



This material has been provided by Asbury Theological Seminary in good faith of following ethical procedures in its production and end use.

The Copyright law of the united States (title 17, United States code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyright material. Under certain condition specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to finish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specific conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be *“used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research.”* If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of “fair use,” that user may be liable for copyright infringement. This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

By using this material, you are consenting to abide by this copyright policy. Any duplication, reproduction, or modification of this material without express written consent from Asbury Theological Seminary and/or the original publisher is prohibited.

Contact

B.L. Fisher Library
Asbury Theological Seminary
204 N. Lexington Ave.
Wilmore, KY 40390

B.L. Fisher Library’s Digital Content
place.asburyseminary.edu



Asbury Theological Seminary
205 North Lexington Avenue
Wilmore, Kentucky 40390

800.2ASBURY
asburyseminary.edu

**A Study of the MT and LXX pluses in Jer 26-29 (33-36):
From Textual to Redactional Implications**

A Thesis submitted to
The Faculty of Biblical Studies Division
Asbury Theological Seminary

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts in Biblical Studies

Approved:


Dr. Lawson G. Stone

by
Pedro López Mombiela
Wilmore, KY, USA

May 1994

Table of Contents

Chapter	Page
1.- Introduction.....	1
Introduction to the Problem.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	2
Review of the Related Literature.....	3
Composition of Jeremiah.....	3
The Text of Jeremiah.....	10
Presuppositions and Methodology.....	14
Limitations of this Thesis.....	15
2.- Classification of Pluses.....	17
Comparative Analysis - I.....	19
Comparative Analysis - II.....	48
3.- Final Considerations and Conclusion	75
Apendix.....	85
Bibliography.....	87

CHAPTER 1

Introduction to the Problem

The Old Testament still is the most unknown and fascinating field in the area of Biblical Studies. Continuously new discoveries are made that clear the cloudiness from the past and enable scholars and students of the Bible to understand progressively about this part of the Bible. The Book of Jeremiah is a good example of this. One of the peculiarities of this book, constituting one of the most interesting features of the Book, is the textual difference between the MT and LXX texts. Before the discovery of the Qumran Scrolls the work on this field was merely a matter of speculation caused by the lack of evidence and the granting of assumptions upon which the Fathers of the Church and others like Josephus based their understanding of textual transmission.¹ With the evidence provided by the Dead Sea community this view changed. At Cave 4 some manuscripts in Hebrew from the Book from Jeremiah were discovered that reflected the textual characteristics of the LXX.² This produced an avalanche of theories, as will be mentioned in the following review of related literature.

This thesis dwells in the study of Jeremiah chapters 26-29 in the MT, and the respective ones in the LXX, chapters 33-36. The purpose of this writing is to analyze the pluses found in both texts and determine their nature and character in order to provide an alternative historical explanation

¹ Josephus assumed was that the Hebrew Text was unchanged and unchanging. F. M. Cross responded to this saying that he and the Fathers of the Church obscured the history of this text by holding the above assumption. F. M. Cross. "The Text Behind the Text of the Hebrew Bible." Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls. Hershel Shanks, ed. (New York: Random House, 1992), 143.

² At Cave 4 of Qumran were found some fragments of manuscripts on the Book of Jeremiah: 4QJer-a, twelve fragments that reflect the text of the MT; 4QJer-b, three fragments, two of which reflect the LXX text while the other one sides with the MT.

from the text of Jeremiah. The reason for choosing these chapters is related to the fact that little study has been given to them.

Statement of the Problem

The literary structure and form of the book of Jeremiah is one of the most difficult; for this results in problems in the exegesis of the book. This difficulty compounds when the MT and LXX texts of this book are compared. Both texts are different in length and arrangement, the LXX represents the shorter version and the MT the longer. The major question to this observation is, do the MT pluses represent a corruption of the original material? What is the character and nature of this extra material? Does this mean the LXX represents a more reliable witness to the original text because of its shortness compared to the MT? Also the LXX has some material that does not appear in the MT. What is the nature of these materials? Does this belong to the earlier edition or material upon which the LXX translator based his work? Did these pluses originally belong to that earlier Jeremaic material or is it the product of an editorial process? All these questions and more have attempted to be answered and they still are the key questions for present investigations.

During the last few years the tendency has been to consider the MT a product of redactional process, and to see the LXX reflecting an earlier Hebrew version of Jeremiah. This thesis seeks to verify what has been done and to check if the pluses contained in the LXX should be considered the product of a redactor(s) or not. This work focuses on three major parts: 1) an analysis of Jeremiah chapters 26-29 in the MT, and chapters 33-36 in the LXX ; 2) the analysis from the results of the first part and an

explanation of what could happen and 3) to provide an alternative explanation, and finally raise questions based on the findings to answer in future studies of the book as a whole.

Review of Related Literature

The following bibliographical review consists of the authors and sources that are the foundational research resource for this thesis. This bibliographic review is done by dividing it into two sections: 1) composition of the book, and 2) the text of Jeremiah.

Composition of the Book: The wide range of literary forms and types; lyric war poems, biographical material, parables, etc., make the Book of Jeremiah one of the most complex in the Old Testament. The major questions scholars have tried to answer deal with the authorship, structure, and date of the book; all these cluster under the big question of the composition of the book. In answering this question, the hot topic is the attempt to establish the relationship between the poetry and prose of Jeremiah.

The theories about the composition of the Book of Jeremiah are based primarily on the conclusions of Bernhard Duhm and Sigmund Mowinckel.³ Duhm⁴ in 1901, using the MT, presented the following analysis of the text of Jeremiah:

³Carroll, Robert P., *Jeremiah: A Commentary* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1986). In the introduction to his commentary, he says, "much of recent research on Jeremiah consists of the development or modification of the views of Duhm and Mowinckel." p.40

⁴Duhm, B. *Das Buch Jeremia*. 1901.

Poems of Jer.

Book of Baruch

Added Supplements

Book of Jeremiah

His conclusions were basically, because the majority of the verses constituted the later additions and Baruch's contribution, the book of Jeremiah as a whole "reflects the fiction of Jeremiah as a preacher." This added material reflects the influence of Deuteronomy. His view concerning the book of Jeremiah begins with a general scroll (*Urrolle*), and this was expanded by Baruch and given its final form by a series of editors who added further material.⁵ Harrison pointed out Duhm's view of the book as a whole was extreme for he reached the conclusion that the authentic oracles of Jeremiah, the *ipsissima verba*, were those poetic portions written in 3:2 rhythm, in a pentameter verse, and chapter 36 as his only authentic prose composition.⁶

Sigmund Mowinckel⁷ took this issue one step forward. He proposed the following sources for Jeremiah:⁸

A ----- Poetic oracles (1-25)

B ----- Stories related to the prophet: 19:1-2, 10-11a,
14-20:6, 26-44. Attributed to Baruch.

C ----- Speeches which do not belong to A or B, by post-
exilic Deuteronomistic redactors: 7:1-8:3; 11:1-5,9-

⁵This view is supported by the majority of the scholars today, with a lots of variation regarding the details.

⁶R. K. Harrison, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969), 809.

⁷Mowinckel, Sigmund. *Zur Komposition des Buches Jeremia*. 1914.

⁸The division of the different sources follows Carroll's division of the sources. Carroll, 39.

14; 18:1-12; 21:1-10;25:1-11a;32:1-2,6-16,24-44;34:1-7,8-22;35:1-19; 44:1-14.

D ----- Latest addition to the text: 30-31 (a minor source)

Like Duhm, he considered A, as the part that preserved the *ipsissima verba* of Jeremiah. Source B forms the biographic material compiled by Baruch,⁹ and C constituting sermonic material followed the same formula as Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic History. Mowinckel concentrated mostly on the prose sermons from the book, seeing a connection with the teachings and ways of thinking characteristic of Deuteronomy. For Holladay, Mowinckel's "sources" do not provide a valid answer to the problem.¹⁰ Holladay observes strongly the differences between the prose and the poetic part do not imply necessarily the existence of literary sources.¹¹ He says this because Jeremiah himself used prose sermons with Deuteronomistic character, poetic features could be detected in the prose sections, and according to Holladay this reflects a new way of recording prophetic discourse. What Baruch did is to apply the conventional style of writing at that time, or applied the style of writing to what he used to write (cf.1975a,411) . Their major argument was the separation of the prose section; biographical material and the sermonic one.

Despite the general acceptance of Mowinckel's analysis for the Book of Jeremiah, today some scholars question the conclusions he reached; even though the scholars' opinions are divided. Among scholars differences of opinion come over the radical difference that Duhm and, especially, Mowinckel made between the sources B and C.¹²

⁹ Mowinckel did not give too much credit to the authorship of Baruch.

¹⁰ For more details on this, see Holladay, 15, and Carroll, 39-40.

¹¹ Holladay, W., *Jeremiah II* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, c1989): 15.

¹² See the comments that Jack R. Lundbom makes about the subject. Lundbom, Jack R. "Jeremiah, Book of." *The Anchor Bible Dictionary III* (1992): 706-721.

The main reason for these discrepancies are the assumptions on which scholars base their work. The basic one is whether the book of the Law, which according to the Biblical record was found during the reign of Josiah, is believed found as the Biblical account says, or was written then.

There is no doubt that Deuteronomistic¹³ characteristics are encountered in this book, the debate is about the nature of this material.¹⁴ On this discussion Thiel¹⁵ proposes out of a Deuteronomistic edition of the Book of Jeremiah. He emphasizes this was a systematic production of the Deuteronomistic School. On his approach he takes this point to an extreme, and as McKane affirms, with Thiel's approach there is the danger in "creating systematic theological aims"¹⁶ for that Deuteronomistic editor/s.

Helga Weippert, 1981a, noticed certain linguistic features in the book which she believes to demonstrate the key for the authorship of Jeremiah on the prose speeches. This view is rejected by Carroll. But as he points out, her approach suggests the idea of not giving too much credit to the Deuteronomistic sources.¹⁷

Holladay in the introduction to his commentary of Jeremiah (v.2) provides us with a very thorough introduction to the history and the problem of Jeremiah. He starts with three basic considerations:¹⁸

1.- Biblical material was gathered by a community. And often it was a period of oral tradition between the event lay behind the tradition and the fixing of the tradition in writing. There is evidence that the

¹³ By Deuteronomistic the writer means features of Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History.

¹⁴ Carroll, 41.

¹⁵ Carroll, 42. Thiel, Winfried. Die Deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 1-25. Neukirchener Verlag: Neukirchen-Vluyn, c1973. Die Deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 26-95. Neukirchener Verlag: Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1981.

¹⁶ Carroll, 42.

¹⁷ Carroll, 42.

¹⁸ Holladay, 2.

book of the prophets of the eighth century of having been compiled by disciples and being expanded by secondary additions; "therefore a similar process at work in the book of Jeremiah."

2.- Chapter 36 of Jeremiah has two documents dictated by the prophet Baruch. The first one was destroyed, and the second one written after the first one, the same but with some additions. In the book of Jeremiah three kinds of material can be distinguished: poetry, biographical material, and sermonic prose.¹⁹

3.- There is the conviction of many scholars Israel did not have today's biographical interest and that what we got of Jeremiah was shaped by the community religious needs, specifically liturgical ones, complicating any attempt to reconstruct a historical Jeremiah.

Holladay's main argument about the prose material of Jeremiah is that it "may preserve Jrm's 'voice' and that it is not to be taken as a literary source."²⁰

Another area for disagreement which comes from the desire to find out the author of the book, has to do with the role of Baruch. Here for Carroll it is too much to credit Baruch as the biographer and companion of Jeremiah.²¹ In his opinion there is room to consider Baruch Jeremiah's amanuensis on the strength of what we read in chapter 36. If Baruch were a biographer and lifetime companion, Carroll says, this would have been reflected in the text in the forms of historical reports, but we find that these stories present a literary and theological character. Questions directed at

¹⁹Mowinckel designated this material as A, B, and C.

²⁰Holladay, 15. See also his article "Fresh look at 'Source b' and 'Source c' in Jeremiah," *Vetus Testamentus* 25 (May 1975): 394-412.

²¹Carroll, 44-45.

this observation could be made. What was the task of an amanuensis? Does the text limit the role of Baruch in describing him as the scribe? Does the fact it is not mentioned that Baruch was a biographer and companion of Jeremiah deny this possibility? What if the main concern of Baruch were theological rather than historical? Carroll's concern is to look for the "Deuteronomist Jeremiah."²²

The question of how and who put together the Book of Jeremiah remains unanswered at this point. The assumptions and conclusions of modern scholars are dispersed from each other, with a great deal of variation.

Skinner²³ and Volz supported chapter 46-51, the oracles against the nations, were not the work of Jeremiah. J. Muilenburg²⁴ affirms that the original material of the book is somewhere in 1:4-25:13. Pfeiffer,²⁵ following Monwinckel division, saw the book as being composed of three parts: 1) words dictated or written by Jeremiah himself, 2) the biographical material (work of Baruch), and 3) miscellaneous material added by later editors. The first and second part being Baruch with a Deuteronomistic style who put them together working as the editor of the book. The main problem with this theory is that nowhere is Baruch mentioned as an editor but as the scribe of Jeremiah (36:2, 32); though it is recognized that the Ancient Near East scribes often did do the work of editing of ancient literary works.

²² For Carroll any access to the historical Jeremiah is not possible. For more information about this see "Jeremiah; Intensive Criticism / Thin Interpretation" by Walter Brueggeman, *Interpretation* 42 (July 1988): 270-271.

²³ J. Skinner, *Prophecy and Religion: Studies in the Life of Jeremiah* (Cambridge: The University Press, 1948): 239.

²⁴ Muilenburg, J., *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* II (1988): 833.

²⁵ Pfeiffer, *PIOT*, 500 ff.

Harrison's observations attribute to Jeremiah most of the book.²⁶ In the fourth year of Jehoiakim, the prophecies of Jeremiah took their initial shape, in about 626 BC. The next stage of this writing took place after the destruction of the first edition by the king (36:32), it was an amplified version of the first one, and it was this that would constitute the basis for the extant edition. According to him the Deuteronomistic style observed by some scholars should be challenged by two important considerations: First, Jeremiah was aware of the content of Deuteronomy or at least the content of the scroll of the law found in Josiah's kingship. Second, "The so-called 'Deuteronomic' style of some of the oracles was in any event nothing more than a form of Hebrew rhetorical prose during the late seventh and early sixth centuries BC."²⁷ He concludes dating the extant form of Jeremiah not later than 520 B.C.²⁸

To all the preceding problems, the historicity of the book stands up. Is the Book of Jeremiah reliable in its historical details? F. C. Fensham²⁹ makes a point in calling our attention to the importance the editor took in placing the events of the Book of Jeremiah in time and space. "The impression created by the Book of Jeremiah as substantiated by comparable extra-biblical sources, is that an editor with a thorough knowledge of the history of the times of Jeremiah has written the historical notes. "And that whoever put together the book "had a good knowledge of the history of his time and was capable of interpreting this history in terms of the prophecies of Jeremiah."³⁰

²⁶ Harrison, 817. For this suggestion see also J. Bright and H. Weippert.

²⁷ Harrison, 817. Harrison here is referring to what Oessterley and Robinson have pointed out about this matter in *IBOT*, 298.

²⁸ Harrison, 817.

²⁹ Fensham, F.C. "Nebukadrezzar in the Book of Jeremiah." *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 10 (1982): 53-65.

³⁰ Fensham, 54.

Text of Jeremiah: One of the most interesting features of Jeremiah is the drastic difference in length and arrangement between the MT and the LXX. The MT presents pluses totaling 2700 words, words that do not have Greek counterparts in the LXX. While the LXX presents a total of about 100 pluses that we do not find in the MT. The arrangement of the book differs greatly, mainly in the place where the Oracles Against the Nation are found. The question of which one of the texts should be considered prior has lead historically to four major theories as are expressed in the introductory chapter of The Greek Text of Jeremiah: a Revised Hypothesis by Sven Soderlund³¹ who summarizes this issue very well. These theories are:

- 1) Abbreviation Theory: The LXX is an abbreviated translation of a *Vorlage* which was identical in form and length to the MT.
- 2) The Editorial Theory: This was proposed by Eichhorn, and said that both text come from different editions of the book that Jeremiah himself produced.
- 3) The Expansion Theory: For the supporters of this theory the LXX text is more trustworthy than the MT. This last one having suffered a process of enormous expansion in the course of transmission.
- 4) The Mediating Theory: Both texts should be considered with the some degree of priority, sometimes it is the MT reflecting a prior reading and other times the LXX should be considered as more reliable.

³¹ Sven Soderlund, The Greek Text of Jeremiah: a Revised Hypothesis, JSOT Supplement Series 47, 1985.

Of these theories the last one was most accepted by the middle of this century, supported by people like John Bright,³² J. A. Thompson,³³ Duham, and Rudolph. Considering the evidence found at Qumran this view has been challenged by Janzen³⁴ who analyzed the evidence from Qumran and studied what he calls "zero variants" (omissions in the LXX) reaching the conclusion that the LXX reflects an older Hebrew text with which agrees in length and arrangement, and the MT was the product of editorial activity in the process of transmission of the text. For that reason the MT should be considered, textually, secondary in comparison to the LXX. 4QJer-a (12 fragments) that F. M Cross dates from the beginning of the second century reflects the MT, while 4QJer-b, in two of the fragments, dated around 150 BC reflects a shorter text as the LXX does.³⁵

The following question related to the relationship between the LXX and MT is expected; is the LXX a shortened form of the MT, or is the MT an expanded form of the LXX? The inclination of the MT to expand is a characteristic of the prose sections, though in the poetic sections of the book there is also expansion. Both traditions present pluses, the task of the scholar is sometimes shaky in trying to determine which pluses are original and which ones are secondary, sometimes the results are based on assumptions with little foundation but reduced to a matter of feeling.³⁶

Holladay examining the sequence of the chapters says; " LXX associates the oracles with 25:15-29, the listing of various nations who will drink the cup of wrath; the association is undoubtedly the original one, so it

³² John Bright, *Jeremiah* (Garden City, New York: The Anchor Bible, Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1965).

³³ J.A.Thompson, *The Book of Jeremiah* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989).

³⁴ J. Gerald Janzen, *Studies in the Text of Jeremiah*. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973).

³⁵ 4QJer-b is representing three pieces of mss.; two agree with the LXX, and the other one with the MT.

³⁶See Holladay's comments p. 4.

follows that the oracles were moved secondarily to their position in the MT...But it is to be assumed that the sequence of oracles in the MT is the original one, since it seems to have chronological basis: The first oracle against Egypt, the oracle against Philistia, and the earliest section of the material against Moab were probably delivered at the time of the battle of Carchemish; oracles against the Transjordanian states follow, together with peoples farther away; and the oracles against Babylon, whose fall would be delayed comes last. On the other hand, though the oracles are in their original position in G, their sequence has been rearrange, to be understood as the Pathian Empire, followed then by Egypt and Babylon (the Seleucid Empire); the others follow geographically, closing with the longest, Moab."³⁷

Holladay remarks that "if the proto-septuagintal text evolved in Egypt, it is striking that an exemplar found its way to Qumran. One wonders, did that Qumran community derive from the authorities in Jerusalem an interest in a variety of textual traditions of Scripture, or was this an interest confined to Qumran itself? One can at least assert that manuscripts were carried long distances and that the Qumran community was hospitable to variant text traditions, at least for Jeremiah."³⁸

The most relevant work on the text of Jeremiah has been done by Janzen³⁹ by means of working with the Qumran manuscripts and comparing them to both the MT and the LXX. He concentrated his study on what he called "zero variants."⁴⁰ His conclusions are that the LXX of Jeremiah preserves a prior reading in many instances in comparison to the MT, which

³⁷Holladay, p. 5.

³⁸Holladay, p. 7.

³⁹J. Gerald Janzen. *Studies in the Text of Jeremiah* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973).

⁴⁰ Janzen used this term to designate the material in the MT which do not appear in the LXX. Omissions according to him is a misleading word, this is the reason he prefers to use a more neutral term.

has undergone much secondary expansion encountered at Qumran, the existence of a Hebrew version that agrees with the LXX shortness and arrangement, and the fact that the LXX translator was relatively literal in his work, "confirms the conjecture that the LXX of Jeremiah must be based on a short Hebrew *Vorlage*, similar to 4QJer-b."⁴¹ To explain this, and for the preceding reason, both the abbreviation and mediating theory should be rejected according to him. This conclusion is based upon the discovery of the Qumran manuscripts, as the writer pointed out earlier.

Adding to Janzen's conclusions and revising them, Emanuel Tov⁴² states that "pseudepigraphal authorship and revision were common practice in antiquity. Among other things, it should be noted that editor II⁴³ did not distort significantly the message of the prophet as handed down to him."⁴⁴ "Both 4QJer-b and the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX developed from an earlier form of edition I and that editor II rewrote a text which was very similar to edition I, but not identical with it."⁴⁵ In this way major issues as to the difference of sequence between the MT and the LXX are suggested

⁴¹ E. Tov, "The Literary History of the Book of Jeremiah in the Light of Its Textual History," *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*. Tigay, J. ed. (1985).

⁴² These are the main sources from this scholar I am going to be considering in this thesis: "The Orthography and Language of the Hebrew Scrolls Found at Qumran, Another Origin on These Scrolls", *Textus* 13 (1986), 31-57. "Criteria for Evaluating Textual Readings: The Limitation of Textual Rules," *Harvard Theological Review* 75, no. 4 (1982), 429-48. "The Nature and Background of Harmonizations in Biblical Manuscripts," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 31 (1985), 3-29. "The Literary History of the Book of Jeremiah in the Light of Its Textual History," *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985. *The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch*, (Scholars Press, Harvard Semitic Museum, 1976). "Some sequence Differences Between the MT and LXX and Their Ramifications For the Literary Criticism of the Bible," *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* XIII (1987): 151-160. "The Nature of the Hebrew Text Underlying the LXX, A Survey of the Problems," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 7 (1978): 53-68. "The Jeremiah Scrolls From Qumran," *Revue de Qumran* v.14, n.54 (Dec. 1986):189-206.

⁴³ Editor II is the one that put together the MT version.

⁴⁴ Tov, "Literary History," 215.

⁴⁵ Tov, 215.

to be related "to late additions in the biblical text whose position was not yet fixed when the archetypes of these two texts were written."⁴⁶

Sven Soderlund warns us Janzen "is often too quick to generalize and simply to assume a shorter *Vorlage*," and that "it is doubtful that the present LXX text is everywhere as reliable a witness to the shorter Hebrew *Vorlage*..."⁴⁷

Studies in the area of the text of Jeremiah continue, mainly, on the direction settled by Janzen and his innovating theory, but also it is good to have the main criticisms that Soderlund has done with this work that inform us of the limitations of the evidence and the danger of seeing too much between the lines.

Presuppositions and Methodology

The author of this thesis tries to be distant from any pre-assumption that could constitute a problem in considering possibilities dealing with the character of the MT and LXX traditions. On the other hand there are two main assumptions that contribute to understand the nature and reason for this study. First, the Biblical material has been collected by the community, and often there is a period of oral tradition between the event or facts it recalls and the writing down of that tradition.⁴⁸ And second, in the Book of Jeremiah one can distinguish three kinds of materials; poetry, biographic

⁴⁶ Tov, Emanuel. "Some Sequence Differences Between the MT and LXX..." Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages XIII (1987):152.

⁴⁷ Soderlund, 247-248.

⁴⁸ In the case of Jeremiah oral and written tradition took place hand in hand though Jeremiah spent 23 years of preaching before writing (chapter 25:3). The evidence of this is found in chapter 36 where the prophet is urged to write down the prophecies by the Lord.

material (the work of a biographer, most likely Baruch), and sermonic prose that has its origin in Jeremiah's own preaching.

The methodological steps taken in this thesis are the following:

First, definition of the pluses encountered in the comparison between the MT text and the LXX in chapters 26-29 (33-36) of the book of Jeremiah. The second step will constitute the comparison of both texts trying to investigate the importance and nature of the plus material by drawing from textual observations redactional implications. Finally, with all the evidence provided by the second step, an effort will be given to identify the source materials, describe the editorial activity, and, then, analyze the implications of the editorial activity.

Limitations of this Thesis

The first limitation comes when the nature of this paper is considered. The area covered in this work is limited to four chapters of the Book of Jeremiah, though its material is representative of what has happened in the book as a whole. In order to reach any conclusive theory in this paper, it would be indispensable to deal with all the book. Then, any attempt to consider any other possibility to explain the origin of the book in any of the two main traditions, namely the MT and the LXX, could be subject of criticism until proven when the Book of Jeremiah is considered in its totality to provide the needed evidence.

Another limitation is that the writer considers just the Hebrew and Greek witnesses to this chapters. For a decisive conclusion it would be necessary at least to check with other witnesses to support the reading from these two traditions. Nevertheless the MT and LXX are considered the

most reliable sources for this kind of study and the rest of them are considered secondary in any textual analysis.

Finally the Qumran manuscripts do not have any fragment that deals with any section of chapter 26 through 29 that reflects the shortness of the LXX. For this reason any attempt to reconstruct a shorter Hebrew text will be done by retrojection of the LXX or by assuming the common parts in both traditions contained in the text as reflected in the MT.

For all the reasons above, the writer's personal goal is to open a way of investigating the problem presented by these two witnesses and amplified and verified the alternative proposed here with the evidence given in the rest of the Book of Jeremiah.

CHAPTER 2

Classification of Pluses

The pluses encountered in these four chapters of Jeremiah are organized according to their textual connotation and literary implications. By this the writer tries to draw for every textual observation, with the exception of haplography and other scribal errors, a literary implication which may help us to see the character or tendency of the tradition that lacks or presents the plus. In doing this the writer has found some problems, namely because there is not, as far as the writer knows, a systematic study done on this direction presenting literary implications from textual variants. The following classification is divided into two parts: 1) Textual Pluses, and 2) Literary Pluses, keeping in mind that the second is based upon the first one.

Textual Pluses:

The following list is not an exhaustive list of textual pluses, for doing so is not the purpose of this thesis. It includes the definition of the Textual Pluses which are found in these chapters.¹

- 1.- Random Omissions: This would include exclusion of material without having any specific reason for it.
- 2.- Haplography: The omission of close words or letter which are similar.
- 3.- Parablepsis: This category is divided into two subgroups, a) homoioteleuton and b) homoioarcton. They refer to scribal errors by which the scribe's eyes skips from a group of words to the next one

¹For a complete list of textual pluses see Tov, Emanuel. Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 236-275.

because they start by the same or a similar word. The distinction between these two groups is often unclear.

4.- Dittography: Erroneous doubling of letters or words or group of words.

5.- Doublets: They are redundant readings created by the melting of different similar readings (from the same or other books).

Literary Pluses:

Literary pluses are inferences drawn from Textual Pluses. The following list is an attempt to organize the findings in chapters 26-29, for as it has been pointed out before, there is not a work that deals specifically with a classification of these pluses in relationship with the textual evidence.

1.- Stylistic plus: These are those pluses that contribute to the fluency of the reading, or give to the reader some literary clues.

2.- Emphatic plus: The main purpose of these is to provide some sort of emphasis mainly to impact the audience to whom the final work was directed to. This is a general category. The majority of the pluses can be classified as such, for this reason the writer classifies as emphatic pluses the ones which do not fit in any of the other categories.

3.- Title plus: These are those additions that fill out names or offices. The purpose of these pluses is not clear, they could have been added to emphasize the text or merely added for stylistic purposes.

4.- Audience oriented plus: Any plus which reveals direct information about the audience of the Book. Conclusions from these

pluses will have to be confirmed by an extended study of the book as a whole..

Comparative Analysis - I

The comparative analysis has been divided into two parts:

Comparative Analysis - I which deals with chapters 26-27 (33-34), and Comparative Analysis - II dealing with chapters 28-29 (35-36). The only reason for this division is so the writer could organize himself better, not because there is any structural division between these chapters.

In the comparative analysis every verse from the MT will be put a side with its counterpart verse from the LXX to facilitate its study. The word none will be written under the category pluses for the verses which do not present any variation. For the rest the plus/es will be noted and classified.

MT 26:1

בראשית ממלכות יהויקים בן-
יאשיהו מלך יהודה היה הדבר
ודברת על-כל-ערי יהודה
הבאים להשתחות בית-יהודה
את כל-הדברים אשר צויתיק
לדבר אליהם אל-תגרע דבר

LXX 33:1

εν αρχη βασιλευς Ιωακιμ
υιου Ιωσια εγενηθη ο λογος
ουτος παρα κυριου

Pluses:

- MT over LXX
- 1) מלך יהודה
 - 2) לאמר

Classification:

Both pluses are secondary in nature . 1) It follows the tendency of MT to fill out names and titles, for this reason that plus ought to be classified as a title plus. 2) Stylistic devise used to introduce a direct discourse,² stylistic plus.

MT 26:2
 כה אמר יהוה עמד בחצר בית
 יהוה ודברת על-כל-ערי
 יהודה הבאים להשתחוות בית-
 יהוה את כל-הדברים אשר
 צויתוך לדבר אליהם אל-
 בגרע דבר

LXX 33:2
 ουτως ειπεν κυριος Στημι εν
 αυλη οικου κυριου και
 χρηματιει απασι τοις
 Ιουδαιοι και πασι τοις
 ερξομενοις προσκυνειν εν
 οικω κυριου απαντας τους
 λογους, ους συνεταξα σοι
 αυτοις χρηματισαι, μη
 αφελης ρημα

Pluses:

Here there is not a real plus. What it is found is a different syntactical construction.

"to all the cities of Juda
 which come to worship
 at the house of YHWH"

Vs

"to al the Judeans and
 everyone who comes to
 worship at the house of
 the Lord"

If both traditions started out from the same booklet³ of Jeremaic material,⁴ it is to be assumed that two things could have

²Theological Dictionary of the O.T. vol. 1. Eerdmans Publishing Company: Grand Rapids, Michigan. 333-4.

³By this term the writer means the collection of writings which have not reach the final stage of book.

⁴The writer of this thesis is open to consider another possibility in the formation of the Book of Jeremiah that also would provide with an alternative explanation for the differences between tha MT and LXX texts of Jeremiah.

happened: 1) The original text left open the possibility of being exclusive or inclusive in specifying who were those ones who come to worship at the house of *YHWH*; or 2) and probably the most likely, the MT reflects the original text⁵ and the version upon which the LXX was based inserted this change to be more inclusive in the application of the original message of Jeremiah.

MT 26:3

אוֹלֵי יִשְׁמְעוּ וַיִּשְׁבוּ אִישׁ
מִדְּרָכּוֹ הַרְעָה וּנְחַמְתִּי אֶל-
הַרְעָה אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי הֹשֵׁב לַעֲשׂוֹת
לָהֶם מִפְּנֵי רַע מַעַלְלֵיהֶם

LXX 33:3

ἰσως ακουσσονται και
αποστραφησονται εκαστος
απο της οδου αυτου της
πονηρας, και παυσομαι απο
των κακων, ων εγω
λογιζομαι του ποιησαι
αυτοις ενεκεν των πωνηρων
επιτηδευματων αυτων

Pluses:

none

MT 26:4

וַאֲמַרְתָּ אֲלֵיהֶם כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה
אִם-לֹא תִשְׁמְעוּ אֵלַי לֵלַכְתָּ
בְּחֹרְתִי אֲשֶׁר נִתְחִי לִפְנֵיכֶם

LXX 33:4

και ερεις, ουτως ειπεν
κυριος, εαν μη ακουσητε
μου, του πορευεσθαι εν τοις
νομιμοις μου οἱς εδωκα κατα
προσωπον υμων

Pluses:

none

⁵ Holladay, p.100. He doubts that the MT in saying "all the cities" is a secondary addition.

MT 26:5
 לשמע על-דברי עבדי הנבאים
 אשר אנכי שלח אליכם
 והשכם ושלח ולא שמעתם

LXX 33:5
 εισακουειν των λογων των
 παιδων μου των προφητων,
 ους εγω αποστειλω προς
 υμας ορθρου και απεστειλα
 και ουκ εισηκουσατε μου

Holladay maintains that this verse is an addition for it breaks the continuity between the preceding and the following verse.⁶ For the purpose of this thesis what it is relevant is to know that both text present this "addition." Since the purpose of this thesis is to compare the MT and LXX texts, and since both traditions present this verse, this observation by Holladay and some others is not considered here.

MT 26:6
 ונתתי את-הבית הזה כשלה
 ואת-העיר הזאתה אתן לקללה
 לכל גויי הארץ

LXX 33:6
 και δωσωτον οικον τουτον
 ωσπερ Σηλωμ και την πολιν
 δωσω εις καταραν πασιν τοις
 εθνεσιν πασης της γης

Pluses:

LXX over MT: πασης

MT over LXX: הזאתה

Classification:

The LXX plus presents an emphatic plus. It qualifies γης. Even though saying just πασιν τοις εθνεσιν της γης would be enough to understand the implications of the statement, the translator of the LXX or may be the text underlying the LXX added πασης to emphasize it.

⁶ Holladay, p.100-104.

The MT plus is a conflate reading. Even though we could expect this demonstrative on bases of the preceding one.⁷ It can be classified as an emphatic plus, too.

MT 26:7
 וישמעו הפהנים והנבאים וכל-
 העם את־ירמיהו מדבר את־
 הדברים האלה האלה בבית
 יהוה

LXX 33:7
 και ηκουσαν οι ιερεις και οι
 ψευδοπροφηται και πας ο
 λαος του Ιερεμιου
 λαλουντος τουτους εν οικω
 κυριου

Pluses:

LXX over MT: ψευδοπροφηται

Classification:

In this verse only one plus is found. This is an interpretative plus, by this the writer means every word which has been changed that makes more specific the meaning of the original word: for same reason the translator/s felt the urge to do this. In these chapters the only plus that can be put into this category as such is ψευδοπροφητης, and it is a plus more than likely introduce by the translator/s of Jeremiah. Instead of translating *nb'im* as προφητης, the translator went a head describing in every instance what kind of prophet the audience is dealing with. In the MT this distinction is implicit while in the LXX it is explicit: it may be that for the translator this distinction was not clear and he clarified it.

⁷ See Janzen, p.45. Holladay, p.100.

MT 26:8

ויהי ככלות ירמיהו לדבר אח
 כל-אשר-צוה יהוה לדבר אל
 כל-העם ויחפשו אתו הכהנים
 והנבאים וכל-העם לאמר מות
 תמות

LXX 33:8

και εγενετο Ιερεμιου
 παυσοιμενον λαλουντος
 παντα, α συνεταξεν αυτον οι
 ιερεις και οι ψευδοπροφηται
 και πας ο λαος λεγων
 θανατω αποθανη

Pluses:

LXX over MT: ψευδοπροφηται

Other Differences:

צוה vs. צוהו

Classification:

For the LXX plus see verse 7. For the rest, it is likely to be the result of scribal error, though it is difficult to determine which tradition represents the original and which one is erroneous.

MT 26:9

מדוע נבית בשם-יהוה לאמר
 פשלו יהיה הבית הזה והעיר
 הזאת תחרב מאין יושב ויקהל
 כל-העם אל-ירמיהו בבית
 יהוה

LXX 33:9

οτι επρογητευσας τω
 ονοματι κυριου λεγων
 Ωσπερ Σηλωμ εσται ο οικος
 και η πολις αυτη
 ερημωθησεται απο
 κατοικουντων και
 εξεκκλησιασθη πας ο λαος
 επι Ιερεμιαν εν οικω κυριου

Pluses:

none

MT 26:10

וישמעו שרי יהודה את
הדברים האלה ויעלו מבית-
המלך בית יהוה וישבו בפתח
שער-יהוה החדש

LXX 33:10

και ηκουσαν οι αρχοντες
Ιουδα τον λογον τουτον και
ανεβησαν εξ οικου του
βασιλεως εις οικον κυριου
και εκαθισαν εν προθυροις
πυλης κυριου της καινης

Pluses:

none

MT 26:11

ויאמרו הפהנים והנבאים אל-
השרים ואל-כל-העם לאמר
משפט-מות לאיש פי נבא אל-
העיר הזאת כאשר שמעתם
באזניכם

LXX 33:11

και ειπαν οι ιερεις και οι
ψευδοπροφηται προς τους
αρχοντας και παντι τω λαω
Κρισις θανατου τω ανθρωπω
τουτω, οτι επροφητευσεν
κατα της πολεως ταυτης
καθω ηκουσατε εν τοις ωσιν
υμων

Pluses:

MT over LXX: לאמר

Classification:

This plus is a secondary addition, constantly used to
introduce a direct discourse. Stylistic plus. See page 17.

MT 26:12

ויאמר ירמיהו אל-כל-השרים
ואל-כל-העם לאמר יהוה
שלחני להנבא אל-הבית הזה
ואל-העיר הזאת את כל-
הדברך אשר שמעוהם

LXX 33:12

και ειπεν Ιερεμιας προς τους
αρχοντας και παντι τω λαω
λεγων Κυριος απεστειλεν με
προφητευσαι επι τον οικον
τουτον και επι την πολιν
ταυτην παντας τους λογους
τουτους ους ηκουσατε

Pluses:

MT over LXX: כל

Classification:

The expression אל-[כל]-השרים ואל-כל-העם is found in 26:11 without כל, this would be enough evidence to say that this כל is a secondary addition, for purposes of emphasis.⁸

MT 26:13

ועתה היטיבו דרכיכם
ומעלליכם ושמעו בקול יהוה
אלהיכם וינחם יהוה אל-הרעה
אשר דבר עליכם

LXX 33:13

και νυν βελτιους ποιησατε
τας οδους υμων και τα εργα
υμων και ακουσατε της
φωνης κυριου, και παυσεται
κυριος απο των κακων, ων
ελαλησεν εφ υμας

Pluses:

MT over LXX: אלהיכם

Classification:

Title plus. It follows the tendency of the MT in adding titles and completing the names of people,⁹ probably to follow Deuteronomy.

⁸See also Janzen, 65-67.

⁹See 26:1

MT 26: 14
וּאֲנִי הִנְנִי בְיַדְכֶם עֲשׂוּ-לִי
כְּטוֹב וּכְיָשָׁר בְּעֵינֵיכֶם

LXX 33:14
και ιδου εγω εν χερσιν υμων
ποιησατε μοι ως συμφερει
και ως βελτιον υμιν

Pluses:

none

MT 26:15
אָךְ יָדַע תְּדַעוּ כִּי אִם־מִמְחִים
אִתָּם אֲחִי כִּי־דָם נָקִי אִתָּם
נִחְנִים עֲלֵיכֶם וְאֵל־הָעִיר הַזֹּאת
וְאֵל־יִשְׁבִּיָּה כִּי בֵּאֵמַת שְׁלַחְנִי
יְהוָה עֲלֵיכֶם לְדַבֵּר בְּאָזְנוֹיְכֶם
אֵת כָּל־הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה

LXX 33:15
αλλ η γνοντες γνωσεσθε οτι,
ει αναιρειτε με, αιμα αθων
διδοτε εφ υμας και επι την
πολιν ταυτην και επι τους
κατοικουντας εν αυτη οτι εν
αληθεια απεσταλκεν με
κυριος προς υμας λαλησαι
εις τα ωτα υμων παντας τους
λογους τουτους

Pluses:

none

MT 26:16
וַיֹּאמְרוּ הַשֹּׂרִים וְכָל־הָעָם אֶל־
הַכֹּהֲנִים וְאֶל־הַנְּבִיאִים אֵין־
לְאִישׁ הַזֶּה מִשְׁפַּט־מוֹת כִּי בִשְׁם
יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ דָּבַר אֱלֵינוּ

LXX 33:16
και ειπαν οι αρχοντες και
πας ο λαος προς τους ιερεις
και προς τους
ψευδοπροφητας Ουκ εστιν
τω ανθρωπω τουτω κρισις
θανατου οτι επι τω ονοματι
κυριου του θεου ημων
ελαλησεν προς ημας

Pluses:

LXX over MT: 1) ψευδοπροφητας
Classification:

See v.7. Interpretative pluse.

MT 26:17

ויקמו אנשים מזקני הארץ
ויאמרו אל-כל-קחל העם
לאמר

LXX 33:17

και ανεστησαν ανδρες των
πρεσβυτερων της γης και
ειπαν παση τη συναγωγη του
λαου

Pluses:

MT over LXX: 1) לאמר

Classification:

Stylistic pluse. See 26:1

MT 26:18

מיכיה המורשתי היה נבא בימי
חזקיהו מלך-יהודה ויאמר אל
כל-עם יהודה לאמר כה-אמר
יהוה צבאות ציון שדה תחרש
וירושלים עיים תהיה והר
הבית לבמות יער

LXX 33:18

Μιχαιας ο Μωραθιτης ην εν
ταις ημεραις Εζεκιου
βασιλεως Ιουδα και ειπεν
παντι τω λαω Ιουδα Ουτως
ειπεν κυριος Σιων ως αγρος
αροτριαθησεται και
Ιερουσαλημ εις αβατον
εσται και το ορος του οικου
εις αλσος δρυμου

Pluses:

MT over LXX: 1) נבא

2) לאמר

3) צבאות

Classification:

See v.7. Interpretative pluse.

MT 26:17
 ויקמו אנשים מזקני הארץ
 ויאמרו אל-כל-קחל העם
 לאמר

LXX 33:17
 και ανεστησαν ανδρες των
 πρεσβυτερων της γης και
 ειπαν παση τη συναγωγη του
 λαου

Pluses:

MT over LXX: 1) לאמר

Classification:

Stylistic pluse. See 26:1

MT 26:18
 מיכיה המורשתי היה נבא בימי
 חזקיהו מלך-יהודה ויאמר אל
 כל-עם יהודה לאמר כה-אמר
 יהוה צבאות ציון שדה תחרש
 וירושלים עיים תהיה והר
 הבית לבמות יער

LXX 33:18
 Μιχαιας ο Μωραθιτης ην εν
 ταις ημεραις Εζεκιου
 βασιλεως Ιουδα και ειπεν
 παντι τω λαω Ιουδα Ουτως
 ειπεν κυριος Σιων ως αγρος
 αροτριαθησεται και
 Ιερουσαλημ εις αβατον
 εσται και το ορος του οικου
 εις αλσος δρυμου

Pluses:

MT over LXX: 1) נבא
 2) לאמר
 3) צבאות

Classification:

Number one is probably deficient in the LXX by means of haplography, the scribe by error skipped the verb.

For number three, once יהוה צבאות and יהוה, are in the text it is easy to assume that the longer form takes over the shorter, and the phrase itself "intrudes upon new contexts."¹⁰ According to Janzen there are only ten textually sound; 5:14; 25:27; 32:14; 44:7; 15:16; 33:11; 51:5; 31:35; 50:34; 51:57 (κυριος παντοκρατωρ).

Both 2 and 3, from a redactional point of view, could be perfectly classified as emphatic; though number three is an addition following the MT tendency to fill out names.

MT 26:19

הַהִמַּחַת הַמַּתְהוּ חֻקֵּיהוּ מִלְּךָ־
יְהוּדָה וְכָל־יְהוּדָה הֲלֹא יִרְאֶה
אֶת־יְהוָה וַיַּחֲלֵ אֶת־פְּנֵי יְהוָה
וַיִּנְחַם יְהוָה אֶל־הָרַעָה אֲשֶׁר־
דִּבֶּר עֲלֵיהֶם וַאֲנַחְנוּ עֹשִׂים רַעָה
גְּדוֹלָה עַל־נַפְשׁוֹתֵינוּ

LXX 33:19

μη ανελων ανειλεν αυτον
Εζεκιας και πας Ιουδα ουχι
στι εφοβηθησαν τον κυριον
και στι εδεθησαν του
προσωπου κυριου και
επαυσατο κυριος απο των
κακων ων ελαλησεν επ
αυτους; και ημεις
εποιησαμεν κακα μεγαλα επι
ψυχας ημων.

Pluses:

MT over LXX: מִלְּךָ־יְהוּדָה

LXX over MT: μη

¹⁰Janzen, p.79

Classification:

Number one is probably deficient in the LXX by means of haplography, the scribe by error skipped the verb.

For number three, once יהוה and יהוה צבאות, are in the text it is easy to assume that the longer form takes over the shorter, and the phrase itself "intrudes upon new contexts."¹⁰ According to Janzen there are only ten textually sound; 5:14; 25:27; 32:14; 44:7; 15:16; 33:11; 51:5; 31:35; 50:34; 51:57 (κυριος παντοκρατωρ).

Both 2 and 3, from a redactional point of view, could be perfectly classified as emphatic; though number three is an addition following the MT tendency to fill out names.

MT 26:19

ההמת המתהו חזקיהו מלך-
יהודה וכל-יהודה הלא ירא
את-יהוה ויחל את-פני יהוה
וינחם יהוה אל-הרעה אשר-
דבר עליהם ואנחנו עשׂים רעה
גדולה על-נפשותינו

LXX 33:19

μη ανελων ανειλεν αυτον
Εζεκιας και πας Ιουδα ουχι
στι εφοβηθησαν τον κυριον
και στι εδεθησαν του
προσωπου κυριου και
επαυσατο κυριος απο των
κακων ων ελαλησεν επ
αυτους; και ημεις
εποιησαμεν κακα μεγαλα επι
ψυχας ημων.

Pluses:

MT over LXX: מלך-יהודה

LXX over MT: μη

¹⁰Janzen, p.79

Classification:

- 1.- מלך־יהודה is a secondary addition. It could be classified as a title plus following the MT inclination to fill out names.
- 2.- מן could be classified as an stylistic pluses to build a rhetorical question that should be answer in a negative way. This plus is due to the translators of the text.

MT 26:20
 וגם־איש היה מחנבא בשם
 יהוה אוריהו בן־שמעיהו
 מקרית היערים וינבא על־
 העיר הזאת ועל־הארץ הזאת
 ככל דברי ירמיהו

LXX 33:20
 και ανθρωπος ην
 προφητευων τω ονοματι
 κυριου, Ουριας υιος
 Σαμαιου εκ Καριαθιαριμ και
 επροφητευσεν περι της γης
 ταυτης κατα παντας τους
 λογους Ιερεμιου

Pluses:

MT over LXX: על־העיר הזאת

Classification:

Thompson considers this plus an unimportant omission.¹¹ Textually two things may have happened; 1) the MT is a conflate text putting together the readings על־העיר הזאת and על־הארץ הזאת¹², or 2) the LXX suffered haplography. On this basis there is not solid evidence to draw any redactional implication. This would depend upon the scholars preference. If the first one is the case then it will be classified as an emphatic plus. And if the

¹¹ Thompson, p.522. (footnote no.7)

¹²Janzen, pp. 21,199.

second is what really happened, which is very likely,¹³ there is not any redactional inference.

MT 26:21
 וישמע המלך־יהויקים וכל־
 גבוריו וכל־השרים את־דבריו
 ויבקש המלך המיתו וישמע
 אוריהו וירא ויבא מצרים

LXX 33:21
 και ηκουσεν ο βασιλευς
 Ιωακιμ και παντες οι
 αρχοντες παντας τους λογους
 αυτου και εξητουν
 αποκτειναι αυτον και
 ηκουσεν Ουριας και
 εισηλθεν εις Αιγυπτον.

Pluses:

- MT over LXX:
- 1) וכל־גבוריו
 - 2) וירא ויברה
 - 3) המלך

Classification:

For 1 and 2, the same possibilities than verse 20 are present. Conflation of texts or haplography. For number one Janzen¹⁴ suggest the first had happened, for the second one Janzen¹⁵ proposes the same as a possibility, perhaps the MT editor/s or even the author conflated this text to connect the fleeing to Egypt. Haplography is suggested by this writer as a possibility with stronger ground.¹⁶

¹³It is very possible that the translator or the scribe who copied the Hebrew text which the LXX was based on, accidentally skipt על־העיר הזאח.

¹⁴Janzen, p.21.

¹⁵Janzen, p.21-22.

¹⁶So does Holladay, p 101.

MT 26:22
 וישלח המלך יהויקים אנשים
 מצרים את אלנתן בן-עכבור
 ואנשים אהו אל-מצרים

LXX 33:22
 και εξαπεστειλεν ο βασιλευς
 ανδρας εις Αιγυπτον

Pluses:

MT over LXX: 1) יהויקים

2) את אלנתן בן-עכבור ואנשים אהו
 אל-מצרים

Classification:

Both of them are secondary expansions, emphatic pluses. the first one may just be added to make clear the reader remembers what king is the text talking about, making sure the audience knows that Jehoiakim is the one who destroyed the scroll, or just to fill out a title to provided same sort of consistency with the editor/s work..

MT 26:23
 ויזיאו את-אוריהו ממצרים
 ויבאהו אל-המלך יהויקים
 ויפיהו בחרב וישלף את-נבלתו
 אל-קברי בני העם

LXX 33:23
 και εξηγαγοσαν αυτον
 εκειθεν και εισηγαγοσαν
 αυτον προ τον βασιλεα και
 επαταξεν αυτον εν μαχαιρα
 και ερριψεν αυτον ει το
 μνημα υιων λαου αυτου

Pluses:

none

MT 26:24
 אך יד אחיקם בן-שפן היתה
 את-ירמיהו לבלתי תח-אתו
 ביד-העם להמיתו

LXX 33:24
 πλην χειρ Αχικαμ υιου
 Σαφαν ην μετα Ιερεμιου του
 μη παραδουναι αυτον εις
 χειρας του λαου του μη
 ανελειν αυτον

Pluses:

none

MT 27:1	LXX 34:1
בראשית ממלכת יהויקים בן- יאשיהו מלך יהודה היה הדבר הזה אל-ירמיה מאת יהוה לאמר	-----

Pluses:

MT over LXX: all verse

Classification:

From a textual point of view it seems that the editor/s of the MT tradition copied it from 26:1. From a narrative point of view, it provides the historical background for the rest of chapter 27, which it is apparently wrong.¹⁷ Carroll takes too far the implications of this redactional addition, doubting of the relevance of 26:1 on the assumption that if 27:1 is not correct as the introductory background of the rest of that chapter probably 26:1 is not correct either.¹⁸ This assumption has not a logical ground because both traditions, the MT and the LXX, present this introduction for chapter 26; for this reason it is to be assumed that in the original text chapter 26 counted with this introduction.

Other Observations:

A peculiarity can be notice regarding the spelling of the name of the prophet, which lacks of is final ך. Concerning this same

¹⁷Holladay, p.112. Janzen, p.14. Carroll, p.526

¹⁸Carroll, p.526.

scholar assume a literary independence of the three chapters (27-29).¹⁹

MT 27:2

כה-אמר יהוה אלי עשה לך
מוסרות ומטות ונחתם על-
ציארך

LXX 34:2

ουτως ειπεν κυριος ποιησον
δεσμους και περιθου περι
τον τραχηλον σου

Pluses:

none

MT 27:3

ושלחתם אל-מלך אדום ואל-
מלך מואב ואל-מלך בני עמון
ואל-מלך צר ואל-מלך צידון
ביד מלאכים הבאים ירושלם
אל-צדקיהו מלך יהודה

LXX 34:3

και αποστελεις αυτους προς
βασιλεα Ιδουμαιας και προς
βασιλεα Μωαβ και προς
βασιλεα υιων Αμμων και
προς βασιλεα Τυρου και
προς βασιλεα Σιδωνος εν
χερσιν αγγελων αυτων των
ερχομενων εις απαντησιν
αυτων εις Ιερουσαλημ προς
Σεδεκιαν βασιλεα Ιουδα

Pluses:

LXX over MT: εις απαντησιν αυτων

Classification:

Probably this is a secondary addition by the translator or the editor of the Hebrew text upon which the LXX is based. It is an emphatic plus, with inclusive purposes from a narrative point of view.

¹⁹Tov, Textual and Literary History, p. 161, n.30. Holladay, p.114.

MT 27:4
 וצוית אחם אל-אדניהם לאמר
 כה-אמר יהוה צבאות אלהי
 ישראל כה תאמרו אל-
 אדניכם

LXX 34:4
 και συνταξεις αυτοις προς
 τους κυριους αυτων ειπειν
 ουτως ειπεν κυριος ο θεος
 Ισραηλ ουτως ερειτε προς
 τους κυριους υμων

Pluses:

MT over LXX: צבאות

Classification:

Secondary plus. Title plus.

MT 27:5
 אנכי עשיתי אח-הארץ אח-
 האדם ואח-הבהמה אשר על-
 פני הארץ בכחי הגדול
 ובזרועי הנטויה ונחתיה לאמר
 ישר בעיני

LXX 34:5
 οτι εγω εποιησα την γην εν
 τη ισχυι μου τη μεγαλη και
 εν τω επιχειρω μου τω
 υψηλω και δωσω αυτην ω
 εαν δοξη εν οφθαλμοις μου

Pluses:

LXX over MT: οτι

MT over LXX אח-האדם ואח-הבהמה אשר על-פני הארץ

Classification:

οτι is more than likely a stylistic plus. The translator understood that Hebrew grammatical structure in terms of substantiation.

The MT plus over the LXX is very likely due to haplography by the LXX translator, or by the scribe that copied the Hebrew text behind the LXX.²⁰ Against this question could be

²⁰Janzen, p.118.

raised considering the number and genre of the suffix in the following verb; וַנַּחֲתִיהָ הִיא is feminine singular, referring to הָאָרֶץ.²¹

MT 27:6
 וַעֲתָה אֲנִי נֹחֵת אֶת־כָּל־
 הָאָרֶץ וְהָאֱלֹהִים בְּיַד נְבוּכַדְנֶאֱצַר
 מֶלֶךְ־בָּבֶל עֲבָדִי וְגַם אֶת־הֵיחַ
 הַשָּׂדֶה נֹחֵת לוֹ לַעֲבֹדוֹ

LXX 34:6
 ἔδωκα τὴν γῆν τῷ
 Ναβουχοδονοσορ βασιλεὶ
 βαβυλωνος δουλεύειν αὐτῷ
 καὶ τὰ θηρία τοῦ ἀγροῦ
 ἐργάζεσθαι αὐτῷ

Pluses:

- MT over LXX:
- 1) Contrast between MT אֶת־כָּל־הָאָרֶץ and LXX τὴν γῆν.
 - 2) בְּיַד
 - 3) Contrasts: עֲבָדִי vs. δουλεύειν αὐτῷ (עֲבָדוֹ)

Classification:

- 1) According to Janzen the LXX reading is better, for the MT misinterpreted אֶת הָאָרֶץ because of references to individual states.²² This preference is contextual, the emphasis is on Nebuchadnezzar as being over everything on the earth not just upon a nation. On the other hand we can see the tendency of the MT as being exclusive, the punishment is the nation of Judah. While the LXX keeps its inclusive tendencies, though in this case it may reflect the original reading.
- 2) Probably it is a stylistic minus on the side of the LXX, a translator's minus.

²¹Holladay, p.112.

²²Janzen, p.66. Holladay, p.121.

3) The LXX reading is preferable. Probably the MT change by accident the final ך for a ך.²³ This conclusion is on the basis that in the LXX there are not other places where the expression *my servant* appears. On the other hand Bright mentions another possibility; the expression *my servant* may have been offensive in some circles,²⁴ if this is the case it could be inferred that this expression was omitted from the text of the LXX, or the Hebrew text behind it, and substituted by *to serve him* in basis of following part of the verse.

MT 27:7	LXX 34:7
ועבדו אתו כל־הגוים ואח־בנו	
ואח־בן־בנו עד בא־עת ארצו	-----
גם־הוא ועבדו בו גוים רבים	
ומלכים גדלים	

Pluses:

MT over LXX: all verse

Classification:

There are two possibilities, expansion, or subtraction. Janzen supports the first possibility for it relates to 25:14 which also is missing in the LXX.²⁵ He states that "the verse disagrees from, and weakens, the trust of the oracle."²⁶ According to Holladay this verse came out of popular piety.²⁷ On the other hand Bright²⁸ gives also the alternative of subtraction as possibility. On this basis it is difficult to infer any redactional implication.

²³For a complete dicussion of this matter see Janzen, pp54-57,

²⁴Bright, p.200.

²⁵Janzen, p 102.

²⁶Janzen, p.102.

²⁷Holladay, p.

²⁸Bright, p.200.

MT 27:8

והיה הגוי והממלכה אשר לא־
 יעבדו אחוֹ את־נבוכדנאצר
 מלֶךְ־בבל ואת אשר לא־יהוּן
 את־צוֹארוֹ בעל מלֶךְ־בבל
 בחרב וברעב ובדבר אפקד על
 הגוי ההוא נא־ס־יהוה עד־
 המי אחס בידו

LXX 34:8

και το εθνος και η βασιλεια
 οσοι εαν μη εμβαλωσιν τον
 τραχηλον αυτων υπο τον
 ζυγον βασιλεως βαβυλωνος
 εν μαχαιρα και εν λιμω
 επισκεψομαι αυτους ειπεν
 κυριος εως εκλιπωσιν εν
 χειρι αυτου

Pluses:

- MT over LXX: 1) לא יעבדו [את־נבוכדנאר]²⁹ מלֶךְ־בבל
- 2) וברעב
- 3) על־הגוי ההוא vs. αυτους

Classification:

- 1) All this section can be an accidental omission by the LXX translator/s.³⁰ The name of the king of Babylon ought probably to be considered a conflate reading.³¹ Emphatic plus.
- 2) Probably this is an expansion by the MT editor/s for the construction "sword and pestilence" without "famine" reoccurs in other places in the book.³² Probably this plus could be classified as an stylistic one to follow the almost consistent recurrence of these three words together.
- 3) Secondary plus.³³ Interpretative plus.

²⁹This brackets are to consider the possibility for the name of the Babylonian king to be a secondary reading within that first plus.

³⁰Janzen, 14.

³¹Holladay, 112-3. Janzen, 14.

³²Holladay, 113. For all this verse see also Janzen, pp. 14, 74, 118.

³³Holladay states that this is an "unnecessary specificity," 113.

Other Differences:

In 27:6 through 29:3 the name of the Babylonian king is spelled differently than in the rest of the book. It is assumed this spelling is a later one, probably by a later deformation of this name³⁴ and the spelling with אָר , which occurs in the rest of the book, representing the correct spelling according to Babylonian grammar. In every instance in these four chapters, except for 27:6, The name Nebuchadnezzar, with this spelling, is a secondary plus. In spite of all of this questions should be raised about the text as the MT and LXX are studied comparatively. The LXX is basically constant in transliterating Hebrew names, if this is the case, then the text were the LXX based its translation presented a later spelling of Nebuchadnezzar.³⁵ There is also the possibility for this name of having two alternative spellings, and for them be used indiscriminately.³⁶ Nevertheless the problem remains difficult to solve for the phenomena takes place in only this section of Jeremiah where the name is often secondary.

MT 27:9

ואחם אל-השמעו אל-נביאיכם
ואל-קסמיכם ואל-חלמתיכם
ענניכם ואל-כשפייכם אשר
ואל-הם אמרים אליכם לאמר
לא תעבדו את-מלך בבל

LXX 34:9

και υμεις μη ακουετε των
ψευδοπροφητων υμων και
των μαντευομενων υμιν και
των ενυπνιαζομενων υμιν
και των οιωνισματων υμων
και των φαρμακων υμων των
λεγοντων ου μη εργασηθε
τω βασιλει βαβυλωνος

³⁴See also Holladay, 114.

³⁵ נְבוּכַדְנֶאֱצַר = Ναβουχοδονοσορ

³⁶See appendixes II.

Pluses:

MT over LXX: אליכם

Other Differences: Different spelling.

חלמתיכם vs. ευστυνιαζομενων

Classification:

The classification of this plus can be ambiguous. Janzen³⁷ gives the alternative for this coming from v.14, but this can not be supported for in the LXX this word does not appear in v. 14 because of haplography.

For the different spelling; contextually *your dreams* does not make much sense, while *your dreamers* would be more accurate.³⁸

MT 27:10
כי שקר הם נבאים לכם למען
הרחיק אתכם מעל אדמתכם
והרחתי אתכם ואבדתם

LXX 34:10
οτι ψευδη αυτοι
προφητεουσιν υμιν προς το
μακρυναι υμας απο της γης
υμων

Pluses:

MT over LXX: והרחתי אתכם ואבדתם

Classification:

This is an expansion from v.15,³⁹ probably to emphasize what has been said in the same verse.

³⁷Janzen, p.45.

³⁸Carroll, p.528. Bright, p.196. Also see Holladay, p.113.

³⁹Janzen, p.45.

MT 27:11

והגוי אשר יביא את-צוארו
 בעל מלך-בבל ועבדו והנחתיו
 על-אדמתו נאם-יהוה ועבדה
 וישב בה

LXX 34:11

και το εθνος ο εαν εισαγαγη
 τον τραχηλον αυτου υπο τον
 ζυγον βασιλεως Βαβυλωνος
 και εργασηται αυτω και
 καταλειψω αυτον επι της γης
 αυτου και εργαται αυτω και
 ενοικησει εν αυτη

Pluses:

MT over LXX: נאם-יהוה

Classification:

This reading is a conflate reading. From a redactional point of view, it is an emphatic plus; although there is the possibility of this being a stylistic plus for the MT consistently adds this expression in all the oracles. In either case the editor/s wanted to emphasize the Words from YHWH or more than this the origin of these oracles in contrast with the ones coming from the false prophets.

MT 27:12

ואל־צדקיה מלך־יהודה דברתי
 ככל־הדברים האלה לאמר
 הביאו את־צואריכם בעל מלך
 בבל ועבדו אחוֹ ועמוֹ והיו

LXX 34:12

και προς Σεδεκιαν βασιλεα
 Ιουδα ελαλησα κατα παντας
 του λογους τουτους λεγων
 εισαγαγετε τον τραχηλον
 υμων

MT 27:13

למה תמותו אתה ועמך בחרב
 ברעב ובדבר כאשר דבר יהוה
 אל־הגוי אשר לא־יעבד את־
 מלך בבל

LXX 34:13

MT 27:14

ואל־השמעו אל־דברי הנבאים
 האמרים אליכם לאמר לא
 תעבדו את־מלך בבל כי שקר
 הם נבאים לכם

LXX 34:14

και εργασασθε τω βασιλει
 Βαβυλωνος οτι αδικα αυτοι
 προφητεουσιν υμιν

Pluses:

MT over LXX: 12b-14a

Classification:

This seems to be an accidental omission by the LXX translator or by the editor/s of the LXX *Vorlage*. Though this is difficult to determine,⁴⁰ if there is a chiasm in this section and this is not a fictitious structure, then, the safest position is to consider verse 13 and 17 original.⁴¹ Haplography. This does not have any redactional implication for is an unintentional error.

⁴⁰For an argument against the possibility of haplography see Rudolph, Wilhelm. *Jeremia*. HAT 12. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1968. He considers this verse to be a secondary expansion for it interrupts the imperative found in verse 12 and the prohibition in verse 14.

⁴¹Holladay, p.116. Bright, p.196. Janzen, p.118.

MT 27:15

פי לא שלחתיים נאם־יהוה והם
נבאים בשמי לשקר למען
הדיחי אחכם ואבדהם אהם
והנבאים הנבאים לכם

LXX 34:15

οτι ουκ απεστειλα αυτους
φησιν κυριος και
προφητεουσιν τω ονοματι
μου επ αδικω προς το
απολεσαι υμας και
απολεισθε υμεις και οι
προφηται υμων οι
προφητεουσιν υμιν επ
αδικω ψευδη

Pluses:

LXX over MT: επ αδικω ψευδη

Classification:

The plus is a doublet based upon the first שקר, in a different sequence.⁴² It is an emphatic plus; its purpose is to underline the character of the message of those prophets, for in this case the translators did not use the word ψευδοπροφηται but προφηται.

MT 27:16

ואל־הכהנים קאל־כל־העם
הזה דברתי לאמר פה אמר
יהוה אל־השמעו אל־דברי
נביאיכם הנבאים לכם לאמר
הנה כלי בית־יהוה מושבים
מבבלה עתה מהרה פי שקר
המה נבאים לכם

LXX 34:16

υμιν και παντι τω λαω τουτω
και τοις ιερευσιν ελαλησα
λεγων ουτως ειπεν κυριος μη
ακουετε των λογων των
προφητων των
προφητεουστων υμιν
λεγοντων ιδου σκευη οικου
κυριου επιστρεψει εκ
βαβυλωνος οτι αδικα αυτοι
προφητεουσιν.

Pluses:

MT over LXX: עתה מהרה

⁴²Janzen, p.26. Carroll, p.528.

Classification

Secondary addition. To solve the problem raised by the plus in verse 22.⁴³

MT 27:17	LXX 34:17
אֱלֹהִים שָׁמְעוּ אֵלֵיהֶם עֲבָדָיו אַחַד־ מִלְךְ־בְּבֹל וַחֲיוּ לְמַה תְּהִיָּה הַעִיר הַזֹּאת חֲרָבָה	

Pluses:

MT over LXX: all verse

Classification:

It is likely that the LXX omitted this part by accident, and that the reading presented by the MT could be considered the original one because of the chiasm that rules this part.⁴⁴ According to Bright⁴⁵, "it is difficult to resist the conclusion that this text (LXX) is more original than...MT."⁴⁶ This writer considers safer to consider the MT as original, for there is not strong evidence to prove the discontinuity provided by this verse, and this would explain the chiastic structure found here.

MT 27:18	LXX 34:18
וְאִם־נִבְּאִים הֵם וְאִם־יֵשׁ דְּבַר־ יְהוָה אִתָּם יִפְגְּעוּ־נָא בִּיהוָה צְבָאוֹת לְבַלְתִּי־בָאוּ הַכִּלִּים הַנּוֹחֲרִים בְּבֵית־יְהוָה וּבֵית מֶלֶךְ יְהוּדָה וּבִירוּשָׁלַם בְּבִלָּה	εἰ προφηταὶ εἰσὶν καὶ ἐστὶν λογος κυρίου ἐν αὐτοῖς ἀπαντησάτωσαν μοι

⁴³Holladay, 114.

⁴⁴To see a more detail explanation of it see Holladay, p.116. Compare also with verse 13.

⁴⁵Bright, p.197.

⁴⁶See also Janzen, p.45-46, and Carroll, p.529.

Pluses:

- MT over LXX: 1) ביהוה צבאות vs. μοι (בי)
- 2) לבלתי-באו הפלים הנוחרים בבית-
יהוה ובית מלך יהודה ובירושלם
בבלה

Classification:

In the first plus, for the different reading, it is clear what happened, in the original the divine name was abbreviated and the LXX translator, or the Hebrew text behind this, read a personal pronoun instead of the divine name. Both pluses represent secondary expansion, conflation.⁴⁷ In the second case the possibility of haplography could be also considered. The first plus is a title plus, and the second one, if it is not an accidental omission, is an emphatic one.

MT 27:19
כי כה אמר יהוה צבאות אל-
העמדים ועל-הים ועל-המכנות
ועל יתר הפלם הנוחרים בעיר
הזאת

LXX 34:19
ὅτι οὕτως εἶπεν κύριος καὶ
τῶν ἐπιλοιπῶν σκευῶν

Pluses:

- MT over LXX: 1) צבאות
- 2) אל-העמדים ועל-הים ועל-המכנות
- 3) הנוחרים בעיר הזאת

Classification:

⁴⁷Holladay, p.114. Carroll, p.529. Janzen, p.74.

- 1) Secondary expansion following the MT tendency to fill out names. Title plus.
- 2) Secondary expansion, conflate reading from 2 Kings 25:13.⁴⁸ This plus has emphatic purposes, though sometimes it is difficult to determine if there is an stylistic intention or not for it is over emphatic all over this section. Another possibility is that the editor/s wanted the reader to keep in his mind both Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic history specially the books of Kings.
- 3) A secondary addition that could be considered as a summary gloss.⁴⁹ Emphatic plus, for it underlines the message.

MT 27:20

אשר לא-לקחם נבוכדנאצר
 מלך בבל בגלותו את-יכוניה
 בן-יהויקים מלך-יהודה
 מירושלם בבליה ואת כל-חרי
 יהודה וירושלם

LXX 34:20

ων ουκ ελαβεν βασιλευς
 βαβυλωνος στε απωκισεν
 τον Ιεχονιαν εξ Ιερουσαλημ

MT 27:21

כי כה אמר יהוה צבאות אלהי
 ישראל על-הפלים הנותרים
 בית יהוה ובית מלך-יהודה
 וירושלם

LXX 34:21

Pluses:

- MT over LXX:
- 1) נבושדנאצר
 - 2) בן-יהויקים מלך-יהודה
 - 3) בבליה ואת.....וירושלם

Classification:

⁴⁸Janzen, 46. Holladay, 114.

⁴⁹This is what Janzen suggests, a summarizing gloss based on verse 21. Janzen, 46.

The first two pluses are secondary pluses.⁵⁰ Title pluses. The third one presents same problems in determining its character. It could be an error by haplography,⁵¹ or a conflate reading. This last is the one suggested by Janzen because of its over emphatic reading.⁵² If this is the case, which it is likely, the plus has an emphatic character, emphasizing YHWH's judgment.

MT 27:22
 כבלה יובאו ושמה יהיו עד
 יום פקדי אתם נאם־יהוה
 והעליתים והשיבתים אל־
 המקום הזה

LXX 34:22
 εις βαβυλωνα εισελευσεται
 λεγει κυριος

Pluses:

MT over LXX: ושמה יהיו עד יום פקדי אתם והעליתים
 והשיבתים אל המקום הזה

Classification:

Probably it is a secondary gloss, to emphasize the message of hope, from 29:10, 14; 24:6; 32:5.⁵³ (in the MT the post-exilic hope is a major concern for the editor/s of this tradition, this is specially in this addition).

⁵⁰Janzen, 69-75. Holladay, 114.

⁵¹The scribe could have skipt from the first menton to Jerusalem to the next.

⁵²Janzen, 46-47.

⁵³Janzen, 47. Holladay, 114.

Comparative Analysis - II

This section constitutes the analysis resulting from the comparison of chapters 28-29 (35-36) of Jeremiah. As the writer has pointed out before this division is not structural, it is just an easier way for the writer to work with the text.

MT 28:1

ויהי בשנה ההיא בראשית
ממלכת צדקיה מלך־יהודה
נשנת הרבעית בחדש החמשי
אמר אלי הנני בן־עוזר
הנביא אשר מגבעון בבית
יהוה לעיני הכהנים וכל־העם
לאמר

LXX 35:1

και εγενετο εν τω τεταρτω
ετει Σεδεκια βασιλεως Ιουδα
εν μηνι τω πεμπτω ειπεν μοι
Ανανιας υιος Αζωρ ο
ψευδοπροφητης ο απο
Γαβαων εν οικω κυριου κατ
οφθαλμους των ιερεων και
παντος του λαου λεγων

Pluses:

MT over LXX: בראשית ממלכם

LXX over MT: ψευδοπροφητης

Classification:

The MT provides the reader with a historical problem. It is difficult to fit the following information within the historical background presented here. This plus may be considered an attempt to harmonize 27:1 with the actual date of the incident.¹ As it has been seen before, 27:1 is a later addition for this reason the historical background provided by the LXX should be considered a prior reading.

For ψευδοπροφητης see 26:7.

¹Bright, p.200.

MT 28:2
 כה־אמר יהוה צבצוח אלהי
 ישראל לאמר שברתי את־על
 מלך־בבל

LXX 35:2
 ουτως ειπε κυριος συνετριψα
 τον ζυγον του βασιλεως
 Βαβυλωνος

Pluses:

- MT over LXX: 1) צבאוח אלהי ישראל
 2) לאמר

Classification:

Two possibilities ought to be considered; a) this plus was omitted by the LXX translator/s or by the LXX-*Vorlage* editor/s, or b) the MT suffered from extension. Janzen² considers it an MT addition following what he calls "the prophetic cliché כה אמר יהוה and נאם יהוה". Otherwise it would be difficult to explain this phenomenon as an omission by the LXX translator or even the LXX-*Vorlage* for we would have problems of consistency in doing so. לאמר is a secondary addition. Stylistic plus.

MT 28:3
 בעוד שנחלים ימים אני משיב
 אל־המקום הזה את־כל־בלי
 בית יהוה אשר לקח
 נבוכדנאצר מלך־בבל מן־
 המקום הזה ויביאם בבלי

LXX 35:3
 ετι δυο ετη ημερων και εγω
 αποστρεψω ει τον τοπον
 τουτον τα σκευη οικου
 κυριου

Pluses:

- MT over LXX: 1) כל
 2) אשר לקח נבוכדנאצר מלך־בבל מן־

²Janzen, pp. 75-76.

המקום הזה ויביאם בבל

Classification:

- 1) It is more likely for this to be a secondary addition.³ From a redactional point of view this was inserted to make emphasis.
- 2) It is a secondary plus, a conflated reading probably from the preceding chapter in an attempt to emphasize the unity with the preceding chapter and, more than this, the given message. For this reason it ought to be classified as an emphatic plus.

MT 28:4
 ואת־יכניה בן־יהויקים מלך־
 יהודה ואת־כל־גלות יהודה
 הבאים בבלה אני משיב אל־
 המקום הזה נאם־יהוה כי
 אשבר את־על מלך בבל

LXX 35:4
 και Ιεχονιαν και την
 αποικιαν Ιουδα οτι
 συντριψω τον ζυγον
 βασιλεως Βαβυλωνος

Pluses:

- MT over LXX:
- 1) בן־יהויקים מלך־יהודה
 - 2) כל
 - 3) הבאים בבלה אני משיב אל־המקום הזה
 נאם־יהוה

Classification:

- 1) Secondary plus.⁴ Title plus. Following the tendency of MT to fill out names.
- 2) Secondary plus.⁵ Emphatic plus.

³Janzen, 65-67. Bright, 200.

⁴Janzen, pp. 69-71.

⁵Janzen, 65-67.

3) Expansionist gloss taken out from the preceding chapter.⁶ It defines people of Judah. The conflict is developed among those people, the false prophesy is directed towards them. Emphatic plus.

MT 28:5
 ויאמר ירמיה הנביא אל-הנניח
 הנביא לעיני הפהנים ולעיני
 כל-העם העמדים בבית יהוה

LXX 35:5
 και ειπεν Ιερεμιας προς
 Ανανιαν κατ οφθαλμους
 παντος του λαου και κατ
 οφθαλμους των ιερεων των
 εστηκοτων εν οικω κυριου

Pluses:

MT over LXX: הנביא (twice)

Classification:

This plus reflects the tendency of the MT in filling out names.⁷ Because in the LXX can not be found any pattern for the abbreviation of titles, these MT pluses ought to be considered secondary. It is obvious that the purpose is again emphatic in terms of contrasting the institutional prophet with the divine prophet. The irony of the fact that prophet was contradicting prophet,⁸ and for instance to make more clear the chaotic religious situation of the people of the land.

⁶ Holladay, 125. Janzen, 48.

⁷ Janzen, 69-70. Carroll, 539.

⁸ Bright, 201.

MT 28:6

וַיֹּאמֶר יִרְמְיָהּ הַנְּבִיא אִמֵּן כֵּן
 יַעֲשֶׂה יְהוָה אֶת־דְּבָרָיךָ אֲשֶׁר
 נִבְאָח לְהָשִׁיב כְּלֵי בֵּית־יְהוָה
 וְכָל־הַגּוֹלָה מִבָּבֶל אֶל־הַמְּקוֹם
 הַזֶּה

LXX 35:6

καὶ εἶπεν Ἰερεμίας ἀληθῶς
 οὕτω ποιησαὶ κύριος στησαὶ
 τὸν λόγον σου ὃν σὺ
 προφητεύεις τοῦ ἐπιστρεψαὶ
 τὰ σκευὴ οἴκου κυρίου καὶ
 πᾶσαν τὴν ἀποικίαν ἐκ
 Βαβυλωνος εἰς τὸν τόπον
 τοῦτον

Pluses:

MT over LXX: הַנְּבִיא

Classification:

See v. 5

MT 28:7

אֲךָ שָׁמַעְנָא הַדְּבָר הַזֶּה אֲשֶׁר
 אָנֹכִי דָּבַר בְּאַזְנוֹיְךָ וּבְאַזְנוֹי כָּל־
 הָעָם

LXX 35:7

πλὴν ἀκουσατε τὸν λόγον
 κυρίου ὃν ἐγὼ λέγω εἰς τὰ
 ὠτα ὑμῶν καὶ εἰς τὰ ὠτα
 πάντος τοῦ λαοῦ

Other Differences:

הַדְּבָר הַזֶּה vs τὸν λόγον κυρίου

Classification:

It is more than likely that the LXX translator/s read יהוה instead of הוה which could have been deteriorated and in a quick reading the translator got the divine name. For this reason, and following the consistency of the current construction הוה הדבר, the MT should be considered prior over LXX. Contextually there is not difference, the problem is just textual.

MT 28:8

הנביאים אשר היו לפני
 ולפניך מן־העולם וינבאו אל־
 ארצות רבות ועל־ממלכום
 גדלות למלחמה ולרעה ולדבר

LXX 35:8

οι προφηται οι γεγονοτες
 προτεροι μου και προτεροι
 υμων απο του αιωνος και
 επροφητευσαν επι γης
 πολλης και επι βασιλειας
 μεγαλας εις πολεμον

Pluses:

MT over LXX: ולרעה ולדבר

Classification:

Secondary addition to follow the three fold pattern ולדבר
 9. It provides to the context with a strong emphatic
 contrast with לשלם in v. 9.

MT 28:9

הנביא אשר ינבא לשלום פבא
 דבר הנביא יודע הנביא אשר־
 שלחו יהוה באמת

LXX 35:9

ο προφητης ο προφητευσας
 εις ειρηνην ελθοντος του
 λογου γνωσονται τον
 προφητην ον απεστειλεν
 αυτοις κυριος εν πιστει

Pluses:

none

MT 28:10

ויקח חנניה הנביא את־המוטה
 מעל צואר ירמיה הנביא
 וישברהו

LXX 35:10

και ελαβεν Ανανιας εν
 οφθαλμοι παντος του λαου
 τους κλοιους απο του
 τραχηλου Ιερεμιου και
 συνετριψεν αυτους

⁹Holladay, 125.

Pluses:

MT over LXX: הנביא (twice)

LXX over MT: εν οφθαλμοις παντος του λαου

Other differences:

המוטת vs המוטת

Classification:

The MT plus is a secondary addition, a title plus. The LXX plus is likely a secondary addition,¹⁰ probably for emphatic purposes (it may be to emphasize the witness of this action).

About the Other Differences contextually the plural reading should be encourage.¹¹

MT 28:11
 ויאמר הנביא לעיני כל-העם
 לאמר פה אמר יהוה פכה
 אשר אח-על נבכדנאצר
 מלך-בבל בעוד שנחים
 ימים מעל צואר כל-הגוים
 וילך ירמיה הנביא לדרפו

LXX 35:11
 και ειπεν Ανανιαις κατ
 οφθαλμοις παντος του λαου
 λεγων ουτως ειπεν κυριος
 ουτως συντριψω τον ζυγον
 βασιλεως Βαβυλωνος απο
 τραχηλων παντων των εθνων
 και ωχετο Ιερεμιας εις την
 οδον αυτου

Pluses:

none

¹⁰Janzen, 64.

¹¹Holladay, 125.

MT 28:12
 ויהי דבר־יהוה אל־ירמיה
 אחרי שְׁבוֹר הנְנִיָּה הנְבִיא
 אֶת־הַמוֹטָה מֵעַל צִוְּאָר יִרְמִיָּה
 הַנְּבִיא לֵאמֹר

LXX 35:12
 και εγενετο λογος κυριου
 προς Ιερεμιαν μετα το
 συντριψαι Ανανιαν τους
 κλοιους απο του τραχηλου
 αυτου λεγων

Pluses:

- MT over LXX: 1) הַנְּבִיא
 2) יִרְמִיָּה הַנְּבִיא

Other differences:

הַמוֹטָה for המוטה

Classification:

For הַנְּבִיא see 28:5; title plus. For number two, the omission in the LXX is due to the reading of the possessive pronoun instead of the name of the prophet, either possibility could be plausible, though the MT would sound to repetitive.¹² For the rest see 28:10.

MT 28:13
 הַלֹּךְ וְאָמַרְתָּ אֶל־הַנְּנִיָּה לֵאמֹר
 כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה מוֹטָח עַץ שְׁבַרְתָּ
 וְעָשִׂיתָ חַחְתִּיָּהֶן מִטוֹחַ בְּרוֹזַל

LXX 35:13
 βαδιζε και ειπον προς
 Ανανιαν λεγων ουτως ειπεν
 κυριος κλοιους ξυλινους
 συνετριψας και ποιησω αντ
 αυτων κλοιους σιδηρους

Pluses:

none

¹²See Holladay, 125. Carroll, 538. Bright, 198.

MT 28:14

כי כה־אמר יהוה צבאות
אלהי ישראל על ברזל נתתי
על־צוואר כל־הגוים האלה
לעבד אח־נבכדנאצר מלך־
בבל ועבדהו וגם את־הית
השדה נתתי לו

LXX 35:14

οτι ουτως ειπεν κυριος ζυγον
σιδηρουν εθηκα επι τον
τραχηλον παντων των εθνων
εργαζεσθαι τω βασιλει
Βαβυλωνος

Pluses:

- MT over LXX:
- 1) צבאות אלהי ישראל
 - 2) האלה
 - 3) נבכדנאצר
 - 4) ועבדהו וגם את־חית השדה נתתי לו

Classification:

- 1) Secondary plus; title plus, following the MT tendency to fill out names (specially in this case the divine name¹³).
- 2) Probably it is a double reading, an addition similar to the phraseology of 25:9, 27:6.¹⁴ From a narrative point of view this pluses serves the purpose of emphasis, it may reflect also its excludivistic tendency.
- 3) See 27:8
- 4) Probably an expansion from 27:6.¹⁵ Emphatic pluses, to point out where the real prophetic message stands.

¹³For more information about this see Janzen, 75-86.

¹⁴Janzen, 48. Holladay, 125.

¹⁵Janzen, 48.

MT 28:15

וַיֹּאמֶר יִרְמְיָה הַנְּבִיא אֶל־חַנְּנִיָּה
הַנְּבִיא שְׁמַע־נָא חַנְּנִיָּה לֹא־
שְׁלַח־ךָ יְהוָה וְאַתָּה הַבְּטַחַת אֶת־
הָעָם הַזֶּה עַל־שִׁקְרָה

LXX 35:15

καὶ εἶπεν Ἰερεμίας τῷ Ἀνανία
οὐκ ἀπεσταλέν σε κύριος
καὶ πεποιθῆναι ἐποίησας τὸν
λαὸν τοῦτον ἐπ' ἀδικίᾳ

Pluses:

MT over LXX: 1) הַנְּבִיא

2) שְׁמַע־נָא חַנְּנִיָּה

Classification:

- 1) Secondary addition. See 28:5.
- 2) This is to be considered an omission by the LXX translator/s or the LXX-Vorlage. Haplography.

MT 28:16

לִכְן כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה הַנְּנִי
מִשְׁלַח־ךָ מֵעַל פְּנֵי הָאָדָמָה
הַשְּׁנָה אֶתָּה מִת כִּי־סָרָה
דְּבַרְתָּ אֶל־יְהוָה

LXX 35:16

διὰ τοῦτο οὕτως εἶπεν κύριος
ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐξαποστελλῶ σε
ἀπὸ προσώπου τῆς γῆς τοῦτω
τῷ ἐνιαυτῷ ἀποθάνῃ

Pluses:

MT over LXX: כִּי־סָרָה דְּבַרְתָּ אֶל־יְהוָה

Classification:

Most scholars see this plus as an addition by the MT based upon Dt 13:6.¹⁶

MT 28:17

וַיִּמַּת חַנְּנִיָּה הַנְּבִיא בַשָּׁנָה הַהִיא
בְּחֹדֶשׁ הַשְּׁבִיעִי

LXX 35:17

καὶ ἀπεθάνεν ἐν τῷ μηνὶ τῷ
ἐβδομῷ

¹⁶Janzen, 48. Holladay, 126. Bright, 200. Carroll, 540.

Pluses:

- MT over LXX: 1) חנניה הנביא
2) בשנה ההיא

Classification:

- 1) Secondary plus. Emphatic plus. Within this plus חנניהⁱ is a title plus to continue with the consistency of MT to fill out names.
2) This is likely to be an expansionist addition from v. 16.¹⁷ To emphasize the fulfillment of Jeremiah's prophesy, helping to stress the contrast between both prophets.

MT 29:1
ואלה דברי הספר אשר שלח
ירמיה הנביא מירושלם
כל אל-יחר זקני הגולה ואל-
הכהנים ואל-הנביאים ואל
העם אשר הגלה נבוכדנאצר
מירושלם בבלה

LXX 36:1
και ουτοι οι λογοι της
βιβλον ους απεστειλεν
Ιερεμιας εξ Ιερουσαλημ προς
τους πρεσβυτερους της
αποικιας και προς τους ιερεις
και προς τους
ψευδοπροφητας επιστολην
εις Βαβυλωνα τη αποικια
και προς απαντα τον λαον

Pluses:

- MT over LXX: 1) הנביא
2) יחר
3) אשר הגלה נבוכדנאצר מירושלם בבלה
- LXX over MT: ψευδοπροφητας

¹⁷Janzen, 48. Holladay, 126.

Classification:

- 1) See 28:5.
- 2) It is difficult to consider this word as a secondary plus because of the uncertainty of its meaning, if this is true what probably happened is that the LXX translator skipped this word considering its difficulty in translating it.¹⁸
- 3) This material has been glossed from chapter 24 and 52.¹⁹ For this reason ought to be consider secondary in character. This plus provides more information that in an stylistic way helps to introduce the chapter.

For the LXX plus see 26:7

MT 29:2
 אהרי צאת יכניה-המלך
 והגבירה והפרסים שרי יהודה
 וירושלם והחרש והמסגר
 מירושלם

LXX 36:2
 υστερον εξελθοντος Ιεχονιου
 του βασιλεως και της
 βασιλισσης και των
 ευνουχων και παντος
 ελευθερου και δεσμωτου και
 τεχνιτου εξ Ιερουσαλημ

Pluses:

שרי יהודה וירושלם vs. και παντος ελευθερου
 וירושלם

Classification:

According to Holladay this verse "interrupts the continuity of v.1 and 3.²⁰ In any case, the writer is force to consider this verse for it appears in both traditions. If the MT reflects a better reading than the LXX,²¹ this plus by the LXX would represent the inclusivistic

¹⁸Holladay, 131.

¹⁹Janzen, 48. Holladay, 132.

²⁰Holladay, 132.

character of the Greek text. This verse constitutes a double reading from 2 Kings 24:14-16.²²

MT 29:3

בִּיד אֲלֵעֲשֶׂה בֶן־שָׁפָן וּגְמַרְיָה
בֶּן־חֲלָקִיָּה אֲשֶׁר שָׁלַח צְדָקִיָּה
מֶלֶךְ־יְהוּדָה אֶל־נְבוּכַדְנֶאֱצַר
מֶלֶךְ בָּבֶל בְּבִלְהָ לְאֹמֵר

LXX 36:3

εν χειρι Ελεασα υιου Σαφαν
και Γαμαριου υιου Χελκιου
ον απεστειλεν Σεδεκιας
βασιλευς Ιουδα προς
βασιλεα Βαβυλωνος εις
Βαβυλωνα λεγων

Pluses:

MT over LXX: נְבוּכַדְנֶאֱצַר

Classification:

See page 27:8

MT 29:4

כִּי אָמַר יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת אֱלֹהֵי
יִשְׂרָאֵל לְכֹל־הַגּוֹלָה אֲשֶׁר־
הִגְלִיתִי מִירוּשָׁלַם בְּבִלְהָ

LXX 36:4

ουτως ειπεν κυριος ο θεος
Ισραηλ επι την αποικιαν ην
απωκισα απο Ιερουσαλημ

Pluses:

MT over LXX: 1) צְבָאוֹת

2) בְּבִלְהָ

Classification:

1) It is probably a secondary plus following the consistency in usage of the formula יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל.

2) Expansionist addition from 27:20.²³ Emphatic plus.

²¹Janzen, 32.

²²Holladay, 132. Janzen, 32.

²³Janzen, 48.

MT 29:5
בני בתים ושבו ונטעו גנות
ואכלו אח־פֿרין קחו נשים

LXX 36:5
οικοδομησατε οικους και
κατοικησατε και φυτευσατε
παρδεισους και φαγετε τους
καρπους αυτων

Pluses:

none

<p>MT 29:6 קחו נשים והולידו בנים ובנות וקחו לבניכם נשים ואח־בנותיכם חנו לאנשים ותלדנה בנים ובנות ורבו־שם ואל־חמעטו</p>	<p>LXX 36:6 και λαβατε γυναικας και τεκνοποιησατε υιους και λαβετε τοις υιοις υμων γυναικας και τας θυγατερας υμων ανδρασιν δοτε και πληθυνεσθε και μη σμικρυνθητε</p>
--	--

Pluses:

MT over LXX: ותלדנה בנים ובנות

Classification:

Tov considers this plus as evidence of a post-exilic addition.²⁴ Nevertheless there is also the possibility of us dealing with omission in the LXX, by haplography.²⁵ For this plus, because of the uncertainty we encounter here, it is difficult to make a redactional implication.

²⁴ He includes this as evidence to prove that Edition II (MT, and the texts that reflect its reading) is a latter edition than Edition I (represented by the LXX and Qumran findings). Tov, E. Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible. Fortress Press: Minneapolis, 1992. p. 321.

²⁵Janzen, 103-4. Holladay, 132.

MT 29:7	LXX 36:7
וּדְרָשׁוּ אֶחָד־שְׁלוֹם הָעִיר אֲשֶׁר הַגְּלִיתִי אֹתְכֶם שָׁמָּה וְהִתְפַּלְלוּ בְּעֵדָה אֶל־יְהוָה כִּי בְשָׁלוֹמָה יִהְיֶה לָכֶם שְׁלוֹם	καὶ ζήτησατε εἰς εἰρήνην τῆς γῆς εἰς ἣν ἀπακίσα ὑμᾶς ἐκεῖ καὶ προσευξασθε περὶ αὐτῶν πρὸς κύριον ὅτι ἐν εἰρήνῃ αὐτῆς ἐστὶ εἰρήνη ὑμῖν

Pluses:

העיר vs. της γης

Classification:

Most scholars take the LXX reading as preferable,²⁶ though the MT reading is the *lectio difficilior*²⁷. It is not likely that the MT suffered from scribal error, for to mistake הָעִיר for הָאָרֶץ, and there is the possibility of taken הָעִיר distributively.²⁸ If this is the case the LXX translated using a more accurate word to reflect this. If this is the case this is an interpretative change.

MT 29:8	LXX 36:8
כִּי כֹה אָמַר יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶל־יְשִׁיאוּ לָכֶם נְבִיאִים אֲשֶׁר־בְּקִרְבְּכֶם וְקִסְמִים וְאֵל־ הַשְׁמָעוּ אֶל־חִלְמֹתֵיכֶם אֲשֶׁר אַחַם מַחֲלָמִים	ὅτι οὕτως εἶπεν κύριος μὴ ἀναπειθετώσαν ὑμᾶς οἱ ψευδοπροφῆται οἱ ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ μὴ ἀναπειθετώσαν ὑμᾶς οἱ μαντεῖς ὑμῶν καὶ μὴ ἀκούετε εἰς τὰ ἐνυπνία ὑμῶν ἅ ὑμεῖς ἐνυπνιαζέσθε

Pluses:

MT over LXX: צבאות אלהי ישראל

²⁶Bright, 208. Carroll, 552-3. Holladay, 132.

²⁷For warnings on this Internal Criteria see Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 302-5.

²⁸Bright, 208.

Classification:

Secondary plus; title plus. The MT tends to expand names in a more consistent way than the LXX does.

MT 29:9	LXX 36:9
כִּי בִשְׁקֶר הֵם נִבְּאִים לָכֵם בְּשֵׁמִי לֹא שְׁלַחְתִּים נֶאֱמַר יְהוָה	οτι αδικα αυτοι προφητεουσιν υμιν επι τω ονοματι μου και ουκ απεστειλα αυτους

Pluses:

MT over LXX: נֶאֱמַר יְהוָה

Classification:

It is a secondary plus. A expansionist addition from parallel context.²⁹ For our purposes this is an emphatic plus, to highlight the origin of the words, from יְהוָה.

MT 29:10	LXX 36:10
כִּי־כֹה אָמַר יְהוָה כִּי לִפְנֵי מַלְאָח לְבַבְל שְׁבַעִים שָׁנָה אֶפְקֹד אֶתְכֶם וְהִקְמַתִי עֲלֵיכֶם אֶת־דְּבַר־הַטּוֹב לְהָשִׁיב אֶתְכֶם אֶל־הַמְּקוֹם הַזֶּה	οτι ουτως ειπεν κυριος οταν μελλη πληρουσθαι Βαβυλωνι εβδομηκοντα ετη επισκεψομαι υμας και επιστησω τους λογους μου εφ υμας του τον λαον υμων αποστρεψαι εις τον τοπον τουτον

Pluses:

MT over LXX: הַטּוֹב

Other differences:

דְּבַר־י vs. τους λογους μου

²⁹Janzen, 83.

conflation of a variant text for the expression **אחריית וחקוה** appears elsewhere.³³

MT 29:12
 וקראתם אחי והלכתם והתפללתם
 אלי ושמעתי אליכם

LXX 36:12
 και προσευξασθε προς με
 και εισακουσομαι υμων

MT 29:13
 ובקשתם אחי ומצאתם כייני
 חדרשני בכל-לבבכם
 ונמצאתי לכם נאם-יהוה ושבת
 אח-שביתכם וקבצתי אתכם

LXX 36:13
 και εκζητησατε με και
 ευρησατε με οτι ζητησατε με
 εν ολη καρδια υμων

MT 29:14
 מכל-הגוים ומכל-המקומות אשר
 אשר הדחתי אתכם שם נאם-יהוה
 והשבתי אתכם אל-המקום
 -הגליתי אתכם משם

LXX 36:14
 και επιφανουμαι υμιν

Pluses:

- MT over LXX:
- 1) וקראתם אחי והלכתם
 - 2) נאם-יהוה ושבת אח-שביתכם וקבצתי
 אתכם מכל-הגוים ומכל-המקומות אשר
 הדחתי אתכם שם נאם-יהוה והשבתי
 אתכם אל-המקום אשר-הגליתי אתכם
 משם

Other Differences:

ונמצאתי vs. ונדאיתי

³³Holladay, 133.

Classification:

1) Holladay proposes that this order was in the original text and that **והלכתם אתי ויקראתם אתי** is original while the rest of it could be a variant of an analogous reading in a conflate text.³⁴

2) All this addition is generated from other related passages, 16:15, 23:3, 32:37, etc.³⁵ Holladay, on the other hand, argues that not all this plus ought to be considered expansionist for there are certain parts that could be perfectly attributed to the prophet or to the original structure of the text.³⁶

For the verb difference Holladay prefers to follow the LXX.³⁷

MT 29:15
 כִּי אָמַרְתֶּם הַקִּים לִנְוִי יְהוָה
 וְנִבְאִים בְּבִלְהָ

LXX 36:15
 ὅτι εἶπατε κατεστήσεν ἡμῖν
 κύριος προφήτας ἐν
 βαβυλῶνι

Pluses:

none

³⁴Holladay, 133. So does Bright, 205.

³⁵Janzen, 48. Also see Bright, 205.

³⁶Holladay, 133, 134-5.

³⁷Holladay, 133.

<p>MT 29:16 פִּי־כֹה אָמַר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי־מִלְכָּךְ הַיּוֹשֵׁב אֶל־כִּסֵּא דוֹד וְאֶל־כַּל־ הָעַם הַיּוֹשֵׁב בְּעִיר הַזֹּאת אֲחִיכֶם אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יֵצְאוּ אִתְּכֶם בְּגוּלָה</p>	<p>LXX 36:16</p>
<p>MT 29:17 כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת הַנְּנִי מִשְׁלַח בִּם אֶת־הַחֶרֶב אֶת־הָרַעֵב וְאֶת־הַדָּבָר וְנַחֲתִי אוֹתָם כַּתְּאֲנִים הַשְּׁעָרִים אֲשֶׁר לֹא־ תֵּאכְלֵנָה מֵרַע</p>	<p>LXX 36:17</p>
<p>MT 29:18 וְרִדְפֹתִי אַחֲרֵיהֶם בַּחֶרֶב בְּרַעֵב וְנַחֲתִים לְזוּעָה לְכָל מַמְלָכוֹת הָאָרֶץ לְאֵלֶּה וּלְשִׁמָּה וּלְשָׂרְקָה וּלְחֶרְפָּה בְּכָל־הַגּוֹיִם אֲשֶׁר־ הִדְחִיתִים שֵׁם</p>	<p>LXX 36:18</p>
<p>MT 29:19 תַּחַת אֲשֶׁר־לֹא־שָׁמְעוּ אֶל־ דְּבָרֵי נְאֻם־יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר שְׁלַחֹתִי אֵלֵיהֶם אֶת־עַבְדֵי הַנְּבִיאִים הַשֹּׁכֵם וְשָׁלַח וְלֹא שָׁמְעוּם נְאֻם־יְהוָה</p>	<p>LXX 36:19</p>
<p>MT 29:20 וְאַתֶּם שָׁמְעוּ דְבַר־יְהוָה כֹּל־ הַגּוּלָה אֲשֶׁר־שְׁלַחֹתִי מִירוּשָׁלַם בְּבַלָּה</p>	<p>LXX 36:20</p>

Pluses:

MT over LXX: all

Classification:

The order that occupies this material is some what confusing for interrupts the continuity between verses 15 and 21. Within this material some can be considered secondary by addition in the MT text, with deuteronomic characteristic, and some of the text can be defective by haplography in the LXX.³⁸ Because these verse are not found in the LXX, it is difficult to determine the magnitude of this. For this reason the writer will not infer any redactional implication.

MT 29:21	LXX 36:21
כה-אמר יהוה צבאות אלהי ישראל אל-אחאב בן-קוליה ואל-צדקיהו בן-מעשיה הנבאים לכם בשמי שקר הנני נתן אחס ביד נבוכדראצר מלך-בבל והפם לעיניכם	ουτως ειπε κυριος επι Αχιαβ και επι Σεδεκιαν ιδου εγω διδωμι αυτους εις χειρας βασιλεως Βαβυλωνος και παταξει αυτους κατ οφθαλμους υμων

Pluses:

- MT over LXX:
- 1) צבאות אלהי ישראל
 - 2) בן-קוליה ; בן-מעשיה
 - 3) הנבאים לכם בשמי שקר
 - 4) נבוכדראצר

Classification:

- 1) Secondary plus; title plus.
- 2) It is uncertain the character of this plus. It is interesting that these names and its titles only appear in Neh 11:7, which could suggest a secondary addition. On the other hand there is the

³⁸Janzen, 118. So does Holladay, 133-4.

possibility of Jeremiah wanting to play on the name קוליה , for which קללה and קלם in the next verse will provide this intended patron.³⁹

3) It is most likely for this to be a secondary plus, from verse 9 and others.⁴⁰ Emphatic plus.

4) See 27:8

MT 29:22

ולקח מהם קללה לכל גלות
יהודה אשר בבבל לאמר
ישמך יהוה כצדקיהו וכאחב
אשר-קלם מלך-בבל באש

LXX 36:22

και ληψονται απ αυτων
καταραν εν παση τη αποικια
Ιουδα εν Βαβυλωνι λεγοντες
ποιησαι σε κυριος ως
Σεδεκιαν εποιησε και ως
Αχιαβ ους απετηγανισε
βασιλευς Βαβυλωνος εν πυρι

Pluses:

none

Other differences:

The MT misspells the name אַחאַב .

MT 29:23

יען אשר עשו נבלה בישראל
וינאפו אח-נשי רעיהם
וידברו דבר בשמי שקר אשר
לוא צויתם ואנכי היידע ועד
נאם-יהוה

LXX 36:23

δι ην εποιησαν ανομιαν εν
Ισραηλ και εμοιχωντο τας
γυναικας των πολιτων αυτων
και λογον εχρηματισαν εν
τω ονοματι μου ον ου
συνεταξα αυτοις και εγω
μαρτυς φησι κυριος

³⁹Janzen, 71-2. Holladay, 134.

⁴⁰Janzen, 49. Holladay, 134.

Pluses:

- MT over LXX: 1) שקר
2) הוידע

Classification:

- 1) Secondary expansion from preceding verses (v.21, 27:15, 29:9,33).⁴¹ Emphatic plus.
2) It is uncertain to determine if this reading is a derived from an original form or conflate reading.⁴²

MT 29:24
וּאֵל־שִׁמְעִיהוּ הַנְּחַלְמֵי הָאָמַר
לְאָמַר

LXX 36:24
καὶ πρὸς Σαμαίαν τὸν
Αἰλαμίτην εἶπες

Pluses:

MT over LXX: לְאָמַר

Classification:

As pointed out before, there is the consistency by the MT in adding this plus to introduce any direct discourse. Secondary addition.⁴³

MT 29:25
כֹּה־אָמַר יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת אֱלֹהֵי
יִשְׂרָאֵל לְאָמַר יֵעַן אֲשֶׁר אָתָּה
שַׁלַּחַת בְּשִׁמְכָה סִפְרִים אֶל־כָּל־
הָעָם אֲשֶׁר בִּירוּשָׁלַם וְאֶל־
צַפְנִיָּה בֶן־מַעֲשִׂיָּה הַכֹּהֵן וְאֶל
כָּל־הַכֹּהֲנִים לְאָמַר

LXX 36:25
οὐκ ἀπεστείλα σε τῷ
ὀνοματι μου καὶ πρὸς
Σοφονίαν υἱὸν Μασσαίου
τὸν ἱερεᾶ εἶπε

⁴¹Janzen, 49. Bright, 205.

⁴²Janzen, 22. Holladay, 134.

⁴³Holladay, 145.

Pluses:

- MT over LXX:
- 1) כה-אמר יהוה צבאות אלהי ישראל
 - 2) לאמר (twice)
 - 3) ספרים
 - 4) אל-כל-העם אשר בירושלם /
ואל-כל-הכהנים

Other differences:

יען אשר אתה שלחת בשמחה vs ουκ απεστειλα σε τω
ονοματι μου

Classification:

- 1) Probably this plus ought to be considered secondary for it follows the MT consistency in adding this introductory address.⁴⁴
- 2) Secondary pluses, to introduce direct discourse.
- 3) Secondary plus. Emphatic plus.
- 4) Secondary addition, for in the next verse the letter is addressed in second person singular.

MT 29:26
יהוה נתנך כהן תחת יהוידע
הכהן להיות פקדים בית יהוה
לכל-איש משגע ומחנבא
ונחתה אתו אל-המהפכת ואל-
הצינק

LXX 36:26

Pluses:

LXX over MT: και παντι ανθρωπω

⁴⁴See 28:2.

Other Differences:

MT פקידים (plural) vs LXX פקיד (singular)

Classification:

MT because of the construction of v.25 needs a plural form,⁴⁵ it can be implied that this was a force necessary change to be made, and that the LXX could represent the original form.

The LXX plus is to be considered secondary, taken from the same verse, probably to make emphasis. Though there is the possibility for this to be an unconscious copy of the same phrase.

MT 29:27
ועתה למה לא גערת בירמיהו
הענתתי המתנבא לכם

LXX 36:27

Pluses:

none

MT 29:28
כי על-כן שלח אלינו בבל
לאמר ארפה היא בנו בתים
ושבו ונטעו גנות ואכלו את-
פריהן

LXX 36:28

Pluses:

LXX over MT: ου διατουτο απεστειλεν

MT 29:29
ויקרא צפניה הפהן את-הספר
הזה באזני ירמיהו הנביא

LXX 36:29
και ανεγνω Σοφονιας το
βιβλιον εις τα ωτα Ιερεμιου

⁴⁵Holladay, 145.

Pluses:

MT over LXX: הכהן / הנביא

Classification:

Both are to be rendered as secondary additions.⁴⁶

MT 29:30

ויהי דבר-יהוה אל-ירמיהו
לאמר

LXX 36:30

και εγενετο λογος κυριου
προς Ιερεμιαν λεγων

Pluses:

none

MT 29:31

שלח על-כל-הגולה לאמר פה
אמר יהוה אל-שמעיה הנחלמי
יען אשר נבא לכם שמעיה
ואני לא שלחתי ויבטח
אחכם על-שקר

LXX 36:31

αποστειλον προς την
αποικιαν λεγων ουτως ειπε
κυριος επι Σαμαιαν τον
Αιλαμιτην επειδη
επροφητευσεν υμιν Σαμαιας
και εγω ουκ απεστειλα
αυτον και πεποιθεναι
εποιησεν υμας επ αδικοις

Pluses:

MT over LXX: כל

Classification:

See 26:12; 28:3.

⁴⁶See 26:1

MT 29:32

לכן פה-אמר יהוה הנני פקר
 על-שמעיה הנחלמי ועל-זרעו
 לא-יהיה לו איש יושב בחוף
 העם הזה ולא-יראה בטוב
 אשר-אני עשה-לעמי נאם-
 יהוה פי-סרה דבר על-יהוה

LXX 34:32

Pluses:

- MT over LXX: 1) הנחלמי
 2) נאם-יהוה פי-סרה דבר על-יהוה

Other Differences:

- 1) בחוף העם הזה vs. εν μεσσω τμων
 2) לעמי vs. τμου

Classification:

- 1) Secondary plus. Title plus.
 2) Secondary expansion. Stylistic plus, it was added to closing
 devise for the oracle.⁴⁷

For the other differences the LXX is more specific than the
 MT, and probably reflects a better reading.⁴⁸

⁴⁷Holladay, 146.

⁴⁸Janzen, 74. Holladay, 145.

CHAPTER 3

Final Considerations and Conclusion

In this section the evidence is brought together. The reached conclusions will be analyzed within the internal structure of the four chapters. For this reason, first the writer gives a brief introduction to this structure.

Even though it is difficult to conceive the unity of these chapters, for they are not in chronological order, the theme throughout is basically the same. From the beginning the tradition has gathered chapters 26-29 together as a unit.¹ This was the understanding of both traditions, for they provide the same order for these chapters. The theme of false-true prophecy is very relevant in observing this unity, and more over these chapters deal with Jeremiah's personal struggles in his ministry and also God sovereign control and deliverance, as promised to him in the first chapter of the book . In chapter 26 Jeremiah is almost put to death because the leaders, specifically the religious authorities (v.8), considered him a false prophet because his message of destruction (v.9).² The information provided by this chapter is crucial, the audience realizes the primary reason Jeremiah was not put to dead was his connection within the priesthood and the government (26:16-7).³

¹If both traditions derived from the same archetype, they follow the order established by whoever put together this material and form the final work. But if the possibility for these two traditions of gathering the Jeremiatic material separately can be considered, then it is relevant to notice that they, independently, came up with the same order. Another option is that from the beginning these constituted a topical unit.

²It is relevant to notice that the priests and prophets did not pay attention to Jeremiah's call to repentance (v.3) but just to the destructive consequences of their doing. This was so, probably, because they thought they were going in the right direction with their institutionalized religion.

³Notice that in the narrative the editor or the author added the story of another prophet sent by God who was not as fortunate as Jeremiah was.

Chapters 27 and 28 deal with the specific cases of Jeremiah's struggle; in 27 the Lord tells Jeremiah to make yokes and place them on his neck and send a message for the surrounding regions and finally to Zedekiah; YHWH is going to send his servant, Nebuchadnezzar, to rule over all of them, and the ones who do not submit themselves to him will perish. The message of this chapter is divided into three main sections. The first one starts with a general address, "this is what you will say to your masters", the second is address to Zedekiah, " in like manner I spoke to Zedekiah king of Judah," and third is address to the priests and all the people. The message is basically the same, they must surrender to the king of Babylon and, most importantly, there is the exhortation not to listen to their prophets for they are prophesying lies in saying that they will not serve the Babylonian king.

27:4-11	27:12-15	27:16-22
<u>Address:</u> "to your masters"	<u>Address:</u> "to Zedekiah king of Judah"	<u>Address:</u> "to the priests and to all this people"
<u>Message:</u> 1.- YHWH has given the land to Nebuchadnezzar. 2.- Do not listen to your prophets.	<u>Message:</u> 1.- Submit to the king of Babylon. 2.- Do not listen to the words of the prophets.	<u>Message:</u> 1.- Do not listen the words of your prophets. 2.- Serve the king of Babylon.

These chapters develop their theme in terms of recurring contrasts between what it is the "national feeling" of what God is going to do and what God's truthfully desires and wills for the nation. This idea is particularized in chapter 28, where the specific contrast appears between the true and the false prophet (Jeremiah vs. Hananiah).

Chapter 29 concludes this section of exhortation not to listen to their prophets with the condemnation of two of those false prophets, Ahab and Zedekiah (verse 21), and Shemaiah. All this section, chapters 26 through 29, started by the Lord's warning not to listen to their prophets, but now in chapter 29 there is a flash of hope if the Judeans turn to God. The solution is not in listening to their prophets but in praying to the Lord (vv.12-13). Nevertheless this message of hope is not all this chapter is about. Following the pattern of the preceding chapters, it finishes with judgment upon other false prophets (vv.21-32).

Going back to the textual evidence and redactional implications; the evidence found in these chapters reinforces the reality that recovering the original text is not just a matter of erasing the pluses found in the MT edition and retroverting the reading from the LXX. This task is a more difficult and complicated one, for as it has been proved both editions present some sort of evidence that leads the writer to conclude that both tradition has suffered changes due to independent redactional efforts.

The name/title pluses can be easily dismissed in considering them as irrelevant pluses. This is a tempting conclusion for the majority of them are just the filling out of names or titles, and it provides a key for consistency by the MT editor/s of Jeremiah. This would not be an accurate picture of these pluses, for among them there are some that can bring us some insight about the redaction process of the Book, or even can provide us with a picture of what that original text contained, or perhaps the pluses can open questions to address different possibilities about this matter.

A clear example of this is 27:1. It is difficult to not consider the emphatic character of these pluses, more over in a certain way the majority of the MT and LXX pluses have some emphatic connotation. In analyzing

the evidence, the struggle is visible in understanding the unity of this section, mainly chapter 26 with 27-29, and this plus is the one that points this out. It is evident the MT editor/s had some problems in understanding the connection between chapters 26 and 27. This is reflected by the addition of this plus, it is obvious that he/they understood chapter 27 needed some kind of connection linking with the preceding chapter. Even this was done erroneously by understanding the link had to be in terms of historical relationship with the preceding chapter instead of connecting it with the following material or just leaving it blank as the LXX does. It is likely the original text did not introduce this chapter, as represented in the LXX.⁴

Another interesting fact is that both traditions kept the same order concerning these chapters. Most likely, the document which these tradition based their development had the mentioned arrangement. This difference, as noticed before, would be a crucial point if the MT was rearranging all previous material, which supposedly followed the same order as presented by the LXX, for it is obvious that this presented a problem for the MT editors in terms of the unity of this material. The fact that this does not happen affirms that really there was not a consistent pattern for the new arrangement the MT displayed.

Title pluses are provided for a diversity of reasons. Sometimes they are added also to provide emphatic points. This could perfectly be the case in the completion of the divine name and the emphatic repetition of the name of the Babylonian king. In the first case, the recurrence of the full divine name is obviously a theological emphasis. This emphasis gives us an

⁴Even though same other conclusions could be raised in considering the other traditions, for they provide a variations of introductions to chapter 27, it is very likely they were influenced by this confusion provided by the MT tradition.

interesting contrast, which happens as well in other prophetic writings. The fact God's nation is put under punishment but yet God is "YHWH of host the God of Israel;" though sometimes this title is not written fully but in the abbreviated form, "YHWH of hosts." The theological impute of the book stands up, God is in control of every situation, and every historical event happens under His supervision. The post-exilic Judah had to understand the exile and misfortune of their people did not happen because they put their hope in the wrong god. The opposite is the case, they had forsaken God, now the result is punishment. If they had listened to the message of their prophets this would never have happened.

The next category of pluses encountered in the comparison of both traditions are the emphatic ones. As the writer has pointed out before this is a general category and in some instances many of the other pluses can be considered within this line. These pluses provided the reader with information about the end the editor/s wanted to reach in that edition of the book. It is relevant to notice that many of these additions are not necessary unless the editor wanted to make clear the point of Jeremiah's message (27:19,21) and the circumstances the events developed, especially the over emphasis of the consequences for not following YHWH (27:10, 15; 28:14). Another feature emphatic pluses underline is the message of the false prophets (27:18; 28:4,8), though this could be considered together with the emphasis of the true message, for they are interrelated by contrast. Finally in chapter 27, 28 these pluses come to us as a way of providing a strong contrast between the false prophet's message and the true word from YHWH (verse 18 Vs. 19, 21; 28:4).

Interpretative pluses are provided to explain/complete ideas or words that were problematic in the eyes of the editor/s or even to provide some

sort of emphasis.⁵ This category is filled by LXX pluses, with the exception of one MT plus (28:16). In some cases these pluses are the immediate result of the translation process, for interpretation is always involved in such work; this is the case with 27:5 (the translator chose to introduce a subordinated junction), 7 (the translator appeals to his common sense and decides to translate *city* as *land*). Other features, such as correcting some theological problem, can be attributed to the redactional process rather than to the translation one; this is the case in 27:6, 26: 7, 8, 16, and 29:1. The fact the translator/s decided to translate this recurrence of the word *prophet* as *false prophet* shows he/they wanted to provide the reader or listener with an explicit contrast. The only one plus by the MT on this area, 28:16, is an explanatory one, the editor/s made clear everyone understands that YHWH's judgment is because of Israel's rebellion against Him. Any of these pluses are added to clarify or highlight what the editor/s or translator/s considered important to be understood by the reader or the listener of this book.

Stylistic pluses are those ones that were added to impress beauty within the narrative or just to provide links between different material or ideas. In the MT 26:1, 11, 17, 18; 28:2; 29:24 are evidence of a consistent plus all over the book (לאמר). The purpose of it is to introduce direct discourses, for this reason many times it is not worthy to be translated but provide the reader with a mark where these direct speeches start. The pluses in 27:11; 29:9, 11 contribute to the beauty of the reading, though it cannot be forgotten that they can be considered emphatic pluses that appeal

⁵There is a difference between the emphasis provided by the interpretative pluses and that one of an emphatic plus. Interpretative pluses give the reader some kind of explanation of what is going on or what kind of people they are dealing with while an emphatic plus will just underline what it has been already pointed out.

to the origin of the oracle. 27:1 was added to provide a link between the preceding and following chapter, and 27:22 as a theological link for the editor/s considered important to add this light of hope within the fact of the judgment. In the LXX, 26:19 presents a necessary addition to build a rhetorical question, this plus is the result of the translation process. 27:6 denotes a stylistic subtraction for the sake of the translation.

Another set of pluses can be distinguished in dealing with these chapters of the book of Jeremiah, they represent differences in the construction of sentences or ideas. They also help the reader of the book to appreciate the tendencies of thought of both traditions. The first one is found in 26:2; this different construction could suggest a change of direction by the LXX. Two possibilities are to be considered; 1) it could just be a mere error done by the translator, or 2) the translator or even the editor of the Hebrew text underlying the LXX may be giving the reader some clues about the ones the book was directed toward. If the last option is the case, and some consistency will have to be found in the book as a whole, the LXX will present a more inclusivistic message than the MT.

Finally in dealing with these chapters, there is a section the writer has named "other differences" which reveals some clues about the redactional process. Two types of differences are noticed: 1) The ones due to scribal error, which really do not provide any clue about this, for they are due to mistakes (26:8; 29:15, 22); and 2) differences due to scribal corrections, which can be subdivided into two subcategories:

- a) LXX corrections (28:10,12) or just reflecting a prior reading (29:10 ?). In which the LXX or the text behind it has introduced a necessary change, according to the editor/s of this tradition, to correct the text, or just to clarify or emphasize the

content. These were probably errors introduced in the text during the transmission process and the scribes attempted to recover the original reading.

b) MT corrections (29:11, 26, 32) or just reflecting a prior reading (29:10 ?).

The second type is the one relevant for this thesis, for these were the result of conscious changes introduced by the editor/s of both traditions. Sometime these changes were right and other times were wrong, but the editorial intention can be drawn as the starting point of these changes. The corrections of the previous text according to what the scribe/s thought that fit better the context are key elements in the fixing of a new edition. Though the preceding is true, the writer is aware these changes could just represent the consequences of the transmission process and not of an editorial effort.

Questions Raised by this Study

The purpose of this section is to formulate questions that will be the starting point of any further study of the Book of Jeremiah by this writer.

The first set of questions are related to the editorial process of both traditions. It has been demonstrated by this writer that both traditions have undergone some kind of redactional process. The first question to ask is about the assumed starting point of any textual study that every tradition based its work upon a finished literary work:⁶ Is this assumption correct?

⁶The aim of textual criticism is that there was an original archetype of the book. A finished and organized unity which by process of transmission by redactional means gave birth to the versions and traditions are

Are there possibilities for the two traditions in basing their work upon an unfinished literary work?, if so, is this the case in Jeremiah? The second set of questions are related to the order of the material in Jeremiah: Is there a consistent link between the sections which are organized differently that can reflect an independent redaction work apart from the idea of one tradition basing its work upon the other, or was one tradition merely basing its work upon the other and rearranged the last one?.

The following questions are directly related to this study. The first set of questions are directed towards the title pluses. It is obvious that in comparing the MT with the LXX there is a consistency by the MT editor/s in adding these pluses; but there are some exceptions to this⁷ that cannot be explained by considering their redundancy, for it seems that excessiveness in repetition was not an issue the editor/s considered. Is the consistency for adding these pluses a fact? If so, is there some connection that links the material in which the pluses are added to them?

Concerning the rest of the pluses: How far do the emphatic pluses take the reader into the mind of the redactor once the book as a whole is considered? How far does the LXX translator/s in his/their interpretative task go? Is this just reduced to falsehood of prophesy?

Finally there are some instances in which, comparing both traditions, some inclusive/exclusive character can be distinguished.⁸ The next set of questions deal with this. Is this inclusiveness/exclusiveness just the fact of comparing these two traditions? Is this an accurate observation of the

encountered today. This is an assumption, and as such can be right or wrong, for not completed original book of the ancient world, at the best of the writer's knowledge, has been ever found

⁷Many times nouns and titles appear in their simple form. This is the case with 26: 2, 4, representing the recurrence of the simple form for the divine name, 26: 12 Jeremiah without the title "the prophet", and so on.

⁸See 26:2 as an example of this possible observation.

purpose of those editor/s or is it just an accident and there was not intention in being inclusive/exclusive considering different audiences?

APENDIX

Four different spellings of the Babylonian king can be found in the Book of Jeremiah comparing the MT, LXX, and the Targum¹:

- 1.- נבוכדראצר [-רא-]
- 2.- נבוכדראצור [-רא-ו-]
- 3.- נבוכדנאצר [-נא-]
- 4.- נבוכדנצר [-נ-]

	MT	LXX	TARGUM
21:2	ננבוכדראצר	*	נבוכדנצר
21:7	"	*	"
22:25	"	*	"
24:1	"	Ναβουχοδονοσσρ	"
25:1	"	*	"
27:6	נבוכדנאצר	Ναβουχοδονοσσρ	"
27:8	"	*	"
27:20	"	*	"
28:3	"	*	"
29:1	"	*	"
29:3	"	*	"
29:21	נבוכדראצר	*	"
32:1	"	Ναβουχοδονοσσρ	"
32:28	"	*	"

¹The Targum is considered a secondary source for textual studies. Nevertheless, the writer has considered relevant to show the spelling of the Babylonian king as it appears in this version as a late development in the spelling of this name.

34:1	"	Ναβουχοδονοσορ	"
35:11	"	"	"
37:1	"	"	"
39:1	"	"	"
39:5	"	*	"
39:11	"	*	"
43:10	"	Ναβουχοδονοσορ	"
44:30	"	"	"
46:2	"	"	"
46:13	"	"	"
46:26	"	*	"
49:28	נבוכדראצור	*	"
49:30	נבושדראצר	*	"
50:17	"	*	"
51:34	"	Ναβουχοδονοσορ	"
52:4	"	"	"
52:12	"	"	נבוכדראצר
52:28	"	*	נבוכדנצר
52:29	"	*	"
52:32	"	*	"

* absence of the name

" same spelling than above

Bibliography

- Altham, R. "Bere'sit in Jer 26:1, 27:1, 28:1, 49:34." Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages 14 (1988): 1-7.
- Bright, John. A History of Israel. 3rd. ed. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1981.
- Bright, John. "The Date of the Prose Sermons of Jeremiah." Journal of Biblical Literature 70 (1951): 15-35.
- Brooke, George J. Exegesis at Qumran. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series, no. 29. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985.
- Brown, J.P. "The Septuagint as a Source of the Greek Loan-Words in the Targums." Biblica 70, no. 2 (1989): 194-216.
- Bruce, F.F. "Prophetic Interpretation in the Septuagint." Bulletin of the International Organization for LXX and Cognate Studies. Princeton, NJ: International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies.
- Bruce, F.F. Second Thoughts on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1961.
- Brueggemann, Walter. "Jeremiah Intense Criticism/Thin Interpretation." Interpretation 42 (July 1988): 268-280.
- Carroll, Robert P. "Radical Clashes of Will and Style: Recent Commentary Writing on the Book of Jeremiah." Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 45 (1989): 99-114.
- Christesen, Duene L. "In Quest of the Autograph of the Book of Jeremiah: A Study of Jeremiah 25 in Relation to Jeremiah 46-51." Journal of Evangelical Theological Society 33 (June 1990): 145-153.
- Clements, Ronald E. "The Prophets and His Editors." The Bible in Three Dimensions. Sheffield: JSOT, 1990.
- Crenshaw, James L. "A Living Tradition: The Book of Jeremiah in Current Research." A Journal of Bible and Theology 37 (April 1983): 117-129.

- Cross, Frank Moore, and Talmon, Shemanyahu, ed. Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1975.
- Cross, Frank Moore. The Ancient Library of Qumran. Garden City New York: Anchor Books, 1961.
- Davies, Philip R. and White, Richard T, ed. A Tribute To Geza Vermes: Essays on Jewish and Christian Literature and History. JSOT series (1990).
- De Waard, Jan. "Old Greek Translation Techniques and the Modern Translator." The Bible Translator 41, no.3 (Jul. 1990): 311-319.
- Diamond, A.R. Pete. "Jeremiah's Confessions in the LXX and MT: A Witness to Developing Canonical Function?" Vetus Testamentum 40 (Jan.1990): 33-50.
- Dijkstra, Meindert. "Prophecy by Letter (Jer. 29:24-32)." Vetus Testamentum 33 (July 1983): 319-322.
- Grothe, Jonathan F. "An Argument for the Textual Genuineness of Jeremiah 33: 14-26." Concordia Journal 7 (Sept.1981): 188-191.
- Holladay, William L. "God Writes a Rude Letter (Jer.29:1-23)." The Biblical Archaeologist 46 (Sumer 1983): 145-146.
- Holladay, William L. "The Identification of the Two Scrolls of Jeremiah." Vetus Testamentum 30 (Oct. 1980): 452-467.
- Fenshan, F.C. "Nebukadrezzar in the Book of Jeremiah." Journal Northwest Semitic Languages 10 (1982): 53-65.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. The Dead Sea Scrolls: Major Publications and Tools for Study. Atlanta: S.J. Scholars Press, 1990.
- Golb, Norman. "The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Perspective." American Scholar 58 (Spring, 1989): 177-207.
- Lundbom, Jack R. "Jeremiah, Book of." The Anchor Bible Dictionary 3 (1992): 706-721.

- Manahan, Ronald E. "A Theology of Pseudoprophets: A Study in Jeremiah." Grace Theological Journal 1, no.1 (Spr. 1980): 77-96.
- Martens, Elmer A. "Narrative Parallelism and Message in Jer. 34-38." Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis (1987): 33-49.
- May, Herbert Gordon. "Towards an Objective Approach to the Book of Jeremiah: the Biographer." Journal of Biblical Literature 61 (1942): 139-155.
- McKane, William. "Jeremiah 27:5-8, Especially 'Nebuchadnezzar, my servant'." Prophet und Prophetenbuch (1989): 98-110.
- Meindert, Dijkstra. "Prophecy by Letter: Jer. 29:24-32." Vetus Testamentum 33 (Jul.1983): 319-322.
- Merrill, Eugene H. Kingdom of Priests: A History of Old Testament Israel. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1987.
- Miller, J. Maxwell & Hayes, John H. A History of Ancient Israel and Judah. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1986.
- Muclenburg, J. "Jeremiah the Prophet." Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1990.
- Olofsson, Staffan. "The Translation of Jeremiah 2:18 in the LXX: Methodological Linguistic and Theological aspects." Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament 2 (1988): 169-200.
- Payne, J.B., ed. "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Old Testament Text." New Perspectives on the Old Testament (1970): 201-211.
- Rabin, Chaim. "Dead Sea Scrolls and the History of the Old Testament Text." Journal of Theological Studies 6 (Oct. 1955): 174-182.
- Rahlfs, Alfred. Septuaginta. Germany: Biblia-Druck Stuttgart, 1979.
- Reimer, David J. "A Problem in the Hebrew Text of Jeremiah 10:13, 51:16." Vetus Testamentum 38 (July 1988): 348-354.
- Shanks, Hershel. "Dead Sea Scrolls Update." Biblical Archaeology Review 16, no.4 (1990): 44-49.

- Shanks, Hershel, ed. Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls. New York: Ramdon House, 1992.
- Schottroff, W. and Stegeman, W. "The Prophetic Discourse and Political Praxis of Jeremiah: Observations on Jer. 26 and 36." God of the Lowly (1984): 47-56.
- Schreiden, Jacques. Les Enigmes Des Manuscrits de la Mer Morte. Wetteren, Belgique: Editions Cultura, 1961.
- Sheppard, Gerald T. "True and False Prophecy within Scripture." Canon, Theology and Old Testament Interpretation, 262-82. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988.
- Soderlund, Sven. The Greek Text of Jeremiah: A Revised Hypothesis. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series, no. 47. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985.
- Taylor, Robert R. "Difficult Texts from Isaiah and Jeremiah." Difficult Texts of the Old Testament (1982): 343-55.
- Thompson, J.A. The Book of Jeremiah. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1989.
- Tov, Emanuel. "Criteria for Evaluating Textual Readings: The Limitations of Textual Rules." Harvard Theological Review 75, no.4 (1982): 429-448.
- Tov, Emanuel. "Some Sequence Differences Between the MT and LXX and Their Ramifications for the Literary Criticism of the Bible." Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages 13 (1987): 151-160.
- Tov, Emanuel. Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.
- Tov, Emanuel, ed. The Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche. Leiden: Israel Antiquities Authority, 1993.
- Tov, Emanuel. "The Jeremiah Scrolls from Qumran." Revue of Qumran 14, no.54 (1986): 189-206.

- Tov, Emanuel. "The Literary History of the Book of Jeremiah in the Light of its Textual History." Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985.
- Tov, Emanuel. "The Nature and Background of Harmonizations in Biblical Mss." Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 31 (1985): 3-29.
- Tov, Emanuel. "The Nature of the Hebrew Text Underlying the LXX; a Survey of the Problem." Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 7 (1978): 53-68.
- Tov, Emanuel. "The Orthography and Language of the Hebrew Scrolls Found at Qumran." Textus 13 (1986): 31-57.
- Tov, Emanuel. The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976.
- Tov, Emanuel. "The Use of Concordances in the Reconstruction of the Vorlage of the LXX." Catholic Biblical Quarterly 40 (Ja. 1978). 29-36.
- Vermes, Geza. Discovery in the Judean Desert. New York, Tounai, Paris and Rome: Desclee Company, 1956.
- Wal, Adri J. O. vander. "Jeremiah 2:31; a Proposal." Vetus Testamentum 41 (July 1991): 360-363.
- Walters, Stanley D. "Hannah and Anna: The Greek and Hebrew Texts of 1 Samuel 1." Journal of Biblical Literature 107, no.3 (1988): 385-412.
- Weinfeld, Moshe. Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1992.
- Williams, Michael J. "An Investigation of the Legitimacy of Source Distinctions for the Prose Material in Jeremiah." Journal of Biblical Literature 112, no.2 (1993): 193-210.
- Worth, Charles. The Dead Sea Scrolls: Graphic Concordance to the Dead Sea Scrolls. Louisville: Westminster/John Know Press, 1991.
- Yadin, Yigael. "Three Notes on the Dead Sea Scrolls." Israel Exploration Journal 6, no.3 (1956): 158-162.

Zeitlen, Solomon. "The Masora and the Dead Sea Scrolls." Jewish Quarterly Review 49 (1959): 161-163.