

THE DOUBLE TEXT OF JEREMIAH.

IN the Book of Jeremiah, the text of the Septuagint, as is well known, differs more widely from the Hebrew than is ordinarily the case in the Old Testament. In the other books of the Old Testament, the variations are, perhaps, the most marked and important in the cases of 1 and 2 Samuel and Ezekiel; but in the prophecies of Jeremiah they are more considerable still. In the text of the Septuagint, as compared with the Hebrew, there are very numerous omissions, sometimes of single words, sometimes of particular clauses or passages, there are occasionally additions, there are variations of expression, there are, lastly, transpositions. The number of words in the Hebrew text which are not represented in the Septuagint has been calculated at 2,700, or one-eighth of the entire Book. It must not, however, be concluded from these figures that the *substance* of the prophecies is proportionately diminished, for many of the omissions consist of words which have no appreciable bearing upon the sense, such as the title *the prophet* attached to the name "Jeremiah," or the parenthetic "saith the Lord" (where the fact itself is plain from the context), or the substitution of "the Lord" by itself for the fuller title "the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel," or other similarly abbreviated forms of expression. Other omissions are, of course, more important, as 10, 6-8. 10. 11, 7-8 (except the last words "and they did them not"). 29, 14 (except "And I will be found of you"). 16-20. 33, 14-26; and several times (but not always) where the words, as read in the existing Hebrew text, *appear elsewhere* in the Book, 8, 10^b-12 (see 6, 13-15). 17, 1-4 (with 3^b. 4^b comp. 15, 13-14). 30, 10-11

(see 46, 27-28). 39, 4-13 (4-10 in the Hebrew text abridged¹ from 52, 7-16). 48, 40^b. 41^b (see 49, 22). The additions in the Septuagint are unimportant, and need not detain us. Illustrations of variations of expression will be referred to subsequently. The transpositions, so far as they concern words or clauses (*e.g.* "prophet and priest" for "priest and prophet," or the altered position of "saith the Lord" in 1, 19. 3, 16 and elsewhere), though there are many such instances in the course of the Book, are also of subordinate importance. The really important difference of order between the Septuagint and Hebrew text is in the position assigned to the prophecies on foreign nations, chapters 46-51. These, which in the Hebrew text are placed at the end of the entire Book (being only followed by the historical chapter 52 (=2 Kings 24, 18-25, 30, usually in a purer text), which the note at the end of 51, 64 shows was not regarded by the compiler as Jeremiah's work), are arranged in the Septuagint so as to follow 25, 13—the second part of this verse, in the form *The things which Jeremiah prophesied concerning the nations*, forming a superscription to them, ver. 14 being omitted, and the entire group being followed by vers. 15-38 (ver. 15 beginning *Thus said the Lord the God of Israel*), which afford indeed an excellent and appropriate sequel to them. The *order* of the nine prophecies composing the group is also different in the Septuagint, as well as the position occupied by the group as a whole.

These variations between the two texts of Jeremiah have for long been noticed by commentators and critics, and many hypotheses have been proposed for the purpose of accounting for them. By some, the variations have been attributed to the carelessness of copyists in transcribing the version of the Septuagint;² by others, to the incom-

¹ Comp. especially ver. 8 with 52, 12-14.

² Jerome, Prologue to Commentary on Jeremiah ("librarium errore confusum"). This explanation is certainly insufficient.

petence and arbitrariness of the LXX translators themselves;¹ others have thrown the source of the variations further back, supposing them to arise from the fact that the existing Hebrew text, and the text from which the LXX translation was made, exhibit *two different recensions* of Jeremiah's writings, and regarding (as the case may be) the one or the other of these as representing more faithfully the prophet's own words.² It is evident that the problem which the double text presents can never be solved by the *à priori* method of starting with a fixed conviction as to the necessary or inherent superiority of one of the two texts above the other: the only method by which its solution can be successfully attempted is by a systematic investigation of the differences which the two texts present, and a careful comparison of individual cases for the purpose of ascertaining on which side the superiority lies. And by several of the writers named this has been done, with more or less completeness, though the conclusions to which they have been led have not always been the same. The case is one, no doubt, in which it is difficult to establish a perfectly objective standard; and hence different critics obtain different results. An impartial and judicious estimate of the claims that have been advanced on both sides is given by Kuenen.³

¹ So De Wette (originally), Wichelhaus, Nägelsbach, Graf, Keil (though admitting that in particular cases better readings have been preserved in LXX).

² So, but differing widely in their estimate of the fidelity with which the LXX translators reproduced the text of their recension, J. D. Michaelis, Movers, De Wette (later, following Movers), Ewald (*Prophets*, iii. 91 f. Engl. tr.), Bleek (*Introduction to the O.T.* §§ 214-218 [in Wellhausen's edition, 1878, §§ 191-195]), Kuenen, Hitzig (*Commentary*, ed. 2, 1866, pp. xv-xviii), the Dean of Canterbury (in the *Speaker's Commentary*, p. 324 f.), Scholz (*Der Massoretische Text und die LXX-Uebersetzung des Buches Jeremias*, 1875). These scholars, however, mostly prefer themselves the text of LXX only with reserve, and admit, especially Ewald (who indeed practically follows the LXX hardly more than Graf), that the translators performed their work with more or less arbitrariness and neglect. The Dean of Canterbury, however, absolves the translators from these faults, but thinks that the MS. used by them was one that had been transcribed in haste.

³ *Historisch-kritisch Onderzoek*, etc. (1863), ii. pp. 240-249.

The foregoing remarks have been suggested by a work in which the entire subject has been taken up afresh, published recently by an American professor, the Rev. E. C. Workman.¹ Prof. Workman has devoted much independent study to the comparison of the two texts; and the task has evidently been with him a labour of love. The contents of the volume, stated briefly, are as follows. After some preliminary remarks on the general relation subsisting between the existing Hebrew text of the Old Testament and the Septuagint translation, Prof. Workman in his first chapter surveys the different explanations which have been offered of the variations occurring in the Book of Jeremiah, and states the method which he proposes to follow himself. The five following chapters are devoted to a discussion of these variations, which are classified in order; *viz.* the omissions, additions, transpositions, alterations, substitutions. Chap. vii. is an examination of the causes to which the variations may be due; chap. viii. consists of an estimate of the value of the LXX translation; chap. ix. sums up the results of the entire investigation. Chap. x., however, will be to many the most attractive part of the work. This is headed, "The Conspectus of the Variations," and contains in two parallel columns, occupying 116 pages, all the passages in which the two texts differ, the Hebrew word (or words) being transcribed in one column, and the other column exhibiting the reading underlying the LXX translation, as restored by Prof. Workman. For this, the most novel part of his work, Prof. Workman states in his preface that he has had the assistance of a Jewish scholar, Dr. S. Mandelkern; and we may say at once that, judged merely as a piece of Hebrew translation, it is excellently done.

¹ *The Text of Jeremiah; or, a Critical Investigation of the Greek and Hebrew, with the variations in the LXX, retranslated into the Original and Explained.* By the Rev. E. C. Workman, M.A., Professor of Old Testament Exegesis and Literature in Victoria University, Cobourg, Ont., Canada. With an Introductory Notice by Prof. Franz Delitzsch, D.D. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1889.)

There are occasional oversights, though seldom serious ones;¹ and the Hebrew, as a rule (judged apart from the context to which it is presumed to belong), is bright and idiomatic.

We turn, however, to the wider and more important question. Has Prof. Workman advanced the subject with which he deals? From what we had heard, we had cherished great expectations as to what Prof. Workman's book would accomplish; and we perused it, when it appeared, with great interest: we regret therefore the more to find ourselves compelled to answer this question in the negative. We are very far from desiring to disparage Prof. Workman's labours. His honesty, his industry, his singlemindedness are conspicuous upon every page; but we are bound to say that the *methods* by which he has carried on his work appear to us to be radically unsound. He starts with the assumption of principles which really have first to be proved. He is a warm advocate of the claims of the Septuagint version; and in his reaction against the depreciation with which it has been viewed in some quarters, in particular by Graf, he invests its translators with ideal excellences, and can discover in their work hardly any blemishes. He thinks indeed, that unless the translator possessed the fullest qualifications which the learning and training of the Alexandrian schools of the time could confer, he would not have been selected

¹ Thus 3, 3 מאין will not construe; 6, 8 תוסר should be 2 fem.; 6, 12 ונשותיהם is a strange error for ונשיהם; 9, 15 read בלֹתֶם (so 49, 37); 10, 23 גִּלְגֵּי for גִּלְגֵּי; 12, 16 ונבגה; 15, 18 מִאֲנָה is an impossible form; 18, 21 וְהִאֲקַמֶם do.; 22, 27 לְבַל is not biblical; 23, 31 the inf. abs. should be נִוֵם; 25, 15 הַחֲמֵר may have been read by the LXX translators, but cannot have been written by Jeremiah; 25, 29 בְּאִשֶׁר the syntax is incorrect; 28, 1. הַנְּבִיא הַשֶּׁקֶר do. (also 6, 16); 29, 11 וְאֲחֻשָׁב should be וְאֲחֻשָׁב (or וְחֻשְׁבִּי); 32, 44 לֹא יִרְדְּמוּ is not correct; 41, 5 שְׂמֵנִים אֲנִישִׁים do.; 49, 25 read אֲהֹב; 51, 20. 21. 22 וְהַפְּצִיתִי is an error for וְהִפְצִיתִי; 51, 27 הָרְמוֹי for הָרְמוֹי (*à part*); 51, 39 יִרְדְּמוּ for יִרְדְּמוּ.

for such an arduous and important task (p. 7 f.). He believes (pp. 217, 281) that the book was translated with the utmost carefulness, "as literally as the genius of the flexible Greek language would allow, the translator or translators having in no way arbitrarily changed the original Hebrew text, and having in no instance been influenced either by personal scruple, theological bias, or religious tendency."

These contentions, however, are based, in fact, on *à priori* considerations. There is no more sufficient reason for supposing that the translator of Jeremiah was selected on the ground of his special qualifications, than for supposing that the translator of the Minor Prophets was so selected; and if so, we fancy that Prof. Workman will admit either that the Hebrew text of the Minor Prophets used by the translator was often in a singularly defective state, or that Hebrew scholarship at Alexandria must have been at a low ebb. Whichever alternative be accepted, the conclusion is not favourable to the unconditional and necessary superiority claimed on behalf of the LXX version of Jeremiah. This parallel is, however, only adduced for the purpose of showing the fallacy of the *à priori* argument: the question of the *actual* comparative value of the Hebrew and LXX remains as before; and the only method by which this can be ascertained is by *comparing the two together*, and where they differ by considering which is better in accord, (a) with the general standard of well-established Hebrew usage, (b) with the standard supplied in particular by the parts of Jeremiah where the two texts *agree*. When this has been done, we believe that it will appear that the translators have by no means proceeded with the scrupulousness and precision which Prof. Workman attributes to them. They have permitted themselves, in one word, like most other ancient translators, to *paraphrase*, to make additions, alterations, and omissions, especially *slight* ones, to a far greater

extent than Prof. Workman allows for. Hence his restoration of the presumed Hebrew original upon which their translation was based rests in large measure upon *illusion*; the variations which he and Dr. Mandelkern so patiently reproduce in Hebrew are, in very many cases, simply more or less paraphrastic renderings of the same Hebrew text which we possess ourselves! We entirely agree with Prof. Workman that much has been laid to the charge of the translators (especially by Graf and Keil) of which they are guiltless: in other words, we accept cordially the main principle for which he contends, *viz.* that the deviations, in a large number of cases, were already present in the MS. used by them, *i.e.* that they were *recensional*; and our agreement with him in his main thesis causes us to regret the more that he has shown so little power of discriminating between real and only apparent recensional variations, and has in consequence failed in the main object which he set himself, *viz.* to exhibit, in a perspicuous and convenient form, *the approximate text of the recension which was in the hands of the Greek translators.*

We proceed to offer specimens of Prof. Workman's method, which we hope may be regarded as sufficient to substantiate what we have alleged. It will be remembered that there are throughout *two* questions, which are distinct from one another: 1. What is the Hebrew text underlying the LXX translation? 2. Is this text preferable to the existing Hebrew text? Prof. Workman's answer to the first question is stated very fully and clearly; it occupies the whole of the long chapter headed "The Conspectus of the Variations." The second question he does not answer systematically, but he gives the reader to understand that though he does not suppose the text represented by LXX to be entirely free from error, he is very generally disposed to prefer it to the Hebrew text which we at present possess.

The Hebrew word שרירות *firmness*, in a bad sense, *obstinacy*, occurs in Jeremiah eight times; as the LXX, however, express it by a word of a different meaning, it is inferred by Prof. Workman that they had a different text before them, which is restored by him accordingly. Thus 3, 17 ἐνθυμήματα, W. מועצות; 9, 13. 16, 12. 18, 12 τὰ ἀρεστά, W. תְּאוֹת; 23, 17 πλάνη, W. תְּעִית: in 11, 8 and 13, 10 the word is not represented in LXX; perhaps also not in 7, 24, though it seems to us that במועצות is the word which is here not represented, and that שרירות is expressed, as in 3, 17, by ἐνθυμήματα. There is not the smallest basis for any one of these supposed restorations. Prof. Workman has overlooked the fact that in the two other places where the word occurs in the Old Testament, Deuteronomy 29, 18. Ps. 81, 13, it is represented in LXX by ἀποπλάνησις (as by πλάνη in Jeremiah 23, 17) and ἐπιτηδεύματα: if these do not satisfy him that the LXX in all cases read the same word which we now have (though, not understanding it etymologically,¹ they rendered it by words more or less suggested by the context), then, as it is not to be supposed (upon his principles) that the translators of Deuteronomy and the Psalms were *less* trustworthy than the translator of Jeremiah, he is landed in one of these extraordinary conclusions, either, *viz.* that שרירות, an actual Hebrew word, was seven (or eight) different times expunged from the MSS. used by the LXX, or that three distinct words, standing originally in the seven (or eight) passages, were changed in the Massoretic text to a word not otherwise occurring in Hebrew at all! We venture to think that every reasonable critic will admit that the “restorations” in the cases referred to are one and all

¹ As the other ancient translators did not understand it, and hence render differently: thus Pesh. always **ܕܩܠܒܝܢ** *wishes*; Targum היררהו *imagination*; Aquila σκολιότης, whence no doubt Jerome's *pravitas*; Symmachus ἀρεσκεία (see the *Hexapla* on Ps. 81, 13); Saadyah in Deut. **הוּי** *desire*.

imaginary, and that the LXX in each passage read precisely the same consonantal text¹ which we read now.

We proceed to consider some passages taken at random. 7, 26 ויקשו את ערפם LXX ἐσκήρυναν τὸν τράχηλον αὐτῶν. Τράχηλος, however, happens sometimes to express צואר; and hence Prof. Workman forthwith restores this word as the reading of LXX here. In doing this he neglects *three* facts: (1) that τράχηλος also represents ערף (as Deuteronomy 10, 16. 31, 27 and elsewhere, *in the same phrase*); (2) that הקשה צואר is an unidiomatic combination (unless, to be sure, it can be proved that wherever *hardness of neck* is spoken of in the Hebrew Bible—some seventeen times—ערף is always an error for צואר!); (3) that he has himself left ערף הקשה without any alteration in 17, 23 and 19, 15!—14, 7 our iniquities testify against us LXX ἀντέστησαν, whence W. קמו for ענו, producing a most improbable figure in this connexion (Job 16, 8 is different), and not noticing that ענה is rendered by exactly the same verb in LXX Deuteronomy 19, 18. Isaiah 3, 8, and especially in the very similar passage Isaiah 59, 12.—11, 14. 14, 12 רנה LXX δέησις, W. תחנה and תפלה, overlooking the fact that רנה, the cry of prayer, is constantly expressed by δέησις in the Psalms.—15, 21 עריצים oppressors LXX λοιμῶν, W. strangely תחלואים (*sicknesses!*) But λοιμὸς expresses the same Hebrew word עריץ in Ezek. 28, 7. 30, 11. 31, 12. 13.—18, 10 have done evil *in my sight* (בעיני) LXX ἐναντίον μου, W. לפני before me. But see 7, 28. 40, 4 where Prof. Workman himself does not suggest that the LXX had any reading differing from ours.—17, 27 palaces of Jerusalem, LXX ἀμφοδα, W. הצות; but 49, 26 no change! 6, 5 the same word is rendered θεμέλια; which of course suggests to Prof. Workman the reading יסודות. But ארמנות is represented six times in Amos 1-2, as well as elsewhere, by θεμέλια; and it is certain that it is one of the many words

¹ It may be admitted that they may have vocalized as a plur. (שררות).

the meaning of which was unknown to some of the LXX translators.—19, 5 nor did it come up upon my heart (a Hebrew idiom=nor did it enter into my mind: see Acts 7, 23), LXX οὐδὲ διανοήθηεν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ μου, W. ולא חשבתִי בלבי. It is true, LXX render the idiom literally in 3, 16. 32, 35. 44, 21; but it is far more probable that they were not perfectly uniform, than that such a weak expression should have been used as Prof. Workman restores (especially when it is remembered that the passage is *parallel* in thought to 7, 31. 32, 35); moreover, in 7, 31, where their rendering is exactly the same, he *makes no change!*—24, 8 and 25, 19 שריו LXX μεγιστᾶνες, whence W. concludes that they read גדוליו. Yet μεγιστᾶνες corresponds to שרים in 34, 10. 49, 38. 50, 35 (which he leaves unaltered!) and thrice in other books.—25, 30 the Lord shall *roar* . . . shall *mightily roar* against his fold, LXX χρηματιεῖ . . . λόγον χρηματιεῖ; W. ידבר . . . ידבר ידבר will speak . . . will speak a word. There is no doubt that Prof. Workman and his coadjutor can write excellent Hebrew *prose*; but do they seriously ask us to believe that the LXX *read* this *prose* in their MS.? Have they both forgotten Amos 1, 2, where LXX similarly paraphrase the figure by ἐφθέγγαστο? Is the entire Old Testament to be reconstituted upon the basis of a *literal* retranslation of the Septuagint Version? In the same verse, for *his fold* LXX have τόπου αὐτοῦ, W. accordingly מקומו *his place*. But (1) LXX paraphrase נוח similarly in Psalm 79, 7; and (2) where the same rendering occurs in 49, 19, no different reading is postulated by Prof. Workman himself!—32, 35 *to pass through* (the fire) to Moloch, LXX ἀναφέρειν *to offer*, W. להקריב. But Exodus 13, 12 ἀφελείς, Ezek. 16, 21 ἀποτροπιάζεσθαι for the same Hebrew word, show that the translators simply paraphrase: “*to pass through* (the fire) to Moloch” is a standing expression in Hebrew, “*to offer to Moloch*” is never found.—49, 18 like the overthrow of

Sodom and Gomorrha, 'וע כמהפכת ס' וע LXX ὡσπερ κατεστράφη Σ. καὶ Γ., W. 'כאשר נהפכה ס' וע' (a similar change in 50, 40). The LXX render likewise by a verbal form Deuteronomy 29, 22; Isaiah 13, 19; Amos 4, 11. But surely, because Greek idiom will not admit of the peculiar Hebrew construction being rendered literally, Prof. Workman does not propose to eliminate this classical expression from the pages of the Hebrew Bible? or even to suggest that, by some extraordinary freak of transmission, it was already, in *five different places*, corrupted into the inelegant form which he "restores," before the time when the LXX translation was made?—50, 11 תפישו LXX ἐσκιρτᾶτε, W תפוי (Gen. 49, 24), truly a case of "fumum ex fulgore." The LXX read exactly what we read, as is clear from their rendering of Malachi 3, 20.—50, 45 צעירי הצאן LXX τὰ ἀρνία τῶν προβάτων αὐτῶν, W. צפירי צאנם (*goats of their flock!*). But is not ἀρνία as venial a paraphrase of צעירי *little ones*, as it is of בני *young ones* in Ps. 114, 4?

The use of the *infinitive*, in lieu of the finite verb, in certain circumstances, is a familiar and well substantiated Hebrew idiom, though one which it is naturally difficult, and even impossible, to reproduce in another language. It occurs several times in the Hebrew text of Jeremiah, sometimes (as 7, 9) with great force (Ewald, *Heb. Syntax*, § 328^b), and always in entire accordance with idiom. Because however LXX render, as they could not help rendering, by a *finite* verb, they are supposed to have had a finite verb in their text, which is everywhere restored—or rather corrupted—accordingly (3, 1. 7, 9. 18. 8, 15. 14, 5. 19. 22, 14. 23, 14. 32, 33. 36, 23. 37, 21). Because the expression יושבי ירושלם inhabitants of Jerusalem is sometimes rendered in LXX οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐν Ἱερ., they are supposed in such cases to have had in their MS. היושבים בירושלם (8, 1. 11, 2. 9. 17, 25. 19, 3 etc.), an expression never found in the Old Testament. Innumerable cases

also occur in which slight differences of tense, or number, or person, or construction (*e.g.* 5, 14; but contrast 7, 13. 18. 23, 38 etc.), or the substitution of a pronoun for an article, or the addition or absence of a small particle, etc., are supposed to point to different readings in the MS. used by the LXX,—as a rule, quite needlessly.

It is a peculiarity of Hebrew to employ a *singular*, in many cases, where a western language would use a plural. Thus Hebrew writers say often “your *heart*” instead of “your *hearts*”; and in general are apt to use *collective* terms in preference to true plurals, as *tear* for *tears*, *chariot* (or *chariotry*) for *chariots*, sometimes even *man* for *men*. Naturally in such cases, where the Hebrew has a singular term, the LXX have used a plural in accordance with the prevalent usage of the Greek language. Prof. Workman, however, believes that in all such cases—all, at least, which he has not overlooked—the LXX actually *had* plurals in the text which they used; and the plural for the singular figures in his “*Conspectus of Variations*” accordingly! Examples: 2, 22. 3, 2. 5, 7. 7, 22. 11, 20. 12, 9. 13, 17. 14, 20. 16, 18. 18, 23. 23, 14. 31, 33. 34. 32, 23. 36, 3. 47, 2. 48, 35. On account of the Greek *δάκρυα*, the unnatural דמעות for דמעה is restored in 8, 23. 9, 17. 13, 17. 14, 17. 31, 16. Where the Greek has ἄρματα, רכבים (which occurs *once* only in the Old Testament, Cant. 1, 9) or מרכבות is supposed always to have been read by the translators: 17, 25. 22, 4. 46, 9. 47, 3 (here in an impossible form רִכְבֵּי), 50 37. 51 21. In 11, 11 Behold, I bring *evil* upon them, the LXX have κακά: accordingly רעות is declared to have been their reading; yet, by another of the inconsistencies which are so conspicuous in Prof. Workman’s book,¹ in 6, 19. 19, 3. 35,

¹ See besides those which have been noticed, 6, 22 compared with 25, 32. 31, 8. 50, 41; 6, 24 (where חבליים ביוֹלָדָה is contrary to usage) compared with 50, 43; 11, 22 with 29, 32; 14, 1 with 7, 22; 42, 20 with 42, 2. 7, 16. 11, 14. 14, 11 etc.

17. 45, 5, where the same phrase occurs, no change is considered necessary. Hebrew writers speak uniformly of delivering into the *hand* (not *hands*) of so and so—whether a singular or plural follows: LXX usually have εἰς χεῖρας, and בִּידִי is duly recorded as having been their reading (20, 4. 5. 21, 7. 10. 22, 25. 26, 24 and *passim*). On this we would observe that the *standing usage* of the Old Testament is בִּידִי not בְּיָדִי: which supposition then is the more probable? that the LXX simply wrote “into the *hands*” for “into the *hand*”; or—for these are the alternatives—either that the Hebrew text of the entire Old Testament is so corrupt that we do not know what was idiomatic in Hebrew and what was not, or that Jeremiah himself deserted the idiom of his own language, or that a scribe, who of course must also have been conversant with Hebrew, introduced *throughout the Book* this un-Hebrew expression?

Hitherto we have confined ourselves to the first of the questions stated above, and have endeavoured to show cause why we cannot accept Prof. Workman's restoration, as a genuine representation of the Hebrew text used by the LXX. Let us next approach his restoration from a different point of view, and (accepting it, provisionally, in the form in which he sets it before us) inquire how far it can claim superiority to the existing Hebrew text. We must be brief; and our opinion will perhaps be sufficiently indicated if we take two or three chapters and compare the two texts. In chap. ii. the conspectus exhibits seventy-five variations (or groups of variations) between the Hebrew and the presumed original of the LXX. Of these we should say that about twelve are, or might plausibly be argued to be, better than the corresponding readings in the Hebrew,¹

¹ 2, 6 שמה (see 51, 43); 12; 20 שְׁבַרְתִּי and נִתְקַתִּי, and אֶעְבֹּד (as the Kt.) 21 (though not as Prof. Workman restores, but as is suggested by Graf, *viz.* לְמַרְחֵק for לִי סוּרֵי הָ, cf. Deut. 32, 32 = *πικρία*); 27 יִלְדֵתֵנִי; 30 לִקְחָתֶם, חָרַב, and עַל־פֶּלֶאֱלֵה; 53 דְּמִי; 34 גַּם אֶת־הַרְעַתְּ לְטַמֵּא; 33 שְׁמַעוּ; 31 וְלֹא יִרְאֶתֶם.

about twenty-four are neutral—the sense differing so slightly, that it is impossible to say that either is superior to the other,—and about thirty-nine are decidedly worse, consisting often of phrases which Jeremiah himself could not possibly have written. We have no space here to examine the passages in detail; but we can assure our readers that we have considered them carefully, and without the smallest bias against the LXX. In chap. vii., out of some fifty-six variations (disregarding the two long omissions in vers. 1–2, 27), only one appears to us to offer a reading preferable to the Hebrew, *viz.* the omission in ver. 24 of (not בשררות, but) במועצות, “in counsels” (which from its imperfect construction may not improbably be a gloss); of the remaining fifty-five, about twenty-six appear to us to be neutral, and about twenty-nine inferior to the present Hebrew. We cannot however conceal our persuasion that the majority of these variations are not “recensional” at all, but are simply due to a slight freedom in rendering on the part of the translators, or (in some cases) to their having misread or misunderstood their Hebrew text. In point of fact, out of the fifty-six variations noted by Prof. Workman in chap. vii., we should say that about *twenty*¹ might fairly be treated as “recensional,” though whether they are all *actually* so is more than we can take upon ourselves to say,—probably not; the rest we should attribute, without the smallest hesitation, to one or other of the causes just indicated. *Mutatis mutandis*, our judgment would not be substantially

In his view of ררנו ver. 31 (p. 237), Prof. Workman has gone entirely astray. We cannot admit that the LXX translation proves רור to mean “be lord,” but, allowing that it does, οὐ κυριευσθησόμεθα would express not הלא ררנו (p. 286), but לא יָרֹד. And on p. 270, the originality of the inversion which he seeks to dispute, is surely confirmed by the usage of the *cognate languages*.

¹ *Viz.* the omissions in vers. 1–2, 3, 4 *end*, 10, 13 *bis*, 20, 21, 24 (במועצות), 26 *end*, 27, 28 *bis*; the addition in ver. 28^a (which agrees with the omission of ver. 27); and ver. 7 בארץ, 22 העלותי, 31 בַּמַּת, 32 הַהֲרִגְם, 34 שִׁשָּׁן and שִׁמְחָם. We have endeavoured to be liberal to Prof. Workman; for it is not possible to be confident respecting some of these.

dissimilar in other parts of the book. We base this opinion largely upon general views. Though it is undoubted that the Septuagint preserves in many cases—perhaps indeed in more cases than is generally supposed—readings superior to those of the existing Hebrew text, it is also undoubted that in the vast majority of cases its readings are greatly inferior; so soon as it deviates from the Hebrew, a deterioration in force, and terseness, and idiomatic freshness at once, as a rule, begins to show itself. Can any qualified Hebrew scholar doubt that chaps. ii. and vii., read in the form in which Prof. Workman exhibits them, are inferior, both in intelligibility and force, to the form in which they appear in the Massoretic text? Upon grounds, not based (as we hope) upon an unreasoning prejudice, but of our *appreciation of Hebrew idiom*, we are thus compelled to conclude that, on the whole, the Massoretic text exhibits the prophecies of Jeremiah in their more original form; and this being so, it appears to us incredible that the vast amount of change, including many of the most violent and extravagant character—witness the stylistic *tours de force* in 2, 23-4. 25. 7, 16—could have been introduced into the text by any scribe, or series of scribes, or at any time. For the variations being mostly *significant*, they must have been due to design, and yet they are of a nature which it is impossible even to imagine any scribe as designedly making.¹ The alternative supposition, that, *to a certain extent*, more than is conceded by Graf and Keil, but considerably less than is contended for by Prof. Workman, the variations of LXX are recensional, but that, beyond this, they are due, partly to the MS. (or MSS.) used being in places imperfectly legible, partly to the fact that the translators either misunderstood the Hebrew, or permitted themselves some

¹ It is probably in its greater *conciseness of expression* that the text of LXX is most frequently superior in originality to the existing Hebrew text. But this seldom affects *style*.

freedom in rendering it, is surely both far more intelligible in itself, and altogether more in accordance with probability and analogy.¹

It is with sincere regret that we have found ourselves compelled to pass this unfavourable judgment upon Prof. Workman's volume. But truth obliges us to own that he is not equal to the task which he has undertaken. His judgments are crude, superficial, and inconsistent; and he is greatly deficient in the faculty of discrimination. In particular, he has not learnt the lesson of Wellhausen's monograph, *On the Text of the Books of Samuel*, in which the distinction between variations due only to the translators, and variations having their source in the MS. or MSS. used by them, *which alone*, as is obvious, *possess any value for the textual critic*, is repeatedly illustrated and enforced. Hence his volume to the textual critic is a disappointing one. He does not find in it what he expects to find, *viz.* a clear and well considered estimate, based on long and discriminating study of the book, of what *are* recensional variations; and he finds in it a great deal which is of no interest or importance to him whatever. Had Prof. Workman considered the variants individually, and eliminated from his *Conspectus* all those which may fairly be regarded as due solely to the translators, he would have produced a handbook which would have been of real service to the student of Jeremiah; as it is, his *Conspectus* bewilders by the mass of irrelevant and worthless material which it contains, and, to all but the trained scholar, is simply misleading. For the present, we hope that all who are interested in the prophecies of Jeremiah will provide themselves with Prof. Workman's volume; but we hope

¹ The *Targum*, to which Prof. Workman often appeals in support of his restorations, of course paraphrased likewise. It would be easy to show also that its evidence is often on other grounds inconclusive. Thus it *regularly* renders חיל by the plural חבלין; how then does its use of this word in 6, 24 show that it read חבלים rather than חיל?

also that they will follow it with the utmost possible discrimination. And for the future we earnestly trust that Prof. Workman may be induced to reconsider the plan upon which he has pursued his investigations; and in a future edition will not shrink from cutting down his *Conspicuous* to one-third or one-fourth—the more, the better—of its present dimensions.

S. R. DRIVER.

*OLD TESTAMENT CRITICISM IN THE LIGHT
OF NEW TESTAMENT QUOTATIONS.*

DURING the past half-century the attention of Hebrew scholars has been directed, perhaps more than at any former period, to the consideration of the text, and the structure of the books, of the Old Testament. The impulse to such studies had its rise a century earlier, but it was only here and there that a solitary student gave himself to the work. In our days the labourers have happily become more numerous. Their work too has been fruitful in results, and when what is certain in these inquiries becomes assured to the Church at large, we shall find that we have advanced greatly in our knowledge of these sacred books, and have gained clearer insight into the manner of God's revelation. But that time, though it be steadily approaching, has not yet arrived. Meanwhile the minds of many, who cannot examine the originals for themselves, grow sorely troubled by the questionings that are current, and not always couched in a reverent form, about matters which they have hitherto deemed unquestionable.

For much of this trouble no doubt the Churches themselves must be held responsible. All study and instruction concerning the origin and history of the Old Testament writings