

JAMES FROHLICH

The Relationship between  
MT and LXX in Jeremiah  
39(46):1–41(48):3 and 52

*Forschungen  
zum Alten Testament 2. Reihe  
133*

---

**Mohr Siebeck**

Forschungen zum Alten Testament  
2. Reihe

Edited by

Konrad Schmid (Zürich) · Mark S. Smith (Princeton)  
Hermann Spieckermann (Göttingen) · Andrew Teeter (Harvard)

133





James Frohlich

The Relationship between  
MT and LXX in Jeremiah  
39(46):1–41(48):3 and 52

Mohr Siebeck

*James Frohlich*, born 1982; 2004 BA in Biblical Languages; 2009 MDiv; 2018 PhD in Old Testament Studies; 2018–21 Adjunct Professor of Biblical Studies at Regent University (VA); 2019–21 Adjunct Professor of Old Testament at Dallas Theological Seminary.  
orcid.org/0000-0001-5473-784X

ISBN 978-3-16-160739-4 / eISBN 978-3-16-161084-4  
DOI 10.1628/978-3-16-161084-4

ISSN 1611-4914 / eISSN 2568-8367 (Forschungen zum Alten Testament, 2. Reihe)

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2022 Mohr Siebeck Tübingen, Germany. [www.mohrsiebeck.com](http://www.mohrsiebeck.com)

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was printed on non-aging paper by Laupp & Göbel in Gomaringen, and bound by Buchbinderei Nädle in Nehren.

Printed in Germany.

To Jessica, who never doubted that this work would be completed



## Preface

This volume began as a doctoral dissertation presented to the faculty of Dallas Theological Seminary in 2018. As such, I would like to thank my dissertation committee comprised of W. Edward Glenny, Brian Webster, and Richard Taylor for their guidance and encouragement throughout the writing process. In particular, I am indebted to Richard Taylor, my advisor, for his willingness to meet with me to discuss questions I had on the text of Jeremiah (even while on sabbatical). I am very pleased to publish this volume with Mohr Siebeck and thank the staff for their support.

I would also like to thank my former professor, Tom Keiser. Without his encouragement I may never have attempted further academic study.

I am indebted to many friends who, in one way or another, have encouraged me while I was writing this dissertation. These include Tim Wakeland, Kevin Patton, Joshua Francis, Jeremy Koleba, and David de Lago Panadero. I would especially like to thank my fellow classmates in the Old Testament department for their many conversations which have contributed to my knowledge and love of the Hebrew Bible – Joel Reemtsma, Nathan Seale, Kyle Essary, and Rich Halloran.

Next, I would like to thank my mother, Rosalinda Cervantes, for her constant support and encouragement.

Finally, I thank my wife, Jessica, and our three children Jude, Tino, and Ori. Without their love and sacrifice, this work would never have come to fruition.





## Table of Contents

Preface .....	VII
List of Abbreviations .....	XV
Chapter 1: Introductory Issues and Methodology .....	1
<i>1.1. Scope of the Study</i> .....	1
<i>1.2. Sources for Accessing the Original Texts</i> .....	4
<i>1.3. Translation Technique</i> .....	6
<i>1.4. Possibility of a Divergent Vorlage</i> .....	7
<i>1.5. Method of the Study</i> .....	9
Chapter 2: Survey and Evaluation of Previous Scholarship .....	11
<i>2.1. Studies Prior to Qumran</i> .....	12
<i>2.2. Studies Since Qumran</i> .....	15
<i>2.3. History of Research on Jeremiah 52</i> .....	18
<i>2.4. History of Research on Jeremiah 39–40</i> .....	22
<i>2.5. Conclusion</i> .....	23
Chapter 3: Comparison of Jeremiah 52 MT and LXX .....	24
<i>3.1. Collation</i> .....	24
<i>3.2. Comments</i> .....	32

3.2.1. Plus of Article .....	32
3.2.2. Minus of Article .....	34
3.2.3. Plural for Singular .....	35
3.2.4. Singular for Plural .....	37
3.2.5. Plus of Preposition .....	39
3.2.6. Minus of Preposition .....	40
3.2.7. Case Differences .....	42
3.2.8. Plus of Pronoun/Verb for Noun .....	43
3.2.9. Article for Pronoun .....	44
3.2.10. Participle for Verb .....	44
3.2.11. Participle for Noun .....	45
3.2.12. Noun for Infinitive .....	45
3.2.13. Adjective for Noun .....	46
3.2.14. Adjective for Participle .....	47
3.2.15. Plus of Conjunction .....	47
3.2.16. Minus of Conjunction .....	48
3.2.17. Dynamic Translation .....	48
3.2.18. Transpositions .....	48
3.2.19. Word Choice .....	49
3.2.19.1. Nouns .....	49
3.2.19.2. Prepositions .....	53
3.2.19.3. Verbs .....	55
3.2.20. Content .....	55
3.2.21. Pluses .....	61
3.2.22. Minuses .....	64
3.3. <i>Excursus on Verses 18–19</i> .....	78
3.3.1. Jer 52:18 .....	80
3.3.2. Jer 52:19 .....	85
3.3.3. Conclusion .....	88
3.4. <i>Variants for Further Study</i> .....	91
3.5. <i>Conclusion</i> .....	96
3.5.1. The Jeremiah Tradition .....	99
3.5.2. Jer LXX Read on Its Own .....	99
Chapter 4: Comparison of Jeremiah 52 LXX and 2 Kings 24:18–25:30 LXX .....	101
4.1. <i>Collation</i> .....	101

4.2. <i>Comments</i> .....	108
4.2.1. Plus of Article .....	108
4.2.2. Minus of Article .....	108
4.2.3. Plural for Singular .....	109
4.2.4. Singular for Plural .....	110
4.2.5. Plus of Preposition .....	110
4.2.6. Minus of Preposition .....	111
4.2.7. Case Differences .....	112
4.2.8. Verb Form .....	114
4.2.9. Plus of Relative Pronoun/Verb for Noun .....	115
4.2.10. Participle for Noun .....	116
4.2.11. Ordinal for Cardinal .....	116
4.2.12. Plus of Conjunction .....	116
4.2.13. Dynamic Translation .....	116
4.2.14. Transpositions .....	116
4.2.15. Word Choice .....	117
4.2.15.1. Nouns .....	117
4.2.15.2. Prepositions .....	123
4.2.15.3. Verbs .....	124
4.2.15.4. Miscellaneous .....	129
4.2.16. Content .....	130
4.2.17. Pluses .....	134
4.2.18. Minuses .....	137
4.3. <i>Excursus on Agreements with 2 Kings</i> .....	138
4.3.1. Jer 52 LXX Agrees with 2 Kgs against Jer 52 MT .....	140
4.3.1.1. Collation .....	141
4.3.1.2. Comments .....	141
4.3.2. Jer 52 MT Agrees with 2 Kgs against Jer 52 LXX .....	142
4.3.2.1. Collation .....	142
4.3.2.2. Comments .....	143
4.3.3. Evaluation of Previous Research on Jer 52 .....	145
4.4. <i>Conclusion</i> .....	150
4.4.1. Independent Translations .....	153
4.4.2. Jer LXX Read on Its Own .....	153
 Chapter 5: Comparison of Jeremiah 39(46) MT and LXX .....	 155
5.1. <i>Collation</i> .....	155

5.2. <i>Comments</i> .....	157
5.2.1. Plus of Article .....	157
5.2.2. Minus of Article .....	158
5.2.3. Plural for Singular .....	158
5.2.4. Minus of Preposition .....	158
5.2.5. Verb for Infinitive .....	160
5.2.6. Verb for Participle .....	160
5.2.7. Verb for Noun .....	161
5.2.8. Participle for Infinitive .....	161
5.2.9. Active for Passive/First for Second Person .....	162
5.2.10. Imperfect for Perfect .....	162
5.2.11. Plus of Conjunction .....	162
5.2.12. Word Choice .....	163
5.2.12.1. Nouns .....	163
5.2.12.2. Prepositions .....	163
5.2.12.3. Verbs .....	164
5.2.13. Pluses .....	166
5.2.14. Minuses .....	167
5.3. <i>Variants for Further Study</i> .....	171
5.4. <i>Excursus on Jeremiah 39(46) and Jeremiah 52//2 Kings 25</i> .....	172
5.4.1. Jer 39(46) LXX and Jer 52 LXX .....	172
5.4.1.1. Collation .....	172
5.4.1.2. Comments .....	172
5.4.2. Jer 39(46) LXX and 2 Kgs 25 LXX .....	173
5.4.2.1. Collation .....	174
5.4.2.2. Comments .....	174
5.5. <i>Conclusion</i> .....	175
5.5.1. Minor Differences .....	176
5.5.2. Jer MT .....	176
5.5.3. Jer LXX Read on Its Own .....	177
 Chapter 6: Comparison of Jeremiah 40(47)–41(48):3 MT and LXX .....	 179
6.1. <i>Collation</i> .....	179
6.2. <i>Comments</i> .....	185

6.2.1. Plus of Article .....	185
6.2.2. Minus of Article .....	186
6.2.3. Plural for Singular .....	186
6.2.4. Singular for Plural .....	188
6.2.5. Plus of Preposition .....	189
6.2.6. Minus of Preposition .....	189
6.2.7. Case Differences .....	190
6.2.8. Article for Pronoun .....	190
6.2.9. Negative Particle for Pronoun .....	190
6.2.10. Noun for Infinitive .....	191
6.2.11. Participle for Verb .....	191
6.2.12. Verb for Participle .....	191
6.2.13. Participle for Infinitive .....	192
6.2.14. Active for Passive .....	192
6.2.15. Adverb for Prepositional Phrase .....	192
6.2.16. Minus of Conjunction .....	192
6.2.17. Dynamic Translation .....	192
6.2.18. Transpositions .....	193
6.2.19. Word Choice .....	194
6.2.19.1. Nouns .....	194
6.2.19.2. Prepositions .....	195
6.2.19.3. Verbs .....	196
6.2.19.4. Particles .....	197
6.2.20. Content .....	197
6.2.21. Pluses .....	199
6.2.22. Minuses .....	201
6.3. <i>Variants for Further Study</i> .....	208
6.4. <i>Excursus on Jeremiah 40(47)–41(48):3 and 2 Kings 25</i> .....	208
6.4.1. Collation of Jer 40(47)–41(48):3 MT and 2 Kgs 25 MT .....	209
6.4.1.1. Collation .....	209
6.4.1.2. Comments .....	210
6.4.2. Collation of Jer 40(47)–41(48):3 LXX and 2 Kgs 25 LXX .....	212
6.4.2.1. Collation .....	212
6.4.2.2. Comments .....	213
6.5. <i>Conclusion</i> .....	215
6.5.1. Jer MT .....	217
6.5.2. Jer LXX Read on Its Own .....	217

Chapter 7: Conclusion .....	218
Bibliography .....	221
Index of References .....	233
Index of Modern Authors .....	236
Subject Index .....	238

## List of Abbreviations

AASF	<i>Annales Academiae scientiarum fennicae</i>
AB	Anchor Bible
AIL	Ancient Israel and Its Literature
<i>BASOR</i>	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i>
BDAG	Bauer, W., F. W. Danker, W. F. Arndt, and F. W. Gingrich. <i>Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> . 3rd ed. Chicago, 1999
BDB	Brown, F., S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs. <i>A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> . Oxford, 1907
BDF	Blass, F., A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk. <i>A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> . Chicago, 1961
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium
<i>BHS</i>	<i>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</i>
<i>BiBh</i>	<i>Bible Bhashyam</i>
<i>BIOSCS</i>	<i>Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies</i>
<i>BRev</i>	<i>Bible Review</i>
<i>BSac</i>	<i>Bibliotheca sacra</i>
BWANT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament
BZAR	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für altorientalische und biblische Rechtsgeschichte
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
CATSS	Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies
CBET	Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
ConBOT	Coniectanea biblica: Old Testament Series
<i>DCH</i>	<i>Dictionary of Classical Hebrew</i> . Edited by D. J. A. Clines. 8 vols. Sheffield, 1993–2011
DHL	Dissertationes Humanarum Litterarum
DJD	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert
DSS	Dead Sea Scrolls
ESV	English Standard Version
<i>ETR</i>	<i>Etudes théologiques et religieuses</i>
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament



GBSOT	Guides to Biblical Scholarship: Old Testament Series
GELS	<i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint</i> . Muraoka, T. Leuven, 2009
GKC	<i>Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar</i> . Edited by E. Kautzsch. Translated by A. E. Cowley. 2nd. ed. Oxford, 1910
L&N	<i>Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains</i> . Edited by J. P. Louw and E. A. Nida. Vol. 1. New York, 1988
HALOT	<i>The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> . Koehler, L., W. Baumgartner, and J. J. Stamm. Translated and edited under the supervision of M. E. J. Richardson. 4 vols. Leiden, 1994–1999
HAT	Handbuch zum Alten Testament
HeBAI	<i>Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel</i>
HKAT	Handkommentar zum Alten Testament
HR	Hatch, E. and H. A. Redpath. <i>Concordance to the Septuagint and Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament</i> . Oxford, 1897. Suppl., 1906. Reprint, 3 vols. in 1, Grand Rapids, 1998
HS	<i>Hebrew Studies</i>
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
HTR	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
HUBP	The Hebrew University Bible Project
HUCA	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
ICC	International Critical Commentary on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments
IEJ	<i>Israel Exploration Journal</i>
IJT	<i>Indian Journal of Theology</i>
IOSCS	International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies
Joüon	Joüon, P. <i>A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew</i> . Translated and revised by T. Muraoka. <i>Subsidia biblica</i> 27. Rome, 2006
JSem	<i>Journal for Semitics</i>
JSJSup	Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series
JSP	<i>Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha</i>
JNSL	<i>Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages</i>
JTS	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
KAT	Kommentar zum Alten Testament
LEH	Lust, J., E. Eynikel, and K. Hauspie. <i>A Greek - English Lexicon of the Septuagint</i> . 2 vols. Stuttgart, 1992–1996
LSJ	Liddell, H. G., R. Scott, and H. S. Jones. <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> . 9th ed. with revised supplement. Oxford, 1996
LXX	The Septuagint
MSU	Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens
MT	The Masoretic Text
NAC	New American Commentary
NAWG	Nachrichten (von) der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen

NICOT	New International Commentary on the Old Testament
OBO	Orbis biblicus et orientalis
OTL	Old Testament Library
OTS	Old Testament Studies
OTWSA	Die Ou-Testamentiese Werkgemeenskap in Suid-Afrika
PFES	Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue biblique</i>
<i>RevQ</i>	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>
SBOT	The Sacred Books of the Old Testament
<i>SacEr</i>	<i>Sacris erudiri</i>
SBB	Stuttgarter biblische Beiträge
<i>SubBi</i>	<i>Subsidia biblica</i>
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
SBLSCS	Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies
ScrHier	Scripta hierosolymitana
SCS	Septuagint Commentary Series
<i>SEÅ</i>	<i>Svensk exegetisk årsbok</i>
<i>SJOT</i>	<i>Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament</i>
SJSJ	Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism
SVTG	Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum
TCT	Textual Criticism and the Translator
TECC	Textos y Estudios “Cardenal Cisneros” de la Biblia Políglota Matritense
<i>Text</i>	<i>Textus</i>
THB	Textual History of the Bible
THBSup	Supplements to the Textual History of the Bible
<i>TR</i>	<i>Theological Review</i>
TREN	Theological Research Exchange Network
<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
VTSup	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
<i>WTJ</i>	<i>Westminster Theological Journal</i>
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
<i>ZAW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
<i>ZKT</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie</i>



## Chapter 1

# Introductory Issues and Methodology

As many scholars have previously noted, the Septuagint translation of Jeremiah is much shorter and appears, at times, in a different order than the Masoretic Text. More specifically, LXX contains about 3,100 fewer words when compared to MT, making it about one-seventh shorter.<sup>1</sup> Currently, there is no consensus among scholars as to the reason for this vast difference. Due to this lack of consensus, further study is needed on the relationship between MT and LXX in this book.

Rather than attempting to survey the entire book of Jeremiah, this work will look thoroughly at chapters 39–41:3 and 52.<sup>2</sup> The central question is this: “Did the Septuagint translator cause the differences between MT and LXX in these chapters?” This book will observe the technique of the Septuagint translator of Jeremiah in order to determine if it fits within his translation profile to cause the vast differences between MT and LXX in the target chapters. The work concludes that the large-scale differences between MT and LXX in Jer 39–41:3 and 52 are due to a divergent Hebrew *Vorlage*.<sup>3</sup>

### 1.1. Scope of the Study

Many of the works surveyed in chapter 2 consider the text of Jeremiah as a whole. Although this is certainly beneficial and has enhanced the study of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Young-Jin Min, “The Minuses and Pluses of the LXX Translation of Jeremiah as Compared with the Massoretic Text: Their Classification and Possible Origins” (PhD diss., Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1977), 1.

<sup>2</sup> The rationale for using a smaller case study and for selecting these chapters is given in §1.1.

<sup>3</sup> This work will point out several differences between MT and LXX which appear to be caused by translation technique. However, as a whole, it will be argued that many of the major differences between these two witnesses are caused by a divergent Hebrew *Vorlage* because they do not align with the profile of the Septuagint translator.

relationship between MT and LXX in this book, there is something to be said for smaller test cases as well. Works that view the book as a whole are forced to rely on selective examples.<sup>4</sup> These types of works choose the best examples to prove their point, but they cannot present the totality of the evidence. The ability to present all of the evidence for a small piece of the book is the benefit of a test case.<sup>5</sup> Test cases have the advantage of looking at minor differences that are often overlooked by large-scale works. Undoubtedly, the many other chapters of Jeremiah which are outside the scope of this book will refine what is found here. Since only a few chapters are highlighted, the conclusions should not be taken as paradigmatic for the whole book of Jeremiah. The method employed will discuss all differences between MT and LXX in the target chapters, both those that support the thesis of this work and those which seem to contradict it.

Another benefit of a test case is that it is easier to uphold methodologically. Larger scale works tend to overlook important matters that are not central to their method, such as textual criticism. Ideally, one would like to look at the whole book with the rigor and scrutiny that are applied to smaller test cases, but at present this is not practical for the large book of Jeremiah. Once test cases have been run over many chapters of the book, these can then be combined to survey the book as a whole in a way that deals with the text more comprehensively than is usually done by works that overview the entire book.

This work is based largely on the test case of chapter 52 of Jeremiah. It is also supplemented by a thorough study of chapters 39–41:3. The rationale for selecting Jer 52 is that it has a parallel text found in 2 Kgs 24:18–25:30, which allows for fuller analysis than is possible with the average passage in Jeremiah. The Hebrew texts of Jer 52 and 2 Kgs 24–25<sup>6</sup> are similar; however, the LXX translations of these two passages contain many differences. When Jer 52 MT and 2 Kgs 24–25 MT are the same (and there are no quantitative differences in

---

<sup>4</sup> For similar comments, see Shelley L. Birdsong, *The Last King(s) of Judah: Zedekiah and Sedekias in the Hebrew and Old Greek Versions of Jeremiah 37(44):1–40(47):6*, FAT 2:89 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017), 157–58; Andrew G. Shead, *The Open Book and the Sealed Book: Jeremiah 32 in Its Hebrew and Greek Recensions*, JSOTSup 347 (London: Sheffield, 2002), 17.

<sup>5</sup> One disadvantage of test cases is that they cannot offer an assessment of the whole book. They are, by nature, selective. But this is a different kind of selectivity than is seen in works that survey an entire book. Test cases are selective in scope but thorough in analysis. Works which survey an entire book are broad in scope but selective in analysis (at least for larger books, such as Jeremiah).

<sup>6</sup> For ease of reference, 2 Kgs 24:18–25:30 may be referred to “2 Kgs 24–25” in this study (or further abbreviated as 2 Kgs 25).

Jer 52 LXX and 2 Kgs 24–25 LXX),<sup>7</sup> one can be reasonably sure that both LXX translations worked from the same Hebrew *Vorlage*. This overlap allows one to compare the two Greek translations for issues of syntax, lexicology, morphology, style, etc. The places where 2 Kgs LXX differs from Jer 52 LXX highlight different translational approaches by the two translators.<sup>8</sup> These differences can shed light on the translation technique and any possible ideological motivations that influenced the Jer LXX translation. Understanding these possible viewpoints and motivations will help to determine if it fits within the translator's profile to cause the vast differences between MT and LXX in the target chapters.

A further reason for selecting chapter 52 as a test case is that an extensive text-critical monograph has been published on this chapter.<sup>9</sup> Abate's work helps set the text-critical foundation on which an evaluation of the translation technique can be based. Without first establishing the earliest possible forms of the Hebrew and Greek texts, one might base translation technique decisions on variant readings, which would lead to error.

A final reason for selecting chapter 52 is that this chapter plays a central role in Fischer's understanding of Jer MT and LXX. Fischer, however, thinks the LXX translator abridged a proto-MT type source text. Fischer thinks chapter 52 is an ideal starting point for analyzing MT and LXX in Jeremiah because its *Vorlage* is extant in 2 Kgs 24–25, which provides an external reference point for comparing these texts.<sup>10</sup> In this, he agrees with most scholars that the book of Jeremiah borrowed from 2 Kgs to get its information for chapter 52.<sup>11</sup> Since Fischer deals extensively with Jer 52, analysis of this chapter provides an opportunity to interact with one of the main proponents for the priority of MT.

The analysis of chapter 52 is supplemented by a study of Jer 39(46)–41(48):3. These chapters contain a great deal of overlap with Jer 52 and 2 Kgs 24:18–25:30. This overlap includes similar themes (e.g., the destruction

---

<sup>7</sup> For the sake of clarity and consistency, 4 Reigns 24:18–25:30 will be referred to as 2 Kgs 24:18–25:30 LXX (or as “2 Kgs 25 LXX”).

<sup>8</sup> See Jannes Smith, “Jeremiah 52: Thackeray and Beyond,” *BIOSCS* 35 (2002): 55–96, esp. 93–94.

<sup>9</sup> Emma Abate, *La fine del regno di Sedecia*, TECC 76 (Madrid: Higher Council for Scientific Research, 2008).

<sup>10</sup> Georg Fischer, “Jeremia 52 – ein Schlüssel zum Jeremiabuch,” in *Der Prophet wie Mose: Studien zum Jeremiabuch*, BZAR 15 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2011), 42–63, esp. 42. See also Georg Fischer, “Das Jeremiabuch als Spiegel der Schrift- und Lesekultur in Israel,” in *Der Prophet wie Mose: Studien zum Jeremiabuch*, BZAR 15 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2011), 209–27, esp. 210–11.

<sup>11</sup> Georg Fischer, “Les deux faces de Jérémie 52,” *ETR* 74 (1999): 481–89, esp. 482.

of Jerusalem and the removal of the temple vessels) and vocabulary, as well as whole verses being parallel in these texts (e.g., Jer 39:1–10//Jer 52:4–16//2 Kgs 25:1–12;<sup>12</sup> Jer 40:5–9//2 Kgs 25:22–24; Jer 41:1–3//2 Kgs 25:25). These parallels allow one to consider how consistent the Jer LXX translator is in handling similar passages and also allow for a further comparison between the LXX translation of Jeremiah and that of 2 Kings.<sup>13</sup>

Since chapters 39–41:3 are thematically similar to chapter 52, they provide ample opportunity for the Greek translator to demonstrate any possible *Tendenz*. That is, if the Greek translator deviates from his Hebrew text in chapter 52 for theological or other reasons, one might expect that he would do the same in other similar contexts in the book.<sup>14</sup> All of this provides many different angles to ascertain a possible motivation for the Jer LXX translator to deviate from his proto-Masoretic *Vorlage* in these chapters if, indeed, this is the case.

## 1.2. Sources for Accessing the Original Texts

For the purposes of this work, the basis for the text of LXX is Ziegler's edition for the book of Jeremiah,<sup>15</sup> the Cambridge edition will be used for the books of

---

<sup>12</sup> In LXX, vv. 4–13 are missing in chapter 46 (i.e., ch. 39 in MT).

<sup>13</sup> Some think there was more than one LXX translator for the book of Jeremiah or that the second half of the book was revised because of many translational differences between chapters 1–28 and 29–52. See Emanuel Tov, *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*, HSM 8 (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1976). The chapters in this case study belong to the second half of the book, so this phenomenon would not greatly impact the present study. For consistency and ease of reference, this work will refer to “the Septuagint translator” of Jeremiah, rather than to possible Septuagint translator(s).

<sup>14</sup> For a similar methodology for ascertaining possible *Tendenz* in LXX, see Sharon Pace Jeansonne, *The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 7–12*, CBQMS 19 (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association, 1988), 103–4. This does not mean that every difference of a theological nature has to be mentioned more than once. At times, a translator may exploit an ambiguous passage by filling it with a more theological meaning. But this could be occasioned by an ambiguous context that may not be repeated elsewhere. Furthermore, a translation may contain a clear reference to *Tendenz* that is mentioned only once. With this in mind, the best way to uncover *Tendenz* is by finding several places where the translator intentionally diverges from his *Vorlage*. Intentional theological differences that occur only once are harder to attribute to *Tendenz* methodologically, but this is by no means impossible.

<sup>15</sup> Joseph Ziegler, ed., *Ieremias, Baruch, Threni, Epistula Ieremiae*, SVTG 15 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1976).

Kings,<sup>16</sup> and Rahlfs' edition for all other books (including the Apocrypha).<sup>17</sup> Ziegler's edition presents the standard critical text for Jeremiah. Both the Cambridge edition and Rahlfs' edition are based mainly on codex Vaticanus. The apparatus of each of these editions (especially those of Ziegler and Cambridge) has been consulted and any deviations from these editions are noted.

For the Hebrew text of Jeremiah, *BHS* will be used as a base text.<sup>18</sup> This edition will be supplemented by the text and apparatus for the book of Jeremiah in the HUBP, as well as the text-critical work by Abate (for chapter 52), and Barthélemy.<sup>19</sup>

For the Hebrew text of Kings, *BHS* will be used as a base text. This edition will be supplemented by the works of Abate, Stade and Schwally, Barthélemy, and Burney.<sup>20</sup> The Cambridge edition of the Greek text of Kings will be supplemented by Rahlfs' Septuagint, the Antiochene text as reconstructed by Fernández Marcos and Busto Saiz, the text-critical work of Abate, and other sources.<sup>21</sup> All citations from the Vulgate are taken from Weber's edition.<sup>22</sup> Any divergences from these standard critical works will be noted.

<sup>16</sup> Alan England Brooke, Norman McLean, and Henry St. John Thackeray, eds., *The Old Testament in Greek according to the Text of Codex Vaticanus, Supplemented from Other Uncial Manuscripts, with a Critical Apparatus Containing the Variants of the Chief Ancient Authorities for the Text of the Septuagint*, vol. 2, *The Later Historical Books; Part 2, I and II Kings* (Cambridge: University Press, 1930).

<sup>17</sup> Alfred Rahlfs, ed., *Septuaginta*, 2nd rev. ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006).

<sup>18</sup> K. Elliger and W. Rudolph, eds., *Biblia hebraica stuttgartensia* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1997).

<sup>19</sup> C. Rabin, Shemaryahu Talmon, and Emanuel Tov, eds., *The Book of Jeremiah*, HUBP (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1997); Abate, *La fine*; Dominique Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*, OBO 50/2, *Isaïe, Jérémie, Lamentations* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1986).

<sup>20</sup> Bernhard Stade and Friedrich Schwally, *The Books of Kings: Critical Edition of the Hebrew Text Printed in Colors Exhibiting the Composite Structure of the Books*, trans. R. E. Brünnow and Paul Haupt, SBOT 9 (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1904); Dominique Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*, OBO 50/1, *Josué, Judges, Ruth, Samuel, Rois, Chroniques, Esdras, Néhémie, Esther* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1982); C. F. Burney, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings with an Introduction and Appendix* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1903). Microfiche.

<sup>21</sup> Natalio Fernández Marcos and José Ramón Busto Saiz, *El texto antioqueno de la Biblia Griega*, vol. 2, *1–2 Reyes*, TECC 53 (Madrid: CSIC Institute of Philology, 1992). Also, D. G. Deboys, "The Greek Text of 2 Kings" (M. Litt. thesis, University of Oxford, 1981).

<sup>22</sup> Robert Weber, ed., *Biblia sacra iuxta vulgatum versionem*, 5th ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007).



When comparisons in translation technique are drawn with other books of the Bible, *BHS* will be used as the Hebrew base text. For the Septuagint, the Göttingen edition will be used for any examples in the book of Jeremiah, and the Cambridge edition will be used for the books of Kings. Outside of these books, Rahlfs' edition of the Septuagint will be used as the Greek base text.

### 1.3. Translation Technique

Translation technique describes the relationship between the Hebrew parent text and the Septuagint translation.<sup>23</sup> It analyzes how the target language (in this case, Greek) renders different elements of the parent text. This is done by analyzing lexical equivalents, formal equivalents, word order, consistency, style, and any other grammatical, syntactical, or lexical features that have a bearing on how one language is transferred to another.<sup>24</sup> Ultimately, the point in studies of translation-technique is to determine the general profile of the translation (i.e., what are the normal renderings and tendencies).<sup>25</sup>

The reasons why a translator may depart from his *Vorlage* are often overlooked in studies of translation technique. This work aims to go beyond mere statistical data that recounts percentages of divergence from the putative LXX *Vorlage* by inquiring into why the translator departed from his *Vorlage* whenever he does and determining how this helps in the study of translation technique.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> Anneli Aejmelaeus, "What We Talk about When We Talk about Translation Technique," in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays*, rev. and exp. ed., CBET 50 (Leuven: Peeters, 2007), 205–22, esp. 205.

<sup>24</sup> Emanuel Tov, "The Nature and Study of the Translation Technique of the LXX in the Past and Present," in *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies Jerusalem 1986*, ed. Claude E. Cox, SBLSCS 23 (Atlanta: Scholars, 1987), 337–59, esp. 339.

<sup>25</sup> See Raija Sollamo, "Translation Technique as a Method," in *Translating a Translation: The LXX and Its Modern Translations in the Context of Early Judaism*, ed. H. Ausloos et al., BETL 213 (Leuven: Peeters, 2008), 35–41, esp. 36–37.

<sup>26</sup> As Muraoka points out, some linguistic information that is beneficial for the study of translation technique is not easily quantifiable by statistical analysis because it deals with style and aesthetics. See T. Muraoka, "Translation Techniques and Beyond," in *Helsinki Perspectives on the Translation Technique of the Septuagint: Proceedings of the IOSCS Congress in Helsinki 1999*, ed. Raija Sollamo and Seppo Sipilä, PFES 82 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2001), 13–22, esp. 22.

The translation technique of Jer LXX will be evaluated through the criteria given by Barr and Tov.<sup>27</sup> However, this analysis will be refined by comments on other linguistic factors that may impact translation technique.<sup>28</sup> Barr's and Tov's criteria primarily include the following: internal consistency, representation of Hebrew constituents by separate Greek equivalents, word order, quantitative representation, and adequacy of lexical choices.<sup>29</sup>

## 1.4. Possibility of a Divergent *Vorlage*

At the theoretical level, the possibility that Jer LXX is based on a Hebrew text different from that of MT should be acknowledged. As will be noted in chapter 2, 4QJer<sup>b</sup> and 4QJer<sup>d</sup> provide evidence of a Hebrew text of Jeremiah that is different from MT but aligns closely to LXX in matters of rearrangement and a shorter text. Furthermore, many introductory studies have confirmed a “fairly literal” translation technique employed in the places where LXX does not contain a minus compared to MT.<sup>30</sup> One would not expect a “literal” translator to

---

<sup>27</sup> James Barr, *The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations*, MSU 15 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1979), 20–49; Emanuel Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*, 3rd rev. and exp. ed. (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015), 18–29.

<sup>28</sup> Robert Timothy McLay, “Translation Technique and Textual Studies in the Old Greek and Theodotion Versions of Daniel” (PhD diss., Durham University, 1994), 123–73, [http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/5485/1/5485\\_2924.PDF?UkUDh:CyT](http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/5485/1/5485_2924.PDF?UkUDh:CyT) (accessed February 23, 2016). See also Robert Timothy McLay, *The OG and Th Versions of Daniel*, SBLSCS 43 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996). Similarly, Lemmelijn notes that the approach of Barr and Tov needs to be used in conjunction with an “accurate linguistic and grammatical investigation of the literal and free renderings of the different linguistic phenomena.” See Bénédicte Lemmelijn, “Two Methodological Trails in Recent Studies on the Translation Technique of the Septuagint,” in *Helsinki Perspectives on the Translation Technique of the Septuagint: Proceedings of the IOSCS Congress in Helsinki 1999*, ed. Raija Sollamo and Seppo Sipilä, PFES 82 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2001), 43–63, esp. 62.

<sup>29</sup> For an overview of these criteria, see James Frohlich, “The Transmission of the Text of Jeremiah: Jeremiah 52 as a Test Case” (PhD diss., Dallas Theological Seminary, 2018), 9–16.

<sup>30</sup> Based on a preliminary study of consistency in translating Hebrew prepositions and conjunctions, Tov and Wright identified Jeremiah as a “fairly literal” translation. See Emanuel Tov and Benjamin G. Wright, “Computer-Assisted Study of the Criteria for Assessing the Literalness of Translation Units in the LXX,” *Text* 12 (1985): 149–87, esp. 185. Similarly, Sollamo's work concludes that Jeremiah is among the books which contain “the most

introduce large-scale differences.<sup>31</sup> Therefore, one should acknowledge the possibility that some of the large-scale differences in the book are not due to the translator but rather due to his *Vorlage*.

One begins a study of translation technique by comparing LXX to MT as if MT were the *Vorlage*, but this is just the starting point. One should acknowledge that it is possible that the Septuagint translator faithfully translated from a *Vorlage* different from MT.<sup>32</sup> Of course, a comparison between LXX and MT must be done since MT is all we have as a basis (apart from sections of various chapters found at Qumran – none of which include the chapters under consideration in this work).

Having said this, one must not too hastily posit a divergent *Vorlage*. Rather, he should seek to ascertain, in light of the translation technique, if it was possible for the Septuagint translator to arrive at his Greek translation from a text similar to MT.<sup>33</sup> One does this by knowing the tendencies and habits of the translator.

---

slavish renderings” based upon its translation of Hebrew semiprepositions. See Raija Solamo, *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuagint*, AASF, DHL 19 (Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1979), 286.

<sup>31</sup> See Hermann-Josef Stipp, *Jeremia 25–52*, HAT I/12,2 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019), 3–4. It could be argued that the Septuagint translator rendered his *Vorlage* fairly literally but still introduced editorial differences, such as omissions and the rearrangement of his text. This cannot be excluded *a priori* as a possibility. Having said this, one needs to consider what makes the most sense of the evidence. See §4.3 where it is argued that many of the pluses in Jer 52 MT are later additions.

<sup>32</sup> See Jeansonne, *The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 7–12*, 2–3. Barr similarly notes that the Greek translation, at times, may not seem literal compared to MT, but it may in fact be a literal translation of a different Hebrew text. Barr, *The Typology of Literalism*, 10.

<sup>33</sup> See Anneli Aejmelaeus, “What Can We Know about the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Septuagint?” *ZAW* 99 (1985): 58–89, esp. 66. Many factors, other than a divergent *Vorlage*, may have led to a difference between MT and LXX. For example, if the Hebrew text contains difficult syntax or a rare word, this could cause the LXX translator to diverge from his source text in order to make better sense of the difficulty within the context of his translation. Other factors include the following: difficulty in determining word division, difficulty in deciphering between homonyms, mistakes by copyists during the transmission of either MT or LXX, intentional changes by the translator (theological, stylistic, or otherwise), and a general lack of understanding the peculiarities of the Hebrew source text. See W. Edward Glenny, *Finding Meaning in the Text: Translation Technique and Theology in the Septuagint of Amos*, VTSup 126 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 46, 144–45.

## 1.5. Method of the Study

Each chapter will begin by providing a collation of the Hebrew text and LXX.<sup>34</sup> The work will discuss both variances and places of non-variance that may be beneficial to understanding the Septuagint translator's technique. For example, certain Greek lexemes or Greek syntactical constructions employed by the Septuagint translator may not be at odds with the Hebrew text (i.e., they may not technically be considered a "variant"), but how consistent the translator is in using these constructions may provide valuable insight into his translation technique. Therefore, this study is concerned not only with areas of variance between MT and LXX but also with areas of correspondence or agreement.<sup>35</sup>

Alongside the collation, descriptive terms are listed that label and identify each entry in the collation for quick reference and for categorizing purposes. Labels have been chosen so as not to prejudice the situation up front as much as possible. Therefore, terms such as "plus" or "minus" simply indicate that one of the texts in the collation has a reading that is not present in the other. These labels are not intended to determine how the "original" text or the *Vorlage* of the Septuagint would have read.<sup>36</sup>

The body of the chapters will analyze the variants listed in the collation of each respective chapter. At many points, it may simply be stylistic change or variation that led to a difference between MT and LXX. At times, it will be difficult to determine why a translator chose to render his *Vorlage* in a way that is formally different from the putative *Vorlage*. Likewise, it will often be difficult to determine a difference introduced by the translator from a difference in *Vorlage*.

At every step, this work will consider what might have been the Hebrew *Vorlage* of LXX if it differed from MT. The analysis will seek to determine why the translator rendered a given Hebrew construction the way he did and how consistent he is at doing this. This work will attempt to uncover whether there are any reasons as to why LXX differs from MT in terms of variances or translation preference. It will also try to determine why the LXX translation of

---

<sup>34</sup> In keeping with this study, the collation and comments will focus solely on the Hebrew text and the Septuagint translation. Other versional evidence may be used but only as it relates to understanding the relationship of the Hebrew text and LXX.

<sup>35</sup> Accordingly, the present work differs from Abate's collation at many points. See Abate, *La fine*. See the sections entitled "Variants for Further Study" in chapters 3, 5, and 6 of this work for a discussion of consistency in Jer LXX in various Greek constructions.

<sup>36</sup> For a similar methodology, see Richard A. Taylor, *The Peshiṭta of Daniel*, Monographs of the Peshiṭta Institute Leiden 7 (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 26–27.

Jer 52 differs from the LXX translation of 2 Kgs 24:18–25:30, especially in areas where MT of these is the same (and, therefore, it is likely that their Hebrew *Vorlage* read the same). The work will look for patterns that may develop that may help determine whether the differences are due to translation technique, *Vorlage*, or *Tendenz*. Assigning a motivation to a possible *Tendenz* will be the last step considered due to its subjectivity (although, of course, any observation of translation technique has an element of subjectivity to it).<sup>37</sup>

At the conclusion of each chapter, the work will note how often each type of variation occurs. The conclusion section will also summarize the findings of the chapter by noting how often each type of variant was assigned to translation technique or to a divergent *Vorlage*.

There is much subjectivity that accompanies any translation technique study. What one scholar deems as proof of a divergent *Vorlage*, another scholar may deem as evidence of the hand of the translator. Due to its subjective nature, translation technique studies are not necessarily studies that provide an “end-all” discussion. And, indeed, they have not provided this. However, they are necessary for discussing the relationship between the Hebrew and Greek texts. With this in mind, this work, along with other works that contain a more in-depth scrutiny of smaller sections of Jeremiah, can provide the materials needed to help better ascertain whether the Septuagint translator abridged a proto-Masoretic *Vorlage*, or whether his Hebrew text looked significantly different than what is found in MT.<sup>38</sup> Only after a thorough, critical observation of large sections of the book can one hope to find the patterns necessary to help determine this. The author hopes that this book will make a modest contribution to understanding the relationship between LXX and MT in Jer 39–41:3 and 52, so that this study can be combined with others to understand better the relationship between MT and LXX in the book of Jeremiah as a whole.

---

<sup>37</sup> Staffan Olofsson, *The LXX Version: A Guide to the Translation Technique of the Septuagint*, ConBOT 30 (Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell International, 1990), 70.

<sup>38</sup> Of course, if the translator used a proto-MT source text, it might look a little different from what is found in MT. However, the differences between MT and LXX in the book of Jeremiah are so extensive that one would not expect the LXX translator to have used a proto-MT type source text unless he intentionally abridged his *Vorlage*.

## Index of References

References in parentheses refer to the versification in LXX if different than that of MT.  
References mentioned in footnotes are not included unless deemed important.

<i>2 Kings</i>		25:17	36, 120–21, 129–30,
24–25	2–3, 18–21, 64, 145–		132, 136–37
	50, 155, 218	25:18	71–72, 113, 132–33
24:6	60	25:19	110–11, 113, 122, 127,
24:18–25:30	2–3, 19, 24, 75–76,		133
	101, 218	25:20	127
24:18	35, 112, 117, 134	25:21	127
25	13	25:22–26	138
25:1–12	4	25:22–24	4
25:1–4	174–75	25:22	13, 208
25:1	109, 111, 114–15, 118,	25:23–25	209–15
	124–25, 134	25:23	13, 203
25:2	41, 112, 118	25:24	13, 198–99
25:3	35, 108, 110, 125	25:25	4, 13
25:4–12	22, 176–77	25:27	44, 127–28
25:4	66–67, 108–10, 112,	25:28	122, 130
	115–19, 125, 130, 137	25:29	122, 128
25:5	56, 108–10, 123–26,	25:30	34, 115–16, 122–24,
	131		133–34, 138
25:6	111		
25:7	117, 134	<i>2 Chronicles</i>	
25:8	44–45, 55–56, 129,	36	21
	131		
25:9	34, 119, 131, 134–35	<i>Jeremiah</i>	
25:10	112–13, 135–36	25	16
25:11	137–38	26(33):21	66
25:12	111–12, 119–20, 126,	27(34)	16, 76
	131	29(36)	16
25:13	34, 54, 120, 126	33(40)	16, 21
25:14–15	90–91	37(44)–40(47):6	23
25:14	115, 117, 131–32	39(46)–41(48):3	2–4, 23, 219
25:15	136	39(46)–40(47):6	23
25:16	110, 113, 132, 136		

39(46)	21, 139, 148–49, 155, 177–78	41(48):1–3 41(48):1 41(48):2 41(48):3 43(50):6 47(29) 51(28):64 52	4, 91, 209–15 194–95, 207 207 191, 200, 208 207 16 19 2–3, 13, 18–21, 23–24, 32–34, 101, 139, 145– 50, 155, 172–73, 178, 218–19 35, 42, 49–50, 91, 112, 117, 134 21, 64–65 92 4 172–73 33, 40–41, 45–46, 50, 55–56, 109, 111, 114– 15, 118, 124–25, 134 41, 92, 112, 118 35, 41, 66, 92–93, 108, 110, 125, 159 22, 176–77 37, 39, 42–43, 54–55, 61–62, 66–67, 108–10, 112, 115–19, 125, 130, 137 35, 37–38, 50–51, 56, 108–10, 123–26, 131 38–39, 67, 111 117, 134 20, 67, 93 57 33–34, 44, 67–68, 93– 94, 129, 131 34–35, 57, 119, 131, 134–35 38–39, 68, 112–13, 135–36 20–21, 69–70, 137–38 58, 70, 111–12, 119– 20, 126, 131 34, 36, 46, 51–52, 54, 63, 71, 120, 126
39(46):1–10	4		
39(46):1–2	21–22, 157, 172–175		
39(46):1	159, 163–66		
39(46):2	66, 159, 162, 165, 171		
39(46):3	22–23, 158, 165, 167, 171		
39(46):4–13	13–14, 21–22, 167–68, 176–77, 219		
39(46):14	160, 162, 168		
39(46):15–40(47):6	168	52:1	
39(46):15	168–69		
39(46):16	158, 160, 162, 165–66, 169–170	52:2–3 52:3 52:4–16 52:4–7 52:4	
39(46):17	158, 160, 162, 166–67, 170		
39(46):18	158, 161, 163–64, 170–71		
40(47)–41(48)	13		
40(47)–41(48):3	214	52:5 52:6 52:7–16 52:7 52:8 52:9 52:10–11 52:10 52:11 52:12 52:13 52:14 52:15 52:16 52:17	
40(47):1–6	168		
40(47):1	185, 191–94, 196, 201–2		
40(47):2	186, 193, 195–98		
40(47):3	198, 202–3		
40(47):4	186–87, 194–95, 203– 4		
40(47):5–9	4		
40(47):5	13, 187, 192–93, 198– 99, 204		
40(47):6	13, 204		
40(47):7–9	209–15		
40(47):7	13, 187–89, 197, 199– 200, 204		
40(47):8	188, 192, 205		
40(47):9	13, 190, 197–99, 201		
40(47):10	191, 200, 205, 208		
40(47):11	185, 188		
40(47):12	189, 193–94, 206		
40(47):13	187		
40(47):14	197, 200, 206		
40(47):15	187, 189–90, 192, 200, 206–7		
40(47):16	187, 191, 196, 206		

52:18–19	78–79, 88–91	52:25	35–37, 40–41, 45, 47,
52:18	40, 80–85, 115, 117, 131–32		53, 60, 72–74, 110–11, 113, 122, 127, 133
52:19	46–47, 62, 81–91, 136	52:26	127
52:20	36, 47, 58–59, 71, 94, 110, 113, 132, 136	52:27	20, 74–76, 127
52:21–23	120–21, 129–30, 132, 136–37	52:28–30	21, 76–77, 95, 138
52:21	36, 48, 59–60, 94	52:31	43–44, 48, 60–61, 95, 127–28
52:22	36, 48, 63–64, 95	52:32	37, 41–42, 53, 122, 130
52:23	52, 64, 95	52:33	39, 48, 122, 128
52:24	45, 52–53, 71–72, 113, 132–33	52:34	34, 43, 48–49, 77–78, 115–16, 122–24, 133– 34, 138



## Index of Modern Authors

- Abate, E. 3, 5, 9, 18, 49, 56, 81–82, 87, 90,  
121, 133, 146  
Aejmelaeus, A. 8  
Allen, L. C. 205
- Barr, J. 7–8  
Barthélemy, D. 5, 58, 64, 68, 73–74, 109,  
132  
Bauer, H. 160  
Beckman, J. C. 189  
Birdsong, S. L. 2, 23, 159, 162, 167–71,  
177–78, 193, 196, 198, 202–4  
Blau, J. 128  
Bright, J. 17–18, 59, 167, 205  
Bogaert, P.-M. 18, 22, 61, 64–65, 69, 75,  
149, 167–68, 170–71, 177–78  
Burney, C. F. 5, 117  
Busto Saiz, J. R. 5, 121, 135
- Carroll, R. P. 186  
Conybeare, F. C. 95, 114, 197  
Cross, F. M. 15
- Deboys, D. G. 5, 136  
De Rossi, J. B. 186, 188, 205
- Ehrensward, M. 44  
Eichhorn, J. G. 12  
Engel, H. 21, 51, 146, 149
- Fernández Marcos, N. 5, 121, 135  
Field, F. 57  
Fischer, G. 3–4, 17, 19–21, 65, 74, 76–77,  
82–89, 94–95, 100, 146–50, 153–54,  
164–66, 176, 178
- Frohlich, J. 7, 72, 90, 209, 212
- Giesebrecht, F. 14  
Glenny, W. E. 8  
Goldman, Y. 16–17, 65, 75–76,  
Grabe, J. E. 12–13
- Holladay, W. L. 59, 75, 188, 199  
Huey, F. B. 17
- Janzen, J. G. 11, 13, 15–16, 20, 55, 58–59,  
69–70, 72, 76–77, 132, 139, 145–46,  
167, 188, 198, 201, 204, 206  
Jeansonne, S. P. 4, 8  
Joüon, P. 46, 122, 162
- Keown, G. L. 59, 167, 205  
Klein, R. W. 134, 139
- Leander, P. 160  
Lange, A. 11, 150, 206  
Lundbom, J. R. 46, 59, 61, 66, 68, 72–73,  
75, 77, 167, 171, 186
- Martin, R. A. 39–41, 44, 53, 57, 61, 112,  
124, 129, 163–64, 195–96  
McKane, W. 62, 64, 72, 74, 86, 171, 203,  
205, 211  
McLay, R. T. 7, 55  
McLean, P. D. 119, 123–24, 129, 138  
Min, Y.-J. 1, 11, 15–19, 67, 76, 81, 140–  
41, 145, 150, 218  
Movers, F. C. 13–14, 66, 145–46, 167,  
206, 208  
Müller, R. 68, 91

- Muraoka, T. 6, 33–34, 46, 50–51, 53, 55,  
81–83, 112–13, 119, 121, 127, 131,  
164, 171, 190, 194, 196–97
- O'Connor, M. 54, 168, 193, 198
- Olofsson, S. 10, 88
- Pakkala, J. 68, 91
- Person, R. F. 19, 61–62, 80, 82, 86–88, 94,  
133–34, 146, 149
- Pietersma, A. 89
- Rabin, C. 5
- Rahlfs, A. 5–6, 50, 56, 58, 60, 95, 98, 119,  
121, 124, 126, 127
- Rezetko, R. 44, 91
- Rofé, A. 69–70
- Romeny, B. H. 68, 91
- Rudolph, W. 14
- Saunders, M. 89
- Scalise, P. J. 59, 167, 205
- Scholz, A. 14, 58, 63–65, 77, 95, 147
- Schwally, F. 5, 129, 136
- Segal, M. 47
- Shead, A. G. 2, 11, 47, 77, 97, 118, 218–  
219
- Smith, J. 3, 18, 41–42, 49–53, 56, 59, 61–  
62, 64, 69, 71, 74–75, 80–82, 86–89,  
91–93, 113–15, 119, 133
- Smothers, T. G. 59, 167, 205
- Soderlund, S. K. 16
- Sollamo, R. 6–8, 93, 129, 195
- Spohn, M. G. 12–13
- Stade, B. 5, 129, 136
- Stipp, H.-J. 8, 17, 20–23, 43–44, 61, 64–  
65, 69–70, 76–77, 95, 145–146, 149,  
167–70, 198, 202, 204
- Stock, G. 95, 114, 197
- Sylburg, F. 87
- Talmon, S. 5, 78
- Taylor, R. A. 9
- Thackeray, H. 18, 115, 188
- Tov, E. 4–7, 11, 16–17, 20, 37, 74, 116,  
139–40, 145–46, 150, 161, 169–70,  
178, 206–7, 219
- Volz, D. P. 14
- Waard, H. de 21–23, 38, 60, 66, 68, 70, 72,  
78, 82, 84, 87, 90, 209, 212
- Waard, J. de 69, 171, 205
- Walser, G. A. 33, 49–50, 95, 108, 114,  
117, 128–29, 159, 161, 190, 195, 197
- Waltke, B. K. 54, 168, 193, 198
- Weber, R. 5
- Weis, R. D. 178, 202
- Wevers, J. W. 67, 80, 120, 130, 135–36
- Williams, R. J. 189
- Wright, B. G. 7
- Young, I. 44, 163
- Ziegler, J. 4–5, 32, 50, 56, 58, 67, 73, 95,  
108, 115, 171, 196,

## Subject Index

- Agreement  
– of Jer LXX and 2 Kings 140–42, 145–50, 166, 173, 198–99, 204–5, 207–12  
– of Jer MT and 2 Kings 142–50, 188, 207, 209, 211–15
- Anger of the Lord 21
- Antiochene text, *see* Lucianic recension
- Army  
– of Babylon 51  
– of Egypt 51  
– of Judah 51
- Baruch 12
- Circular reasoning 21
- Collation 9, 18, 24–31, 101–7, 141–43, 172, 174, 179–84, 209–10, 212–13
- Conflation 15, 68, 78, 90, 132–34, 147
- Construct noun 32
- Dative case 42, 190
- Dead Sea Scrolls 15–16, 19  
– 4QJer<sup>b</sup> 7, 11, 19–20  
– 4QJer<sup>d</sup> 7, 11, 20
- Deblatha/Riblah 56
- Doublet 13, 15, 22, 139
- Double rendering 62
- Dynamic equivalent 52
- Exile 21, 69–70, 75–77
- Gate 130  
– between the two walls 37, 154
- Gedaliah 13, 74, 204
- Genitive case 46, 49, 190
- God of Israel 169
- Hamath 67, 73
- Hapax legomenon 86
- Haplography 58, 73
- Hendiadys 62
- Hexapla 22
- House  
– of the king 51  
– of the Lord 51  
– mill ~ 57
- Influence  
– of 2 Chr on Jer LXX 59  
– of 1 Kgs on Jeremiah tradition 83, 86, 90, 94–95, 99, 132  
– of 2 Kgs on Jeremiah tradition 75–76, 90  
– of 2 Kgs on Jer LXX 19, 58–59  
– of 2 Kgs on Jer MT 147–50, 218  
– of 2 Kgs LXX on Jer LXX 60–61, 153
- Jehoiachim 60–61
- Jehoiachin 60–61, 76
- Jeremiah 12, 22, 168, 178, 197–98
- Jeremiah (Book of)  
– textual history 11, 19, 148–50, 211–12  
– two editions 12–19, 202
- Jerome 12
- Jerusalem 57, 65, 76–77, 148, 177–78, 192, 201–2
- Judah 65, 77, 193–94, 201–2
- Kaige recension 119, 123, 126, 130, 138
- Kethib/Qere 21, 36, 160
- Literary criticism 16–17, 23
- Lord of hosts 169

- Lucianic recension 5, 18, 22, 32, 67, 121, 135, 214
- Manuscript Schøyen 4612/9 11
- Metonymy 52–53, 57, 60, 92, 138
- Mizpah 194
- Nebuzaradan 70, 177
- Nebuchadnezzar/Nebuchadrezzar 22, 76–77, 150, 177
- Neologism 33
- Official(s)  
– Babylonian 22–23, 171, 177
- Old Latin, *see* *Vetus Latina*
- Orthography 21, 24
- Patronym 13
- Pillars of temple 20, 36
- Qumran, *see* *Dead Sea Scrolls*
- Redaction criticism 19–20
- Riblah, *see* *Deblatha/Riblah*
- Siege 92, 118, 124–25, 164–65
- Septuagint copyist(s) 12
- Seraiah 71–72
- Solomon 94
- Stereotypical translation 34, 55, 83, 87, 93, 129, 188
- Tendenz 3–4, 10, 155, 166–67, 175–76, 219
- Translation technique 3–4, 6–8, 10, 16, 18, 23–24, 68, 77, 96–99
- Translator  
– of Jer LXX 4, 13–16, 18–19, 21, 35, 41, 96–100, 147, 150–54, 161, 164–67, 177–78, 215–17  
– of 2 Kgs LXX 18, 153–54
- Transliteration 51–52, 56, 58, 67, 86, 119–21
- Temple 178
- Test case 2, 138
- Text criticism 2–3, 17–18, 23
- Versions, ancient 9, 18, 47, 68
- Vetus Latina* 22
- Vorlage 3–4, 8–9, 14, 18–19, 22, 24, 56, 155, 211–12
- Zedekiah/Sedekias 23, 55, 149–50, 177–78  
– guilt of 21
- Zephaniah 72, 133