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) xlvii.
⁵ See especially F.C. Movers, De utriusque recensionis vaticiniorum Jeremiae ... 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,* 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 Masorthische Text (see n. 5); F. Giesebrecht, Das Buch Jeremia (HAT, 1894) xix-xxxiv.


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*. 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 4QJerbd 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 .Requires (v. 2) and of Requires (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 quantitative 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.).

(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 LXX 12 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>MT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>הבארמשה מלכט וירוקה בן יושביה מלך יהודה ויהוה מלך יהודה על זכרוןיה</td>
<td>etre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>על תשכ״ו עמלשׁת אל מלך יהודה אל מלך יהודה ויהוה אל מלך יהודה על העדים</td>
<td>etre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>על תשכ״ו עמלשׁת אל מלך יהודה אל מלך יהודה ויהוה אל מלך יהודה על העדים</td>
<td>etre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מלך זכרוןיה מלכט וירוקה בן יושביה יוויחיון וירוקה ייפו</td>
<td>etre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>על ויהוה מלך יהודה בן יושביה ייגה</td>
<td>etre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>על ויהוה מלך יהודה בן יושביה ייגה</td>
<td>etre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11 E.g., 27:12 LXX: ובארמשה מלכט וריכז בן יושביה מלך יהודה על זכרוןיה MT: ובארמשה מלכט וריכז בן יושביה מלך יהודה על זכרוןיה

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

13 The text-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.
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ملك يهوذا 4: גזירתו של יאש א讷יה לא נקראה על מצרים בסוף ה-
מלק יויוה 4: גזירתו של יאש א讷יה לא נקראה על מצרים בסוף ה-

כון התמרו אלא א舉辦ם 5: אבקש מהויא של ה-
כון התמרו אלא א舉辦ם 5: אבקש מהויא של ה-

בכחו הגרום בימי בני יהודה והנהר לארץ ים יש בשנים
על פן יאריה עמליה והרוים בימי בני יהודה והנהר לארץ ים יש בשנים

לעביד והם אד את השידה 6
לעביד והם אד את השידה 6

ונא כי 마지막 פתק מלך בבל
ונא כי到最后 פתק מלך בבל

כנון 한 גה על כה את אד את והו מבר יג והו במבר מלך בבל

היהם

לא יהיה לי אריהם בעלב מלך בבלآחרי יבגנה
לא יהיה לי אריהם בעלב מלך בבלآחרי יבגנה

נאמו ה, עוד כי אד את 9: אשים ולא י בעצמו אזל
נאמו ה, עוד כי אד את 9: אשים ולא יづくりו אזל

כמזכרה ולא חלבם אלא גניבים ולא גניבים אחר והמות
כמזכרה ולא חלבם אלא גניבים ולא גניבים אחר והמות

לא ולהדרי את מלך בבל 10 כי שכור הם הגאים כגון להים הרוחים הבאים
לא ולהדרי את מלך בבל 10 כי שכור הם הגאים כגון להים הרוחים הבאים

מעל אלטרמות 11: והנה אל אד את גניבי עלב
מעל אלטרמות 11: והנה אל אד את גניבי עלב

מלך בבל עלב ונהרוהי על אָדוֹת
מלך בבל עלב ונהרוהי על אָדוֹת

12: והנה בבל עלב ונהרוהי על אָדוֹת
מלכ בל ונכד גנוזיהו עלו אדמית. והם היה, וחיברו וייסב ב.12

פייחו מלכ乙烯ו יזרחי בבל הדרים חכים לברוס הובא וואירפס
פייחו מלכ乙烯ו יזרחי בבל הדרים חכים לברוס הובא וואירפס

 מעט מלך בבל אף עד אדם וחיבר 13ymphס שמה פאזוله והנמק בתמר

ברעב ובכר נצרהזכר ב, איז דוי אשא לא ישבו את מלך בבל

ואל החמנים ולא דברה נבואת יאמירה אלאכב לארם ולא תענוג אלא מלך בבל

יכול שקר תבנאי לפנים 15יכה לא שלחתים נאם והצביים בצורת שקר
יכול שקר תבנאי לפנים 15יכה לא שלחתים נאם והצביים בצורת שקר

למפני הזרחי עצמה ושלמי יהודים והנביאים ובנונים לפנים (לא) שקר לפנים
למפני הזרחי עצמה ושלמי יהודים והנביאים ובנונים לפנים

יאל כל ענה והא אבתו יזרחי לאמור כל אום, אלא חסירה ולא
יאל אבתו והם כל ענה והא אבתו יזרחי לאמור כל אום, אלא חסירה ולא

ברכי נבואת הנביאים לפנים לאמור היה כל צה, מושבלת מעמוד
ברכי נבואת הנביאים לפנים לאמור היה כל צה, מושבלת מעמוד

יכול שקר הדוה נבואת לפנים 17יכול שקר הדוה נבואת לפנים אלא שסוער אשליהו עברプラスת את מלך בבל

מדדה. 18כך נבואת הים והים יש
לא שלחתים 18ואו נבואת הוא ואו יש
יחי לה mãoה יזרחי יהודים וברכה

ברכז! אנתו יוסיפה את ב.
ברכז! אנתו יוסיפה את ב.

וכחי מלאך ה.19וכח יזרחי יזרחי עברת
וכחי מלאך ה.19וכח יזרחי יזרחי עברת
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). 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.

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 Qeré 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).

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 לְךָ and לְךָ have not been represented in the LXX of Gen 12:1; 12:2; 12:5; 27:43; Josh 20:2; 24:22.
Jer 31:21. However, in general the LXX translators represented מָלַיְיָה and מַלְיֵיָה 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 מָלַיְיָה resulted from a shorter Hebrew Vorlage or from an omission by the translator.

3. מַלְיֵיָה 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 מַלְיֵיָה in the LXX. The Lucianic tradition also omits the suffix of מַלְיֵיָה.

4. מַלְיֵיָה This word occurs 19 times in the MT of Jeremiah in the phrase מַלְיֵיָה יְהֹוָה. In four of its occurrences in this phrase מַלְיֵיָה is reflected in the LXX, but in the remaining 15 cases it is not represented. מַלְיֵיָה 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 מַלְיֵיָה יְהֹוָה מַלְיֵיָה, which occurs here and in another 31 verses in MT, but never in the LXX (see Bright, 35). מַלְיֵיָה 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 מַלְיֵיָה יְהֹוָה was invented only at the end of the period of the Judges, and does not occur even once in Genesis-Judges.

5. מַלְיֵיָה The LXX’s omission may have resulted from homoioteleuton if the scribe’s eye jumped from the first occurrence of מַלְיֵיָה to its second occurrence. However, it is more likely that this section was added in ed. II: the addition is found between two segments
which must be taken as one phrase in view of such verses as 32:17, 10:12 and 51:15. Further, the pronominal suffix of hywfnh ṣw≪rah tawµµyµçhµtaµtyçµhtaµhnh hywfnh ṣrw, 10:12 and 51:15. Further, the pronominal suffix of hyttnwµ in v. 5b refers to the first occurrence of ṣaw rah tawµµdahµtaµ, a fact which makes it unlikely that the section lacking in the LXX was omitted by mistake.


6. נִתְנָה 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 יגוזה האצט רבדו וניי and 42:15 יגוזה התה הסותים והוים. Elsewhere in Jeremiah was rendered faithfully by kai vuv (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 kai vuv γυνατες γυνασεσθε, i. e., יד ויתנה יד רחני (cf. also v. 22). There was thus some textual fluidity between the two editions with regard to this word.

אֵלֶּה 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 יגוזה האצט רבדו וניי and 42:15 יגוזה התה הסותים והוים. Elsewhere in Jeremiah was rendered faithfully by kai vuv (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 kai vuv γυνατες γυνασεσθε, i. e., יד ויתנה יד רחני (cf. also v. 22). There was thus some textual fluidity between the two editions with regard to this word.

The Vorlage of the slightly deviating translation ρων γην was most likely identical with MT because similar translations are found elsewhere in Jeremiah (see 23:3 משל ארמיא - ἀπὸ πάσης τῆς γῆς; 32:37; 40:11). The translator either took רָצוֹן (countries) as meaning ‘world’ or avoided the plural form of γη (thus P. Katz, ThZ 5 [1949] 7).

6. לֶנֶבּוּכֶדְנֶצֶּר/ם This 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 נֶבּוּכֶדְנֶצֶּר as a Diplomatic Term in Jeremiah,” JBL 88 (1969) 74-77, who describe, each in his own way, the background of נֶבּוּכֶדְנֶצֶּר 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 נַבּוּךְ דַּנְעֶזֶּר 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 נַבּוּךְ דַּנְעֶזֶּר 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  הַלַּעֲבֹּד, by which notation their close relationship is stressed. The added/missing  הַלַּעֲבֹּד resulted by way of haplography/dittography from the preceding הַלַּעֲבֹּד, 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  is reflected in the LXX and in the parallel verse 2 Kgs 25:24 as  לַעֲבֹּד; cf. also Isa 66:14  וָדְבַּבָּב — τοῖς σεβομένοις αὐτόν = דִּבְרֵי). 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 הַלַּעֲבֹּד 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, הַלַּעֲבֹּד, is contextually not very plausible. First of all, the repetition of הַלַּעֲבֹּד is syntactically awkward, in particular in the short text of ed. I. נַבּוּךְ דַּנְעֶזֶּר מִלְכַּי לַעֲבֹּד הִמֵּא הַשָּׁה הַשָּׁה לַעֲבֹּד וַתּוֹרֵה... Secondly, to the best of our knowledge, elsewhere in the Bible ‘countries’ (ארɜָה) do not worship God as implied by the reading of ed. I. Therefore the reading of ed. II נַבּוּךְ דַּנְעֶזֶּר probably reflects the original text which was corrupted to הַלַּעֲבֹּד of ed. I, partly under influence of the ensuing הַלַּעֲבֹּד. At a later stage, the reading of ed. II in 27:6 probably influenced the textual expansions in 25:14 and 43:10. הַלַּעֲבֹּד 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:

עָלֶה בָּרוּזָה תַּחְתָּל שֶׁאָרָה פֶּל הַתָּוִים עֵמֵבָא מַלֶּקֶת בָּא (the italicized words are lacking in ed. I).

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

7. The translator could conceivably have omitted this verse prophecying 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. 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 (50:29; 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, באлемент הנפקוד (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. The addition later in the verse may have led the editor of ed. II to expand the vague conditional בַּעֲדַהָה to the fuller בַּעֲדַת יִבְרְאֵל (cf. also 25:12 in ed. II). ו (autem) should be considered a reformulation of MT, here and elsewhere (e.g., Jer 31:28; Isa 3:24; 7:22, 23).

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.

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, תהלית, part 7 [Tel Aviv 1962] 404-405 and esp. n. 7).

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.

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’).

This phrase was added for the sake of clarity. Similar expansions are found often in ed. II, see, e.g., 28:12 LXX אֵלָה אֵלָה, MT אָלָה אל; 29:32 LXX אֵלָה אֵלָה, MT אָלָה אל; 52:8 LXX אָלָה אל = 2 Kgs 25:5 LXX and MT), MT אָלָה אל. See further Janzen, Jeremiah, 73-74.

Active verbal forms have also elsewhere been changed to passive ones, or vice-versa (see n. 13). בַּעֲדַת אֲדָמָה appears very rarely in the Bible as a transitive verb, as it does here.
9. μκτλμβα τον ἐνυνθαξηοτεν ουμίν of the LXX (your dreamers), also reflected in the other versions, may reflect μκτλμβα 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., κεκαβ, βασιλεύς, and frequently in rabbinic Hebrew). In that case, all translators identified μκτλμβα as the plural (qatâlôt) of the nomen agentis. This assumption presupposes a developed linguistic understanding on the part of all translators (μκτλμβα in 29:8 has not been understood in this way [τα ἐνυνθαξηοτα ουμίν], but that word occurs in a different construction). As a consequence, it is more likely that the translations of this verse reflect a variant μκτλμβα.

10. την ταγος του βασιλευς 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 μκτλμβα του βασιλευς occur in a similar context: μκτλμβα του βασιλευς τον μεσούμον.

11. την ταγος του βασιλευς 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).

12. ημερησι Απεσταλατομεν The translator apparently vocalized this word as ημερησι (καπεδα).
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 והיון 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. The pronominal suffix is not expressed in the LXX nor in V. For the assumption of a variant ידוע, see n. 13.

16. The LXX freely added the pronoun ידוע (cf. n. 13).

17. The LXX reflects a doublet לֵמָשׁ (ךָשָׁרְק) לֵמָשׁ on which see Ziegler, Beiträge, 96 (our punctuation of the Greek differs from that of Ziegler: ידוע [ךָשָׁרְק] יתעֹושׁ [13] ידוע ו...). The doublet is by definition secondary, and the two parts of the doublet differ in the sequence of their constituents.

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

18. In the whole section, God is mentioned in both the first and third person. Therefore possibly יבד has been changed in one of the traditions to חסד or vice versa. Alternatively, one reading may have developed from the other on the textual level: a scribe may have written יבד as an abbreviated tetragrammaton which was later misunderstood as יבד, or vice versa. On the practice of abbreviating the tetragrammaton, see TCHB, 256–57. Similar problems arise in 6:11 חסד יבד reflected in the LXX as יבד; 8:14 לֵמָשׁ reflected in the LXX as לֵמָשׁ; and 40:3 חסד יבד reflected in the LXX as יבד.
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 יִרְדֵּס הַמִּשְׁתָּחְנוּת (18, 21) instead of the similar phrase יִרְדֵּס הַמִּשְׁתָּחְנוּת found in ed. I. These vessels (כֶּסֶם) 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.’

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 differently from its use in ed. I. In ed. I יִרְדֵּס הַמִּשְׁתָּחְנוּת 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 יִרְדֵּס הַמִּשְׁתָּחְנוּת is problematical. While in the reconstructed ed. I these words continue the opening formula יִרְדֵּס הַמִּשְׁתָּחְנוּת, יִרְדֵּס הַמִּשְׁתָּחְנוּת the translator started a new sentence with them: καὶ τῶν ἐπιλοπίων σκειρίων (as for the remaining vessels ...). His Vorlage actually may not have contained יִרְדֵּס הַמִּשְׁתָּחְנוּת even though it is included in the full formula יִרְדֵּס הַמִּשְׁתָּחְנוּת 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 יִרְדֵּס הַמִּשְׁתָּחְנוּת. In principle ἐπιλοπίων may reflect both יִרְדֵּס הַמִּשְׁתָּחְנוּת and יִרְדֵּס הַמִּשְׁתָּחְנוּת 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 (אשכאר הגר).  

20. נְלֵכָה 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.

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.

21. רָכַב נֵבְעַדנְדַּעָז 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.

אשכאר הגר—ירשׁלם This is an explanatory addition as in 29:4 בַּפֶּה לֹא.

22. רָכַב נֵבְעַדנְדַּעָז 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, וַיְרָכַב is mentioned (cf. J. Ziegler, Beiträge, 92). Cf. further 39:6 and 2 Kgs 24:14.

21. רָכַב נֵבְעַדנְדַּעָז 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. רָכַב נֵבְעַדנְדַּעָז ... אֵשכֶא—אַשֶּכֶא וַרְכַּב—אָשֶכֶא 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).

A similar use of this verb is found in ed. II (not ed. I) in 32:5 רָכַב—אֶשֶכֶא. As a rule, this verb refers to human beings and not to inanimate things as here. For a discussion of the uses of רָכַב—אֶשֶכֶא, see J. Scharbert, “Das Verbum PQD in der Theologie des Alten Testaments,” BZ NF 4 (1960) 209–26.
This word occurs eight times in the Bible, of which seven are to be found in Jeremiah.