

## TEXTUAL GLEANINGS FROM THE VULGATE TO JEREMIAH

BENJAMIN KEDAR-KOPFSTEIN

### I

The precise points of divergence between the MT and the MS (or MSS) on which Jerome worked, are difficult to ascertain. Yet the very existence of variance between them has always been assumed by scholars, and justly so. Chronologically speaking, the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Vulgate\* stands roughly half-way between the biblical scrolls from the Judaean Desert and the standardized texts of the Massoretic schools. Its text form therefore is bound to reflect its historical position, at least to some extent.<sup>1</sup> However, in comparing Jerome's Latin version with our present-day Hebrew Bible we note that a great many divergences between the two texts are due either to the translator's desire for stylistic smoothness, his theological interpretation or to his misconception of a word or a phrase. Consequently, any divergence between MT and V has to undergo a minute analysis before it can be classified as a presumptive pristine variant.

In the present paper we shall adduce cases, culled from the Book of Jeremiah, where there seems ground for believing that the variation between MT and V originated from divergent readings in Jerome's Hebrew *Vorlage*. A textual reconstruction of this sort admittedly cannot claim certainty, but has to content

- \* The Vulgate (V) as well as Jerome's Com. are quoted from Vallarsi's first edition (1734-42) of Jerome's complete works. Volume 9 contains the OT Vulgate, vol. 4 the Com. on Jer. (Thus, e.g., iv, 215 stands for volume 4, Jerome's *Commentarius*, column 215).
- 1 It seems necessary again to stress this point in view of Y. Kutscher's criticism of my article "Divergent Hebrew Readings in Jerome's Isaiah", *Textus* IV (1964). Kutscher (Leshonenu 30, 196, 228 f.) advises me to rely on the opinion of scholars such as Wellhausen and Stummer who according to him, deny V any value for the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible. However, Kutscher's statement is inaccurate: Wellhausen indeed was rather doubtful as to the value of V (but cp. against this Nowack, *Die Bedeutung des Hieronymus fuer die alttestamentliche Textkritik*, Goettingen 1875); Stummer, on the other hand, ignores V only where it agrees with the Greek VSS against MT. He also states in his *Einfuehrung in die lateinische Bibel* (Paderborn 1928), 123-  
"...dass Hieronymus einen Text vor sich hatte, der im wesentlichen mit dem uebereinstimmt, der uns vorliegt." The words 'im wesentlichen' are crucial.

itself with attempting to establish a convincing degree of probability. In this connection it should be stressed that the extreme variety of translation techniques employed by Jerome warrants a discriminative approach to the various sections of V.<sup>2</sup> From the point of view of textual criticism the paraphrastic rendition of, e.g. the Book of Esther cannot be invested with the weight of proof which the close rendering of the Hebrew Psalter possesses. As regards the Prophets, Jerome on the whole aimed at giving a faithful rendition of the Hebrew. Therefore, here every textual deviation deserves our attention.

## II. Sense-divisions

Jerome was aware of the importance of dividing the biblical text into sense units, as well as of the problems involved in this procedure. He favoured a 'cola et commata' system which facilitated the reading and comprehension of the text: "legite igitur et hunc iuxta translationem nostram, quoniam per cola scriptus et commata manifestiorem legentibus sensum tribuit" (Praef. in Ez.). More than once he remarks on a divergent verse-division found in the LXX;<sup>3</sup> thus e.g.—

'Jer. 8:17, 18 MT:

		ונשכו אתכם נאם ה':
		מבליגייתי עלי יגון עלי לבי דוי
T:		ויקטלון יתכון אמר ה' על דהוו מלעיגין לקבל נבייא
		דמתנבן להון דונא ותינחחא איתי עליהון אמר נבייא לבי דוי
S:		וננכתונכון אמר מריא בלית בעקתי ולבי דוא עלי
LXX:		καὶ δῆξονται ὑμᾶς ἀνίατα
		μετ' ὀδύνης καρδίας ὑμῶν ἀπορουμένης
V:		et mordebunt vos ait dominus
		dolor meus super dolorem in me cor meum moerens

He comments (iv, 904): "DOLOR MEUS SUPER DOLOREM IN ME COR MEUM MOERENS pro quo, ut supra diximus, LXX superiori sententiae quae dicta sunt copularunt, ut ponerent: ET MORDEBUNT VOS AIT DOMINUS INSANABILITER; CUM DOLORE CORDIS VESTRI DEFICIETIS."

Usually, Jerome adheres to the Hebrew against the LXX. Therefore, we have to ascribe more weight to those cases where he diverges from the Hebrew text division. We cannot be guided, of course, by the modern system of punctuation and capitulating found in the printed Clementine edition of the Vulgate,

2 Cp. B. Kedar-Kopfstein, *The Vulgate as a Translation* (Diss. Hebrew University of Jerusalem 1968), pp. 271 ff.

3 Cp. iv, 348 on Is 26: 9; iv, 426 f. on Is 27: 1, 2; *ibid.* on Is 31: 9, 32: 1.

and even older MSS are not reliable in this respect.<sup>4</sup> However, the syntactical constructions found in V and also the *lemmata* and quotations in Jerome's commentaries sometimes offer a clue as to how he established the sense-units.

2: 30, 31 MT: אריה משחית: הדור אתם...  
 T: כאריא דמחבל עם דרא אתון  
 S: אריא מחבלנא אנתון דרא  
 LXX: ὡς λέων ὄλεθρεύων καὶ οὐκ ἐφοβήθητε  
 V: quasi leo vastator generatio vestra

The Latin syntax makes it evident that against the MT verse division, Jerome here combined the last words of V. 30 with the beginning of the next verse. Moreover, the whole clause is given as a lemma followed by the comment (iv, 854): "instar leonis universa vastavit, et tamen vestra generatio quae paucorum interfectione debuerat emendari, omnis perserveravit in scelere...". LXX, it is true, exhibits a somewhat similar combination which in Jerome's rendering (*ibid.*) reads "quasi leo vastator et non timuistis".<sup>5</sup> Yet the Greek wording itself diverges radically from the Hebrew, that it is not likely to have influenced Jerome. If, then, he is at variance with MT, we may assume that he was acquainted with a divergent reading.

44: 12 MT: יפלן כחרב ברעב יתמו מקטן ועד גדול  
 T: ויסופון כולהון בארעא דמצרים יתרמון כחרבא ובכפנא  
 יסופון מזעירא ועד רבא  
 S: ונמותון כחרבא ובכפנא ובמותנא<sup>6</sup>  
 51: 12 LXX: καὶ πετοῦνται ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ καὶ ἐν λιμῷ  
 καὶ ἐκλείψουσιν ἀπὸ μικροῦ ἕως μεγάλου  
 V: cadent in gladio et in fame  
 et consumentur a minimo usque ad maximum

V's dependence on LXX is deceptive. When we compare the whole verse in the two Versions, we notice such wide divergence that the LXX influence on V in the above clause becomes highly improbable. The insertion of the conjunctive 'et' in V does not prove a divergent text since Jerome was prone to add the conjunction for stylistic reasons. Yet its insertion in the verse under review proves that Jerome divided it into sense units different from those indicated by the Massoretic accents.

50: 5 MT: ציון ישאלו דרך הנה פניהם  
 T: לציון ישאלון למיזל אורחא מכבשא קדמיהון  
 S: על אורחתה דציהון נשאלון באפיהון

<sup>4</sup> Cp. M. Noth, *Die Welt des A.T.* (3rd ed. Berlin 1957), p. 277.

<sup>5</sup> LXX saw in the words הדור אתם the root יר-א; cp. A. W. Streane, *The Double Text of Jeremiah* (Cambridge 1896), p. 47.

<sup>6</sup> S exhibits an omission due to homoeoteleuton.

- 27: 5 LXX: ἕως σιὼν ἐρωτησοῦσι τὴν ὁδόν  
 ὧδε γὰρ τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν (δώσουσι)  
 V: in sion interrogabunt viam  
 huc facies eorum

Again V parallels LXX: 'viam' — τὴν ὁδόν. This does not prove, however, Jerome's automatic dependence on his Greek predecessors since he differs from them strongly in the syntactical sequence (facies eorum. venient *etc.* against τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν δώσουσι).<sup>7</sup> Jerome's interpretation 'interrogabunt viam' thus derives from his own understanding of the passage, which differs from the one implied by the Massoretic accents.

- 48: 19 MT: שאלי נס ונמלטה אמרי מה נהיתה  
 T: שאילר למערקיא ולמשיזביא אמרו מה הוה  
 S: שאלי לדערק ולדמתפלט אמרי מנא הוא

- 31: 19 LXX: καὶ ἐρώτησον φεύγοντα καὶ σφῶζόμενον καὶ εἶπον τί ἐγένετο  
 V: interroga fugientem et ei qui evasit dic quid accidit

Here the variance makes it clear that V divides the verse thus:

interroga fugientem                    שאלי נס  
 et ei ...dic                                ונמלטה אמרי

In this he diverges from MT as well as from LXX.

- 2: 2 MT: זכרתי לך חסד נעוריך אהבת כלולתיך  
 T: דכירנא לכוך טבות יומי קדם רחמת אבהתכוך  
 S: אתדכרת לכי טיבותא דטליותכי רחמתא דמסיברנותכי  
 LXX: ἐμνήσθην ἐλέους νεότητός σου καὶ ἀγάπης τελειώσεώς σου  
 V: recordatus sum tui miserans adolescentiam tuam et caritatem  
 desponsationis tuae

The construct state זכרתי לך חסד נעוריך which parallels אהבת כלולתיך, is the object of the clause governed by זכרתי. The interpretation of the Hebrew construction involves an exegetical question: does the phrase 'kindness of thy youth' (AV) refer to the loving confidence of the nation in its youth (cp. T and Jewish commentators), or rather to God's loving care for the newly born people (so many modern commentators)?<sup>8</sup> However, this question is irrelevant for the translation. Both ideas could have been expressed by the Latin construction.

7 LXX has a sequence of three verbs (δώσουσι καὶ ἤξουσιν καὶ καταφεύξονται) for Heb. באו וגלו. The first Gk verb is probably based on a reading ישימו or the like. At any rate, V does not agree with LXX.

8 Cp. Ehrlich, Randglossen IV p. 235, and S. Talmon, "The 'Desert Ideal'," *etc.*, in *Biblical Motifs* (ed. A. Altmann; Cambridge 1966), 53. Another instance of divergent vocalization plus divergent word division may be discerned in 9:14 MT: אשר למדום: אבותם V: quod didicerunt a patribus suis, which is evidently based on a reading (הלומד מכל אדם: אשר למדו מאבותם).

On the base of somewhat similar constructions in which either **חסד** appears as *regens* or **נעורים** as *rectum* (cp. 2S 9: 3; Is. 55: 3, 63: 7; Lam. 3: 22; Ps. 52: 3, 10 etc. and Jer. 3: 4, 31: 19; Mal. 2: 14, 15), we should expect a rendition such as ‘*misericordia adolescentiae*’, or ‘*miseratio (gratia) virginitatis (pubertatis)*’ or the like. Moreover, such a rendering would exactly parallel ‘*caritas desponsationis*’. Why, then, did Jerome forgo this obvious solution? A variant reading, namely **חסיד**, must be ruled out since it would be absolutely unsuited to the context, although in Jer. 3: 12 **חסיד**, V- ‘*sanctus*’, is rendered by Jerome (iv 860): ‘*misericos ego sum*’. The clue to the solution may be found in the rendition of the following clause:

- 31: 2 MT: על כן משכתיך חסד  
 T: על כן דברית יתכון בטבון  
 S: מטל הנא נגדתכי לטיבותא  
 38: 2 LX: διὰ τοῦτο εἴλκυσά σε εἰς οἰκτείρημα  
 V: ideo attraxi te miserans

Here too **חסד** becomes ‘*miserans*’. Since the word in question is an adverbial acc. qualifying the verb **משך**, the wording of V is quite adequate. It stands to reason that Jerome had a similar interpretation in mind when he translated the above verse. **חסד** qualifies the verb **זכר**: ‘I remember lovingly thy youth...’.

- 49: 16 MT: תפלצתך השיא אתך זדון לבך  
 T: טפשותך אטעיאת יתך רשע לבך  
 S: עולך אטעיך ושובהרה דלבך  
 29: 17 LXX: ἡ παιγνία σου ἐνεχείρησέ σοι  
 ἰταμία καρδίας σου (κατέλυσε κτλ.)  
 V: arrogantia tua decepit te et superbia cordis tua

The disjunctive accent indicates that **תפלצתך** is to be understood as a syntactically detached invocation, whereas **זדון לבך** constitutes the subject of the subsequent clause: ‘thou terrible one, the pride of thy heart has deceived thee.’ This interpretation also avoids the grammatical discord between the fem. **תפלצת** and the masc. predicate **השיא**. Yet the VSS reject this interpretation. Ignoring the grammatical difficulty, they take **תפלצת** as the subject of the clause. In this respect, Jerome is in agreement with the other VSS (and mediaeval commentaries<sup>9</sup>), while in the word choice and sentence construction he diverges from them to an extent which points to the relative independence of his judgement: V — ‘*arrogantia*’ vs. G — **παιγνία** T — **טפשותא**, S — **עולא**; V — ‘*et superbia cordis tui*’ vs. G — **ἰταμία καρδίας σου κατέλυσε κτλ.**, T — **רשע לבך**, (S parallels V). At any rate, it seems mandatory that the apparatus of any critical edition of the Hebrew Bible make note of this divergence of V

9 Qimḥi: תפלצת... ענין אימה ורעדה, אמר אימתך שהיתה מוטלת על שכניך... השיאה אותך

(and other VSS) from the conception implied by the Massoretic accents.

- 46: 17 MT: קָרְאוּ שָׁם פְּרֻעָה מֶלֶךְ-מִצְרַיִם שְׁאוֹן הַעֲבִיר הַמוֹעֵד  
 T: זמינו לתמן פרעה מלכא דמצרים דסגיאין אתרגושתיה מעדי זמניא  
 S: וקרו תמן שמה דפרעון חגירא מלכא דמצרין דלוחא ומעבר זבנא  
 26: 17 LXX: καλέσατε τὸ ὄνομα φαραω νεχαω βασιλέως αἰγύπτου σαων  
 εσβι εμωηδ  
 V: vocate nomen pharaonis regis aegypti  
 tumultum adduxit tempus

The variant reading קָרְאוּ to which LXX and V testify, is duly recorded in the critical editions of the Bible. That this also entails a transposition of the half-sentence divider *athnahta*, though, has not been noted. Moreover, V differs from MT in disregarding the disjunctive accent on שְׁאוֹן which was understood as a derogatory reference to Pharaoh, the King of Egypt (Cp. mediaeval commentaries). V combines שְׁאוֹן with the following words. Furthermore, V converts the first word of the clause into an acc., and the last into the subject of the clause. The resultant Latin reading should be understood thus: 'Call Pharaoh... by this name TIME BRINGS UP TROUBLE'. It appears that here V exhibits an affinity with the Greek translations of:

Aq.: σαων παρηγαγεν ο καιρος;  
 ηχος παρηγαγεν επαγγελιαν

Sym.: ... καιρος παρεγενετο

Theod.: παραχον ηγαγεν ο καιρος, and especially with that of

Josephus: παραχον ηγειρεν ο καιρος<sup>10</sup> which apparently suited his reading of the Hebrew.

### III. Vocalization

The divergent sense division sometimes entails, or is based upon, a different vocalization.

<sup>10</sup> On the version of this passage cp. J. Ziegler, *Septuaginta-Jeremias*, (Goettingen 1957), pp. 102, 106. Ziegler mentions the affinity of V to Josephus in 51: 59 (LXX 28: 59), 37: 21 (LXX 44: 21). Further examples:

- 6: 20 MT: וקנה הטוב Ios: αρωμα καλαμου  
 V: et calamum suave olentem  
 49: 4 MT: (הבת) השוכבה 30: 4 Ios.: τρυφερωτατη  
 V: (filia) delicata  
 49: 8 MT: העמיקו לשבת 29: 9 Ios.: καταδυετε εις χασματα  
 V: descendite in voraginem  
 49: 11 MT: עזבה יתמך אני אחיה 29: 12 Ios.: εασον τους ορφανους τους εν σοι εγω  
 γαρ αυτους διασωσω  
 V: relinque pupillos tuos ego faciam eos vivere.

- 51: 53 MT: וכי תבצר מְרוֹם עֵזָה  
 T: וארי תכרוך כרכין תקיפין עד רומא  
 S: ואן תסים ברומא עושנה  
 28: 53 LXX: καὶ ὅτι ἐὰν ὀγκυρώσῃ ὕψος ἰσχύος αὐτῆς  
 V: et firmaverit in excelso robur suum

The Hebrew construct state is almost exclusively rendered in V by a genitive construction. This rendering is frequently maintained even where the *nomen regens* functions as attribute. Sometimes, though, the Latin gen. construction of two nouns has been replaced by one that employs a noun and an adjective. Thus:

- Ez. 30: 6 MT: וירד גאון עזה  
 V: et destruetur superbia imperii eius  
 Is. 37: 24 MT: מרום הרים... מרום קצו  
 V: altitudinem montium... altitudinem summitatem eius  
 Ex. 15: 16 MT: בגדל זרועך  
 V: in magnitudine brachii

but also —

- Ez. 33: 28 MT: ונשבת גאון עזה  
 V: et deficiet superba fortitudo eius  
 Is. 21: 15 MT: כבד מלחמה  
 V: gravi proelii  
 Na. 3: 3 MT: וכבד פגר  
 V: et gravis ruinae

In the verse under discussion, Jerome used neither of the above manners of translation. Instead he rendered מְרוֹם — ‘in excelso’. This does not point to a variant בְּמְרוֹם, but to a reading מְרוֹם taken as an adverbial acc. (*acc. loci*). This could be adduced as partial support for the suggested emended reading (מְעֵזָה) מְרוֹם<sup>11</sup> (cp. S).

- 51: 55 MT: גִּתְּן שְׁאוֹן קוֹלָם  
 T: וירימון באתרגושת קלהון  
 S: דאזל קלהון  
 28: 55 LXX: ἔδωκεν εἰς ὄλεθρον ψωνήν αὐτῆς  
 V: dedit sonitum vox eorum

Again V dissolves the gen. construction, reading שְׁאוֹן, not שְׁאוֹן־, in distinction to:

- Is. 17:12, 13 MT: שְׁאוֹן מֵיִם  
 V: sonitus aquarum.

The word was not understood as an adverb (thus T, cp. G), but as the object

11 Cp. Ehrlich, Randglossen IV p. 371.

of גַּתָּן. Consequently, we have to assume that it was read גַּתָּן (cp. G). V thus takes the verse to mean: 'their voice gave the sound'.

49: 2 MT: והיתה לתל שממה  
T: ותהי לתל צדו  
S: ותהוא לתלא חרבא

30: 2 LXX: καὶ ἔσονται εἰς ἄβατον καὶ εἰς ἀπώλειαν  
V: et erit in tumulum dissipata

V generally renders the noun שְׁמֵמָה — 'desertum', 'solitudo', 'desolatio' (so freq. in Jer.) *etc.* There was no linguistic or logical objection to a construction such as 'tumulus solitudinis', since Jerome did not abstain from palpably tautological combinations, *e.g.*:

Jer. 12: 10 MT: למדבר שממה  
V: in desertum solitudinis

Jo. 2: 3 MT: מדבר שממה  
V: solitudo deserti.

Here one might have expected a gen. construction or at least an adjectival one, similar to:

Dt. 13: 17 MT: והיתה לתל עולם  
V: et sit tumulus sempiternus

Jos. 8: 28 MT: (וישימה) לתל עולם שממה  
V: tumulum sempiternum

which would have required: 'et erit in tumulum dissipatum'. But the fem. form 'dissipata' refers back to the city Rabbath, mentioned earlier in the verse. We may assume that against the Mass. accents, Jerome separated תל from שממה and read the latter as a verbal form שְׁמָמָה (or שוּמָמָה). The fluctuations between שממה and שוּמָמָה have been confirmed by the Qumran Scrolls.<sup>12</sup> Jerome's reading finds additional support in the VSS Aq. and Sym. who translate: καὶ ἐστὶ γῶμα ἠφανισμένη.

52: 6 MT: ויחזק הרעב בעיר ותקיף כפנא בקרתא  
S: עשן כפנא בקריתא  
LXX: καὶ ἐστερεώθη ὁ λιμὸς ἐν τῇ πόλει  
V: et obtinuit fames civitatem

At first sight, V may impress us as an idiomatic rendering of the Hebrew, compared with the stylistic artistry employed, *e.g.* in:

Gn. 41: 57 MT: כי חזק הרעב בכל הארץ  
V: et malum inopiae temperarent

47: 20 MT: כי חזק עליהם הרעב  
V: prae magnitudine famis

12 *E.g.*: Is. 62: 4, 64: 10 MT: שְׁמֵמָה 1 Q Is-a: שוּמָמָה; Is. 1: 7 MT: וְשְׁמָמָה 1 Q Is-a: ושמוּמו.



of נִתְּן. Consequently, we have to assume that it was read נִתְּן (cp. G). V thus takes the verse to mean: 'their voice gave the sound'.

49: 2 MT: והיתה לתל שממה  
T: ותהי לתל צדו  
S: ותהוא לתלא חרבא

30: 2 LXX: καὶ ἔσονται εἰς ἄβατον καὶ εἰς ἀπώλειαν  
V: et erit in tumulum dissipata

V generally renders the noun שְׁמָמָה — 'desertum', 'solitudo', 'desolatio' (so freq. in Jer.) *etc.* There was no linguistic or logical objection to a construction such as 'tumulus solitudinis', since Jerome did not abstain from palpably tautological combinations, *e.g.*:

Jer. 12: 10 MT: למדבר שממה  
V: in desertum solitudinis  
Jo. 2: 3 MT: מדבר שממה  
V: solitudo deserti.

Here one might have expected a gen. construction or at least an adjectival one, similar to:

Dt. 13: 17 MT: והיתה לתל עולם  
V: et sit tumulus sempiternus  
Jos. 8: 28 MT: (וישימה) לתל עולם שממה  
V: tumulum sempiternum

which would have required: 'et erit in tumulum dissipatum'. But the fem. form 'dissipata' refers back to the city Rabbath, mentioned earlier in the verse. We may assume that against the Mass. accents, Jerome separated תל from שממה and read the latter as a verbal form שְׁמָמָה (or שוּמָמָה). The fluctuations between שממה and שוּמָמָה have been confirmed by the Qumran Scrolls.<sup>12</sup> Jerome's reading finds additional support in the VSS Aq. and Sym. who translate: καὶ ἐστὶν χωμα ἠφανισμένη.

52: 6 MT: וַיִּחְזַק הָרֶעִב בְּעִיר  
T: וַתִּקְיַף כַּפְנָא בְּקִרְתָּא  
S: עֶשֶׂן כַּפְנָא בְּקִרְיָתָא  
LXX: καὶ ἐστερεώθη ὁ λιμὸς ἐν τῇ πόλει  
V: et obtinuit fames civitatem

At first sight, V may impress us as an idiomatic rendering of the Hebrew, compared with the stylistic artistry employed, *e.g.* in:

Gn. 41: 57 MT: כִּי חֹזֵק הָרֶעִב בְּכָל הָאָרֶץ  
V: et malum inopiae temperarent  
47: 20 MT: כִּי חֹזֵק עֲלֵיהֶם הָרֶעִב  
V: prae magnitudine famis

<sup>12</sup> *E.g.*: Is. 62: 4, 64: 10 MT: וַשְׁמָמָה 1 Q Is-a: שוּמָמָה; Is. 1: 7 MT: וַשְׁמָמָה 1 Q Is-a: ושמומו.

Further:

Gn. 43: 1 MT: **והרעב כבד בארץ**  
 V: interim fames omnem terram  
 vehementer premebat

In other biblical books, especially in the Prophets, the situation is quite different, as may be seen especially from the parallel occurrence of the above Jeremiah verse in:

2 Ki. 25: 3 MT: **ויחזק הרעב בעיר**  
 V: praevaluitque fames in civitate

Here we have an adequate translation, the Heb. verb being rendered by an intransitive Latin verb, and **בעיר** — 'in civitate'. It follows that the rendition in Jer. attempts to be literal, but is based upon a slightly divergent vocalization: 'obtinere' stands for a transitive **והחזיק ב..** (cp. Jer. 8: 2 where the hiph'il of **חזיק** becomes 'obtinuit') pointing to a reading: **ויחזק הרעב בעיר** which seems to underly Jerome's rendition. It should be stressed that we do not imply that this is a legitimate Hebrew reading, let alone a preferable one.<sup>13</sup>

The incertitude as to the correct pronunciation which results from the lack of a standardized vocalization, occasionally results in a double translation.

30: 3 MT: **ושבתי את שבות עמי... והשבתי את הארץ**  
 T: **ואתיב ית גלות עמי... ואתיבנין לארעא**  
 S: **ואהפך שביתא דעמי... ואהפך אגון לארעא**  
 37: 3 LXX: **καὶ ἀποστρέψω τὴν ἀποικίαν λαοῦ μου...**  
**καὶ ἀποστρεψω αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν γῆν**  
 Aq.: **επιστρεψω την αποστροφην... και καθισω**  
 V: **et convertam conversionem populi me...**  
**convertm eos ad terram**

The problem is well known and obvious: the similarity in form and contiguity in the occurrence of the hiph'il derivatives from the stems **ישׁב** and **שׁוׁב**—caused many a confusion in the textual traditions of the Bible, as e.g. in Jer. 42: 12 MT: **והשיב אתכם** V: 'et habitare vos faciam'.<sup>14</sup> We have to assume, however, that Jerome tried to remain as close as possible to the Hebrew.

13 Prof. Kutscher, *op. cit.*, has rejected a presumptive reading Is 9: 2 **בלקחם** (cp. Kedar, *op. cit.* Textus IV, p. 207) since only an ignoramus would use this form instead of the correct **בקחתם**. The fact remains that V exhibits a conflated translation: one portion ('capta praeda') points to a derivative of **לקח**, the other ('dividunt spolia') testifies to the root **חלק**. The most likely explanation seems to be a metathesis: **בחלקם** became **חלקם** by a copyist's slip and had to be translated. Since when does a slip of the pen need the sanction of classical grammar?

14 Jer 42: 12 **והשיב אתכם**, as well as **והשיב אתכם**, was considered as carrying on the person of **אתן** in the same verse. But V: **habitare... faciam**, against MT: **והשיב אתכם**, LXX: **επιστρέψω**. — Zah 10: 6 V: **et convertam eos**, against MT: **והשבתי אתכם**, LXX: **καὶ κατοικιῶ αὐτούς**.

This can be proved by the overwhelming consistency in rendering the stem ב"ש by 'reducere, convertere' etc. and the stem ב"ש" by 'sedere', 'habitare' and the like, as e.g. in:

32: 37 MT: וְהִשְׁבַּתִּים... וְהִשְׁבַּתִּים

V: et reducam eos... et habitare eos faciam

In the verse under discussion (30:3), V agrees with MT. Yet we find as a lemma to Jerome's commentary (iv, 1052): "covertam eos, sive sedere faciam in terram". Unfortunately, what Jerome wished to indicate by this 'sive' is by no means unequivocal. After this particle, he sometimes adduces the translation of the LXX or the later Greek VSS. At other times he introduces the OL wording or any other rendering.<sup>15</sup> In the present case, he may have had in mind Aquila's rendition with which most probably, he was acquainted.

2: 13 MT: אֲשֶׁר לֹא יִכְלוּ הַמַּיִם

T: דְּלֹא יִכְלִין לְקִימָא מֵיָא

S: דְּלֹא מְשׁוּחִין לְמִקְבָּא בְּהוֹן מֵיָא

LXX: οἱ οὐ δύνησονται ὕδωρ συνέχειν

V: quae continere non valent aquas

V offers a double translation: 'continere' (= יְכִילוּ) and 'valent' (= יִכְלוּ). This dual tradition (arising from the defective writing of the Hebrew word) has found its expression in the VSS and among them, LXX. Jerome, however, was not blindly dependent on LXX for he changed the order of the verbs. He probably would not have followed his Greek predecessors had he not vacillated himself as to the proper pronunciation of יִכְלוּ.

48: 27 MT: כִּי מֵדִי דְבַרְיָהּ בּוֹ

T: וְעַל דְּאִסְגִּית עֲלִיהוֹן פִּתְגָמִים בְּכֵן תִּטְלַטְלוֹן

S: כַּד עֲבַד הוּיִת עֲמָה קִרְבָּא

31: 27 LXX: ὅτι ἐπολέμεις αὐτόν

Sym.: οτι αφ ου ελαλησας επ αυτω

V: propter verba ergo tua quae adversum illum locutus es.

The double rendering found in V is evidently based on divergent readings of the word דְּבַרְיָהּ (דְּבַרְיָהּ) — 'verba tua', and דְּבַרְיָהּ — 'locutus es' (cp. Sym.).<sup>16</sup>

15 Cp. J. Ziegler, "Die Septuaginta Hieronymi im Buch des Propheten Jeremias", *Festchrift A. Dold* (ed. B. Fischer and V. Fiala-Beuron 1952), p. 24: "Auch die mit 'sive' eingefuehrten Lesarten gehen groesstenteils auf die hexaplarische Rezension zurueck. 2. Manche 'sive'-Lesarten stimmen mit M ueberein. 3. Manche 'sive'-Lesarten gehen gegen die LXX. 4. Verschiedene 'sive'-Lesarten stammen von den juengeren griechischen Uebersetzern Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion. 5. Verschiedene 'sive'-Lesarten sind nur andere lateinische Synonyme, die auch also Uebersetzung moeglich sind. 6. Etliche 'sive'-Lesarten sind freie Wiedergaben...."

16 Cp. S. Mandelkern, V.T. Concordantiae (6th ed. Tel Aviv 1964), p. 285: י"ח' בלשנא כתיב: וְהִשְׁבַּתִּים... וְהִשְׁבַּתִּים Note the somewhat similar double rendering: "וְהִשְׁבַּתִּים... וְהִשְׁבַּתִּים".

26: 18 MT: (מיכה המורשת) היה נבא בימי חזקיהו  
 T: ...היה מתנבא  
 S: ...אתנבא הוא

33: 18 LXX: ἦν ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις...  
 Aq.: αὐτος ἐπροφητεύσεν ἐν ἡμέραις...  
 Sym.: ἦν προφητεύων ἐν ἡμέραις...  
 V: fuit propheta in diebus ezechiae

Of all the VSS, only V renders the Heb. verb form by a noun. Such uncalled for conversion is quite rare. Therefore it is not surprising that in his commentary (iv, 1029) Jerome gives preference to a rendition that avoids it and stays closer to the Heb. נבא: "michaeae de morasthi qui prophetavit sub rege ezechiae...". Thus we may conclude that V reflects a Heb. variant: זיהיה נבא.

32: 12 MT: (לעיני הנמאל) ולעיני העדים הפתבים (בספר המקנה)  
 T: ולעיני שהדיא דכתיבין  
 S: ולעין שהדיא דכתיבין

39: 12 LXX: κατ' ὀφθαλμοὺς τῶν ἐστηκότων καὶ γραφόντων  
 Aq., Sym.: ... τῶν μαρτυρῶν τῶν γεγραμμένων

V: in oculis testium qui scripti erant (in libro emptionis)

V like Aq. and Sym. (cp. T and S) reads הפתבים. The commentary (iv, 1085) however, is based on a reading akin to the MT: "vidente anameel... et testibus qui subscripserant... in emptionis volumine...".

#### IV Grammatical Variants

V rather frequently exhibits the grammatical person of a verb, or the number of a noun different from those of MT. Innumerable changes of this kind are due to the working manner of Jerome rather than to divergent readings. It is either the different structure of the two languages, Hebrew and Latin, or

5: 13 MT: לרוח והדבר אין בהם

V: in ventum locuti et responsum non fuit in eis

Some MSS omit the word 'locuti', yet its originality can be deduced from Jerome's commentary (iv,876) where the *lemma* exhibits the word in question and the subsequent explanation reads: "et quidquid loquuti sunt prophetae, in ventum loquuti sunt etc." For further examples of double translation see Kedar, *op. cit.*, Textus IV, 207..

- 17 The Vulgate translation of the Prophets was completed by the year 392. Jerome wrote his commentary on Jeremiah close to his death in 420. Thus a span of about thirty years separates the Vulgate to Jeremiah from the commentary on it. If we assume that he made use of different MSS on different occasions, we do so in view of the scarcity of MSS; cp. R. Gordis, *Kohleth* (Schocken Paperback ed. N.Y. 1968), 133: "...Rabbis tended to cite Scripture from memory, especially since manuscripts were rare and often inaccessible." Also P. de Lagarde, *Anmerkungen zur griechischen Uebersetzung der Proverbien* (1863), 2.

his desire for stylistic smoothness that force him to introduce a grammatical change.<sup>18</sup> He complains about the rough transitions in MT (iv, 214): “prophetae ideo obscuri sunt quia personae in his plurimae commutantur”, (cf. also iv, 344). It is only to be expected, then, that he makes attempts to harmonize, e.g.:

5: 21, 22

V:	MT:
audi...	שמעו נא...
habentes oculos non videtis	עינים להם ולא יראו
et aures et non auditis	אזניים להם ולא ישמעו
me ergo non timebitis...	האזתי לא תיראו...
non dolebitis	לא תחילו

The tendency of harmonization, however, is inconsistent. In many instances extremely harsh transitions are left intact; e.g.:

48: 36	quia plus fecit quam potuit	על כן יתרת עשה
	idcirco perierunt	אברו

Cases of divergence of text involving grammatical features deserve to be analyzed, and wherever additional indirect evidence makes it probable that they indeed reflect divergent readings, they should be recorded in any text-critical apparatus.

49: 20	MT:	אם לוא יסחבום צעירי הצאן אם לא ישים עליהם נוהם
	T:	אם לא יגררון ויקטלון תקיפי עמא אם לא יצדון עליהון מדורהון
	S:	דנגרון אנון כצירא דענא ונצדון עליהון דירהון
29: 21	LXX:	ἐὰν μὴ συμψησθῶσι τὰ ἐλάχιστα τῶν προβάτων ἐὰν μὴ ἄβατωθῆ ἔπ' αὐτὴν κατάλυσις αὐτῶν
	V:	si non deiecerint eos parvuli gregis nisi dissipaverint cum eis habitaculum eorum
50: 45	MT:	אם לא יסחבום צעירי הצאן אם לא ישים עליהם נוה
	T, S:	as above
27: 45	LXX:	ἐὰν μὴ διαφθαρή τὰ ἄρνια τῶν προβάτων αὐτῶν ἐὰν μὴ ἀφανισθῆ νομὴ ἀπ' αὐτῶν
	V:	nisi detraxerint eos parvuli gregum nisi dissipatum fuerit cum ipsis habitaculum eorum

A comparison of the parallel passages may provide guidance in deciding whether a Latin divergence is a matter of rendering or reading. The Lt wording in the second occurrence keeps to Jerome's usual translation practice: ישים 3rd pers. sing. regarded as indicating an indefinite subject is rendered by the Latin passive form 'dissipatum', the subject being supplied by the object

18 Cp. Nowack, *op. cit.*, 19 f.

of the Heb. clause. (Cp. Gn. 11: 9 MT: ... על כן קרא שמה... V: et idcirco vocatum est nomen eius; and freq.) It is equally possible that Jerome ascribed to ישים the meaning of in 'inwardly transitive' hiph'il (G-K 53d), i.e. 'to become arid', and such a comprehension was bound to lead him to the rendering by a Lt. passive form (cp. the passive constructions found in LXX). If, then, in the first occurrence of the verse under review Jerome opted for a different translation, namely 'dissipaverint', he most probably had a basis for this in his Heb. text. Since he takes 'parvuli gregis' (צעירי הצאן) as subject of 'dissipaverint' which thus parallels 'deiecerint', the rendition of the Heb. pl. form יסחבו, it stands to reason that he read also the second Hebrew verb in the plural: ישימו.

30: 11 MT: (ויסרתוך למשפט) ונקה לא אַנְקֶךָ

T: ושיצאה לא אשיצינך

S: ומזכיר לא אזכירך

37: 11 Theod.: καὶ ἀθωσεν σου ἀθωσσω σε

V: ut non videaris tibi innoxius

This conversion of the 1st pers. sing. into the 2nd pers. is extraordinary. There is no obvious reason why the 1st pers. of אַנְקֶךָ should be changed, coming as it does after the 1st pers. of ויסרתוך. Indeed at a later stage, while writing his commentary on the Prophets, Jerome was not quite satisfied with his previous translation; the lemma of his commentary reads (iv, 1054): "ut non tibi videaris innoxius, sive et mundans non mundabo te" The 'sive' serves here to introduce a Lt rendering of Symmachus' versions, as is clarified by the commentary (*ib*): "quod autem intulit 'ut non tibi videaris innoxius', sive iuxta symmachum 'et mundans mundabo te'. vel iuxta aquilam 'quum te erudiero per iudicium, nequaquam innocentem faciam' illud significat etc." Yet it is noteworthy that Jerome deems the correction important enough to be included in the lemma. How, then, should the grammatical conversion from the 1st pers. to 2nd pers. which takes place in V, be explained? Internal-Latin reasons, such as exegetical or stylistic ones, were not decisive as it becomes evident from the parallel passage:

46: 28 MT: (ויסרתוך למשפט) ונקה לא אַנְקֶךָ

T, S: as above

26: 28 LXX: καὶ ἀθωσῶν σου ἀθωσσω σε

V: nec quasi innocenti parcam tibi

Here V demonstrates the practicability of closely following the Heb text. On the other hand the first occurrence (30: 11) calls to our mind those verses where the biblical text employs the 2nd pers., e.g.:

25: 29 et vos quasi innocentes

et immunes eritis

ואתם הנקה

תנקו

49: 12 et tu quasi innocens relinqueris ראתה הוא נקה תִּנְקָה  
 (Note the addition of 'quasi' which semantically parallels the construction with 'videri' in the verse under review). Thus it becomes probable that Jerome's translation of our verse is based upon a divergent Hebrew text: נקה לא תִּנְקָה. Here we should note that the two readings לא אֲנִיִּקֶךָ and לא תִּנְקָה are not really different from a logical point of view, for the statements 'I consider thee not innocent' and 'thou art not innocent' express essentially the same idea. Therefore we may assume some textual fluctuation in Heb MSS.

A case in point is the following:

2: 20 MT: כי מעולם שִׁבְרֹתַי עִלְךָ נִתְקַתִּי מוֹסְרֹתֶיךָ  
 T: ארי מעלמא תברית ניר עממיא מצוריכון פסקית חניקיכון  
 S: מטל דמן עלם תברת גירכי ופסקת חניקיכי  
 LXX: ὅτι ἀπ' αἰῶνος συνέτριψας τὸν ζυγόν σου διέσπασας τοὺς δεσμούς σου  
 V: a saeculo confregisti iugum meum  
 rupisti vincula mea

The lemma to Jerome's commentary has (iv, 849): "confregisti iugum meum, sive tuum; rupisti vincula mea, sive tua". Here we have to reckon with the inherent ambivalence of the possessive pronoun which may convey a subjective or an objective meaning, e.g.:

1 Ki. 12: 4 אביך הקשה את עֲלֵנוּ ואתה עתה הקל... וּמַעַלּוֹ

In this verse reference is obviously made to one and the same yoke, called at one time 'our yoke', namely the one imposed on us, and at another time 'his yoke', i.e. the one imposed by him. In the verse from Jer. under review, V has attached the pronoun of the 1st pers. sing. to the nouns denoting 'yoke' and 'bands'. Since the speaker is God, the meaning is that the yoke and bands are His commandments. Had V employed the possessive pronoun of the 2nd pers. the interpretation would have been that 'yoke and bands' denote the people's obligation and commitment. These are two aspects of the same situation and, consequently, no exegetical reason could have induced Jerome to introduce a change in the use of pronouns. It stands to reason, then, that he read a divergent Heb text: עלי... מוֹסְרֹתַי.

There are further complications in this verse. Firstly: שִׁבְרֹתַי... נִתְקַתִּי. The ambiguity of form permits us to regard the Heb verbs as either the (archaic) 2nd sing. fem. or 1st pers. sing. LXX and V reflect the former interpretation: 'thou hast broken... thou hast burst'. It should be noted, however, that this interpretation does not have a direct bearing on the choice of an adequate pronoun; witness LXX: τὸν ζυγόν σου against V: iugum meum. The VSS of Aquila and Theodotio read the 1st pers. sing.<sup>19</sup> "I have broken... I have

<sup>19</sup> Aq., Theod.: διέσπασα. This was probably intended by MT; cp. Genesius Kautzsch

burst". This conveys the promise of salvation: God breaks the oppressor's yoke, (cp. Qimḥi). The final projection of the divergence is found in the subsequent word: The Kethib has אַעבֹר (לא), while the Quere demands אַעבֹר (לא). This latter reading is in concord with the interpretation of the previous words as denoting salvation: after each act of deliverance Israel had promised 'no more to transgress' God's commandments (cp. Rashi, Qimḥi.). On the other hand the Kethib, expressing Israel's defiance 'I will not serve', is in keeping with the interpretation of the passage as denoting Israel's disobedience. Consequently, LXX and V retain the Kethib.

The following example suggests a similar textual instability as regards the possessive pronoun.

- 30: 8 MT: אַשְׁכַּר עָלוּ... וּמוֹסְרוֹתַיךָ אֲנַחֵק  
 T: אַתְּכַר נִיר (כַּשְׂדָּאֵי מִצְוֹאֲרֵיכֹן) וְהִנִּיקִיכֹן אֶפְסֵק  
 S: אַתְּכַר נִירָה (מִן צוֹרֵךְ) וְהִנִּיקִיךְ אֶפְסֵק  
 37: 8 LXX: συντριψὼ ζυγὸν ...καὶ τοὺς δεσμοὺς αὐτῶν διαρρήξω  
 V: conteram iugum eius... et vincula eius dirumpam

It would be erroneous to assume that the change of the second pronoun in V is due to Jerome's desire to overcome the discord between the two pronominal suffixes found in the Heb text. If this were the reason, why would the discordant 'collo tuo... et non dominabuntur ei' have been left in the same verse? Moreover, as the previous example has demonstrated, a certain flexibility exists in the employment of pronouns. Jerome evidently reckons with this flexibility and frequently carries a grammatical discordance found in the Heb text into his Lt version. e.g.:

- Nahum 1: 13 מִטְהוּ... וּמוֹסְרוֹתַיךָ  
 V: iugum eius...et vincula tua

V reflects the Heb text against LXX which is rendered into Lt by Jerome in his commentary (vi 545): "virgam eius... vincula eius". The verse is paraphrased (ib.): "virgam eius, id est assyrii de dorso tuo et vincula tua dirumpam: vel per metaphoram potestatem eius significans: vel certe, virgam qua percutere conabatur et vincula quae captivis parabat." Jerome had no difficulty in equating 'thy bands' with 'his, i.e. the enemy's power' and with 'the bands prepared by him for your captivity'. Thus it becomes plausible to assume that in Jer 30: 8 Jerome was acquainted with a divergent reading: אַשְׁכַּר עָלוּ... וּמוֹסְרוֹתַיךָ.

It should, of course, be admitted that alterations in the area of personal pronouns may be due here and there to the requirements of style, linguistic structure, or context. Thus, e.g. 46: 8 MT: מִיָּמִים V: fluctus eius, exhibits an

§44h, note 1. Unvocalized Aramaic exhibits a similar ambiguity: תְּבַרַת, 1st pers. s.; 2nd pers. s. 3rd s.f.



explanatory use of a Lt pronoun; 50: 36 MT: הכדים V: 'divinos eius', belongs to those quite frequent cases where the Heb article is rendered by a Lt pronoun.<sup>20</sup> However, in some instances the alteration in V can best be explained through a divergent Heb *Vorlage*.

- 2: 35 MT: ותאמרי כי נקיתי אך שב אפו ממני  
 T: ברם תב רוגזיה מני  
 S: מטל הנא אהפך רוגזה מני  
 LXX: ἀλλὰ ἀποστραφήτω ὁ θυμὸς αὐτοῦ ἀπ' ἐμοῦ  
 V: et propterea avertatur furor tuus a me

We may be tempted to assume an inner Latin corruption: 'suus' becoming 'tuus' through a scribal slip. However, all the textual evidence at our disposal confirms the reading 'tuus'. Although the use of this pronoun may be due to Jerome's free choice, it seems more probable that he relied on a Hebrew MS which maintained the dialogical character throughout the passage and read:

ותאמרי... "אך שב אפך ממני", הנני נשפט אותך

- 46: 27 MT: ואת זרעך מארץ שבים  
 T: וית בנך מארע גלותהון  
 S: ולזרעך מן ארעא דשכיתהון  
 26: 27 LXX: καὶ τὸ σπέρμα σου ἐκ τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας αὐτῶν  
 V: et semen tuum de terra captivitatis tuae

A close translation of the pronominal suffix attached to the last noun, such as 'suae' (cp. 2 Ch. 6: 37, 38) or 'eorum' (cp. Jer. 30: 10, see below), would have suited perfectly. There is no logical contradiction between the two pronominal suffixes: 'your sons' return from 'their exile'. Thus no need for harmonizing exists. Moreover, we may turn to the parallel passage:

- 30: 10 MT: ואת זרעך מארץ שבים  
 T: וית בנך מארע גלותכון  
 S: as above  
 37: 10 Theod.: καὶ τὸ σπ. σου ἀπο γῆς αἰχμ. αὐτῶν  
 V: et semen tuum de terra captivitatis eorum

In view of this evidence we submit that V's rendition of the verse 46: 27 is based upon a Heb MS that substituted a final כ for a final מ: ואת זרעך מארץ שביך: מ

- 50: 2 MT: הכישו עצביה חתו גלוליה

- 20 For this phenomenon see 1 S 23: 23; 1 K 22: 38; Is 28: 12 etc. Cp. Kedar, *The Vulgate as a Translation*, 181 ff.  
 21 Similar passages, e.g. Is 12: 1, may have influenced the Hebrew copyist. — Cp. 3: 4, 5 MT: .אם ישמר לנוצח. הניטור לעולם ואתה, הניטור לעולם אם ישמר לנוצח. V: dux virginitatis meae tu es, numquid irasceris in perpetuum aut perseverabis in finem. (Also Aq., Sym.: μητις).  
 22 30: 10 T: גלותכון for MT: שבים also testifies to textual flexibility as regards the pronominal suffix.

T: בהיתו צלמנהא אתברא טעותהא

S: בהתו פתכריה ואתתברו גליפיה

27: 2 Theod.: εἶδωλα αὐτῆς... τὰ βδελύγματα αὐτῆς

V: confusa sunt sculptilia eius superata sunt idola eorum

The unwarranted introduction of the discordant 'eius... eorum' in V is surprising. The customary and much smoother rendition would have been: 'sculptilia eius... idola eius'; thus Micah 1: 2, similarly Isaiah 10: 11 and freq. Thus we are led to assume a Heb reading: **עצביה... גוליהה**. Of course, as compared with MT such reading cannot claim to possess equal value. Indeed it gives the impression of a scribal error, due perhaps to the frequent occurrence of **גוליהה** (more than a dozen times in the book of Ezechiel; **גוליהה** occurs only in the present verse).

6: 29 MT: רעים לא נתקו

T: ועובדיהון בשיא לא שבקו

S: וכישתהון לא גמרא

LXX: πονηρία αὐτῶν οὐκ ἐτάκη

V: malitiae enim eorum non sunt consumptae

The usual translation of **רעים** (= 'the wicked') would have been 'pessimi' (12: 14, 15: 21; Ez 30: 12 and freq.). Here, we are able to notice the traces of a tradition which interpreted **רעים** as 'wicked ways; wickedness'. When we turn to V the question arises whether the rendition there is a mere imitation of LXX or a translation in its own right. The latter alternative seems more probable since there are a number of divergences between the Greek and the Lt versions in this passage.<sup>23</sup> Therefore it is not unreasonable to assume that V, as other VSS, was acquainted with a divergent Heb text which exchanged **ה** for **י**: **רעתם**.<sup>24</sup>

49: 14 MT: התקבצו ובאו עליה וקומו למלחמה

T: אתכנישו ואתו עלה וקומו לאגוזא קרבא

S: קומו נסק עליה לקרבא

29: 15 LXX: συναχθητε και παραγενεσθε εις αυτην αναστητε εις πολεμον

V: congregamini et venite contra eam et consurgamus in proelium

No reason can be seen for the change of the imperative **קומו** parallel to **התקבצו** and **באו** ('congregamini et venite') into the cohortative 'consurgamus'.

23 LXX: ἐξέλιπε ...ἐξέλιπε, against V: defecit... consumptum. LXX: ἀπὸ πυρός, V: in igne. LXX: ἀργυροκόπος, V: conflator (not 'argentarius', cp. iv, 890). LXX: φουσητήρ V: sufflatorium (and not 'follis', the usual Lt word for 'bellows', cp. Jerome's remark *ibid.*).

24 For the conversion of **רעתם** (sing.) into 'malitiae' (pl.) see 11: 15, 44: 5 and freq.

In similar instances V follows quite closely the Hebrew: e.g.–

6: 4, 5 MT: קומו ובעלה  
V: consurgite et ascendamus

against

49: 28, 31 MT: קומו עלו  
V: surgite et ascendite

We turn to the parallel verse in the Book of Obadiah:

Ob 1 MT: קומו ונקומה עליה למלחמה  
T: קומו ונתעתד עליה לקרבא  
S: קום ונקום עליה לקרבא  
LXX: ἀνάσθητε καὶ ἐξαναστῶμεν ἐπ' αὐτήν εἰς πόλεμον  
V: surgite et consurgamus adversus eum in proelium

Here again we have the cohortative 'consurgamus' but this time it mirrors the Heb text. The question arises whether the verse in Jer reflects Jerome's dependence on his Lt rendering of Ob rather than this acquaintance with a Heb variant. The comparison of the parallel passages reveals a discrepancy in details:

<i>Jer</i>	<i>Ob</i>
missus est	misit
contra eam	adversus eum
ecce enim	ecce
(parvulum) contemptibilem contemptibilis (tu es) etc.	

Such discrepancy weakens the supposition that Jerome used his translation of Ob as model. Consequently we assume a Heb variant in Jer: ונקומה, (cp. S).

38: 23 MT: כי ביד מלך בבל תתפש ואת העיר הזאת תשרף באש  
T: ארי ביד מלכא דבבל תתמסר וית קרתא הדא תתוקד בנורא  
S: אלא באידוהי דמלכא דבבל תשתלם וקריתא הוא תאקד בנורא  
45: 23 LXX: ὅτι ἐν χειρὶ βασιλέως βαβυλῶνος συλλημφοθήσῃ καὶ ἡ πόλις αὐτῆ κατακαυθήσεται  
V: sed in manu regis babylonis capieris  
et civitatem hanc comburet igni

LXX rests on the reading of a Heb passive form: תשרף. This reading is contradicted by our present day Heb text which does not permit us to regard את העיר as the subject of the clause. On the other hand the active form, 2nd sing. masc., of MT hardly suits the context since the person addressed is not the Babylonian king who is about to burn the city, but the king of Judah. MT can only laboriously be explained: '...thou, Zedekiah, shalt cause this city to be burned'. V makes it clear that it is the hostile king who will destroy the city of Jerusalem. In view of the contradictory evidence it seems convincing that originally there existed two equally legitimate readings:

a\* והעיר הזאת תִּשְׂרַף

b\* ואת העיר הזאת יִשְׂרַף

LXX would thus be based upon a\*, MT — on a compromise conflated reading of a\* and b\*, while V would rest on b\*.<sup>25</sup>

It is a rather common phenomenon that a Heb sing. is rendered by a Lt plur., and vice versa. This rendering apparently occurs frequently for reasons that have no bearing on textual criticism, e.g. — 50: 20 MT: חטאת V: peccatum, the sing. is probably due to the stylistic desire to produce an exact parallel to עון (sing.) in the first stichos of the verse; 51: 51 MT: (בית ה') מקדשי V: sanctificationem, the Lt sing. was caused by the conception of the one, sole Temple in Jerusalem; 1: 18 MT: חמות V: murus, a usual conversion (cp. 39: 8, 51: 58 Is 26: 1; Neh 2: 13, 4: 1 etc.). Admittedly, in a few cases the most probable cause of the grammatical discrepancy between MT and V is that the latter made use of a divergent Heb *Vorlage*. E.g. —

31: 35 MT: חקת ירח וכוכבים

T: גזירת סיהרא וכוכביא

S: ודוברא דסהרא ודכוֹכבא

38: 36 LXX: σελήνην καὶ ἀστέρας

Aq.: ακριβειαν σεληνης και αστρων

V: ordinem lunae et stellarum<sup>26</sup>

V makes use of the plur. 'ordines' elsewhere (Ex 28: 27; Neh 13: 30 etc.) and could have employed this form here. One should also compare the similar idiom:

33: 25 MT: חקות שמים וארץ

T: גזירת שמיא וארעא

S: ונמוֹסֵא דשמיא וארעא

40: 25 Theod.: ακρ. ουρ. και γης

V: leges caelo et terrae

There can be no doubt, then, that Jerome was able and willing to reflect in his language the plur. of the Heb when he wished to do so. Thus we may assume that in the V 31: 35 he read the singular: — חֻקַּת (cp. VSS).

51: 18 MT: הבל הִמָּה מעשה תעתעים

T: למא אינון עובד תולעבא

S: לא מדם אנון ועבֹדא אנון שטיִא

28: 18 LXX: μάταιά ἐστιν ἔργα μεμωκημένα

25 Cp. 5: 14 MT: לאש... עצים

LXX: πυρ... ξυλα (אש... עצים)

V: in ignem... in ligna (לאש... לעצים)

26 The semantic similarity between 'ordo' (V) and דוברא (S) is noteworthy. Cp. Is 5: 17 MT: כדברים, V: iuxta ordinem suum.

V: vana sunt opera et risu digna

V's rendition is strange. The least that can be said about it and should be noted in any critical apparatus, is that it contradicts the Massoretic accents. But there seems to be more to it: 'vana sunt' as rendition of *הכל (הוא, המה)* frequently constitutes the final words of a clause (10: 3; Ps. 94: 11; Eccl. 11: 10 and freq.); why have these words been combined to 'opera' in the verse under review? This question becomes more acute in view of the identical idiom and its Lt rendition:

10: 15 MT: הכל הִמָּה מַעֲשֵׂה תַעֲתָעִים

V: vana sunt et opus risu dignum

Here we encounter the expected translation. Since this is the earlier occurrence (10: 15) of the idiom, it is important to examine whether Jerome was cognizant of it when he came to translate the later chapter (51: 18). The identical rendition of the rare *תַעֲתָעִים* namely 'risu dignum' proves sufficiently that this was indeed the case. Why, then, did he deviate from his own earlier wording 'vana sunt et opus', substituting for it 'vana sunt opera'? This remains inexplicable unless we suppose a divergent reading that compelled Jerome to do so. He may have read *הם המעשים הכל* or the like.

#### V. Lexical variants

Most instances where the deviating text of V seems to testify to lexical variants in its Hebrew original have already been recorded in critical editions of the Bible. Though it remains, of course, a matter of debate whether each specific presumptive reading stands the test of critical scrutiny, the phenomenon itself of divergent readings in V should not be questioned. In the following an additional number of Hebrew variants which may be deduced from V, are set forth, and the supporting evidence lending plausibility to our deduction is detailed. Needless to say the recognition of a variant reading by itself does not determine its value, much less its preferability to MT.

27: 16 MT: הנה כלי בית ה'

T: הא מני בית מקדשא דה'

S: הא מאנא דביתה דמריא

34: 13 LXX: ἰδοὺ αἰσθησάκου σκευῶν κυρίου

V: ecce vasa domini

In addition to the wording *כלי בית ה'* given above and elsewhere (28: 3, 6; 2 Ch 36: 7; Ez 1: 7), the Hebrew Bible makes use of the contracted expression *כלי ה'* (Is 52: 11) and the expanded phrase *כלי עבדת בית ה'* (1 Ch 28: 13). Some textual fluctuation between *כלי ה'* and *כלי בית ה'* may thus be expected, but this pertains to the Hebrew MSS and not to the Vulgate. Jerome keeps

strictly to the Hebrew wording in all the cases indicated above; e.g. Is 52: 11 'vasa domini', 1 Ch 28: 13 'et in universa vasa ministerii templi domini', Jer 28: 3 'omnia vasa domus domini' etc. Thus the Lt omission in the verse under review, 'vasa domini' vs. 'כלי בית ה' is noticeable. It gives us the impression of being based upon a Hebrew MS that read: הנה כלי ה'.

- 51: 58 MT: ויגעו עמים בדי ריק ולאמים בדי אש ויעפו  
 T: ויהלון עממא דבבל לריקנו ומלכותא תסוף אשתא וישתלהון  
 S: ונלאון עממא סריקאית ואמותא בנורא נתטרפן  
 28: 58 LXX: καὶ οὐ κοπιάσουσι λαοὶ εἰς κενόν καὶ ἔθνη ἐν ἀρχῇ  
 ἐαλείψουσιν  
 V: et labores populorum ad nihilum  
 et gentium in ignem erunt et disperibunt

The first Hebrew word of the clause, a verb form, is rendered by a Lt noun. This in itself is an unusual procedure. In the present context it created a syntactical roughness by eliminating the verb predicate of the clause. This roughness was not quite satisfactorily smoothed by the insertion of 'erunt' and thus the syntactical isolation of the last verb ויעפו could be maintained (for a different treatment see LXX). Now, it is hardly plausible that Jerome produced these complications of his own accord. Indeed in the quite similar verse in the book of Habakkuk, Jerome offers a word for word rendition: —

- Hab 2: 13 MT: וייגעו עמים בדי אש ולאמים בדי ריק יעפו  
 V: laborabunt enim populi etc.

Thus for the verse in Jer we have to assume a divergent Hebrew text:

...ויגעו עמים<sup>27</sup>

- 31: 5 MT: נָטְעוּ נְטָעִים וְחָלְלוּ  
 T: צוּבוּ שְׁתִּילִין וְאַחִילִין  
 S: צוּבִי נִצְבַּחְתָּא וְשִׁבְחִי  
 38: 5 LXX: φυτεύσατε καὶ αἰνέσατε  
 V: plantabunt plantantes et donec tempus veniat non vinde-  
 miabunt

V not only adds a phrase but also changes the promise into a negative statement. Such a drastic modification is in sharp contrast with Jerome's principles and usual translation practice in the books of the Prophets. Thus a divergent Hebrew text suggests itself: נָטְעוּ נְטָעִים וְעַד בָּא הָעַת לֹא יִחְלְלוּ. Its scribe may have been influenced by the deuteronomic curse on disobedience (Dt 28: 30): כִּרְם תִּטַּע וְלֹא תִחְלְלֶנּוּ. When Jerome wrote his commentary almost thirty years later he was amazed at what appeared to him to be a highly inaccurate rendering. Therefore, as lemma to his commentary he set out to translate the text form

27 Or: ויגעו, a scribal error due to the similarity between ו and י.

with which he had become acquainted in the meantime and which approaches MT (iv, 1059): “plantate plantaria et vindemiate”. This reflects a Hebrew reading: גִּטְעוּ וְנָטְעוּ גִּטְעִים וְהָלִלוּ (cp. LXX).<sup>28</sup>

37: 9 MT: הלך ילכו מעלינו  
 T: אסתלקא יסתלקון מגנא כסדאי  
 S: דאזלין מגן כלדיא

44: 9 LXX: ἀποτρέχοντες ἀπελεύσονται ἀφ’ ἡμῶν  
 V: euntes abibunt et recedent a nobis

There can be hardly any reason other than textual divergence in the Hebrew *Vorlage* for the Lt wording. Either rendering ‘euntes recedent a nobis’ (cf. 1 K 18: 12) or ‘euntes abibunt a nobis’ (cf. 1 K 5: 19) would have sufficed and been in accordance with Jerome’s way of translating. In order to explain the conflation we have to presume a dittography in Jerome’s Hebrew text: הלך ילכו ילכו מעלינו. However it is not too bold to conjecture that Jerome’s Hebrew text read: הלך ילכו ויעלו מעלינו (cf. V.4 same chapter, 21: 2, 34: 21 and freq.). The graphic similarity between יעלו and עלינו may explain the scribal slip.

29: 14 MT: והשבתי אתכם אל המקום אשר הגליתי אתכם משם  
 T: ואתיב יתכון לאתרא דאגליתי יתכון מתמן  
 S: ואהפככון לאתרא דאשביתכון מן תמן

Theod.: και επιστρεψω υμας εις τον τοπον οθεν απωκισα υμας  
 εκειθεν (εκει)

V: et reverti vos faciam de loco ad quem transmigrare vos feci

This may be another example of a ‘transposed view-point’. The restoration of a people to its former situation exhibits the two aspects of leaving exile and of returning to the homeland. The phrase under discussion bears the stamp of a later comforting gloss; G omits it altogether. It may have been inserted in different Hebrew MSS in diverse formulation. V seems to reflect this wording: והשבתי אתכם אל המקום אשר הגליתי אתכם. (Cf. Zah 2: 2 מצרים; Jer 29: 7 שמה אשר הגליתי אתכם שמה). Note also the fluctuation in the Greek version: εκευθεν versus εκει). It is noteworthy that Jerome in his commentary stresses both aspects of restoration, thus harmonizing his rendition (and its presumptive *Vorlage*) with MT (iv, 1045): “redire eos faciat de universis gentibus et de

28 Latin ‘plantarium’ may stand for גִּטְעִים or נָטְעִים (Ps 144: 12). The Lt word which usually signifies a ‘(nursery)-garden’ (cp. Lewis & Short, *A Latin Dictionary*, Oxford impr. 1958, 1384) appears only once in the Bible:

Dan 2: 41 MT: ומן נצבתא די פרזלא  
 V: de plantario ferri

According to Lewis & Short, *op. cit.*, *ibid.*, the Lt word denotes here ‘the sole of the foot’. This is obviously wrong. Jerome derived נצבתא from Aramaic נצב, ‘to plant’. (Cp. Levit. Rabba s. 25 למנצב נציבין, ‘to plant trees’).

cunctis locis ad quae expulerit eos, et captivitate laxata, pristinum statum et patriam recipere.”

40: 5 MT: ועודנו לא ישוב ושבה אל גדליה

T: ואם לית את צבי למיתב ותוב לות גדליה

S: ואמר לה אן פאש אנת תב לות גדליה

47: 5 LXX: εἰ δὲ μὴ ἀπότρεχε καὶ ἀνάστρεψον πρὸς γ.

Sym.: καὶ πρὶν ἢ ἀπαλλαγῶ ἐγὼ ἀναστρέφε οἰκησον παρα γ.

V: et mecum noli venire sed habita apud godoliam

The Hebrew is grammatically awkward and interrupts the context, yet the Vulgate did not attempt to smooth its awkwardness. The paraphrastic imperative ‘come not with me’ sounds strange after verse 4 ‘if it seem good unto thee... come with me into Babylon’. The vb שׁוּב would most naturally refer to a return to Jerusalem and be translated by Lt ‘revertere’ or the like; here it is rendered by ‘venire’ and thus pictures the journey to Babylon from Nebuzaradan’s point of view. Why should Jerome have introduced these changes, and why should he have avoided the solutions offered by other VSS?<sup>29</sup> It seems easiest to assume a Hebrew text which caused him to translate the way he did. Instead of ישוב he probably read תשוב (cf. T). The Lt ‘mecum’ is perhaps based upon Hebrew עמדי; this then forced the crucial change from ‘returning (to Jerusalem)’ into ‘going (to Babylon)’. The following word ושבה was not taken as a derivative of שׁוּב but of ישׁב (cf. Symmachu’s dual rendering). Thus we are inclined to restore a Hebrew text: ...לֹא תָשׁוּב וְשָׁבָה.

29 Cp. also the mediaeval commentators.