently touches upon differences between the two parts of the Jer-LXX and, in fact, "the theory of Thackeray... is one of the reasons Jeremiah was selected for this syntactical study" (*ib.*, 7). Prof. Martin kindly permitted us to quote from his unpublished dissertation.

21. I. Soisalon-Soininen, *Die Infinitive in der Septuaginta*, *AASF B* 132 (Helsinki 1965) 169-176. Cf. further n. 25 below.

22. P. Walters, *The Text of the Septuagint, etc.* (Cambridge 1973) 314, n. 14.

23. E. Duval, "Le texte grec de Jérémie d'après une étude récente," *RB* 12 (1903) 394-403; R. R. Harwell, *The Principal Versions of Baruch*, diss. Yale Univ. (New Haven, Conn. 1915) 53, 65-66; E. J. Bickerman, "Transmission" 161, n. 43; W. Rudolph, *Jeremia²*, *HAT* (Tübingen 1958) XXI.

24. Baudissin, *Kyríos*, I, 198.

25. Recognizing a distinct difference between the two parts of Jer (see IV 7), Soisalon-Soininen concluded: "obwohl also das Material hier schon ziemlich deutlich auf zwei verschiedene Übersetzer hinweist, muss man die Frage trotzdem unbeantwortet lassen" (*Infinitive*, 174).

26. Unless otherwise indicated, "Jer" denotes both Jer 1-52 and Bar 1:1-3:8.

27. Since several LXX revisions have been labeled "R", we avoid using this siglum alone.

28. Our hypothesis, as well as Thackeray's, refers to the different renderings of the two sections of Jer-LXX in the LXX's sequence of chapters--the most salient feature of which is its location of the prophecies against the foreign nations (chapters 46-51 of MT) after Jer 25:13 of MT. It should be stressed that a rearrangement of the Greek text according to the sequence of MT would not basically change the distribution pattern in such clear-cut examples as III 18 and 43. Moreover, when rearranged, the lexical differences between Jer a' and b' cannot be explained at all, while our hypothesis offers at least one possible solution.

29. For example, the assumption (1) that the dividing line between the two parts of Jer lies between chapters 28 and 29 of the Greek (see the appendix to ch. IV), and (2) that Bar 1:1-3:8 was revised by Jer-R (ch. V).

30. An interesting corollary of the comparison of the LXX of Jer, Ez and the MP is that the similarity of Jer a' and the MP to Ez is almost exclusively limited to the first part of Ez (chapters 1-27 = Ez a'). It is therefore possible that Ez a' (and c'?) reflects the OG of Ez, while Ez b' was retouched by an unknown hand. This supposition is corroborated by the fact that in approaching the question along a different line of reasoning, Barthélemy ascribed Ez b' to a *katège*-like revision (cf. p. 164).

31. In any event, differences between the characteristic renditions of the OG of Jer, Ez and the MP have not been evinced.

32. J. Ziegler, *Die Einheit der Septuaginta zum Zwölfprophetenbuch*, *Beilage zum Vorlesungsverzeichnis der Staatl. Akademie zu Braunschweig* (1934/1935) 1-16 = *Sylloge* (Göttingen 1971) 29-42.

33. Barthélemy, *Devanciers*.

34. For a summary, see E. Tov in R. A. Kraft (ed.), *SCS* 2 (1972) 1-15.

35. For bibliographical references, see ch. VII, notes 32-36 as well as in Tov, *Baruch* (see bibliography).

36. For bibliographical references, see ch. VII, notes 37-40.

37. For some similarities between the different sections of Ez, see Thackeray, "Ezekiel," 406; for Is, cf. the studies mentioned in ch. VII, n. 38.

38. J. Ziegler, *Jeremias, Baruch, Threni, Epistulae Ieremiae. Vt Graecum, Auctoritate Societatis Litterarum Göttingensium Editum*, vol. XV (Göttingen 1957); henceforth: Ziegler, *Ier.*

39. Ziegler did not commit himself as to whether his reconstruction refers to the archetype of all the known MSS of Jer or whether this text is meant to represent the copy of Jer-LXX prepared by the original translator(s).

40. Ziegler, "Einleitung," 56-60.

41. As a rule, variants found *only* in O and L are not included because by implication they are secondary in the textual development of Jer.

42. S. Mandelkern, *Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae Hebraicae atque Chaldaicae*⁵ (Tel Aviv 1962).

43. E. Hatch and H. A. Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint* (Oxford 1897); henceforth: HR. The following tools were used in addition to HR: X. Jacques, *List of Septuagint Words Sharing Common Elements* (Rome 1972); E. Camillo dos Santos, *An Expanded Hebrew Index for the Hatch-Redpath Concordance to the Septuagint* (Jerusalem [1973]).

44. Many of these emendations are discussed in the first chapter of Ziegler, *Beiträge*.

45. The concordances are found in Tov, *Baruch* (see bibliography).

46. Cf. P. Katz and J. Ziegler, "Ein Aquila-Index in Vorbereitung," *Vt* 8 (1958) 264-285; J. Barr, *JSS* 12 (1967) 296-304; R. Hanhart, *ThR* 64 (1968) 391-4; E. Tov, *Textus* 8 (1973) 164-174.

47. J. Reider, *An Index to Aquila, completed and revised by N. Turner, Suppl. to Vt* 12 (Leiden 1966).

48. It should be pointed out, however, that the great majority of our examples were discovered by independent study. References were added only later.

49. In chapters III-IV, the renditions in Jer a' are contrasted to those in Jer b'. In order that the discrepancy between the two sections be defined more precisely, they are also designated Jer-OG and Jer-R, even though the substratum of Jer b' belongs to the OG as well.

CHAPTER II

IMPORTANT SIMILARITIES BETWEEN JER A' AND JER B'

While the proof for a theory of multiple authorship necessarily begins with the demonstration of lexical differences between two or more sections of a book, any discussion of a revision should start with the agreements between the original translation and the assumed revision. For if one wishes to establish that a certain translation contains a revision of another one, one must prove first that the two translations have a *common basis*. The ideal way of proving such a relationship would be by comparing two translations of one text, because translation equivalents for one and the same word in the source language can be compared. In this way it is possible to prove that *kaige*-Th and Lucian¹ revised the OG, that Aquila and Symmachus revised the *kaige*-Th revision² and that "Theodotion" revised the LXX of Daniel, etc.³

However, the problem under discussion is more complicated than the ones mentioned above because it is difficult to demonstrate the common basis of two translations of *different* texts (Jer a' and Jer b'). This common basis can be demonstrated theoretically only if we succeed in pointing to important agreements in translation vocabulary which distinguish the two sections from the remainder of the LXX.

There are obviously many agreements in translation options between Jer a' and Jer b', but we shall have to dismiss the more obvious ones (such as *ἄνθρωπος* - *ἄνθρωπος*) in order to concentrate on the *distinctive* agreements. With the aid of concordances it can be determined whether or not a certain agreement is distinctive, i.e., whether or not it recurs in other books.

In our discussion we shall list separately (1) unique and rare renditions common to Jer a' and b', and (2) rare Greek words, common to Jer a' and b', which sometimes render different Hebrew words. We shall refrain from giving here examples of what we consider "distinctive" agreements, referring the reader to the first examples of each section.

Before presenting the evidence, we shall discuss two alternative explanations of the agreements between Jer a' and b':

1. A few of the agreements between Jer a' and b' have been recognized by Thackeray. Probably because Thackeray recognized only a few instances, he attributed them to a secondary factor, supposedly during or after the process of the translation of Jer by two different translators (see below, p. 21).
2. If one does not adhere to a two-translator theory, the most obvious explanation of important agreements between two different parts of the same book is that they point to its original translator: Idiosyncracies of any translator naturally are visible in all parts of one book. Of the two possibilities, the second one needs no special proof. No attention need be paid to important agreements between two parts of homogeneous composition because they are expected. Only when doubts arise about the unity of a composition are such agreements studied. In our view, if the first explanation is dismissed, it follows by implication that the second one is correct.

The first possibility was formulated by Thackeray in different ways:

- (a) Jer.β' imitated Jer.α' ("Gr.Tr.Jer.", 253-4);
- (b) Later redactors or scribes were responsible for "a certain amount of mixture of the two styles" (*ib.*, 254);
- (c) The similarities resulted from "imperfect collaboration of two workers, the second of whom only partially followed the lead of the first" (*Septuagint*, 35).

Concerning Thackeray's views as a whole, the following may be maintained:

1. An adaptation of the vocabulary of Jer b' to that of Jer a', or *vice versa*, which could account for the above-mentioned agreements, would have required an extraordinary recall of the translation of the other part. Since many words occur in completely different contexts, it is nearly impossible that

a translator, redactor, or scribe could know of their occurrence in the other part of the book unless he had access to some kind of a Hebrew-Greek and Greek-Hebrew concordance.

2. Some of the examples mentioned below cannot be accounted for by any of the explanations mentioned by Thackeray: Group (2) contains several instances of rare Greek words common to the two sections and in ten of these examples (35-45) the rare Greek word reflects more than one Hebrew word. There seems to be no reason why anyone would copy a certain rare Greek word (reflecting a given Heb 1) from one section to the other as a representation of a different Heb word (Heb 2).

3. Differences between Jer a' and b' are more numerous and salient than the similarities between the two. It is thus *a priori* very unlikely that the similarities were inserted or developed secondarily while so many striking differences were left untouched. In Jer a', for example, ἰδὲ λέγει κύριος renders ἦ ἴδὲ ἰδ 58 times, whereas the same phrase is translated 69 times in Jer b' by οὐτως εἶπε κύριος (III 18).

More detailed observations regarding Thackeray's theory follow:

1. The attribution of the important agreements between Jer a' and b' to a "mixture of the two styles" is a misnomer and a misrepresentation of the evidence. The situation could have been called a "mixture of the two styles" only if renditions which manifestly characterize either Jer a' or Jer b' had occurred several times in the other part as well. The below-mentioned correspondences, on the other hand, cannot be considered to constitute such a mixture since they do not represent characteristic features of the *style* of either Jer a' or b', but rather are rare renditions and words found in two parts of one book.

2. The suggestion that a given translator *imitated* the vocabulary of a colleague has no parallel in the LXX. The only book whose translation options were repeated elsewhere was the Pentateuch, but the "Sitz im Leben" of borrowings from the Pentateuch was completely different: Those who embarked upon the translation of the Prophets and Hagiographa leaned on the Greek translation of the Pentateuch because they employed its

vocabulary and in some instances it provided them with needed lexical assistance.

Moreover, can it be claimed that Jer. β' imitated the *vo-cabulary* of his colleague? After all, he did not reproduce characteristic elements of Jer. α', but he supposedly copied some renditions which characterize only Jer a' and b'. This cannot be called the "imitation of a colleague's vocabulary."

3. The assumption that redactors were needed to weld together Jer a' and Jer b' seems farfetched. Furthermore, there is no proof for the existence of such redactors. If there had been redactors, they probably would have attempted to erase the differences between Jer a' and b'; and if they had introduced similarities between the two sections, they would have chosen more easily recognizable similarities.

4. In our previous remarks we alluded to the "imperfect collaboration of two workers" mentioned by Thackeray. It seems to us that given the present data, such a possibility exists only if the two translators cooperated (or if one translator used a written copy of the other's translation) in the representation of Hebrew words which might have caused lexical difficulties. This possibility can only be taken into consideration in a few of the examples given.

We conclude that there is no reason to accept any of Thackeray's explanations for the similarities between Jer a' and b'. As a result, we consider them to be indications of the OG translation of Jer. Special importance must be attached to the renderings which are indicated as (e) (see below, p. 23); doubts with regard to the relevance of "paralliel" renderings (see p. 23) may be disregarded.

The next chapter (III) is intended to prove that the OG of Jer has been preserved only in Jer a' and was lost for Jer b', which, in its present form, represents a revised text. By this reasoning we hope to establish that it is the OG substratum of Jer b' which shares peculiar features with the OG of Jer a'. Of course, this OG substratum in Jer b' is more extensive than the 45 examples of this chapter suggest (see also pp. 167-68 for some criteria for the reconstruction of the OG of Jer b'), but additional elements of this stratum cannot be identified

with the same degree of certainty. Hence the number of similarities (ch. II) is smaller than the number of differences (chapters III and IV).

The items listed below are represented in two columns.⁴ The left column refers to Jer a' (chapters 1-28) and the right one to Jer b' (Jer 29-52 and Bar 1:1-3:8). For our purposes it is very important to note that a given rendition occurs only in a certain unit; hence the sign ' after a certain rendition means that the *rendition* occurs only in the below-mentioned verses (in this chapter only in Jer a' and b'). Similarly, the asterisk (*) means that a certain Greek *word* occurs only in the below-mentioned verses (in this chapter only in Jer a' and b').

The examples cluster around a certain rendering of the Hebrew word common to Jer a' and b' which is listed at the beginning of each item. Additional renditions of the Heb are mentioned only when they emphasize the uniqueness of the rendition discussed. When mentioned, such renditions are written after a ---> sign. In this chapter the renditions which are mentioned after the ---> sign refer to the *whole* of the LXX.

Two additional notations are used:

(e): a few renditions (1, 14, 15, 27, 28, 30) reflect an unusual common understanding of a certain Hebrew word and are therefore of special importance for establishing the common basis of Jer a' and b'. Such readings are marked as (e), that is "erroneous," because they reflect an incorrect understanding of the Hebrew word. We shall not enter here into an analysis of what is a 'correct' and what is an 'incorrect' rendering of the Hebrew because such a discussion would lead us beyond the scope of the present study. Suffice it to say that we are interested in the peculiarity of the renderings marked as (e).⁵

(parall): some of the similarities are found in parallel verses occurring in an identical or nearly identical fashion in Jer a' and b' (items 27-31). Although it is possible that these similarities derived from harmonization, internal evidence, as analyzed in item 31, seems to refute such a suspicion. Moreover, it is very unlikely that parallel verses were harmonized, since their vocabulary tends to be different.⁶ Nevertheless, for the sake of accuracy, these examples are denoted "parall".

1. *Unique and Rare Renditions Common to Jer a' and b'*

(1) (ה'הגנב) האש - ה'אנ ! (e)
l:6(σ ω 106^c) 4:10(MS 26; | 39(32):17
ω rel) 14:13(ω 106^c)

---> האש in (ה') האש : δέρμα (Jos 7:7); δ & (Jud 6:22);
πηδαριός (Ez 4:14 20:49(21:5)); οἰμωμοι (Ez 9:8 11:13); δ (2 Ki.
3:10 6:5,15).

Since this is the first example of ch. II, we shall describe our notation in detail:

The word האש in the phrase ה'הגנב האש was rendered in both parts of Jer with ה'אנ. This translation is not found outside Jer (see the sign !); additional renditions in other books of the LXX are listed in the second part of the notation. ה'אנ occurs three times in Jer a' and once in Jer b'. The translation option may be considered erroneous (e).

Ziegler is probably correct in assuming that the original reading was ה'אנ not only in 1:6, 14:13 and 39(32):17, but also in 4:10 where the manuscript support is very weak.⁷

The translator probably derived האש ('alas') from the root הא and, interestingly enough, translated it in accordance with the LXX of Ex 3:14 האש הא האש - έγω εἶμι θ'άων.⁸

(2) הא , הא , הא - ἀπορόπιτω
8:14,14 28(51):6 | 29(47):5

cf. 27(50):30 άπύτω VI 32 and Jud 15:17 הא הא - ἀναύρεσις
οταχόνος.

The two parts of Jer share a peculiar rendering which recurs a few times in the MP (see VI 32). It looks as if the translation of הא and הא with ἀπορόπιτω reflects variants from the root הא (also reflected by the simplex άπύτω in 27(50):30), but probably the translator's *Vorlage* did not contain such variants. Rather, the renderings under investigation reflect the text of the MT which the translator avoided, so to speak, by representing the ambiguous grapheme daleth/resh as a

resh rather than a *daleth*. Even though such an assumption does not suggest itself easily,⁹ further evidence in Jer-LXX also makes it likely that the original translator avoided the roots הא and הא: In 29(47):6 הא is read as הא (έπώθητι). In 6:2 הא is read as הא/רמה/רמה (ר'ה'ש'ש'ש). The translation of the Heb with δωαλέτω in 14:17¹⁰ and with άπτω in 30:15(49:26)¹¹ probably reflects the same uncertainty about the meaning of the Heb.¹²

(3) הא - έκλεκτός
3:19 הא הא - γון έκλεκτύν | 32:20(25:34) הא הא -
and further Hag 2:7 Zach 7:14 (cf. VI 34).

---> Especially έπιθυμητός. Further έπαινος, έπιθύμημα, έπιθυμία, κάλλος, ώρατος.

(4) הא - στερέω
5:3 10:4 | 52:6
and Sir 34:11 50:1.

cf. הא - στερέος in 38(31):11 and Ps 34(35):10.
---> Especially κρατέω.

(5) הא , הא - πεδός !
6:15 | 29:22(49:21)
cf. הא (הא) - πεδός in Is. 17:1 and Ez 26-32 (6 x).

(6) הא - άλαδύω !
4:8 | 29(47):2 30(49):3
| 31(48):39¹² 32:20(25:34)

---> θρηνώ (also Jer 28(51):8), όλοδυω (also Jer 31(48):20, 31). Cf. הא - άλαγαμός in Jer 32:22(25:36); this translation does not occur elsewhere.

(7) הַשְׁמַד - δέρου !

7:25 25:4 | 33(26):5 39(32):33 42(35):14
 51(44):4

---→ δερνύζων 1 Sam 17:16 2 Chr 36:15 Jer 25:3 (cf. הַשְׁמַד - δερνύζω passim).

(8) לְהַשִּׁיב - ἀλεθρος !

28(51):55 | 32:16(25:30)

---→ לְהַשִּׁיב - 'destruction' mainly: ἀπώλεια, ταλαιπωρία. לְהַשִּׁיב - 'noise' mainly: κραυγή, ἦχος.

(9) הַצֵּדִיק !

9:26(25) περικειρόμενος τὰ | 30:10(49:32) κεκαρμένοι πρὸ
 κατὰ πρόσωπον | προσώπου αὐτῶν 32:9(25:23)
 περικεκαρμένους κατὰ πρόσωπον
 αὐτοῦ (+ variants)

Cf. הַצֵּדִיק - πρόσωπον in Lev 13:41.

---→ יָצַד - compounds of כָּדַד.

---→ הַצֵּדִיק - variously (mainly rendering הַצֵּדִיק - 'side', 'corner').

The aforementioned renditions of יָצַד and הַצֵּדִיק occur only here. Furthermore, περικείρω is a *hapax* in the LXX.

(10) סָדַד - ἀποδοκιμάζω

6:30,30 7:29 8:9 14:19 | 38:35(31:36)
 and Ps 117(118):22; further *passim* in Sym.

---→ Especially ἀπωθέω (also Jer 2:37 4:30 6:19), ἐξουθενέω and -ώω.

(11) הָרַח - μεγιστάν

24:8 25:18(49:38) 27(50):35 | 32:5(25:19) 41(34):10
 and 2 Chr 36:18 Prov 8:16 Is 34:12 Sir 8:8.

---→ Especially δοχων (cf. also III 47).

(12) יָפַח - χρεία in בְּן יָפַח יְאִיר !

22:28 σκευος οὐ οὐκ ἔστι | 31(48):38 ἀγγεῖον οὐ οὐκ ἔστι
χρεία αὐτοῦ | χρεία αὐτοῦ

cf. Hos. 8:8 σκευος ἀχρηστον; Sir 11:23 χρεία = יָפַח ?

---→ Only here and in 1 Sam 15:22 18:25 is יָפַח used as 'desire' (in a concrete matter).

(13) יָח - στρουθός !

10:22 | 30:11(49:33)

---→ δράκων, ἐχίνος, σεύρη.

(14) יָחַח, חִוּח ('street(s)', 'open spaces') - ἔξωθεν ! (e)

9:21(20) 11:6 28(51):4 | 40(33):10 44(37):21
 51(44):6,9,17,21 Bar 2:23
 (cf. V 29)

Except for 9:21(20) (יָחַח), 28(51):4 (חִוּחַ) and 44(37):21, ἔξωθεν occurs in the phrase ἐν πόλει (יָח) Ιουδα καὶ ἔξωθεν Ιερουσαλημ.

---→ Mainly δόδος or one of its compounds (cf. δόδος in Jer 5:1 7:17, δόδος in Jer 7:34 14:16, and ἔξωδος in Jer 11:13 - all in the phrase דָּלְשָׁל יְרוּשָׁלַם בְּחִצְרוֹת יְהוּדָה בְּעָרֵי).

The translation of יָחַח, חִוּחַ ('street(s)') with ἔξωθεν probably resulted from the translator deriving the word incorrectly from יָח ('outside').¹⁴ It is not impossible that this mistranslation was brought about by a faulty exegesis of the phrase דָּלְשָׁל יְרוּשָׁלַם בְּחִצְרוֹת יְהוּדָה בְּעָרֵי, resulting from the attribution of a similar meaning to the first and second parts of the phrase.¹⁵

The simultaneous occurrence of "correct" and "incorrect" renderings of the same word within Jer a'--or, for that matter, within Jer--is hardly understandable, but the phenomenon is not without parallel in the LXX and deserves a special investigation.¹⁶

(15) הַעֲלֶה - וָפֶלְעִיָּא (e)

26(46):11 | 37(30):13

cf. Sir 30:23 הַעֲלֶה - וָפֶלְעִיָּא; 41:14 הַעֲלֶה - וָפֶלְעִיָּא.

In the mentioned instances is the translation of הַעֲלֶה derived from the root עָלַ, similar to הַעֲלֶה (הַעֲלֶה) in Sir, also translated with וָפֶלְעִיָּא.¹⁷ In 31(48):2, on the other hand, מַתְּ הַעֲלֶה was misread by the translator as הַעֲלֶה and correctly rendered with ἵαρεῖα.¹⁸ This rendition may be traced to Jer-R. In that case Jer-R left וָפֶלְעִיָּא in 37(30):13 unrevised. See further n. 16.

(16) הַעֲלֶה - וָפֶלְעִיָּא - וָפֶלְעִיָּא !

1:16 | 52:9

---→ Literally: 2 Ki 25:6 Ps 36(37):30 Jer 4:12 12:1.

(17) הַעֲלֶה - various Vorlagen

4:31 - עֵי - נֶחֱם - 6:15 -	34:6(27:8), 43(36):23 44(37):
תִּלְבָּה עֵשֶׂה תִּלְבָּה 6:29 - נֶחֱם - 6:29,	21 49(42):17,22 (MP: מֶתָּה)
24:10 - תִּלְבָּה - 7:28 - תִּלְבָּה (כִּרְחֹב)	51(44):12,18,27 - תִּלְבָּה 51(44):
9:10(9) - יֵצֵא - 14:4 - תִּלְבָּה	27 - תִּלְבָּה 31(48):11 - כִּרְחֹב
14:6, 15:10, 26(46):28 - תִּלְבָּה	38(31):40 - תִּלְבָּה 42(35):19 -
18:14 - עֹזֵב - 28(51):30 - חֲדַל	כִּרְחֹב 43(36):29, Bar 2:23 - שְׂבַח
28(51):58 - יֵעָץ -	Bar 2:18 - כִּלְיָי (?)

הַעֲלֶה occurs more frequently in Jer-LXX than in the other books of the LXX.¹⁷ (only in Ps the verb occurs regularly as a translation of הַעֲלֶה). The verb was thus well-liked by the translators of Jer (cf. Ziegler, *Beiträge*, 20, 52; "Einleitung," 58) and of the MP (see VI 35) as a "stopgap" reflecting sundry *Vorlagen*, in particular when lexical difficulties were met.

(18) הַעֲלֶה - וָפֶלְעִיָּא / הַעֲלֶה / הַעֲלֶה

1:15 הַעֲלֶה - וָפֶלְעִיָּא - מִמְלִיכָה עֲפִינָה -	32:12(25:26) הַעֲלֶה - מִלְכֵי
וָפֶלְעִיָּא 25:9 הַעֲלֶה - מִשְׁפָּחָה -	בַּעֲלֵי הַעֲלֶה - מִמְלִיכָה
מִמְלִיכָה וָפֶלְעִיָּא 26(46):24	
הַעֲלֶה - וָפֶלְעִיָּא - וָפֶלְעִיָּא	

---→ Literally, also in Jer (*passim*).

In a few instances Jer-LXX rendered הַעֲלֶה not with its standard reading as '(the people) of the North', but as '(the people coming) from the North' in accordance with Jeremiah's frequent prophecies referring to a threatening people arriving from the North. Note, however, that in Jer a' בֹּרֶכְךָ is used, in accordance with the regular practice in the LXX, as against הַעֲלֶה in Jer b'.

(19) הַעֲלֶה - וָפֶלְעִיָּא

Occurrences listed in HR: Jer a': 9; Jer b': 16; elsewhere: 35. Occurrences in MS B only: Jer a': 3; Jer b': 11; elsewhere: 17.¹⁹

הַעֲלֶה occurs more often in Jer-LXX than in any other book of the LXX. One notes that וָפֶלְעִיָּא is nearly always used in the LXX instead of הַעֲלֶה in order to preclude the harsh juxtaposition of consonants (see Thackeray, *Grammar*, 138). The original translator of Jer (or the first scribe?) thus used וָפֶלְעִיָּא more than his fellow translators.

(20) הַעֲלֶה - וָפֶלְעִיָּא

10:12		40(33):2
and 1 Chr 22:10.		

---→ Especially εἰσπαύζω (also Jer 26(46):14 28(51):12,15), κατεσθύνω, κατορθόω (also Jer 10:23). κατορθόω renders also הַעֲלֶה, *niph'al*, *polet*, *hithpa'el*, and διορθόω renders הַעֲלֶה, *polet* in Jer 7:3,5 (and not elsewhere).

(21) יָלַד - τεκνοποιέω
 12:2 (יָלַדוּ); MT יילכוּ | 36(29):6 הוֹלִיִּדוּ 38(31):8(7)
 (יָלַדוּ); MT יִלְדוּ
 and Is 65:23 יָלַד; Gen 11:30 יָלַד לֵךְ אֵין - οὐα τεκνοποιεί.

---→ Especially γεννάω, τέκνω, γέννομαι.

(22) רָחַק - πόρρω
 12:2 | 31(48):24 32:12(25:36)
 and Is 66:19.
 Cf. further רָחַק - πόρρωθεν in 2 Ki 20:14 Is 39:3. πόρρω and
 πόρρωθεν further render רָחַק, לָמְרוֹק, לָמְרוֹק, מְרוֹק, מְרוֹק.

---→ Especially words derived from μακρ-.

(23) רָחַק - λίαν
 24:3,3 | 30:8(49:30) 31(48):29
 (Α σφοδρα)
 and five times elsewhere in the LXX.

---→ In the LXX רָחַק is much more frequently rendered by σφόδρα
 (i.a. 10 times in Jer a' and 3 times in Jer b') than by λίαν.

(24) רַע - σύμμε(ε)λικτος !
 27(50):37 | 32:6,10(25:20,24)
 cf. Prov. 11:15 רַע - συμμελίγυμι and Ez 27 *passim* מַעַרַב -
 σύμμελικτος.

---→ επίμικτος.

(25) רָחַק - σύχουμα
 9:10(9) 16:11 27(50):6 | 31(48):11 35(28):11 48(41):
 10,12,15,17 52:7 AC
 (πορεύομαι rel) Bar 1:22

σύχουμα renders רָחַק 10(11) times in both parts of Jer
 (and in addition מָרַק in 29(49):7). Elsewhere in the LXX the
 verb occurs only 10 times (of which 6 times reflect רָחַק). The
 conglomeration of occurrences of σύχουμα in Jer (generally =
 רָחַק) thus sets both parts of the book apart from the remainder
 of the LXX.

(26) חָרַח - κύριος παντοκράτωρ²⁰
 3:19 5:14 15:16 23:16 | 29:29(49:18) 32:13(25:27)
 27(50):34 28(51):5,57 | 37(30):3 SAVC (rel om) 39(32):
 14,19 40(33):11 51(44):7
 Bar 3:1,4
 further: 2 Sam 4 x, 1 Ki 2 x, 1 Chr 3 x, MP 100 x, Sir 1 x.

---→ κύριος σαβαωθ Is 58 x and elsewhere 8 x; κύριος τῶν
 δυνάμεων²¹ 24 x.

Only in Jer and the MP (cf. VI 33) is the Hebrew phrase
 rendered exclusively by κύριος παντοκράτωρ.

(27) רָבִיב - δευώτης ! (parall) (e)
 24:1 | 36(29):2 Bar 1:9 (cf. V 28)
 Cf. Is 42:7 רָבִיב - δευώτης.

The word רָבִיב ('smith')²² was apparently unknown to the
 translators of the LXX: While Jer-LXX vocalized the Heb as רָבִיב
 or רָבִיב, both the translator of 2 Ki 24:14,16 (συγκλείων), Sym
 in Jer 36(29):2 (συγκλείων) and Lucian in 2 Ki 24:14
 (συγκλείστης) read רָבִיב.²³

The similarity between the two parts of Jer is more strik-
 ing in view of the fact that δευώτης itself occurs elsewhere
 only once (Gen 39:20 -רָבִיב).

(28) רָחַק - ήνω ! (parall) (e)
 23:19 | 37(30):23, both: ἐπὶ (τοῦς)
 ἄσπετις ἦσει

Only here in the LXX was ἰνῆ ('to whirl') rendered with ἴλω. ²⁴ This rendition may have been influenced by the meaning 'to occur' of ἰνῆ in post-Biblical Hebrew (cf. Levi, s.v.).

(29) יָהָר - ἔκδιδώω ! (parall)
27(50):44 | 29:20(49:19)

---→ ἔξάγω, προφιδάω, τρέχω.

(30) הִלְעִיךְ - ἀνθίστημι (parall) (e)
27(50):44 | 29:20(49:19)
and further Job 9:19.

---→ הִלְעִיךְ does not occur elsewhere in the OT.

Because τρεῖς was frequently rendered in the LXX with ἀνθίστημι, the translators of Jer and Job must have derived ἰλιεῖν somehow from τρεῖς, or otherwise their *Vorlagen* differed from MT. ²⁵ The latter assumption may be supported by the rendition of אָג and סֵם in 29:20 (49:19): ὑψίστημι.

2. Rare Greek Words Common to Jer a' and b'

Jer a' and b' share several Greek words which recur rarely, if at all, in the LXX. Several of these words also reflect rare or unique renditions. The unique words are indicated with an asterisk (*).

(31) ἐγχευρέω²⁶
18:22 שָׁחַח כָּרָו - ἐνεχεύομαι | 29:17(49:16) - אָשַׁח
לֹדְיוֹן (ἐνεχέωσαν S*) = כָּרָו
שָׁחַח²⁷ 28(51):12 חָסַח
(S* ἐγχευρέω)
and further: 2 Chr 23:18 ...וַיִּבְרַח...וַיִּשְׁמַח - ἐνεχεύομαι (-ισεν B^c)
δὲ ἀχειρόσ.

ἐγχεύομαι* (parall)
23:20 (הָשִׁיב; מַתְּחִיל) | 37(30):24 מַחֲזִיב

---→ מַחֲזִיב - variously, i.a. βδέλυγμα (also Jer 11:15), ὄργη (also Jer 28(51):11).
---→ מַחֲזִיב - especially nouns from ἄσπε- and νομ-. Cf. further Jer 13:27 ἀπαλλοτριώσας.

The fact that the verb ἐγχευρέω is unique to Jer-LXX indicates that the word must have been an organic part of its first stratum. None of its occurrences could have been secondarily harmonized with the others because it renders three different verbs in Jer a' and b'. It seems reasonable to postulate the same original status for ἐγχεύομαι since it does not occur outside Jer-LXX. However, since ἐγχεύομαι occurs in two parallel passages in Jer a' and b', one passage could have been harmonized with the other. Moreover, such an assumed harmonization is very unlikely because 23:20 and the parallel verse 37(30):24 are differently phrased in Greek. Moreover, the fact that the cognate verb ἐγχευρέω was part of the OG of Jer considerably strengthens the first assumption.

(32) וַיִּבְרַח - ἀμφοδον* (parall?)
17:27 | 30:16(49:27)

There exists a double agreement between Jer a' and b':

1. In both verses ἀμφοδον denotes a 'block of houses surrounded by streets' (see LSJ, s.v., and Thackeray, *Septuagint*, 34) and not 'street', ²⁸ a meaning which occurs more frequently (see the lexica, esp. Preisigke; the "Three" use ἀμφοδον as an equivalent of ἄλυσ).

2. Apparently the majority of the LXX translators were ignorant of the meaning of וַיִּבְרַח (the various renditions are conveniently listed by Blake²⁹). In Jer a' and b', on the other hand, ἀμφοδον approaches our understanding of וַיִּבְרַח.³⁰

(33) מחפכת - καταράκτης !
20:2,3 | 39(29):26³¹

Ancient and modern sources are at variance about the meaning of מחפכת, which occurs only rarely in the OT.

The equivalent in Jer-LXX of מחפכת, καταράκτης, should probably be understood as 'dungeon' (thus Schleusner³²). Several sources took מחפכת also as 'dungeon',³³ while others understood it as 'basement',³⁴ 'room',³⁵ or as an instrument used for torture such as 'stocks'.³⁶

(34) כַּלְנִיִּם - χαυώνες or sim.* (parall)

7:18 | 51(44):19

---> Both the Hebrew word and its Hellenized transliteration occur only here.

(35) חַפְצֵי - χρημετίζω*
5:8 | 38(31):7

---> μερατίζω (Jer 27(50):11),³⁷ ἀγαλλιάω, ταράσσω, βοάω, χαίρω.

See also: χρημετισμός*

8:6 - מְלֹחֶה (?) 8:16 - מַצְהֵרָה |
13:27 - מַצְהֵרָה;
and further Am 6:7 - מְרִיחַ (cf. VI 21).

(36) יְטַמְּאֵם, יְטַמְּאֵם*

יְטַמְּאֵם: 6:23 27(50):42 - | יְטַמְּאֵם: 29:17(49:16) - יְרִיחַ³⁸
אֲכָרִי

(37) סַמְמָא*

22:19 - סַב | 29:21(49:20) (συνμψύζω AQ,
σύννεμι S) - סַב 31(48):33 -
פִּסַס

(38) προμαχών
5:10 - שְׂרֵיטוֹתַי (MT) שֹׁרֵר - חֹרֶב 40(33):4 - חֹרֶב³⁹
and Ez 4:2 - דִּיק (cf. VI 55).

(39) ἀλγερός*

10:19 - נַחְלָה (מכתי) | 37(30):12 - נַחְלָה (מכתך)
| 37(30):13 לְמַזְרֵר - עַל־עַל ἀλγερόν
Cf. Jer 4:19 אֲחִילָה (Q: אֲחִילָה - ἀλγῶ; this translation does not occur elsewhere).

ἀλγερός is very rare in Greek literature (*Thesaurus*).

(40) ἀπολογέομαι*

12:1 - רִיב | 38(31):6 נִצְרִיִם - ἀπολογοῦμενοι

ἀπολόγημα*

Cf. further:
20:12 - רִיב

(41) τρομαλία

13:4 16:16 - נִקִּי | 29:17(49:16) - חֹנִי
and further Jud 6:2 - מְנַהֵרָה; Jud 15:8,11 - פִּיטֵי.

(42) ἀποικισμός*

26(46):19 (S* ἀποικία) - נִלְהָה | 31(48):11 - נִלְהָה 50(43):11,11
| Bar 2:30,32 - שְׂבִי - שְׂבִי (cf. V 31)

---> לְהָה and נִלְהָה were usually rendered with ἀποικία and ἀφικαλώσῃα (also in Jer).

(43) ἀμελέω*

4:17 - מְרַה | 38(31):32 - בְּעַל־עַל⁴⁰

ἀμελῶς*

Cf. further:
| 31(48):10 - רְמִיחַ

(44) פְּלִקְלִימָא

18:22 - לכד - 20:17 - הרה | 41(34):3 - פשח
and Hos 9:11 - הריני - Job 18:10 - מלכודת. See also VI 36.

(45) פְּלִקְלִימָא

20:9 (מַלְכִּימָא) | 31(48):31 - קלה
and 2 Sam 24:14 (not in MT); Sir 51:7 - סריב.

NOTES

CHAPTER II

1. See A. Rahlfs, *Lucians Rezension der Königsbücher*, *Septuaginta-Studien* 3 (Göttingen 1911) 192ff.
2. See Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 246ff. who discussed isolated readings of the "Three" in order to establish that Aq and Sym depend upon *kaige*-Th. It may be added that better proof of such a relationship can be provided through comparison of running texts. This is possible for the book of Psalms with the aid of texts published by G. Mercati, *Psalterii Hexapli Reliquiae* (Vatican 1958), as well as for the Aquila text of 2 Ki published by F. C. Burkitt, *Fragments of the Book of Kings according to the Translation of Aquila* (Cambridge 1897). The present writer's own pilot studies performed on both texts support Barthélemy's assumptions.
3. By the same method the present writer has attempted to prove that the Giessen Papyri 13, 19, 22 and 26 of Deut and the Samaritan inscription from Saloniki contain a revision of the LXX rather than a translation of the Samaritan Pentateuch, see # 78 (1971) 355-383 and 81 (1974) 43-48.
4. The following items adduced in this chapter were mentioned by Thackeray and Ziegler: Thackeray, "Gr.Tr.Jer.", 253-54: 15, 32, 36, 37; *id.*, *Septuagint*, 33: 1, 7, 14, 26, 34; Ziegler, *Beiträge*, 30: 6.
5. These and other examples cited in ch. II could undermine our working hypothesis, according to which Jer-R would probably have revised these words in Jer b'. However, this and other inconsistencies of Jer-R are explained below (pp. 44-45) as one of the traits of all revisions of the LXX.
6. For examples see Tov, *Diss. Jeremiah*, chapter III, appendix 1. Lists of parallel verses are provided by Spohn, *Jeremias Vates*, 9; Workman, *Jeremiah*, ch. V; S. R. Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the OT* (N.Y. 1898) 276-277; Giesebrecht, *Jeremia*, XXXVIII.
7. Spohn, Streane (both *ad loc.*) and Rahlfs read ω (better ω) in all four verses. Though supported by γTH $\text{HHN}-\omega$ $\kappa\upsilon\text{p}\epsilon$ in 2 Ki 6:5, 15 and $\text{HHN}-\omega$ in 2 Ki 3:10, this conjecture has a strong foundation only in Jer 4:10. It is unlikely, however, that the same textual development ($\omega \rightarrow \delta \omega$) took place in three different verses in Jer. Moreover, this substitution did not occur in the MSS of the above-mentioned verses 2 Ki 3:10, 6:5, 15, nor in Jer 6:6, 22:13, 18, 23:1, 41(34):5, in all of which ω reflects γH (Jer 6:6 MH $\text{H}\gamma\text{H}$). On ω and ω see also Walters, *Text*, 229-236.
8. Cf. Ziegler, *Beiträge*, 40 (where earlier literature is mentioned) and further Thackeray, *Septuagint*, 34; C. H.

Dodd, *The Bible and the Greeks* (London 1935) 4; Fritsch, *Pentateuch*, 22-23; F. Büchsel, *ThWNT*, s.v. εἶμι, δ ὦν.

9. For the background of this and similar renderings, see the present author's "On 'pseudovariants' Reflected in the Septuagint," *JSS* 20 (1975) 165-177.

10. The employment of διαλείπω in Jer-LXX suggests that the translator availed himself of this verb as a "stopgap," like ἐκλείνω (cf. II 17), indicating that he had experienced difficulty.

11. ...ἰδὲν...πρὸς... The repetition of πρὸς indicates that the translator either was ignorant of the Heb or had no recourse to Greek synonyms (see Ziegler, *Beiträge*, 29, n. 1, where this practice is further exemplified). The former possibility is more likely.

12. In 31(48):2 and 32:23(25:37) the Heb is correctly represented by πᾶς. These renditions may have been inserted by Jer-R. Cf. further n. 16.

13. ...ἰδὲν...πρὸς... (v) Katz and Ziegler] ἡρῶν ολολύγατε L'; κατηλάξε(v) (+ X ολολύγατε O Arm = MT) rel. Cf. Ziegler, *Beiträge*, 30. The fact that ἀλαλάω is characteristic of Jer-LXX, in its turn supports the proposed emendation of the corrupted reading found in nearly all MSS.

14. Thackeray, *Septuagint*, 34, surmised that the translator misrepresented ἡρῶν(ἡρῶν) as ἔξωθεν because ἡρῶν was abbreviated in his *Vorlage* as 'הוּ. However, while a scribe might conceivably have abbreviated ἡרֹוֹן in the recurring phrase יְרוּשָׁלַיִם וְהַר הַרְיֵהוּ וְהַר הַרְיֵהוּ, the abbreviation of ἡרῶν in 28(51):4 cannot be accounted for, despite G. R. Driver's few examples of abbreviated pronominal suffixes described in *Textus* 1 (1960) 117. Moreover, while ἡרῶν-'outside' is almost exclusively written *plene* in MT, the occurrences in Jer of ἡרῶν-ἔξωθεν are written defectively. This fact makes Thackeray's assumption even more difficult.

On the other hand, Thackeray's explanation accounts well for the simultaneous occurrence of "correct" and "incorrect" renditions in the same book. According to his explanation, in some instances the translator might have identified 'הר' correctly as ἡרῶν, while in others he failed to do so.

15. See especially the construction of 40(33):10 εὐπόμενος ἰουδα καὶ ἔξωθεν ἰερουσαλημ ταῖς ἀποσημέναις (בערי חמשותף ירושלים ובתורה ירושלים) which may indicate that the two parts were considered coordinate.

16. See, e.g., the different renditions of העלה and הרחיב in Jer (II 15,32) and the differences between the LXX translations of Is 18:2 and 18:7.

17. According to J. Ziegler, *ZAW* 77 (1958) 281, the grandson of Sirach depended in this instance on Jer-LXX.

18. ...ἰδὲν...πρὸς... οὐκ ἔστιν εἶτε ἰατρῆα Μωσῆ Ziegler] ἀγαυοτάτα Μωσῆ QVO...; ἰατρῆα Μωσῆ ἀγαυοτάτα B-S A C'...

γαυοτάτα...ἰατρῆα Μωσῆ L'. The greater part of the MSS thus contain a doublet composed of ἰατρῆα (= ἰατρῆ) and ἀγαυοτάτα (= ΜΤ ἡρῶν). ἰατρῆα unquestionably was the original rendition in this verse, subsequently approximated to ΜΤ (thus also Ziegler, *Beiträge*, 102).

19. As expected, for nearly all occurrences of ἄναξ, variants of τὰς are recorded.

20. Dodd, *op. cit.* (n. 8), 19, surmised that παντοκράτωρ, as a rendition of הַרְבֵּי(הוּ), was coined on the model of κοσμοκράτωρ, meaning "the one God who rules and controls all as these powers are δύναμεις, κύβητος παντοκράτωρ may be regarded as a paraphrase (rather than a translation) of הַרְבֵּי הוּ in the sense represented by κύβητος τῶν δυνάμεων." See further AR, s.v.; W. Michaelis in *ThWNT* 3, 913-14; W. H. Roscher, *Ausführliches Lexicon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie* (Leipzig 1897-1909), s.v. and recently B. Lifshitz, *Donateurs et Fondateurs dans les Synagogues Juives* (Paris 1967) 28-29.

21. This is also Th's main rendition (see Schmitt, *Theodotion*, 27) adopted by O (see Sois.-Soin., *Zusätze*, 154). That of Aq was σπαριῶν (see Ziegler in Katz-Ziegler, "Aquila Index", 275; Katz, *Philos Bible, etc.* (Cambridge 1950) 149 and that of Sym was ...σπαριῶν and ...δυνάμεων (Katz, *ib.*).

22. For the various opinions on the meaning of this ἄβυθ and its relationship to ἄβυθ - 'dungeon', see Rudolph, *Jeremia*, 144.

23. Cf. ἄβυθ - σφυγμῶν in Aq's translation of Lam 2:7.

24. Cf. the translation of ἄβυθ with ἔρχομαι by Sym in 2 Sam 3:29 and also that of ἄβυθ with σπυγμῶν in Jer 38(31):4, 13. The latter equivalent, however, is problematic.

25. A third possibility must be excluded because it holds true for Jer only: In Jer the translation may have resulted from a parallelism of ἄβυθ...ἄβυθ - ἀντιστήσεται...στήσεται.

26. For the interchangeability of ἐγχειρόω, -ῶν and -ῶν, see Ziegler, "Einleitung," 110.

27. Having erroneously read ἡρῶν as ἡρῶν, the translator adapted the verb to its object. A similar development occurred in Jer 18:20 ἡρῶν ἡρῶν - συνελάλησαν δὴματα and Ps 118(119):85 ἡρῶν...ἡρῶν - δὴνησαν...δδολεσχίος. See M. L. Margolis, *ZAW* 77 (1907) 249.

28. However, ἀμφοδὸν in Jer 17:27 was incorrectly understood as 'street' by the Old Latin *apud* Tyconius (*Itinera*; see F. C. Burkitt, *The Book of the Rules of Tyconius, Texts and Studies* III, 1 [Cambridge 1895] 62) and by E. A. Sophocles, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods* (Boston 1870) s.v. ἀμφοδὸν, quoting Jer 17:27 as 'street'.

29. R. P. Blake, *JThSt* 25 (1932) 254ff. See also Seeligmann, *Isaiah*, 52; P. J. Heawood, "הַרְבֵּי וְהַרְבֵּי", *JThSt* 13 (1911-2) 66-73; G. B. Caird, *JThSt* 19 (1968) 460-61.

30. אַרְבֵּי is further rendered in Jer with θεμέλιον (6:5), γῆ (9:21(20)) and ναός (37(30):18).

31. אַרְבֵּי הַרְבֵּי וְהַרְבֵּי אֵל - εἰς τὸ ἀπόλειμμα καὶ εἰς τὸν καταρκάτην. The word order of the LXX's *Vorlage* was probably inverted (thus Streane, *Jeremiah*, 206 and BDB, s.v. כַּחֲמֵשׁ).

32. "Locus subterraneus quo pro carcere utebantur." Schleusner's explanation was not documented by him but the assumed meaning 'dungeon' may have been extended from another meaning of καταρκάτης, viz. 'porticulis' (see LSJ, s.v.; in the LXX καταρκάτης also renders אַרְבֵּי - 'sluice'; cf. Sym פְּלִיטָה - καταράματα in Is 25:11).

33. 1. LXX 2 Chr 16:10 and Sym in Jer 36(29):26 : φυλακή.
2. Aq in Jer 36(29):26 : καταράτην (leg. καταρήτην ? Ziegler, *Jer.*; See LSJ, s.v.), cf. Sym in Job 36:6 אַרְבֵּי - אַרְבֵּי (trap door').

3. The Peshitta in Jer 29:26 : אַרְבֵּי אַרְבֵּי.
4. The Vulgate in Jer 20:2,3 29:26 : nervus.
5. "Iosippos" in Jer 20:2 : δεσμοτήριον.
6. Cf. also Rashi ad Jer 20:2.

34. Targum to Jer : כִּיפְתָה.

35. The Peshitta in Jer 20:2,3 : אַרְבֵּי.

36. 1. Sym in Jer 20:2 βασανιστήριον (86, Syn).
2. Sym in Jer 20:3 στεβλωτήριον (86) and in 20:2 (Jerome: "Bas. sive στροβλ.").

3. R. David Qimhi on 20:2.
4. BDB, s.v.
5. Rudolph, *Jeremia*, 118.
6. LSJ, *Suppl.*, s.v.: "dub.sens., perh. stocks or pillory, LXX Je. 36(29).26".

37. F. Wutz's emendation (χρητέλλω) in *Die Transkriptionen von der Septuaginta bis zu Hieronymus* (Stuttgart 1924) 34 was rightly rejected by Ziegler, *Beiträge*, 25.

38. See further 30(49):4 הַרְבֵּי הַרְבֵּי - φύγατες ἀρούας 239] τῆς ἀρούας L-51 311 Bo Tht; τῆς ἀρούας rel. Although τῆς ἀρούας has good manuscript support in this verse, its correctness may be doubted in view of the translation of the same Hebrew word with the similar θυγάτηρ ἀρουμένων in 38(31):22. The majority reading in 30(49):4 must have developed from ἀρούα under the influence of the adjacent 29:17(49:16). Cf. further Ziegler, *Beiträge*, 48-49 and Walters, *Text*, 294, n. 88.

39. This rendition was probably influenced by that of אַרְבֵּי with χόραξ in the same verse.

40. This rendition should be considered a free, contextual translation.

CHAPTER III

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN JER A' AND B' PROBABLY RESULTING

FROM JER-R'S REVISIONS IN JER B'

The first translators who embarked upon translating the Hebrew Bible chose their Greek equivalents mainly on the basis of linguistic identifications, but they were also guided by literary and contextual considerations and several of their choices were tendentious. The results of the translators' search for equivalents are not the same in the various books of the Canon, nor in the different semantic fields. One of the reasons leading to these differences is the fact that within the books of the LXX there are opposing tendencies with regard to the representation of individual Hebrew words. "Literal" translators not only attempted to choose those equivalents which would express the meaning of the Hebrew word in the best way, but they also tended to use the same rendition as much as possible. In this way a translator's jargon developed in which certain Hebrew roots and words were represented with one standard ("stereotyped") translation. This system facilitated the translation process and, in a way, was also of help to the reader. Less literal and "free" translators used only that part of the system which was needed to make their translation understandable within the framework of the LXX--mainly some basic concepts and frequently occurring words--but they often deviated from it in accordance with the special requirements of the context and their feeling for style.

Differences in the translation vocabulary should be expected not only between different books, but also within any given unit that may be considered homogeneous. For a translator may vary the use of translation equivalents, often without any apparent reason and often in accordance with literary or contextual considerations and/or exegetical traditions.¹

As a result of this situation, consistency in the representation of a given Heb l with Gk l is not to be expected in any single book of the LXX. Only very literal translations, such as Aquila's revision of the LXX, may be regarded as

consistent with regard to the employment of translation equivalents. By way of example, we may mention the verb לָמַח which is represented in the various books of the LXX with more than 80 equivalents, while in Aquila's revision mainly with πορεύουσα.

It needs, therefore, hardly to be stressed that one should be very cautious in drawing conclusions with regard to a peculiar distribution of translation options within any book of the LXX. Only when the distribution does not reflect types of variation or exegesis may it be regarded as reflecting a special situation. Conversely, if the variation follows a clear pattern, it cannot be considered mere "variation" and an alternative explanation is needed. Such, apparently, is the case in Jer-LXX:

It seems to us that the differences in translation equivalents of one Hebrew word within the book of Jer cannot be ascribed to mere variation,² nor do they result from the occasional insertion in Jer-LXX of readings from other translations. The differences are too numerous and they follow a relatively clear pattern: Many Hebrew words, roots, and phrases are rendered in Jer 1-28 differently from their translation in chapters 29-52 and Bar.

It is improbable that after ch. 28 a single translator would have changed his vocabulary as drastically as the observed evidence would necessitate; it was therefore suggested by Thackeray, "Gr.Tr.Jer.", that two different translators were responsible for Jer a' and b'. However, we have attempted to demonstrate in the preceding chapter that Jer a' and b' exhibit many important agreements which make such a two-translator theory untenable. We therefore turn to an alternative explanation of the facts which takes account both of the differences and of the agreements: The two sets of data are best explained by a theory which supposes a partial revision of the book of Jer, or, more precisely, a revision of Jer-LXX, now preserved only in part. We hope to demonstrate in this chapter that it was Jer b' which was revised. The *per contra* assumption that Jer a' embodies a revision (of a different kind) is discussed in appendix 1 to this chapter.

Data provided in this chapter are intended to show how a Hebrew word was rendered in Jer a' mainly by Gk 1, while in Jer b' mainly by Gk 2. We hope to demonstrate that the relationship between Gk 1 and Gk 2 is that of an original to its revision. It is further assumed that, as a rule,³ the Gk 1 rendition originally formed part of the OG of Jer b'.⁴

Differences⁵ between Jer a' and b' are classified according to the presumed tendencies of Jer-R's revision, viz.,

1. more precise renditions;
2. corrections of erroneous renditions;
3. stereotyped (literal) replacing non-stereotyped (free) renditions;
4. renditions reflecting the Heb more consistently;
5. other changes.

Although we described above in a general way what we mean by 'stereotyped', the characterizations 'literal' and 'stereotyped' need to be discussed more thoroughly, though not in the present context.⁶

Our suggestion is not without difficulties. They may be summarized as the following:

1. A major problem in the recognition of Jer-R as a revised text is the question of what may be expected from a revision of the LXX. Unfortunately, the rich literature on the LXX revisions contains only few descriptions of the revision techniques employed, so that the reader may get an imprecise picture from knowing only one or two revisions.

We shall first attempt to define the essence of the LXX revisions:

A given textual tradition can be considered a revision of the LXX if the following two conditions are met:

- (a) The LXX and the revision share a common textual basis, established by the recognition of distinctive agreements.
- (b) The reviser retouched the LXX in a certain direction, generally towards a more precise reflection of his Hebrew source. Other revisions aim at greater clarity as well as at improvement of the Greek language.

The first of these conditions is met with regard to Jer-R as has been shown in ch. II. The second condition is met once we can show that there exists a common denominator to the various changes which presumably were introduced by Jer-R. It seems to us that this common denominator is a trend towards a more precise and consistent representation of the Hebrew *Vov-lage*. Similar tendencies are found in the "Three" (Aq, Sym and Th), the revisions of Origen and Lucian and, to a lesser extent, in several pre-Hexaplaric revisions such as Pap. Ryl. Gk. 458 of Deut, Pap. Chester-Beatty-Scheide 967 of Ez, Pap. Antinoopolis 8 of Prov, 4QLXX Num, 7QLXX Ex. It is noteworthy that a much smaller number of Greek words was changed in the revisions of the latter kind than in the revisions of the "Three", Origen and Lucian. By way of example, we may quote Ziegler's description of Pap. Chester-Beatty-Scheide 967 of Ez: "Diese Bearbeitung nach dem hebr. Text war keine durchgehende, sondern nur gelegentliche Verbesserung."⁷ It is hard to determine why certain revisions were thorough while others were merely superficial. As a rule the earlier revisions were less thorough than the later ones; beyond this we can say only that the character of the reviser determined the scope of the revision.

Within the framework of the known revisions of the LXX the revision of Jer-R will thus be no exception, if we describe it in the following as a revision which, as far as we know, retouched only a limited number of words.

2. Closely related with the aforementioned problem is the question of the *inconsistency* of the assumed revision of Jer-R. Different renditions of one Hebrew word found in Jer a' and Jer b' are described here as the original rendition and its revision. However, if this assumption is correct, one must acknowledge that the reviser was rather inconsistent, because he left many renditions unrevised which he retouched in other instances. Furthermore, he did not revise certain words which he would have retouched according to what we know about his revision technique (e.g., some of the examples of ch. II, in particular some "incorrect" renditions). Moreover, his revision is characterized by several revisional tendencies which are at

times opposed; contrast, e.g., literal non-stereotyped renditions with stereotyped non-literal renditions (see below).

While recognizing these difficulties, it seems to us that they are not insurmountable because similar phenomena are found in other revisions of the LXX.

A good example of this point is the revision of Lucian. For (the historical) Lucian left many readings unrevised which he retouched in other instances. Moreover, since the days of Rahlfs,⁸ Lucian's revision has been characterized as containing both elements which bring the LXX into closer conformity with MT and elements which are meant to improve the Greek style of the translation. This situation was partly caused by the discrepancy between Lucian's source and his own preferences,⁹ but in practice the two tendencies are incompatible. Another example is the revision of Symmachus, containing both literal elements apparently derived from *kaige*-Th's revision,¹⁰ as well as paraphrastic renditions issuing from Symmachus himself.¹¹ Opposing tendencies of another type are also present within *kaige*-Th: on the one hand one notices stereotyped renditions, such as the translation of מִיָּאִם with ἀπό also when the Heb is used as 'everyone',¹² and on the other hand one finds etymological, non-stereotyped translations such as יָצַב/צָב - στῆλδω (based upon ἵστα - στῆλη),¹³ as well as the unusual, non-stereotyped translation of מִנְּאִם with ἐγὼ εἶμ.¹⁴ The co-existence of literal non-stereotyped renditions and stereotyped non-literal translations in Jer b' should therefore certainly not surprise us.

The list of inconsistencies of the LXX revisions can be extended. However, for us it is of importance to stress that the mere fact of the inconsistencies should not prevent the very assumption that Jer b' contains a revision. The fact that a given revision is inconsistent did not undermine previous analyses of revisions.¹⁵ See further below, pp. 157ff.

As indicated above, we suggest our working hypothesis in spite of the mentioned difficulties because the agreements discussed in ch. II do not seem to leave any other possible explanation of the differences between Jer a' and b'. The evidence is classified according to the presumed tendencies of Jer-R's revision, and those items which are the most

convincing for the assumption of a revision are found at the beginning of each section. The reader who wants to get an impression of the more important examples before reading them in our sequence is advised to read first the data collected in items 1,18,19 and 43.

The data listed below are presented as in the preceding chapter: In this chapter the left column contains renditions of Jer a' which are contrasted to renditions of Jer b' found in the right column. Renditions found only in Jer a' or b' are marked †; Greek words found only in Jer a' or b' are marked *. In this chapter the additional renditions of the Heb mentioned after the sign ----> refer respectively to Jer a' or Jer b' only.

1. More Precise Renditions

Jer-R replaced some renditions of Jer-OG with renditions which in his opinion better expressed the meaning of the Heb.

		(1) <u>הבדל</u> <u>הבדל</u>
<u>ἀφανισμός</u> (18 x)		<u>ἄβατος</u> , noun † (12 x) 16
9:11(10) 10:22 12:11,11		29:14,18(49:13,17) 30:11(49:33)
18:16 19:8 25:9,11,12		32:4,24(25:18,38) 39(32):43 49(42):18
26(46):19 27(50):3,13,23		51(44):6,22 Bar 2:4,23
28(51):26,29,37,41,62;		
this is also the chief rendition of Ez and the only one of the MP (VI 61); elsewhere 2 x.		
----> ἄβατος, adj. 6:8		----> ἔρημος 41(34):22 BSC† (ἄβατος AQVO = Bar 2:23); ἀπόλεια 30(49):2 51(44):12. ἐκστασις 5:30.
12:10 28(51):43; ἀπολία 8:21; ἔρημος 4:27; ἐρήμωσις 4:7; ἐκστασις 5:30.		

Since this is the first example of ch. III, we shall describe our notation in detail. A comparison of the two columns shows that הבדל (הבדל) is differently represented in Jer a' and Jer b'. ἀφανισμός is the main rendition of the Heb in Jer a'

(18 x), where it is in addition rendered seven times in other ways. In Jer b' the Heb is mainly rendered with ἄβατος (12 x); other renditions are used on three occasions.

As indicated by the sign †, the rendition ἄβατος does not occur outside Jer b' (in the three mentioned verses in Jer a', the word is used as an adj.). Jer a's main rendition, ἀφανισμός, is also the main rendition of Ez.

<u>הבדל</u> ('to destroy', 'to be desolate') ¹⁷	
<u>ἀφανίζω</u> (3 x)	<u>ἄβατός*</u> (1 x)
12:11 27(50):21,45 (both <i>הִבְהִי'ל</i>); and frequently in the MP, Ez and Lam (VI 61).	29:21(49:20)
----> ἔρημός 10:25	----> ἔρημός 40(33):10.

Jer-OG's ἀφανισμός ('the act of destroying') has been replaced by Jer-R with ἄβατος (literally 'untrodde¹⁸' because the former does not precisely represent the Heb.¹⁹ Jer-R even went so far as to innovate a corresponding verb ἄβατός, which occurs only here in Greek literature (cf. *Thesaurus*), and which relates to ἄβατος as ἔρημός to ἔρημος, both of which occur frequently in the LXX.

		(2) <u>הבדל</u>
<u>τολαιωρέω</u> (6 x)		<u>ὄλλυμι</u> (7 x)
4:13,20,20 9:19(18) 10:20		29:11(49:10) 30(49):3
12:12;		31(48):1,15,18,20 38(31):2(MT <i>הִבְהִי'ל</i>)
and further 7x in the MP (VI 1) Is 33:1 Ps 16(17):9.		<u>ἀπόλλυμι</u>
----> (ἐξ)ολεθρεύω 5:6		29(47):4;
28(51):53,55		and further Is 23:1,14 Ez 32:12.
		----> ἐξολεθρεύω 29(47):4;
		πλήρωω 30:6(49:28). ²⁰

ταλαιπωρία (2 x)²¹
 6:7 20:8;
 and lxx in the LXX.

ἴπῳ
ταλαιπωρία (2 x)
 6:26 15:8 28(51):56;
 cf. further Mich 2:4 (VI 1).

Since the root ταλαιπωρ- ('to endure hardship')²² does not precisely represent ἴπῳ ('to devastate', 'to plunder'; generally in passive: 'to be destroyed'), it was revised by Jer-R to the stronger (ἀπ)όλλυμι.

The renditions of ἴπῳ are instructive for understanding Jer-R's revision technique: The *nomen agentis* ἴπῳ²³ is reflected in Jer a' (ταλαιπωρία), Jer b' (δλεθρος), and elsewhere²⁴ as a *nomen actionis*.²⁵ In 31(48):8,32 Jer-R presumably altered an earlier ταλαιπωρία to δλεθρος, replacing the translation option, but not altering the basic understanding of the Heb. The latter action was completed only by Ag and Sym.²⁶

γένουτο (3 x)²⁷
 3:19 (not in MT) 11:5 15:11
 (MT ἦμα);
 and thus generally in the LXX.²⁸

(3) ἴμα
ἀληθός! (1 x)
 35(28):6
 Elsewhere ἀληθός renders several times ἴμα, ἴμα and ἴμα.

While ἴμα is rendered in Jer a' with a verb ('let it be'), it is rendered in Jer b' with an appropriate adverb.

(4) ἴμα
ἐπίχλειρον* (3 x)
 17:5 21:5;
 and *passim* in the LXX.
 29:11(49:10) MT ἴμα - ἐπίχλειρον
 Rudolph] MSS δια χλειρον²⁹

31(48):25 (ἐπίχλειρον V)
 34:4(27:5) BSA (βραχύων rel)
 ---→ βραχύων 39(32):17,21
 Bar 2:11.

Jer-R apparently considered ἐπίχλειρον ('that which is above the hand') a more precise rendition of ἴμα than βραχύων although he left this rendition twice unrevised.

ἐπίχλειρον is not attested elsewhere in Greek literature (cf. *Thesaurus*)³⁰ and may have been coined by Jer-R.

(5) ἴμα
μετά (3 x)
 3:7 12:15 24:1;
 and *passim* in the LXX.
ὑστερον + gen.! (4 x)
 36(29):2 38(31):19,19
 47(40):1(?)³¹
 ---→ μετά 35(28):12 38:33(31:32)
 39(32):16 41(34):8
 43(36):27 Bar 1:9.

In place of the stereotyped LXX rendition (ἴ)μα and μετά Jer-R used a rendition which may have been chosen because it shows the etymological connection between (ἴ)μα and ἴμα - ὑστερος.

Jer-R used ὑστερον + gen. in a sense which, according to our lexica,³² is not documented before the LXX.³³ Cf. also VII 4.

(6) ἴμα
τοῦ μα (10 x)
 16:12 17:23,23,24,24,27
 18:10 19:15 23:14
 28(51):62; and *passim* in the LXX.
πρός τὸ μα! (12 x)
 39(32):40 41(34):9 42(35):8,
 9,14 43(36):25 45(38):26
 49(42):13 51(44):5,7
 Bar 1:19 2:5
 ---→ 7:8 ἴμα ἴμα - ὄθεν
 ὄθεν ὄθεν ὄθεν.

The most frequent rendition in the LXX of ἵπλη is that of Jer-OG (τοῦ μή). Since many of the LXX translators felt that this rendition did not adequately express both components of ἵπλη, several new renditions were introduced, especially (1) ὅπως μή, ἵνα μή, ὥστε μή, all starting a final clause, and (2) παρὰ τὸ μή, τὸ παράπαν μή, τοῦ μή εἰς τέλος, τὸ καθόλου μή and πρὸς τὸ μή.³⁴ Yet, none of these more precise renditions outnumber τοῦ μή in any one book of the LXX. Jer-R, on the other hand, was the only translator who almost consistently employed a more precise rendition than τοῦ μή, i.e., πρὸς τὸ μή (τοῦ μή in 33(26):24 was probably left unrevised).³⁵ See further pp. 165-66.

(7) ἵπλη + inf.

<u>finite clause</u> (3 x)	<u>πρὸς τὸ + inf.</u> ! (4 x)
ἵνα 7:18 ὅπως 11:5	34:8,12(27:10,15) 39(32):29,
27(50):34; and <i>passim</i> in	35
the LXX.	

---→ 7:10 Πηγουγεναν ἵπλησιν - ἀπεσήμεθα τοῦ μή ποιῆν.³⁶

Jer-OG's rendition is the usual one in the LXX,³⁷ revised by Jer-R to the more literal πρὸς τὸ + inf.

The evidence gathered in this and the preceding items indicates that in the LXX the use of πρὸς + art. inf. is limited to Jer-R, with the exception of Ex 1:16 where, however, πρὸς governs the dative.

(8) ἵπλη ('to serve someone')

<u>δολεῖω</u> (10 x)	<u>ἐργάζομαι</u> ! (15 x)
2:20 5:19,19 8:2 11:10	34:5,7,9,9,10(27:6,9,11,11,12)
13:10 16:11,13 22:9 25:6;	35(28):14 37(30):8,9 41(34):
and <i>passim</i> in the LXX.	14,18 47(40):9 Bar 1:22
	2:21,22,24
---→ -ὁ ἵπλη - ἐργάζομαι παρὰ	---→ δολεῖω 34:5(27:6)
22:13.	41(34):9 42(35):15 Bar 1:12.

Instead of Jer-OG's equivalent ἵπλη - δολεῖω, Jer-R preferred to render ἵπλη with ἐργάζομαι. This lexical choice is significant because ἐργάζομαι is not used in classical Greek as 'to serve someone'.

Jer-R's choice of this verb may have been motivated by his wish to represent both meanings of ἵπλη ('to carry out work', 'to serve someone')³⁸ with one verb.³⁹ He also may have opted for a verb which was connected with ἵπλη - ἐργον.⁴⁰

(9) ἵπλη

<u>μετανοῶ</u> (4 x)	<u>παύομαι</u> (4 x)
4:28 8:6 18:8,10; and 6 x	33(26):3,13,19 38(31):15
in the MP (see VI 3) and else-	(παρκααλέω B ^{mg} AVC=Matth 2:18);
where 3 x (once in Jer b').	and Is 1:24.

<u>μεταπέλομαι</u> (1 x)	<u>ἀναπαύομαι</u> ! (1 x)
--------------------------	---------------------------

20:16; and *passim* in the LXX.
cf. Gen 5:29 Διαναπαύω.

---→ 15:6 οὐδέη - ἀνήσω αὐτούς = οὐδέη.

Jer-OG's μετανοῶ and μεταπέλομαι, together with παρακαλέω⁴¹ the stereotyped renditions of ἵπλη in the LXX, were revised by Jer-R to (ἀνα)παύομαι.⁴² It is possible that μετανοῶ in 38(31):19 was left unrevised.

Jer-R probably rendered forms of ἵπλη as if they were derived from ἵπλη (generally represented with (ἀνα)παύομαι).⁴³ If so, he made an erroneous revision.

(10) ἵπλη

<u>καίρω</u> (25 x)	<u>χρῶνός</u> ! (3 x)
2:27,28 3:17 4:11 5:24 6:15	29:9(49:8) 37(30):7 38(31):1
8:1,7,15 10:15 11:12,14,14	BSA (καυρός rel)
(MT ἵπλη) 14:8,19 15:11 18:23	
26(46):21 27(50):4,16,20,27,31	
28(51):6,18;	
and further <i>passim</i> in the LXX.	

καρπός (Jer-OG), denoting both 'the right moment' and 'time' (the latter from the Hellenistic period onwards), is a somewhat ambiguous rendition of $\eta\chi$. It was possibly for this reason that Jer-R replaced it with the unambiguous χρόνος. 45

(11) $\psi\iota\theta\epsilon\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$

$\sigma\tau\eta\rho\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$ (1 x)	$\xi\phi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\eta\mu\epsilon\iota$! (1 x)
21:10;	51(44):11
and further Am 9:4 and Ez (9 x);	
cf. VI 68).	$\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\mu\epsilon\iota$! (1 x)
Cf. $\delta\alpha\psi$ - $\sigma\tau\eta\rho\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$ in 17:5	49(42):15
24:6; $\delta\epsilon\iota\lambda$ פניל - $\sigma\tau\eta\rho\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$	$\iota\delta\theta\eta\mu\epsilon\iota$ (1 x)
3:12.	49(42):17;
	and elsewhere in the LXX (3 x).

Jer-OG's free rendition ('to fix') may have been revised by Jer-R to three more precise ones.

2. *Connections of Erroneous Renditions*

Jer-R revised some renditions of Jer-OG, which he presumably considered incorrect. 46

(12) $\gamma\beta\eta$

$\delta\iota\sigma\sigma\kappa\omicron\upsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$! (9 x)	$\sigma\upsilon\gamma\kappa\omicron\tau\tau\omega$! (1 x)
13:14 28(51):20,21,22(3 x),	31(48):12 BSAC' ($\sigma\upsilon\upsilon\tau\eta\rho\acute{\iota}\beta\omega$ rel)
23(3 x); cf. Th in Dan 9:7	
$\gamma\beta\eta$ - $\delta\iota\sigma\sigma\kappa\omicron\upsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$.	

Jer-OG $\delta\iota\sigma\sigma\kappa\omicron\upsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$ ('to scatter') is an incorrect rendering of $\gamma\beta\eta$ ('to shatter'), based upon the meaning of the root in Rabb. Hebrew ('to scatter' = Targum *ad loc.*), of which $\delta\iota\sigma\sigma\kappa\omicron\upsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$ is an equivalent (9:16(15) 10:21 23:1,2). 47 Jer-R corrected this rendition.

(13) $\mu\omicron\tau\eta\sigma\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota$

$\mu\omicron\tau\eta\sigma\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota$! (3 x)	$\mu\omicron\tau\eta\sigma\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota$ (1 x)
8:2 9:22(21) 16:4;	32:19(25:33);
cf. Dan 2:5 $\mu\omicron\tau\eta\sigma\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota$ -	and further 2 Ki 9:37 ($\mu\omicron\tau\eta\sigma\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota$)
$\mu\omicron\tau\eta\sigma\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota$.	Ps 82(83):11 ($\mu\omicron\tau\eta\sigma\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota$).

Jer-OG, ignorant of the precise meaning of $\mu\omicron\tau\eta\sigma\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota$, 48 probably derived it from $\mu\omicron\tau\eta\sigma\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota$ and rendered it in accordance with the context. 50 Jer-R corrected $\mu\omicron\tau\eta\sigma\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota$ to $\mu\omicron\tau\eta\sigma\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota$.

(14) $\lambda\lambda\eta\lambda\eta$

various (3 x)	$\lambda\lambda\eta\lambda\eta$! (1 x)
26(46):9 $\lambda\lambda\eta\lambda\eta$ -	32:2(25:16) BSA ($\epsilon\kappa\mu\alpha\upsilon\upsilon$. rel)
$\lambda\lambda\eta\lambda\eta$ ($\lambda\lambda\eta\lambda\eta$)	
$\lambda\lambda\eta\lambda\eta$ ($\lambda\lambda\eta\lambda\eta$)	
28(51):7 - $\lambda\lambda\eta\lambda\eta$	

Presumably unacquainted with the precise meaning of $\lambda\lambda\eta\lambda\eta$,

Jer-OG rendered it in three different ways:

- In 26(46):9 the Heb is reflected by a "passe partout" translation (cf. III 25), conforming with its context. 51
- In 27(50):38 he vocalized the Heb differently from MT. 52
- The rendition in 28(51):7 may have resulted from ignorance or from a different exegetical tradition (cf. Targ $\lambda\lambda\eta\lambda\eta$).

Jer-R rendered the Heb correctly.

(15) $\lambda\lambda\eta$

$\lambda\lambda\eta$ (2 x)	$\lambda\lambda\eta$ (2 x)
13:19 $\lambda\lambda\eta$ - $\lambda\lambda\eta$ $\lambda\lambda\eta$	39(32):44 and 40(33):13 $\lambda\lambda\eta$
$\lambda\lambda\eta$ - $\lambda\lambda\eta$ $\lambda\lambda\eta$	and $\lambda\lambda\eta$ - $\lambda\lambda\eta$ $\lambda\lambda\eta$
$\lambda\lambda\eta$ $\lambda\lambda\eta$ $\lambda\lambda\eta$	and $\lambda\lambda\eta$ in the LXX.
and $\lambda\lambda\eta$ in the LXX.	

In the OT $\lambda\lambda\eta$ denotes (1) 'a certain region in the South' and (2) 'the South'. Since in the four above-mentioned verses

Heb. כּ

Jer-OG: Gk 1 τάδε (representing the Heb in כּ חמך ח);
 Gk 2 οὕτως generally representing the Heb in other circumstances

Jer-R: Gk 2 οὕτως only.

(18) כּ חמך ח

<u>τάδε λέγει κύριος</u> (58 x)	<u>οὕτως εἶπε κύριος</u> (69 x)
2:31 4:3(οὐτως*) 4:27 5:14	30(49):1 30:6(49:28) 31(48):
6:6,9,16,21,22 7:3,20,21 8:4	1,40 32:1,13,14,18(25:15,27,
9:7,15,23(6,14,22) 10:2,18	28,32) 33(26):2,4,18 34:1,3,
11:3,11,21 12:14 13:1,9,13	16(27:1,4,19) 35(28):2,11,13,
14:15 15:2,19 16:3,5,9	14,16 36(29):4,8,10,21,31,32
17:19,21 18:13 19:3,11,15	37(30):2,5,12(λέγει Α),18
20:4 21:4,8,12 22:1,3,6,11,18	38(31):2,7,15,16,23,36(35)
23:2,15,38 24:5,8 25:8,15(49:	39(32):3,14,15,28,36,42
35) 27(50):18,33 28(51):1,33,	40(33):2,4,10 41(34):2,13,17
58	42(35):17,18 43(36):29,30
	44(37):7,9 45(38):2,3,17
	46(39):16 49(42):9,15,18
	50(43):10 51(44):2,7,11,25,
	30,32(45:2),34(45:4) Bar
	2:21

---> οὕτως λέγει κύριος 14:10
 (εἶπεν S) 21:7 23:16.

Since an investigation of the renderings of כּ חמך ח should not be separated from an examination of all *verba dicendi* with כּ, the following chart lists the renderings of (1) כּ + *v.d.* (= *verba dicendi*) (חמך, חמך, חמך, חמך), excluding renderings of the formula כּ חמך ח, listed in (2).

	(1) <u>כּ</u> חמך ח		(2) <u>כּ</u> חמך ח			
	a	b	a	b	c	d
Gen	4		1	1		
Ex	2	2		11		
Num	1	1		2		
Jos				3		
Jud		1	1	2		3 ⁶¹
Reigns a'		5		1		
b'b'		1		2		
b'c'	1	1		3		1 ⁶⁰
c'c'	2	4		15		
c'd'		2		28		1
1 Chr	1		1	1		1
2 Chr	3		3	5		3
MP				43		
Is a'	3		4	13		4
Is b'			21	6		
Jer a'	2		3	58		
Jer b'		2	2	3		69
Ez				122		2

The stereotyped LXX rendition of כּ חמך ח, also when connected with a *v.d.*, is οὕτως (1a). In this situation, however, the rendering with τάδε (1b) is just as frequent because the Hebrew *v.d.* + כּ חמך ח is best represented with a Greek *v.d.* + τάδε. The same applies to the formula כּ חמך ח, whose predominant rendition τάδε λέγει δέτω (2b) is used also in classical Greek as 'he says/said the following' (LSJ, s.v. λέγω III,8).

In addition to the predominant LXX rendition of כּ חמך ח כּ חמך ח, τάδε λέγει δέτω (2b), the LXX translators used three more literal renditions: in renditions 2a, c and d the present tense was replaced by the aorist and/or כּ חמך ח is represented with its stereotyped equivalent, with οὕτως.⁶² Only in two translation units is the non-stereotyped rendition of the phrase outnumbered by more stereotyped ones:
 Is b' οὕτως λέγει : τάδε λέγει = 21:6.⁶³
 Jer b' οὕτως εἶπε : τάδε λέγει = 69:3.

While the relationship between the two parts of Is needs further study, it is reasonable to assume that Jer-R's renditions bear the mark of a revision.⁶⁴

It is noteworthy that the known revisers of Jer-I,XX, while generally leaving *τάδε λέγει κύριος* and *οὕτως εἶπε κύριος* un-revised, often altered *οὕτως εἶπε κύριος* to *τάδε λέγει κύριος*,⁶⁵ probably because the latter is the main LXX rendition. Likewise, the "Three", O and L added *τάδε λέγει κύριος* to the LXX in many asterized passages in Jer.⁶⁶ *τάδε λέγει κύριος* is also in other parts of the LXX their most frequent rendition.⁶⁷ It is remarkable that in the reproduction of 'ה אמר כה Jer-R's lexical choice was more literal than those of the other revisers of the LXX.

(19) אַחַר־מֵתִים

<u>θεοὶ ἀλλότριου</u> (12 x)	<u>θεοὶ ἕτερου</u> (7 x)
1:16 5:19 (εἕτερου A) 7:6,9,18	39 (32):29 42 (35):15 (ἀλλοτριου SA)
11:10 13:10 16:11 19:4,13	51 (44):3,5,8,15 (om BS)
22:9 25:6;	Bar 1:22;
and further Hos 3:1 (VI. 2) and elsewhere 6 x.	and further <i>passim</i> in the LXX.
---→ θεοὶ ἕτερου 16:13 (ἀλλοτριου QV).	

Jer-R substituted the stereotyped rendition of *הַמָּתִים* for Jer-OG's rendering.⁶⁸

(20) יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ

<u>προσέχω τὸ οὖς (τὰ ὦτα)</u> (3 x)	<u>κλέψω τὸ οὖς (τὰ ὦτα)</u> (4 x)
7:24,26 25:4;	41 (34):14 42 (35):15 51 (44):5
and Is 55:3 Dan 9:18.	Bar 2:16;
	and <i>passim</i> in the LXX.
---→ κλέψω τὸ οὖς 17:22.	

The employment of *προσέχω τὸ οὖς* in classical Greek probably influenced Jer-OG in the choice of this non-stereotyped rendition, subsequently altered by Jer-R.

(21) יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ

<u>ἐναντίον</u> (2 x)	<u>πρὸς + ἀφ'αλλήλων</u> (5 x) ⁶⁹
7:30 (ἐναντίον AQ) 18:10	34:4 (27:5) 39 (32):30 41 (34):15
<u>ἐνώπιον</u> (1 x)	47 (40):5 Bar 1:22;
7:11	and <i>passim</i> in the LXX.
	---→ ἐναντίον 47 (40):4
	Bar 1:12; dat. 33 (26):14. ⁷⁰

Both renditions are well-represented in the whole LXX, cf. Johannesohn, *Präpositionen* 191, 196.

While leaving three renditions untouched, Jer-R chose to express the two constituents of the preposition with their stereotyped renditions.⁷¹

(22) יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ

<u>ἐναντίον</u> (6 x)	<u>κατὰ πρόσωπον</u> (20 x)
1:17 2:22 15:9 18:23 19:7	29:20 (49:19) 33 (26):4 37 (30):20
25:17 (49:37)	38:37 (31:36) 41 (34):15,18
<u>ἐνώπιον</u> (1 x)	42 (35):5,19 43 (36):7,9,22
7:10	44 (37):20 49 (42):2 51 (44):10
	52:12,33 Bar 1:11 2:10,14,19
	---→ εἰς πρόσωπον 30 (49):5;
	ἐναντίον 47 (40):10 Bar 2:28;
	πρότερος 35 (28):8,8 41 (34):5.

κατὰ πρόσωπον (5 x)

18:17,20 24:1 27 (50):8,44

πρὸ προσώπου (4 x)

9:13 (12) 15:1,19 21:8

Contrary to Jer-OG, Jer-R for the most part rendered *יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ* as *κατὰ πρόσωπον*, which faithfully represents the two components of the Heb.⁷²

It should be noted that Jer-R substituted *ἐναντίον* not only as an equivalent of *יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ*, but also of *יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ* (III 21) and of *יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ* (III 27).

All the renditions occur *passim* in the LXX.

(23) קַיִן הָרַחַקδέχομαι παιδεύαν (4 x)

2:30 5:3 7:28 17:23;

and Zeph 3:2,7.

Cf. also Prov. 1:3 δέχομαι

στροφῆς λόγων.

(έκ) λαμβάνω παιδεύαν (2 x)

39(32):33 ἐλαβεῖν (εἶτι λαβεῖν

BSA) 42(35):13 λαμβάνω;

and further Prov 8:10.

Jer-OG's δέχομαι correctly rendered קַיִן הָרַחַק denoting 'to receive' in the above-mentioned expression.⁷³ Jer-R employed the stereotyped rendition of קַיִן הָרַחַק ('to take') - (έκ) λαμβάνω.

(24) Variousέχω (6 x)

3:3 - עַד 9:8(7) - וַיֵּחַ 15:18

17:5 מְבַח - ἐπιείδα έχω 18:15 - וְ

27(50):42 - פִּיִּתִּיחַ

Four of the six occurrences of έχω represent non-stereotyped renditions of the Heb. Since this use is not found in Jer b', it may be assumed that the reviser eliminated the use of έχω for this reason.

(25) Variousπαρασκευάζω (5 x)

6:4 מְקַלְמֵי עַלְיָהּ קְדָשׁוֹ - παρασκευάσαθε

ἐπ' αὐτὴν εἰς πόλεμον

12:5 מִיִּזְבֵּחַ אֶת הַחֹהֵלֶק - παρασκευάση

έφ' ἱεροῦς⁷⁴

26(46):9 הַכֹּכַב יִלְלֵךְ וְהַחֶמְדָּה - παρασκευά-

σατε (κατασκ. Α) τὰ ἄρματα⁷⁵

27(50):42 מְקַלְמֵי... עַד - παρασκευ-

σαμέν... εἰς πόλεμον

28(51):11 מִיִּזְבֵּחַ הַבְּרָרָה - παρασκευάζετε

τὰ τοξόματα

Occurring in only six additional places in the LXX, this verb was clearly cherished by Jer-OG. The mentioned examples show that Jer-OG availed himself of this verb particularly when he felt uncertain about the meaning of the Heb. The broad meaning of παρασκευάζω made it an adequate "passe-partout" rendition.⁷⁶

Since this general use of παρασκευάζω is not found in Jer b', it was probably eliminated by Jer-R.

(26) קָדַשׁκατοικέω : *passim*κατοικέομαι (10 x)

2:15 4:7 6:8(-τίζω B) 9:11

(10) 17:6 22:6 27(50):13

(-τίζω QV), 39 28(51):29,37;

and the MP, Is and Ez, cf.

VI 69.

κατοικέω : *passim*

---→ In Jer a': especially

καθίζω, κἀθήμαι.

---→ In Jer b': especially

ένοικέω, καθίζω, κἀθήμαι.

Jer-OG often represented active forms of קָדַשׁ with κατοικέομαι because either the *Vorlage* has a passive meaning,⁷⁸ or because the translator chose to render the phrases קָדַשׁ and קָדַשׁ יִלְלֵךְ with passive forms (see III 28). Jer-R possibly eliminated this use of κατοικέομαι (cf. 30(37):18 and the examples mentioned in item 28).

(27) לֹא יִשְׁתָּ - διαρτάνω +...

(in all the obj.: God)

έναντι/έναντίον (4 x)

dat. (6 x)

3:25 8:14 14:20 16:10;

and *passim* in the LXX.

40(33):8,8 47(40):3 51(44):

23 Bar 1:13 2:5;

and *passim* in the LXX.---→ dat. 14:7⁷⁹ 27(50):7;and *passim* in the LXX.

---→ έναντι/έναντίον Bar 1:17

2:33 3:2,4,7; cf. further

44(37):18 ἀδικέω (different object).

Since Jer-OG wanted to avoid the slightly harsh expression 'to sin to (God)', he rendered the Heb with ἀμαρτάνω ἐναντί/ἐναντίον.⁸⁰ This translation was frequently revised by Jer-R to its literal rendition.⁸¹ The number of renditions left unchanged by the reviser is rather large; but, since all of them are concentrated in Bar 1-3, an alternative explanation may be suggested.⁸²

(28) ἴND + noun

verb, esp. δύν/παρά + art.

inf. (5 x)

4:7 שׁוּר יְיָND - παρὰ τὸ μὴ κατοικεῖσθαι αὐτάς
 7:32 דִּיבַר יְיָND - δὶὰ τὸ μὴ ὑπόχλειν τήνον 26(46):19 שׁוּר יְיָND - δὶὰ τὸ μὴ ὑπόχλειν κατοικούντας ἐν αὐτῇ 28(51):29 שׁוּר יְיָND - καὶ μὴ κατοικεῖσθαι αὐτήν 28(51):37 שׁוּר יְיָND - καὶ οὐ κατοικηθήσεται;
 and *passim* in the LXX.
 Cf. יבִּרַב + noun - παρὰ τὸ μὴ + inf.: 2:15 9:10,11,12(11,12,13).⁸⁴

ἀπό + noun (5 x)

33(26):9, 41(34):22 שׁוּר יְיָND- ἀπό κατοικούντων
 39(32):43, 40(33):10 דַּבַּר יְיָND- ἀπό ἀνθρώπων Bar 2:23 ἀπό ἐνοικούντων
 ---→ παρὰ τὸ μὴ + inf.
 40(33):10; 83 31(48):9 יְיָND שׁוּר יְיָND - πόθεν ἔνοικος αὐτῆ (= יְיָND) בָּרָא (αὐτης SOQV)]
 ἀπο ἐνοικούντων αὐτάς A.

Occurring also *passim* in the LXX, in the "three" and in O,⁸⁵ the rendering found in Jer-OG represents the short Heb expression adequately, although not literally, since it adds an infinitive to the Heb.⁸⁶ Jer-R's ἀπό + noun,⁸⁷ on the other hand, was meant to reflect ἴND + noun more precisely.⁸⁸ It is noteworthy that Jer-R's renderings are more successful from a reviser's point of view than those of the "three" and O (cf. n. 85).

(29) ὑπόχλω

ὑπόχλω (4 x)

5:13 7:32 (יְיָND) 26(46):19 (יְיָND) 27(50):20;
 and *passim* in the LXX.

In many sentences lacking a copula in the Heb, the LXX translators added ὑπόχλω, especially in negative sentences. This usage is not found in Jer b' (for יְיָND, see III 28).

(30) δόλλ

δόλλ : *passim* in Jer a'

δόλλ (25 x)

1:12,15 2:10 3:8,14,25 4:8,
 15,22,28 8:17 15:20 16:9
 20:4 21:10(στ, S*) 22:4,11
 (στ, S) 23:12 26(46):21,27
 27(50):11 28(51):5,14,29,33;
 cf. further VI 70.

δόλλ : *passim* in Jer b'

As in the remainder of the LXX, Jer-OG generally used both δόλλ and δόλλ for יָ, employing δόλλ particularly to avoid a hiatus (see Thackeray, *Grammar*, 139). Jer-R limited himself to δόλλ.

(31) δέ

δέ : καὶ = 1:42

(22:917 occurrences)

δέ : καὶ = 1:148

(6:889 occurrences)⁸⁹

Turner observed that the relation between δέ and καὶ ranges from 1:1 in 4 Macc to 1:188 in Jer b' (*Synaxar*, 331-2), the latter displaying an un-Greek style in this respect. The situation in Jer a' is somewhere in the middle (1:42). It is therefore significant that Jer-R, more than any other translator of the LXX, avoided using δέ where καὶ would represent the Heb way in a stereotyped way.⁹⁰

(32) The Employment / Lack of the GK Article in Accordance with the Heb

In the concluding remarks to his penetrating study of the article in Jer-LXX (*Beiträge*, ch. IV), Ziegler remarked: "Der Artikel ist oftmals in der Ier.-und Thr.-LXX im Anschluss an MT (also besonders beim Status constructus) nicht gesetzt worden. Er fehlt häufiger in Ier. II und Thr. als in Ier. I" (*ib.*, 167).⁹¹ On the other hand, the *addition* of the article against the Heb follows the rules of the Greek language. In the following syntactical conditions a more or less different trend in Jer a' and b' is discernible:

a. *prep. + noun + suff.*,
e.g., בְּלַחֲמֵי - ἐν (τῆ) βουλῆς αὐτοῦ⁹²

article : 125 x | article : 60 x
no article : 35 x | no article : 40 x

b. *prep. + double noun*

"gern der doppelte Artikel"
(Ziegler, *ib.*, 127), e.g.,
13:22 δὲ τὸ πλῆθος τῆς
ἀδικίας σου

"...er fehlt dagegen in Ier.
II...gewöhnlich..." (*ib.*, 127)
e.g., 29(47):3 ἀπὸ φωνῆς ὀρυθῆς
αὐτοῦ

c. *prep. + עַר + proper noun*
e.g., הַחַיִּי בְּעַר

article (4 x)

4:16 7:17,34 17:26

article (1 x ?)

51(44):21⁹³

no article (1 x)

11:6

no article (11 x)

38(31):24 39(32):44 40(33):
10,13 41(34):7,7 51(44):2,6,
17,21 Bar 2:23(33) בִּי, followed immediately by a verb⁹⁴ἡμέρα + rel. pron. + rel.
clause (2 x)

7:22, 11:4 ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἧ ἀνήγα-
γον (ἡ ἡμέρα QV);
and thus generally in the LXX
(see Sois.-Soin., *Infinitive*,
24 - 27).

ἡμέρα + gen. abs. / part.
conj. (4 x)

38:32(31:31) ἡμέρα ἐπιλαβομέ-
νου μου 43(36):2 ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας
λαλήσαντός μου (om ης VQ^CL)
48(41):4 τῆ ἡμέρα τῆ δευτέρᾳ
παύξαντος αὐτοῦ
Bar 2:28 ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐντειλαμένου
σου and elsewhere in the LXX
(cf. Sois.-Soin., *Infinitive*,
26), Aq, Th and O.⁹⁵

---→ ἡμέρα + noun 38(31):6(5);
ἡμέρα + rel. pron. + rel.
clause 41(34):13 Bar 1:19,20

Jer-OG's translations render the Heb well, but since they include a relative pronoun not found in the Heb, they were re-placed with a gen. abs. or part. conj., probably the closest a Greek translation can come to the Heb.

b. *Gk 1 (stereotyped) and Gk 2 in Jer a' versus Gk 2 (stereotyped) only in Jer b'*

Jer-OG rendered the Heb with two or more renditions, which the reviser tended to reduce to one, i.e., its stereotyped rendition in the LXX.

All renditions mentioned in this section occur *passim* in the LXX.

(34) נָאֵלָה

ἐκφέρω (5 x)

8:1 17:22 27(50):25
28(51):10,44

ἐξάγω (10 x)

33(26):23 38(31):32(31)
39(32):21 45(38):22,23
46(39):14 52:31 Bar 1:19,20
2:11

ἐξάγω (4 x)

10:13 15:19 20:3 28(51):16

ἀνάγω (2 x)

7:22 11:4

---→ ἐξαφρόω 41(34):13;
ἐκφρόω Bar 1:8 2:24.

(35) שָׁבַר
שָׁבַר

συντριβή (4 x)

4:6 6:1 27(50):22 28(51):54

σύντριμμα (3 x)

31(48):3,5 37(30):12

σύντριμμα (4 x)

6:14 8:21 10:19 14:17

σύντριμμος (1 x)

4:20; cf. VI 29.

(36) לָּחַץ

ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό (4 x)

3:18 6:12 26(46):12
27(50):4

ἄμα (4 x)

30(49):3 31(48):7 38(31):24
48(41):1

ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ (1 x)

13:14

ἄμα (4 x)

6:11,21 27(50):33 28(51):38

ἁμοθυμαδόν (2 x)

5:5 26(46):21

(37) פָּן

κύριος : *passim* in Jer a'

θεός (7 x)⁹⁶

1:1,2 3:21 4:4 9:20(19)
(κύριος AC) 14:10 27(50):15;
and elsewhere rather infre-
quently in the LXX.⁹⁷

κύριος : *passim* in Jer b'

However, the *Vorlage* of 3:21
4:4 14:10 and 27(50):15 may
actually have read חִפְּלָא.

Reserving θεός for חִפְּלָא, Jer-R eliminated the non-stereo-
typed rendition of 'ח.

(38) פָּן qal

ΥΛΥΝΩσκω (25 x)

2:16(MT לִי),19,23 3:13
5:1,4 6:15,27 8:7,7 9:3,
16,24(2,15,23) 11:18,19
12:3 13:12,12 14:20
15:12(MT לִי),15 16:21
17:9 18:23 22:16,16
(27(50):24 QVOL')

ΥΛΥΝΩσκω (19 x)

31(48):30 33(26):15,15
38(31):34 39(32):8 40(33):3
43(36:19) 45(38):24 47(40):
14,15 48(41):4 49(42):19,19
51(44):3,15,28 Bar 2:15,30,31
---→ οἶδα 38(31):34(33).

οἶδα (11 x)

4:22 7:9 9:6(5) 10:23,25
14:18 15:14 16:13 19:4
22:28 24:7

ἐπίσταμαι (4 x)

1:5,6 2:8 17:16

ἐπὶ ΥΛΥΝΩσκω (2 x)

4:22(ΥΛΥΝ. AL'C) 5:5

Jer-R used mainly ΥΛΥΝΩσκω.

(39) פָּן

ᾤσ : *passim* in Jer a'

ᾤσε (6 x)

3:2 14:8 26(46):8

27(50):37(AQ^{ext}-130-239-613)

ᾤσ : *passim* in Jer b'

L-36 311 ως) 28(51):14,30;
for further variants, see
Ziegler, *Ier.*

Jer-R used only ως.

<u>οὐχί</u> (5 x)	(40) <u>ὄχι</u>
2:16(17) 7:19 14:22 23:24	<u>οὐχί</u> (3 x)
(μη ουχι) 23:29B*SQ*(ουκ B ^C ;	33(26):19 45(38):15
ουκ rel)	51(44):21
<u>οὐ</u> (5 x)	---→ οὐ μή 42(35):13.
3:1,4 5:3 ⁹ 13:21 22:15,16	

Limiting οὐ to ὄχι, ¹⁰⁰ Jer-R rendered ὄχι mainly with
οὐχί. ¹⁰¹

(41) Emphatic Forms of the Greek Pers. Pronouns

<u>ἐμοῦ</u> (1 x)	<u>ἐμοί</u> (1 x)
4:17	38(31):20
<u>ἐμοί</u> (5 x)	
12:8,9 13:25 15:16 20:8	
<u>ἐμέ</u> (10 x)	
2:13,16(17),19 4:22 5:22	
7:19 9:3(2) 16:11 22:16	
24:7	

Nearly all the occurrences in Jer-LXX of the emphatic forms of the pers. pronouns in the oblique cases (except when preceded by a preposition) are limited to Jer a'. ¹⁰² Jer-R may have discontinued the use of the emphatic forms, restricting himself to the ordinary forms of the pronoun. ¹⁰³ The ordinary forms occur *passim* in Jer a' and b'.

4. Renditions Reflecting the Heb in a More Consistent Way

The phenomenon described as "translational consistency" may come to light in different, even opposing, forms, whose common characteristic is the tendency to represent the Heb according to preconceived principles. ¹⁰⁴ While in section (3) the revisional tendency is determined by the *character* of the rendition (stereotyped versus non-stereotyped), the renditions mentioned below (4a, 4b) are preferred by Jer-R by virtue of their being the *only* rendition in Jer b', not necessarily more stereotyped within the LXX.

a. Gk 1 and Gk 2 in Jer a' versus Gk 1 only in Jer b'

Instead of Jer-OG's two different renditions of the same Heb, Jer-R tended to employ only one, thus representing the Heb in a more consistent way.

<u>παῖς</u> (3 x)	(42) <u>בן</u>	<u>παῖς</u> (18 x)
21:7 22:4 26(46):28		32:5(25:19) 33(26):5(δουλος Qtxt) 41(34):9,10,11,16,16
<u>δοῦλος</u> (4 x)		42(35):15BS ^C (δουλος rel)
2:14 7:25 25:4 26(46):27		43(36):24,31 44(37):18
		47(40):9 51(44):4(δουλος A)
		52:8 Bar 1:20 2:20,24,28

Jer-OG might have distinguished between παῖς and δοῦλος. ¹⁰⁵
Jer-R confined himself to παῖς. ¹⁰⁶

b. Gk 1 (= Heb 1 + Heb 2) in Jer a' versus
Gk 1 (= Heb 1) and Gk 2 (= Heb 2) in Jer b'

Jer-OG used one Greek word to render two different Hebrew words, while Jer-R tended to employ two different Greek words.

(43) <u>π δνδ</u>	<u>σησὶ κὺριος</u> (21 x)
<u>λέγει κὺριος</u> (68 x) ¹⁰⁷	30(49):2(λεγει κ.OC'), 15(49): 26) 31(48):12,35,38 36(29):23
1:8,15,17,19AQ (ειπεν κυριος BSVOC') ¹⁰⁸ 2:2,9,12,17,19,	

22,29 3:1,12,13,14,16(φου
 κυριος Q),20 4:1,9,17 5:1
 (MT DNJ),9,15,18,22,29 6:12
 7:11,19,30,32 8:1 9:9,24,25
 (8,23,24) 13:14,25 15:3,6
 16:1,11,16 17:24 19:6,12
 (επειν κ. S) 21:7 22:5,16,24
 23:4,5,23,24,30,33 26(46):
 5,18,23,28 27(50):20,21,31
 28(51):24,26,39,52,53;
 and *passim* in the LXX (Pent,
 2 Ki, MP, Is, Ez).
 ---→ φου κίριος 2:3(OI,
 λεγει and sic Ziegler) 23:12
 AQVOL'..(rel om) 25:12
 AQVOL'..(rel om) 27(50):20
 AQVOL'... (rel om) - in the
 last mentioned three verses
 Ziegler correctly omits φου
 κίριος with BS...; εϊπε
 κίριος 27(50):30,40.

While the rendition found in Jer-OG, λέγει κίριος, 109 is
 by far the most frequent translation in the LXX of 'ה דנס, φου
 κίριος is almost exclusively confined to Jer b'.

It may be suggested tentatively that Jer-R, the "Three",
 O and L, endeavored to distinguish between 'ה דנס - λέγω, εϊπον (as
 in 'ה דנס חכ - οϊτως εϊπε κίριος and 'ה דנס - εϊπε κίριος) and
 דנס - φουκί. A few cases were left unrevised.¹¹⁰

While changing an earlier λέγει κίριος to φου κίριος, the
 revisers did not modify the basic understanding of דנס as a
 verb rather than a noun.¹¹¹

A fact which sheds further light on the background of Jer-
 R's revision is that Jer-R shares the rendition of this formula
 only with the "Three", O and L, and that this is their most
 frequent rendition.¹¹² See also VII 1.

c. Exegetical consistency:

Gk 1 (= Heb 1, meaning 1 and 2) in Jer a' versus Gk 1
 (= Heb 1, meaning 1) and Gk 2 (= Heb 1, meaning 2) in Jer b'

Contrary to Jer-OG, Jer-R distinguished in some cases be-
 tween two meanings or usages of a word. The few examples of
 this group do not conform with the implication of the preceding
 ones.

(44) פֶּהַר

λαλέω : *passim*
 1. subject human: λαλέω : *passim*
 2. subject God or prophet: χρηματίζω ! (7 x)

33(26):2,2 (subject:Jer.) 36(29):23 (false
 proph.) 37(30):2 (Jer.) 43(36):2 (BSQV
 λαλέω) (Jer.) 43(36):4 (BS λαλέω) (Bar.)
 47(40):2 VOQ^{mgL} (BSAQC' λαλέω) (God);¹¹³
 further 1 Ki 18:27 (MT פֶּהַר) Job 40:3(8).¹¹⁴

---→ λαλέω 36 x in 33(26):7 - Bar 2:28;
 λέγω 35(28):7.

CF. further דנס - χρηματίζω 32:16,16(25:30,
 30).

The rendering of the divine and prophetic speech and the
 roaring of God (דנס) with χρηματίζω ('to give oraculum')¹¹⁵ in
 Jer b' was exegetically motivated. Jer-R was highly inconsis-
 tent in the insertion of this verb. It is noteworthy that
 χρηματίζω is a distinct Jer b' word within the LXX.

(45) פֶּהַר ('false prophet') 116

προφήτης : *passim*
 ψευδοπροφήτης (8 x)
 33(26):7,8,11,16 34:7(27:9)
 35(28):1 36(29):1,8;
 and elsewhere Zach 13:2.

---→ ψευδοπροφήτης 34:12,13(27:15,
 16) 39(32):32.

Jer-R endeavored, however inconsistently, to make a distinction between the real and the false prophet (both נביא) 117 by using ψευδοπροφήτης as the main rendition of נביא - 'false prophet'.

Not attested to elsewhere in classical literature, ψευδοπροφήτης was probably coined by the LXX translators 118 on the basis of προφητεύω ψευδῶ which frequently occurs in Jer-LXX. 119 See further p. 165.

(46) נָבִיא

σπέρμα (3 x)

7:15 22:30 26(46):27;
and *passim* in the LXX.

---→ 2:21 Πῶς γῆν -
καρποφόρον...ἀληθινήν.

1. σπέρμα (4 x)

38(31):27 σπέρμα ἀνθρώπου καὶ
σπέρμα κτήνους
42(35):7 σπέρμα οὐ μὴ σπειρήτε
42(35):9 σπέρμα οὐκ ἐγένετο
ἡμῖν (cf. v. 7)

2. γένος (5 x) 120

36(29):32 (of Shemaiah)
38(31):35,37(36) τὸ γένος
Ἰσραηλ 43(36):31 (of Jehoiakim)
48(41):1 ἀπὸ γένους τοῦ
Βασιλέως;
and further Lev 21:17 Esth
6:13 Dan 1:3.

Jer-R apparently wished to distinguish between 'seed', 'offspring' in general (= σπέρμα) and 'offspring of a certain person or group' (= γένος). For the latter meaning, cf. תַּרְבִּי ('family') in Rabbinic Hebrew.

(47) שׂר

ἀρχών (8 x)

1:18 2:26 4:9 8:1 17:25,25
24:1 28(51):59;
and *passim* in the LXX.
---→ ἡγεμών 28(51):57 B-S-538
A O L' (ηγούμενος rel).

51(44):9,17,21 52:10 Bar 1:
9,16 2:1;
and *passim* in the LXX.

2. שׂר in כַּלָּל כְּשֵׁר /
תַּלְמִידֵי שׂר ἡγεμών' (12 x)

45(38):17 46(39):3 (ηγούμενου
B), 3(αρχοντες OL) 47(40):7,
13 48(41):11,13,16 49(42):1,
8 50(43):4,5

While Jer-OG used the stereotyped rendition of שׂר only--
the one occurrence of ἡγεμών is problematic 121--Jer-R differenti-
ated between 'leader' (ἀρχων) and 'military leader' (ἡγεμών);
the latter rendition does not occur elsewhere. 122

(48) תַּלְמִידֵי שׂר 123

'habitation' - νομή (2 x) 124

10:25 27(50):7
'habitation' - ἰόνος (2 x)
29:20(49:19) 32:16(25:30);
and Ps 22(23):2(תַּלְמִידֵי שׂר) 78(79):
7.

'abode of sheep' - νομή
(3 x) 124

23:3 27(50):19,45

'abode of sheep' - κατάλυμα
(1 x)

29:21(49:20)

'abode of shepherds' - κατά-
λυμα (1 x)

40(33):12

תַּלְמִידֵי שׂר ('pasture') - κατάλυμα
(1 x)

32:23(25:37) καταλύματα Σποηνί
καταλοιπα BSAC'O., καλα ΟΙ,V
...; and further Ex 15:13
(תַּלְמִידֵי שׂר).

תַּלְמִידֵי שׂר ('pasture') - νομή
(1 x) 124

23:10;
cf. תַּלְמִידֵי שׂר - νομή 10:21 23:1.
---→ תַּלְמִידֵי שׂר ('pasture') - τρέβοσ
9:10(9).

Jer-R not only chose translation options different from those of the OG, but also distinguished between two different meanings of πη: πη ('habitation') - τόπος; πη ('abode'), together with πη ('pasture') - κατάλυσις and κατάλυμα.¹²⁵

5. Other Changes

(49) πη in πη πη πη πη πη (or sim.)

σάββα (1 x)
 21:9;
 and *passim* in the LXX.
 ---→ πη (in a different context) - πη 27(50):10.
εὐρεμα † (3 x)
 45(38):2 46(39):18 51:35(45:5)

πη ('booty') is here part of an idiom referring to the returning soldier who discovers that his soul is the only booty.¹²⁶ As a stereotyped rendition of πη, Jer-OG's σάββα did not convey this connotation in the target language. Jer-R's lexical choice, on the other hand, achieved this goal. This rendition does not occur elsewhere.

(50) πη, mainly *hiph'el*

έξωδέω (10 x)
 8:3 16:15 23:2(ἀνωδέω A),3,8
 24:9 25:16(49:36) 26(46):28
 (εἰσάγω V) 27(50):17 28(51):
 35(MT πη);
 and further 9 x in the LXX.
εἰσέρω (1 x)
 37(30):17
 30(49):5 39(32):37 Bar 2:4,
 13,29 3:8;
 and further Is 56:8; cf. also
 Deut 30:4, Neh 1:9, Ps
 146(147):2 - εἰσπορά.

Jer-OG's έξωδέω is a perfect rendering of the Heb. εἰσέρω ('to scatter'), found in Jer b', seems inappropriate at first glance, but since in the OT πη is interchangeable with πη ('to scatter'),¹²⁷ this rendition should not be

considered unapt. The fact that other translators and revisers rendered πη similarly¹²⁸ corroborates this point.

It is difficult to determine whether Jer-R was influenced by the technical meaning of εἰσπορά when he replaced έξωδέω with εἰσέρω.¹²⁹

(51) πη

μαθητής (8 x)
 20:11(μαθητης A) 26(46):9
 (μαθητης A),12,12 27(50):9,36
 28(51):30,56;
 and Jud 5:23 A (doublet) 1 Chr
 28:1 and the MP (8 x; cf. VI
 7).
λοχμός (3 x)
 9:23(22) 26(46):5,6
λοχμός (3 x)
 29:23(49:22) 31(48):14
 39(32):18; and *passim* in the
 LXX.
δυνατός (5 x)
 48(41):16 50(43):6 51(44):20
 Bar 1:4,9, in the first three
 verses MT reads (וְיָרֵךְ)
πη; 130
 and *passim* in the LXX; cf. al-
 so 23:9 וְיָרֵךְ(1) - έξωδέω
 in Aq.

The main rendition of Jer-OG does not represent the usual equivalent of the Hebrew word in the LXX. 131 Jer-R preferred the two standard renditions of πη.

APPENDIX 1

Is Jer a', and not Jer b', in the nature of a revision?

A two-translator theory would have been a natural explanation for the differences between Jer a' and b'. However, important agreements between the two parts have led us to look for a translator-reviser theory. We have attempted to locate this reviser in the second part of the book. However, from the outset it would not be impossible that Jer a', and not Jer b', includes a revision, although of a different nature. This possibility is considered here.

Several of the examples of chapter III may indicate that Jer a' contains a revision towards a more flexible translation technique, or, at times, towards better Greek.¹³² Alternately, some examples could be adduced to show that Jer a' was revised towards greater literalness and a more stereotyped translation (see items 44 and 48 above and items 4,12,17,19 of the next chapter). The assumption of a revision of Jer a' could be supported by the following remarks of Thackeray and Ziegler: "The words used in Jer. α generally have some Hexaplaric support, whereas those in Jer. β do not" (Thackeray, "Gr.Tr.Jer.", 252); "Da gewöhnlich der erste Jer.-Übers. wörtlich wiedergibt..." (Ziegler, *Beiträge*, 103). However, neither Thackeray nor Ziegler documented their remarks.

An assumed revision of Jer a' is, however, unlikely:

1. If Jer a' were a revision, what kind of revision could it be? It could hardly be a revision towards greater literalness, since the renditions indicating such a trend are too few. It could be said that Jer a' embodies a revision towards a more flexible translation technique, such as that of Sym. But one immediately notes that, while in some examples the renditions of Jer a' are more flexible than those of Jer b', as a rule they are often identical to and certainly no more flexible than the lexical choices used in the other books of the LXX. In other words, if Jer a' were a revision, it would be a revision towards the general LXX vocabulary. Such a supposed tendency

is not paralleled in any known LXX revision. Moreover, if the vocabulary of Jer a' is closer to that of the LXX in general than that of Jer b', it seems methodologically more sound to assume that Jer a' represents the OG itself rather than a revision towards its vocabulary.

2. Turning to external evidence, some of Jer-R's renditions are paralleled by identical ones of the later revisions (see p. 161). The renditions of Jer a', on the other hand, do not have any "Hexaplaric support" (against Thackeray as quoted above).

3. In ch. VI it is suggested that Jer a', Ez a' and the MP were probably produced by one translator. This translation presumably was the OG of these books. It is further hypothesized that renditions common to the OG of Jer a', Ez a' and the MP were subsequently altered by Jer-R in Jer b'. Such an assumption is more natural than supposing that Jer b' alone embodies the original text of Jer while a reviser retouched the whole of the MP, Ez a' or the whole of Ez and one half of Jer. Moreover, the renditions common to these three books bear no revisional traits.

APPENDIX 2

Chapter 52 = Jer. Y' ?

In "Gr.Tr.Jer.", 260, Thackeray adduced two arguments in favor of his tentative proposal that ch. 52 incorporates a third unit--in particular, a third translator--in addition to Jer. α' and Jer. β'.

1. Except for 52:24,31, φαδρτω is nowhere in the LXX¹³³ spelled with -ττ (see also Ziegler, "Einleitung", 120).
2. In 52:33 τπ is rendered with σσαη, as frequently in the LXX, in contrast with ιαδρτω in Jer 43(36):24 48(41):5 50(43):12. The latter rendition occurs frequently elsewhere in the LXX.

Probably more impressed by the secondary nature of ch. 52 in MT than by textual evidence relating to the LXX, Thackeray provided only these two arguments to support his assumption of a third translator. Thackeray's arguments are not convincing,¹³⁴ but on the other hand, there is little positive evidence that the substratum of ch. 52 was part of the OG,¹³⁵ and was subsequently revised by Jer-R because the Hebrew vocabulary of ch. 52 differs from that of the remainder of Jer.¹³⁶ On the other hand, the location of ch. 52 between two sections which were both revised by Jer-R (chapters 29-51 and Bar 1:1-3:8) makes it likely that it underwent the same revision.

NOTES
CHAPTER III

1. The most frequent type of "variation" is the use of non-stereotyped renderings of a certain Hebrew word as opposed to stereotyped renderings of the same word. Some examples to this effect are discussed by G. Bertram, "Der Sprachschatz der Septuaginta und der des hebräischen Alten Testaments," ZAW 16 (1939) 88ff.
2. On the other hand, A. Scholz, *Der masorethische Text und die LXX. Uebersetzung des Buches Jeremias* (Regensburg 1875) 14 described some of the differences between Jer a' and b' (III 9, 45, 47, 52 IV 1, 3, 17, 18), as follows: "Der Übersetzer wechselt gern in den Ausdrücken bei Wiedergaben der nämlichen hebräischen Wörter."
3. Gk 1 and Gk 2 are the *main* renditions of a given Hebrew word in Jer a' and b' respectively. While it is assumed that in these cases Gk 1 was the original reading of Jer b', it is not impossible that in some instances Jer b' contained a different rendition, i.e., Gk 3.
4. This assumption is corroborated by the findings of ch. VI which show that some words were rendered with Gk 1 in the OG of Jer, Ez and the MT, often to be altered by Jer-R with Gk 2.
5. The following items adduced in ch. III were mentioned by these scholars: Spohn, *Jeremias Vates*, 17: 18, 49; Frankl, "Studien", 449: 13, 16; Thackeray, "Gr. Tr. Jer.", 247ff.: 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 15, 23, 28, 29, 39, 42, 44, 45, 46, 47, 49, 51; *id.*, *Septuaginta*, 31: 43; *id.*, *Grammar*, 139: 30; Baudissin, *Kyrios*, I, 191, n. 1: 37; Ziegler, *Beiträge*, IV: 32; Turner, *Syntax*, 122ff.: 27, 243: 36, 41ff.: 41; H. A. Redpath, *JThSt* 7 (1906) 608-609: 37.
6. On stereotyped renderings, see the present author's paper, "Three Dimensions of LXX Lexicography", to be published shortly.
7. J. Ziegler, "Pap. 967", 94.
8. A. Rahlfs, *Lucians Rezension der Königsbücher*, *Septuaginta-Studien* 3 (Göttingen 1911).
9. On the relationship between Lucianic and "proto-Lucianic" elements, see E. Tov, *RB* 79 (1972) 101-113 and the bibliography mentioned there.
10. See Barthélemy, *Devaniers*, 246ff.
11. See, e.g., H. J. Schoeps, "Symmachusstudien III: Symmachus und der Midrasch", *Biblica* 29 (1948) 31-51; *id.*, *Biblica* 26 (1945) 100-111.

12. Barthélemy, *Devanaiers*, 48ff.
13. *Ib.*, 59-60.
14. *Ib.*, 69ff.
15. See, e.g., to the discussion on Pap.Ryl.Gr. 458 starting with its *editio princeps* by C. H. Roberts, *Two Biblical Papyri in the John Rylands Library* (Manchester 1936), as well as to the revisions described by the following scholars: P. Katz, *Philo's Bible etc.* (Cambridge 1950); D. W. Gooding, *Revisions of the Septuagint Pentateuch, Tyndale Lecture 1964* (London 1955); G. Zunz, "Der Antinoe Papyrus der Proverbia und das Prophetologion", *ZAW NF* 27 (1956) 124-184 (on which see especially P. Katz, *ZAW NF* 28 (1957) 77-84); D. Barthélemy, *Devanaiers*.
16. The same rendition occurs in Sym in Ez 14:15 (LXX: ὄφραυσιμός).
17. Other meanings of שָׁמַח are rendered in Jer with ἐξίστημι (2:12 4:9 18:16) and οὐσθησάμενος (19:8 27(50):13).
18. This rendition may have been influenced by phrases like Ez 14:15 עָלַי עָלַי עָלַי כִּלְכִּיל עָלַי כִּלְכִּיל Jer 9:9, 10, 11 and *passim*.
19. Differences between Jer a' and b' are not due to a possible differentiation between שָׁמַח and שָׂמַח, both occurring *passim* in the book.
20. See Ziegler, *Beiträge*, 49.
21. In Jer a' ταλαυπηρία further renders שָׁמַח (4:20) and שָׁמַח or שָׁמַר (חַי שָׁמַר) in 28(51):35.
22. Etymologically, ταλαυπη- represents τλάω ('to endure') and πω- ('hardship' = πνεύ-), see Suidas, s.v. ταλαυπηρος).
23. Rendered as such in Ob 5 Is 16:4 Job 12:6.
24. Mich 2:4 Job 15:22.
25. The number of translations of תָּמַח as 'destruction' is too large for the assumption of a variant תָּמ.
26. Jer 15:8 ταλαυπηρία λυμαινομενος σ'. 28(51):56 ταλαυπηρία δολοφειρον σ', ταλαυπων α' (86), προνομευων α' (Syh). 31(48):8 ὀλεσρος) προνομευων α'.
27. For both the Heb תָּמַח and its Greek translation, cf. S. Talmon, "Amen as an Introductory Oath Formula", *Textus* 7 (1969) 124-129.
28. Besides, תָּמַח is transliterated in 1 Chr. 16:36 Neh 5:13 8:6.

29. See Ziegler, *Beiträge*, 28-29.
30. Because ἐνύκτερον is not attested to in Greek literature, Origen was unable to explain the meaning of this word. He writes: "ἐνύκτερον ἢ τὸ οὐκίτερον παρτομνον ἢ τοῦς ὄντος ἢ τοῦς ἀφθῆν ἢ τοῦς μισθωτοῦς, ἐνύκτερον γὰρ ὁ μισθός" (Chisler, *Catenae*, 481; quoted by Schleusner, s.v.). At the end of this sentence, Origen refers to the plural form of ἐνύκτερον, denoting 'wages'.
31. Ziegler prints in 47(40):1: μετὰ B-S-106' C' 26 Bo Aeth Arm] οὐτερον 88 L-407; pr οὐτερον rel(tō 88 L-407 add: Pap. Sorb. Inv. 2250, published by J. van Haelst, *Recherches de Papyrologie* 1 (1961) 113-120).
1. The evidence may be explained as following:
 of Jer-OG (now preserved in BS...only), replaced by Jer-R with ὕστερον (only preserved in 88 L-407 Pap.Sorb.Inv. 2250). Many MSS contain a hybrid reading ὕστερον μετὰ resulting from Jer-R's revision. This suggestion has an advantage over one alternative explanation:
 2. ὕστερον has crept into the MS tradition of 47(40):1 from 36(29):2 38(31):19, 19. Such an assumed development would be awkward because only in Jer b' is (')תָּמַח rendered with ὕστερον and nothing calls for its secondary insertion in 47(40):1.
 3. A third explanation seems more plausible: ὕστερον μετὰ is a late doublet composed of an original μετὰ and an Origenic or Lucianic reading ὕστερον. The lack of concordances to O and L prevents us from knowing whether they employed this rendition elsewhere as well.
32. LSJ, s.v. ὕστερον IV, 1 records ὕστερον + gen. as 'behind', a meaning which might have developed easily into a temporal usage, as in Jer b'.
33. A similar usage is found in Matth. 21:32 22:27 (cf. Luc. 20:32f.); see Blass-Debrunner-Funk 164, 4. However, Jer-R presumably preceded Matthew (see VII, section 3).
34. See Sois.-Soin., *Infinite*, 79 for references.
35. The non-occurrence of πῶς τὸ μὴ in the LXX outside of Jer b', together with its presence in some of the books of the Apocrypha and the NT (cf. C. W. Votaw, *The Use of the Infinitive in Biblical Greek* [Chicago 1896] 20 and Kneucker, *Baruch*, ad 1:19), may suggest a late date for this rendition.
36. The genitive of τοῦ μὴ in 7:10 depends upon the preceding verb. Jer-LXX probably read אָיִן(ם) (thus Streane, *Jeremial*, ad loc.).
37. See Sois.-Soin., *Infinite*, 72.
38. This assumption is based on the fact that both in classical Greek and in the LXX ἐργάζομαι is used primarily as 'to carry out work'. However, neither ἐργάζομαι nor ἔργον occur in Jer-IXX and Jer-MT in this meaning, so that our suggestion is conjectural.

39. By this practice Jer-R enlarged the semantic range of ἐργάζομαι.

40. For yet a different view, see F. Gryglewycyz, *Biblica* 37 (1956) 324.

41. Cf. C. Bertram, *παράκαλέω*, *ThWNT* 5, 775, n. 20.

42. ἀναπαύω and παύω are distinct "Lieblingswörter" of Jer b'. In Jer b' παύω renders not only הָלַח, of which the GK is a frequent equivalent, and מָחַץ, but also מָחַץ (31(48):2-32:23(35:37); cf. II 2), מָחַץ (38(31):37(35)), כָּחַץ (51(44):10) and מָחַץ (38(31):35). ἀναπαύω renders גָּלַח (29(47):6), מָחַץ (30:12 (49:23)) and מָחַץ (31(48):11). ἀναπαύω does not occur in Jer a'. παύω occurs only in 28(51):63 (77C).

43. This view concurs with Giesebrecht, *Jeremia*, XXX. Streane, *Jeremiah*, 192, on the other hand, depicts Jer-R's lexical choice as euphemistic; Martin, *Synax*, 176-77, similarly considers it anti-anthropomorphic (cf. also Fritsch, *Pentateuch*, 17). However, the latter two characterizations are not borne out by the evidence since παύομαι in 38(31):15 does not refer to God.

44. Examples of similarly incorrect etymological renderings of אָג are mentioned by Reider, *Prolegomena*, 38-39.

45. Cf. however, J. Barr, *Biblical Words for Time* 2 (London 1969) 36ff. See further below, p. 166.

46. The distinction between sections 1 and 2 is artificial, created to serve our immediate purposes.

47. In Rabbinic Hebrew נָפַץ thus assumed the meaning of נָפַץ; see Jastrow, *ad loc.*

48. נָפַץ is not attested to in post-Biblical Hebrew (Levi).

49. A similar opinion has been expressed by Frankl, "Studien", 449-450. It seems improbable that the first translator consciously distinguished between παρόδευμα (Israel) and κόπιον (the other nations) (thus A. Geiger, *Urschrift und Übersetzungen der Bibel* (Breslau 1857) 415).

50. Cf. Aristophanes, *Thesm.*, 670: τοῖς ἄλλοις παρόδευμα ὕβρεως.

51. Likewise, in Nah 2:5 was רָכַב הָרָבֶל rendered by συγχυθήσονται τὰ ὄρματα, in accordance with the preceding καὶ οὐ τῆρις θορυβήσονται (מַתְּרִישׁ הָרַעֲלֵן הָרָבֶל).

52. The vocalization of הָרָבֶל may also have been founded on a deviating exegetical tradition, also reflected in the translations of אָג (ἐγκαυχῶνται) and Συμ (καυχῶνται).

53. See Jastrow, s.v. נָפַץ II. Note further that אָג and Συμ frequently rendered מָחַץ and הָלַח with συστροφή ('mob').

54. Cf. הַחֲרִיב ('terror', 'destruction') - ἀπόλεια in Ez 26:21 27:36 28:19.

55. מָחַץ is attested, i.a., in Ps 89:45 and in Aramaic in Targ. Jon. to Ps 101:5,8 119:139 143:12 (מַחַץ מָחַץ) and Ezr 6:12. A connection between מָחַץ (to be read as מָחַץ?) and 'מָחַץ' was suggested, although in a different way, by A. M. Honeyman, "*Megôr Mis-sābīb* and Jeremiah's Pun", *JT* 4 (1959) 424-426.

56. ἔδν (9 x), εἶ (4 x), εἰ πῶς (3 x), ἔδν πῶς (1 x), εἰ ἄρα (1 x), ἕνα (2 x), ὅρα μὴ (1 x), ὅπως (6 x).

57. μῆναι, based on a similar understanding of the Heb, occurs in Gen 24:5,39 27:12 43:12 1 Ki 18:27 Job 1:5. It is noteworthy that מָחַץ is rendered in Gen 18:24-32 with ἔδν (6 x) but in 24:5 - 43:12 with μῆναι and πῶς. This discrepancy between the two parts of Gen may provide an additional criterion for the distinction between the two parts of Gen to which attention was drawn by O. J. Baab, "A Theory of Two Translators for the Greek Genesis", *JBL* 52 (1933) 239-243.

58. Cf. IV, n. 34; VII, n. 7.

59. Including מָחַץ and מָחַץ. מָחַץ, מָחַץ etc. are not included.

60. 16:7 ἔλεγε.

61. One of the three instances is 9:9 ἔλεγε.

62. See also column la.

63. See Baumgärtel in Herrmann-Baumgärtel, *Beiträge*, 21-22.

64. Jer-R's rendition not only ousted an earlier τῶδε λέγει κῆπος, but it also constituted the most consistently stereotyped rendering of the Hebrew phrase found in the LXX.

65. The preserved evidence refers mainly to O and/or L, whether or not preceded by the "Three" or one of them (mostly Th). The precise numbers are: L alone 20 x; L, Aq and Sym 1 x; Aq and Sym 1 x.

The following two exceptions were noted in Jer: Jer 13:1 L' and 17:19 L'-198-538 and the "Three" οὕτως εἶπεν κύριος (LXX τῶδε λέγει κύριος).

66. OL alone 1 x; OL and Th 8 x; O, Aq and Sym 1 x. In 18:11, on the other hand, the "Three" (X), O (X) and L add: οὕτως λέγει κύριος.

67. See Sois.-Soin., *Zusätze*, 155 for O and Reider, *Index Aquila*, 167 for Aq. Ziegler's claim "sicherlich hat a' niemals τῶδε λέγει übersetzt" ("Einleitung", 92) is probably correct.

68. Elsewhere ἀλλότριος generally renders מָחַץ and מָחַץ, i.a. in the phrase under review θεοὶ ἀλλότριοι (e.g., Jer 2:21 5:19 8:19).

69. E.g., 34:4(27:5) δόξῃ ἐν ὄψαλαμοῖς.
70. וכישר בעיניכם - καὶ ὡς βέλτιον ὄμην.
71. Shenkel, *Kings*, 13-18, showed that the OG translator of Ki rendered בעיני + human with ἐν ὄψαλοῖς and בעיני + God with ἐνώπιον (cf. Fritsch, *Pentateuch*, 12), while the *kaige*-Th reviser limited himself to the literal rendering ἐν ὄψαλοῖς. Jer-OG cannot be compared to Ki-OG because Jer א' includes only one case of בעיני + human (7:11).
- While it is true that Jer-R rendered א' with prep. + ὄψαλος only (not merely with ἐν ὄψαλοῖς as *kaige*-Th), he varied the rendering of בעיני + human (33(26):14 47(40):4,5 Bar 1:12). Jer-R and *kaige*-Th are therefore not similar.
72. Also Origen rendered לפני mainly with κατὰ πόσωτον, cf. Sois.-Soin., *Zusätze*, 146.
73. The same rendition of חקל occurs another 17 times in the LXX (including Jer 9:20 32:14(25:28)).
74. The translation of חקל with ποσόν in 22:15 probably should be considered a translation guess similar to the rendering in 12:5.
75. See III 14.
76. For a similar employment of certain Greek words in the LXX of Is, see R. K. Ottley, *The Book of Isaiah according to the Septuagint* (Cambridge 1906) II, 270; Ziegler, *Isaiah*, 13-14; Seeligmann, *Isaiah*, 57.
77. In 22:6, however, a passive form is found.
78. E.g., 17:6 חשב לא - οὐ κατοικεῖται
79. רבן כשרהרנן לן רמאנן - πολλὰ αἱ ἀμαρτίαι ἡμῶν ἐναντίον σου ὅτι οὐ σὸν ἠάστροεν . ἀμαρῶν + dat. may have been used here by way of variation because the alternative rendition (ἀμαρτίαι) ἐναντίον occurred earlier in the same verse. See further Ziegler, *Heiträge*, 94-95.
80. This translation is discussed by Fritsch, *Pentateuch*, 59-60 and D. H. Gard, *The Exegetical Method of the Greek Translator of the Book of Job*, *JBL Monograph Series VIII* (1952) 29. Additional examples of this rendering are listed by Johannes-son, *Präpositionen*, 192, 196.
81. Cf. Helbing, *Kasussyntax*, 215-217 and Martin, *Syntax*, 122.
82. The alternative explanation admittedly uses a double standard for the reconstruction of the underlying Heb of Bar: it is not impossible that ἀμαρῶν ἐναντι/ἐναντίον reflects לפני רמא, because this construction occurs frequently in the later Hebrew in which Bar was written (e.g., Sir 38:15 (LXX ἐναντι), B.T. Ber. 17a, 19a, *Yoma* 36b, *Meg.* 30a, 31b, *Ta'anit* 27b; cf. also 1 Sam 20:1 (LXX ἐνώπιον)).

83. This rendition is either an unrevised remnant of the OG, or a Hexaplaric addition (thus Martin, *Syntax*, 191, n. 1), or, more likely, a result of the translator's wish for variation (ἀνὸ + noun occurs in the same verse).
84. לפני does not occur in the Heb of Jer b'.
85. E.g., Is 6:11 Ez 33:28 34:8 Zeph 3:6. δὶδ/μαρῶ + art. inf. is also the most frequent rendition of the "three" (mainly μαρῶ, e.g., Jer 28(51):29,37 33(26):9) and of O (usually μαρῶ, e.g., Jer 19:11 40(33):12 51(44):22).
86. For a similar situation in Biblical Hebrew, compare, e.g., 4:7 נתמא הויה מארין לרשב ירשב ו 32:43 ארם חרין לרשב ירשב with 51:62 נתמא ירשב בחמא ירשב לרשב ו 51:62 נתמא ירשב בחמא ירשב לרשב ו.
87. Jer-R's employment of ἀνὸ as the standard rendition of לך created a Hebraism in constructions like the present one, since ἀνὸ is not used in classical Greek as 'without', 'deprived of' (except in such *composita* as ἀναγορεύω, ἀνάφορος, see LSJ, s.v. ἀνὸ, D 6).
88. However, this rendering quite correctly reflects only the first of the two compounds of לך. An attempt to represent also the second component entailed renderings such as those of Jer-OG and the "three" (see n. 85).
89. To Turner's figures for Jer b' (4:754 = 1:188; see below) we added the relevant figures for Bar.
90. Turner did not explicitly mention the *Vorlagen* of the occurrences of δέ which are included in his calculation. δέ probably mainly represented a *wa*.
91. The same tendency is visible in the following LXX revisions: (1) אq and *kaige*-Th: see Reider, *Prolegomena*, 43; Sois.-Soin., *Zusätze*, 148-149; Ziegler, *Beträge*, 151-157. (2) Lam (according to Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 47, part of *kaige*-Th): cf. Ziegler, *ib.*, 167. (3) Pap. 967 of Ez: cf. Ziegler, "Pap. 967", 89. (4) O: cf. Sois.-Soin., *ib.*, 148-149; Ziegler, *ib.*, 157.
92. Cf. Ziegler, *ib.*, 127. All numbers are quoted from Ziegler, who, incidentally, does not list the verses to which the numbers refer. Ziegler's numbers refer to Jer 29-52 only, but relevant figures for Bar could not be added because Ziegler does not state to which combinations of prep. + noun + suff. he refers.
93. The article should probably be omitted here with C' (cf. also 51(44):6,17 where the article is wanting).
94. Generally an infinitive with a pron. suff., e.g. 11:4 ביריך חרין ארם.
95. Jer 7:22 א', 11:4 א', 11:7 פ' O (X), 48(41):4 פ' (=LXX!).

96. In the following instances θεός is secondary in MS S: 26(46):23 S ο θεος B; κριος ο θεος rel) 28(51):7 S θεος (κριος rel) 44(37):17 S θεος (κριος rel).

97. 1 Ki(11 x) 1 Chr(10 x) 2 Chr(5 x) 1 Esdr(6 x) Ps(11 x) Prov(21 x) Is(67 x). The figures are culled from H. A. Redpath, *JThSt* 7 (1906) 608. Redpath's numbers are slightly exaggerated because he also includes variants from individual MSS.

98. Cf. Baudissin, *Kyrios*, I, 191, n. 1: "Vielleicht be- ruht es auf Verschiedenheit der Übersetzer, dass die 'Ver- tauschung', soviel ich siehe, nur bis 28:7 des griechischen Textes vorkommt, von da an nicht mehr".

99. Ziegler reconstructed σου<ου>ι<. σου<ου> seems to be more probable.

100. Thus *pasaim*.

101. Cf. Blass-Debrunner-Funk, 427.

102. The data are culled from Martin, *SynTax*, 41.

103. In most of the above-mentioned instances, the trans- lator stressed the pronoun, usually following MT. In addition, one notes that in nine instances the emph. pron. either pre- cedes or follows another pers. pron. (2:16(17), 19 7:19 12:8,9 13:25 15:16 22:16 24:7, e.g., σε ἐμέ). It may thus be sug- gested that the juxtaposition of the two pronouns caused the use of the emphatic forms.

104. Since the tendency to represent the Heb with a stereotyped rendition, exemplified in the previous section, is also a form of "translational consistency", this section in- corporates *additional* forms of translational consistency.

105. ἄν of God - δοῦλος 7:25 25:4 26(46):27 (ναῖς in 26(46):28 is probably a variation after δοῦλος in the preceding verse). ἄν of human is rendered with ναῖς in 21:7 22:4 and with δοῦλος in 2:14. If Jer-OG indeed distinguished between the two usages of ἄν, the distinction has not been carried out consistently.

106. Jer-R did not make any of the distinctions between different meanings or usages of ἄν such as were made by some of the other translators, cf. n. 104 and also W. Zimmerli, ναῖς θεοῦ, *ThWNT* 5, 672ff.; see further Thackeray, *Grammar*, 7-8; P. Katz, *Die Welt des Orients* 2 (1954-9) 268.

107. λέγει κριος (om OI) in 23:29 is the non-original part of a doublet (see also Ziegler, *Beiträge*, 100).

108. Cf. Ziegler, *Beiträge*, 37-38.

109. The discussion of the translation options of בְּנִי in ἦ בְּנִי should not be separated from other combinations with בְּנִי like בְּלִבִּי בְּנִי (Num 24:3,15). Since their number is small, they

may be mentioned here: φωνή (Num 4 x; Ps 1 x) and ἰδέε λέγει (Prov 1 x); the *Vortage* of 2 Sam 23:1 has been read differently by the Greek translator.

110. In four instances Jer-R left λέγει κριος of the OG unrevised. In six other places the text reads εἶπε κριος. These latter renditions may be remnants of the OG - cf. two identical renditions in Jer a'. Alternatively, some of them may reflect a variant ἦ בְּנִי (= εἶπε κριος in 6:15 31(48):8 37(30):3 40(33):13 51(44):26). Or, less likely, Jer-R might have used this equivalent himself.

111. G. R. Driver, *The Hebrew Scrolls* (Oxford 1951) 41 as- sumed that the "ancient translators" treated בְּנִי as a finite verb (בְּנִי) rather than a noun. His hypothesis may find support in the Rabbinic Hebrew verb בְּנִי/בְּנִי (cf. Jastrow, s.v.), as well as in the following inner-Greek evidence (not in the Qum- ran orthography בְּנִי); see E. Y. Kutscher, *The Language and Lin- guistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1QIs^a)* (Leiden 1974) 499):

It may be contended that the LXX translators represented בְּנִי with a verb rather than a noun because of syntactical dif- ficulties (see below). However, these obstacles are lacking in Num 24:3,15 בְּנִי בְּנִי. בְּנִי בְּנִי which is nevertheless rendered as ... εἶπε φωνή Βαλαάμ... φωνή δ' ἀνθροπος. For similar cases see Num 24:4,16 Prov 30:1 Ps 36(35):2.

There are, however, strong arguments in favor of the as- sumption that the translators read בְּנִי, although treating it as a finite verb:

That at least Origen and Sym knew of the existence of a noun בְּנִי may be inferred from:

1. In the second column of the Hexapla in Ps 36(35):2, Origen transcribed בְּנִי as νοου, cf. G. Mercati, *Psalterii Hebraei Reliquiae I* (Vatican 1958), while he rendered the Heb with φωνή in the fifth column. (It may, however, be argued that the fifth column was independent of the second column whose text presumably existed before his time).

2. In Jer 23:31, where בְּנִי does not occur in the phrase ἦ בְּנִי, Sym rendered it with λόγος. Besides, he always ren- dered ἦ בְּנִי with φωνή κριος.

It is further noteworthy that ἦ בְּנִי nearly always occurs in an extra-syntactical position which made it nearly impos- sible for the Greek translators and revisers to render the Heb literally, e.g., with (δ) λόγος (τόν) κριου. Such a transla- tion would have disturbed the syntax of the surrounding Greek sentence.

It is difficult to reconcile the two lines of argument. Possibly some translators indeed read בְּנִי, although the major- ity read בְּנִי. On the whole, the arguments favor a בְּנִי vocali- zation by the translators.

The question as to whether the translators read either בְּנִי or בְּנִי was first brought to my attention by Prof. S. Talmon.

112. The "three", O and L were checked for Jer-LXX only. A more generalizing remark for the renderings used by O and Th is made by Sois.-Soin., *Zusätze*, 155: "in den asterisierten Zu- sätzen und danach auch wenigstens in 9' ist dagegen φωνή κριος die gewöhnliche Wiedergabe".

113. For the variants of the last three verses, see Ziegler, "Einleitung", 46.

114. The *Vorlage* of χρηματιζω in Job is not easily ascertainable. Cf. Helbing, *Kassusynitar*, 245 and Ziegler, "Einleitung", 46.

115. Cf. Helbing, *ib.*

116. The occurrences of אֵל as 'false prophet' are listed in BDB, s.v.

117. It is no coincidence that the wish to make this distinction arose in the LXX of Jer: Jeremiah and his biographer refer to false prophets more than any other OT author. Thus Jer-R acted as an exegete, who introduced an element of precision into the terminology of the Hebrew book.

118. Thus also J. Reiling, "The Use of ΠΕΥΔΑΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ in the Septuagint, Philo and Josephus", *Mt* 13 (1971) 148.

119. 14:14,15 20:6 23:25,25,32 34:10,14,16(27:12,17,19). The noun itself was coined after such nouns as ψευδοματις, ψευδομαδους and ψευδοαλόγος.

120. Cf. further 38(31):1 לַאֲשֵׁרֵי תַלְמֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל - יִשְׂרָאֵלִים. The wording of this verse was probably influenced by 38(31):35,37(36) γένος Ισραηλ.

121. The following doubts should be raised against the relevance of ἡγεμών in 28(51):57 to the present discussion:

1. ἡγεμών (= ἡγῶ), occurring in the sequence ἡγεμόνας... σπαρατῆρους, may have been influenced by similar adjacent sequences (in which ἡγεμών renders ἡגב):
Jer 28(51):23 ἡγεμόνας (ἡγεμόνα A) καὶ σπαρατῆρους.
Jer 28(51):28 ἡγουμένους (ἡγεμόνας A)... καὶ σπαρατῆρους.
Cf. also Ez 23:23 ἡγουμένους (V; ἡγεμόνας rel) καὶ σπαρατῆρους.

2. ἡγεμών is not unanimously attested by all witnesses of 28(51):57: ἡγεμόνας B-S-538 A O L' ἡγουμένου rel (cf. Ziegler, *Beiträge*, 48).

3. It is not impossible that the translator read הַגְּבִיבִים סַבְבֵי הַכַּחֲשֵׁי וְהַכַּחֲשֵׁי בְּמַלְאָכָאֵי הַכַּחֲשֵׁי וְהַכַּחֲשֵׁי וְהַכַּחֲשֵׁי וְהַכַּחֲשֵׁי in place of מַלְאָכָאֵי הַכַּחֲשֵׁי וְהַכַּחֲשֵׁי וְהַכַּחֲשֵׁי וְהַכַּחֲשֵׁי וְהַכַּחֲשֵׁי וְהַכַּחֲשֵׁי and the rendering of ἡגב with ἡγεμών is paralleled by the examples mentioned under (1).

122. This distinction was not consistently carried out because Jer-R left 45(38):22,25 unrevised.

123. τόμος, inserted in some MSS in 27(50):44 from the parallel verse 29:20(49:19), should be omitted with MSS B-S-106' C'-613 Bo Aeth (thus Ziegler).

124. ἡγῶ(ἡγῶ) is further rendered with vomῆ in Prov 24:15 Am 1:2 Zeph 2:6 Ez 25:5 (cf. VI 63).

125. Neither the OG nor Jer-R treated the two lexemes ἡγῶ and ἡγῶ differently.

126. See BDB, s.v. לָלַךְ, 2; Rudolph, *Jeremia*, ad 21:9; Bright, *Jeremiah*, 184.

127. MT 30:11 is identical with 46:28 except for מְצַוֵּיךָ in 30:11 versus מְצַוֵּיךָ in 46:28. See S. Talmon, "Synonymous Readings in the Textual Traditions of the OT", *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 8 (1961) 353.

128. Dan 9:7 ὁ'; Jer 8:3 α'σ'; 23:3 <α'σ'>; 34:8(27:10) α'σ' O(×) L; 36(29):14,18 ὁ' OL ×; 50(43):5 α'σ' × (86). See further VII 2.

129. Already at an early date διασπορά was used as a technical term denoting the Jewish diaspora, cf. Deut 28:25 Jer 15:7 41(34):17 Ep.Jac. 1:1. Note further that the renditions listed in the right column refer to the scattering of Israel (with the exception of Jer 37(30):17); in these cases διασπορά denotes the 'bringing into the diaspora'. Cf. K. L. Schmidt, *διασπορά*, *THNT* 2 (1935) 98-104 and Seeligmann, *Isaiah*, 113 on Is 35:8.

It is not certain whether Jer-R was influenced by the technical meaning of the verb since 30(49):5 refers to Edom and 37(30):17 has the *simpler* of the verb.

130. It is improbable that Jer-R made a distinction between ἡγῶ - δουρατός and ἡ(1)גב - (α)χουρός: (1) δουρατός renders ἡגῶ inadequately and the juxtaposition in 51(44):20 of τοῖς δουρατοῖς and τοῖς γουβαῖς makes such an assumption unlikely. (2) In 37(30):6 and 38(31):22 ἡגῶ is rendered with ἀνθρώπος.

131. It is noteworthy that μαχητής occurs primarily in chapters 25-32 which contain the oracles against the nations. It is also found once outside these chapters, and moreover in 26(46):5,6 (α)χουρός is employed. As a result, no firm distribution pattern for μαχητής and (α)χουρός in Jer a' can be formulated.

132. Some additional examples of differences between Jer a' and b', not included in chapters III and IV, could support the assumption that Jer a' embodies a revision.

133. Cf., however, ἐφολαττεν in MSS AM in Job 29:2, mentioned by Thackeray, *Oramina*, 123. Thackeray refers also to Job 17:4 AC, but this reference could not be located.

134. "Sehr fraglich bieibt, ob Kap. 52 wirklich nur ein späterer Nachtrag ist" (Ziegler, "Einleitung", 128, n. 1).

135. See συνοχή in v. 5 (VI 16); ορεπόω in v. 6 (II 4); μετὰ κρίσεως in v. 9 (II 16).

136. See ἐπιστάτης in v. 25 (IV 9).

CHAPTER IV

ADDITIONAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN JER A' AND B' ("SYNONYMOUS RENDITIONS")

The preceding chapter dealt with differences between Jer a' and b' which were explained in a particular way. We have attempted to demonstrate that some renditions in the first part of the book were replaced in the second part of the book with renditions displaying a certain revisional tendency.

This chapter lists additional differences between the two parts of the book which are not characterized by any particular revisional tendency such as the ones described in the previous chapter. We shall list here different renditions of a certain Hebrew word which are found concurrently in the LXX, and without any grammatical or contextual condition determining the occurrence of one rather than the other. We refer, for example, to the different renditions of $\beta\upsilon\lambda\eta$, namely $\alpha\alpha\sigma\sigma\upsilon\lambda\omega$ and $\alpha\alpha\sigma\alpha\tau\alpha\beta\alpha\upsilon\lambda\omega$ (example 1). We suggest calling such renditions "synonymous renditions" (a term which is taken from S. Talmon's "synonymous readings"¹) because from a translator's point of view they are synonymous representations of one Hebrew word. Generally, the Greek words themselves are also synonymous in meaning, but this is not implied in the term "synonymous renditions".²

While the occurrence of synonymous renditions in Jer a' and b' does not necessarily prove our thesis--indeed, several of the examples listed below were taken by Thackeray as evidence for his two translator theory³--it seems to us that such renditions are to be expected in Jer-R's revision as they are present also in other revisions of the LXX: Revisers such as Symmachus, Origen and Lucian--and to a lesser extent, Aquila--inserted into their revisions also new translation equivalents which were not more literal or consistent than the renditions they replaced.⁴ It is hard to know in every instance why the revisers replaced the old renditions with new ones since we are lacking thorough studies of the revision techniques employed. Sometimes the revisers introduced new words because they simply

preferred them to the old ones. In other cases, the synonymous renditions may bear a certain revisionary trait which cannot always be ascertained. For this reason some of the examples of this chapter should perhaps be listed in the previous chapter.

Examples of renditions of Jer-OG, replaced with synonymous ones, are provided below. Unless otherwise specified, there is no significant difference between the two renditions. It should be pointed out that many of Jer-R's renditions are more rare in the LXX than those in Jer a'.

The items are presented as in ch. III. --> references refer to Jer a'b' only.

(1) תַּעֲרִים

παροργίζω (5 x)

7:18,19 8:19 11:17 25:6;
and *passim* in the LXX.

παροργαζάτω (4 x)

39(32):29,32 SA (παρ. rel.)
51(44):3,8;
and further Deut 32:16 B
(ἐπαρ. rel.)

The two words are close in meaning; ⁵ παραοργαζάτω ('to embitter') is a stronger expression.

(2) שָׁן

κατακατηνύω (4 x)

7:12 17:6 23:6 28(51):13;
and *passim* in the LXX.

καταλύω (3 x)⁶

29:17(49:16) 30:9(49:31)
32:10(25:24);
and Sir (4 x).

---> ἀδθημαι Bar 3:3(?).

Jer-R apparently cherished the root καταλυ- (see also III 48)

Jer-R's rendition is more rare in the LXX.

(3) לַשָּׁשׁ, תַּחֲתָשׁ

χαρά (3 x)

15:16 - תַּחֲתָשׁ 16:9 - לַשָּׁשׁ
25:10 - לַשָּׁשׁ;
and *passim* in the LXX.

χαριστή, χαριστούνη (4 x)

31(48):33 תַּחֲתָשׁ - χαριστούνη
(χαρισμη S^c QV) 38(31):13 לַשָּׁשׁ
- χαριστή (χαρισουνη QOC);
ευφροσυνη A) 40(33):11 תַּחֲתָשׁ -
χαριστούνη (χαρισμη AVI), Bar
2:23 χαριστούνη (cf. VI18);
χαρισμή further occurs in Job
(3 x) and χαριστούνη in Lev 22:
29 and 1 Sam 18:6.

---> 7:34 תַּחֲתָשׁ לַקַּיִץ - φωνή
χαρισόντων.

Jer-R's rendition is more rare in the LXX.

(4) לַאֲמַר/לַאֲמַר

a. *past tense*

εἶπον πρός (21 x)

1:7,9,12,14 3:6,11 9:13(12)
11:6,9 13:6,12 14:11,14 15:
1,2 16:10 18:11 19:1,14
21:3 24:3 28(51):61;
and frequently in the LXX.

εἶπον + dat. (28 x)

33(26):17,18 35(28):15
42(35):13 43(36):15,19 (πρός
AC') 44(37):18 45(38):4,14,
15,17,19,24,25 47(40):2,14,15
48(41):6 BAC' (om SQV),8
49(42):2,4,5,9 50(43):2
51(44):20,24,34(45:4)

εἶπον + dat. (4 x)

2:27 13:18 20:3
28(51):59

εἶπον πρός (6 x)

33(26):12 35(28):5,13 36(29):
25 46(39):16 47(40):16

b. *future tense*

εἰπὼ πρός (8 x)

11:3 13:12,13 14:17 15:2
21:8 22:8 23:35 (MT γ)

εἰπὼ + dat. (2 x)

32:13(25:27) 45(38):26

ἐρώ + dat. (6 x)

4:11 10:11 16:11 (πρός
AVOC') 17:20 BS (πρός rel)
19:3 23:33

ἐρώ πρόσ (1 x)

36(29):24

c. *present tense*

λέγω + dat. (1 x)

23:17 39(32):25 45(38):20 50(43):1

λέγω πρόσ (3 x)

The stereotyped LXX rendition of $\lambda\sigma \gamma\mu\sigma$ (in the MT of Jer strongly prevailing over $\rightarrow \lambda \gamma\mu\sigma$) is $\epsilon\lambda\tau\omicron\nu \pi\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$,⁸ also found in Jer-OG. Jer-R, on the other hand, preferred $\epsilon\lambda\tau\omicron\nu + \text{dat.}$,⁹ leaving eight renditions unrevised.¹⁰ Similar differences between Jer a' and b' are visible in the translation of the imperfect of $\gamma\mu\sigma$.¹¹

(5) ἔπειθ'

ἀνθ' ὧν (4 x)

5:14 7:13 19:4 (ἄνω ἔπειθ')
23:38;
and *passim* in the LXX.

---→ $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota\delta\eta$ 25:8.

ἐπειδή (3 x)

31(48):7 36(29):31 (ἄνω ἔπειθ')
42(35):18 (ἄνω ἔπειθ');
and *passim* in the LXX.

---→ $\delta\upsilon' ἄν$ 36(29):23 (ἄνω ἔπειθ').

(6) ἄνω

καθώς (9 x)

7:14,15 12:16 13:5 17:22
18:4 19:11 27(50):15,18

καθάπερ (2 x)

13:11 23:27

---→ $\delta\lambda\upsilon\theta' ὧν$ 5:19.

καθὰ (6 x)

39(32):42 51(44):17,30 Bar
1:6 2:2,28

καθάπερ (1 x)

Bar 2:20

---→ $\delta\omega\pi\epsilon\rho$ 31(48):13 38(31):
28 50(43):12; $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ 51(44):13;
καθώς 33(26):11 49(42):2,18.

Jer-R preferred καθὰ (which is not found in Jer a') as a rendering of $\lambda\gamma\mu\sigma$, in contrast to Jer-OG's καθώς. Although similar in meaning, the two conjunctions have a different background: καθώς originated only in the Hellenistic period and an Atticist such as Phrynichus condemned it in favor of καθό and καθά.¹²

(7) ἔ + inf. constr. (ἄνω)

art. inf. : 56 x
anarthr. inf.: 16 x;
the art. inf. is further favored by the LXX of Jud 2 Chr Ez and by Aq¹⁴ and Th.¹⁵

art. inf. : 35 x
anarthr. inf.: 59 x;
the anarthr. inf. is further preferred by the translators of the Pent and many other books, by Sym¹⁶ and Th-ban.¹⁷

The rendition favored by Jer-OG contains a formal equivalent for λ (τοῦ). The un-Greek employment of the article may have caused Jer-R and other revisers to omit it often.

(8) ἔπειθ'

ὡσεβέω (3 x)
2:8,29 3:13;
further in the MP (see VI 62),
Is 59:13 Ez 18:31.

ἀποστήμι (2 x)

40(33):8 Bar 3:8; 18
and further Ez 20:38. Cf. al-
so 2 Chr 21:8,10,10 - $\gamma\omega\sigma$
... τ $\mu\mu\mu\mu$.

(9) ἔπειθ'

καθεστημένος (1 x)

20:1 (ἔπειθ' of the temple);
and 2 Chr 31:13. καθίστημι
also renders ἔπειθ' in the LXX
(i.a. 2 x in Jer a' and 5 x
in Jer b').

ἐπιστάτης (2 x)

36(29):26 (ἔπειθ' of the temple);
52:25 (ἔπειθ' of the soldiers);
and elsewhere 2 Ki 25:19
(// Jer 52:25). ἐφίστημι also
renders ἔπειθ' in the LXX (i.a.
2 x in Jer a' and 1 x in Jer
b').

(10) πγ + pron. suff. or in the constr. state

<u>καίᾱ</u> (11 x)	<u>πονηρία</u> (5 x)
1:16 2:19 3:2 4:18 6:7 7:12 8:6 11:15,17 12:4 28(51):24 (αδύκια A); and <i>passim</i> in the LXX.	31(48):16 39(32):32 40(33):5 51(44):3 Bar 2:26; and <i>passim</i> in the LXX.
<u>κακᾱ</u> (5 x)	<u>κακᾱ</u> (2 x - 5 x)
2:27 11:12 14:16 15:11 18:8; and <i>passim</i> in the LXX.	51(44):5,9 (4 x)
---→ <u>κάκαστος</u> 2:28 (κρίστους C)	
11:14 28(51):2; <u>πονηρία</u> 23:11.	

As in the remainder of the LXX, πγ is rendered in Jer a' and b' by κακᾱ, both when used absolutely and when containing a pron. suff. or occurring in the constr. state. In the latter two conditions, however, Jer-OG more strongly favored κακᾱ, while Jer-R preferred πονηρία.

(11) πδ

<u>ἀλλογονομα</u> (7 x) ¹⁹	<u>λαμβάνω</u> (6 x)
8:9 27(50):2,9,24 28(51):31, 41,56; and <i>passim</i> in the LXX.	31(48):1,41 39(32):3,28 41(34):22 Bar 1:2; and <i>passim</i> in the LXX.
---→ <u>σλλαμβάνω</u> 5:26 6:11.	<u>σλλαμβάνω</u> (7 x)
	31(48):7,44 39(32):24 41(34):2 (not in MT) 44(37):8 45(38):3,28; and <i>passim</i> in the LXX.

(12) σβγ (gal and pi'el)

<u>ἰδομαι</u> (7 x)	<u>ἰαίρεσῶ</u> (3 x)
3:22 6:14 15:18 17:14,14 19:11 28(51):8; and <i>passim</i> in the LXX.	37(30):13 (MT ΠΓΒΦΓ),17 40(33):6; and further 2 Ki 8:29 9:15 2 Chr 22:6 (all σβγ <i>hithpa'el</i>), 9 (MT אחרת).
---→ <u>ἰαίρεσῶ</u> 28(51):9, 20	
Jer-R's rendition is more rare in the LXX.	
	(13) <u>πצפ</u>
<u>ἄκρον</u> (3 x)	<u>ἕβρος</u> (3 x)
12:12,12 25:16(49:36); and <i>passim</i> in the LXX.	32:17,19,19(25:31,33,33); and <i>passim</i> in the LXX. ²¹
<u>ἔσχατον</u> (3 x)	
10:13 28(51):16,32; and <i>passim</i> in the LXX.	

(14) πצג

<u>ἀνάτιτω</u> (6 x / 5 x)	<u>καίῶ</u> (3 x)
9:12(11) (11:16) ²² 17:27 21:12,14 (MT <u>בְּחַיִּי</u>) 27(50):32; and <i>passim</i> in the LXX.	30:16(49:27) 39(32):29 (κατασ. OC) 50(43):12; and <i>passim</i> in the LXX.
---→ καίῶ 26(46):19 Wutz καυθήσεται MSS κληθήσεται ουαα; ἐμπυρίῳ 4:26 (MT בַּחֲרִי) 28(51):30,58.	---→ κατακαίῶ 30(49):2; ἀνάτιτω 31(48):9 (ἀπιτω BS).

(15) γπג

<u>κατασκήπιτω</u> (2 x) ²³	<u>καθαίρεσῶ</u> (3 x)
1:10 2:15; and <i>passim</i> in the LXX.	38:28(31:27) 40(33):4 (καθ- ημα AC') 52:14; and <i>passim</i> in the LXX.

קט

κατασκήνω (1 x)

27(50):15;

and *passim* in the LXX.καθαίρω (1 x)

24:6

Jer-OG preferred to render verbs of destruction with κατασκήνω, while Jer-R opted for καθαίρω.

(16) קלס

ἀνασφύζω (2 x)

26(46):6 28(51):6;

and *passim* in the LXX.31(48):6,8,19 (ἀνασφύζω Q)

39(32):4 41(34):3 45(38):18,

23 46(39):18 48(41):15;

and *passim* in the LXX.

פלס, פלס

ἀνασφύζομαι (3 x)

27(50):28,29 28(51):50;

and *passim* in the LXX.---→ ἀνασφύζομαι 51(44):14,24

(17) קכ

πλησθόν (13 x)

5:8 6:21 7:5 9:4,8,20(3,7,

19) 19:9 22:8,13 23:27,30,

35 26(46):16;

and *passim* in the LXX.πλήθυνε (2 x)²⁵36(29):23 38(31):34 BS (αδελ-φος A0; πλησθόν rel);²⁶

and further Prov 11:9,12

24:43(28).

---→ πλησθόν 41(34):15,17

43(36):16.

πολίτης (Jer-R) occurs only rarely in the LXX²⁷ and its occurrence in Jer b' is therefore noteworthy even though πλησθόν is more frequent in Jer b' (3 x) than πολίτης.

(18) נבלה

λέγω (3 x)

7:33 9:22(21) 19:7;

and Deut 28:26.

ἐπισημαίνω (2 x)²⁸

41(34):20 43(36):30;

and *passim* in the LXX.---→ ἐπισημαίνω 16:18.

(19) נביד/זריע/נטרייה

(ἐν χειρ.) ἐκτεταμένη ! (1 x)

21:5;

cf. נָבִיד - ἐκτείνω *passim* in

the LXX.

(ἐν βραχίονι/ἐπιχεύω) ἐπιηλάτῃ
(4 x)

34:4(27:5) 39(32):17,21 Bar

2:11;

and *passim* in the LXX.

This rendition may have been influenced by the similar rendering of the parallel phrase רָמַר יָד with כַּיֵּר בְּהַלָּחֵה.²⁹

(20) נחח (subject תחח)

χέω ! (1 x)

7:20

οὐδέω (3 x)

49(42):18,18 51(44):6;

and elsewhere in the LXX, also with other subjects.

(21) ורב

μύχαισα (35 x)

2:30 4:10 5:12 9:16(15)

11:22 12:12 14:12,13,15,16,

18 (σοφαισα A0L') 15:2,2,3,9

16:4 18:21,21 19:7 20:4,4

21:7,9 24:10 25:17(49:37)

26(46):10,14,16

δωψαία (12 x)

45(38):2 46(39):18 49(42):16,

17,22 50(43):11 51(44):12,

13,18,27,28 Bar 2:25;

and *passim* in the LXX.

27(50):16,21,35,36,37,37;
and *passim* in the LXX.

ῥοιπαῖα (2 x)

5:17 6:25

μάχαυρα (13 x)

29(47):6 31(48):2,10 32:2,
13,15,17,24(25:16,27,30,31,38)
33(26):23 34:6(27:8) 38(31):
2 39(32):24,36 41(34):17

Though predominant in Jer a', μάχαυρα is used in Jer b' only in half of the verses. It may thus be assumed that in some instances³⁰ Jer-R replaced μάχαυρα with ῥοιπαῖα.

(22) ἦν

ἐντέλλομαι (16 x)

1:7,17 7:22,23,23,31 11:4,4
13:5,6 14:14 17:22 19:5
23:32 27(50):21 28(51):59;
and *passim* in the LXX.

συντάσσω (9 x)

33(26):2,8 34(27):3(4)
36(29):23 39(32):13,35
41(34):22 44(37):21 Bar 1:20;
and elsewhere in the LXX.

ἐντέλλομαι (13 x)

29(47):7 39(32):23 42(35):6,
10,14,18 43(36):5,8,26
45(38):10,27 Bar 2:9,28

ἐντέλλομαι, the only rendition of the Heb in Jer a', occurs also in Jer b', possibly as an unrevised remnant of the OG of that section. Jer-R also changed ἐντέλλομαι to συντάσσω (9 x). συντάσσω does not occur in Jer a', nor does it frequently render ἦν in any other part of the LXX except Ex and Num.

(23) πῦρ (subject ἦν)

σεῖω (3 x)

8:16 27(50):46 28(51):29;
and further Ez (4 x), with different subjects.

φοβέομαι (1 x)

29:22(49:21) BS (σεῖω rel);³¹
and Ez 27:28.

(24) ἦν

ἦν (3 x)

5:22 (waves) 27(50):42 (sea)
28(51):55 (waves);
and 5 x in the LXX.

βουβέω ! (2 x) 32

31(48):36,36 (heart) 38(31):
36 (waves)

σπεύδω ! (1 x)

38(31):20 (intestines)

καυάλω (1 x)

6:23 (sea);
and Is 17:12.

μαμάσσω ! (1 x)

4:19 (heart)

APPENDIX

The exact dividing line between Jer a' and b'

As part of the working hypothesis for chapters III and IV, it was postulated that Jer b' is preserved from 29(47):1. This assumption is verified here.

Listed below are the characteristic renditions of Jer a' (OG) and Jer b' (Jer-R) on both sides of the imaginary dividing line. The list contains characteristic renditions of Jer a' (OG) in 28(51):41-64, whereas characteristic renditions of Jer-R which occur in this section are underlined. The same method is applied to renditions peculiar to Jer-R in the section on the other side of the imaginary dividing line, viz. 29:1-23(47:1-7; 49:7-22).

1. Jer 28(51):41-64

41	לכד - ἀλίσκομαι	IV 11
41	שמדח - ἀφανισμός	III 1
43	שמדח - ἄβατος, adj.	III 1
50	פלמיח - ἀνασφύζομαι	IV 16
52,53	ה'ה אחר - λέγει κύριος	III 43
54	שבר - συντριβή	III 35
55	המה - ἦχος	IV 24
56	שודד - ταλαιπωρία	III 2
56	לכד - ἀλίσκομαι	IV 11
56	נבור - μαχητής	III 51
57	שרית - ἡγεμόνας BSAOL'1 ηγουμενους rel	III 47
58	ה'ה אחר כה - <u>τάδε λέγει κύριος</u>	III 18
58	ערער - καταστροφή	IV n. 23
62	שמדח - ἀφανισμός	III 1
62	ה'ה אחר לבלתי - <u>τοῦ μὴ εἶναι</u>	III 6

2. Jer 29:1-23(47:1-7, 49:7-22)

2	ה'ה אחר כה - <u>τάδε λέγει κύριος</u>	III 18
4	שדד - ἀπόλλυμι	III 2
8	ה'ה אחר כה - <u>τάδε λέγει κύριος</u>	III 18
9	תע - χρόνος	III 10

11	ΓΠΘ - ὄλλουμ	III 2
11	ΥΓΥ - ἐπέχειουον	III 4
13	Γ η κηκ ηδ - ιάδε λέγει κύριος	III 18
14	Γ η κηκ ηδ - λέγει κύριος	III 43
14, 18	κηκ - ἔβατος	III 1
20	κηκ - τόπος	III 48
20	υ ββλ - κατὰ πρόσωπον	III 22
21	κηκ - ἀρατώ	III 1
21	κηκ - κατὰλυσις	III 48
22	ηγγ - φοβέομαι	IV 23

Since the hand of Jer-R can be detected from 29(47):4 onwards,³³ it is reasonable to assume that the MSS of Jer-LXX display his revision from 29(47):1 onwards.³⁴ See further VII, section 2.

The likelihood that Jer b' starts at the beginning of chapter 29 rather than after 29:15(49:14) (after the last "exception" in v. 14) is increased by an additional factor: V. 3 contains six pairs of prepositions + (double) noun + pron. suff. In four cases the LXX, conforming with the Heb, lacks articles. In one instance it has one article, and in another it has two. This trend of conforming with the Heb points to Jer-R rather than to the OG (see III 32).

NOTES

CHAPTER IV

1. S. Talmon, "Synonymous Readings in the Textual Traditions of the OT," *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 8 (1961) 335-383. For a discussion of some synonymous renditions in the LXX, see Hatch, *Essays*, 22ff. "Synonymous renditions" in the LXX deserve to be studied in a separate monograph.
2. Many of these synonymous renditions appear elsewhere as variants in the MSS of the LXX or as variants between the LXX and the text quoted from the LXX in the NT and Church Fathers.
3. The following items adduced in this chapter are mentioned by Thackeray, "Gr.Tr.Jer.", 247ff.: 1,2,3,6,7,8,10,12,14,17,22,24; Martin, *Synfax*, 117ff.: 4; Köhler, "Beobachtungen," 25:20.
4. See Hatch, *Essays*, 27 for Sym; Sois.-Soin., *Zusätze*, 155 and Johnson, *Samuel*, 42ff. and J. Ziegler, *Festschrift G. R. Driver* (Oxford 1963) 176ff. for O; for L: J. Ziegler, *Biblica* 40 (1959) 224-227 (where earlier literature is mentioned) and B. M. Metzger, *Chapters in the History of NT Textual Criticism* (Leiden 1963) 25; and for Aq: Reider, *Prolegomena*, 34ff. For παραμικρόν see especially Walters, *Text*, 150-154.
5. Hesychius explains παραμικρόν with παροργίζεν. See further 44(37):13 ηγγη γλα - ἀνθρώπος παρ' ἃ κατέλυσε, probably read as ηγγη, cf. 52:11 ηγγη ηγγη and BDB, s.v. ηγγη.
6. No similar discrepancy between Jer a' and b' is recognizable for λαλέω (usually reflecting לָלַח):

Jer a'	Jer b'
λαλέω πρός 12 x	λαλέω πρός 9 x
λαλέω + dat. 1 x	λαλέω + dat. 4 x

Cf. Helbing, *Kasussyntax*, 238-239.
7. Jer-OG's renditions, almost exclusively reflecting לָלַח, conform with the general picture of εἶπον in the LXX:

לָלַח - εἶπον πρός 812 x	-לָ לָלַח - εἶπον + dat. 459 x
-לָ לָלַח - εἶπον πρός 49 x	לָלַח - εἶπον + dat. 333 x

The figures are culled from Helbing, *Kasussyntax*, 218.
8. The reviser might have avoided εἶπον πρός because he preferred to limit πρός to the local sense of לָלַח. However, probably neither the OG nor the reviser had a clear intention when using either εἶπον πρός or εἶπον + dat., both good Greek expressions (see LSJ, s.v.). Some books of the LXX prefer one of the two renderings, but in such cases the other one is not excluded; see Helbing, *Kasussyntax*, 217-220.

Martin, *Syntax*, 118-119, distinguished in Jer between cases in which God is the subject of εἶπov, and those in which εἶπov has a human as its subject. However, since examples of the first group are confined to the Heb of Jer a', the distinction does not seem to be justified.

The differentiation between the two renditions is not determined by the occurrence of personal names after the verb which might have caused the use of πρὸς rather than the dative. Among the occurrences of εἶπov in Jer a' one finds one p.n. (personal name) rendered by εἶπov πρὸς and one by εἶπov with the dative. In Jer b' nine of the 29 cases of εἶπov with the dative are followed by a p.n., and likewise five of the six cases of εἶπov πρὸς are followed by a p.n. This picture makes Jer-R's preferences for εἶπov with the dative more evident. Jer-R rendered nine occurrences of ἄδא with a p.n. by εἶπov + dat. although in these cases one would have expected πρὸς according to the above-mentioned statistics.

10. A similar opposition between Ez a' and b' was noticed by Turner, "Ezekiel", 13.

11. The evidence for the present tense of the verb, although scanty, is at variance with that for the past and future tenses.

12. *Eclogae*, 397, quoted by LSJ, s.v. See further Swete, *Introduction*, 297, and Turner, *Syntax*, 320.

13. The figures are culled from Sois.-Soin., *Infinitive*, 173 ("ein sehr deutlicher Unterschied" between the two parts of Jer). To the figures for Jer we have added those for Bar (35 = 34 + 1; 59 = 52 + 7).

14. See Reider, *Prolegomena*, 50.

15. See Schmitt, *Theodotion*, 83-84.

16. Sois.-Soin., *Infinitive*, 201.

17. See Schmitt, *ib.*

18. The reconstruction of Bar is based upon Jer 33:8 MT (*contra* Kneucker, *Baruch*, *ad loc.*).

19. See further 2:26 נַדְנַן - ἀποκομαί.

20. This rendition was probably introduced as a variation after 28(51):8 (δομαί).

21. μέπος in the meaning of 'side' is not attested in the available dictionaries, but the relevant evidence is supplied by J. A. L. Lee, "A Neglected Sense of μέπος," *Antichthon* 6 (1972) 39-42.

22. הַלְלֵנוּ שָׂא תִצַּח תִּלְבַּן... - ἀνήσθη πῶς ἐπ'αυτῆν μεγάλη ἡ θάλασσα ἐπὶ σέ (om ἀνήσθη πῶς ἐπ'αυτῆν ο). ἀνάπρω belongs to the non-original part of the doublet, see Ziegler, *Beiträge*, 100.

23. κατασκήνω renders further in Jer a' ἠνῆθ (5:10) and ἡγεῖ (28(51):58). It does not occur in Jer b'.

24. This rendition was probably introduced as a variation after σῶζω, occurring at the beginning of the sentence.

25. In the listed passages πολίτης undoubtedly means 'fellow man', a meaning which is not quoted in the lexica. Orally Hesyclus records a meaning close to 'fellow man': πολίτης δ συμπολιτεύόμενός τινα καὶ συνώγ (cf. 3:20 ὅγ - συνών).

26. See Ziegler, "Einleitung", 45.

27. πολίτης further renders תְּמִיץ in Zach 13:7 and תְּמִיץ in Gen 23:11.

28. See further 40(33):5 פַּרְס - νεμρός.

29. Ex 14:8 Num 33:3 Deut 32:27 Is 26:11. Cf. also Is 3:16 לְרִיב לְרִיב וְלִנְדָּבָה - ὁψηλάφ τραχύλαφ.

30. Especially chapters 45-51, cf. VII, n. 7.

31. See Ziegler, "Einleitung", 45.

32. βουβέω occurs elsewhere only in 1 Chr 16:32 (βυβ); βόμβησις is found only in Bar 2:29 (βὸβη), cf. V 19.

33. For a possible reading of Jer-R in 28(51):57 see III, n. 121.

34. In 29:2,8,13,14(47:2 49:7,12,13) four renditions of the phrases הַ קָּמַר הַסּוּחַ and הַ קָּמַר were left unrevised possibly because of their formulaic character. The fact that all four instances occur immediately after the imaginary dividing line is intriguing (cf. VII, n. 7).

CHAPTER V

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN BARUCH AND JER-LXX

There can be no doubt that the first part of Bar (Bar 1:1-3:8), extant in Greek and in several secondary translations, was originally composed in Hebrew,¹ but opinions are divided whether the second part was written either in Greek or in Hebrew. Although our main interest lies in the first part of Bar, relevant data from Bar 3:9 ff. are not excluded *a priori*.

In considering the textual status of Bar, scholars have been preoccupied with two major problems: first, the number of documents composing Bar, a question which has both textual and literary aspects;² second, the question of the relationship between Bar, Jer and Dan: Bar, like the bulk of Qumran literature and several apocryphal books, comprises a mosaic of Biblical passages. The two books most frequently quoted and elaborated upon in this mosaic are Dan and Jer and it has been recognized that there exists a special relationship between Bar on the one hand and Jer and Dan on the other.³

This chapter is devoted to an examination of the relationship between the two translations of Bar and Jer, omitting consideration of their Hebrew *Vorlagen*.³ Previous discussions of the issue have not distinguished consistently between the primary (Hebrew) and secondary (Greek) level, and this inaccuracy has led to misunderstandings.

The discussion of the translation equivalents of Bar is based on a reconstruction of its Hebrew *Vorlage* which is found in the appendix to this chapter. Like all reconstructions, all so this one is tentative, but it should be stressed that two factors render many details in the reconstruction rather stable: (1) Bar was translated with literal accuracy by a relatively consistent translator;⁴ (2) the reconstruction can be supported by many Biblical parallels which the author of the Hebrew Bar most likely had in mind. These parallels are provided in the study mentioned on p. 127.

In Bar's mosaic of Biblical verses, quotations from Jer, often phrased like the LXX of Jer, are prominent. Some scholars asserted that this resemblance between Bar and Jer-LXX resulted from Bar's use of the Greek of Jer.⁵ Elaborating upon this theory, Kneucker stated that Bar was so well acquainted with Jer "dass er bei seiner Arbeit unwillkürlich-gedächtniss-mässig-hebräische Worte und Satzverbindungen in ähnlicher und gleicher Weise griechisch wiedergab" (*Baruch*, 85). Schürer⁶ and Thackeray (at one time)⁷ even assumed that Bar deliberately imitated the style of Jer.

The majority of scholars, however, explained the resemblance between Bar and Jer-LXX as resulting from an identical translator for both books,⁸ or for Jer-LXX and the first part of Bar.⁹ Thackeray explained the similarities in a more satisfactory manner; for, while working on the problem of the different translators of Jer, he found that the first part of Bar (1:1-3:8) was actually rendered by the second translator of Jer, Jer. β,¹⁰

Thackeray's view of the relationship between Jer β' and Bar is basically correct. We hope to prove the correctness of Thackeray's preliminary statement which was appended to his article on Jer.¹¹ It is of interest to note that Thackeray reluctantly abandoned this view at a later stage,¹² but finally returned to his original opinion.¹³

While according to Thackeray the second part of Jer and the first chapters of Bar were produced by the second translator of Jer, in our opinion they contain the work of Jer-R. It is our intention to show that both Bar 1:1-3:8 and Jer 29-52 were finally formulated by one person (Jer-R). In this way we hope to prove one of the presuppositions on which some of the examples in chapters II-IV are based. It should be pointed out that this chapter provides no additional proof that Jer β' is a revision rather than a second translation. Relevant data concerning the revisional elements included in Jer 29-52 and Bar were provided in ch. III.

Our discussion of the relationship between Bar and Jer is rather complicated because the examples have to be subdivided into many categories. This system has been chosen because we want to be able to dismiss alternative explanations before

reaching our own conclusion that Jer-R's hand is also visible in Bar. As a result, similarities between Bar and Jer-R are subdivided into two groups, with three additional groups of items further exemplifying Bar's relation to Jer-LXX (see n. 1 below):

1. Bar = Jer-R in quotations from Jer β' (items 1-5)
2. Bar = Jer-R outside quotations from Jer β'
 - α. Bar = Jer-R ≠ Jer-OG (items 6-19)
 - β. Bar = Jer-R = LXX ≠ Jer-OG (see n. 2 below) (items 20-27)
3. Bar = Jer α'β' (items 28-30)
4. Bar ≠ Jer β' (items 31-33)
5. Bar ≠ Jer α' (items 34-35)

A further distinction is made in groups 1 and 2 between:

- a. Agreements between Bar and Jer β' in some isolated renditions;
- b. Similarities between Bar and Jer-R in recurring renditions which distinguish Jer β' as a whole from Jer α' (and the remainder of the LXX). See below, n. 3.

Note 1: The examples below refer to significant (dis)agreements only, excluding disagreements which involve different *Vorlagen*. Thus, one should not expect to find references to all the passages of Jer which are quoted in Bar.

Note 2: The translation vocabulary of Jer-R and Bar often agrees with that of the other LXX books, while the corresponding translation option of Jer-OG is isolated within the LXX (2α). In contrast to the examples of group 2α, the items of group 2β indicate that Bar could have been rendered by any one of the LXX translators, with the exception of Jer-OG.

Note 3: The distinction between category (a) and (b) is made to counter the claim that agreements between Bar and Jer-R in given phrases result either from Bar's use of Jer β' or from a reworking of Bar according to Jer β'. We maintain that this argument cannot be held against evidence gathered in category (b), especially when words characteristic of Jer-R are found within quotations from Jer α'.

Note 4: It is important to stress that no example of Bar = Jer OG ≠ Jer-R could be found.

In the following, "Jer b'" and "Jer-R" denote Jer 29-52 only, and do not include Bar as they do in the remainder of this study. ¹ and * refer to renditions and words occurring in Jer b' and Bar only. Reference is made to the relevant discussions in chapters II-IV where some of the below-mentioned renditions are discussed in full.¹⁴

1. *Bar = Jer-R in Quotations from Jer b'*

The following examples could be taken as proof that Bar was retouched according to the LXX of Jer b'. However, the data adduced in section (2) refute such an assumption.

a. *Agreements between Bar and Jer b' in some isolated renditions*

(1) πῶλον - ὑποχείριος !

Bar 2:4 καὶ ἔδοκον αὐτοῖς ὑποχείριους ἰσάσας ταῖς βασιλείαις ταῖς κύλιφ ἡμῶν εἰς ὄνειδιμόν καὶ εἰς ἄβατον; Jer 49(42):18 καὶ ἔσεθε εἰς ἄβατον καὶ ὑποχείριος καὶ εἰς ἄβαν καὶ εἰς ὄνειδισμόν (ἠῶρη) καὶ ἄλλὰ ἠῶρη.

The Heb Bar paraphrased Jer 29:18 כְּכֹל מְכַלְכֶּנּוּ לְכָל יְרֵקֶה לִזְרֵחַ הַגִּיחַ וְנִחְנִיחַ the Greek Bar's use of ὑποχείριος is related to the LXX of Jer 49(42):18, whose wording is close to Jer 29:18. Kneucker's assumption (*Barneh, ad loc.*) that in both cases ὑποχείριος¹⁵ reflects πῶλον is probably correct.¹⁶

(2) πῶρον - παγεῖός

Bar 2:25 ἐξερριμένα τῷ καύματι τῆς ἡμέρας καὶ τῷ παγεῖῳ τῆς νοκτός; Jer 43(36):30 ἐρριμένον ἐν τῷ καύματι τῆς ἡμέρας καὶ ἐν τῷ παγεῖῳ τῆς νοκτός (ἡλί) καὶ ἄλλοι (משלכת לחור ביום וקרה בלילה).

Both translations appear to be based upon the LXX of Gen 31:40. ¹⁷ παγετός occurs elsewhere only in Sir 3:15 (כפורה).

(3) בַּרְבַּל - ἀποστολή !

Bar 2:25 καὶ ἀπεδύνασαν ἐν πόνοις πονηροῖς ἐν λιμῷ καὶ ἐν βουφαίᾳ καὶ ἐν ἀποστολή; Jer 39(32):36 ἐν μαχαίρα καὶ ἐν λιμῷ καὶ ἐν ἀποστολή (בחרב ובדעב ובדבר).

ἀποστολή should probably be explained with Schleusner, s.v., as 'pestilentia a Deo immissa'¹⁸ and not with LSJ, *Suppl.*, as 'exile'.¹⁹ בַּרְבַּל does not occur elsewhere in Jer b'; in Jer a' it is rendered by ἄνατος, as in the remainder of the LXX.

(4) שָׁרַי - κυριεύω !

Bar 2:34 quotes Jer 37(30):3. Only in these two places is שָׁרַי rendered by κυριεύω (cf. Ex 15:9 שָׁרַיָהוּ - κυριεύω and Num 21:24 שָׁרַי - κατακυριεύω).²⁰

b. *Similarities between Bar and Jer-R in recurring renditions which distinguish Jer b' as a whole from Jer a' (and the remainder of the LXX)*

(5) שָׁמַח - ἄβατος !

Bar 2:4 = Jer 49(42):18 (quoted in item 1). The rendering of שָׁמַח with ἄβατος is discussed in item 15 below.

2. *Bar = Jer-R Outside Quotations from Jer b'*

a. *Bar = Jer-R ≠ Jer-OG*

The below-mentioned examples provide reasonable proof that Jer-R and Bar are identical.

a. *Agreements between Bar and Jer b' in some isolated renditions*

(6) אִישׁ יְהוּדָה וְרַעְיָתָהּ יִירָשׁוּלַם

Bar 1:15 = Dan 9:7. Bar's translation differs from both Dan-LXX and Dan-Th, but concurs with Jer 42(35):13:

Bar 1:15

= Jer 42(35):13 ἀνθρώπων Ιουδα καὶ τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν Ιερουσαλημ

Dan-LXX 9:7 ἀνθρώπους Ιουδα καὶ καθήμενους ἐν Ιερουσαλημ

Dan-Th 9:7 Ιουδα καὶ τοῖς ἐνοικοῦσιν ἐν Ιερουσαλημ

Note the different renderings of ישא²¹ and of ישבי and ישב.

(7) תורה - פרסטיאμα

Bar 1:18 and 2:10 = Dan 9:10. While Dan-LXX and Dan-Th rendered תורה by its usual equivalent (νόμος), Bar used פרσטיαμα, a rendition which recurs only in Jer 39(32):23, 51(44):10 and 2 Chr 19:10 - thus very rare when compared to the numerous occurrences of νόμος.²²

(8) דאב - πεινώω !

Bar 2:18 = Deut 28:65. Instead of the rendition of דאב in Deut (τρακουμένη ψαχή), Bar rendered the Heb by ή ψαχή ή πεινώσα. Elsewhere in the LXX is דאב rendered by πεινώω only in Jer 38(31):25 (הבש דאב) - ψαχή πεινώσα and 38(31):12. It seems as if this translation reflects לעב (interchanges of ל/ד and ס/ע) but it should, in fact, be considered a "pseudo-variant" (cf. II, n. 9), resulting from the translator's ignorance of דאב.

(9) שבח - έκλεέπω

Bar 2:23 = Jer 7:34 (Jer a'). The first word of the quotation (תשבחי - καταλύω) appears in Bar as έκλεέπειν ποιέω. The rendering of שבח by έκλεέπω recurs only in Jer 43(36):29 and Jos 5:11.

(10) תללית - πράγματα !

Bar 2:33 = Jer 25:5 (Jer a'). In Jer תללית is rendered with έπιτηδεύματα, as in the remainder of the LXX. Bar's rendition (πράγματα) recurs only in Jer 51(44):22.

b. *Similarities between Bar and Jer-R in recurring renditions which distinguish Jer b' as a whole from Jer a' (and the remainder of the LXX)*

(11) לבלתי - ποδες תו מ ה ! (III 6)

Bar 1:19 καὶ έσχεδεδίξομεν προς το μη έκούειν της φωνης αυτου ; cf. Bar 2:5 προς το μη έκούειν της φωνης αυτου.

Bar 1:19 = Dan 9:11 בללתי בקותי שמוע בקותי וטרור, Dan-LXX καὶ έπέστησαν το μη έκούσαι της φωνης σου, Dan-Th καὶ έξέκλιναν το μη έκούσαι της φωνης σου.

The usual LXX rendition of לבלתי is το μη, occurring also in the LXX and Th translations of Dan. Bar's rendition προς το μη, on the other hand, recurs only in Jer b'; more precisely, the use of the art. inf. with ποδες + acc. (rendering both לבלתי and לעל) is confined to Jer b' (III 6,7). Therefore, the identical rendition of לבלתי with ποδες το μη in Bar and Jer b' strongly suggests the identity of Bar and Jer-R, especially since the similarity is found within a quotation from Dan.

(12) עבר ('to serve someone') - έργάζομαι ! (III 8)

This rendition occurs only in Jer 34:5 - 47:9 (11 x) Bar 1:22 2:21,22,24.

(13) תיהי - δυσμαέπω (III 50)

Bar 2:13 and 2:29 resemble Jer's style, but do not elaborate upon any particular passage. Bar 2:4 and 3:8, on the other hand, paraphrase Jer 24:9 (Jer a'). In all four verses Bar agrees with Jer-R in translating תיהי by δυσμαέπω and not by έξωδέω, a rendition which characterizes Jer a' (it occurs, e.g., in the above-mentioned 24:9; cf. further III 50).

(14) ה אמר כ ח - οὕτως εἶπε κύριος (III 18)

Bar 2:21 οὕτως εἶπε κύριος. Since Jer-R's rendition of the Heb, οὕτως εἶπε κύριος (replacing an earlier τάδε λέγει κύριος) occurs only rarely outside Jer b', the agreement between Bar and Jer-R is all the more significant.

(15) תשמח - άβραος ! (III 1)

Bar 2:23 quotes Jer 7:34 (Jer a') and the end of the verse uses one of the characteristic expressions of Jer, תשמח...תיהי. Unlike the LXX of Jer a' (άφραυσμός), Bar rendered תשמח with άβραος, a rendition which is confined to Jer b'.

The same rendition occurs in Bar 2:4, quoting Jer 49(42):
18 (see item 5).

(16) לְחַדָּשׁ + noun - אִמָּה + noun (III 28)

Bar 2:23 καὶ ἔσται πᾶσα ἡ γῆ εἰς ἄβασιν ἀπὸ ἐνοικοῦντων.
The first part of the phrase quotes Jer 7:34 (Jer a'), while
the last two words have many parallels in Jer and Zeph, but not
in Jer 7:34. Like Jer-R, and unlike Jer-OG, Bar rendered לְחַדָּשׁ
+ noun literally with ἀνά + noun.

(17) לְחַדָּשׁ - prep. + ὀφθαλμῶς (III 21)

Bar 1:22 ποιῆσαι τὰ καιά κατ' ὀφθαλμοῦς κυρίου θεοῦ ἡμῶν;
cf. Jer 39(32):30 ποιούντες τὸ πονηρὸν κατ' ὀφθαλμοῦς μου;
18:10 ποιήσωσι τὰ πονηρὰ ἐναντίον μου.

Bar's treatment of לְחַדָּשׁ conforms with that of Jer-R (see
III 21). However, the evidence for Bar is scanty, especially
since Bar 1:12 ἐδηόσωμεν χόλον ἐναντίον αὐτῶν probably also re-
flects לְחַדָּשׁ.²³

(18) חַרְחַר - χαρισσοῦνη (IV 3)

Bar 2:23 = Jer 7:34 (Jer a'). Instead of Jer's חַרְחַר לְחַדָּשׁ -
φωνὴ χαϊρόντων, Bar translated חַרְחַר with χαρισσοῦνη. χαρισσοῦνη
occurs elsewhere only in Lev 22:29 1 Sam 18:6 Jer 31(48):33
40(33):11 and Bar 4:23.

(19) βουβ- (IV 24)

Bar 2:29 βόμβησις ('buzzing'), probably translating לַחֲדָשׁ,
is a *hapax* for the LXX. The cognate verb βομβέω occurs only in
Jer 31(48):36 - חֲדָשׁ, 38(31):36 - חֲדָשׁ and 1 Chr 16:32 - בַּז.

β. *Bar* = *Jer-R* = *LXX* ≠ *Jer-OG*²⁴

The items of this group indicate that Bar could have been
rendered by any one of the LXX translators with the exception
of Jer-OG.

(20) לְחַדָּשׁ - παῖς (III 42)

This rendition occurs in Jer 32:5 - 52:8 (14 x), Bar 1:20
2:20,24,28 3:37 and *passim* in the LXX. Jer-OG rendered the
Heb both with δοῦλος (4 x) and with παῖς (3 x). However, לְחַדָּשׁ
appears in Bar in its religious use, and Jer-OG rendered such
instances mainly by δοῦλος.

(21) בְּיָמֵי דְחִינָא - θεοὶ ἔτεροι (III 19)

This rendition occurs in Jer 39:29 - 51:15 (6 x), Bar 1:22
and *passim* in the LXX. Jer-OG rendered the Heb mainly with
θεοὶ ἀλλότριου (12 x).

(22) לְחַדָּשׁ - κλίνο τὸ οὖς (III 20)

Bar 2:16 = Dan 9:18. Bar's rendition לְחַדָּשׁ מְחַה - κλίνο τὸ
οὖς σου conforms with Dan-Th, Jer b' (4 x) and the remainder of
the LXX, and differs from that of Dan-LXX and Jer-OG (see III
20).

(23) לְחַדָּשׁ - συνατῶς (III 51)

This rendition occurs in Jer b' (3 x), Bar 1:4,9 (ד'לְחַדָּשׁ
read as ב'לְחַדָּשׁ) and *passim* in the LXX. Jer-OG rendered the Heb
mainly with μακρήσ (8 x).

(24) לְחַדָּשׁ - καθά (IV 6)

This rendition occurs in Jer b' (3 x), in Bar 1:6 2:2,28
and *passim* in the LXX. καθά does not occur in Jer a'.

(25) לְחַדָּשׁ - συντάσω (IV 22)

Bar 1:20 συντάσω occurs within a quotation from Jer 11:4
(Jer a'). This common LXX rendition occurs also 8 times in Jer
b', but never in Jer a'.

(26) לְחַדָּשׁ + inf. constr. rendered by the Greek
anarthr. inf. (IV 7)

Bar's preference for the anarthr. inf. (7 x; art. inf. 1
x) conforms with Jer-R (anarthr. inf. 52 x; art. inf. 34 x).

Jer-OG, on the other hand, usually rendered the *lamed* with the art. inf. (56 x; anarthr. inf. 16 x).

(27) ישׁוּב - ἐνοικέω

This rendition occurs in Jer b' (8 x), Bar 2:23 and *passim* in the LXX. ἐνοικέω does not occur in Jer a'.

3. *Bar = Jer a'b'*

Bar shares with Jer a'b' three renditions, two of which are mistranslations. These examples are considered as possible proofs that Bar was part of the OG translation of Jer (see below).

(28) תְּסֵבֶר - δεσπόωνς ! (II 27)

Bar 1:9 quotes Jer 24:1 (Jer a') and differs slightly from Jer 36(29):2 (Jer b'). In all three places תְּסֵבֶר has been read as תְּסֵבֶר or תְּסֵבֶר and rendered with δεσπόωνς, a word which recurs but once in the LXX.

(29) הַיְצוֹת ('streets') - ἔξωθεν ! (II 14)

Bar 2:23 = Jer 7:34 (Jer a'). Instead of Jer's ἐκ πόλεων Ιουδα καὶ ἐκ διόδων Ιερουσαλημ, Bar rendered יהודי מקרי ירושלה with ἐκ πόλεων Ιουδα καὶ ἔξωθεν Ιερουσαλημ. The mistranslation of ירושלה with ἔξωθεν occurs only in Jer a'b' and Bar. Cf. II 14.

(30) ἀποικισμός * (II 42)

This word occurs only in Jer a' (1 x), Jer b' (3 x) and Bar (2 x).

4. *Bar ≠ Jer b'*

Thus far the discussion has focused upon agreements between Bar and Jer b', pointing out only one minor discrepancy. This item and two additional differences are listed here.

(31)

Jer 43(36):30 ῥύπτω, Bar 2:25 ἐγκόπτω (see item 2).

(32)

Jer 39(32):40 καὶ τὸν φόβον μου δόσω εἰς τὴν καρδίαν αὐτῶν (בְּלִבָּתָם יִרְאוּתִי יְרֵאוּתִי); Bar 3:7 ἐπί.

(33)

Jer 34:10(27:12) εἰσαγάγετε τὸν Ἰσραήλιν τὸν Ἰσραήλιν (הִבִּיאֵנוּ אֵת צְרוּרֵינוּ); Bar 2:21 κἀνάγατε τὸν Ἰσραήλιν τὸν Ἰσραήλιν.

5. *Bar ≠ Jer a'*

Many important differences between Bar and Jer a' were noted above, namely, those cases in which Bar agreed with the vocabulary of Jer-R while quoting from Jer a'. These examples are summarized on pp. 122-24. The following two items represent additional points of difference between Bar and Jer a':

(34)

Bar 1:21-22 = Jer 7:24. Instead of Jer's πορεύομαι (הלך), Bar used εὐχόμεαι (cf. II 25), and instead of τοῖς ἐνθουμήμασι τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν τῆς καρδίας (עַל הַבְּשֵׁרוֹת לִבְךָ), he rendered ἐν δαυνοίᾳ καρδίας αὐτοῦ τῆς πονηρίας.

(35)

Bar 2:26 οὐδὲ πονηρίαν οἴκου Ισραηλ differs from Jer 11:17 ἀντι τῆς κακίας οἴκου Ισραηλ (בְּגִלְלֵי רַעַת בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל); cf. also IV 10.

6. *Conclusions*

The following chart summarizes the important agreements between Bar and Jer-R:

Bar	quoting from	identical with LXX of	supposed Vorlage of Bar = MT of Jer, etc.	translation of Bar = Jer-R	parallel transl. of Jer-OG, if any
(13) 2:4 3:8	Jer 24:9 (Jer a')	Jer-R	נחמ	בואנען	עָשֵׂה
(14) 2:21	Jer 7:34 (Jer a')	Jer-R	נחמ	בואנען	עָשֵׂה
(15) 2:23	Jer 7:34 (Jer a')	Jer-R	נחמ	בואנען	עָשֵׂה
(16) 2:23	Jer 7:34 (Jer a')	Jer-R	נחמ	בואנען	עָשֵׂה
(17) 1:22	Jer 7:34 (Jer a')	Jer-R	נחמ	בואנען	עָשֵׂה
(18) 2:23	Jer 7:34 (Jer a')	Jer-R	נחמ	בואנען	עָשֵׂה
(19) 2:29	Jer-R	Jer-R	נחמ	בואנען	עָשֵׂה
(21) 1:22	Jer-R = LXX	Jer-R = LXX	נחמ	בואנען	עָשֵׂה
(22) 2:16	Dan 9:18	Dan-TH and Jer-R = LXX	נחמ	בואנען	עָשֵׂה
(23) 1:4	Jer-R = LXX	Jer-R = LXX	נחמ	בואנען	עָשֵׂה
(24) 1:6	Jer-R = LXX	Jer-R = LXX	נחמ	בואנען	עָשֵׂה
2:6,28	Jer 11:4 (Jer a')	Jer-R = LXX	נחמ	בואנען	עָשֵׂה
(26) 10 x	Jer-R = LXX	Jer-R = LXX	נחמ	בואנען	עָשֵׂה
(27) 2:23	Jer-R = LXX	Jer-R = LXX	נחמ	בואנען	עָשֵׂה
(28) 1:9	Jer 24:1 (Jer a')	Jer-R = Jer-OG	נחמ	בואנען	עָשֵׂה

Bar	quoting from	identical with LXX of	supposed Vorlage of Bar = MT of Jer, etc.	translation of Bar = Jer-R	parallel transl. of Jer-OG, if any
(1) 2:4	Jer 29:18 and Gen 31:40 and	Jer 49(42):18	נחמ	בואנען	עָשֵׂה
(2) 2:25	Jer 36:30	Jer 43(36):30	נחמ	בואנען	עָשֵׂה
(3) 2:25	Jer 32:36	Jer 39(32):36	נחמ	בואנען	עָשֵׂה
(4) 2:34	Jer 30:3	Jer 37(30):3	נחמ	בואנען	עָשֵׂה
(5) 2:4	Jer 42:18	Jer 49(42):18	נחמ	בואנען	עָשֵׂה
(6) 1:15	Dan 9:7	Jer 42(35):13	נחמ	בואנען	עָשֵׂה
(7) 1:18 2:10	Dan 9:10	Jer 39(32):23 and 51(44):10	נחמ	בואנען	עָשֵׂה
(8) 2:18	Deut 28:65	Jer 38(31):25	נחמ	בואנען	עָשֵׂה
(9) 2:23	Jer 7:34(Jer a')	Jer 43(36):29	נחמ	בואנען	עָשֵׂה
(10) 2:33	Jer 25:5(Jer a')	Jer 51(44):22	נחמ	בואנען	עָשֵׂה
(11) 1:19	Dan 9:11	Jer-R	נחמ	בואנען	עָשֵׂה
(20) 1:20	Dan 9:11	Dan 9:11 and Jer-R = LXX	נחמ	בואנען	עָשֵׂה
(20) 2:20,24,28	Jer-R	Jer-R	נחמ	בואנען	עָשֵׂה
(20) 3:37	Jer-R	Jer-R	נחמ	בואנען	עָשֵׂה
(12) 1:22	Jer-R	Jer-R	נחמ	בואנען	עָשֵׂה
(12) 2:21	Jer 27:12	Jer-R	נחמ	בואנען	עָשֵׂה
(12) 2:22,24	Jer 27:9	Jer-R	נחמ	בואנען	עָשֵׂה
(13) 2:13,29	Jer-R	Jer-R	נחמ	בואנען	עָשֵׂה

Bar	quoting from	identical with LXX of	supposed Vorlage of Bar = MT of Jer, etc.	translation of Bar = Jer-R	parallel transl. of Jer-OG, if any
(1) 2:4	Jer 29:18 and Gen 31:40 and	Jer 49(42):18	נחמ	בואנען	עָשֵׂה
(2) 2:25	Jer 36:30	Jer 43(36):30	נחמ	בואנען	עָשֵׂה
(3) 2:25	Jer 32:36	Jer 39(32):36	נחמ	בואנען	עָשֵׂה
(4) 2:34	Jer 30:3	Jer 37(30):3	נחמ	בואנען	עָשֵׂה
(5) 2:4	Jer 42:18	Jer 49(42):18	נחמ	בואנען	עָשֵׂה
(6) 1:15	Dan 9:7	Jer 42(35):13	נחמ	בואנען	עָשֵׂה
(7) 1:18 2:10	Dan 9:10	Jer 39(32):23 and 51(44):10	נחמ	בואנען	עָשֵׂה
(8) 2:18	Deut 28:65	Jer 38(31):25	נחמ	בואנען	עָשֵׂה
(9) 2:23	Jer 7:34(Jer a')	Jer 43(36):29	נחמ	בואנען	עָשֵׂה
(10) 2:33	Jer 25:5(Jer a')	Jer 51(44):22	נחמ	בואנען	עָשֵׂה
(11) 1:19	Dan 9:11	Jer-R	נחמ	בואנען	עָשֵׂה
(20) 1:20	Dan 9:11	Dan 9:11 and Jer-R = LXX	נחמ	בואנען	עָשֵׂה
(20) 2:20,24,28	Jer-R	Jer-R	נחמ	בואנען	עָשֵׂה
(20) 3:37	Jer-R	Jer-R	נחמ	בואנען	עָשֵׂה
(12) 1:22	Jer-R	Jer-R	נחמ	בואנען	עָשֵׂה
(12) 2:21	Jer 27:12	Jer-R	נחמ	בואנען	עָשֵׂה
(12) 2:22,24	Jer 27:9	Jer-R	נחמ	בואנען	עָשֵׂה
(13) 2:13,29	Jer-R	Jer-R	נחמ	בואנען	עָשֵׂה

Bar	(29) 2:23	Jer 7:34 (Jer a')	Jer-R = Jer-OG Jer-R = Jer-OG	(30) 2:30,32
quoting from				
Identical with LXX of				
supposed <i>Vorlage</i> of Bar = MT of Jer, etc.	תִּלְכֵּי	תִּלְכֵּי	Jer-R = Jer-OG	
translation of Bar = Jer-R	תִּלְכֵּי	תִּלְכֵּי	Jer-R = Jer-OG	
parallel transl. of Jer-OG, if any	תִּלְכֵּי	תִּלְכֵּי	Jer-R = Jer-OG	

The agreements between Bar and Jer-R were divided into two groups: agreements occurring within quotations from Jer b' and agreements found outside such quotations. Similarities outside quotations were found to outnumber those within. It is therefore incorrect to assume that the similarities in vocabulary resulted from Bar's borrowing from Jer-LXX because, if they occur outside quotations from Jer, they cannot be considered as borrowings. For the same reason it cannot be assumed either that the quotations from Jer in Bar were revised according to Jer-LXX. It is further inconceivable that the translator of Bar either imitated Jer or was influenced by his style, because the agreements are limited to the *second* part of Jer.

The large number of agreements clearly prove that Jer-R revised Bar. Some of the agreements occur between isolated renditions found in both Bar and Jer b' (1a, 2a), while others reflect characteristic recurring renditions, some of which occur only in Jer b' and Bar (1b; 2a, b). Nearly all the examples were taken from the vocabulary of Jer-R and Bar; in addition, four agreements in the rendering of syntactical features were listed (11,16,24,26).

Two facts reinforce the similarity between Bar and Jer-R:

1. Bar does not significantly agree with any translation other than Jer b' and the Pentateuch.²⁵ Since the translators of many books of the LXX often relied upon the earlier-translated Pentateuch, renditions peculiar to the Pent and Bar (and Jer b') only are to be expected.
2. Some of the similarities between Bar and the technique of Jer-R are found within verses identical with verses in Dan (6,7,11,22).

The thirty important agreements between Jer-R and Bar are more striking when one considers the complete lack of similarity between Jer a' and Bar. In fact, the two often disagree:

1. Various words in passages quoted from Jer a' were rendered in Bar according to the technique of Jer-R whenever that technique differed from Jer-OG (9,10,13,15,16,18,25). Cf. further items 34-35.

2. Several of Bar's renditions conform with the usual LXX technique, including Jer-R, while disagreeing with Jer-OG's (unusual) renditions (group 2 β).

Thus the hand which we have detected in Bar and Jer b' cannot be recognized in Jer a'.

The few--but important--similarities between Bar, Jer a' and Jer b' listed in items 28-30 may bear witness to the stage of the first translation of Jer and Bar evidenced in Jer a' and in the substratum of Jer b' and Bar. However, evidence connecting Bar with the OG of Jer is not as strong as the links between Bar and Jer-R. The reason for this discrepancy is the difficulty in documenting examples of the former group.²⁶

It should be noted that the results of the investigation of the textual relationship between Jer and Bar are conclusive for Bar 1:1-3:8 only. Except for one less important similarity between Bar 4:23 and Jer-R (item 18), there is no indication that the relationship of Bar 3:9 ff. to Jer-R is the same as that of Bar 1:1-3:8 to Jer-R. In fact, it is as yet uncertain whether Bar 3:9 ff. was translated at all.

However, any conclusion on the relationship between Bar 3:9 ff. and Jer based on an *argumentum ex silentio* may be misleading, since Bar 3:9 ff. provides no data for a suitable comparison with the LXX of Jer: In contrast to Bar 1:1-3:8, Bar 3:9 ff. never quotes Jer. Since its contents differ both from Jer and the first part of Bar, it is very difficult to prove any possible equation of Jer-R and Bar 1:1-3:8 with Bar 3:9 ff. by comparing their respective vocabularies. Such a comparison is further hampered by the uncertainty concerning the original language of Bar 3:9 ff. If one could successfully demonstrate the linguistic unity of the two (three?) parts of Bar, it could be assumed that Bar 3:9 ff. was revised by Jer-R; however, the linguistic unity of Bar remains to be examined. The linguistic pilot studies known to me tend to disprove such a unity.²⁷

APPENDIX

The Hebrew Vorlage of Bar 1:1-3:8

The discussion of the translation options in Bar is based on our reconstruction of the Hebrew *Vorlage* of 1:1-3:8. This reconstruction is presented here without any annotation. A full list of Biblical parallels which the author of Bar most likely had in mind--and which thus support our reconstruction--as well as some notes are found in the present author's *The Book of Baruch (Greek and Hebrew), Texts and Translations, Pseudepigrapha Series 6, Society of Biblical Literature* (1975). The reader will also find there an analysis of the tentative nature of our reconstruction.

The reconstruction presented below is based upon Ziegler's printed text, reflecting his view of the original form of Bar, of which MS B generally is the most faithful representative.²⁸

While the entire Hebrew reconstruction must remain tentative, a few particularly doubtful retroversions are noted by underlining, e.g., 2:25 בְּתַלְמֵי. At times alternative possibilities are suggested in parentheses, e.g. (ל)מִקְטָן, i.e., מִקְטָן or למִקְטָן. The relatively defective orthography²⁹ makes no claim to represent the actual *Vorlage* of the translator.

1 וְאֵלֶּה דְבָרֵי הַסֵּפֶר אֲשֶׁר כָּתַב בְּרוּךְ בֶּן נְרִיָּה בֶן מְחִסֵּיהַּ בֶּן צְדָקִיָּה הַ
2 וְהַסְדִּיָּה בֶן הַקִּיָּה בְּבָבֶל : בַּשָּׁנָה הַחֲמִישִׁית שֶׁמִּשְׁמַעָה לְחֹדֶשׁ בַּעַת אֲשֶׁר לָכֹדוּ
3 הַכַּשְׂדִּים אֶת יְרוּשָׁלַם וְיִשְׂרָאֵל בָּאֵשׁ :
4 וַיְקִרָא בְרוּךְ אֶת דְּבָרֵי הַסֵּפֶר הַזֶּה כְּאֲזוּנֵי יְכִנְיָה בֶן יְהוֹיָקִים מֶלֶךְ יְהוּדָה
5 וְכַאֲזוּנֵי כָל הַעַם הַכְּאִרִי אֶל הַסֵּפֶר : וְכַאֲזוּנֵי הַנְּבִיִּים וְנְבִיֵי הַמְּלָכִים וְכַאֲזוּנֵי
6-7 הַזְּקֵנִים וְכַאֲזוּנֵי כָל הַעַם (ל)מִקְטָן (ו)עַד נְדוּלָה לֵיל הַיְשׁוּבִינִי וְכַאֲזוּנֵי כָל נְדוּ-
7 לְבָר : וְיִשְׁלַח יְרוּשָׁלַם אֶל יְהוֹיָקִים בֶּן הַקִּיָּה בֶּן שְׁלֹחַ הַכֹּהֵן וְאֵל הַנְּבִיִּים
8 וְאֵל כָּל הַעַם הַנִּמְצָאִים עִמּוֹ בִּירִשְׁלָם : בְּקֻדְמוֹת אֶת כְּלֵי בֵית ה' הַמְרֻצָּאִים מִן
9 הַהֵייל לְהַשְׂבִּיב אֶל אוֹיֵץ יְהוּדָה בַּעֲשׂוֹה לְטִירֹן כְּלֵי כֶסֶף אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה צְדָקִיָּה בֶן
10 יֵאֱשׁוּמָה מֶלֶךְ יְהוּדָה : אוֹדֵי הַגְּלוּת בְּנִדְכֻדָאֲצָר מֶלֶךְ בָּבֶל אֶת יְכִנְיָה וְאֶת
הַשְּׂרִיר וְאֶת הַחֲסַדְיָה וְאֶת הַנְּבִיִּים וְאֶת עַם יִשְׂרָאֵל מִיְרִשְׁלָם וְיִבְרָאֵם כֻּלָּם :
וַיִּבְרָא יְהוָה שְׁלֹחַנו אֶל יִכְיָה כַּסֵּף וְקִבַּר בְּכַסֵּף עֹלָלוֹת וְחַסְמוֹת הַלְבוּשׁוֹת

- 11 יעשו מנחה והעלו על מזבח ה' אלהינו : והתפללו בעד חיי נבוכדנצר מלך בבל ובעד (ואל) חיי בלשצצר בנו למען יהיו ימיהם ימים חשמים על הארץ : ויתן ה' עז לנו ויאר את עינינו נחיהנה) בצל נבוכדנצר מלך בבל ובלא בלשצצר בנו ובעבד אחס ימים רבים נמצא חן בעיניכם :
- 12 והתפללו בעדנו אל ה' אלהינו כי תשאנו לה' אלהינו ולא שב אה' והתחננו ממנו עד היות הזה : וקראו את חסד הזה אשר שלחנו אליכם להתודות בבית ה' ביום חן ובימי מועד :
- 13 ואשר לה' אלהינו הצדקה ולבו בשם הפנים כיום הזה ואיש יהודה ולשיב ירושלים : ולמליכיו ולשריו ולבתינו ולבבאינו ולאבותינו :
- 14 אשר תשאנו לה' (לפני ה') : ומדינו בו ולא שמענו בקול ה' אלהינו ללכת בתורת ה' אשר נתן לפנינו : (ל)מך היום אשר הוציא ה' את אבותינו מארץ מצרים יעד היום הזה ממרים היינו עם ה' אלהינו וסוד לבתי שמוע בקולו : והדבק בנו היעה האלה אשר צוה ה' למשע עבדי ביום הוציא את אבותינו מארץ מצרים לחם לנו ארץ זבת חלב ודבש כיום הזה : ולא שמענו בקול ה' אלהינו כהל דברי הנבאים אשר שלח אלינו : ונלך איש בשדירת לבו היע לעבוד אלהים אחרים לעשות את היע בעיני ה' אלהינו :
- 15 ויקם ה' את דברו אשר דבר עלינו ועל שפטינו השפטים את ישראל ועל מלכיו ועל שרינו ועל איש ישראל יהודה : לא נעשה חסד כל תעמים כאשר נעשה בירושלם ככתוב בתורת משה : לאכל איש (את) בשע בנו ואיש (את) בשע בתו : ויתן אחס לזונה (לזונה) לכל המלכות אשר סביבותינו לזדוה ולשעה בכל הגרים (אשר) סביבותינו אשר הדיח ה' שנ : ויהיו למשח ולא למעלה כי תשאנו לה' אלהינו לבלתי שמעו בקולו :
- 16 לת' אלהינו הצדקה ולבו ולאבותינו בשם הפנים כיום הזה : אשר דבר ה' עלינו כל היעה הזאת כאו עלינו : ולא הלינו את פני ה' לשוב איש ממשכנו (ממקצתו) לבס היע : וישעי ה' על ידעו ויביאה עלינו כי צדיק ה' על כל מעשיו אשר צוה אחרו (לנו) : ולא שמענו בקולו ללכת בתורת ה' אשר נתן לפנינו :
- 17 ועוה ה' אלהי ישראל אשר הוצאת את עמך מארץ מצרים ביד חזקה ובאחרת ובמופתים (ו)לכח גדול ובויע נטויה ותעש יך שש ביום הזה :
- 18 תשאנו (ה)ערינו (ה)רשענו : ה' אלהינו ככל צדקתך יוש אפך ממנו כי נשארנו מעט בגרים אשר הדיחנו שם : שמע ה' אל תפלתו ואל תחננונו והצילנו למענך וחו לנו הן לפני שובינו : למען תדע כל הארץ כי אתה ה' אלהינו כי שמך נקרא על ישראל ועל עמו : ה' השקיפה ממעון קדשך ושמך לבן (החכם) אלינו תעוה ה' אונך השמע : פקח עיניך וראה כי לא תמתיש במשולך אשר לקחה רוחם מקרב יתנו כבוד הצדקה לה' : כי לב רבו ורבץ הזלמת פנופה (ונ)כשלה ובלינו עינינו הדאבנו נפש יחנו לך כבוד וצדקת ה' :
- 19 כי לא על צדקות אבותינו ומלכינו אנחנו מפילים חוננונו לפניך

- 20 ה' אלהינו : כי שלחו אפך וצחקת בנו יאשר דברת ביד עבדי הנבאים
- 21 לאמר : כה אמר ה' הטו צדאיכם ועבדו את מלך בבל חשבו על הארץ אשר נתת לאבותיכם : ואי לא תשמעו בקול ה' לעבד את מלך בבל : (ו)תשבתו מעיי יהודה ומחצות ירושלם קול ששורן וקול שמחה קול חתן וקול בלה הריחה כל הארץ לשמה מאין יושב :
- 22 ולא שמענו בקולך לעבד את מלך בבל ותקם את דבריך אשר דברת ביד עבדיך הנבאים להוציא את עממת מלכינו והא עממת אבותינו
- 23 ממקומה(ן) : והנן משלכות לחיב ביות ולקח מליקה וימתו בתוואים (בבגעינ) רעים ביעע בודב ובודב : והתן את הבית אשר נקרא שמוך עלינו לזרבה(לשמחה) כיום הזה בגלל רעה בית ישראל וכית יהודה :
- 24 ותעש עמנו ה' אלהינו ככל חסדך וככל רחמיך הרבים : כאשר דברת ביד עבדך משה ביום צרות אחר לבס את חורתך לפני בני ישראל לאמר :
- 25 אס לא תשמעו בקולי כי הוצנך הגדול ורב הזה ישוב למעט בגרים אשר אדחת שם : כי ידעו כי לא ישמעו אלי כי עם קשה ערה הוא וישיבו אל לבבם בארץ שבטים : וידעו כי אני ה' אלהיהם ונתתי להם לב ואזן שמעתי (קשורה) : וידור לי בארץ שביח ויזכרו שמי : וישבו מערפם הקשה (מקשי ערפם) ומדע מעלליהם כי יזכרו את דרך אבותם הטהורים לה' (לפני ה') : והשיבתה אל הארץ אשר נשבעתי לאבותם לאביהם (ו)ליצחק וליעקב וירשעה ורחביהם ולא ימעטו : וכיזוי להם ביות עולזו להירח להם אלהיהם והתוהו יהיו לי לעוה ולא אתוה עור את עמי ישראל מעל האומה אשר נחתי להם :
- 26 ה' צבאות אלהי ישראל נפש בצרה הרוח עשתה קדחה (צעקה) אליך : שמע ה' חננו כי תשאנו לך (לפניך) : כי אתה שכן עד האבתנו אבדי עד : ה' צבאות אלהי ישראל שמע נא אל תפלת מתי ישראל ובני החסות לך (לפניך) אשר לא שמעו בקול ה' אלהיהם והדבק בנו היע : אל חזק עונות אבותינו כי זכר ידך ושמך בעת הזאת : כי אתה ה' אלהינו ונודך ה' : כי על כן נתת (את) יראתך על לבבנו לקרא בשמך ונודך בשבינו כי השבינו אל לבבנו ול עון אבותינו הטהורי לך (לפניך) : הנה אבותנו היום בשבינו אשר הדיחנו שנ לזרבה ולאה (ולזונה) ככל עונות אבותינו אשר פשעו בה' אלהינו :

1. For a detailed proof of what appears to be the *communis opinio* on the original language of Bar 1:1-3:8, see J. J. Kneucker, *Das Buch Baruch, Geschichte und Kritik, Übersetzung und Erklärung auf Grund des wiederhergestellten hebräischen Urtextes* (Leipzig 1879) 20ff. Prof. J. Strugnell has kindly informed me that he has not identified any fragments of the lost Hebrew text of Bar among the Qumran fragments from cave IV.
2. See the various commentaries, and especially A. Penna, *Baruch, La Sacra Bibbia* (Roma-Torino 1956) where earlier literature is quoted.
3. Cf. E. Tov, "The Relation between the Greek Versions of Baruch and Daniel" in: M. E. Stone, ed., *Studies in the Bible and Armenian Philology* (Jerusalem 1975).
4. On the literalness of Bar's translation, see Kneucker, *Baruch*, 24ff., 82. His consistency is exemplified by several recurring phrases which are translated identically: 1:18 = 2:10; 1:15 = 2:6; 1:19 = 2:5.
5. L. Bertholdt, *Historische Einleitung etc.* (Erlangen 1814) IV, 1752; H. Hävernick, *De Libro Baruchi Commentatio Critica* (Königsberg 1843) 9 (not accessible to me); O. C. Whitehouse *apud* Charles, *Apocrypha*, I, 557.
6. E. Schürer *apud* J. Herzog (ed.), "Apokryphen des NT," *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*³ (Leipzig 1896) I, 642.
7. Thackeray, *Septuagint*, 87. See below, n. 12.
8. F. Hitzig, *Die Psalmen* (Heidelberg 1836) II, 119-120; A. Dillmann, *Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie* 3 (1858) 480; D. Zündel, *Kritische Untersuchungen über die Abfassungszelt des Buches Daniel* (Basel 1861) 190.
9. O. F. Fritzsche, *Kurzgefasstes Exegetisches Handbuch etc.* (Leipzig 1851) I, 173; H. Ewald, *Die jüngsten Propheten des Alten Bundes*² (Göttingen 1868) III, 255; J. T. Marshall in J. Hastings (ed.), *Dictionary of the Bible* (Edinburgh 1898-1904) I, 252. See also n. 12.
10. Thackeray, "Gr. Tr. Jer." (1903) 261-266. See also his article "Septuagint" *apud* J. Orr *et alii* (edd.), *The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia* IV (Chicago 1915) 2730.
11. Thackeray's evidence, for Bar 1-2 only, is provided in three pages of examples, many irrelevant to the issue.

12. Thackeray, *Septuagint* (1920) 87. At this time Thackeray was convinced that the translator of Bar imitated Jer's style.

13. See his commentary on Bar *apud* C. Gore, *A New Commentary on Holy Scripture* (London 1928) II, 105. To the best of my knowledge, four scholars have expressed their agreement with Thackeray's views: E. Nestle, *Septuaginta Studien* 4 (Stuttgart 1903) 15-16; Harwell, *Baruch*, 65-66 (according to Harwell, Jer. b' translated the *whole* book of Bar); A. Penna, *op. cit.*, 16; B. H. Wambacq, "L'Unité littéraire de Bar.", I-III, 8" in J. Coppens (ed.), *Sacra Pagina* I = *Bibl. Ephem. Theol. Lovar.* XII-XIII (Paris 1959) 455-460.

14. The following of the items mentioned below were noted by Thackeray, "Gr. Tr. Jer.", 262ff.: 1,3,5,8,9,11,12,14,15,18, 19,22,23,24,28,29,30.

15. ὑποχείριτος ('subject to...') generally governs a noun in the dative. Therefore it would seem that the wording of Jer 49(42):18 depends upon Bar 2:4. However, ὑποχείριτος is also used absolutely, both in the LXX (Num 21:2 Jos 6:2) and in classical Greek (LSJ, s.v.).

16. The reconstructed *Vorlage* of Bar, יחנה לזנה לכה , המלכה , may be compared to identical phrases in Jer 15:4 24:9 29:18 34:17 (in all Q; זונה). Cf. further Deut 28:25 where the same word is constructed with a different verb (זונית לזנה). On the basis of this evidence one is inclined to reconstruct the *Vorlage* of the LXX of Jer 49:18 as יחנה לזנה וזנה לזנה (cf. 2 Chr 29:8 MT).

The reconstruction of ὑποχείριτος as περι is not without problems since the two words have a different meaning. However, the retroversion is sustained by the quoted parallels of the *whole* phrase and by the fact that the majority of the translators of the LXX were apparently unfamiliar with זונה and thus guessed its meaning: all six occurrences of זונה are rendered differently, and only two approach our understanding of the Heb. Cf. further Bar 3:8 ὄφλησις which is also tentatively reconstructed as περι .

17. $\text{αυγαλομηνος τῷ καύματι}$ (καυσωσι A...) καὶ παγετῶ τῆς νεμέρας

18. Thus also E. Nestle *Septuaginta Studien* 4 (Stuttgart 1903) 16. The only parallel for a passive meaning of ἀποστολή is provided by its use as 'expedition' in Thuc. 8:8 (LSJ, s.v.: cf. also ἀπόστολος - 'messenger').

The translation of τῷ by ἀποστολή may be viewed as a euphemism or a Midrashic rendition: According to several passages in the OT, pestilence is "sent" by God, see especially Jer 24: 10 $\text{אמר יהוה אלהי ישראל כה אמר יהוה אלהי ישראל ויהי כי אשלח את העם הזה לרעה ויהי כי אשלח את העם הזה לרעה ויהי כי אשלח את העם הזה לרעה ויהי כי אשלח את העם הזה לרעה$ and further, Lev 26:25 $\text{אשלח את העם הזה לרעה ויהי כי אשלח את העם הזה לרעה ויהי כי אשלח את העם הזה לרעה ויהי כי אשלח את העם הזה לרעה}$. Cf. also Ps 78:49 where $\text{אשלח את העם הזה לרעה}$ is rendered in the LXX (77:49) by ἀποστολήν δὲ ἀγγέλων πονηρῶν.

19. LSJ, *Suppl.* does not quote any evidence in support of its explanation of ἀποστολή in Jer and Bar.

20. R. Polzin, *HTR* 60 (1967) 469-470 and esp. n. 9 (brought to my attention by Prof. J. Strugnell) explained the λλοψα form πῶρι (col. XVIII l.16) from πῶρι (to rule) rather than πῶρι . Along the same lines he suggested that the LXX translators who rendered πῶρι in Num 21:24 and Jer 37(30):3 with καταπιεῖω and κατελεῖω respectively, derived the Heb from πῶρι , since the Greek verbs primarily render verbs denoting 'to rule'. Polzin's suggestion, which may be extended to the LXX of Ex 15: 9, is attractive; however, the mentioned renditions may also be viewed as *ad hoc* exegesis.

21. In the phrase under consideration, πῶρι is rendered in the plural throughout Jer: 4:4 11:2 12:9 17:25 18:11 39(32):32.

22. Although generally reflecting πῶρι and πῶρι , *this* πρόσταγμα in Bar and Jer b' should not be considered to presuppose either one because of the parallel in Dan 9:10. S. H. Blank, "The LXX renderings of OT Terms for Law", *HUCA* 7 (1930) 276 holds a different view.

23. It appears that Bar 2:14 $\text{δὸς ἡμῶν χάριν κατὰ πρόσωπον τῶν ἀποκασάντων ἡμῶς}$ does not reflect the preposition ἐν (thus Kneucker, *ad loc.*), but ἐν ; cf. the rendering of ἐν with κατὰ πρόσωπον in Bar 2:19 and the MT of Esth 2:17 and 8:5.

24. See p. 113, n. 2.

25. Bar 2:5 = Deut 28:13 ὕδατος .
Bar 2:16 = Deut 26:15 καθάρω .
Bar 2:18 = Deut 28:65 $\text{ὄφθαλμοὶ ἐκλεῖνοντες}$. (cf. item 2).
Bar 2:25 and Jer 43(36):30 = Gen 31:40 παγετός (cf. item 2).

26. Likewise, the examples of chapters III and IV outnumber those of ch. II.

27. A. Wifstrand, "Die Stellung der enklitischen Person- alpronomina bei den Septuaginta", *Bulletin de la Société Royale des Lettres de Lund* (1949-50) 64; R. A. Martin, "Some Syntactical Criteria of Translation Greek", *Vt* 10 (1960) 297-306, 309-310. See also Martin's forthcoming syntactical study of Bar.

28. Cf. also Kneucker, *Baruch*, 97.

29. Cf. *ib.*, 29.

CHAPTER VI

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE LXX OF JER, EZ AND THE MP

The investigation of the vocabulary of Jer a' and b' has often referred to the LXX of MP and Ez. Relevant data are listed here in detail (with references to chapters III-IV), together with much material not included in the preceding chapters.

It is important to deal here separately with the relationship between Jer, Ez and the MP because the data listed below shed some light on the nature of the OG of Jer. Furthermore, an analysis of the data will provide some support for the working hypothesis presented in this study: Important similarities between Jer a', Ez and the MP regarding renditions and rare words suggest that the three are closely related. Jer b' is excluded from this group because it normally presents other translation equivalents. Although the majority of the new translation equivalents of Jer-R are revisional, the examples themselves do not provide additional proof that the second part of Jer contains a revision rather than a different translation. It should be added, however, that if we are correct in assuming that Jer a', the MP and Ez a' (see below) were produced by one person, it is unlikely that this translator embarked upon the translation of one complete book (the MP), one half book (Jer), and either another half book (Ez a') or another whole book (Ez). Rather, it stands to reason that this translator embarked on the translation of the *whole* of these three books. If this reasoning is correct, some of the conclusions of this chapter may be taken as additional support for the working hypothesis concerning the nature of Jer b'.

This chapter lists important agreements (common renditions and rare words) between (1) Jer and the MP; (2) Jer and Ez; (3) Jer and both the MP and Ez.

As in chapter II, a distinctive agreement is defined as a rendition or word which is common to two or more LXX books and which distinguishes them from the remainder of the LXX. Such an agreement is more significant if the particular rendition is

the only one or the main one utilized in the books under discussion. Information of this kind is provided below.

Since the discussion of the relationship between Jer, Ez and the MP requires the use of unbiased terminology, the renditions occurring in the two parts of Jer are referred to as Jer a' and b' rather than Jer-OG and Jer-R.

The ---→ references relate to additional renditions of the Heb in the remainder of the LXX. If these data are listed in chapters III-IV, reference is made to the relevant items.¹

As a rule, we shall not repeat detailed references or descriptions of translation options which are provided in chapters III-IV. A reference like (III 2) at the beginning of an item refers the reader to the relevant discussion for further information.

1. *Jer and the MP*

- a. *Jer a' and the MP*
 α. *Common renditions*

(1) Ἰησ - ταλαιπωρέω (III 2)

The main rendition of Jer a' (6 x) and the MP (Hos 10:2 Mich 2:4 Joel 1:10,10 Zach 11:2,3,3); elsewhere 2 x (Jer b': (ἀπ)όλλυμι).

---→ See III 2.

Ἰησ, Ἰησ - ταλαιπωρία (III 2)

A characteristic rendition of Jer a' (3 x) and Mich 2:4 Ἰησ, Ἰησ - ταλαιπωρία ἐταλαιπώρησαν (Jer b': ὀλεσθός).

---→ See III 2.

(2) Ἰησ, Ἰησ - θεοὶ ἀλλότριου (III 19)

The main rendition of Jer a' (12 x) and of the MP (Hos 3: 1); elsewhere 6 x (Jer b': θεοὶ ἕτερου).

(3) Ἰησ - μετανοέω (III 9)

The main rendition of Jer a' (4 x), and the only rendition of the MP (Am 7:3,6 Joel 2:13,14 Jon 3:9,10 4:2 Zach 8:14); elsewhere 3 x (of which once in Jer b'). In Jer b' (ἀνα)παύομαι is used.

---→ See III 9.

(4) Ἰησ - καταδυναστεύω

One of the two renditions used in Jer a' (7:6 27(50):33) and the main rendition of the MP (Hos 5:11 12:7(8) Am 4:1 Zach 7:10); elsewhere 1 x. Cf. Ἰησ - καταδυναστεύω in Am 3:9 Jer 6:6 Ez 22:12 (elsewhere the word occurs only twice).

---→ Especially συνασαντεύω and ἀδικέω.

(5) Ἰησ - σεισθήν!

Jer 27(50):39 Mich 1:8; cf. Is 13:21 Ἰησ, Ἰησ - σεισθήν.

---→ Ἰησ, Ἰησ - στρουθός.

(6) Ἰησ - λῆμμα

Jer a' 7 x (23:33(ρημα S*), 33, 34, 36, 36, 38, 38), MP 5 x (Nah 1:1 Hab 1:1 Zach 9:1 12:1 Mal 1:1); elsewhere 1 x.

---→ Is: ὄρασις, ὄραμα, ῥῆμα.

(7) Ἰησ - μαχητής (III 51)

Jer a' 8 x and the MP 8 x (Am 2:14 Joel 2:7 3(4):9,11 Ob 9 Zach 9:13 10:5,7); elsewhere 2 x.

---→ See III 51.

(8) Ἰησ, Ἰησ - καταφεύγω ἐπὶ/πρὸς (τὸν) κύριον!

Jer 27(50):5 and Zach 2:11(15) only.

---→ προστίθημι, συμπαραγίγνομαι, also when Ἰησ is used with reference to God (Is 56:3,6).

(9) מְדַבֵּר - μελεῖσθῶ !

Jer 14:3 Nah 2:6 Zach 11:2.

----> Variously.

(10) דַּבֵּר - ἀντρέω !

Jer 8:2 Zeph 1:6.

----> Mainly *ἤντιμι* or one of its *composita* (also in Jer and the MP).

(11) דַּבֵּר - ἀμειράω !

Jer 27(50):11 Mal 4:2(3:20).

----> *ἐξιπιάζομαι* Hab 1:8. The Heb does not occur elsewhere.

(12) דַּבֵּר(ו) - μαίωμαι !

Jer 3:6,8,12 Hos 11:7 14:5. This rendition should be considered as an etymological translation of *דַּבֵּר(ו)* on the basis of *דַּבַּר*.

----> In Jer: *ἀποτροπή* Jer 5:6 8:5 (*ex* *דַּבַּר*); *ἀκοσσία* 2:19 (*ex* *דַּבַּר*); *σύντριμμα* 3:22, *ἀμειρά* 14:7, both in accordance with their context.

(13) דַּבֵּר - καύχημα

Jer 13:11 17:14 28(51):41 and Zeph 3:19,20; elsewhere Deut 10:21. Cf. *לָלַח* - *(κατα)καυχόμαι* (especially Jer-LXX).

----> Especially *ἀνεσις*.

(14) דַּבֵּר - συνέρχομαι !

Jer 3:18 Zach 8:21.

----> *ἐρχομαι* and its *composita*.

(15) דַּבֵּר - συνοχή !

Jer 52:5 Mich 5:1(4:14); cf. *צַרַּךְ - συνέχω* (2 Sam 20:3) and *צַרַּךְ - συνέχω* (1 Sam 23:8).

----> Especially *συνεχῆ*.

(16) שָׁחַט - καταπόσω !

Jer 6:26 Mich 1:10.

----> Elsewhere the Heb word occurs only twice.

(17) אָהַר - ἐξακολουθέω

Jer 2:2 Am 2:4; elsewhere Sir 5:2.

----> Stereotyped two word renditions.

(18) בְּחִילָה - σύμψη !

Jer 2:32 Joel 1:8.

----> Especially *παρένοος* (also in Jer and the MP)

β. *καρε words*

All words listed below are rare in the LXX. Some of them are infrequently used *composita* or compound words, while the simplex form or other *composita* of the simplex form may be frequent LXX words. E.g., *ἀναφηραίνω* (item 24) is rare in the LXX, while *ἐρηαίνω* (rendering *רָחַם* and *רָחַם* similar to its *compositum* *ἀναφηραίνω*) occurs in the whole LXX (including Jer and the MP).

(19) κατακαυχόμαι *

Jer 27(50):11 - *עָלַו*; 27(50):38 - *יְחַלְלוּ* (MT *יְחַלְלוּ*, cf. III 14); Zach 10:12 - *יְחַלְלוּ* (MT *יְחַלְלוּ*).

(20) הַבְּרַר - ἰταβύριον *

Jer 26(46):18 Hos 5:1.²

----> *θαβουρ*.

(21) ἀρεμείωνός * (II 35)

Jer 8:6 - מלחמת (?) - מלחמה - מלחמת (?) 8:16 13:27 - מצהלה - מצהלה; Am 6:7 - מרזח - מרזח

(22) χερσόμεαι

Jer 2:31 - מאפליה - מאפליה; Nah 1:10 - מרכיח את - מרכיח את Prov 24:46(31).

(23) αχοίνος

Jer 8:8 - עט - עט; 18:15 - שביל - שביל; Mich 6:5 Joel 3(4):18 - השטיות - השטיות; elsewhere Ps 138(139):3 - רבעי - רבעי.

(24) ἀναξήκραίνω

Jer 27(50):27 - חרב - חרב; Hos 13:15 - יבש - יבש; elsewhere Sir 43:3 - תרחיח, 14:9 (=?).

(25) αἰσώμα *

Jer 8:16 - אכירגן - אכירגן; Hab 3:8 - מרכבה - מרכבה.

(26) πνευματοσφο- *

Jer 2:24 פוחה רוח - פוחה רוח - פוחה רוח Hos 9:7 איש הרוח - איש הרוח - איש הרוח; elsewhere Hos 3:4 - פוח - פוח.

According to the *Thesaurus*, πνευματοσφο- is not attested to before the time of the LXX.

(27) σῦλας *

Jer 26(46):14 - סכך - סכך; Nah 1:10 - סכך - סכך (MT *aliter*).

----→ סך - פוטן, דאסס, שפיל, מוטדמ.

(28) σφραגίζω, σφραγίς, σφραγιστός *

Jer 5:30 18:13 23:14 - ספוטס. Hos 6:10 ספוטס; cf. Jer 2:12 - שפער - שפער - שפער.

(29) στυγισμός

Jer 4:20 - שבר - שבר; Am 5:9 - שבר - שבר; Zeph 1:10 - שבר; Mich 2:8 - משבר (?); elsewhere 2 Sam 22:5 - משבר - משבר.

----→ שבר - Especially στυγισμός, στυγιστής.

(30) σταλάττω/δάτω

Jer 28(51):64 - שקע - שקע; Am 9:3 - נסתר - נסתר; Mich 7:19 - נבש - נבש; elsewhere Ex 15:5 - ירד - ירד.

(31) αἰσώματα

Jer 2:34 - זלזל - זלזל; elsewhere Ex 22:2(1) - זלזל. Note further that αἰσώμα occurs only in Jer 38(31):9 (זלזל) and that αἰσώμα is limited to Ez 12:5,7,12 Job 24:16.

b. *Jer a'b'* and the MP³

(32) ἀποκρύπτω *

A characteristic rendition found only in Jer a' (3 x), b' (1 x), Hos 10:7 11:1(10:15) (2 x) Ob 5.

(33) ἀποκρύπτω - ἀποκρύπτω (II 26)

The only rendition of Jer a' (7 x), b' (9 x), the MP (100 x);⁴ elsewhere 10 x.

----→ See II 26.

(34) ἀπατάω *

Jer a' 1 x, b' 1 x, the MP 2 x.

----→ See II 3.

(35) ἐπιλείπω (various *Vorlagen*) (II 17)⁵

ἐπιλείπω is much more frequent in Jer a'b' and the MP than in other parts of the LXX. We noticed in II 17 that the translator of Jer a'b' sometimes used this verb as a "stopgap" translation when experiencing difficulties. The same holds

true for the MP: Hos 4:3 - חֲדָשׁ; 13:2 - פָּשַׁע; Am 8:13 - חָלָה; Jon 2:8 - חָלָה; Nah 1:4 - חָלָה; Hab 2:13 - חָלָה; 3:17 - חָלָה; Zeph 1:2,3 - חָלָה; 2:9 - חָלָה (? MT חָלָה); 3:6 - חָלָה; Zach 11:9 - חָלָה; 13:8 - חָלָה (ἐκθλιβω C).

(36) σύλληψις (II 44)

Jer a' 2 x, b' 1 x, the MP 1 x; elsewhere 1 x.

----→ See II 44.

c. *Jer b' and the MP*

(37) חֲדָשׁ - אֲלֹסֹס !

Jer 33(26):18 Mich 3:12 (parall).

----→ Especially ὀψιλόν and βωμός, also in Jer and the MP.

(38) חָלָה - ἐξέστημι !

Jer 43(36):24⁶ Hos 3:5 Mich 7:17.

----→ Especially φοβέσθαι.

2. *Jer and Ez*

a. *Jer a' and Ez*

α. *Common renditions*

Because it is important to determine which section of Ez agrees with the renditions of Jer a' (b'), the below-mentioned examples are arranged in the sequence Ez a', b', c' (Ez 1-27, 28-39, 40-48).

(39) חָלָה, חָלָה - ἀφίστημι ! (Ez a')

Jer 6:8 Ez 23:17,18,18,22,28.

----→ The Heb word occurs rarely elsewhere.

(40) חָלָה - πασάλομαι ! (Ez a')

Jer 6:24 27(50):43 Ez 21:7(12).

----→ Especially ἐκλώω.

(41) חָלָה - Σοφ ! (Ez a')

Jer 21:13 (MT חָלָה) and 10 times in Ez 26-27.

----→ Τύπος *passim*, including Jer b', Ez b' and the MP.

(42) חָלָה - διορέω ! (Ez a')

Jer 27(50):40 Ez 16:26. Elsewhere the Greek verb occurs only once.

----→ Various; cf. also IV 2 for Jer.

(43) חָלָה - φαρύρα ! (Ez a')

Jer 28(51):11 Ez 27:11.

----→ Various.

(44) חָלָה - ἐκλέτω ! (Ez a')

Jer 6:29 Ez 15:4. See also VI 35.

----→ Various.

(45) חָלָה - ἀτιμία (Ez a'b'c')

Jer 3:25 6:15 (MT חָלָה) 20:11 23:40 (חָלָה) 28(51):51
Ez 16:52,63 36:7,15 39:26 44:13.

----→ αίσχύνη, βδασαός, δνειδισμός, ἐντροπή, δνειδος.

(46) חָלָה - λοιμός ! (Ez b')

Jer 15:21 Ez 28:7 30:11 31:12 32:12.

----→ Various.

(47) πολυανδρεϊον * (Ez b')

Jer 2:23, 19:2,6,6 - ג'א'י - ג'א'י; Ez 39:11 - ג'א'י; Ez 39:11,15,16 - ת'מ'ן.

The rendering of ג'א'י in both Jer and Ez with πολυανδρεϊον indicates a close connection between the two books. The background of this rendition is adequately explained by Walters.⁷

---→ ג'א'י, ג'א'י mainly φ'ραγ'ε, also in Jer and Ez.

β. *Rare words*

(48) κόλασις ! (Ez a'c')

Jer 18:20 (= ?); Ez 14:3,4,7 18:30 44:12 - מ'כ'ש'ל - מ'כ'ש'ל.

(49) δυσασορπισιμός * (Ez a')

Jer 24:9 - ז'ר'ע'ז (ז: ז'ר'ע'ז); Ez 6:8 - ז'ר'ע'ז; 13:20 - פ'ר'ח'ת'ח.

(50) βελόστασις * (Ez a')

Jer 28(51):27 - מ'פ'ט'ר; Ez 4:2 - כ'ר; 17:17 21:22(27) - פ'ד'י.

(51) πέλυξ * (Ez a')

Jer 23:29 - פ'ט'ר'י; Ez 9:2 - כ'ל'י מ'פ'י - כ'ל'י.

(52) ὑπερόψωμα * (Ez a')

Jer 27(50):42 Ez 23:6,12.

---→ Variously.

(53) πολύμυλα * (Ez a')

Jer 13:23 - מ'ר'כ'ר'ח - מ'ר'כ'ר'ח; Ez 23:15 (MT מ'ר'כ'ר'ח); 27:16 - ר'ק'מ'ה.

(54) καταμεντέω * (Ez a')

Jer 28(51):4 - ד'ק'ר; Ez 23:47 - ב'ר'א.

(55) προμαχών * (Ez a') (cf. II 38)

Jer 5:10 - ש'ר'ר (MT ש'ר'ר); 40(33):4 - מ'ר'ב (cf. II, n. 39); Ez 4:2 - פ'ד'י.

(56) ἄποσφάγισμα * (Ez b')

Jer 22:24 Ez 28:12 (MT מ'ר'ח'ח).

---→ σφ'ράγ'ις, δ'ακ'τ'ύλ'ος.

b. *Jer b' and Ez*

(57) ἡλλοε - χάρουε (Ez a')

Jer 40(33):4 Ez 4:2 26:8; elsewhere Is 37:33. Cf. further Ez 17:17 ἡλλοε ἡλλοε - χ'α'ρ'α'σ'φ'ο'λ'ί'α.

---→ π'ρ'ό'σ'χ'ο'μ'α, χ'ώ'μ'α.

(58) ῥεγ - φοβέομαι ! (Ez a')

Jer 29:22(49:21) BS (σε'ώ' rel; cf. IV 23) Ez 27:28

---→ Cf. IV 23.

(59) ὑγρασία * (Ez a')

Jer 31(48):18 - מ'נ'צ; Ez 7:17, 21:7(12) - מ'ד'ב'.

(60) ἄποψωμα ! (Ez b')

Jer 30(49):2 51(44):12 Ez 29:8,9,12 32:15.

---→ Cf. III 1.

3. *Jer a', the MP and Ez*

a. *Common renditions*

(61) ἄσπασιμός (Ez a') (III 1)

The main rendition of Jer a' (18 x), the MP (15 x),⁸ and Ez a' (9 x);⁹ elsewhere 2 x (Jer b': ἀβ'α'τ'ος).

---→ Cf. III 1.

דדש - אפאנ'ל'זω (Ez a'b') (III 1)

One of the renditions of Jer a' (3 x),¹⁰ the only rendition of the MP¹¹ and the main rendition of Ez¹² (Jer b': אבאר'ו).

(62) גשב - אפפ'ל'ω (Ez a')

The only rendition of Jer a' (3 x; cf. IV 8), Ez (18:31), and the main rendition of the MP (Hos 7:13 8:1 Am 4:4 Zeph 3:11; Hos 14:10 גשב - אפפ'ל'ס);¹³ elsewhere Is 59:13.

---→ Especially voim-.

גשב - אפפ'ל'εα (Ez a')

The only rendition of Jer a' (5:6) and the MP (19 x),¹⁴ and the main rendition of Ez;¹⁵ elsewhere 5 x.

---→ Especially nouns derived from voim- and αμοστ-.

(63) ה'ל'ל, ה'ל'ל - voim' (Ez a') (III 48)

The main rendition of Jer a' (6 x) and the MP (Am 1:2 Zeph 2:6), further Ez 25:5; elsewhere 1 x (Jer b': τόπος, κατάλυσις, κατάλυμα).

(64) ל'ל - σοστρέφω, σοστροφή (Ez a')

Jer 4:16 ל'ל - σοστροφאי (derived from ל'ל); Hos 4:19, 13:12 ל'ל - σοστροφή; Ez 13:20 ל'ל - σοστρέφω; elsewhere 1 x.

(65) ה'ד'ק - καύων (Ez a')

Jer 18:17 (cf. 28(51):1; not in MP) Hos 12:1(2) 13:15 Jon 4:8 Ez 17:10 19:12; elsewhere 1 x.

---→ Especially vóτος, also in Ez a'c'.

(66) ה'ל - βόλις (Ez a')

Jer 9:8(7) 27(50):9 Hab 3:11 Zach 9:14 Ez 5:16; elsewhere 1 x.

---→ Especially βέλος (not in Jer, the MP and Ez).

(67) ה'כ'ר - δολοφ'ω (Ez a')

Jer 2:6 9:12(11) 27(50):13 Zeph 3:6 Zach 7:14 Ez 5:14 14:5 (36:34 AL'); elsewhere 2 x.

---→ Various.

(68) ה'ש' - στυπ'ζω (Ez a'b') (III 11)

Jer a' 3 x, Am 9:4, Ez 9 x (6:2 13:17 15:7 20:46(21:2) 21:2(7) 25:2 28:21 29:2 38:2).

---→ Various.

(69) ה'ש' - κατολ'ομαι (Ez a'b') (III 26)

A free rendition of Jer a' (10 x), the MP (Joel 3(4):20 Zach 1:11 2:4(8) 7:7 9:5) and Ez (26:20 29:11 35:9 39:6); elsewhere 5 x.

(70) ה'כ' - δολ'ω (Ez a'c') (III 30)

Jer a' 25 x, the MP 123 x,¹⁶ Ez a' 62 x,¹⁷ Ez c' 5 x;¹⁷ only one occurrence in Ez b',¹⁷ and none in Jer b'; elsewhere not frequent.¹⁸

Jer a', the MP and Ez a' share a rendition which is not very frequent in the LXX.¹⁸ The above numbers are important for the understanding of the relationship between the different sections of Ez; see below, p. 150.

---→ Cf. III 30.

(71) ה'ת'ר - νόμιμα (Ez c')

Jer 33(26):4 (νομοι AVOL') Hos 8:12 Ez 43:11 44:5,24; elsewhere 1 x.

---→ Especially vόμος (also in Jer, Ez and the MP).

β. Rare words

(72) ληρητής * (Ez a')

Jer 7:11 - לְרֵי; Hos 7:11 - נְדָד; Ob 5 - דָּד;
 Ez 22:9 אֲנָשִׁי רַכְלִי - ἀνδρες ληρηται.

(73) ἄνα - φρύαγμα * (Ez a')

Jer 12:5 Hos 4:18 Zach 11:3 Ez 7:24 24:21.

---→ Especially ὄβου (also in Jer a'b', Ez b' and the MP).

(74) קַבֵּץ (mainly קִבְצָה) - εἰσδέχουαι * (Ez a')

Jer 23:3, the MP (Hos 8:10 Mich 4:6 Hab 2:5 Zeph 3:8,
 19,20 Zach 10:8,10), Ez (11:17 20:34,41 22:19,20,20).

---→ Especially συνάγω (also in Ez and the MP).¹⁹

(75) κατάκιος * (Ez a')

Jer 2:20 - לְעָנִי; Hab 3:3 - לְפָרִי (?); Zach 1:8 - כְּעָנִי;
 Ez 20:28 - כְּעָנִי.

(76) קָה - ἐραστής (Ez a')

Jer a' (22:20,22), the MP (Hos 2:5,7,10,12,13(7,9,12,14,
 15)) and Ez 16:33,36,37 23:5,9,22; elsewhere 1 x. Cf. fur-
 ther Jer 4:30 קָה - ἐραστής.

---→ The Heb occurs elsewhere only twice.

(77) τέσσαρα ! (Ez a')

Jer 15:3 (SAQ τεσσερα) Zach 1:18 6:1 Ez 1:6,8.

---→ τέσσαρα. The LXX translators generally changed the first
αἴψα of τέσσαρα to an εἰσῆλθον because of the ensuing ῥῆμα
 (Thackeray, *Grammar*, 73). The original αἴψα has been pre-
 served only in the above-mentioned cases.

(78) ὑποαίω (Ez a')

Jer 1:13 נִפְרוּחַ סִיר - λέβητος ὑποαιόμενος; Am 4:2 דִּירֹת
 - λέβητες ὑποαιόμενοι; Ez 24:5 (MP דִּיר); elsewhere 2 x.

The LXX of Am manifestly depends upon Jer-LXX.

(79) ἐμπόμπια (Ez a'c')

Jer 3:17, 7:24 - שְׂרָרִית - לְבוּשׁ (but cf. Ziegler);
 Ez a'c' - גְּלוּלִים (15 x);²⁰ Ez 14:22,23 24:14 - עָלְיָה; else-
 where 6 x (Sir 4 x).

(80) τὸ πορόπιον (Ez a'c')

Jer 7:4 (not in MP), Zeph 3:6 - מַכְלִי; Ez 20:9,14,15,22,
 41:6 (not in MP) 46:20 - לְכַלְתִּי; elsewhere 1 x.

(81) δὲ εὐβουλή * (Ez c')

Jer 12:12 - שָׁפֵר; Ob 14 - פָּרַךְ; Zach 9:10 - בָּבַר; Ez 47:8 -
חֲרָצְתִּי; 47:11 - חָרָץ; 48:30 - חָרָצְתִּי.

4. Conclusions

Many important similarities between Jer a', Ez(a') and the MP in renditions and rare words suggest that the three are closely related. This relationship is apparent both between Jer a' and the MP; Jer a' and Ez(a'); Jer a', the MP and Ez (a'); and between the MP and Ez a'c'.²¹ According to Thackeray, the positive evidence mentioned above may be supplemented by a certain amount of negative evidence, namely the absence of certain common words from this group of books.²² Few important disagreements between Jer a', Ez and the MP can be discovered.²³

The similarities between Jer a', Ez and the MP are so striking that we postulate with Thackeray that the three books²⁴ were translated by one individual or otherwise by one group.²⁵ Since this translator produced a translation which we describe as the OG of Jer, it follows by implication that the extant translations of Ez and the MP also exhibit the OG version.²⁶

One should be aware of the tentative character of our conclusions, which are based upon significant similarities collected in the course of the study of Jer-LXX only. It is, however, important to stress that we did not encounter any differences between Jer a', Ez a' and the Mp27 with regard to their characteristic renditions described in chapters II-VI.28

While significant agreements between Jer a', the MP and Ez are rather numerous, few significant agreements between these books and Jer b' are discernible. Furthermore, in nearly all instances of special agreements between Jer a', the MP and Ez, Jer b' stands apart with his own translation equivalents. The majority of the latter are revisions, such as the ones described in ch. III. For example, $\mu\delta\omega\omega$ is rendered in Jer a', the MP and Ez by $\delta\sigma\upsilon\upsilon\iota\omicron\upsilon\delta\omicron\varsigma$, but in Jer b' by $\delta\beta\alpha\rho\omicron\varsigma$ (item 61). In this case, Jer-R probably substituted an earlier $\delta\sigma\upsilon\upsilon\iota\omicron\upsilon\delta\omicron\varsigma$ with $\delta\beta\alpha\rho\omicron\varsigma$ as suggested in ch. III. Also, for other examples, such as 1,2,3,7,57,58,61,62,63,65,67, it is assumed that Jer-R replaced earlier renderings of Jer a', Ez and the MP. As indicated on p. 135, the data listed in this chapter provide scant independent support for the assumption that Jer b' is a revision rather than a second translation.

Similarities between Ez and the OG of Jer are distributed in Ez in an interesting way: 30 are limited to Ez a', 2 to a'b', 4 to a'c', 4 to b', 2 to c' and one is found in a'b'c'. The considerable agreement of the OG of Jer and the MP with only the first part of Ez can hardly be coincidental. Hence, it stands to reason that Ez a' reflects the OG of Ez, while the other two sections contain a different text type, possibly a revision. For example, in the OG of Jer a', the MP and Ez a', $\iota\delta$ is represented by both $\delta\tau\iota$ (*passim*) and $\delta\iota\omicron\tau\iota$ (respectively 25, 123 and 62 times), while in Jer b' it is represented only by $\delta\tau\iota$. It may thus be assumed that the reviser of that section preferred to render the Heb with $\delta\tau\iota$ only; the same applies to Ez b' (only one instance of $\delta\iota\omicron\tau\iota$) and to Ez c' (5 cases of $\delta\iota\omicron\tau\iota$). Precise data are listed in item 70; see also items 41, 61 and 62.

The assumption that Ez b' represents a later revision may further be corroborated by the following:

1. Thackeray, "Ezekiel", and Herrmann²⁹ listed differences between the two (three) different "translators" Ez a' c' and b' (Ez a', b' and c'). Yet, at the same time, Thackeray (*ib.*, 406) acknowledged the existence of important similarities between Ez a' and b'.
2. Approaching the question from a different angle, Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 47, assigned Ez b' to a *kaige*-like revision.

The correctness of this hypothesis has yet to be verified by a minute inner-Greek analysis of Ez-LXX.

1. The following items adduced in this chapter were mentioned by Thackeray, "Proph.", 580ff.: 6,7,20,24,25,26,27,41,43,50,51,52,55,59,70,72,74,76,80,81; Thackeray, *Grammar*, 73:77.
2. הרר is transliterated in the same way in Eusebius' *Onomasticon* (P. de Lagarde, *Onomastica Sacra* (Göttingae 1870) 268) and Josephus, *Ant. Jud.* V.1,22 XIII,15,4; *Bell. Jud.* IV,1,8. Cf. also 'Αραβόπουλον in Polybius V.70,6. The ending of 'Ιραβόπουλον may be compared to that of הרר , transliterated as *Kapuhlioc* in I Ki 18:19,20 2 Ki 2:25 4:25. The prothetic *iota*, on the other hand, is hard to account for-- Thackeray, *Grammar*, 170, n. 4 refers to 'Αραβόπουλον ("heights in Rhodes and at Agrigentum") as a possible source of influence on the present spelling of 'Ιραβόπουλον.
3. Sections 1bc and 2b are not subdivided into (a) common renditions and (β) common rare words since the examples are too few.
4. Some or all of the MSS of Am 6:14 Zeph 2:9 Zach 1:3, 3 7:4 read $\text{κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων}$, which is generally Hexaplaric. Further, in Zach 13:2, MSS B..read Σαβαωθ . Ziegler correctly refers both readings to the apparatus. Cf. J. Ziegler, *Quoddecim Prophetae, Septuaginta...Vol.XIII* (Göttingen 1943) 122-123.
5. Cf. also item 44 for Ez.
6. $\text{ἐξέστησαν Schleusner}$ [ἐξεστησαν AQ*, ἐξεστησαν C, ἐστησαν rel.
7. According to P. Walters, *Text*, 179, the unexpected translation of ה'ל with πολυανδρεῖον derived from Ez 39:11,15, 16 where ה'ל ה'ל is literally rendered with $\text{τὸ γαί τὸ πολυανδρεῖον τοῦ γωγ}$. Since γαί and πολυανδρεῖον are used here synonymously, the translators of Ez also rendered elsewhere ה'ל (ה'ל) with πολυανδρεῖον . In these translations, Walters perceived influence from Ez-LXX on Jer-LXX. However, it is probable that identity of translator rather than influence lies at the source of the mentioned similarity.
8. Hos 5:9 Mich 1:7 6:16 7:13 Joel 1:7 2:3 3(4):19, 19 Zeph 1:13,15 2:4,13 3:1(2:15) Zach 7:14 Mal 1:3.
9. Ez 4:16 (ה'ל) 6:14 7:27 12:19 (ה'ל) 12:20 14:8,15 15:8 23:33. Additional renditions of ה'ל in Ez were listed by Herrmann in Herrmann-Baumgärtel, *Beiträge*, 11. The different renditions of ה'ל were assigned by him to the three assumed translators of Ez. E.g., Ez a' always used ἀφανισμός , with the exception of 14:16 (ἀλεθρος).

10. See also ἐρημώω in 10:25.
11. Hos 2:12(14) Am 7:9 9:14 Mich 6:13 Joel 1:17 2:20 (ἠπιδω) Hab 1:5 Zeph 2:9 (ἠπιδω) 3:6 7:14.
12. Ez 4:17 6:6 12:19 19:7 20:26 25:3 36:4,34,35, 35,36. ἠπιδω is further represented by συντριβῶ (6:4), ἐρημώω (29:12 30:7,7 32:15 33:28,29 35:3,7) and ἀπόλλυσι (30:12, 14). The various renditions of ἠπιδω were assigned by Herrmann (*ib.*) to the three translators of Ez. See further n. 9.
13. See also Am 4:4 ἀνομέω W(vid.)] ἄοεβέω B-V 7 7¹-613 c¹-68-239.
14. Am 1:3,6,9,11,13 2:1,4,6 3:14 5:12 Mich 1:5,5,13 3:8 6:7 7:18.
15. Ez 18:28,30,31 21:24(29).
16. Hos 1:2,4,6,9 3:4 4:1,1,10,14 5:1,3,14 6:7(6) 7:6 8:6,13 9:1,4,12,12,16 10:3 11:1,9 13:13,15 14:2,5,10 Am 3:7,14 4:2,13 5:3,4,17,22 6:8,11,14 7:11 9:9 Mich 1:3, 7-9 2:1 3:7 4:4,10 5:4(3) 6:4 7:6,8 Joel 2:1,11,23 3(4):1,12,13,17 Ob 15,16,18 Jon 1:10,12 4:2 Nah 1:15(2:1) 2:2(3),2(3) 3:19 Hab 1:5,6 2:3,8,11,17 3:17 Zeph 1:7,18 2:4,9,10,14 3:8,8,13,20 Hag 2:5(4),7(6),24(23) Zach 2:6,8, 8,9,10,13(10,12,12,13,14,17) 3:9,9,10(8,8,9) 4:9,10 5:3 6:15 8:6,10,14,17,23 9:1,2,8,13,16 10:2,2,5,6,8 11:2,11,16.
- Both in this note and the next one Ziegler's text is quoted without the variants listed in the apparatus.
17. Ez 1:20 2:5,6,6 3:5,7,9,20,26,27 5:6,13 6:10,13 7:8,8,9(4,4,5),13,19,23 8:12,17 10:17 11:12 12:2,3,6,15,20, 25 13:9,14,21 14:7,23,23 16:14 17:21,24 18:32 20:12,20, 38,40,42,44 21:5,7,21,32(10,12,26,37) 22:16,22 23:28,34,49 24:24,27 25:5,6,7,11,17 34:11 40:4 42:6,13,14 47:12.
18. According to Thackeray, *Grammar*, 139, the books of the LXX contain 358 instances of δῶτι, of which 250 occur in the MP, Ez a' and Jer a'. Even though Thackeray's statistics include too much evidence for our purpose (he includes not only doubtful readings but also occurrences of δῶτι reflecting a *Vorlage* other than 'C), they show that the translators of Ez a', Jer a' and the MP used δῶτι more than the other LXX translators (cf. further III 30).
19. Ez 16:37,37 28:25 29:13 34:13 37:21 38:8 39:17, 27 Hos 1:11(2:2) Mich 1:7 4:12 Joel 3(4):2,11. One notes that εὐσεβήσασθαι occurs more frequently in Ez a', while συνδύω prevails in Ez b'.
20. Ez 14:5,7 16:36 18:6,15 20:16,24,31 22:3,4 23:7,30,37,49 44:10.
21. Cf. Thackeray, "Proph.", 580ff.; *Septuagint*, 29.
22. Thackeray, "Proph.", 582, mentions the following words "καθ' (one doubtful instance in Ez. a and one in Jonah), οὖν, παῖδων, πάλιν (one instance in Jer. c), παρὰλυεσθαι,

παύειν (one instance at the end of Jer. a), ποτέ, συναντῶν, συντάσσειν". Some of Thackeray's examples are convincing (οὖν *versus* οἶ; συντάσσειν *versus* ἐντέλλεσθαι), while others are less powerful.

23. In one instance, however, Jer-LXX differs rather significantly from the MP and Ez: ὄν ὑπόνον, generally rendering ἠπιδω, occurs frequently in the whole LXX, including the MP (18 x), Ez a' (15 x) and Ez c' (7 x), but never in Jer-LXX (cf. further Johannesson, *Kasus*, 81).

24. Baumgärtel in Herrmann-Baumgärtel, *Beiträge*, 32-38, S.F. Johnson, *The Septuagint Translators of Amos*, diss. Univ. of Chicago (Chicago 1938) and G. Howard, *VT* 20 (1970) 108-112, advocate multiple authorship for the MP as a whole or for Amos. However, such claims were convincingly refuted by Thackeray, *Septuagint*, 29; Kaminka, *Studien*, 8-9; J. Ziegler, *Die Einheit der Septuaginta zum Zwölfprophetenbuch, Beiträge zum Vorlesungs-vereins der Staatl. Akademie zu Braunsberg* (1934-1935) 1-16; T. Muraoka, *VT* 20 (1970) 496-500.

25. Thackeray, *Septuagint*, 39, tentatively suggested that one translator rendered both the Prophetic Books and Reigns c'c'.

26. Similarly Thackeray, "Proph.", 578-579 and *Septuagint*, 29, 117. While according to Thackeray Jer a', Ez a'c' and the MP formed part of one large unit, distinct from the translators Jer b' and Ez b', we tentatively suggest to assign the three books to one primary unit which was subsequently revised in two of its sections (Jer b' and Ez b'; see below). Cf. also M. I. Margolis, *JAGS* 30 (1910) 304, T. Muraoka, *Textus* 8 (1973) 22-23, and J. A. Arieti, *JBL* 93 (1974) 343.

27. The differences mentioned by Thackeray, "Proph.", 582, are not significant. Likewise, we are not convinced by the examples which Kaminka, *Studien*, 14-15, used in attempting to prove that the translator of the MP "did not know Jer and Ez"; moreover, the majority of them refer to Jer b'.

28. Thus differences in the rendering of isolated words, phrases and verses should be disregarded since similar differences occur within any book of the LXX. Cf. especially J. Ziegler, *Biblica* 34 (1953) 399ff.

29. Herrmann-Baumgärtel, *Beiträge*, 1-19.

CHAPTER VII

SOME CONCLUSIONS

1. *A Characterization of Jer-R*

In the course of our discussion several characteristics of Jer-R became evident. On the basis of the data listed above and some additional criteria, we shall attempt here to characterize Jer-R's revision as a whole.

Jer-R must have used a Hebrew text for his revision. His tendencies run parallel to those of other revisers as indicated in the footnotes. While retouching the OG according to this Hebrew text, he introduced several new translation options; some of these were merely synonymous (ch. IV);¹ as a rule, however, the reviser inserted renditions which in his opinion better expressed the meaning of the Heb (III, section 1),² he corrected some erroneous renditions (section 2), introduced stereotyped and more consistent renditions of the Heb (sections 3 and 4),³ and corrected the OG in other ways (section 5). That Jer-R was a reviser is further made probable by a few important agreements with the "Three", discussed in the appendix to this section.

It is evident that at times Jer-R's aims were incompatible. Thus his distinction between προφήτης and ψευδοπροφήτης (III 45) as well as between λαλέω and χρηματίζω (III 44) is contrary to the tendency toward the stereotyped rendering of individual Hebrew words (III, sections 3 and 4). In addition, many of the examples of synonymous renditions (ch. IV) are not literal reflections of the Heb, and other renditions are imprecise (e.g., III 9,49,50,51).

Jer-R employed renditions which had been used before him as well as renditions which are not found in other parts of the LXX, the majority of which preceded his revision (see below): III 1,2 (partly), 3,5,6,7,8,9,10,14,18 (rarely elsewhere), 44 (rarely elsewhere), 49. Jer-R apparently also coined new words which

are not attested to in other Greek sources: ἄβαρώ (III 1), ἐπέλερον (III 4).⁴

Chapters III and IV list many examples of renditions which were revised by Jer-R. Since the items discussed comprise only a small percentage of the translation of Jer b', it is of interest to consider Jer-R's approach to the whole of the OG. Because objective data for the determination of the extent of Jer-R's revision are lacking--the OG of Jer b' is lost--we must content ourselves with conclusions drawn from inference:

1. Since Jer-R dealt with *minutiae* such as the article and various prepositions,⁵ it is reasonable to assume that his revision was at times thorough.
2. Recognition of a relatively large number of agreements between Jer a', Ez and the MP suggests the same conclusion. Many of these renditions were altered by Jer-R, as can often be shown.

On the other hand, several facts suggest that Jer-R's revision was neither thorough nor consistent:

1. Several free and erroneous renditions common to both Jer a' and b' were not revised by Jer-R (II 1,2,14,15,16,17,18, 26,27,28,30).
2. Numerous free or "inconsistent" renditions were left as such in Jer b' and revised only by the "Three", O and L.
3. Certain renditions were in some cases revised but in others left untouched. Such unrevised readings are listed amongst the data provided in ch. III and IV.⁶ The appearance in Jer b' of both the revised and the unrevised renditions can be ascribed to no other factor but inconsistency.⁷
4. In the following instances, Jer-R changed the Greek lexemes only, without modifying Jer-OG's understanding of the Hebrew words:
 - a. The OG rendering of יְיָ, ταλαυπόλα, was changed by Jer-R to δαερος, both reflecting the Hebrew *nomen agentis* as a *nomen actionis* (III 2, see p. 48).
 - b. Both λέγει κύριος (Jer-OG) and φησὶ κύριος (Jer-R) represent בְּנֵי as a verb (III 43).

c. In 29:21(49:20), Jer-R altered an earlier ἀφανίζω (also found in the parallel 27(50):45) to ἄβαρώ. In both verses the form of בָּנֵי was understood similarly.

It thus appears that Jer-R seriously intended to make the OG conform to his idea of a more literal and stereotyped translation, but he was not at all consistent in carrying out his intention. Jer-R's inconsistency is discussed above, pp. 44-45.

The majority of the examples in chapters III and IV are qualitative revisions, i.e., renditions which replace earlier translation options. In a few instances, Jer-R's quantitative revisions omit or add elements in accord with MP, e.g., III 24, 32,33. Thus it stands to reason that Jer-R paid the same attention to quantitative and qualitative differences between the OG and his Hebrew *Vorlage*. This assumption cannot be substantiated, however, since we have no access to the OG of Jer b' or to the Hebrew *Vorlage* of Jer-R.

Our characterization of Jer-R is founded upon a comparison of renditions of the same Hebrew words in both Jer a' and b'. Since this is the only objective method, we refrain from commenting on non-comparative evidence, i.e., a comparison of translation techniques referring to different Hebrew *Vorlagen*.⁸

No data are available for comparing the translational skills of Jer-OG and Jer-R. According to our working hypothesis, Jer-R had the advantage of possessing the OG translation which he tried to improve, and the data described in ch. III indeed indicate that Jer-R's translation was more precise and stereotyped than that of the OG.⁹ Hence Thackeray's suggestion that Jer. β' (for him the second *translator*) was "unskilled"¹⁰ and "the weaker scholar of the two"¹¹ is not borne out by the data collected by us nor are his own examples convincing (see n. 10). Further, it seems to us that Thackeray's group of "literal or unintelligent versions" in which he includes Jer. β',¹² is based on a wrong assumption: "literal" versions are not necessarily "unintelligent" and *vice versa*.

Nothing is known about the literary background and geographical origin of the reviser.

APPENDIX

Jer-R and the "Three"

Only a few characteristic renditions of Jer-R not re-touched by Th and Aq have been transmitted as θ' or α' (see pp. 165ff.). As a rule, the "three" altered renditions found in Jer α' and β' in accordance with their own translation technique: e.g., Jer-OG's rendition of TTW , ταλαιπωρέω , was changed by Jer-R to $(\acute{\alpha}\nu)\delta\lambda\lambda\upsilon\mu\iota$ (III 2). Aq,¹³ on the other hand, generally rendered the Heb with προνομεύω (or προνομή), Sym used mainly διαφθείρω , while Th, like Jer-OG, used ταλαιπωρέω (ταλαιπώρος).

The following examples of renditions common to Jer-R and the "three" in their translations of the whole OT undoubtedly indicate a close relationship--if not interdependence--between them. It seems to us that the first example is rather important.

1. The most common LXX rendition of $\text{'\eta \eta\eta\eta}$ is λέγει κύριος , changed by Jer-R to φησὶ κύριος , occurring only three times outside Jer β' (III 43). It is noteworthy, therefore, that φησὶ κύριος is also the standard rendition of the "three". It is very hard to determine with whom this rendition originated.¹⁴
2. Jer-R changed Jer-OG's rendition of \eta\eta\eta (ἐξεδέω) to διασπείρω (6 x) and σπείρω (1 x) (III 50). Since the rendition of the Heb with διασπείρω recurs only once in the LXX (cf. also three occurrences of διασκοπά), it is significant that the "three", Dan-Th, O and L employ this rendition *passim*.¹⁵
3. Jer-OG's rendering of \eta\eta\eta , ἀφανισμός , was revised by Jer-R to ἄβυστος (III 1). This rendering occurs only in Jer-R and in Sym in Ez 14:15 (LXX ἀφανισμός).
4. Jer-R revised μετά as a rendition of $(\text{'})\eta\eta\eta$ to ὕστερον + gen. (III 5). While this rendition does not occur elsewhere in the LXX, it is found in Sym in Ps 72(73):24 and in the late revision Ndpt in Num 31:2.¹⁶

2. *Why is Jer-R's Revision Preserved Only in Jer b'?*

To postulate a revision of Jer 29ff. only cannot be justified because it is hard to understand why a reviser would start at 29:1, leaving aside the whole first part of the book. It is assumed, therefore, that Jer a' has also undergone revision by Jer-R, although such a revised text has not been preserved and no vestige of this revision can be traced.¹⁷

It must be admitted that neither internal nor external evidence known to us provides a reasonable clue as to why the revision of Jer-R is found only in Jer b'. Therefore, we shall have to turn to an irrational solution based on an assumption that a mistake was made sometime between the preparation of the original translation and the writing of our present manuscripts.

A calculation of the respective lengths of Jer a' and b' presents the key to the solution of the problem: Both in their Greek form¹⁸ and in their Hebrew *Vorlagen*¹⁹ the two are nearly identical in length (if Bar 1:1-3:8 is included).^{20,21} The fact that the lengths of both Jer a' and b' equal half of Jer-LXX leads to the assumption that Jer-LXX was divided into two scrolls of approximately equal length, a rather common practice in antiquity.²² Hence it can be assumed that there were two sets of scrolls of Jeremiah--one set of two scrolls of the OG and another set of two scrolls containing an early revision of the OG, namely Jer-R. For some reason, a scroll containing the first half of the text type of the OG was combined with one of the type of Jer-R, and this combination became the archetype of the present text of Jer.

The redactor of the archetype probably did not realize that he used two different text types or else was unable to obtain two scrolls of the same kind since scrolls were scarce at that time.²³ Even the improbable assumption that the redactor purposely chose a revised scroll for Jer b' can be accommodated in our hypothesis.

This description necessitates two additional presuppositions:

1. All the extant manuscripts of Jer-LXX are based on one archetype, not necessarily identical in all details with the first translation of Jeremiah. It should be noted that the

character of the MSS easily allows for the assumption of such an archetype, of which MSS ABS are the best representatives.²⁴

2. The dividing line in both text types occurred at the same point. It seems reasonable that, once the precedent of breaking up Jer-LXX at a certain point was established, it was perpetuated in later manuscripts. Moreover, the dividing line between Jer a' and b' marks a clear contextual division which can easily be remembered (cf. also n. 20).

Our explanation of the present text of Jer is best sustained by referring to parallel phenomena in other books of the LXX:

1. In all the MSS of 1-4 Reigns, OG sections alternate with sections of the *kaige*-Th revision in the following sequence:²⁵

Reigns a'	(1 Sam)	OG
Reigns b'b'	(2 Sam 1 - 11:1)	OG
Reigns b'c'	(2 Sam 11:2 - 1 Ki 2:11)	<i>kaige</i> -Th
Reigns c'c'	(1 Ki 2:12 - 1 Ki 21)	OG
Reigns c'd'	(1 Ki 22 - 2 Ki)	<i>kaige</i> -Th

Thackeray's²⁶ and Barthélemy's²⁷ assumption that the alternation between Reigns b'b' and b'c' had a theological basis has been refuted by Shenkel.²⁸ However, in starting Reigns b'c' at 2 Sam 10:1 rather than 11:1, Shenkel unfortunately had to admit that "the reason for beginning the KR [= *kaige*-Th] at 10:1 is not yet apparent" (*ib.*, 118).

Similarly, no plausible solution has been suggested for the alternation between Reigns c'c' and c'd'. Thackeray again ascribed this alternation to theological factors,²⁹ while Barthélemy (*ib.*, 142) followed by Shenkel (*ib.*, 63), suggested that the *kaige*-Th section started at 1 Ki 22 because the LXX arranged the preceding two chapters in an inverted order.³⁰

An attractive alternative solution was suggested by R. A. Kraft.³¹ As in our hypothesis for Jer, Kraft suggested that the archetype of Reigns was composed of scrolls of different text types, probably accidentally juxtaposed. The advantage of this view over previous assumptions is that it considers the alternation as unintentional, while the plausibility of the

intricate intentions, set forth by other scholars, is at best dubious.

2. The problem of the relationship between the two (three) parts of Ez has yet to be investigated in detail. While Thackeray distinguished two different translators,³² and Herrmann three,³³ Barthélemy³⁴ and Kase³⁵ differentiated between parts of the original translation and a later revision. It is noteworthy for our discussion that Kase ascribed the change of text type to a combination of two different scrolls.³⁶

3. There are important agreements and differences between the two parts of Is. Scholars who stressed the differences suggested that Is was rendered by two different translators (Is a' = 1-39; Is b' = 40-66).³⁷ On the other hand, those who emphasized the similarities supported the unity of the book.³⁸ Of them, Ziegler³⁹ and Seeligmann⁴⁰ were aware that both the differences and the agreements should be explained adequately and thus postulated either an earlier partial translation which was used by the translator, or a subsequent partial revision of Is. It is not impossible that the present text of Is, too, resulted from a juxtaposition of two different scrolls.

The suggestion that revised and unrevised scrolls were juxtaposed in the archetypes of Jer, Reigns and Ez receives further corroboration from the following facts:

1. The whole LXX is a heterogeneous collection of different text types, early and late, unrevised and revised.⁴¹ Probable revisions are Eccl (= Aq?),⁴² Dan(Th),⁴³ Lam (= *kaige*-Th?),⁴⁴ 2 Chr.⁴⁵ Taking into consideration the fact that the individual books of the LXX were either written on one scroll or were composed of various scrolls, we may assume that some of these scrolls happened to contain revisions. The fact that there is no rational explanation of the situation that certain books are of a mixed text type is thus paralleled by the inexplicable situation in which certain LXX books as a whole contain revisions.

2. Various uncial MSS of the LXX contain early revisions in certain books only, e.g., MSS APM... in Ex.-Deut.⁴⁶

3. Some uncial and minuscule MSS shift in a single book from one text type to another,⁴⁷ a situation which resulted from the scribes' using scrolls of different text types.

3. *The Date of Jer-R's Revision*

The date of Jer-R's anonymous revision cannot be determined with the aid of external evidence. Internal evidence is scanty, but nevertheless enables a reasonable determination of the revision. When adding below data relating to the *terminus a quo* and *terminus ad quem* of Jer-R, we shall provide several alternative criteria since some of the data are problematic either by themselves or as a means for dating.

The date of the composition of Jer-OG serves as the sole *terminus a quo* for Jer-R. Since Sirach's grandson testifies⁴⁸ that he knew the *πρωτότα* in Greek and since it can be shown that he actually used their text,⁴⁹ it may be presumed that Jer and Bar 1:1-3:8⁵⁰ were translated before 116 B.C.⁵¹

The following data may be used in fixing the *terminus ad quem* for Jer-R:

1. In three cases *kaige*-Th probably presupposes Jer-R: Within the LXX the rendition of מַלְאִךְ with *ψευδοπροφήτης* occurs eight times in Jer b', once in Jer a', and once in the MP (III 45). Thus from an occasional occurrence of *ψευδοπροφήτης* Jer-R developed a tendency to make it the main rendition of מַלְאִךְ when denoting a 'false prophet'.

Outside the LXX, *ψευδοπροφήτης* occurs a few times in Th (*sub* X), O (*sub* X) and L in Jer b'.⁵² Because no additional *ψευδοπροφήτης* readings are transmitted for Th (O and L cannot be checked), it stands to reason that Th's readings in Jer b' presuppose the present text of Jer-R. Moreover, Th's use of *ψευδοπροφήτης* in 35(28):5 with reference to Hananiah depends upon 35(28):1, where the same prophet is named *ψευδοπροφήτης* (Jer-R).

The OG rendering of מַלְאִךְ, τοῦ μᾶ, was revised by Jer-R to πρὸς τὸ μᾶ (III 6), not found elsewhere in the LXX. Outside the LXX it occurs in two asterized passages in Jer 34:15(27:18)

Th, O, L and 41(34):10 O, L' (probably based upon an earlier rendition of Th--Origen's main source in asterized passages-- which has not been preserved). The latter reading is doubtless influenced by an identical reading of Jer-R in the same verse.

Since this rendition is not attested to elsewhere in Th⁵³ and since it is limited within the LXX to Jer b', Th in Jer necessarily depends upon the present text of Jer-R.

Jer-R's rendition of ηΥ with χρόνος (III 10) is shared by O in Esth 5:13 and α'θ' in Jer 37(30):7 καὶ χρόνος θλιύτως (LXX καὶ χρόνος στενός). Since this rendition is not found elsewhere in the LXX nor in Aq or Th, the α'θ' reading may have depended upon the text of Jer-R. It is, however, also possible that the marginal reading providing this information is imprecise.⁵⁴

It is thus safe to assume that Th in Jer presupposes the present text of Jer-R. This assumption gains some support from various renditions common to Jer-R and the "pthree" (see p. 161) since Th presumably preceded the other two revisers.⁵⁵ On this basis it can be determined that Jer-R preceded the *kaige*-Th group, of which the readings of Th in Jer formed part.⁵⁶ However, at the present state of research, not only the precise date of *kaige*-Th has yet to be determined (on the basis of the leather scroll of the MP the date of *kaige*-Th is now ascribed to the period preceding 50 A.D.,⁵⁷ or to the end of the first pre-Christian century⁵⁸); moreover, the number of strata of which *kaige*-Th is composed⁵⁹ must also be ascertained and it must also be determined whether Th in Jer can be assigned to the probably pre-Christian stratum.

2. The quotations from Jer 38(31):31-34 in Hebr. 8:8-12 10:16 contain two renditions which are characteristic of Jer-R: Hebr. 8:11 = Jer 38(31):34(33) πολλῆς (IV 17). Hebr. 8:9 = Jer 38(31):32 ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπιβουλομένου μου (III 33). Also other agreements in the same verses between Jer and Hebr. permit the assumption that the author of Hebrews (80-90 A.D.) knew the present text of Jer-R.

3. Within Greek literature the word ψευδοπροφήτης is nearly exclusively limited to the LXX of Jer b' (III 45; see also p. 165). Thus Josephus' employment of ψευδοπροφήτης (*Ant. Jud.* X, 111; based upon Jer 44(37), where this word is not used) is clearly based on the present text of Jer-R. Although the LXX text reflected in Josephus does not contain any other *characteristic* reading of Jer-R, it is so close to that of Jer b',⁶⁰ that Josephus must have known Jer b' in its revised form. The date of the *Ant. Jud.* is 93/94 A.D.

4. The text of Jer-R is reflected in the *Vetus Latina*,⁶¹ dated in the middle⁶² or toward the end⁶³ of the second century A.D.

On the basis of a synopsis of the above data, Jer-R's revision may be dated in general terms only--between approximately 116 B.C. and ca. 50 A.D. The following may suggest that Jer-R should be dated in the earlier part of this period:

(1) Since no traces of the OG of Jer b' could be found (see n. 17), it is reasonable to assume that only a short time lapsed between the writing of the OG and the composition of the archetype in which the OG of Jer b' was replaced.

(2) Jer-R's revision is remote from the slavish literalness of *kaige*-Th and Aquila. Since the general development of LXX revisions is towards greater literalness and consistency, Jer-R antedates the other revisions from a typological point of view. Also the other little-known revisions (such as Pap.Ryl. Gk. 458 of Deut, 4Q LXX Num, 7Q LXX Ex, Pap.Chester-Beatty-Scheide 967 of Ez) are dated before the turn of the eras, some as early as 100 or 150 B.C.

4. Some Criteria for the Reconstruction of the OG of Jer b'

The OG of Jer b' has been lost. However, in the course of chapters II-VI we have developed a few criteria for its reconstruction:

1. Whenever Jer a' and b' significantly agree in a rendition which distinguishes both from the other LXX books, the rendition in Jer b' belongs to the OG substratum of that section (ch. II).

2. Whenever Jer b' agrees in a characteristic rendition with the MP and/or Ez, this rendition belongs to the OG substratum of Jer b' (ch. VI).
3. Whenever the relationship between two renditions of the same Heb in Jer a' and b' is that of an original rendition to its revision (ch. III), the rendition in Jer b' is secondary and originated with Jer-R. The OG of Jer b' was presumably identical to the rendition found in Jer a'.
4. The same may hold true when the renditions of Jer a' and b' are merely synonymous (ch. IV).

5. Whenever Jer a'--in contrast with Jer b'--significantly agrees with the OG of the MP and/or Ez, the former is the original rendition, while that of Jer b' is probably secondary (ch. VI). The OG of Jer b' was probably identical with Jer a' = MP and/or Ez.

5. *Some Implications of the Present Study for the Understanding and Use of the "LXX"*

Our study presents a certain view of the relationship between the two sections of Jer as well as on the character of the book of Bar. We cannot claim that our suggestion is without difficulty. There are too many gaps in our knowledge. However, if we pause for a moment and assume that the theory is correct, there are a few implications for LXX scholarship:

It is important for the understanding of the essence of the LXX canon that an additional section of the "LXX" has been described as a revision rather than the OG translation. This shows once more that the "LXX" is a heterogeneous collection of translations, original and revised, early and late, free and literal.

For OT scholarship, the main importance of the LXX lies in its Hebrew *Vorlage*, which at times may be superior to MT. The retroversion of the LXX of Jer is of particular importance in this respect, since we believe that its underlying text is generally older than the MT. More precisely, we have attempted to show elsewhere that the two are recensionally different, the

LXX reflecting an early edition of the book of Jeremiah, and MT containing a later edition of that book.⁶⁴ Since a detailed retroversion of the LXX of Jer is of importance for this purpose and since it utilizes an investigation of translation options, one must constantly keep in mind that the second part of the book does not contain the original translation.

If our view of the nature of the Greek translation of Bar is correct, some tentative conclusions need to be drawn with reference to the study of the LXX in general, Bar's canonical status and its date.

1. It seems that the now apocryphal book of Bar was once joined with Jer, and was translated into Greek by the translator of the latter and revised by the same reviser who retouched the second part of Jer. This means that in the text-critical study of the LXX, the book of Bar must be taken into consideration in the same manner as Jer. Evidence from the LXX of Bar may be as important for solving textual problems as similar evidence from Jer.
2. Several Church Fathers of the second century and onwards quoted parts of Bar as "Jeremiah says..."⁶⁵ We thus know that for the readers of the canon of the LXX, Bar was considered either an appendix to Jer or part of it. We may assume the same status for Bar at an even earlier date, since both the translator and the reviser of Bar referred to Bar in the same way as they did to Jer.

3. The problem of the canonical status of Bar is raised not only by the anonymous revision of the book, but also by the other LXX revisions. Ziegler's edition of Bar contains several references to renderings by *kaige*-Th⁶⁶ as well as one reference to a rendering of Aquila.⁶⁷ This one reference seems insufficient proof that Aquila revised Bar as late as 130 A.D. But *kaige*-Th undoubtedly considered Bar as part of the canon.

It is noteworthy that this situation is quite unique with regard to the books of the Apocrypha. Of the Apocrypha only Bar and the additions to Dan are known to have been revised by *kaige*-Th, or, for that matter, by any of the "three".⁶⁸

4. The Hebrew text of Bar, now lost, was still extant at the time of the anonymous reviser. Otherwise he could not have performed his task. The same is true for the time of *kaige*-Th

as well as for Origen. For at two places in Bar marginal Hexaplaric notes state $\acute{\omicron}\acute{\upsilon}$ $\kappa\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha$ ($\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron$) $\mu\alpha\acute{\omicron}$ $\tau\acute{\eta}$ $\epsilon\beta\beta\alpha\acute{\alpha}\phi$, i.e., "this word (these words) is (are) not found in the Hebrew." 69 Also the occurrence in the Hexaplaric manuscripts of asterisks and obeluses shows that Origen made use of a Hebrew text. On the other hand, in the fourth century A.D. the Hebrew was unknown to Jerome.

NOTES

CHAPTER VII

1. For similar tendencies in other LXX revisions, see IV, n. 4.
2. See Reider, *Prolegomena*, 20ff. and Rahlfs-Lühkemann, 10-11 for Aq. For *kráge*- η h see Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, *passim*; Shenkel, *Kings*, 13ff.; M. Smith, *Biblica* 48 (1967) 443-445 and J. A. Grindell, *CBQ* 31 (1969) 499-513.
3. See Reider, *Prolegomena*, 26ff. and Sois.-Soin., *Zusätze*, 151 for Aq. For *kráge*- η h, see Sois.-Soin., *ib.* and Schmitt, *Theodotion*, 61.
4. See Reider, *Prolegomena*, 16, 33 and App. I for Aq. For O, see Sois.-Soin., *Zusätze*, 155.
5. Jer-R altered the renderings of the following prepositions and conjunctions: $\eta\gamma\lambda\lambda$ III 6; $\eta\gamma\lambda$ III 7; $\eta\gamma\lambda$ III 21; $\eta\beta\beta$ III 22; $\eta\kappa\theta$ III 28; η III 30; η , IV 5. He revised previous renditions of the Hebrew article (III 32) and of the *zamed* + inf. (IV 7). Jer-R also eliminated $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ as a rendering of the *waw* (III 31).
6. E.g., in 69 instances an earlier $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota$ $\mu\acute{\omicron}\rho\omicron\iota\omicron\varsigma$ was revised by Jer-R to $\acute{\omicron}\tau\omega\varsigma$ $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\iota\epsilon$ $\mu\acute{\omicron}\rho\omicron\iota\omicron\varsigma$, while in three places it was left unrevised (cf. III 18). For further examples, see III 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 21, 22, 27, 28, 32(?), 38, 41, 44, 45, 46(?), 51, 52(?) IV 4, 6, 7(?), 10, 14, 16, 17, 22, 23.
7. In a few instances the revised and unrevised renditions are found in different parts of Jer (III 4, 6, 7, 18 IV 17, 22), but their different distribution patterns cannot be coordinated into one coherent pattern. E.g., the assumption that Jer-R was less consistent in the beginning of Jer 29-52 holds for III 1 and 18 only.
8. One may, for example, investigate the word order praed./subj./obj. in relation to its *Varlage* in both Jer a' and b'. Various aspects of this problem were examined by Martin, *Syntax*, 52, 81. Neither Martin's investigation nor a pilot study of us carried out in several chapters of Jer a' and b' reveal significant differences between Jer a' and b'.
9. That Jer b' also gives the impression of a more literal translation than Jer a', is due to the fact that Jer b' contains more prose sections than Jer a'. The prose of Jer contains few problematic words and, as a rule, is easily translatable with stereotyped renditions.
10. Thus "Gr.Tr.Jer.", 256, where Thackeray also referred to Strane, *Jeremias*, 194. Thackeray also noted that Jer. β "contains the most glaring instances in the LXX of a translator

who was ignorant of the meaning of the Hebrew, having recourse to Greek words of similar sound" (*Grammar*, 14). This characterization of Jer b' was repeated by Martin, *Syntax*, 312.

Neither Streane's example (23:19-20 // 37(30):23-24) nor those of Thackeray seem to justify their assertions. Thackeray's evidence merely consists of a few Greek transliterations of difficult words and of exclamations which developed in the MS tradition into similar Greek words, e.g., 38(31):21 ה'ן ה'ן ה'ן - τῆμοῖαν ex τῆμοῖαν; 41(34):5 ה'ן ה'ן ה'ן - ἑὸς ἄδου ex ὁ ἄδου. Moreover, even if the examples had been convincing, the transliterations might have been remnants of the OG translation of Jer b', since similar ones are found in Jer a', e.g., 8:7 ה'ן ה'ן - ἄρουῖ ex ἀρουῖ. On the transliterations, see Ziegler, *Beiträge*, 83-86 and E. Tov, *Festschrift* 8 (1973) 82ff.

11. *Septuagint*, 32. Since Thackeray did not compare the skill of Jer. β' with that of Jer. α', this description is ill-founded.

12. Thackeray, *Grammar*, 13.

13. Cf. Reider, *Index Aquilae*; J. Ziegler, *VT* 8 (1958) 277.

14. An interesting, albeit naive, solution to this problem was suggested by H. P. Smith, *Hebraica* 3 (1887) 195, n. 1 and repeated by F. Schwally, *ZAW* 8 (1888) 199, n. 3 and Giesebrecht, *Jeremias*, xxxiv. According to these scholars, the φῶνι κῦριος readings in Jer b' derived from the Hexapla. However, it should be argued that these readings are too numerous for such an assumption and this suggestion does not account for the other characteristic renditions of Jer-R.

15. Jer 8:3 α'σ': 23:3 α'σ'; 34:8 (27:10) α'σ' OL; 36(29): 14, 18 σ' OL; 50(43):5 α'σ' (acc. to MS 86).

Since Aq generally rendered the Heb with ἐξῶθε (9 x), the four renditions with διαστεῖω probably originated with either *kaiḡe*-Th or Sym. Sym also rendered the Heb once with ἐξῶθε (37(30):17).

16. ὄρτοσιν also renders 37 in Prov 22:4 (Sym), Am 4:12 (Aq) and Gen 49:19 (anonymous note in Cod. Ambros.).

17. We have been unable to trace vestiges of the OG text of Jer b' or of a revision of Jer a'. In Tov, *Diss. Jeremias*, pp. 202-208, evidence was furnished which could be explained as such; however, none of the examples is conclusive, since all have alternative explanations. Our investigation was based upon internal evidence in MSS and early papyri of Jer-LXX, as well as quotations in Church Fathers, in the NT, the text of Josephus and that of the secondary versions. For details and bibliographical references, see *ib.*, 202-203.

18. In MS A the relation between the two parts is 66-1/2: 62-1/2 columns.

19. The MT of Jer a' comprises 48-2/3 pp. in the edition of M. H. Letteris (London 1953), while that of Jer b' includes 49-1/4 pp. The number of pages for the *Vorlage* of Bar 1:1-3:8

is computed as follows: Jer-LXX (ed. Swete) : Jer-MT = Bar(Gk) : x.

The Hebrew MS used by the Greek translators was one eighth shorter than MT (see I, n. 1). Since both parts of the Greek Jer are shorter than MT by the same ratio (see, e.g., the "con-spectus" in Workman, *Jeremias*, 283-398), the Hebrew *Vorlagen* of Jer a' and b' must have related to each other as Jer a' and b' in the MT.

20. The assumed dividing line (28:64-29:1 according to the sequence of the LXX) divides the book into two equal parts and at the same time it is suitable from a contextual point of view: the oracles against two great powers, Egypt and Babylon, occur on one side of the dividing line (26-28), while those against the smaller nations (29-31) occur on the other. One notes, however, that the oracles against Egypt and Babylon are preceded in the LXX by an oracle against Elam (25:14-19(49:34-39)). According to some scholars (see Rudolph, *Jeremia*, 245, 274), this situation indicates that the Greek translator considered Elam as a representative of a third great power, viz. Persia. The same may be true for the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX.

21. Attention should be drawn here to the fact that the scribe of MS A left some space in the last line of ch. 28 (i.e., at the dividing line between Jer a' and b') which he filled with nine arabesques (∆). Similarly shaped arabesques (∆, ∆, ∆, ∆, ∆, ∆, ∆, ∆, ∆) are also inserted after 41(34):7, 11 and at the end of chapters 42(35) and 46(39). The evidence suggests that the scribe(s) ? of MS A often employed these arabesques in empty spaces at the ends of lines so that the next unit would start at the beginning of a new line. Indeed, in 29(47):11 and 41(34):12 (the lines after the arabesques) the new unit starts with a capital letter, and in the other three instances the next line, which contains the "title" of a new unit, is narrower than the adjacent lines. See H. J. M. Milne and T. C. Skeat, *Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus* (London 1938) 20-21 (where a similar use of arabesques in MS S is described) and V. Gardthausen, *Griechische Palaeographie* (Leipzig 1879) 292.

Thackeray's suggestion ("Gr. Tr. Jer.", 260), followed by Duval, "Jer", 401, that the arabesques after 28:64 in the LXX show that the scribe of MS A knew of the bipartition of Jer-LXX is not convincing. Thackeray (*ib.*) misrepresents the facts since the arabesques are not "usually inserted only at the end of a book".

22. That large units were divided in antiquity into different scrolls by authors, redactors and scribes was established by Th. Birt, *Das antike Buchwesen* (Berlin 1882) *passim*; *id.*, *Die Buchrolle in der Kunst* (Leipzig 1907) 215ff.; L. Blau, *Studien zum althebräischen Buchwesen und zur biblischen Literaturgeschichte* (Strassburg 1902) 46ff.; W. Schubart, *Das Buch bei den Griechen und Römern* (Berlin 1907) 35ff.; M. St. J. Thackeray, "The Bisection of Books in Primitive Septuagint MSS", *JThSt* 9 (1907-08) 88-98; F. W. Hall, *A Companion to Classical Texts* (Oxford 1913) 8ff.; K. Huber, *Untersuchungen über den Sprachcharakter des griechischen Leviticus* (Giessen 1916) 95-99.

The following data may be added to the ancient sources and evidence cited by the scholars mentioned above:

1. That IQIsa was bisectioned by its scribes was suggested by P. Kahle, *Die Hebräische Handschriften aus der Höhle* (Stuttgart 1951) 72-77; M. Noth, *Vf* 1. (1951) 224-226; C. Kuhl, *Vf* 2 (1952) 332-333; M. Martin, *The Scribal Character of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Louvain 1958), 65-70.
2. The same holds true for IQH, see E. L. Sakenik, מלך המלך חזקוני (Jerusalem 5713) 33; M. E. Del Medico, *L'Épigone des manuscrits de la Mer Morte* (Paris 1957) 207-208, 483-484; Martin, *op. cit.*, 59-64.
3. Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 167-168, showed that the leather scroll of the Greek MP was written by two scribes.
4. It is generally assumed that 1-2 Sam, 1-2 Ki, 1-2 Chr each originally formed one book (cf. Eissfeldt, *Introduction*, 268-269, 530) whose unity was first interrupted by the LXX translators.
23. The importance of the scrolls for the understanding of early deviating text types has been well described by Bickerman, "Transmission". Among other things, he stressed that there did not exist two identical or nearly identical scrolls of any Biblical book because of the many changes inserted in the individual scrolls.
24. See Ziegler, "Einleitung", 56-60.
25. See Thackeray, "Kings" and Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 36 and *passim*.
26. According to Thackeray, "Kings", 263, the OG translator purposely omitted the unifying section Reigns b'c' ("the story of David's sin and the subsequent disasters of his reign"), while a later *translator* filled in the gap.
27. According to Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 140-141, the *kaige*-th reviser of Reigns revised only that section which most urgently needed it, viz. "<le> récit de la faute et des malheurs de famille de David" (Reigns b'c'), especially since this section has no parallel in Chr.
28. Since Shenkel, *Kings*, 117-120 showed that Reigns b'c' did not start with 11:1, he undermined the basis for the assumptions of Thackeray and Barthélemy.
29. According to Thackeray, *ib.*, the OG translator omitted Reigns c'd' because of its contents ("the story of growing degeneracy under the later Monarchy culminating in the captivity"), while a later translator undertook the translation of the missing section.
30. According to Shenkel, the *kaige*-th reviser originally retouched only 2 Ki, revising merely the chronology of 1 Ki since he did not wish to engage himself in a complete revision of that section. This partial revision involved the reworking of the end of 1 Ki 22, while the remainder of the chapter was submitted to an even more superficial correction. However, Shenkel's complicated suggestion can not be supported by any evidence.

31. R. A. Kraft, *Gnomon* 37 (1965) 482: "Prior to the development of the codex in the early centuries of our era (especially 3rd-4th), it must have been an extremely difficult matter to retain a consistent text type throughout a work like Samuel-kings, which would require several scrolls for its transcription. We do not know exactly what kind of MSS Origen consulted in his text-critical labors, but it is safe to assume that he had access both to scrolls and at least to small-scale codices. Origen would have had little control over the integrity of the text that came into his hands, especially if it arrived in the form of a codex in which sections of originally different textual nature had been juxtaposed through the transcription of older and shorter scrolls." Kraft's assumption necessarily implies that the books 1-4 Reigns were written on at least five scrolls, roughly corresponding with 1 Sam, 2 Sam a', 2 Sam b', 1 Ki and 2 Ki (starting at 1 Ki 22).
32. Thackeray, "Ezekiel", distinguished between Ez a' (1-27) + c' (40-48) and b' (28-39). Cf. also J. Schäfer, *Theologie und Glaube* 1. (1909) 289-291; E. H. Kase *apud* Johnson, *Schweizer*, 64; Turner, "Ezekiel", 17ff.
33. Herrmann in Herrmann-Baumgärtel, *Beiträge*, lff., distinguished between Ez a', b' and c'. This assumption was accepted with a slight change by Turner, "Ezekiel" (1956), although earlier it had been refuted convincingly by Kase, *ib.*, 52-73 (1938).
34. Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 47, tentatively characterized Ez a'c' as the OG, while ascribing Ez b' to a *kaige*-like revision. Cf. also pp. 150-51 above.
35. According to Kase, *ib.*, Ez a' reflects a revision, while Ez a'b' contain the OG.
36. The fact that this revision has made its influence permanently felt only in I-XXVII is to be connected once more with the practice of bisectioning Scriptural books. The origin of the type of text with which we are familiar would be sufficiently accounted for by a combination of two rolls, the first of which contained the text of I-XXVII in its revised form, the second containing the text of XVIII [read: XXVIII; E.T.] - XLVIII in an unrevised form" (*ib.*, 73).
37. G. B. Gray, "The Greek Version of Isaiah, Is It the Work of a Single Translator?", *JThSt* 12 (1911) 286-293; F. Baumgärtel in Herrmann-Baumgärtel, *Beiträge*, 20-31.
38. J. Fischer, *In welcher Schrift lag das Buch Isaías den LXX vor?* *BZAW* 56 (Giessen 1930) 2-5; Ziegler, *Isaías*, 31ff.; Seeligmann, *Isaiah*, 39ff.
39. *Isaías*, 45-46.
40. *Isaiah*, 42.
41. The heterogeneous nature of the canon of the IXX can not sufficiently be stressed; see especially R. A. Kraft, *IBES*, s.v. "Septuagint" (in press).

42. See G. A. Barton, *Ecclesiastes*, ICC (N.Y. 1908) 8-11, where earlier literature is mentioned; Thackeray, *Grammar*, 13, 60; Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 21-33.

43. All MSS with the exception of 88-Syh(=0) and Pap.967 contain the text of "Th"; cf. Schmitt, *Theodotion*, where earlier literature is mentioned.

44. Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 47. According to Barthélemy, Cant and Ruth are also "probably" part of the *kaige*-Th revision.

45. Barthélemy, *ib.*, mentions also 2 Chr as belonging to a *kaige*-like revision. Previously, 2 Chr was thought to have been revised by Th (H. Howorth and C. Torrey; for precise references, see Jellicoe, *SMS*, 290ff.), but this suggestion was refuted convincingly by B. Waide, *Die Esdrasbücher der Septuaginta*, *Biblische Studien* XVIII (Freiburg im Breisgau 1913) 37ff.; G. Gerleman, *Studies in the Septuagint*, II: *Chronicles* (Iund 1946) 1-7; R. W. Klein, *Studies in the Greek Text of the Chronicles*, unpubl. diss. Harvard Univ. (Cambridge, Mass. 1966) 311ff.

46. See D. W. Gooding, *Revisions of the Septuagint Pentateuch*, *Byzantine Lecture 1954* (London 1955). For additional examples, see P. Katz, "Rezensionen", 78ff. and Wevers, "Formungen", 45ff.

47. Relevant examples are mentioned by Thackeray, *Septuagint*, 131 and G. F. Moore, *AJSL* 29 (1912) 50-51; see further the introductions to the various volumes of the Göttingen Septuagint. MS 54 may serve as an example: In Gen 1-22:21 it reflects a mixed text according to J. Wevers (1974) or a Lucianic text according to Rahlfs (1926), while from 22:22 onwards it contains the text-type of the *Catena*.

48. Prologue, 1.9.

49. See J. Ziegler, *BZAW* 77 (1958) 280-281.

50. As for the date of Bar, "all attempts to fix the date of the first part of the book--nay, of the book as a whole--have failed because no definite clues are available" (R. H. Pfeiffer, *History of N.T. Times* (N.Y. 1949) 415). The main criterion for the dating of Bar is the dependence of the prayer of repentance in 1:15-2:9 on Dan 9:4-19. Even though Dan 9 was added to the book of Dan at a later stage, its date is probably close to that of the bulk of Dan (167-164 B.C.). Thus nothing prohibits the dating of Bar in the period preceding 116 B.C., as was indeed done by Harwell, *Baruch*, 66; Pfeiffer, *op. cit.*, 413-416; T. André, *Les Apocryphes de l'A.T.* (Florence 1903) 257; Penna, *Baruch*, 13.

51. This is the generally accepted date of the Greek translation of Sirach. See U. Wilcken, *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* III (1906) 321; Eissfeldt, *Introduction*, 597.

52. Jer 35(28):59' (X) O(X)-233 L' Arm
35(28):10π' (X) Q; προστης 86) L'-233 Chr
35(28):12 L'-233
35(28):15 L'-233 Arm^p Tht
35(28):17 L'-233 Chr

θεσοδοποφητης occurs further in:
20:14 יהוה - יהושע] θεσοδοποφητης 86txt-710 233
34:13(27:16) יהוה - προσητων] θεσοδοποφητων Arab.

53. Ex 8:22(18) ωστε μη 2 Sam 14:13 τοῦ μη
2 Ki 23:10 ut non(Syh) Ez 3:21 τῶα μη
Ez 13:22 τοῦ-καβαλου μη>α'θ' Ez 17:4 τοῦ μη α'θ'.

54. The scribe who noted the variant reading of α'θ' in the margin of MS 86 might have wished to record the difference between LXX στενός and α'θ' ελιγός only, while being imprecise with regard to the preceding noun which he copied from the LXX.

55. Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 246-253, 261-265, and O'Connell, *Theodotion*, have made it plausible that Aq and Sym did not revise the OG, but rather improved upon the *kaige*-Th revision. If proved correct, this opinion may pinpoint the origin of many, if not all, of the collective readings of the "Three" as *kaige*-Th.

56. Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 47, mentioned as belonging to the *kaige* revision readings both from the Theodotion column and "celles <sc. ajoutes Theodotion> souvent anonymes à la Septante de Jérémie". Even though Barthélemy was intentionally vague (on p. 44 he mentioned "ajoutes" without any classification, thus including anonymous "ajoutes" and those which derived from Aq), his conclusion on the character of Th in Jer is doubtless correct. Barthélemy's characterization of Th is based mainly upon the translation of בל with καίτε, which also characterizes other members of the *kaige*-Th group; cf. Barthélemy, *ib.*, 31ff.; Schmitt, *Theodotion*, 88; O'Connell, *Theodotion*, 275.

One should note the following shortcomings of Barthélemy's list of καίτε readings in asterized passages in Jer:

1. The list should not have included readings of Aq, such as 34:5(27:6) and 38(31):19.
2. 28(51):44 ο' (8' sec. Syh) X (cf. the marginal note in the Syh) is erroneously omitted from the list.
3. Not all the listed readings are "ajoutes"; the readings in 14:5 34:5(27:6) are mere corrections.
4. Since Barthélemy did not record the readings from the Syh, he wrote, e.g., "VIII 12 καίτε ... 88 233, la marge de Q et l'ensemble des manuscrits 'lucianiques'". However, the source of these readings, viz. α'ο'θ' (X), is not listed by Barthélemy, since it is mentioned in the Syh.

57. Barthélemy, *ib.*, 167ff.

58. Cross, *ALQ*, 171, n. 13.

59. Since Schmitt, *Theodotion*, has shown convincingly that Th and Ban-Th are not to be identified as one reviser, the

καίγε-*th* group must be composed of at least two layers. Cf. also J. A. Grindell, *CBQ* 31 (1969) 511 and K. Koch, *VT* 23 (1973) 362-5.

60. *Ant. Jud.* X, 121 λάκον βοοφόρου πλήρη = Jer 45(38):6. X, 137 διεσπάρσαν = 52:8. X, 141 συλλαφθεῖς ἀχθήσεται... καὶ λαλήσει αὐτῷ κατὰ στόμα καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ = 41(34):3 (the text of Jos. is not based on the reading of B-S-106'-538 Bo Aeth Arab all of which omit καὶ...στόμα), or does Jos. reflect 39(32):4?

X, 145 λυχνύτας = 52:19.

X, 149 = 52:24, 25.

X, 175 νήπια = 49:16 Syh^{mg} (B-S^C (τας λουπας*)-130-239-538 A-106 O τα λουπα; I-407 τοὺς λουπους; τα νηπια και τα λουπα 449; τα καταλοινα rel. Does Josephus here reflect the tradition found in Syh^{mg}, or rather is his text influenced by the LXX of 50(43):6, where the same expression occurs?

61. 29:14(49:13) ὅτι εἰς ἄβατον - quia nemo pertransiet (cf. III 1). 29:18(49:17) ἔσται... εἰς ἄβατον - erit... sine vestigio (cf. III 1); both examples are quoted from F. C. Burkitt, *The Old Latin and the Itala, Texts and Studies* IV, 3 (Cambridge 1896) 81-92. 31(48):1 (and *passim*) οὐδὲς εἶπε κόποις - sic dicit Dominus (cf. III 18); quoted from F. C. Burkitt, *The Book of the Rules of Hygonius, Texts and Studies* III, 1 (Cambridge 1895) 53 and *passim*. Elsewhere in Hyconius τᾶδε λέγει κόποις is rendered with haec dicit Dominus (e.g., p. 79). 37(30):8, 9 ἐργονια - operabuntur (cf. III 8); quoted from Huglo, "Fragments de Jérémie selon la Vetus Latina", *Vigiliae Christianae* 8 (1954) 83-86--as opposed to δουλεύω - servio in III:10, quoted from E. Ranke, *Par Palimpsestorum Wincburgensium Antiquissimae Veteris Testamenti Versionis Latinae Fragmenta* (Vindobonae 1871). 46(39):18 ἔσται ἡ ψυχὴ σου εἰς εὐφρονα - erit anima tua in inventione (cf. III 49); quoted from Ranke, *op. cit.*

62. F. Stummer, *Einführung in die Lateinische Bibel* (Paderborn 1928) 8.

63. Roberts, *Text and Versions*, 237.

64. Cf. E. Tov, "L'incidence de la critique textuelle sur la critique littéraire dans le livre de Jérémie", *RB* 79 (1972) 189-199.

65. The quotations are listed by Hoberg, *Baruch*, 7-19, while Harwell, *Baruch*, 61, cites some additional data to show that Bar was appended to Jer.

66. 1:1, 2 2:2, 11, 29 4:13.

67. 2:13.

68. We may disregard the one reference to Sym in Susanna 43 where ο' probably is a mistake for ο'.

69. 1:17 2:3.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AC W.F. Arndt and F.W. Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the NT* (Cambridge 1957).
- O.J. Baab, "A Theory of Two Translators for the Greek Genesis", *JBL* 52 (1933) 239-243.
- Barthélemy, *Les Devaniers d'Aquila, Suppl. to VT* 10 (Leiden 1963).
- Baudissin, *Kyrios*
- BDB F. Brown, S.R. Driver and Ch.A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the OT* (Oxford 1959).
- BH K. Kittel and P. Kahle, *Biblia Hebraica* 3 (Stuttgart 1966).
- Bickerman, "Some Notes on the Transmission of the Septuagint", *A. Marx Jubilee Volume* (N.Y. 1950) 149-178.
- Blass-Debrunner-Funk F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the NT*, translated and revised by R.W. Funk (Chicago 1961).
- Bright, *Jeremiah*
- Bright, *Jeremiah, Anchor Bible* (N.Y. 1965).
- S. Brock, *The Recensions of the Septuagint Version of I Samuel*, unpubl. diss. Oxford Univ. (Oxford 1966).
- Charles, *Apocrypha*
- Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the OT* (Oxford 1913).
- Cross, *AIQ*
- F.M. Cross, Jr., *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies* (New York 1961).
- Cross, "Biblical Text"
- Cross, *AIQ*
- Duval, "Jer."
- Duval, "Le texte grec de Jérémie d'après une étude récente", *RB* 12 (1903) 394-403 (review of Thackeray, "Gr.Tr. Jer.").

- Eissfeldt, *Introduction*
 O. Eissfeldt, *The Op., An Introduction, etc., translated by P.R. Ackroyd* (N.Y. and Evanston 1965).
- Field, *Hexapla*
 F. Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum quae Supersunt* (Oxonii 1875).
- Frankl, "Studien"
 P.F. Frankl, "Studien über die Septuaginta und Peschito zu Jeremia", *MGMJ* 21 (1872) 444-456; 497-509.
- Fritsch, *Pentateuch*
 C.T. Fritsch, *The Anti-anthropomorphisms of the Greek Pentateuch* (Princeton 1943).
- Chistler, *Catenae*
 M. Ghislerii Romani, *In Ieremiam Prophetam Commentarii* (Lugduni 1623).
- Giesebrecht, *Jeremia*
 F. Giesebrecht, *Das Buch Jeremia²*, HK (Göttingen 1907).
- Gooding, *Revisions*
 D.W. Gooding, *Revisions of the Septuagint - Pentateuch, Tyndale Lecture 1954* (London 1955).
- Gooding, *Tabernacle*
 Id., *The Account of the Tabernacle, Translation and Textual Problems of the Greek Exodus, Texts and Studies NS VI* (Cambridge 1959).
- Harwell, *Baruch*
 R.R. Harwell, *The Principal Versions of Baruch*, diss. Yale Univ. (New Haven, Conn. 1915).
- HR
 A. Hastoupis, *The Septuagint Text of the Book of Jeremiah (Chs. I to 25)*, unpubl. diss., Northwestern Univ. (Chicago 1950).
- Hatch, *Essays*
 E. Hatch and H.A. Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint* (Oxford 1897).
- Helbing, *Grammatik*
 E. Hatch, *Essays in Biblical Greek* (Oxford 1889).
- Helbing, *Kasussyntax*
 R. Helbing, *Grammatik der Septuaginta, Laut und Wortlehre* (Göttingen 1907).
- Herrmann-Baumgärtel, *Beiträge zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Septuaginta* (Berlin 1923).
- Hoberg, *Baruch*
 Id., *Die Kasussyntax der Verba bei den Septuaginta* (Göttingen 1928).
- J. Herrmann and F. Baumgärtel, *Beiträge zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Septuaginta* (Berlin 1923).
- G. Hoberg, *Die älteste lateinische Übersetzung des Buches Baruch* (Freiburg 1902).

- G. Howard, "Some Notes on the Septuagint of Amos", *VT* 20 (1970) 108-112.
- X. Jacques, *List of Septuagint Words Sharing Common Elements* (Rome 1972).
- Janzen, *Jeremiah*
 J.G. Janzen, *Studies in the Text of Jeremiah*, Harvard Semitic Monographs 6 (Cambridge, Mass. 1973).
- Id., "Double Readings in the Text of Jeremiah", *HTR* 60 (1967) 433-447.
- Jastrow
 M. Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, etc.* (N.Y. 1903).
- Jellicoe, *SMS*
 S. Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Oxford 1968).
- Johannessohn, *Kasus*
 M. Johannessohn, *Der Gebrauch der Kasus und der Präpositionen in der Septuaginta. I: Gebrauch der Kasus* (Berlin 1910).
- Johannessohn, *Präpositionen*
 Id., *Der Gebrauch der Präpositionen in der Septuaginta, NAWG, Phil.-Hist. Kl. 1925, Beiheft* (Berlin 1926).
- Johnson, *Scheide*
 A.C. Johnson, H.S. Gehman and E.H. Kase (ed.), *The John H. Scheide Biblical Papyri. Ezekiel* (Princeton 1938).
- Johnson, *Samuel*
 B. Johnson, *Die Hexaplarische Rezension des 1. Samuelbuches der Septuaginta, Studia Theologica Lundensia 22* (Lund 1963).
- S.E. Johnson, *The Septuagint Translators of Amos*, diss. Univ. of Chicago (Chicago 1938).
- Kaminka, *Studien*
 A. Kaminka, *Studien zur Septuaginta an der Hand der zwölf kleinen Prophetenbücher* (Frankfurt a. M. 1928).
- Katz, "Rezensionen"
 P. Katz, "Frühe hebraisierende Rezensionen der Septuaginta und die Hexapla", *ZAW* 69 (1957) 77-84.
- Katz-Ziegler, "Aquila-Index"
 Id. und J. Ziegler, "Ein Aquila-Index in Vorbereitung", *VT* 8 (1958) 264-285.
- Kneucker, *Baruch*
 J.J. Kneucker, *Das Buch Baruch* (Leipzig 1879).
- Köhler, "Beobachtungen"
 L. Köhler, "Beobachtungen am hebräischen und griechischen Text von Jeremia Kap. 1-9", *ZAW* 29 (1909) 1-39.

- R. A. Kraft, *Gnomon* 37 (1965) 474-483 (review of Barthelemy, *Devanciens*).
- E. Kühl, *Das Verhältnis der Massora zur Septuaginta in Jeremia* (Halle 1882).
- J. Levy, *Wörterbuch über die Paläudim und Mišraschim* (Berlin und Wien 1924).
- H.G. Liddell and R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon* 9, revised by H.S. Jones (Oxford 1940).
- F.A. Barber, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, A Supplement (Oxford 1968).
- R.A. Martin, *The Syntax of the Greek of Jeremiah*, Part I: *The Noun, Pronouns and Prepositions in their Case Constructions*, unpubl. diss. Princeton Theol. Sem. (Princeton, N.J. 1957).
- Id.*, "Some Syntactical Criteria of Translation - Greek", *Vf* 10 (1960) 295-310.
- J.D. Michaelis, *Observationes in Jeremiae Vaticinia*, ed. J.F. Schleusner (Goettingae 1793).
- F.C. Movers, *De Utriusque Recensionis Vaticiniumum Jeremiae*... Commentatio Critica (Hamburgi 1837).
- T. Murakoa, "Is the Septuagint Amos VIII 12 - IX 10 a Separate Unit?", *Vf* 20 (1970) 496-500.
- K.G. O'Connell, S.J., *The Theodotionic Revision of the Book of Exodus*, Harvard Semitic Monographs 3 (Cambridge, Mass. 1972).
- A. Penna, *Baruch*, *la Sacra Bibbia* (Roma-Torino 1956).
- F. Preisigke, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden* (Berlin 1925-31).
- A. Rahlfs and L. Lütkenmann, *Hexaplarische Randnoten zu Isaia's I-16*, *NAWG, Phil.-Hist. Kl.* 1915 (Berlin 1916).
- J. Reider, *Prolegomena to a Greek-Hebrew and Hebrew-Greek Index to Aquila* (Philadelphia 1916).
- Id.*, *An Index to Aquila*, completed and revised by M. Turner, *Suppl. to Vf* 12 (Leiden 1966).

- Roberts, *Text and Versions*
- Rudolph, *Jeremia*
- Schleusner
- Schmitt, *Theodotion*
- Seeligmann, *Isaiah*
- Shenkel, *Kings*
- Sois.-Soin., *Richter*
- Sois.-Soin., *Zusätze*
- Sois.-Soin., *Infinitive*
- Spohn, *Jeremias Vates*
- Streane, *Jeremiah*
- Swete, *Introduction*
- B. J. Roberts, *The OT Text and Versions* (Cardiff 1951).
- W. Rudolph, "zum Text des Jeremia, I: zum griechischen Text", *ZAW* NF 7 (1930) 272-281.
- Id.*, *Jeremia*², *HAT* (Tübingen 1958).
- J. F. Schleusner, *Novus Thesaurus Philologico-Criticus sive Lexicon in LXX* (Lipsiae 1820-21).
- M. Schmidt, "The Book of Jeremiah", *The New World* (1900) 655-675.
- A. Schmitt, *Stamm der sogenannte "S" - Text bei Daniel wirklich von Theodotion?*, *MSU* IX (Göttingen 1966).
- A. Scholz, *Der Masorethische Text und die LXX. Übersetzung des Buches Jeremias* (Regensburg 1875).
- Schulz, *De Ieremiae Textus Hebraici Masorethici et Graeci Alexandrini Discrepantia* (Treptow a.d. R. 1861).
- I. L. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah, A Discussion of its Problems* (Leiden 1948).
- J. D. Shenkel, *Chronology and Recensional Development in the Greek Text of Kings* (Cambridge, Mass. 1968).
- I. Soisalon-Soininen, *Die Textformen der Septuaginta-Übersetzung des Richterbuches*, *AASF* B 72,1 (Helsinki 1951).
- Id.*, *Der Charakter der asterisiernten Zusätze in der Septuaginta*, *AASF* B 114 (Helsinki 1959).
- Id.*, *Die Infinitive in der Septuaginta*, *AASF* B 132 (Helsinki 1965).
- M.G.L. Spohn, *Jeremias Vates e Versione Iudaeorum Alexandrinorum, etc.* (Lipsiae 1794-1824).
- A. W. Streane, *The Double Text of Jeremiah (Masoretic and Alexandrian) Compared etc.* (Cambridge 1896).
- H. B. Swete, *An Introduction to the OT in Greek*² (Cambridge 1914).

- Thackeray, "Gr.Tr.Jer."
Thackeray, "Ezekiel"
Thackeray, "Proph."
Thackeray, "Kings"
Thackeray, *Grammar*
Thackeray, *Septuagint*
Thesaurus
THWNT
Tov, *Diss. Jeremiah*
Tov, *The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch - A Discussion of an Early Revision of Jeremiah 29-52 and Baruch 1:1-3:8*, unpubl. diss. Hebrew University (Jerusalem 1973).
Id., "L'incidence de la critique textuelle sur la critique littéraire dans le livre de Jérémie", *RB* 79 (1972) 189-199.
Id., "The Relation between the Greek Versions of Baruch and Daniel", in: M.E. Stone (ed.), *Studies in the Bible and Armenian Philology* (Jerusalem 1975).
Id., *The Book of Baruch (Greek and Hebrew)*, Texts and Translations, Pseudepigrapha Series 6, SBL (1975).
Turner, "Ezekiel"
Turner, *Syntax*
- S. Talmon, "Synonymous Readings in the Textual Traditions of the OT", *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 8 (1961) 335-383.
H.St.J. Thackeray, "The Greek Translators of Jeremiah", *JThSt* 4 (1902-03) 243-266.
Id., "The Greek Translators of Ezekiel", *ib.*, 398-411.
Id., "The Greek Translators of the Prophetic Books", *ib.*, 578-585.
Id., "The Greek Translators of the Four Books of Kings", *JThSt* 8 (1906-07) 262-278.
Id., "The Dissection of Books in Primitive Septuagint MSS", *JThSt* 9 (1907-08) 88-98.
Id., *A Grammar of the OT in Greek according to the Septuagint* (Cambridge 1909).
Id., *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship, Schweich Lectures 1920* (London 1921).
A. Stephanus, *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae* (Paris 1842-47).
G. Kittel und G. Friedrich (edd.), *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum NT* (Stuttgart 1933 -).
E. Tov, *The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch - A Discussion of an Early Revision of Jeremiah 29-52 and Baruch 1:1-3:8*, unpubl. diss. Hebrew University (Jerusalem 1973).
Id., "L'incidence de la critique textuelle sur la critique littéraire dans le livre de Jérémie", *RB* 79 (1972) 189-199.
Id., "The Relation between the Greek Versions of Baruch and Daniel", in: M.E. Stone (ed.), *Studies in the Bible and Armenian Philology* (Jerusalem 1975).
Id., *The Book of Baruch (Greek and Hebrew)*, Texts and Translations, Pseudepigrapha Series 6, SBL (1975).
N. Turner, "The Greek Translators of Ezekiel", *JThSt* NS 7 (1956) 12-24.
Id., apud J.H. Moulton, *A Grammar of NT Greek*, vol. III *Syntax* (Edinburgh 1963).

- Walters, *Text*
Walters, *The Text of the Septuagint, Its Corruptions and their Emendation* (Cambridge 1973).
B. M. Wambacq, "Les prières de Baruch (L.15 - 2,19) et de Daniel (9,5-19)", *Biblica* 40 (1959) 463-475.
Id., "L'Unité littéraire de Bar., I-III, 8", in: J. Coppens (ed.), *Sacra Pagina I = Bibl. Ephem. Theol. Lovar. XII-XIII* (Paris 1959) 455-460.
J. Wevers, "Septuaginta Forschungen seit 1954", *ThR* 33 (1968) 18-76.
I. Wichelhaus, *De Jeremiae Versione Alexandrina* (Hallis 1847).
G. C. Workman, *The Text of Jeremiah* (Edinburgh 1889).
J. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias, Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen XII,3* (Münster i.W. 1934).
Id., "Die Bedeutung des Chester-Beatty-Scheide Pap. 967 für die Textüberlieferung der Ezechiel-Sept.", *ZAW* 61 (1945-48) 76-94 = *Sylloge* (1971), 321-339.
Id., "Die Septuaginta Hieronymi im Buch des Propheten Jeremias", in: B. Fischer und V. Pála (edd.), *Colligere Fragmenta, Festschrift Alban Dold, Texte und Arbeiten I,2* (Beuron 1952) 13-24 = *Sylloge* (1971) 345-356.
Id., *Jeremias, Baruch, Threni, Epistula Jeremiae, VI Graecum, Auctoritate Societatis Litterarum Göttingensis Editum*, Vol. XV (Göttingen 1957).
Id., *ib.*, 7-146 ("Einleitung").
Id., *Beiträge zur Teremias-Septuaginta, NAMG, Phil.-Hist. Kl. 1958*, 2 (Göttingen 1958).
Id., "Jeremias-Zitate in Väter-Schriften", *Historisches Jahrbuch* 77 (1958) 347-357 = *Sylloge* (1971) 439-449.

GREEK AND HEBREW INDEXES

The Greek and Hebrew indexes list all the Hebrew words and their main Greek renditions which are discussed in the numbered items of chapters II-VII.

The Hebrew index is arranged according to the alphabet.

ἀβρααμ	III 1	V 5,11	VII 3
ἀβραάμ	III 1		
ἄβραμ	IV 13		
ἀβραάμ	II 6		
ἀβραάμ	II 39		
ἀβραάμ	III 3		
ἀβραάμ	IV 11		
ἀβραάμ	III 19	VI 2	
ἄβραμ	VI 36		
ἄβραμ	III 37		
ἀβραάμ	III 27		
ἄβραμ	II 43		
ἄβραμ	II 32		
ἄβραμ	III 34		
ἀβραάμ	VI 24		
ἀβραάμ	III 9		
ἄβραμ	IV 14		
ἀβραάμ	IV 16		
ἄβραμ	II 30		
ἄβραμ	IV 5		
ἀβραάμ	II 20		
ἄβραμ	VI 10		
ἄβραμ	II 19		
ἄβραμ	III 28	V 16	
ἀβραάμ	II 10		
ἀβραάμ	II 42	V 30	
ἄβραμ	III 2		
ἀβραάμ	II 40		
ἀβραάμ	II 2	VI 32	
ἄβραμ	V 3		

ἀποσπράγισμα	V 56		II 17	V 9	VI 35,44
ἀπώλεια	III 16	VI 60	II 3	VI 34	
ἀρχων	III 47		IV 19		
ἀσεβεία	VI 62		III 34		
ἀσεβέω	IV 8	VI 62	III 50		
ἀτιμία	VI 45		IV 14		
ἀφανίζω	III 1	VI 61	III 21,22	V 17	
ἀφανισμός	III 1	V 15	VI 79		
ἀφύστημι	IV 8	VI 39	V 27		
βελόστασις	VI 50		IV 22		
βόλις	VI 66		III 36		
βομβ-	V 19		III 21,22	V 17	
βομβέω	IV 24		III 34		
βραχίον	III 4		VI 17		
γένουτο	III 3		VI 38		
γένος	III 46		II 14	V 29	
γινώσκω	III 38		III 50	V 13	VII 2
δέ	III 31		IV 5		
δεσπότης	II 27	V 28	III 38		
δέχομαι	III 23		III 38		
διασκορπίζω	III 12		IV 9		
διασκορπισμός	VI 49		III 36		
διασπείρω	III 50	V 13	III 4		
διὰ τὸ μῆ	III 28		VI 76		
διεκβολή	VI 81		III 8	V 12	
διοδεύω	VI 67		IV 4		
διόρυγμα	VI 31		IV 10		
διότι	III 30	VI 70	III 19	V 21	VI 2
δολεῖω	III 8		III 49		
δοῦλος	III 42	V 12	III 24		
δυνατός	III 51	V 23	III 47		
ἐγχευρέω	II 31		II 28		
ἐγχεύρημα	II 31		III 33		
εἶ	III 17		IV 24		
εἶπε κύριος	III 18		III 37		
εἶπον	IV 4		III 19	V 21	
εἰοδέχομαι	VI 74		IV 18		
ἐκδιώκω	II 29		IV 12		
ἐκλαμβάνω	III 23		IV 12		
ἐκλείπω					
ἐκλεκτός					
ἐκταμένος					
ἐκφύρω					
ἐμοῦ					
ἐμπροσζω					
ἐναντίον					
ἐνθύμημα					
ἐνοικέω					
ἐντέλλομαι					
ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ					
ἐνόπιον					
ἐξάγω					
ἐξακολουθέω					
ἐξίστημι					
ἐξώθεν					
ἐξώθew					
ἐπειδή					
ἐπιγινώσκω					
ἐπίσταμαι					
ἐπιστάτης					
ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό					
ἐπίχειρον					
ἐραστής					
ἐργάζομαι					
ἐρῶ					
ἔσχατον					
ἔτερος					
εὐρεμα					
ἔχω					
ἡγαιῶν					
ἦκω					
ἡμέρα					
ἦχω					
θεός					
θεοὶ ἕτεροι					
θνησιμῶτον					
ἴδωμαι					
ἴατροῦ					

ἴνα	III 7
ἐπιπέζομαι	VI 52
ἐπιπασία	VI 25
ἐσχυρός	III 51
ἔσως	III 17
Ἰταβύριον	VI 20
ἴταμία	II 36
ἴταπέξ	II 36
καθά	IV 6 V 24
καθαίρέω	IV 12
καθεσταμένους	IV 9
καθώς	IV 6
καί	III 31
καιρός	III 10
καίω	IV 14
κακά	IV 10
κακία	IV 10
καταδυναστεύω	VI 4
καταδύω/δίνω	VI 30
κατακαυχάομαι	VI 19
καταιεντέω	VI 54
κατάλυμα	III 48
κατάλυσις	III 48
κατάλυω	IV 2
καταπάσσω	VI 16
κατὰ πρόσωπον	III 22
καταρράκτης	II 33
κατασκάπτω	IV 15
κατασκηνώω	IV 2
κατάσκιος	VI 75
καταφεύγω	VI 8
κατουκέομαι	III 9 VI 69
κατουκία	VI 12
κατ' ὄφθαλμοῦς	III 21
κασσω	VI 65
κασχημα	VI 13
κάλω	III 20 V 22
κόλασις	VI 48
κόπριον	III 13

κουαίνω	IV 24
κυριεύω	V 4
κύριος	III 37
λαλέω	III 44
λαλέω μετὰ κρίσεως	II 16
λαμβάνω	III 23 IV 8 VII 6
λέγει κύριος	III 43 VII 1
λέγω	IV 4
λήμμα	VI 6
ληστής	VI 72
λίαν	II 23
λοιμός	VI 46
μαίμασσω	IV 24
μαίνομαι	III 14
μάχαιρα	IV 21
μαχήτης	III 51 IV 7
μεγιστάν	II 11 VI 9
μέρος	IV 13
μετά	III 5 VII 4
μεταμέλομαι	III 9
μετανοέω	III 9 VI 3
Ναγεβ	III 15
νεκρός	IV 18
νομή	III 48 VI 63
νόημα	VI 71
νότος	III 15
νόμψη	VI 18
οἶδα	III 38
οἴχομαι	II 25
ὄλεθρος	II 8 III 3
ὄλλυμι	III 3
ὀμοθυμαδόν	III 36
ὀμορέω	VI 42
ὄπως	III 7
ὄρθρου	II 7
ὄτι	III 30
οὐ	III 40
οὕτως εἶπε κύριος	III 18 V 14
οὕχι	III 41

όφθαλμός	III 21	V 17
δών	II 1	
παγειός	V 2	
παῖς	III 42	V 20
πάντοθεν	II 45	
παντοκράτωρ	II 26	VI 33
παράδειγμα	III 13	
παράλυμαι	VI 40	
τὸ παράπαν	VI 80	
καρπικραῦνω	IV 1	
παρασκευάζω	III 25	
παρὰ τὸ μῆ	III 28	V 28
παροργίζω	IV 1	
παύομαι	III 9	
πεινώ	V 8	
πέλυε	VI 51	
πλησίον	IV 17	
πνευματοφορ-	VI 26	
πούκιγμα	VI 53	
πολύτης	IV 17	
πολυανδρεῖον	VI 47	
πονηρία	IV 10	
πέρρω	II 22	
πράγμα	V 10	
προιαχών	II 38	VI 55
προνομή	III 32	
προσέχω	III 20	
προσταγμα	V 7	
πρὸς τὸ	III 7	V 11
πρὸς τὸ μῆ	III 6	
πρόσωπον	III 40	
προφήτης	III 45	
πτώσις	II 5	
ρομφαία	IV 21	
σελεήν	VI 5	
σεῖω	IV 23	VII 8
σκιστάω	VI 11	
σάβλα	III 49	
σάβλαξ	VI 27	

σοο	VI 41	
σπεύρω	III 5	
σπέρμα	III 46	
σπεύδω	IV 24	
στάζω	IV 20	
στερέω	II 4	
στηρίζω	III 11	VI 68
στρουθός	II 13	
συγκόπτω	III 12	
συλλαμβάνω	IV 11	
σύλληψις	II 44	VI 36
σύμμι(ε)κτός	II 24	
συμψάω	II 37	
συνέρχομαι	VI 14	
συνοχή	VI 15	
συντάσσω	IV 22	V 25
συντριβή	III 35	
σύντριμμα	III 35	
συντριμμός	III 35	VI 29
συστρέφω	VI 64	
συστροφή	VI 64	
σχοῖνος	VI 23	
σφίζω	IV 16	
τάδε λέγει κύριος	III 18	V 14
ταλαιπώρω	III 2	V 11
ταλαιπωρία	III 2	VI 1
τεκνοποιέω	II 21	
τέσσαρα	VI 77	
τὸ παράπαν	VI 80	
τόπος	III 48	
τοῦ μῆ	III 6	
τρομαλία	II 41	
ὕγρασία	VI 59	
ὕψιχον	III 29	
ὕψικαίω	VI 78	
ὕποχέριος	V 1	
ὕστερον	III 5	VII 4
ὕψηλός	IV 19	
φασέτρα	VI 43	

φησι κύριος	III 43	VII 1
φωβέσθαι	IV 23	VI 58
φρικτός	VI 28	
φρικώδης	VI 28	
φύλαγμα	VI 73	
χαρά	IV 3	
χάραξ	VI 57	
χαριστική	IV 3	
χαριστόννη	IV 3	V 18
χαυώνες	II 34	
χερρόσμαι	VI 22	
χέω	IV 20	
χρηεία	II 12	
χρεμετίζω	II 35	
χρεμετισμός	II 35	VI 22
χρηματίζω	III 44	
χρόνος	III 10	
ψευδοπροφήτης	III 45	
ὄων	II 1	
ὄσ	III 39	
ὄσει	III 39	
ὄφελεια	II 15	

אדיר	VI 9	
אחב	VI 76	
אחה	II 1	
אילי	III 17	
אחר(י)	III 5	VII 4
אין	III 29	
אלהים אחרים	III 19	V 21 VI 2
אמן	III 3	
אמר	IV 4	
ארמון	II 32	
במה	VI 37	
בעיני	III 21	V 17
בת יענה	VI 5	
בתולה	VI 18	
גארן	VI 73	
גאר, גיא	VI 47	
גבור	III 51	V 23 VI 7
דאב	V 8	
דבר	III 44	
דבר משפחה	II 16	
דבר	V 3	
דמה, דמם	II 2	VI 32
דמן	III 13	
דרש	VI 10	
ה	III 32	
ה	III 37	
ה צבאות	II 26	VI 33
הולעיר	II 30	
הרגיא	III 34	
הטח און	III 20	V 22
היליל	II 6	
הכין	II 20	
הכעיס	IV 1	
הלא	III 40	
הלך	II 25	VI 14
הלך אחר	VI 17	
המה	IV 24	
המון	VI 47	
התייץ	II 29	

הרים	IV 21
השכם	II 7
החילל	III 14
התפליש	VI 16
-ו	III 31
זרעה	V 1
זמח	II 31
זרע	III 46
זרע	III 4
חול	II 28
חצות	II 14 V 29
חרתם	VI 56
חזק	II 4
חטא	III 27
חמדה	II 3 VI 34
חפץ	II 12
חץ	VI 66
חרב	IV 21
חרר	VI 44
ידע	III 38
יחיה	III 37
יום	III 33
יחדיר	III 36
ילד	II 21
יען	IV 5
יענה	VI 5
יפת	IV 14
יקע	VI 39
ירש	V 4
ישב	III 26 VI 69
-כ	III 39
כח אמר ח'	III 18 V 14
כנביות	II 34
כר	III 30 VI 70
כל	II 19
כלמה	VI 45
-ל	IV 7 V 26
לבלתי	III 6 V 11
לכד	IV 11

למען	III 7
לפני	III 22
לקח	III 23
מאד	II 23
מאין	III 28 V 16
מאס	II 10
מגור	III 16
מהפכת	II 33
מוזח	II 31
מכשול	VI 48
מלט	IV 16
מסר	II 27 V 28
מעללים	V 10
מצר	VI 15
משא	VI 6
מש(ר)בה	VI 12
נאם ה'	III 43 VII 1
נביא	III 46
נבלה	IV 18
נבב	III 15
נדה	III 50 V 13 VII 2
נרה	III 48 VI 63
נחם	III 9 VI 3
נטרי	IV 19
נלוח	VI 8
נפל	II 5
נפץ	III 12
נקע	VI 39
נתך	IV 20
נתץ	IV 15
סללה	VI 57
עבר	III 8 V 12
עבר	III 42 V 20
עבר	VI 67
בעיני	III 21 V 17
ערב	II 24
עריץ	VI 46
עשש	VI 4
עת	III 10

פּוּשׁ	VI 11	
פּוּחַד	VI 38	
פּוּלֵט	IV 16	
פּוּקִיד	IV 9	
פּוּשֵׁעַ	IV 8	VI 62
צַבָּאוֹת	IV 4	VI 62
צַחֵל	II 26	VI 33
צוּחַ	IV 22	V 25
צוּר	VI 41	
צַפּוּן	II 18	
צַרַר	VI 64	
קַבֵּץ	VI 74	
קִדִּים	VI 65	
קִפּוּז	IV 13	
קַצְרֵי פֹאחַ	II 9	
קִירוֹ	V 2	
רְחוּק	II 22	
רֶכֶב	VI 45	
רַעַ	IV 17	
רַעַה	IV 10	
רַעֲשׁ	IV 23	VI 58
רַפֵּא	IV 12	
רַפְּחַ	VI 40	
שֵׁאֵב	III 23	
שֵׁאֵרִין	II 8	
שֵׁבֵר	III 35	
שֵׁבֵת	V 9	
שֵׁד	III 2	VI 1
שֵׁדוֹ	III 2	VI 1
שֵׁיט	III 11	VI 68
שֵׁכֶן	IV 2	VI 42
שֵׁלֵט	VI 43	
שֵׁלַל	III 49	
שֵׁמֶחָה	IV 3	V 18
שֵׁמֶחַ, שֵׁמֶחָה	III 1	V 5, 15 VI 60, 61 VII 3
שֵׁמֶחַ	III 1	VI 61
שֵׁעֵר וְרֵחַ, שֵׁעֵר נְרִיָּה	VI 28	
שֵׁר	II 11	III 47
שֵׁשְׁרִין	IV 3	

חִבּוּר	VI 21	
חִתּוּלָה	VI 13	
חִתּוּרָה	V 7	VI 71
חֵן	II 13	
חֵלְעָה	II 15	