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 Masoretic schools. Its text form therefore is bound to reflect its historical position, at least to some extent.\(^1\) 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 uberein stimmt, 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.\textsuperscript{2} 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” (Præf. in Ez.). More than once he remarks on a divergent verse-division found in the LXX;\textsuperscript{3} thus e.g.—

\textit{Jer. 8:17, 18 MT}:

\textit{T:}

ניקלוֹת יִהְבָּךְ אָמְרָה, עַל דָּהָר מְלַפְּנִיָּה עַל בַּבָּרָא

דִּמְתִּנִּי לָהָר וַעֲנִיתָה אָמַר עַל לוֹחְשׁוֹת אָמַר בְּבַרְיָא לְבָרָא

\textit{S:}

גַּנְנְסִינָן אָמַר מֶרְבָּה בֵּית בָּשָׁקָה לְבָרָא לְבָרָא

\textit{LXX:}

καὶ διηύξονται ὦμᾶς ἁνίατα

μετ' ὁδόνης καρδίας ὦμῶν ἀπορομένης

\textit{V:}

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,

\textsuperscript{2} Cp. B. Kedar-Kopstein, \textit{The Vulgate as a Translation} (Diss. Hebrew University of Jerusalem 1968), pp. 271 ff.

\textsuperscript{3} Cp. iv, 348 on Is 26: 9; iv, 426 f. on Is 27: 1, 2; \textit{ibid.} on Is 31: 9, 32: 1.
and even older MSS are not reliable in this respect. 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 משיחת: הודר אתום
   T: נכריא עתומלまって מע דבר עתון
   S: והאריה מחפלセット אתון דריא
   LXX: ὁς λέων ὀλεθρείων καὶ ὁ ἐσφαρήθητε
   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”. 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: יפל בחרית בحسب תחתים ממקם דודים גלעד
   T: רֵשָׁפִּים חֲלוֹת וְסָרָהָים יִהְרָם בַּחֲרָם וְכַמָּה
   S: וְקָמָהָו בַּחֲרָם וְכַמָּהָו
   LXX: καὶ πετοῦνται ἐν βομβαίᾳ καὶ ἐν λυμῷ
   καὶ ἐκλείψουσιν ἀπὸ μικροῦ ἐως μεγάλου
   V: cadent in gladio et in famme
   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: ערֵי ישׁאלָּן דָּרֶךְ וָגוֹת פָּרִים
   T: לְבָנִים ישָׁאלָּן לְמִטֶּרֶף אָרוֹרָהָי מִכָּלָם קָרְמוֹת
   S: על אֶדֶאלָּתי דָּרֶךְ עֹלֶבָּלָם בָּאָפָם

6  S exhibits an omission due to homoeoteleuton,
27: 5  LXX: ἔως σιῶν ἐρωτησοῦσα τὴν ὁδὸν
         ὁδὸς γὰρ τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν (δόξουσι)
V: in sion interrogabat viam
     huc facies eorum
Again V parallels LXX: ‘viam’ — τὴν ὁδὸν. 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 δόξουσι).7 Jerome’s interpretation ‘interroga-
bant viam’ thus derives from his own understanding of the passage, which
differs from the one implied by the Massoretic accents.

48: 19  MT:
     שאלת הנעראת אמרים מה תוחת
T:
     שאלת לערתא ואמריא מה תוחת
S:
     שאלת לערתא אמרייה מה תוחת

31: 19  LXX: καὶ ἐρώτησιν φθέγγοντα καὶ σφιχτόναν καὶ εἰπον 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
     שאלת אמרי
     et ei ...
dic
     ונעראת אמרי
In this he diverges from MT as well as from LXX.

2: 2  MT:
     ודרת הלך תמים ואמרתי ל诰ים
T:
     ודרת הלך תמים ואמרתי
S:
     ודרת הלך שמעתי דמיה יהוה
LXX: ἐμνημησθήνει ἐλέους νεοτητός σου καὶ ἀγάπης τελειώσεως σου
V: recordatus sum tuui miserans adolescentiam tuam et caritatem
     despersions tuae
The construct state which parallels אמרי ל诰ים is the object of the
clause governed by ודרת הלך. 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)?8 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 (δόξουσι καὶ ἐχοῦσι καὶ καταφεύγονται) for Heb.
     לאות תוחת. The first Gk verb is probably based on a reading שימר or the like. At any
     rate, V does not agree with LXX.
     Biblical Motifs (ed. A. Altmann; Cambridge 1966), 53. Another instance of divergent
     vocalization plus divergent word division may be discerned in 9:14 MT: ἀστράκρινον
     καὶ ἀστράκριναν. But V: quod didicerunt a patribus suis, which is evidently based on a reading
     שלום ממל אמן, (cp. Aboth iv, 1: שלום ממל אמן).
On the base of somewhat similar constructions in which either יָדַע appears as regens or מִכְרָא 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 דְּבָרְתִים, must be ruled out since it would be absolutely unsuited to the context, although in Jer. 3: 12 דְּבָרְתִים. V.- 'sanctus', is rendered by Jerome (iv 860): 'misericors ego sum'. The clue to the solution may be found in the rendition of the following clause:

31: 2 MT: על כל משכטניך ידַע T: על כל יָדַע חָסְקָה הַמְּחָטַן S: מִכְרָא נַחַל כֶּרֶם לָהּ V: ideo attraxi te miserans

Here too יָדַע becomes 'miserans'. Since the word in question is an adverbial acc. qualifying the verb מָכַר, 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. יָדַע qualifies the verb מָכַר: 'I remember lovingly thy youth...'.

49: 16 MT: סְפַּר הַשָּׁמַיִם אָתְךָ וַדְּוִי לָכֶנ T: סְפַּר הַשָּׁמַיִם אָתְךָ וַדְּוִי לָכֶנ S: עִתָּל אַטְמוּרִי וַרְבָּתוֹרִי לְדָבֶך V: arrogantia tua decept te et superbia cordis tua

The disjunctive accent indicates that המַלְתַן is to be understood as a syntactically detached invocation, whereas זָרִי לָבֶך 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. המַלְתַן and the masc. predicate אָתְךָ. Yet the VSS reject this interpretation. Ignoring the grammatical difficulty, they take המַלְתַן as the subject of the clause. In this respect, Jerome is in agreement with the other VSS (and mediaeval commentaries9), 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 — παυγνία T — סְפַּר הַשָּׁמַיִם S — עִנָּא; V — 'et superbia cordis tui' vs. G — ἵσταμα καρδίας σου κατέλυσε κτλ., T — ἵσταμα καρδίας σου κατέλυσε κτλ. (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 Qimhi: עַם אָתְךָ רַעָאתָ, אוֹר אִמְטָךְ שֹׁמַעְתָּ מַעֲשָׂלָתָה עַל שְׁכָנִיךָ...הִשָּׁאָה אֲתָךְ.
(and other VSS) from the conception implied by the Massoretic accents.

46: 17 MT: קראת שם פרעה מלך מצרים שיאן הנבך המודע
T: ומיינו להמן פרעה מלך מצרים דקנינויה גראנהויה המודע דוגמא
S: רקיית להמן פרעה מלך מצרים דקנינויה גראנהויה המודע דוגמא
26: 17 LXX: καλέσατε τὸ θνομα φαραώ νεκαϊ βασιλέως αἰγύπτου σαων
V: vocate nomen pharaonis regis aegypti
tumultum adduxit tempus

The variant reading יתכן 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 athnæta, though, has not been noted. Moreover, V differs from MT in disregarding the disjunctive accent on יתכן which was understood as a derogatory reference to Pharaoh, the King of Egypt (Cp. mediaeval commentaries). V combines יתכן 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 παρεγεντο

Theod.: ταραξουν ηγενεν ο καιρος,and especially with that of

Josephus: ταραξουν ηγενεν ο καιρος10 which apparently suited his reading of the Hebrew.

III. Vocalization

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

10 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: קוה דודב Ios: αρωμα καλαμου
V: et calamum suave olientem

49: 4 MT: תמהש ערבב 30: 4 Ios.: τρυφερωτατη V: (filia) delicata

49: 8 MT: דʼ עטצוק לשבת 29: 9 Ios.: καταδυσε εις χασματα
V: descendite in voraginem

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: וַיַּגַּשֶּׁהוּ פֶּרוֹם עֲצָבָה
V: et destruetur superbia imperii eius

Is. 37: 24 MT: מִדְּרֹם הָרָעָם ... מִדְּרֹם כַּפֶּרֶם
V: altitudinem montium... altitudinem summitatem eius

Ex. 15: 16 MT: נֲגָבָל וְרָעָם
V: in magnitudine brachii

but also —

Ez. 33: 28 MT: וַעֲשָׂרֵתּוֹ עֲצָבָה
V: et deficiet superba fortitudo eius

Is. 21: 15 MT: בֶּבְרֶד מַלְתוֹמֵת
V: gravi proelii

Na. 3: 3 MT: בֶּבְרֶד מַגָּר
V: et gravis ruinae

In the verse under discussion, Jerome used neither of the above manners of translation. Instead he rendered מִדְּרֹם — 'in excelsis'. This does not point to a variant קְוָרָם, but to a reading מִדְּרֹם taken as an adverbial acc. (*acc. loci*). This could be adduced as partial support for the suggested emended reading מִדְּרֹם (קְוָרָם) קְוָרָם (קְוָרָם) 11 (cp. S).

Ez. 51: 55 MT: בַּנָּיִם קֶדֶם
T: וַיֵּרָאֵם בַּנָּיִם קֶדֶם
S: דֶּרֶךְ קֶדֶם

28: 55 LXX: έδωκεν εἰς δόλεθρον ψωνῆν αὐτῆς
V: dedit sonitum vox eorum

Again V dissolves the gen. construction, reading שָׂאוֹן קִם, not שָׂאוֹן קִם, in distinction to:

Is. 17:12, 13 MT: שָׂאוֹן קִם
V: sonitus aquarum.

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

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

49: 2  MT: וַהֲקָה לֶחֶם שָׁמִית T: והקר לֶכֶם רִדִּי S: והקר לֶכֶם רִדִּי

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

V generally renders the noun ἔσονται — ‘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: וַלְמָר בַּר שָׁמִית V: in desertum solitudinis

Jo. 2: 3  MT: מָר בַּר שָׁמִית V: solitudo deserti.

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

Dt. 13: 17  MT: והָקָה לֶחֶם רִڅל V: et sit tumulus sempiternus

Jos. 8: 28  MT: וַיֵּשְׁמַע לֶחֶם שָׁמִית (וַיֵּשְׁמַע לֶחֶם שָׁמִית) 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 וי from read the latter as a verbal form שָׁמִית (or שָׁמִית). The fluctuations between שָׁמִית and שָׁמִית have been confirmed by the Qumran Scrolls.12

Jerome’s reading finds additional support in the VSS Aq. and Sym. who translate: וַיֵּשְׁמַע בַּר שָׁמִית.


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: וַיֵּקְחֶם הָרְשָׁע בָּל לֹא אָרֶץ V: et malum inopiae temperarent

47: 20  MT: וַיֵּקְחֶם הָרְשָׁע מְרָצֶם V: prae magnitudine famis

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


30: 2 LXX: καὶ ἔσουσαν εἰς ἁβατον καὶ εἰς ἀπώλειαν V: et erit in tumulum dissipata

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

Jer. 12: 10 MT: וַלְפַרְבָּר שְׁמַמְתָּךְ V: in desertum solituidinis

Jo. 2: 3 MT: מִרְבָּר שְׁמַמְתָּךְ V: solitudo deserti.

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


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 הָלָּךְ and read the latter as a verbal form שְׁמַמְתָּךְ (or שְׁמַמְתָּה). The fluctuations between שְׁמַמְתָּךְ and שְׁמַמְתָּה have been confirmed by the Qumran Scrolls.12 Jerome’s reading finds additional support in the VSS Aqu. and Sym. who translate: καὶ εσται χωμα ηπανασανη.

52: 6 MT: נַחֲלֵךְ הָרְעָב בְּעֵר T: נַחֲלֵךְ הָרְעָב בְּכֵרְתָּךְ S: נַחֲלֵךְ הָרְעָב בְּכֵרְתָּךְ LXX: καὶ ἐστερεαθή οἱ λιμὸς ἐν τῇ πόλει V: et obtinuit famem 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: יִכְוָק הָרְעָב בְּכֵל אַנְדָּךְ V: et malum inopiae temperament

47: 20 MT: יִכְוָק עַלְיָם וְרֹעֶב V: praee magnitude famis

---

Further:

Gn. 43: 1 MT: הרשע נבך בראות
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: ירחוק נבך יער
V: praevaluitique fames in civitate

Here we have an adequate translation, the Heb. verb being rendered by an intransitive Latin verb, and — ‘in civitate’. It follows that the rendition in Jer. attempts to be literal, but is based upon a slightly divergent vocalization: ‘obtinuere’ stands for a transitive ..ב (cp. Jer. 8: 2 where the hiph’il of ייחנן הרעש בער becomes ‘obtinuit’) pointing to a reading: 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.13

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: ר novità אא שברת טמא ..ות salopeים על חריתך
T: ר novità גלגלת טמא ..ות살TemplateName לארעה
S: ר novità שערתא טמא ..ות salopeים גאון לארעה

37: 3 LXX: και ἀποστρέφω τὴν ἀποκτείνει λαοῦ μου...
kαι ἀποστρέφω αὐτοῦς εἰς τὴν γῆν
Aq.: επιστρέφω τὴν ἀποστροφήν ἐν καθισσία
V: et convertam conversionem populi me...
convertam 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 שחר and שער, caused many a confusion in the textual traditions of the Bible, as e.g. in Jer. 42: 12 MT: ושתיבי אבך V: ‘et habitate vos faciam’.14 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 בקחידו (cp. Kedar, op. cit. Textus IV, p. 207) since only an ignoramus would use this form instead of the correct בכחו. The fact remains that V exhibits a conflated translation: one portion (‘capta praedia’) points to a derivative of פְּלִיך, the other (‘dividunt spolia’) testifies to the root פָּלָך. The most likely explanation seems to be a metathesis: בכחו became בקחידו 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 בקחידו, as well as בקחידו, was considered as carrying on the person of יִהְיֶה in the same verse. But V: habitate... faciam, against MT: בקחידו, LXX: ἀποστρέφω. — Zah 10: 6 V: et convertam eos, against MT: בקחידו, LXX: και κατοικῶν αὐτοῦς.
This can be proved by the overwhelming consistency in rendering the stem בוש ה by ‘reducere, convertere’ etc. and the stem בוש by ‘sedere’, ‘habitare’ and the like, as e.g. in:

32: 37 MT: וּתְפָלֶהוּ... וּהָשָׁבֵיהוּ
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. 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 כַּלְכָּל הָדוֹמָה
T: דַּלָּא כַּלְכָּל לָקֵוצָה מְרָא
S: דַּלָּא מִשְׁוֹאֵת לָקֵוצָה בָּאָר מְרָא
LXX: οὐ δινήσονται ὅσορ συνέχειν
V: quae continere non valent aquas

V offers a double translation: ‘continere’ (= כַּלְכָּל) and ‘valent’ (= כַּלְכָּל). 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 כַּלְכָּל.

48: 27 MT: כִּי מָלֵדָה בְּיָדוֹ
T: עַל דַּאָשָׁנִי עָלִיָּיוֹן מַטְמוֹמָה בַּבוֹן מַטְמוֹמָלִי
S: כִּי נַעֲמָה רְחֵם וּרְכֵה
LXX: ὅτι ἔπολεμεις αὐτὸν
Sym.: ὅτι αὐτὸ οὐ εὐαλλησας ἐπ αὐτῷ
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 כַּלְכָּל — ‘verba tua’, and כַּלְכָּל — ‘locutus es’ (cp. Sym.).


16 Cp. S. Mandelkern, V.T. Concordantiae (6th ed. Tel Aviv 1964), p. 285: יָרָבָּר דְּבִרִּי וְיִקְרָא דָבְּרָה, וּסְלֹשְׁתֵּים יִרְיָא בְּשָׁלְטָה. Note the somewhat similar double rendering:
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
his desire for stylistic smoothness that force him to introduce a grammatical change. 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: 

shed...  
habentes oculos non videtis  
et aures et non auditis  
me ergo non timebitis...  
non dolebitis  


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  
idcirco perierunt  


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:  

T:  

S:  

dnogoru.  

29: 21  
LXX:  

V:  
si non deiecerint eos parvuli gregis  
nisi dissipaverint cum eis habitaculum eorum  

50: 45  
MT:  

T, S: as above  

27: 45  
LXX:  

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: 3rd pers. sing. regarded as indicating an indefinite subject is rendered by the Latin passive form ‘dissipatum’, the subject being supplied by the object

of the Heb. clause. (Cp. Gn. 11: 9 MT: ... V: et idcirco vocatum est nomen eius; and freq.) It is equally possible that Jerome ascribed to יסח the meaning of in ‘inwardly transitive’ hiph’īl (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’ (דיייר רnetinet) as subject of ‘dissipaverint’ which thus parallels ‘deiecerint’, the rendition of the Heb. pl. form סומרים, it stands to reason that he read also the second Hebrew verb in the plural: יסח.

30: 11 MT: רִסְתְּרִי רַפַּעַת לְמַשָּׁפֶּשׁ (רָעָ֑י לֹא אֲשֵׁרֵ֖י) T: רִשְׁתְּרִי אֲשֵׁרֵ֖י S: רָעָ֑י לֹא אָסְכֵּֽךְ

37: 11 Theod.: καὶ ἀθοον οὐκ ἀθοομον 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 בֵּיאֲקַר should be changed, coming as it does after the 1st pers. of בֵּיאֲקַר. 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: רִיסְתְּרִי רַפַּעַת לְמַשָּׁפֶּשׁ (רָעָ֑י לֹא אֲשֵׁרֵ֖י) T, S: as above

26: 28 LXX: καὶ ἀθοφῶν οὐκ ἀθοφῶσο 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
et tu quasi innocens relinqueris

(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: נָכָה אֲלֵּךְ אל שָׁכַר בָּעַרְתָּךְ וְתָמְרִיתָךְ מַטְעָרָה.

Here we should note that the two readings נָכָה אֲלֵּךְ and נָכָה אֲלֵּךְ do not really differ 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: רִכְיֵל שֵׁבֶרְךָ עֲלֵךְ תָּמְרִיתָךְ מַטְעָרָה

T: אַטְיֵרָה מֶשֶׁל יֵשֵׁבָתָה גַּרְפָּה שָׁמָמְיָה מֶרְאָה יִשָּׁרְיַךְ וְשֵׁרָיָה

S: מַשְׁלִיךְ דְּנָמָא עִלְּמָא נַבְרַיְתָא נַזֵּרָה יִשָּׁרְיַךְ וְשֵׁרָיָה

LXX: δότι ἀν' ἀιόνος συνετριπτάς τόν ζυγόν σου διεσπάσας τοὺς δεσμοὺς σου

V: a saeculo conregistisi iugum meum

rupistivincula mea

The lemma to Jerome’s commentary has (iv, 849): “conregisti iugum meum, sive tuum; rupisti vincula mea, sive tuum”. 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 אֲבָרֵיכַ חִפְשֵׁת את הֵחָלֵת נָכָה תְרוּ הָה יְהלָלָה... וַתְּשַׁלֵּם

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: עליל.

There are further complications in this verse. Firstly: שֵׁבֶרְךָ... נָכָה. 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: τόν ζυγόν σου against V: iugum meum. The VSS of Aquila and Theodotio read the 1st pers. sing.19 “I have broken... I have

19 Aq., Theod.: διεσπάσας. 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 אֲנָבַר (anover), while the Qere demands אֲנָבַרְו (anovero). 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: אֵשֶׁר עֶלֶּה ... וֹמֶסְרִיתָךְ אֲנָחָה
T: אֵשֶׁר נָר (כְּשֶׁדֶא מְנָאַהְרִיךְ) וֹתִינְקִילוֹ אֶפֶסָק
S: אֵשֶׁר נָרָה (מְנָאַהְרִיךְ) וֹתִינְקִילוֹ אֶפֶסָק
37: 8 LXX: συντρίψω ξυγόν ...καὶ τοὺς δεσμοὺς αὐτὸν 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 ‘colo tuo... et non dominabantur 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 מִשָּׁרָה ... וֹמֶסְרִיתָךְ
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 disrumpam: 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: עלל... מִשָּׁרָה.

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: וּמִּן V: fluctus eius, exhibits an

§44h, note 1. Unvocalized Aramaic exhibits a similar ambiguity: ובחרת, 1st pers. s.; 2nd pers. s. 3rd s.f.
explanatory use of a Lt pronoun; 50: 36 MT: בְּדִיוֹנִס אֶלְוָא מַעֲרָדָה V: ‘divinos eius’, belongs to those quite frequent cases where the Heb article is rendered by a Lt pronoun. However, in some instances the alteration in V can best be explained through a divergent Heb Vorlage.

2: 35 MT: התאמרו כי织תי (אָךְ שאָמֶר מַנְנִי)
T: בְּדִיוֹנִס אֶלְוָא מַעֲרָדָה
S: מִשָּׁל חַמָּה אַחֲמֶק רַגְלָהּ מֵנוּ
LXX: ἀλλὰ ἀποστραφήσω δ 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:

יְהוֹעֵה יַעֲשֶׂהוּ...ןַעֲשֶׂהוּ לֹא אֲפֶרֶךְ מָכָא. חַמָּה בֵּשֵׁם אָוָהֲק
46: 27 MT: יְהוֹעֵה יַעֲשֶׂהוּ שְׁכִיָּר מַעֲרָדָה סְכִיָּר
T: רַי בֵּן מַעֲרָדָה נֵרָדוֹתָה
S: לָלוֹדֲךָ נַמְא אַהֲרַנִי נֵרָדוֹתָה
LXX: καὶ τὸ σπέρμα σου ἐκ τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας αυτῶν
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: יְהוֹעֵה יַעֲשֶׂהוּ שְׁכִיָּר
T: רַי בֵּן מַעֲרָדָה נֵרָדוֹתָה
S: as above
LXX: καὶ τὸ σπέρμα σου ἐκ τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας 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 ב for a final מ. 22 יְהוֹעֵה יַעֲשֶׂהוּ שְׁכִיָּר מַעֲרָדָה מַעֲרָדָה מַעֲרָדָה
50: 2 MT: נְבִיּוֹשׁ עֹבֵדָה וַתָּהוֹלֵא לְאָלָלִיהָ

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: אֲלַלָךְ בֵּית אֲלַלָךְ מִקְרָו לָעֲלָךְ נֶשׁ שֵׁם לֹא מִקְרָו לָעֲלָךְ. V: dux virginitatis meae tu es, nunquid irasceris in perpetuum aut perseverabitis in finem. (Also Aq., Sym.: μὴ ποιεῖται).
22 30: 10 T: also testifies to textual flexibility as regards the pronominal suffix.
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: נbero... נבורה. 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 נבורה (more than a dozen times in the book of Ezechiel; נבורה occurs only in the present verse).

The usual translation of רעימ (= ‘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 רעימ 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. Therefore it is not unreasonable to assume that V, as other VSS, was acquainted with a divergent Heb text which exchanged נ for נ: רעימ.

No reason can be seen for the change of the imperative of the parallel to and רוקמ (‘congregamini et venite’) into the cohortative ‘consurgamus’.


24 For the conversion of רועész (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: קומד וגו
V: consurgite et ascendamus

against

49: 28, 31 MT: וגו
V: surgite et ascendite

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

Ob 1 MT: קומד וגו

T: קומד וגו

S: קומד וגו

LXX: ἀνάστησε καὶ διεξαναστήσουμεν ἐπ’ αὐτὴν 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:

**Jer**

| missus est | Ob |
|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: וגו (cp. S).

38: 23 MT: כרי ידים בטוחש ואת תقيام وتאות לכלות
T: כרי ידים בטוחש ואת תقيامяет
S: כרי ידים בטוחש ואת תقيامяет

45: 23 LXX: δὴ ἐν χειρὶ βασιλέως βαβυλώνος συλλημφθῆσαι καὶ ἡ πόλις αὕτη κατακαυθῆσεται
V: sed in manu regis babylonis capieris

et civitatem hanc comburet igni

LXX rests on the reading of a Heb passive form: יַחֲרָק. This reading is contradicted by our present day Heb text which does not permit us to regard יַחֲרָק 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:
LXX would thus be based upon a*, MT — on a compromise conflated reading of a* and b*, while V would rest on b*. 25

It is a rather common phenomenon that a Heb sing. is rendered by a Lt plur., and vice verse. This rendering apparently occurs frequently for reasons that have no bearing on textual criticism, e.g. — 50: 20 MT: peccatum, the sing. is probably due to the stylistic desire to produce an exact parallel to וַעֲשָׂה (sing.) in the first stichos of the verse; 51: 51 MT: sanctificationem, the Lt sing. was caused by the conception of the one, sole Temple in Jerusalem; 1: 18 MT: wall: 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: קֶקֶת יִרְדָּם וְרָכָבִים
T: וְיִרְדָּם וְרָכָבִים
S: וְיִרְדָּם וְרָכָבִים
LXX: σελήνην καὶ ἄστερας
Aq.: aeresion σελήνης καὶ αστρῶν
V: ordinem lunae et stellarum 26

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: קִחְתָּת שִׂמְמָה וַאֲרוֹן
T: נוּרֵת שִׂמְמָה וַאֲרוֹן
S: נוּרֵת שִׂמְמָה וַאֲרוֹן
LXX: leges caelo et terrae

40: 25 Theod.: ακρ. oup. καὶ γῆς

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: —קֶקֶת (cp. VSS).

51: 18 MT: הַבָּלָה מִמֶּשֶׁת חָתִים
T: לָמָּה אֲדוֹנִי חָתִים
S: לָמָּה אֲדוֹנִי חָתִים

28: 18 LXX: μάταια ἐστίν ἔργα μεμωκημένα

25 Cp. 5: 14 MT: תְּראֵם...עָבְזָה
LXX: πυρ...ξυλά (רָעָם...עַבְרָם)
V: in ignem...in ligna

26 The semantic similarity between ‘ordo’ (V) and ἐργα (S) is noteworthy. Cp. Is 5: 17 MT: וְכִלָּרָם, 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 Masoretic accents. But there seems to be more to it: 'vana sunt' as rendition of הנב (וַאֲנָה, חֲבָל) 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: הנב (וַאֲנָה, חֲבָל) מַעֲשָׂהּ תִּדְבַּרְיָהּ

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 מַעֲשָׂהּ תִּדְבַּרְיָהּ 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 הנב (וַאֲנָה, חֲבָל) מַעֲשָׂהּ 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: הנב (וַאֲנָה, חֲבָל) מַעֲשָׂהּ תִּדְבַּרְיָהּ

T: האלה מַעֲשָׂהּ מַצָּהָ שְׁדִּי

S: האלה מַעֲשָׂהּ מִמְצָה הָדְרוֹיָה

34: 13 LXX: ἱδοὺ σκέφτηκεν ὅτι κύριον

V: ecce vasa domini

In addition to the wording 'הָדְרוֹיָה מַעֲשָׂהּ תִּדְבַּרְיָהּ' given above and elsewhere (28: 3, 6; 2 Ch 36: 7; Ez 1: 7), the Hebrew Bible makes use of the contracted expression מַעֲשָׂהּ תִּדְבַּרְיָהּ (Is 52: 11) and the expanded phrase 'הָדְרוֹיָה מַעֲשָׂהּ תִּדְבַּרְיָהּ' (1 Ch 28: 13). Some textual fluctuation between 'הָדְרוֹיָה מַעֲשָׂהּ תִּדְבַּרְיָהּ' and 'הָדְרוֹיָה מַעֲשָׂהּ תִּדְבַּרְיָהּ' 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. כל הבית יד is noticeable. It gives us the impression of being based upon a Hebrew MS that read: כל הבית יד.

51: 58  MT:
ורוצו שמי מביר לאברים יבר אשם ייעמה
T: והتدخل סמיא מבבר לירוטו עלברות השם אשם יששתולים
S: הנלאים שמים סהקלאיהם ומיחוד מבבר נטעים
LXX: καὶ οὗ κοπίσασοι λαοὶ εἰς καινὸν καὶ ήθον ἐν ὕργῳ ἐκλειποῦσιν
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 ריבך 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:
וריבך אברים יבר לאברים יבר ייעמה
V: laborabunt enim populi etc.

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

...כי תMatchers עמיים

31: 5  MT:
נשות נמסים חקלות
T: נבות שלח باسم יוהלי
S: זבח נגבת רשקות
LXX: φυτεῦσατε καὶ οἰνόσατε
V: plantabunt plantantes et donec tempus veniat non vindemiambant

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: כלת נמסים רצע אני חקלו כלת. Its scribe may have been influenced by the deuteronomic curse on disobedience (Dt 28: 30):

כרם חקלו ולא חקלו. 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: יינת, a scribal error due to the similarity between י and א.
with which he had become acquainted in the meantime and which approaches MT (iv, 1059): “plantate plantaria et vindemiate”. This reflects a Hebrew reading: וְקָנֹֽהָ֑ו בְּעֵרְשֵׁ֖י חָלָֽלָ֑ל (cp. LXX). 28
37: 9 MT: וְקָנֹֽהָ֑ו בְּעֵרְשֵׁ֖י חָלָֽלָ֑ל
T: אֲסַפְּרוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ מַעֲנֶֽהָ יִֽרְאֶ֖הוּ
S: דִּאֶֽוְלָ֑לָּו מַעֲנֶֽהָ יִֽרְאֶ֖הוּ
LXX: άποστρέφοντες άπελεύσονται άφ’ ήμῶν
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: וְקָנֹֽהָ֑ו בְּעֵרְשֵׁ֖י חָלָֽלָ֑ל. However it is not too bold to conjecture that Jerome’s Hebrew text read: חָלָֽלָל וְקָנֹֽהָ֑ו בְּעֵרְשֵׁ֖י חָלָֽלָ֑ל (cf. V.4 same chapter, 21: 2, 34: 21 and freq.). The graphic similarity between בְּעֵרְשֵׁי and וְקָנֹֽהָ֑ו may explain the scribal slip.
29: 14 MT: וְחַשְׂבָּֽנָ֑י אֲדֹנֵ֖י הַמַּקְוָֽא אֲדֹנֵ֖י הַמַּקְוָֽא מַעֲשֶֽׂה יְהֹוָֽה
T: וַתַּחְפֹּֽנָ֑נָֽי אֲדֹנֵ֖י הַמַּקְוָֽא אֲדֹנֵ֖י הַמַּקְוָֽא מַעֲשֶֽׂה יְהֹוָֽה
S: וַתַּחְפֹּֽנָ֑נָֽי אֲדֹנֵ֖י הַמַּקְוָֽא אֲדֹנֵ֖י הַמַּקְוָֽא מַעֲשֶֽׂה יְהֹוָֽה
Theod.: καὶ εὐπορεύσω υμᾶς εἰς τὸν τόπον οὗθεν ἀποκίσας υμᾶς εἶκεθεν (ἐκεῖ)
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: וַתַּחְפֹּֽנָ֑נָֽי אֲדֹנֵ֖י הַמַּקְוָֽא אֲדֹנֵ֖י הַמַּקְוָֽא מַעֲשֶֽׂה יְהֹוָֽה. (Cf. Zeh 2: 2 הַמַּקְוָֽא אֲדֹנֵ֖י הַמַּקְוָֽא מַעֲשֶֽׂה יְהֹוָֽה. Note also the fluctuation in the Greek version: εἰκεθεν versus εἰκεῖ). 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 בְּעֵרְשֵׁי חָלָֽלָ֑ל (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: מַעֲשֶֽׂה יְהֹוָֽה מַעֲשֶֽׂה יְהֹוָֽה
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 מַעֲשֶֽׂה יְהֹוָֽה from Aramaic נַעֲשָֽה, ‘to plant’. (Cp. Levit. Rabba s. 25 נַעֲשָֽה, ‘to plant trees’).
cunctis locis ad quae expulerit eos, et captivitate laxata, pristinum statum et patriam recipere.”

40: 5    MT:      ותורם לא ישוב משנה אָל גְדוֹלִית
            T:      ואחד ליה אָל לָמוּרָה והנה לָהוּ גְדוֹלִית
            S:      ואמור לָהּ כָּא מְאָשׁ אַנְאָה תָּבוּ לָהוּ גְדוֹלִית

47: 5    LXX: eι δὲ μὴ ἀναπτρέχει καὶ ἀναστρέφων προς γ.  
         Sym.: καὶ πρὶν ἡ απαλάγα ἐγὼ αναστρέψει οἰκήσον παρὰ γ.  
         V:    et necum 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 שָׁנְבַּר 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? It seems easiest to assume a Hebrew text which caused him to translate the way he did. Instead of שָׁנְבַּר he probably read מַשְׁבַּר (cf. T). The Lt ‘mecum’ is perhaps based upon Hebrew הב יָנָא; this then forced the crucial change from ‘returning (to Jerusalem)’ into ‘going (to Babylon)’. The following word רָשָׁב was not taken as a derivative of הב but of שָׁנְבַּר (cf. Symmachus’ dual rendering). Thus we are inclined to restore a Hebrew text: ...כָּא מְאָשׁ אַנְאָה