

CHAPTER TWENTY-TWO

EXEGETICAL NOTES ON THE HEBREW VORLAGE OF THE SEPTUAGINT OF JEREMIAH 27 (34)

Every book of the LXX contains data that is important for the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible. A few books also contain information that is of significance for the literary criticism of these books and, in a way, of the whole Bible. The book that contains the most extensive information of this kind is probably the LXX of Jeremiah.¹

The LXX of Jeremiah probably reflects an early edition of the Hebrew book, to be called ed. I, differing recensionally from the later edition of MT, to be called ed. II.² This hypothesis is based on the fact that the LXX is shorter than MT by one seventh and that it reflects a different text arrangement. Both issues have been the subject of much scholarly debate, and, as in similar cases, scholars have questioned whether the short text of the LXX stems from a deliberate shortening by the translator(s)³ or whether it is simply derived from a shorter Hebrew text. Scholars who have accepted the former possibility⁴ ascribed to the translator a free approach, assuming that he shortened his *Vorlage* drastically. Such an approach derived not only from a certain understanding of the techniques used by the LXX translators but also from the fact that these scholars did not know of Hebrew scrolls, such as the Qumran scrolls, which differ significantly from MT. On the other hand, scholars who accepted the latter opinion⁵ assumed that the

¹ See Tov, "Jeremiah" and *TCHB*, chapter 7.

² Thus "Tov, "L'incidence." In the meantime many studies have been devoted to this topic, expressing a view *pro* or *contra*. See Dogniez, *Bibliography* and my summarizing article "The Characterization of the Additional Layer of the MT in Jeremiah," in: *Erlsr* 26 (forthcoming).

³ The problem as to whether Jeremiah was rendered by one translator, two translators, or a translator and a reviser (thus Tov, *Jeremiah and Baruch*) probably does not affect the issues discussed here.

⁴ Especially M.G.L. Spohn, *Jeremias Vates*, etc. (Lipsiae 1824) 1-24; K.H. Graf, *Der Prophet Jeremia* (Leipzig 1862) xl-lvii.

⁵ See especially F.C. Movers, *De utriusque recensionis vaticiniorum Jeremie ... indole et origine commentatio critica* (Hamburg 1837); A. Scholz, *Der Masorethische Text und die LXX-*

Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX was much shorter than MT, lacking many words and phrases, and also whole sentences and even passages which are found only in MT. These scholars thus expressed confidence in the translator's conservative approach to the Hebrew text, although this aspect has not been stressed to any extent. Typical proponents of a short Hebrew *Vorlage* are Janzen, *Jeremiah*, Tov, "L'incidence" and "Jeremiah,"* and Bogaert, "De Baruch à Jérémie." The arguments which support the assumption that a short Hebrew text lies behind the LXX may be summarized as follows:

(1) Short versus long texts are found elsewhere in the LXX, especially Ezekiel, 1 Samuel 17–18, and Joshua 6, 12, and 20 (see Tov, "Ezekiel"*, "Samuel"*, "Joshua"**). The clue to an understanding of these units lies in a correct understanding of their translational character. If a certain unit was rendered in a free fashion, translational omissions and additions may be expected. On the other hand, if a unit was rendered faithfully, such omissions and additions are not to be expected. Consequently, if a faithfully rendered translation unit is nevertheless shorter than MT, its *Vorlage* was probably also shorter. The latter situation seems to apply to Jeremiah. With the exception of passages in which the translator encountered linguistic difficulties (for some examples, see TCU, 162–171), Jeremiah was rendered rather faithfully,⁶ and the prose sections of the translation may be regarded as literal. We should thus not expect that this translator shortened his *Vorlage* substantially. On the other hand, since the book of Job was rendered in an extremely free fashion, its short Greek text must be approached differently.⁷

(2) The nature of most of the elements lacking in the LXX (the 'minuses'⁸) is such that they can easily be explained as additions in ed. II (see a tentative classification of these elements in Tov, "Jeremiah"**).

(3) The additional elements (pluses) found in ed. II often do not suit their context. This point may be recognized from an analysis of both content and syntax—see Tov, "Jeremiah,"* section b i.

(4) The name of the king of Babylon is spelled in the MT of chapters 27–29 in its later spelling *Nebuchadnezzar*, while in the remainder of the

Übersetzung des Buches Jeremias (Regensburg 1875); A.W. Streane, *The Double Text of Jeremiah* (Cambridge 1896).

⁶ For a short description of the translation technique of the LXX of Jeremiah, see A. Scholz *Der Masorethische Text* (see n. 5); F. Giesebrecht, *Das Buch Jeremia* (HAT, 1894) xix–xxxiv.

⁷ See Gerleman, *Job*; D.H. Gard, *The Exegetical Method of the Greek Translator of the Book of Job* (JBL Monograph Series 8; Philadelphia 1952).

⁸ This neutral term denotes both elements actually omitted and elements which were absent from the translator's *Vorlage*.

book it occurs in its original form *Nebuchadrezzar*.⁹ Since the name *Nebuchadnezzar* is lacking in all its occurrences in chapters 27–29 in the LXX, these may be recognized as a second layer in MT.

(5) The fragments of 4QJer^{b,d} are very similar to the underlying text of the LXX, both in the length and in the differing arrangement of the text (for details see *DJD XV*).

(6) In several instances in which the text of Jeremiah runs parallel with that of Kings (mainly Jeremiah 52 // 2 Kings 24–25), the short text of the LXX of Jeremiah is also found in 2 Kings (both in MT and in the LXX); see Tov, “L’incidence,” 282.

The minuses characterize the LXX of this book as a whole and this phenomenon is taken into consideration in the evaluation of individual instances. At the same time, the translators did omit several small Hebrew elements such as particles, intermissions, conjunctions, and pronouns in accordance with their feeling for style. For example, see the discussion below of לְ (v. 2) and of וְשָׁהָה אֲנָכִי (v. 6). Further, the possibility of erroneous omissions by the translator or subsequent generations is not disregarded (for an example see the discussion of vv. 13–14).

The present study is based upon the assumption that the short LXX text of Jeremiah reflects a short Hebrew text. This hypothesis is not proved here, but it is illustrated in chapter 27 (chapter 34 of the LXX). In this chapter MT contains a relatively large number of pluses over against the LXX.

This study presents a reconstruction of the Hebrew *Vorlage* of chapter 27, annotated with notes relating to the character and origin of the additions of ed. II.¹⁰

1. *The reconstruction*

The reconstruction of the Hebrew *Vorlage* of Jeremiah 27 is as problematic as any other reconstruction (for the problems, see *TCU*, chapter III), but it enables a reasonable presentation of the quanti-tative differences between the two editions of Jeremiah. The reconstruction records quantitative differences as well as qualitative differences

⁹ Also in other details chapters 27–29 stand out from the remainder of the book, especially with regard to their orthography (see W. Rudolph, *Jeremia* [3d ed.; HAT, 1968], ad loc.).

¹⁰ For discussions of chapter 27, also of its Greek text, see E.W. Nicholson, *Preaching to the Exiles* (Oxford 1970) 94–96; W. Thiel, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 26–45* (WMANT 52; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1981).

(different words, etc.), if only because sometimes the two types cannot be separated.¹¹

2. Chapter 27 according to the LXX (ed. I) and MT (ed. II)

The reconstructed *Vorlage* of the LXX¹² of Jeremiah 27 (34) is presented on the first lines, and the expanded edition of MT on the second lines (in italics). The text of the LXX is based on Ziegler, *Ieremias*. The text of MT is not reproduced in full, the printed words being limited to those instances in which they differ from the LXX. These are mainly additions of ed. II.

The notes accompanying the reconstruction refer to the character and origin of the additions of ed. II and they raise questions with regard to the correctness of the reconstruction, in particular on the basis of an analysis of the translator's techniques.¹³ The notes are written in the form of a textual-exegetical commentary on Jeremiah, contributing also to the literary criticism of that book.¹⁴

LXX	1
MT	1
בראשית ממלכת יהויקם בן יאושיהו מלך יהודה היה דבר זה אל	ב
2 כה אמר ה' עשה (?) מוסרות ומטעות ונחתם	ב
ירמיה מאה ה' לאמר 2 כה אמר ה' אליו עשה לך מוסרות ומטעות ונחתם	ב
על צוארך 3 ושלחיהם אל מלך אדום ואל מלך מואב ואל מלך בני עמו "אל	ב
על צוארך 3 ושלחיהם אל מלך אדום ואל מלך מואב ואל מלך בני עמו "אל	ב
מלך צר ואל מלך צידון ביד מלאכים הבאים ל夸ראם ירושלם אל צדקיהו	ב
צער ואל מלך צידון ביד מלאכים הבאים ירושלם אל צדקיהו	ב
מלך	ב

¹² The orthography of the reconstruction follows MT as much as possible.

¹³ The textual-critical value of many small details in grammatical categories cannot be evaluated: disharmony/harmony in the use of pronouns, nouns, verbal forms, as well as number; see *TCU*, 154–162.

¹⁴ According to the accepted view, the book of Jeremiah is composed of three layers, sometimes described as sources: A (authentic sayings of the prophet), B (a biographical account) and C (a deuteronomistic layer). It is relevant to note that several elements of the C stratum were found to be lacking in ed. I (see Tov, "L'incidence"). Below such elements of the C stratum which are absent in ed. I. are occasionally referred to. For this purpose we use the list of characteristic expression of the C stratum which was compiled by J. Bright, *JBL* 70 (1951) 30-35. A reference such as "Bright, 14" refers to item 14 of his list.

מלך יהודה 4 וצוויתם אל אדניהם לאמר כה אמר ה' אלהי ישראל מלך יהודה 4 וצוויתם אל אדניהם לאמר כה אמר ה' צבאות אלהי ישראל

כה תאמרו אל אדניכם 5 אגוי עשיתי את הארץ כה תאמרו אל אדניכם 5 אגוי עשיתי את הארץ את האדם ואת הבהמה אשר

בכחיו הנדול ובזרועיו הגנוטיה ונתתיה לאשר ישר בעני 6 על פני הארץ בכחיו הנדול ובזרועיו הגנוטיה ונתתיה לאשר ישר בעני 6 ועתה

(?) נתתי את הארץ ביד נבוכדנאצר מלך בבל אגוי נתתי את כל הארץות האלה ביד נבוכדנאצר מלך בבל

לעבדו ונם את חיה השדה לעבדו 7 שעבדי ונם את חיה השדה נתתי לו לעבדו 7 ועבדו אותו כל הגנים ואות

בנו ובן עד בא עת ארצנו נם הוא ועבדו בו גנים רבים ומלאים

8 ו' הגנו והמלוכה אשר 8 והיה הגנו והמלוכה אשר לא יעמדו אותו את נבוכדנאצר מלך בבל ואת נדולים

לא יתן את צוארו בעל מלך בבל בחרב וברעב אפקד עליהם לא יתן את צוארו בעל מלך בבל בחרב וברעב וכדבר אפקד על הגנו ההוא אשר

נאם ה' עד תמי אתם בידנו 9 ואתם אל המשמעו אל נבייכם ואל נאם ה' עד חמוי אתם בידנו 9 ואתם אל המשמעו אל נבייכם ואל

קסמיכם ואל חלמיכם ואל ענייכם ואל כשפיכם אשר הם אמרו קסמיכם ואל חלמיכם ואל ענייכם ואל כשפיכם אשר הם אמרו אליכם

לא העבדו את מלך בבל 10 כי שקר הם נבאים לכם למען הרחיק אתכם לא העבדו את מלך בבל 10 כי שקר הם נבאים לכם למען הרחיק אתכם לא אמר

מעל אדמתכם 11 והגנו אשר יביא את צוארו בעל מעל אדמתכם והדוחקי אתכם ואבדתם 11 והגנו אשר יביא את צוארו בעל

מלך בבל ועבדו והנהתו על אדמתו ועבדה ויישב בה 12 ואל

מלך בבל ועבדו והנתתי על אדמתו נאם ה' ועבדה וישב בה 12 ואל

**צדקה מלך יהודה דברתי ככל הדברים האלה לאמר הביאו את צוארכם
צדקה מלך יהודה דברתי ככל הדברים האלה לאמר הביאו את צוארכם**

**13 ועבדו
בעל מלך בבל ועבדו אותו ועמו וחו 13 למה תמושתו אתה ועמך בחרב**

ברעב ובבדר כאשר דבר ה' אל הנני אשר לא יעבד את מלך בבל 14

**את מלך בבל
ואל השמשו אל דברי הנביאים האמורים אליכם לאמר לא תעבדו את מלך בבל**

**כי שקר הם ונאים לכם 15 כי לא שלחחים נאם ה' והם נביםם בשם לשר
כי שקר הם ונאים לכם 15 כי לא שלחחים נאם ה' והם נביםם בשם לשר**

**למען הדיחי אחכם ואבדתם אתם והנביאים הנביאים לכם (ל) שקר שקר לכם
למען הדיחי אחכם ואבדתם אתם והנביאים הנביאים לכם**

**16 ואל כל העם הזה ואל הכהנים דברתי לאמר כה אמר ה' אל השמשו אל
16 ואל הכהנים ואל כל העם הזה דברתי לאמר כה אמר ה' אל השמשו אל**

**דברי נבייכם הנביאים לכם לאמר הנה כל' בית ה' מושבים מבבלה
דברי נבייכם הנביאים לכם לאמר הנה כל' בית ה' מושבים מבבלה עתה**

**כי שקר מהה נהם ונאים לכם 17
מהרה כי שקר מהה נהם ונאים לכם 17 אל השמשו אליהם עבדו את מלך בבל**

**לא שלחחים 18 ואם נביםם הם ואם יש
וחיו למה תהיה דשיך חוות הרבה 18 ואם נביםם הם ואם יש**

**דבר ה' אתם יפנו נא כי
דבר ה' אתם יפנו נא בה צבאות לבלתי בא חכמים הנוהרים בכית ה'**

**19 כי כה אמר ה'
ובית מלך יהודה ובירושלם בבלה 19 כי כה אמר ה' צבאות אל העמדים**

אשר לא על (?) יותר הכללים ועל חיים ושל המכוניות ועל יותר הכללים הנדרירים בשיר הזהא 20

לקחם מלך נבוכדנאצר מלך בבל במלתו את יכוניה בן יהויקים מלך יהודה

ירושלים מירושלם בכליה ואת כל חרי יהודה וירושלים כי כה אמר ה' צבאות

אליהו ישראלי על הפליג הנוראים בית ה' ובית מלך יהודה וירושלים

בבליה יוכאו נאם ה' ובליה יוכאו ושםה יהו עד יומ פקדין אתם נאם ה' והעליתום והשכיתום

אל חמקום זהה

1. I The original heading of this chapter may have mentioned Zedekiah instead of Jehoiakim (Zedekiah of S represents an ancient correction), so that the original title has either been corrupted or lost. See further H. Schmidt, "Das Datum der Ereignisse von Jer 27 und 28," *ZAW* 39 (1931) 138-144, who claimed that the original text of 27:1 mentioned the seventh year of Zedekiah. However, probably at one time this chapter, like several other ones, had no heading (see the complete or partial lack of a title in ed. I in chapters 2, 7, 16, 25, 47, and 50), and the present heading was added in ed. II. The episode described in this chapter took place during Zedekiah's reign (see vv. 3 and 12) and v. 1 erroneously repeats the heading of the preceding chap. (26:1). **בשנה הַזֶּה** in 28:1 (lacking in ed. I) probably presupposes 27:1 in ed. II. For a more detailed discussion of the historical background of chapters 27-28, see A. Malamat, *VTSup* 28 (1975) 135, and the literature quoted there.

2. **אָלֶה**] This word was added in ed. II to the phrase ‘thus said the Lord’ also in 13:1, 17:19, and 25:15 (as well as in ed. I in 19:1). Similar additions are found in the *Qerê* text of Ruth 3:5, 17. Possibly the pronoun was added to stress the dramatic character of the action described here (cf. the use of the same formula in Isa 8:1, 5, 11 and Jer 18:5; 24:4).

לְ A literal representation of this word would not have suited the character of the Greek language, for which reason it may have been omitted here. Similarly and לְכָם have not been represented in the LXX of Gen 12:1; 22:1; 22:2; 22:5; 27:43; Josh 20:2; תְנוּ לְכָם (Gen 12:1); בָרַח לְךָ (Gen 12:1); שׁבֹו לְכָם (Gen 22:5); לְלִדְךָ (Gen 22:2).

Jer 31:21 **הַצִּיבֵּי לְךָ**. However, in general the LXX translators represented **לְךָ** and **לְמִם** literally when used as a ‘dativus ethicus’ (e.g., Deut 1:13; Josh 18:4; Judg 20:7; 2 Sam 2:21). It is therefore hard to tell whether the present omission of **לְךָ** resulted from a shorter Hebrew *Vorlage* or from an omission by the translator.

3. [] **מְלָאכִים** To this word the Greek translator added the pronoun **αὐτῶν**, which probably does not represent a variant reading (see n. 13). The same applies to the omission of the pronominal suffix of **וְנִתְתָּם** in the LXX. The Lucianic tradition also omits the suffix of **וְשָׁלֹחֶת**.

לְקָרְאתָם [] **εἰς ἀπάντησιν αὐτῶν** of the plus in the LXX (**αὐτῷ** of manuscripts S 26 710 is probably secondary) reflects **לְקָרְאתָם** (cf. 2 Sam 5:23 **לَا הַעֲלָה** rendered by **οὐκ ἀναβήσει εἰς συνάντησιν αὐτῶν = לְקָרְאתָם** **לَا הַעֲלָה** and cf. a similar addition in the parallel verse 1 Chr 14:14). Alternatively, it is unlikely that the LXX reflects **לְבָנִים** even though this word was rendered five times by **εἰς ἀπάντησιν** in Chronicles: in these instances **לְפָנִי** denotes ‘towards’ in war contexts (see 1 Chr 14:8) or was thus understood by the translators, but such a meaning could not be ascribed to **לְפָנִי** in the present context had it appeared here.

The short reading of MT is probably more original than that of the LXX. For additional examples of a long text of ed. I as opposed to a short text of ed. II, see 1:17,18; 3:18; 6:16; 7:7; 14:7, 13, 15; 31:14 and further G. C. Workman, *The Text of Jeremiah* (Edinburgh 1889) 70 ff., and Janzen, *Jeremiah*, 63–65.

4. [] **צְבָאוֹת** This word occurs 19 times in the MT of Jeremiah in the phrase **כִּי אָמַר הָ' צְבָאוֹת**. In four of its occurrences in this phrase is **צְבָאוֹת** reflected in the LXX, but in the remaining 15 cases it is not represented. **צְבָאוֹת** also lacks in the LXX when used in similar expressions; for details see Janzen, *Jeremiah*, 75. A case of special interest is the long phrase **הָ' צְבָאוֹת אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל**, which occurs here and in another 31 verses in MT, but never in the LXX (see Bright, 35). **צְבָאוֹת** was thus often added in ed. II. On the other hand, A. Rofé, “The Name YHWH SEBA'OT and the Shorter Recension of Jeremiah,” in: R. Liwak and S. Wagner (eds.), *Prophetie und geschichtliche Wirklichkeit im alten Israel* (Stuttgart 1991) 307–315, claims that this word was systematically removed from the MT of Jeremiah, as the phrase **הָ' צְבָאוֹת** was invented only at the end of the period of the Judges, and does not occur even once in Genesis-Judges.

5. [] **אַתָּה הָאָדָם—הָאָדָם** The LXX’s omission may have resulted from homoioteleuton if the scribe’s eye jumped from the first occurrence of **הָאָדָם** to its second occurrence. However, it is more likely that this section was added in ed. II: the addition is found between two segments **עֲשֵׂיתִי**

הנה אתה עשית את השמים ואת הארץ בכחך הנדול ובורועי הנטויה which must be taken as one phrase in view of such verses as 32:17 וְנִתְהַיָּה in v. 5b refers to the first occurrence of הארץ, a fact which makes it unlikely that the section lacking in the LXX was omitted by mistake.

The phrase **את האדם ואת הבחמה** occurs frequently in the C stratum of Jeremiah, see Bright, 32. For the idea expressed in the expanded text, see Isa 45:12-13. See also M. Weinfeld *apud* S. Paul, *Proceedings of the Fifth World Congress of Jewish Studies ... 3-11 August 1969*, I (Jerusalem 1972) 111 on the relationship between Jer 27:5 and the quoted verses of Isaiah; A. van der Kooij, "Jeremiah 27:5-15: How do MT and LXX Relate to Each Other?" *JNSL* 20 (1994) 59-78.

וְשַׁהַה] This word denotes that the speaker or author reached an important point in a speech or discourse, but such a word could be added at a later stage in the development of the text. This word is also absent in ed. I in 40:4 and 42:15 **וְשַׁהַה הַנֶּה פָתַח תִּיךְ חֵוֹם**. Elsewhere in Jeremiah was rendered faithfully by **καὶ νῦν** (2:18; 7:13; 14:10; 18:11; 26:13; 29:27; 32:36; 37:20; 42:22; 44:7); in 42:19 is represented by **καὶ νῦν γνόντες γνώσεσθε**, i. e., **וְעַהֲה יְדֻעַתְּךָ** (cf. also v. 22). There was thus some textual fluidity between the two editions with regard to this word.

אַכְפִּי] It is hard to know whether this word was found in the translator's *Vorlage*. It is represented in the LXX as part of ἔδωκα, but the translator could also have represented it separately, i. e., ἐγὼ ἔδωκα. A similar question arises in 1:18 **וְאַנְיִהְנֶה נְהִיזֶךְ - ἵδοὺ τέθεικά σε**.

הָאָלָה] The *Vorlage* of the slightly deviating translation τὴν γῆν was most likely identical with MT because similar translations are found elsewhere in Jeremiah (see 23:3 **מְכָל הָאָרֶצָות** - ἀπὸ πάσης τῆς γῆς; 32:37; 40:11). The translator either took אָרֶצָות (countries) as meaning 'world' or avoided the plural form of γῆ (thus P. Katz, *ThZ* 5 [1949] 7).

לְעַבְדֹו/עַבְדִי] The phrase 'Nebuchadnezzar ... my servant' recurs in 25:9 and 43:10 where it is again absent in the LXX. Thus, Nebuchadnezzar is known as God's servant in MT (ed. II) of Jeremiah, but not in the LXX (ed. I). Some scholars believe that Jeremiah himself called Nebuchadnezzar God's servant and that the idea was omitted by the Greek translator because of theological motivations (for references, see W.E. Lemke and Z. Zevit, to be mentioned below). Of particular interest are the discussions by T.W. Overholt, "King Nebuchadnezzar in the Jeremiah Tradition," *CBQ* 30 (1968) 39-48, and Z. Zevit, "The Use of **עַבְדָךְ** as a Diplomatic Term in Jeremiah," *JBL* 88 (1969) 74-77, who describe, each in his own way, the background of **עבד** in the above-mentioned

three verses within the Jeremiah tradition. On the other hand, according to W.E. Lemke, "Nebuchadnezzar, My Servant," *CBQ* 28 (1966) 45-50, the mentioning of **עבד** in MT (ed. II) derived from a scribal error in 27:6 (see below). This verse, in turn, influenced the text of 25:9 and 43:10. However, in our view the mentioned opinions are imprecise because they treat the three verses on one level. However, the problems involved in these verses are different and therefore a middle course between the two main views may be suggested: in the two verses in which 'Neb. ... my servant' is missing in ed. I, it apparently was absent in the translator's *Vorlage*, too. This is one of the many 'omissions' of (parts of) names in ed. I; see in particular the frequent 'omission' of Nebuchadnezzar's name, as in v. 20, below. However, this situation differs completely from the circumstances of 27:6, where either the reading of ed. II has developed from that of ed. I, or vice versa. Thus **עבד** was not added or omitted in 27:6, but it formed part of either the original text of this verse or of a corrupted version. An analysis of the readings can determine the way in which the corruption went. The combined readings of ed. I and II may be recorded as **(ל)עבדיו/ו**, by which notation their close relationship is stressed. The added/missing *lamed* in **עבדו** resulted by way of haplography/dittography from the preceding **בבל**, and the interchange of *yod* and *waw* occurs in all stages of the Hebrew script (incidentally, a similar interchange is found in 40:9 where MT **עובד** is reflected in the LXX and in the parallel verse 2 Kgs 25:24 as **μετέριον**; cf. also Isa 66:14 — **τοῖς σεβομένοις αὐτόν** = **עבדיו**). The graphical similarity of the two readings is better explained by the assumption of a textual error than by a theological change.

If indeed one reading development from the other one in 27:6, which of the two may contextually be considered as the original? The preferred assumption is that **עבדו** of ed. I is original because the reading of ed. II which calls Nebuchadnezzar God's 'servant' is paralleled only in two places in ed. II and these should probably be considered as secondary. However, the reading of ed. I, **עבדו**, is contextually not very plausible. First of all, the repetition of **עבדו** is syntactically awkward, in particular in the short text of ed. I **ובוכדנאצָר מֶלֶךְ בָּבֶל עֲבָדוּ וּמָה אַתְּ חִשְׁדָה לְעַבְדוֹ**. Secondly, to the best of our knowledge, elsewhere in the Bible 'countries' (**אַרְצֹות**) do not worship God as implied by the reading of ed. I. Therefore the reading of ed. II (**עבדו**) probably reflects the original text which was corrupted to **עבדו** of ed. I, partly under influence of the ensuing **עבדו**. At a later stage, the reading of ed. II in 27:6 probably influenced the textual expansions in 25:14 and 43:10. In ed. II is characteristic of the vocabulary of the C stratum in which also David is

called God's 'servant' (Bright, 33). Cf., however, Z. Zevit, "The Use," who explains the word as 'vassal.'

Note further that the wording of 27:6 forms the basis of ed. II in 28:14:

על ברזל נתתי על צואר כל הנוים לעבד את מלך בבל
(the italicized words are lacking in ed. I).

[נתתי לו] This is probably a stylistic expansion based on the beginning of the verse (cf. also 28:14 quoted above and a similar addition of *את* in 20:5).

7. [עובדו—נדלים] The translator could conceivably have omitted this verse prophesying submission to the grandson of Nebuchadnezzar because, to our knowledge, Nebuchadnezzar did not have a grandson who ruled. However, since we cannot ascribe such developed historical motivations to the translator elsewhere in Jeremiah, it is doubtful that they should be ascribed to him here. For the same reason it is also unlikely that the translator would have omitted this verse as disagreeing with the idea of an exile lasting seventy years, foretold in Jer 29:10. Since the translator probably did not omit this verse, it must have been lacking in his *Vorlage*, as suggested, too, by our general view of the shorter text of the LXX. The idea that Babylon, the instrument of God's punishment, would ultimately be punished is found in additions in both this verse and in 25:14 – lacking in ed. I. *כי עבדו בם ומלכים נדלים נם מהנה נוים רבים* – *ושלממו להם כפультם וכמעשה דיהם*. There are also additional parallels in both wording and content between chapter 27 and the MT of 25:8-14. The secondary character of these additions is particularly evident in 27:7 where the added section does not conform with its immediate context. Here nations are rebuked and warned that they are to be punished by Babylon and in this context a punishment of Babylon itself is not expected which will impart a completely different dimension to the text. Further, the idea of the ultimate punishment of Babylon is also expressed in the prophecy on Babylon (50:s29; 51:24, 56) which is generally believed to be secondary, either wholly or in part.

Finally, it should be asked whether the editor of ed. II did at all refer to the grandson of Nebuchadnezzar or whether instead he was using a general expression denoting subsequent generations. The possibilities are discussed by Janzen, *Jeremiah*, 101-103 and Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, 144, n. 5. If the editor of ed. II added the phrase '... and his son and the son of his son ...' retrospectively, the section may have been written after 539, the last year of Nebunaid, although in fact he was not of Nebuchadnezzar's offspring. According to another interpretation, the section may have been written before 560, in which year Evil Merodach was murdered. According to J. Bright, *JBL* 70 (1951) 24, Jer 27:7 would

hardly have been formulated in its present form after 560 (for possible further indications of the date of the addition in MT see below on v. 18 ff). However, more likely is the view of M. Weiss, **כדרותהו המkräא** (3d ed.; Jerusalem 1987) 106–110, who asserts that the phrase is meant as a type of superlative, referring to ‘many generations’ after Nebuchadnezzar (cf. especially Jer 2:9).

8. **היה (ו) יעדו — ואת אשר**] The addition later in the verse may have led the editor of ed. II to expand the vague conditional *waw* וְהִי to the fuller **היה** (cf. also 25:12 in ed. II). **V (autem)** should be considered a reformulation of MT, here and elsewhere (e.g., Jer 31:28; Isa 3:24; 7:22, 23).

לא יעדו — ואת אשר] This stylistic addition is meant to stress beyond v. 6 that Nebuchadnezzar is the instrument of punishment used by God. A similar addition is found in 25:9 where the editor of ed. I stated in a general way that *a* people coming from the North will cause a destruction, while ed. II explicitly mentions Nebuchadnezzar. See further the addition of ed. II in 21:7 **איביהם מבקשי** ... **אתן נפשם** (the italicized words were added in ed. II).

All the prophecies in chapters 4–8 which refer to the people coming from the North (4:5–8, 12–13, 6:1–8, 22–26, 8:14–17) mention neither Nebuchadnezzar nor Babylon. This implies that at the beginning of his career Jeremiah spoke only in a general way of a people coming from the North. Babylon’s task in the punishment of Israel was mentioned for the first time in 605 when the events had made it clear to the prophet that the nation which God had been speaking of was in fact Babylon: see 36:1–2, 29; 25:1–14 (MT) as well as later prophecies (cf. Y. Kaufmann, **תולדות האמונה הישראלית**, part 7 [Tel Aviv 1962] 404–405 and esp. n. 7).

ובדבר] The short text was expanded in accordance with the full formula (cf. Bright, 27). Similar expansions of this formula are found in the MT of 21:9, 44:13, and 42:17, 22 compared with v. 16.

— έμβάλωσι τὸν τράχηλον αὐτῶν] The change from the singular form of the verb to a plural one in the LXX (cf. n. 13) follows that of its subject (‘the nation or kingdom’).

על הני ההוא] This phrase was added for the sake of clarity. Similar expansions are found often in ed. II, see, e.g., 28:12 LXX, MT **ציאר צוירו**, 29:32 LXX, MT **בתוכם העם הזה**; 52:8 LXX (= 2 Kgs 25:5 LXX and MT), MT **את צדקהו**. See further Janzen, *Jeremiah*, 73–74.

עד תמי אמר - ἔως ἐκλίπωσιν] Active verbal forms have also elsewhere been changed to passive ones, or vice-versa (see n. 13). **תמי** appears very rarely in the Bible as a transitive verb, as it does here.

9. [τῶν ἐνυπνιαζομένων ὑμῖν of the LXX (your dreamers), also reflected in the other versions, may reflect חֲלָמִיכֶם of MT. On the other hand, this rendering may also reflect חֲלָמֹתֶיכֶם of MT if this word was taken as a *nomen agentis* (thus M. Segal, *Leshonenu* 10 (5699) 154-156; cf. various other words in Jeremiah, e.g., בְּחֻנָה, יְקֻשׁ, and frequently in rabbinic Hebrew). In that case, all translators identified חֲלָמֹתֶיכֶם as the plural (*qatōlōt*) of the *nomen agentis*. This assumption presupposes a developed linguistic understanding on the part of all translators (חֲלָמֹתֶיכֶם in 29:8 has not been understood in this way [τὰ ἐνύπνια ὑμῶν], but that word occurs in a different construction). As a consequence, it is more likely that the translations of this verse reflect a variant חֲלָמִיכֶם.

10. [לֵאמֹר] This word was often added in ed. II (see, e.g., 1:4; 39:16; 40:15; 45:1). The addition in the present verse may have been derived from v. 14 where הנבאים האמרים אליכם לאמור occur in a similar context: אליכם לאמור לא תעבדו.

10. [וזדחתו אתם ואבדתם] The addition is based upon v. 15, a verse which is similar in content to v. 10. The expression is characteristic of the C stratum (see Bright, 31).

11. [נאם ה'] This and similar phrases (נאם אַדְנִי ה', etc.) occur 109 times, both in editions I and II. In an additional 65 instances the phrase occurs only in ed. II.

11. [ועבדה ועבדך] The translator apparently vocalized this word as (וְעַבְדָךְ).

12. [בעל מלך בבל] This phrase has been added from vv. 8, 11. After the first verb in 12b was expanded with these words, the object of the second verb had to be reduced to 'him.' For the phrase of הביאו את צואריכם ועבדו of ed. I, cf. Neh 3:5 כולם בעבדת אדנייהם.

12. [למה — אתה (13) — בבל (14)] This long 'omission' of the LXX is instructive for an understanding of the methodological problems raised by the shorter text of the LXX. At least part of MT must be original as the next verse makes no sense without this text. In the LXX 'for they are prophesying falsely to you' (at the end of v. 14) refer to the king of Babylon, but in MT they correctly refer to the false prophets mentioned in v. 14. Therefore v. 14a, now lacking in the LXX, must have been original. Hence the translator's omission of the section between ועבדו in v. 12 and תעבדו in v. 14 was probably due to homoioteleuton. At the same time, the content of v. 13 is secondary, and we may therefore have to treat this verse as other verses of similar nature are treated, as having been absent in the LXX's *Vorlage*. The added section does not mention any new data, as it is based on v. 8 whose elements it contains in a different order. Its secondary nature also comes to light from the phrase

in the beginning of v. 13 ('why should you and your people die') since it repeats the preceding phrase 'and you shall live' in different words. Ed. II thus contains both in vv. 12-13 and in v. 17 the word וְחַיָּה coupled with a rhetorical question (cf. also Ezek 18:32, 33:11). For a different analysis of vv. 12 ff. in the LXX, see H. Seebass, ZAW 82 (1970) 449 ff.

15.] **הָדִיחַי** The pronominal suffix is not expressed in the LXX nor in V. For the assumption of a variant **הָדִיחַה**, see n. 13.

] The LXX freely added the pronoun ὑμῶν (cf. n. 13).

לְכֶם—לְכֶם The LXX reflects a doublet שָׁקֵר/שָׁקֵר לְכֶם on which see Ziegler, *Beiträge*, 96 (our punctuation of the Greek differs from that of Ziegler: ὑμῖν [ἐπ' ἀδίκῳ] ψευδῆ [13] ὑμῖν καὶ ...). The doublet is by definition secondary, and the two parts of the doublet differ in the sequence of their constituents.

For the added שָׁקֵר cf. the LXX of 14:15 and 29:23; see further above on 27:3. The assumption of a homoioteleuton **לְכֶם - לְכֶם** is less likely because the reconstructed *Vorlage* of the LXX is contextually difficult.

16.] Cf. 28:5 **לְעֵינֵי הַכֹּהֲנִים/וּלְעֵינֵי כָּל הַעֲמָדָה**. In the LXX translation of this verse the order of the two phrases is inverted, as in 28:5.

] **עַתָּה מִהָּרָה** This addition is apparently based on the date mentioned in 28:3 ('two years'). Ed. I refers to the question of whether the temple vessels will return at all, whereas ed. II raises the question of when they will return. The phrase 'two years' has been added on the basis of 28:3 also in ed. II of 28:11. According to others ???, these words were omitted by the translator in accord with Bar 1:8.

17.] **אֵל תִּשְׁמַעְוּ — חֲרָבָה** The short text of ed. I in v. 17 in vv. 14-15 is paralleled by **כִּי שָׁקֵר הֵם נְבָאִים לְכֶם**¹⁵ **כִּי לֹא שְׁלָחָתִים** a fact which supports our reconstruction (see further 29:9 **כִּי בְשָׁקֵר** **הֵם נְבָאִים לְכֶם בְּשָׁמֵי לֹא שְׁלָחָתִים**). The addition in ed. II is based on v. 12 (cf. also 25:18 and 26:9). The second part of the addition is phrased as a rhetorical question similar to v. 13.

18.] **בָּי/בָּה'** In the whole section, God is mentioned in both the first and third person. Therefore possibly **בָּי** has been changed in one of the traditions to **בָּה'** or vice versa. Alternatively, one reading may have developed from the other on the textual level: a scribe may have written **בָּי** as an abbreviated tetragrammaton which was later misunderstood as **בָּה'**, or vice versa. On the practice of abbreviating the tetragrammaton, see TCHB, 256-57. Similar problems arise in 6:11 reflected in the LXX as **חַטָּאת יְהוָה**; 8:14 reflected in the LXX as **לְיְהוָה חַטָּאת**; and 40:3 reflected in the LXX as **חַטָּאת לְיְהוָה**.

כָּבָאֹת—בְּבִלְהָן] From here to the end of the chapter MT is greatly expanded. Except for two significant additions, the expanded text stresses details that were already found in the short text. It is remarkable how well the editor of ed. II managed to insert the new elements (sometimes whole sentences) between the existing parts of ed. I without introducing significant changes.

The author of the additions showed a great interest in the fate of the temple vessels, adding details which are based, among other things, on data mentioned in both Jeremiah and 2 Kings.

In the course of his reworking, the editor of ed. II used the expression **הַכְּלִים הַנּוֹתָרִים** (18, 21) instead of the similar phrase **יְהָרֶךְ הַכְּלִים** found in ed. I. These vessels (כָּלִים) were specified as ‘the vessels left in the house of the Lord’ (both ed. I and II) and ‘the vessels in the house of the king’ (ed. II only). In the second detail, ed. II contains a little piece of information not contained in ed. I which is probably reliable. In 52:13 Nebuzaradan is said to have burnt both ‘the house of the Lord and the house of the king,’ and, as it is known that Nebuchadnezzar took vessels from the ‘house of the Lord’ before it was burnt, he probably acted similarly with regard to the vessels found in the ‘house of the king.’

19. צָבָאֹת—הַמְכֻנּוֹת ... הַנּוֹתָרִים בָּעֵיר הַזֹּאת] According to ed. I, the prophet threatened that the vessels still left in the temple would eventually be exiled to Babylon. These vessels are specified in ed. II as: (1) the temple vessels described here as ‘the pillars, the sea and the stands’—this information derives from 52:17 (+ 2 Kgs 25:13) where these items are mentioned in a different sequence; (2) ‘the rest of the vessels which are left in this city’ (v. 19)—these are the vessels left in the royal palace as appears from ed. II in vv. 18 and 21, even though the phrase used in v. 19 is more encompassing. Notably, in his rephrasing of the text, the editor of ed. II used **יְהָרֶךְ** differently from its use in ed. I. In ed. I **יְהָרֶךְ הַכְּלִים** denote all the vessels except for those ‘which ... the king of Babylon did not take away’ (20), but in ed. II they refer to all the vessels except for ‘the pillars, the sea and the stands’ (v. 19).

The reconstruction of **עַל יְהָרֶךְ הַכְּלִים** in **עַל** is problematical. While in the reconstructed ed. I these words continue the opening formula **כִּי כָּה אָמַר**, the translator started a new sentence with them: καὶ τῶν ἐπιλογίπων σκευῶν (as for the remaining vessels ...). His *Vorlage* actually may not have contained **עַל** even though it is included in the full formula **עַל כִּי כָּה אָמַר** occurring in v. 21 and elsewhere in the MT and LXX (cf. 22:6, 23:2, 15). H. Seebass, ZAW 82 (1970) 415, n. 16, reconstructed the LXX as **מִתְהָרֶךְ**. In principle **ἐπιλογίπων** may reflect both **יְהָרֶךְ** and **הַנּוֹתָרִים** because the Greek word renders both words in the LXX. However, the

assumption of a condensed translation is unlikely because it disregards the problem of the other two words which are not represented in the LXX (*בעיר זואת*).

20.] **לקחם** The pronominal suffix of the verb is not represented in the LXX. This ‘omission’ may or may not represent a variant reading, cf. n. 13.

נָבוּכְדְּנָאָצָר [Nebuchadnezzar’s name was often added in ed. II to the phrase ‘king of Babylon,’ see 28:14; 29:3, 21; 32:28; 46:13; 49:30; 50:17.

[בן יהויקים מלך יהודה] One of the characteristic features of ed. II is its frequent expansion of proper nouns by adding the name of the father and/or the title ‘king (of Judah).’ Jechoniah’s name was expanded in this way here and also in 28:4. For similar examples of expanded names see Janzen, *Jeremiah*, 139–54.

אשר חֲנִילִיתִי מִירוֹשָׁלָם בָּבֶלְהָ [This is an explanatory addition as in 29:4

וְאַת—וַיַּרְאֵל] These words were added in ed. II on the basis of a Hebrew tradition of 29:2 underlying the LXX in which, among other things, *הַחֲרִי* is mentioned (cf. J. Ziegler, *Beiträge*, 92). Cf. further 39:6 and 2 Kgs 24:14.

21.] **כִּי כֵּה—וַיַּרְאֵל** [This is a typical stylistic addition which neither contains new information nor stresses any particular matter. The editor of ed. II added so many elements in the preceding two verses that he felt obliged to repeat parts of vv. 18–19 by way of ‘Wiederaufnahme.’

22.] **וְשָׁמָד—אֶחָם ... וְהַעֲלִיתִים—זֹהֵה** [The addition in this verse stresses that the vessels which were still left in the temple would be exiled to Babylon and subsequently would be returned to Jerusalem. The latter idea is not consistent with the spirit of the surrounding verses that deal with false prophets and not with the fate of the temple vessels. Even if the latter would have been the case, it nevertheless seems anticlimactic to have mentioned immediately after the threat to the vessels that ultimately they would be returned to Jerusalem. The added section must be considered secondary because of its contents and, hence regarded as a post-exilic retrospective gloss (cf. Ezra 1:7, 11, 6:5 and Dan 5:2–3 with regard to their wording and content). Its date may be applied to the whole of ed. II (see also on v. 7 above).

שָׁד פְּקֻדִּי [A similar use of this verb is found in ed. II (not ed. I) in 32:5 **פְּקֻדִּי אֶתְךָ**. As a rule, this verb refers to human beings and not to inanimate things as here. For a discussion of the uses of **פְּקֻדָּה**, see J. Scharbert, “Das Verbum PQD in der Theologie des Alten Testaments,” *BZ NF* 4 (1960) 209–26.

וְהַשִּׁבְתִּים] This word occurs eight times in the Bible, of which seven are to be found in Jeremiah.