

THE ORACLES AGAINST THE PHILISTINES AND EDM
IN THE GREEK TEXT OF JEREMIAH:
CHAPTER 29 AS A MICROCOSM OF THE PROBLEMS PRESENTED
BY THE SEPTUAGINT VERSION OF JEREMIAH

BY

SVEN KENNETH SODERLUND

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW,
FACULTY OF DIVINITY, FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

AUGUST, 1978

Notes to Chapter 1

1. For an interesting review of the use made of the Jeremiah tradition in early Judaism and Christianity see the recent study by C. Wolff, Jeremia im Fröjudentum und Urchristentum, Berlin, 1976.

2. Such at least is the traditional picture of the origin and growth of the LXX drawn by H.B. Swete (Introduction, pp. 1-28) and H. St. J. Thackeray (ISBE, IV, 2722 ff.; Jewish Worship, pp. 10-11) and often repeated in handbooks and articles. In a recent contribution, E. Tov has cautioned against too readily assuming a connexion between Alexandria and the translation of the non-pentateuchal books of the LXX ("The Nature of the Hebrew Text Underlying the LXX", JSOT 7 (1978), esp. pp. 53-54).

3. Little work has been done on the relative dating of the various books comprising the LXX, but see the remarks by Thackeray in ISBE, IV, 2730, and in Jewish Worship, p. 28. For a helpful summary of Thackeray's views on the internal dating of the books see Jellicoe, SMS, pp. 64-70, esp. p. 67. Mention could also be made in this connexion of the article by H.A. Redpath, "Contributions Towards Settling the Date of the Translation of the Various Books of the Septuagint", JTS 7 (1906), 606-615.

4. τὸ "πρῶτον" εἴτε μὴ νοήσαντες ἐξεῖλάν τινες τῶν γεγραμμένων εἴτε καὶ οἰκονομήσαντες ἐξεῖλκιν οἱ ἔρδομήκοντα, θεὸς ἂν εἰδείη, GCS, Origenes III, p. 137.

5. Cf. in the first apparatus of Ziegler's edition the appropriate quotes at 15:19, 17:26, 18:13, 28:44, 30:10, 34:2, 37:6, and 38:2.

6. The idea that the Sixtine edition was dependent on the Aldine was first mooted by Paul de Lagarde (Mittheilungen, I, 123) and has since been confirmed by the studies of A. Rahlfs ("Die Abhängigkeit der sixtinischen Septuaginta-Ausgabe von der aldinischen", ZAW 33 (1913), 30-46), M.L. Margolis ("The Aldina as a Source for the Sixtine", JBL 38 (1919), 51-52), and J. Ziegler ("Der Text der Aldina im Dodekapropheten", Biblica 26 (1945), 37-51, esp. 49-51).

7. For background information to the publication history of both the smaller and larger Cambridge editions see H.B. Swete, The Old Testament in Greek, I, xi; Introduction, pp. 188-190; as well as the "Prefatory Note to Genesis" in BM, I, 1906, i-v, and "Preface to the Octateuch", I, 1917, v-vii.

8. Cf. his remarks in Anmerkungen, p. 3 (Mitt. I, 21), "Noch einmal", (Mitt. III, 230-231), and Pars prior, p. xvi.

9. For useful summaries on the history and objectives of the Göttingen series see the articles by W. Kappler ("Ziele und Aufgaben des Göttinger Septuaginta-Unternehmens", GGA 202 (1940), R. Hanhart ("L'edizione dei LXX e la fondazione Göttingense che la prepara" RivStorLettRel 1 (1965), 351-352), and J. W. Wevers ("The Göttingen Septuagint", IOSCS Bulletin 8 (1975), 19-23).

10. Ieremias Vates e versione Ioudaeorum Alexandrinorum ac reliquorum interpretum graecorum emendatus notisque criticis illustratus, 2 volumes, Leipzig, 1824 ("Tomus 2 post obitum patris edidit, F.G.A. Spohn").

11. Das Buch Jeremia griechisch und hebräisch (Nach dem Tode des Herausgebers besorgt von J. Dahse und Erwin Nestle), Stuttgart, 1924.

12. For instance, the title page now prints the name as Jeremias with a "J" instead of with an "I" as in the first edition (this produces an inconsistency, however, since the name remains as "Ieremias" at the top of every page of the text). For other slight changes in the new edition see the discussion below in Ch. 3, pp. 132-133.

13. In Colligere Fragmenta (FS Alban Dold), eds. B. Fischer and V. Fiala (Texte und Arbeiten 2), Beuron, 1952, pp. 13-24.

14. Historisches Jahrbuch 77 (1958), 347-357.

15. The quote comes from M.H. Goshen-Gottstein, "Theory and Practice", Textus 3 (1963), 149, n. 70. Note also the recent comment by B. Childs in Old Testament Books for Pastor and Teacher, Philadelphia, 1977, pp. 15-16, to the effect that he prefers "the very useful" edition of Swete in favour of "the eclectic text" of Rahlfs.

16. See the statement recorded above (p. 4) from the Cambridge University Reporter, 13 March, 1883, particularly the comment that the apparatus of the larger edition would "provide materials for the critical determination of the text". Swete remarks that the collation of HP "promise materials upon which a critical revision of the text may ultimately be based" (OT in Greek, I, ix), and with regard to his own edition he feels that a reliable reproduction of Codex Vaticanus "supplies at least an excellent standard of comparison, . . . until a critical text has been produced (Introduction, p. 190). According to their "Prefatory Note to Genesis", Brooke and McLean say that their object is to present "the evidence available for the reconstruction of the text or texts of the LXX" (BM, I, 1, i).

17. See the remark in "Prefatory Note to Genesis" on Lagarde: "He alone, if any one, could have 'sustained the labour,' --not only of the preliminary task which has been entrusted to us, but also of its more important sequel--the reconstruction of the pre-hexaplaric text of the LXX., so far as that is now possible" (p. iv). Compare also Swete's remarks on Lagarde, Introduction p. 288 and OT in Greek, I, x.

18. Again in the "Prefatory Note to Genesis" note the statement, "At an early stage of the undertaking it was decided that it would be premature to attempt to provide a reconstructed or 'true' text in this edition". Similarly in the "Preface to the Octateuch" (1917), "No attempt has been made to provide a reconstructed or 'true' Septuagint text. As Dr Deissmann said at the Oriental Congress at Hamburg when the plan of our edition was discussed, 'In the present state of LXX studies an edition of the LXX in the strict sense of the word is not yet possible. What however is possible and absolutely necessary is a trustworthy collection of the textual material.' The work originally undertaken by the Syndics of the Press in 1883 was based on the same view. In preparing the present volume we have come across no evidence of any sort which has led us to modify our belief in its absolute truth". See also Swete on Tischendorf: "It was plain to him that the time had not come for the construction of a critical text", OT in Greek, I, ix.

19. E.g., G. Lambert, Nouvelle Revue Théologique 80 (1958), 990.

B. Botte, Recherches de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale 25 (1958), 147-148.

R. Tournay, RB 65 (1958), 292.

O. Eissfeldt, TLZ 83 (1958), 22-24.

H. Schneider, TRe 65 (1960), 101-106.

20. This remains the clearest example of the change of style in the second half even though the actual phrase οὐτως, εἰπε καὶ οὐτως, occurs for the first time only in 30:1.

21. Already in 1794 M.G.L. Spohn suggested that the different versions of the parallel passage in 29:19-20 (49:18-19) // 27(50):44-45 implied different hands Ieremias vates (published 1824), pp. 9-10 (cf. also pp. 17, 20). See also the remarks by P.F. Frankl (1872), pp. 448-449, A. Scholz (1875), p. 14, C. Workman (1889), p. xxvii, A.W. Streane (1896), p. 1, n. 1, and J.J. Kneucker (1879), p. 83, n. 8. Only E. Kuhl (1882) made an explicit statement to the effect that the translation of Jer was a unity (p. 8).

22. "The Greek Translators of Jeremiah", JTS 4 (1902-03), 245-266; Jewish Worship, pp. 29-37.

23. "The Greek Translators of Ezekiel", JTS 4 (1902-03), 398-411; "The Greek Translators of the Prophetical Books", JTS 4 (1902-03), 578-585; "The Greek Translators of the Four Books of Kings", JTS 8 (1906-07), 262-278.

24. See for example the contributions by:

G. Buchanan Gray, "The Greek Version of Isaiah: Is it the Work of a Single Translator?", JTS 12 (1911), 286-293.

J. Herrmann and F. Baumhörtel, Beiträge zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Septuaginta, 1923.

O.J. Baab, "A Theory of Two Translators for the Greek Genesis", JBL 52 (1933), 239-243.

N. Turner, "The Greek Translators of Ezekiel", JTS 7 (1956), 12-24.

M.S. Hurwitz, "The Septuagint of Isaiah 36-39 in Relation to that of 1-35, 40-66", HUCA 28 (1957), 75-83.

G. Howard, "Some Notes on the Septuagint of Amos", VT 20 (1970), 108-112.

T. Muraoka, "A Re-examination of the Two-translator Theory of a Septuagint Book", unpublished paper read at Uppsala International meeting IOSCS, 1971.

T. Muraoka, "The Greek Texts of Samuel-Kings: Incomplete Translations or Recensional Activity", 1972 Proceedings, 1972 90-107.

J.A. Arieti, "The Vocabulary of Septuagint Amos", JBL 93 (1974), 338-347.

25. "The Present State of Proto-Septuagint Studies", JAOS 61 (1941), 88, n. 31.

26. See for example the critiques by:

A. Kaminka, Studien zur Septuaginta, 1928, p. 9.

J. Ziegler, Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias, 1934, pp. 31-46.

J. Ziegler, Die Einheit der Septuaginta zum Zwölfprophetenbuch, 1934-35, pp. 1-16.

J. Ziegler, "Der textkritische Wert der Septuaginta des Buches Job", Miscellanea Biblica, II, 277-296, 1934.

A.C. Johnson, H.S. Gehman, E.H. Kase, The John H. Scheide Biblical Papyri: Ezekiel, 1938, pp. 52-73.

I.L. Seeligmann, The Septuagint Version of Isaiah, 1948, pp. 39-42.

D.W. Gooding, The Account of the Tabernacle, 1959. The book argues for a unity in the translation of the LXX of Exodus, except for Ex 38 which comes from a different hand (cf. Chs. 4-7 of the book).

T. Muraoka, "Is the Septuagint Amos VIII 12-IX 10 a Separate Unit?" VT 20 (1970), 496-500.

D. Barthélemy, Les Devanciers d'Aquila, 1963, pp. 91ff.

27. Some representative examples are the following:

E. Duval, "Le texte grec de Jérémie d'après une étude récente", RB 12 (1903), 394-403.

L. Köhler, "Beobachtungen", ZAW 29 (1909), 1-39, esp. p. 5, n. 4.

W.W. Graf von Baudissin, Kyrios, 1929, I, 191, n. 1.

R.A. Martin, Syntax, 1957, p. 7.

W. Rudolph, Jeremia, 1968, p. xxiii.

E. Würthwein, Der Text des Alten Testaments, 3 1966, p. 53, n. 1.

28. Ziegler says, "Bei der Untersuchung des Übersetzungscharakters ist zu beachten, dass die Ier.-LXX nicht einheitlich ist. Dies haben schon ältere Textkritiker bemerkt, so Spohn. Thackeray nimmt zwei Übersetzer an Mann muss Thack. zustimmen" Ieremias, p. 128, n. 1. In Beiträge he speaks for instance of "dem zweiten Ier.-Übersetzer", pp. 28-29 and passim.

2 29. See K.H. Graf, 1862, pp. xl ff., and F. Giesebrecht, 1907, pp. xxvff. For a list of the major LXX omissions see A. Gelin, Dictionnaire de la Bible, IV, col. 857ff.

30. MT order: Egypt, Philistines, Moab, Ammonites, Edom, Damascus, Kedar, Elam, Babylon. LXX order: Elam, Egypt, Babylon, Philistines, Edom, Ammonites, Kedar, Damascus, Moab.

31. Ziegler thinks that this phrase has reference not only to the large transpositions of the oracles but also to the many differences in word order between the LXX and MT texts (Ieremias, p. 44, n.1).

32. "They [i.e. the Jewish elders] hid from the knowledge of the people as many of the passages which contained any scandal against the elders, rulers, and judges, as they could, some of which have been preserved in uncanonical writings (Apocrypha)" Ante-Nicene Library, X, p. 377 (in Gk, PG 11).

33. GCS, Origenes X, p. 388. See quote in translation below, p. 56.

34. E.g. HTR 57 (1964), esp. 287 (n. 28), 298-299; IEJ 16 (1966), esp. 82 (n. 6), 84-85, 92-93 (n. 36), 94; "The Evolution of a Theory of Local Texts", QHBT, esp. pp. 308-309.

35. E.g. RB 81 (1974), 631 (F.L.); CBQ 38 (1976), 109-110 (R.W. Klein); JJS 28 (1977), 198 (P. Wernberg-Møller); SOTS Book List, 1975, pp. 35-36 (W. McKane). Two extended reviews--both critical--are those by G.F. Hasel in Bibliotheca Orientalis 32 (1975), 236-238, and M. Dahood in Biblica 56 (1975), 429-431.

36. The closest approximation in the field of LXX to this method that I have found is the work by J.C.M. das Neves, A teologia da tradução grega dos Setenta no livro de Isaías, Lisbon, 1973, where he takes Ch. 24 as a test-case for exploring the theological tendencies of the LXX version of Isaiah. The method has also been used with profit in various book reviews, e.g. the review of L.H. Brockington The Hebrew Text of the Old Testament (Bibliotheca Orientalis 32 (1975), 84-85) where the reviewer evaluates the book on the basis of Gen 49.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 2

1. A number of MSS listed by Ziegler (Ieremias, pp. 8-10) are incomplete or fragmentary and do not contain Ch. 29; these are 147, 198, 231, 393, 445, 449, 456, 567, 951, 966, 980.

An additional nine MSS exist which do contain the text of Jer 29 but have not been collated for this study; these are 97, 228, 420, 430, 435, 461, 501, 568, 684. These late and less important minuscules were among those not collated for the Göttingen edition of Jer; they were therefore not included in their photograph-microfilm collection and consequently were unavailable to me during my visit there. MSS 97 (known in HP and Nestle-Dahse by the number 33) and 228 were collated by HP (from whence they were taken over by Nestle-Dahse). These two, along with 430, 435, and 568, and "Catena" MSS and contain the same type of text as that described below in the section on the C group (pp. 91-96). MSS 420 and 501 are dependent on 631 and 36 respectively, both of which have been collated for our study.

Ziegler (p. 11) also lists MSS 349, 533, and 573 as containing Jer texts but this information is incorrect according to Rahlfs' Verzeichnis. The MSS in question are indeed Catena texts as noted by Ziegler, but they do not contain the book of Jer (cf. Rahlfs, Verzeichnis, p. 26, pp. 186-7, p. 205).

Another MS collated by HP (followed by Nestle-Dahse) is 41, but this MS according to Rahlfs' Verzeichnis is one of those which is "vorschollen".

2. In the collation of HP the codex is cited by the abbreviation "Alex" (for a MS reading included in the main text of Grabe's edition of Alexandrinus) and by the Roman numeral III (for a MS reading not incorporated into Grabe's text). Tischendorf used the symbol "Ax" in his critical apparatus.

3. Symbol in HP: XII. In the collation of Field this MS is known both as "Cod. XII" and "Cod. Jes", the latter name coming from Montfaucon's designation of it as "Ms. Jes[uitarum]".

4. The alternative and more common symbol for this MS has been the Heb letter נ , but printing and typing expediency favours the use of the letter S.

5. Symbol in HP: 23.

6. Those oracles with different page number for the Philistine and Edom oracles follow the Heb arrangement of the text. An exception is MS 106 which has a special order (see below p. 105).

7. In Field's collation this MS is designated 87*.

8. In Field's collation this MS is designated 87. MS 88 in Field has reference to a collation by Bernardo Stephanopoli of a not very accurate copy of the original codex executed by Leo Allatius (d. 1669).

9. This MS is one of the few which contains the entire Bible; in BM referred to by the letter "p".

9^a. Designated 144 in HP and Nestle-Dahse.

10. This papyrus, containing fragmentary verses from Chs. 28-32, is one of five papyri unavailable to Ziegler at the time of his publication (in addition to 986, these are 804, 817, 837, and 984). However, the yield from Jer 29 is not great: only the two end letters -υ, from the definite article τοῦ, in 29:11

11. Three remote Latin allusions to the text of Jer's Philistine and Edom oracle on file at the Centre d'Analyse et de Documentation Patristique at Strasbourg are the following:

1) Origen, in his commentary on Matthew, (GCS, Origenes XI, p. 7) is thought indirectly to hint at 29(47):4 in the following remark: ". . . quomodo et visio Tyri vel quaecumque prophētantur de Tyro vel de principe Tyri, quomodo etiam visio quadrupedum in deserto apud Esaiam pendent in duobus istis mandatis".

2) Pseudo-Cyprian in Adversus Iudaeos (CCL 4, p. 273; also in the edition of D. van Damme, Freiburg, 1969, p. 127) may have 29:19(49:18) in mind in the phrase "et ad solitudinem Sodomae patriam eorum redegit".

3) Victorinus Poetovionensis in In Apocalypsim (CSEL 49, p. 52) may allude to 29:23(49:22) // MT 48:40 in the phrase "et quod morte devicta ascenderit in caelis extendens alas suas".

However, these allusions are so uncertain and secondary that they can be dispensed with in the collation.

12. Walton made no attempt to harmonize the Gk and Heb texts in parallel columns, so that LXX Jer 29 is found opposite MT Jer 29!

13. The term preferred by Ernest C. Colwell ("Method in Classifying and Evaluating Variant Readings", pp. 96-97). For Colwell a "variation unit" is defined as a certain length of text "wherein our manuscripts present at least two variant forms; it is that passage in which differences occur". By this concept Colwell wishes to avoid the misleading impression that can be created by the setting up of one text as the norm against which "variants" are plotted (see also the article by E.J. Epp, "Toward the Clarification of the Term 'Textual Variant'" in the George D. Kilpatrick FS, especially pp. 156-157). We may accept Colwell's point and caution, but the fact remains that the only practical way to proceed is to use one particular text against which to plot other readings. It only needs to be emphasized again that this collation text is entirely neutral and that no value judgement on the "variants" to that text is intended at this stage.

14. Even earlier, groupings of MSS had already been noticed by Holmes and Parson in the process of their collations (cf. the comments in the preface to Vol. 1 on the peculiar text represented by MSS 19, 108, 118, in the Pentateuch).

15. Account must be taken of the change of textual pattern within some MSS; e.g. 130 is under influence of the L group in Chs. 1-9, similarly 538 in Chs. 17-20, 37-38, 48-49 (cf. Ziegler, Ieremias, p. 83).

16. By the term "recension" in this discussion is to be understood a text that has been subjected to consistent and deliberate revision, as opposed to one that has been formed by accidental or ad hoc scribal change.

17. Previous scholars (e.g. Thackeray, Grammar, p. 4; Soisalon-Soininen, Der Charakter der asterisierten Zusätze in der Septuaginta, p. 1; D.W. Gooding, Recensions of the LXX Pentateuch, p. 5) have pointed to the Origenic recension as the place to start in the work of LXX text restoration, and my research confirms the methodological validity of this approach.

18. Gk text in GCS, Origenes X, p. 388. English translation taken mainly from M.F. Wiles, "Origen as a Biblical Scholar", CHB I, p. 457.

19. Other references by Origen to his use of the critical signs can be found in the following places: Epistula ad Africanus, PG 11, cols. 56-60; Johannescommentar, GCS, Origenes IV, p. 410; Die Schrift vom Gebet, GCS, Origenes II, p. 332.

The traditional view that Origen took over the Ἀριστάρχεια σήματα from the Alexandrian grammarians in his work on the Hexapla is well presented by Swete, Introduction, pp. 69ff. In more recent times the question has been raised by P. Kahle whether these signs were ever present in the Hexapla at all ("The Greek Bible Manuscripts Used by Origen", JBL 79 (1960), 116). It is true that nowhere does Origen explicitly state that he employed these signs in the Hexapla itself. As Jellicoe has pointed out (SMS, p. 124), this is only an inference we make and as such may be quite erroneous. For our present purposes, however, the question is purely academic. The vital point is that Origen on his own testimony--and this can hardly be controverted--did use these signs somewhere. Jellicoe suggests in response to Kahle's challenge that Origen some time after the completion of the Hexapla may have composed a separate recension of the LXX with the signs included, but this is pure speculation and has no more merit in it than the traditional view. Apart from the evidence of Mercati's Hexaplaric fragment of the Psalms (which may be open to other explanations, cf. Bo Johnson, Die Hexaplarische Rezension des 1. Samuelbuches der Septuaginta, pp. 14-15), it still seems in order to speak of the fifth column text of the Hexapla as containing the LXX recension of Origen replete with the critical signs.

20. It goes without saying that not every asterised reading in our MSS is uncritically to be attributed to Origen. The question of the reliability of the signs is a problem that must be dealt with case by case. This will be demonstrated in the analysis below.

21. Critical signs are occasionally found in other MSS besides those mentioned here, e.g. at 29:4 in MSS 449-770 (see below, p. 64).

22. Other forms of the obelus attested elsewhere are — ∇ ÷

(cf. Field, I, lv-lvi). The sign ω is of infrequent occurrence and is unique to Syh. Field devoted a special section to it (I, lxiv-lxvii) and concluded that it is merely a different form of the obelus. Ziegler agrees with this in regard to its use in Jer (Ieremias, pp. 78-79), but in Is (Isaias, p. 59, n. 1) and in Ez (Ezechiel pp. 42-43) he thinks it is used rather as a kind of index to point out a reading present in Syh but absent in 88.

23. See below p. 66 n. 26 for a discussion of the reliability of Hexaplaric signs on double readings.

24. Compare the comment by Margolis, "The principle of expressing the Hebrew nota accusativi was present to the mind of Origen when he started his work of revision; where he failed to live up to it in the earlier edition he made up for the omission in the subsequent recension" (Margolis is speaking of the Hexapla and Tetrapla editions respectively), "The Textual Criticism of the Greek Old Testament", Transactions of the American Philosophical Society 67 (1928), 194.

25. This view was defended by Wevers in his article, "A Study in the Textual History of Codex Vaticanus in the Books of Kings," ZAW 64 (1952), 189. S.P. Brock came to a negative conclusion on this subject in his study of the recensions of the Gk Samuel, 1966, p. 55.

26. The same pattern of new reading asterised, old reading no sign may be observed in 88-Syh on eleven occasions elsewhere in Jer (3:19 5:5 6:12 31:30 31:31 34:7 36:2 38:8,12 39:8 51:28). On eight occasions in 88-Syh both elements of a double reading are marked (new reading asterised, old reading obelised: 2:6 4:20 6:2 31:36 37:6 38:13,14 45:9). Six times in 88-Syh neither part of a double reading has preserved a sign (29:14 33:17 38:12 48:9 49:1 51:23, cf. Ziegler, Ieremias, p. 79). These statistics point to the inconsistency with which Origen's critical signs have been preserved even in our primary Hexaplaric witnesses. For confirmation of this compare the article by C.T. Fritsch, "The Treatment of the Hexaplaric Signs in the Syro-Hexaplar of Proverbs", JBL 72 (1953), 169-181.

27. An alternative explanation might be that $\epsilon\pi\iota\pi\tau\eta\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ was intended to translate וְהָיָה (cf. the translation $\pi\tau\epsilon\rho\phi\upsilon\eta\sigma\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu$ for וְהָיָה in Is 40:31), but this seems less likely. According to 86^{mg} and Syh^{mg}, both Aquila and Symmachus substituted $\alpha\nu\alpha\beta\eta\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ for $\epsilon\pi\iota\pi\tau\eta\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ ($\alpha\nu\alpha\beta\alpha\iota\nu$ is the standard translation of וְהָיָה both in Aquila and in the LXX), while the reading $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\pi\iota\pi\tau\eta\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ of Symmachus in 86^{mg} is definitely sub asterisco indicating an addition; also the presence of the conjunction with $\epsilon\pi\iota\pi\tau\eta\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ suggests that this verb corresponds to the Heb וְהָיָה rather than וְהָיָה .

28. Where it is assumed, but cannot be proved because of the nature of the Syriac language, that Syh attests the same reading as 88, this is indicated by the annotation 88(-Syh).

29. Ziegler thinks that the Q^{mg} reading which assigns the addition of $\lambda\lambda\phi\lambda\phi\lambda\phi$ to $\alpha'\theta'$ is the correct one rather than the ϕ' symbol in 86^{mg} (see his second apparatus).

30. Jerome's words are: "vix enim unus aut alter invenietur liber, qui ista [i.e. additamenta hexaplaris] non habeat" (CSEL 55, p. 389).

31. For example, Ziegler has determined that 233 is a MS heavily influenced by the Hexaplaric recension and wherever possible associates it with the O group. There is no evidence in Jer 29 which would of itself lead to this conclusion and the matter can be decided only on the basis of a study of the entire book. In fact, it will be argued below (pp. 118-19) that 233 is not Hexaplaric in the OAN section.

32. This is the same methodology as that employed by S.P. Brock in his unpublished Oxford dissertation, The Recensions of the Septuagint Version of 1 Samuel, cf. p. ix.

33. It should be noted that this symbol differs from the italicized L employed by Ziegler; in the latter's text the joint attestation of the sub-groups L + l is marked L'. In the critique of Ziegler's text (Ch. 3) when citing directly from his apparatus I sometimes employ his italicized symbols (cf. pp. 118 ff.); otherwise I normally use the unitalicized forms which entail no commitment to Ziegler's sub-groups.

34. An unintentional scribal change from π to σ is theoretically also possible.

35. $\omega' = \text{'}\lambda\sigma\text{'}\pi\pi\phi\sigma$ a new translator whose readings are attested approximately 100 times in Jer (cf. Ziegler, Ieremias, pp. 102, 106). In Jer 29 we have additional examples of his translation in vv. 3(2x), 4, 9, 20.

36. In the majority text the phrase reads $\phi\tau\tau\alpha\chi\epsilon\kappa\alpha\iota\omega\zeta\omega$. In the hypothetically faulty uncial, the middle arm of the ϵ may have been missing and hence the letter would have been read as a sigma (σ). To make sense of the resultant text, $\phi\tau\tau\alpha\chi\epsilon\kappa\alpha\iota\omega\zeta\omega$ the first part was read as $\phi\tau\tau\alpha\chi\epsilon$, followed by full stop. The κ was then taken for the conjunction $\kappa\alpha\iota$, and the latter part read $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \Delta\iota\omega\zeta\omega$ (cf. the remark by Ziegler, Ieremias, p. 81 that several erroneous readings show that L goes back to an uncial "codex archetypus").

37. The incidence of readings in this section would probably have been higher still had the whole of the chapter been quoted by Chr/Tht. For it should be understood that when Chr/Tht fail to support a reading from O/L or simply L this is more often due to the fact that the reading in question is not attested by Chr/Tht than to the fact that they have a different reading.

38. There are a total of six double readings in the L recension of Jer 29. Here they are all brought together:

- 29:6 ἕως τίνος κόψεις / ἕως πότε συστραφήσεσθε
 29:10 σοι / οἱ
 29:11 (τὸ) σπέρμα αὐτοῦ / διὰ χεῖρα
 29:12 ἵνα σωθῶσιν / καὶ ἐγὼ αὐτοὺς διασώσω
 29:14 βοσὸρ / ἐν μέσῳ μέρους
 29:20 καὶ τοὺς νεανίσκους ἐπ' αὐτὴν ἐπιστήσατε / καὶ
 τίς ἐκλεκτὸς πρὸς αὐτὴν ἐπισκέψομαι

39. The omission in v. 8 of ἔχετο σοφία αὐτῶν L⁵¹ 407 449¹ was undoubtedly caused by scribal parablepsis: συνετῶν ἔχετο σοφία αὐτῶν.

40. "Constantinopolis usque Antiochiam Luciani martyris exemplaria probat," Praefatio Hieronymi in librum Paralipomenon, PL 28, col. 1392.

41. See the works of Ceriani ("Le recensioni dei LXX e la versione latina detta Itala", p. 1 R. Istituto Lombardo, 1866), Field (Origenes Hexaplorum quae supersunt . . . fragmenta, I, 1875, pp. lxxxiv-xciv; II, pp. 428-429), Lagarde (Ankündigung, p. 22; Pars Prior, pp. xiii-xv; Mittheilungen, I, 175), Rahlfs (Septuaginta-Studien III) and Moore ("The Antiochian Recension of the Septuagint", The American Journal of Semitic Languages 29 (1912-13), 37).

42. See "La prétendue 'recension lucianique'" in Les Devanciers d'Aquila, 1963, pp. 126-127, and especially his "Post-Scriptum: la 'recension lucianique'", appendix to the article "Les problèmes textuels de 2 Sam 11,2 - 1 Rois 2,11 reconsidérés à la lumière de certaines critiques des 'Devanciers d'Aquila'", in 1972 Proceedings (Septuagint and Cognate Studies 2), ed. R.A. Kraft, 1972, pp. 64-89.

Quite arbitrarily Barthélemy proposes that the term "recension" must be reserved for a text that gives evidence of deliberate approximation towards the Heb ("Post-Scriptum", pp. 72-74). But why the Heb must be a criterion for the definition of a recension is a mystery. It seems better to continue using the term with reference to a text that has undergone conscious revision according to certain discernible guidelines. Under this definition the L group of Jer certainly qualifies as a "recension".

43. The situation which obtains in Jer is therefore quite different from the text commonly labeled Lucianic in Samuel where already Wellhausen showed that it contained many ancient readings lost elsewhere in the Gk Tradition.

44. According to Rahlfs' Verzeichniss there exist another four Jer Catena MSS: 97, 430, 435, 567(fragmentary), and 568. For Ziegler's assertion that MSS 349, 533, and 573 are also Catena MSS containing the book of Jer see p. 15 n. 1 above;

for Ziegler's contention that MS 68 is dependent on the Catena text see below, p.109 n. 54 .

45. Die Propheten-Catenen nach römischen Handschriften, Freiburg, 1889, p. 2, n. 2.

46. C readings have not been documented in these lists.

47. The discovery of pre-Hexaplaric revisions or recensions is no new thing; cf. earlier the discussion by D.W. Gooding, "The Argument for a Pre-Origenic Recension", pp. 88-89 of his Cambridge thesis The Greek Deuteronomy (1954) and the articles by G. Zuntz and P. Katz in ZAW 68 (1956), 124-184, and ZAW 69 (1957), 77-84, respectively. Most recently one thinks of the Kaige recension discovered by Barthélemy.

My conclusions on the character of the Q text--which were reached quite independently--correspond to those of Ziegler (Ieremias, p. 63) and thus tend to confirm the soundness of his interpretation (contra R. Tournay, RB 65 (1958), 292, in a review of Ziegler's Jeremiah text).

48. Compare the very similar textual phenomena in the recensions of 1 Sam where readings attested within the limits of O/D + L/E are likely to be Hexaplaric, whereas those with wider support or those without the support of O/D are less likely so (Brock, Recensions, pp. 127ff.).

49. "Le recensioni dei LXX de^{la} versione latina detta Itala," 1886, p. 106; De codice Marchaliano seu Vaticano graeco 2125 Prophetarum, 1890, pp. 48ff., 105ff.

50. R.R. Ottley, Isaiah According to the Septuagint, I, 1904, pp. 6ff., 14ff.; II, 1906, pp. xff., xxxiff; Handbook to the Septuagint, pp. 91ff. W.O.E. Oesterley, Studies in the Greek and Latin Versions of the Book of Amos, 1902, p. 2 ("That Q contains the Hesychian text is universally admitted"); F.C. Burkitt, EB, IV, 1903, col. 5021 ("the Hesychian text is best represented by the first hand of Codex Marchalianus"); W. Grossouw, The Coptic Versions of the Minor Prophets, 1938, p. 16; A. Vaccari, "The Hesychian Recension of the Septuagint," Biblica 46 (1965), 60-66; Gehman, JBL 48 (1929) 329-332, and HSDB, 1963, p. 351; J.W. Wevers, IDB, IV, 1962, p. 275.

51. Rahlfs was sceptical of being able to trace the Hesychian text, cf. Septuaginta, I, p. xxxi, though earlier, Septuaginta Studien, II, 1907, pp. 183-197, he had identified the Hesychian recension with the Lower Egyptian text in Psalms. Ziegler has been negative throughout, cf. Isaias, p. 23, Ezechiel, p. 29, n. 3, Daniel, p. 47, n. 1. Others have tried to identify it with the B text, e.g., Grabe, Letter to Mill, 1705; recently re-argued by Jellicoe, JBL 88 (1963), 409-418.

52. Ceriani, De codice Marchaliano, pp. 34-35; Swete, Introduction, p. 144.

53. The above are more significant A readings; there are of course other unique A readings which are merely clerical and orthographic.

54. Another pair of minuscules that belong to this group are 68 and 122, but these are near identical copies of B, at least in Jer. Ziegler describes 68 as a Catena text (Ieremias, p. 11), but this is definitely not so in Jer. Some examples from Jer 29 that prove the dependence of 68 and 122 on B are the following:

- 29:3 ἐφ' B S 68 122 130] ἐπὶ rel.
- 29:4 ἐπερχομένη B 68 122] ἐρχομένη rel.
- 29:9 δαίδαλ B 68 122] δεδων 401 538 544 ; δεδωνω 534 ;
δαίδαν rel.
- 29:10 ὡς B S 68 122] ὡς περ A-106-410 C-613 ;
ὡς εἰ rel.
- 29:11 οἱ καὶ B S 68 122 130
- 29:13 εἶπεν B S 68 122 538] λείπει rel.
- 29:21 αὐτήν B S* 68 122 106 410 130 538] αὐτή A ; αὐτῆς S* 66 ;
αὐτοῦ rel.
- 29:22 ἐφοβήθη B S 68 122 538] ἐσ(ε)ίσθη rel.

Notes to Chapter 3

1. Some examples of the decidedly secondary readings which it attests for Jer 29 are the following (underlined):

29:1 καὶ ἐγένετο ῥῆμα κυρίου πρὸς ἱερεμίαν τὸν προφήτην ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀλλοφύλοις πρὸ τοῦ πατάξει φαραῶ τὴν γῆν = MT

29:4 τοὺς ἀλλοφύλους τοὺς καταλοῖπους τῶν νήσων τῆς καππαδοκίας = MT

29:13 ἰδοὺ οἷς = MT; οὐ μὴ ἀθώωθήσῃ, ὅτι πίων πίεσαι = MT

29:16 ἰδοὺ μικρόν = MT

29:18 ἐκστήσεται καὶ συριεῖ ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν πληγὴν αὐτῆς = MT

29:19 om. παντοκράτωρ = MT

29:22 om. ὅτι = MT; om. καὶ = MT

2. A comparative chart of selected readings from Jer 29 illustrates the kind of trivial modifications found in various editions of the LXX textus receptus:

<u>B*</u>	<u>Sistine</u>	<u>Maine</u>	<u>Bagster</u>	<u>van Ess/Tisch.</u>	<u>Suete</u>
29:4 ἐξολιθρεύσει (ἐξολο. B ^c)	c	c	c	c	*
29:5 ἀπερίφη (ἀπερρ. B ^c)	c	*	c	c	*
Ἐνακείμ	-κιμ	*	-κιμ	-κιμ	*
29:6 οὐκ (οὐχ B ^c)	c	c	c	c	c
29:10 καταλίψουσιν (καταλείψ. B ^c)	c	c	-λείψουσι	c	c
κατάλιμμα (καταλει. B ^c)	c	c	c	c	*
ἐπιθήσουσιν	-σι	*	-σι	-σι	*

<u>29:12</u> ὕπολίπεσθαι (ὕπολείπ. B ^c)	c	c	c	c	*
ζήσεται (ζηση. B ^c)	c	c	c	c	*
χῆραι	pr. αἱ	*	pr. αἱ	pr. αἱ	*
<u>29:13</u> ἀθωμίνη (ἀθωω. B ^c)	c	c	c	c	c
<u>29:17</u> νοσσειάν (νοσσι. B ^c)	c	c	c	c	c
<u>29:19</u> καθίσῃ	-σει	*	-σει	-σει	*
ἐνοικήσει	κατοί.	*	κατοί.	κατοί.	*
<u>29:20</u> στήσται (στήσε. B ^c)	c	c	c	c	c
<u>29:21</u> συψήθωσιν (συψηθωσι B ^c)	c c	c *	συψηθωσι	c c	* *
αὐτήν	αὐτούς	*	αὐτούς	αὐτούς	*
<u>29:23</u> ἐκτείνει (εκτεν. B ^c)	c	c	c	c	*

3. Cf. above, p. 6 . He was, of course, aided by a great deal of scholarship that had already been expended on the LXX of Jer (cf. his remark, "Die notierte Literatur zeigt, dass bereits in ausgiebiger Weise die LXX von Ier. Thr. Bar. untersucht worden ist" Beiträge, p. 6).

4. Note that Lagarde listed the witnesses in this order, "Noch einmal", pp. 230-231.

5. The sub-divisions in some of the other editions one feels

become too complicated to be helpful, e.g. Isaias L^{''} = lI + lII + lIII, and C^{''} = C + cI + cII.

6. See his comments in Duodecim Prophetae, pp. 138-139; however, in Isaias the insert sheet "Erklärung der Zeichen und Abkürzungen" contains an extensive list of "codices mixti".

7. Cf. above the discussion on the sub-divisions in L, pp. 87-9

8. For example, why in 29:15 are V-239-538 joined by hyphens for the reading $\tau\alpha \epsilon\theta\nu\eta$, but 106 239 538 are not joined by hyphens for the variant $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\gamma\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$? Why in 1:19 for the variant $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\epsilon(\nu)$ is 410 included with the Q group rather than with the B group?

9. Question: Why does Ziegler employ a period with abbreviations for the Church Fathers but not for the daughter versions?

10. These extraordinary omissions are as follows:

In Is

15:1	106 538 ^{txt}	109 91 ^{txt} -490 ^{txt}
17:1	106 538 ^{txt}	
19:1	106 538 ^{txt}	407 763 ^{txt}
21:1	106 538 ^{txt}	301
21:11	106 538 ^{txt}	393
22:1	106 538 ^{txt}	763 ^{txt}
23:1	106 538 ^{txt}	763 ^{txt} 407 ^{txt} 456

In Jer

26(46):13	106 538 ^{txt}	
27(50):1	106 538 ^{txt}	
29(47):1	106 538 ^{txt}	Bo Arm ^p
29:8(49:7)	46 106 538 ^{txt}	
30(49):1	46 106 538 ^{txt}	Arm ^p
30:6(49:28)	106 538 ^{txt}	
30:12(49:23)	106 538 ^{txt}	763 ^{txt} Arm ^p

11. For example, for the reading $\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\upsilon \mu\acute{\iota}\kappa\rho\acute{\omicron}\nu$ at 29:16 Ziegler cites all the supporting and non-supporting evidence; why he made an exception in this case is not entirely clear.

12. Ziegler's comment to the effect that this calculation "ist nicht allzu schwierig" (Ieremias, p. 138) is not entirely fair. For somebody well familiar with the MS evidence for a particular book such calculations may not be too demanding, but for the occasional reader or scholar who quickly needs to know the supporting evidence for a particular reading the process is not at all so simple.

13. Cf. the entry at 1:19: $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota$ Cyr Tht } $\epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon\iota(\nu)$
 B-S-239-538 V+ O-233 C. The mention of Cyril and Theodoret with
 the lemma text does not mean that they only attest the $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota$
 reading; rather it means that $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota$ is found in all Gk
 MSS not mentioned for $\epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon\iota(\nu)$, plus the Fathers Cyril and
 Theodoret.

14. Hence S.P. Brock's remark in the SOTS Book List, 1978,
 p. 46, to the effect that the new edition "is evidently a straight
 reprint of the 1957 edition...without any alterations" re-
 mains generally true with the exception of the apparatus to Jer 29.

15. See for example the work being done on the Armenian
 version: M.E. Stone, "The Old Armenian Version of Isaiah: Towards
 the Choice of the Base Text for an Edition", Textus 8 (1973),
 107-123.

16. Cf. the critique of Wever's edition of Genesis by K.G.
 O'Connel in CBQ 39 (1977), 119 ff.

17. Some anonymous marginal readings are known to come
 from the Hexaplaric recension while others come from the Lucianic
 recension (see above, p. 86). It must be a difficult, if not
 impossible, task on every occasion to correctly associate these
 readings with the right group. Ziegler more often than not
 links an anonymous marginal reading with the Hexaplaric recension.

18. See Ziegler's explanation for this procedure, Isaias,
 p. 113.

19. The term "contemporary" approach is mine rather than
 Walters'. Walters employed no parallel term to the adjectives
 "traditional" and "documentary" used to describe the first two
 alternatives.

20. A couple of minor differences may however be noted.
 In the case of the movable nu Ziegler follows the "school rule"
 (cf. his comment Duodecim Prophetae, p. 118) whereas Rahlfs
 inserts it regardless of what letter follows. In the Edom oracle
 compare the following spellings:

	<u>Rahlfs</u>		<u>Ziegler</u>
30:3	$\epsilon\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\psi\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu$	29:10	$\epsilon\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\psi\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota$
	$\epsilon\pi\iota\theta\eta\sigma\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu$		$\epsilon\pi\iota\theta\eta\sigma\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota$
30:6	$\epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon\nu$	29:13	$\epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon$
30:8	$\alpha\pi\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\lambda\epsilon\nu$	29:15	$\alpha\pi\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\lambda\epsilon$
30:	$\epsilon\nu\epsilon\chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu$	29:1	$\epsilon\nu\epsilon\chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\eta\sigma\epsilon$
30:12	$\epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon\nu$	29:19	$\epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon$
30:14	$\sigma\upsilon\mu\psi\eta\sigma\theta\omega\sigma\iota\nu$	29:21	$\sigma\upsilon\mu\psi\eta\sigma\theta\omega\sigma\iota$

By contrast Ziegler appears always to employ the final
sigma for $\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega$, where Rahlfs occasionally omits it, cf.
 13:9, 35:6.

21. See the comment by G.D. Kilpatrick in his review of R. Hanhart's Zum Text des 2. und 3. Makkabäerbuches (1960): "It is quite clear from these pages (i.e. Ch. 1) how much students of the Greek Bible owe to Dr. P. Katz, but we have to distinguish between what our authors wrote and what is philologically correct," GGA 215 (1963), 12. See also a comment to the same effect by T. Muraoka in his review of Walters' Text, JSS 19 (1974), 307.

22. Ziegler himself says that in the matter of proper names he has subjected Rahlfs and Katz to a new appraisal, the result of which is embodied in Ch. 2 of Beiträge, "Transkriptionen".

23. The comment is not necessarily meant as a criticism but merely as reporting on Ziegler's methodology.

24. W. Kappler, "Ziele und Aufgaben des Göttinger Septuaginta-Unternehmens", GGA 202 (1940), 115-124.

25. Cf. above, p.5n.8

26. The most common Heb equivalence is as might be expected שֶׁרָאָה (Gen 45:7 2 Ki 14:7 4 Ki 19:31 Is 14:30 Jer 27(50):26 Jer 27(40):11) or רָאָה (Is 10:22 14:22), but it is also used to translate רָאָה in Jud 5:13 4 Re 10:11, רָאָה in 3 Re 15:4, רָאָה in Job 22:20, and possibly רָאָה in Is 37:30.

27. The interpretation of the phrase is complicated by the uncertainty regarding the reading δὲ χεῖρα at the commencement of the verse which Ziegler emends to ἐπὶ χεῖρα, but on the basis of the MS reading the sentence ὡλοντο δὲ χεῖρα ἀδελφοῦ καὶ γείτονός μου might be translated, "they have perished each by the hand of his brother and his neighbour", which seems preferable to ὡλοντο δὲ χεῖρα ἀδελφοῦ σὺν τῷ γείτονός μου, "they have perished each by the hand of his brother, my neighbour", where the deity seems to speak of Israel as "my neighbour".

28. The same thing can be seen happening in Ziegler's decision in the form of the "concluding formula" λέγει / εἶπε / φησὶ κς. In 1:19 and 2:3 Ziegler opts for the form λέγει, κύριος on the basis of translation pattern (see below, p.197 n.32) against that of the main MS evidence (cf. his explanation Beiträge, p. 38).

29. In NT textual criticism there is a lively on-going debate concerning the validity of the eclectic method and how far it is to be carried; see for instance the Festschrift for Prof. G. Kilpatrick Studies in New Testament Language and Text (1976) which includes essays both pro and contra Kilpatrick's own position. Three useful survey articles on the present state of the debate are those by J.E. Epp in JBL 93 (1974), 386-414, HTR 69 (1976), 211-257, and D. Parker, NTS 24 (1977), 149-162. A real desideratum for LXX textual criticism is a careful analysis and evaluation of the craft of textual criticism as it has been practiced and is being practiced today in the Gk OT. For a sampling of Kilpatrick's method applied to the LXX see his review of W. Kappler and R. Hanhart's editions of 1, 2, and 3 Maccabees in GGA 215 (1963), 10-22.

30. "Diese Ausführungen zeigen, dass eine v o l l e Gewähr für die Ursprünglichkeit verschiedener Lesarten nicht immer geboten werden kann....Die fortschreitende Forschung mag manche Lesarten, die im App. stehen, in den Text aufnehmen und umgekehrt", Duodecim Prophetae, p. 133.

31. See the statistics given by B. Metzger, The Text of the New Testament, pp. 184-5.

32. Cf. K. Lake, The Text of the New Testament, pp. 9-10. For a review of the arguments advanced against the practice of emendation in the NT in a paper advocating a return to this practice, see the lively article, written with wit reminiscent of A. E. Houseman, by John Strugnell, "A Plea for Conjectural Emendation in the New Testament", CBQ 36 (1974), 543-58.

33. The lexicons distinguish between רִבְּיָא and רִבִּי , the former found only in the construct form רִבִּי with יִצְחָק (5x) or לֵאזֶרַי (1x) referring to the deity, the latter in all other contexts. For the purpose of this review, no such distinction is necessary.

34. The same tendency simply to employ the root meaning of רִבְּיָא is characteristic of the Min Gk VSS. Thus Aquila, where attested, almost uniformly uses $\delta\upsilon\nu\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\eta\varsigma$ (Is 34:7, 46:12, Ps 21(22):13, 49(50):13, 77(78):25, 131(132):2, or $\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ (Is 10:33), except 1 Sam 21:7(8) זֶרַח (MS 57 sub σ') and Lam 1:15 $\delta\pi\epsilon\rho\mu\epsilon\gamma\acute{\iota}\theta\eta$, (probably reading רִבְּיָא). The other versions were more free but still stayed close to the base meaning, e.g., Symmachus has $\delta\upsilon\nu\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\eta\varsigma$ (Is 49:26), $\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ (Is 10:33), $\kappa\rho\alpha\tau\alpha\iota\acute{o}\varsigma$ (Is 34:7), $\sigma\kappa\lambda\eta\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ - (Is 46:12), $\tau\alpha\tilde{\upsilon}\rho\omicron\varsigma$? (Ps 21(22):13, Field citing Montfaucon), $\pi\acute{\alpha}\gamma\mu\mu\epsilon\gamma\alpha\varsigma$ (Ps 67(68):31), $\delta\pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\eta}\phi\alpha\nu\omicron\varsigma$ (Ps 75(76):6), $\mu\epsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ (Ps 77(78):25), $\mu\epsilon\gamma\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\varsigma$ (Lam 1:15); Theodotion has $\delta\upsilon\nu\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\eta\varsigma$ (Ps 77(78):25), $\iota\sigma\chi\upsilon\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ (Is 34:7), and $\kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\varsigma$ (Is 10:33).

Among the Eng VSS the RV tends in the same direction, cf., Jud 5:22 "strong ones," and similarly Jer 8:16, 26(46):15.

35. The equivalence $\tau\alpha\tilde{\upsilon}\rho\omicron\varsigma$ / רִבְּיָא (not always a correct equivalence) was facilitated in each instance by the association of רִבְּיָא with some other animal, e.g., in Jer 27(50):11 $\tau\alpha\tilde{\upsilon}\rho\omicron\varsigma$ / רִבְּיָא is parallel to $\beta\omicron\iota\delta\iota\omicron\nu$ / לֵהָזֵז . The Eng VSS agree that the correct translation there is "strong horses" (RV) or "stallions" (RSV, NEB, JB). The LXX (mis)translation $\beta\omicron\iota\delta\iota\omicron\nu$ has determined the further mistranslation of לֵהָזֵז by $\kappa\rho\epsilon\mu\iota\tau\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$; לֵהָזֵז / לֵהָזֵז is otherwise correctly and uniformly rendered in Jer by $\chi\rho\epsilon\mu\iota\tau\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$ / $\chi\rho\epsilon\mu\iota\tau\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ (cf., 5:8 8:16, 13:27, 38(31):7). The important point to note, however, is that the meaning $\beta\omicron\iota\delta\iota\omicron\nu$ was derived from the immediate context.

36. The majority of MSS have the reading $\iota\pi\pi\alpha\sigma\iota\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ "ππων but this is undoubtedly a double reading, as recognized by Giesebrecht (p. 231), Kühler (p. 16) Streane (p. 111), Rudolph (ZAW,

p. 279), and Ziegler (Beiträge, p. 99). That ἰππασίας and not ἰππων was the original reading is made virtually certain by the following considerations: it is inexplicable why the reading ἰππασίας should have been added to ἰππων since the addition would make a clear reading more difficult and would not correspond to the Heb; on the other hand, it is easy to see that ἰππων could have been added later to give sense to the Gk, cf., the omission of ἰππων in V-46-86-198-239-544 O-233 verss.^p Possibly ἰππων was at one time a marginal gloss on ἰππασίας which was later incorporated into the text. Origen probably found only ἰππασίας in his Vorlage, otherwise he would also have included ἰππων, placing one of the words under obelus. Ziegler correctly prints only ἰππασίας in the text.

37. All the MSS read ὁ μόσχος ὁ ἐκλεκτός, but again it is possible that we have here another double reading (so Giesebrecht, p. 231, Köhler, p. 21, and Streane, p. 263). Ziegler is also convinced that the pair form a double reading but is less certain which of the two words was original and which was added later. In his discussion of this lectio duplex (Beiträge, p. 96) he seems to prefer ἐκλεκτός as the original, though he admits that μόσχος could also be considered such, in which case ἐκλεκτός is later approximation to the Heb. In the text he shows his ambivalence by printing both words but placing ὁ ἐκλεκτός in square brackets. Whether μόσχος or ἐκλεκτός or even ὁ μόσχος ὁ ἐκλεκτός was the original Gk, it is clear that the translation was derived from the context as a parallel to the Egyptian bull-god Apis (a translation based in turn on the reading אַפִּי־סָפַר "Apis has fled" vs. MT אַפִּי־סָפַר "swept away").

38. These could represent different Vorlagen (for 1 Sam 21:8 cf. Lagarde's suggestion that LXX testifies to a reading אַפִּי־סָפַר אֶל־בְּרִיָּה but see the remark by S.R. Driver, Notes, p. 176; for Ps 75(76):6 BHS propose אֶל־בְּרִיָּה; for Is 46:12 BHS suggest אֶל־בְּרִיָּה), or they may be desperate attempts by the translators to make sense of the Heb that for one reason or another was difficult to the translator (cf. for instance the various translations of אֶל־בְּרִיָּה in the Eng VSS of Is 46:12). The Heb and Gk of Job is notoriously difficult to correlate and in the case of אֶל־בְּרִיָּה we cannot even be sure that this was intended as a translation of אֶל־בְּרִיָּה (cf. the question marks in HR).

39. Text of the NT, p. 185, n. 1.

40. Ibid, p. 183.

41. According to the researches of H.J.M. Milne and T.C. Skeat (Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus, London, 1938, pp. 54-55), the book of Jer (along with Is, Lam, MP, ShepHer) was copied by Scribe B. The careless habits of this copyist they find hard to describe in moderate language and are amazed he could have been chosen for such an important job. They write, "He [Scribe B] seems to have had no firm visual impression of Greek, so barbarous and grotesque are the forms which his

misspellings can present to the eye, and with such utter inconsistency does he sway from correct to incorrect. . . . Pure blunders, like telescoping of words and omission of letters or syllables, are incredibly common . . . ; more curious is the wrong insertion of the consonant in the middle of the word, as in $\pi(\rho)\sigma\iota\eta\sigma\eta$ (Jer 37:24), $\delta\sigma\rho(\mu)\alpha\tau\alpha$ (Jer 26:4), $\sigma\alpha(\nu)\rho\kappa\alpha\nu$ (Jer 51:35). Another frequent error is produced by metathesis, $\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ for $\epsilon\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$ (Is 35:6), $\delta\iota\omega\mu\iota\epsilon\nu$ for $\delta\iota\omega\mu\epsilon\nu\epsilon\iota$ (Jer 3:5). . . ." In the light of this testimony it is not difficult to see how the $\sigma\tau$ of $\acute{\sigma}\tau\acute{o}\pi\omicron\varsigma$, could have been inverted by metathesis to $\tau\omicron$, or how a ρ might suddenly have appeared between π and σ of $\pi\omicron\varsigma$, to yield $\pi\rho\omicron\varsigma$ (cf. $\pi(\rho)\sigma\iota\eta\sigma\eta$ Jer 37:24).

42. If $\tau\acute{o}\ \pi\rho\acute{o}\sigma\omega\pi\omicron\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$ corresponds to ןןבן this presumably means that the translator read ןןב as a collective for ןןב .

43. According to Ziegler (Beiträge, p. 68), Grabe proposed $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \kappa\rho\alpha\upsilon\eta\ \theta\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\eta\varsigma\ \sigma\omicron\upsilon\phi$. But this is not correct. The statement in the "Prolegomena" clearly reads, "pro $\theta\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\eta\varsigma\ \omicron\upsilon\kappa$ in Rom. Cod. legendum sit $\epsilon\nu\ \theta\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\eta\ \sigma\omicron\upsilon\phi$, juxta Heb. $\eta\text{ןב} - \text{ןןב}$."

44. This translation is found in Ex 10:19 13:18 15:4,22 23:31; Num 14:25 21:4 33:10,11; Dt 1:40 2:1 11:4; Josh 2:10 4:23 24:6; Jud 11:16(A text); Ps 105(106):7,9,22 135(136):13, 15; Neh 9:9. In 3 Re 9:26 is found $\tau\eta\varsigma\ \iota\sigma\chi\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta\varsigma$.

45. According to Streane, the addition of the negative is found in 2:3(2x) 5:2 9:5(4) 23:32 28(51):58 29:22 (49:21) 38:35 (31:37). The omission is found in 2:25, 4:1 5:3,10 18:18 28(51):3 43(36):25. Streane also refers to Wellhausen, Der Text der Bücher Samuelis, p. 26, for evidence of the same phenomenon happening in 1 and 2 Reg. Along the same lines compare the recent article by M.L. Klein, "Converse Translation: A Targumic Technique", Biblica 57 (1976), 515-537, especially pp. 516-529, "Addition or Deletion of the Negative Particle".

46. Cf. the device employed in the current Peshitta project, The Old Testament in Syriac, General Preface, 1972, p. VIII.

47. Compare J. Barr's review of Walters' The Text of the Septuagint, particularly his comment, "Walters seems to have belonged to an age which accepted the emendation of the text more readily than the present generation of scholars does", HJ 26 (1975), 61-63.

48. For some examples of conjectured readings that have been vindicated by papyri discoveries in Ezekiel, see Ziegler, Beiträge, p. 17.

Notes to Chapter 4

1. Thackeray actually delineated three translation units in the book, the third being the "Historical Appendix", Ch. 52, which he designated "Jeremiah y"; however, he adduced only scant support for the third translator and seemed less sure of his case in this matter (cf. "Gr. Tr. Jer.", pp. 246, 260).

2. Ziegler's treatment of the multiple translator problem in Jer is in fact ambiguous and unsatisfactory. Several times he distinguishes between "Ier. 1" and "Ier. II" and refers to them as "der erste Ier.-Übersetzer" (Beiträge, p. 127) and "der zweite Ier.-Übers." (Beiträge, p. 49); this distinction then becomes the basis for text-critical decisions, e.g., in the preference for the form $\lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\iota\ \kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ at 1:19 and 2:3 where the majority of MSS have $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\iota\ \kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ and $\varphi\acute{\eta}\nu\epsilon\iota\ \kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ respectively (cf. Beiträge, p. 38; Ieremias, p. 44). On other occasions he simply speaks of "der Übersetzer" apparently with reference to the whole book and makes decisions on the basis of the unity of the translation, e.g. his preference for the word $\kappa\alpha\lambda\alpha\mu\acute{\eta}\mu\omicron\tau\alpha$ at 29:10 (Jer b') versus the majority text readings $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\epsilon\iota\mu\mu\alpha$ (-ωτα) on the precedent of the translation $\kappa\alpha\lambda\alpha\mu\acute{\alpha}\sigma\theta\epsilon$ for לִבְיָנִי at 6:9 (Jer a') Beiträge, p. 48).

3. For elaboration of this part of Tov's argument see pp. 6, 42, 135 of his book, and particularly the appendix, "Why is Jer-R's Revision Preserved Only in Jer b'?", pp. 162-165.

4. Cf. LSJ. Usually the context is one of joy, exultation or victory rather than one of pain or grief, but the latter sense certainly is attested, including the NT usage at Mk 5:38.

5. Rahlfs. Jer a': 1:18 5:19 16:10 18:23 19:15 23:8.

Jer b': 29:2 33:2,2 36:1 39:23 43:11,16,32 47:5
48:12 51:1.

Elsewhere: Gen 19:4 Lev 6:22 Deut 22:19,29 Josh 6:12,
13,19 2 Re 3:25 3 Re 2:26 12:24 13:11 1 Chr 10:11 16:47
17:10 Esth 8:13 9:28 Ps 21:23 Prov 25:4 Am 7:10 Zech 7:5
Ez 38:8 Dan(Th.) 4:8.

6. Ziegler. Jer a': 18:23 19:15 23:8; Jer b': 29:2
33:2,2 39:23 48:12 51:1.

7. Tov believes that the readings $\tau\omicron\ \acute{\upsilon}\psi\omicron\varsigma\ \sigma\omicron\upsilon$ (from יִשְׁחַד־וּ or יִשְׁחַד־וּ versus MT יִשְׁחַד־וּ) in 6:2 and יִשְׁחַד־וּ in 29(47):6 (from יִשְׁחַד־וּ versus MT יִשְׁחַד־וּ) are additional examples of the same deliberate attempt to avoid the roots יִשְׁחַד / יִשְׁחַד .

8. Not 29(49):7 as in Tov, p. 31.

9. The totals include all occurrences of the translated name in question whether or not a corresponding יִשְׁחַד־וּ

is found in the MT. My totals do not always coincide with those of Tov. For instance, in the case of σαβαωθ his total of 58 for Is and 8 elsewhere seem to be based on the aggregate sums as found in HR. My totals, where possible, are based on Ziegler's critical texts. In the case of Jer we both record 7 occurrences of παντοκράτωρ in Jer b', but Tov obtains this figure by including 37(30):3 attested by SAVC but rejected by Ziegler, while he fails to mention 38:36(31:35), a firmly attested occurrence of παντοκράτωρ. Tov's reference to παντοκράτωρ in Jer 29:29 must be corrected to 29:19.

10. σαβαωθ

Josh 6:16(17)

1 Re 1:3,11,20 15:2 17:45

1 Esd 9:46

Is 1:9,24 2:12 3:1 5:7,9,16,24,25 6:3,5 7:7 8:18
9:7(6) 10:16,24,33 13:4,13 14:22,24,27 17:4 18:7,7 19:4,12,
16,25 21:10 22:5,12,14,15,17,25 23:9,11 25:6 28:5,22,29
29:6 31:4 37:16,32 39:5 44:6 45:13,14 47:4 48:2 51:15
54:5.

11. παντοκράτωρ

2 Re 5:10 7:8,25(MT v.26)27

3 Re 19:10,14

1 Chr 11:9 17:7,24

Sir 42:17

Hos 12:5 Am 3:13 4:13 5:14,15,16,27 9:5 Mi 4:4

Na 2:14 3:5 Hab 2:13 Zeph 2:10 Hag 1:2,5,7,9,14

2:4,6,7,8,9,9,11,23,23 Zech 1:3,4,6,12,14,16,17 2:8,

9,11,(MT 12,13,15) 3:7,9,10 4:6,9 5:4 6:12,15 7:3,

9,12,12,13 8:1,2,3,4,6,6,7,9,9,11,14,14,18,19,20,21,22,23

9:15 10:3 11:4 12:5 13:7 14:16,17,21,21 Mal 1:4,

6,8,9,10,11,12,14,17, 4:1,3 (MT 3:19,21)

Jer a' 3:19 5:14 15:16 23:16 27(50):34 28(51):5,57

Jer b' 29:15(45:18) 32:13(25:27) 38:36(31:35) 39(32):14,

19 40(33):11 51(44):7

Bar 3:1,4.

12. τῶν δυνάμεων

Josh 5:13(MT v.14 נבצ)

2 Re 6:2,18

3 Re 17:1 18:15 4 Re 3:14 19:20,31

Ps 23(24):10 45(46):8,12 47(48):9 58(59):6 68(69):7

79(80):5,8,15,20 83(84):2,4,9,13 88(89):9.

13. Thackeray was aware of the rendition παντοκράτωρ running right through Jer and MP but could accomodate this to his multiple translator theory (Jewish Worship, p. 33).

14. These totals are based on Ziegler's text which means that for the purpose of our sums at least, we accept the elimination of τὰδε at 9:17, οὕτως at 21:7, while reading λέγει rather than εἶπεν at 29:13.

15. Comparison with Tov's statistics (p. 17) and mine reveals some discrepancies in the sums achieved. But since Tov does not give references for most of his totals it is impossible to check one against the other. His total of 49 instances of τὰδε λέγει in Reigns may include the formula at 1 Re 14:7 which however is found in a passage attested only by the A text among the uncials. For 2 Chr I count 6 rather than 5 occurrences of τὰδε λέγει while for MP I find 44 rather than 43. Where Tov does give references these are found to be incorrect in the following places: The translation of כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה by τὰδε λέγει κύριος occurs in Jer 61 times not 58 times as stated by Tov, pp. 21, 56, 57. Tov's list on p. 56 fails to note the occurrences of τὰδε λέγει at 2:2,5 and 28:36. The totals for οὕτως εἶπεν in Jer b' are 71 not 69; Tov fails to mention 34:13, 40:12, and 41:2(2nd occurrence), while his list includes Bar 2:21 (Bar references are not incorporated in our lists). Tov's total of 3 for οὕτως λέγει includes 21:7 where, however, the οὕτως is eliminated by Ziegler; it is strange to find Tov not following Ziegler here since in almost every other instance he does accept Ziegler's text.

16. τὰδε λέγει

Gen 45:9

Ex 4:22 5:1,10 7:17 8:1(7:26) 8:20(16) 9:1,13
10:3 11:4 32:27

Num 20:14 22:16

Josh 7:13 22:16 24:2

Jud 6:8 11:15

1 Re 2:27 2 Re 7:5,8 12:7,11 24:12

3 Re 2:30 11:31 12:24 13:2,21 17:14 20(21):19,19
21:2(3),5,13,14,28,42 22:11 4 Re 1:4,6,11,16 2:21 3:16,17
4:43 7:1 9:3,6,12,18,19 18:19,29,31 19:36,20,32 20:1,5
21:12 22:15,16,18

1 Chr 17:7 2 Chr 11:4 18:10 20:15 21:12 24:20 36:23

Am 1:6,9,11,13 2:1,4,6 3:11,12 5:3,4,16 7:11,17
Mi 2:3 3:5 Ob 1 Na 1:12 Hag 1:2,5,7 2:6,11 Zech 1:3,
4,14,16,17 2:8(12) 3:7 6:12 7:9 8:2,3,4,6,7,9,14,19,20,23
11:4 Mal 1:4

Is 7:7 10:24 22:15 29:22 36:4,14,16, 37:3,6,21
38:1,5 52:3 56:1,4 57:15 65:13 66:12

Jer a' 2:2,5,31 4:3,27 5:14 6:6,9,16,21,22 7:3,20,21

8:4 9:7,15,23(6,14,22) 10:2,18 11:3,11,21 12:14 13:1,8,13
 14:15 15:2,19 16:3,5,9 17:19,21 18:13 19:3,11,15 20:4
 21:4,8,12 22:1,3,6,11,18 23:2,15,38 24:5,8 25:15(49:35)
 27(50):18,33 28(51):1,33,36,58

Jer b' 29:1(47:2) 29:8,13 (49:7,12)

Ez 2:4 3:11,27 5:5,7,8 6:3,11 7:2,5 11:5,7,16,17
 12:10,19,23,28 13:3,8,13,18,20 14:4,6,21 15:6 16:3,36,59
 17:3,9,19,22 20:3,5,27,30,39,47(21:3), 21:9,24,26,28(14,29,
 31,33) 22:3,19,28 23:22,28,32,35,46 24:3,6,9,21 25:3,6,8,
 12,13,15,16 26:3,7,15,19 27:3 28:2,6,12,22,25 29:3,8,13,19
 30:2,10,13,22 31:10,15 32:3,11 33:27 34:2,10,11,17,20 35:3,14
 36:2,3,4,5,6,13,22,33,37 37:5,9,12,19,21 38:3,10,14,17 39:1,
 17,25 43:18 44:6,9 45:9,18 46:1,16 47:13.

17. οὕτως εἶπε

1 Chr 17:4 2 Chr 12:5 18:26 34:23

2 Esd 1:2

Is 18:4 21:6,16 31:4

Jer b' 30:1,6(49:1,28) 31(48):1,40 32:1,13,14,18
 (25:15,27,28,32) 33(26):2,4,18 43:1,3,13,16(27:2,4,16,19)
 35(28):2,11,13,14,16 36(29):4,8,10,21,31,32 37(30):2,5,12,18
 38(31):2,7,15,16,23,36(35) 39(32):3,14,15,28,36,42 40(33):2,
 4,10,12 41(34):2,2,13,17 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 51:32,34(45:2,4).

18. οὕτως λέγει

Gen 32:4(5)

Jud 11:15

1 Chr 21:10,11 2 Chr 34:24,26

Is 8:11 28:16 30:12,15 37:33 42:5 43:1,14,16
 44:2,6,24 45:1,11,14,18 48:17 49:7,8,22,25 50:1 51:22 52:4
 65:8 66:1

Jer a' 14:10 (21:7 lec. dup. acc. to Ziegler) 23:16

Jer b' 41(34):4 42(35):13.

19. The following is a list of the textual variants for the messenger formulas as found in Ziegler's apparatus:

Variants for τὰδε λέγει

4:3 οὕτως λέγει S*

13:1 οὕτως εἶπε(ν) L = οἱ γ'

17:19 οὕτως εἶπε(ν) L - 191 - 538

29:13 τὰδε εἶπεν B-S-538

Variants for οὕτως λέγει

14:10 τὰδε λέγει 86^{ms} 710

23:16 οὕτως εἶπε(ν) O-233 L

41:4 οὕτως εἶπε(ν) O-86^{ms}-233 L

42:13 οὕτως εἶπε(ν) O-233 L

Variants for οὕτως εἶπε

The form τάδε λέγει is found in the L group (or part thereof) at 31:40 32:13,18 35:2,14 36:8,21 37:18 38:7,16 39:14,28,42 41:2,17 43:29 44:7,9 45:3 49:15,18 51:11,25.

The form οὕτως λέγει is found in miscellaneous MSS (indicated in the parentheses) at 35:2(233) 36:8(233) 36:22(534) 37:12(A 613) 38:16(233) 39:14(233) 40:12(Q-V+ OLC) 43:29(87^{txt}) 51:7(239).

Where the MF is missing in the LXX it has been supplied in O/L by τάδε λέγει at 11:22 13:12 17:5 22:30 34:21 36:16,17,25 40:17,20,25 38:35 42:19 and by οὕτως λέγει at 18:11.

The most common variant in the above lists is the change in the L recension from the anomalous form οὕτως εἶπε to the standard usage τάδε λέγει, not surprisingly, considering what is already known about the tendency of that recension to prefer a more natural Gk. The opposite tendency of changing τάδε/οὕτως λέγει to οὕτως εἶπε is found in 13:1 17:19 23:16 41:4 42:13.

20. ταλαιπωρίῳ 4:13,20,20 9:19(18) 10:20 12:12
ὄλλυμι 29:11(49:10) 30(49):3 31(48):1,15,
 18,20 (Tov also includes 38(31):2 where MT has יַטִּיחַ).
ἀπόλλυμι 29(47):4
(ἐξ)ολεθεύω 5:6 28(51):53,55
πλησσω Q-613 Zi. 30:6(49:28).
21. ταλαιπωρία 6:7,26 15:8 20:8 28(51):56
ὄλεθρος 31(48):3,8,32.
22. μάχιρα 2:30 4:10 5:12 9:16(15) 11:22
 12:12 14:12,13,15,16,18 15:2,2,3,9 16:4 18:21,21 19:7
 20:4,4 21:7,7,9 24:10 25:17(49:37) 26(46):10,14,16 27(50):16,
 21,35,36,36,37,37, 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
- ρόμφαία 5:17 6:25 45(38):2 46(39):18
 49(42):16,17,22 50(43):11,11 51(44):12,13,18,27,28.
23. ρόμφαία 195; μάχιρα 166.
24. μάχιρα Gen 22:6,10 27:40 31:26 34:25,26
 48:22 Ex 15:9 17:13 22:24(23) Lev 26:8,25,33 Num 14:43
 21:24 22:29,31 Deut 13:15(16) 20:13 32:25,41,42 33:29
 Josh 5:2,3 10:11, 19:47 21:42^a 24:30^a
- ρόμφαία Gen 3:24 Ex 5:21 32:27 Num 22:23
 31:8 Josh 5:12(13) 6:20(21) 8:24 24:12.

25. μάχηρα Ez 5:2,12 26:6,8,9,11,15 28:7,23
30:4,5,6,11,17,21,22 31:17,18 32:12,19,21,23,24,26,27,28,29,
30,31,32, 33:27 35:5,8 38:4,8,21 39:23.

ρομφαία Ez 5:1,2,12,17 6:3,8,11,12 7:15
11:8,10 12:14,16 14:17,21 21:9,11,12,14,15,19,20,28 23:10,25
24:21 29:8,10 30:24,25 30:10,11 33:2,3,4,6.

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

συντάσσω 33(26):2,8 34(27):3(4) 36(29):23
39(32):13,35 41(34):22 44(37):21.

27. καίρος / ην 2:27,28 3:17 4:11 5:24 6:15 8:1,
7,15 10:15 11:12,14,14(MT ην) 14:8,19 15:11,11 18:23 26(46):21
27(50):4,16,20,27,31 28(51):6,18

χρόνος / ην 29:9(49:8) 37(30):7 38(31):1.

28. Biblical Words for Time, ²1969, elaborating a point made by G.B. Caird in The Apostolic Age, p. 184, n. 2.

29. Op. cit., p. 37; for further remarks on the words for "time" in the LXX cf. pp. 125-127.

30. Origen tried to guess at the meaning of the word: ἐπίχειρον ἢ τὸ σκῆπτρον περίστησιν ἢ τοὺς ὑπὸ τὴν ἀγκύνην ἢ τοὺς μισθούτους, ἐπίχειρα γὰρ ὁ μισθός
Ghisler II 841 (not 481 as in Schleusner, Tov, p.83, n. 30).

31. We call these "concluding formulas" because this is their main, though certainly not their only, function, cf. R. Rendorff, ZAW 66 (1954), 28.

32. Again the statistics are based on Ziegler's text which means reading λέγει at 1:19 and 2:3 (against the majority text witnesses), taking 21:7 as a concluding formula by eliminating οὕτως, and considering λέγει κύριος at 23:29 a double reading. The totals include all occurrences of the Gk formula whether or not a corresponding formula is found in the MT.

As often, my figures differ slightly from those of Tov. He lists a total of 71 references for λέγει κύριος; my total is 75 (Tov omits the second occurrence of the formula at 2:19, 3:12 and 38(31):35; also he neglects to mention the occurrences at 8:13 and 25:19). Under the reference for φησὶ κύριος, Tov fails to mention 34:12.

λέγει κύριος 1:8,15,17,19 2:2,3,9,12,17,19,19,22,29
3:1,12,12,13,14,16,20 4:1,9,17 5:1,9,15,18,22,29 6:12 7:11,
19,30,32 8:1,13 9:9,24,25(8,23,24) 13:14,25 15:3,6 16:1,11,
14,16 17:24 19:6,12 21:7 22:5,16,24 23:4,5,23,24,30,33,7
25:19(49:39) 26(46):5,18,23,28 27(50):20,21,31 28(51):24,26,
39,52,53,57 29:14(49:13) 32:17(25:31) 34:18(27:22) 51:35(45:5)

φησὶ κύριος 30(49):2,15 31(48):12,35,38 34:12(27:15)
36(29):23 37(30):3,17,21 38(31):20,27,28,31,32,33,35,35,37(37,
37,36),38 41(34):22 46(39):18 49(42):11

(27:8) εἶπε κύριος 30:5,10(49:5,32) 27(50):30,40 34:6
37(30):8 38(31):1 41(34):5

33. λέγει is changed to φησὶν in sundry MSS at 2:3 3:16 22:16 25:19 28:26 34:18 it is changed to εἶπε in some MSS at 1:8,17,19 19:12 27:31.

φησὶ is changed to λέγει in various MSS at 30:2,15 31:12 36:23 37:3,21 38:27,31,32,35,37,38 49:11, and to εἶπε at 41:22.

εἶπε is changed to λέγει in some MSS at 27:30 34:6 37:8 41:5, and to φησὶν at 27:30 30:10.

When the formula יהוה אמר is missing in the LXX (as it frequently is) it is usually added in the O and L recension (sometimes in conjunction with a few other MSS). The most common form of the addition by far is φησὶν κύριος (65x: 3:10 5:11 7:16 8:17 9:3,6 12:17 13:11 15:9,20 16:15 18:6 21:10,13,14 23:1,2,11,12,28,31,32,32 25:7,9,12,17,18 27:4,20,35 28:48 29:17 30:2,5,8,9 31:15,25,30,43,44,47 32:15 34:9 35:4 36:9,11,14,14,19,19 37:11 38:14,16,17,34 39:5,30,44 40:14 41:17 42:13 46:17 51:29); sometimes we find the form λέγει κύριος (7x: 8:3 15:21 23:29 27:10 28:25,48 36:32); and occasionally even εἶπε κύριος (3x: 8:12 26:25 38:14).

34. Cf. Tov, p. 89, n. 110. In the list of references to εἶπε κύριος as renditions of יהוה אמר Tov neglects to mention 29:19(49:18) and 40(33):11.

35. ἀφανισμός 9:11(10) 10:22 12:11,11 18:16
19:8 25:9,11,12 26(46):19 27(50):3,13,23 28(51):26,29,37,
41,62

ἀβάτος 6:8 12:10 28(51):43 29:14,18(49:13,
17) 30:11(49:33) 31(48):9 32:4,24(25:18,38) 39(32):43
49(42):18 51(44):6,22. Cf. also 30(49):2 (המחשבה לנח)

ἐρημος 2:15 4:27 41(34):22

ἐρήμωσις 4:7

ἐκτασις 5:30

ἀπορία 8:21

ἀπώλεια 30(49):2 51(44):12.

36. ἀφανίζω 12:11 27(50):45

ἀβαστόω 29:21(49:20)

ἐρημόω 10:25 40(33):10

ἐξίστημι 2:12 4:9 18:16

σκυθρωπάζω 19:8 27(50):13.

37. Cf. Reider-Turner, pp. 1 and 37.

38. κατασκηνόω 7:12 17:6 23:6 28(51):13

<u>καταλύω</u>	29:17(49:16) 30:9(49:31) 32:10(25:24)
<u>κατοικίζω</u>	7:3,7
<u>οἰκέω</u>	31(48):28.

39. There is a further difficulty in considering καταλύω a "synonymous rendition" to κατασκηνόω in 29:17(49:16). The sense demanded for καταλύω in the context of 29:17 is that of "destroy" or "demolish" (Bagster: "burst"), rather than that of "lodge" as in the Heb. Is it reasonable to assume that a reviser, anxious to bring the Gk text into better conformity with the Heb, would replace a perfectly logical translation choice (κατασκηνόω) with another word (καταλύω) which in the syntax of the sentence gave it a meaning quite different from that of the Heb?

40. It was, in fact, this passage which Spohn already in 1794 pointed to as indicating different translators (Ieremias vates, p. 9).

41.	<u>νομή</u>	10:25 23:3,10 27(50):7,19,45
	<u>τόπος</u>	29:20(49:19) 32:16(25:30)
	<u>κατάλυσις</u>	29:21(49:20)
	<u>κατάλυμα</u>	40(33):12.
42.	<u>κατὰ πρόσωπον</u>	18:17,20 24:1 27(50):8,44 29:20
(49:19)	33(26):4 37(30):20 38:37(31:36) 41(34):15,18 42	
(35):5,19	43(36):7,9,22 44(37):20 47(40):10 49(42):2 51	
(44):10	52:12,33	
	<u>πρὸ πρόσωπον</u>	9:13(12) 15:1,19 21:8
	<u>εἰς πρόσωπον</u>	30(49):5
	<u>ἐναντίον</u>	1:17 2:22 15:9 18:23 19:7 25:17
(49:37)	47(40):10	
	<u>ἐνώπιον</u>	7:10
	<u>πρότερος</u>	35(28):8,8 41(34):5.
43.	<u>σεῖω</u>	8:16 27(50):46 28(51):29
	<u>φοβέσθαι</u>	29:22(49:21).
44.	<u>ἰσχυρός</u>	5:16 9:23(22) 26(46):5,6 29:23
(49:22)	31(48):14 39(32):12	
	<u>μαχητής</u>	20:11 26(46):9,12,12 27(50):9,36
28(51):30,56		
	<u>δυνατός</u>	48(41):16 50(43):6 51(44):20
	<u>ἀνὴρ</u>	14:9.

45. On p. 5 and p. 20 Tov states that the reviser theory must be correct "by implication" if it can be shown that Thackeray's explanation of the agreements between Jer a' and b' is incorrect.

On p. 6: "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."

On p. 42: "We have attempted to demonstrate in the preceding chapter that Jer a' and b' exhibit many important agreements which make a two-translator theory untenable."

On p. 45: "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'."

46. See his remark on p. 8: "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 . . . the data provided in this chapter can be accommodated to our working hypothesis."

47. On Ch. V, p. 112: "It should be pointed out that this chapter provides no additional proof that Jer b' is a revision rather than a second translation."

On Ch. VI, p. 135: "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."

48. See, for example, Part I of Memory and Manuscript by G. Gerhardsson (Uppsala, 1961) for an interesting study of the role of memory within Judaism.

49. See the note by P.D.M. Turner "ANOIKODOMEIN and Intra-Septuagintal Borrowing", VT 27 (1977), 492-493 as well as other unpublished studies by her along the same lines (e.g. "Unravelling the Internal History of the Septuagint: A New Method Exemplified", paper read at OT Seminar, Cambridge University, Feb. 1977).

50. Tov is forthright about the limitations inherent in his study. For instance, he says, "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 (p. 6). Similarly, "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" (p. 168). Such candor is refreshing.

51. Nor is the case similar to our argument for a pre-Hexaplaric revision underlying the Q text since in the latter instance the argument proceeds entirely from extant MSS readings.

Notes to Chapter 5

1. It was an important part of A.P. Haustoupis' dissertation to show that many of the divergencies attributed to the LXX and MT texts of Jer were simply due to the lack of a trustworthy LXX edition of Jer. Cf. also W. Rudolph's article in ZAW 7 (1930), esp. 272-281.

2. G. Vermes has expressed himself to the effect that unless the matter is dealt with promptly the discovery threatens to become "the academic scandal par excellence of the twentieth century", The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective, 1977, p.24.

3. On 2QJer see DJD, III, 62-69. On 4QJer^a and 4QJer^c Cross comments that they contain a text "with virtually no significant deviations from the traditional text", QHBT, p. 308, a statement which may be verified at least with regard to 4QJer^a in Janzen's Appendix, pp. 174-181. For a discussion of the date (c. 200 B.C.) and orthographic features of 4QJer^a, see Cross JBL 74 (1955), esp. 162-164, BANE, pp. 145-153, and QHBT, p. 316, n. 8. See also D.N. Freedman, Textus 2 (1962), 87-102.

4. The attention of the scholarly community at large was first alerted to the existence of this MS, together with a preliminary publication of part of one fragment in Cross' book, The Ancient Library of Qumran, 1958, p. 139, n. 38 (1961, p. 187, n. 38). The MS is of slightly later date (the Hasmonean period) than 4QJer^a (QHBT, p. 308).

5. It is recognized, of course, that 4QJer^b is not an isolated phenomenon in the entire range of LXX-Qumran studies. The Samuel scrolls from Qumran in particular have furnished evidence for an LXX-type Heb text on a much larger scale than 4QJer^b. By analogy, this would tend to increase our confidence in extrapolating from the small fragments of Jer, but arguments from analogy in these cases have to be handled with caution, as Goshen-Gottstein has reminded us (The Book of Isaiah: Sample Edition with Introduction, 1965, p. 14). Also, D.W. Gooding has made the point that, depending on whether the Heb Vorlage of the LXX of Jer and 4QJer^b are regarded as members of a close-knit Family or merely of a broad text-type, the range in possible agreements between the LXX and 4QJer^b had it survived in full could easily vary anywhere from as high as 95 per cent to, say, 60 per cent (JSS 21 (1976), 23-24).

6. The same point regarding concurrent expansion and contraction was also made by W.G. Lambert and A.R. Millard in their book Atra-ḫasīs: The Babylonian Story of the Flood, 1969, cf. p. 38.

7. The Descent of Manuscripts, Oxford, 1918.

8. The Primitive Text of the Gospels and Acts, Oxford, 1914;
The Acts of the Apostles, Oxford, 1933.

9. Gk renditions of the main introductory formulas:

a) הדבר אשר היה אל ירמיהו מלת יהוה

This formula is rendered literally $\delta \lambda \acute{o} \gamma \omicron \varsigma \delta$
 $\gamma \epsilon \nu \acute{o} \mu \epsilon \nu \omicron \varsigma \pi \rho \acute{o} \varsigma \lambda \epsilon \iota \tau \epsilon \mu \acute{\iota} \alpha \nu \pi \alpha \rho \acute{\alpha} \kappa \upsilon \rho \acute{\iota} \omicron \varsigma$ in 37(30):1,
 41(34):1,8, 42(35):1, also in 11:1, 18:1, 21:1, 39(32):1, 47(40):1,
 but in the latter instances with $\pi \rho \acute{o} \varsigma \lambda \epsilon \iota \tau \epsilon \mu \acute{\iota} \alpha \nu /$
 $\pi \alpha \rho \acute{\alpha} \kappa \upsilon \rho \acute{\iota} \omicron \varsigma$ inverted. On two occasions the same formula is
 found without מלת יהוה and the LXX follows suit in 25:1
 and 51(44):1. On one occasion the formula is entirely missing in
 the Gk along with most of the following verse (for discussion of
 this see pp. 228-229).

b) ויהי דבר יהוה אלי

The construction is rendered literally $\kappa \alpha \iota \epsilon \gamma \acute{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \tau \omicron /$
 $\epsilon \gamma \epsilon \nu \acute{\eta} \theta \eta \lambda \acute{o} \gamma \omicron \varsigma \kappa \upsilon \rho \acute{\iota} \omicron \varsigma \pi \rho \acute{o} \varsigma \mu \epsilon$ in 1:11,13,
 13:8, 18:5, and 24:4. At 1:4 the LXX reads $\pi \rho \acute{o} \varsigma \alpha \acute{\upsilon} \delta \acute{\omicron} \nu$
 instead of $\pi \rho \acute{o} \varsigma \mu \epsilon$. For the omission of the
 formula in 2:1 and 16:1 see p. 228 and pp. 229-230 .

c) ויהי דבר יהוה אל ירמיהו

This formula is identical with the foregoing except that it
 replaces אלי with אל ירמיהו . The normal
 Gk translation, as expected, is $\kappa \alpha \iota \epsilon \gamma \acute{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \tau \omicron / \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \nu \acute{\eta} \theta \eta$
 $\lambda \acute{o} \gamma \omicron \varsigma \kappa \upsilon \rho \acute{\iota} \omicron \varsigma \pi \rho \acute{o} \varsigma \lambda \epsilon \iota \tau \epsilon \mu \acute{\iota} \alpha \nu$ 35(28):12,
 36(29):30, 40(33):1, 41(34):2 (MT adds מלת יהוה which LXX
 omits), 43(36):27, 44(37):6 (MT adds הנביא , om. LXX),
 49(42):7. On two occasions the Gk has $\pi \rho \acute{o} \varsigma \mu \epsilon$ instead
 of $\pi \rho \acute{o} \varsigma \lambda \epsilon \iota \tau \epsilon \mu \acute{\iota} \alpha \nu$ 39(32):26, 42(35):12. The formulas in
 MT 33:19;23 are missing in the LXX as part of the long passage
 vv. 14-26 absent from LXX Jer 40.

d) ויאמר יהוה אלי

This formula is consistently rendered $\kappa \alpha \iota \epsilon \pi \acute{\omicron} \lambda \epsilon \tau \omicron \kappa \upsilon \rho \acute{\iota} \omicron \varsigma$
 $\pi \rho \acute{o} \varsigma \mu \epsilon$ in 1:12,14, 3:6,11, 11:6,9, 13:6, 14:11,14,
 15:1, and 24:3.

e) הדבר אשר דבר/צוה ...

This formula is found in four places in the OAN section of
 the book: 26(46):13, 27(50):1, 28(51):59, and 51:31(45:1), but
 only in the latter instance does the Gk follow the Heb exactly.

f) ... היה הדבר היה (אל ירמיהו) מלת יהוה

There are three closely related headings which contain this
 phrase: 33(26):1, 34(27):1, and 43(36):1. The LXX omits the
 formula in 34(27):1 while it attests minor variants in the other
 two verses. The omission of the introduction in 34(27):1 may be
 related to the problematic mention of יהויקים in MT 27:1
 which contradicts the content of the succeeding verses dealing
 with Zedekiah. The usual approach has been to emend Jehoiakim
 to Zedekiah (with some Heb MSS, Syr, and Arab), but Janzen regards

MT 27:1 secondary from MT 26:1 (p. 14, # 24).

g) Miscellaneous introductory headings are found in 36(29):1, 37(30):4, and 46(39):15 where the LXX follows the MT exactly; in 1:1-2 and 39(32):6 the LXX diverges more significantly.

10. For the Gk translation of these see the preceding chapter, pp. 189-191, notes 16, 17, 18.

11. Missing on its own: 11:22 13:12 18:11 22:30 36(29):25 38:35(31:37) 42(35):19;
Missing as part of a larger context: 17:5 34(27):21 36(29):16,17 40(33):17,20,25.

12. This figure includes the expression כֹּה נָא יְהוָה of MT 9:21. For Gk translations see preceding chapter, p. , n. 32.

13. Missing on its own: 3:10 5:11 7:13 8:3,17 9:3(2),6(5) 12:17 13:11 15:9,20 18:6 21:10,13 23:1,2,11,12,24,28,29, 31,32,32 25:17,18(49:37,38) 27(50):4,10,35 28(51):25 29:17(49:16) 30:5,8,9(49:6,30,31) 31(48):25,30,43,44 32:15(25:29) 34:9(27:11) 36(29):9,11 38(31):14,16,17,34 39(32):44 41(34):17 42(35):13 46(39):17 51(44):29;
Missing as part of a phrase: 9:22(21) 16:5 21:14 25:7,9,12 35(28):4 36(29):14,14,32 39(32):5,30;
Missing as part of verses unrepresented in the LXX: (MT references) 29:19,19 30:10,11 33:14 46:26 48:47 49:6 51:48.

14. Translated by εἰπε κύριος in 6:15
29:19(49:18) + παντοκράτωρ 31(48):8 37(30):3 40(33):11,13 51(44):26.

15. Missing on its own in 30(49):2 and as part of a larger context in 8:12.

16. 6:6,9 9:6,16 19:11 23:15 25:8,28,32 26:18 27:19 33:12 49:7,35 50:33 51:58.

17. 23:16.

18. 11:22 29:17(49:16).

19. 21:4 23:2 40(33):4 49(42):9 41(34):2,13 51:32(45:2) 44(37):7.

20. 11:3 24:5 32:1(25:15) 37(30):2 39(32):36.

21. 13:22.

22. 5:14.

23. 7:21 19:15 27(50):18 28(51):33 31(48):1 35(28):2,14 36(29):8,21 38(31):23 39(32):15 42(35):13,18 49(42):15,18 50(43):10 51(44):11.

24. 7:3 9:15 16:9 19:3 34:3(27:4) 36(29):4 46(39):16
51(44):2,25

25. 32:13(25:27) 39(32):14

26. 34(27):21 36(29):25 42(35):19

27. 42(35):17 45(38):17

28. 51(44):7

29. 5:14 15:16 23:16 27(50):34 28(51):5,57 32:13(25:27)
38:36(31:35) 39(32):14 40(33):11 51(44):7

30. Janzen's statistics in these tables are generally reliable, though it is to be regretted that he seldom gives references, thus making verification difficult. Some corrections, that need to be made are the following:

In Table B.1, in the column labeled "Other",

for 1 Is כה אמר אדני יהוה read כה אמר אדני יהוה
קדש ישראל קדש ישראל

for Ez כה אמר האל יהוה read כה אמר האל יהוה

for 2 Is כה אמר יהוה מלך ישראל read כה אמר יהוה מלך ישראל

" כה אמר אדני יהוה ואלהיך read כה אמר אדני יהוה
יהוה אלהיך

In Table B.3, in the column labeled "Other",

for 2 Is אמר ברחמך יהוה read אמר ברחמך יהוה

On p. 159 in the column labeled "Other",

for והוא יאמר ויהוה read והוא יאמר ויהוה
והוא יאמר ויהוה

Also on p. 159 there are 9 (not 8) occurrences of the formula אמר יהוה in the MT.

According to Janzen's remark on p. 78, the statistics for the divine name are given in Tables B.3, B.4, and B.5. But no tables B.4 and B.5 are found. It seems clear that a title is missing at the top of p. 159 which should read "Table B.4,

אמר יהוה and אמר יהוה In Jeremiah"
(compare B.3 " אמר יהוה and אמר יהוה Outside Jeremiah"). As for Table B.5 there is nothing in Appendix B corresponding to this.

31. All the Eng VSS consulted--except NEB--translate the construction $\text{לִּיְהוָה יִהְיֶה$ in the normal way as indirect object of the infinitive construction לִּיְהוָה יִהְיֶה . NEB, however, takes this as a direct object, "... because the day is upon them when Philistia will be despoiled and Tyre and Sidon destroyed to the last defender". It is difficult to defend the NEB in this translation. Not only is it contrary to normal classical Hebrew usage but, like the LXX, it breaks the unity of the composition by deflecting the poem from its otherwise single-minded preoccupation with the Philistines (was NEB influenced by the LXX?).

32. Such an alliance after 605 B.C. is not otherwise known in historical sources, but its existence is quite plausible (see Bright, AB, p. 310).

33. The Heb is admittedly difficult. Literally it translates, "every survivor, helper". By taking לִּיְהוָה in the sense of "escapee" ("Entronnener") instead of "survivor", Duhm (p. 344) declared the phrase "blanker Unsinn". But this verdict is surely extreme. Volz (p. 302) is much more sober in his estimate that in a passage which is poetically terse, the expression can be taken as a case of asyndetic apposition (cf. GK, 131b,c) and hence proposes the translation "jeden Ubrigen, nämlich Bundesgenossen". The RSV translation "every remaining ally" reflects this reasonable interpretation.

34. Compare the frequent use of κατάλοιποι in vv. 4-7. In v. 4b and v.5 it translates שְׁאֵרֵי ; in v. 7 the Gk phrase $\text{ἐν τοῖς καταλοίποις, ἡπείροθεν αὐτοῦ}$ mysteriously represents MT $\text{שְׁאֵרֵי יְעֲזָבֵהוּ}$, suggesting again a very free use of κατάλοιποι .

35. It has commonly been regarded as a gloss by the commentators, cf. Movers (p. 22), Fried. Delitzsch (Lese und Schreibfehler, p. 137), Schwally (p. 195, n. 3), Giesebrecht (p. 234), Streane (p. 267), Duhm (p. 344), Cornill (p. 460).

36. This explanation was first proposed by Giesebrecht (p. 234).

37. By means of this emendation, Christensen translates "How long will you whirl about, O sword of Yahweh?", omitting הוּא with the LXX. But the emendation following 2QJer must be rejected out of hand; it is completely insensitive to the parallels in Deut 14.1, Jer 16.6, 48.37 cited. Moreover, 2QJer does not endorse the linking of חֶרֶב לַיהוָה with תִּתְּנוּרָהּ since הוּא חֶרֶב is firmly attested by that MS. תִּתְּנוּרָהּ is undoubtedly secondary in 2QJer (cf. the variant יִתְּנוּרָהּ (text יִתְּנוּרָהּ) in some Heb MSS at 5:7). The example is typical of the many arbitrary emendations of the MT in Christensen's work (e.g. in MT 49:3 he emends the Heb in the opposite direction: MT $\text{בְּגִרְיוֹתָ} \rightarrow \text{בְּגִדְיָהּ}$ p. 225). The same spirit prevails in the article, "Jeremiah 49.28-33; An Oracle Against a Proud Desert Power", by W.J. Dumbrell (The Australian Journal of Biblical Archaeology, 2 (1972), 99-109), which acknowledges indebtedness

both to Christensen and Janzen. In the works of Christensen and Dumbrell the ghost of Duhm has reappeared to haunt the interpretation of Jeremiah's poetry. The simple invocation of metri causa is apparently sufficient to justify a multitude of the most arbitrary emendations. From the same school, see the more sober comment by D.K. Stuart, Studies in Early Hebrew Meter, 1976, "Emendation may rarely be attempted metri causa alone" (p. 22). The NEB admits the 2QJer reading יָרַרְרָה תִּתְּנָה into its footnote register, cf. Brockington, p. 213.

38. Contra H.M. Orlinsky, "The Septuagint as Holy Writ and the Philosophy of the Translators", HUCA 26 (1975), 89-114, esp. 109-110.

39. For a discussion of the inner-Gk textual problems associated with the word κατα λείψανον (κα) see Ch. 3 above, pp. 156-7.

40. Rahlfs's retention of σοι following ἡλθον in the body of the text is indefensible on text-critical grounds. See Ch. 3, p. 155.

41. 3:22? (Ziegler emends to οἶδε), 4:24 8:8,9 24:1 25:15(49:35) 27(50):12 29:13,16(49:12,15) 32:15(25:29) 37(30):23 39(32):17,24,27 41(34):2.

42. Participle-verb constructions (26 occurrences): 3:1 4:10 5:11 6:15 7:5,5 10:5 12:16 13:12 14:19 22:4 26(46):28 28(51):58 32:14(25:28) 33(26):15 33(26):19 38(31):18,20 43(36):16,29 44(37):9 45(38):3,17 46(38):18 48(42):10 49(42):19 51(44):17;

Noun-verb constructions (13 occurrences): 9:4(3) 17:24 22:10 23:32 26(46):5 27(50):34? 28(51):56? 31(48):9 33(26):8 39(32):4 41(34):3 45(38):15 47(40):14.

43. Jer α : 11:12 20:15 (Gk has participle only) 23:17,39; Jer β : 29:13(49:12) 32:15(25:29) 48(41):6,15.

In addition to the preceding verses where the Gk attests only half of the Heb inf. abs. construction, there are also two occasions where the Gk omits the entire construction: 13:17 and 49(42):22. Then, of course, there are those occasions where the Gk construction is missing as part of a larger context missing in the LXX: 6:15 11:7 28(51):57 37(30):11 51(44):29. On yet other occasions the Gk translates in anomalous ways, e.g. 6:9,29 8:13 25:30(32:16) 51(44):25(3x). The last mentioned verse has three examples of the Gk infinitive with finite verb, the closest approximation possible to the MT but the worst possible Gk (these examples should be added to the lone instance of this phenomenon discovered by Thackeray in Josh 18:13, "Renderings of the Infinitive Absolute in the LXX", p. 600; Grammar, p. 47). Finally there are those occasions where the Gk has the typical construction associated with a Heb inf. abs. but where it is missing in the MT: 3:1 12:11 22:24 28(51):57 39(32):28 41(34):2.

44. Compare the different vocabulary ἡλθον / καθάρθω and the different constructions, participle-verb/noun-verb.

45. For a useful discussion of the significance of this series in relation to the problem of Deuteronomic prose-form in Jer, see the discussion by H. Weippert, pp. 187-91.

46. Since a series implies more than one, only those passages of two or more terms are included in the above list. However, there are also numerous instances where the same construction is used with only one term, לשמה being the most popular. In the Edom oracle cf. 29:14(49:13) $\text{לְחַרְבוֹתָיִם} / \text{וְיִשְׁמְרוּן} / \text{וְיִשְׁמְרוּן}$ and 29:18(49:17) $\text{וְיִשְׁמְרוּן} / \text{לְחַרְבוֹתָיִם}$. Even where the Heb is lacking the ל prefix, the Gk often translates as though it were present, e.g., 9:11(10) $\text{וְיִשְׁמְרוּן} / \text{לְחַרְבוֹתָיִם}$. On occasions a Gk series is created even where none exists in the Heb, e.g. 30(49):2 $\text{וְיִשְׁמְרוּן} / \text{וְיִשְׁמְרוּן} / \text{וְיִשְׁמְרוּן}$.

47. If לְחַרְבוֹתָיִם is to be regarded as secondary, perhaps the source of the reading is not 25:18--which is after all subsequent to 25:11--but rather the very similar phrase in 7:34 $\text{וְיִשְׁמְרוּן} / \text{וְיִשְׁמְרוּן}$ (cf. 25:11 וְיִשְׁמְרוּן).
(כל הארץ לחרבה לשמה).

48. For another example of the translator's awareness of the contemporary situation, see the discussion on the omission of בְּפִיָּוֹר in 29(47):4, p.64 above. However, the argument from Tendenz is admittedly vulnerable here (i.e. in 32:4(25:18)), since in the very similar passage of 51(44):22, the LXX does attest the translation of

49. Textus 8 (1973), 26.

50. The rendition of לשמה by ἐκ τῆς οὐρανόθεν is irregular since the normal Gk equivalent for לשמה in Jer b' is ἐκ τῆς οὐρανόθεν (Jer a' ἐκ τῆς οὐρανόθεν). The word is indeed found once elsewhere, 30(49):2, apparently as a translation for לשמה but the passage is ambiguous.

51. This is the simplest explanation for the LXX reading וְיִשְׁמְרוּן in this verse.

52. Taking the approach that "Das Nomen לְחַרְבוֹתָיִם (Jer 29:9, 11, 18 44:22 49:13) ist in diesem Zusammenhang auffällig; denn es lässt sich thematisch nur schwer mit den anderen Begriffen zusammenbringen", H. Weippert (p. 189, n. 364) thinks this is the reason why the LXX omitted the verb in 25:11 and why it read לְחַרְבוֹתָיִם instead of לְחַרְבוֹתָיִם in 25:9. She does not comment on the LXX omission of לְחַרְבוֹתָיִם in MT 49:13, but presumably would apply a similar explanation. As has been pointed out, however, it is questionable whether the distinction between לְחַרְבוֹתָיִם and the other terms is as radical as Weippert suggests, and even if it were to exist, it is doubtful that the translator would have been alert to it. לְחַרְבוֹתָיִם is well attested in Jer both on its own as well as in series and relates without great difficulty to the other terms, so that an explanation from Tendenz as the reason for the omission in the Gk does not seem persuasive in these cases.

53. For a discussion of the textual problems connected with the B-S reading $\Theta\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\eta, \sigma\acute{\upsilon}\kappa$ see Ch. 3, pp. 170-172 .

54. Compare the interchange of τ and γ in the parallel passages, Ps 18:11 ($\gamma\iota\gamma\iota$) and 2 Sam 22:11 ($\gamma\iota\gamma\iota$), as well as in the Samaritan variant $\gamma\iota\gamma\iota$ to Deut 28:49 (in the LXX rendered $\sigma\rho\gamma\mu\alpha$).

55. The verb $\gamma\iota\gamma\iota$ occurs only four times in the OT: Deut 28:49, Ps 18:11 and the parallel passages of Jer 48:40 // 49:22. In Deut 28:49 it was translated $\sigma\rho\gamma\mu\alpha$ (see previous note), in Ps 17(18):11 by $\pi\iota\sigma\iota\gamma\mu\iota$, simply repeating the translation of the previous verb $\gamma\iota\gamma\iota$.

56. In the LXX the verses are absent from their MT position within the chapter (i.e. following v. 6) but do appear at the end of the chapter.

57. On account of the different chapter arrangement in the two texts, the omitted portion of the last two doublets cited is the second member of the pair when read in the Gk text only.

58. Janzen cites only eight examples, but he surely intends these to be representative rather than exhaustive. Other examples of larger duplicates that might easily be added are 7:31-32//19:5-6, 16:14-15//23:7-8, 23:5-6//33:15-16, 39:1-10//52:4-16. For useful lists giving most examples of duplicates in Jer, large and small, see Kuenan, p. 253 and Driver, ILOT, p. 259.

59. Since the appearance of Janzen's study, another thesis has been written on the subject (unavailable to me): Y-J. Min, The Minuses and Pluses of the LXX Translation of Jeremiah as Compared with the Massoretic Text, Jeruslaem, 1977.