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ABSTRACT

As to the relationship between MT and LXX Jeremiah scholars are of the opinion that the so-called short text underlying LXX, and attested by 4QJerb,4 represents an earlier edition of the book of Jeremiah than the longer version of MT, attested by 2QJer and 4QJera,c,e. Most recently Yohanan Goldman has made a very detailed contribution to the discussion in his study, entitled Prophétie et royauté au retour l'exil (1992). One of the chapters he deals with is Chapter 27 (LXX: 34), verse 5-15 (1992:123-167). His thesis is that LXX reflects an earlier Hebrew text of that passage, whereas most pluses in MT are to be seen as part of a later redaction. In this article the differences between MT and LXX Jer 27 (34):5-15 are dealt with, reviewing at the same time the thesis of Goldman. It is argued that LXX of that passage represents a text which is the result of shortening an underlying Hebrew text for reasons of context (e.g. assimilation) and content. The conclusion is that, contrary to his view, MT Jer 27:5-15 attests an earlier text than LXX does.

I.

It is generally assumed that there are some bits of evidence (2QJer; 4QJerab,c,d,e) and strong indications as well (LXX Jer) which do point to two texts/editions of the book of Jeremiah in Palestine in the Hellenistic period.2 Many scholars, not all of them though, are of the opinion that the so-called 'short' edition underlying the LXX (cf. 4QJerb,d) represents an earlier text of the book of Jeremiah whereas the 'longer' version (cf. 2QJer) represents an earlier text.

---

1 Expanded version of a paper delivered at the Congress of the Old Testament Society of South Africa in Stellenbosch, 16 September 1993, which I prepared while being visiting professor in the Department of Ancient Near Eastern Studies (University of Stellenbosch).
2 For Qumran Jeremiah see now Tov (1989:189-206). For literature on MT and LXX Jeremiah see Piovanelli (1992:11f.).
2Q Jer; 4Q Jer\textsuperscript{a,c,e}; MT) should be seen as the result of a redactional reworking of the earlier text.\textsuperscript{3}

Most recently, Yohanan Goldman from Fribourg, Switzerland, has made an interesting and very detailed contribution to the discussion in his study entitled, \textit{Prophétie et royaute au retour de l’exil} (1992). One of the passages he deals with is chapter 27 (LXX: 34), verses 5-15 (1992:123-167). His thesis is that LXX reflects an earlier Hebrew text of Jer 27, whereas most pluses in MT are part of a later redaction. It is the aim of this paper to review his analysis of the relationship between MT and LXX of this chapter, in particular verses 5-15.\textsuperscript{4}

\section*{II.}

Verse 5:

\begin{center}
\begin{verbatim}

Εγώ ἐποίησα τὴν γῆν

καὶ δόσω αὐτὴν ὧν ἔκαν ὄφθαλμος μου.
\end{verbatim}
\end{center}

Goldman rejects the idea, that the minus in LXX resulted from \textit{homoiooteleuton}. He is of the opinion that, though in MT the plus is acceptable as an apposition, "il faut reconnaître que le G présente une cohésion supérieure au M" (1992:126). His arguments are: (a) the pronominal suffix in \textit{ἐποίησα} refers to the first \textit{γῆν}, so that the presence of the second \textit{γῆν} in the text would be confusing; (b) the plus \textit{interrupts the expression}, ἐποίησα + \textit{δόσω αὐτὴν} (cf. 32:17).

It is true that the Hebrew text, presupposed by LXX, displays a more straightforward syntactic structure than MT does. But it is also true that the plus is very well acceptable as an apposition, as Goldman admits. The question is how to weigh both sides of the coin. Goldman (and others) favours the assumption that LXX being the smoother text is the better and


\textsuperscript{4} Verses 1-4 are left out of consideration, because Goldman does not deal with these verses.
earlier one. However, one can also argue that MT being the fuller text has been shortened in order to get a smoother and easier text.

A Schenker adheres to the older view that the plus of MT was left untranslated by error (homoioteleuton), and that this clause is not to be seen as a later expansion. "V. 6b erwähnt die Tiere. Diese Erwähnung würde ohne das Glied "Mensch und Tier auf dem Anlitz der Erde in V. 5 jedes Sinnes entbehren! Unter der Voraussetzung dieses Gliedes in V. 5 bildet V. 6 aber eine sinnvolle Fortsetzung des Gedankens: Erde, Menschen und Tiere sind Gottes Werk, und Gott überträgt Nebukadnezzar Macht über die Erde und über die Tiere" (Schenker 1991:138 [note 7]). Goldman is not convinced by this argument; he states that the motif of the animals in verse 5 can be missed, for being not essential to the theme of verses 5-6, and further that "la mention de la הָדוֹמֵה n’est pas vraiment compatible avec la הָדוֹמֵה תְּרוּ כָּלּוֹ du v. 6" (1992:129). As to the second argument it must be said that, though הָדוֹמֵה has not the same meaning as הָדוֹמֵה תְּרוּ, הָדוֹמֵה is quite compatible in this context with הָדוֹמֵה תְּרוּ of verse 6. The latter expression always conveys a very specific meaning by denoting the wild beasts. This is not in conflict with הָדוֹמֵה, because this word, related here, together with דָּרָק, to the earth created by God, is best understood in a general sense including the wild beasts (see for this possibility texts such as Deut 28:26; Jer 15: 3; 19:7; 1 Sam 17:44 [שם הָדוֹמֵה הָדוֹמֵה]).

According to Goldman the plus of verse 5 is not an essential part of the theme of verses 5-6. Though it is difficult to prove that the plus would be necessary, the plus makes good sense contextually: God has made not only the earth as such, but also man and beast on the earth, that is the inhabited world, which is fully in line with the contents of the following verses (MT and LXX; see below). The distinction between the earth as such and man and beast on earth is also known from passages such as Gen 1: 2:4bff.(J), and Isa 45:12. One expects, therefore, verse 5 to have the plus for expressing clearly, as in the other passages, the notion of the inhabited world. And as far as LXX is concerned it is quite possible to regard this text, or its Vorlage, as being the result from an assimilation to a text such as Jer 32(39):17.

---

5 Goldman is of the opinion that the expression 'man and beast' in 27:5 is to be understood, in the light of other passages in Jeremiah, as denoting "le monde habité de Juda" (1992:127), but this meaning does not fit in with the notion of the created earth in 27:5.

6 According to Thiel (1981:7) the expression 'by my great power and my outstretched arm' is to be seen as redactional (dtr). This would mean that not the clause 'man and beast on the earth' is redactional, but the expression after this clause. On ἐξήκεισθαι in LXX verse 5 see Tov (1976:49f.).
Verse 6:

62 A VAN DER KOOIJ

As to the differences between MT and LXX, Goldman discusses first of all the reading τὴν γῆν, 'the earth', for MT קהל הארץ, 'all these lands'. Together with Schenker he is of the opinion that 'the earth' should not be taken here in a political sense, but in a cosmic sense. He regards the expression, 'all (these) lands', as a transformation from the earth in a cosmic sense towards the earth as "un ensemble géopolitique"(1992:131). Further, he states that the expression, 'all these lands', does not occur elsewhere, and that 'these' reminds one of 'all these nations' in 25:9 and 28:14, two places in which 'these' is a plus in MT. In the cases of 27:6 and 28:14 he assumes that the plus of 'these' is part of a later redaction.

This evaluation of Goldman raises several questions. First, it is to be asked whether 'the earth' in LXX should be understood in a cosmic sense and not in a political one. The expression δουλεύειν αὐτῷ in the same verse (see below) does not suggest a cosmic sense, on the contrary, and the same is the case with the political notions of 'nation' and 'kingdom' in verse 8. (Cf. also the parallelism between γῆ and οἰκουμένη in 10:12.)

Second, the singular γῆ in LXX might go back to a Hebrew text with יָֽרָאָה, but as has been argued by E Tov (1979:82) it is more likely that it constitutes a rendering of the plural 'all lands' since there are similar cases in Jeremiah (e.g. 23:3; 32(39):37; 40(47):11 [MT חַלֶּה קָּרָא; LXX πᾶσα η γῆ]). Third, as to the expression of 'all these lands' (ἡ οἰκουμένη τῶν γῆν), which is not without parallel (see Gen 26:2, 4), the question is whether 'these' is to be seen as part of a later redaction, both in verse 6 and in 28:14. The reading of 28:14, 'all these peoples', certainly constitutes a link with ch. 27, but the fact that 'these' is not found in LXX does not say so much, because it is likely that LXX 28:14 (πᾶντων τῶν ἐθνῶν) results from an assimilation to verse 11 of the same chapter (πᾶντων τῶν ἐθνῶν; = MT). As for our text, MT 27:6, I would also argue on the basis of the immediate context: the text of 'all these lands' makes perfect sense, because it refers to the nations mentioned in verse 3.
(MT=LXX). This specific contextual relationship between verse 6 and verse 3 favours the idea that MT offers the primary text of verse 6 (cf. Weippert 1981:65 [note 3] and Stipp 1992:27 [note 32]). LXX, on the other hand, represents a text without a specific reference to verse 3; this text is best understood as resulting from an assimilation to verse 5:

- verse 5: ἑγὼ ἐποίησα τὴν γῆν

- verse 6: ἐδωκαὶ τὴν γῆν.

In both verses τὴν γῆν conveys the meaning of the earth in the sense of the inhabited world (see above). The assimilation to verse 5 accounts for the fact that LXX verse 6 does read τὴν γῆν, and not πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν as in 23:3; 39(32):37, and 47(40):11 (see above). Since there are good reasons to assume that the Hebrew underlying LXX verse 6 contained at least the reading 'all lands', the assimilation of verse 6 to verse 5 apparently is due to the translator (cf. Stipp 1992:27). The effect is that the position of Nebuchadnezzar to whom the earth is given reminds one of the position of man in Gen 1:27 and Ps 8:7-9. There is, however, also an important difference to be noted: according to Gen 1 and Ps 8 man is given authority over the beasts of the earth, but Nebuchadnezzar is given power not only over the beasts, but also over men (cf. 'nation', 'kingdom' in verse 8). For another suggestion of a parallel see below, sub III.

Goldman considers the plus ובכ ארצות, together with the pluses of verses 5-6 mentioned above, part of a later redaction, thereby emphasizing again the political nature of this redaction. However, in line with my comments on the expression 'all these lands' it is my view that the beginning in Hebrew, 'and now it is I (who give all these lands)', attests a text primary to LXX, whereas the minus of LXX fits in with the assimilation between verse 5 and verse 6 ('I made the earth' // 'I gave the earth'). The Hebrew text, ובכ ארצות, 'and now it is I ...', is part of the specific relationship between verse 3 and verse 6: it introduces the message concerning the lands of the kings mentioned in verse 3, namely that the God who has created earth and man on earth, is the one who has decided to give all these lands in the power of Nebuchadnezzar. The Hebrew ארצות as a rule indicates an important moment in a discourse (Jenni 1972:8f.); here it presents the message concerning 'these lands' as being an inference from the statement of verse 5. And the emphatical use of T underlines the idea that just because T have created the world, it is T' who as Lord of the world can give 'all these lands' to Nebuchadnezzar. In this way verse 6 explains also the symbolical action of the yokes mentioned in verse 2. See further below, on the discourse structure of verses 6-8.

---

7 Schenker (1991:140 [note 9]) is of the same opinion as to the reference to verse 3, but he regards MT as secondary on the assumption that ובכ and the demonstrative pronoun in this and other places of MT Jer are to be seen as additions.
According to Goldman the variant reading of MT is secondary to the text attested by LXX. "Dans le text bref (G), Dieu domine l'histoire mais reste assez distant de la scène politique" (1992:133). This may be true for the meaning of LXX, but the reading of LXX is easily explained as being part of the assimilation between verses 5 and 6:

- verse 5b: καὶ δῶσω αὐτὴν φ'...

- verse 6: ἐδώκα τὴν γῆν τῷ Ναβ...

MT יְהֹוָה - LXX δοῦλον αὐτῷ: Goldman has a long discussion here, dealing with two questions, (a) that of the Hebrew underlying the Greek, and (b) that of the authenticity of the Greek text itself. He convincingly argues that the Vorlage was reading יְהֹוָה (= MT), and not לָו (so Janzen 1973:54-57), further, that LXX is to be regarded as the original text (cf. Ziegler), and thirdly that the translator for some reason or another has interpreted the Hebrew as an infinitive (1992:135). Yet there is one point, not touched upon by Goldman, which should be taken into account: the rendering of the root יְהֹוָה by the verb δοῦλον. LXX Jer 29-52 shows a strong preference for the equivalence of יְהֹוָה - ἔργαζόμεθα (cf. Tov 1976:50f., and Schenker 1991:157f.), although the rendering δοῦλος is also found in this part of the book (41(34):9; 42(35):15). In line with the hypothesis of Tov (1976) one might assume that the instance in our verse was left unrevised.8 It is also possible that the translator, though using the verb ἔργαζόμεθα in the last part of verse 6, preferred to use the verb δοῦλος with 'the earth' as (intended) subject in order to avoid confusion with the well-known idiom in Greek, ἔργαζόμεθα τὴν γῆν, 'to till the land'.

MT יְהֹוָה - LXX --: Though a plus of minor importance, Goldman suggests to take the plus of MT as being in line with the other redactional elements of verses 5-6. "... l'auteur s'est senti obligé de distinguer entre la terre, maintenant présentée comme un ensemble géopolitique, et les 'bêtes sauvages'" (1992:132). Because of the 'political' redaction of verse 5 (the plus) and of verse 6 ('all these lands') it was felt by the author (redactor), so Goldman argues, to reformulate the last clause of verse 6 into "une phrase autonome" (1992:132). However, I do not think the idea of a distinction between the world in the political sense and the wild beasts is right, because in MT verse 5 the world is said to be the world of man and beast including the wild beasts (see above). Moreover, the inhabited earth in the sense of a geo-political entity is not a particular feature of MT, but as I have argued above, this notion is also present in LXX.

In my view, LXX, or its Vorlage, is best understood as a stylistic simplification of the whole text: 'I gave the earth to Nabouchodonosor ..., and the beasts of the field to serve him'. It is not necessary to repeat 'I

8 For critical remarks on the hypothesis of Tov see now Stipp (1991), and on this particular case see Stipp (1991:124).
gave him', as soon as the expression 'to give in the hand of' has been harmonized with the expression of verse 5b ('to give someone'). MT has a variation: 'to give all these lands in the power of (תֵּחָל), and 'even the beasts of the field I give him to serve him' (לְךָ הָעַרְיָֽו). It is to be noted that as a result of the stylistic simplification LXX has no equivalent for הבְּ.

Verse 7:

The question of verse 7 is that LXX has no rendering of this part of ch. 27. Goldman agrees with Janzen (1973:101-103) in saying that verse 7 weakens "la dynamique de l'oracle", whereas the omission reveals "la force dramatique de la suite des vv. 6.8" (1992:136).

It is not to be denied that LXX verses 5-8 make good sense indeed, and that verse 7 does not fit in well with this discourse. According to verse 6 the earth, i.e. all nations, has been given to Nebuchadnezzar to serve him. The text of verse 7, 'all nations will serve him', would be a needless repetition. It is therefore better to have verse 8 as continuation of verse 6 (in LXX).

Goldman holds the view that the political and historical dimension of MT verse 7 has been prepared by the pluses of verses 5-6. Verse 7 is further regarded to be part of a redaction which is also found in 25:11 and 28:14 (motif of all nations) on the one hand, and in 25:11ff. and 29:6 (motif of 70 years, and third generation) on the other.

There are indeed clear relations between 27:7 on the one hand and texts such as 25:11-14; 28:14 and 29:6 (?) on the other (a relation with 30:8 seems to be far-fetched). The question, however, is whether these textual relations are due to one and the same redaction. From texts such as 24:3-6; 25:11f. and 50:17 (Nebuchadnezzar 'the last (king)' [נְבֻכַחְנֵדֶנֶזֶֽא]) one gets the impression that the end of the Babylonian world power was expected during the reign of Nebuchadnezzar, after a period of 70 years, understood in the symbolical sense of a 'full' period of time. According to 27:7, however, the nations will serve not only Nebuchadnezzar, but also his son, and the son of his son (see also 29:4-14.28 [verse 28: אֵלֶּ֖ד, 'it (the exile) will be long']). These texts seem to be part of a later redaction which wants to emphasize that the era of restoration and return
from exile will come later than expected. (It implies a more literal understanding of the motif of '70' years; cf. 2 Chron 36:21). Jer 28 is also to be mentioned as belonging to this later redaction, because here too 'the discussion' is about the question whether freedom from the yoke of Babel will come soon, or not.

It is interesting to see that this later redaction is partly attested by LXX (29:28; see also 28), and partly not (27:7). LXX reflects a text secondary to MT, because it clearly presupposes a Hebrew text including the later redaction, though lacking at the same time some elements of it. Thus, LXX seems to represent an interpretation of Jer which no longer show any interest in the question why the end of the Babylonian empire did not occur during the reign of Nebuchadnezzar.

As to its function within the immediate context (verses 6-8) MT verse 7 appears to constitute one of the (three) steps of the line of thought of this passage:

(1) 'I give all these lands ...' (verse 6; related to verses 2-3);

(2) 'and all the nations will serve him ...' (verse 7);

(3) 'a nation or kingdom that will not serve him ...' (verse 8).

Thus, beginning with a specific group of lands (verse 6) verse 7 goes on with all the nations in general, followed by a general statement (verse 8) about any nation that will not serve the king of Babylon.

Though both versions, MT and LXX, present a coherent text in the case of Jer 27:5-8, for reasons mentioned above concerning verse 6, and because verse 7 is the link between verse 6 and verse 8, MT verses 6-7 are to be seen as the primary text (on verse 8, see below). LXX, on the other hand, attests a shortened text; as a result of the assimilation between verses 5 and 6 the text of verse 7 could be omitted as being superfluous: it would be pointless to repeat the idea of LXX verse 6 (the earth is given to Nebuchadnezzar to serve him) by saying that 'all nations will serve him'. It is further to be noted that MT verse 7 and verse 8,

- 'all the nations shall serve him' (verse 7);

- 'any nation and kingdom that will not serve him' (verse 8),

display a closer relationship on word level than LXX verse 6 and verse 8 do:

---

9 For a second re-interpretation of the '70' years see Daniel 9.
- 'I gave the earth ...' (verse 6);
- 'any nation and kingdom that will not submit to the yoke ...' (verse 8).

Verse 8:

καὶ τὸ έθνος καὶ η βασιλεία,
καὶ αὐτὸ μη ἐμπάλασαι τὸν τράχηλον αὐτῶν
υπὸ ζυγὸν βασιλείως Βαβυλώνος,
ἐν μαχαίρα καὶ ἐν λίμῷ ἐπισκέψομαι αὐτούς,

εἶπε κύριος, ἐως ἐκλίπωσιν ἐν χειρὶ αὐτοῦ.
Goldman is of the opinion that the plus of MT weakens the coherence of the passage (1992:148). He then points to elements of verse 8 which suggest redactional reworking: the first έθνος seems superfluous after verse 7; ἐκ τοῦ Βαβυλῶνος is strange; the order 'to serve' - 'to submit to the yoke' differs from that of verse 11; the difference between plural (ὁ Βαβυλῶνος) and singular (ὁ βασιλεύς) in the same verse. In his view, the plus of MT is to be seen as resulting from redactional reworking which was meant to establish a closer relationship between verse 8 and verse 11:

'a nation that will not serve the king of Babylon, and that will not submit to his yoke' (verse 8);

'a nation that will not submit to the yoke of the king of Babylon and will not serve him' (verse 11).

As to verse 8 two questions are to be discussed: (a) which words make up the plus of MT ?, and (b) is it precisely the textual plus of MT verse 8 which should be ascribed to a redactional initiative?

Ad (a): According to Goldman the plus begins at Θησείον and ends up with βασιλεύς. This may be so, but it stands more to reason to regard the following part of the text as being the plus over against LXX: οὐ θησείον, βασιλεύς ... ἐν τῷ βασιλεύς. Be that as it may, LXX does not contain a rendering of the clause with the expression 'to serve the king of Babylon',
but only of the clause with the phrase 'to submit to the yoke of the king of Babylon'.

Ad (b): It is true that verse 8 shows redactional traces. However, a literary critical analysis of this verse does not necessarily lead to the conclusion drawn by Goldman, namely that the plus of MT represents precisely the result of the supposed redaction. In my view, the following literary critical observations strongly suggest that the clause of מלך בבל is to be seen as a redactional addition: the strange element the singular פֶּלֶט which differs from the plural used in the rest of the verse (דָּבָר ; העבדין); the idiom מִכָּלַל יְהוָה which differs from the one in verse 11f. (תִּכְלַל). It is further to be noted that verses 7-9, without the redactional plus in verse 8, display a consistent use of the verb עֹבֵד, 'to serve':

- verse 7: ...
- verse 8: ...
- verse 9: לא עבדו אט מלך בבל

Verse 11 is the first place where the idiom of 'to submit to the yoke' is used. The redactional plus of verse 8 seems to serve the purpose of anticipating on verse 11 (this may account for the singular פֶּלֶט in verse 8; cf. verse 11: פֶּלֶט).

This means that the textcritical plus of MT over against LXX is not the same clause as the redactional plus of MT. The fact that LXX reflects the Hebrew text including the redactional addition, means that MT verse 8 attests the primary text.

It is to be asked for what reason LXX verse 8 does not reflect the textcritical plus of MT. To my mind the reasons may have been that the clause of not serving the king of Babylon was felt to be superfluous because of the absence of verse 7, and that the exclusive choice of the idiom of 'submitting to the yoke of the king of Babylon' in verse 8 was meant to establish a better parallelism between verse 8 and verse 11:

'a nation that will not submit to the yoke ...' (verse 8);

'a nation that will submit to the yoke ...' (verse 11).

MT - LXX 'אָנָה שָׁמֶל מַעֲשֵׂי בְּרוֹר שָׁמֶל מַעֲשֵׂי בְּרוֹר – LXX ἐν μαχαῖρᾳ καὶ ἐν λαιῳ : LXX does not attest here the longer formula, but has the shorter one. Both formulas occur in MT (for the shorter one see e.g. 14:15f.; 16:4; 18:21: 42:16) and in LXX (for the longer one see e.g. 14:12; 21:7; 41(34):17). According to Tov (1979:86) "the short text has been expanded in accordance with the full formula". However, it is more likely that מְדּוֹם, usually rendered by θάνατος, was left untranslated in our text because of the last part of the verse: ἐκεῖ εἰλίπωσιν. The verb ἐκλείπω is used as the equivalent of מְדּוֹם (42(49):17), but also of מִכָּל (see 44(51):12ff.). It would, therefore, be strange to have also the word θάνατος in a text.
which ends up with ἔκλαιγον. A similar case is to be found in 42(49):17: LXX: ἔκλαιγον οὖν ἄρα καὶ ἐν λίμῷ; MT: מָוְתָה בְּרֹעָה דְּרוֹדָה.

MT אֶלֶף לֹא - LXX αὐτοῦς: This rendering of LXX is translational: the personal pronoun in plural is in line with the plural of the preceding clause (ὅσοι ... ἐμβάλλοσι).

MT ητερ τοις βι σαμ οὐκ ιν - LXX αὐτοῦ οὖν ἐπὶ τινι αὐτοῦ: Goldman assumes that the Hebrew text underlying LXX (DDP ; cf. 24:10: MT = LXX) represents the primary text, whereas MT results from a later redaction to emphasize God as being active in the history of peoples (1992:155).

In MT the reading יָם מִן דָּב is in line not only with similar forms in verse 15 (לָמָּם וּדָב) and 22 (מִינֶה פַּדְרָּה; see also verse 10), but also with the emphatical use of יָבִךְ in verses 5 and 6. MT Jer 27 is characterised by a strong underlining of the 'ע of God. The picture of LXX is different: the emphasis on 'ע (_Enable) is present in verse 5 only, and not in verse 6 (as a consequence of the assimilation between verse 5 and 6 [see above]); furthermore, no rendering of the suffix first person singular is to be found in verses 8, 15 and 22 (verse 22 is a special case since the verbal form involved belongs to a part of this verse that has no counterpart in LXX). It may be that LXX puts less emphasis on God as acting in history, but as we have stated above (on verses 5-6) not only MT but also LXX clearly conveys a political notion. See in the case of verse 8 the element ἐπισκέψωμαι (cf. MT).

The following considerations are in favour of the idea that MT represents the primary text:

(a) the reading of MT is lectio difficilior, because the verb מָמַה is rarely used in the transitive sense in OT (cf. Tov 1979:86);

(b) the emphasis on the 'ע of God is in line with verses 5-6 (MT);

(c) the relationship between מָמַה and הָגִיד is similar to that between the emphatical 'ע and 'in the hand of Nebuchadnezzar' in verse 6 (MT).

LXX (verse 8, ending), on the other hand, is in line with the tendency of LXX verse 6. It may also be due to assimilation to 24:10.
Verse 9:

οὐ μὴ ἐργάσησθε τῷ βασιλεὺς Βαβυλῶνος.

MT ἄραὶ τὸ ὁμοίως ἀλλήλων λαὸς - LXX ἔγοντων: According to Goldman LXX, which should be read with an article (τῶν ἔγοντων), reflects the Vorlage ἀλλήλων λαὸς, whereas the pluses of MT, ἄραὶ τὸ ὁμοίως λαὸς, serve the 'political' purpose of putting the nations and Judah on the same level by assimilating verse 9 to verse 14 (espec. ἀλλήλων λαὸς) (1992:155-157).

LXX can, however, easily be explained as a simplified rendering of a redundant Hebrew text (twice the root מָרָא). MT verse 9 is similar to verse 14 indeed, but both verses display also an interesting stylistic difference: verse 9 is marked by the emphatical use of the personal pronoun:

... ἄραὶ τὸ ὁμοίως ἄραὶ τὸ ὁμοίως...

which is not the case in verse 14:

... ἀλλήλων ἀλλήλων...

Besides, the long enumeration of the 'scholars' in verse 9 justifies, syntactically speaking, the presence of a הָעַרְכָּה-clause and of the use of the personal pronoun לַא as well. Thus it can be argued that MT attests the primary text.
Verse 10:

As to the plus of MT (הַשְּׁפֵרְךָ לְךָ נַעְשֶׁהָ לֶבַךְ)

Goldman points to the parallelism between verse 10 and verse 15:
- verse 10: בְּחֵם אֵיתָן אֵיתָן
- verse 15: לְמִשׁ בְּחֵם אֵיתָן אֵיתָן

There is a clear parallelism between verse 9-10 and verse 14-15 in MT indeed, and the last clause of verse 10 and of verse 15 respectively is part of that parallelism. Goldman is of the opinion that this parallelism results from a later redaction which underlines "le parallélisme entre Juda et les nations", and that LXX attests here (as in other verses) an older text. "Le traducteur n’avait pas de motif particulier de rejeter המ" (1992:158).

It is not easy to decide which text is to be seen as the primary one. It may be that the last part of verse 10 was omitted in order to establish a contrastive parallelism between this verse and verse 11:
- verse 10: πρὸς τὸ μακρύναι ύμᾶς ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ύμῶν
- verse 11: καὶ καταλείψαν ἀυτὸν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς αὐτοῦ,

Verses 12-15:

12]
13] Goldman (1992:159f.) argues that the text underlying LXX is more coherent than MT ("... une cohésion supérieure à l'ensemble du 'plus' du M"), and that the pluses of verses 12-13 are related to the 're-interpretation' of verses 5-11. As to the text underlying LXX he assumes,
together with Tov (1979:87), that the translator's omission of verse 14a was probably due to *homoioioteleuton*, because verse 14b makes no sense without verse 14a.

The additions of MT verse 12f. are regarded by Goldman as being in line with the redactional reworking ('re-interpretation') of verses 5-11, characterised by a strong political tendency. He discusses the following aspects of MT verse 12f. which in his view reflect the 'political' interest (1992:163-166):

1. The similarity between the message for Judah and for the nations: this is to be seen as an important part of the notion of the "politique de Dieu" in MT (verse 7);
2. The 'political' notion of the *nation* in the sense of king + people as being typical of MT;
3. The message of life for the nation. This motif is also found in Jer 21:7-9, but the difference is that the alternative of life and death is not put before individuals (so in 21:7-9), but before the *nation* as a whole.

On Goldman's suggestions and evaluations of the relationship between MT and LXX Jer 27:12-15 I would like to make the following remarks:

(a) It is assumed that verse 14 was part of the Hebrew underlying LXX verse 12-14, but that it was omitted due to *homoioioteleuton*. For this mistake, made by the translator, Tov points to the same endings of the omitted section in verse 13 (733 מֶלֶךְ בַּבֶּל) and in verse 14b (733 מֶלֶךְ בַּבֶּל) (1979:87). However, this would mean that also verse 13, at least part of it, was present in the Vorlage of LXX. Goldman holds the view that the same endings of the omitted section are to be found in verse 12 of the Vorlage of LXX (73רָמַנ מֶלֶךְ בַּבֶּל) and in verse 14b (73 מֶלֶךְ בַּבֶּל), whereas verse 12 (ending) - verse 13 were absent in this Vorlage.

(b) The assumption that LXX verse 12, εἰσαγάγετε τὸν τρόφητον ὀμῶν, reflects the (primary) Hebrew text, דָּבָר לָעַל וּלְעַל (without בַּבֶּל) ever existed (Seebass 1970:450 [note 11]). Tov refers to Neh 3:5 (1979:87) but this example is not of much help, because, there too, the idiom is attested with the preposition ב (the only difference being that instead of 'yoke' the Hebrew דָּבָר, 'service', is found). This means that LXX verse 12 makes the impression of having shortened a longer Hebrew passage (cf. Seebass). If this is so, then it must be doubted that the Vorlage of the following part of the verse did read דָּבָר לָעַל וּלְעַל, as is assumed by Goldman, instead of דָּבָר לָעַל.

(c) The shortening of the Hebrew idiom in LXX, by omitting 'to the yoke of the king of Babel', may well be related to the rest of the Greek text, κω ἐργάσασθε τῷ βασιλεί Βαβυλώνος, in order to avoid the repetition of 'the king of Babel'.
(d) As to the three aspects of the supposed re-interpretation of verse 12-14 the following comments are to be made:

ad 1) If verse 14a was also part of the Vorlage of LXX, then MT is not the only text containing a similar message for the nations and for Judah (verse 9-10//verse 14-15).

ad 2) The idea of king + people as nation is not typical of MT only; as for LXX, see the combination of Sedekia + 'the king of Judah' (verse 12), and the plural 'you' (ibid.), which may refer to the king and his people.

ad 3) The motif of life and death in verse 12 (ending) and verse 13 is clearly related to the question of serving the king of Babel. Verse 13b refers explicitly to verse 8: both verses convey the same idea, viz. that every nation, Judah included, that will not serve the king of Babel, will suffer from the sword and famine, and will die. So verses 12-13 add nothing new to its context.

The question remains whether the longer text of verses 12-14 is to be seen as a re-interpretation of a shorter Hebrew text underlying LXX. The problem is how to evaluate LXX of these verses. In my view the following considerations suggest that LXX presupposes the text of MT as Vorlage (or attests a shorter Hebrew text, secondary to MT):

(a) The above mentioned shortening of the idiom about the submitting to the yoke in verse 12b.

(b) The most important difference concerns verse 13. (Even if verse 13 were to be seen on literary critical grounds as secondary, as some do, this does not necessarily mean that this verse was missing in the Vorlage of LXX.) According to this text Zedekiah and his people are summoned to serve the king of Babel in order to 'live', and not 'to die'. The difficulty here is that Jer 24:8ff. (MT=LXX) clearly states that Zedekiah and his people will die. In order to solve this tension between both passages it may well be that verse 13 was left out in (the Vorlage of) LXX. MT represents the textus difficilior.

Finally, for a more detailed analysis of MT-LXX verses 12-15 the discussion of MT-LXX verses 16-22 must be taken into account. It may suffice to mention the following points:

(a) The beginning of LXX verse 16 is most interesting: ὑμῖν καὶ παντὶ τῷ λαῷ τοῦτῳ καὶ τοῖς ἱερεῖσιν ... The discourse structure of LXX verses 12-22 seems to be quite different from MT, because the beginning of verse 16 suggests that the section of verses 16-22 is not meant as a new one as in MT but is to be seen as the continuation of the words spoken to Zedekiah (cf. Seebass 1970:449). The proposal of Goldman to take the Greek words, ὑμῖν καὶ παντὶ τῷ λαῷ, as constituting the ending of verse 15 (1992:169), does not recommend itself in the light of the parallelism between LXX verse 14 (ending),
(b) In LXX verses 12-22 the words of the prophets of Judah, as quoted in verse 16, do concern only with the question of the return of the vessels of the temple (σκεύη οἴκου κυρίου ἐπιστρέφει ἐκ Βαβυλῶνος), whereas in LXX verses 5-11 the prophets of the nations are interested in the matter of not serving the king of Babylon (οὐ μὴ ἐργάσητο τῷ βασιλεί Βαβυλῶνος). This is not to deny that the notion of 'serving the king of Babel' is present in verses 12-22 (see verse 12, word of God), but as far as the prophets are concerned their words are about the vessels of the temple (cp 35(28):3). So there appears to be, in LXX Jer 34, an interesting difference between the two sections of the chapter, which seems to go together with a different rendering of Hebrew יַשֵּׁי in verses 5-11 by ψευδή, and in verses 12-22 by δόικα / ἐπ' δόικῳ (cf. 35(28):15 and 36(29):9.31). This may throw light on the omission of verse 14a (containing words of the prophets about not serving the king of Babel), but this has to be studied in more detail, together with the rest of chapter 34(27).

III.

To conclude, I would like to make the following remarks.

1. Goldman has provided us with a detailed analysis of the relationship between MT and LXX Jer 27:5-15. In comparison with earlier studies the important thing is that due attention is paid to the aspect of coherence in both texts (MT and LXX), that is to say, to the contextual function and meaning of the differences between the two texts. However, as to the question of priority it is my conclusion that MT Jer 27:5-15 attests an earlier text than the Old Greek does.

2. As to the Vorlage of LXX Jer Goldman adheres to the view that for our passage, and for other passages as well, the Old Greek can be retroverted, if the pluses of MT can be explained as part of a redactional reworking of the text. This approach makes sense, as far as the argument goes, of course. However, it is sometimes held by scholars that the reconstruction of the Vorlage of LXX Jer is not so difficult, because in the light of Qumran evidence LXX Jer should be seen as a literal translation. It is to be noted, however, that the evidence from Qumran is very small indeed, and that LXX Jer is not

---

10 It is probable that the two elements of LXX verse 15 (ἐπ' δόικῳ ψευδή) represent a conflated reading. Ziegler considers ἐπ' δόικῳ as secondary, but in view of the pattern in the whole of ch. 34 ψευδή is to be seen as secondary to the reading ἐπ' δόικῳ.
that literal as for instance Theodotion Jeremiah.\textsuperscript{11} We really do not know to which extent the complete scroll of 4QJer\textsuperscript{b} did agree with LXX Jer.\textsuperscript{12} In my view, more attention should be paid to the translation technique of LXX Jer, including the aspect of elements of interpretation, by studying the Old Greek of Jer not only by a formal (statistical) approach, but also, and even more so, by a contextual approach.

It is, therefore, not so easy to decide in cases of differences between LXX and MT, including pluses and minuses, whether LXX Jer reflects a different Vorlage, or whether a specific difference is to be seen as due to the translator. For an example of the second possibility see MT-LXX Jer 27(34):5-6.

3. The assumption that the Vorlage of LXX Jer represents an earlier text/edition of the book of Jeremiah means that this text is of prime importance to the literary/redactional critical study of the book. On the basis of a global confrontation between this assumption and the literary critical views of S Mowinckel, E Tov (1972:199) draws the conclusion that the literary critical analysis of Jeremiah is far more complicated than was thought before. However, one should also consider the possibility of testing the assumption about the Vorlage of LXX Jer on the basis of a literary critical analysis of MT in its own right. As an example I may refer to the discussion of the 'textcritical' and the 'redactional' plus of Jer 27:8.

4. The theme of our congress is 'The Book of Jeremiah. Reconstructing backgrounds for texts'. A most important aspect of this theme is the study of the function of texts within a particular culture and period of history, or the reading of texts against the background of a certain period of history (instead of limiting oneself to inner-textual exegesis). This applies, of course, not only to the Vorlage of LXX Jer or to the pre-masoretic text of Jer (the forerunner of MT Jer), but also to LXX Jer itself. Let me give, at the end of this paper, an example of reading LXX Jer as part of the Jewish literature of the period in which the Old Greek of Jer was produced, the second century BC.

The example concerns verses 5-6 of our pericope, LXX Jer 34(27):5-15. As we have argued above, the differences between LXX and MT verse 6 are due to the translator, the author of LXX Jer. The view expressed in LXX verses 5 and 6 is quite a specific one: God, creator and thus lord of the inhabited world, gives the earth to whom he shall please, and (verse 6)

\textsuperscript{11} Stipp (1992:3) is of the opinion that the Vorlage of LXX Jer is easy to reconstruct because of "die geradezu sklavische [sic] Anlehnung der Übersetzer an ihr hebräisches Jeremiabuch".

\textsuperscript{12} The relationship between 4QSam\textsuperscript{a} and LXX Sam constitutes an interesting analogous case, where beside a large number of agreements (over against MT) also some important differences are to be taken into account.
he gave the earth to Nabouchadonosor to serve him. This view reminds us of the same idea to be found in a book that dates from the same century as LXX Jer does, namely the book of Daniel.

In Dan 4 and 5 it is stated, four times, that the Most High, God, rules 'the kingdom of men, and gives it to whom he will' (MT 4:14.22.29; cf. 5:21). These texts are part of the interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream of a tree, and the underlying idea is that the inhabited world, 'the kingdom of men' (מִלְכוֹת הַמֶּ֫לֶךְ), was given to Nebuchadnezzar (cf. MT 4:19, and 5:18). The crucial thing is that this should be recognized by Nebucadnezzer.13

The difference between LXX Jer and Dan is that in LXX Jer αὐτὴν refers to 'the earth' created by God, whereas the suffix of הנה in Dan refers to 'the kingdom of men'. But as we have seen, in LXX Jer 34(27):5-8 ἡ γῆ conveys the meaning of the inhabited world, because it is the world which will 'serve him' (verse 6), and which comprises of nations and kingdoms (verse 8). Apparently, the notion of God as creator of the earth is taken in the sense of God as lord of the inhabited world. (See also 2 Kings 19:15 (par. Isa 37:16), where the notion of God as (the only) lord of 'all kingdoms of the earth' (everything) goes together with the confession that God has created heaven and earth.)

Thus, there appears to be an interesting 'theological' agreement between LXX Jer and the book of Daniel. Since LXX Jer is somewhat of later date than the book of Daniel, it might have been that the assimilation of verse 6a to verse 5, the result being that verse 6 reads 'God gave the earth to Nebuchadnezzar to serve him', is due to influence of the view expressed in Dan 4:14 (see above) together with verse 19 of the same chapter (verse 19 [ending]: οἱ λαοὶ τῆς ἀρχής; Old Greek: καὶ πᾶσαι αἱ χώραι σοι δουλεύουσιν).
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13 It is interesting to see that the clause, 'He gives it to whom he will' (אַל מִקְי יְהוָה מִן הָעַל), is rendered in Theodotion Dan as follows: καὶ ὁ ἐὰν δόθη δοῦναι αὐτὴν (sc. τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν ἀνθρώπων)(4:14; see also verses 22 and 29), a rendering fully in line with LXX Jer 34(27):5. The Old Greek has a variety of renderings in these verses; 4:28 reads καὶ ὁ ἐὰν βουλήτου δοῦσαι αὐτὴν.)


ABSTRACT

2 Sam 6 consists of several layers of tradition. The earliest part was a legend on the death of Ussiah (vv. 3*,4.6.7*) which emphasizes the holiness of God and the ark. This legend was transformed into a David-story through the addition of v. 2*, in which form David is criticized for attempting to bring the ark (originally from the northern kingdom) to Jerusalem with the help of Judean nobles. Vv. 9-12 place primary attention on Davids’ repentance. During the post-exilic period the text was first enlarged by vv. 15.17-19*. David, portrayed as the ideal priest, brings the ark to Jerusalem in a triumphal procession. In the "Michal-episode" vv. 14.16.20-22, David properly submits to Yahweh, while Michal stresses honor; for this criticism of David, she is punished with barrenness. The final redaction (vv. 3a*.13) lays stronger accent on the triumphal procession as a ritual.

Innerhalb der alttestamentlichen Darstellung der vor- und frühstaatlichen Zeit spielen Erzählungen, die die Lade erwähnen, eine bedeutende Rolle. Ein kurzer Überblick über das Alter der einzelnen Belegstellen zeigt jedoch, daß es sich dabei größtenteils um relativ junge Berichte handelt, die kaum den Anspruch auf historische Zuverlässigkeit erheben können. Die meisten Belege entstammen den der Priesterschrift zugewiesenen Texten in den Büchern Exodus bis Numeri (Ex 25,10.14-16.21.22; 26,33f.; 30,6.26; 31,7; 35,12; 37,1.5; 39,35; 40,3.5.20.21; Lev 16,2; Num 3,31; 4,5; 7,89) sowie der dtr Redaktion innerhalb des Dtn (Dtn 10,1-