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A CRITICAL STUDY OF SCRIBAL ERRORS IN THE
BOOK OF JEREMIAH IN THE LIGHT OF THE SEPTUAGINT

INTRODUCTION

For the sake of a better understanding of the subject for investigation it is necessary to begin with some general remarks regarding "The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah". In the Hebrew Bible this book bears the simple title "Jeremiah", indicating the subject of the work rather than the author. As for the author, or rather authors, there are three possibilities: The first possibility is that some, and perhaps most, of the book was written by Baruch at the dictation of Jeremiah. The second possibility is that parts of the book were written by Jeremiah himself. The third possibility is that several authors may have added various sections to the writings of Baruch and Jeremiah. Judah seems to have been the place where most of the book was written, but parts may have been added in Babylon, Egypt, and again in Palestine during the post-exilic period. As for the date of the book it is impossible to name a certain year, for, as we have already indicated, the work was the result of compilation. The call of Jeremiah was in the thirteenth year of the reign of Josiah or 626 B.C., but the

1. J 36:4, 26,32 (J is used as an abbreviation for Jeremiah)
first roll was written in 604 B.C., from which the beginning of the book may be dated. The work may have been expanded and suffered change until the first century B.C. when the Old Testament canon was closed. However, most of the book was likely completed by about 580 B.C., after the destruction of Jerusalem and the removal of Jeremiah to Egypt.

A little study soon reveals that the book is not in chronological order; it is rather arranged according to subjects, for it is primarily a prophetic work. The contents may be roughly divided into three classes: prophesies, biographical sections, and historical narratives.

A knowledge of the process of redaction is essential to the proper understanding of a book like Jeremiah, and it is more important in a research study such as this. This redaction of the book may be divided into four main stages. The first stage was the nucleus of the book contained in the original roll written by Baruch and later destroyed by Jehoiakim. The second stage was the second roll which was also written by Baruch at the dictation of Jeremiah. This was more than a re-writing of the first roll; it was a larger edition, for, "there were added besides unto them many like words". The third stage was that of the additions made to the second roll by Baruch, Jeremiah, and likely other scribes; this stage was concluded at the death of Jeremiah or...
shortly thereafter, perhaps about 580 B.C. The fourth and last stage of redaction was the work of the many editors and scribes who made changes and additions until the Hebrew canon was closed. It was in this last stage that the book received its present forms in the Hebrew and Greek versions; and, as it was a process of several centuries, it involved many hands. In this final process of redaction is the problem of whether or not the MT and LXX represent two distinct redactions of Jeremiah. This problem, however, lies outside of the field under consideration, as will shortly be explained.

It has been pointed out that this book may be dated from the close of the seventh century B.C. Therefore the present text has been copied many, many times before it has come down to the present time. The text has naturally deteriorated like the text of any other work in this long process of transmission through the centuries. This was more true before the invention and use of printing, although even under modern methods any text is likely to also suffer deterioration. In being copied and handed down by many scribes and under various conditions a text may suffer deterioration in two ways.2

The first is external deterioration which is the deterioration of the physical writing materials. The manuscripts may disintegrate through

1. MT is used as an abbreviation for the Massoretic text of the Hebrew Bible. For the explanation of "Massoretic Text" see Strach, H.L. "Text of the Old Testament," A Dictionary of the Bible, James Hastings, ed. IV. P. 729. LXX is used as an abbreviation for the Septuagint, the Greek version of the Bible.
dampness or mould; pages or whole sections may be lost; the ink may
fade; they may become partly illegible from much thumbing or soiling.
These and more difficulties beset the reader and copyist of ancient
manuscripts.

The second type of deterioration is internal, that which is due
to the copyist himself. There are many kinds of such errors, some of
which are: haplography, which is the inadvertent omission of similar and
nearby letters or words; dittography, which is the inadvertent repeti­
tion of letters or words; other aberrations of such homoiotetics, which
is a mistake of the eye due to similarity in the endings of words,
phrases, or even whole sections; confusion of similar letters or words;
transposition of letters or words.

Similar to the process of transmission is that of translation,
for the translator has all the difficulties of the copyist and more of
his own. The only process of translation of interest here is that from
the Hebrew to the Greek which will be discussed below.

The specific problem that is to be considered in this dissertation
arises from the transmission and translation of Jeremiah. The LXX, or
Greek version of the Old Testament, was made in Egypt during the period
when Alexandria became an important center of Jewish culture. It was
begun in the third century B.C. and was likely completed by the first
century A.D. For the most part the LXX is a tolerable translation of

1. Although the translation of the LXX may have been made by more than one
translator, for the sake of convenience the singular number of the noun
will be used in this thesis.
the received Hebrew text, but the book of Jeremiah is the most important exception to this statement. The differences between the LXX and MT of Jeremiah are greater and more numerous than in any other book of the Old Testament. For example, it has been estimated that there are about 2,700 words, or one-eighth, of the MT not expressed in the LXX, and there are a few words, about a hundred, of the LXX not expressed in the MT. Another important variation is that of order, for the arrangement of the contents in the LXX differs widely from the MT, particularly in the position of the oracles against foreign nations. A third major type of variation between the LXX and MT includes the many differences in meaning and content. These are found with varying degrees of frequency, but there are some in every chapter. In one verse alone seven various differences were found.

All of these numerous discrepancies may be classified under three heads: errors of the copying process, errors of the process of translation, and intentional changes made by editors, scribes, or translators. The third type of difference includes those that might arise from the fact that the LXX is a different redaction from the MT. Of these three only the first two are to be considered in this thesis.

The title of this treatise is "A Critical Study of Scribal Errors in the Book of Jeremiah in the Light of the Septuagint" which in part explains the purpose in view. It has already been pointed out that there

2. J 36:32
has been much opportunity for errors to creep into the text because of
the processes of copying and of translation, therefore the purpose in
view is to study these errors by explaining how they arose and how they
can be corrected. Since there are two versions of the same book, the MT
and the LXX, each can be used to check against the other, thus providing
a method of discovering and correcting scribal errors. However, let it
be understood that the purpose of the thesis is not to produce a corrected
edition of the text of Jeremiah, which would indeed be a prodigious task.
The purpose is rather to present a method of criticism and to study the
manner in which it may be applied to correct scribal errors in any similar
situation. The use above of the term scribal errors necessarily elimi­
nates those discrepancies between the MT and LXX of Jeremiah which arise
from differences in redaction or from intentional changes made by scribes;
the study of these errors would be a task large enough for a separate
treatise.

The general outline of procedure will be to take up first the pro­
cess of translation of the LXX text of Jeremiah and the errors arising
from that process. Second, the deterioration of the texts will be dis­
cussed, by pointing out how the LXX has deteriorated in various ways and
by taking up the several types of errors which have caused the deteriora­
tion of the Hebrew text down to the MT. Since the interest is primarily
in the Hebrew text, the errors that have arisen in that text will be
discussed in detail.

1. In checking one text against the other much use was made of "Jeremia,
Præparavit W. Rudolph" which is a critical edition of the Hebrew text
of Jeremiah. The apparatus criticus in this work was especially valuable
in detecting variations between the MT and LXX.
CHAPTER I

PROCESS OF TRANSLATION OF THE TEXT

In Egypt, and particularly in Alexandria, there was a large colony of Jews during and after the exile. These Jews probably spoke an Egyptian dialect of Aramaic until the conquests of Alexander the Great, after which the spoken language changed to Greek. As the Old Testament was written in Hebrew, a dead language even at that date, a need arose for a translation of the Hebrew Bible into the spoken tongue of the people that they might more readily read it.

Tradition has it that the translation was made at the request of Ptolemaeus Philadelphus by seventy-two Jewish scribes, from which the term Septuagint and the symbol LXX are derived. This tradition, however, has no historical basis. The process of translation was a gradual one, beginning first with the Pentateuch, which was completed in the third century B.C. The translation of the Prophets and the Writings followed, and the whole Old Testament was finished by the first century A.D. We have no knowledge of those who made the translation, but they would naturally be Jewish scribes living in Egypt.

The particular point of interest here is the LXX of Jeremiah, for it is in this book that the most marked divergence of the LXX from the

---

MT is found. To explain the reasons for this great divergence is a large task, but the chief reason is that the manuscripts from which Jeremiah was translated were carried early into Egypt. There is no evidence as to the exact time when they were taken to Egypt, but it was evidently before there ceased to be additions and changes made to the Hebrew text. As there was less of a tendency on the part of Egyptian Jews to modify the text than on the part of Palestinian or Babylonian Jews, the text would more nearly remain in its original condition until the time of translation and afterwards. Therefore, in the LXX of Jeremiah there is represented a different and older text of the Hebrew than is to be found in the MT. It is on this point that the present investigation hangs.

In order to know the extent to which the LXX may be relied upon as a means of checking the accuracy of the MT it is necessary to discuss the comparative validity of the two texts. The various authorities in this field have differed widely on this point. Some claim the LXX has no authority as a valid text. For example, Graf writes of the LXX:

It is altogether impossible to give this new edition - for one can scarcely call it a translation - any critical authority, or to draw from it any conclusion as to the Hebrew text having existed in any other form from that in which we have it at present.

This position is the more remarkable since Graf began his commentary

with a very favorable view of the LXX. Kiel and Orelli agree with Graf in favoring the MT. In direct contrast to the position of Graf is that of Workman who maintains that the LXX represents a much purer text, and in the places where the texts disagree he has attempted to restore the original by translating the LXX into Hebrew. Movers and Bleek also distinctly favor the LXX. 1

The viewpoint of the majority of recent scholars is more tenable, and this will be better understood as the discussion proceeds. Briefly it is this: No general statement can be made of the comparative validity of the MT and LXX of Jeremiah. One cannot be preferred instead of the other except in specific cases, and these must be judged individually. Among those who hold this or a similar position are Driver,2 Streane,3 Giesebrecht,4 Kuenen and Peake.5

In discussing the comparative validity of the two texts one phase to be noted is the great difference in the quantity, for it has already been stated that approximately one-eighth of the MT is not represented in the LXX. Some of the omissions are relatively long passages, for example 33:14-26 and 39:4-13; these must be judged individually, according to the evidence. On the other hand, there are very many minor omissions, particularly conventional expressions such as "saith Jehovah", which is omitted by the LXX sixty-four times. A similar example is the

5. Peake, op. cit., I p. 65-F.
proper noun Nebuchadnezzar which is omitted twenty-three times in
the LXX, more than half of the number of times that it occurs in the
MT. In the MT the word Jehovah is often modified by such epithets as
"Jehovah of hosts" or "Jehovah, the God of Israel", but these are usually
lacking in the LXX. It is these many minor phrases in the MT which
give the reader a sense of diffuseness as he reads the text, and it is
the many omissions which make the LXX seem concise.

These omissions on the part of the LXX may be explained in two
ways. They may have been omitted deliberately by the translator, for
there are so many omissions that it is not reasonable to assume that they
were omitted inadvertently. The other explanation is that these so-called
omissions are not in reality omissions, but rather they were not found
in the text used by the translator. The Hebrew text was expanded by
scribes and editors during the processes of redaction and transmission
following the time when the text used by the translator was taken to
Egypt or separated from that edition which finally became the MT. There-
fore, the LXX was and is free from these additions which were made to the
MT. Of these two explanations the latter will be found to be the more
reasonable.

As stated above, there is no indication as to the precise date
when the text from which the LXX was made was either carried into Egypt
or in some other way separated from the text that became the MT; but

1. cf. Davidson, op. cit., p. 574.
it is evident that it was prior to the fixation of the text of Jeremiah as it is found in the MT. The many additions to the MT may therefore have been made either before or after the translation of the LXX. The point is that the LXX of Jeremiah, at least in the matter of many of the additions to the MT, represents an older and therefore more trustworthy text. However, this does not necessarily mean that the LXX represents a purer or even more original text in the matter of other differences. Despite the fact that the LXX appears to be the older text in certain respects it may not be a purer text. Even if it be regarded as a separate and older redaction than the MT, it may have suffered in transmission that it is not purer and therefore not to be regarded as more original. The most that can be said here is that the LXX is in general more reliable than the MT in the matter of omissions because it represents a text dating prior to the later expansion of the Hebrew text.

Another important divergence of the LXX from the MT is in the position of the oracles against foreign nations, which are found in the Hebrew in chapters 46-51 and in the Greek version after 25:13. The order of the several prophecies is also different in the LXX. It is not necessary in this thesis to discuss this difficult problem, but it should be noticed that various authorities point to this difference as

   Hirsch, op. cit.
   Peake, op. cit., p. 66.
   Briggs, op. cit., p. 189.
indicating that the LXX is the more original text. Others do not agree that the position and order of the oracles in the LXX are the original but that they point to the original position and order which were different than those of either the MT or LXX. Therefore, it can be said that in this case the LXX is just as valid as the MT if not more so.

It must be admitted that there are many cases where the LXX differs from the MT because the translator was at fault. He made many errors unintentionally and also some intentional changes in the text as he translated it. In order to understand why there were so many errors made by the translator, it is necessary to discuss the many difficulties with which he had to contend.

In the first place, Hebrew was then, as it is now, a dead language, for Aramaic was the Semitic tongue which was spoken at that time. The translation of any dead language involves difficulties with unknown or obscure words, constructions, and idioms. Such a case may be found in 13:18 where the LXX reads "mighty ones" for גותי which means "queen" in this case. It is likely that the translator was not familiar with this idiomatic and infrequent use of this word as meaning "queen". In addition to this, Jeremiah contained various historical, geographical, and other references with which the translator was evidently unfamiliar. The reason is evident, namely, that the translator lived in a land foreign

1. e.g. Smith, G. A. Jeremiah, p. 216.
2. e.g. Peake, op. cit., II p. 3-f.
to these references and with which he would naturally be unfamiliar. An example is the reading of "to the border of the sea" in the LXX for the MT "from Abarim" in 22:20. The translator was unfamiliar with Mt. Abarim, although there are references to it in Num. 27:12 and Deut. 32:49, and he translated the word \( \text{ MT: } \overline{\text{Abarim}} \) as best he could.

In the second place, a source of difficulty for the translator was the condition of the manuscripts from which he translated. There are many cases in which the LXX represents Hebrew words which, although different in meaning, are in general similar to the words in the MT. There may be a difference of two or three letters within a word or of several words within a phrase. In some of these cases at least it is likely that the manuscripts were in such a bad state of preservation that the translator was able to make out only some of the letters and had to fill in the rest. Such might have been the case in 12:17 where the Hebrew is \( \overline{\text{ MT: } \text{ hear}} \), but the LXX reading for the same word represents \( \text{ LXX: } \text{ turn} \), a difference of two consonants.

In the third place, a similar source of difficulty may have arisen from the careless writing of the Hebrew text used by the translator. In the Hebrew language there were and are letters which are very difficult to distinguish unless they are made carefully. For example, in the ancient Hebrew alphabet there were the letters \( \text{ MT: } \overline{\text{ b}} \) and \( \text{ MT: } \overline{\text{ r}} \). They are with difficulty distinguished by modern scholars when they decipher inscriptions or papyri, and if they have been carelessly written, it is almost an impossible task to decipher them in some cases. In the modern Hebrew alphabet a like example is the similarity of \( \text{ MT: } \overline{\text{ d}} \) and \( \overline{\text{ r}} \).
The text may also have had other evidences of carelessness such as transposition of letters and words, confusion of consonants, etc.

In the fourth place, the translator was also troubled with the lack of division of the consonants into words. Therefore a given group of letters could be divided into different words to give different meanings. There was also no punctuation to help the translator. To add to the difficulties there were contractions and abbreviations which might easily be misunderstood unless the translator was thoroughly understood them and the context.

In the fifth place, some of the difficulties which the translator had were peculiar to Hebrew and allied Semitic tongues. At that time the language was written only with consonants, for the vowels were supplied by the reader. This was a great hindrance to an accurate rendering of the text, especially if the translator was not certain in supplying the proper vowel points. There were cases in which different vowels could be supplied with a given set of consonants to give different meanings, and each form would be correct grammatically, perhaps with equally good meaning. An example may be found in 2:34 where the word was so pointed in the MT as to read "all these", but the same word was pointed by the translator to read "every oak". In the Hebrew language there are several letters called vowel letters, or they might also be called semi-consonants, for these letters have some consonantal value. However, they are also used to indicate which vowels are to be preferred. They are the guides to help the reader supply the proper vowels to the word, and this was more important in ancient days when the vowels were
not written. Yet, these vowel letters, \( \acute{\jmath} \), \( \grave{\jmath} \), \( \check{\jmath} \), and \( \breve{\jmath} \), were sometimes not written in the manuscripts. The confusion that this could cause may be illustrated by pointing out the fact that this would, in some cases, make the singular the same as the plural.

From the foregoing it is evident that the translator would have many difficulties, even if he were a thorough student of Hebrew and of the content of the book of Jeremiah. The fact is that he was not, at least in some respects, competent for his task, and this increased the possibility of mistakes in his work. In some cases he was unable to divide the letters into the proper words or to supply the proper vowel letters. The example of Abarim in 22:20, as given above, also applies here. Another example is in 10:9 where he fails to recognize a prepositional prefix and renders \( \text{Abarim} \text{ from Upha\'z} \), as "Mophaz". His grammatical equipment was deficient, for certain constructions puzzled him, like the idiomatic use of \( \acute{\jmath}/\jmath \) for "queen" in 13:18 which was mentioned above. This example is also illustrative of his unfamiliarity with Hebrew vocabulary. Because he was uncertain of the meanings of some words he would derive them from the wrong roots. Thus in 22:22 the word \( \acute{\jmath}/\jmath \) is pointed to read "your wickedness" in the MT, deriving it from the root \( \acute{\jmath}/\jmath \). In the LXX the inappropriate reading is "your friends", showing that the translator so pointed the consonants as to derive the word from a wrong root, \( \breve{\jmath}/\jmath \).

If the training of the translator had been better he would not have had so much difficulty in interpreting abbreviations, contractions, and omissions of vowel letters. He would also have been able to correct
minor errors in the text, such as omissions and transpositions of consonants, but it appears that he was unable to do so. From what has been mentioned here it must be apparent that the LXX as a translation suffered greatly from the poor training of the translator, and to that extent the validity of the LXX has been impaired.

In this connection mention should be made of the fact that the translator would be as liable to make scribal errors as any scribe who was only copying the text, perhaps more so. These would be errors caused by slips of the eye as he read his text and wrote the translation. They would include such mistakes as transposition, omission, duplication, and confusion of consonants or words. These will be discussed as if they were errors of the copying process, for if they are errors of the Hebrew text there is no way of telling whether they were made by a copyist or the translator. However, if these errors were made in the Greek text, they may be discovered, although again they may have been made by a Greek copyist just as well as by the translator. The only point to be made here is the possibility of such scribal errors on the part of the translator, for they affect the accuracy and validity of the LXX as a translation. This is all the more true since the translator was poorly equipped for his task.

Much of the variation of the LXX from the MT can be explained as made unintentionally by the translator, yet it appears that to some extent he was guilty of intentionally changing the text which he translated. Earlier in the discussion the conciseness of the LXX was contrasted with the diffuseness of the MT, and it was stated that this indicated that
most of these so-called omissions were not in the Hebrew text used by
the translator. However, the translator cannot be entirely acquitted
of deliberately simplifying and abbreviating the text, for example, in
1:10 the LXX has only three of the four synonyms for "destroy", and in
18:7 the LXX has only two of the three synonyms found in the MT. 1

When the translator came to obscure references he was led to in-
terpret rather than translate the text. An excellent illustration of
this is to be found in 2:23 where the Hebrew reading is 317 ἡθβημα "the
valley", evidently referring to the valley of Gehenna where bodies were
thrown. When the translator came to this he rendered it as 7 δ θάλα
"the cemetery".

Much of the seeming arbitrariness of the translator was really
caused by a different conception of a translation than the one which
is held today. He was content to give a rough translation, and this
was more likely since his knowledge of Hebrew was very imperfect. At
any rate, he is not guilty of intentionally changing the text on a large
scale. If he had deliberately intended to abbreviate all or most of
the text he would naturally have omitted those passages which are re-
peated. Yet of the thirty passages which are repeated in Jeremiah he
omits only seven, and there is reason to believe that these seven were
not in his text. 2 The LXX is too much like the MT to admit of widespread
changes by the translator, and where there are important differences,
such as the position and order of the oracles on foreign nations in

1. cf. Davison, op. cit., p. 574.
2. Ibid.
46-51 or the omission of 33:14-28, the evidence supports the general trustworthiness of the translator.

In concluding this discussion of the comparative validity of the LXX and MT texts of Jeremiah the statement made above should be repeated, namely, that no general preference can be given for either one. In many cases, particularly in the matter of omissions, the LXX is to be preferred. In many other cases, like the evident mistakes of the translator, the LXX is clearly less reliable than the MT. Therefore, each case of variation must be decided by itself and the preference given on the basis of the evidence. This also represents the opinion of the majority of scholars on this question.

1. cf. Peak, op. cit., p. 68.
2. Smith, op. cit., p. 15.
Variations Due to Translation

When the LXX was translated the translator first had to divide the undivided consonants into words. This does not necessarily mean that he did it deliberately, for it would be done more or less automatically, depending upon his familiarity with the language and the text. Since this was the first step of the translator the variations resulting from it will be discussed first in this chapter on the various types of variation due to the translator.

Many of the examples of variations due to the division of consonants have been complicated by other differences, such as the transposition or confusion of consonants. In order to simplify the procedure the present discussion will be confined, as far as possible, to those examples which are not so complicated.

The opening word of 3:6 (3:5 in the Hebrew text) in the MT is 

\[ \overline{\text{Thine inhabitation}} \]

This word was divided by the translator, adding the first half to the preceding sentence \( \overline{\text{turn; usury}} \), "Thine inhabitation is in the midst of deceit ---.

According to the LXX the last of v.5 and first of v.6 read, "They crossed not to turn aside. Usury upon usury ---". The LXX division of the consonants is superior, and with its aid a better and clearer emendation (19)
may be made.1

In 10:9 there is a list of rare goods from various lands, and mention is made in the MT of gold "from Uraphah" (מראפת). The LXX translator failed to identify the initial consonant as a preposition and transliterated the complete word as the proper noun "Mophaz" (Μωφᾶς). The LXX is evidently in error, for there is no evidence for the existence of such a place as "Mophaz".

In the previous chapter mention was made of the instance in 22:20 where the translator read מארי for the MT מארם, "from Abarim". Although the LXX reading is possibly correct the MT division of the consonants fits in better with the similar use of Lebanon and Bashan in the same verse. Abarim is not peculiar to this verse, for mention of Mt. Abarim is made in Num. 27:12 and Deut. 32:49.

There is a curious illustration of an error in the division of the consonants in 46:15. Moreover, this instance is not treated properly in the more important English commentaries. The first three words in the MT are ממריאו מעון מבר, "Why are thy strong ones swept away?". The LXX, however, has a very different text: διὰ τις ἔσσεγεν ἀεὶ σοι Ἄπεις, "Why did Apis flee from thee?". There are other variations here, but the one of interest at present is the division of the Hebrew word ממריאו "swept away" into two words by the translator. The

1 cf. Peske, op. cit., p. 165.
2 cf. Strane, op. cit., p. 65.
3 Rudolph, W., Jeremiah, p. 20.
4 cf. Dan. 10:5
second of the two he translated as coming from the root "to flee". The consonants (hp) he presumed represented the god Apis, for Apis is identified with an Egyptian god whose name is written in the Egyptian language with the same consonants (h-p) as the Hebrew. It is pronounced Hep, Hop, Hap, or Hop(i).\(^1\) The leading English commentators fail to explain this connection between the MT and LXX, but it did not escape the Germans Duhm and Giesebrecht.\(^2\) It would be very easy for the translator to make an error such as this, especially since the context dealt with Egypt. Some claim that the LXX is to be preferred here on the grounds that the translator, being an Egyptian Jew, would be in a better position to understand this prophecy which pertains to Egypt.\(^3\) A careful study of the text does not uphold this claim, and the MT must be regarded as preferable.\(^4\)

In 48:35 the MT is difficult as it now stands. The phrase \(71/72\) may be translated "him that offereth in the high place", or, more properly, "him that bringeth up in the high place." The LXX represents a division of the same consonants in this way, \(72\) \(7-7/7(3)\), thus, the LXX reads "him that cometh up to the altar" which represents the different division of the consonants.

3. Streane, op. cit., p. 266.
5. Giesebrecht, op. cit., p. 231.
plus ΦΦΦ which has been omitted by haplography from the MT. That is why the letter Π was placed in parentheses, for the omitted ΦΦΦ should be replaced between the letter Ρ and ΦΨ. It is immaterial which ΦΦΨ was omitted. There is no reason to assume, as Streane does, that the Θ must be omitted to give the LXX reading, for the participle ΦΨςΦΨςΦΨςΨςΦΨςΨς is exactly parallel to ΦΦΨςΨς. Streane failed to note the necessity of inserting the haplograph ΦΦΨςΨς.

In this case the LXX is supported by the Vulgate, Aquila, and Symmachus texts, and it is to be preferred.

The most important examples of variation due to the division of consonants have been given. Similar examples may be found in the following places: 5:6 8:18 16:7 20:9 31:8. In most of such cases, there are other differences which make it a difficult task to decide which manner of dividing the consonants is preferable. Each case must be studied in a manner similar to that which was used above before a decision can be made. In general it may be said that the MT division is to be preferred unless there is good reason to support the LXX. Those who made the division in the MT, whether the Masoretes or other Hebrew scholars, were better equipped for the task than the translator of the LXX.

In the Hebrew language most of the words are derived from trilliteral verb roots in such a fashion that a long list of nouns, adjectives, and

1. Loc cit.
verb forms may be derived from a single root. The language is so con­structed that similar and even identical words may be derived from different roots with totally different meanings. Moreover, some roots are identical in form although actually different roots with different meanings. The problem of identifying the root of a given word was much more difficult before the use of written vowels, for the distinguishing of various and similar roots largely depends on the vowels, whether writ­ten or understood. As the translator had no vowels written in the text which he used, he was greatly puzzled at times as to the proper root from which to derive certain words. When Hebrew was a living language there was no necessity for the native Hebrew to know the roots in order to speak; he merely learned the meanings of the various words without classifying them as derived from certain roots. It was a different mat­ter when Hebrew became a dead language, for then the Hebrew student or translator needed to know the proper roots from which to derive the words in order to accurately understand the language. In the LXX there are cases in which the Greek represents Hebrew words derived from different roots than the roots for the corresponding words as pointed in the MT.

In 2:31 the LXX rendering is "we will not be ruled over" for the MT "we are broken loose". There is the addition of the negative, but the important divergence is that the translator presumed the word }7}'7 came from the root }7} } "to rule over" instead of from the root "to break loose". The passage makes good sense in either text, and the meaning is much the same. There is no evident reason why the LXX should be preferred instead of the MT. As it is usually better to allow the
Hebrew text to remain as it is unless there is a good reason to change it and in a case like this no emendation of the MT should be suggested.

There is an example of variation in 17:8 in which the LXX is clearly superior. The word כְּרֵךְ is so pointed in the MT as to derive it from the root כָּרֵךְ, "to see". The translator, however, took it to be from the root כַּרְךָ, "to fear" and pointed it as such. The first part of this verse in the MT reads, "For he shall be as a tree planted by the waters, and that spreadeth out his roots by the river, and shall not see when heat cometh." The word "fear" is more appropriate in this connection than "see" and is the preferred reading. 1

Two other examples are to be found in 17:9, 16. In v.9 the MT רֵךְ has been pointed to mean "dangerously sick", but in the LXX it has been pointed to mean "man". In both cases the root is written כָּרֵךְ, but the root in the first case means "to be evil, to be deadly", while the root in the second case means "to be strong". In the MT the sentence reads thus, "The heart -- desperately sick", but in the LXX it is "The heart -- (it is) the man." The meaning is a little changed in v.16, and the words are slightly different although they are from the same roots as those given above. The MT reads, "neither have I desired the woeful (ץוּ) day", and the LXX reads, "neither have I desired the day of man" (ץו). In neither of these examples is the

1. Rudolph, op. cit., p. 34
   Peake, op. cit., 1 p. 223
   Driver, op. cit., p. 100
   Streane, op. cit., p. 100
LXX preferable, although in the second example the meaning of the two texts is very similar. The "day of man" would refer to the judgment day, a "woeful" day. In these two cases the translator chose the more frequently used meaning of the word, but he was in error.

There is a favorite expression of Jeremiah, י"ע בתי יִתְנָה, "terror on every side" which occurs several times in the book. The translator was apparently confused as to the actual meaning of the expression. In 20:3 it is used as a proper noun in the MT, but the translator did not understand it as such and attempted to translate instead of transliterating. The word י"ע comes from the root י"ע, meaning "to be afraid", but the translator derived it from the root י"ע meaning "to gather" or "to dwell". He translated with the word מְנַהֲג, meaning "exile" or "foreigner", as a proper noun. In v.10 of the same chapter the same expression is used in the MT, but it is not used as a proper noun. Here the translator rendered it as a participial construction, "gathering round". In these cases the translator failed to recognize the expression as a favorite one of Jeremiah, and derived it from a wrong root. In fact he translates the expression differently every time it occurs.

The MT is again to be preferred in 22:22, although the LXX makes fair sense. The MT reads יִתְנָה "your wickedness," from the root יִתְנָה "to be evil", but the LXX "your friends" would require the word to be derived from יִתְנָה, "to desire," "to be friendly". The sentence is
better as it stands in the MT, "Surely then shalt thou be ashamed and confounded for all thy wickedness".

In 31:12 the MT 777 comrades is united" is represented in the LXX as from the root 777 "to be united". In the MT the phrase as it stands, "and shall flow together", is obscure, but the LXX makes it clear. The LXX agrees with the rest of the verse, for Jeremiah is speaking of the prosperity and happiness at the return of "Israel".

The above examples of variation due to derivation from different roots are the most important. They will suffice to show that the MT is usually to be preferred unless there is some particular reason to favor the LXX. Other instances of variations due to roots may be found in 2:34, 36; 9:5; and 46:15.

The system of writing Hebrew without vowels has already been explained, and the importance of supplying the proper vowels to the consonants should be evident. Therefore, the previous discussion on dividing the consonants into words and deriving the words from roots applies also in the discussion of variations due to vocalization. The discussion is therefore limited to those variations in which the consonants are the same and only the vowels are different.

In Jeremiah there are very many minute variations between the MT and LXX, and most of these resulted from the using of different pointing.

by the Masoretes and the LXX translator. There are so many of these that only the important ones may be referred to or discussed.

In the MT of 2:20 there is the word יָּשַׁבְשָׁב, meaning "I have broken". The same word is rendered "Thou hast broken" in the LXX, which represents a difference of only one vowel under the second from last consonant (יָּש). In this case the one who pointed this word in the MT did not recognize the archaic second person feminine ending and mistakenly pointed it as an ordinary first person singular ending. In this verse, as it stand in the MT, the subject understood is God, "For of old time I have broken thy yoke and burst thy bands". The context deals with the rebellion of the Hebrews. Therefore the sentence is less clear if it refers to God breaking the yoke. If the person is changed to second, it becomes more clearly a reference to the rebellion of the Hebrews. Grammatically speaking, either the MT or LXX is correct, and either pointing is acceptable. The LXX, however, is more suitable in meaning.

Reference was made in the previous chapter to a variation due to pointing in 2:34. As it is in the MT the verse reads, "Also in thy skirts is found the blood of the souls of the innocent poor; I have not found it at the place of breaking in but upon all these." In the LXX the last word is "Oak" representing יָּשַׁב instead of the MT יָּשַׁבְשָׁב.

1. Streane, op. cit., p. 16
2. Rudolph, op. cit., p. 4
   Driver, op. cit., p. 10
   Peake, op. cit., p. 95
Again, the variation is caused by the difference of only one vowel, but the meaning is quite different. In either text the meaning is obscure. Presumably "these" would refer either to "Israel's" evil deeds or to "skirts", but there is no acceptable explanation if the word should be pointed as "oak". Although Kennedy prefers the LXX, the MT pointing allows a better meaning. Again it should be noticed that there is no grammatical reason for preferring either one.

In the meaning of the last word of 4:31 there is a decided difference between the pointing of the MT and the LXX. The last sentence of the verse in the MT is, "Woe is me now, for my soul fainteth before the murderers". Instead of the "murderers" the LXX reads "the slain", which represents ı’י instead of ı’י a difference of three vowels. Either word is appropriate in the connection, but a slight preference may be given to the MT because of the reference to the murderers in v.30, "they seek thy life".

A difference in mood may be found in 11:18. The MT is "and the Lord gave me knowledge of it", but the LXX is, "Oh Lord, give me knowledge". There are other differences here, but the one of importance now is the pointing. The MT reads יִפְשָׁתִי instead of יִפְשִׂיתו, but the translator pointed the same word יִפְשָׁתִי. The LXX cannot be supported, for the context is all in the past tense. It seems to be understood that Jeremiah already knew the evil practices of the Hebrews, hence

3. Peake, op. cit., I p. 100
the imperative is out of place.

There is no need for further discussion of variation due to different vocalization of the same consonants. The reasons for the variations and the process of determining the correct pointing, where possible, should be clear. It remains to give a list of the more important variations due to vocalization which have not already been discussed. The references are classified mainly according to whether the MT or LXX is to be preferred. There are a few cases in which it is impossible to ascertain the preference, and these are placed in a third group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT Preferred</th>
<th>LXX Preferred</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24:6</td>
<td>4:19</td>
<td>6:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:2,34</td>
<td>23:17, 35, 36</td>
<td>38:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37:8</td>
<td>21:7, 15</td>
<td>36:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41:10</td>
<td>38:22, 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48:21</td>
<td>44:17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50:5, 21</td>
<td>46:17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51:38, 50</td>
<td>49:1, 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50:9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52:12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of the divergence of the LXX from the MT was caused by the translator's unfamiliarity with certain Hebrew words. His faulty training as a translator of the Hebrew language has already been discussed, and a conspicuous point is his inadequate knowledge of Hebrew vocabulary. The foregoing discussions on the division of consonants, the derivation from roots, and the vocalization of consonants are closely allied with the present discussion of the translator's deficient knowledge of Hebrew vocabulary. Although it is true that the first step of the translator would be to divide his undivided consonants into words,
yet at the same time he would have to have in mind the meaning of the word he was thus forming. The same would be true of the process of vocalization or derivation from roots. In any case, the final test of a translation is whether or not the translation conveys the meaning of the original language; the technical knowledge of the translator is of less importance. But it is in this final test that the LXX translator of Jeremiah is found wanting, for he did not adequately understand the meaning of the Hebrew text.

This deficiency of the translator is more apparent in his rendering of proper nouns, although he also had trouble with common nouns and other parts of speech. As the most important variations are those of proper nouns they will receive the most attention in this discussion. It can be easily understood why the translator had more difficulty with proper nouns, for, in a language which has no capital letters and in which proper nouns almost invariably have meanings as common nouns, proper nouns are very difficult to identify. The LXX translator did one of three things when he came to a proper noun: he transliterated, used a Greek or Egyptian proper noun, or translated.

For the most part, the translator rightly transliterated the proper nouns, although there are many exceptions to this statement. He was hindered by the differences in Greek and Hebrew pronunciation, and he made mistakes which are difficult to explain. For example, in 31:30 there is a reference to the brook Kidron, and instead of "Kidron" the LXX has "Kedron" (Ἄδρων). The mistake of one vowel is not important, but it is typical of many such slight variations. Another example is
The LXX "Hophaz" for the MT "from Uphaz" which was mentioned above under another topic. The translator must have been unfamiliar with the proper noun, for he mistakenly transliterated the prepositional prefix "from" as part of the word. In 6:1 he failed to transliterate Tekoa properly, for he spells it Thekoue (Θεκοῖα). This difference may be explained, in part. In the Hebrew text there is a prepositional prefix "in" attached to the word which gives the initial consonant a soft (th) instead of a hard (t) sound (שְׁלֹאָת יִשְׂרָאֵל), but that would not affect the sound of the proper noun in translating it. This evidently was a slip by the translator. The difference in the vowels may be accounted for by the fact that it is possible to point the word as in the LXX, but it wasn't the vocalization used by the Hebrews. A similar example is found in the same verse, for the LXX reads "Hithchacharai" for the Hebrew "Beth-haccher-em" (בֵית הָאָכַר עַמָּה).

There are a few cases where the translator used an Egyptian or Greek proper noun instead of transliterating. Thus in 2:16, 46:14,19 he did not transliterate the Hebrew "Noph" but used instead the word "Memphis". The translator knew that "Memphis" would be more clear to his readers, for "Noph" was evidently a colloquial Semitic or Egyptian name for the capital of lower Egypt. In 2:18 the translator did not transliterate the word "Shihor", which here refers to the Nile, instead he used "Geon" (גון), which is likely derived from the word גון,
32

"earth". The word "Nile" means "blue" or "dark"; the Hebrew "Shihor" means "black" or "dark"; the LXX "Geon" has a similar meaning in the sense of "earthy" and thus "dark" or "turbid".

There are a few examples of translating a Hebrew proper noun. The LXX reading "border of the sea" for the MT "Abarim" in 22:20 was discussed in the first chapter. The LXX makes quite a difference in 3:2, for it has "crow" instead of the MT "Arabian". The consonants are almost identical for either word, but it is obvious that the more appropriate is "Arabian". In this verse there is a comparison between the wickedness of the Hebrews and the Arabian who lies in wait in the wilderness, ready to attack and rob travellers. Another example is the failure of the translator to recognize "Terror-on-every-side" in 20:3 as a proper noun, and, in addition, he even translated the word wrongly, as was noted above.

At times the translator resorted to transliterating words when he did not understand the meaning of them. A peculiar Hebrew word in 31:21, יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָוָא יָو
explaining it.

In some cases the translator felt the need of explaining rather than just translating. In 2:23 the MT "the valley" refers to the valley of Gehenna outside of Jerusalem which was used for burning refuse, and some bodies of the dead were also thrown there. The LXX reads ἡ ἁγαθὴ ἀποκαρέων meaning "the cemetery". Evidently the translator thought the MT word too obscure and interpreted with the words "the cemetery". In commenting on this verse Kent is in error in interpreting the LXX as reading "the place where many men are burned". It is true that the Greek word literally means "the place of many men", but it is used as an idiom for cemetery. There is also no reference to burning in the LXX.

It is impossible to ascertain to what extent abbreviations were used in the ancient Hebrew manuscripts, but there are a few differences which may indicate that the translator misunderstood such abbreviations and the omission of vowel letters. In a later chapter the omission of consonants from the MT will be discussed, but it should be noted here that where there is a difference between the MT and LXX due to the omission of a vowel letter, the possibility that the letter was not written in the text should be considered. One example will be given here. The LXX has "as fire" instead of the MT "as a man" in 6:23. The difference is between אֱ and אָ, and if the vowel letter was not

written it means that the translator failed to supply it.

It is difficult to identify an error due to an abbreviation, for the error may have been due to some other cause. However, an error in 6:11 may have been caused by an abbreviation of the word נְאָפֶס to נְאָפֶס according to Kennedy. The MT has נְאָפֶס נְאָפֶס נְאָפֶס "the wrath of Jehovah", but the LXX as it stands represents נְאָפֶס "my wrath". It is possible that there is an example of an error due to the translator mistaking a Hebrew word for an abbreviation in 5:19, but it is questionable. Here the MT has נְאָפֶס "how" and the LXX נְאָפֶס נְאָפֶס נְאָפֶס "so be it, Jehovah". It is the suggestion of Rudolph that נְאָפֶס was taken to be an abbreviation of the three Hebrew words by the translator, but it is doubtful. Other errors which may be due to abbreviations are found in 5:17 15:14 31:7 33:9 34:19 37:4 23:26.3

In concluding this chapter on variations due to translation, it hardly need be said that there are very many errors which may be attributed to the training of the translator of the LXX of Jeremiah. His technical knowledge of the language was very deficient, likewise his knowledge of the content of the book. The important types of errors have been discussed, and a sufficient number of examples have been given to illustrate the cause of these errors and the process of identifying and correcting them.

1. cf. Kennedy, op. cit., p. 175.
2. op. cit., p. 7
CHAPTER III

DETERIORATION OF THE SEPTUAGINT

This thesis is primarily concerned with scribal errors in the MT of Jeremiah, but it is necessary to devote a large portion of the work to the study of the LXX before it is used to detect and correct errors in the MT. The process of translation of the LXX and the errors due to that process have already been discussed. There remains only one topic to be discussed before the scribal errors of the MT will be treated.

If the Hebrew text has deteriorated because of scribal errors which have crept into the text, it should be presumed that the Greek text has deteriorated in a similar fashion. Such is the case, for any text in any language necessarily suffers deterioration in being copied many times under various conditions. This thesis is not directly concerned with scribal errors in the LXX of Jeremiah, but, as the LXX is to be used in checking the MT, the comparative accuracy of the LXX must be determined. It is not necessary here to make a detailed analysis of scribal errors in the LXX, but enough of such a study should be made to determine the extent of such errors.

In general it may be said that the LXX does not have nearly as many errors as the MT. Not all of the reasons why this should be true are manifest. One reason is the difference in the languages. The Greek
language was more exact than the Hebrew, especially since the Hebrew language had no written vowels or other pointing in the text. The great advantage that the Greek text would have is obvious; for it would be much easier for a Greek copyist to detect an error after it had been made. Another reason why the LXX should have fewer mistakes is that it has been copied less frequently than the MT. The sources of the MT are older than the LXX, although this does not mean that they are older than the Hebrew text which the LXX represents. The MT and its sources have then been copied more often than the LXX for two reasons: (1) it is older than the LXX. (2) The Hebrew Bible has been used under more varying conditions than the Greek. The Greek Old Testament was used chiefly in those lands which were dominated by Greek influence, but the Hebrew Bible was used by Jews as well as by some Christians in all lands.

The various errors will be classified, as far as possible, according to their types. There is no clear example of transposition of letters, although Rudolph claims there is one in 8:7. The Greek reads λεγωθαι τοις αδρομοις, "field swallow" or "wild swallow", but the Hebrew reads שָׂפָה, which Rudolph suggests is due to a mistake in copying שָׂפָה for שָׂפָה, which he presumes was a transliteration of the Hebrew שָׂפָה. This is improbable, for in that case the שָׂפָה would have to be the noun and שָׂפָה an adjective. There is no such adjective, for the adjectival form is שָׂפָה שָׂפָה.

An example of inadvertent addition of a letter may be found in 34:5. The difference between the MT "they will burn" and the LXX "they will weep" is best explained as an error of the copyist in writing
A very similar mistake was also made in the same verse. Another possible example of addition of a letter may be found in the copying of ἓτι, "because" for ἓτι, "why" in 26:9.

Two examples of haplography, the inadvertent omission of letters, may be given. In 2:5 there are several differences between the MT and the LXX, but one may be explained as the copying of ἔχεσα, "have" for ἔχεσας, "hold back". The copyist evidently copied ἱκεῖοι, "rams" for ἱμεῖοι, "princes" in 25:34.

Several examples of mistakes due to a difference of only one letter are to be found. In 5:31 the LXX reads "they slapped "with their hands)" , but the MT reads "they ruled (by their hands)". This represents an error of copying ἔχεσας ἦσαν, for ἔχεσας ἦσαν.

The Greek copyist may have copied λαος "people," for ναος, "temple" in 30:18, although this would assume an unusual meaning for ναος. The Hebrew word here means "fortress" or "palace". Usually ναος is confined to the meaning "temple", although strictly speaking it may refer to any "dwelling place". A difference of ἓτι, "because" for ἓτι, "again" is found in 31:4. In this verse there are two clauses which should both begin with ἓτι according to the MT, but in the LXX the first of the two clauses begins with ἓτι by error. Another copyist's mistake is τῆς "the" for γῆς, "land" in 48:33. The word for "land" is in the MT, but in the LXX it must be supplied. A similar case is found in 49:37 where "evil" or "evils ", ἔκακα, is in the MT but not in the LXX, and it must be supplied to complete the thought. Instead the
preposition \( \text{xar\textsuperscript{a}} \), "with", appears, which is not represented in the MT. An error of one letter may have occurred in 50:15, but it is only a possibility. The MT has "shout" as the first word of the verse, but the LXX has "prevail against", \( \text{xata\textsuperscript{a} proan\textsuperscript{a}re} \). The LXX reading may have arisen from an error in copying \( \text{xata\textsuperscript{a} proan\textsuperscript{a}re} \). The difficulty is that this word is usually used in the LXX to mean "applauding", and it is hardly more than a possibility that it was used to render the MT "shout" in this verse. An example similar to that found in 30:16 is the mistake of \( \text{laoc\textcircled{C}} \) for \( \text{vaoc\textcircled{C}} \) in 51:11. In this case, however, the \( \text{vaoc\textcircled{C}} \) exactly represents the Hebrew "temple" which the copyist mistakenly copied as "people".

Many of the differences between the MT and the LXX which seem to be due to changes made in the LXX after translation are differences of several letters. It was by no means uncommon for a copyist to make a mistake of several letters, especially when there were two words of similar appearance or sound. In the examples given below the MT is understood to be more valid than the LXX, and the probable explanation of the LXX variation from the MT is given. However, the explanations should be regarded as suggestive rather than final. There is not enough evidence to state dogmatically that such an error arose in a certain way, and the same statement applies to any type of error within the LXX which has been discussed. For the sake of brevity and simplification the examples will be given in tabular form. In the first column are the supposedly incorrect

---

LXX words and in the second column the suggested original words which represent the corresponding terms in the MT and from which the present LXX words may have been derived.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested incorrect words in the LXX</th>
<th>Suggested original words in the MT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:22 έορταν &quot;will be&quot;</td>
<td>γέοδοιται &quot;will fall&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:26 μάνα &quot;manna&quot;</td>
<td>μα καδ &quot;will fall&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25:23 πος (proper noun)</td>
<td>θεσπ &quot;will be&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25:37 καταλοικά &quot;remnants&quot;</td>
<td>καταλοικα &quot;abodes&quot;²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30:20 διεσκευασται &quot;will go&quot;</td>
<td>διεσκευασται &quot;will be&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:21 ἡμέρας &quot;shoulders&quot;(?)</td>
<td>ἡμέρας &quot;ways&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35:5 ἱεροί (proper noun)</td>
<td>ἱερα &quot;will be burnt&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56:24 ἐὰν ()νομ &quot;sought&quot;</td>
<td>ἐὰν ()νομοὶ &quot;were afraid&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46:9 άνάβας &quot;mount&quot;</td>
<td>άνάβας &quot;handle&quot;³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46:19 άκοψιται &quot;will be called&quot;</td>
<td>άκοψιται &quot;will be burnt&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48:12 ἱερὰν &quot;horns&quot;</td>
<td>ἱερὰν &quot;jars&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48:17 ἐκ βαρίων &quot;utter&quot;</td>
<td>ἐκ βαρίων &quot;know&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50:16 βαρίων &quot;serpents&quot;</td>
<td>βαρίων &quot;leaders&quot;⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62:24 η () &quot;the way&quot;</td>
<td>η () &quot;the threshold&quot;⁵</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. Transliteration of the Hebrew "offering".
2. or "resting places" (Hebrew, "folds")
3. or "hold up"
5. "the threshold" or "the door".
In addition to the above examples of the various types of variations of the LXX from the MT due to deterioration of the LXX, similar types of errors may be found in the following references, but they are obscure and difficult to explain: 15:10; 23:27; 25:10, 23:37; 31:13; 29:26,27; 19, 35; 52:24; 45:2; 48:17, 28; 49:21, 25, 36; 51:32, 34; 52:19.

In general, the errors within the LXX may be said to have been due to two factors, the human element and the physical condition of the manuscripts. In some cases the copyist was careless in his work and made various mistakes of eye or ear. In other cases the copyist was handicapped by the illegibility of the manuscript. Some of the letters and even whole words were blurred from many causes, such as much thumbing, fading of ink, or actual disintegration of the parchment or papyri. In these cases the copyist had to reconstruct the words as well as he could.

In concluding this chapter, it may be said that, although there are many errors within the LXX, it has come down to the present age in good condition. The errors are no more than those which are to be expected in a text as old as the LXX. It is certain that the LXX has been kept in a better condition than the MT, for, as will be seen later, there are far more scribal errors in the MT than in the LXX.
CHAPTER IV

ERRORS OF CONFUSION

The previous chapters of this thesis have been somewhat introductory in character, for the subject proper of this thesis, the critical study of the scribal errors in the book of Jeremiah, is discussed in this and the remaining three chapters. It was necessary to discuss the LXX of Jeremiah with some detail in order to understand properly its relation to the MT, its validity as compared with the MT, and the manner in which it may be used to check against errors in the MT. The scribal errors in the MT may be classified according to the type of variation, depending on whether they were due to confusion, transposition, addition, or omission of consonants or words.

The term confusion is here used in the sense of copying by mistake, one letter for another, although in the same position. There are two reasons why letters and words may be confused in the process of copying a text. These reasons are the same as those mentioned in the preceding chapter in connection with the deterioration of the LXX, namely, the errors were due either to the deterioration of the writing materials or to the element of personal fallibility on the part of the copyist. The liability of the scribe to err in his copying increased in proportion to the deterioration of the manuscripts. This was particularly true of those cases in which some of the letters were entirely

(41)
obliterated, for he would have to fill in the missing letters according to the context. Even when the scribe copied from a perfect text he was liable to make mistakes in copying consonants or words which were similar in form or sound. Moreover, he seems to have made mistakes where little or no similarity is apparent. Most of the confusion was due to similarity in form, but some of it was also due to similarity in sound, for, as the scribe copied the text, he might think of the sound as well as the appearance of what he was copying. In addition, it seems that occasionally a scribe would read the text aloud as another wrote the copy, which would provide opportunity for errors due to similarity in sound to creep into the text.

There are cases of confusion of vowel letters which may have been due either to similarity in sound or form or to the fact that the vowel letters were not always written. The most common of these was the confusion of ə and ʌ. The difference in meaning caused by the confusion of these two letters may be little or much. Thus in 21:6 the LXX represents ə(ə) for the MT ʌ(ʌ), but the difference in meaning is only the addition of "and" to the word as it is translated in the LXX. In this case the difference is so slight that either text is acceptable. In a similar instance in 50:8 the LXX represents a change of ʌ to ə, but in this case the meaning of the MT is more appropriate. It might be noted here that in those cases in which the MT is to be preferred it is presumed that the error arose in the text.

1. cf. Streane, op. cit. p. 14
from which the LXX was made after it became separated from that text which became the MT. When the LXX is preferred it implies that the error crept into the text which became the MT after it was separated from that text from which the LXX was made. In 46:22 there is an instance of the confusion of  and  in which the meaning of the MT is much better, for instead of the MT  "army", the LXX has  "sand". The LXX is to be preferred in the other examples of the confusion of  and  which may be found in 31:5, 50:6, and 51:58.

There are three examples of the confusion of  and  . In 2:24 the LXX reading represents a correction in a suffix from  to  , changing the pronoun from "his" to "her". There is no doubt of the validity of the LXX in this case for it is supported by several other Hebrew manuscripts and by the MT marginal reading. There are two more examples of the confusion of  and  in 49:8 and 51:28 in which no preference may be given.

There are two examples of the confusion of  and  . In 32:25 the MT reading is more appropriate in the context but in 26:20 the LXX is superior to the MT.

In 31:5 is the only example of the confusion of  and  . The MT  "profane" or "enjoy" is more appropriate in this verse than the LXX  "praise".

Several of the consonant letters were confused more than once.

1. Rudolph, op. cit., p. 4.
as has already been noticed, but the confusion of \( \overline{\imath} \) and \( \imath \) is found so frequently that it merits special attention. There are thirteen instances of the confusion of these consonants, and the reason for such frequent confusion is not hard to find, for the two letters are similar in the modern Hebrew alphabet as well as in the ancient Semitic alphabets. The similarity is readily discernible in three various ways of writing the same two letters, \( \overline{\imath}-\imath \), \( \imath-\imath \), \( \overline{\imath}-\imath \). The difference such confusion may make can be seen in 2:16 in which the MT has \( \overline{\imath} \overline{\imath} \), "they have broken thee", but the LXX represents \( \overline{\imath} \overline{\imath} \overline{\imath} \), "they have known thee". In this case the LXX is superior, for the figure of breaking "the crown of the head" as it stands in the MT is too strong for this passage, and the LXX lends a smoother reading. The other occurrences of the confusion of \( \overline{\imath} \) and \( \imath \) are similar to this example and may be classified as follows:

Confusion of the letters \( \overline{\imath} \) and \( \imath \):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT Preferred</th>
<th>LXX Preferred</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15:12</td>
<td>3:15</td>
<td>8:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:37</td>
<td>6:7</td>
<td>13:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32:59</td>
<td>6:18</td>
<td>48:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40:11</td>
<td>47:5</td>
<td>48:30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some letters were confused more than once and many more only once, but there is no need of discussing them. The process of determining the preferred reading is similar to that used above in the

1. Kautzsch, E. Basset's Hebrew Grammar, p. x. (Table of early Semitic alphabets)
discussion of the confusion of \( \text{\textdollar} \) and \( \text{\textcent} \), for the decision depends on an examination of the context and other evidence. Most of these letters which were confused have little similarity in appearance to explain the cause of variation. Therefore, in such cases it is likely that the manuscripts had so deteriorated that the letter was either very obscure or obliterated. However, it is also possible that the copyist would confuse distinct letters although they had little or no similarity. There are a few letters which had some similarity in the ancient Semitic alphabets although little or none in the present Hebrew alphabet. These are \( \text{\textdollar} \) and \( \text{\textcent} \), \( \text{\texteuro} \) and \( \text{\textcent} \). Moreover, the confusion of \( \text{\texteuro} \) and \( \text{\textcent} \) may be partly explained through similarity of sound or through phonetic change. The letter \( \text{\texteuro} \) may sound like either "v" or "h"; the letter \( \text{\textcent} \) may sound like either "p" or "f".

The remaining cases of confusion of letters have been studied, and the results are given below. Each case has been studied by itself and the preference given to the MT, the LXX, or neither, depending on the most appropriate meaning or other evidence. The Hebrew letters which were confused are given as well as, where possible, the preference of text. The first table contains those examples which occurred more than once and the second table those which occurred only once.

1. Ibid.
2. Brockelmann, C. "Semitische Sprachwissenschaft" p. 66
Letters confused more than once.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mt Preferred</th>
<th>LXXPreferred</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Pi, \Pi$</td>
<td>$L, S$</td>
<td>$L, S$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20:17$</td>
<td>$25:12$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Pi, J$</td>
<td>$\Pi, J$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3:8$</td>
<td>$4:12$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Pi, J$</td>
<td>$\Pi, J$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$28:10$</td>
<td>$44:12$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$31:39$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25:32$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Pi, J$</td>
<td>$\Pi, J$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$11:10$</td>
<td>$31:11$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$49:12$</td>
<td>$47:15$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Pi, J$</td>
<td>$\Pi, J$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$31:22$</td>
<td>$25:29$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7:29$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Letters confused only once.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mt Preferred</th>
<th>LXXPreferred</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Pi, \Pi$</td>
<td>$L, \Pi$</td>
<td>$L, \Pi$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$12:12$</td>
<td>$21:12$</td>
<td>$11:12$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3:4$</td>
<td>$3:4$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$31:17$</td>
<td>$31:17$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$31:18$</td>
<td>$31:18$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$31:39$</td>
<td>$31:39$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$34:10$</td>
<td>$34:10$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$46:12$</td>
<td>$46:12$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$51:59$</td>
<td>$51:59$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many cases of difference between the MT and the LXX represent variations of more than one letter within a word although the two words thus differentiated in the two texts may be similar in other letters. The reasons for these variations were discussed in the opening of this chapter, but it should be noted here that the greater the variation in the word or words the greater is the likelihood that the manuscript deteriorated in that place. It is more likely that differences of
several letters were caused by physical deterioration of the manuscripts than by the copyist, for it is not very probable that a copyist would be so careless. Yet it is possible that copyists made mistakes of several letters and even of more than one word in copying a perfectly distinct text. The general similarity of the varying words may be a similarity of sound, but more frequently it is a similarity of appearance.

In many cases the difference is not confined simply to confusion of letters, although this is the chief source of variation, for other differences are frequently present, such as the omission, addition, or transposition of letters. A few examples will be given to illustrate these points.

The MT of 216 reads \( \text{7)Y \emptyset \text{i\( )\} ,} \) “and the shadow of death”, but the LXX represents \( \text{7} \text{1\( )\} \text{I}\) \( \text{and unfruitful}\). In this case it is uncertain which is to be preferred, for either word is appropriate in the context. Smith and Rudolph prefer the LXX, and the Syriac also supports the LXX. Peake, however, claims that this and other variations in this verse in the LXX would spoil the meter. In this instance there is general similarity of form and also of sound in two of the letters \( \text{7} \) and \( \text{I}\) for the letters are both dentals and have similar sounds.

1. op. cit., p. 92.
2. op. cit., p. 2.
3. Ibid.
4. op. cit., I p. 89.
In 20:8 the MT \( \text{P} \text{\textit{Y}} \text{\textit{M}} \) "I shall cry out", is represented by the LXX as \( \text{P} \text{\textit{W}} \text{\textit{N}} \), "I shall laugh". The context is obscure here; therefore, neither word may be definitely preferred. Skinner, however, prefers the LXX. There is also some similarity of sound in this case, for \( \text{W} \) is similar to \( \text{V} \). It is easy to see how the manuscript may have been so poorly preserved in this spot that the two middle letters were obliterated or very indistinct; consequently, the copyist would have only the first and last letters with which to reconstruct the word.

An example of more than one type of difference within a word may be found in 6:19 in which the MT \( \text{\textit{Y}} \text{\textit{J}} \text{\textit{J}} \text{i} \text{\textit{W}} \text{\textit{N}} \text{\textit{S}} \), "of their thoughts", is represented in the LXX to be \( \text{\textit{Y}} \text{\textit{J}} \text{\textit{J}} \text{\textit{W}} \text{\textit{S}} \text{\textit{A}} \), "of their backturning". The LXX reading fits in well with the idea of the rebelliousness of the people contained in the context and should be preferred. In this case there is a transposition of one letter and the addition of another letter to the MT.

Procedure similar to that used above was applied in the study of the following cases in which there are variations of more than one letter, although there is general similarity between the two varying words. As in the tables given above, the preferred text is indicated where it is possible to do so.

---

2. cf. Peake, op. cit., I p. 145
   Driver, op. cit., p. 37
Variations of several consonants within similar words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mt Preferred</th>
<th>LXX Preferred</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:17</td>
<td>3:1</td>
<td>4:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:9</td>
<td>9:10</td>
<td>9:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:9</td>
<td>25:24</td>
<td>9:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:5</td>
<td>29:7</td>
<td>12:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28:23</td>
<td>29:14</td>
<td>25:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27:6</td>
<td>31:9</td>
<td>25:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29:32</td>
<td>32:43</td>
<td>29:32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30:18</td>
<td>35:2</td>
<td>30:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:15</td>
<td>37:16</td>
<td>30:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:21</td>
<td>38:28</td>
<td>31:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:23</td>
<td>40:6</td>
<td>31:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32:24</td>
<td>40:19</td>
<td>31:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32:37</td>
<td>42:1</td>
<td>32:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35:6</td>
<td>42:20</td>
<td>32:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37:7</td>
<td>45:10</td>
<td>32:36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41:11</td>
<td>46:25</td>
<td>35:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41:5</td>
<td>47:5</td>
<td>36:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46:26</td>
<td>48:4</td>
<td>37:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49:2</td>
<td>50:6</td>
<td>37:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50:24</td>
<td>50:11</td>
<td>37:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50:26</td>
<td>50:17</td>
<td>38:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50:42</td>
<td>51:50</td>
<td>42:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50:44</td>
<td>51:68</td>
<td>44:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51:13</td>
<td>46:7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51:26</td>
<td>46:14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51:27</td>
<td>48:2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52:8</td>
<td>49:19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49:28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49:32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51:19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51:58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the variation of letters within a single word, there are numerous examples of differences within several words, although the words have a general similarity. These variations are characterized by confusion, omission, addition and transposition of letters, although the general appearance or sound of the words may be similar. These variations are discussed here rather than in one of
the subsequent chapters because the chief difference is in the confusion of letters. If there is a difference of several words, it probably implies a large degree of deterioration of the manuscripts, for it is not likely that a copyist would make an error of several words. Yet such scribal errors are possible, especially if the scribe was very careless.

In 6:6 the MT may be translated "this is the city to be visited;" but the LXX reads "0 city of falsehood". The MT and the Hebrew which the LXX represents are placed parallel in order that the similarity may more readily be seen:

\(\text{MT}: \gamma\rho\omega \eta \gamma\mu\gamma \hbar \eta \), "this is the city to be visited."  
\(\text{LXX}: \gamma\rho\omega \eta \gamma\mu\gamma \hbar \), "0 city of falsehood."  

The LXX gives a much better meaning here, and it is preferred by many commentators.  

The example below is found in 13:19. In this case the LXX is clearly the original text, for the Hebrew of the MT is doubtful. Moreover, the LXX is supported by other texts, such as the Syriac and Vulgate. The initial \(\eta\) is evidently a dittograph from the preceding word.  

\(\text{MT}: \eta\lambda\varepsilon \iota \lambda \iota \eta \), "it is wholly carried away captive."  
\(\text{LXX}: \eta\lambda\varepsilon \iota \lambda \iota \), "an entire captivity."  

It is uncertain which text is to be preferred in the instance found

---

5. Peake, op. cit., p. 140.  
7. Driver, op. cit., p. 27.  
in 15:16, although Skinner prefers the LXX.  

The Hebrew is doubtful in the MT, but the LXX is little if any better. The LXX connects the first two words with the close of v.16, beginning v.16 with "Consume them."

\[
\text{Mt: } \text{7:21} \quad \text{"Thy words were found and I did eat them" (Mt).}
\]

\[
\text{LXX: } \text{7:21} \quad \text{"from those who set at nought thy words. Consume them "(LXX).}
\]

The remaining examples of variations of several words with general similarity are given below, classified as far as possible according to the preference of text.

### Variations within more than one word with general similarity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mt Preferred</th>
<th>LXX Preferred</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25:4</td>
<td>6:16</td>
<td>7:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25:8</td>
<td>11:11</td>
<td>26:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28:9</td>
<td>15:12</td>
<td>33:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28:7</td>
<td>25:29</td>
<td>35:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30:16</td>
<td>25:33</td>
<td>50:26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30:17</td>
<td>32:36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:1</td>
<td>34:2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:8</td>
<td>34:19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34:10</td>
<td>41:6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49:9</td>
<td>41:9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50:15</td>
<td>44:25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50:26</td>
<td>48:9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52:34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this chapter on the confusion of consonants and words the various types of variation have been discussed. First, the cases of confusion of single consonants were studied. Second, there was the discussion of the confusion of more than one consonant within a single word. Third, the

1. Skinner, op. cit., p. 204
cases of variations due to differences within several words but with general similarity were dealt with. Examples have been discussed to illustrate the method of procedure in explaining and correcting the errors, and the remaining cases have been classified as far as possible according to which text is to be preferred.
CHAPTER V

ERRORS OF TRANPOSITION

In the previous chapter there was a discussion of those scribal errors which have arisen because of the confusion of consonants within one or more words. The next type of error to be discussed is that of errors due to the transposition of consonants within a word. By transposition is meant the misplacement of one or more letters in the copying process. Transposition is usually in the form of the interchanging of two adjacent consonants, although consonants may be misplaced a distance of more than one letter. The explanation of such misplacement of letters is the same as that given in the previous chapter and should be kept in mind here, namely, that the scribal errors were due either to the deterioration of the manuscripts or to the fallibility of the copyist.

The transposition of consonants is found to be the least frequent of the four types of error, and the reason for this is obvious. A copyist would be less likely to misplace letters as he copied because such errors would be more easily detected than errors due to the confusion, omission, or addition of letters. The misplacement of a consonant greatly affects the appearance, sound, and meaning of the word, much more so than when a letter is confused, omitted, or added. Although there are not many instances of errors due to the transposition of consonants, yet a chapter should be devoted to them since they represent
a distinct type of scribal error.

In 2:16 there is an example of the interchanging of two consonants. The MT may be translated thus: "and they have made his land waste, his cities are burned up, without inhabitant". Instead of "are burned up" the LXX has "are broken down", representing  \( \gamma \gamma \gamma \) (LXX) for \( \gamma \gamma \gamma \) (MT). The present MT reading of \( \gamma \gamma \gamma \) should be corrected to \( \gamma \gamma \gamma \), making it more similar in the ending to the LXX.\(^1\) Although the LXX is supported here by the Syriac and the Vulgate texts and also by four Hebrew manuscripts, there is no reason to prefer it rather than the MT, for the meaning of either is appropriate here.\(^2\)

There is a similar example, involving the same two words, in 4:26 in which the LXX has \( \gamma \gamma \gamma \), "are burned up" for the MT \( \gamma \gamma \gamma \) "are broken down". In this case, however, the LXX reading is more fitting in the context and is supported by sixteen of the Hebrew manuscripts, therefore it is to be preferred.\(^3\)

It is uncertain whether or not there is an example in 12:4, where the MT has \( \gamma \gamma \gamma \gamma -\gamma \gamma \gamma \), "and the herbs of the whole country" but the LXX \( \gamma \gamma \gamma \gamma -\gamma \gamma \gamma \), "and all herbs of the country". If this variation is to be explained as an error of misplacement, it is unusual, for it is unlikely that a copyist would make an error so obvious. The errors of transposition are usually misplacements of a single consonant or the interchanging of two consonants. It may be possible that

\(\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\) Rudolph, op. cit., p. 3
\(\text{\textsuperscript{2}}\) Ibid.
the translator mistakenly read \( \text{\(n\)}} \), taking the \( \text{\(n\)}} \) from the following word, and treated \( \text{\(n\)}} \) as a modifier of the preceding word. The word \( \text{\(n\)}} \) cannot be used to modify a preceding word, nor is it common for \( \text{\(n\)}} \) to be so used. In this case there is no basis for judgment other than the appropriateness of meaning, and in either text the passage gives a fitting meaning.

There seems to be little doubt that the LXX discloses a scribal error in 22:23 where the present MT has two consonants which have been interchanged. The MT reads \( \text{\(n\)}} \), "though shalt be pitied", but the LXX indicates the reading, \( \text{\(n\)}} \), "thou shalt groan". Here the LXX gives a better and more nearly correct meaning since it is supported by the Syriac and Vulgate texts and also by some modern authorities.

Two very similar examples of the interchanging of \( \text{\(n\)}} \) and \( \text{\(n\)}} \) are found. In 30:7 the MT has \( \text{\(n\)}} \), "woe", but the LXX reading is \( \text{\(n\)}} \), "they were" which Rudolph prefers. In 51:2 however, the MT has \( \text{\(n\)}} \), "they were" and the LXX has \( \text{\(n\)}} \), "woe". The word is likely corrupt in either text, for a different and preferable reading is given by the Syriac and Vulgate texts. In this instance, therefore, neither the MT nor LXX may be cited as preferable.

There is little difference in meaning between the MT and LXX in

1. Rudolph, op. cit., p. 43
2. Strosne, op. cit., p. 136
3. Peake, op. cit., p. 289
3. Ibid., p. 100.
35:5 where the MT \( D' \gamma \lambda \), "bowls" is represented in the LXX to be \( \gamma \lambda \), "goblet". Either word makes equally good sense here, and there is no other evidence as to which text is to be preferred. The extra consonant \( \delta \) in the MT text may be explained either as a haplograph, in the case of LXX, or as a ditto graph, in the case of the MT, for the following word begins with \( \delta \).

A change of the person of a verb is indicated by the LXX in 43:12, for it has \( \gamma \gamma \gamma \), "he will kindle" instead of the MT \( \gamma \gamma \gamma \), "I will kindle". The context calls for the LXX reading, for the other verbs in the sentence are in the third person, which makes a first person in this verb inappropriate. Furthermore, the Syriac and Vulgate texts here agree with the LXX.\(^1\)

The LXX is likely in error in 50:7 where it has \( \gamma \gamma \gamma \gamma \gamma \gamma \gamma \), "leave them alone" for the MT \( \gamma \gamma \gamma \gamma \gamma \gamma \), "are not guilty". Although either text is appropriate here, the MT is a little more fitting.

The remaining examples of the transposition of consonants which have not been discussed are of a similar nature, although in some cases the words contain other scribal errors which complicate their treatment. A study of these remaining instances of transposition of consonants reveals that the MT is preferable in 31:37; 42:17 and 50:32; the LXX is preferable in 9:2 and 12:4; and neither text is preferable in 23:28 and 31:38.

---

1. Rudolph, op. cit., p. 83
In this chapter those scribal errors were discussed which are characterized by the transposition of one or more consonants. It was pointed out that this type of error is the least frequent, mainly because the misplacement of a letter so greatly changes the appearance, sound, or meaning of a word that it is easily noted. Usually this misplacement is in the form of the interchanging of two adjacent letters although a letter or letters may be misplaced a distance of several letters. As in the previous chapter, the preference of text was indicated whenever the context or other evidence provided a basis for judgment.
CHAPTER VI

ERRORS OF OMISSION

In the two preceding chapters the scribal errors due to the confusion and the transposition of consonants were discussed. In this chapter the errors due to the omission of letters and words will be discussed, which will leave one more class of errors, the addition of letters and words, for the final chapter.

Many of the variations between the MT and the LXX are the result of additions to or omissions from one text or the other. In the introduction of this thesis the fact was mentioned that there are very many words in the MT which are not represented in the LXX, but it was also pointed out that this fact is chiefly due to the processes of redaction and expansion of the MT rather than to any process of abbreviation in the LXX, either intentionally or unintentionally. However, there are many errors of omission or addition on the part of both texts which may be termed scribal errors. In this chapter the omission of single consonants in both texts will be discussed first; the omission of words from the LXX due to the similarity in the beginning of the passage will be discussed second; the omission of words from the LXX due to similarity in the ending of the passage will be discussed third; the omission of a few words from the MT will be discussed fourth.

It was easy for the copyist to skip over one or more letters as
he copied the text, especially if the manuscript was poorly written or badly preserved. Here, as in the preceding chapters, the same two reasons for scribal errors are found, namely, personal fallibility on the part of the scribe and the deterioration of the manuscripts. The letters omitted are frequently similar to or identical with adjacent letters, although in some cases no similarity is apparent. In the following discussion the errors will be classified in the order mentioned above and according to whether they are omissions from the MT or from the LXX.

A simple example may be found in 4:10 where the word "sword" has the article (א"ה) with it in the LXX but not in the MT. This letter was likely omitted by mistake because the last letter of the preceding word is also א, for it is particularly easy to skip over one of two adjacent and identical letters. The א may be regarded as an inadvertent omission from the MT.¹

In 4:26 there is an example of the omission of א from the MT. In this verse, as it stands in the Mt, the concluding clause does not have "and" (א) to connect it with the rest of the sentence. The LXX does have "and" here, moreover, it is supported by several of the Hebrew manuscripts and also by the Vulgate and Syriac texts.² It is not hard to understand that it would be easy for a scribe to overlook a letter so simply made as א; this would be even more true of the Hebrew

¹. cf. Kennedy, op. cit., p. 132.
An example of the omission of " may be found in 32:33, in which the present MT has the form 73/f, "teach". This form may be either infinitive or perfect indicative of the third person, but an imperfect verb of the first person is required by the context. The infinitive form might be acceptable if a pronoun of the first person were with it, but there is none. The LXX indicates that the " has been omitted by error and that the form should be 72/3/f teach" or "though I teach". The LXX reading greatly simplifies the Hebrew text and renders a more appropriate meaning. In addition, the LXX is upheld by the Syriac and Vulgate texts and also by Rudolph.

In the following table further examples of omissions from the MT are given. These are regarded as omissions from the MT rather than additions to the LXX because the evidence, which may be either internal or external, so indicates. The uncertain cases, which may be regarded either as additions to one text or omissions from the other will be left to the next chapter. In this table it will be noticed that the vowel letters, especially ) and ', are more frequently omitted than the other letters. This is due, partly to the fact that some of the vowel letters may not have been written, and partly to the fact that ) and ' are simply formed letters which may easily be overlooked.

1. Rudolph, op. cit., p. 66.
Examples of single consonants omitted from the MT

1 5:7; 32:12; 33:2; 38:27; 41:10; 44:10; 48:34
2 28:13; 42:10
3 27:3; 51:69
4 42:16

The cases of omission of letters from the LXX are very similar to those from the MT. In 6:23 the MT reads "every one set in array, as a man to the battle," "as a man" being a translation of $\omega \alpha \nu \delta$. Instead of this the LXX represents the word $\omega \alpha \nu \delta$, "as fire", which is inappropriate in this passage. In addition, the LXX is not supported by any other reading; for that reason there is little doubt that the letter $\eta$ was omitted by error.¹

There is an example of the omission of $\eta$, "and", from the LXX in 15:12. This makes the following word in the text a modifier, "of brass" instead of "and brass", as in the MT. The word "and" is required here, for "brass" is correlative with "iron" in the same sentence: "can one break iron, even iron from the north and brass?". Other examples of the omission of consonants from the LXX are given in the table below. Again the frequency of the omission of vowel letters, especially $\dot{\alpha}$ and $\dot{\iota}$ should be noticed.

---
Examples of single consonants omitted from the LXX

30:8; 49:14, 30, 33; 50:16, 33, 42
3:2; 22:21; 26:23; 27:15; 51:25
62:14
76:4
81:14
12:10:5

Of the many words and passages in the MT which are omitted from the LXX, some appear to be scribal omissions. However, it is not advisable to say definitely that they were omitted by error, for there is always the possibility that they are the result of the expansion of the MT during the process of redaction. The most that can be said of the following examples is that it is possible or probable that they were omitted by error. The examples will be discussed under the two heads given above: those omissions which are due to similarity of beginning, and those omissions which are due to similarity of ending.

By similarity of beginning is meant that the beginning of the omitted word or passage is similar to that part of the text which immediately follows the omitted word or passage. The eye of the copyist skipped over the portion of the text between the two similar points.

For example, in 32:28 there is in the MT a passage as follows:

"into the hand of the Chaldeans and into the hand of Nebuchadrezzar." The LXX omits "into the hand of the Chaldeans and", possibly because the eye of the copyist passed from
the first to the second \textsuperscript{7'-2}. Here there is no textual support for the LXX so the MT is presumably correct.

In 37:15 the MT has \textsuperscript{7'} as \textsuperscript{7'} \textsuperscript{7'} in the house of fetters'. This may have been because a scribe skipped from the first to the second \textsuperscript{7'}, for there seems to be no other explanation of the omission.

An important error of omission in the LXX is that of 51:44b-49a where it seems likely that the eye of a scribe passed from "Babylon shall fall" in v. 44 to "Babylon shall fall" in v. 49. Most of the modern authorities agree that this omission was accidental on the part of a copyist.\footnote{1}

Other examples similar to those given above, of omissions from the LXX because of similarity of beginning may be found in 32:14; 37:15; 44:1, 10, 14; 45:4; 49:13; and 50:36.

The omissions due to similarity of ending are those in which the scribe's eye passed from the last part of the passage which he correctly copied to the last part of the passage which he omitted, leaving out the text in between and one of the two similar portions.

In 27:5 the MT reads "I have made the earth, the man and the beast that are upon the earth" but the LXX omits all after "I have made the earth". A copyist evidently passed from the first to the second "the earth". The omission of the passage disturbs the meaning of the sentence; therefore the LXX omission is likely an error.\footnote{2}

\begin{itemize}
\item 1. Rudolph, op. cit., p. 104
\item Cornill and Ritzeig in Peake, op. cit., II p. 275
\item Strane, op. cit., p. 308
\item 2. cf. Rudolph, op. cit., p. 52, Peake, op. cit., II p. 45
\end{itemize}
There are three words repeated in 36:28, 29 which seemingly caused a scribe to err in omitting "concerning Jehoiakim the king of Judah" at the opening of v. 29. His eye passed from the words in v. 28 to the same words in the next verse causing him to make the omission. The omitted words are necessary in this verse to make clear to whom the Lord asks Jeremiah to speak concerning the burning of the roll.

One of the two possible examples of the omission of longer passages from the LXX because of similarity of ending is found in 27:20b-22a. This example is difficult to explain with an English translation, for the word order in the Hebrew is very different. In v. 20 the Lord is speaking of the remaining sacred vessels in the city which were not taken away when Jeconiah and the nobles were taken from "Jerusalem to Babylon." After these words the LXX omits as far as the end of v. 21 and the beginning of v. 22 where the MT has "and at Jerusalem: (They shall be carried) to Babylon." In the Hebrew text "Jerusalem" and "to Babylon" are adjacent in both v. 20 and v. 21-22; therefore, it seems that the copyist skipped from \( \text{\textperiodcentered} \text{\textperiodcentered} \text{\textperiodcentered} \) in v. 20 to \( \text{\textperiodcentered} \text{\textperiodcentered} \text{\textperiodcentered} \) at the close of v. 21 and the beginning of v. 22. It should be remembered in this connection that punctuation, such as the period (:), was not used in the ancient Hebrew manuscripts.

There is some doubt whether the passage 39:4-13 is absent from the LXX because of an error of omission, although Rudolph suggests that

1. cf. Rudolph, op. cit., p. 73
The possibility is that a copyist's eye jumped from the words "king of Babylon" at the close of v.3 to the same words at the close of v.13. Driver, however, doubts that these verses were in the text used by the LXX translator, for he regards them as a late addition. The question cannot be discussed here; it is sufficient to point out that there is a possibility of an error of omission because of similarity of ending.

Further examples of words which may have been omitted from the LXX by error due to similarity of ending may be found in 27:6; 44:29; 46:25; and 48:8.

There are only three instances of the omission of words from the MT because of scribal errors. At the close of 9:16 the word "with it" which is omitted from the MT, is preserved in the LXX. The omission may be explained by the similarity of "with the first word of the next verse, for one of two similar and adjacent words is easily overlooked. The LXX word adds to the clarity of the verse, and it is also preferred by Rudolph.

The LXX also preserves a word omitted from the MT in 32:12, in which the prophet speaks of "Hamamel, mine uncle's son". The word "son" must be supplied in reading the MT. Although there is no evident similarity to explain the omission, there can be little doubt about it.

1. Rudolph, op. cit., p. 77.
2. Driver, op. cit., p. 239.
4. cf. 32:7, 8, and 9.
for, in addition to the requirements of the context, the LXX reading is supported by 11 of the Hebrew manuscripts and also by the Syrian text.

The present Hebrew text of 48:35 is difficult and obscure in meaning, for the MT נָֽאֶ֣ז נַֽיְּ֣ים does not give a satisfactory sense. The LXX, however, indicates that there is an omission of ਨੀਣ which should be present twice. The phrase should be, then, נָֽאֶ֣ז נַֽיְּ֣ים "him that goeth up to the altar" which is more satisfactory in meaning.

In this chapter the scribal errors of omission have been discussed, including omissions of single consonants, words, and longer passages. It was pointed out that these omissions are usually due to similarity of letters or words, causing the scribe's eye to wander and omit letters and words as he copied the text. However, in some cases there seems to be no similarity to explain the omissions. The omissions from the LXX were found to be more numerous than those from the MT, and these were classified according to whether the omissions were due to similarity of beginning or of ending of the words or passages in question.

---

2. Driver, op. cit., p. 196
CHAPTER VII

ERRORS OF ADDITION

Three types of scribal errors have already been discussed: first, the errors of confusion; second, the errors of transposition; and third, the errors of omission. In this chapter there will be the discussion of the fourth type of scribal errors, those due to the addition of one or more letters to either text. The treatment of the subject will be similar to that used in the preceding chapter on the errors of omission. First, the errors of single consonants will be discussed; second, the errors of more than one consonant will be discussed; and third, errors which are uncertain and which may be regarded either as errors of omission or addition will be mentioned. As in the previous chapter, the examples will be grouped according to whether the errors arose in the MT or the LXX. It should be self-evident that if an error is regarded as an addition to the MT, then the LXX is to be preferred in that instance, and vice versa.

There are many examples of the addition of single consonants to the MT which seem to be due to scribal errors. However, many such variations, as was pointed out in the preceding chapter, may have been in part due to the fact that the LXX was made from a Hebrew text which was different from and more brief than the MT. Therefore, these examples may be said to be probably scribal errors, for there is always the possibility that
some of the variations are due to the process of redaction.

In 1:14 one word in the MT is not appropriate, and the Hebrew can hardly be translated literally. The word מָצַּה (matsa), "shall be opened", is not fitting in this sentence, "Out of the North evil shall be opened upon all the inhabitants of the land." Instead of "shall be opened" some translators render it as "shall break forth". The LXX, however, indicates that a letter has mistakenly been inserted and that the word should be מְצַּח (metsach), "shall be blown", from the root מָצַּח (matsach), which may be used in the sense of "blowing up (i.e., kindling) a fire". This change makes the sentence more forceful and agrees with the same word in v.13. Most of the commentators agree that the letter מ is an insertion and should be omitted.

There is an example in 2:34 of the mistaken addition of a letter similar to an adjacent letter: Instead of the MT יְהַבֹּד (yehabad), "in thy skirts", the LXX indicates the reading יָהַבֹּד (yabad), "in thy hands". The sentence in the MT does not make good sense, for the reference to "skirts" is obscure. The LXX "in thy hands" makes the sentence clearer. The error is best explained as the erroneous insertion, by a scribe, of the letter י which is similar to the preceding ה. This similarity is apparent in the present Hebrew alphabet, but it may be more easily noticed if the ה is written י, as it is sometimes in old Hebrew manuscripts. The

1. cf. v.13; Is. 54:16; Ex. 21:31
Peake, op. cit., I, p. 84.
Driver, op. cit., p. 5.
Streams, op. cit., p. 6.
similarity is also apparent in certain ancient Semitic as well as modern Hebrew alphabets: $\mathcal{D}$-$\mathcal{I}$, $\mathcal{Y}$-$\mathcal{H}$, $\mathcal{B}$-$\mathcal{L}$. The LXX, which is here supported by the Syriac text and also by Rudolph and Kenney, is apparently correct.\textsuperscript{2}

Some of the cases of addition seem to be clear cases of dittoography, which is the mistaken repetition of a letter or word. In 29:8 the MT has $\mathcal{B}^{1}\mathcal{D}^{1}\mathcal{N}^{1}\mathcal{N}^{1}$, "ye are causing dream", but the LXX represents $\mathcal{B}^{2}\mathcal{S}^{2}\mathcal{N}^{2}$, "ye dream". The hiphil of this verb does not occur elsewhere in the sense used in the MT; moreover, it does not give a clear meaning to the sentence. The LXX indicates that the hiphil form should be kal and that the initial $\mathcal{S}$ is due to a repetition of the last letter of the preceding pronoun. Although the final form ($\mathcal{B}$) is not the same as the usual form ($\mathcal{S}$) in the present manner of writing Hebrew, the distinction was not made in ancient manuscripts. Here the LXX clears up an obscure sentence; it is also supported by the Syriac and Vulgate texts as well as by several critics.\textsuperscript{3}

There seems to be an example of the addition of a vowel letter in 18:19 in which the LXX has "my pleading" for the MT "$\mathcal{Z}'\mathcal{I}'$", "my adversaries". As it stands in the MT, the verse does not give a fit-

\textsuperscript{1} Kautzsch, op. cit., loc. cit.
\textsuperscript{2} Rudolph, op. cit., p. 5.
\textsuperscript{3} Kenney, op. cit., p. 152.
\textsuperscript{3} Rudolph, op. cit., p. 56.
\textsuperscript{4} Peake, op. cit., II, p. 55.
\textsuperscript{5} Driver, op. cit., p. 170.
\textsuperscript{6} Kenney, op. cit., p. 152.
ting meaning, for it is peculiar that a man should plead with God to listen to his adversaries: "Give heed to me, O Lord, and hearken to the voice of my adversaries". If the LXX reading, "my pleading", is used, the thought is clearer and stronger. In addition, the LXX is supported by the Syriac and Vulgate texts and also by the Targum.

Further examples of the addition of single consonants to the MT because of scribal errors are given in the table below. As in the discussion on the omission of consonants, it should be noted that the vowel letters, especially \( \lambda \) and \( \upsilon \), are more frequently sources of error than other letters. It was mentioned in the previous chapter that this is partly due to the simple form of some of the vowel letters and partly due to the irregular writing of some of them. These examples are similar to those discussed above, and the technique of studying them is similar.

Examples of addition of single consonants to the MT

| 4:4; 25:20; 31:5; 44:14 | 46:10; 46:11; 51:29 |
| 6:20; 23:23; 43:2; 46:22; 49:36 |
| 40:10 |
| 51:55 |
| 52:31 |

Fewer instances of the addition of single consonants to the LXX

---

are found, but those which are found are similar to the additions to the MT. The discussion of one example will be sufficient here.

In 14:8 the LXX appears to be corrupt, and one error is the addition of a letter to a word. The LXX νήγην, "one born", does not fit in with the preceding thought of the verse in which God is called upon not to be "as a sojourner in the land." For the LXX "as one born in the land" does not agree with this. The MT preserves the more original form ιγην, "a wayfaring man", which agrees better with the thought of "as a sojourner in the land", indicating that the consonant was mistakenly added by a scribe.

Similar examples of mistaken additions of single consonants are referred to below. Again it is noticeable that the vowel letters are more frequently erroneously written.

Examples of addition of single consonants to the LXX

7:8; 15:12; 28:12; 50:5;34.
14:3
5:20:4
7:51:3
7:51:2

It was possible for a scribe to insert erroneously similar groups of consonants and words as well as single consonants. Usually the added word is similar to an adjacent word, either in the same line or in a nearby line.

In 8:3 there is an example of a word repeated by error, presumably
from the line above in the Hebrew text. The verse reads, "and death shall be chosen rather than life by all the residue which remain in all the places whither I have driven them." The second "which remain" is evidently redundant, and if it is omitted in accordance with the LXX the verse is much more smooth. The LXX is supported by the Syriac text and by most commentators.¹

There is an example of the repetition by error of a similar word in 10:25, which in turn is a repetition of Ps. 79:6,7, if one of the repeated words is omitted. The second half of the verse reads, "for they have devoured Jacob, yea, they have devoured him and consumed him and have laid waste his habitation." The words "yea, they have devoured him" are a single word in the Hebrew text which is not found in the LXX nor is it found in Ps. 79:6,7. It is obviously a repetition of the same verb which precedes it, although in a slightly different form. There can be little doubt that the insertion of the word is an error of dittography, and most authorities agree to this.²

There may be an example of an error of addition involving several words in 39:16, but it is only a possibility. The LXX does not have the

1. Rudolph, op. cit., p. 17.
   Peake, op. cit., I, p. 168.
   Streane, op. cit., p. 59.
   Driver, op. cit., p. 46.

2. Rudolph, op. cit., p. 81.
   Driver, op. cit., p. 84.
   Peake, op. cit., I, p. 177.
   Streane, op. cit., p. 75.
   Kennedy, op. cit., p. 159.
last part of v.16, "and they shall be accomplished before thee in that day." It is suggested by Peake and Rudolph that these words are a corrupt repetition of similar words in the opening of v.17. However, the words do not seem to be superfluous, and they may be rightly found in the MT.

More examples of the addition of words to the MT because of scribal errors may be found in 6:28; 24:9; 29:12, 23; 37:1; 40:8; 41:1; 43:1; 48:18; and 50:9, 21. In most of these cases the repetition is due to the copying by error of an adjacent and similar word.

Only two examples of the addition of words to the LXX because of scribal errors are found. A clear example may be found in 20:4. The LXX read, "and I will give (thee and) all Judah into the hand of the king of Babylon, and he shall carry them captive to Babylon and shall slay them with the sword." The MT does not have "thee and", for it begins "and I will give all Judah". The LXX represents the beginning of the sentence as יִֽתְנֵנֵי יָֽהֹנָֽן (יָֽהֹנָֽן יִתְנֵנֵי) יִתְנֵנֵי, which literally is "and thee and all", but the יִתְנֵנֵי is evidently a dittoograph of the next four consonants. This was possible in the ancient manuscripts, for neither the final form (יִתְנֵנֵי) of יִתְנֵנֵי nor the hyphen was used. There seems to be little doubt that this is a case of insertion by error, for the second personal pronoun does not agree with the use of the third personal pronouns in the same verse, although these third personal pronouns are found both in the

   Rudolph, op. cit., p. 78.
In 32:35 the LXX contains a repetition of a proper noun, "Moloch", as a common noun, "king". The two words have the same consonants in the Hebrew language, and without the vowel pointing they appear identical. The reading "king Moloch", as in the LXX, is not appropriate, for Moloch was a god, and as such, was not likely to be addressed as "king".

There are several cases in which it is impossible to decide whether a certain letter or word is an error of addition to one text or an error of omission from the other. The evidence is such that it seems impossible to determine which text is preferable. The technique of studying them is the same as that used in this and the preceding chapter; therefore, it is hardly necessary to discuss any of the examples. Two of such cases involving the omission or addition of words are found in 25:15 and 32:11. The cases involving single consonants are given below. Once again the frequency of errors of the vowel letters is noticeable.

Examples of either addition or omission:

- 32:5; 34:17; 40:3; 44:1; 46:4; 50:16
- 35:4; 50:31; 51:22, 56
- 76:26; 48:8
- 72:26; 31:20
- 5 32:12; 35:6
- 7 31:21
- 9 29:11

In this chapter the fourth type of scribal error, that of additions,
has been discussed. Examples of additions of single consonants or words to the two texts have been discussed, and further examples have been listed. Many more instances of additions to the MT were found than additions to the LXX. As in the discussion of omissions, it was noticeable that the vowel letters, especially \( \varepsilon \) and \( \eta \), were more frequently added than other letters. The additions were usually found to be repetitions of similar and adjacent letters or words. In conclusion, it might be well to mention once more that scribal errors in general, including errors of addition, are the result of two elements in the copying process, personal fallibility on the part of the copyist and deterioration of the manuscripts, producing an indistinct or illegible text.
In concluding this thesis, it is necessary to note several things: first, the object of the thesis; second, the method of procedure; third, the summary of the study; and fourth, the value of such a study.

The specific object of the thesis is given in the title: "A Critical Study of Scribal Errors in the Book of Jeremiah in the Light of the Septuagint". In the introduction the general purpose was said to be "to present a method of criticism and to study the manner in which it may be applied to correct scribal errors in any similar situation". The object of the thesis, therefore, has been to study scribal errors in the Book of Jeremiah by a comparison of the two important texts, the MT and the LXX. These errors were studied to show how they arose, how they may be detected, and how they may be corrected. The statement made in the introduction should be emphasized again, namely, that the object throughout has not been to produce a corrected text of the Book of Jeremiah, but rather to study and explain a method of criticism which may be used to study scribal errors in any text in which the conditions are similar.

The method of procedure used was to begin with a discussion of the
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general material on the Book of Jeremiah and the two important texts of that book, the MT and the LXX. In this was included the process of translation of the LXX and also those variations which were due to that process. This general discussion was important because it was essential to a proper understanding of the critical study of the scribal errors which followed. These errors were detected by a comparison of the two texts, although the apparatus criticus of Rudolph's edition of the Hebrew text was of great assistance in identifying the variations. His readings, however, were verified by comparison with the actual Hebrew and Greek texts.

In studying these errors two types of evidence were used; first, there was the internal evidence which largely depends upon the appropriateness of the given word or passage in the context; second, there was the external evidence. The external evidence included variant readings from other Hebrew manuscripts and variant readings from other texts, such as the Syriac or the Vulgate. Both types of variant readings were largely derived from Rudolph's apparatus criticus. The external evidence also included the various views of leading commentators on the Book of Jeremiah.

The content of the thesis may be summarized in the following manner. The introduction was devoted to a general discussion of the Book of Jeremiah, including its author or authors, date, content, redaction and transmission. The importance of the LXX of the Book of Jeremiah was noted. The subject of the investigation was defined, and the general
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method of procedure was outlined.

In Chapter I there was a general discussion of the process of translation of the LXX. The purpose, date, and time of the translation were discussed, including the relation of the LXX of Jeremiah to the rest of that translation. Then the comparative validity of the MT and the LXX was discussed. The difficulties of the LXX translator were mentioned, which, together with the inadequate knowledge of the translator, explained many of the unintentional variations between the LXX and the MT. Mention was also made of intentional variations caused by the translator. In concluding the chapter it was stated that no general statement could be made concerning the comparative validity of the MT and the LXX, for the various differences must be treated individually.

A discussion of the variations due to the process of translation comprised Chapter II. The variations were classified according to whether they were due to wrong division of consonants into words, derivation from wrong roots, mistaken vocalization, or unfamiliarity of the LXX translator with Hebrew vocabulary and idiom.

The errors made in the LXX after it was translated were treated in Chapter III, and they were classified according to the type of error, including transposition, addition, and omission of consonants.

The last four chapters were discussions of the four main types of scribal errors which arose in the MT, that is, errors due to confusion, to transposition, to omission or to addition of consonants. The procedure in each chapter was similar. The errors of single consonants were dis-
cussed first, followed by the discussion of errors of more than one
c consonant and errors of several words. In each chapter it was dis-
covered that the vowel letters, especially \( \) and \( \), were more frequently
the sources of errors than other letters. In each chapter, so far as
it was possible, the examples were classified according to whether the
MT or the LXX was to be preferred. Many examples were found which could
not be classified according to preference of text and were classed as
uncertain, usually because of the lack of sufficient evidence. In each
chapter it was also pointed out that there were two causes for these
errors, the fallibility of the copyists and the deterioration of the
manuscripts.

The value of such a study as was made in this thesis is that it
reveals, especially to whoever makes the study, the manner in which
errors in a given text may be treated critically. This is especially
true in regard to other books of the Bible, for the method outlined
here is particularly adapted to a study of Biblical texts. If any
student should read and study the method used in this thesis, he would
be prepared to make a similar study of scribal errors in any other book
of the Bible. No study such as this has been made of the Book of Jeremiah
in English, at least not to the author's knowledge. For that reason,
it is possible to say that this thesis has made some contribution to the
general field of Semitics and to the particular field of the treatment
of scribal errors in Biblical texts. Several definite contributions
which this thesis may have made are as follows: an explanation, not so
far published in English, of the incorrect LXX reading of "Why did Apis flee" in 46:15; 1 a correction of Streane’s explanation of the LXX variation in 48:25; 2 a correction of Kent’s reading of "the place where many men are burned" in 2:23; 3 and a correction of Rudolph’s explanation of ‘αυτη’ in 8:7. 4
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