AN EXCURSUS ON BISECTIONING IEREMIAS

The following essay does not appear in the printed edition of NETS due to considerations of space,
but is provided in the online edition because it elucidates the approach of the translators.

BISECTIONING IEREMIAS

Since the existing theory (or theories) of bisectioning is (are) squarely based on a perceived one-to-one relationship of the translated text to its alleged source text, it might reasonably have been discussed under Translation Profile. Given, however, the continued prominence of this theory in scholarship on this book, we have decided to treat it briefly in its own right.

The State of the Question

For our present purposes, current Jeremian studies may be summarized in terms of three propositions: (1) that Ieremias is thought to bear witness to a version of the book older than and at variance with its counterpart in MT; (2) that it gives evidence of either two consecutive translators (1-28, 29-52) or of one translator (1-52) and a later reviser, only half of whose revision (29-52) has survived to the present; (3) that its textual-linguistic makeup displays both an isomorphic relationship to its Hebrew source(s) and a notable discontinuity in Hebrew-Greek lexical and grammatical equivalence.

Thackeray-Tov Hypothesis

Though earlier modern scholarship was more interested in the relationship between the Greek and Hebrew versions of the book, a certain lack of homogeneity in the Greek, both between and within what later came to be known as the two halves of Ieremias, had not gone unnoticed. But it was Henry St. John Thackeray who first proposed the two-translator hypothesis.[1] That is to say, based on certain seemingly patterned inconsistencies between Ier 1-28/29, on the one hand, and Ier 29/30-51(52), on the other, Thackeray sought to establish that each part was the work of a separate translator, even though the translator of the second part showed a degree of continuity with the translator of the first part.

Joseph Ziegler in his Göttingen edition (see above) professed himself to be in sympathy with Thackeray's theory, but at the same time wondered whether Thackeray's second translator might possibly have been a reviser instead. It was, however, left to Emanuel Tov to test Ziegler's hypothesis.[2] Tov has undoubtedly made the strongest case possible for the bisectioning of Ieremias. Against Thackeray, Tov argued in favor of a reviser for the second half, namely, 29-52, labeled by him Jer-R, the first part of whose work apparently did not survive the vicissitudes of transmission. His conclusions have dominated Jeremian discussions ever since, which is not to say that they have gone wholly unchallenged.

---

[1]Thackeray, H. St. John, "The Greek Translators of Jeremiah," *JTS* 4 (1903) 398-411

[2]Tov, Emanuel, *The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch. A Discussion of an Early Revision of the LXX of Jeremiah 29-52 and Baruch 1:1-3:8.* (Harvard Semitic Monographs.) Scholars Press, Missoula, Montana: 1973.

Critique of Tov(-Thackeray)

Hermann-Josef Stipp[3] has launched the most articulate critique of Tov's theory, by calling attention to its three most problematic aspects: (1) that the mixed character of chapter 29, seemingly having features of both halves of the book, poses a serious problem for Tov's modified version of Thackeray's theory; (2) that the lack of credible motivation for revision toward a Hebrew text (evidently the shorter Alexandrian version rather than the longer Masoretic one) places any theory of revision under considerable strain; (3) that a closer study of Ieremias (and Barouch) shows distributional patterns problematic to Tov's theory, suggesting instead a more complex stratification.

In partial confirmation of Stipp's third point, T. S. L. Michael in a paper delivered to the Basel Congress of the IOSCS (2001)[4] argued that the so-called doublets in 1-28 (= Jer A), contrary to reasonable expectation, often do not show translational consistency and that a variety of inconsistent translation choices span the alleged distinct halves of Ieremias. Most telling perhaps is Michael's observation that both Thackeray's theory of two translators and Tov's theory of translator plus reviser display an essentially descendant or deductive mode of research. That is to say, the linchpin in Thackeray's theory—and Tov follows suit on bisectioning *per se*— is the translation's most conspicuous feature, namely, that כה אמר יהוה ("thus says YHWH") is translated by τάδε λέγει κύριος in chapters 1-29, but by οὕτως εἶπε κύριος from chapter 30 onward, with a concomitant contrast of λέγει κύριος and φησὶ κύριος respectively for Hebrew נאם. Thus in Thackeray's list of twenty-eight differences between the so-called two halves, τάδε λέγει κύριος in distinction from οὕτως εἶπε κύριος ranks as number one.[5] Though in Tov's study this contrast is not listed as primary, Michael's basic observation is nonetheless borne out by Tov's Introduction,[6] the substance of which is reflected in the chapter headings of his book. Though one finds a discussion of *similarities* between so-called Jeremiah A and Jeremiah B (chapter II) and *differences* between Jer A and Jer B (chapter III) and further chapters on supplemental issues, one looks in vain for a discussion of similarities and differences within smaller segments of Ieremias, hence at the micro-level. While such is consistent with the title of Tov's book and the focus of his research, it does underscore its descendant or deductive mode. Furthermore, since similarities are made to function as a backdrop to *revisionary* difference, difference is effectively precluded from having been original. It should also be noted that the studies of both Thackeray and Tov are one-directional, i.e., from the Hebrew to Greek but not vice-versa. As a result, a one-sided view of Ieremias's textual-linguistic makeup emerges.

That bisectioning, with the phrase in question as starting point, poses certain dangers, due to the relative distance of supporting items from the central line of demarcation, was rightly noted

---

[3]Stipp, Hermann-Josef, *Das masoretische und alexandrinische Sondergut* 18. Stipp deals with these issues in greater detail in his, "Offene Fragen zur Übersetzungskritik des antiken griechischen Jeremiabuches," *JNSL* 17 (1991) 117-128.

[4]T. S. L. Michael, "Bisectioning of Greek Jeremiah: A Problem to be Revisited?" *BIOSCS* 39 (2006) 103-114.

[5]In spite of that, however, Thackeray puts 29 with the second half. See also Ludwig Köhler for the central importance of this formula: "Beobachtungen am hebräischen und griechichen Text von Jeremia Kap. 1-9," *ZAW* 29 (1909) 1-39 [9 note 3].

[6]See e.g. p. 5.

by Ludwig Köhler in reaction to Thackeray.[7] For it is only logical that once a line of demarcation has been introduced, similarities and differences between the resultant two halves tend to eclipse and override the same phenomena within each half. Moreover, a translation technical investigation, though good at establishing equivalence between the source text and the target text, tends to pay too little attention to the broader issue of translational norms. For that there is needed a full descriptive analysis of the textual-linguistic makeup of the Greek in a strictly *ascendant* or *inductive* mode.

BISECTIONING AND BEYOND

Since dealing with the entire topic of bisectioning in a strictly inductive manner is beyond the scope of this discussion and furthermore requires at least a book-length treatment, we will here touch on two central components, namely, the formulaic כה אמר יהוה and its frequently concomitant נאם יהוה—an investigation which, perhaps ironically, does suggest a certain duality but not of the kind that has been proposed—and the allegedly mixed character of chapter 29.

"Thus says/said the Lord" and *"says the Lord"*

On Thackeray's two-translator theory, the Greek representations of these two formulaic phrases are variant translation options for the same Hebrew. That is to say, translator one opted for τάδε λέγει κύριος and λέγει κύριος respectively, while translator two preferred οὕτως εἶπε κύριος and φησὶ κύριος, all allegedly without any corresponding difference in meaning. On Tov's theory, since a reviser takes the place of translator two, the second pair constitutes a correction of the Old Greek text based on the perception that it better represents the source text.[8] As our term "concomitant" is meant to indicate, it is doubtful that on the Greek side the respective two phrases function independently, whatever the form-critical analysis of their Hebrew counterparts.

A priori, there might seem to be good reason for treating the different Greek representations as simple, translational options. After all, within the LXX, Hebrew כה is rendered by both τάδε and οὕτως, the qatal of √אמר is glossed by λέγει as well as by εἶπε, and נאם is at times translated by φησί. In terms of lexical correspondence, therefore, there is no objection to the suggested pairing. When, however, one raises the question of usage in the target language, certain restrictions quickly begin to present themselves, first of which is distribution. Given the fact that οὕτως functions chiefly as an adverb of manner and τάδε typically plays a nominal role, syntactic overlap, though possible, is likely to be rather limited.[9] Here we can limit ourselves to either one with a verb of speaking.

Both οὕτως λέγει and οὕτως εἶπε appear with some regularity in Classical literature with *oratio recta* either preceding or following the verb. Similarly, τάδε λέγει is well represented there, but a search for τάδε εἶπε yielded but a single instance (Xenophon *Anabasis* 2.5.41). Perhaps not unexpectedly φησί is legion.

---

[7]Köhler, *ibid*.

[8]In spite of the fact that Tov ends up assigning chapter 29 to the reviser, the contrast in question is noted on p. 21 as a mark of difference.

[9]It is therefore not surprising that οὕτως is the favorite in the LXX.

When one turns to the LXX, the distribution of these items (not counting Ieremias) is similar. We limit ourselves largely to the prophetic corpus (again excluding Ieremias), where τάδε λέγει occurs some two hundred times and οὕτως λέγει twenty-six times, all of them in Esaias. On the other hand, οὕτως εἶπε occurs eight times, four of them in Esaias and twice in LXXDaniel and once each in Barouch and Lamentation, with a further six instances outside the prophetic corpus. One might add another dozen or so instances of οὕτως with a different verb of speaking in the past tense and/or with a person other than 3rd singular. By contrast, τάδε εἶπε never occurs in the prophets, and only four times elsewhere in the LXX (1Rgns 2.30; 9.9; 10.18; 15.2). As far as φησί is concerned, though it occurs elsewhere in the LXX, including nine times for נאם, it does not make an appearance in the prophets apart from Ieremias.

In summary, it may be noted that whereas both The Twelve and Iezekiel are entirely predictable in their rendering of כה אמר יהוה as well as of נאם יהוה with their respective glosses of τάδε λέγει κύριος and λέγει κύριος, neither Esaias nor Ieremias shows such consistency. One can go one step farther by noting that Esaias is inconsistent but not in a strictly patterned manner. Though one might suggest that Esaias' use of οὕτως λέγει (25*x*) intermingled with τάδε λέγει (19*x*) marks the former as being less committed to the *ipsissima verba* of the speaker, such is not immediately obvious. Since both usages are standard Greek and since they are not obviously patterned in Esaias, they may be regarded as free variants of one another. Of more interest is that on four occasions (18.4; 21.6, 16; 31.4) Esaias uses οὕτως εἶπε. While this usage too is standard Greek and to that extent need not occasion surprise, the past tense is noteworthy. The reason for its use in all four cases is, however, patently obvious. Since in each case a personal reference to the prophet himself is included, the oracle, received by the prophet in the past, is *now* conveyed to its intended audience, but presented simply as divine speech in the past, not as an oracular utterance in the present, i.e., something being transmitted by the prophet as mouthpiece of God. In other words, an *oracle* has become *reported divine speech*, even though *oratio recta* has been retained. Since this transformation from oracle to reported divine speech does not occur with τάδε but only with οὕτως, we may have support for an earlier suggestion, namely, that οὕτως signals something less than the (divine) *ipsissima verba,* irrespective of *oratio recta*.[10]

We return to Ieremias. Though the distribution of the competing concomitant formulae is patterned in the book, this does not mean that one finds the level of consistency that obtains in The Twelve and Iezekiel. From 1-29 the standard pattern is τάδε λέγει κύριος + λέγει κύριος.[11] Twice along the way (14.10; 23.16) we find οὕτως in the place of τάδε, and twice (27.30, 40) we find εἶπε rather than λέγει representing נאם. Since in 27.40 the reference is to Sodoma and Gomorra, this may have occasioned the deviation from pattern, but the reason in 27.30 is less clear unless it be meant to recall earlier predictions of similar doom. Since in 6.15

---

[10]Also of interest in Esaias is that on ten occasions where MT has נאם, the Greek has τάδε λέγει (1.24; 17.4(3), 6; 19.4; 22.25, 30.1; 31.9, 37.34; 52.5[bis]). Though textual difference between MT and Esaias' source text cannot be precluded, more likely would seem an interpretation נאם as initiating an oracle rather than concluding one. In five of these cases Ziegler fails to punctuate his text accordingly: 19.4; 30.1; 37.34; 52.5 (bis). For further LXX occurrences of οὕτως εἶπεν that are of interest see 2 Esdras 1.2; 5.9.

[11]Given relationship of the source text of Ieremias to MT, the differences noted may, of course, be textual rather than translational. On the other hand, such inconsistency is completely in character for Ier.

MT has אמר, it is in character for Ieremias to have εἶπε since the aorist is the default mode for qatal. From chapter 30 onward the standard pattern becomes οὕτως εἶπε κύριος + φησὶ κύριος, though again with exceptions, this time more in number than in 1-29. On six occasions (30.5, 10; 34.6; 37.8; 38.1; 41.5) εἶπε represents נאם, and on another five (31.8; 37.3; 40.11, 13; 51.26) it represents אמר, as one might expect. Once (34.18) λέγει has נאם as counterpart, and once (51.35) λέγει has אמר as equivalent. Lastly, 38.35 has φησί in place of MT's כה אמר and 41.4 features οὕτως λέγει κύριος for כה אמר יהוה (but note that the message is addressed to Sedekias about his personal imminent fate).

Though the deviations have their own story to tell, they decidedly do not endanger a pattern, seeing that in 1-29 they amount to circa 3% of the total, and in 30-52 to circa 10% (most of them to the past tense in accord with οὕτως εἶπε κύριος).

We come to the point of our investigation. Though it is clear that both τάδε λέγει and οὕτως εἶπε represent standard Greek usage, it is equally clear that the latter cannot be regarded as a free variant of the former. That is to say, since εἶπε demands its temporal due, the phrase as a whole must be taken to convey a speech act in the past. The use Esaias makes of εἶπε is an unmistakable cue. Moreover, since beginning in chapter 30 a switch is made from λέγει to εἶπε and τάδε thus ceased to be a viable option, οὕτως is made to replace the latter. Consequently, if Thackeray's two-translator theory is to receive support from this finding, it must be concluded that the second translator understood the Hebrew formula in a substantially different manner from the first translator, i.e., as a speech act in the past rather than in the present. Whereas translator one makes a distinction between (1) a divine speech act in the past (e.g., 1.7, 9, 12, 14; 3.6, 11; 9.13; 11.6, 9; 13.6; 14.11, 14; 15.1; 19.1; 24.3) reported by the prophet and (2) a divine speech act in the present mediated by the prophet as mouthpiece of God, translator two presented all as divine speech acts in past time, although *oratio recta* is used in both cases. Tov's revisionary theory likewise cannot be sustained by the evidence at hand, first because τάδε λέγει and οὕτως εἶπε are not free variants, one of the other, and, second, because none of the revisers known to us insisted on a past verb instead of a present one in the formula in question, making revision most unlikely. From the perspective that τάδε (οὕτως) λέγει and οὕτως εἶπε represent a difference in temporal deixis, the different representations of נאם can also fall into place. In 1-29 where the lead formula is in the present tense, the concomitant formula follows suit. From chapter 30 onward where the lead formula is in the past tense, the concomitant formula again follows suit, that is to say, φησί is used as a quotative, a function this verb is often assigned in Greek usage. For instance, both Philo and Josephus make extensive use of it when quoting "Moses" and in Classical literature one regularly finds it for "Homer." Quotatives take their temporal reference from context.

It would seem, therefore, that the temporal switch, which occurs at 30.1, is in need of a different explanation than the Thackeray-Tov theory can provide.

Chapter 29

In an appendix to chapter IV, entitled "The exact dividing line between Jer a´ and b´, Tov seeks to prove (in line with Thackeray) that chapter 29 belongs to the so-called second half. To do so, he selects ten readings from 28.41-64, which are thought to be characteristic of the first

half, and ten readings from 29.1-23, which are thought to be characteristic of the second half.[12] In point of fact, however, though most of the contrasting equivalences are technically unique to their respective half, they are frequently made to create the wrong impression. We illustrate here with one example from each grouping. The equation of the noun שבר - συντριβή in 28(51).54 is said to be characteristic of 1-28.[13] The evidence is as follows: συντριβή 4.6; 6.1; 27(50).22; 28(51).54; σύντριμμα 6.14; 8.21; 10.19; 14.17; 31(48).3, 5; 37(30).12[14]; σύντριμμος 4.20. To be added is שברון - σύντριμμα in 17.18. When one then further adds שבר - συντρίβω with thirteen occurrences respectively, what stands out as being remarkable is not the contrast between the so-called two halves but their identity, to the extent that this item surely belongs in Tov's chapter II,[15] if anywhere. Not to be overlooked are the semantic differences among the three noun formations. All in all, not only does this item fail to prove bisectioning based on different translators, but revision fares even worse by it.

For so-called Jer B we select √שדד - (ἀπ)όλλυμι. Tov cites both the simplex and compound forms as evidence and in his discussion treats nouns as well as verbs. The evidence is as follows: ταλαιπωρέω/ία 4.13, 20(bis); 6.7, 26; 9.19(18);10.20; 12.12; 15.8; 20.8; 28(51).56; ὀλεθρεύω 5.6; 32.22(25.36); ἐξολεθρεύω 28(51).53, 55; 29(47).4; ἀπόλλυμι 29(47).4; ὄλλυμι 29.11(49.10); 30(49).3; 31(48).1, 15, 18, 20; 38(31).2 (< שריד); πλήσσω 30.6(49.28); ὄλεθρος 31(48).3, 8, 32. Finally it deserves to be noted that, though in 10.20 Ziegler reads ἐταλαιπώρησε (a conjecture of Spohn), all manuscript evidence supports ὤλετο. Though the second example shows slightly more discontinuity between the so-called two halves than the preceding one, what is also clearly in evidence is the continuity—as well as discontinuity— within *both* halves. Neither, however, supports simple bisectioning nor, for that matter, that chapter 29 belongs to the second half rather than to the first.

The remaining nine items cited for the respective halves fare no better, particularly when one factors in contextual variation, both obligatory and optional (interpretive). In illustration of the latter factor we offer κατάλυσις for נוה in 29.20(49.19), discussed by Tov as III 48 (pp. 73-74). The evidence is as follows: נוה = νομή 10.25; 23.3; 27(50).7, 19, 45 = τόπος 29.20(49.19); 27(50).44; 32.16(25.30) = κατάλυσις 29.21(49.20) = κατάλυμα 40(33).12. To be sure, on the presupposition that Ieremias is a translation that prizes lexical consistency above all else, one might indeed suggest (secondary) revision or a change in translator, but what if that presupposition is not borne out by a descriptive analysis of the textual-linguistic makeup? After all, not only is τόπος used in both halves to gloss נוה, but chapter 29 itself shows internal inconsistency. Furthermore, basic semantic differentiation among the notions of "feeding" (νομή), "respite" (κατάλυσις/κατάλυμα) and "location" (τόπος) readily accounts for the text we have.[16]

---

[12]All are documented and discussed by Tov in chapters III and IV.

[13]We select III (35) and III (2) respectively.

[14]Occurrences in the other half, here and below, appear in bold print.

[15]"Important Similarities between Jer A´ and Jer B´."

[16]In his discussion of the reputed split between κατασκηνόω and καταλύω for שכן, Tov claims the "Jer-R apparently cherished the root καταλυ−" (p. 95) with a reference" to III 48. His listing of the evidence is, however, seriously deficient and should be: κατασκηνοω 7.12; 17.6; 23.6; 28(51).13 = καταλύω 29.17(49.16); 30.9(49.31);

Perhaps more important than showing that the items selected by Tov for the purpose of proving that chapter 29 belongs to the so-called second half, rather than to the first half, is to note that Tov's entire demonstration *presupposes* bisectioning based on different agency. But when one does a full analysis of chapter 29 one finds, perhaps not surprisingly, that on the matter of Hebrew-Greek equations—apart from the formulae τάδε λέγει κύριος and λέγει κύριος—it faces in both directions and to that extent shows itself to be a rather *typical* chapter of Ieremias. It features sixteen equations[17] unique to chapter 29: נחל = χειμάρρουν 29(47).2; שטף = κατακλύζω 29(47).2; פנה hi = ἐπιστρέφω 29(47).3; כרת hi = ἀφανίζω 29(47).4; שריד = κατάλοιπος 29(47).4; עד מתי = ἕως τίνος 29(47).5; אסף ni = ἀποκαθίστημι 29(47).6;[18] איד = δύσκολος 29.9(49.8); שחת hi = ἐπιτίθημι 29.9 (49.8); גלה pi = ἀνακαλύπτω 29.10(49.11); עזב = ὑπολείπομαι 29.12(49.11); משפט = νόμος 29.13(49.14); זדון = ἰταμία 29.17(49).16; עבר qal = παραπορεύομαι 29.18(49.17); נוה = κατάλυσις 29.21(49.20); שמם = ἀβατόω 29.21(49.20). As an aside we note that some of these items occur elsewhere in Ieremias but for different Hebrew. Chapter 29 further features two internal inconsistencies: נוה = τόπος 29.20(49.19) = κατάλυσις 29.21(49.20); שכן = γείτων 29.11(49.10) = πάροικος 29.19(49.18).

For comparative purposes we selected Ier 11 and Ier 41, for which the respective statistics are: seven unique and four inconsistent, and nine unique and five inconsistent.

In light of what has been discussed in the preceding sections, we would submit that a thorough, strictly inductive study of Ieremias is a desideratum of the highest order, and that a new explanatory hypothesis is needed for its textual-linguistic makeup.

BEYOND BISECTIONING: A NEW PROPOSAL

James Watts has recently argued[19] that the OAN (Oracles Against the Nations), rather than being secondary to (so-called) Edition II (MT) of Jeremiah, should instead be regarded as an integral part thereof. He further notes that the same may well be true for Edition I (cf. LXX). In the nature of the case, our concern here is with the latter, but at two, complementary, levels. The first of these is the Greek text as representing its Hebrew source (LXX-H), and, second, the Greek text as an explication of its source text (LXX-G). I begin with the former.

If the OAN are read as integral to LXX-H, it divides the book into two distinct parts, chapters 1-32 (LXX-H1), on the one hand, and 33-52 (LXX-H2), on the other. LXX-H1 is comprised of a panoramic overview, reputedly from the reign of Josiah (1.2) till the fall of Jerusalem, but in conceptual scope, from Israel's beginnings (i.e., the exodus from Egypt) to a judgment of cosmic proportions on *all* nations and Israel's resultant return. LXX-H2, taking up Ier 1.3, makes something of a fresh start with the reign of Jehoiakim (Ioakim) (33.1), with whom the actual deportation effectively began. This time, however, the tale proceeds in a more prosaic manner, with added historical moorings and specificity, and includes the rebellious return to Egypt in the

---

32(25).24 = κατοικίζω 7.3, 7 = κατοικέω 27(50).39 = οἰκέω 31(48).28. Absent too are κατάλυμα in 14.8 for לון and καταλύω in 28(51).43 for עבר, 44(37).13 for פקד and 45(38).22 for טבע hoph. Occurrences of καταλύω ("to leave") in 7.34 and 16.9 can justifiably be ignored.

[17]Limited to Hebrew words that occur at least three times.

[18]Be it noted that the Greek word occurs only in so-called Jer A.

[19]James W. Watts, "Text and Redaction in Jeremiah's Oracles Against the Nations," *CBQ* 54 (1992) 432-447.

closing chapters (49-51). In term of structure, it should be noted that 25.1 recalls 1.5 (Jeremiah appointed prophet to *all nations*) and anticipates the OAN (25.14-28.58; 29.1-31.44), with 25.13 functioning as introduction. Directly following the OAN comes the parable of the cup (32.1[25.15]), with a direct reference to 1.5 (32.1). First in line of the nations to whom the cup is to be given (32.4) is Judah, and the text then issues into an oracle against Jerusalem (32.16-24). Quite clearly, therefore, the OAN are meant to include Judah and to function as an integral part of the book.[20] For further confirmation see 43(36).2.

As in MT so in LXX-H the focus of the entire book is the career of the prophet. LXX-H1, however, predominantly portrays Jeremiah as divine mouthpiece, whereas LXX-H2 places prime emphasis on Jeremiah as preacher of God's word. Not only is the reader told at various points in LXX-H1 that Jeremiah is God's mouth (1.9; 5.14; 15.19; cf. 23.16)[21]—something shared with MT—but compared to MT the role of Jeremiah in LXX-H1 is less conspicuous and the Lord's correspondingly more prominent. Thus for example, whereas MT begins, "The words of Jeremiah," LXX-H1 begins, "The word of God which came to Jeremiah." Other instances of the same kind are 7.2; 16.1, 19; 27(50).1, 59; 29(47).1. Furthermore, in phrases like "a word came from the Lord / to Jeremiah," read by LXX-H1 (11.1; 18.1; 21.1), MT has the two phrases transposed. Lastly, MT's dual reference to Jeremiah and Pharaoh's attack on Gaza is lacking in LXX-H1 (29[47].1), as are fourteen verses preceding 32.1(25.15) dated in MT to the fourth year of Jehoiakim and the first of Nebuchadnezzar. Consequently, both Jeremiah and chronographic data are less prominent in LXX-H1 than they are in MT.

No doubt adding further to the two-ness of LXX-H is the fact that much of what Jeremiah preaches in LXX-H2 has already been given in oracular form in LXX-H1, with Deuteronomy as a backdrop.

There is, therefore, good reason to believe—as Watts maintains for MT (Edition II)—not only that the OAN are an integral component of LXX-H, but also that they make the book into a duology, in part one of which Jeremiah functions as the conduit of divine oracles, whereas in the sequel he proclaims the divine word, harking back to past oracles as appropriate. In historical terms the two cover the same period.

That Ier was cognizant of the duology is apparent from the fact that in part I he used what in the prophetic corpus is the oracular formula: τάδε λέγει κύριος ("this is what the Lord says") followed by the divine *ipsissima verba*, while in part II a switch was made to οὕτως εἶπε κύριος ("thus did the Lord say") followed by reported divine speech. Unfortunately, Ier made the switch too early, beginning with the oracle against Ammon in 30.1 rather than after 33.1, the beginning of the "sequel." The reason for his confusion may well have been that 30.1-5 is strongly reminiscent of Israel's dispossession of (half of) Ammon at time of the conquest (Josh 13.24-28), an impression only strengthened by the reference to Ai (Gai) in v. 3 and possibly further by the name of the territory (Galaad [30.1]) instead of the tribe's (Gad [49.1]). One might also note here the last clause in v. 2 where MT reads "Israel shall dispossess who dispossess him" (followed by "said the Lord") but LXX "Israel shall succeed his rule." Related to this reading of the Greek may be its silence about Ammon's restoration (contra MT 49.6).

---

[20]That Ier probably understood 32.16-24 specifically as an oracle is underscored by his double use of χρηματίζω in v.16, doubly reiterated in 33(26).2 but retro-jected to the beginning of the reign of Ioakim.

[21]Contrast 43.4, 18, 27, 32; 51.31.

As noted above, the intriguing use made of ψευδοπροφήτης (without any explicit warrant in the source text), is readily explained as a likely recognition by Ier of LXX-H as a duology. Also of interest is Ier's use of χρηματίζω ("give an oracle"), seven times to translate דבר pi (33[26].2[bis]; 36[29].23; 37[30].2; 43[36].2, 4; 47[40].2), normally glossed by λαλέω, and twice to render שאג (32.16[25.30]), glossed in 2.15 by ὠρύομαι ("roar"). To be added here is χρησμολογέω ("utter an oracle") in 45(38).4 for דרש. Since neither χρησμολογέω nor χρηματίζω (with the noted sense[22]) occurs elsewhere in the LXX, at the very least they point up Ier's interest in (formal) oracles. What is of further interest is that, on three occasions, χρηματίζω refers specifically to oracles compiled in a book. In an undated reference in 37(30).2 Ieremias is reported to have been told: "Write in a book all the words that I gave you as oracles," and in 43(36).2, 4, dated to the fourth year of Ioakim, Ieremias is told to commit to writing "all the words that I gave you as oracles against Ierousalem and against Iouda and against all the nations, from the day of my speaking to you, from the days of King Iosias of Iouda even until this day." It may be, therefore, that all instances of χρηματίζω are intended to refer to a written collection of oracles, which formed the basis of Ieremias' preaching from 33.1 onward. To press this speculation one step farther—it is possible that most, if not all, references to a book (25.13; 28.60, 63; 36.1; 37.1; 43.1-32; 51.31) were perceived to refer to what we now have in Ier 1-32. Certainly of interest is that "a book" is said to have been compiled in the fourth year of Ioakim (43(36).2, 4; 51.31[45.1]) and the sequel within the duology commences with the reign of Ioakim (33.1).

Also of interest would seem to be Ier's use of ἀποκαθίστημι ("restore to a former state/condition") for אסף ni in 29(47).6, and earlier as an occasional translation of שוב (hi) (15.19; 16.15; 24.6; 27[50].19). As a gloss for אסף it is unique in the LXX. Though שוב is common throughout Jeremiah, only in a handful of cases is it rendered by ἀποκαθίστημι, as a result of which it is very much a marked usage. Noteworthy, too, is that it appears only in what we have delineated as Part I of the duology (1-32). Since all instances except 29.6 have God as subject with Israel as object and since restoration of Israel through exile to the innocence of its youth is a major theme in 1-32, the appearance of this verb perhaps need occasion no surprise. But whereas the panoramic overview (1-32) speaks of both "return" and "restoration", its more "realistic" sequel (understandably) speaks only of "return."

This new proposal, we believe, is better able to account not only for the translational-technical data but for the textual-linguistic makeup of the Greek text of Jeremiah as a whole, than either version of the current theory.

ALBERT PIETERSMA

---

[22]Though 3Rgns 18.27 is a possibility. See, however, Prov 31.1 and 2Makk 2.4