NOTES AND STUDIES

THE GREEK TRANSLATORS OF JEREMIAH.

IN this note I shall attempt to show (1) that the Greek version of the book of Jeremiah falls into two nearly equal portions, which have been rendered by different translators, possibly from two separate collections of prophecies: (2) that the hand of the translator of the second portion is to be traced in the first part of the book of Baruch: (3) that the first portion of the Greek Jeremiah has a close affinity with the Greek versions of Ezekiel and the minor Prophets, whereas the Greek Isaiah stands outside the group thus formed.

(1) THE TRANSLATORS OF JEREMIAH.

In attempting to prove a plurality of translators in any book or group of books in the LXX, there are two facts in particular which one must bear in mind. The first is that the translators did not, for the most part, rigidly render each Hebrew word by a single Greek equivalent. The rendering varies in the same book and in the same context[1]. Indeed, in the Pentateuch, variety of rendering in the same context seems to be the rule with the translators, who sought thereby to avoid the monotony of the Hebrew[2]. The second fact to be taken into account is the corrupt state of the text, due to the mixture of several types of text, and particularly to the intrusion into the LXX of the renderings of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion from the parallel columns in Origen's Hexapla. If, however, after making due allowance for these two facts, we find that the same Hebrew word is rendered with fair consistency in one way in one part of a book, and in another way in another part, we are justified in inferring a change of translators. And this is what we find in the Greek Jeremiah.

The indications that more than one hand was employed in the rendering of this book into Greek have not escaped notice[3]. But

[1] Swete, *Introd. to O. T.* p. 317.

[2] Thiersch, *De Pentateuchi Vers. Alex. libri tres*, pp. 52 ff. His list of examples might easily be increased. They cannot, I think, be entirely accounted for by Hexaplaric influence.

[3] See e. g. Streane, *The double text of Jeremiah*, p. 1 and *passim*; Workman, *The*

the commentators appear to consider that this variety of rendering is spread over the whole translation, and have failed, so far as I am aware, to observe that the change in style and vocabulary takes place at a definite point in the middle of the book. I find that the two portions of the translation are composed of chaps. i–xxviii (according to the Greek arrangement of chapters) and chaps. xxix–li, which I shall call respectively Jeremiah *α* and Jeremiah *β*. The final chapter lii forms an appendix and the Greek is probably by a third hand (*γ*): of this I will speak later. It will be worth while to indicate by a rough plan the portions into which the Greek translation falls and the different arrangement of matter in the Greek and in the Hebrew.

	Greek.	*Hebrew.*
α.	(1) i–xxv 13 Prophecies mostly of an early date, forming the oldest nucleus (i–xx): prophecies of various dates against kings of Judah and false prophets (xxi–xxv 13).	i–xxv 14 = *α* (1) of Greek
	(2) xxv 14–xxviii. Against Elam, Egypt, Babylon	xxv 15–xlv = *β* (2) of Greek
β.	(1) xxix–xxxi. Philistines, Edom, Ammon, Kedar, Damascus, Moab	
	(2) xxxii–li. Summary list of the nations to whom 'the cup of fury' is to be sent. Prophecies mostly of the period preceding the taking of Jerusalem intermixed with history of the same period. Supplementary prophecy to Baruch (li).	xlvi–li = *α* (2), *β* (1) of Greek, the prophecies being in this order: Egypt, Philistines, Moab, Ammon, Edom, Damascus, Kedar and Hazor, Elam, Babylon
γ.	lii Historical Appendix (= 2 Kings xxiv, xxv)	lii = *γ* of the Greek.

It will be seen that, in regard to *structure*, the difference between the Greek and Hebrew texts consists in the position assigned to the group of prophecies against the foreign nations, and the arrangement of these prophecies among themselves. In the Greek they are placed in the middle of the book, immediately after the words in xxv 13, 'And I will bring on that land [Babylon] all my words which I have pronounced

text of Jeremiah, p. xxvii 'Although in general this book is characterized by great consistency in the use of many specific terms, yet sufficient irregularity appears in certain portions of it to justify the supposition that several persons were employed in making the Greek version'; Kneucker, *Das Buch Baruch*, p. 83 (note), remarks that the Greek of Jeremiah 'appears to be translated by at least two hands'; Scholz, *Der masoret. Text u. die LXX Uebersetzung des Buches Jeremias*, p. 14, gives a useful list of examples; Frankl, *Studien über die Septuaginta u. Peschito zu Jeremia*, pp. 5 ff.

against it, even all that is written in this book'; in the Hebrew they are relegated to the end of the book, being followed only by the historical appendix. In the Greek they appear to be arranged according to no system; in the Hebrew they are arranged in an orderly geographical sequence, beginning with Egypt and continuing eastwards to Babylon. There are, of course, also considerable differences of *text* between the Greek and Hebrew books, the Greek text being much the shorter of the two; into these differences I do not propose to enter.

As regards the divisions into which the Greek translation falls, it may be noted at once that the break does not come at the point (xxv 13) where the Hebrew and Greek arrangement of chapters diverges, but rather later. 'Jeremiah α' includes a small group of three prophecies against foreign nations.

In the following table I give the renderings of various Hebrew words and phrases in the two parts of the translation, placing first those which most clearly indicate the point where the break comes. Some of the instances are selected from the list of Hebrew expressions characteristic of Jeremiah given by Dr. Driver[1]. I have placed in square brackets those passages where an α rendering occurs also in the β portion or *vice versa*, and have generally noted the renderings of the Hebrew word in the other prophetical books of the LXX. The references, where it seemed necessary to give them, are to the chapters and verses of the Greek text as edited by Dr. Swete.

TABLE I.

Hebrew	*Jeremiah* α (i–xxviii)	*Jeremiah* β (xxix–li)
1. כה אמר יהוה	τάδε λέγει Κύριος *passim* about 60 times in chaps. ii–xxviii [Also xxix 1, 8, 13 AQ] So Is. Ez. Min.	οὕτως εἶπεν Κύριος *passim* about 70 times (xxx 1–li 34) τάδε εἶπεν K. xxix 13 B

In chap. xxix we thus get a combination of the α and β renderings, and two instances of the α rendering. It might be thought from this instance that we should place the break in the middle of chap. xxix. Other usages, however, go to show that no part of that chapter belonged to the α portion. A certain amount of mixture of the two vocabularies is seen in the three opening chapters (xxix-xxxi) of the β portion. Apart from these passages in chap. xxix, ὅδε does not occur in Jer. β, except as an equivalent for the similar-sounding הידד (xxxi 33 αἵδε, xxxii 16 οἵδε), where the Greek may be a corruption of an original transliteration αἰδάδ.

[1] *Introd. to O. T.*[3] pp. 257 ff.

Hebrew	*Jeremiah α* (i–xxviii)	*Jeremiah β* (xxix–li)
2. 'to make desolate'	τάσσειν εἰς ἀφανισμόν	τιθέναι (διδόναι) εἰς ἄβατον
(שׁוּם) שׁוֹם	τάσσειν 8 times ii 15–xix 8 Ez.[12] Min.[14] (not Is. thus)	[τιθέναι, διδόναι occur in both groups]
(שׁמּה) שׁמה	ἀφανισμός 18 times ix 11–xxviii 62 Ez.[10] Min.[14] (not Is.)	ἄβατος (-ον) 13 times xxix 14–li 22

The word ἄβατος occurs four times in α, but always as an adj. with γῆ or ἔρημος; in β (except in two passages) it is used almost as an abstract noun. Cf. the verb ἀβατοῦν xxix 21.

3. (יושׁב) מאין 'without (inhabitant)'	διὰ τὸ μὴ ὑπάρχειν vii 32 (τόπον) xxvi 19 (κατοικοῦντας) καὶ μὴ κατοικεῖσθαι αὐτήν xxviii 29	ἀπὸ ἐνοικούντων xxxi 9 A (πόθεν ἔνοικος of B is a corruption) xxxiii 9 A (ἀπὸ κατ. B) li 2 A Q* (ἀπὸ ἐνοίκων B)
	παρὰ τὸ μὴ κατοικεῖσθαι iv 7 (παρὰ τὸ μὴ ii 15, ix 10 ff. = מבלי) cf. Zeph. iii 6 παρὰ τὸ μηδένα ὑπ. μηδὲ κατοικεῖν	ἀπὸ κατοικούντων xli 22 [παρὰ τὸ μὴ εἶναι xl 10, 12]

Under this head it may be noted that the verbs ὑπάρχειν and ἐνοικεῖν are confined respectively to Jer. α and Jer. β.

	ὑπάρχειν iv 14, v 13, vii 32, xxvi 19, xxvii 20	ἐνοικεῖν xxix 2 A, 19, xxx 1, xxxi 9 A, xxxiii 9 A, xxxiv 9, xxxviii 24, xlix 17, li 2 A, 8 אA
4. יצת hi.	ἀνάψω πῦρ καὶ καταφάγεται (ἕδεται) xvii 27, xxi 14, xxvii 32 ἀνάπτειν also in chaps. ix, xi, xxi, xxvii [xxxi 9 A] Lam. Ez. Min.	καύσω πῦρ καὶ καταφ. xxx 16 καίειν renders different Hebrew words in α and in β
5. לקח מוסר	δέξασθαι παιδείαν ii 30, v 3, vii 28, xvii 23 Zeph.[2]	λαβεῖν παιδείαν xxxix 33, xlii 13
6. רפא	ἰᾶσθαι[7] (chaps. iii, vi, xv, xvii, xix, xxviii) Lam. Min.	ἰατρεύειν[4] (chaps. xxxvii, xl). [Also xxviii 9 ἰατρεύσαμεν . . . καὶ οὐκ ἰάθη]

Hebrew	*Jeremiah* α (i–xxviii)	*Jeremiah* β (xxix–li)
7. עת	καιρός[27] (from ii 27 to xxviii 18)	χρόνος xxix 8, xxxvii 7, xxxviii 1 (xlv 28 =יום)
8. שכן	κατασκηνοῦν[4] (vii 12, xvii 6, xxiii 6, xxviii 13)	καταλύειν (chaps. xxix, xxx, xxxii)
9. נוה (מרעית)	νομή[8] (chaps. x, xxiii, xxvii) ? τρίβος ix 10	τόπος [xxvii 44 AQ=] xxix 20, xxxii 16 κατάλυμα xl 12 κατάλυσις xxix 21
10. נגב	νότος xiii 19 (πόλ. αἱ πρὸς νότ.), xvii 26	νάγεβ xxxix 44=xl 13 (ἐν πόλεσιν τῆς ν.)
11. כעס hi.	παροργίζειν vii 18 f., viii 19, xi 17, xxv 6 Ez.[5] Min.[3]	πικραίνειν xxxix 32 B, xl 9, xliv 15 παραπικραίνειν xxxix 29, 32 אA
12. 'his soul shall be for a prey' (שלל)	ἔσται ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτῷ εἰς σκῦλα xxi 9 (cf. εἰς προνομήν xxvii 10)	ἔσται ἡ ψ. (αὐτοῦ) εἰς εὕρεμα xlv 2, xlvi 18, li 35
13. שדד	ταλαιπωρεῖν iv 13 (οὐαὶ ἡμῖν ὅτι ταλαιπωροῦμεν), 20 *bis*, ix 19, x 20 (ἐταλαιπώρησεν, ὤλετο: a doublet), xii 12 (xxviii 48 Q[mg]) Min.[7]	ὄλλυσθαι xxix 11, xxx 3, xxxi 1 (οὐαὶ ἐπὶ N. ὅτι ὤλετο), 15, 18, 20, xxxviii 2 Verb only elsewhere in Job and Prov. ? πλήσσειν xxx 6 Q
	[ὀλεθρεύειν, ἐξολεθρεύειν are used in both parts to render this word, ὀλ. in v. 6, xxxii 22, ἐξολ. in xxviii 53, 55, xxix 4]	
שד, שדד	ταλαιπωρία (iv 20=שבר), vi 7, 26 (ἥξει ταλ.), xv 8, xx 8, xxviii 35, 56 Ez.[1] Min.[8]	ὄλεθρος xxxi 3, 8 (ἥξει ὄλ.), 32
14. שמחה ששון	χαρά xv 16, xvi 9, xxv 10	χαρμοσύνη (χαρμονή) xxxi 33 (-μονή א[c.a] Q), xxxviii 13 Q (-μονή Bא), xl 11 (-μονή A)

In the following instances the distinction between the two portions of the book is not quite so well marked. We here find one of two renderings confined to the α or β portion, while the second is represented throughout the book; and again we have some peculiar rendering, almost

if not quite unique in the LXX, confined to the chapters xxix–xxxviii, while the *a* rendering reappears towards the end of the *β* portion.

Hebrew	*Jeremiah a*	*Jeremiah β*
15. זרוע	βραχίων xvii 5, xxi 25, xxviii 14 [xxxix 17, 21]	τὸ ἐπίχειρον (='arm') xxxi 25, xxxiv 4 (βραχ. Q) The Lexicons (Schleusner excepted) only quote the plural, meaning 'wages.' In the only other passage where the word occurs in the LXX (2 Macc. xv 33 τὰ ἐπίχειρα τῆς ἀνοίας) the context makes it probable that the meaning intended is 'arm' (Vulg. *manum*)
16. Various	διασκορπίζειν[10] (from ix 16 to xxviii 23)	[διασπείρειν in both parts]
17. 'my servants' (the prophets: עבד)	δοῦλοί μου vii 25, xxv 4, xxvi 26 (δ. μου Ἰακώβ) Ez.[5] Min.[6] Is. (last part)	παῖδές μου [xxvi 28 παῖς μου Ἰακώβ] xxxiii 5, xlii 15 BN (δουλ. AQ) li 4 (δουλ. A) Bar.[5] Is. (i–lii) *pass.* not in Ez. Min.
18. usu. פקד	ἐκδικεῖν only in *a* 16 times (v 9–xxviii 52) Ez.[9] Min.[21]	[ἐπισκέπτεσθαι throughout the book, 9 times in each part]
usu. נקמה	ἐκδίκησις only in *a* 12 times Ez.[pass.] Min.[3]	Ez.[4] Min.[7]
19. צוה	[ἐντέλλεσθαι in both parts, a^{16}, β^{11}] Ez. Min.	συντάσσειν 8 times (chaps. xxxiii–xliv) not in Ez. Min.
20. הנני מביא	ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐπάγω v 15, vi 19, xi 11, xix 3, 15 [li 35]	ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ φέρω xxx 5, xlii 17, xlvi 16 ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἄγω xxxviii 8
21. דֶּבֶר	θάνατος xiv 12, xxi 6, 7, xxiv 10 [xli 17, li 13 A]	ἀποστολή xxxix 36 (ἐν μαχαίρᾳ καὶ ἐν λιμῷ καὶ ἐν ἀπ.)

Hebrew	*Jeremiah α*	*Jeremiah β*
		Only else thus in Bar. ii 25 ἐν λιμῷ καὶ ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ καὶ ἐν ἀπ.
22. דבר pi. (שאן)	[λαλεῖν throughout the book]	χρηματίζειν (of utterances of God and of His prophets) xxxii 16 *bis*, xxxiii 2 *bis*, xxxvi 23, xxxvii 2, xliii 2 AQ^{mg} (λαλ. Bא), 4 AQ (λαλ. Bא)
23. נחם ni.	μετανοεῖν iv 28, viii 6, xviii 8, 10 [xxxviii 19] Min.	παύεσθαι (ἀπό) xxxiii 3, 13, 19, xxxviii 15 (ἐπί) B* (παρακληθῆναι al.) ἀναπαύεσθαι (ἐπί) (ἀπό אA) xlix 10. Verb used four times in the β portion
24. רע	πλησίον 13 times in chaps. v–xxvi [xxxviii 34 A = אח. xli 15, 17, xliii 16] Is. Ez. Min. &c.	πολίτης (= 'fellow-citizen') xxxvi 23, xxxviii 34 Only else in Prov.[3]
25. נביא	[προφήτης *passim* in both parts]	ψευδοπροφήτης ('Midrashic,' Streane) [vi 13], xxxiii 7, 8, 11, 16, xxxiv 7, xxxv 1, xxxvi 1, 8 Only else in Zech.[1]
26. למען	[ἵνα in both parts]	πρὸς τό only in xxxiv 12, xxxix 29, 35, xliii 25
27. לבלתי	[τοῦ μή in both parts]	πρὸς τὸ μή only in xxxix 40, xli 9, xlii 8 f, 14, xlv 26, xlix 13, li 5, 7
28.	Anarthrous infinitive rare: inf. with τοῦ usual.	Anarthrous inf. common, but inf. with τοῦ is also used, esp. from chap. xxxix onwards.

This list of instances may be considered needlessly long; it might easily be increased. A glance at any part of the Oxford Concordance will show numerous examples of words which are represented only up to the end of the twenty-eighth chapter, and of others which only make their appearance after that point[1]. There is not, indeed, as we have seen, quite the same uniformity of rendering in the β portion as there is in the α portion. But I think it will be admitted that it has been established beyond a doubt that that point marks the end of one translator's work and the beginning of the work of a second.

The only other explanation which might conceivably account for the facts is that of Hexaplaric influence. The words used in Jer. α generally have some Hexaplaric support, whereas those in Jer. β do not. It might be argued that, owing to the different arrangement of chapters in the Greek and the Hebrew, the Greek text had been revised or corrupted up to a certain point only by the Hexapla, and that the Hexaplaric rendering, at first written in the margin, had then ousted the original Septuagint rendering. But, as we have seen, the point where the vocabulary alters is not the point where the Greek and Hebrew arrangement of chapters diverges. Nor is it at all probable that, if such a revision or corruption took place, the Hexaplaric readings should have so entirely superseded the original text. That the influence of the Hexapla will not account for the facts may, I think, be shown by a single instance. Aquila renders עת by καιρός in the first half of the book, but at xxxvii 7 he with Symmachus agrees with the LXX in reading χρόνος. Such an alteration in a translator who is usually consistent can only be due to his following his LXX text, which therefore presumably contained the same double vocabulary which we find in our text. Moreover, the difference in the vocabulary of the two parts existed in the Greek text from which the Old Latin version was made. That version, for instance, has 'Haec dicit Dominus' in the earlier chapters, 'Sic dicit Dominus' in the later (cf. Tyconius, *Rules*, ed. Burkitt, p. 49 with p. 53).

If it is granted, then, that the evidence clearly points to the Greek Jeremiah being the work of at least two translators, we may go on to inquire whether any reason can be traced to account for this division of labour. Do the translations form parts of a single undertaking, or are they quite independent renderings, possibly separated by some distance of time, and afterwards welded into a single whole? Was the Hebrew Jeremiah,

[1] Among the α words may be noted ἀσεβεῖν[4] and ἀσέβεια[2], διαφθείρειν[11] and διαφθορά[4], δοκιμάζειν[7] and δοκιμαστός[1], κακία[16], κακοποιεῖν[2], κάκωσις[3], καταδυναστεύειν[4], κληρονομία[11], σοφός[7], ὡσεί[7]. Of β words attention may be called to ἀποκλαίεσθαι[2], ἀποτρέχειν[3] (xli–xlvii), βομβεῖν[2], γένος[6], δύναμις[25] (α[4]), δυνατός[4] (from xxxix), ἡγεμών[11] (from xlv = שׂ, elsewhere rendered ἄρχων), καθά[4] (from xxxix), φόβος[7] (xxx–xxxix).

for the purposes of translation, divided more or less at haphazard into two nearly equal parts, which were then assigned to different translators? In favour of a haphazard division may be urged the parallel case of the LXX of Ezekiel. Since I first became aware of the distinction between the two portions of the Greek Jeremiah, further investigation has revealed the interesting fact that the LXX of Ezekiel also is not homogeneous. Here again the hand of a second translator makes its appearance half-way through the book, in the middle of the long prophecy against Tyre. This second hand begins at Ezek. xxviii 1 and continues to the end of Ezek. xxxix, where the first hand apparently resumes the task. The proofs of this statement must be reserved till later. It is sufficient to note here the remarkable fact that a break occurs at almost the same point in the Greek versions of each of these two prophetical books. The facts are, however, not quite identical in the two cases. In Jeremiah the work of the first translator seems to represent a distinct whole; he ends with the denunciation of Babylon, a section which, when the chapters came to be rearranged (as I believe they were) by the Massoretes, was still kept as the most suitable conclusion for the whole book. There are, as we shall see, other phenomena to be accounted for here, and it may be argued that the division in this case was not merely an arrangement made for convenience and expedition in translation, but that we have in the LXX of Jeremiah a testimony to at least two collections of his prophecies.

I have suggested that the evidence points to the existence of *at least two* collections of prophecies of Jeremiah. For the portion which I have called Jeremiah β almost certainly embraces more than one collection of *Hebrew* matter, and it is just possible that some of these smaller collections had been rendered into Greek independently, and that these earlier renderings were made use of by the redactor of the whole Greek collection 'Jeremiah β.' Roughly speaking, the subdivisions of Jeremiah β may be said to be (1) xxix–xxxi, (2) xxxii–xxxviii, (3) xxxix–li. (1) is the second group of prophecies against foreign nations. This group forms a kind of link between the two collections. While there is a general agreement with the β vocabulary, many of the words characteristic of the α portion also reappear. But it may be noted that the use of these words is often differentiated in some way from their use in α, as if the translator of chapters xxix–xxxi had read the existing rendering of the first twenty-eight chapters, and had imitated its vocabulary. An instance of this is the use of the word *τραμία [1] (xxix 17 τραμία καρδίας, xxx 4 θύγατερ τραμίας), which is confined in the LXX to these chapters. The word *τραμός, as the rendering of אבור, is confined in the LXX

[1] I use an asterisk to denote that a word occurs in the LXX only in the passages referred to.

to Jeremiah *a* (vi 23, xxvii 42). The substantive is due to imitation of Jeremiah *a*: it does not appear to be due to identity of translator, because the equivalent in *a* for שובב, rendered (*θύγατερ*) *ἰταμίας* in xxx 4, is (*υἱοὶ*) *ἀφεστηκότες* (iii 14) or *ἐπιστρέφοντες* (iii 22). Other instances of *a* words occurring in *β* (1) are **ἄμφοδον* (xvii 27, xxx 27), **συμψᾶν* (xxii 19, xxix 21, xxxi 33), *τρυμαλιά* (a^2 and, representing another Hebrew word, xxix 17). But I cannot claim to have satisfactorily worked out the divisions of the second half of Jeremiah in the Greek, if such exist: and it is possible to carry such arguments from style too far. The two main divisions of the book are well marked, and a certain amount of mixture of the two styles was inevitable when they came to be welded together, and the difference of the styles was noted by redactors or scribes.

Turning to the question of the priority of the Hebrew or Greek text in the position and arrangement of the 'foreign nations,' I would call attention to certain introductory clauses and editorial notes occurring in the Massoretic text (and partially in the LXX), which, I believe, find their true explanation in the arrangement of chapters in the Greek text. These are as follows:—

Hebrew	*Greek*
xlvi 1. The word of the Lord which came to Jeremiah the prophet concerning the nations.	xxv 14
Of Egypt: concerning the army of Pharaoh-neco, &c.	xxvi 2
13. The word that the Lord spake to J. the prophet, how that Neb. king of Bab. should come and smite the land of Egypt.	xxvi 13
xlvii 1. The word of the Lord that came to J. the prophet concerning the Philistines, before that Pharaoh smote Gaza.	xxix 1 (beginning of Jer. *β*) *Ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀλλοφύλους*
xlviii 1. Of Moab.	xxxi 1
47. *Thus far is the judgement of Moab.*	(not in the Greek: Moab is the last of the nations in the LXX)
xlix 1. Of the children of Ammon.	xxx 1
7. Of Edom.	xxix 8
23. Of Damascus.	xxx 12
28. Of Kedar and of the kingdoms of Hazor which Neb. king of Bab. smote.	xxx 6
34. The word of the Lord that came to J. the prophet concerning Elam in the beginning of the reign of Zedekiah king of Judah.	xxvi 1

Hebrew	*Greek*
l 1. The word that the Lord spake concerning Babylon, concerning the land of the Chaldaeans, by J. the prophet.	xxvii 1
li 64. *Thus far are the words of Jeremiah.*	(clause not in the Greek; end of Jeremiah α)

The points to which I would call attention are (1) that the introductory clause, 'The word of the Lord which came' or 'the word that the Lord spake' is only found in the case of the three prophecies (Elam, Egypt, Babylon), which belong to Jeremiah α, and (in the Hebrew, but not in the LXX) in the section concerning the Philistines which opens Jeremiah β: (2) that the two glosses in the M. T., no doubt emanating from the same hand, which indicate the end of the judgement of Moab and the end of the words of Jeremiah, coincide in the Greek with the close of the second group of foreign nations, and with the close of Jeremiah α respectively. The inference to be drawn from this is that the section-headings came into existence when the chapters were arranged as in the LXX, and that the LXX arrangement, explaining, as it does, these short prologues and epilogues, is older than the arrangement of the M. T.

It is somewhat remarkable that at the very point in the Greek, at the close of the denunciation of Babylon, where we have found that the vocabulary alters, the M. T. appends the words, 'And they shall be weary. Thus far are the words of Jeremiah.' It is true that in the M. T. the denunciation of Babylon is placed practically at the close of the whole book, being followed only by the historical appendix (chap. lii), which appears to be taken from the end of the second book of Kings. The note would therefore appear to stand in an appropriate place in the M. T., and to indicate that, in the opinion of the editor or redactor who added it, this historical appendix was no part of the work of Jeremiah (Streane, *Camb. Bible*: Payne Smith, *Speaker's Commentary*). The words 'And they shall be weary' are out of place here, but they occur just before in verse 58; this would seem to show that at one time the note occurred after verse 58, and that the brief notice of the sending of the book of 'the words that are written concerning Babylon' to that city, and the symbolical sinking of it in the river Euphrates was, along with chapter lii, excluded by the editor from the writings properly belonging to Jeremiah (see Streane, *Double text*, p. 305: Driver, *Introduction*[8], p. 252). But the scholion must be considered together with the only other note of the kind which we find in the whole book, namely that occurring in the M. T. at the end of chap. xlviii Heb. (xxxi Greek) 'Thus far is the judgement of Moab.' There is no

particular reason in the M. T. why the close of the prophecy against Moab, which there stands third among the prophecies against the nations, should be so carefully marked. But, as we have seen, in the Greek Moab is the last of the nations. Since, then, we have found that the subscription to the Moab prophecy is more intelligible with the LXX order of chapters, I venture to think that the explanation of the similar note at the end of the Babylon prophecy is also to be sought in the LXX.

The theory, then, which I would tentatively suggest to account for the facts is as follows. In the third century B.C. the prophecies of Jeremiah had been collected into two main groups. The first of these (i–xxviii in the Greek) comprised prophecies mostly of an early date, to which had been appended the prophecies directed against the three world-powers Elam, Egypt, and Babylon. The second (xxxii–li in the Greek) contained the prophecies and historical narratives for the most part belonging to the latter part of Jeremiah's life, and referring to the capture and the events preceding the capture of Jerusalem. The second collection was specially connected with Baruch; it closed with the brief prophecy addressed to him, and the older portion of the book of Baruch was attached to it by way of appendix. The prophecies against the lesser nations probably at first circulated separately, and were afterwards grouped together without regard to systematic arrangement and prefixed to the second collection. When the Greek translation of the prophetical books was undertaken, at Alexandria, probably in the second century B.C., these two main collections had not yet become united. The two Hebrew collections were rendered by different translators. These translations may have been made at the same time as parts of a single undertaking, or possibly the second translation may have been made at a slightly later date than the first. But it is not necessary to suppose that the *Greek* Jeremiah was ever in circulation in the form of two distinct books. The second translator's work would probably, as soon as it was made, be attached to the other portion. The second collection was rendered from a text considerably shorter than the Massoretic text[1] by an unskilled translator[2], employing a peculiar phraseology, which is illustrated most often (where any Biblical illustration is found at all) by the sapiential and other late books of the LXX. In the second group of foreign nations (xxix–xxxi) he seems to have had before him a Greek translation made by some one who was acquainted with the first collection (i–xxviii), and to have incorporated it with slight alteration in his own work. The note 'hitherto are the words of Jeremiah'

[1] The divergences between Hebrew and Greek are most marked in the second half of Jeremiah, especially in chaps. xxxiv–xxxvi (Streane, *Double text*, p. 194).

[2] Streane, *ibid.* p. 211.

was added at the end of the first Hebrew collection whilst it still circulated as a separate book, and a similar note was appended at the end of the group of prophecies against the lesser nations. When the collections were fused together, these notes remained in some copies of the Hebrew text. The Massoretes, finding the first of these glosses standing in the middle of the book, naturally supposed that there had been a disarrangement of subject-matter and transported the denunciation of Babylon to the close of the whole book. This carried with it the rest of the prophecies on foreign nations, and the opportunity was at the same time taken to rearrange these in a more systematic order.

I am aware that the latter part of this theory, as regards the editorial note in chap. xxviii (li), is open to objection, but some such theory is required to account for the facts. My proposed solution explains the somewhat singular fact that a fresh translator begins at the very point where a note in the M. T. states that the prophecy ends, and it offers an explanation of the relegation of the 'foreign nations' to the end of the book in the M. T. It does not, it is true, carry us back to the earliest collections of Jeremiah's prophecies. The prophecy on Babylon, which closes the first collection, was, according to all recent critics, not the work of Jeremiah (see e. g. Driver, *Introduction*[2], pp. 250 ff.). It may be noticed that each group has its appropriate conclusion. The first ended with the anathema upon Babylon and the story of the symbolical act by which its doom was foretold. The second ended with the prophecy to Baruch, the scribe and reputed literary executor of the prophet.

The theory that our book of Jeremiah is a compilation from older collections is no new one. The opening verses of the book, as commentators point out, bear witness to its gradual growth. 'The words of Jeremiah . . . to whom the word of the Lord came in the days of Josiah the son of Amon, king of Judah, in the thirteenth year of his reign. It came also in the days of Jehoiakim the son of Josiah, king of Judah, unto the end of the eleventh year of Zedekiah the son of Josiah, king of Judah; unto the carrying away of Jerusalem captive in the fifth month' (i 1–3). The third verse or the last part of it may have been added when the two main collections were united[1]. Dr. Driver says 'the large amount of variation between the LXX and the Massoretic text may be most readily explained by the supposition that in some cases Jeremiah's writings were in circulation for a while *as single prophecies, or small groups of prophecies*, in which variations might more easily arise than after they were collected into a volume' (*Introd.* 254 f.).

Nor is the theory of two (or three) main collections entirely new,

[1] Bertholdt regards the verses as introductory to the first twenty-four chapters only. But verse 3 b finds its explanation in xlvi 2, lii 5, 12.

though the passages which have been adduced from Josephus and Rabbinical writings to support it are of very doubtful validity.

Already in the eighteenth century J. G. Eichhorn had been led by the differences between the arrangement of chapters in the Hebrew and the LXX to maintain that the prophecies of Jeremiah were divided into two books. These consisted, according to Eichhorn, of (1) chaps. i–xxiv (of the Greek) followed by the 'foreign nations' group and (2) chaps. xxxii–li: he thus included the whole of the 'foreign nations' group in the first book[1]. Eichhorn's theory was followed in the main by Bertholdt[2]. The latter critic writes (op. cit. pp. 1457 f.) 'There are some very clear traces to hand that before the bringing together and editing of the present book of Jeremiah three separate collections of these were already in existence, and that by the conglomeration (*Zusammenfügung*) of these with the addition of a few separate pieces the present book has arisen, and moreover in a twofold form, as represented in the Hebrew text and in the Alexandrian version. Down to Origen's time the prophecies of Jeremiah according to the Alexandrian version consisted of two distinct parts, of which the first comprised chaps. i–xxiv, and the second the rest of the book in the order of the Alexandrian version. Hence Josephus speaks of two books of prophecies of Jeremiah.' He goes on to argue that the division was not first made by the Greek translators, but was found by them in their Hebrew original. His *three* earlier collections are (1) chaps. i–xxiv, (2) the foreign nations (two different collections made in different places), (3) chaps. xxxii–li; the later additions were chaps. xxv 1–13 and xxxii (=xxv 15–38 of the Heb.). I cannot find what evidence Eichhorn and Bertholdt adduce for the statement that a twofold division existed in the LXX down to Origen's time. But the theory of such a division finds a remarkable confirmation in the double vocabulary, which appears to have escaped their notice. This confirmatory evidence is a strong testimony to the acuteness of these older critics.

The passage in Josephus, on which both Eichhorn and Bertholdt rely, occurs in *Ant. Iud.* x 5. 1. After describing the death of Josiah the historian proceeds: *Ἱερεμίας δὲ ὁ προφήτης ἐπικήδειον αὐτοῦ συνέταξε μέλος [θρηνητικόν], ὃ καὶ μέχρι νῦν διαμένει. οὗτος ὁ προφήτης καὶ τὰ μέλλοντα τῇ πόλει δεινὰ προεκήρυξεν ἐν γράμμασι καταλιπὼν καὶ τὴν νῦν ἐφ' ἡμῶν γενομένην*

[1] *Repertorium für biblische u. morgenländische Litteratur*, Leipzig, 1777, pp. 160 ff.; Eichhorn, *Einl. in das A. T.*, Leipzig, 1803, pt. iii, pp. 146 ff. See also *Encyc. Bibl.* vol. ii, art. 'Jeremiah' (to which I owe these references). The writer of that article seems to be wrong in giving Eichhorn's divisions as chaps. i–xxiv and xxv–lii.

[2] *Historisch-kritische Einleitung in . . . Schriften des A. u. N. T.*, Erlangen, 1813, pt. ii, pp. 1411–78.

ἅλωσιν τήν τε Βαβυλῶνος αἵρεσιν. οὐ μόνον δὲ οὗτος προεθέσπισε ταῦτα τοῖς ὄχλοις, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ προφήτης Ἰεζεκίηλος, ὃς [ὅς om. SLVE Lat.] πρῶτος περὶ τούτων δύο βίβλους γράψας κατέλιπεν. ἦσαν δὲ οἱ δύο τῷ γένει ἱερεῖς, ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν Ἱερεμίας ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις διῆγεν κ.τ.λ. The passage appears to state that *Ezekiel* wrote two books concerning the captivity and the fate of Babylon, and that he wrote before Jeremiah (πρῶτος). But the difficulty of this interpretation is that Josephus could not have considered Ezekiel the earlier writer of the two, nor can the reference be to the early division of Ezekiel into chaps. i–xxxix and xl–xlviii, as the latter chapters contain no reference to the exile. The writer of the article 'Jeremiah' in the *Encyl. Bibl.* thinks it probable that the words are a later gloss, but the phrase γράψας κατέλιπεν recalls the style of the historian rather than of the glossator. The difficulty of referring thè words to Ezekiel has convinced Eichhorn and Bertholdt that Jeremiah is the subject of the verb κατέλιπεν. Eichhorn would accordingly regard οὐ μόνον δὲ . . . Ἰεζεκίηλος as a parenthesis. The meaning of the passage is very obscure, and it can only be adduced with very great hesitation in support of the theory of the division of Jeremiah into two books. Still, in the absence of any satisfactory explanation of the words as referred to Ezekiel, I should be inclined to think that Eichhorn's explanation is not impossible, either adopting his punctuation or regarding ὃς πρῶτος as a corruption.

A passage in the Midrash entitled 'Sifré,' a commentary on Numbers and Deuteronomy dating from the second century A.D.[1], has also been quoted in support of the theory which is here advocated. Edersheim in his article on Josephus in the *Dict. of Christian Biography* (vol. iii, p. 454), after referring to the passage in Josephus which we have been considering, says, 'A similar arrangement of Jeremiah into two books is also mentioned in Jewish tradition (Sifré, ed. Friedmann, 64 a), although it is difficult to explain the division, as the Rabbinists do, on the same ground as that of the book of Ezekiel' (i. e. as a division of the prophecies into those which predicted destruction and those which conveyed hope and comfort). The passage in Sifré is a commentary on Deut. i 1, 'These are the words which Moses spake,' &c., and the writer is arguing that wherever the phrase 'these are the words of' such and such a person occurs in Scripture, it always refers to a rebuke. After quoting Amos i 1, the Sifré proceeds[2], 'Huic simile tu dicis, Et haec sunt verba quae locutus est Jeremias super Israel et super Jehuda (= xxx 4, Heb.). Num haec duntaxat prophetavit Jeremias? *Nonne duos libros scripsit Jeremias* (והלא ב' ספרים כתב ירמיה)? Dictum est enim, Huc usque verba Jeremiae (= li. 64 Heb.). Et cur dictum est "Haec sunt verba"? Sed hinc

[1] Schürer, *H. J. P.* i 1. 145.

[2] I quote from the Latin version in Ugolini, *Thesaurus Ant. Sacr.* vol. xv, col. ccccl (= Friedmann (א) סד).

docemur fuisse verba increpationum. Dictum est enim, Vocem terroris . . . ex ipsa salvabitur' (= xxx 5, 6 Heb.). It was at first sight rather remarkable, in view of the evidence of the LXX given above, to find the passage 'Hitherto are the words of Jeremiah' apparently quoted in support of the statement that Jeremiah wrote two books. I have, however, had the advantage at this point of the opinion of Mr. Israel Abrahams, Reader in Talmudic at Cambridge, who has kindly gone into the whole passage of Sifré and a parallel passage in the Midrash Yalkut, and has convinced me that the reference here is not to any division of the prophecy of Jeremiah, but to the two books traditionally assigned to him, viz. the prophecy and Lamentations. The passage li 64 appears to be cited because it contains a definite statement that Jeremiah wrote much more than is contained in chapter xxx, and not in support of the statement about two books, the words והלא ב׳ ספרים כתב ירמיה being as it were in parenthesis.

But though external evidence is lacking, I think the internal evidence given above for the division into two books has considerable weight. It must, however, be admitted that the parallel case of the two translators employed in the rendering of Ezekiel, where the break does not coincide with a break in the subject-matter, renders the interpretation here given of the facts somewhat doubtful.

In concluding this part of my subject, I would add a few words with regard to chap. lii. The Greek of this chapter is, I am inclined to think, by yet another (a third) translator[1]. The chapter is evidently in the nature of an appendix, being placed at the end of both Hebrew and Greek texts. It is wanting in Cod. 41 of Holmes and Parsons, a MS of the ninth or tenth century. The Hebrew has little in common with the rest of the book of Jeremiah, so that a comparison of renderings in this chapter and in the other parts of the book is difficult. But I would call attention to the use of the Attic ττ in the verb φυλάττειν, which occurs in this form only in this chapter in the whole of the LXX (verse 24 in MS B, verse 31 A), and to the rendering of בגד by στολή in verse 33: it is rendered by ἱμάτιον in chaps. xliii, xlviii and l. It should be added that the Greek is not taken from the Greek of 2 K. xxiv, xxv.

PS. I find that the Codex Alexandrinus contains a slight indication of a break at the end of Jeremiah α. The closing words of chap. xxviii do not occupy a whole line, and the remainder of the line is occupied by a rough arabesque thus:

ΕΠΑΓΩΕΠΑΥΤΗΝ ❯ ❯ ❯ ❯ ❯ ❯ ❯ ❯ ❯

These arabesques are usually inserted only at the end of a book, not at the end of an ordinary section. Codex A has them, however, in Jeremiah also at xli 11, xlii fin., xlvi fin.; I do not find any other instances of them in this book.

[1] So Bertholdt (op. cit. p. 1478).

(2.) The relation of the Greek Jeremiah to the Book of Baruch.

The book of Baruch, although only five chapters in length, is clearly a composite work. It falls into two main sections i 1–iii 8 and iii 9–v 9. The former of these sections is a translation from a lost Hebrew original. This is shown not only by the style and by the occurrence of mistaken renderings which can only be explained by retranslation into Hebrew, but also by the express mention of a Hebrew original in certain marginal notes in the Syro-hexaplar text, stating that words in i 17 and ii 3 are 'not in the Hebrew[1].' On the other hand, there can be little doubt that in the second part of the book the Greek is original. Schürer's conclusion as to the formation of the book is that 'its first half was originally composed in Hebrew, then translated into Greek, and completed by the addition of the second half[2].' Dr. Ryle and Dr. James have shown, I think conclusively, that in the closing section of Baruch (iv 36–v 9) use is made of the fifth of the Psalms of Solomon, the Greek version of which is assigned by them to the last decade of the first century B.C. They have thus been led to place the 're-edition' or final reduction of the book of Baruch to its present form in the period following the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus[3]. The date of the first portion is more doubtful. From the apparent use made of the book of Daniel[4] it would seem to be not earlier than the Maccabean period, to which date many commentators would assign it. Ewald, however, followed by J. T. Marshall (art. 'Baruch' in Hastings' *Bible Dict.*), would place it as early as 320 B.C., while on the other hand Schürer, Kneucker and others place it after the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D., i.e. at about the same time at which the latter portion was written and the whole book was re-edited. It is, however, much more likely, and in accordance with the practice of the time, that a writer wishing to console his countrymen after the events of A.D. 70 would select an older and not a contemporary writing to which to append his own composition; and moreover the early and unhesitating acceptance of the book by Christian writers is difficult to explain, unless some portion at least of the work is earlier than the close of the first century A.D.[5] I should then on a priori grounds be inclined to assign to the first portion of Baruch a date considerably earlier than that given by Schürer and Kneucker.

[1] Ceriani, *Monum. Sacra et Profana*, tom. i, fasc. i (Milan, 1861).

[2] *H. J. P.* div. ii, vol. iii, 191.

[3] *The Psalms of Solomon*, lxxii ff.

[4] This, however, is disputed by J. T. Marshall (art. 'Baruch,' Hastings' *Bible Dict.*), who finds merely a use of an ancient form of prayer which has been incorporated in Daniel ix.

[5] Swete, *Introduction to O. T.* p. 275.

The following evidence will, I think, prove that the Greek of Baruch (first part) must be at least a century earlier.

The affinity between the Greek of the first portion of Baruch and the Greek version of Jeremiah has been pointed out by several critics, e. g. Nestle[1], J. T. Marshall[2], and Kneucker[3], the only question being whether this is due to identity of translator or to imitation. What has not been noticed is that the resemblance is practically confined to that portion of the Greek Jeremiah which I have called Jeremiah β. To show this I have appended what is, I think, a fairly complete list of the LXX passages which illustrate the first two chapters of Baruch.

Table II.

Bar. i 9. The verse is almost identical with the LXX of Jer. xxiv 1, except that *τοὺς δυνατούς* takes the place of *τοὺς πλουσίους* (*πλησίους* B*), and the words *καὶ τὸν λαὸν τῆς γῆς* are added. *Δυνατός* in Jer. only occurs in the β portion (4 times in chaps. xxxix–li), as does also the phrase *ὁ λαὸς τῆς γῆς* (xl 9, xliv 2, lii 6, 25 *bis*). *Δεσμώτης* is a misrendering of מסגר ('locksmith') occurring also in Jer. xxxvi 2.

10. *μάννα* = מנחה as in Jer. [xvii 26] xlviii 5, but in the former passage (*καὶ θυμιάματα καὶ μάννα*) the words *καὶ μάννα* are possibly a doublet. Elsewhere the usual transliteration is *μαναά*.

11. Ναβουχ. . . καὶ . . Βαλτασὰρ *νἱοῦ αὐτοῦ*. Cf. Dan. v 2 ff.

13. *οὐκ ἀπέστρεψεν ὁ θυμὸς* K. Cf. Jer. xxiii 20.

14. *ἐξαγορεῦσαι*. Cf. Dan. Θ' ix 20.

15–18. The opening of the confession reads like a fusion of Daniel ix 7–10 (with some of Theodotion's renderings) with Jer. xlii 13 (*ἀνθρώπῳ Ἰούδα καὶ τοῖς κατοικ. Ἱερ.*: in Jer. *a* [five times, also in xxxix 32] the phrase is *ἄνδρες Ἰ. καὶ οἱ κατοικ. ἐν Ἱερ.*) and Jer. xxxix 32 (*καὶ τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν ἡμ. καὶ τοῖς προφ. ἡμῶν*, not in Dan.).

17. (*αἰσχύνη* . .) *ὧν ἡμάρτομεν*. Cf. Jer. li 23 *ἀπὸ προσώπου ὧν ἡμάρτετε*.

19. Cf. Dt. ix 7, 24 (*ἀπειθοῦντες ἦτε*).

πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἀκ. τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ (also in ii 5): Jer. xlix 13. For *πρὸς τὸ μή* (peculiar to Jer. β) see Table I.

σχεδιάζειν not in LXX, used by Polyb. and Diod. in the sense of 'to be negligent.'

[1] Swete, *Introduction to O. T.* p. 276, note 1, 'Dr. Nestle points out that Baruch and Jeremiah seem to have been translated by the same hand, unless the translator of Baruch deliberately copied the translator of Jeremiah.'

[2] Hastings' *B. D.* 'There can be little doubt that he who translated Jeremiah also translated Baruch i 1–iii 8, and probably found it in Hebrew attached to Jeremiah.'

[3] *Das Buch Baruch* (1879), p. 83.

20. ἐκολλήθη . . ἡ ἀρά: cf. Dt. xxix 20. ἀρά: Jer. β (xlix 18, li 22). Μωυσ. παιδὶ αὐτοῦ (cf. ii 20, 24, 28): Jer. β uses παῖς in this connexion, but Jer. α δοῦλος (Table I). The Pentateuch uses θεράπων. δοῦναι . . ὡς ἡ ἡμ. αὕτη: the anarthrous inf. is characteristic of Jer. β. Contrast Jer. xi 5 τοῦ δοῦναι . . καθὼς (ὡς A) ἡ ἡμ. αὕτη.

22. διανοίᾳ: in Jer. only at xxxviii 33. Contrast Jer. xxiii 17 πορεύεσθαι τοῖς θελήμασιν αὐτῶν (πλάνῃ καρδίας αὐτοῦ). ἐργάζεσθαι θεοῖς (ii 21 f., 24 τῷ βασ. Βαβυλῶνος)=עבד: so Jer. β (xxxiv 5, 7, 9 *bis*, 10, xxxv 14, xxxvii 8 f., xli 14, xlvii 9). Jer. α uses δουλεύειν.

Bar. ii 1. (Cf. ii 24, 35) στῆσαι τὸν λόγον: Jer. xxxv 6.

2. καθά (also in i 6, ii 28): peculiar in Jer. to β portion (xxxix 42, xl 11 A, li 17, 30).

3. τοῦ φαγεῖν ἡμᾶς ἄνθρωπον κ.τ.λ.: cf. Jer. xix 9 (where however ἕκαστος is used for איש). Also Lev. xxvi 29, Dt. xxviii 55.

4. ὑποχείριος: Jer. xlix 18. εἰς ὀνειδισμὸν καὶ ἄβατον: a use of ἄβ. peculiar to Jer. β (Table I). οὗ διέσπειρ. αὐτ. ἐκεῖ (ii 13, 29): Jer. xxxix 37.

5. ὑποκάτω καὶ οὐκ ἐπάνω: cf. Dt. xxviii 13.

6. Dan. ix 7.

7. ἃ ἐλάλησεν Κ. ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, πάντα τὰ κακὰ ταῦτα ἃ ἦλθεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς. For the relative sentence standing without any construction, cf. Jer. xlix 19 ἃ ἐλάλ. Κ. ἐφ' ὑμᾶς κ.τ.λ.

8. δεῖσθαι τοῦ προσώπου Κυρίου: J. xxxiii 19.

9. γρηγορεῖν ἐπὶ (c. dat.): J. v 6, xxxviii 28 *bis* (c. acc.).

10. = i 18 repeated.

11. Καὶ νῦν Κύριε: J. xliv 20. ὃς ἐξήγαγες . . αὕτη: J. xxxix 21, 20.

12. ἡμάρτ. ἠσεβ. ἠδικ.: Dan. ix 5 (LXX).

13. ὅτι κατελείφθημεν ὀλίγοι: J. xlix 2.

14. δέησις: Jer. a^3 (not β).

15. τὸ ὄν. σου ἐπεκλήθη ἐπὶ Ἰ. καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ γένος αὐτοῦ (cf. ii 26 ἐπ' αὐτῷ): J. xxxix 34 and xli 15 (ἐπί c. dat.). τὸ γένος Ἰσραήλ (= זרע): J. xxxvi 32, xxxviii 1, 35, 37, xliii 31 [xlviii 1]; but in Jer. α (xxiii 8) τὸ σπέρμα Ἰ.

16. Dt. xxvi 15, Is. xxxvii 17 = 4 K. xix 16. κλίνειν τὸ οὖς: Jer. β^3, also in xvii 22. In Jer. α the usual rendering of the Hebrew is προσέχειν τὸ οὖς (τοῖς ὠσίν), vii 24, 26, xxv 4.

18. οἱ ὀφθ. οἱ ἐκλ. καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ ἡ πεινῶσα: from Dt. xxviii 65, but with the reading πεινῶσα (as in J. xxxviii 25) in place of τηκομένην of Dt.

19. καταβάλλειν τὸν ἔλεον: cf. πίπτειν (τὸ) ἔλεος J. xliii 7, xliv 20, xlix 2, ῥίπτειν τὸν (τὸ) ἔλεον J. xlv 26, Dan. ix 20 (θ'). This use of ἔλεος (= תחנה 'supplication') is confined in Jeremiah to the β portion.

21. Οὕτως εἶπεν Κύριος: in Jer. confined to β portion (Table I). ἐργάζεσθαι: see above.

23. ἐκλείψειν ποιήσω: cf. J. xxvi 28 ποιήσω ἐκλιπεῖν. ἐκ πόλ. Ἰούδα καὶ ἔξωθεν Ἱερ.—φωνὴν νύμφης: cf. Jer. xl 10 f. ἔξωθεν = בחוצות ('in the streets') in Jer. β (xl 10, li 6, 9, 17, 21), also in xi 6 (cf. xxviii 4); in Jer. α the Hebrew is usually correctly rendered by δίοδοι (or ὁδοί) Ἱερ. (i 28, v 1, vii 34, xiv 16). Χαρμοσύνη: Jer. β (Table I). εἰς ἄβατον ἀπὸ ἐνοικούντων = J. xxxi 9 (A).

24. τοῦ ἐξενεχθῆναι κ.τ.λ.: a definite reference to J. viii 1, but with the variant reading τόπου for τάφων of Jer.

25 a: J. xliii 30. ἐν λιμῷ καὶ ἐν ῥομφ. καὶ ἐν ἀποστολῇ: ἀποστολή only thus (= דֶּבֶר) in J. xxxix 36 (Table I). Ἐν ῥομφ. καὶ ἐν λ.: J. xlv 2, xlix 17, 22, li 12, 18, 27. In Jer. α the phrase is ἐν μαχαίρᾳ καὶ ἐν λιμῷ καὶ ἐν θανάτῳ (xiv 12, &c.).

28. ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐντειλαμένου σου. For the construction of participle with pronoun dependent on ἡμέρα cf. J. xxxviii 32 ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπιλαβομένου μου, xliii 2 ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας λαλήσαντός μου (*sic*), xlviii 4 τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ δευτέρᾳ πατάξαντος αὐτοῦ; and contrast J. xi 4 ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ᾗ ἀνήγαγον.

29. βόμβησις is a ἅπαξ λεγόμενον: the cognate verb βομβεῖν is only found in LXX in J. xxxi 36, xxxviii 35, and once in 1 Chron.

30. λαὸς σκληροτράχηλος: Ex. Dt. ἀποικισμός in LXX only elsewhere in Jer. [xxvi 19], xxxi 11, l 11; ἀποικία, which is also common in Jer. β, occurs below in Bar. iii 7, 8.

34. The first half of the verse is taken from Jer. xxxvii 3 with the insertion of the names of the patriarchs; with the latter half cf. J. xxxvi 6 (σμικρύνειν there only in LXX).

35. Cf. J. xxxiv 40, xxxviii 33.

After this point in Baruch the only noteworthy coincidences with the LXX of Jeremiah seem to be χαρμοσύνη iv 23 and ἀγαυρίαμα iv 34 (the latter word also occurs in Isaiah and Job). The Greek of the latter part of Baruch is of an entirely different character, and is certainly by another hand.

What we find then in the first half of Baruch is that it contains a large number of peculiar or mistaken renderings which are confined to the latter half of Jeremiah. Where Jeremiah α and β have rendered a constantly recurring phrase in different ways, it is always the β rendering which is selected by the Baruch translator. Not only so, but the peculiar constructions of Jeremiah β (Bar. ii 7, 28), and its particles (καθά) are repeated, and a derivative of a rare word in Jer. β is created (βόμβησις). Even where the writer of the Hebrew Baruch is borrowing from the first part of Jeremiah, the translator introduces words characteristic of the second part (Bar. i 9), or indicates a variant reading (ii 24). He inserts a phrase of Jer. β into a quotation from Deuteronomy

(ii 18). The phenomena admit, I think, of but one solution, namely that the translator of Baruch is identical with the translator of the second portion of Jeremiah. It must be remembered that he had before him a Hebrew original which was a mosaic of phrases taken from Jeremiah. It is out of the question to suppose that in the course of his work he carefully consulted an existing Greek version of the prophet to see how every phrase had already been rendered. It is no doubt conceivable that he might have made a very close study of the Greek version and could produce a very faithful imitation of the style from memory. But even so it remains unexplained why the imitation should be confined to the latter part of Jeremiah, unless the version which he knew was restricted to that portion of the prophet; and it is highly improbable that the imitation should have extended to constructions such as we find in Baruch ii 7 and 28, and to such a phrase as *οὕτως εἶπεν Κύριος*[1].

If, then, as I think must be acknowledged, the translator of Baruch (part I) is identical with the second of the translators of Jeremiah, we have a clue to guide us towards the date when the Greek Jeremiah was completed. The writer of Baruch was, I think it must be admitted, acquainted with the book of Daniel, and the translator seems to have used a Greek version of Dan. ix 5–10. This brings our translator down to about the close of the second century B. C. A certain *terminus ad quem* is afforded by the long quotation from Jer. xxxviii 31 ff. in the Epistle to the Hebrews (viii 8 ff.). The writer of the Prologue to Ecclesiasticus (about 132 B. C.) makes an indirect allusion to the existence of a translation of 'the prophecies' in his day[2], but we are left in doubt as to the extent of the collection. The second half of Jeremiah may have been just rendered when the Prologue to Ecclesiasticus was written: at any rate it was probably completed and attached to the other portion not very long after that date[3].

[1] Kneucker (p. 84) denies the identity of the translators of Jeremiah and Baruch. But he has failed to distinguish the two translators of Jeremiah, and most of the instances which he quotes are therefore not to the point. The most noteworthy instance of dissimilarity quoted by him is *κλίνειν τὸν ὦμον* (Bar. ii 21) as contrasted with *εἰσάγειν* (*ἐμβάλλειν*) *τὸν τράχηλον* Jer. xxxiv 6, 9, &c.

[2] *οὐ μόνον δὲ ταῦτα, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ νόμος καὶ αἱ προφητεῖαι καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν βιβλίων οὐ μικρὰν ἔχει τὴν διαφορὰν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς λεγόμενα.*

[3] The absence of early quotations from the second part of Jeremiah is somewhat remarkable. In the N. T. besides the passage in Hebrews the only certain reference is Matt. ii 18 (= Jer. xxxviii 15, with variants from the LXX text). In the Apostolic Fathers, according to the index in the smaller edition of Lightfoot and Harmer, there is no quotation from any chapter later than the twenty-fourth. Justin only quotes from the earlier chapters. Clement of Alexandria and Irenaeus, while quoting freely from the first part, have about five quotations each from the second part.

Whatever date we assign to the latter half of the book of Baruch, we must, it seems, give a much earlier date to the first portion than that proposed by Kneucker and Schürer.

H. ST. JOHN THACKERAY.

(*To be continued.*)

A MISUNDERSTOOD PASSAGE (ISAIAH xli 5–7).

[5] *The isles saw, and feared; the ends of the earth trembled: they drew near, and came.* [6] *They helped every one his neighbour; and every one said to his brother, Be of good courage.* [7] *So the carpenter encouraged the goldsmith, and he that smootheth with the hammer him that smiteth the anvil, saying of the soldering, It is good: and he fastened it with nails, that it should not be moved.*

LAGARDE'S conjecture that the passage Isa. xli 6, 7 is misplaced in all our present texts, and that its original context is to be found in ch. xl 18–20, has of late met with marked favour. Profs. Duhm (2nd edit., 1902) and Marti (1900) accept it without hesitation in their commentaries; Dr. Cheyne follows it, with some corrections of reading, in his *Critical Edition of the Hebrew Text of Isaiah*, 1899; and Prof. Skinner in the *Cambridge Bible* (1898), who does not adopt it, shows plainly that it appears to him to be a suggestion of weight.

And yet there is much to be said in favour of the present position of the two verses, and possibly not all has yet been urged which might be reasonably urged against their transposition. In the first place, though hospitality may be found for Isa. xli 6, 7 with the earlier passage, xl 18–20, it cannot be said that the new position provides a perfectly obvious context. There is, indeed, no gap for these verses to occupy; the Dutch scholar Oort and Dr. T. K. Abbott placed them *after* xl 20 (Cheyne, *Introduction*, p. 299), but the present tendency is to place them *before* that verse. But neither position can they take without discomfort; the words לֹא ימוֹט ('not be moved') have an awkward sound at the end of successive verses, and Dr. Cheyne accordingly omits them from xli 7 in his *Critical Text*. Moreover, on the theory that the passage xli 6, 7 originally stood after xl 19 or 20 no good reason can be given for its removal to its present place. Presumably it was a pure accident with nothing to explain it.

One more difficulty—a serious one—remains. *Ex hypothesi* xli 5 is an insertion the purpose of which is to connect the misplaced verses (6, 7) with their new context. But I hope to show later on that on the one hand ver. 5 stands in a definite relation to ver. 2, and on the other that it is followed very appropriately by verses 6, 7. If ver. 5 be an