

The Two Different Books of Jeremiah Should Be Edited Independently and Sequentially

Young-Jin Min*

1. Jer-LXX Differs from Jer-MT in the Matter of Length

The primary focus of interest in the present paper concerns a possible edition that will have the two different Books of Jeremiah in one single volume of the Old Testament independently and sequentially: One is the Book of Jeremiah preserved in the LXX (Jer-LXX) and the other is the Book of Jeremiah preserved in the Masoretic text (Jer-MT).

It is a well-known fact that the LXX of Jeremiah (Jer-LXX) is shorter than the MT of Jeremiah (Jer-MT). According to the results of a computer analysis, Jer-LXX is 1/7 shorter than Jer-MT by having a total of 3,097 minuses.¹⁾ This statistical datum differs from that which is

* Deputy General Secretary of the Korean Bible Society. Director of Institute for Biblical Text Research

1) See Ch. II 1: Basic statistical data in Young-Jin Min, "The Minuses and Pluses of the LXX Translation of Jeremiah as Compared with the Masoretic Text: Their Classification and Possible Origins" (unpublished thesis, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1977); henceforth: Min, "Minuses and Pluses . . ." P.-M. Bogaert ed., *LE LIVRE DE JEREMIE Le Prophete et son milieu les oracles et leur transmission* (Leuven University Press, 1981), pp. 146, 148, 150, 160; Sven Soderlund, *The Greek Text of Jeremiah A Revised Hypothesis*, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 47, JSOT Press, 1985 p. 11; R. P. Carroll, *Jeremiah, Old Testament Guides*, JSOT Press, 1989 p. 29; Hermann-Josef Stipp, *Jeremia im Parteienstreit* (Anton Hein, 1992), p. 1; F. B. Huey, Jr., *Jeremiah/ Lamentations*, The New American Commentary 16 (Broadman Press, 1993), p. 30; Hermann-Josef Stipp, *Das masoretische und alexandrinische Sondergut des Jeremiabuches* (Universitaetsverlag Freiburg Schweiz,

reflected in K. H. Graf's work, *Der Prophet Jeremia*(Leipzig 1862), which counted 2,700 words absent from the Alexandrian version of Jer-LXX as compared with its MT.²⁾

The reasons for such quantitative difference between Jer-MT and Jer-LXX have been the subject of much scholarly debate. One view attributes the difference in length to the translation technique which abridges the Hebrew *Vorlage* on which the Greek translation is based. The other ascribes the same phenomenon to a Hebrew *Vorlage* which was originally shorter than the MT. The former thesis maintains that the LXX translator or translators felt that he or they could often fulfill the task more efficiently by condensing and even, at times, omitting redundant phraseology. Accordingly, many of the elements which are represented only in the MT are missing in the LXX as the result of intentional deletion by the translator(s). The latter point of view contends that the elements which are represented only in the MT stem from an expansionist tendency of the Hebrew text.

In his *Studies in the Text of Jeremiah*(1965)³⁾ G. Janzen dealt with the problem by using two new tools: the new critical edition of the Old Greek text of Jeremiah by Ziegler in the Göttingen series and the new manuscript evidence from Qumran (4QJer^b) for the Hebrew text of Jeremiah. Janzen set out to demonstrate that the shorter readings of Jer-LXX reflect a Hebrew *Vorlage* with shorter readings.

Janzen strongly refuted the theory of Graf-Giesebrecht that the Greek translator frequently abridged his Hebrew *Vorlage*. Janzen had at his disposal new manuscript evidence (4QJer^b) for the Hebrew text of Jer. He noted that 4QJer^b reflects a text-type identical with that which seems to underlie the LXX translation. Thus, 4QJer^b was used by him as a

1994), p. 1; Konrad Schmid, *Buchgestalten des Jeremiabuches* (Neukirchener Verlag, 1996), pp. 16-17.

2) K. H. Graf, *Der Prophet Jeremia* (Leipzig, 1862), XLIII: "Der von dem alexandrianischen Uebersetzer dargebotene Text erweist sich als ein wesentlich Kuerzerer, denn ungefuehr 2700 Woerter des masorethischen Textes, etwa der Sechste des Ganzen, sind darin nicht ausgedruckt . . ."; henceforth: Graf, *Jeremia*.

3) J. G. Janzen, *Studies in the Text of Jeremiah*, unpubl. dissertation, Harvard University, 1965, Published in 1973 (see n. 40). Henceforth: Janzen, *Studies*.

fundamental source to confirm the existence of a shorter form of the Hebrew text of Jer and to refute the theory of Graf-Giesebrecht, which explains the divergent Greek readings as a result of translation technique. In his analysis of 4QJer^b Janzen advanced strong evidence that a shorter Hebrew text of Jer agrees with Jer-LXX.⁴⁾

In "*L'incidence*"(1972) and subsequent publications,⁵⁾ E. Tov has shown a new aspect of the question of the relationship between Jer-LXX and Jer-MT. He observed that the differences between these two texts are not solely a matter of textual tradition. Jer-LXX and Jer-MT are not two traditions of one text, but they represent two different editions of the book of Jer. He regarded the shorter edition of the LXX as the first edition (Ed. I) and the long edition of the MT as the second edition (Ed. II).⁶⁾

R. W. Klein⁷⁾ examined the evidence of extensive expansion in the MT of Jeremiah. He also used the new evidence found in 4QJer^b, as the basis for a new approach to the whole problem of the Jer-LXX. He considered, as do Janzen and Tov, the shorter readings in the LXX as reflecting a shorter and more original Hebrew text.

Previous studies seem to deal with one possibility to the exclusion of other: either the translator's abridgement of the Hebrew *Vorlage* or the assumption of a short Hebrew *Vorlage*. Both possibilities should have been given equal consideration. As a result of their limited investigations, what eventually emerged was collection and an analysis of "some" examples which would serve only to enforce their specific views. As a rule, many minuses and pluses in Jer-LXX had not been analyzed until 1977 on the one hand, and no attempt was made to organize a systematic and correlative classification of both minuses and pluses. In previous

4) *Ib.*, pp. 87-115.

5) E. Tov, "L'incidence de la critique textuelle sur la critique littéraire dans le livre de Jérémie," *RB* 79 (1972), pp. 189-199; henceforth: Tov, "L'incidence"; *id.*, "Septuagint, The Contribution of the Septuagint to OT Scholarship," *IDBS* (N.Y.1976), pp. 807-11; *id.*, "Trumata . . . (Heb.)," *Shnaton* (1976), pp. 165-182. Henceforth: Tov, *Shnaton*.

6) Tov, "L'incidence," p. 191.

7) R. W. Klein, *Textual Criticism of the Old Testament, From the Septuagint to Qumran* (Philadelphia, 1974).

studies detailed discussions were devoted mainly to the problem of the minuses. The minus elements always claimed primary consideration because of their high frequency. Pluses have not yet been fully discussed in relationship to minuses.

In Min's survey mentioned above (see note 1), from the outset the quantitative divergence was ascribed neither to the translators nor to their Hebrew *Vorlage*, and accordingly neither the translator's abridgement nor the expansionistic character of the MT has been viewed as the only possible explanation of the differences in textual quantity. Rather, throughout his survey, the following two parallel sets of considerations was taken into account.

Set 1. Viewed from the angle of the LXX

- 1) Possible abridgement of a longer Hebrew *Vorlage* by the translator.
- 2) A shorter Hebrew *Vorlage* faithfully represented by the LXX translator.

Set 2. Viewed from the angle of the MT

- 1) Possible abridgement of a longer Hebrew text (MT) in the process of the transmission of the text as reflected in the LXX.
- 2) Possible expansion of a shorter Hebrew text (like the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX)

The study, for the first time, gave a complete list of the minuses and pluses in the Jer-LXX as against the mere selections in previous discussions. Plus elements which presumably were based on Hebrew pluses have been tentatively retroverted into Hebrew in order to be analyzed together with the minus elements. The minus and plus elements have been classified by the same syntactic criteria, and a correlation list was compiled. This comparative study of the minuses and pluses afforded some evidence for determining the character and origins of the minuses and pluses in Jer-LXX.

Belows are some conclusions based on his analysis of the minuses and pluses in Jer-LXX.⁸⁾

- (1) Jer-LXX is 1/7 shorter than Jer-MT.
- (2) The minus elements in Jer-LXX are too numerous and peculiar to have been accidental; rather, they are characteristic of Jer-LXX.
- (3) It is impossible to know the origins of minuses and pluses solely by an analysis of their external appearance with the exception of some clear cases of additions by the translator. The problem of the shorter text of Jer-LXX, therefore, should be explained "collectively" either on the assumption of a shorter Hebrew *Vorlage* or on the assumption of an abridgement of the Hebrew *Vorlage* by the Greek translator.
- (4) The hypothesis that the translator abridged his Hebrew *Vorlage* by omitting insignificant and superfluous Hebrew expressions is difficult to uphold, partly since the same elements are faithfully represented in other places of Jer-LXX and partly because the same elements also occur frequently in pluses.
- (5) The majority of the minus and plus elements are modifiers related, in the main, to stylistic mode rather than subject-matter of the text. Considering the high frequency of modifiers, it is reasonable to suppose that minuses in Jer-LXX have been added to the Hebrew text by the Biblical literati.⁹⁾ Such literati, who were clearly style-conscious, participated in the formation of the Biblical text. It is doubtful, however, that the minuses in Jer-LXX were omitted from the Hebrew *Vorlage* by the same translator who reproduced verbatim even the minor Hebrew elements.
- (6) Minuses may appear in sentence form. These can be classified as containing either introductory or conclusive remarks. Some sentence-type minuses can be deemed supplementary in nature. The introductory or conclusive remarks are editorial rubrics

8) Min, "The Minuses and Pluses . . . ," pp. 181-182.

9) For the discussion on the biblical stylistics and the creative activity of the Biblical writers, see S. Talmon, "The Textual Study of the Bible - A New Outlook" in F. M. Cross and S. Talmon, eds., *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* (Cambridge, Mass. 1975), pp. 321-400.

rather than redundant readings which could have been easily omitted by the translator. The supplementary elements are necessary to make a sentence complete. It is doubtful that the translator deliberately made complete sentences defective by omitting sentence-parts.

- (7) With the exception of a few cases of *homoioteleuton* and *homoioarkton*, the majority of the long minuses are new compositions based on several passages.
- (8) Minuses in Jer-LXX are the results of the possible expansion of a short Hebrew text toward the present MT, and pluses in Jer-MT are possibly variants representing a different Hebrew *Vorlage*.

A characterization of the additions in Jer-MT can be summarized as follows:¹⁰⁾

- (1) Jer-MT contains "numerous" additions (3,097 words) which are not represented in the Hebrew *Vorlage* of Jer-LXX. Revision was made in one direction. Revisers or editors revised the Hebrew text of Jer by adding some elements to the previous text, and not by removing elements from it. On the whole, Jer-LXX is 1/7 shorter than Jer-MT.
- (2) The additions may be divided into two categories: "short" and "long". The short additions are comprised of small Hebrew elements which cannot be classified as independent sentence-parts, syntactic units, and sentence-types (usually one member of a compound sentence). The long additions usually are comprised of one or several verses.
- (3) The additions were made both in prose and poetry sections. However, in the amount of additions, prose section exceeds poetry section. Among the 3,097 minuses, 2,439 instances (79%) occur in prose while 658 instances (21%) occur in poetry.

10) Min, "The Minuses and Pluses . . . ," pp. 312-313.

- (4) The overwhelming majority of the short additions take the form of modifiers which are related to style rather than subject-matter. These modifiers are qualifying forms which depend on other forms to enhance their meaning.
- (5) Long additions are mainly editorial remarks or passages newly composed from other verses.
- (6) There are three dominant sources for the aforementioned additions: immediate context (30%); parallel passages in Jer and elsewhere (20%) and words which occur *passim* in Jer (35%). A small number of additions (8%) are derived from material not known from other passages in the MT.
- (7) Additions were made as a result of: Explicitness of the implicit participants (mainly separate subjects and objects), adjunction; qualification (mostly adverbs); juxtaposition, contextual or parallel assimilation; and composition from various verses.
- (8) In a certain case, differences in theology/ideology can be identified in the process of additions.

2. Jer-LXX Differs from Jer-MT in the Arrangement of Material

Another important aspect of the comparison between Jer-LXX and Jer-MT is the arrangement of the material related to the "Foreign Nation Oracles". In Jer-LXX the order of the nations denounced is different from that in Jer-MT and the collection of the "Foreign Nation Oracles" follows the summary in 25:1-14. Jer-MT, however, breaks the connection between 1:1-25:14 and 25:15-38; 46-51 by placing the oracles after chps. 46-51. Furthermore, the sequence of the individual oracles against foreign nations is different in Jer-LXX than in Jer-MT.¹¹⁾

The following table is designed to compare chapter and verse divisions between Jer-LXX and Jer-MT. This is not a complete comparative table of the Book of Jeremiah, but contains only the verses dealt with in the discussion related to the comparison between Jer-LXX and Jer-MT.

11) For detailed discussion, Robert P. Carroll, *Jeremiah A Commentary*, Old Testament Library (SCM Press Ltd, 1986), p. 53; Peter C. Craigie, Page H. Kelley, Joel F. Drinkard, Jr, *Jeremiah 1-25*, Word Biblical Commentary Volume 26 (Dallas: Word Books Publisher, 1991), p. xlii; William L. Holladay, *Jeremiah 2, A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah 26-52*, Hermeneia - A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989), p. 5; A. Rofe, "The Arrangement of the Book of Jeremiah," *ZAW* 101 (1989), pp. 390-398.

LXX(MT)

9: 1 (**8:23**)
9: 5 (**9: 4**)
9: 7 (**9: 6**)
9:12 (**9:11**)
9:13 (**9:12**)
9:14 (**9:13**)
9:16 (**9:15**)
9:24 (**9:23**)
9:26 (**9:25**)
26: (**46:**)
27: (**50:**)
28: (**51:**)
29:10 (**49: 9**)
29:19 (**49:18**)
29:22 (**49:21**)
30: 4 (**49: 4**)
30: 9 (**49:31**)
31: (**48:**)
33: (**26:**)
34: 2 (**27: 3**)
34: 7 (**27: 9**)

LXX(MT)

34:12 (**27:15**)
34:14 (**-**)
35: (**28:**)
36: (**29:**)
37: (**30:**)
38: (**31:**)
39: (**32:**)
40: (**33:**)
41: (**34:**)
42: (**35:**)
43: (**36:**)
44: (**37:**)
45: (**38:**)
46: (**39:**)
47: (**40:**)
48: (**41:**)
49: (**42:**)
50: (**43:**)
51: (**44:**)
51:33 (**45: 3**)
51:34 (**45:18**)

MT (LXX)	25:32 (32:18)	36: (43:)
8:23 (9: 1)	25:33 (32:19)	37: (44:)
9: 2 (9: 3)	25:34 (32:20)	38: (45:)
9: 3 (9: 4)	25:38 (32:24)	39: (46:)
9: 4 (9: 5)	26: (33:)	40: (47:)
9: 5 (9: 6)	27: 1 (34: -)	41: (48:)
9: 6 (9: 7)	27: 2 (34: 1)	42: (49:)
9: 8 (9: 9)	27: 3 (34: 2)	43: (50:)
9: 9 (9:10)	27: 4 (34: 3)	44: (51:)
9:11 (9:12)	27: 5 (34: 4)	45: 1 (51:31)
9:12 (9:13)	27: 6 (34: 5)	45: 2 (51:32)
9:13 (9:14)	27: 7 (34: -)	45: 3 (51:33)
9:14 (9:15)	27: 8 (34: 6)	45: 4 (51:34)
9:15 (9:16)	27: 9 (34: 7)	45: 5 (51:35)
9:16 (17)	27:10 (34: 8)	46: (26:)
9:17 (18)	27:11 (34: 9)	47: 4 (29: 4)
9:21 (22)	27:12 (34:10)	47: 5 (29: 5)
9:23 (24)	27:13 (34: -)	47: 6 (29: 6)
9:25 (26)	27:14 (34:11)	48: (31:)
25:14 (-)	27:16 (34:13)	49: 4 (30: 4)
25:15 (32: 1)	27:17 (34: -)	49: 9 (29:10)
25:16 (2)	27:18 (34:15)	49:18 (29:19)
25:17 (3)	27:19 (34:16)	49:21 (29:22)
25:18 (4)	27:20 (34:17)	49:31 (30: 9)
25:20 (6)	27:21 (34: -)	50: (27:)
25:22 (8)	28: (35:)	51: (28:)
25:24 (10)	29: (36:)	
25:25 (11)	30: (37:)	
25:26 (12)	31: (38:)	
25:27 (13)	32: (39:)	
25:28 (32:14)	MT (LXX)	
25:29 (32:15)	33: (40:)	
MT (LXX)	34: (41:)	
25:30 (32:16)	35: (42:)	

The followings are the two different sequences of the individual oracles against foreign nations which are in Jer-LXX and in Jer-MT.

In Jer-LXX

Elam (LXX 25:14-20; MT 49:34-39)
Egypt (LXX 26:2-28; MT 46:2-28)
Babylon (LXX 27:1-28:64; MT 50:1-51:64)
Philistines (LXX 29:1-7; MT 47:1-7)
Edom (LXX 30:1-16; MT 49:7-22)
Ammon (LXX 30:17-21; MT 49:1-6)
Syria (LXX 30:29-33; MT 49:23-27)
Arab (LXX 30:23-28; MT 49:28-33)
Moab (LXX 31:1-40; MT 48:1-47)

In Jer-MT

Egypt (46:2-28; LXX 26:2-28)
Philistines (47:1-7; LXX 29:1-7)
Moab (48:1-47; LXX 31)
Ammon (49:1-6; LXX 30:17-21)
Edom (49:7-22; LXX ?)
Syria (49:23-27; LXX 30:29-33)
Arab (49:28-33; LXX 30:23-28)
Elam (49:34-39; LXX 25:14-20)
Babylon (50:1-51:64; LXX 27:1-28:64)

It is clearly visible in the different location of the oracles against foreign nations (chps. 46-51 in Jer-MT), which follow 25:13 in Jer-LXX, and also the different internal arrangement of the oracles.

The reason that the present study presents both different location of the oracles against foreign nations and the different internal arrangement of the nations denounced is not to discuss the different arrangement itself, but to emphasize the riskiness and the limit of

parallel edition of the two different texts or subordinate edition in which reading of Jer-LXX are indicated in the apparatus of the Hebrew base text.

3. Jer-LXX Differs from Jer-MT in Theology/Ideology

- 1) "Nebuchadrezzar is known just as king of Babylon in Jer-LXX, but he is known as "God's servant" in Jer-MT

(1) Jer 25:9

YLT Jer 25:9

Lo, I am sending, and have taken all the families of the north - an affirmation of Jehovah - even unto Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon, My servant, and have brought them in against this land, and against its inhabitants, and against all these nations round about, and have devoted them, and appointed them for an astonishment, and for a hissing, and for wastes age-during.

LXE Jer 25:9

Behold I *will* send and take a family from the north, and will bring them against this land, and against the inhabitants of it, and against all the nations round about it, and I will make them utterly waste, and make them a desolation, and a hissing, and an everlasting reproach.

Jer-LXX	Jer-MT
a family from the north	all the families of the north
(G lacks)	an affirmation of Jehovah
(G lacks)	"even unto Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon, My servant"

(G lacks these)

**and against all these nations
round about¹²⁾**

make them utterly waste

have devoted them¹³⁾

and an everlasting reproach¹⁴⁾

and for wastes¹⁵⁾ age-during

Weiser, Rudolph follow LXX and delete "an affirmation of Jehovah" and "even unto Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon, My servant"(cf. BHS): "These are syntactically awkward, and are probably a gloss to indicate that the prophecy was actually fulfilled by Nebuchadnezzar."¹⁶⁾ Holladay suggests deleting the phrase "- an affirmation of Jehovah - even unto Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon, My servant," with Jwe-LXX; So Duhm, Giesebrecht, Cornill, Condamin. The phrase is an expression from the MT text of 27:6.¹⁷⁾ Janzen¹⁸⁾ does not offer the best solution.; BHS also suggests deleting the phrase.¹⁹⁾

Surprisingly a pagan emperor is described as the servant of the Lord.

12) "and against all these nations round about": Though the phrase is present in G as well as in M, it is an expression based on verses 15-38 and does not belong in a judgment on Judah (v. 1) (so Rudolph) (Holladay, *Jeremiah I*, pp. 662-3); BHS suggests this passage is an addition anticipating verses 15ff.

13) *vehaharamtim*, "I will put them to the sacred ban" or "I will utterly destroy them"; herem indicates that a holy war practice of the complete annihilation of the population (cf. Josh. 7-8; I Sam 15:1-9) (Carroll, *Jeremiah*, p. 492).

14) *herpat*. "and into an everlasting reproach" (Jer-LXX); "and for wastes age-during" (Jer-MT). Reading with G *uleherpat* for M *ulehorbot*; the inhabitants can hardly become rubble. The same three nouns are found in 29:18. (Holladay, *Jeremiah I*, p. 663)

15) *horbah*. Driver, 1937, pp. 118-19, retains *hrbh*, 'idle gossip,' cf. NEB, 'a scandal forever.'

16) John Bright, *Jeremiah: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, Anchor Bible 21, Double & Company Inc., 1965, p. 157.

17) See also Werner E. Lemke, "Nebuchadrezzar, my Servant" CBQ 28 (1966), pp. 45-50.

18) Janzen, *Studies*, p. 44.

19) Holladay, *Jeremiah I*, p. 662.

Exactly the same description is applied to the prophets called by the Lord in v. 4. Application of the title "my servant" to Nebuchadrezzar was apparently offensive in some circles. LXX omits or alters on each occurrence in the Jeremiah book (cf. 25:5; 43:10).²⁰⁾ The reference to Nebuchadrezzar as "my servant" raises interesting questions. J. A. Thompson maintains that the phrase "even unto Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon, My servant" was omitted by the Jer-LXX translator who objected to giving such a title and such a place of honor to a pagan king.²¹⁾

As Thompson has already pointed out²²⁾ correctly, there is no evidence that the king of Babylon was ever a worshiper of Yahweh. Clearly he was God's instrument for judgment on Judah (cf. Cyrus in Isaiah 44:28-45:1, called 'my shepherd', 'my anointed').

It occurs also in the Hebrew at 27:6. It recalls the way in which Deutero-Isaiah, at a somewhat later date, speaks of the Persian Cyrus. See Isa 45:1ff. Deutero-Isaiah seems to reserve the title "servant" for Israel, and gives Cyrus the more prestigious one of 'my anointed' and 'my shepherd'.

According to Thompson the term "servant" is widely used in the context of suzerain-vassal relationships in the ancient Near East and forms a regular part of treaty terminology. The vassal was obligated to place his army at the service of his overlord. Nebuchadrezzar is here seen as the vassal of Yahweh, and as such he is summoned along with the tribes of the north to destroy Judah and its inhabitants for their rebellion against him.²³⁾

On the contrary, application of this title to Nebuchadnezzar can be explained as being added in the process of expansion by edition II (MT) due to defensive theological or ideological attitude toward the Babylonian king.

20) John Bright, *Jeremiah*, p. 200.

21) Thompson, *Jeremiah*, 1980, p. 521.

22) J. A. Thompson, *Book of Jeremiah*, The New International Commentary on the Old Testament (William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1980), p. 512.

23) Z. Zevit, "The Use of *ēbed* as a Diplomatic Term in Jeremiah," *JBL* 88 (1969), pp. 74-77 (Thompson, *Jeremiah*, p. 513.).

Tov²⁴⁾ and McKane²⁵⁾ observe that the expressions in MT are explanatory glosses or exegesis whose aim is to identify Judah's enemy with Babylon, and, more particularly, with Nebuchadnezzar.

And the MT reading "my servant" as a designation for Nebuchadnezzar instead of the infinitive expression "to serve him" is a surprising variation which has occasioned much comment (Lemke); it is evidently the fruit of later theological speculation which exalted station of Nebuchadnezzar (as a negative figure alongside of Cyrus, 'his anointed', Isa 45:1 - a positive figure?)²⁶⁾

(2) Jer 27:6

YLT Jer 27:6

And now, I - I have given all these lands into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon, My servant, and also the beast of the field I have given to him to serve him;

LXE Jer 27:6

I gave the earth to Nabuchodonosor king of Babylon to serve him, and the wild beasts of the field to labour for him.

The phrase "Nebuchadnezzar, my servant" also occurs in 25:9; 43:10 (lacking in G but see on 43:10); there are some problems in establishing whether the first edition knew this phrase or not (*abdi*, 'my servant', is conspicuously absent in G 25:9; 50:10 [MT 43:10], Tov concludes that MT here reflects the original text rather than G; but G is the original text in the other two references [25:9; 43:10]).²⁷⁾

Yahweh identifies himself as the one who is responsible for Nebuchadnezzar's steady taking over of one kingdom after another; to

24) E. Tov, "Some Aspects of the Textual and Literary History of the Book of Jeremiah," in P.-M. Bogaert (ed), *Le Livre de Jérémie*, pp. 145-167, esp., p. 165-167.

25) William McKane, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jeremiah*, The International Critical Commentary (T. & T. Clark, 1986), p. 624.

26) Holladay, *Jeremiah II*, 1989, p. 121.

27) Robert P. Carroll, *Jeremiah*, p. 527.

rebel against Nebuchadnezzar would be to rebel against God.²⁸⁾

The reading "earth" is preferable to the MT reading "these lands"; the reference is to the omnipotence of Nebuchadnezzar over every thing on the earth, including wild animals, not to specific nations. LXX ("the earth") may be more original, with MT representing an effort to make it clear that *haarts* does not mean just "the land" (Judah), but all the countries mentioned above.²⁹⁾

(3) Jer 43:10 (LXX 50:10)

YLT Jer 43:10

Jer-LXX
(G lacks)³⁰⁾

the earth³¹⁾ to
Nabuchodonosor
king of Babylon

(G lacks)³²⁾
to labour for him³⁴⁾

Jer-MT

And now, I

all these lands into the hand of
Nebuchadnezzar
king of Babylon

My servant,³³⁾
to serve him

and thou hast said unto them: Thus said Jehovah of Hosts, God of Israel: 'Lo, I am sending, and I have taken Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon, My servant, and I have set his throne above these stones that I have hid, and he hath stretched out his pavilion over them,

28) Holladay, *Jeremiah II*, p. 121.

29) John Bright, *Jeremiah*, p. 200.

30) G lacks the introductory phrase *veattah anoki*.

31) Reading G (*haàrets*) for M (*vehaaratsot haeleh*).

32) Janzen (*Studies*, p. 19) suggests tentatively that it is a haplography caused by homoioteleuton, but he does not press his proposal. (McKane, *Jeremiah II*, p. 687)

33) *abdi*. See also Werver E. Lemke, "Nebuchadrezzar, my Servant" *CBQ* 28 (1966), 45-50; Janzen, *Studies*, pp. 54-57.

34) *leàbdo*.

LXE Jer 50:10 [MT 43:10]

and thou shalt say, Thus has the Lord said; Behold, I *will* send, and will bring Nabuchodonosor king of Babylon, and he shall place his throne upon these stones which thou hast hidden, and he shall lift up weapons against them.

Jer-LXX	Jer-MT
(G lacks <u>them</u>)	And thou hast said unto them
(G lacks)	Jehova of Hosts, God of Israel
king of Babylon	King of Babylon,
(G lacks)	My servant,
<u>he</u> shall place³⁵⁾ his throne	I have set³⁶⁾ his throne
thou hast hidden	I have hid

G lacks 'my servant' in the phrase 'Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon, My servant', cf. 25:9; 27:6, where the fullest form of the phrase appears in MT but the whole phrase is lacking in G 25:9. G lacks 'my servant', but has 'to serve him', which may reflect MT which, in turn, probably influenced 43:10.³⁷⁾

Addition of the phrase "my servant" creates such a close relationship between Yahweh and Nebuchadrezzar, the actions of the latter can be represented as those of the former.

"he shall place"

So with G; but Heb. "I have set" is not impossible.³⁸⁾

35) *vesam*.

36) *vesanti*.

37) Carroll, *Jeremiah*, p. 725.

38) Bright, *Jeremiah*, p. 259.

"thou hast hidden"

Jer-LXX "thou hast hidden," second person masculine singular

Jer-MT "I have hid," first person common singular

"thou hast hidden"

So LXX^{BA}, MT "I have hid" does not fit well in an address where Yahweh is the speaker, although it may be that in the spoken form of address Jeremiah identifies his action as Yahweh's own. (Bright, 259)

Jer-LXX

(G lacks)³⁹⁾

Jer-MT

**into the yoke of
the king of Babylon**

(G lacks)

and live

vs. 10-13

"The sign Jeremiah enacts is to be made clear to the Judean exilic community in Egypt. The prophet is instructed to explain the meaning behind what he has done. Nebuchadrezzar, Yahweh's servant will successfully exercise power over Egypt and her Pharaoh and will be Yahweh's instrument of judgment upon those who thought to find safety there against the counsel of Yahweh and Yahweh's prophet."⁴⁰⁾

2) The idea that one who serves Nebuchadrezzar will enjoy a (long) life is found in Jer-MT, and not in Jer-LXX.

(1) Jer 27:12

39) G lacks the phrase "into the yoke of the king of Babylon". MT repeated the phrase from verses 8, 11.

40) KSS, *Jeremiah II*, 1995, p. 257.

YLT Jer 27:12 And unto Zedekiah king of Judah I have spoken according to all these words, saying, 'Cause your necks to enter into the yoke of the king of Babylon, and serve him and his people, and live.

LXE Jer 27:12 I spoke also to Sedekias king of juda according to all these words, saying, Put your neck into, and serve the king of Babylon.

The speaker of the verse ("I have spoken") is Jeremiah himself. By saying "Cause your necks to enter into the yoke of the king of Babylon, and serve him and his people, and live." Jeremiah was discouraging resistance to the Babylonians. This kind of utterance is so seditious.

"In the execution of his purposes of judgment Yahweh the Creator and the Lord of the whole earth had chosen to give the earth into the hands of Nebuchadrezzar. To resist Nebuchadrezzar was, therefore, to resist Yahweh (27:5-8)... Despite discouragement Jeremiah preserved to the last in his insistence that the only thing to do was to acknowledge Yahweh's hand of judgment in the activities of Nebuchadrezzar and to surrender to him."⁴¹)

(2) Jer 27:17

YLT Jer 27:17 Ye do not hearken unto them, serve the king of Babylon, and live. Why is this city a waste?

LXE 27:17 I sent them not.

BHS treats v. 17 as an addition to MT as G lacks it; it disrupts the flow of verses 16, 18 on the subject of the (temple) furnishings. (Carroll, *Jeremiah*, p. 529)

YLT Jeremiah 27:16 And unto the priests, and unto all this

41) Thompson, *Jeremiah*, p. 93.

people, I have spoken, saying, 'Thus said Jehovah, Ye do not hearken unto the words of your prophets, who are prophesying to you, saying, Lo, the vessels of the house of Jehovah are brought back from Babylon now in haste, for falsehood they are prophesying to you. 17 Ye do not hearken unto them, serve the king of Babylon, and live. Why is this city a waste? 18 'And, if they be prophets, and if a word of Jehovah be with them, let them intercede, I pray you, with Jehovah of Hosts, so that the vessels that are left in the house of Jehovah, and {in} the house of the king of Judah, and in Jerusalem, have not gone into Babylon.

The phrase "serve the king of Babylon, and live" appears only in Jer-MT in 27:12, 17. Jer-LXX lacks this phrase in both places. In both occurrences to live means, as Tov mentioned, to enjoy a long life, which is known elsewhere from the Sixth, from deuteronomistic phraseology and Amos 5:4, 6.

Honour thy father and thy mother, as Jehovah thy God hath commanded thee, so that thy days are prolonged, and so that it is well with thee, on the ground which Jehovah thy God is giving to thee.

4. The Two Editions of Jeremiah

Tov's two editions hypothesis, mentioned above, was based on the observation that the differences between the two texts are visible in their respective lengths and text arrangements, the most striking example is the different location of the prophecies against the foreign nations. Moreover, Tov contended that the Hebrew tradition behind the LXX is now evidenced in 4QJer^b, both in the matter of length and in the arrangement of the text.⁴²⁾

42) Tov, *IDBS*, col. 807-8.

Tov also indicated that these two editions of Jeremiah once existed in Hebrew. For this reason, according to Tov, it is not sound methodologically to correct the longer text of the MT on the basis of the shorter text of the LXX as the BH and also BHS do in their critical apparatuses.⁴³⁾ Moreover, it is to his credit that Tov recognizes the interdependence of "lower" and "higher" criticism in dealing with our problem.⁴⁴⁾

Tov's main concern was to examine closely the character of the minuses in the LXX (or "the additions to the second edition," as he calls them) in order to understand the nature of the second edition of the book of Jeremiah. According to him, the nature of the elements lacking in the LXX is mainly such that they can be easily explained as additions in the second edition of the book of Jeremiah. A tentative classification of the additions to the second edition is found in his "L'incidence":⁴⁵⁾

- a) Stylistic expansions (appended names, repetition of short expressions in the same verse, formulas);
- b) Additions from similar contexts;
- c) Editorial remarks (introductory or conclusive remarks, new material);
- d) Deuteronomistic additions.

Tov leaves a more detailed characterization of the minus elements in the LXX to further research, but he has shown a tendency in the general direction found in the second edition of the book of Jeremiah.

43) Tov, "L'incidence," p. 191.

44) A more detailed examination of this problem is found in Tov, *Shnaton*, pp. 165-182. This opinion is reflected also in S. Talmon, "Textual Study of the Bible - A New Outlook" in F. M. Cross and S. Talmon, eds., *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*, p. 328: "The 'shorter' versus the 'expansionistic' text of Jeremiah on the surface is a textual problem and thus comes under the heading of 'lower criticism'. But if the roots of the question go as deep as the fifth century B.C.E., the issue, in fact, connects and concurs with problems of 'higher criticism', namely the presumed intrusion of non-Jeremianic material into the book ascribed to the prophet".

45) Tov, "L'incidence," pp. 192-7.

In *Shnaton*, Tov advanced the discussion with regard to the nature of the additions in the second edition:⁴⁶⁾

- a) Many of the additions in the second edition "do not suit their respective context" (e.g., 1:3; 27:1; 27:22; 28:16; 29:14; 29:16-20; 36:6; 41:2);
- b) Most additions of the second edition repeat details which were mentioned in the first edition, but sometimes the editor of the second edition inserted "new data" not known from other verses (e.g., 27:7; 27:18; 25:1; 25:26; 36:22; 38:12; 41:16);
- c) In many details the two traditions reflect "recensionally different" redactions of the book of Jer.

5. The Problem of Superiority or Inferiority of One Edition Over the Other

Janzen dealt with the problem of the relative superiority of the LXX to the MT by raising the question: "If G reflects a *Vorlage* with the shorter reading, is this reading superior or inferior to the longer reading of M?" He concluded that the LXX is generally superior to the MT in those omissions obviously not due to scribal lapses because the LXX reflects faithfully the original shorter Hebrew *Vorlage* while the MT has been affected by conflation and other expansion.⁴⁷⁾

The problem of the origin of the difference in length between the LXX and the MT has been discussed in connection with the debate over textual superiority. One point of view is that the MT is superior because the LXX reflects an abridged and mutilated form of its Hebrew *Vorlage*. Another point of view maintains the superiority of the LXX on the assumption that the MT has been affected by conflation and other forms of expansion while the LXX faithfully reflects the Hebrew *Vorlage*.

From the very beginning, the problem of which of the two texts was

46) Tov, *Shnaton*, pp. 180-2.

47) Janzen, *Studies*, pp. 8-9, 128.

superior could not have been treated objectively. For those who consider one text superior to the other, "superiority" means no more than a reflection of an original text. For example, for Movers,⁴⁸⁾ Scholz,⁴⁹⁾ and Janzen,⁵⁰⁾ the LXX is considered preferable simply on the grounds that it reflects a shorter Hebrew *Vorlage* while the MT has been affected by expansion. However, for Graf⁵¹⁾ and Giesebrecht,⁵²⁾ the LXX is a mutilated and corrupted text because it arbitrarily abridged its Hebrew *Vorlage*.

The superiority or inferiority of one text over the other should be examined by grammatical, syntactical, and stylistic criteria, and not by "original" *versus* "secondary". M. Dahood's critical review of Janzen⁵³⁾ has also pointed out that "before one can adequately examine the longstanding problem of the relative merits of MT and LXX in the book of Jeremiah, one must more fully study the grammatical and poetic phenomena of the Hebrew text".

6. Two Canonical Books Should Be Edited Independently and Sequentially

Historically the two different editions of the Book of Jeremiah were accepted as part of the canon by two different historical traditions. On the one hand, the shorter Hebrew text of Jeremiah reflected in the Septuagint was the only book of Jeremiah of the whole church in ancient times, but also it remains as the canonical book of Jeremiah of the Orthodox Church from the very beginning until now. On the other hand, the longer text of Jeremiah reflected in the preserved Hebrew Masoretic text has been accepted as the canonical book of Jeremiah by the Roman Catholic Church since the Trent Council of 1546, where the Vulgate - reflecting

48) Movers, *Deutrisque recensionis Vaticiniorum Jeremiae* (Hamburg, 1837).

49) Scholz, *LXX-Uebersetzung*, p. 229.

50) Janzen, *Studies*, p. 128.

51) Graf, *Jeremia*, LI.

52) Giesebrecht, *Das Book Jeremia*, HK(Goettingen, 1907), pp. XIX-XXXIV.

53) in *Biblica* 56 (1975), pp. 429-431.

the longer text of Jer-MT - was accepted as an official translation of the Old Testament, and by the Protestant Church from its beginning at the Reformation. Therefore, these two different literary editions of Jeremiah deserve to be translated and edited independently and sequentially as a part of the Old Testament.

1) The textual variants and different arrangements of material reflected in both the Greek and Hebrew witnesses of Jeremiah should be regarded as having their own literary growth, rather than only having textual variants which we can identify in other books of the two Old Testament text tradition (LXX and MT). To choose only one of these two literary traditions for textual criticism may not be acceptable methodologically.

2) Using only one literary tradition (such as Jer-MT) as the base text and the other (such as Jer-LXX) to compare textual variants in the marginal notes will not give a sufficient explanation of the literary background of these two books of Jeremiah.

3) Neither is it a satisfactory solution to compare the two different texts by showing them in parallel format, because they are different in their arrangement of material, and therefore it would be inevitable to rearrange the material either of Jer-LXX or Jer-MT according to the base text if such an editorial format were applied.

4) It is conceivable for the two books of Jeremiah to be edited independently and sequentially in the same volume of the Old Testament. The sequence of the two books, whether Jer-MT comes first and Jer-LXX comes next, or vice versa, can be decided according to the understanding of the historical importance of the book in each church tradition.

5) The superiority or inferiority of one text over the other should be examined by grammatical, syntactical, and stylistic criteria, and not by "original" *versus* "secondary".