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This dissertation examines the variant manuscripts of the book of Jeremiah in light of the practice of ancient Near Eastern, scholarly scribes who were responsible for transcribing and transmitting prophetic oracles. These scribal scholars were active contributors to the process of divination, i.e., in the discernment of the deity’s will. Through techniques of textual divination—especially vertical reading, intra-textual harmonization, and analogical reapplication—these scribes shaped and expanded the meaning of prophetic oracles. Significantly, these techniques of textual divination illuminate the practice of the Jewish scribes who formed the book of Jeremiah. In particular, they shed light on the processes which produced Jeremiah’s numerous doublets. Each doublet marks an occasion of textual divination when a scribe would lift a set of verses from one context and copy them into another; and through vertical reading and intra-textual harmonization—and sometimes analogical reapplication—such moments of duplication would generate fresh revelation. Also, toward the generation of fresh revelation, the duplicating scribe would often rephrase and adapt the doublet’s text
in the process of duplication. Thus, in their creation of doublets the scribes responsible for the formation of Jeremiah resemble the scribal scholars of the ancient Near East. For this reason, it would not be unreasonable to propose that the diving scribes of Second Temple Judea (and earlier) who formed the book of Jeremiah were entrusted with a scholarly vocation comparable to the vocation of scribal scholars in the ancient Near East. Both groups of scribes were authorized, “inspired” conduits of divine revelation. Finally, the divinatory origins of the creation and growth of Jeremiah, have implications for how we should interpret the extant manuscript forms of the book. The main two surviving forms of the book—that of the Masoretic Text and that of the Septuagint—are best understood not as subsequent “Editions,” but as snapshots of an ongoing and more gradual process of scribal divination.
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CHAPTER 1:
INTRODUCTION

In the beginning, there were scribes. Long before the arrival of authors or editors—in the modern sense of these words—scribes walked across the face of the earth creating the art of writing, developing forms of literature, and composing and preserving literary traditions. Often misunderstood as mere copyists, such ancient scribes in fact became the original educated elites of society, responsible not only for the transmission of texts from one generation to the next, but also the study, revision, and ongoing formation of traditional texts.

In the ancient Near East, certain scribes acquired an additional role; to them fell the responsibility of recording, interpreting, and discovering divine revelation. To this end, these scholarly scribes developed techniques of decoding and reading the writing of the gods in the movements of the stars, in abnormal markings of animal livers, and, above all, in textual records of such divine communications; for written records of divine communication were also considered to be sources of divine revelation. In fact, the study and interpretation of such records were essential to the project of divination. Yet, these scholarly scribes did not simply study and interpret written records passively. They also played an active role both in the initial formation of such records and in the subsequent expansion and adaptation of those records in light of new contexts. This process of study, interpretation, expansion, and adaptation may be termed textual divination—a
textually-focused and textually-expressed method of discerning the divine will. Through textual divination, records of divine communication continued to grow and develop as scholarly scribes folded new interpretations of existing records into those records so that the two were largely indistinguishable. Discussed more fully in the second chapter, such scholarly scribes functioned in their societies as “inspired,” that is, legitimate and divinely sanctioned conduits of divine revelation.

It is the contention of this dissertation that in the Second Temple (and perhaps earlier) period there existed a similar class of Jewish scholarly scribes who were responsible for the formation and transmission of written records of divination. These particular Jewish scribes were not simply passive guardians of divination records, but akin to scholarly scribes in the ancient Near East played an active role in the ongoing interpretation and expansion of these records through textual divination. This is to say, they were themselves diviners, participants in the discovery of the divine will and contributors to an ever-expanding body of revelatory literature.¹ In other words, such Jewish scribes, like their ancient Near Eastern counterparts, were “inspired.”

Support for this contention is most clearly observed through a close examination of the formation of the Bible’s prophetic books. Unique among the scrolls of Hebrew scripture, prophetic books originated in part as collections of prophetic oracles and, for

this reason, never lacked status as revelatory texts. Consequently, in many cases the
literary growth of a prophetic book coincides with occasions of textual divination, when
scribes studied a given prophetic book and thereby uncovered fresh revelation which
could then be recorded within the same book. Thus, studying the literary growth of
prophetic books opens a window into the divinatory role exercised by certain “scholarly”
Jewish scribes.

Among the prophetic books of the Bible, the book of Jeremiah stands out for its
exceptionally complicated literary history. A diverse assortment of prose and poetry, of
complaints and narrative, Jeremiah\(^2\) no doubt underwent a long literary journey from
initial oracle collection to full-fledged prophetic book. To our great fortune, Jeremiah
survives in two remarkably different forms: a shorter and presumably older form—
attested mainly by the Septuagint (G)—and a longer and presumably more recent form—
known from the Masoretic Text (M).\(^3\) This fortuity has afforded scholars an opportunity
for understanding how prophetic books grew and developed in the hands of creative,
divining scribes.

Through comparing the long and short forms of Jeremiah, we may glimpse the
final stages of the book’s literary growth. Treated in detail in the fifth chapter, in these
last stages, Jeremiah grew through the insertion of such additions as “Deuteronomistic”
phrases, headings to prophecies, and intra-textual repetitions—i.e. repetitions of material
already found in Jeremiah—to name a few examples. Of notable size are several lengthy

\(^2\) Throughout this study, I will use the name Jeremiah to refer to the biblical book of Jeremiah and
not to the prophetic figure featured within this book unless otherwise noted.

\(^3\) Reasons for considering G to be a witness to an older form of Jeremiah are discussed in chap. 3.
doublets added to the long form of the book. Each doublet marks an occasion of duplication, when a scribe would lift a set of verses already found in Jeremiah and copy them elsewhere in the book. Significantly, the shorter (and presumably earlier) form of Jeremiah appears to be in part the product of a similar process of duplication. This form is already replete with doublets of comparable size and tenor. By my count, the shorter form of Jeremiah contains at least twenty-nine intra-textual doublets.

For several reasons, this dissertation makes Jeremiah’s doublets its primary subject of inquiry for studying the book’s formation and the divinatory practices of Jewish “scholarly” scribes utilized therein. To begin, the sheer quantity of doublets in the book of Jeremiah makes studying the function and nature of these doublets a crucial component of understanding the formation of Jeremiah. Especially useful are the earlier doublets—those that are part and parcel of the book’s short form—whose study permits us a glance behind the usually opaque curtain of our relatively empirical manuscript evidence whereby we may witness the ways earlier generations of divining scribes expanded the book. Moreover, doublets mark occasions of textual divination, when scribes generated new revelatory meaning out of existing revelation through applying that revelation to new literary contexts. The prevalence of doublets in Jeremiah offers ample opportunities for investigating how textual divination was practiced. Furthermore, since scribes practiced duplication over an extended period of time—both in the production of

---

4 By my count, the long form of Jeremiah contains seven unique doublets: 6:13-15 // 8:10b-12; 15:(12)13-14 // 17:(1-3a)3b-4; 23:5-6 // 33:14-16; 24:8-10 // 29:16-20; 30:10-11 // 46:27-28; 48:40b, 41b // 49:22; 39:4-10 // 52:7-16. Not all of these doublets are necessarily constituent of the final stages of Jeremiah’s literary growth, as some of these may have been lost through haplography.

5 Not included in this count are Jeremiah’s inter-textual doublets, i.e. external doublets shared by Jeremiah and another biblical book.
the short form of Jeremiah and afterwards in its most recent stages of growth—examining the book’s doublets enables to one assess changes and constants in scribal practice during the period of Jeremiah’s formation.

It should be clear that by referring to repeated texts in Jeremiah as “doublets,” we do not mean to denigrate these repetitions as thoughtless redundancies readily disregarded. We maintain the opposite; doublets often pinpoint sites of literary and theological intentionality that should be excavated for insightful historical artifacts. Not only do they serve as primary evidence of textual divination, Jeremiah’s doublets also provide us with a chance to study the various ways scribes “copied” their master texts. Considered in depth in the fourth chapter, scribes enjoyed a range of creative license when duplicating. At times, the scribe would produce a nearly identical copy of the original text. At other times, the scribe would adapt, enlarge, interpret, and/or paraphrase his or her source. In essence, doublets are of immense historical value, granting us access to the intentions and practices of early Jewish scholarly scribes.

1.1 Contents of Dissertation

Given the purposes of this study—to understand the scribes who composed Jeremiah as inspired scholarly scribes who were responsible for discerning the deity’s

While the overwhelming majority of scribal scholars were undoubtedly men, women were occasionally involved in scribal education and text production and thus may have, from time to time, even functioned as scribal scholars. For instance, in the kingdom of Mari, King Zimri-Lim’s sister and high priestess, Inibšina, advised the king on matters of divination, offering her own interpretation of a prophetess’s oracle (see chap. 2). In another Mari letter, ARM 26 237, the king’s aunt, Addū-duri, does the same. All of the known scholars of Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal in the neo-Assyrian period, however, are men. Given the possibility of women scribal scholars, I will make use of gender-neutral language whenever possible and appropriate. For the occasional role of women in education and text production, see David M. Carr, Writing on the Tablet of the Heart, 11–12.
will through textual divination—we must be clear about what we mean by the terms “scribal scholar” and “textual divination.” Toward this end, the second chapter of this study presents an examination of some of the various ways that textual divination was conducted in the wider ancient Near East. In particular, the second chapter focuses on examples of textual divination attested in two corpora of literary prophecy: the transcriptions of oracles found in certain Mari letters and the oracle collections from Neo-Assyria—i.e., the closest Near Eastern approximates to the biblical prophetic books. Having a good grasp of the ways textual divination was practiced in the ancient Near East will sensitize us to notice and comprehend similar types of textual divination at play in the production of Jeremiah.

With this historical and cultural backdrop freshly painted in the second chapter, attention may be shifted to address the book of Jeremiah itself. However, before taking direct aim at Jeremiah’s doublets, we must first grasp the big picture of the formation of the book as a whole. For our analyses of the doublets are based on a specific understanding of the textual growth of Jeremiah. The third chapter of this study presents an overview of the formation of the book focusing primarily on scholarly theories that address the most recent stages of the book’s textual growth. In particular, the case for considering Jeremiah’s variant text forms (attested by G and M) as distinct and subsequent “Editions” of the book is put forward.

The fourth chapter finally delivers an extensive treatment of a sampling of Jeremiah’s doublets. Each doublet is put to detailed analysis in order to ascertain the duplication technique which produced the doublet, the responsible scribe’s rationale for creating the doublet, and the duplicate’s divinatory function in its new literary context.
Through such analyses, we may observe how scholarly Jewish scribes practiced textual divination, generating new meaning out of existing records of divination. To anticipate one conclusion reached in chap. 4, the “later” doublets, i.e. those attested by M alone, do not appear to originate from one scribal hand, but perhaps reflect the efforts of a number of scribes. This conclusion suggests that the scholarly perception of Jeremiah’s variant text forms as subsequent “Editions” is not entirely correct. In light of this suggestion, chap. 5 is devoted to a reconsideration of the formation of the final stages of Jeremiah’s literary growth. In place of subsequent “Editions” this chapter suggests that Jeremiah’s variant text forms should be viewed as snapshots of a more incremental and less systematic process of scribal expansion.

Finally, in chap. 6, we offer a final analysis of several prominent features characteristic of Jewish scribal practice which emerge out of our examination of Jeremiah’s doublets; and we conclude with a brief comparison of the practice of textual divination attested by the formation of the book of Jeremiah and by the divinatory texts from the ancient Near East examined in chap. 2. As we will see, both Jeremiah and such Near Eastern texts attest to the same techniques of textual divination. In both cases we encounter examples of new revelation created through the intentional arrangement and harmonization of disparate oracles into a single text and through the reapplication of existing oracles to secondary contexts on the basis of discernible principles. In light of these similarities, we conclude that the scribes who produced the book of Jeremiah, like those responsible for Near Eastern divinatory texts, were scribal scholars entrusted with the vocation of discerning the will of the deity anew through the study and interpretation of records of divination.
1.2 Scribes and Scribal Practice in the Ancient Near East

Before proceeding to our examination of ancient Near Eastern divinatory texts, we must first articulate what we mean by the term scribe and then discuss several aspects of ancient Near Eastern scribal practice that are relevant for understanding the formation of the book of Jeremiah. In recent years a number of key studies on scribes and scribal practice in the ancient Near East have presented a picture of ancient scribes that complicates the traditional understanding of scribes. Often, the word scribe conjures up the image of a monk devoted to the mechanical, albeit painstaking task of producing exact copies of master texts. There is much truth to this portrayal of scribes, as illustrated, for example, by the practice of the Masoretes, accredited with the faithful transmission of the consonantal text of the Hebrew Bible for centuries. Producing exact copies of texts was also a primary goal of scribes in the ancient Near East. Yet, as recent

---


8 Emanuel Tov, Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, 3rd rev. and expanded ed. (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2012), 30, draws attention to the meticulous care of Jewish scribes in the words of R. Ishmael: “My son, be careful, because your work is the work of heaven; should you omit (even) one letter or add (even) one letter, the whole world would be destroyed” (b. Sot. 20a).

9 For example in the building of Ashurbanipal’s library, scribes were tasked with the reproduction of identical replicas of master texts (gabarû); see, A. Leo Oppenheim, Ancient Mesopotamia: Portrait of a Dead Civilization, rev. ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977), 244. Also, in the first millennium, we encounter scribal colophons asserting the accuracy of text reproductions of given texts; cf., Carr, Writing on the Tablet of the Heart, 38; for examples of such colophons, see: Hermann Hunger, Babylonische Und Assyrische Kolophone, AOAT 2 (Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker, 1968), 125–45. Addressing the subject of scribal accuracy more generally, van der Toorn, Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible, 126, writes, “It suffices to look at cuneiform compositions represented by copies from different periods to be struck by the scrupulous adherence on the part of successive generations of scribes to the ‘master copy’ (gabarû) or the “original” (labîrû) of their texts,” also noting that such scribes neither added nor subtracted from the master text, even leaving lacunae unrestored and counting each line.
studies show, this sketch does not offer a complete picture of scribes in the ancient Near East. As alluded to above, scribes were also the educated elite of their day; their training equipped them to be literary artists and not simply copyists. This is not to say that all scribes are created equal. 10 Scribal education in the Near East was multi-tiered; only a select few became scholars who studied and composed divinatory texts, for example. 11 Moreover, it is probable that exceptional scribes did arise occasionally from the scribal ranks and creatively reshape the literary landscape. 12 Yet, as a consequence of their education, ancient scribes on the whole were prepared not just to make copies of traditional texts, but to be shapers and composers of this tradition as well. For this reason, it is difficult to maintain a hard and fast division of labor between scribe (narrowly defined as copyist) and author/editor, as is typically assumed by much biblical scholarship. 13 According to this older model, authors (or, editors) are the artistic geniuses

---


11 A. Leo Oppenheim, “The Position of the Intellectual in Mesopotamian Society,” Daedalus 104 (1975): 38–42, saw the scribal “scholar” as only one possible role that a scribe could have; the ummānū or at least the rab ummānū, for Oppenheim, were a distinct class of scribe; Laurie E. Pearce, “The Scribes and Scholars of Ancient Mesopotamia,” in CANE 4:2265–78, reserves the title of ‘scholar’ for a few extraordinary scribes only; cf. Jean Bottéro, Mesopotamia: Writing, Reasoning, and the Gods, trans. Zainab Bahrani and Marc Van de Mieroop (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 291. Similarly, Carr, Written on the Tablet of the Heart, e.g. 36, uses the term “master scribe” to distinguish scribes with a higher level of training; in the Late Babylonian period aspirant scholars completed a second, more advanced educational phase; cf. Petra D. Gesche, Schulunterricht in Babylonien im ersten Jahrtausend v. Chr., AOAT 275 (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2001), 150, 201–18.

12 This possibility is reflected by the practice of attributing the great literary works from previous centuries to famous scribes of old: e.g. Gilgamesh to Sin-liqi-unninni and Etana to Lunanna; cf. W. G. Lambert, “A Catalogue of Texts and Authors,” JCS 16 (1962): 67. The existence of a 7th or 6th century B.C.E. literary genius from ancient Israel could also explain the emergence of the hugely-influential “Deuteronomistic movement” that irrevocably altered the literary, religious, and linguistic landscape of the people of Judah.

13 Toorn, Scribal Culture and The Making of the Bible, 109, on this point writes, “The traditional distinction between authors, editors, and scribes is misleading because it obfuscates the fact that authorship and editorship were aspects of the scribal profession.”
responsible for creatively composing texts, whereas scribes are mere technicians, with a technical skill of writing but lacking in creative inspiration or academic interest.

Currently, it is more fashionable to speak of editors (or redactors)\(^\text{14}\) of the books of the Hebrew Bible rather than of authors—though the former is often a mere cipher for the latter.\(^\text{15}\) Yet the use of the term editor typically maintains the artificial boundary between those who creatively shape texts (authors/editors) and those who mechanically make copies (scribes).

To understand why creative literary expression is the property of scribes in general and not that of supposed “editors” alone, it may be helpful to pause and add a few words about how scribal education shaped scribal practice. In the last two decades, Assyriologists have enjoyed much success reconstructing the extent and nature of Sumerian education in the Old Babylonian period as well as that of education in the first millennium.\(^\text{16}\) As far as we can tell, the purpose of scribal education was not to produce

\(^{14}\) Van Seters has identified numerous problems with the way modern biblical scholars use the term “editor;” see especially, The Edited Bible: The Curious History of the “Editor” in Biblical Criticism (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006).

\(^{15}\) For rise and fall of the romantic view of authors in biblical scholarship see, van der Toorn, Scribal Culture and The Making of the Bible, 29–31.

mere copyists or secretaries. In truth, among student texts excavated from scribal schools there is a noted dearth of exercises devoted to teaching basic “practical” scribal skills. Instead, archeological finds suggest that scribal education had as its goal the formation of an elite class of educated and “enculturated” intelligentsia who had mastered and ingested the great literary and intellectual traditions of their day. As a consequence of this education, scribes were prepared, not just to make exact copies, but to contribute creatively to the composition and adaptation of texts.

One dimension of scribal education in particular requires further unpacking: in the course of their training, scribes were required to put great amounts of traditional material to memory. At each educational stage, the scribe acquired a larger repertoire of


18 Carr, Writing on the Tablet of the Heart, 20, uses the adjective “enculturated” to describe scribes who are living embodiments and stewards of the traditions, institutions, and values of their respective cultures; cf. van der Toorn, Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible, 57–59.

19 Carr, Writing on the Tablet of the Heart, 8–9, 21ff. See for example, Veldhuis, “Elementary Education at Nippur,” 26, 143–44; idem., Niek Veldhuis, “Continuity and Change in the Mesopotamian Lexical Tradition,” in Aspects of Genre and Type in Pre-Modern Literary Cultures, ed. B. Roest and H. L. J. Vanstiphout (Groningen: Styx, 1999), 109; Herman L. J. Vanstiphout, “Some Remarks on Cuneiform
memorized tradition. In the end, a scribe could recite by heart everything from lengthy strings of words\textsuperscript{20} to traditional phrases and sayings to larger literary works and full-scale epics. Indeed, as Vanstiphout argues, “it is even probable, that quite a few scribes in the [Old Babylonian] period carried the whole of Classical Sumerian Literature if not in their heads, then at least in their broader awareness.”\textsuperscript{21}

The prominent role of memorization and memory in scribal training impacted scribal practice in two significant ways. First, the content of scribal memory—memorized bits and pieces of tradition—equipped scribes with textual building material with which they could construct literary works.\textsuperscript{22} Whether creating a fresh copy of an existing text or composing a new, original text, scribes could draw upon a trove of memorized traditional phrases, images, and themes.\textsuperscript{23} As a result, texts transmitted and composed within a single scribal stream were as a whole crafted out of the same pool of memorized traditions, with the result that all such texts echoed each other in a complex

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{20} Veldhuis, “Elementary Education at Nippur,” 13; written exempla of archaic (third millennium B.C.E.) Sumerian lexical lists are all excerpts from larger comprehensive lists that probably “primarily existed in the memories of those who had learned them by heart, and were, as such, rarely put into writing.”


\textsuperscript{22} On this note, Carr, \textit{Writing on the Tablet of the Heart}, 36, writes: “the shape of the educational system did not just teach the master scribe-author a set of cuneiform signs and rules of grammar. It also gave him (or occasionally her) a set of broader textual chunks, templates, and motifs. When a scribe reached a high level of mastery of the tradition, he could then use this memorized compositional lexicon to create new works.”

\textsuperscript{23} To this list could be added traditional characters, plots, narratives, and genres among other things; cf. van der Toorn, \textit{Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible}, 21–22
\end{flushright}
web of inter-textual and intra-textual relationships. When we examine the doublets of Jeremiah in chap. 4, we will see that Jewish scribes possessed their own treasury of Jeremianic material from which they could construct and adapt doublets. The abundance of both intra-textual repetitions and allusions as well as inter-textual links with the wider corpus of Jewish scripture—most notably the Deuteronomistic History (DtrH) and Deuteronomy—suggests that memorization was an important component of scribal education in Second Temple Judea.

Second, the practice of writing from memory endows a written text with a distinct character. Although scribes were literate, they inhabited a largely oral culture and—relying on their memory—approached their literary tasks with an oral mentality. In the previous century, it was common for scholars to draw a hard line between oral and literary texts and between oral cultures and literary cultures. It was once thought that with introduction of literacy and written texts, oral culture would swiftly come to an end. In more recent studies, however, the line between oral and literary cultures has eroded. As literacy emerges among the scholarly elite of an oral society, that society’s oral

---


worldview does not immediately disappear. Hence, literate scribes may approach the process of creating a written text with an oral mentality. Such an approach comes with several implications for scribal behavior.

For the literate scribe operating with an oral mentality and relying on memory, texts possessed a dual nature. That is to say that while texts existed physically as written documents inscribed on stone or scroll, often this existence was in some ways secondary to text’s embodied existence as a memorized and internalized oral (or mental) text written on the hearts of scribes. For instance, of certain Near Eastern texts, Hurowitz writes, “written and oral transmission existed side by side as supplementary media, equally necessary for perpetuating the same composition.” Hurowitz points to a sampling of literary texts which contain written instructions to keep the words of the text “in the mouth” and “in the ear.” In other words, a text’s written state served to perpetuate the text’s existence as a performed and memorized oral/mental text. Each written copy of a text could be understood as a different written performance of that text, whose


28 On the relationship between written and oral texts in an oral culture, Niditch, Oral World and Written Word, 76–77, writes, “The written text provides a portion of tradition that becomes set, an icon, perhaps a sacred object that may be ritually studied sequentially or read in for special occasions, or copied when the old papyrus begins to succumb to age. The stories, the customs, the rituals, and the proverbs live, however, in the oral culture, in the lives and words of people.”


primary oral/mental existence in some ways transcended its various written embodiments.\textsuperscript{31}

As a mental text, the wording of the text—and even its structure—would not be fixed necessarily, but would be subject to the limitations and open to the possibilities of memory. As actors memorize scripts in order to perform them, so scribes memorized texts in order to copy them anew. While memorization helped guarantee the accuracy of new copies, memorization also opened up several creative opportunities that utilized scribal memory. In addition to the possibility of inter- and intra-textuality (mentioned above), memorization invites the use of synonymous variation—variations in wording that have the same meaning.\textsuperscript{32} To expand upon an image used by Carr, as jazz musicians riff on traditional songs producing new melodies that echo the originals, so scribes could riff on traditional poetic verse or storyline creating a fresh literary expression of their memorized sources.\textsuperscript{33} When recopying a text, scribes enjoyed a range of creative license


\textsuperscript{32} Starting with Shemaryahu Talmon, “Synonymous Readings in the Textual Traditions of the Old Testament,” in Studies in the Bible: Edited on Behalf of the Institute of Jewish Studies in the Faculty of Humanities, ed. Chaim Rabin, ScrHier 8 (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1961), 335–83, the concept of synonymous variation (or synonymous readings) typically describes interchangeable variations in wording that were often preserved (from variant manuscripts) by scribes as double readings. Following the lead of Raymond Person, “The Ancient Israelite Scribe as Performer,” JBL 117 (1998): 604–605, I expand the term to refer to all variations in wording and order that do not change the meaning of the text at hand (i.e. that do not introduce, omit, or replace a reference to a concrete entity). For the connection between the oral mentality of scribes and the use of synonymity, see: Person, ibid.; Carr, Writing on the Tablet of the Heart, 42; although Doane, “The Ethnography of Scribal Writing and Anglo-Saxon Poetry,” does not use the terminology of “synonymity” or “synonymous variant,” he describes occurrences of such phenomena in Anglo-Saxon poetry.

\textsuperscript{33} Carr, Writing on the Tablet of the Heart, 41.
depending on the occasion and the text in view. Sometimes—akin the careful and strict performance of classical music—scribes meticulously copied a text word for word; at other times, however, scribes felt at liberty to paraphrase, rearticulate, or even reformulate a text according to their interests and taste. Even when a scribe produced a copy of a given text through the direct consultation of a written exemplum, the scribe could rely to different degrees on his or her memorized mental text. Moreover, the influence of this mental text could unconsciously cause interference with the written exempla, even when a scribe’s aim was to produce a verbatim copy. In summary, as a consequence of the role of memorization in scribal education, text copied and transmitted in the ancient Near East display varying degrees of inter-textuality and intra-textuality as well as synonymous variation. As we will see, many of the doublets of Jeremiah display a notable amount of both intra-textuality (and to a lesser extent inter-textuality) as well as synonymous variation, characteristics that suggest the text of these doublets were filtered through the duplicating scribe’s memory.
CHAPTER 2:
SCRIBAL SCHOLARS AND TEXTUAL DIVINATION
IN THE ANCIENT NEAR EAST

Given the aims of this study to understand the book of Jeremiah as a product of textual divination in the hands of scribal scholars, it is necessary that we provide precise definitions of the terms “textual divination” and “scribal scholar.” Beginning with the latter, by scribal scholar we mean an educated, professional diviner whose vocation was to discern the will of the deity through various means of divination and especially textual divination. And by textual divination, we mean the discovery or discernment of the divine will through the transcription (or re-contextualization) of revelation and subsequently through the interpretation of the written records of revelation resulting from such transcription. These concise definitions require further elaboration before they may be fully appreciated. Toward this end, we must situate these terms within their wider ancient Near Eastern context, the context out of which these concepts emerge. In this chapter we will first provide a description and analysis of the scribal scholar in ancient Mesopotamia and of the scholarly craft of textual divination. Following this description and analysis, specific examples of textual divination from ancient Near

---

34 By transcription I refer to the initial writing down of non-textual or pre-textual revelation.

35 By re-contextualization, I signify the introduction of an already-inscribed revelation into a new literary context.
Eastern divinatory literature will be presented and examined. We will focus on Mari letters that report oracles and on oracle collections from Neo Assyria; less attention will be given to the compendia of liver omens. By examining specific ways textual divination was manifested in the ancient Near East, we will be sensitized to detect and appreciate comparable types of textual divination utilized in the formation of the book of Jeremiah.

2.1 The Scribal Scholar in Ancient Mesopotamia

This study focuses on a particular category of scribes, namely the scribal scholar. As mentioned, by *scribal scholar* we mean to identify a class of educated professionals found in the ancient Near Eastern world who shared a common scholarly and divinatory function in their respective societies, i.e. the discernment of the divine will through various means of divination, including textual divination, often on behalf of a

36 I refer to transcriptions of oracles embedded in letters from Mari as “oracles reported in the Mari letters” in order to distinguish these transcriptions from the literary form *oracle report* known from the Neo-Assyrian archives of Nineveh. Formally distinct from oracle reports, such oracle-reporting letters manifest their own consistent structure; see: Aaron Schart, “Combining Prophetic Oracles in Mari Letters and Jeremiah 36,” *JANES* 23 (1995): 76.


38 With the word “scholar,” we do not intend to conceive of these scribes anachronistically as scholars in the modern sense of the word. Cf., in contrast, the anachronism of A. Leo Oppenheim, “Perspectives on Mesopotamian Divination,” in *La Divination en Mésopotamie ancienne et dans les régions voisine*. (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1966), 40. In order to create some conceptual distance between the modern scholar and the scholar of Mesopotamia (and Judea), we will intentionally refer to the latter as a scribal scholar.
king. Ancient Mesopotamia knew numerous disciplines of divination, from extispicy to astrology. Each discipline required the specialized skills of a different class of diviner (though one figure could be trained in more than one discipline). Extispicy, for example, was the domain of the bārû, and astrology the upšarru. With the invention of writing, many of these disciplines developed a textual counterpart: the practice of extispicy was supplemented by the formation of textual records of extispicy which were subsequently arranged into literary collections. Astrology, in turn, saw the development of the highly literary Enûma Anu Enlil, an extensive compilation of astrological omens, empirical and theoretical. Importantly, these collections and compilations were themselves considered sources of divine revelation, worthy of study and interpretation. Just as diviners sought the divine will through the interpretation of the empirical world, so too could diviners discover this will through the exegesis of divinatory literature. This textual development of the practice of divination—a development sometimes described as the textualization of divination—necessitated the existence of a distinct category of diviner trained to read the writing of the gods not only in abnormal markings of animal livers or in the movements of stars, but also in textual records of divine communication. In short, the textualization of divination required the emergence of the scribal scholar, a diviner trained to perform textual divination.

Like most terminology employed by historians to make sense of phenomena observed in the ancient world, the concept of the scribal scholar is a modern etic construction. There is no single Akkadian, Hebrew, or Aramaic word used in ancient texts that corresponds with our conception of the scribal scholar. For example, in the Neo-Assyrian period, the Akkadian word ummânu refers with some frequency to a class
of scholarly diviners who advise the king.\textsuperscript{39} Yet, this is not the only meaning of the word *ummânu*.\textsuperscript{40} Neither is this word the only term utilized in ancient texts to demarcate scholarly diviners in the royal court.\textsuperscript{41} The presence or absence of a particular word in a given text is not as important as the role played by a particular figure within that text. The term “scribal scholar” identifies a variety of figures that perform a similar divinatory function in their respective societies regardless of the specific terminology used to describe such figures in ancient texts.

2.1.1 The Vocation of the Scribal Scholar

In the ancient Near East, kings were accompanied by highly educated scribal scholars who functioned as the king’s spiritual guardians and moral advisors along with a host of other diviners.\textsuperscript{42} It was their responsibility to keep the king abreast of any and all divine communication. To this end, such scholars occupied themselves with the observation, collection, and transcription of omens and oracles. Additionally, these scribes discovered new revelation through the practice of textual divination, a concept discussed below in detail. Their vocation can be summed up with the phrase *ma ṣṣartu ša*

\textsuperscript{39} See, for example, Parpola, *Letters from Assyrian and Babylonian Scholars*, xiii.

\textsuperscript{40} Among its various meanings, the term *ummânu*, in the NA and NB periods may indicate a craftsman or a creditor; cf., “*ummânu*,” CAD 20:108–115.

\textsuperscript{41} Scribes functioning as divining scribal scholars in the royal court carry various titles including: *upšarru* “astrologer,” *bārû* “seer/haruspex,” *āšipu* “conjurer/exorcist,” *asû* “physician,” and *kalû* “lamentation chanter;” see, for example: Parpola, *Letters from Assyrian and Babylonian Scholars*, xiii.

šarri na āru, “to keep the king’s watch,” a phrase recurring frequently in the letters of scribal scholars to the Neo-Assyrian throne.\textsuperscript{43}

Such scribal scholars were active in royal courts throughout the history of the ancient Near East.\textsuperscript{44} During the reigns of Neo-Assyrian kings Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal—reigns that are roughly contemporaneous with the period of “classic prophecy” in ancient Israel and not far removed from the advent of Hebrew literary prophecy—the institution of royal divination appears to have reached a new apex.\textsuperscript{45} Ashurbanipal alone employed no less than forty-five scholars who earned their keep as practitioners of divination for the crown.\textsuperscript{46}

The vast amounts of resources invested in the enterprise of divination on behalf of the king were largely a consequence of the religious (and political) convictions of the ancient Near Eastern world. The king was understood to be the gods’ representative on earth.\textsuperscript{47} For things to go well in the state, so it was thought, it was imperative that the

\textsuperscript{43} Parpola, \textit{Letters from Assyrian and Babylonian Scholars}, xxi; in the Old Babylonian period, the diviner in the royal court was described as wāšīb na ʾar šarrīm, “the one who sits in front of the king,” and as a mālkūm, “an adviser.” For references to these phrases, see: Ulla Jeyes, \textit{Old Babylonian Extispicy: Omen Texts in the British Museum} (Istanbul: Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut te stanbul, 1989), 23–24 and 27–28.

\textsuperscript{44} For diviners in the Old Babylonian period, see: Jeyes, \textit{Old Babylonian Extispicy}, 15–36; for Egyptian “sages” who played an analogous role in the pharaoh’s court, see: Ronald J. Williams, “The Sage in Egyptian Literature,” in \textit{The Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East} (ed. John G. Gammie and Leo G. Perdue; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 25–29.

\textsuperscript{45} We cannot, however, be completely sure on this point; we may have more evidence of scribal divination from this period simply by fortune.

\textsuperscript{46} Parpola, \textit{Letters from Assyrian and Babylonian Scholars}, xiv.

king faithfully execute the divine will and maintain harmony in the world. This imperative required that the king walk in step with the divine will, obeying the gods’ commandments and maintaining cultic purity. Should the king come into error, he would need to be alerted of his mistake and would have to follow specific measures to atone for his sins and thereby avoid divine punishment on himself and his land.  

The gods conversed with the king—both revealing their will and warning of coming punishment for disobedience—through omens, dreams, oracles, and similar modes of divine communication (including revelatory texts). However, as discussed below, the raw data of divine revelation had to be interpreted and their meaning expressed clearly in human language, a process that frequently involved putting such revelation into (human) writing. Here, the king was at the mercy of his scribes who could read, write, interpret, and transcribe any divine communication in whatever form it happened to manifest. Upon these scholarly scribes rested the fate of the kingdom.

Such scholars acquired this divinatory ability through inheriting an ancient tradition they believed was revealed and instituted by the gods themselves. In the first millennium, scribal scholars traced their wisdom and scholarly traditions back to

48 As suggested by Parpola, Letters from Assyrian and Babylonian Scholars, xvii, see: W. G. Lambert, “Dingir. sà. dib. ba Incantations,” JNES 33 (1974): 267–322, for examples of incantation used to appease the gods from the Late Assyrian and Late Babylonian periods.


50 Parpola, “Mesopotamian Astrology and Astronomy,” 53, writes, “[The king] was not able to understand the ways of the gods or the language they spoke. It was only a handful of learned men trained to read the signals sent by the gods who could do this.” Famously, Ashurbanipal boasted of his education as a student of divination comparable to that of an ummânu; yet even he would not entrust divination to himself, but relied heavily on his scholarly advisors. For a discussion of Ashurbanipal’s self-praise, see: Toorn, Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible, 54–55.
renowned ancient scholars (unnānū) and to legendary sages (apkallū) from the mythic past, and ultimately to divine revelation from the mouth of Ea (ša pī Ea), the god of wisdom. Such mythological origins of their scholarly wisdom supported the perception that scribal scholars were “inspired,” i.e. legitimate conduits of divine revelation. With this portrait of the vocation of scholar scribes in hand, we may now turn to consider the practice of textual divination.

2.2 Ancient Near Eastern Divination

Before discussing textual divination in detail, it may be useful to define more broadly what we mean by divination in the ancient Near East. The word divination can mean any method through which a person acquires and/or discerns revelation or communication from the supernatural realm, frequently from a deity or deities. In

---


52 Ibid., 67 VI.15–16; there, the legendary sage Adapa is credited with texts from before the flood.

53 Ibid., 72; Erica Reiner, “The Etiological Myth of the Seven Sages,” Or 30 (1961): 1–11; for a succinct overview of this perspective on the origins of scholarly wisdom, see: Parpola, Letters from Assyrian and Babylonian Scholars, xvii-xix. Additionally, the art of divination itself was considered a gift from the gods; see: W. G. Lambert, “Enmeduranki and Related Matters,” JCS 21 (1967): 132.

54 Or, more specifically, what we mean by ancient Near Eastern divination as practiced and described by the educated elite; on this subject, Frederick H. Cryer, Divination in Ancient Israel and Its Near Eastern Environment: A Socio-Historical Investigation, JSOTSup 142 (Sheffield, Eng.: JSOT Press, 1994), 127, reminds us that “…we are perforce compelled to deal with written sources alone, which means in practice that we have information stemming from only the diviners themselves or from their correspondence with other literati…."

55 Cf. the definition of divination found in Michael Loewe and Carmen Blacker, eds., Oracles and Divination (Boulder: Shambhala; New York, 1981), 1: “By divination we mean the attempt to elicit from some higher power or supernatural being the answers to questions beyond the range of ordinary human understanding.” Divination may be defined more broadly; for example: Evan M. Zuesse, “Divination: An Overview,” Encyclopedia of Religion 4:2369, defines divination as “…the art or practice of discovering the personal, human significance of future or, more commonly, present or past events.” For our purposes,
ancient Mesopotamia and ancient Israel, divination typically had as its goal the
discernment of the divine will, often in response to specific requests posed to the gods or
a god.\textsuperscript{56}

Modern scholars have suggested various models for classifying the different
forms of divination found in ancient Mesopotamia (and ancient Israel).\textsuperscript{57} It is common
practice in Assyriology to divide ancient Near Eastern divination into two major types,
inductive and non-inductive divination.\textsuperscript{58} This bifurcation, in part, serves to distinguish

however, it is advantageous to focus on the expression of divination attested most frequently in ancient
Jewish and Near Eastern texts, i.e. communication between, specifically, human persons and (personal or
anthropomorphized) deities in the divine realm. For a description of divination in the ancient Near East,
Blacker (Boulder, CO: Shambhala, 1981), 142–73; Walter Farber, “Witchcraft, Magic, and Divination in
Ancient Mesopotamia,” \textit{CANE} 3:1895–1909; and Erica Reiner, \textit{Astral Magic in Babylonia}, Transaction of
For a description of divination in ancient Israel, see: J. R. Porter, “Ancient Israel,” in \textit{Oracles and

\textsuperscript{56} For the purpose of divination in the ancient Near East, see above, and: A. Leo Oppenheim,
\textit{Ancient Mesopotamia: Portrait of a Dead Civilization}, rev. ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press,
1977), 206–77; Beate Pongratz-Leisten, \textit{Herrschaftswissen in Mesopotamien: Formen der Kommunikation
Corpus Project, 1999); Martti Nissinen, “Comparing Prophetic Sources: Principles and a Test Case,” in

\textsuperscript{57} For a brief summary of the history of modern scholarship on ancient Near Eastern divination,

\textsuperscript{58} Martti Nissinen, \textit{References to Prophecy in Neo-Assyrian Sources}, SAAS 7 (Helsinki: Neo-
26, prefers the terms “deductive” and “inspired” divination for the same bifurcation. Reiner, \textit{Astral Magic
in Babylonia}, 61–63, utilizes the terms provoked and unprovoked for a similar distinction. With his broader
definition of divination, Zuesse, “Divination: An Overview,” 4:2370, divides divination into three types:
“intuitive divination,” “wisdom divination,” and “possession divination,” with the second corresponding
more or less with “inductive” divination—that is involving learned technical skills—and the first and third
roughly approximate to the non-inductive type. Noted by Gurney, “The Babylonians and Hittites,” 142, as
early as the Roman period, ancient authors distinguished types of divination along lines similar to the
modern inductive/non-inductive dichotomy: cf., for instance, Cicero, \textit{Div.} 1.71–72, for the use of the terms
\textit{divinatio naturalis} (“natural divination,” i.e. inspired by revelation or possession) and \textit{divinatio artificiosa}
(“artificial divination” deduced through the interpretation of signs). For a summary of how divination has
forms of divination that do and do not require the technical skills of a learned scribal scholar. The first, inductive divination (or “technical”/“mechanical” divination), such as extispicy or astrology, requires the skills of an experienced scribal scholar trained to read divine writing wherever it is inscribed, for instance, on the liver of a sheep, in the night sky, or in a written record of divine revelation. If written records are any indication, the vast majority of divination in the ancient Near East was of this kind.

The second, non-inductive divination (or “intuitive”/“inspired” divination), includes forms of divination, such as prophecy and oneiromancy, which do not

---


necessarily require the expertise of a scribal scholar but simply the availability of an intermediary such as a prophet.

There are various shortcomings of this model. The term “inductive” could suggest that this form of divination is always “induced,” that is, intentionally brought about or solicited through the manipulation of something in the natural world. While this might be the case with forms such as extispicy or lecanomancy, astrology—which can be classified as inductive—may respond to unsolicited omens observed in the heavens. Conversely, forms of non-inductive divination can be solicited, as when a king requests an oracle from a prophet. Another problem speaks directly to the question of the involvement of scribal scholars in the practice of divination: while it is the case that forms of non-inductive divination are frequently practiced by intermediaries that do not


64 See: Cryer, Divination in Ancient Israel and Its Near Eastern Environment, 141–42; and, Kitz, “Prophecy as Divination,” 23–24.


66 E.g. Nissinen, References to Prophecy in Neo-Assyrian Sources, 6. Bottéro, Mesopotamia, 125–26., perhaps manages to avoid this problem through employing the label “deductive” instead of “inductive:” thus, while astrological phenomena are not (necessarily) induced, accessing the meaning of such phenomena does requires technical expertise, i.e. deduction.

67 To offer an example, prophetic oracles are frequently solicited by kings such as Zimri Lim in the Mari Letters; or, in Hebrew scripture: e.g. 2 Kgs 19:1–4 (=Isa 37:1–4); Jer 21:1–2.
necessarily have the formal training of scribal scholars, this does not negate the significant hermeneutical role often played by scribal scholars filtering, interpreting, and transcribing the raw data of non-inductive divinatory experience. With oneiromancy, this is clearly the case; dreams, with great frequency, require the interpretation of skilled diviners. One has only to consider the extensive compendia of dream oracles which offered scholarly guidelines for dream interpretation. Moreover as we will see, the interpretation of prophetic oracles also fell into the scribal scholar’s domain.

2.3 Textual Divination

Given our interests in the role played by scribal scholars in divination, one manifestation of divination in particular is especially important to discuss, namely, textual divination, a mode of divination predicated on the existence of scribal scholars. In order to understand the nature of textual divination, it may be useful to rehearse its origins. Mentioned briefly above, not long after the development of writing, some scribes began producing written records of empirically observed or experienced omens, prophetic oracles included. Moreover, oracle texts were brought into the school curriculum. The decision to put revelation down into writing was probably

---

68 Bottéro, *Mesopotamia*, 113–116; note the category of “symbolic dream” in Oppenheim, “The Interpretation of Dreams in the Ancient Near East,” 206–17, which marks dreams that require the technical skills of a scribal scholar.


70 See below, §2.4.2; for significant overlapping of prophecy and scribal arts in the biblical book of Habakkuk, see: Michael H. Floyd, “Prophecy and Writing in Habakkuk 2,1-5,” *ZAW* 105 (1994): 470–78.
multidimensional. Writing plays an obvious role as an aid to memorization. Also, through writing one could transmit divination results across geographical distances. This was especially important when omens contained messages or pertinent information for an addressee, often a king, who was not an immediate observer or receptor of the divine communication. Some of our most important evidence for divination in the ancient Near East comes from letters written by scholars or deputies reporting the results of divination to their respective kings. Divination results were also put to writing in order to transmit them across temporal distances; they were preserved textually for future reference. If given results were proven to be accurate, as in the case of “fulfilled” prophecy, their textual preservation would become all the more pertinent. As confirmed divine revelation, such written results could be mined for further revelation in light of new and hypothetical situations. Finally, as will become apparent below, it seems beyond doubt

---


72 The Mari letters contain many transcriptions of prophetic oracles addressed to King Zimri-Lim, who was not present to witness the original divinatory experience. The Mari letters containing oracle reports are collected in Martti Nissinen, Prophets and Prophecy in the Ancient Near East, ed. Peter Machinist, SBLWAW 12 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003). From the Neo-Assyrian period, Parpola, Letters from Assyrian Scholars to the Kings Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal, has collected numerous letters from scribal scholars to kings Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal, which report divination results; see further: Parpola, Letters from Assyrian and Babylonian Scholars.


74 In the Neo Assyrian period, we see examples of scribal scholars applying time-tested prophetic oracles to new situations; see: Nissinen, “Spoken, Written, Quoted, and Invented,” 262–63. On this
that omens were put to writing especially because the moment of transcription was an occasion for interpretation and because, once in written form, such signs could be subjected to the hermeneutical possibilities inherent in the mechanics of writing.

Once put to writing, such records became repositories of divine revelation and worthy of study, interpretation, and reapplication.\textsuperscript{75} This was the beginnings of textual divination, a \textit{textually-focused} and \textit{textually-expressed} form of divination.\textsuperscript{76} With textual divination, the focus of divinatory arts shifted to include not only the observation and interpretation of new empirical omens but also the study and interpretation of written collections of previously recorded divine revelation. Thus divination acquired a \textit{textual focus}.

Moreover, with this broadened focus, diviners began to discover new revelation through a literary process of turning older written traditions over, examining them in the light of new and hypothetical contexts, and then extrapolating further implications on the basis of certain interpretive principles and in conformity with certain literary pressures.\textsuperscript{77}

\textsuperscript{75} On the emergence of written oracle collections, see Ann K. Guinan, “A Severed Head Laughed: Stories of Divinatory Interpretation,” in \textit{Magic and Divination in the Ancient World}, ed. Leda Jean Ciraolo and Jonathan Lee Seidel; Ancient Magic and Divination 2 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 9: “Once the systematic recording of omens began, divination became a complex, literate discipline…Scribes…not only recopied, but also revised, edited, and systematically expanded the texts they inherited.”


\textsuperscript{77} In cases, the new context that spawned the generation of new revelation out of older material could be described as “historical,” e.g. the political or cultural developments in the real world of the
This new revelation, discovered or generated out of the earlier tradition, was then *textually expressed*; that is to say it was inscribed into the tradition becoming an often indistinguishable constituent of that tradition. In this way, extensive omen compendia, collections of prophetic oracles, and even eventually the prophetic books of the Hebrew Bible came into existence. With the nascence of textual divination came the need for a new class of professional diviner—conversant in the literary traditions of divination and skilled in the art of hermeneutics and the science of writing. In sum, it required the expertise of the scribal scholar.

2.4 Textual Divination in Practice

With the above definition of textual divination, we may proceed to discuss and classify examples of the actual practice of textual divination in ancient Mesopotamia. Such discussion and classification will prepare us to detect and appreciate the traces of similar forms of textual divination preserved in the manuscripts of Jeremiah.

The examples utilized in this chapter as evidence for textual divination originate from two major branches of divinatory literature from Mesopotamia: 1) the Old Babylonian omen compendia and 2) the written records of prophecy found in the letters of Mari (18th century B.C.E.) and the oracle collections from the Neo-Assyrian royal archives of Nineveh (7th century B.C.E.). There are good reasons for the selection of this evidence in particular for this project. Regarding the first body of evidence, the vast

---

composing scribe. In the majority of cases, however, the new (revelation-inspiring) context was simply a new literary setting. This is to say, the introduction of records of divine revelation into a new literary setting, or even into written form for the first time, played a significant role in the formation of new “textual” revelation.
majority of extant divinatory texts from Mesopotamia are omen compendia, a tradition that originated in the Old Babylonian period and continued to develop through the Neo-Assyrian period, and survived as late as the Seleucid period. Given the pervasiveness of this tradition and its endurance, any discussion of textual divination is obligated to take into account the methods of such divination detected in the formation of these compendia. As we will see, in spite of the temporal distance between these compendia and Hebrew prophetic literature—not to mention the substantial generic differences between them—the forms of textual divination evinced by these compendia are illuminative of what we encounter in the Jeremiah scroll.

As to the second body of evidence, the written records of prophecy found within letters from Mari and especially within the oracle collections of Nineveh represent the closest Near Eastern literary parallel to Hebrew prophetic literature. While the latter is clearly much more developed than the former, it is highly likely that the latter evolved out of quotidian records of oracles—such as we find in the Mari letters—and early compilations of oracles—like those preserved in Nineveh. For this reason, techniques of textual divination detected in these two Near Eastern corpora could model for us ways textual divination may have contributed to the growth of textual traditions like Jeremiah.

78 Here we must exercise cautions since Hebrew prophetic literature, the oracle-reporting Mari letters, and oracle collections are formally very distinct. Moreover, these corpora originate from worlds that are very different from each other in terms of chronology, geography, and culture. We must keep these differences in mind as we make our comparisons.

Since the omen compendium, the letter (from Mari), the oracle collection are all distinct genres with different functions, it would not be surprising to find that each displays its own techniques of textual divination, thus making direct comparison of techniques across the genres more difficult. This qualification, however, should not bar one from attempting to uncover commonalities between these disparate methods and thereafter proposing larger umbrella categories of textual divination useful for comparative purposes. Based on my analysis of these practices, the various techniques of textual divination in ancient Near Eastern divinatory texts may be grouped together into two umbrella categories: 1) literary generation and 2) reapplication by analogy.

The first, literary generation, identifies the scholarly creation or discovery of new revelation that results when existing revelatory data are introduced into a new literary form, i.e. when scribal scholars either transcribe revelation into written form for the first time (transcription) or introduce already transcribed revelation into a new literary context (re-contextualization). Such moments both subjected revelatory data to the literary pressures and expectations of those new contexts and—at the same time—rendered them susceptible to the hermeneutical possibilities inherent in those contexts. In brief, new meaning is generated by the conventions and possibilities of each given literary form.

The second category of textual divination, reapplication by analogy, refers to the reapplication of revelatory data on the basis of interpretive principles. The practice of this category of textual divination is a reflection of the hermeneutical assumption that a

---

80 Occasions of reapplication by analogy may in some instances coincide with moments of literary generation. Whereas literary generation always involves placing revelatory data into a new literary context, reapplication by analogy may involve only the expansion of a given omen within the omen’s original literary context.
true interpretation of revelation is itself revelatory and can be mined for further meaning. When revelatory data are assigned an initial interpretation, this assigning does not exhaust the meaning of these data. True interpretations of such data are ripe with divinatory potential. In fact, the particular wording or formulation of the initial interpretation could invite or even imply a secondary analogous interpretation perceived to be nested within the original. In such cases, the primary and derivative interpretations of the revelatory data are analogically related to each other. When deriving secondary meaning out of a given interpretation, scribal scholars were guided by certain interpretive principles. In many cases, these principles are discernible, allowing us to articulate the analogical relationship existing between the original interpretation and its derivative.

With these two umbrella categories of textual divination in mind, we are now in a position to analyze specific examples of textual divination at play in our selection of literary divination from the ancient Near East. Understanding how textual divination functioned in these contexts will prepare us to perceive comparable practices at work in the formation of the book of Jeremiah.

2.4.1 Textual Divination in Omen Compendia

With the omen compendia we encounter manifestations of textual divination in both categories: literary generation and reapplication by analogy. In fact, the vast majority of entries found in the compendia are explainable as products of reapplication by analogy and especially literary generation; that is to say, the lion’s share of revelation
in the form of omens has no empirical basis, but is a creation of scribal scholarship and
the fruit of textual divination. 81 We will consider examples of both of these types in turn.

2.4.1.1 Reapplication of Omen Apodoses by Analogy

In the compendia, each omen consists of a textual representation of a revelatory
sign (the protasis) and an interpretation of that sign (the apodosis). As noted above,
ancient scholars considered both the textual representation of a sign and the interpretation
of that sign to be revelatory. In their transmission of omen compendia, scribal scholars,
with some frequency, would take up an existing apodosis and, guided by certain
analogical principles, derive a secondary interpretation of the given omen’s protasis on
the basis of the existing apodosis. Such principles are often discernible. 82 An
illuminative example is the principle of pars familiaris/pars hostilis: by this principle a
favorable omen for one’s enemy was viewed secondarily as being unfavorable for oneself
or an unfavorable omen for one’s enemy as favorable to oneself, and vice versa. The
following omen illustrates this principle:

You will consume the harvest of your enemy; its second interpretation: the
harvest of the land will thrive. TIM 9 80:3 83

The first 84 prognosis, pronouncing misfortune on the enemy’s harvest implies its
antithesis, the promise of a favorable outcome for one’s own harvest.


82 For a discussion of the analogical principles that guided the discovery of secondary meaning of
already-interpreted omens, see: Jean Bottéro, “Symptômes, Signes, Écritures, En Mésopotamie Ancienne,”

83 See discussion of this omen in Winitzer, “Writing and Mesopotamian Divination,” 83.
To provide an example of another principle, the meaning of an omen may be expanded on the basis of an established metaphor:

[If a Hole is situated [in the … of the Presence]: the full(y loaded) boat will sink or: a pregnant woman will die in her labour. *OBE* 1 ob. 6\(^\text{85}\)

The omen’s second meaning, concerning the pregnant woman, is derived from a metaphorical reading of the first: a loaded boat can be a metaphor for a childbearing woman. Guided by such analogical principles, scribal scholars discerned new revelation out of existing records of omens. As we will see, comparable principles played a similar guiding role in the formulations of secondary interpretations of prophetic oracles in literary prophecy.

2.4.1.2 Literary Generation in Omen Compendia

Omen compendia also attest to the practice of literary generation. In the production of these compendia, scribal scholars composed new omens in response to the literary pressures inherent in the literary form *omen compendium.*\(^\text{86}\) Some explanation is in order: *omen compendia* consist of omens (protases and corresponding apodoses)

---

\(^{84}\) As noted by Winitzer, “Writing and Mesopotamian Divination,” 85, since either interpretation could, by the principle of *pars familiaris/pars hostilis* be derived from the other, we cannot determine which one came first historically; so, by “first,” we merely indicate the interpretation that literarily precedes the other.


\(^{86}\) For the literary pressures and conventions resulting that generated new omens, see: Winitzer, “Writing and Mesopotamian Divination;” Winitzer, “The Generative Paradigm in Old Babylonian Divination,” 204–620.
arranged into series according to certain formal patterns, or “gradation paradigms.”\textsuperscript{87} In other words, certain paradigms guided the order and organization of individual omens as they were collated by scribal scholars. Yet, after the omens were placed in order, there frequently were gaps in the compendia that needed to be filled for a given paradigm to be complete. The literary genre, omen compendium—which in essence consists of series of gradation paradigms—would not allow for such incompleteness and would put significant pressure on the scribal scholar to complete the paradigm. In such cases, the scribal scholar was constrained or at least prompted to create new hypothetical omens (hypotheticals) and their respective interpretations in order to fill such perceived gaps.\textsuperscript{88}

One such pattern is the well-studied “right-left” paradigm ubiquitous in records of extispicy.\textsuperscript{89} For almost every sign inscribed on one side of a given zone of a sheep’s liver—right or left—a corresponding sign on the opposite side of that zone would be expected. The occurrence of a mark on the right side of the \textit{padānum}, or “path,” for example, would anticipate the occurrence of an identical mark on the left side of that same zone. If no corresponding sign could be found in the omen records, the right-left pattern would demand the imaginative creation or generation of such a sign to complete the paradigm. Along with the right-left paradigm, many more could be mentioned, some

\textsuperscript{87} This terminology is borrowed from Winitzer, “The Generative Paradigm in Old Babylonian Divination,” 205.

\textsuperscript{88} Cf. Hermann Hunger and David Edwin Pingree, \textit{Astral Sciences in Mesopotamia} (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 6; Francesca Rochberg, “Empiricism in Babylonian Omen Texts and the Classification of Mesopotamian Divination as Science,” \textit{JAOS} 119 (1999): 568–69; Winitzer, “The Generative Paradigm in Old Babylonian Divination,” 17, writes, “…the diviner-scholar set out to construct new hypotheticals along with their respective interpretations on the basis of recorded omens and by way of a variety of implicit ideas of hermeneutics;” Winitzer, ibid., 12–16, notes that earlier studies perceived such “gap filling” as exceptional rather than as the rule.

\textsuperscript{89} Studied, for example, by Starr, \textit{The Rituals of the Diviner}, 15–25.
simple—such as the presence-absence (of a zone)—others more complex—e.g. top-middle-bottom—all of which exerted creative pressure on scribal scholars in their production of compendia.

From Winitzer’s perspective, the paradigms themselves generated new lacuna-filling omens. This is to say, the literary generation of new revelation is a direct consequence of re-contextualization, as omen records are placed into a new literary form and arranged accordingly. The very act of introducing traditional divinatory material into this new literary form fostered the discovery of new revelation.

In addition to the generation of new revelation, the process of arranging omens according to these literary (or organizational) paradigms did not leave preexisting omens unaltered. In order to fit omens into these paradigms, scribal scholars actively shaped such omens, emending them where needed. Such adaptation exemplifies in a second, more minor way how literary pressures inherent in a given genre of divinatory literature led to the textual creation or discovery of revelation. In the following discussion of literary prophecy, we will return several times to this observation: whenever revelatory data are transcribed or subsequently re-contextualized in a new literary setting, the literary pressures inherent in those settings both leave their mark on existing revelatory

---

90 Defined by Winitzer, “The Generative Paradigm in Old Babylonian Divination,” 234, as “oppositional.”

91 Defined as “pointillism” ibid., 316–17.

92 Winitzer (ibid., 206), writes that organizing omens into gradation paradigms “was never merely a passive and reflective activity” but was “a dynamic undertaking, one which invariably affected previously unaffiliated entries according to their new-fashioned situations. Frequently this process inspired actual changes in the composition of preexisting omens and also engendered entirely new omens according to the order imposed by the larger matrix of the gradation paradigm. In short, inter-omen organization was a creative and generative process.”
data and also generate new material. This brings us to our next section on literary prophecy.

2.4.2 Textual Divination in Literary Prophecy

As mentioned above, the two major sources of literary prophecy from ancient Mesopotamia are the oracles reported in the Mari letters and the Neo-Assyrian oracle reports and collections. When these sources are put to careful examination, one encounters divinatory phenomena comparable to what we found in our analysis of omen compendia: divine revelation was interpreted, adapted, and created through various means of textual divination. These sources also offer examples of both categories of textual divination: (a) scribal scholars employed the techniques of vertical reading and intra-textual harmonization, defined below, in order to generate new meaning; and (b) scribal scholars reapplied existing prophetic oracles analogically to address new contexts. The following sections will discuss examples of each of these categories, beginning with the oracle-reporting letters from Mari and then turning to consider the literary prophecy found at Nineveh.

2.4.2.1 Textual Divination in the Mari Letters

Of the thousands of letters excavated at Mari, about fifty report the activities and oracles of prophets from the region of Mari.93 While these documents, formally speaking,

---

are letters and not oracle reports such as we find in neo-Assyrian, these letters still provide us with an opportunity to examine the role transcription and re-contextualization played in the formation of divinatory meaning. Moreover, they showcase techniques of textual divination comparable to what we encounter in other forms of divinatory literature. Importantly, the scribes—or at least the deputies who commissioned these scribes—did not simply communicate these prophetic oracles passively. They played an active role in the interpretation and shaping of those oracles. Their creativity, in this regard, anticipates the influence scribal scholars of the Neo-Assyrian court would exert on divinatory literature.

The clearest example of such creativity involves an oracle of a qammatum or prophetess of Dagan to king Zimri-Lim, an oracle that is reported three times by three different writers. These reports allow us to compare how these different letter writers...

---


94 Jack M. Sasson, “The Posting of Letters with Divine Messages,” in Florilegium Marianum II: Recueil D’études À La Mémoire d’Maurice Birot, ed. D. Charpin and J.–M. Durand, Mémoires de Nouvelles assyrologiques breves et utilitaires 3 (Paris: SEPOA, 1994), 305, demonstrates that when multiple letters of a single scribal official in Mari can be compared, that official’s particular bias becomes apparent: “Thus, no matter which divinity is at stake, no matter what prophecy is being communicated, no matter which prophet is chosen as conduit, when transmitted through Aunt Addū-duri, the message will caution the king about treachery or danger (XXVI: 195, 238); via Sister Inibšina, it will warn him about letting down his guard (XXVI: 197, 204); through the Wife Šiptu, it will comfort and cheer him (XXVI: 211, 213, 236).”

95 The third report, that of Kanisan (ARM 26 202), attributes the oracle to a certain mu ʿām rather than to a qammatum of Dagan (cf. ARM 26 197, 199); Parker, “Official Attitudes Toward Prophecy at Mari
(Inibshina, Sammetar, and Kanisan) determined to represent the prophetess’s utterance in written form. Importantly, the three reports do not agree with each other; each scribe reproduced a different version of the prophetess’s words.

The following table presents a synopsis of the three accounts. In each account, the voice of the prophetess is clearly demarcated from the voice of the letter writer through introductory and concluding formula and/or through the disruption and resumption of the letter’s primary narrative, in which the prophetess is referred to in the third person.  

### TABLE 2.1

**SYNOPSIS OF THE ORACLE OF THE PROPHETESS OF DAGAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inibshina (<em>ARM</em> 26 197)</th>
<th>Sammetar (<em>ARM</em> 26 199)</th>
<th>Kanisan (<em>ARM</em> 26 202)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[quoting his father,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kibri-Dagan]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now, a <em>gammatum</em> of Dagan of Terqa came and spoke to me. She said:</td>
<td><em>…a gammatum</em> of Dagan of Terqa came and spoke [to me]:</td>
<td>Kibri-D[agan], my father, [wrote to me] in Mari. [This is what] he wrote:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The peacemaking of the man of Ešn[unna] is false: <em>beneath straw water runs!</em> I will gather him into the net that I knot. I will destroy his city and I will ruin his wealth, which comes from time immemorial.”</td>
<td>“<em>Beneath straw water runs</em>. They keep on sending [ing to you] messages of friendship, they even send their gods [to you], but in their hearts they are planning something else. The king should not take an oath without consulting god.”</td>
<td>“[I heard] the words [that] were uttered [in the temple of Dagan. This is what] he wrote:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is what she said to me.</td>
<td>She demanded…</td>
<td>‘<em>Be[neath straw water runs</em>. The god of my lord has come! He has delivered his enemies in his hands.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Now, as before, the prophet broke out into constant declamation.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This is what Kib[ri-Dag]an wrote [to me].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As this table reveals, these three reports are far from identical. Besides the thrice-repeated phrase “beneath straw water runs,” which seems to be a warning of trickery,97 the three accounts of the oracle have little in common verbally. In the letters of Inibshina and Sammetar, the phrase is accompanied by an explanation: both explicitly warn of the

---

deceitful intentions of a certain purported ally; yet they do so with very different words. With the third report, that of Kanisan, the oracle contains the opaque phrase by itself without explanation.\(^98\) Moreover, the details of the reports do not agree with each other.\(^99\) By Inibshina’s accounting, the oracle specifies the deceitful party as “the man of Ešnunna;” but for Sammetar and Kanisan, the prophetess’s oracle does not indicate the suspect’s identity. Additionally, the oracle in both Inibshina’s and Kanisan’s recounting concludes with a guarantee of victory, albeit in different words. That of Sammetar, however, ends with an imperative and a tacit threat: “The king should not take an oath without consulting god.” To wit, victory is not guaranteed but contingent on the King Zimri-Lim’s choices. It appears, therefore, that the scribal officials who reported these oracles felt at liberty to restate the prophetess’s message in their own words even to the point of changing the oracle’s meaning.\(^100\) In this capacity, these officials show themselves to be comparable to the textual-divining scribal scholars of the Neo-Assyrian court, not simply relaying raw revelatory data to their respective kings, but submitting alongside these data their expert analysis of such revelation.

\(^98\) That is, unless Kanisan’s interpretation of the phrase (or that of his father, Kibri-Dagan), consists of the following promise of deliverance: “The god of my lord has come! He has delivered his enemies in his hands.”

\(^99\) Compare the following with the observations of Parker, “Official Attitudes Towards Prophecy at Mari and in Israel,” 57–60; and Sasson, “Water beneath Straw.”

\(^100\) The disparity between the three might suggest that what we have here is just three different oracles by the same prophetess rather than three versions of the same oracle. However, Sammetar’s report mentions that the same prophetess also delivered this very message to Inibshina, the author of the first report; additionally, the sense of Kanisan’s report and that of Inibshina’s are synonymous—a warning of treachery followed by a promise of victory—and thus are reasonably viewed as witnesses to the same oracle. The alternative explanation would have the prophetess herself interpreting her own words in contradictory ways. It seems more convincing that the variations in the interpretation of the phrase “beneath straw water runs” originate in the imaginations of distinct intellects. Cf. comments of Parker, “Official Attitudes Toward Prophecy at Mari and in Israel,” 58.
2.4.2.2 Vertical Reading and Intra-Textual Harmonization: Literary Generation in Mari Oracle Reports

The three accounts of the words of the prophetess from Terqa also manifest two techniques of textual divination: namely, vertical reading and harmonization. These techniques illustrate how new meaning is generated through the process of transcription, as scribes produce written accounts of prophetic oracles. The letter, as a literary genre, offers the possibility of presenting more than one oracle at a time and arranging them in a single text in a meaningful, or even meaning-generating, way. When two or more oracles are so arranged in a single text, these oracles are naturally read in light of each other in a process that could be termed “vertical reading.” Through vertical reading, new meaning is generated out of preexisting oracles as details from one oracle are assumed by the reader/hearer to apply to the others. In this way, oracles juxtaposed in a single text are experienced as a unified text with a single meaning greater than that of its constituents.

Related to vertical reading is the more active practice of intra-textual harmonization. With intra-textual harmonization, scribes rewrite one (or more) oracle(s) in light of another found in the same collection. Intra-textual harmonization is actually not that conceptually different from vertical reading. With vertical reading two or more oracles are already—to a certain extent—tacitly harmonized with each other as these oracles are read in light of each other. Actual intra-textual harmonization merely takes this practice and intensifies it, making it explicit. It is not uncommon for scribal scholars to utilize both intra-textual harmonization and vertical reading in the same text. Both practices—vertical reading and intra-textual harmonization—generate new meaning out of existing revelation. Both practices are detected in the prophetic letters from Mari.
In order to illustrate these practices, let us consider the larger literary context of Sammetar’s recounting of the prophetess’s oracle as presented in the following table:\textsuperscript{101}

\begin{table}
\centering
\caption{Table 2.2
Sammetar to Zimri-Lim (\textit{ARM} 26 199)}
\begin{tabular}{|p{\textwidth}|}
\hline
Speak to my lord: Thus Sammetar, your servant: Lupa um, prophet of Dagan, arrived here from Tuttul. The message that my lord entrusted him in Saggaratum:

\begin{quote}
…Wherever you go, joy will always find you! Battering ram and siege tower will be given to you, and they will travel by your side; they will be your companions…
\end{quote}

…to me he [Lupa um] spoke:

\begin{quote}
“What if the king, without consulting god, will engage himself with the man of \textit{Eš}nunna! As before, when the Yamin[ite]s came to me and settled in Saggaratum, I was the one who spoke to the king: ‘Do not make a treaty with the Yaminites! I shall drive the shepherds of their clans away to ḫubur and the river will finish them off for you,’ Now then, he should not take an oath without consulting god.”
\end{quote}

This is the message Lupa um spoke to me. Afterwards, on the following [da]y, a qammatum of Dagan of T[erqa] came and spoke [to me]:

\begin{quote}
“Beneath straw water ru[ns]. They keep on send[ing to you] messages of friendship, they even send their gods [to you], but in their hearts they are planning something else. The king should not take an oath without consulting god….”
\end{quote}
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

As this table illustrates, in Sammetar’s account, the prophetess’s oracle is only one of several oracles reported and is situated after a few oracles by the prophet Lupa um. This positioning is deliberate. As noted above, in his version of the

prophetess’s oracle, Sammetar omits the identity of the deceitful party with whom Zimri-Lim should exercise caution. Yet, the reader of his letter would have no questions as to this person’s identity. In agreement with Inibshina’s account, a reading (or hearing) of the letter as a whole reveals that the deceitful one is “the man of Ešnunna.” In Sammetar’s case, however, this detail is suggested by the content of another oracle in the same letter.102 This oracle, originating from the prophet Lupa ṭum, cautions the king about trusting the man of Ešnunna—printed in bold in table 2.2 above—and urges Zimri-Lim not to make a treaty with this man without first consulting the deity. Since this oracle is immediately followed by the words of the prophetess of Dagan, Zimri-Lim (and any other audience) would hear the prophetess’s message as a continuation of Lupa ṭum’s warnings not to trust the man of Ešnunna.

If we did not have in our possession the other two versions of the prophetess’s message, we would not know for certain whether Sammetar intended this vertical reading, i.e. if he intended his audience to read the prophetess’s words in light of those of Lupa ṭum; but with Inibshina’s version in hand, a version that does explicitly mention the identity of the untrustworthy man, we can reasonably surmise that Sammetar agreed with Inibshina on this count but chose to identify the figure in a slightly less explicit way. That this vertical reading was intended by Sammetar is also confirmed by the fact that Sammetar intra-textually harmonizes the end of the prophetess’s message with the end Lupa ṭum’s oracle so that both conclude with the identical warning (underlined in table 2.2 above): “He [the king] should not take an oath without consulting god.” This intra-

textual harmonization demonstrates that Sammetar did in fact intend the oracles of his letter to be read in light of each other.\(^{103}\)

As a consequence of this intra-textual harmonization, however, the prophetess’s oracle in Sammetar’s report ends on a different note than the other two versions of the oracle, which, as mentioned, finish with a guarantee of victory. Here we encounter another instance where vertical reading may have been intended:\(^{104}\) while it is true that Sammetar’s citation of the prophetess’s oracle lacks words of victory, his letter as a whole does not. As may be seen in table 2.2 above, Sammetar begins his report with another oracle of Lupa ḫum that gives comparable assurance:

Wherever you go, joy will always find you! Battering ram and siege tower will be given to you, and they will travel by your side; they will be your companions (\textit{ARM} 26 199, 11-14).\(^{105}\)

It seems likely that Sammetar intended the prophetess’s oracle to be read in light of these words of assurance. If so, two details missing from Sammetar’s version of the oracle \textit{vis-à-vis} those of Inibshina and Kanisan—i.e. the identity of the deceiver as the man of Ešnunna (found in Inibshina’s version) and the reassurance of victory (found in both Inibshina’s version and that of Kanisan)—are not missing from Sammetar’s report as a whole but are supplied by other oracles included within this report. Ending on a different

\(^{103}\) The repetition of these lines is discussed in Schart, “Combining Prophetic Oracles in Mari Letters and Jeremiah 36,” 88; and Parker, “Official Attitudes Toward Prophecy at Mari and in Israel,” 57–60; Parker attributes the phrase in both oracles to Sammetar. However this is not certain. Sammetar could have duplicated it from Lupa ḫum’s words.

\(^{104}\) Besides this example, we could mention another: on its own, Lupa ḫum’s initial oracle of assurance lacks a concrete, definite referent. Followed by several warnings with more specific content, however, the initial oracle appears to address the situation involving the conniving man of Ešnunna. Thus, vertical reading goes both directions, i.e. up as well as down.

\(^{105}\) Translation from Nissinen, \textit{Prophets and Prophecy in the Ancient Near East}, 30.
note, however, Sammetar’s report conveys a different meaning than the letters of Inibshina and Kanisan: Zimri-Lim is not left with the assurance of victory, but a moral imperative to consult the deity. In short through the careful arrangement and intra-textual harmonization of oracles, Sammetar effectively changes the meaning of the prophetess’s message.

To summarize, Sammetar’s letter displays the intentional employment of vertical reading and intra-textual harmonization. And by these divinatory techniques, Sammetar generates new meaning. In doing so, the scribal official demonstrates the hermeneutical possibilities inherent in many forms of literary prophecy—including biblical prophetic books—wherever multiple oracles are juxtaposed in a single text.

Several other oracle-reporting letters from Mari witness to these divinatory techniques, as well. For instance in another letter (ARM 26 237), the adviser Addū-duri informs King Zimri-Lim about an enigmatic dream and immediately afterwards

106 Noted, as well, by Parker, “Official Attitudes Toward Prophecy at Mari and in Israel,” 59.

107 See, for instance, the discussion of letters containing multiple oracles in Schart, “Combining Prophetic Oracles in Mari Letters and Jeremiah 36.” Wherever two or more oracles are combined into a single letter the opportunity for vertical reading and intra-textual harmonization arises. Besides the examples discussed in Schart (i.e. ARM 26 237; A.1121 + A.2731; and ARM 26 199), many other reports contain multiple oracles and thus could be investigated for evidence of vertical reading and intra-textual harmonization; these include: ARM 26 194, 196, 200, 207, 208, 209, 212, 216, 219, 221bis, 234, and 239.

108 On the identify of Addū-duri, see: Sasson, “Mari Dreams,” 284, who see her as a “highly placed lady (283),” who “did move easily among Mari’s top administrators;” Schart, “Combining Prophetic Oracles,” 79, identifies Addū-duri as a “lay person,” as opposed to a “professional.” Whatever Sasson and Schart might mean by these descriptions, there does not seem to be a substantial distinction between Addū-duri’s function as a scribal advisor and the role played by the other officials involved in the reporting and interpretation of divination. Note for example, she sends her hair and hem along with her letter for confirmation. Regardless of her status, Addū-duri (or whoever composed this letter in her name) must be appreciated as a textual diviner who deliberately utilized the letter form to shape the content and meaning of the revelation according to her interpretation of that revelation.
reports a prophetic oracle. In the dream Addū-duri enters the temple of the goddess Bēlēt-Ekallim (“Lady of the Temple”) and after realizing that the goddess is nowhere to be found begins to weep. Then she hears a priest calling out over and over the words “Come back, O Dagan.” Importantly, the letter does not provide an explicit interpretation of this mysterious dream; neither does the dream offer clear advice for how the king should respond. These lacunae are tacitly filled by the immediately following oracle which plainly orders the king to remain home. That is to say, when read with the dream as a part of a single letter, the oracle functions as an interpretation of that dream. Note the juxtaposition of the dream and the oracle in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARM 26 237, 8-26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In my dream I entered the temple of Bēlēt-ekallim, but Bēlēt-ekallim was not present (ul wašbat) nor were there images in front of her. When I saw this, I began to weep. This dream of mine took place during the evening watch. When I returned, Dadā, the priest of Ištar of Bišra, was standing at the gate of Bēlēt-ekallim, and an eerie voiced kept calling out:

“Come back, O Dagan! Come back, O Dagan! (tūra Dagan)”

This is what it kept calling out over and over.

Another matter: a prophetess arose in the temple of Annunitum and spoke:

“Zimri-Lim, do not go on campaign! Stay (šib) in Mari, and I shall continue to answer.”

---


110 The following translation and normalization (slightly emended) is from Nissinen, Prophets and Prophecy in the Ancient Near East, 68.
A. Schart observes that the oracle—which cautions the king *to stay home* and not to go on campaign—seems to be linked to specific details of the dream, namely the intense emotion associated with the *departure* of the goddess *from her home*.¹¹¹ Through vertical reading, the image of the absent goddess, which so disturbs Addū-duri, serves to intensify the oracle’s warning.

That this intensifying vertical reading was intended is perhaps confirmed by the shared language and imagery between the two: in the dream the goddess was “not seated” (*ul wašbat*) in the temple; in the oracle, the king is told to “stay” (*šib*) in Mari.¹¹² Also the dream ends with a voice tolling out the cry, “*tūra Dagan, tūra Dagan*” (“Come back Dagan! Come back Dagan!”), which could be read as the proper name of a previous ruler of Mari, ‘Tura-Dagan,’ and thus hints that the dream concerns the king.¹¹³ In brief, the letter found in *ARM 26 237* presents another clear example where a letter writer, employs the hermeneutical technique of vertical reading to generate new meaning out of a given revelation.

In conclusion to this section, the reporting of oracles found in the Mari letters illustrates how letter writers—when recording oracles—functioned like the scribal scholars of the Neo-Assyrian court, employing textual divination to establish and interpret the meaning of those oracles. It makes little difference whether these instances of textual divination arose from the creativity of Zimri-Lim’s officials or from the

---

¹¹¹ Schart, ibid., 78–80.

¹¹² Normalization and translation from ibid., 77–78.

liberties taken by their anonymous scribes, if the officials did not write their own reports. In either case, as practitioners of textual divination, the authors of these reports clearly play an active role in the discernment of the divine will and in the production of revelatory texts. Moreover, the literary generation of divine revelation through vertical reading and intra-textual harmonization utilized in the records of prophecy from Mari finds some affinity with the literary generation of new omens in the Old Babylonian omen compendia. For both, it is the organizational aspect of the literary form that generates the new revelation. The organization of omens into gradation paradigms prompts the creation of lacunae-filling omens; the organization of oracles in letters enables the possibility of both reading neighboring oracles in light of each other and of intra-textual harmonization. In this regard, the production of omen compendia and the reporting of oracles in letters are not all that different. The composition of both involves the creative adaptation, interpretation, and generation of divine revelation, operations that require the expertise of an educated and skilled divining scribe. While conclusions made about the identity of these scribes from Mari must remain tentative, it does not seem unwarranted to view these scribes as scribal scholars akin to the scholars active in the courts of Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal. To the textual divination of these latter scholars we will now turn.

2.4.2.3 Textual Divination in Neo-Assyrian Literary Prophecy

Fast-forwarding one thousand years to the seventh century B.C.E., we come to the records of oracles found in the literary prophetic texts of the Neo-Assyrian court. Our primary evidence for literary prophecy in this later period are the oracle reports (SAA 9
nos. 5-11) and oracle collections (SAA 9 nos. 1-4) from the reigns of Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal. Our focus will be placed chiefly on one collection in particular: SAA 9 no. 1. Though removed from the reports of oracles in the Mari letters by a millennium, this Neo-Assyrian oracle collection displays similar techniques of textual divination as those witnessed in the letters of Mari: most clearly, the collection manifests the literary generation of new revelation via vertical reading and intra-textual harmonization. Furthermore, the Neo-Assyrian oracles collections as a whole witness to occasions of reapplication by analogy, as scribal scholars recycled traditional oracles in light of new historical contexts. In the following pages we will examine pertinent examples of these techniques of textual divination.

2.4.2.4 Literary Generation in Neo-Assyrian Oracle Collections

The oracle collection SAA 9 no. 1 presents us with multiple occasions of intra-textual harmonization and vertical reading. The individual oracles of the collection seem to have been intentionally shaped into a whole. For example, most of the oracles offer Esarhaddon assurance of the defeat of his enemies. This repeated motif could reflect the intentional intra-textual harmonization of these oracles by the compiling scribal scholar. Alternatively, this common theme could simply explain why these ten oracles were selected for compilation in the first place. In either case, the references to the king’s
enemies depend on vertical reading to be properly understood: several oracles refer to certain enemies without providing any clues to the identity of these foes. For instance, in the opening oracle of the collection, no. 1.1, three times Ištar promises defeat over the king’s enemies, but the identity of these adversaries is never revealed. Other references to royal opponents in nos. 1.4, 1.8 (and possibly no. 1.7, though this last oracle is admittedly broken and may have identified the conspirators more precisely) carry the same uncertainty. When read independently from the other oracles of the collection, these unspecified references could potentially refer to any number of adversaries. In the literary context of this oracle collection, however, these enemies of Esarhaddon can only be the king’s brothers and their supporters who challenged his claim to the throne. For other oracles in the collection explicitly refer to circumstances pertaining to Esarhaddon’s sibling rivalry over the kingship. Immediately following the references to unspecified enemies in no. 1.1, the oracle no. 1.2 mentions Esarhaddon’s residency in the bēt rēdūtēka, “Palace of Succession” (i 33’); a little later, the oracle no. 1.6 twice refers to Esarhaddon as the alpu kēnu, the “legitimate heir” (iv 5-6 and 20). These details clearly associate their respective oracles with Esarhaddon’s conflict with his fraternal rivals prior to his coronation. In sum, the technique of vertical reading enables one to identify the references to enemies as Esarhaddon’s brothers.

Vertical reading is also required to make sense of other details: the terse reference to divine favor in no. 1.3, “rīšāk issi Aššūr-a u-iddina šarrīya rīši Arbail” “I rejoice over Esarhaddon, my king! Arbela rejoices!” (ii 11’-12’), taken on its own, does not have a

116 Normalization and translation in this and the following paragraphs is from Nissinen, Prophets and Prophecy in the Ancient Near East, 104.
clear reference. Positioned after no. 1.2, which alludes to Esarhaddon’s struggle to be recognized as crown prince, this phrase becomes a religious explanation for Esarhaddon’s political triumph: he had the approval of the goddess Arbela (Ištar). To offer one more illustration of vertical reading, the oracle no. 1.9 (v 28) describes Ištar as leaving for the steppe (ēri). According to Nissinen, this description refers to Ištar’s occasional practice of sojourning in her shrine the Palace of the Steppe in Milqia during periods when the king was away on campaign.117 With the king’s victorious return from military conquest, Ištar, too, would come back to her primary residence.118 While Nissinen has correctly identified the primary meaning of the description of Ištar’s movement to the steppe, following oracle no. 1.8, the phrase carries a secondary connotation. In this oracle, Ištar recalls the queen mother’s accusation that the goddess has caused her son to wander the steppe (ēru) (v 20), an allusion to Esarhaddon’s flight from Nineveh in 681 B.C.E. to escape his brothers’ conspiracy against him.119 Immediately following this oracle, the statement that Ištar has gone to the step in no. 1.9, reads like a response to the queen mother’s complaint: Esarhaddon may have been driven out to the wilderness, but he was not alone; Ištar went out to the wilderness with him, and now has brought him back to the city in safety. As these examples demonstrate, the scribal scholar who formed this collection made use of vertical reading (and possibly intra-textual harmonization) to generate a new, unified meaning out of originally disparate oracles.

117 Nissinen, References to Prophecy, 23; idem., Prophets and Prophecy in the Ancient Near East, 110, note b.

118 Ibid., 125, n. d.

119 Nissinen, References to Prophecy, 22.
The intentionality of the scribal scholar to form a unified text out of originally disparate oracles is visible in another way: the first and last oracles of the collection are linked by common language. Consider the following table. Both oracles use nearly identical diction to refer to the reliability of the deity’s words:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAA 9 no. 1.1 i 15'-17'</th>
<th>SAA 9 no. 1.10 vi 6-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ayyūte dibbiyā ša aqqabakkanni ina mu i lā tazzizūni</td>
<td>lūni dabābu pāniu ša aqqabakkanni ina mu i lā tazzizi ūmā ina mu i urkī tazzazma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have I spoken to you any words that you could not rely upon?</td>
<td>You could rely upon the previous word I spoke to you, couldn’t you? Now you can rely upon the later words, too!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the commonality between these two oracles does not reflect deliberate intra-textual harmonization, the compiling scribe has clearly positioned these two oracles at the beginning and end of the collection to form a thematic inclusio, which serves to unite the corpus as a whole.

Yet a more compelling reason exists for concluding that the compiling scribe deliberately arranged the oracles of this collection so that together they would form a

---

120 The following normalization and translation is from Nissinen, *Prophets and Prophecy in the Ancient Near East*, 1. Nissinen, ibid., suggests the words of no.1.10 (vi 6-12) might be an allusion to those of no.1.1 (i 15'-17').
single message. The responsible scribal scholar did not compile the oracles of the collection haphazardly; rather as Parpola observes, the scribe arranged them roughly in chronological order so that as a whole the oracles trace several steps of Esarhaddon’s complicated journey to the throne following his father’s assassination.\footnote{Parpola, lxviii–lxix.} In a sense, this chronological arrangement can be read as a narrative: the story of Esarhaddon’s struggle to become king. No one oracle on its own could achieve this reading; only as a thoughtfully arranged compilation do these oracles function as a meaningful story. Here we encounter another dimension of the hermeneutical possibilities of literary prophecy: the oracle collection, in particular, is a literary form that allows discrete, disparate oracles to be arranged intentionally so that together they convey a single message, or even, as in the case of SAA 9 no. 1, a single narrative. The use of individual oracles to form a unified narrative is simply an extension of the techniques of vertical reading and intra-textual harmonization already discussed above. Narrative arrangement is a scribal (and divinatory) technique that in a sense “harmonizes” a series of oracles so that together they narrate a coherent story. Together with the previous examples of vertical reading and intra-textual harmonization, the narrative use of oracles in SAA 9 no. 1 demonstrates how scribal scholars exploit the hermeneutical possibilities inherent in specific literary forms to generate new divinatory meaning. Moreover, we see in this instance of narratively arranged oracles a preliminary step toward the development of full-fledged prophetic narratives as we encounter in the Hebrew Bible. A next possible step in this development
would be the inclusion of headings identifying the purported historical context of the collected oracles.\textsuperscript{122}

Put concisely, the literary form \textit{oracle collection}, similar to the oracle-reporting \textit{letters} from Mari, provided scribal scholars and letter writers, respectively, with hermeneutical possibilities useful for generating new meaning: namely, the divinatory techniques of vertical reading, narrative arrangement, and (possibly) intra-textual harmonization. With such techniques in hand the scholar who compiled SAA 9 no. 1 spun a single narrative out of a string of originally separate oracles. Importantly, this newly woven narrative likely addressed a later historical context that arose many years after the original oracles were first written down. Thus, in this case, the scribe employed these generative techniques of vertical reading, narrative arrangement, and harmonization toward a greater purpose, namely, that of reapplication by analogy.

\textbf{2.4.2.5 Reapplication by Analogy in Neo-Assyrian Literary Prophecy}

This brings us to our final example of textual divination from the ancient Near East, namely the utilization of reapplication by analogy in the Neo-Assyrian oracle collections. That the compiling Assyrian scholar intended the oracle collection SAA 9

\textsuperscript{122} Note that this picture of the “historization” (i.e., situating an otherwise ahistorical text within a particular historical context) of the written records of oracular prophecy that became the prophetic books of the Bible differs from that of Philip R. Davies, “‘Pen of Iron, Point of Diamond’ (Jer 17:1): Prophecy as Writing,” in \textit{Writings and Speech in Israelite and Ancient Near Eastern Prophecy}, eds. E. Ben Zvi and M. H. Floyd, SBLSymS 10 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000), 77. Davies imagines that such “historization” would occur only with the addition of blocks of narrative and superscriptions to the oracle collections. In contrast, the oracle collections of neo-Assyria, which are roughly contemporaneous with the emergence of Hebrew divinatory literature, were already historicized as soon as they were bound together by nature of their intentional chronological arrangement. Cf. the criticism of Davies in John van Seters, “Prophetic Orality in the Context of the Ancient Near East: A Response to Culley, Crenshaw, and Davies,” in \textit{Writings and Speech in Israelite and Ancient Near Eastern Prophecy}, eds. E. Ben Zvi and M. H. Floyd, SBLSymS 10 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000), 86.
Positioned strategically in the last oracle of the collection, this phrase seems to point to the continuing relevance of the oracles as constituents of a larger collection addressing a later situation.

The compiling scribe was not interested in just telling the story of Esarhaddon’s rise to power in 681-680 B.C.E., but apparently intended his narrative to speak to a new historical context, namely Esarhaddon’s installment of his son Ashurbanipal as crown prince in 673 B.C.E. Importantly, the oracles of this collection share many points of commonality with Nin A, a royal inscription composed for this very occasion.123 This inscription, like SAA 9 no. 1, recounts the narrative of Esarhaddon’s journey to the throne; yet this recounting is not narrated for Esarhaddon’s sake, but in order to legitimate Esarhaddon’s appointment of Ashurbanipal as crown prince and to warn potential challengers to the throne of the consequences of revolting.124 As Parpola convincingly argues, it is highly likely that SAA 9 no. 1 was formed out of existing oracles on the same occasion and for the same purpose as the inscription Nin A.125 This scenario would explain why the two have so many commonalities.126

---

123 Nissinen, References to Prophecy, 19–30; Parpola, Assyrian Prophecies, lxiii–lxxv.


125 Parpola, Assyrian Prophecies, lxix; Nissinen, “References to Prophecy,” 15–16.

126 On this note, Nissinen, ibid., 30, writes, “The affinities between the initial part of the Nin A…inscription and the extant prophetic oracles received by Esarhaddon during the described period turn out to be too many and too striking to be quite accidental.”
Remarkably, this oracle collection (SAA 9 no. 1) and that royal inscription (Nin A), are not the only two of their kinds to share theme, occasion, and purpose. Another inscription, Ass. A, and the oracle collection SAA 9 no. 2 appear to partake in a similar relationship. Noting these two instances of an inscription paired with an oracle collection, Parpola writes:

The existence of two thematic collections of oracles correlating with two separate sets of inscriptions strongly points to a mutual dependency between the two classes of texts; in other words, it seems that the oracle collections were compiled at about the same time as the respective inscriptions.\textsuperscript{127}

That SAA 9 no.1 was compiled for the same reason that Nin A was composed—namely, the installment of Ashurbanipal as the crown prince—is confirmed by the last words of the final oracle of the collection (no. 1.10 vi 27-30) which extend the goddess’s favor and protection to Esarhaddon’s successor: 

\textit{marā’ka…šarrūtu…uppaš, “your son…will exercise the kingship.”}\textsuperscript{128}

In sum, SAA 9 no.1 offers an example of scribal scholars taking a series of oracles from one setting and reapplying them to another historical context. Read in this later historical context, details from the original oracles take on new significance: the reference to the future rule of an unspecified son of Esarhaddon in no. 1.10, just mentioned, becomes a foretelling of Ashurbanipal’s reign; the allusions to Esarhaddon’s enemies now allude to potential challengers of Ashurbanipal; and references to divine favor for Esarhaddon come to apply to Ashurbanipal.

\textsuperscript{127} Parpola, \textit{Assyrian Prophecies}, lxix.

\textsuperscript{128} Normalization and translation from Nissinen, \textit{Prophets and Prophecy in the Ancient Near East}, 111.
Importantly, the reapplication of these Esarhaddon-focused oracles to Ashurbanipal is not arbitrary, but is based on a clear interpretive principle not unlike those we encountered in the formation of the secondary apodoses in the omen compendia. Like those interpretive principles, the principle at work here is based on the assumption that what applies to one situation would apply to an analogous situation. Oracles originally addressed to Esarhaddon can be reapplied to Ashurbanipal because the two monarchs came to power through analogous circumstances. The succession of both figures was irregular and thus a source of suspicion and an opportunity for rivals to seize power. Sennacherib’s appointment of Esarhaddon was somewhat atypical in that the latter was not the king’s oldest son. Under normal circumstances, the oldest male child of a given king would succeed his father on the throne. It is not surprising, then, that Esarhaddon’s older brothers immediately challenged his installment. Less than ten years later, we encounter similar circumstances: Esarhaddon selected his own successor; and following his father’s footsteps, he did not choose his oldest son, Šamaš-sumu-ukin, but appointed his fourth son, Ashurbanipal, to be crown prince. At this time, perhaps in order to forestall potential politic resistance and unrest (such as Esarhaddon saw in his ascent to the throne), scribal scholars offered a defense of Esarhaddon’s irregular appointment of a fourth son based on the earlier divine approval of Esarhaddon’s own installment as Sennacherib’s crown prince. This is to say, the analogous circumstances of Esarhaddon’s installation as crown prince and that of Ashurbanipal allowed scribal scholars to recycle oracles pertaining to the former in their discernment of the divine will.

129 The details surrounding the succession of Esarhaddon are discussed by Nissinen, *References to Prophecy,* 17–22.
regarding the latter. Analogous historical circumstances enable the analogical reapplication of divine revelation much in the same way that analogous secondary interpretations of omen protases were derived out of existing apodoses.

2.5 Conclusion

In conclusion, we have observed the divinatory practices of scholarly scribes (and letter writers) engaged in the creation of various forms of divinatory texts: omen compendia, oracle-reporting letters, and oracle collections. While generically distinct from each other and composed by different kinds of scribes in different centuries, all of these texts attest to a common portfolio of divinatory practices. Whether oracle-reporting letters authored by officials in Mari, omen compendia arranged and expanded by Old Babylonian diviners, or oracle collections organized by Neo-Assyrian scholars, all point to a common intellectual tradition of discerning the divine will through various means of textual divination. While these means may differ from text to text or genre to genre, many of them are readily classified as one of two major types of textual divination: literary generation and reapplication by analogy. By utilizing these techniques, scribes—whom we have described as scholars—performed a mode of divination that was both textually focused and textually expressed. Through the transcription or re-contextualization of divinatory data and through interpreting existing written records of divination, such scribal scholars attempted to discern the will of the gods anew and in the process produced the vast corpora of divinatory literature known from the ancient Near East. I will argue in later chapters that a comparable process of textual divination in the
hands of Jewish scribal scholars in part produced the literary prophecy found in the Hebrew Bible, as exemplified by the formation of the book of Jeremiah.
CHAPTER 3:

A SURVEY OF SCHOLARSHIP ON THE FORMATION OF JEREMIAH

As mentioned in the introduction, this study examines the doublets of Jeremiah as moments of textual divination, when Jewish scribes created or discovered new revelation through literary generation and/or reapplication by analogy. Yet, before turning our attention to examining Jeremiah’s doublets, it is important grasp the big picture of how the book of Jeremiah took shape. For our analysis of Jeremiah’s doublets is based on a particular understanding of the textual formation of Jeremiah. In this present chapter, we provide an overview of the formation of the book of Jeremiah focusing primarily on the final stages of the book’s textual growth. At the close of this chapter, we will briefly mention a widely accepted theory explaining the formation of Jeremiah’s final literary stages, namely Tov’s Two-Edition theory. In chap. 5, after studying Jeremiah’s doublets, we will revisit this theory in greater detail, offering a fresh evaluation of the textual data of Jeremiah, and in light of this evaluation suggest ways that the theory may be refined.
3.1 Overview of the Formation of the Book of Jeremiah

For what follows, consult the following table of the literary stages of Jeremiah:

TABLE 3.1
THE FORMATION OF THE BOOK OF JEREMIAH
3.1.1 The Divinatory and Scribal Origins of Jeremiah

The book of Jeremiah—surviving in two dramatically different forms—undeniably experienced a long and complicated textual development. In the hands of many generations of divining scribes, the book took shape out of written records of prophetic oracles spoken by a prophet with the name of Jeremiah in the years leading up to the Babylonian deportations of 597 and 587 and afterwards. As oracle records and collections from neo-Assyria attest, it was normal protocol for royal scribal scholars to keep an account of divine communication uttered by prophets. The kingdom of Judah, under the thumb of Nineveh until the end of the seventh century, likely followed suit. Among the various diviners in Judah at the time, Jeremiah—with his pro-Babylonian theology—ended up on the right side of history, confirming his identity as a prophet of Yhwh and his oracles as divine revelation. As confirmed divine revelation, any written records of Jeremiah’s prophetic words (or oracles associated with him) surviving the fall of Jerusalem would become a treasured repository of Yhwh’s past communication and a reservoir of further revelation, rich with divinatory potential.\(^{130}\) These written records probably contained both poetic and prose oracles; there is no reason to suppose “authentic” words of the prophet are to be found in the poetic material of Jeremiah (or, 

---

\(^{130}\) Robert R. Wilson, “Current Issues in the Study of Old Testament Prophecy,” in *Inspired Speech: Prophecy in the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of Herbert B. Huffman*, ed. J. Kaltner and L. Stulman, JSOTsup 378 (New York: T & T Clark, 2004), 43, writes that the “fulfillment” of prophetic oracles would demonstrate “that they were truly of divine origin, and they were therefore thought to be an endless reservoir of revelation.” A more negative conception of the text of Jeremiah as a reservoir for further elaboration is discussed by William McKane, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jeremiah. Volume 1: Introduction and Commentary on Jeremiah I-XXV*, ICC (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1986), lxii.
“A” material) alone. Over time, divining scribes tapped Jeremiah’s divinatory potential: collecting his oracles, arranging them in meaningful ways, and reinterpreting them in light of new events. Moreover, scribes (or perhaps a single “editing” scribe) combined these oracle collections with narrative traditions about the prophet (typically identified as “B” material) and other kinds of material (e.g. the first-person “confessions,” which reflect on the experience of being a prophet) thereby producing what we might call an early version of the book of Jeremiah, or Jer\textsuperscript{A+B} (the siglum communicates that this version of Jeremiah contains, at minimum, Jeremiah’s A and B material).

The processes that produced Jer\textsuperscript{A+B} are largely cloaked in darkness. We cannot confirm whether this version of the book took shape in a single compositional moment or formed gradually, passing through many generations of scribal hands. Most likely, Jer\textsuperscript{A+B} is the result of some combination of both smaller ongoing scribal expansion and divination and of larger-scale scribal revisions.

3.1.2 The Relationship of the Book of Jeremiah to the Deuteronomistic Tradition

At some point—which may or may not be identical with the moment that generated Jer\textsuperscript{A+B}—the Jeremiah tradition came under the influence of the


\footnote{132 See previous note.}
Deuteronomistic tradition and accumulated a wealth of Deuteronomistic phrases and words and, to a lesser extent, assumed theological perspectives common to the Deuteronomistic History (DtrH) and Deut 4:44-29:1 (D). Scholars have offered a whole host of explanations to account for the exchange of diction and ideas that occurred between Jeremiah and DtrH/D. Proposals range from asserting that Jeremiah was a supporter of Josiah’s Deuteronomistic reforms to suggesting that Jeremiah’s writings were co-opted by the Deuteronomistic “school.” In light of more contemporary understandings of scribal practice in the ancient Near East, however, it is much simpler to

---


maintain that the Jeremiah tradition was treasured (as scripture) and shaped within an exilic and post-exilic scribal context that also treasured and shaped the traditions of DtrH and D and which aimed to create out of these disparate traditions a unified Jewish identity and religious tradition. Within such an environment, an exchange of language and ideas between the traditions is not only expected but also necessary for forming out of these traditions a coherent body of scripture. While the book of Jeremiah—by virtue of its divinatory origins—never lacked special status as revelation and thus was always viewed as something akin to “scripture,” over time the book became scripturalized—i.e. formed with other authoritative religious texts into a single scriptural tradition—through the inter-textual accumulation (and exchange) of language and thought not only from (and with) DtrH/D but also from (and with) the breadth of nascent Jewish scripture.

Again, it is not entirely clear to what extent the inter-textuality of Jeremiah with DtrH/D reflects the work of a single (Deuteronomistic?) “editor,” or the outcome of a longer and more gradual process of incremental revision and divination. Once more, some combination of these two options probably best explains the data. Argued in detail in chap. 5, the so-called Deuteronomistic layer of material found in Jeremiah—typically labeled “C” material—is not evenly Deuteronomistic, was not created by a single editor/reviser (at least two different hands were involved), and should not automatically be assumed to be a “redactional” layer. Much of what is identified as C is explainable as the results of ongoing, limited scribal inter-textual and especially intra-textual expansion. This is not to say no large-scale “Deuteronomistic” revision took place, only that we

---

136 See, § 1.2.
should not begin by assuming such a revision and thereby miss potential evidence of more limited scribal practice. Once suggested, a hypothesis of a reviser (or “editor”) has a way of gobbling up all the evidence and explaining away all the data without a careful consideration of other possibilities.

3.1.3 The Formation of \( \text{Jer}^{+n} \)

The earliest text of Jeremiah that we can reconstruct with a reasonable degree of confidence is the common text lying behind both the \emph{Vorlage} of the Septuagint (\( V^G \)) and the \emph{Vorlage} of the Masoretic Text (\( V^M \))—a text we will identify with the siglum \( \text{Jer}^{+n} \).\(^{137}\)

Between \( \text{Jer}^{A+B} \) and \( \text{Jer}^{+n} \) probably stand several generations of manuscripts, though we do not know how many, hence the superscript “+n” in the siglum. It is possible that \( \text{Jer}^{+n} \) equals \( \text{Jer}^{A+B} \). Some scholars attribute \( \text{Jer}^{+n} \) wholesale to a single Deuteronomistic “editor” who both combined Jeremiah’s A and B material and contributed a “redactional” layer of C material.\(^{138}\) This scenario—as we already hinted—is unlikely. As explained in

---

137 When the Septuagint (\( G \)) and the Masoretic Text (\( M \)) agree, we can be fairly confident that their agreement attests to the text of their common ancestor, \( \text{Jer}^{+n} \). For the purposes of this dissertation, we can assume that Ziegler’s critical text represents—to an adequate degree—the Old Greek of Jeremiah free of post-translation revision of the Greek text toward the proto-MT. Ziegler’s results are accepted by most; e.g., Sven Soderlund, \emph{The Greek Text of Jeremiah: A Revised Hypothesis} (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985). When \( G \) and \( M \) disagree, it is often still possible, though more difficult, to discern the text of \( \text{Jer}^{+n} \). For each variant, a variety of explanations must be considered: scribal error in either \( G \) or \( M \), limited scribal development of either text, or more systematic revision of \( G \) or \( M \). For example, when a group of variants form a pattern, an argument can sometimes be made for considering these variants as a systematic change, and thus a development away from the common text. Frequently, discriminating between possible explanations is left to the judgment of the critic, and thus humility is imperative. When variant readings of a single word, phrase, or verse are synonymous it usually impossible to determine which is more original; cf. Shemaryahu Talmon, “Synonymous Readings in the Textual Traditions of the Old Testament,” in \emph{Studies in the Bible: Edited on Behalf of the Institute of Jewish Studies in the Faculty of Humanities}, ed. C. Rabin, ScrHier 8 (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1961), 336.

chap. 5, Jer+n displays textual features that appear to be the product of ongoing and limited scribal expansion and incremental revision.

A clear indicator that Jer+n took form at least in part through limited scribal expansion is the presence of the many doublets and redundancies that populate Jer+n. As we will see in chap. 4, doublets provide a reasonably certain window into the formation of Jer+n, since doublets typically originate as an already-existing text is duplicated and added to a new context. Thus unless we are to assume all of these repetitions were penned by the same hand, the presence of duplicates in Jer+n suggests that this version of Jeremiah developed in stages.

It is important to note, however, that we lack manuscript evidence for the textual development of Jeremiah between JerA+B and Jer+n. In the absence of such empirical evidence, scholarly conjecture into the formation of Jeremiah is often based on observations of textual features alone and thus is unverifiable. For instance, the repetition in A material of phrases found in C material was for one scholar sure evidence that Jeremiah’s poetry had been reinterpreted by the Deuteronomists;139 for another, it demonstrated that the man Jeremiah composed both poetry and prose.140 As these contradictory interpretations of the same literary evidence illustrate, one cannot establish

139 E.g., Winfried Thiel, Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 1-25; idem., Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 26-45.

the textual history of Jeremiah—or that of any other ancient text—on the basis of textual features alone.

For this reason, we will found our reconstruction of the formation of \textit{Jer}^{+n} on the basis of scribal practices attested in actual manuscripts of Jeremiah. In other words, we must begin by analyzing the variant readings constituent of the extant versions of Jeremiah and by this means establish the ways in which scribes were actually executing their craft. Not until after such analysis is conducted should we begin to theorize about the formation of \textit{Jer}^{+n}. For example an analysis of the variant manuscripts of Jeremiah indicates that in its final stages, Jeremiah was enlarged through duplication. On the basis of this empirical observation, it is reasonable to assume that any doublet already found at the earlier stage of \textit{Jer}^{+n} was formed through a similar process of duplication.

3.1.4 The Final Literary Stages of Jeremiah

Analysis of the final literary stages of Jeremiah after \textit{Jer}^{+n} is complicated by the fact that the book survives in two dramatically different forms: a shorter and presumably older version—witnessed mainly by the Old Greek translation of Jeremiah (G) and attested to a limited degree by Hebrew fragments of the Dead Sea Scrolls (4QJer\textsuperscript{bd})—and a longer and probably later version—evinced primarily by the medieval Masoretic Text (M) and other Dead Sea Scroll fragments (2QJer and 4QJer\textsuperscript{ac}). The latter differs from the former in both length and structure. The form of Jeremiah found in M—which contains many pluses\textsuperscript{141} of varying length—is 16.6\% longer than the form represented by G.\textsuperscript{142}

\textsuperscript{141} I use the words “plus” and “minus” neutrally to refer to zero variants and do not intend to imply by them which is more original.
Additionally, a substantial section of Jeremiah—the Oracles Against the Nations (OAN)—found in the middle of G, stands near the end of the book in M.

Furthermore, both forms of Jeremiah contain a certain amount of unique smaller-scale scribal expansions. The number of such expansions in each form varies significantly; M contains a much higher frequency of expansions than G. Importantly, as Janzen observes, both forms of Jeremiah contain the same kinds of smaller-scale scribal expansions: both display a multiplication of 1) double readings, 2) intra-textual harmonization, and 3) filled in names and titles, to give some examples.\(^{143}\) That both texts contain unique examples of the same kinds of scribal expansions suggests that the Vorlagen of both—i.e., \(V^G\) (the Hebrew text lying behind G) and \(V^M\) (the text lying behind M)—developed independently from a common source, namely \(\text{Jer}^{+n}\).\(^{144}\) The higher frequency of these smaller expansions in \(V^M\) when compared to that of \(V^G\) invites the conclusion that \(V^M\) is removed from \(\text{Jer}^{+n}\) by many more generations of manuscripts than \(V^G\). Finally, the uneven presence of such scribal expansions in the two Vorlagen makes it possible to distinguish both from \(\text{Jer}^{+n}\). Whenever either \(V^G\) or \(V^M\) lacks a given

---

\(^{142}\) Young-Jin Min, “The Minuses and Pluses of the LXX Translation of Jeremiah as Compared with the Massoretic Text: Their Classification and Possible Origins,” (Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University, 1977), 1.

\(^{143}\) John Gerald Janzen, Studies in the Text of Jeremiah (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1973); Janzen’s analysis of these three kinds of smaller-scale scribal expansions is discussed below starting in § 3.2.2.3. Cf. the observations of Hermann-Josef Stipp, Das masoretische und alexandrinische Sondergut des Jeremiabuches: Textgeschichtlicher Rang, Eigenarten, Triebkräfte, OBO 136 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994), 145.

\(^{144}\) This view was first considered by Franz Karl Movers, De utriusque recensionis vaticiniorum Jeremiae: Graecae Alexandrinae et Hebraicae Massorethicae, indole et origine commentatio critica (Hamburg: F. Perthes, 1837); cf. Stipp, Das masoretische und alexandrinische Sondergut des Jeremiabuches, 59, who writes, “Er \([V^G]\) verkörpert im allgemeinen ein älteres Stadium der Textenwicklung, ist aber kein unmittelbarer Vorläufer des masoretischen Typs, sondern hat seit der Aufspaltung der Textüberlieferungsstränge ein geringes Maß an Umgestaltung erfahren, das bei der Rekonstruktion des gemeinsamen Ahnen ausgesondert werden muß.”
expansion of this sort *vis-à-vis* the other, we may deduce that the shorter reading represents the wording of *Jer*\textsuperscript{en}. In sum, the two extant forms of Jeremiah present scholars with a complicated puzzle that begs for a solution. We will now discuss and evaluate the various ways scholars have attempted to solve this puzzle.

3.2 Recent Scholarship on the Two Forms of Jeremiah

3.2.1 Three Possible Solutions to the Puzzle of Jeremiah’s Two Forms

The differences between M and G can be explained in multiple ways.\(^{145}\)

Logically, (#1) the *Vorlage* of M (\(V^M\)) could represent an expanded (and reordered) form of a more original (and shorter) Hebrew text lying behind G (\(V^G\)). Conversely, (#2) \(V^M\) could be more original, while G could represent an abbreviated (and rearranged) version of \(V^M\). If (#2), then either (a) the translators of Jeremiah abbreviated and restructured Jeremiah in the process of making their translation,\(^{146}\) or (b) they used an already-abbreviated and reordered form of the Hebrew text of Jeremiah as the basis of their research.

---


translation. When adjudicating between these possibilities, it advisable to be clear which step in the above algorithm one is addressing.

A fourth possibility—involving large-scale scribal error—could be considered, but this possibility in actuality is not a viable explanation. One could attempt to explain all of the minuses of G as occasions of haplography either by a Hebrew scribe or by the Septuagint translators. This strategy is showcased by J. Lundbom, who operates with the assumption that simply demonstrating the possibility of haplography proves the fact of haplography. This deduction is far from the truth. Merely demonstrating the possibility of haplography does not establish its fact. While no one doubts that at least some of these minuses did result from haplography, the sheer number of minuses found in G far exceeds the amount which could be reasonably explained as stemming from scribal error. In a majority of cases, it is impossible to establish with certainty that haplography in fact occurred. For this reason we will consider haplography on a case-by-case basis, though acknowledging in humility that in many instances we are not able to settle the matter. We will not, however, invoke haplography as a panacea for every minus found in G.

Finally, when adjudicating between the three remaining possible solutions, it should be noted that for scribal practice, expansion—rather than abridgment—is the rule.


This is not to say that scribes never shorten their texts, but that by default texts tend to grow in the hands of scribes and are abridged only on exceptional occasions. Textual expansion, on the other hand, may occur either gradually or rapidly depending on the scribe and the circumstance at hand. With regard to Jeremiah, if the pluses of $V^M$ are due to scribal expansion (explanation #1 above), such scribal expansion may have arisen all at once in one compositional moment in the hands of a single scribal reviser, gradually over many generations of manuscripts through limited scribal expansion, or some combination of both larger-scale revision and limited scribal expansion. In contrast, if the pluses of $V^M$ attest to an older Hebrew form of Jeremiah that has been intentionally abridged in $V^G$—explanation #2(b)—the only likely explanation is that this abridgement is entirely the result of a single moment of revision. That is to say, given the default tendency of scribes to expand their texts, it is extremely unlikely that such abridgement would have resulted gradually over many generations of manuscripts.

3.2.2 An Evaluation of Possible Solutions

In what follows, we will consider each of the three possible explanations outlined above, considering three kinds of evidence: first, the translation quality of $G$; second, the witness of the Dead Sea Scrolls; and third, the secondary nature of the pluses in $V^M$.

3.2.2.1 First Consideration: Translation Quality of $G$

To begin, good reasons exist for doubting the possibility of #2(a)—that the translators of $G$ intentionally abbreviated their Hebrew text. Central to dismissing this possibility is our evaluation of the translators’ translation technique. The highly literal and highly consistent quality of $G$’s translation is easily verifiable. The process for
measuring the translation quality of the books of the Septuagint—Jeremiah included—is relatively straight forward. As Tov explains, translations in the Septuagint range from highly “literal” to highly “free.” A highly literal Greek translation of a Hebrew text is marked by the following criteria: 1) internal consistency—a rendering of “all occurrences of a given Hebrew word, element (e.g. preposition), root or construction as far as possible by the same Greek equivalent” resulting in a text full of stereotyped language and Hebraisms; 2) an attempt to represent each constituent part of a Hebrew word by individual Greek equivalents; 3) an adherence to Hebrew word order against Greek convention; and, 4) the matching of each Hebrew element with one corresponding Greek element, so that the translation has a one-to-one relationship with its Vorlage. When applied to G, the criteria demonstrate that this translation is decidedly literal and consistent. Tov evaluates, “With the exception of passages in which the translator encountered linguistic difficulties, [Jeremiah] was rendered quite faithfully, and the prose sections of the translation may even be regarded as literal.” Numerous scholars concur with Tov’s evaluation.


150 Ibid., 20–24.

151 Tov, ibid., also mentions the fifth criterion of “linguistic adequacy of lexical choices,” but this criterion is more subjective and so is not considered here.


Given that the translators of G were committed to producing a highly literal and consistent translation of their Hebrew text, it does not seem convincing that the differences between G and M are due to deliberate alteration by the translators themselves.\textsuperscript{154} Tov writes:

If a certain section was rendered in a free fashion, translational omissions and additions may be expected. On the other hand, if a certain translation unit was rendered faithfully, such omissions and additions are not to be expected. Consequently, if a faithfully rendered translation unit is nevertheless shorter than [M], its \textit{Vorlage} was probably also shorter….We should thus not expect that the translator of [Jeremiah], who adhered in general to the Hebrew, shortened his \textit{Vorlage} substantially.\textsuperscript{155}

Moreover, as J. Janzen explains, the translators clearly exerted much effort to represent the Hebrew text of Jeremiah as faithfully as possible even in places where that text was broken or awkward and would not make sense in Greek or when it contained unknown words that could only be transliterated.\textsuperscript{156} That the translators did not omit even these difficult passages seems to undermine the claim that they were at liberty to omit words and phrases of Jeremiah. In the same vein, it is highly unlikely that the translators used

\textsuperscript{154} This argument was first put forward by Scholz, \textit{Der masorethische Text und die LXX-Übersetzung des Buches Jeremias}; see discussion in Janzen, \textit{Studies in the Text of Jeremiah}, 5–6.

\textsuperscript{155} Tov, “Exegetical Notes,” 75.


---

the moment of translation as an occasion for producing a better arrangement of the book’s chapters—e.g. relocating the OAN from the end of the book to the middle of chap. 25. For, improving the major structural problems of the book clearly was not a concern for them; they faithfully reproduced their Hebrew Vorlage even with its striking chronological discrepancies and largely incoherent structure.\(^{157}\) All this to say, the major differences in length and order must have already existed in the Vorlage of G (\(V^G\)).

3.2.2.2 Second Consideration: Evidence from the Dead Sea Scrolls

This deduction— that a shorter Hebrew text of Jeremiah stands behind G—is corroborated by the discovery of Hebrew manuscripts of Jeremiah among the Dead Sea Scrolls, namely 4QJer\(^{b,d}\). Although fragmentary, 4QJer\(^{b,d}\) present a Hebrew text that agrees in many details (though not entirely) with the shorter form of Jeremiah found in the Septuagint.\(^{158}\) This discovery—along with an appreciation of G’s consistent and literal translation quality—convinced many that a shorter Hebrew text does in fact stand

\(^{157}\) John Bright, Jeremiah: Introduction, Translation, and Notes, AB 21 (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1965), lvi, describes the structure of Jeremiah as “a hopeless hodgepodge thrown together without any discernible principle at all.”

\(^{158}\) As summarized by, Tov, “The Literary History of the Book of Jeremiah in Light of Its Textual History,” 363; 4QJer\(^{b,d}\) share seven minuses with LXX Jeremiah and follows the variant verse ordering of LXX Jeremiah; 4QJer\(^{b,d}\), however, do not share three minus of LXX Jeremiah, “agree with MT against LXX in five details” and also (probably) include a few “unique readings found in neither LXX nor MT,” though in both case the text is broken so we cannot determine if the different readings are significant; I would add that all five of the agreements with MT against LXX are insignificant or synonymous variants of exactly the sort that one would expect to find if scribes were relying (at least in part) on a mental text of Jeremiah when producing a new copy. These fragments are also discussed in: Emanuel Tov, “The Jeremiah Scrolls from Qumran,” RevQ 14 (1989): 189–206; idem, “Three Fragments of Jeremiah from Qumran Cave 4,” RevQ 15 (1992): 531–41; idem., “Some Aspects of the Textual and Literary History of the Book of Jeremiah,” 146–48 ; Idem., “The Literary History of the Book of Jeremiah in Light of Its Textual History,” 363–64; William McKane, “The History of the Text of Jeremiah 10,1-16,” in Mélanges bibliques et orientaux en l’honneur de M Mathias Delcor, eds. A. Caquot, S. Légasse, and M. Tardieu, AOAT 215 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1985), 297–304; the critical texts of 4QJer\(^{b,d}\) are found in Eugene C. Ulrich, ed., Qumran Cave 4.X: The Prophets (DJD 15; Oxford: Clarendon, 1997).
behind G, and thus laid to rest the possibility that the translators abbreviated the text themselves.\textsuperscript{159} Renewed appreciation for the agreement between 2 Kgs 25 and the short text of Jer 52 in G added confidence to this conclusion.\textsuperscript{160}

For a few, however, the fragmentary quality of the Qumran witness leaves the question open. These fragments could be anything, from a loose citation or some form of excerpted text,\textsuperscript{161} and do not necessarily indicate the existence of an entire scroll of Jeremiah containing a shorter text roughly equivalent to G. Moreover, other fragments from Qumran, 2QJer and 4QJer\textsuperscript{2,c}, attest to the antiquity of the text lying behind M, i.e. V\textsuperscript{M}.\textsuperscript{162} Could not 4QJer\textsuperscript{b,d} be aberrations whose similarity with the Septuagint is merely coincidental? One reason many scholars are inclined to give weight to 4QJer\textsuperscript{b,d} as evidence for a short form of Jeremiah is their growing appreciation of the existence of


\textsuperscript{160} E.g., Movers, De utriusque recensionis vaticiniorum Jeremiae; Janzen, Studies in the Text of Jeremiah, 3, 69, 109–11; Tov, “Exegetical Notes,” 75–76; Janzen, Studies in the Text of Jeremiah, 69, also notes striking agreement in the presentation of names not only between Jer 52 and 2 Kgs 25, but also between the latter and Jer 40:7-9 and 41:1-4; cf. Stipp, Das masoretische und alexandrinische Sondergut des Jeremiabuches, 89–90.

\textsuperscript{161} Brent A. Strawn, “Excerpted Manuscripts at Qumran: Their Significance for the Textual History of the Hebrew Bible and the Socio-Religious History of the Qumran Community and Its Literature,” in The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls, Vol. 2: Dead Sea Scrolls and the Qumran Community, ed. J. H. Charlesworth, The Second Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006), 141–42, writes, “If, due to the state of preservation, we cannot be sure a small-sized scroll is truly excerpted, then we also cannot be sure, given the existence of the excerpted documents (as both manuscripts and genre), that it is not excerpted” (emphasis in original); and if excerpted, the text-critical value of the biblical text therein is uncertain.

\textsuperscript{162} A fifth fragment, 4QJer\textsuperscript{e}, is too small to be analyzed. The critical texts of these manuscripts are found in Ulrich, Qumran Cave 4.X: The Prophets.
what E. Ulrich describes as “variant-literary editions” for many of the books of Jewish scripture. It appears that multiple forms of these books were simultaneously in circulation—as authoritative scripture—among ancient Jewish communities. In other words, the reception of a religious text as authoritative scripture did not necessitate the fixing of that book’s structure or content. Both continued to be in flux—to different degrees for different books—as scriptural books were preserved and handed down by believing communities even into the late Second Temple period. In what has been called the post-Qumran paradigm of textual criticism, scholars no longer find it surprising or improbable that books such as Jeremiah would exist in two dramatically different forms. Furthermore, this paradigm has “resurrected” the value of the Septuagint as a “primary

---

163 In light of the concerns raised by John Van Seters, *The Edited Bible: The Curious History of the “Editor” in Biblical Criticism* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006), it may be preferable to refer to these variant versions not as “editions” but perhaps as variant-literary “text-forms,” or simply variant-literary “versions.”


tool” for textual criticism (for books whose Septuagint translation is highly literal). Reflecting on Jeremiah in light of this paradigm shift, Janzen writes:

Current studies based on the biblical manuscripts from Qumrân are presenting a new picture of the history of the biblical text in its broad outlines and are vindicating the method which seeks to use the Septuagint as a witness to a text tradition at times divergent from [M]. As a result the whole approach which minimizes the divergence between [G and M], and seeks to explain divergent Greek readings as resulting from transmission technique or Tendenz, is seriously called into question.

Thus, while the evidence for a shorter Hebrew Vorlage of G is limited to a few fragments from the Dead Sea Scrolls (and the common readings found in 2 Kgs 25), the existence of variant-literary editions for a sizeable number of Jewish scriptural books in antiquity has convinced most that these fragments do in fact represent a variant text of Jeremiah very similar to the Hebrew Vorlage standing behind G.

3.2.2.3 Third Consideration: The Secondary Nature of Pluses in V^M

Before settling the question of the existence of a shorter Hebrew text as the Vorlage of G, we must consider one more category of evidence, namely the secondary nature of several types of pluses in V^M. Significantly, many of the types of pluses found in V^M can be understood as scribal expansions only. As noted above, J. Janzen, in his seminal study on the text of Jeremiah, catalogued and analyzed three major categories of pluses that are undeniably secondary in nature:

166 Thus, Cross, The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies, 132, in reference to the “historical books.” Emanuel Tov, “The Nature of the Large-Scale Differences Between the LXX and MT S T V, Compared with Similar Evidence in Other Sources,” in The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible: The Relationship between the Masoretic Text and the Hebrew Base of the Septuagint Reconsidered, ed. A. Schenker, SBLSCS 52 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2003), 121–44, also argues for the value of the LXX as a witness to the early formation of the texts of the Hebrew Bible.

(1) Janzen observed that a large number of the pluses of $V^M$ (between forty-five and sixty-five) may be explained as double readings—i.e. readings that combine or conflate alternate wordings of the same bit of text from two or more manuscripts (or, from the scribe’s mental text, as I would emphasize). As double readings, these pluses mark occasions of textual growth and scribal expansion.

(2) Janzen identifies two hundred and twenty-five unique cases of intra-textual harmonization in the pluses of $V^M$, where one passage is amplified or rewritten in light of the particular wording of a similar passage found within Jeremiah. Such harmonization may be intentional or accidental; either way, as instances of harmonization, this grouping of pluses in $V^M$ shows itself to be the product of textual growth and scribal expansion, as well.

(3) Janzen observes that $V^M$ with high frequency presents a fuller version of personal names and titles (in comparison to a more concise presentation of those names and titles in $V^G$). If these differences were on a smaller scale, then we could possibly

---


169 Janzen, *Studies in the Text of Jeremiah*, 10, himself notes the possibility of double readings being based upon the “memory of another reading.”

170 Ibid., 211 n. 83.

171 Janzen, ibid., uses the language of “additions” or “expansions” taken from “parallel or related contexts,” rather than the language of “intra-textual harmonization.”

172 Ibid., 34–68.

173 We will consider these instances of intra-textual harmonization again in chap. 5 §5.3.3.

explain these differences as accidental scribal omissions.\textsuperscript{175} Yet, because the amount of expanded names in $V^M$ is quite substantial, only two explanations are plausible: (a) the fuller names of $V^M$ are evidence of extensive scribal growth—either due to limited, but ongoing, scribal expansion or to one moment of revision—or (b), the short names arose from a single, isolated moment of abridgment.

Janzen offers a series of arguments in support of (a). He points to evidence from 2 Kings 25 and 4QJer\textsuperscript{d} of Hebrew texts that agree with G’s shorter name renderings against the long forms found in $V^M$.\textsuperscript{176} This evidence, however, demonstrates only that the shorter Greek text of Jeremiah reflects a shorter Hebrew text. On its own, it does not settle the question of whether $V^M$ is expanded or $V^G$ abridged.\textsuperscript{177}

More conclusive are Janzen’s reflections on the spelling of Nebuchadrezzar’s name in $V^M$’s pluses (discussed at length in chap. 5)\textsuperscript{178} and on that text’s expansions of the divine name.\textsuperscript{179} With regard to the latter, the title , “of hosts,” occurs eighty-two times in $V^M$; only ten of these eighty-two are also found in $V^G$. Additionally, we find , “God of Israel,” attached to the divine name forty-nine times in $V^M$; only fourteen of these forty-nine instances are represented by $V^G$. Given the default scribal tendency to expand—as opposed to shorten—their texts, it seems very unlikely that the

\textsuperscript{175} Ibid., 69.

\textsuperscript{176} Janzen, \textit{Studies in the Text of Jeremiah}, 69–70.

\textsuperscript{177} For example, the shortened names of Jer 52:1-34 in $V^G$ could reflect the harmonization of this chapter toward 2 Kings 25:3-30 rather than a sign of $V^M$’s expansion against 2 Kings 25 = Jeremiah 52.

\textsuperscript{178} Janzen, \textit{Studies in the Text of Jeremiah}, 70.

\textsuperscript{179} Ibid., 75–86.
minuses of $V^G$ are a consequence of gradual scribal shortening. More likely is the possibility of a systematic shortening of the text by a solitary editing scribe within a single compositional moment. However, this possibility is not convincing. For if the minuses of $V^G$ represent a scribal abridgment of Jeremiah, we are left to wonder why the responsible scribe had the tenacity to eliminate seventy-three\(^{180}\) occurrences of and thirty-five of but stopped short of removing all of them. Furthermore, it is difficult to imagine under what circumstances a scribe would put the orthodox honorific under erasure at all, when its presence elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible is widespread.\(^{181}\) In sum, the pluses to the divine name in $V^M$ are highly suggestive of scribal expansion. As we will discuss in chap. 5, the spelling of Nebuchadrezzar’s name in the pluses of $V^M$ concurs with the assessment that the fuller names of $V^M$ are expansions.

Janzen’s study of these three types of pluses reveals that many of the pluses of $V^M$ can be understood only as textual additions. Taken all together, Janzen’s study—not to mention his discussions of many other features of the Greek and Hebrew texts of Jeremiah—points in one clear direction: $V^M$ by and large represents a later and expanded version of Jeremiah. Even if scribal error may account for some of the minuses in $V^G$—minuses considered here as evidence of expansion—which undoubtedly is the case, or even if some minuses in $V^G$ originated from very occasional scribal abridgment, the

\(^{180}\) $V^G$ contains one unique instance of (Jer 30:20).

\(^{181}\) Janzen, ibid., 75, makes similar arguments against the possibility of attributing the shortened forms of the divine name to an abbreviating translator.
weight of the evidence cannot be ignored. Of the possibilities considered above, explanation (#1)—that the pluses of $V^M$ are, in general, the result of scribal expansion—makes the most sense of the data. The shorter text witnessed by $G$ is not the product of intentional abridgement by either a Hebrew editor or a Greek translator. As Janzen concludes:

The text of $[V^G]$ contains only a very small amount of secondary expansion. In the great majority of its zero variants, it preserves a text superior to that of $[V^M]$. The evidence does not support the commonly held theory that the translator abridged his Vorlage, so that, except where scribal lapse is patent or must be assumed, $[V^G]$ may be taken as a substantially faithful witness to the Hebrew text at home in Alexandria.\(^{182}\)

Janzen’s conclusion agrees with the evidence of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the evaluation of the translation quality of $G$ discussed above. Moreover, taking his conclusion for granted, many subsequent studies have enjoyed success in their ability to make sense of the expansions and changes found in $V^M$—a fact that has lent confirming support to this conclusion.\(^{183}\) Furthermore, understanding $V^M$ as a secondary form of

\(^{182}\) Ibid., 128.

Jeremiah adheres to the general axiom *lectio brevior lectio potior*, reflecting the well-attested fact that texts tend to grow over time. For these reasons, following Janzen’s study, most scholars have come to accept the temporal superiority of $V^G$ and the expansive nature of $V^M$.\(^{185}\)

### 3.2.3 Tov’s Theory of Two Editions of Jeremiah in Brief

Soon after the publication of Janzen’s work, Tov offered a compelling interpretation of Janzen’s data that has been widely accepted, an interpretation we will call the Two-Edition theory. Tov asserted that $V^M$ represents a second “edition” of Jeremiah (edition II) which is almost entirely the work of a single “editor” (editor II) who

---

\(^{184}\) Discussed in Janzen, *Studies in the Text of Jeremiah*, 9, 191 n. 35.

\(^{185}\) Without necessarily agreeing with all of his examples, we also point the reader to Stipp, *Das masoretische und alexandrinische Sondergut des Jeremiabuches*, 66–91, who considers further reasons for considering many of the special readings of $M$ vis-à-vis $G$ as changes away from the common text of $Jen$:

1. some special readings in $M$ (variants unique to $M$) form sets reflecting the same motivation;
2. other special readings of $M$ are clearly disjunctive with their contexts;
3. others are grammatically problematic;
4. a number of words and phrases constituent of the special readings of $M$ are unique to the pluses of $V^M$
5. the minuses in $G$ cannot be explained convincingly as systematic omissions;
6. certain special readings in $M$ presuppose the relocation of the OAN (Stipp also notes (7) the agreement of short readings in $G$ with 4QJer\(^b,d\) and 2 Kings 25). With regard to (2) and (3), we welcome the advice of Andrew Shead, *The Open Book and the Sealed Book*, 24, who—on the basis of “our imperfect knowledge of biblical Hebrew (a product of the small size of the body of surviving literature and the lack of native speakers)”—recommends caution in dismissing perceived difficulties in the Hebrew text.
expanded an earlier edition of Jeremiah (edition I)—more or less equal to \( \text{Jer}^+ \).\(^{186}\)

Edition I is also the product of an editor (editor I), who may in fact be the Deuteronomistic editor of Jeremiah. Building off Janzen’s foundation, Tov provided an extensive catalogue of types of pluses found in \( V^M \) which he attributes to editor II.\(^{187}\)

Importantly, this catalogue includes almost all of the expansions of \( V^M \) vis-à-vis \( \text{Jer}^+ \).

Tov’s editor is also responsible for the different chapter arrangement of \( V^M \). In short, the book of Jeremiah, as we know it today, is the product of two major and subsequent editorial moments.

We will provide more detailed assessment of the Two-Edition theory in chap. 5. Here, we will only acknowledge briefly certain question that will become important as we consider Jeremiah’s doublets in the next chapter. While Tov’s theory presents a simple solution to the puzzle of Jeremiah’s two forms, one wonders if it is necessary to attribute all of the expansions of \( V^M \) to a single hand working in one compositional moment. Could not the various types of pluses stem from multiple hands? Or, is there a cogent reason to attribute all to one figure? Moreover, on what grounds should we assume a single revising scribe created, for instance, all of doublets unique to \( V^M \)? Are these doublets all of the same kind, or do they reflect the same revisional bias? As we turn to consider the doublets of Jeremiah in the follow chapter, we will keep these questions at the front of our minds.

---

\(^{186}\) The idea of considering the versions of Jeremiah as two separate editions was first articulated by Johann G. Eichhorn, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, vol. 4, 4th ed. (Göttingen: Rosenbusch, 1824), 170–222.

CHAPTER 4:

SCRIBAL DIVINATION IN THE BOOK OF JEREMIAH: DOUBLETS

4.1 Introduction to the Later Doublets

A comparison of the two surviving forms of Jeremiah reveals that scribes frequently expanded the book through duplication. The text of Jer* itself already contained around thirty doublets; and among the pluses of V we count another five to seven more. In other words, the scribes who created the “later” doublets of V were simply continuing a scribal practice utilized numerous times in the production of Jer*.

Examining the doublets of Jeremiah, then, provides us with a window into the formation of Jer* as well as V. Moreover, as anticipated in the previous chapter, our study of these doublets may raise questions about cogency of the Two-Edition theory. Also important to our overall thesis, examining these doublets also offers us first-hand evidence of how Jewish scribes created and shaped revelatory texts. Moments of

---


189 The five certain later doublets are: 6:13-15 // 8:10b-12; 23:5-6 // 33:14-16; 30:10-11 // 46:27-28; 48:40b, 41b // 49:22; 39:4-10 // 52:7-16. Two more doublets—15:(12)13-14 // 17:(1-3a)3b-4; 24:8-10 // 29:16-20—may be additions of V or may have been lost through haplography. See textual analyses of the first below.
duplication mark occasions of textual divination, when divining scribes through literary
generation and reapplication by analogy uncovered new meaning out of existing
revelation. Analyzing the ways scribes created duplicates and the function of those
duplicates in their secondary contexts will assist us in our comparison of the divinatory
practices of Jewish scribes with that of their ancient Near Eastern counterparts.

In this chapter we will study a sampling of doublets from the last two identifiable
stages of the formation of Jeremiah. Since we desire to build our analysis of the text of
Jeremiah on a more empirical foundation, we begin our study of duplication with
Jeremiah’s later doublets—doublets whose duplication is attested by actual manuscript
variants, i.e. those found in V_M alone—and only afterwards turn to consider a few
examples of earlier doublets found in Jer^n for which we lack such empirical evidence.

Presently, in this chapter, we will examine each of the later doublets of the book
in three steps. Each doublet consists of two textual units, or twins: the original twin and
the secondary, duplicate twin. For each doublet we will offer 1) a synoptic and textual
analysis of the doublet’s text as witnessed by both of the doublet’s twins in order to
establish the text of the doublet at the moment of duplication and to catalog the textual
variants that occasioned this moment; 2) (on the basis of this textual analysis) an
assessment of the scribe’s technique of duplication, i.e., an evaluation of the duplicate’s
degree of similitude with its source text (see below for a range of options); and 3) an
investigation into the scribe’s intentions for creating the doublet and the divinatory
function of the doublet in its secondary context. Before embarking on our voyage
through the later doublets, we must map out our methodology and rationale for each of
these three steps.
4.1.1 Step 1: Synoptic and Textual Analysis

First, prior to analyzing any given doublet, it is necessary to establish as far as possible the text of each doublet twin at the moment of duplication. For these texts were not necessarily stable, but in all probability continued to develop and change after the moment of duplication through both inadvertent alterations and intentional modifications. In order to establish the text of the doublet at the moment of duplication (the goal of step one), we offer a three or four-column synopsis of each doublet’s text. The first two columns contain the main textual witnesses to the (presumably) older twin of the doublet: G in the first column and M in the second. The third and fourth columns contain G and M of the duplicate, respectively (later doublets, which by definition are not represented by G, lack this third column).

The Greek text of each doublet often provides us with our earliest textual witness to each doublet. Since the Septuagint is based on a Hebrew Vorlage \(V^G\) that differs from the Hebrew Vorlage of M \(V^M\), wherever the readings of G and M of a given doublet twin agree, we can be fairly confident that their agreement lends us an accurate picture of the text of \(J\text{er}^{++}\). Additionally, when we encounter differences between G and M of a given twin, it is often possible to arrive at plausible—and even probable—explanations for these differences and thereby establish the text of that twin.

---

190 For G, we will use Ziegler.

191 For M, we will use BHS.

192 Other textual witness, such as the Dead Sea Scrolls, will be considered within the textual notes. The fragments of the book of Jeremiah from the Dead Sea Scrolls may be found in Ulrich, \textit{Qumran Cave 4.X: The Prophets}.

193 See n. 137, in chap. 3.
Following each synopsis, we provide text critical notes and offer an analysis of all significant variants—both those existing between G and M and those existing between the duplicated twin and its duplicate.¹⁹⁴ Such variants typically arise for one of three discernible reasons: 1) scribal error (including translation error), 2) synonymity,¹⁹⁵ and 3) scribal innovation (these last two are discussed below). Also, we must stay alert for occurrences of what we will call *post-duplication harmonization*: i.e., occasions when scribes—after the moment of duplication—harmonized doublet twins with each other thereby heightening their similitude. When the texts of doublet twins in M agree with each other against the witness of G, such harmonization may be suspected. In such cases, the variant reading in G may preserve the original reading of its respective doublet twin. Sometimes the difference in G may be understood as the product of *synonymous* translation, when the translator rendered his Hebrew *Vorlage* with a varying but synonymous reading.¹⁹⁶

4.1.1.1 Synonymity and Innovation

As mentioned above, some variants created in the process of duplication reflect synonymity while others betray scribal innovation. These two scribal practices require further discussion. When scribes reproduced a written text, they were not always obliged to produce an identical copy of that text. At times, such scribes were at liberty to change

---

¹⁹⁴ Insignificant variants, such as variations in orthography, will not be discussed.

¹⁹⁵ By “synonymity” I mean the use or presence of synonymous readings and synonymous variations in a text. See discussion below.

¹⁹⁶ Granted the highly conservative and literal translation technique of the translator, there is usually no reason to assume that a variant reading in G (against the agreement of readings of a doublet twin in M) arose from translator innovation.
the text’s wording. Some changes in wording are synonymous; this is to say, while altering the presentation of the text, synonymous changes do not significantly change the text’s meaning. We refer to such changes as *synonymous variation*.\(^{197}\) Other changes do significantly change the text’s meaning, changes we classify as *innovation*.

At this point it is necessary to define precisely what counts as an innovative change, i.e. a significant change in meaning. Innovative change involves the elimination, addition, or replacement of a reference to a concrete entity, whether a person, place, thing, or idea. For example, in the doublet of 23:5-6 // 33:14-16 a reference to king Zedekiah—\(\text{Ιωσεδεκ} = \text{יוצדק} \) (Jer 23:6 G)—is replaced with a reference to the city Jerusalem— “Yhwh is our righteousness” (Jer 23:6 M and Jer 33:16).\(^{198}\)

Again, in 15:(12)13-14 // 17:(1-3a)3b-4, the image of divine fire burning against the people of Judah— “against you” (15:14 M and G)—is replaced by the image of unending fire— “forever” (17:4 M).\(^{199}\) In the first case, a concrete reference to a specific king is replaced by new concrete referent, the city of Jerusalem. In the second, the image of divine fire burning against the Judeans is supplement by the addition of a new concrete concept, namely the idea of fire burning forever (the original concept, that the fire is directed against Judah, is not eliminated as it may be assumed from context).

In either case, the variation introduced by the duplicating scribe is innovative, i.e. it brings to the duplicate’s text a new concrete referent not found in the original.

\(^{197}\) See discussion of synonymity in chap.1 §1.2.

\(^{198}\) See discussion in § 4.2.3 below.

\(^{199}\) See discussion in § 4.2.2 below.
In contrast to innovation, synonymous variation—while changing the wording of a text—does not eliminate, add, or replace a reference to a concrete entity. For example, a scribe could refer to Yhwh’s rescue of his people as salvation (יִשָּׁע) or as deliverance (נִיצָל). In Jeremiah, Yhwh can say that he will deliver Jeremiah—

“For I am with you, says Yhwh, to deliver you” (1:19; cf. 1:8; 1:17 G)—that he will save Jeremiah—

“For I am with you, says Yhwh, to save you” (30:11 M)—or both at the same time—

“For I am with you to save you and to deliver you” (15:20; cf. 42:11). All three variants carry roughly the same meaning—that is they all refer to the same specific concept, namely Yhwh’s rescue of Jeremiah. Put concisely, synonymous variation, while changing the text’s wording, does not change the concrete referent of that wording.

4.1.1.2 A Classification of Textual Variants

In order to bring precision to our analysis of Jeremiah’s doublets in step one, we will classify every textual variant according to the following technical categories:

1. **Scribal error**

2. **Post-duplication harmonization** (referred to as “PDHarm” in the textual analyses below): already discussed above.

---

200 These example are discussed in more detail in the analysis of the doublet of 1:18-19 // 15:20 below in §4.3.1.

201 These categories follow similar categories employed by Molly M. Zahn, *Rethinking Rewritten Scripture: Composition and Exegesis in the 4QRevised Pentateuch Manuscripts* (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 17–19. In addition to these categories, we will also indicate occasions when synonymous or innovative additions in the text of a duplicate are intra-textual (added from elsewhere in Jeremiah) or inter-textual (added from elsewhere in Hebrew scripture).
3. **Non-significant variation**: minor (and often unconscious) variations that fluctuate in the course of a text’s transmission and which typically have no real significance. Non-significant variants include differences in orthography, the addition and subtraction of minor elements like conjunctions and the direct object marker, and some variations in singular and plural and in masculine and feminine.

4. **Minor synonymous variation**: (employed by scribes consciously or unconsciously) variation of one minor word or element, such as the addition or subtraction of a pronoun or the word “all,” an insignificant change in verbal form or in the vocalization of a Hebrew root, or the transposition of a series of single words or short phrases.

5. **(Major) Synonymous variation**: (employed by scribes consciously or unconsciously): the addition, omission, replacement, or transposition of a word (or words) or of a short phrase that does not change the text’s meaning; i.e., it does not introduce, replace, or omit a reference to a concrete entity.

6. **Minor and major innovation**: (more likely to reflect a conscious choice of a scribe) the addition or replacement (or less often, the omission) of a word (or words) or of a short phrase that changes the text’s meaning; i.e., that introduces and/or omits a concrete reference to a person, place, thing, or idea. Such innovation may be *minor or major*. A minor innovation, while modifying the text’s referents in some way, does not alter the text’s meaning radically but complements the text’s existing meaning and function. A major innovation, in contrast, changes the meaning of the text as a whole in a radical way, so that the original function of the doublet has been replaced.

   It may be helpful at this point to provide a couple of examples which illustrate this last distinction between minor and major innovation. The doublet of Jer 1:18-19 // Jer 15:20 offers an example of the former. In this doublet, (the prophet) Jeremiah’s opposition is first described in 15:20 simply as “this people” referring to the people of Judah. When this verse is duplicated in the first chapter of the book, the description of Jeremiah’s opposition is expanded to include “the kings of Judah” and “its princes.” While this innovative addition introduces two new

---

entities—Judah’s kings and princes—these new entities do not erase or undermine the preexisting referent, namely the Judean people, but complement this referent, specifying in greater detail who in particular among the Judeans are Jeremiah’s adversaries. Furthermore, this innovation does not change the primary function of the verse, i.e. to encourage Jeremiah in the face of opposition.

An example of major innovation may be found in the doublet of 49:22 // 48:40b, 41b. The text of the doublet’s original twin is directed against Edom. In the duplicate, however, references to Edom have been replaced with references to Moab. With this replacement, the meaning and function of the doublet is radically altered. The doublet’s text no longer functions as an oracle foretelling the doom of Edom but as an oracle announcing Moab’s end. This is to say, the original function of the text has been entirely erased and supplanted by a new function. Thus, this text change counts as a major innovation, an innovation that does not complement the original meaning and function of the doublet, but replaces them.

4.1.2 Step 2: Assessment of Duplication Technique

On the basis of each textual analysis (step one) we will present a translation of each doublet at the moment of duplication and offer an assessment of the doublet’s duplication technique (step two). Here we will provide definitions for the various techniques of duplication utilized by duplicating scribes. As mentioned, scribes enjoyed a range of creative license when creating a duplicate—from verbatim repetition to creative adaptation. The range of creative license practiced by our scribes may be mapped onto two different, albeit related, spectrums. The first measures the scribe’s adherence to the original text’s wording and order. The second spectrum measures the
scribe’s adherence to the original text’s meaning. Adherence to wording and adherence to meaning do not necessarily correspond to each other. While changing a text’s meaning often requires one to modify that text’s wording, altering a text’s wording does not necessitate a change in meaning. For example, one could imagine a duplicate so replete with synonymous variation that little of the text’s original wording is left intact, yet, all the while, adhering relatively closely to the sense of the original. The doublet of Jer 1:18-19 // Jer 15:20, mentioned in brief already, illustrates this possibility. A quick glance at the texts of this doublet in M testifies to the high degree of textual variation existing between them (common elements are underlined):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 4.1</th>
<th>SYNOPSIS OF JER 1:18-19 // JER 15:20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jer 1:18-19</strong></td>
<td><strong>Jer 15:20</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These twins are clearly not identical. Yet, in spite of their numerous differences (including the minor innovations discussed above), the meaning of the doublet is more or less the same; both function to encourage the prophet Jeremiah in the face of opposition.
Conversely, we might expect to encounter a duplicate whose diction replicates its twin in every detail save a single word, which on its own dramatically alters the meaning of the whole text. The doublet of Jer 49:22 // Jer 48:40b, 41b, which also came into the discussion above, falls into this category. In the following synopsis one can see the nearly perfect similitude of the two doublet twins:

**TABLE 4.2**
SYNOPSIS OF JER 48:40B, 41B // JER 49:22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jer 48:40b, 41b</th>
<th>Jer 49:22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>... 40</td>
<td>... 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... 40</td>
<td>... 41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The twins are virtually identical except for the place names (underlined in the synopsis). Although these twins display zero synonymous variation, the changes in place names completely alter the meaning of the doublet. Thus, as these two doublets—Jer 1:18-19 // Jer 15:20 and Jer 48:40b, 41b // Jer 49:22—demonstrate, adherence to wording and adherence to meaning are distinct parameters. For this reason, two distinct spectrums are required for measuring scribal duplication technique. The following table

---

203 The plus “it goes up” in 49:22 is a post-duplication addition. See discussion below in § 4.2.5.2.
presents the various duplication techniques utilized by Jeremiah’s scribes arranged according to adherence to wording and adherence to meaning:

### TABLE 4.3

**SCRIBAL DUPLICATION TECHNIQUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Repetition (no change in meaning)</th>
<th>Minor adaptation</th>
<th>Major adaptation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Verbatim duplication</strong> (word-for-word duplication)</td>
<td>Verbatim repetition</td>
<td>Verbatim repetition with minor adaptation</td>
<td>Verbatim repetition with major adaptation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Loose citation duplication</strong> (some synonymous variation)</td>
<td>Loose citation</td>
<td>Loose citation with minor adaptation</td>
<td>Loose citation with major adaptation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paraphrastic duplication</strong> (more synonymous variation)</td>
<td>Paraphrase</td>
<td>Paraphrase with minor adaptation</td>
<td>Paraphrase with major adaptation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.2.1 Scribal Adherence to Wording and Order

Let us begin with the first spectrum measuring scribal adherence to the original text’s wording and order. At one end of this spectrum, scribes could produce an identical or nearly identical copy of their source, a technique which we label *verbatim repetition*. Aside from the expected “scribal noise”—such as non-significant variation and scribal error, which arise inevitably as a text is transmitted—verbatim repetition produces a duplicate virtually identical to its twin, free from even minor synonymous variation. This technique may suggest something about the scribe’s intentions. Certainly, extra care was taken to replicate the original exactly. In comparison to the following modes of
duplication, verbatim duplication may rely to a greater degree on the direct consultation of a written text—visually or aurally—rather than on memory.

Moving along the spectrum, we come to what we will describe as *loose-citation repetition*. Loose-citation repetition reproduces the same meaning of the original while exhibiting *some* flexibility in wording and/or order. Put differently, the variants constituent of a loose citation repetition—including the addition and omission of entire phrases—are synonymous; that is, they do not alter the gist of the original text. To qualify as loose citation repetition, a duplicate may abound in minor synonymous variation, but must limit other forms of synonymous variation to one instance per verse at most. If the synonymous variation of a given doublet is more pervasive (two or more instances per verse), we classify the duplication as *paraphrase*. The line between loose-citation and paraphrase is not hard and fast. The difference between the two is a matter of degree, not kind; the point of distinguishing the two is to acknowledge that doublets display different amounts of synonymous variation. There is a limit, however, to the degree of variation a doublet may exhibit before it no longer may be classified as a doublet. When the disparity between the two texts of a (potential) doublet is too great, there is insufficient evidence to conclude that one text is directly based on the other.

In either case, loose-citation or paraphrase, the responsible scribe—while committed to reproducing the text’s original meaning—was not obliged to preserve the original’s wording and/or order. It is unclear if this freer practice implies anything of the scribe’s intentions. The fluidity with which he or she creates a duplicate may simply indicate the scribe’s dependence upon a mental text as opposed to a written text. The “text,” in such instances, would not be a fixed written form (to be copied verbatim), but a
memorized and somewhat flexible configuration of ideas that could have different written instantiations; each twin would represent a different scribal performance of the same mental text.

4.1.2.2 Scribal Adherence to Meaning

Each of the categories of duplication defined above—verbatim, loose-citation, and paraphrase—may be further parsed according to the scribe’s adherence to the source text’s meaning. When a duplicate twin strays from the meaning of its older sibling—introducing, omitting, or replacing a reference to a concrete entity—the duplicate no longer qualifies as a repetition but enters the realms of minor and major adaptation.204

On the rigid end of the spectrum, we find doublets with no substantial difference in meaning. In spite of synonymous variation, the duplicate’s gist is more or less the same as its twin. The techniques of duplication classified above—verbatim repetition, loose citation, and paraphrase—all fall into this rigid category. In all of these instances, the duplicating scribe seems to have had reason for preserving the original text’s meaning in the duplicate.

Some duplicates also display scribal innovations. As discussed above, such innovations can either be minor or major. This study classifies a doublet containing one or more minor innovations as a minor adaptation and a doublet containing at least one

204 The meaning of a text may be altered in two ways: 1) most obviously, a text’s meaning may be changed through modifying its wording in one of the ways described above: i.e. addition, omission, and rearrangement; but also, 2) a text’s meaning may be changed through re-contextualization even without altering its wording. Simply by being introducing into a new literary context, a text takes on new meaning via the vertical reading created through re-contextualization. The effects of re-contextualization are considered in step three. In step two we will consider only changes in meaning brought about through the modification of the doublet’s text.
major innovation (and any amount of minor innovations) as a major adaptation. As we will see, with cases of minor and major adaptation, the scribe’s intentions for duplication are often more obvious.

4.1.3 Step 3: Rationale and Divinatory Function of the Duplicate

For each doublet, once we have assessed the scribe’s technique of duplication, we will attempt to uncover the scribe’s rationale for creating the doublet and to describe the divinatory function of the duplicate in its secondary context. In the process of doing so, we must necessarily establish which doublet twin is original, and from there attend to how the creation of the duplicate results in vertical reading and harmonization, not to mention occasions of reapplication by analogy. It is important, however, that we distinguish a scribe’s utilization of a specific duplication technique from the scribe’s motivation for creating a doublet. Describing the former is largely a matter of empirical analysis; uncovering the latter, however, requires some speculation. That said, scribal technique and scribal intention are inextricably related, and it is often possible to detect a given scribe’s intentions partly on the basis of the particular technique the scribe employed.

Finally, recognizing that I am not the first to study Jeremiah’s doublets, I bring my discussion into conversation with other scholarly opinions on these matters. Here, in order not to repeat myself time and again, I offer a few global reflections on the assumptions and methods of the scholars with whom I engage.

205 Here I follow Zahn, Rethinking Rewritten Scripture, 12–17.
4.1.3.1 The Witness of the Septuagint

A seminal issue is the question of how to understand occasions when doublets found in $V^M$ are missing in G. Many scholars are hesitant to consider the likelihood that doublets unique to $V^M$ are expansions, and some exhibit a marked bias toward M, assuming many if not most differences in G are defective—either through scribal error or deliberate alteration or omission.\(^{206}\) It seems that some such scholars are willing to consider very complicated and tenuous explanations for the absence of a doublet in G rather than accept the rather simple solution found in the possibility of a scribal expansion in $V^M$. This current study has the advantage of being written long enough after the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls to benefit to a greater degree from the post-Qumran paradigm of textual criticism.

4.1.3.2 The Role of Literary Observations in Reconstructing a Text’s History

Another issue requiring reflection is the role literary observations of a text play in reconstructing the literary development of the text. As mentioned in the previous chapter, attempts to reconstruct the literary history of a book like Jeremiah on the basis of observed literary features alone are unsuccessful. For example, in wishing to adjudicate which twin of a doublet pair is more “original,” scholars often appeal to the degree to which a doublet fits or does not fit into its literary context. Sometimes, a twin is thought

to be more “original” than its sibling simply because it coheres more convincingly in its immediate context. The assumption here is that a text would find itself repeated in a secondary context only through scribal error or careless duplication, in which case the duplicate’s alien status would be marked by its disjunction with its environment. However, one could just as easily argue the other way around. The twin that fits more snugly into its literary context is more likely to be secondary than its sibling, since 1) a duplicate may be harmonized to fit its secondary context; 2) a secondary context may be harmonized in light of an inserted text; and 3) the suitability of a secondary context may invite the insertion of a duplicate in the first place (we find examples of all three in the following analyses). As these counter examples demonstrate, literary observations—such as the suitability of a doublet in its context—cannot on their own resolve questions of textual history. That said, literary observation can provide secondary, supporting evidence given the presence of stronger, primary evidence such as manuscript witnesses.

4.1.3.3 When is a Doublet a Doublet?

To mention one more matter, scholars do not always agree on what counts as a doublet. For example, similar texts are often considered doublets—i.e. produced through duplication—only when those texts are nearly identical. Overlooked is the possibility that scribes would use the occasion of duplication to adapt or paraphrase a text rather than copy it slavishly. Thus, we must also discuss how we define what is and is not a
doublet. We must take into account three parameters: length, similitude, and frequency.\textsuperscript{207}

With regard to the first, it seems that to be a doublet the repeated text must be of a certain length, neither too short nor too long. In the book of Jeremiah, we encounter a plethora of repeated phrases that are only a few words in length. Phrases such as

, “there is no healing for you,”\textsuperscript{208} and / , “for I am with you to rescue you / save you,”\textsuperscript{209} could be considered doublets since they are repeated verbatim in the book. However, given their brevity, we count such phrases as “recurring phrases”\textsuperscript{210} rather than as doublets. The category doublet is reserved for repetitions that are roughly one verse in length. At the other extreme, we could imagine repetitions that stretch to great lengths such as entire chapters.\textsuperscript{211} While an upper limit to the definitional length of doublet is possible, none of the potential doublets of Jeremiah approaches this boundary.

A second parameter to consider is that of similitude. Obviously, texts repeated verbatim should count as doublets. What about texts that are similar but not identical? How similar must two texts be to be considered a doublet? The greater the disparity between a duplicate and its source, the harder it is to define the two as a doublet. When

\textsuperscript{207} For a discussion on the definition of a doublet, see: Macchi, “Les doublets dans le livre de Jérémie,” 119–20.

\textsuperscript{208} Jer 30:13; 46:11.

\textsuperscript{209} Jer 1:8; 1:17 (G); 1:19; 15:20; 30:11; 42:11; 46:28.

\textsuperscript{210} Parke-Taylor, The Formation of the Book of Jeremiah, uses the same terminology.

\textsuperscript{211} For example, consider the famous biblical doublet of Psalm 18 // 2 Sam 22.
the disparity between two texts is extreme, there is not sufficient evidence to conclude that one text is actually based on the other, and thus is a duplicate. Importantly, in describing two similar texts as a doublet, we are asserting that these texts have a genetic relationship to each other; namely, a scribe consciously and directly produced the secondary twin through the duplication of its sibling. In this study, duplication does not refer to the scribal practice of creating a text out of bits of memorized tradition that accidently resembles another text also made from this tradition.

For example, we do not count the plus of Jer 11:7-8—found only in M—as a doublet though it bears a close resemblance to a few texts found elsewhere in Jeremiah.\footnote{212} Some see this plus as a duplication of 11:4. Janzen, for his part, explains it as a duplication of Jer 7:24-26 and of “Deuteronomistic language elsewhere.”\footnote{214} The problem—a problem alluded to in this observation of Janzen—is that 11:7-8 does not just resemble one text from somewhere else in Jeremiah, e.g. 7:24-26, but it consists almost entirely of traditional Jeremianic and Deuteronomistic language found throughout the

\footnote{212} Since a clear trigger for haplography is lacking, these verses appear to be a later addition; the case for haplography considered by David N. Freedman and Jack R. Lundbom, “Haplography in Jeremiah 1-20,” in Frank Moore Cross Volume, eds. B. A. Levine and et al., ErIsr 26 (Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society, 1999), 33, requiring an emendation of V\textsuperscript{6}, is possible but not entirely convincing; cf. Jack R. Lundbom, “Haplography in the Hebrew Vorlage of LXX Jeremiah,” HS 46 (2005): 310. This possibility is also considered by Janzen, Studies in the Text of Jeremiah, 204, n. 13, and is followed by Leslie C. Allen, Jeremiah: A Commentary, 1st ed., OTL (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2008), 134–35.


\footnote{214} Janzen, Studies in the Text of Jeremiah, 94; cf. ibid., 39–40, where Janzen writes that 11:7-8 is drawn from 7:22-24, which probably is a typo.
book of Jeremiah, and for this reason resembles several sections of the book. The text of 11:7-8 reads as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
7 & \text{ כי העד העדתי } \\
8 & \text{ הוא בקולי }
\end{align*}
\]

The six phrases that are underlined above are phrases which are each utilized multiple times in Jeremiah with some variation:

1. Variations of the phrase “your ancestors in the day I brought them up out of the land of Egypt” are found in Jer 7:22, 25; 11:4; 16:14-15; 34:13 (cf. 2:6; 23:7; 31:32; 32:21) and around twenty times in D and DtrH.

2. “rising early and” + inft. – this turn of phrase, is utilized with different infinitives in Jer 7:13, 25; 25:4; 26:5; 29:19; 32:33; 35:14, 15; 44:4 (cf. 25:3).


4. The exact wording “they did not incline their ear” is repeated in 7:24, 26; 17:23; 34:14; 35:15 (cf. 25:4).

5. Variations of the phrase “they walked, each in the stubbornness of their evil heart” are situated in Jer 3:17; 7:24; 16:12;18:12.

6. The phrase “the words of this covenant” stands earlier in chap. 11 at vv. 2, 3, 6 (cf. Jer 34:18; 2 Kgs 23:3; Deut 28:69 [29:1 Eng.], 9).

---


217 Cf. ibid., 42.

218 Cf. ibid., 33.

219 Cf. ibid., 40.
From this analysis, Janzen’s proposal appears to have merit. The plus of 11:7-8 shares four out of six phrases with Jer 7:24-26: phrases (1), (2), (4), and (5). We could argue, then, that 11:7-8 makes a doublet with 7:24-26. Yet, as we just saw, 11:7-8 also holds these same phrases in common with many other sections of Jeremiah. To illustrate, phrases (1), (3), and (6), could have been drawn intra-textually from the first half of chap. 11. In brief, the proliferation of these six phrases in Jeremiah prevents us from excluding the possibility that 11:7-8 was simply constructed out of stock Jeremianic and Deuteronomistic language and is not a conscious duplication of a specific text such as 7:24-26. To recap, potential doublet twins must share a certain degree of similitude for one to posit that a given twin was consciously based on the other.

A third parameter, frequency, requires brief mentioning only. In addition to doublets, Jeremiah contains triplets and quadruplets. This study, while ostensibly focused on doublets, does consider one triplet on the basis of the assumption that a tripled text reflects the same scribal tendency that produced the book’s doublets.

4.2 The Later Doublets: Text and Interpretation

Now that we have articulated our three-step plan of attack, we may commence with our analysis of a sampling of Jeremiah’s later doublets (those found in M only), and then turn to consider a few of the book’s early doublets (attested by G and M) found in the common text of Jer\textsuperscript{+n}.

\footnote{Cf. ibid., 38.}
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4.2.1 Text #1: From the Least to the Greatest, All are Greedy (Jer 6:13-15 // Jer 8:10b-12)

4.2.1.1 Preliminary Considerations

Our first doublet stands in the midst of the opening poetic chapters of the book. The first occurrence of the doublet’s text (Jer 6:13-15) is attested by both M and G; the second occurrence (8:10b-12) is found in M only, and thus is likely to be a duplicate added after the point of Jer+n. Furthermore, no triggers for haplography exist, and thus we cannot explain the absence of 8:10b-12 in G as resulting from scribal error.221

There is some disagreement as to where the doublet’s text begins. Both doublet twins are located after lines that are very similar to each other (Jer 6:12 ≈ 8:10a). This similarity is visible in the following synopsis (common elements are underlines):222

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 4.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SYNOPSIS OF JER 6:12 = JER 8:10A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jer 6:12</th>
<th>Jer 8:10a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>____ ____ ____</td>
<td>____ ____ ____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


222 For 6:12, G and M are virtually identical; G includes one extra pronoun τούτων. Texts G and M are also virtually identical in 8:10a. For this reason, it is sufficient to present only the text of M in this synopsis.
Both verses speak of the handing over—“they will be turned over” (6:12) and “I will give away” (8:10a)—of Judah’s belongings—“their houses” (6:12 only); “fields” (6:12 and 8:10a); “wives” (6:12 and 8:10a)—to “others” ( ). On the basis of this similarity, McKane\textsuperscript{223} and Carroll\textsuperscript{224} opt to include these lines as part of the doublet’s text. However, this procedure disregards our manuscript evidence; the fact that G includes 8:10a in agreement with M but does not include 8:10b-12—the verses of the doublet—strongly suggests (1) that 8:10a already stood in Jer\textsuperscript{m} and (2) that the duplication that added vv. 10b-12 to chap. 8 is a later and independent development. As discussed below, the similarity between these verses (Jer 6:12 \approx 8:10a) is more likely what invited the duplication in the first place.


4.2.1.2 Textual Analysis

TABLE 4.5

THE DOUBLET OF JER 6:13-15 // JER 8:10B-12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 ὡ ἐπὸ πρὸς αὐτῶν</td>
<td>a 13</td>
<td>a 10b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἔως εὐλόγων</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πάντε b συνετέλεσαν τὸ ἄνο a b</td>
<td>b b</td>
<td>b b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d ἀπὸ ἤτορεω</td>
<td>d c</td>
<td>d c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἔως πευκοφόρητον d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πάντε ἐποίησαν πεισμὸν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 καὶ ἵνα τὸ σύντομον</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e τοῦ λαοῦ ou e ἕξουσιν</td>
<td>e e</td>
<td>e e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ λέγουσι εἰρήνη εἰρήνη</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἕτερον ἐπίνει εἰρήνη</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 κατηγορήθησαν</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡ ἀξιοθείας g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b καὶ υἱὸν ἐκατοσθενεύον</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κατηγορήθησαν h</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i καὶ τὴν ἑτερον κἀπών</td>
<td>k j i</td>
<td>k j i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οὐκ ἐγνώσαν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διὰ τοῦτο πεσοῦνται</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l ἐν τῇ πτώχει αὐτῶν l</td>
<td>l l</td>
<td>l l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c καὶ εἴναι καρπὸν m ἐπισκοπῆ</td>
<td>m c</td>
<td>m c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a...a  **Minor synonymous variations (+/– pronoun): “from the (their) least to the (their) greatest” – M of Jer 6:13 includes both 3mp pronouns, while both are lacking in M of 8:10; G has the first pronoun only. All three readings are virtually identical in meaning. The insignificant differences noted between these versions of the same phrase suggest that the phrase belongs to the scribes’ memorized repertoire of traditional material, a possibility confirmed by the presence of additional variations of the phrase both in **Jer**^m^ (31:34; 42:1,8; 44:12) and in the pluses of **V**^M^ (16:16). Moreover, the phrase (with less variation) is a traditional trope found throughout the Hebrew scriptures: Gen 19:11, 1
Sam 30:2,19; 2 Kgs 23:2; 25:26; 2 Chr 15:13; 34:30; Esth 1:5,20; Jonah 3:5; cf. 1 Kgs 22:31; Job 3:19; Ps 115:13.

b...b  **Synonymous translation:** συνετελέσαντο ἄνοα “carried out lawless deeds” (6:13 G) / “are greedy for unjust gain”—or more literally, “the one who cuts (unjustly) a(n) (unjust) cut”225—(6:13 M, 8:10 M) – the rendering of the phrase in Greek is a perfectly acceptable (if not wooden) translation of the Hebrew idiom.226 We find the same translation of this Hebrew phrase in Prov 1:19.

c  **Non-significant variants (+/- conjunction)** – in three places we find a *vav* added or subtracted. In the last two instances, the *vav* is found in 6:13-15 M and 8:10b-12 M but not 6:13-15 G; these instances of agreement in M could reflect *post-duplication harmonization* (hereafter, *PDHarm*).

d...d  Possibly minor synonymous variation (the order of “priest” and “prophet” in 6:13 G is reversed in 6:13 M and 8:10b M), with *PDHarm* of 6:13 M toward 8:10b M – when priests and prophets are mentioned collectively in Jeremiah, the priests are usually mentioned first, as in G of 6:13.227 Moreover, in three other places, M reverses this standard order against G (Jer 14:18; 23:11, 33). It seems plausible that 6:13 G preserves the original order which was reversed in the duplicate. After the moment of duplication, the original sequence in 6:13 M was harmonized toward the reversed order of 8:10b M. Alternatively, the reading in G could represent a correction toward the more standard ordering of priest before prophet. Either way, this transposition may indicate the scribe’s reliance upon a mental text.

e...e  **Synonymous variation (intra-textual):** ( )“(daughter of) my people” – in 8:11 the word “daughter” was probably inserted into the phrase “the wound of my people” in order to harmonize the duplicate with its context;228 the identical construct chain (“the wound of the daughter of my people”) already stands in 8:21. While the shorter variant (“my people”) is much more common—occurring about thirty-eight times in Jeremiah alone—the longer variant (“daughter of my people”) appears to have been an alternative way to refer to Yhwh’s people (and found in Jer 4:11; 6:26; 8:19, 22, 23; 9:6). This synonymous alternative enabled the duplicating scribe to harmonize the text of the doublet with its secondary context.

---


226 McKane, *Jeremiah 1*, 146–7, understands the reading (συνετελέσαντο ἄνοα “carried out lawless deeds”) in G to be a generalization of the more specific sin of being “greedy for gain” in M.

227 E.g. Jer 2:8, 26; 4:9; 8:1; 13:13; 18:18; 26:7, 8, 11, 16; 29:1; 32:32. Prophet is listed before priest (in both M and G) only twice in 5:31; 23:34.

Scribal error or synonymous translation: “there is no peace” (6:14 M, 8:11 M) possibly misread as οὐκ ἔστιν εἰρήνη “where is peace” (6:14 G) – we encounter the original phrase in Jer 12:12 and 30:5, both of which are translated as οὐκ ἔστιν εἰρήνη. Alternatively, the reading in G may simply be a synonymous representation of the Hebrew in Greek rhetorical style.

Uncertain: the Greek in 6:15 seems to be translating a different and perhaps shorter Hebrew text (by one word) than the text shared by both doublet twins in M, unless of course the translation simply reflects a scribal error. If the shorter reading is more original, the agreement in M between 6:15 and 8:12 at this point would be due to PDHarm.

Synonymous translation: “Yet, they were not ashamed at all” (6:15 M; 8:12 M) / καὶ οὐδὲν κατασχύνο ἐνοι κατασχύνοντο “but they were not ashamed like those who are ashamed” (6:15 G) – the translator offers a more or less synonymous take on this somewhat odd construction of an intensifying inf. absolute.

Non-significant variant (different conjunction)

Minor synonymous variation (change in verbal form), or simply non-significant variant (orthography; insertion of mater): in 6:15 M the verb is vocalized as a hiph. inf. const. “disgrace” / in 8:12 M, as a niph. inf. const. “disgrace” – the reading in 6:15 G, αὐτῶν “disgrace,” is an apt translation of either. Apart from the Masoretic pointing, the consonants of both readings in M could be vocalized as either a hiph. or niph. inf. const.

Possibly minor synonymous variation (+/– pronoun) and PDHarm: 6:15 G includes the pronoun αὐτῶν “their [disgrace]” in the sentence “they do not know their disgrace” / the pronoun is not found in 6:15 M or 8:12 M (cf. +/- pronoun in a...a above and b...b below). The 3mp pronoun represented by 6:15 G may be original and may have

---

229 Holladay, Jeremiah 1, 211; Carroll, Jeremiah, 197; Parke-Taylor, The Formation of the Book of Jeremiah, 94.

230 The fragmented text of 4QJer at 8:12 may indicate a reading closer to that of G; disregarding the superscript correction, this scroll, at the very least, presents a text that is shorter than M by one word just like G: 4QJer originally stood as ... [ ...] and was only later corrected to ... [ ...].

231 For a discussion of different constructions of the intensifying inf. absolute, see: Bruce K. Waltke, An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 584–88.

232 Holladay, Jeremiah 1, 211, corrects the hiph. in 6:15 to a niph. like 8:12, arguing that the hiph., meaning “to humiliate,” does not make sense in this context. HALOT 2.480 advises reading a niph. in 6:15 as in 8:12; cf. McKane, Jeremiah 1, 147; Parke-Taylor, The Formation of the Book of Jeremiah, 95.
been inadvertently omitted in the creation of 8:12 M, in which case 6:15 M could reflect harmonization; or the pronoun could be a post-duplication insertion in V. The presence or absence of the pronoun does not significantly affect the sentence’s meaning.

Minor synonymous variation (+/- pronoun / revocalization): “those who fall” (6:15 M, 8:12 M) / πτώσει ἄπων “their falling” (= ) (6:15 G); cf. Jer 49:21 where this same Greek phrase translates – G likely witnesses to the original consonants, (unless scribal error is at play), which could be vocalized with G as a noun + pronoun or with 6:15 M and 8:12 M as a plur. ptc. by the insertion of a yod. The agreement of 6:15 and 8:12 in M thus probably reflects PDHarm. The difference in meaning created by this change is negligible.

Non-significant variant (post-duplication insertion of mater): “I will visit (i.e., punish) them” (6:15 M) / ἐπισκόπῃ ἄπων “their visitation” (6:15 G) – the consonants of 8:12 M, , may be vocalize as a verb like 6:15 M ( ) or as a noun in agreement with 6:15 G and with the Masoretic vocalization in 8:12 ( ). Originally, 6:15 probably read , which was copied exactly in 8:12, but interpreted as a noun + pronoun by G. The mater in 6:15 M was then added after the moment of duplication. Cf. the consistent presence of matres in 6:13-15 M vis-à-vis 8:10b-12 M:

6:13 // 8:10b // 6:15 // 8:12; 6:15 // 8:12; and,
6:15 // 8:12 (see j above).

In contrast, Holladay, Jeremiah 1, 211, deems to be the lectio difficilior and thus takes it as the original reading of 6:15.

Janzen, Studies in the Text of Jeremiah, 95, notes that this is the only time parallel passages in Jeremiah displays a consistent differing orthographic pattern.
4.2.1.3 Duplication Technique

TABLE 4.6
TRANSLATION OF JER 6:13-15 // JER 8:10B-12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jer 6:13-15</th>
<th>Jer 8:10b-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 For from their least and to their greatest, all are greedy for unjust gain. From priest and to prophet, all deal falsely.</td>
<td>10b For from the least and to the greatest, all are greedy for unjust gain. From prophet and to priest, all deal falsely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 And they have healed the wound of my people as if it were a small matter, saying, “Peace, Peace,” but there is no peace.</td>
<td>11 They have healed the wound of the daughter of my people as if it were a small matter, saying, “Peace, Peace,” but there is no peace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 They acted shamefully, for they committed an abomination. Yet, they were not ashamed at all. They do not even know (their [disgrace]) how to be disgraced. Therefore, they will fall in their falling. In the time I visit them they will stumble, says Yhwh.</td>
<td>12 They acted shamefully, for they committed an abomination. Yet, they were not ashamed at all. And, they do not know how to be disgraced. Therefore, they will fall among the fallen. In the time I visit them they will stumble, says Yhwh.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The duplicate found in 8:10b-12 is not a verbatim repetition of 6:13-15 but displays some synonymity including between four and six occasions of minor synonymous variation (underlined with a dotted line) and one synonymous intra-textual addition (underlined with a dashed line). There are no instances of scribal innovation. We can count as many as six possible occasions of post-duplication harmonization. On the basis of this analysis, we classify this doublet as an example of loose citation.
4.2.1.4 Rationale for Duplication

Scholars have offered various assessments of the fittingness of the doublet in its secondary context from describing it as “more intrusive” in chap. 8 than chap. 6\(^{235}\) to appreciating it as “an excellent redactional fit.”\(^{236}\) From our perspective, the doublet’s text complements chap. 8 in several ways, which may help explain why the text was duplicated and inserted there in the first place.

The text of the doublet was probably added into chap. 8 on the basis of pre-existing similarities between this chapter and chap. 6.\(^{237}\) As discussed above, in both chapters each twin follows a very similar pronouncement of judgment that probably “triggered” the duplication.\(^ {238}\) Moreover, preceding each doublet twin we find a statement concerning the rejection of the divine word:\(^ {239}\) Jer 6:10 states,

, “Look! The word of Yhwh is to them an object of scorn.

They take no delight in it;” in the same vein, Jer 8:9 tells, , “Look!

They reject the word of Yhwh.” The similarity of chap. 8 to chap. 6 probably invited a scribe to copy the verses from the latter and insert them into the former.

\(^{235}\) Park-Taylor, *The Formation of the Book of Jeremiah*, 97; note that Holladay, *Jeremiah 1*, 283, simply disregards Jer 8:10b-12 from his comments on the basis of its “secondary” character.


\(^{238}\) Allen, ibid., 110. However, McKane, *Jeremiah 1*, 146–47, 187, and Carroll, *Jeremiah*, 197, include these verses (6:12 and 8:10a) as part of the doublet, rather than as the trigger for the duplication.

\(^{239}\) Carroll, ibid., 198.
4.2.1.5 The Duplicate’s Divinatory Function

Once inserted into chap. 8, the doublet’s text plays an exegetical divinatory function—impacting the meaning of this chapter via vertical reading. In at least five ways, the doublet echoes or interprets details from the beginning of chap. 8.240

(1) In 8:4 Yhwh asks “when they fall, do they not get up again?” In this statement, the image of falling signifies a temporary condition. With the doublet, however, the image of falling indicates something permanent: those who fall will be counted among the slain (נפלים) in battle (v. 12);241 read in this light, the fallen of v. 4 take on a more morbid light and are linked to corpses mentioned later in v. 23 (Eng. 9:1) (חָלָל).

(2) Verse 6 expounds the universality of guilt: “there is not one who repents;” this universality is reemphasized by the opening words of the doublet in v. 10 condemning all from the least to the greatest, from prophet to priest. (3) Chapter 8 holds the people accountable for deceit (תרמית) in v. 5, and the sopherim (scribes) for their lying pen (עט שׁקר) in v. 8; yet, the nature of this falsehood is left unspecified. The text of the doublet provides some specificity; after reiterating that the people have acted with deceit (v. 10)—“everyone practices falsehood”—the doublet’s text offers two examples of deceitful action: first, the people have papered over a serious fracture (שֶׁבֶר), pretending that it has been healed, and claiming that there is peace, when in fact the opposite is true (v. 11); second, when they should be ashamed (בושׁ) of their behavior,

240 The following observations are noted in part by Allen, Jeremiah, 110.

241 For “slain” as a translation of נפלים, see: Holladay, Jeremiah I, 217.
they act as if nothing has happened (v. 12). (4) L. Allen also detects an echo of vv. 8-9 in the doublet’s indictment of priest and prophet (v. 10); v. 8 addresses the “torah [teaching] of Yhwh”—which Allen argues is the domain of the priests (perhaps at least at the time of duplication)—and v. 9, the “the word of Yhwh”—which is the concern of the prophets. (5) Finally, in Jer+ theh shame is limited to “the wise” (8:9); with the insertion of the doublet in V, shame is broadened to encompass the people as a whole (v. 12). In short, through vertical reading, the text of the doublet in chap. 8 serves to intensify a few points made earlier in the chapter: the universality of guilt—especially that of the prophet and priest—and the problem of falsehood.

Furthermore, the doublet also reimagines what is meant by “falling,” provides specific examples of the deceit practiced by the people, and widens the category of those deserving of shame.

Since the text of the duplicate does not contain innovations or (with the exception of the addition of “daughter;” see below) significant synonymity, we cannot verify if the duplicating scribe intended this divinatory function—echoing and interpreting its secondary context. Yet, as our analysis of Jeremiah’s doublets as a whole will show, the use of vertical reading by duplicating scribes is widespread. Moreover among the various examples of vertical reading found in those doublets as a whole, we encounter the same kinds of interpretive moves at those detected here: echoes, reinterpretations, and specifications of details found in each doublet’s secondary context. It would not be unreasonable, then, to consider that the occasions of vertical reading suggested here may have been intended by the duplicating scribe.
In addition to this exegetical divinatory function, the present duplicate also serves to introduce two themes—the lack of healing and the absence of peace (Jer 6:14 // 8:11)—which like chords of a rope are intertwined throughout the remainder of the chapter. After the duplicate in v. 14, we hear of the people seeking protection in “fortified cities”—a sure sign of the absence of peace—and of “poisonous water”—a cause for failing health. The following verse, v. 15, explicitly mentions these two themes explicitly: “[We] waited for peace, but there was nothing good; for a time of healing, but look! Terror!”

The absence of peace is further echoed in v. 16, which describes the sound of warhorses, and perhaps in v. 20, which alludes to the unexpected and unfortunate continuation of conflict even after the harvest season, when warring kings typically return home. The need for healing is flagged in v. 17 through the image of snake bites, in v. 18, which describes the prophet’s heart as being sick (דוי), and in v. 21, which mentions the “wound of the daughter of my people”—language repeated within the doublet itself (v. 11). Finally, v. 22 completes this section lamenting the continuing sickness of the people in spite of the availability of balm (צֳרִי) and of a healer (רֹפֵא). In sum, in its secondary context, the doublet serves another divinatory purpose introducing two themes that dominate the remainder of the chapter.

It is probable that the duplicating scribe was aware of the doublet’s capacity for accomplishing this second function—a capacity that may have in part motivated the creation of the duplicate in the first place. For, as noted in the textual analysis above, the scribe harmonized the reference in the doublet’s text to “the wound of my people” (6:14
// 8:11) toward a similar reference in 8:21 (“the wound of the daughter of my people”) adding from that verse the word “daughter.” This harmonization, if intentional, could indicate that the scribe appreciated the thematic connections between the doublet’s text and the remainder of chap. 8. 242

4.2.2 Text #2: “Your Wealth and Treasure I Give as Plunder” (Jer 15:(12)13-14 // Jer 17:(1-3a)3b-4)

4.2.2.1 Preliminary Considerations

The doublet of 15:(12)13-14 // 17:(1-3a)3b-4 is one of the more complicated doublets, and for this reason the following considerations are more extensive than usual. Moreover, any conclusions reached herein must remain tentative. Several interrelated factors complicate our efforts to analyze the doublet. First, the doublet twin of 17:(1-3a)3b-4 is missing in G, which suggests that a scribe created this doublet only after $V^M$ separated from $V^G$. However, this twin may have simply been lost through scribal sight error; i.e., via parablepsis from (the final word of 16:21) to (in the opening formula of 17:5a, the last word absent in G). 243 On the other hand, some observations (relayed below) may point away from the likelihood of haplography.

Related to this question is the issue of the delimitation of the doublet. It is not entirely clear where the doublet begins. Verses 3b-4 of chap. 17 are very similar to

242 Note the unusual orthography in 8:15 of “(healing”), which could explain the atypical spelling of the same root in v 11— for ; the duplicating scribe may have followed the quiescent spelling of the root found in 8:15 rather than preserving the orthography of the doublet’s text.

15:13-14, while 17:1-3a have little in common with 15:12. Thus, many are content to
limit the doublet to 15:13-14 // 17:3b-4. Others, however, find the minimal links between
17:1-3a and 15:12 to be sufficient for including these verses as a part of the doublet.
Importantly, one’s assessment of this issue shapes one’s conclusions on the question of
the possibility of haplography:

a) If 17:1-3a and 15:12 are considered constituent of the doublet, the possibility that
the minus of this doublet in G marks an occasion of parablepsis seems slightly
less likely, since, in this case, the text eliminated on accident would coincidentally
 correspond perfectly with the text of a lengthy doublet.

b) Conversely, if 17:1-3a and 15:12 are not assumed to be part of the doublet, the
likelihood of parablepsis seems slightly more likely, since the missing text would
not appear to target the text of a doublet in particular; the elimination of the
doublet would be an accident of the larger unintended deletion of several lines of
text that happened to contain the doublet.

Another factor may turn some away from accepting the possibility of
haplography. Perhaps significantly, the minus in G includes the opening formula of 17:5,

“Thus says Yhwh,” which follows the doublet’s text in M. Supposing for
the moment that 17:1-4 is an addition to VM, we would not be surprised to find that the
responsible scribe added this formula after his or her insertion to mark the end of this
insertion and the resumption of the received text. After all, one characteristic of VM is the
proliferation of such divine speech formula. The same (or a similar) formula is added to
VM at least another ten times.244 Thus, the presence of this formula at the beginning of
17:5 may reflect the expansive nature of VM. If so this formula may indicate that 17:1-4

244 11:22; 13.12; 18.11; 22:30; 29:25; 31:37; 35:19; possibly also 23:16; three more instances are
found in the large addition to VM, 33:14-26, namely 33:17, 20, 25; cf. Janzen, Studies in the Text of
Jeremiah, 84–85.
is an addition. In any case, resolving the question of haplography does not determine a more pressing issue, namely which doublet twin is original.

The large majority of researchers consider the twin of chap. 15 to be the duplicate and that of chap. 17 to be the original. Primary appeals are made to the supposed disjunctive nature of the doublet’s text within chap. 15 and its better fit in chap. 17. In this section, I will cautiously go against the grain of scholarship and propose that the twin of 15:(12)13-14 is the original. For apart from the purported tension of the doublet within chap. 15, little points away from the possibility that the doublet originated in chap. 15 and was carried over to chap. 17 secondarily. For this reason we will offer here a reevaluation of the coherence of the doublet within chap. 15.

The text of the doublet consists of divine speech announcing the despoiling and punishment of Judah. In chap. 15, this announcement appears to have been dropped abruptly into the middle of one of Jeremiah’s confessions, vv. 10-18. Verses 10, 15-18 (and possibly v. 11) express the lamenting complaints of the prophet that are seemingly interrupted by Yhwh’s announcement, an announcement that pays no regard to the prophet’s lamentation in v. 10. For this reason, many have thought the text of the announcement, i.e. the text of our doublet, was inserted in chap. 15 by mistake.

Before one is able to evaluate this perception of the doublet’s disjunction in chap. 15, one must deal with vv. 11 and 12, verses which come between Jeremiah’s confession.

---

and Yhwh’s announcement. These verses are notoriously difficult to interpret. Each contains a plethora of textual difficulties and significant variant readings. We will examine each verse in brief. The following examination will also be relevant for later discussions of the doublet’s rationale and function.

4.2.2.1.1 Preliminary Analysis of 15:11

Let us begin with a synopsis of the text of 15:11 in G and M:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15:11 M</th>
<th>15:11 G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>אמר יהוה</td>
<td>γένοιτο δέσποτα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אם־לא שותך</td>
<td>κατευθυνόντων αὐτῶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אם־לוא הפגעתי בך</td>
<td>εἰ ἡ παρέστην σοι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בעת־רעה ובעת־צרה</td>
<td>ἐν καιρῷ τῶν κακῶν αὐτῶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>את־האיב</td>
<td>καὶ ἐν καιρῷ θλίψεων αὐτῶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>εἰ ἀγαθὰ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>πρὸ τὸν ἐχθρόν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Verse 11 consists of a double oath, both of which are introduced by “if not.” The first interpretive puzzle is to determine whether these oaths are spoken by the prophet or by Yhwh. Note that the verse begins with a significant variant: where M reads “Yhwh said,” G shows γένοιτο δέσποτα = “May it be, O Yhwh.”

Given the strong graphical similarity of resh and nun in ancient Hebrew scripts, scribal
error likely accounts for the variation. Whichever reading one accepts significantly affects how one understands the remainder of the verse. If the reader follows G, v. 11 stands as a continuation of Jeremiah’s confession begun in v. 10. Alternatively, taking M as original marks v. 11 as divine speech divine speech.

While the reading of M has its defenders, the reading of G makes the most sense grammatically and is followed by the majority. Several kinds of evidence favor the latter. First, introducing an oath with the word “amen,” though uncommon, is not unheard of (cf. Jer 28.6; 1 Kgs 1.36). Second and conversely, the reading of M is highly irregular. The opening formula , as an introduction to divine speech, is

---

246 In contrast, Pierre Maurice Bogaert, “Jérémie 17,1-4 TM, oracle contre ou sur Juda propre au texte long, annoncé en 11,7-8.13 TM et en 15,12-14 TM,” in La double transmission du texte biblique: Études d'histoire du texte offertes en hommage à Adrian Schenker, eds. Y. Goldman and C. Uehlinger, OBO 179 (Fribourg: Editions universitaires Fribourg Suisse, 2001), 62, suggests that a reviser deliberately changed the reading attested in G to that of M.


248 So, most commentators; e.g., Bright, A Prophet’s Lament and its Answer, 62–63; O’Connor, The Confessions of Jeremiah, 27, 29; Carroll, Jeremiah, 324.

249 Henning Graf Reventlow, Liturgie und prophetisches Ich bei Jeremia (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1963), 211; Hubmann, Untersuchungen zu den Konfessionen, 206; Holladay, Jeremiah 1, 466; McKane, Jeremiah 1, 348; Parke-Taylor, The Formation of the Book of Jeremiah, 28.

250 See previous note.

never used again anywhere in Jeremiah or in the entire prophetic corpus.\footnote{Cf. Holladay, *Jeremiah 1*, 446. A longer version of the phrase stands at the beginning of Jer 46:25 (Yhwh of hosts, the God of Israel, says”). Note that this longer phrase is entirely an addition of V. By way of contrast, the phrase “Thus says Yhwh” introduces divine discourse over one hundred fifty times in Jeremiah alone. Holladay’s reasons (ibid.) for preserving the formula of 15:11 M are not convincing.}{252} This absence suggest that the reading in G, while uncommon, is the original reading.

Third, the remainder of v. 11 makes sense as a continuation of Jeremiah’s voice and not as divine speech. The remainder of v. 11, however, is not easily interpreted. Both of the verse’s oaths begin with a verb whose meaning is contested— and Since these verbs are in parallel, deciding the meaning of one partially fixes the meaning of the other. We will consider both verbs in turn.

Traditionally, the enigmatic word was taken as a contracted form of “your remnant”—a reading found in some manuscripts.\footnote{Holladay, *Jeremiah 1*, 446. This reading is followed by Parke-Taylor, *The Formation of the Book of Jeremiah*, 26–27, esp. n. 61.}{253} The qere’ (and some manuscripts) suggests the reading “I have freed you” (piel perf. from “to free”); the genitive absolute in G, κατευθυνόντων αὐτῶν “in their prosperity”\footnote{Cf. translation of NETS and of Georg Walser, *Jeremiah: A Commentary Based on Ieremias in Codex Vaticanus* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 73–75.}{254} (≈ מישׁרם?), assumes a Hebrew text containing a derivative of the root “to be straight, to be upright.”\footnote{Alternatively, the translator could be (mistakenly?) reading the root “to pronounce happy, call blessed;” see, Hubmann, *Untersuchungen zu den Konfessionen*, 206. The confusion of this word is also compounded by the fact that G lacks an equivalent to the first occurrence of the words “if not” which—in their second occurrence—is faithfully represented in the second half of the verse as εἰ η “if”}{255} None of these readings, however, is particularly satisfying; and scholars have suggested a host of other emendations and readings.\footnote{256}
Before we can decipher the meaning of the first oath, we must consider the second, which reads (put woodenly: “If I have not entreated you / cause you to meet (?) with the enemy in the time of evil and in the time of distress”) (15:11b). Diamond suggests that the key to unlocking the meaning of this second oath is to determine whether the word here has a positive or negative connotation. While most assume that the hiph. of has a positive tone, Diamond (following Hubman) suggests otherwise. He points out that the nearest grammatical parallel to this verbal construction (hiph. + … + …) is found in Isa 53:6b where Yhwh “lays” “on him” [his servant] “the iniquity” of Yhwh’s people. On analogy to Isa 53:6b, Jer 15:11b could be translated “I will lay on you the enemy.” Though it is not immediately clear what it would mean to lay the enemy on someone, Diamond believes that this action has a definite negative connotation. He then

not” (all three are underlined in the table 4.7) (cf. the translations in G of 31:27; 49:5). This minus along with the uncertainty of the opening words of the verse and of the word, as well as the transposition of = εἰ ἄγαθα “for good,” (both of which are placed in a dashed box in the synopsis) could suggest that one or both versions of v. 11 have experienced some corruption.


Diamond, The Confessions of Jeremiah in Context, 59–60. By positive, Diamond seems to mean something that benefits the receiver of the action—such as “interceding.” By implication, a negative action would be malevolent. This analysis is complicated by the presence of the phrase “for good,” which suggests that whatever the actions of this verse (whether positive or negative) are intended to bring about good. Diamond, ibid., 226, n. 75, rightly points out that such good intentions do not automatically rule out verbs with negative connotations.


suggests that the *hiph.* of *פגע* in Jer 15:11 has the same sense as the *qal* of *פגע*—thus meaning “to meet,” “encounter,” “to touch”—and translates v. 11b, “…I have inflicted you with the enemy.” This reading, Diamond proposes, makes sense as divine speech in which Yhwh responds to the prophet’s complaint in v.10 that he is cursed by his own people. With these words, the deity explains to Jeremiah that his suffering at the hands of his countrymen “accords with the divine will and purpose” and will work out “for good.”

There are three main problems with this interpretation of v. 11. First, this interpretation assumes that the word enemy (*איב*) in v. 11 refers to Jeremiah’s personal opponents. The word *איב*, however, everywhere else in Jeremiah refers to a foreign enemy only, usually Babylon. Thus, it is unlikely that 15:11 is referring to Jeremiah’s countrymen.

Second, in the remainder of the book of Jeremiah, *פגע* always refers to the intercession of a subordinate to an overseer. Twice, the verb describes the intercession of the prophets with Yhwh (7:16; 27:18). In a third place, the word expresses the

---

260 Diamond, *The Confessions of Jeremiah in Context*, 52 (emphasis mine); cf. Hubmann, *Untersuchungen zu den Konfessionen*, 207–8. As for the consonants *שׁרותך*, Diamond, ibid., 60, proposes the unlikely reading “I have set you at odds” (an irregular *piel* of an unattested root “to make an enemy, to set at odds”). He admits that as a geminate root, would come as a *po’el* (*שֹׁרֵרִיך*), and thus his reconstruction would be unexpected. Moreover, Holladay, *Jeremiah 1*, 446, argues that this root would mean “to defame.”


262 The meaning of *איב* in 15:14 is debated, but its meaning is bound up with one’s interpretation of the word in 15:11.
intercession of certain royal officers with king Jehoiakim, urging the king not to burn a scroll (36:25).

Third, Diamond’s translation of the hiph. of củ in Jer 15:11 does not do justice to the sense of củ in Isa 53:6b. In Isa 53:6b, and within the broader context of Isaiah 53, the servant of Yhwh is not merely inflicted with the people’s iniquity, but is made a sin offering (אשׁם) for the people (53:11)—becoming one who suffers the consequences of the people’s iniquity in their stead.²⁶³ When the hiph. of củ is employed a few verses later in Isa 53:12, it stands in parallel with forgiving the sins of the many (הוא חטא־רבים נשׂא).²⁶⁴ We could say that the servant is burdened, or even inflicted, with the people sins, but only if we add that this burdening of the servant has some kind of atoning function.

In light of this wider context, Isa 53:6b should be understood as stating that Yhwh has

²⁶³ Some scholars, aiming to avoid the traditional Christological interpretation of the suffering servant songs of Deutro-Isaiah, deny the servant the role of vicarious suffering; cf. discussion in Brevard S. Childs, Isaiah, 1st ed., OTL (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), 420–23. Yet, one does not have to read Isaiah 53 with a specifically Christian lens to acknowledge the vicariousness of the servant’s suffering. Consider the wider context of chap. 53: in v. 5 the servant grotesquely suffers the punishment of the people’s sins; that is, the servant receives the chastisement that secures the people’s peace: מוסר שׁלומנו עליו. The same thought is resumed in vv. 10-12: in v. 10, the servant is explicitly said to be made a “guilt offering” (אשׁם); in v. 11, the servant, while carrying the iniquity (עונתם) of the many (רבים), justifies (יצדיק) them, or perhaps justifies the righteous one for them—depending upon the identity of the just one (צדיק); and again in v. 12, the servant carries away (i.e. forgives) the sins of the many (חטא־רבים נשׂא). The vicarious role of the servant in Isaiah 53 is accepted by many, e.g.: John L. McKenzie, Second Isaiah, AB 20 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1968), 133–36; John J. Collins, Isaiah, Collegeville Bible Commentary Old Testament 13 (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1986), 115–16; Shalom M. Paul, Isaiah 40-66: Translation and Commentary, Eerdmans Critical Commentary (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2012), 406; John Goldingay, The Theology of the Book of Isaiah (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2014), 70–72; John Goldingay, The Message of Isaiah 40-55: A Literary-Theological Commentary (London: New York: T&T Clark, 2005), 488; though Goldingay, ibid., 504–5, suggests the verb צפה in 53:6 implies more than sharing in the suffering of others, but also suffering at their hands. He translates the verse “Yhwh let hit/fall” on him the wrong doing of all of us. However, Goldingay does not provide any substantial evidence for his interpretation, but only points out that the preposition ב is used instead of על.²⁶⁴ Cf. also the hiph. of củ in Isa 59:16.
caused the servant to be an agent of mediation (or intercession) to deal with the people’s iniquity.\textsuperscript{265}

In sum, in Jer 15:11 does not refer to Yhwh’s infliction of Jeremiah with the adversity of his countrymen. Instead, it likely alludes to the prophetic ministry of intercession, a ministry highlighted numerous times in Jeremiah.\textsuperscript{266} In this case, v. 11 is a continuation of Jeremiah’s confession in v. 10.

Once we determine that in Jer 15:11 refers to prophetic intercession and that v. 11 is spoken by Jeremiah, interpreting the parallel verb becomes much simpler. Of the various proposals suggested by scholars, one candidate seems the most plausible: many emend the word so that it reads as הָעָצָמָהוּ “I have served you [for good]” (piel of \textit{שׁרת}).\textsuperscript{267} This reading presents a picture of Jeremiah as a servant of Yhwh, a

\textsuperscript{265} Note that by this understanding the direct object marker in Isa 53:6b more precisely marks the issue which the intercession addresses. We could translate Isa 53:6b as “Yhwh caused him [his servant] to be a mediation regarding the iniquity of us all.” Applied to Jer 15:11, the enemies of this verse—who are marked by —are not simply an infliction, but the pressing issue addressed by the intercession of this verse. While in Isa 53:6b the preposition used with marks the agent of intercession—the one caused to make intercession—in Jeremiah, this preposition combined with always indicates the one to whom intercession is made (Jer 7:16; 27:18; 36:25). In all three cases, the verb may be a hiph., though in 7:16 M and 27:18 M the verb is pointed as a qal ( and respectively). In both cases the verb could be repointed as a hiph. with a defective hireq yod. Thus in Jer 15:11, while the preposition may signal the one making intercession, it likely designates the one to whom intercession is made. The verse could be taken in two different ways: (less likely) I, Yhwh, have made you, Jeremiah, an agent of intercession to deal with the enemy; or (more likely), I, Jeremiah, have interceded with you, Yhwh, to deal with the enemy. Either way, pace Diamond and Hubman, it is too simplistic to state that the verb in Jer 15:11 carries a negative connotation only, since the burdening of either Jeremiah or Yhwh with the enemy has the positive effect of dealing with the enemy.

\textsuperscript{266} Cf. 27:18; the prophet’s role as intercessor is assumed by the command to Jeremiah not to intercede \textit{[ ]} in 7:16; cf. 11.14; 14:11; 18:20.

picture which coheres with the portrayal of Yhwh’s prophets elsewhere in the book as divine servants. Moreover, it makes a strong parallel with the understanding of articulated above—making intercession. Together these verbs convey the prophet Jeremiah’s vocation as an intermediary. As O’Connor articulates, “The language of these verses [15:10-11], therefore portrays Jeremiah as a faithful prophet who intercedes for his people on the day of judgment.”

It is also revealing to note that the picture of the prophet as intercessor—suggested by our interpretation of 15:11—coheres with the imagery of the beginning of chap. 15 in which Yhwh rejects the intercession of Moses and Samuel—figures named for their status as paragons of faithful prophets and intercessors (15.1). Prior to this reference (at the close of chap. 14), the people of Judah come to Yhwh, confess their sins, and ask for relief from their suffering and punishment (14:19-22). In 14:21, they even make direct appeal to the covenant. The opening words of chap. 15 serve as Yhwh’s response to their confession and appeal: Yhwh asserts that he will reject all such appeals, even discounting the intercession of the two greatest covenant mediators. Such rejection calls into question the efficacy and legitimacy of the prophetic vocation of intercession. If Yhwh rejects the mediation of Moses and Samuel, how much more will Yhwh refuse the prayers of Jeremiah? Interpreting 15:11 as a continuation of Jeremiah’s

269 O’Conner, The Confessions of Jeremiah, 34.
270 The intercession of Moses is featured, for example, in Exod 32:11-13; Num 14:13-19, and that of Samuel in 1 Sam 7:5, 8-9; 12:19, 23.
271 Cf. Allen, Jeremiah, 175.
confession in which he recounts his own ministry of intercession (and implicitly his failure as an intercessor) makes a convincing fit within this wider context. The rejection of the prayers of Moses and Samuel anticipates and heightens the consternation of Jeremiah’s appeal to his own mediation in 15:11, if indeed this verse is intended to be read as discourse of the prophet.

All things considered, we would tentatively suggest that v. 11 makes the most sense as a continuation of Jeremiah’s confession of v. 10 and as the prophet’s recounting of his role as intercessor for the people. This conclusion makes the most sense of the various interpretive puzzles presented by v. 11, grammatical and contextual. As explained below, it solidifies the perception that the doublet’s text interrupts the speech of the prophet. Before considering this implication, we must briefly examine the text of the following verse.

4.2.2.1.2 Preliminary Analysis of 15:12

Verse 12 comes with its own interpretive difficulties. Like the preceding verse, the text of v. 12 survives in two notably dissimilar forms. Consider the following synopsis:
TABLE 4.8
SYNOPSIS OF JER 15:14 M AND JER 15:12 G

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jer 15:12 M</th>
<th>Jer 15:12 G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>εἰ γνωσθήσεται σίδηρο</td>
<td>καὶ περιβόλαιον χαλκοῦν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The text of G reflects at least one scribal error and perhaps a second (see textual analysis below). Some consider the verse to be a corruption of 17:1. For those who find it meaningful, v. 12 seems contain a reference to one or two possible entities. Many see the mentioning of “iron” (ברזל) and/or “iron from the North” (ברזל מצפון) as a cipher for Babylon, the coming invaders from the north. Some others discern in the reference to bronze (נחשׁת)—or of a covering of bronze (περιβόλαιον χαλκοῦν), if one reads with G—an allusion to Yhwh’s protection of Jeremiah, perhaps in anticipation of the metaphorical fortification of the prophet portrayed in 15:20.

Of the two, the first interpretation seems the more certain. Throughout the book, the enemy from the North is described by means of a variety of creative metaphors.

---

272 Rudolph, *Jeremia*, 90, describes v. 12 as a Verstümmelung of 17:1; Bright, *Jeremiah*, 109–10, is open to this possibility.


274 In 15:20, we read that Yhwh will make Jeremiah “to be a fortified wall of bronze.” This interpretation is followed by Holladay, *Jeremiah 1*, 454, and Diamond, *The Confessions of Jeremiah in Context*, 61.

1:14 a boiling pot facing away from the North
4:6 evil and great destruction from the North (cf. 6:1)
10:22 a great commotion from the North
46:10 a sacrifice in the North
46:20 a gadfly from the North
47:2 rising waters from the North
51:58 destroyers from the North

As O’Connor concludes, the image of ‘iron from the North’ in 15:12 “belongs with this list of metaphoric descriptions of the enemy.”277 Furthermore, Holladay notes a connection between this reference to iron and the iron bars ( meioth barzel ) and iron yoke ( aleh barzel ) of Jer 28:13-14 which symbolize Babylon’s enslavement of Judah.278

The second interpretation of v. 12, however, is more doubtful. While Yhwh’s defense of Jeremiah is described metaphorically as a bronze wall in 15:20 // 1:18—and as an iron pillar in a later gloss in 1:18 M279—elsewhere bronze, used in connection with iron, stands as a metaphor for the people’s stubbornness (6:28), and so a connection with Jeremiah is debatable. To its favor, this interpretation does cohere with the text of the confession. In v. 10, Jeremiah speaks of his opponents who curse him, and v. 15 mentions those who persecute him. A word guaranteeing the prophet’s protection—as

---

276 Minus in G.
278 Holladay, Jeremiah 1, 455. Cf. Deut 28:48, where enslavement to the enemy (cf. Jer 5:14) is described as being subjected to an iron yoke ( meioth barzel ). On analogy to this verse in Deuteronomy, we could conclude that Jer 15:12, which describes Babylon in terms of their capacity to enslave (iron from the north), is thematically linked to Jer 15:14, which explicates the enslavement.
279 Cf. discussion below in §4.3.1.
this interpretation proposes—fits this milieu, and anticipates the longer promise of protection in 15:20.  

On the other hand, this interpretation struggles to explain the remainder of v. 12. Diamond tries to resolve the tension of v. 12 by identifying both the “iron from the north” and the “bronze” as allusions to Jeremiah. This resolution, however, is wanting on two counts. First, decoding “iron from the north” as a reference to Jeremiah seems gratuitous in light of the extensive association of both “iron” and the “north” with Babylon. Second, the only other time Jeremiah is associated with iron in the book—the iron pillar of 1:18—is very likely a late gloss, as mentioned above. There is no reason then, to link the reference to iron in 15:12 to the figure of Jeremiah.

Perhaps a more convincing answer may be found by considering other references to bronze in the Book of Jeremiah. It seems plausible that the whole of 15:12 (and v. 13) is connected to the final chapter of Jeremiah where the enemy from the North (Babylon) both breaks into pieces the bronze pillars, stands, and basin of the temple (52:17), and also plunders all of the wealth and treasures of the temple (52:18). These two actions—

---


282 Ibid., 61, among others, notes that the phrase “from the North” might simply allude to the northern origins of iron in Asia Minor, and thus need only be taken as an image of strength; see: V. F. Winnett, “Iron,” *IDB*, 2.725; cf. Holladay, *Jeremiah 1*, 454. But, referencing iron only to allude to its strength would contradict the mentioning of bronze—if bronze and iron refer to the same entity, as Diamond supposes—which compared to even standard iron is fairly weak.

283 For her part, O’Connor, *The Confessions of Jeremiah*, 36, finds a solution in the proposal that the verse’s first *ברזל* refers to the people of Judah (including Jeremiah’s personal enemies), who can neither break the second *ברזל* (the iron from the North, i.e. Babylon) nor *נחשׁת*, that is Jeremiah. Yet, the identification of the first as the people of Judah is based solely on 6:28, where, as mentioned, Judah’s stubbornness is poeticized not as iron by itself but as iron and bronze together. Removing this keystone topples the unique contribution of this solution.
breaking bronze temple structures and plundering the wealth of the temple—correspond to 15:12 and 15:13 respectively. The first, 15:12, mentions the smashing of bronze structures, and the second, 15:13, describes the plundering of Judah’s treasures (which perhaps alludes to the plundering of the temple alongside the general despoiling of Judah). If this interpretation is correct, Jer 15:12 would be inextricably connected to v. 13—which is relevant for the following discussion.

Like many interpretations of 15:12, this last hypothesis might benefit from a reconstruction of the Hebrew text on the basis of G and M; but in our case the few emendations suggested here are fairly minor and hardly necessary. We propose the following emendations: following G, we delete the second occurrence of ברזל in M counting it as a product of dittography and omit the conjunction before “bronze.” The resulting text reads: “Will iron from the north break bronze?”—a question answered in the affirmative, albeit implicitly, by the following verse which announces the plundering of treasures and wealth (v. 13). Even without these suggested emendations, the text—as it stands in M—is still largely intelligible from this perspective: “Will iron, iron from the north, break also bronze?”

Without solving this question here, suffice it to state that regardless of how v. 12 is interpreted, the vast majority agree that in this verse it is the voice of Yhwh that is speaking. We must now return to the question of whether the text of doublet is disruptive

---

284 Discussed in the textual analysis below, the two other main variants of G probably arose through scribal error.

285 In contrast, Janzen, Studies in the Text of Jeremiah, 117, accounts for the minus of the second in G as a loss via haplography.
to chap. 15. Put more specifically, we must determine whether the placement of the doublet in chap. 15 is indicative of lateness or of extrinsic origins.

4.2.2.1.3 An Evaluation of the Coherence of the Doublet in Chap. 15

First, we must raise the caveat that the apparent disjunctive character of the chapter, alternating between divine speech and prophetic confession, may be nothing more than an example of the dialogical and polyphonic nature of the book as a whole. In the poetic sections of the book of Jeremiah, the speaking voice is constantly changing, oscillating between prophet, deity, and people. In chap. 15, Yhwh’s interruption of Jeremiah’s heartfelt confession may be a dialogical tension intended by the compiling scribes of the book. In other words, the perception that the text of the doublet disrupts the flow of the chapter does not necessarily indicate that the text is late or auxiliary.

Second, with this caveat in mind, we must consider what interpretive decisions are required to postulate the supposition that the doublet disrupts the continuity of chap. 15. Interpreters must answer two questions: 1) is v. 11 the speech of Yhwh or Jeremiah? and, 2) is v. 12 part of the doublet? If one determines that v. 11 is divine speech, then, the doublet—however it is delimited—could not be considered disruptive. For in this case, v. 11 on its own would already interrupt the flow of the confession, interjecting divine speech into the midst of the prophet’s discourse. The doublet—if it is indeed

secondary—would simply continue the interruption of v. 11, but itself would not be the disruptive element.

Alternatively, if v. 11 is deemed prophetic speech, and v. 12 is not considered innate to the doublet, then once again, the text of the doublet could not be described as disruptive. In this scenario, the divine speech of v. 12, apart from the doublet, would be the disruptive element, interrupting the flow of the text of the confession. This is to say, the argument that the doublet’s text in chap. 15 is disruptive (and therefore secondary to chap. 15) is only convincing if one concludes both that v. 11 is a continuation of Jeremiah’s lamentation in v. 10 and that v. 12 is constituent of the doublet. Thus we find unconvincing the arguments of those theorists who reject vv. 13-14 as disruptive but either assign v. 11 to Yhwh or consider v. 12 extrinsic to the doublet. Naturally, theories that do both lack cogency.

Third, we must challenge the perception that the text of the doublet lacks coherence with chap. 15—and thus is secondary therein. When seen from another angle, the text of the doublet fits extremely well within the larger context of chap. 15. In the first half of the chapter Yhwh voices his condemnation and punishment of his people. This punishment is expressed both as a future occurrence (vv. 2-5, 9b) and as a past event (6-9a). The text of the doublet, vv. (12)13-14, which describes Judah’s punishment in

---

287 In light of this logic, it is not surprising, then, to find that some who count v. 11 as a divine utterance also attribute the presence of the doublet in chap. 15 to intentional revision: e.g., Gerstenberger, Jeremiah’s Complaints, 394; Holladay, Jeremiah 1, 455; Diamond, The Confessions of Jeremiah in Context, 55–58, leans in this direction.

288 For an example of the former, cf. Carroll, Jeremiah, 327–28; for an example of the latter, see: Bright, “A Prophet’s Lament,” 61–62.

future terms, forms a thematic unity with Yhwh’s discourse in the first half of the chapter. Moreover, the forward-looking perspective of the doublet is anticipated by the return to future tense in v. 9b. In fact, the giving away (נתן) of Judah’s treasure and wealth by Yhwh in v. 13 is the logical extension of the giving away (נתן) of the people’s life to the edge of the sword in v. 9. Once dead, corpses are ripe for despoiling (בז). When seen in this light, it is not vv. (12)13-14 that are disruptive, but the opening lines of the confession, v. 10 (and v. 11) which interrupt the coherent sequence from v. 9 to vv. (12)13-14. If these verses, v. 10 (and v. 11), were removed or transposed to after v. 14, the chapter would run smoothly.290

Seen from this angle, it becomes difficult to argue that the location of the text of the doublet in chap. 15, reflects the intentional placement of a careful scribe. Surely, a half-attentive scribe would have inserted vv. 12(13)-14 into chap. 15 after v. 9, thus yielding a smooth text. There are those, however, who find the surprising placement of the doublet in chap. 15 to be meaningful. For example, Holladay understands the doublet (along with v.11, taken as divine speech) to be a thoughtful and fitting response to the lamenting words of v. 10 (and borrowed from 17:1-4).291 This assessment is linked to the conclusion that the substantial textual differences of 15:13-14 vis-à-vis 17:3b-4 are intentional revisional changes; i.e., modification of the doublet’s text that harmonize the doublet with its “secondary” context of chap. 15. These substantial textual difference are

290 Diamond, The Confessions of Jeremiah in Context, 54–64, solves the disjunction of these verses by dividing 15:10-21 into two separate units, each of which consists of a Jeremianic confession and of a divine response. In the first unit, the confession stretches for one verse only (v. 10), which is met by an answer from Yhwh in vv. 11-14. Verse 15 begins a second and independent confession.

291 Holladay, Jeremiah 1, 455–57; cf. Gerstenberger, Jeremiah’s Complaints, 394–96.
discussed in the textual analysis below. This study, however, does not find this conclusion convincing. Contra Holladay, the doublet twin of chap. 15, when compared to that of chap. 17, does not appear to contain variants that could be explained cogently as intentional modifications toward chap. 15. This observation militates against the assessment that the twin of chap. 15 was intentionally added secondarily to this chapter.

The opposite hypothesis, however, is remarkably cogent; namely that the variants of 17:3b-4 (in comparison with 15:13-14), are deliberate adaptations intended to harmonize the text of the doublet with the wider context of chaps. 16-17. The details of this hypothesis are discussed in the textual analysis below.

In the end, two solutions remain. Either the doublet is original to chap. 15—where it acquired its somewhat disruptive appearance as a byproduct of the chapter’s progressive development—and was intentionally modified to fit chap. 17. Or, the text of the doublet was mistakenly inserted into chap. 15 from chap. 17, and only coheres with the first half of the chapter coincidentally. That a sizable doublet of two verses would be mistakenly inserted in the wrong chapter requires several complicated steps and is thus the more difficult and unlikely proposal.\footnote{Cf. the often cited proposal of Janzen, \textit{Studies in the Text of Jeremiah}, 133. Janzen proposes two complicated stories for explaining the presence of the doublet in chap. 15 and its absence in chap. 17 of G. He supposes that the text of 15:12-14 either originated “as a marginal variant to 17:1-4” or as a marginal correction—aiming to restore a lacuna formed by the loss of 17:1-4 via haplography (an omission still attested in G)—which he conjectures was situated between these verses and chap. 15, and which at some point was wrongly inserted into chap. 15. Either way, he explains, M would represent a “conflation…of two manuscript traditions.” Certainly, one of these two suggestions could be correct. The first, however, requires a very incompetent scribe who would not recognize the relationship between the hypothetical marginal gloss and 17:1-4, and who would insert marginal notes into chapters seemingly at random. And the second suggestion requires the conflation of two distant manuscripts separated by at least two manuscript generations, and possibly three. Consider the manuscript stages required by this suggestion: (#1) an older manuscript, containing 17:1-4; (#2) a manuscript reflecting the accidental omission of 17:1-4; (#3) a manuscript containing a marginal correction (which may be the same manuscript as #2); (#4) a manuscript containing the incorrect insertion of the correction into chap. 15. Janzen’s
doubling and modification, reflects a well-attested scribal practice (as this study shows) and is much simpler.

4.2.2.1.4 Preliminary Conclusion and Summary

We cannot solve the question of the doublet’s origin with complete certainty. Yet, the evidence that we have points in one direction. As mentioned, the variants particular to the doublet twin of chap. 17 are easily explainable as modifications aimed to harmonize the doublet with the context of that chapter. Conversely, one has trouble explaining the variants unique to the twin of chap. 15 as intentional modifications. Moreover, the main argument for the secondary status of the twin of chap. 15 is the impression that the doublet does not fit into this chapter, but disrupts the progression of Jeremiah’s confession (vv. 10-18). This impression, however, is not substantiated by a reexamination of the context. The text of the doublet coheres extremely well with the content of Yhwh’s discourse in vv. 1-9 and—according to many scholarly analyses of the chapter—does not disrupt the confession. Such analyses either count v. 11 as divine speech or do not count v. 12 as part of the doublet; in either case, the confession is already interrupted by divine speech apart from the presence of the doublet.

conflating scribe had to have access to both manuscripts #1 and #4, out of which the scribe would produce a fifth manuscript containing both doublet twins. Moreover the scribe responsible for manuscript #4 would be as incompetent as the scribe necessitated by Janzen’s first suggestion. Both theories depend upon the assumption that the middle section of chap. 15 and the beginning section of chap. 17 were juxtaposed in parallel columns. While this suggestion is possible—given the existence of unusually wide-columned biblical scrolls such as 4QJer—a—on the basis of manuscript evidence from Qumran, columns of biblical scrolls are typically narrower, which would preclude this possibility. The two sections were more likely out of line or separated by a third column containing the bulk of chap 16. For a discussion of column width, see: Emanuel Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 78.
Finally, we must consider one more argument in favor of viewing the twin of chap. 17 as the duplicate. As detailed below, the twin of chap. 17 is more expansive than that of chap. 15. Compared with 15:13-14, 17:3b-4 contains a significant plus of six words. If one counts 15:12 and 17:1-3a as a part of the doublet, we may include another expansion of around twenty words. In contrast, the twin of chap. 15 contains no substantial expansions vis-à-vis that of chap. 17. According to our overall study of doublets, the duplicate is frequently the more expansive twin of the doublet (cf. 1:18-19 // 15:20; 6:22-24 // 50:41-43; 23:5-6 // 33:14-17). As the larger twin, the doublet twin of chap. 17 has the appearance of a duplicate.

In sum, it is most plausible to treat the twin of chap. 17 as the duplicate and that of chap. 15 the original. As noted above there is a good chance that the text of the doublet, 17:1-5a, was dropped accidentally via haplography. Yet, this possibility has no relevance in determining which doublet twin is original. Even if lost by haplography, the doublet of chap. 17 would still be considered the duplicate. The occurrence of haplography here would only indicate that the doublet is an early doublet, i.e. not part of the expansions of V*M, but constituent of the common text of Jer*H. In the following analysis we assume that the twin of chap. 17 is the duplicate and that the text of the doublet includes 15:12 // 17:1-3a.

293 See Table 6.3 in §6.1.3.
### TABLE 4.9

**THE DOUBLET OF JER 15:(12)13-14 // JER 17:(1-3A)3B-4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jer 15:12-14 G</th>
<th>Jer 15:12-14 M</th>
<th>Jer 17:1-4 M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 εἰ γνωσθήσεται</td>
<td>a 12</td>
<td>b 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b οἶδήρο b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c καὶ περιβόλαιον χαλκοῦν c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d...d</td>
<td>d...d</td>
<td>d 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 f καὶ τοῦ θησαυροῦ σου εἰ πρόνοι ἡν δῶσο δαντάλλαγ αδ</td>
<td>f e 13</td>
<td>f e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g διὰ πάσα τὰ ἡ ἀρτία σου</td>
<td>g g</td>
<td>g g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h h e f</td>
<td>h h e f</td>
<td>h h e f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f καὶ ἐν πάσι τοῖ ὀρίῳ σου</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i...i</td>
<td>i...i</td>
<td>i 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 καὶ ἵππας σου ἐθνὸς κάκλω τῷ ἐχθρῷ σου ἐν τῇ γῇ ἡ οὐκ ἤδει ὅτι πῦρ ἐκκέκαυται ἐκ τοῦ θυ υ ὁυ ν ἐφ ὑ ἰ καυθήσεται</td>
<td>k j j 14</td>
<td>k j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294 Cf. Gerstenberger, Jeremiah’s Complaints, 395, n. 9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Scribal error ( \( \rightarrow \) ): γνωσθήσεται “it is known” (from γινώσκω = “to know”) (15:12 G) / “it/he breaks” (from ῥαίρω, “to break”).

---

140
Minor innovation: the reference to "iron" in the original twin (Jer 15:12) provided an opportunist scribe an occasion for introducing a new image and theme, namely the image of Judah’s sins engraved with an iron stylus which introduces the theme of the indelibility of Judah’s sin, a theme emphasized by a few more modifications noted below (see c...c and d...d below). This innovation also replaces the reference to “iron from the north,” which probably refers to Babylon (see preliminary analysis above). The second occurrence of the word iron in M of 15:12, missing in G, may have been lost via haplography or doubled through dittography.

Minor innovation and (possible) scribal error: “from the north” (15:12 M) / περιβόλαιον “covering” (= “plating”) (15:12 G) / “point…” (17:1 M) – the reading in G of 15:12 “a covering of bronze” appears to reflect a scribal error or perhaps an intentional textual modification (in the Vg), anticipating Yhwh’s making Jeremiah to be a bronze wall in 15:20. The reading of M of 15:12 is likely original. The innovative addition created by the duplicating scribe is introduced with a wordplay on תצפרו, namely “with the point of a diamond,” which makes a parallel with בעט ברזל “with an iron stylus” (see b...b above). This addition continues the new theme of the indelibility of Judah’s sin introduced in the first part of 17:1. The innovation also replaces a reference to bronze which perhaps alludes to the temple structures destroyed by the Babylonians (see preliminary analysis above).

Minor innovation (in part, inter-textual): along with innovative additions of b...b and c...c, the scribe used the moment of duplication as an opportunity for inserting other fresh material into the beginning of chap. 17 (vv. 2-3a). In 17:2b, the phrase “upon green tree and upon high hills”—denoting the ubiquity of the people’s idolatry—is a synonymous variation of a traditional phrase ( “upon every high hill and under every green tree”) used elsewhere—with slight variation—in Jer (2:20; 3:6; cf. 3:13) and in DtrH (1 Kgs 14:23; 2 Kgs 16:4; 17:10; cf. Deut 12:2-3; 1 Chr 28:4; Ezek 6:13; 20:28). Given the minor variations in wording of the phrase in 17:2—the repetition of the preposition with tree instead of and the double omission of—the phrase was probably added here from memory. Importantly, the tree and hills of 17:2b are said to be occupied in 17:2a by (illicit) altars and Asherim. This specific description of illicit cult sites connects this addition more closely to the employment of this phrase in DtrH and D where it is also explicitly connected with idolatry. The phrase in chaps. 2 and 3 of Jeremiah refers to idolatry only implicitly, by means of a metaphor of adultery. The stronger connection with DtrH and D marks this phrase as an inter-textual borrowing (as opposed to intra-textual). The inclusion of references to altars and Asherim also harmonizes the doublet

295 Thus, Janzen, Studies in the Text of Jeremiah, 117.
conceptually with its secondary context which is devoted to idolatry (see discussion below). This addition ends in 17:3a with the difficult words "(my?) mountain in the field." Perhaps this line was intended as a parallel to "high hills," and should be emended to "mountains in the open country" (וְרֵעָיִם).  

**e** Minor synonymous variations (+/− “all”) – twice in 15:13 // 17:3

**f** Non-significant variations (+/− conjunction) – twice in 15:13

g---g Minor innovation (inter-textual): “without price” (15:13 M) / ἀντίλαλαγμα “as a payment” (= “price”) (15:13 G) / “your high places” (17:3 M) – the reading of 15:13 M, “without price,” simply reiterates the sense of the preceding accusative “as plunder.” From context, the giving away of wealth and treasure without price is an enactment of punishment. In spite of the omission of the negative particle, this sense of punishment is not lost in the variant reading in G, “as a payment.” The fact that G of 15:13 and M of 17:3 both lack the negative particle may suggest that it was added to M 15:13 after the moment of duplication. Most scholars eliminate the particle. Holladay’s attempt to see the reading of 15:13 M as an intentional adaptation of the reading found in 17:3 is unconvincing.  

As is the case with d...d, the replacement reading found in 17:3b, “for your high places,” harmonizes the verse conceptually with its surroundings (16:11-13, 18-20), which are focused on the theme of idolatry (see discussion below). The concern for

---

297 Holladay, Jeremiah 1, 483, finds the reading in M “impossible” (“O my mountain in the field”) and reads the phrase as “the mountain of strife is devastated.”

298 Cf. Allen, Jeremiah, 197 n. f.

299 See the translation of ἀλλαγμα in 1 Kgs 20:2; cf. 2 Sam 24:24 (ἀλλαγμα α’).


301 E.g., Gerstenberger, Jeremiah’s Complaints, 395; Leslie. C. Allen, “More Cuckoos in the Textual Nest: At 2 Kings xxiii. 5; Jeremiah xvii. 3, 4; Micah iii. 3; vi. 16 (LXX); 2 Chronicles xx. 25 (LXX),” JTS 24 (1973): 70; idem, Jeremiah, 179, O’Connor, The Confessions of Jeremiah, 30. The interpretation for this particle offered by Holladay, Jeremiah 1, 456, is not convincing; see discussion above.

302 Holladay, Jeremiah 1, 456, suggests that in 15:13 Yhwh responds to Jeremiah’s confession of v. 10 with the barely comforting words, “I will give your wealth (or perhaps ’strength’) and treasure [as plunder], but not for payment;” i.e., Jeremiah’s despoiling should not be counted as divine punishment, “recompense” for sin, but as something gratuitous. That such words could be thought an appropriate response to Jeremiah’s confession is far from persuasive.

303 Allen, “More Cuckoos in the Textual Nest,” 70–71, believes that 17:3 originally read “without price,” but received a suitable annotation “your high places” from the wider context; after the insertion of this annotation, however, the original reading was accidentally dropped. Allen points to Micah 1:5 as a parallel example where the same mistake occurs. Our interpretation can easily accommodate Allen’s
idolatry located specifically atop high places is distinct to D and DtrH (see below), and with d...d and h...h brings this section of Jeremiah into an inter-textual relationship with the Deuteronomistic tradition. Moreover, like the innovation of i...i below, this replacement seems to interpret its context, specifying that the “wealth and treasure” plundered in this verse includes Judah’s high places, or perhaps the treasure of those high places.

**Minor synonymous variations** (sing./plur.; +/- pronoun): in this sentence the difference in meaning between “sin” (17:3 M) and “your sins” (15:13 M and G) is negligible.

**Minor innovation** (in part, intra-textual): this large plus introduces the idea that the wealth and treasure plundered in Jer 15:13 // 17:3 includes the people’s ancestral heritage ( ) given to them by Yhwh. As relayed below, this addition harmonizes the doublet with the end of chap. 16, which discusses Judah’s heritage (16:18-19). The Hebrew phrase “and you will loosen and with you” does not make sense. Most correct to “your hands” (cf. Deut 15:3: “your hand will loosen”).

**Scribal error** ( ; +/- pronoun): “I will make you serve (your enemies)” (15:14 G, 17:4 M) / “and I will make (your enemies) pass through”(15:14a M) – the fact that G of 15:14a agrees with M of 17:4 strongly suggests that 15:14a originally read “I will make you serve;” after the moment of duplication, scribal error led to the misreading in 15:14 (including the loss of the final kaph). The attempts of some to find meaning in the reading of 15:14a M are not convincing. For example, Holladay, among others, interprets this sentence as Yhwh’s comforting response to Jeremiah’s complaint in v. 10 that all curse him. By this understanding, Yhwh, in v. 14a, assures Jeremiah that Yhwh will cause Jeremiah’s personal enemies—those who curse him—to “pass through”—i.e., be exiled—into a land unfamiliar to Jeremiah. The problems with this interpretation are manifold. First, the term enemy ( ), used in v. 14, never refers to personal opponents in the book of Jeremiah. It always refers to a foreign national enemy, usually Babylon. Second in the immediately following verse, v. 15, Jeremiah asks Yhwh to take vengeance ( ) on his persecutors. This request makes little sense if Yhwh has just explained to Jeremiah that he will carry

propositional, should it be correct; we would, however, attribute the annotation to the duplicating scribe who harmonized this doublet with the secondary context of chap. 17.

---

304 Cf. discussion in Allen, *Jeremiah*, 197 n. h.


306 The word refers to foreign national enemies seventeen times in Jeremiah. The possible, though unlikely, exceptions to this rule are the occurrences of the term in this verse, 15:14, and in 15:11, which as we saw is a particularly difficult verse to translate.
away Jeremiah’s enemies into captivity. Third, it is difficult to read v. 14a as a word of comfort or salvation in light of the rest of v. 14, where Yhwh’s wrath burns against his addressee. Fourth, in the larger Jeremianic tradition, Jeremiah shares the same fate as his personal opponents—being taken into exile in Egypt (Jer 43:5-6)—which seems to undercut the reading of v. 14a as a timely response of Yhwh to Jeremiah’s complaint. In light of these difficulties we accept the far simpler solution—and the witness of G—that this variant in M is a product of scribal error.

k Synonymous variant (intra-textual) and possibly PDHarm: + κύκλῳ “all around” (= לִבְנַת הַמָּרָא 15:14 G): The foreign enemy of Judah is frequently described as attacking from “all sides”: 1:15, 4:17, 6:13, 25; 12:9; 20:10; 52:4, 7; cf. 21:14, where the destruction caused by the enemy is described as being found “all around;” in 25:9 Babylon will bring destruction against “all the surrounding” לָבֵית אֵל מְדֻבָּב מָלְאָת יִשְׂרָאֵל in the great reversal of chaps. 51-52, Babylon herself is attacked on “all sides” (50:14, 15, 29, 32; 51:2). The reference to the enemy in 15:14 probably triggered the insertion of this word by a scribe familiar with the word’s association with Judah’s foreign adversary. The word may be an addition unique to V^G. If the word stood in 15:14 Jer^m, it may have been dropped (perhaps unconsciously) by the duplicator in 17:4; if so, then its absence in 15:14 M would be due to PDHarm.

l Scribal error or possibly minor synonymous variation (+/— “that”): 15:14 M is missing the relative pronoun (against 15:14 G and 17:4 M). The larger phrase in which the relative pronoun is found—in a land you do not know—occurs two more times in Jeremiah with different subjects (16:13; 22:28). In both cases, the relative pronoun is present. This observation plus the agreement of 15:4 G with 17:4 suggests the pronoun’s absence in 15:14 M may be accidental. In any case, the variations are synonymous.

m Minor synonymous variation (change in verbal form): “[a fire] is kindled” = ἐκκέκαυτά (15:14 M G) / “you kindled [a fire]” (17:4) – the difference between the two readings is negligible; in both, Yhwh’s anger is kindled like a fire. The reading in 17:4 seems to place more emphasis on the addressee’s culpability, but such culpability is already present in the previous verse which interprets Judah’s plundering as a consequence of its sins.

307 Though the 2nd person pronouns shift from sing. in v. 14a (“your enemies” איביך) to plur. in v. 14b (“[the fire] will burn against you all עלייכם”), it is difficult to argue that the plur. “you” is not synonymous with the sing. “you,” especially since singular 2nd person pronouns are used collectively for the whole of Judah throughout v. 13. Even Holladay, Jeremiah 1, 456–57, believes that the antecedent of the 2nd person plur. pronoun must be inclusive of Jeremiah. Also, on account of the fiery language of v. 14b, we also find unconvincing the argument of Gerstenberger, Jeremiah’s Complaints, 395, who sees v. 14b as a statement of Israel’s salvation and the banishment of her foes.

308 Though Holladay, Jeremiah 1,484, sees the verb in 15:14 as impossible.
Minor innovation (probably inter-textual): “against you” (15:14 M and G) / “forever” (17:4 M) – with this replacement, the scribe introduces to the doublet the idea of the unending punishment—a concept otherwise not found in the book of Jeremiah. This reading was perhaps inspired by Deut 32:22, where in the Song of Moses we find a phrase nearly identical to Jer 17:4b: “for fire is kindled in my anger and it burns to the depths of Sheol.” In both verses the burning of Yhwh’s anger is compared to something boundless, the depths of Sheol and the stretches of time, respectively. This innovative replacement works together with b...b and “...c above to emphasize the indelibility of Judah’s sin.

4.2.2.3 Duplication Technique

TABLE 4.10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jer 15:12-14</th>
<th>Jer 17:1-4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 Will iron, iron from the north, break also bronze?</td>
<td>1 The sin of Judah is written with an iron stylus, with the point of a diamond it is engraved upon the tablet of their heart and on the corners of your altars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Your strength and...........your treasure I will give as plunder as payment (and) for all of your sins and in all your territory.</td>
<td>2 For their children remember their altars and their Asherim upon green tree and upon high hills. 3 on mountains in the open country. Your strength and all of your treasure I will give as plunder, your high places, for .......sin and in all your territory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 And I will make you serve your enemy (all around) in a land (that) you do not know. For a fire is kindled in my anger. It burns against you.</td>
<td>4 And you will loosen your hand from your inheritance which I gave to you. And I will make you serve your enemy in a land that you do not know. For you kindle a fire burns in my anger. It burns forever.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The duplication technique of our second doublet is notably different from that of our first. Like the first doublet, with the second we still find some minor synonymous variation, at least four instances and possibly five (underlined with a dotted line), and possibly one occasion of synonymous variation (marked with a dashed line); but unlike the first, the present doublet exhibits four instances of minor innovation: a short one-word replacement, a short two-word replacement, a medium six-word addition, and a long twenty-five word addition (counting variants \[b^{\cdots}b, c^{\cdots}c, \text{ and } d^{\cdots}d\] as one addition). These innovations introduce several new ideas to the text of the doublet: the indelibility of Judah’s sin; an identification of Judah’s sin (unspecified in 15:13) as idolatry and specifically as the illicit worship of the high places and Asherim; an identification of Judah’s land (lost in the exile) as Judah’s inheritance; and the perpetuity of Yhwh’s anger. As we will see, these innovations prepare the doublet to complete important divinatory work within its secondary context. In spite of such extensive innovation, the primary function of the doublet is not radically changed; it still speaks (in the same specific terms as its twin) of Yhwh’s fiery wrath that burns against Judah’s sin, a wrath manifested in Judah’s despoiling and enslavement by its enemy. Since the doublet’s function is not radically changed, we classify the doublet of 15:(12)13-14 // 17:(1-3a)3b-4) as a \textit{loose-citation with minor adaptation}. Finally, and tangentially, observe that unlike the pervious doublet, this doublet contains three inter-textual allusions to the Deuteronomistic tradition. As we will see, these allusions are the only occasions of inter-textuality in the doublets analyzed in this chapter.
4.2.2.4 Rationale for Duplication

The text of the doublet was probably attracted to beginning of chap. 17—more exactly to the end of chap. 16—because of its verbal similarity with 16:13. In this verse we read that Yhwh will hurl the people out of their land and “into a land which you [they] and your [their] ancestors do not know” (על־הארץ אשׁר לא ידעתם אתם ואבותיכם) where they will serve (עבד) alien gods. Similarly, the text of the doublet speaks both of an exile in “a land that you do not know” (בארץ אשת לא־ידעתי) and of the exiles being enslaved (עבד). Yet, rather than stitch the doublet’s text into chap. 16 immediately after v. 13, the duplicator wove the doublet into an existing literary seam lying between the end of a thematic unit focused on the idolatry of Judah (16:11-13, 18-20) and the beginning of a short wisdom text which has a parallel in Psalm 1 (Jer 17:5-8).309 In this way, the doublet does not interrupt the flow of the thematic unit of chap. 16 and, placed after this unit, functions as an explication of that unit through vertical reading.

4.2.2.5 The Duplicate’s Divinatory Function

4.2.2.5.1 Overview of Chap 16: The Idolatry of Judah

To appreciate how the doublet, with its many innovations, serves as an explication of its secondary context—most notably the theme of idolatry in 16:11-13, 18-20—it is expedient to offer here an overview of these verses.310 The second half of chap. 16


310 For the sake of time, we will not discuss vv. 14-15, a salvific doublet of 23:7-8, which may have been inserted into this chapter secondarily; cf. Allen, Jeremiah, 192. Situated in this context, the
consist largely of Yhwh’s answer to a threefold question posed by his people in 16:10. In that verse, the people ask: “Why has the Yhwh spoken against us all of this great evil (הגדולה)311? What is our iniquity? What is our sin that we sinned against the Yhwh our God?” Yhwh’s answer, which begins in v. 11 and continues on for much of the chapter, highlights one sin in particular, namely, the sin of idolatry: the ancestors are chided for worshiping and serving (עבד) other gods (v. 11), an offense continued and magnified by the current generation (v. 12), and which results in a fitting punishment, namely their expulsion from the land to serve these said gods elsewhere (v. 13); a few verses later, Yhwh laments that the land is polluted with the carcasses of sacrifices offered to idols and that Yhwh’s inheritance (נחלת) is filled with abominations (v. 18). Following Yhwh’s answer, the theme of idolatry continues: the next verse (v. 19), perhaps spoken by the prophet, imagines a time when the nations will come to Yhwh (presumably in Jerusalem) and with a tinge of irony confess the futility of their religious inheritance (נחל), an inheritance consisting of worthlessness (הבל)—i.e., idols—which have no profit (אין־בם מועיל);312 then in v. 20, we encounter a rhetorical question that asks if one can manufacture one’s own gods, a possibility immediately denied within the verse. The whole idolatry-focused section concludes in v. 21 with Yhwh’s announcement that he will at last make known his power and might. We will return to

311 The word “great” is missing in G.

312 In Jeremiah הבל is used only to describe idols (10:3; 10:15// 51:18), and in Jer 2:8, 11 the phrase “no profit” describes illicit deities; cf. Allen, Jeremiah, 193.
consider this announcement momentarily. First, let us consider how the doublet’s text interprets this long section devoted to the theme of idolatry.

4.2.2.5.2 The Duplicate’s Explication of Its Literary Context

Placed after chap. 16, the text of the duplicate interprets through vertical reading various aspects of this chapter and addresses a few unanswered questions tacitly raised therein. Most notably, the duplicate’s text—with its modifications—provides greater clarity on the nature of Judah’s idolatry and on Yhwh’s response to this idolatry. To begin, while chap. 16 highlights and condemns Judah’s idolatry in general, the chapter does not offer specific details about Judah’s idolatrous practices. However, with the text of the doublet—especially in its many modifications—we are given some specificity. Within the additions of 17:2, the duplicate mentions (illicit) altars (מזבחות) and Asherim (אשׁרה)—cult objects associated with such illicit altars—both of which are said to be located upon tree and high hill. Additionally, the modified duplicate refers to “high places” (במות) in 17:3. Taken together, these additions to the doublet’s text equate Judah’s idolatry—featured in chap. 16—with a specific kind of idol worship condemned in the Deuteronomistic tradition, namely, the so-called “Canaanite” altars and cult objects. Consider, for example, Deut 7:5; 12:2-3; 1 Kgs 14:15, 23; 2 Kgs 17:10; 23:14, where cultic objects such as Asherim are said to be found upon every “high hill” and under every “green tree” and located on top of “high places.”

313 The removal or building up of high places in Judah were particularly important criteria employed in the

313 Cf. Allen, Jeremiah, 199.
Deuteronomistic historian’s evaluation of Judah’s monarchs (cf. 1 Kgs 22:43; 2 Kgs 12:3; 14:4; 15:4, etc.). The references to “altars,” “Asherim,” and “high places” in the text of the duplicate suggest that the duplicating scribe was familiar with this aspect of the Deuteronomistic tradition.

The scribe’s awareness of this tradition helps explain another modification of the duplicate’s text. As noted in the textual analysis, the final phrase of 15:14 (// 17:4)—“for you have kindled a fire in my anger and it will burn against you”—was adapted in 17:4, perhaps on the basis of Deut 32:22, in the Song of Moses. The phrase’s wording in Deut 32:22 and in Jer 15:14b was already remarkably similar (see textual analysis above). When 15:14b was duplicated in Jer 17:4b, the wording was slightly changed—

(15:14b) was replaced by (17:4b)—which brought the resemblance of the two texts even closer together. Both describe the divine anger as something boundless. In Deut 32:22, Yhwh’s fire burn’s unto the depths of Sheol ( ). In Jer 17:4, the deity’s anger burns unto eternity.

Why would a scribe want to reinforce 17:4b’s resemblance to Deut 32:22? In the latter verse—like the wider context of 17:4—the pressing issue is Israel’s idolatry, an offense noted in Deut 32:16-17, 21. Yhwh’s anger is kindled in Deut 32:22 because of the people’s idolatry has provoked Yhwh to jealousy in 32:21. By solidifying the link

---

314 Though, we must qualify this observation since another modification of the verse—namely, the change in verb form—moves them apart slightly: the new verb form in 17:4 ( ) differs from the form found in both 15:14 and Deut 32:22 ( ). However, these variant verb forms are synonymous—the sense of the whole passage is not significantly altered by this difference—whereas the difference between and has more important consequences for the passage’s meaning (see below).
between Deut 32:22 and Jer 17:4b, the duplicator helps us understand why Yhwh’s anger burns like fire: it is the idolatry of Judah that incites the deity’s fiery wrath.

The change from (15:14b) to (17:4b) redirects attention away from those burned by the fire (the people of Judah) and onto the nature of the fire (lasting forever). This shift in focus fits with other modifications found earlier in the doublet. In 17:1, Judah’s sin is described as something permanent—it is inscribed “with an iron stylus” ( ) and a diamond point ( ) upon the tablet of the people’s heart and upon the horns of the altar. In the ancient imagination, to inscribe a text upon a tablet or on a structure is to make a permanent record of that text. For instance, in Job19:24, Job desires an iron stylus ( ) to make a permanent inscription of his words in rock. That Judah’s sin is so inscribed emphasizes its indelibility. The indelibility of Judah’s iniquity in 17:1 is matched by the everlastingness of Yhwh’s fiery wrath in 17:4; and both are related to the ubiquity of Judah’s idolatry—found on every hill and tree.

One wonders if the emphasis of the duplicate on the permanence of sin and wrath reflects exilic uncertainty regarding the length of the exile. By way of this imagery, the duplicating scribe appears to communicate the perspective that the exile of Judah will last indefinitely. The people of Judah will serve their enemies in a land they “do not know” with no hope of return; for their sin is indelible and Yhwh’s wrath, undying. If this reading is correct, we must note that the Tendenz of the duplicate contradicts that of its

315 Also noted by Allen, Jeremiah, 98.
316 Cf. Carroll, Jeremiah, 349.
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context to a certain degree. In 16:14-15, we encounter another doublet (// 23:7-8), which foretells a second Exodus—when Yhwh will be known for delivering his people from exile. 317 Without solving this question here, we can summarize that through vertical reading the doublet functions to elucidate the nature of Judah’s idolatry (and of Yhwh’s anger)—Judah’s idolatry is widespread, has left a permanent mark, and is met by unending flame.

In addition to clarifying the nature of Judah’s idolatry and Yhwh’s anger, the text of the doublet reinterprets other aspects of its secondary context, minor and major, through vertical reading. On the minor end of the spectrum, we learn in 16:17 that Judah cannot hide its citizen’s sins from Yhwh’s gaze; all of their ways are seen by him. The doublet—in its adapted form—continues this thought with a novel image: Judah’s sins are inscribed in the sight of Yhwh upon the very corners of the altar (17:1). Also, chap. 16 contains many horrific images of suffering brought about by the hand of Yhwh including terminal illness (16:4), the cessation of joy (16:9), and exile (16:13). With the text of the doublet, a new aspect of Judah’s suffering is added to this list: the people of Judah will be plundered of their wealth and treasures (17:3).

On the major end of the spectrum, the text of the doublet explicates the meaning of the exile alluded to in 16:13. As noted above, the doublet was probably attracted to the end of chap. 16 in the first place because of the verbal similarity of 15:14 (// 17:4) and 16:13. Through vertical reading, the doublet’s text reinterprets several details of this

317 Since 17:1-4 may have been lost through haplography in V 64, it is not apparent which doublet came first. If that of 17:1-4 is earlier, we could understand the doublet of 16:14-15 as some sort of response to the highly pessimistic tone of the former. On the other hand, if 16:14-15 came first, then 17:1-4 could be viewed as an intentional dampening of the hope sounded in 16:14-15.
latter verse. First, both verses use the Hebrew verb “to serve,” though to different ends. In 16:13, the verb reflects a minor Deuteronomistic trope in which Yhwh ironically permits idolatry on the condition that the idolaters are first expelled from their homeland. By use of the same verb, the duplicate recasts this trope in harsher terms. In the duplicate, the idolaters are doomed, not simply to serve ( ) their illicit deities in an alien context, as in 16:13, but to be enslaved ( ) to their enemies (17:4), who, in addition to removing the Judeans from their homeland, also plunder all of their wealth (17:3).

Second, the text of the doublet helps explain the logic of the exile announced in 16:13 by connecting the exile to another image from chap. 16. As noted above, in 16:13 Yhwh decrees exile as a consequence for the people’s idolatry, though it is left unstated why exile would be a suitable punishment for this crime. A few verses later (16:18), idolatry is featured again, this time in order to describe the pollution of the land and the defilement of Yhwh’s heritage ( ) caused by idolatry. The polluted and defiled condition of the land could provide a potential justification for the forced abandonment of this land; yet no such link is made. Such a link is forged, however, by a modification added to the doublet in 17:4. In that modification, Judah’s exile is described as the loss of its heritage ( ), the land that Yhwh gave to them. Through vertical reading, one can infer that exile is a logical consequence of idolatry, precisely because idolatry

318 The same motif of expelling idolaters to serve their foreign deities elsewhere is found for instance in Deut 4:27-28; 28:64.
pollutes and defiles the land. In order to preserve the purity and holiness of the land, defiling agents, i.e. idolatry and idolaters, must be expelled beyond the land’s borders.

Naming the land that Judah lost in exile as its heritage (נחלה) also heightens a subtle irony present in 16:18-19. There, the defilement of Judah’s heritage in v.18 is tacitly contrasted with the nations’ confession in v. 19 that their heritage of idolatry is an inheritance of lies. With the doublet, in its modified form, the irony is deepened: the nations—who serve other gods by birthright—give up this inheritance as something fallacious and worthless to stand before Yhwh, while Judah gives up its inheritance—the land where Yhwh dwells—to serve the worthless and fallacious idols that the nations have thrown away.

Finally, we note one more major aspect of chap. 16 expounded by the doublet’s text through vertical reading. As mentioned above, Yhwh concludes his polemic against Judah’s sin of idolatry with an announcement that Yhwh will manifest his power (יד) and might (16:21). Yet, apart from the presence of the doublet, this announcement is stillborn. For it is immediately followed, not by a demonstration of power and might, but by a unit of seemingly unrelated wisdom material contrasting the cursed and blessed person (17:5-8). With the insertion of the doublet immediately after 16:21, the reader is invited to interpret the text of the doublet as an illustration of the power promised in 16:21. Note that in 16:21,Yhwh’s power is symbolized by his hand (יד). This is the same hand that in the Deuteronomistic tradition led Israel out of the house of slavery in Egypt (Deut. 4:34; 5:15; 7:19; 9:29; 11:2; 26:8; 2 Kgs 17:36), a tradition known to the scribes of Jeremiah (cf. Jer 32:21). Within Jeremiah, however, we see the reversal of this tradition, with Yhwh extending this hand to fight not for but against Judah (e.g. Jer 21:5).
The doublet appears to continue this reversal, exhibiting the power of Yhwh, not to deliver his people, but to meet out judgment against them. The mighty hand of Yhwh, described in 16:21, empties the hands of Judah in 17:3 (if the usual reconstruction of the latter verse is correct). In sum, placed after 16:21, the doublet presents the punishment of Judah—a punishment consisting of plundering and exile—as a demonstration of Yhwh’s power. In this way, the text of the doublet fills a lacuna of its secondary context which otherwise leaves unfulfilled Yhwh’s promise to display his power.

In conclusion, the doublet of 15:(12)13-14 // 17:(1-3a)3b-4 (to a much greater extent than the previous doublet) demonstrates how a scribe may make extensive use of vertical reading and harmonization to fill out the meaning of a revelatory text: specifying new details, unlocking a text’s logic, addressing unanswered questions, and heightening the text’s rhetorical impact. Unlike the first doublet, this doublet (in its secondary context) does not serve as an introduction for the verses that follow, but instead appears to fill a perceived lacuna in the text. Moreover, unlike the previous, the present duplicate is situated in a preexisting literary seam. The doublet also betrays the hand of a scribe well-versed in the Deuteronomistic tradition, drawing from this tradition on three separate occasions (again unlike the previous doublet). Lastly, as noted above, some of the duplicate’s alterations may reflect an exilic uncertainty about the length of the exile, suggesting that it would continue indefinitely. As we will see, this perspective sits in tension with two other doublets analyzed below, 23:5-6 // 33:14-17 and 30:10-11 // 46:27-28, doublets which highlight the return from exile as the inevitable future.
4.2.3 Text #3: “Look! Days are Coming, Says the Lord!” (Jer 23:5-6 // Jer 33:14-16)

4.2.3.1 Preliminary Observations

1) Most scholars are in agreement that the text of Jer 33:14-16, missing in G, is a duplication of Jer 23:5-6 added in \( \text{VM} \), \(^{319}\) the verses of Jer 33:17-26, also unrepresented by G, are considered secondary as well. \(^{320}\) Of primary importance is determining whether these additional verse (vv. 17-26) were added to chap. 33 in the same compositional moment as the duplicate. It is possible that the moment of duplication provided an occasion for inserting this large plus into the chapter. While most scholars have simply assumed this to be the case, there are good reasons for considering vv. 17-26 as an addition introduced to \( \text{VM} \) sometime after the moment of duplication. We will look into these reasons below.

2) In passing we note that in G the text of doublet in Jer 23:5-6 ends with the words \( \varepsilon\nu\tau\iota\ \piρο\phi\iota\tau\alpha \) (“among the prophets”). We do not include these words in our synopsis as they are part of the doublet’s text only accidentally: these words translate the

---


\(^{320}\) See the scholars listed in the previous note. In disagreement, Lundbom, “Haplography in the Hebrew Vorlage of LXX Jeremiah,” 316, maintains that all thirteen verses of Jer 33:14-26 were lost through haplography, on the very unlikely basis of homoeoaercton of the initial of in v. 14 with that of in 34:1. The possibility that these verses were dropped intentionally by a scribe or translator is convincingly refuted by Janzen, *Studies in the Text of Jeremiah*, 122–23.
now displaced introductory formula of 23:9 (“concerning the prophets”) which introduced a series of oracles concerning prophets that originally followed 23:5-6.321

4.2.3.2 Textual Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jer 23:5-6 G</th>
<th>Jer 23:5-6 M</th>
<th>Jer 33:14-16 M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 ἰδοὺ ἡ ἐραὶ ἔρχονται λέγει κύριο καὶ ἀναστήσως</td>
<td>5 a...a</td>
<td>14 a...a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b...b</td>
<td>b...b</td>
<td>b...b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c...c</td>
<td>c...c</td>
<td>c...c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τῶν αὐτῶν ἀνατολὴν δικαίαν</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ βασιλεύσει βασίλευ</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ συνήσει</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ποιήσει κρί Α καὶ δικαιοσύνην ἐπὶ τῇ γῇ</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐν ταῖ ἥ ἐραί αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σωθήσεται Ἰουδα</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ Ἰοραμὴ κατασκηνώσει</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πεποιθὼ</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ τοῦτο τὸ ὅνο α ὅ</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καλέσει αὐτὸν [κύριο]</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἰωφεδεκ</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

321 Parke-Taylor, The Formation of the Book of Jeremiah, 57. Note that in G, 23:9 follows directly after Jer 23:6. In G, vvs. 7-8 (M) are found later in the chapter after 23:40. The Greek translation probably initially read τοῖ προφήται (compare the translation of the introductory use of the prefixed by the dative article in the oracles against the nations: e.g. 46:2; 48:1; 49:1, 7, 23, 28) and acquired the preposition ἐν by analogy from the use of this preposition with τοῖ προφήται in 23:13, 14.
**Minor innovation (intra-textual):** [ ] “[I will fulfill] the promise (good word) that I have made” – this phrase was probably drawn from Jer 29:10, where Yhwh promises to fulfill ( ) his good words ( ).

Furthermore, it harmonizes the doublet’s text with its immediate context where we read “Thus I will bring upon them all the good fortune that I promise them” (Jer 32:42). The addition introduces to the doublet the notion of promise fulfillment and perhaps also alludes specifically to the promised return from exile which is the subject of Jer 29:10 and 32:42 (see 32:37 for the reference to the return). With b...b and e...e, this addition constitutes a major plus added to the text of the doublet.

**Minor innovation (intra-textual):** this addition reflects stock Jeremiah language; the use of the phrase of “house of Israel” in parallel with “house of Judah” is found only in Jeremiah where it occurs another six times. The specific combination of these phrases plus the doublet’s opening words—“Look! Days are coming!”—may have been inspired by Jer 31:27, 31, where the same combination is found. Importantly, this addition widens the oracle’s audience specifying that the people of Judah and Israel in general, and not simply the Davidic heir, are the beneficiaries of Yhwh’s intentions.

Holladay suggests that the preposition used in the phrase “to the house of Israel” is an error and should be corrected with . The immediately following, parallel phrase “to the house of Judah” uses the correct preposition.

**Minor innovation (intra-textual):** “In those days and in that time I will cause to sprout.” The first part, , was probably borrowed from Jer 50:4, 20; outside of Jeremiah, the phrase is only employed in Joel 4:1. These words provide some temporal specificity to the doublet’s promise that an heir of David will rise up: the heir will come at the same time Yhwh fulfills his promise to the people (see a...a above). With the following verb— —this addition functions as a Wiederaufnahme (cf. … in Jer 23:5 = 33:14), thus marking the end of the major insertion of v. 14. Yet, since the duplicating scribe already utilized the

---

322 Jeremiah 29:10 M reads “my good words;” is missing in G. This suggests that the scribe responsible for Jer 33:14-16 is dependent upon an (at least partly) expanded version of chap. 29; cf. Goldman, Prophétie et royauté au retour de l’exil, 15; Bogaert, “Urtext, texte court et relecture,” 240–41. Less likely is the possibility that the duplicating scribe also inserted the word “good” into 29:10.


324 5:11; 11:10, 17; 13:11; 31:27 (VM only), 31; cf. 3:18.

325 Holladay, Jeremiah 2, 227.

doublet’s verb in v.14 with regard to Yhwh’s “good word”, the scribe composed the Wiederaufnahme with a synonymous verb whose root (_Doublet.) is taken from the original sentence’s direct object: “shoot” → “I will cause to sprout.” ³²⁷

**d...d  Major innovation:** “legitimate heir” (Jer 23:5 M) ≈ ἀνατολῆν δικαίαν “righteous dawn” (Jer 23:5 G) / “branch of righteousness” (Jer 33:15 M).

Many scholars concur that in 23:5 means “legitimate,” pointing to Phoenician inscriptions, which employ the same phrase with this meaning, as evidence. ³²⁸ For this reason, the original oracle suggests a historical context in which a certain Davidic ruler’s claim to the throne was being contested and needed legitimation. In the duplicate—which instead reads—the original phrase’s historical import is completely lost. With the duplicate, concern shifts from a specific king’s legitimacy to the righteousness that will accompany some future king’s rule. The oracle thus becomes less tied to a particular historical context.

The rendering of by ἀνατολῆν in G requires brief comment.³²⁹ Some have thought the translation reflects a later messianic interpretation of the passage, since ἀνατολῆν carries messianic overtones in later texts.³³⁰ Lust, however, believes the ἀνατολῆν was selected for its capacity to represent multiple nuances of and argues that it acquired its messianic overtone only later.³³¹ Either way, the Greek Vorlage equals M.

**e...e  Minor innovation (omission):** the duplicated text of Jer 33:15 omits the phrase “And he will rule as king and deal wisely,” perhaps in order to downplay the importance of the kingship in this oracle (see divinatory function).

**f...f  Minor innovation (different pronoun):** in the duplicate text, the phrase “in his [the king’s] days” (Jer 23:6 M and G) is replaced by “in those days” (Jer

---


³²⁹ For the basic meaning of this word, see: Walser, Jeremiah, 328–29.


once again, the duplicator appears to be drawing attention away from the monarch.

---

**Major innovation (intra-textual):**

“Israel will dwell (in safety)” (Jer 23:6 M and G) / “Jerusalem will dwell (in safety)” (Jer 33:16 M) – in the duplicate, the city Jerusalem supplants the Davidic heir as the main subject of the oracle’s latter half—Jerusalem, not the Davidic king, will receive a new name. Thus, the subject Jerusalem must be introduced here at the beginning of v. 16. The following verb was also adapted accordingly: “it (masc.) will dwell” \(\rightarrow\) “it (fem.) will dwell.”

The image here of Jerusalem (as opposed to Israel) dwelling in safety (\(\text{לבטח}\)) echoes Jer 32:37 where Yhwh states that he will gather the people of Jerusalem (see 32:36) from exile and make them dwell in safety (\(\text{לבטח}\)).

---

**Major innovation:**

“And this is his name, by which he [\(\text{κύριος}\) “the Lord” (G only)] will call him…” (Jer 23:6 M and G) / “And this is what it (fem. sing. = Jerusalem) will be called” (Jer 33:16 M) – the duplicating scribe has made the city Jerusalem the topic of the oracle’s final sentence rather than the Davidic king; it is the city that will be given a new name. The reading in G specifies that it is “the Lord” (\(\text{κύριος}\)) who is announcing the name, though Zeigler is doubtful of the originality of this word, hence the square brackets.

---

**Major innovation (and PDHarm):** \(\text{יוצדק}\) = \(\text{יהוה צדקנו}\) (Jer 33:16 M) – Lipinski and Lust argue convincingly that G preserves the original reading — which they accept as an alternate spelling of king Zedekiah’s name. In the duplicate, this name was replaced with \(\text{יוצדק}\), which according to Lust can only be an appellation for Jerusalem. At a later point, \(\text{יוצדק}\) of Jer 23:6 was harmonized with Jer 23:16. The notion that the city, rather

---


than the king, should be renamed may have been inspired by the naming of the city Jerusalem found in V^M in v. 9 (see below).\textsuperscript{335}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|}
\hline
\textbf{Jer 23:5-6} & \textbf{Jer 33:14-16} \\
\hline
5 Look! Days are coming, says Yhwh, when I will establish for David a \textit{legitimate} heir. And he will rule as king and deal wisely, and he will enact justice and righteousness in the land. \hline
6 In his days, Judah will be saved and \textit{Israel} will dwell in safety. And this is \textit{his name} by which he will be called, \textit{“Zedekiah.”} & 14 Look! Days are coming, says Yhwh, When I will establish the \textit{good word} which I spoke to the house of Israel and to the house of Judah \hline
15 In those days and in that time, I will cause to sprout for David a \textit{righteous} heir. and he will enact justice and righteousness in the land. \hline
16 In those days, Judah will be saved and \textit{Jerusalem} will dwell in safety. And this is \underline{what they will call her, \textit{“Yhwh is Our Righteousness”}}
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

The doublet of Jer 23:5-6 // Jer 33:14-16 shows radical changes in content. The duplicate contains seven innovations (counting \textit{a...a}, \textit{b...b}, and \textit{c...c} as a single innovative addition), minor (underlined with a single line) and a major (underlined with a double line): an addition of sixteen words, fifteen of which are drawn intra-textually from

\textsuperscript{335} As discussed further below, Bogaert, \textit{“Urtext, texte court et relecture,”} 239–40—noting that the reference to the naming of Jerusalem in v. 9 occurs in M only—argues that this reference was added by the same reviser who created the doublet.
elsewhere in Jeremiah; five replacements (totaling seven words); and an omission of three words. These innovations introduce many new ideas to the text of the doublet (and omit a few that are original): a new temporal specificity for when the Davidic heir will arise, namely at the same moment Yhwh keeps his word regarding the end of the exile; an expansion of the oracle’s audience to include not just the king but also the people of Israel and Judah; the erasing of two references to a concrete figure (Zedekiah) and, by extension, of a specific historical context (when Zedekiah’s throne was contested); and the downplaying of the significance of the Davidic heir in tandem with a new focus on the city of Jerusalem. In many regards we are looking at a very different oracle when we read the duplicate of 33:14-16. The original function of the doublet—promoting the reign of a specific king at a specific moment in history—has been eliminated. Instead we have a text with a more general concern for the people of Judah (and Israel) and the well-being of the city Jerusalem. In other words, with this doublet we are dealing with a major adaptation.

It is interesting to note, however, that in spite of the proliferation of innovation in the duplicate, the base text of 23:5-6 is copied verbatim. This is to say, unlike the previous two doublets, we find zero examples of synonymous variation (including minor synonymous variation). The remaining seventeen words of the original doublet twin are simply reproduced word-for-word in the duplicate.336 This exactitude could suggest that the duplicating scribe created his or her duplicate through the direct consultation of a written copy of 23:5-6. The scribe took this text and adapted it significantly; yet by

336 As noted above, of the doublet’s twenty-seven original words, three were omitted, seven were replaced, leaving seventeen which were copied exactly.
leaving almost two-thirds of the original text untouched, the scribe preserved a record of
the genetic relationship between the twins. We classify the duplication technique
employed on this occasion as *verbatim repetition with major adaptation*. 

4.2.3.4 Original Meaning of 23:5-6

At this juncture, prior to looking into the rationale for duplication and the
divinatory function of the duplicate, it would be advantageous to explicate the original
meaning of 23:5-6. For only then will it be clear how the duplicate transforms the
meaning of the doublet’s text. There are several compelling reasons for agreeing with the
following conclusions of Lipinski and Lust outlined above:

(1) Originally, 23:6 contained the name (still preserved in G) which refers
to king Zedekiah.

(2) At the moment of duplication, this name was replaced in 33:16 M with
, an appellation of Jerusalem (which later also replaced the name
in 23:6).

First, makes perfect sense as an alternate spelling of Zedekiah’s name. The sole
difference between the traditional spelling of Zedekiah ( ) and the alternate spelling
is the placement of the theophoric element ( / ), coming at the end of the former
and the beginning of the later. This sort of transposition of the theophoric element
within a person’s name is not unknown in the Hebrew Bible. In fact just a few verses
prior to our doublet (Jer 22:24, 28) Zedekiah’s predecessor, Jehoiachin ( ), is twice
referred to as Coniah ( ), a name in which the theophoric element has also been

337 Zedekiah may also be spelled .
It seems completely reasonable to encounter an inverted spelling of the name Zedekiah within an oracle immediately following an oracle containing inverted spellings of Zedekiah’s predecessor.

Second, the longer name — found in M — does not look like a personal name, but like an appellation for Jerusalem, and for this reason fits the perspective of the duplicate—which is focused on the holy city—as opposed to the original—in which no such focus is found. As Lust explains, the long form of the divine name ( ) never appears as a component of a person’s name; rather, “Most if not all of the names in which [the long form] is attested are symbolic appellations of Jerusalem,” such as

“Throne of Yhwh” (Jer 3:17), “Yhwh is there” (Ezek 48:35), and “City of Yhwh” (Isa 62:12). In Jer 33:16, a verse about Jerusalem, one would expect a toponym such like . In Jer 23:5-6, on the other hand—with its sustained concern for the Davidic heir—a toponym would be unusual, while the name of a specific king would be fitting. Thus, it seems highly plausible that the name originated with the creation of the duplicate, and was only brought into the text of chap. 23 at a later point.

---

338 In Jer 24:1, a third form of Jehoiachin’s name appears ( ), demonstrating that the spelling of kings’ names was not fixed. Cf. Lipinski, “Études sur des textes ‘messianiques’ de l'Ancien Testament,” 54. Lust, “Messianism and the Greek Version of Jeremiah,” 89–90, points to two more examples in the Bible of names in which the location of the theophoric element moves around.

Third, the oracle of 23:5-6 as a whole makes good sense within the historical context of the beginning of the reign of Zedekiah. Zedekiah was installed as king by Nebuchadnezzar in 597 B.C.E. after the Chaldean ruler had exiled Jehoiachin to Babylon (2 Kgs 24:12, 17). As Lipinski explains, given these circumstances it would not be surprising if at that time Zedekiah’s claim to the throne were contested. It seems probable that some Judeans would have continued to support the deposed king, viewing with suspicion the new monarch propped up by Babylon. In such a setting it would not be remarkable to find an oracle arguing for the legitimacy of Zedekiah. In Lipinski’s words, the reference to a “legitimate heir” in 23:5 “vise précisément à combattre pareille contestation.”

An oracle legitimizing Zedekiah also fits the text’s literary context. The oracle comes a few verses after another in which Yhwh takes responsibility for the Babylonian deposal of Jehoiachin (22:24-30). The passage ends with Yhwh’s rejection of Jehoiachin’s lineage: “Thus says the LORD: Record this man [Jehoiachin] as childless, a man who shall not succeed in his days; for none of his offspring shall succeed in sitting

---

340 Carroll, Jeremiah, 446; cf. discussion in McKane, Jeremiah 1, 560. While McKane himself disagrees with this view, he points to a number of scholars who see 23:5-6 as referring to Zedekiah: Joseph Klausner, The Messianic Idea in Israel: From Its Beginning to the Completion of the Mishnah (New York: Macmillan, 1955), 103-4; Bright, Jeremiah, 143, writes: “Very probably Jeremiah uttered these words early in Zedekiah’s reign, when dynastic hopes were being attached to that king by certain of his courtiers.” Cf. Abraham Malamat, “Jeremiah and the Last Two Kings of Judah,” PEQ 83 (1951): 86.


343 Similarly, Skinner, Prophecy and Religion, 312–13, n. 1, argues that this oracle comes exactly where we would expect an oracle about Zedekiah—at the end of a series of oracles against the last kings of Judah: Jehoahaz (Jer 22:11-12), Jehoiakim (22:18-19), Jehoiachin (22:24-30).
on the throne of David, and ruling again in Judah.”\(^{344}\) If Yhwh has rejected the current monarch, one would expect the deity to endorse a replacement. That the Jeremiah tradition would claim divine approval for Zedekiah—who happened to be Nebuchadnezzar’s choice for Jerusalem’s throne—fits with the general pro-Babylonian perspective of that tradition.\(^{345}\) All in all, following an oracle rejecting Jehoiachin, it would be logical to find an additional oracle supporting Zedekiah as the legitimate heir.

Still, not all have taken the reading of G seriously. For instance, Holladay—convinced that the historical Jeremiah did not support Zedekiah—believes the reading preserved in M is original.\(^{346}\) With the name יְהוָה צֶדֶקְנוּ, so Holliday argues, Jeremiah has deliberately reversed Zedekiah’s name, placing the theophoric element first, and further, has replaced the first person singular possessive pronoun (‘my’) with the first person plural possessive pronoun (‘our’) in order to draw a contrast between the Judean ruler and a future Yhwh-backed monarch who would “reverse the characteristics of the reign of Zedekiah.”\(^{347}\) Holladay’s reading, however, relies upon a highly speculative reconstruction of late Judean monarchial history. Moreover, he does not account for the origin of the Greek reading. If Jewish tradition came to view Zedekiah in

\(^{344}\) NRSV.

\(^{345}\) Carroll, *Jeremiah*, 446, makes a similar point: “The oracle here legitimates Zedekiah…Such a reading is consistent with the attitude shown by Jeremiah toward Zedekiah in the narratives and indicates the pro-Babylonian nature of his rule.”


\(^{347}\) Ibid., 617. In the same vein, Holladay, ibid., 620, writes that the foreseen king would “embody the faith of the whole people in the realization of righteousness that has its sources only in [Yhwh];” cf. Parke-Taylor, *The Formation of the Book of Jeremiah*, 57; Peter C. Craigie, *Jeremiah 1-25*, WBC 26 (Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1991), 329.
a bad light, why would a later scribe replace the highly theological reading found in M with a reference to the last and rejected king? Given Zedekiah’s ensuing failure, it is much easier to follow Lipinski and argue that the reading in M of 23:6 is the result of a later scribe’s efforts to erase a reference to Zedekiah as the legitimate heir. Lipinski writes:

…la disparition du nom de Yô edeq dans le texte reçu serait due à la volonté d’éliminer de ce texte par trop embarrassant toute allusion à un roi qui fut imposé illégalement par le souverain babylonien et qui a entrainé par sa politique la ruine du Temple, de la capitale de l’État.  

In short, all evidence points toward the conclusion that the oracle of 23:5-6—in its original form—aimed to garner support for the contested kingship of Zedekiah, but at a latter moment was harmonized in light of its duplicate in 33:14-16.

4.2.3.5 Rationale for Duplication

Chapters 30-33 of Jeremiah, sometimes referred to as the Book of Consolation, contain many oracles of hope that feature the return from exile and the restoration of Judah and Jerusalem. One might expect such a collection of oracles to emphasize the

---


349 The “Book of Consolation” is a modern scholarly construct that may or may not correspond to a section of Jeremiah recognized as such by ancient scribes. At most we can say that this section of Jeremiah appears to have become a repository for hope-filled oracles. For the sake of convenience we will use the title “Book of Consolation” to refer to chaps. 30-33. The term Book of Consolation may also refer, more narrowly, to chaps. 30-31 only. Yet, this smaller unit of hope-filled oracles is connected thematically to the following two chapters which narrate (a) a symbolic prophetic act of hope (32:1-15)—Jeremiah’s purchasing of real-estate—(b) a prayer of Jeremiah uttered in response to this prophetic act (32:16-25), (c) Yhwh’s reply to Jeremiah which ends on a hopeful note (32:26-44), and (d) oracles concerning the rebuilding of Jerusalem and the restoration of Judah (33:1-13).

350 The theme of the return from exile occurs frequently: e.g. in 30:3, 8, 10 (in M only); 31:8-13, 16-18, 21; 32:37. The same is true of the theme of the restoration of Judah and Jerusalem: e.g. 30:3, 17, 18; 31:4-5, 18, 23-25, 28; 33:7, 11.
renewal of the Davidic kingship. Yet, within these chapters the future of this kingship is touched on only lightly (cf. 30:9, 21). It seems that the reestablishment of the monarchy was only a minor concern of the composers of the early form of Jeremiah’s Book of Consolation, that is, the form found in Jer. This relative disinterest in the Davidic dynasty perhaps reflects a time when that dynasty was viewed negatively (e.g. after the reign of Zedekiah?) or when its importance was overshadowed by the hope for an end of exile.

It is not difficult to imagine that at a later point, the relative absence of the king in this hope-assured section of Jeremiah seemed a lacuna too large to leave unfilled. Perhaps for this reason, a later scribe sought to supplement this section intra-textually with material featuring the Davidic dynasty in a positive light. A scour of Jeremiah reveals that the only passage which would suite the scribe’s purposes is the exact oracle that was duplicated in chap. 33, namely Jer 23:5-6. This unit—affirming a new Davidic

---

351 There is no scholarly consensus as to when the Book of Consolation took shape. Norbert Lohfink, “Der junge Jeremia als Propagandist und Poet: Zum Grundstock von Jer 30-31,” in Livre de Jeremie: Livre de Jeremie: le prophete et son milieu, les oracles et leur transmission, ed. P.-M. Bogaert, BETL 54 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1981), 351–68, and Holladay, Jeremiah 2, 158–62, hold to an early date—attributing seven core strophes of Jeremiah 30-31 (which are seemingly directed toward the Northern Kingdom) to a young Jeremiah during the time of Josiah. Jeremiah himself revised these strophes, so they argue, reapplying them to the southern kingdom. On the other end of the spectrum, Carroll, Jeremiah, 569, attributes the whole collection to later “anonymous circles during and after the exile....” Most scholars, however, are interested in explaining the formation of the form of Book of Consolation as found in M, without considering the ways in which the book was actually expanded in V M vis-à-vis V. For a survey of the widely differing scholarly theories on the formation of M’s version of the Book of Consolation, see Bob Becking, Between Fear and Freedom: Essays on the Interpretation of Jeremiah 30-31, OtSt 51 (Leiden: Brill Academic, 2004), 3–8.

352 Obviously, we would not say that ancient scribes recognized chaps. 30-33 as the Book of Consolation, as proposed by modern scholarship. It is reasonable, however, to suppose that scribes were aware that this section of Jeremiah was a repository of hope-filled passages.

353 Thus, Carroll, Jeremiah, 638.
heir who would execute justice and righteousness—fills out the picture of kingship in Judah’s future in the Book of Consolation.

Yet, as we will see in the following section, when the duplicating scribe introduced this oracle to chap. 33, the scribe significantly downplayed the importance of the kingship through various innovative adaptations. Thus the motivation for the duplication of Jer 23:5-6 is more complicated than simply wanting to augment the presence of the king within Jeremiah’s repository of hope-filled passages (i.e., the Book of Consolation). Perhaps instead the scribe was attracted to Jer 23:5-6, not because of its focus on the king—a focus that the scribe minimizes—but because this is the one place in Jeremiah where a future age of righteousness and justice is imagined. The passages of the Book of Consolation were also entirely lacking in an expectation of the restoration of justice and righteousness. To address this significant gap, the duplicating scribe brought to the Book of Consolation the only available intra-textual reference to such restoration (i.e. the oracle of Jer 23:5-6). At the same time, through various textual modifications, this scribe created a version of this oracle that maintained the Book of Consolation’s subdued tone with regard to a new king. Perhaps, then, this doublet was added to Jeremiah not long after the early form of the Book of Consolation (i.e. the form attested in G) took shape, when the restoration of the kingship was still not a priority. Here, of course, we are assuming that Jer 33:14-16 was added to Jeremiah at a different stage than the large plus of Jer 33:17-26—verses which do emphasize the place of the Davidic dynasty in Yhwh’s restoration of Judah. The reasoning behind this assumption is discussed below under *divinatory function*.
4.2.3.6 The Duplicate’s Literary Divinatory

As several scholars have pointed out, many of the adaptations of the duplicate in 33:14-16, *vis-à-vis* the original in 23:5-6, form a coherent pattern reflecting the same motivation.\(^{354}\) Overall these adaptations work (#1) to draw attention away from original oracle’s special concern for the Davidic heir and simultaneously (#2) to harmonize the doublet conceptually with its secondary context—an immediate context concerned with the restoration of Jerusalem, and a larger context (the Book of Consolation) that is focused primarily on the return from exile of the Yhwh’s people and which is relatively uninterested in the Davidic kingship. In this section, we will examine how each of the doublet’s innovative modifications work toward both ends at the same time.

First, with the expansions to the doublet’s text in v.14, the focus of the oracle is shifted away from the king and onto the people of Judah and Israel as a whole—who are the primary subjects of chaps. 30-33. Moreover, the content of Yhwh’s action is expanded beyond the mere reestablishment of the Davidic throne to include the return of Yhwh’s people from exile (v. 14)—assuming the \( \text{‘the good word’} \) in 33.14 does in fact refer to the end of exile promised in 29:10 and 32:42—and the restoration of Jerusalem (v.16)—two themes that dominate the Book of Consolation.\(^{355}\) Thus, the oracle is no longer solely interested in the Davidic heir, but reflects the broader concern of the oracle’s secondary context. The new emphasis on Jerusalem, in particular, radically displaces attention that was originally focused on the king. The oracle that was once a


\(^{355}\) See n. 350 above.
divine legitimization of a certain Davidic heir has been transformed into a symbolic naming of the city of Jerusalem. The naming of Jerusalem now occupies the oracle’s climactic position—a position once filled by the name יְוָהֵשׁעַדָא.

In this regard, the duplicate complements an important theme of chap. 33, i.e. the restoration of Jerusalem. The title given to the holy city—“Yhwh is our righteousness”—connects this city to Yhwh’s enactment of justice. Earlier in the chapter, Jerusalem is a location of grave injustice. Verse 4 describes an unjust, material consequence of war, namely the destruction of civilian houses that were seized and torn down for the war effort. Then, in the following verses, Yhwh makes known his intentions to put the city under repair (אֲרֻכָה) and to give it a fresh beginning (vv. 6-7). In v. 9, the description of this restoration continues and is symbolized by Yhwh’s renaming of the city:

“and it will be to me a name of joy.”

Importantly, the rebuilding of Jerusalem depicted in these verses amounts to a restoral of justice—the righting of wartime wrongdoing—and a material manifestation of Yhwh’s own righteousness. Yet, the connection between this rebuilding and Yhwh’s righteousness is not here made explicit. With the introduction of the duplicate, however—and the revealing of the city’s new name, יהוה צדקנו—Jerusalem is presented as a symbol and embodiment of Yhwh’s righteousness.

Moreover, if the doublet at one time marked the end of the chapters of

356 As discussed below, in v. 9, G lack the word “name” and reads καὶ ἔσται εἰς εὐφροσύνην … “and it (the city) will be a joy….”

the Book of Consolation—as argued below—a confession of Yhwh’s righteousness came to conclude the book as a whole. In this way, Yhwh’s restoration of Judah and her crown city—a restoration described in a plethora of ways throughout the Book of Consolation—is portrayed as being ultimately an expression of Yhwh’s righteousness.

The pattern of diminishing the centrality of the king in favor of other emphases is detected in the other innovations of the duplicate. At the time of duplication, the concern for the legitimacy of Zedekiah—or of any king—was no longer an issue. This concern was cut from the oracle in favor of a different concern reflecting a new historical horizon: the recovery of righteousness. In place of a צמח צדיק, the oracle now speaks of a צמח צדקה—an agent through whom God will establish this righteousness. Once more, the chief concern at the time of duplication seems to be the restoration of justice, and not that of the kingship. Though the new king plays a vital role in fulfillment of God’s justice,

_358_ For references to the restoration of Judah and Jerusalem in the Book of Consolation, see: n. 350 above.

---

Goldman, _Prophétie et royauté au retour de l’exil_, 27–29. Both believe that the modifications of 33:16—namely the insertion of the name Jerusalem and the new name given to it—give the doublet a “coloration sacerdotale” (Goldman, _Prophétie et royauté au retour de l’exil_, 27), arguing that “Jerusalem” must be a reference to the temple and to the temple cult and is thus connected to a reference to temple worship in 33:11. They also ascribe these modifications and a reference to the Levitical priests in 33:18 (the references to these priests in vv. 21-22 may be secondary) to the same revising hand; cf. Allen, _Jeremiah_, 377–78; McKane, _Jeremiah _2_, 861. Goldman, _Prophétie et royauté au retour de l’exil_, 29, suggests further that the new name of Jerusalem is a cipher for Yhwh’s special presence in the temple in Jerusalem. While the introduction of the reference to the priesthood in 33:18 may suggest that the toponym “Jerusalem” was taken (at some point) as such a cipher, it is uncertain if the city name carried this symbolisms at the moment of duplication that created 33:14-16. None of the modifications of the doublet’s text emphasize the sacerdotal character of the city or acknowledge the reference to temple worship in 33:11. Instead, its modifications are explicitly connected to the renaming of Jerusalem (which seems to be linked to the rebuilding of Jerusalem described in v. 6) and to its safety (תב״ח) from the war described in vv. 4-5. If the doublet were to be modified with a sacerdotal Tendenz, we would expect these modifications to reference the cult or the temple more explicitly. Mentioning Jerusalem on its own is hardly a certain indicator of a concern for the priesthood; and for reasons explained below, we consider it probable that Jer 33:17-26 comes from a later hand than that which created the duplicate of Jer 33:14-16. Still, we leave open the possibility that at a later point, another scribe capitalized on cultic implications tacit in the reference to Jerusalem and added the references to the priesthood in 33:18 (and possibly 21-22).

---

358 For references to the restoration of Judah and Jerusalem in the Book of Consolation, see: n. 350 above.
the significance of the king’s reign has been diminished. Erased is the articulation that
“the king will rule and deal wisely” ( ). As Goldman argues, this deletion
is not innocuous, but has the effect of untethering the king’s execution of “justice and
righteousness” ( ) in v. 15 from the king’s own ruling and wise dealing.

Through this deletion, the king’s enactment of justice and righteousness is instead
anchored directly to Yhwh’s action of “springing up a branch of righteousness.”359 It is
Yhwh’s initiative rather than the king’s wise dealings which brings about the justice of
Yhwh.

Attention is further diverted from David’s heir with the replacement of (“his
[the king’s] days”) with in v. 16—a phrase that echoes the earlier line

which itself was inserted into the oracle at the beginning of v. 15. Both
of these insertions emphasize that Judah will be saved—not in the days of the new king in
particular—but in the days when Yhwh fulfills his good word mentioned in v. 14—a
word that pertains to the whole of Judah.

All in all, the various innovations of the duplicate oracle work together toward
two interdependent goals: 1) the curtailing of king’s importance in the coming age, and
(at the same time) 2) the conceptual harmonization of the doublet with its secondary
literary context—a context concerned more with the people of Judah and the restoration
of Jerusalem than the king. As Lust summarizes, “…in this version of the oracle, the

359 Goldman, Prophétie et royauté au retour de l’exil, 14; cf. Lust, “Messianism and the Greek
Version of Jeremiah,” 104.
reference to the historical situation of the individual king Zedekiah disappears. The
Davidic expectations are collectivized and transferred to the town.**360

Having recognized the various ways the text of the doublet has been tailored to
better suit its secondary context, we may now examine the ways the doublet—in its
modified form—both interprets its context and depends on this context for elucidation.
As mentioned, the doublet—in its adapted form—connects Yhwh’s righteousness to the
rebuilding of Jerusalem described in 33:6. Furthermore, through vertical reading, it fills
out the meaning of v.9, which as mentioned above states that Jerusalem will be “a name
of joy.”361 Here a few verses before the doublet—where Jerusalem is given a new
name—we find another line interested in the name of the holy city. It is important to note
that the reading in G lacks the word “name;” but this word may have been lost due to
parablepsis reading for .362 If M preserves the original reading, then this
reading is clearly the inspiration for the adaptation of the doublet—which replaced the
naming of the king with the naming of the city. On the other hand, if the reading of G is
more original, the word may have been added at the same time as vv.14-16.363
Either way, the naming of Jerusalem—the rhetorical climax of the duplicate—functions

360 Lust, “Messianism and the Greek Version of Jeremiah,” 104.

361 The last fem. sing. subject mentioned in the previous verses is the city Jerusalem, so it is
reasonable to conclude that the fem. sing. subject of v.9 is also Jerusalem. After all, the fem. sing. pronoun
“to her” (= αὐτῇ) in v. 6 clearly refers to the city of Jerusalem. And although the word “city” in v. 5
may be a later addition (it is missing in G), the setting of v. 4 is the “city” (Jerusalem), and this setting does
not change in the following verses. Here we disagree with Bogart, “Urtext, texte court et relecture,” 239,
who seems to assume that apart from the additions of the word “city” in v. 5 and of the word “name” in v.
9, the verb in v. 9 would be impersonal and would not refer to the city.

362 Cf. McKane, Jeremiah 2, 858.

through vertical reading as an explication of the meaning of v. 9. On its own, v. 9 indicates that the name of the city will be a joy, but it does not reveal what that name is. A clarification is found in v. 16 where Jerusalem receives its new appellation.

Moreover, the adapted text of the doublet relies on its new context to be fully understood. Only through vertical reading can one determine the content of Yhwh’s good word (הדבר הטוב), a phrase added intra-textually to 33:14. As discussed above, context suggests that Yhwh’s good word refers to the promised return from exile mentioned in 29:10 and 32:37-42. This suggestion is seemly confirmed by another observation. In 33:16, we hear that

“Jerusalem will dwell in safety.”

Though this language (minus the reference to Jerusalem) is original to the doublet, within doublet’s secondary context the phrase becomes an echo of 32:37, which in nearly identical language reads

“I will make them [the citizens of Jerusalem (see 32:36)] dwell in safety.”

The main topic of this verse, 32:37, is also the return from exile. The harmonization of the doublet’s text with this verse (by replacing the name Israel with Jerusalem), invites the duplicate as a whole to be read in the light of this return.

In short, the duplicating scribe relies upon vertical reading and intra-textual harmonization to elucidate both the meaning of duplicate itself and its secondary context. In contrast to the previous two doublets, the present doublet has been radically altered. Through innovative modifications, the duplicator created a new text out of an existing oracle, to complement and complete (the chapters now recognized as) the Book of Consolation—perhaps filling a perceived lacuna, namely the absence of a description of the restoration of justice and righteousness. While the oracle’s original function—
legitimizing the ascension of king Zedekiah—was lost, the oracle’s original concern for the establishment of Yhwh’s righteousness was preserved. The duplicator utilized this concern, first untethering it from the king’s ability to rule and deal wisely, making it instead the initiative of Yhwh who causes a new righteous king to sprout and who, more importantly, brings about the end of exile and the rebuilding of Jerusalem, a city torn apart by injustice. In this way, the duplicating scribe invites the reader to view the return from exile and especially the restoration of Jerusalem as a manifestation of Yhwh’s righteousness. When rebuilt, the holy city will be given a new name, “Yhwh is our righteousness.” As noted in an earlier section, the optimism of this duplicate contrasts with gloomy outlook of the duplicate of 17:1-4, which may suggest that these duplicates come from different hands. On the other hand, like the duplicate of 17:1-4 (and unlike that of 8:10b-12), the present duplicate may address a perceived lacuna of its context. After analyzing three doublets, we have encounter three different assortments of duplicate function, not to mention three different duplication techniques.

4.2.3.7 The Relationship of 33:14-16 to 33:17-26

Until now, we have examined the function of doublet on its own terms without considering the remainder of the large plus of Jeremiah 33, namely, vv. 17-26. Here we will bring these verses into the conversation. Many scholars seem to assume that the whole plus of Jer 33:14-26 was added to Jeremiah at the same time. 364 There is some logic to this assumption. Since these verses are part of a continuous plus of $V^M$, and since

is typically thought to be the work of a single reviser, it seems reasonable to conclude that vv. 14-16 and vv. 17-26 were added in one moment. However, a fresh look at the textual data suggests an alternate hypothesis.

Importantly, much of vv. 17-26—and especially vv. 20-22, 25-26—consists of a reworking of 31:35-37. For this reason it is possible to compare the duplication technique and duplication function (and revision bias) of our doublet, 33:14-16, with the “rewriting” technique and function (and revision bias) of the reworked material of 33:17-26. By revision bias, we mean the motivation for how a text was revised, a motivation that has a direct bearing on a text’s function. Bogaert, in his analysis of this passage, simply describes both the doublet and the rewritten material of vv. 17-26 as “une paraphrase.” Yet, Bogaert does not define what he means by paraphrase, and for this reason, this description is not very useful for comparative purposes.

Perhaps the more precise terminology and analysis employed in this study could be of some use here. As we concluded above, the duplicate of vv. 14-16 represents a verbatim repetition with major adaptation of 23:5-6, whose text was altered according to a consistent and coherent pattern, i.e. the minimization of references to the king in favor of other emphases such as the return from exile and the restoration of Jerusalem. When we consider the remainder of the plus (vv. 17-26), however, we find a rewriting of 31:35-37 of a very different nature, both in terms of rewriting technique and in terms of its function as determined by its revision bias. As to the former, the technique of rewriting


utilized in vv. 17-26 is so free that it would hardly qualify as a paraphrase. As to the latter, the bias of this rewriting—which as we will see multiples references to the Davidic dynasty and underscoring its permanence—appears to be entirely at odds with the bias of the doublet of vv. 14-16.\textsuperscript{367} We will consider both the rewriting technique and revision bias of Jer 33:17-26 in more detail in turn.

To commence, consider the following synopsis of Jer 31:35-37 and Jer 33:20-22, 25-26.\textsuperscript{368}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{367} Not necessarily at odds with, but certainly distinct from the revisional bias of the doublet is the repeated concern for Yhwh’s covenant with the Levitical priest in 33:18, 21-22. McKane, \textit{Jeremiah} 2, 861 understands the references here to the Levites to be “a promotion of the priesthood at the expense of the Davidic king.” Goldman, \textit{Prophétie et royauté au retour de l’exil}, 27–28, considers this repeated interest in the Levitical priesthood to be later glosses. The arguments made in this section are not contingent upon a decision on this matter either way.

\textsuperscript{368} For the following analysis, cf. Goldman, \textit{Prophétie et royauté au retour de l’exil}, 16–21, and Bogart, “Urtext, texte court et relecture,” 242–46, who make similar observations about these two texts. For an analysis of the textual differences between M and G in 31:35-37, see: Becking, Between Fear and Freedom, 43–45.
\end{flushright}
\end{footnotesize}
As the above synopsis displays, Jer 31:35-37 consists of a description of the natural order and two oaths (oaths #1 and #2). For its part, Jer 33:20-22, 25-26 contains an analogy from nature and its own two oaths (oaths #3 and #4). These last two oaths are clearly shaped by the first two in terms of form, theme, and even diction, and the analogy from nature in 33:22 was undoubtedly inspired by oath #2. We will consider the influence of both oaths #1 and #2 upon the addition to chap. 33.

Beginning with oath #1, the dependence of the protases of oaths #3 (33:20) and oath #4 (33:25) upon the protasis of oath #1 is easily perceived. The protasis of oath #1 considers an inconceivable hypothetical, namely that certain aspects of the natural order should fail, i.e. the natural orders described in the preceding verse, 31:35. Following suit,
the protases of oath #3 and oath #4 both entertain their own of inconceivability (that is, the failure of a different set of natural orders).\textsuperscript{369} The apodoses of the three oaths display further similarities. All three state as impossible the cessation of something: the end of Israel as a nation in oath #1; the breaking of the Davidic covenant (and a Levitical covenant) in oath #3; and the rejection of the descendants of David and Jacob in oath #4.

The two texts (i.e. 31:35-36 and 33:20-22, 25-26) also exhibit a minor amount of similar and identical diction: \ldots “by day…by night” (31:35; 33:25) ≈ \ldots “the day…the night” (33:20); and, “statues” (31:35; 33:25; cf. 31:26).\textsuperscript{370} On the basis of these formal, thematic, and linguistic similarities the dependence of the addition of 33:20-22, 25-26 upon 31:35-37 is undeniable.

However, in spite of this clear dependence, one must acknowledge a substantial degree of dissimilitude existing between the content of the two passages. On a superficial level, the content of oaths #3 and #4 seem to mirror that of oath #1 (or at least the description of the natural order assumed by oath #1) since all three refer to the day and the night. Yet, upon closer examination, the content of oaths #3 and #4 are actually quite different. The protasis of oath #1 mentions day and night as a consequence of the oath’s concern to describe the sun, moon, and stars, and their ordained purpose of illuminating day and night. The protases of oaths #3 and #4, in contrast, take interest in day and night only insofar as they occur during their appointed times. These latter two oaths have no interest in the cosmic luminaries nor in their ordained purpose. Moreover,


\textsuperscript{370} Cf. ibid.
the description of the natural order assumed by oath #1 describes the stirring and roaring of the sea; this subject is completely missing from the oaths of Jer 33:20-22, 25-26.

A similar substantial difference is seen the content of the oaths’ apodoses. That of oath #1 is concerned with the continuation of Israel as a nation. The apodoses of oath #3 and #4, however, are entirely focused on the continuation of the Davidic dynasty (and of the Levitical priesthood). With oath #4, the continuation of Israel is also in view, but this concern is substantially dwarfed by the concern for the continuation of David’s line. Thus, while oaths #3 and #4 use oath #1 as a model in terms of form and theme—and to a lesser extent of diction—the two break from this model to such a degree that we are beyond the bounds of duplication and in the realm of new composition.

Oath #2 (31:37) also served as a source for the plus of 33:17-26. This oath’s protasis, which considers two impossible tasks—measuring (מדש) the heavens and exploring the earth’s foundations—inspired the analogy from nature found in 33:22. There the uncountable nature of the hosts of heaven and of the sand of the sea (which are said to be immeasurable [לא ימד]) serves as an analogy for the imagined innumerableness of the Davidic descendants (and the descendants of the Levites). Thus, the analogy from nature in 33:22, while being wholly dependent upon the protasis of oath #2, is by no means its duplicate.

For its part, the diction of the second oath’s apodosis was employed by the apodosis of oath #4 (33:26). The former reads: “Then I will reject all the descendants of Israel on account of all that they did.” Some of this wording is carried over to oath #4 in whose apodosis the impossibility of Yhwh’s rejection of Jacob’s descendants is featured, though as mentioned above, the primary concern of oath #4 is the continuation of the
Davidic kingship. Once again, although oath #2 partially inspired the plus of 33:17-26—specifically the analogy from nature and the apodosis of oath #4—these last two have only a superficial resemblance with their source. In summary, the scribe responsible for creating 33:17-26 undoubtedly utilized some of the themes and language of 31:35-37, and even imitated the oath form found therein; yet what the scribe created out of these bits and pieces was an entirely new text. All things considered, it would be a stretch to describe 33:17-26 as a duplicate of 31:35-37.  

In this regard, the scribal technique used to create the duplicate of 33:14-16 is markedly distinct from that which was utilized in the composition of vv. 17-26. This observation—that the present doublet and the composition of vv. 17-26 were formed through very different techniques of rewriting—does not prove these two creations are the work of different hands. Obviously, a single hand could employ two different techniques in a single revisional moment. Yet, these two units (i.e. vv. 14-16 and vv. 17-26) may be further distinguished by their revision bias. As mentioned, all of the modifications of the doublet’s text observable in vv. 14-16 cohere according to a clear pattern: the minimization of references to the Davidic dynasty. In stark contrast the modifications of the text of 31:35-37, apparent in 33:20-22, 25-26, work in the opposite direction: references to the Davidic king are maximized. Both of the oaths (oaths #3 and #4) and the analogy from nature (33:22), exist solely to magnify the importance of the Davidic line (and of the Levitical priests) and the perception its permanence. The covenant with David is hence on par with the laws of nature. Yhwh guarantees the

continuation of the Davidic line; as long as there is day and night, David will rule over the descendants of Israel. All this to say that the modifications of the plus of 33:20-22, 25-26 actually undo and undermine the modifications of the doublet twin of 33:14-16. That which the latter sought to erase is multiplied by the former. When we consider the remainder of the plus not derived from 31:35-37, we encounter the same bias as 33:20-22, 25-26. Verses 17-18, for instance, are also entirely focused on the perpetuation of the Davidic lineage (and that of the Levitical priests). In other words the whole of vv. 17-26 reflects the same monochromatic Davidic tint, a coloring that clashes with the muted references to monarchy of the duplicate. These verses appear to reflect a different time period than the duplicate—a time when imaging the restoration of the kingship was now urgent; a time when the dearth of references to the throne in the Book of Consolation had to be addressed.

In light of these observations—that 33:17-26 displays a different “rewriting” technique than that of the doublet, and that the revision bias (and thus function) of the former contradicts that of the latter—it appears improbable that both sections were added to $V^M$ by the same scribal hand. Instead, the alternative possibility, that two different scribal hands from two different time periods were involved, appears to be the most cogent solution. If so, we have good reason for reevaluating all of the expansions of $V^M$ ($vis-à-vis$ Jer$^+$) in order to determine whether $V^M$ as a whole is the product of one or multiple scribal hands. In the following chapter, we will focus our critical gaze onto a

---

372 For a discussion of the origins of 33:17-18, see Goldman, Prophétie et royauté au retour de l’exil, 15–16. The only verse of the plus not discussed is 33:24, which contains various enigmatic references, the identification and discussion of which would be beyond the scope of the current section. Suffice it to say that there is no scholarly consensus on either the identity of “these people,” who are speaking ill of Yhwh’s people, or that of the “two families.”
number of V^M's additions. Importantly, even if our evaluation of the relationship of 33:14-16 and 33:17-26 turns out to be incorrect, our more fundamental observations about the divinity function of the former still hold.


4.2.4.1 Preliminary Considerations:

A large number of scholars accept 30:10-11 as the duplicate twin on the basis of the expansive nature of V^M.\(^{373}\) A few others are not convinced even though there is not a trigger for haplography.\(^{374}\) Once again, the fittingness of the doublet in its two contexts is an issue.\(^{375}\) As laid out below, the doublet shares many verbal and thematic connections with chap. 30, and thus appears to be a better fit there than in chap. 46, where the logic of its presence may not be immediately obvious. Thus, one may be drawn to conclude that the doublet is integral, and thus original, to chap. 30 and alien, and so secondary, to chap. 46. Though, as explained at the beginning of this chapter, the fittingness of a doublet in a given context may simply be the result of harmonization by a duplicating scribe.

---


\(^{375}\) Cf. Holladay, *Jeremiah* 2, 324.
Perhaps it is more pertinent to explain the (somewhat) surprising presence of the doublet at the end of chap. 46 in the middle of the OAN. Here we find the doublet’s text nestled between the oracle against Egypt (46:1-26 = 26:1-25 G)\(^{376}\) and the oracle against the Philistines (47:1-7 = 29:1-7 G) in M and between the oracle against Egypt and the lengthy oracle against Babylon (Jer 50-51 = 27-28 G) in G. Janzen, finding the placement of the doublet in M to be unsatisfactory, favors its location in G, where it directly precedes the oracle against Babylon.\(^{377}\) Janzen argues that the doublet’s “motifs of Israel’s return from Exile and [Yhwh’s] judgment on her captors” cohere extremely well with the beginning of Babylon’s oracle—which comparably announces Babylon’s doom and Israel’s safe return from exile. He further observes that in the book of Isaiah the same connection is made between Babylon’s defeat (Isaiah 13-14) and Israel’s return from captivity (Isa 14:1-3).\(^{378}\) Janzen goes on to propose that the doublet began as a marginal gloss on Jer 50:2-5, which was added to the text before 50:1 (and thus after the oracle against Egypt according to the ordering of oracles in G); but with the rearrangement of the oracles in M, the doublet’s connection to the oracle against Babylon was lost.\(^{379}\)

The hypothesis that the text of the doublet began as a gloss on Jer 50:2-5 has not gone unchallenged. For his part, Fischer rejects Janzen’s theory partly because he finds it

---

\(^{376}\) Jer 46:26 is missing in G.


\(^{378}\) Ibid., 221, n. 19.

unconvincing and partly because it does cohere with his earlier conclusion that the order of OAN in M is more original than that of G.\textsuperscript{380} With Janzen, Fischer acknowledges that the doublet and 50:2-5 share in common references to the fall of Babylon and to the return from exile, but he argues that differences in vocabulary, imagery, and emphasis preclude a direct relationship between the two.\textsuperscript{381} Fischer writes, “\textit{Auch wenn sicherlich vom Thema der Heimkehr eine Nähe zwischen beiden Texten besteht, so ist die Ausarbeitung doch zu verschieden, um zwischen beiden einen direkten Zusammenhang anzunehmen.}”\textsuperscript{382} Put concisely, the doublet does not make a convincing gloss of 50:2-5.

Yet, while the doublet may not work well as an \textit{exegetical} gloss of 50:2-5—i.e. a gloss that elucidates the lemma’s meaning—it is completely adequate as an \textit{associative} gloss—a gloss attracted to the lemma due to lexical or thematic similarities.\textsuperscript{383} Moreover, we need not accept every detail of Janzen’s argument to affirm his instincts to see a link between Israel’s salvation and Babylon’s doom. Even if the doublet did not

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{380} Fischer, \textit{Das Trostbüchlein}, 60.
\item \textsuperscript{381} Georg Fischer, “Jer 25 und die Fremdvölkersprüche: Unterschiede zwischen hebräischem und griechischem Text,” \textit{Bib} 72 (1991): 476: e.g. the addressee of the doublet is “my servant Jacob” and Israel, whereas in 50:2-5 it is the people of Israel and the people of Judah; the former speaks of the chastisement of Judah, while the latter is more thoroughly hopeful; and the two passages use different Hebrew words to describe the return from exile ("return/turn back” and “come,” respectively).
\item \textsuperscript{382} Fischer, “Jer 25 und die Fremdvölkersprüche,” 476.
\item \textsuperscript{383} Also, Fischer, “Jer 25 und die Fremdvölkersprüche,” 477, suggests that the text of the doublet makes more sense when placed between the oracles against Egypt against the Philistines, Judah’s neighbors. Those oracles, he explains, present a picture of impending divine destruction from the North (i.e. from Babylon), destruction which threatens to annihilate nearby Judah in the process. The text of the doublet responds to this threat, first by promising salvation, telling Judah to fear not, and second by ensuring that any destruction inflicted on Judah by Yhwh will be restrained. In 50:2-5, in contrast, there is no urgent threat of annihilation for Judah, since it is Babylon, and not Judah’s neighbors, who is facing destruction. However, the pressing issue of the doublet is not the impending destruction of Babylon’s conquest of the Levant, but the aftermath of that conquest. In the doublet, Judah is in need of salvation from exile, a salvation which corresponds to the destruction of Babylon articulated in 50:2-5, and the remainder of chaps. 50-51.
\end{itemize}
originate as a gloss on 50:2-5, Janzen has flagged an important connection, a connection that probably explains the presence of this doublet among the OAN in the first place. Put plainly, the punishment of Judah’s enemies is correlative with Judah’s salvation.

Seen from this angle, the presence of the doublet at the end of chap. 46 is not as surprising as one may first think. In fact, the salvation of Judah is linked to the punishment of Judah’s enemies on a few other occasions in the OAN: besides 46:27-28, we find words of hope for Judah in the oracle against Ammon (49:2), and several times in the oracle against Babylon (e.g. 50:4-8, 19-20). In fact, separating Judah’s hope from its enemies’ doom would be conceptually impossible; in the oracle against Babylon, for example, the two clearly go hand in hand (cf. 50:17-18, 34; 51:5-6, 49).

The presence of our doublet’s text (46:27-28) at the close of the oracle against Egypt, then, is not actually disjunctive but reflective of a larger trend of the OAN which correlates Judah’s flourishing with the withering of its international adversaries. As Allen points out, we encounter the converse in 30:16: there in the milieu of the Book of Consolation—chapters devoted to Israel’s restoration—we find pronouncements against Israel’s oppressors. In sum, the textual evidence of M and G cannot be brushed aside

384 Helpful here is the comment of Allen, *Jeremiah*, 459, who notes a patterned distribution of references to Israel in the OAN: “As a result all the oracles against the nations function as implicit pronouncements of salvation for [Yhwh’s] own people, inasmuch as they involve disaster for Israel’s foreign enemies” (cf. 469). Though, Allen’s comment has in mind the arrangement of the OAN in M in particular, the point remains true for the arrangement of the oracles found in G. In addition to the references to Judah’s (Israel’s) salvation in the oracles against Ammon and against Babylon, Allen flags the reference to Moab’s mocking of Israel in 48:27, which he counts as the given reason for Moab’s ill fate. Allen, ibid., 494, relates the words of hope for Judah in 46:27-28 and 49:2 as a “new stage within the overall collection.”

385 Allen, ibid., 459.
on literary grounds; the doublet twin of 46:27-28 is clearly the original while that of 30:10-11 is the duplicate.

4.2.4.2 Textual Analysis

TABLE 4.14


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27 σὺ δὲ ἦν φοβηθη b...b</td>
<td>b...b</td>
<td>b b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 οὐδὲ ου Ιακωβ b...b</td>
<td>c c d 28 c d c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ηδὲ πτοηθ Ἰσραηλ</td>
<td>c c e e c e 11</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διότι ιδοὺ ἐγὼ σῶζω σε ακρόθεν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ τὸ σπέρ ἀ σου ἐκ γῆ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αἰχ ἀλωσία αὐτῶν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἀναστρέψει Ιακωβ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἴσωκασε καὶ ὑπνόσει</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ὁ παρενοχλόν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 μὴ φοβοῦ c</td>
<td>d 28 c d c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 μηδὲ πτοηθ Ἰσραηλ</td>
<td>c c e e c e 11</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διὸ τὶ ἔσται ὁ παρενοχλόν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ τὸ σπέρ ἀ σου ἐκ γῆ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αἰχ ἀλωσία αὐτῶν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἀναστρέψει Ιακωβ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἴσωκασε καὶ ὑπνόσει</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ὁ παρενοχλόν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Synonymous translations: in three places we encounter different but synonymous Greek translations of the same Hebrew word. (1) “fear not” (2nd masc. sing. jus.) is first rendered with ἦν φοβηθη “fear not” (2nd sing. subj.) in v. 27 and second with ἦν φοβοῦ “fear not” (2nd sing. imptv.) in v. 28. (2) “servant” is translated as... | | |
δοῦλος “servant” in v. 27 and as παῖς “servant” in v. 28; while the latter Greek word is the most frequent translation of יְהוָה in Jeremiah, occurring at least sixteen more times, the former does translated this Hebrew word on three other occasions (Jer 2:14; 7:25; 25:4). (3) “annihilation / end” is translated as συντέλεια “end” in its first occurrence in v. 28 and as ἐκλίπειν “to fail” in its second occurrence in v. 28; συντέλεια appears to be a standard translation of the noun כלה, representing this noun three more times in Jeremiah (4.27; 5:10; 5:18); on the other hand, there is no consistent Greek translation of the verbal form כולה, and so the possibility of determining if this variant translation reflects a different Vorlage is unlikely.

\( b\ldots b \) Synonymous variation (transposition): “says the lord” – the insertion of this divine speech formula is probably connected below \( c\ldots c \). In the process of simplifying the doublet, the duplicating scribe added to the opening line this formula taken from the beginning of v. 28 (see below).

\( c\ldots c \) Synonymous variation (omission):

“You, do not be afraid, my servant Jacob, says Yhwh” – this divine “fear not” command in v. 28 is virtually identical to the divine command that opens v. 27, the only difference being the absence in v. 27 of the divine speech formula. In the duplicate, the scribe eliminated the second occurrence of this command while simultaneously harmonizing the first occurrence with the second; i.e. the scribe added the divine speech formula from the second occurrence to the first (cf. \( b\ldots b \)), a duplication technique we could call maximal conflation.

\( d \) Probably scribal error: “you” (46:28 M) / ἀντών “him” = “him” (46:28 G) – It is possible that a scribe mistook the Hebrew 2nd person sing. pronoun for the 3rd person sing. pronoun, or vice versa. In G, the pronoun serves as the object of the previous sentence, whereas in M, it is the subject of the sentence following.

\( e\ldots e \) Synonymous variation (intra-textual addition): “For I am with you” (46:28 M G) / “for I am with you, says Yhwh, to save you” (30:11 M) – the original reading, “For I am with you,” served as a trigger for the longer Mitsein formula, a formula which was added to the Jeremiah on more than one occasion.

---

386 Alternatively—but less likely—we could attribute this variant to the translator. In four cases, the Hebrew phrase “there is none to frighten” is translated in the Septuagint with οὐκ “not” + a form of the verb to be (εἰ) + a particle (meaning “one who frightens”) + an extra pronoun not represented in the Hebrew text (Lev 26:6; Job 11:19; Ezek 34:28; Zeph 3:13). Thus, one could propose that convention prompted the translator to add the pronoun to Jer 46(26):27. However, we would then still have to explain why the pronoun was missing from G. Plus, in six cases—including once more in Jeremiah (Jer 7:33)—the phrase is translated in the Septuagint without the pronoun (Deut 28:26; Isa 17:2; Ezek 39:26; Mic 4:4; Nah 2:12), and thus adding the pronoun was not obligatory.
occasion. In our discussion of that doublet, we note that this formula may occur with the root “to save” or with the root “to deliver;” the use of the former in this doublet links the Mitsein formula with the first verse of the doublet (46:27 // 30:10) where Yhwh says “Look! I will save you.” The addition is synonymous since it merely repeats an idea already present in the doublet’s text.

Synonymous variation (intra-textual replacement): “I (have) driven you” (46:28) M G / “I (have) scattered you” (30:11 M) – the duplicating scribe has replaced the original wording of the doublet with a near synonym. Both verbs are used frequently in Jeremiah in similar contexts to describe the exile, and they stand in parallel in 23:2. This substitution may have been inadvertent. For reason explained below, the placement of this oracle in its secondary context seems intentional; yet in straying from the original reading of this verse, the scribe missed a potential lexical connection with 30.17, where Judah’s enemies are said to consider Judah to be “the one driven away.”

Non-significant variant (+/– conjunction /particle)

---


388 See §4.3.1 below.

389 With one exception (50[27]:6), the verb ἐκθέω in G always translates the Hebrew root (nine more times), including an occurrence in 51(28):34, in which case scribal error likely occurred.


391 Cf. Fischer, Das Trostbüchlein, 63.
4.2.4.3 Duplication Technique

TABLE 4.15
TRANSLATION OF JER 46:27-28 // JER 30:10-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jer 46:27-28</th>
<th>Jer 30:10-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27 But you, do not be afraid, O my servant Jacob, and do not be dismayed, O Israel. For look! I will save you from afar and your offspring from the land of their captivity. And Jacob will return and have quiet and ease and none will frighten him.</td>
<td>10 But you, do not be afraid, O my servant Jacob, says Yhwh. And do not be dismayed, O Israel. For look! I will save you from afar and your offspring from the land of their captivity. And Jacob will return and have quiet and ease and none will frighten.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 You do not be afraid, O my servant Jacob, says Yhwh. For I am with you. For I will make and end of all the nations into which I have driven you there. But of you, I will not make an end. And, I will chastise you as justice requires, and will by no means leave you unpunished.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This current doublet stands out from the previous three for containing neither minor synonymous variation nor scribal innovations. Yet this doublet of forty-eight to forty-nine words contains a high degree of (major) synonymous variation (underlined with a dashed line): in the duplicate we find two insertions (one of two words and one of three), an omission of seven words, and a replacement of a single word. The three-word insertion and the single-word replacement are drawn intra-textually from stock...
Jeremianic language, and the omission simplifies the doublet's text, eliminating a redundant sentence. This doublet occupies the boundary between loose citation and paraphrase. With regard to the first verse, 46:17 is virtually identical to 30:10, save for the transposition of divine speech formula. The wording of the second verse (46:28 // 30:11), however, exhibits three synonymous variations which makes it a paraphrase.

4.2.4.4 Rationale for Duplication

The text of Jer 46:28-29 was probably attracted to the Book of Consolation, as a part of an ongoing effort of scribes to consolidate many of Jeremiah’s hopeful oracles into a single collection (cf. the duplication of 23:5-6 in 33:14-16). The specific image of salvation from the land of exile (ארץ שׁבים) found in the duplicate in 30:10 coheres with the abounding references to Judah’s return to their homeland in the Book of Consolation.\(^{392}\) Moreover, the immediate context of Jeremiah 30 seems to have been a particularly inviting context for the text of the doublet.\(^{393}\) Immediately prior to the doublet, chap. 30 describes the fearful, current conditions of Yhwh’s people: in v. 5, there is a cry of panic (חרדה) and terror (פחד); in v.6, extreme pain; and in v. 7, a time of distress. On the heels of this description, words of comfort emerge: in v. 7, Jacob (יעקב) will be saved (יושׁע); in v. 8, foreign oppressors will no longer enslave them (לא־יעבדו־בו); and in v. 9, they will instead once more serve (עבדו) Yhwh and David.

\(^{392}\) Other references to the end of exile include 30:3, 8; 31:8-13, 16-18, 21; 32:37.

\(^{393}\) In the words of Allen, Jeremiah, 337, the doublet’s text is “a good redactional fit” with its secondary context.
Following the doublet, the chapter continues with a portrayal of Judah’s suffering as an incurable sickness (vv. 12-13), and then, v. 14 associates Judah’s current suffering with divine chastisement ( ). Finally, in v. 16, we hear of the punishment of Judah’s enemies. The language of the doublet fits snugly in the midst of this imagery: The word in v. 5 is matched by “one who frightens” in v. 10; by “save you” in v. 10 and by “to save you” in v. 11; in vv. 8-9 by “my servant” in v. 10; in v. 14 by “and I will chasten you” in v. 11; and, the divine punishment of Judah’s enemies in v. 16 by “I will make a full end of all the [enemy] nations” in v. 11. Also, both v. 7 and v. 10 refer to the salvation of Jacob specifically. In short, the text of the doublet was attracted to the beginning of chap. 30 probably on the basis of numerous verbal and thematic links.

4.2.4.5 The Duplicate’s Divinatory Function

In several respects, the location of the duplicate—after v. 9 and before v. 12—is the only place in the Book of Consolation in which the doublet would makes sense. In this position, the words of divine assurance of v. 10, “ ,” intra-textually respond

---

394 For the following, cf. Parke-Taylor, The Formation of the Book of Jeremiah, 120; Allen, Jeremiah, 337; Fischer, Das Trostbüchlein, 61.

395 It is possible that the passages referring to Jacob and Israel in the Book of Consolation originally referred to the northern kingdom: c.f. Lohfink, “Der Junge Jeremia Als Propagandist Und Poet,” 352–53; Holladay, Jeremiah, 156–59; Marvin A. Sweeney, “Jeremiah 30-31 and King Josiah’s Program of National Restoration and Religious Reform,” ZAW 108 (1996): 569–83. Yet, in the book’s present form, these passages have come to address Judah as well.

396 Fischer, Das Trostbüchlein, 61, also points out the lexical link between “justice” in v. 11, and the resetting up of Jerusalem’s palace upon its foundations ( ) in v. 18.
through vertical reading to Judah’s cry of panic and terror in v. 5 and to the following
description of the people’s suffering in vv. 6-7. Nowhere else would these words of
divine assurance be so appropriate; for the reference to Judah’s fear in v. 5 is the only
place in the Book of Consolation where such fear is mentioned.\footnote{Other kinds of
fear are referenced in the Book of Consolation: divine fear is mentioned in
32:21, 32:39-49, and in 33:9 Judah is the one feared.}

Moreover, apart from the text of the doublet, the people’s fear expressed in v. 5 is
never explicitly addressed in the Book of Consolation. Thus, the doublet’s words of
assurance fill an important lacuna in the beginning of this book. We should note that
within chaps. 30-33, the emotional and thematic pitch oscillates from reflections on
Judah’s suffering to announcements of divine consolations, from specific plight to fitting
solution. For example, the images of Judah’s sickness in 30:12-15 are met by a promise
of healing in 30:17; the recounting of Rachel’s weeping for her lost children in 31:15
finds consolation in the assurance of their return in 31:16-17; and the portrayal of
Ephraim as a wayward and chasten child in 31:18-19 is answered by the compassionate
voice of a forgiving and welcoming divine parent in 31:20. In view of this pattern (of
matching specific predicament with fitting antidote), the fact that the cry of fear and
panic of v. 5 (apart from the doublet) is left unaddressed creates a tension behooving
attention. With the introduction of the doublet’s imperative to Jacob to have no fear, this
cry meets a timely answer.

Also, through vertical reading the reference to Judah’s salvation in v. 10
elucidates the passing reference to salvation in v. 7.\footnote{Cf. Parke-Taylor, 
_The Formation of the Book of Jeremiah_, 125.} There we read, “Yet,
he will be saved from it.” In its immediate context, the antecedent of “it” seems fairly straight forward, referring back to the specific calamity detailed in vv. 5-7: v. 5 mentions a cry of panic and terror, v. 6 offers an image of men in great pain—like the pain of childbirth—and v. 7 recounts both the fear of v. 5 and the suffering of v. 6 as a great day (גדול היום) and as time of distress (עת־צרה). All together, these images paint a picture of siege and conquest—as opposed to return from exile, for instance. Thus, it appears that v. 7 was originally designed to offer the hope of salvation to those facing impending military conquest. Yet, from such conquest, Judah was definitively not saved.

With the fall of Jerusalem, the promise of salvation in v. 7 seems to have been shipwrecked. Perhaps a divining scribe thought it possible to salvage this promise by transferring it to a different hope. Note that chap. 30 refers to several other hopeful expectations: v. 3 looks for the return from exile; vv. 8-9 foretell the end of foreign rule and the securing of political independence; and v. 17 speaks of the healing of Judah’s sickness and injury (described in vv. 12-15). Perhaps the salvation of v. 7 could be interpreted as a reflex of one of these other expectations. In fact, through vertical reading, the text of the doublet offers a fresh interpretation of the theme of salvation found in v. 7. Within the doublet, Yhwh declares, “Look! I will save you from afar” (הננימושׁיעך מרחוק).

That the duplicating scribe intended this vertical reading is suggested by a modification of the doublet’s text. The scribe intentionally strengthened the link between the doublet and v. 7 by replacing (and harmonizing) the short form of the divine Mitsein

399 Cf. the use of similar imagery in 4:31; 6:22-24.
formula of 46:27—with a longer variant of the formula that employs the root used in v. 7 (and v. 10)—namely, \(^{400}\) In this way, the text of the doublet, in its modified form, reinterprets the salvation of v. 7 as return from exile.

Vertical reading shapes the meaning of the verses following the doublet, as well. The reference in the duplicate to the justness of Judah’s punishment,

“and I chasten you in just measure” (v. 11), anticipates v. 14 (and perhaps v. 15).\(^{401}\) In that verse, Yhwh takes responsibility for Judah’s suffering:

“I have struck you with the blow of an enemy, the chastisement of the cruel, because of the greatness of your guilt; your sins are vast.” Besides these two verses (v. 11 in the doublet and v. 14 [and v. 15?]), chaps. 30-31 do not include such explicit references to the divine punishment of Judah.\(^{402}\) Thus, the placement of the doublet (vv. 10-11) a few verses before v. 14—both of which showcase divine punishment—seems ripe with interpretative potential.

In fact, the reference to chastisement in v. 11 serves to qualify the punishment depicted in v. 14. While v. 14 does indicate that Judah’s suffering is a consequence of sin—and is thereby a form of punishment—the verse does not discuss the fairness of this  

\(^{400}\) Longer and shorter variations of the divine Mitsein formula are found in Jer 1:8; 1:17 (G); 1:19; 15:20; and 42:11. See textual analysis above.

\(^{401}\) The textual history of v. 15 is complicated. The first half of the verse—“Why do you cry out over your hurt? Your pain is incurable” (NRSV)—is completely missing in G, while the second half—“Because your guilt is great, because your sins are so numerous, I have done these things to you.” (NRSV)—is found in G after v. 16; see discussion in McKane, Jeremiah 2, 769. The observations made in this section are not affected by the origins of v. 15, and so we may leave this discussion to the side.

\(^{402}\) Less explicit references to Judah’s punishment may perhaps be discerned in 31:18-19, and 28.
punishment, and actually seems to imply that Judah’s punishment is excessive and disproportionate: Yhwh does not punish as a loving parent or loyal patron, but as an “enemy” who is “cruel”—a word used to describe the mercilessness of Babylon in 6:23. The language of the doublet, however, provides the theological clarification that this punishment is never meted unjustly: “I chastise…in just measure” (v. 11). Once again the question of scribal intentionality arises. We are given insight into the scribe’s motives on the basis of a modification introduced to chap. 30. When the scribe created the duplicate, he or she also inserted the conjunction “indeed” at the beginning of v. 12 immediately after the text of the doublet. With this conjunction, the duplicator indicates that the following verses (including v. 14) are illustrative of the point made by v. 11. The (troubling) poetic depiction of divine punishment of v. 14 must be read in light of the declaration in v. 11 that Yhwh’s chastisements are just.

In sum, it seems certain that the scribe’s placement of the doublet within chap. 30 was deliberate. The text of the doublet helps solve exegetical problems of the Book of Consolation: the otherwise unaddressed fears of v. 5 are allayed, thus reinforcing this book’s preexisting pattern of movement from plight to solution; the reference to Judah’s salvation mentioned in v. 7 is reinterpreted in light of the exile; and the harsh image of Yhwh as a cruel punisher in v. 14 is qualified by an assertion of Yhwh’s justness. Compared to that of the previous doublets, the function of this current doublet in its secondary context is relatively minor. Like the previous doublet of 23:5-6 // 33:14-16,

403 Also, Fischer, *Das Trostbüchlein*, 62, suggests that the “nach der Errettung Züchtigung” of v. 11b connects the hopeful tone of vv. 8-11a with the following dismal images of “Verletzungen und Schmerz.”
the creation of this duplicate may reflect a desire to fill out the Book of Consolation with hope-filled oracles found elsewhere in the Jeremiah tradition. Both of these doublets, it should be noted, have a highly optimistic perspective about the end of exile (in contrast to the duplicate of 17:[1-3a]3b-4).

4.2.5 Text #5: “Like an Eagle” (Jer 48:40b and 41b // Jer 49:22)

4.2.5.1 Preliminary Considerations

The absence of the doublet twin in 48:40b and 41b in G suggests that this doublet is part of the expansions of $\text{V}^M$ and that 49:22 is the original text. In the case of 48:40b, no trigger for haplography exists, though one could argue 48:41b was lost through such sight error.\textsuperscript{404} Yet, the fact that this sight error would correspond perfectly with the doubled text, makes this argument unconvincing. The originality of the doublet twin in 49:22 is also confirmed by that twin’s deliberate wordplay, wordplay that fits the context of chap. 49 (the oracle against Edom). The doublet consists of a couplet containing two metaphorical images: (1) the soaring (דאה) of an eagle, and (2) the affliction (מְצֵרָה) of a woman (in labor?). Both images appear to be derived from the two proper names used in 49:22, “Edom,” and “Bozrah” respectively. This wordplay is lacking in the other version of the doublet (48:40b, 41b) in which both of these proper nouns are replaced by the name “Moab.” The presence of the paronomasia in 49:22 suggests that the doublet’s text was originally designed for the oracle against Edom in chap. 49.

\textsuperscript{404} Cf. Lundbom, “Haplography in the Hebrew Vorlage of LXX Jeremiah,” 319; in 48:41, the scribe’s eye could have skipped from the of to that of , or from the of to that of , the first word in 49:42.
When these images were appropriated for the oracle against Moab, the original plays on word were lost.

Moreover, the insertion of 49:22 into chap. 48 is emblematic of the highly intertextual (and to a lesser extent intra-textual) nature of that chapter. Already by the time of Jer+sn, the oracle against Moab in Jeremiah had become a repository for traditional Hebrew material concerning the nation of Moab found elsewhere in Hebrew scripture.

Much of 48:29-38 (found in Jer+sn) consists of material duplicated from the Moabite oracle of the book of Isaiah (Isa 15-16). In addition, 48:43-44a makes a doublet with Isa 24:17-18a. After the time of Jer+sn, the text of the oracle against Moab continued to be expanded, as revealed by several more pluses unique to \( V^M \)—vv. 45-46 are drawn from Num 21:28-29; 24:17, and v. 47 mimics a phrase used elsewhere in Jeremiah (e.g.

---


406 Which twin is the original is not immediately clear. Since Isaiah 24 is a highly inter-textual chapter, it would make sense to view the presence of the doublet of Isa 24:17-18a as another example of the chapter’s intertextuality. Moreover, since all of the other inter-textual duplications found in Jeremiah 48 are drawn exclusively from oracles against Moab found elsewhere in Hebrew scripture, it would be random for one to be drawn from the apocalyptic material of Isaiah. See Wildberger, Isaiah 13-27, 499. Parke-Taylor, The Formation of the Book of Jeremiah, 139–40.

in Jer\textsuperscript{M} at 30:3; 49:39; and also added to V\textsuperscript{M} at 49.6; cf. 46.26) and Hebrew scriptures at large.\textsuperscript{408} The duplication of 49:22 in 48:40-41, then, is best understand as one moment of a longer process of inter-textual and intra-textual expansion of the oracle against Moab.

4.2.5.2 Textual Analysis

TABLE 4.16

THE DOUBLET OF JER 49:22 // JER 48:40B, 41B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jer 49:22 G</th>
<th>Jer 49:22 M</th>
<th>Jer 48:40b, 41b M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22 ἰδοὺ ὄσπερ ἄετὸν</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b ὀφεῖται καὶ d ἐκτενεῖ τὰ πτέρυγα</td>
<td></td>
<td>d c b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e ἐπὶ ἰχυρῷ ἀπα αὐτῆς</td>
<td>f f e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἐσται ἡ καρδία τῶν ἰχυρῶν τῇ</td>
<td>f f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἰδοὺ αἰα ἐν τῇ ἡ ἔρα ἐκεῖνη</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡ καρδία γυναικὸ ὀδινοῦσῃ</td>
<td>g g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a} Synonymous Variation (intra-textual; post-duplication insertion): + “it will go up” (49:22 M). Given the absence of this word in 49:22 G—in agreement with 48:40b M—this verb was probably added after the moment of duplication to 49:22 to harmonize the doublet with the open words of 49:19, which reads: “Look! Like a lion goes up.”\textsuperscript{409}

\textsuperscript{408} E.g. Deut 30:3; Job 42:10; Ps 14:7; 53:7; 85:2; Ezek 16:35; 29:14; 39:25; Hos 6:11; Joel 4:1; Amos 9:14; Zeph 2:7; 3:20; see discussion below.

\textsuperscript{409} The suggestion of Parke-Taylor, \textit{The Formation of the Book of Jeremiah}, 138, that the added verb reflects the tradition of Isa 40:31 is unnecessary given the proximity of 49:19 to 49:22.
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b. **Non-significant variant (+/- conjunction)**

c. **Scribal error (→):** “he will soar” (49:22 M; 48:40b M) / ὄψεται (= )
“he will see.”

d. **Minor synonymous variant (change in verb tense: wayyiktol → wqatalti), or perhaps scribal error:** “and it will spread” (49:22 M G) / “it spread” (48:40b M)

e. **Scribal error (→ ) or possibly minor synonymous variation (different preposition):** “upon” (49:22 M G) / “to” (48:40b).

f. **Major innovation:** ...
“Bozrah...Edom” (49:22) / ...
“Moab...Moab” (48:40b, 41b) – in order to reapply the text of the doublet to its secondary context, the duplicating scribe replaced the two toponyms of 49:22 with the name Moab. The variant in 49:22 G, ὀχυρόα ἀρα αὐτῆς “her strongholds,” possibly reflects a variant Hebrew text: “her fortress” (ὀχύρων ἡ translates in 48:18).

g. **Synonymous translation:** “like the heart of an afflicted woman (in labor?)” (49:22 M; 48:41b M) / ὡς καρδία γυναικών ὥδινοις “like the heart of a woman birth pangs” (49:22 G) – the meaning of this phrase in M, a phrase occurring nowhere else in the Hebrew scriptures, is uncertain but is usually taken as a reference to a woman in labor (so also G). The phrase looks like a (slightly garbled) synonymous variation of a more common simile comparing one’s anguish to the pain of a woman “giving birth” ( ). Three times in Jeremiah—including twice in the OAN—the simile is used in parallel with the noun “distress” (Jer 6:24; 49:24; 50:43). The simile used in our doublet appears to be pieced together out of this imagery to the same effect; most follow M and vocalize in our doublet as a fem. hiph. participle from “to oppress, afflict,” the root from which is derived.

---


411 Parke-Taylor, ibid., suggests that these prepositions are interchangeable in the book of Jeremiah.

412 Parke-Taylor, ibid., 138, suggests on the basis of 48:41a—where τά ὀχυρόα αὐτῆς translates “the stronghold”—that the text of G 49:22 reflects the Hebrew wording “against her strongholds.”

4.2.5.3 Duplication Technique

This doublet is a borderline case standing between verbatim repetition (with adaptation) and loose citation (with adaptation). The duplicate shows two possible occasions of minor synonymous variation (underlined with a dotted line), though they both could be the result of scribal error. There is otherwise no synonymous variation. By means of two major innovations (underlined with a double line), however, the doublet text was adapted to address an analogous though entirely new subject (both subjects are enemy nations of Judah). These innovations radically change the function of the doublet, replacing its original purpose—announcing the end of Edom— with a secondary purpose—announcing the end of Moab. As such, we classify the duplication technique utilized in the creation of this doublet as a loose citation (or possibly verbatim repetition) with major adaptation.
In this section we will consider both the rationale for duplication and the function of the duplicate at the same time. Janzen suggests that 49:22—a verse mentioning Edom’s capital Bozrah—may have been originally brought over to chap. 48 as a gloss on 48:24 where a Moabite city with the same name (Bozrah) is mentioned; this gloss, he continues, was then accidentally slipped into 48:40-41. While possible, Janzen’s theory does not explain why the text of 49:22 was not inserted into chap. 48 in one piece, but was instead divided in half and inserted in two different places. Upon closer examination, the insertion of the two-half couplets from 49:22 in chap. 48 at two different places does not appear to be accidental but the result of deliberate expansion. As noted above, the doublet consists of two distinct images. When the duplicator cut the couplet in two, he or she simply divided these two images from each other and inserted each at an appropriate spot toward the end of chap. 48. In their respective places in chap. 48, both images have the same divinatory function, i.e. to provide a metaphorical image that is interpreted by the verse that follows. We will look at both images in turn.

The first image, inserted into 48:40, describes the flight of a raptor:

“Look! Like an eagle it will soar and spread its wings upon Moab.”

The import of this image is not immediately obvious. A quick scan of eagle imagery in the Bible shows that this bird of prey may carry a positive or negative connotation.

---


415 On the positive side, in Exod 19:4 an eagle metaphor symbolizes Yhwh’s deliverance of his people. For examples of the negative use of the eagle image, see the immediately following discussion.
Obviously in the context of the Edom oracle (49:7-22)—where Edom’s total ruin is assumed—the image is intended to evoke terror, and in the context of the Moab oracle the situation is equally dire. Yet, what precisely this terrifying image symbolizes requires explication. Within chap. 48, the eagle image inserted into v. 40b is deciphered by the cold, concrete description immediately following in v. 41a:

“the cities are captured, and the strongholds are taken.” In other words, v. 41a interprets the image of a soaring eagle with its outspread pinions as a military invasion which topples the towers and towns of Moab. This is to say, with the insertion of the doublet into 48:40-41, v. 41a functions as a concretization of the added metaphorical image of v. 40b.

This militaristic interpretation of the eagle metaphor is not arbitrary, but conforms to a standard trope of Hebrew biblical tradition. Previously in Jeremiah (4:13), the invasion of Judah’s enemy from the north is compared to the speed of the eagle (נשׁר). The same trope is also found in Lam 4:19, where the pursuers of Zion are swifter than “the eagles of heaven.” In Deut 28:29, the invasion by Israel’s enemy is described metaphorically in language close to Jer 49:22: “as the eagle soars.” We could also point to Hab 1:8, where the Babylonian invasion comes “like an eagle,” and to Hos 8:1, where a perched on the temple is an ill omen.

Given that an image of an eagle functions as a metaphor for invasion in so many cases, it seems plausible that the duplicator was aware of this metaphor and thus found the language of invasion in 48:41a to be an apt place to insert the first half of the couplet of 49:22. Thus, the placement of the first half of the couplet before 49:41a appears to be
intentional. Note that this is an uncommon instance where the inserted text serves as the lemma—the text to be interpreted—while the original text plays the role of interpreter.

Since the placement of the eagle image in chap. 48 is by all indicators intentional, it would not be surprising if placement of the second image of 49:22—that of a woman in pain—also reflects scribal intentionality. This second image is part of a simile comparing the affliction of a woman’s heart to the heart of Moab’s army:

“And on that day, the heart of the warriors of Moab will be like the heart of an afflicted woman.” The meaning of this simile is not entirely clear. As mentioned in the textual analysis, this image of a woman in pain occurs only in this doublet and appears to be pieced together from other imagery common in Jeremiah that relates the people’s anguish to the pain of a woman in labor. Given the unfamiliarity of this image, the duplicating scribe may have felt the need to provide the simile with a clarifying interpretation. By positioning the second image of 49:22 in chap. 48 before v. 42, the scribe allows this following verse to spell out concretely the implications of this simile. There we read: “Moab will be destroyed from (being) a people” (48:42a). This description of the annihilation of Moab decodes the import of the simile in the previous verse: without the courage of Moab’s troops, the nation will cease to exist.

Once more, the interpretation applied to the half-couplet borrowed from the oracle against Edom is not arbitrary. For the half-couplet has a comparable symbolic function in its original context in chap. 49. There, in the oracle against Edom (49:7-22), the text of our doublet comes at the close of an emphatic declaration of the end of Edom as a nation. In 49:18, Edom is compared to Sodom and Gomorrah, the paragons of
annihilated cities. The following verses continue the announcement of Edom’s doom in escalating language: in vv.19-20, Yhwh states that none can prevent his plan to destroy the country; and v. 21 expects the sound of Edom’s collapse to shake the earth. Our text, 49:22, crowns this announcement first with the eagle image (alluding to an invasion) and second with the simile of the warriors’ heart (indicating that Edom’s defenses will fail). Altogether, these verses paint a bleak picture of Edom’s chances of survival. The final simile undermines any remaining hope of averting doom: when Edom is invaded, the last line of defense—instead of holding off the enemy with valor—will cower in anguish.

Since, in its primary context the disheartened woman-warrior simile serves as a poetic anticipation of the total annihilation of Edom, it is all but certain that the duplicator intended the simile to serve a similar function in its secondary context; that is, to foreshadow the end of Moab as a nation. After all, in its secondary context, the simile is followed immediately by a statement to this effect (“Moab will be destroyed from [being] a people” [48:42a]). In both cases, then, the placement of the half verses of 49:22 within chap. 48 appears to be deliberate: both half verses provide poetic imagery which is interpreted—through vertical reading—by the material which follows both.

Finally we note that the reuse of 49:22 in chap. 48 is an example of scribal reapplication by analogy. The duplicating scribe found a poetic couplet that addressed Edom and reapplied it to another neighboring nation of Judah. This reapplication appears to be based on the hermeneutical principle that what is true for one of Judah’s enemies may be true for another. Edom and Moab have an analogous relationship with Judah, and thus divine revelation pertaining to one may be applicable to the other. We also observe that the function of the present doublet differs from that of the other doublets considered
thus far. Unlike the others, this doublet does not serve to interpret its secondary context or to address unanswered questions of that context. Moreover, it uniquely serves a rhetorical function—providing existing content with metaphorical illustrations—and a large-scale function of bringing a measure of theological unity to the OAN—harmonizing Yhwh’s treatment of Moab with his treatment of Edom.

4.2.5.5 A Comparison of the Doublet with the Other Later Material Added to the Oracle Against Moab

As discussed above, the inclusion of this doublet in chap. 48 reflects a larger literary trend, namely the inter-textual and intra-textual expansion of the end of this chapter. After the time of Jer\textsuperscript{49}, along with the addition of our doublet, the chapter was expanded by another three verses: vv. 45-46 were quarried from Num 21:28-29 and 24:17, and v. 47 echoes a word of restoration repeated elsewhere in Jeremiah. These additions to the oracle against Moab provide us with another opportunity to compare the duplication technique and function of our doublet with other later additions found in V\textsuperscript{M}. In the absence of such comparison, one could easily assume that a single revising hand introduced all of the additions to the oracle attested by V\textsuperscript{M}—the doublet, the material from Numbers, and the word of restoration as well. However, as we will see, given the disparity of duplication technique of these additions and, more importantly, the inconsistency of their function, it is more probable that at least two scribal hands were involved.

First, the material copied from Numbers and the text of our doublet betray different duplication techniques. Our doublet was produced by \textit{loose citation} (or possibly
verbatim repetition) with major adaption. In contrast, the verses borrowed from Numbers amount to a paraphrase with minor adaptation. Consider the following synopsis of the material duplicated from Numbers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Num 21:28-29</th>
<th>Jer 48:45-46</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Num 24:17b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…</td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is beyond the scope of this study to offer a full textual analysis of this doublet. Instead we will provide only a catalogue of the textual variants.\(^{416}\) Leaving aside non-significant variants, there are three cases of minor synonymous variation (underlined with a dotted line). More substantial synonymous variations include the following (underlined with a dashed line):

\(^{416}\) For a discussion of these textual variants, see Bogaert, “Heshbon entre Moab et Ammon”; Parke-Taylor, *The Formation of the Book of Jeremiah*, 140–43.
• “from the city of” (Num 21:28) → “from the midst of” (Jer 48:45)\textsuperscript{417}
• “he has given/made” (Num 21:29) → “they are taken” (Jer 48:46)
• “fugitives” (Num 21:29) → “into captivity” (Jer 48:46)

The duplicate also introduces at least two and possibly three minor innovations (underlined with a solid line):

• The replacement of Num 21:28b with Num 24:17b, an innovation that changes the subject who is devoured.

• Possibly, “he will tear down” (Num 24:17b) → “crown of the head” (Jer 48:45) – though scribal error (\textrightarrow x2, or vice versa) seems to be a simpler explanation.\textsuperscript{418}

• “Seth” (Num 24:17b) → “Tumult” (Jer 48:45)\textsuperscript{419}

The occurrence of three synonymous variations in the span of two verses marks the duplicate as a paraphrase. On the basis of this designation alone, the duplication

\textsuperscript{417} Bogaert, “Heshbon entre Moab et Ammon,” 47, notes that the duplicator (inadvertently?) interpreted the king’s name “Sihon” as a toponym parallel to Heshbon. Alternatively, some manuscripts have replaced “from the house of”; cf. Parke-Taylor, The Formation of the Book of Jeremiah, 141.


\textsuperscript{419} To whom “the sons of Seth” refers is uncertain. Commentators point to the suggestion of A. H. Sayce, “Balaam’s Prophecy (Numbers XXIV, 17-24) and the God Sheth,” Hebraica 4 (1887): 1–6, and promoted by W. F. Albright, “The Oracles of Balaam,” JBL 63 (1944): 220, n. 89, interpreting as a reference to the Sutu, a tribe mentioned in an early 2\textsuperscript{nd} millennium B.C.E. execration text from Egypt; cf. Ashley, The Book of Numbers, 497; Milgrom, Numbers, 208. The uncertainty of this reference may have invited the duplicating scribe to offer a novel reading; cf. Levine, Numbers 21-36, 202. Parke-Taylor, The Formation of the Book of Jeremiah, 142, suggests the name “Sons of tumult” may be inspired by Amos 2:2 which contains the phrase “and in tumult Moab will die.”
technique utilized in the creation of the doublet from Numbers stands out from that which produced 49:22 // 48:40b, 41b. Moreover, although for both doublets the duplicating scribe introduced innovations, those introduced into the Numbers doublet are of a different kind that those found in Jer 49: 22 // 48:40b, 41b. In the latter case, a poetic verse about Edom is reapplied (intra-textually) to an entirely new subject, Moab, and thereby radically changed the function of the doublet’s text. In contrast, with the former case, two separate poetic sections already addressing Moab in Numbers were woven together, with some changes in details, to form a conflated text which, while brought (inter-textually) into a different biblical book, continues to address Moab; i.e. the primary subject, Moab, does not change, and the text’s function remains unaltered. The details that do change—unlike the major modifications to the doublet of Jer 49: 22 // 48:40b, 41b—consist of the replacement of a few concrete referents (“Ar,” “the heights of Arnon,” and “the sons of Seth”) with more abstract poetic imagery (e.g., “the edge of Moab and the crown of the head of the sons of tumult”). Thus, although both duplicates are adaptations, the nature of each adaptation is dissimilar. In brief, these two duplicated texts (Jer 49:22 and Num 21:28-29; 24:17b), appended to the oracle against Moab in Jeremiah, exhibit markedly different duplication techniques.

Of greater significance is the observation that these two duplicated texts reflect two different, and even conflicting divinatory functions. As discussed above, the poetic

---

imagery added to chap. 48 from the oracle against Edom works in its secondary context to emphasize the end of Moab as a people. In contrast, the material introduced to Jeremiah 48 from the book of Numbers, shines a more optimistic, albeit dim light on Moab’s fate, suggesting that its people will survive. While in this material from Numbers Moab’s judgment is still assumed, the people are not killed, but taken into captivity (שְׁבִי), a root used twice in 48:46. This slight glimmer of hope is further reflected in the opening words of 48:45—words also added at a later point to the oracle against Moab, though not from another known Hebrew text. In these opening words we learn that some from Moab have escaped and are fugitives (נָסִים). Perhaps it may seem to be a stretch to call these images (of captivity and of escaping fugitives) hopeful. Yet, if Moabites live on, even if in captivity, the possibility is left open that they might one day return and reconstitute a nation. In fact, the final addition to the oracle against Moab in Jeremiah asserts that such restoration is not only possible, but guaranteed by Yhwh:

“But I will restore the fortunes of Moab in the last days, says Yhwh” (48:47). This addition is itself a duplication or at least a reflex of what became a minor Jeremianic trope, a phrase that was incrementally appended to individual oracles of the OAN. Added to the close of the oracle against Moab, this assertion of

421 The expectation in the plus of 48:45 that there will be Moabite fugitives entirely contradicts the sense of the previous verse which asserts that such escapees (“the one who flees”) will be caught (48:44).

422 By the time of Jer, variations of the phrase could already be found at 30:3, 18; 31:23; 32:44; 33:7, 11; and (in the oracles against the nations in) 49:39; in V, variations were also added to 29:14; 33:26; and (in the oracles against the nations in) 49.6 (cf. 46.26). Variations of this phrase are also found throughout Hebrew scriptures. For a discussion of this phrase in its many variations, see: Holladay, Jeremiah 2, 142; Ernst Ludwig Dietrich, Die endzeitliche Wiederherstellung bei den Propheten, 211
Moab’s future restoration undermines the earlier claim made by the text of the doublet (48:40b, 41b // 49:22), i.e. the indisputability of Moab’s total ruin. Given this conflicting vision of the future of Moab, it seems unlikely that both our highly pessimistic doublet and the other more optimistic pluses inserted at the end of chap. 48 in $V^M$ were added to this chapter by the same scribal hand in a single compositional moment. As supporting evidence, we refer to the markedly different duplication techniques displayed by the two additions. For this reason, it appears that we have a second occasion (cf. the doublet of 23:5-6 // 33:14-16 and the later addition of 33:17-26), in which neighboring pluses of $V^M$ do not come from the same moment, but attest to the gradual formation of $V^M$ in the hands of multiple divining scribes. In sum, here we encounter a second instance where an expansion of $V^M$ situated alongside a doublet added to $V^M$ appears to come from two distinct hands.

4.3 The Early Doublets: Text and Interpretation

In this section, we will continue our analysis of Jeremiah’s doublets by turning our attention toward the book’s early doublets, i.e. doublets attested by both LXX Jeremiah and MT Jeremiah, and thus, arguably part of $Jer^{+n}$.

---

4.3.1 Text #6: I Will Make You to be a Wall of Bronze (Jer 1:18-19 // Jer 15:20)

4.3.1.1 Preliminary Considerations

There are good reasons for considering the twin of 1:18-19 to be the duplicate. First, this twin is consistently the more expansive of the two. The oracle’s opening words, the list of Jeremiah’s opponents, and the description of Jeremiah’s fortification are all fuller in 1:18-19 than in 15:20. The sole exception to this trend, the double reading found in 15:20b, may simply reflect the oral and fluid nature of the larger phrase in which the double reading belongs (see k...k and l...l below). Furthermore, each of the expansions found in the twin of 1:18-19 is readily explainable as an adaptation made to suit the doublet for chap. 1 (see below). The alternative solution, that these three elements were compressed for chap. 15, does not enjoy the same kind of explanatory power. The axiom lectio brevior lectio potior appears to carry weight in this case.

---


424 Here I disagree with Hans-Winfried Jüngling, “Ich mache dich zu einer ehernen Mauer, literarkritische Überlegungen zum Verhältnis von Jer 1:18-19 zu Jer 15:20-21,” Bib 54 (1973): 9, who sees 1:19b as an abbreviation of 15:20b-21a. I would argue instead that the duplicated text simply ends with 15:20 and does not include 15:21a. Moreover, the double reading of 15:20b may have been added after the moment of duplication.

425 Here, I use the word oracle casually to refer to a unit of literary prophecy that may or may not be equated with an original oracular prophetic word.

426 For example, it is unclear why a scribe would strike the words “fortified city” while keeping the image of a wall of bronze. Neither phrase fits chap. 15 better than the other. The same observation could be made with regard to the list of Jeremiah’s opponents; nothing in chap. 15 helps us understand why this list would be reduced to include “this people” only. Indeed, the specificity of the doublet in chap. 1 would enrich the shadowy description of Jeremiah’s opposition in chap. 15.
Second, the opening chapter of Jeremiah plays a double role of narrating the person Jeremiah’s commissioning as a prophet and introducing themes found throughout the remainder of the book. From the first chapter we learn that Jeremiah’s oracles will feature Judah’s judgment (1:13-16)—a major concern of the poetry of chaps. 1-24—and the fate of the nations (vv. 5, 10)—the focus of chaps. 25, 46-51. The text of the doublet, vv. 18-19, contributes to this introductory chapter a foreshadowing of the motif of Jeremiah’s rejection and suffering at the hands of his people, a motif emphasized in the confessions of Jeremiah and the book’s B material. It seems reasonable to postulate that as the book of Jeremiah expanded and took shape and the confessions and B material were added, need arose for updating the introduction to reflect the book’s new, wider compass.\footnote{Cf. Holladay, \textit{Jeremiah 1}, 25.}

Why the text of 15:20 in particular would be selected for this purpose is easily discernible; the text of 15:20 enjoys strong verbal and thematic links with chap. 1 (see below). The opposite hypothesis—namely that part of Jeremiah’s commissioning found in chap. 1 should be inserted into chap. 15—leaves several questions unanswered. Why should vv. 18-19 of chap. 1 in particular be selected for chap. 15 and not any other selections of Jeremiah’s commissioning?\footnote{Appealing to the verbal link between bronze and iron in 1:18 and in 15:12 as an impetus for the duplication fails on two counts. First, the text of 15:12 is highly uncertain, given the difficulty of the Hebrew text in M and the different reading found in G. Second, only the phrase “fortified wall of bronze” is found in 15:20; the missing phrase “iron pillar” is not found in 1:18 G, and thus was likely added to 1:18 after the moment of duplication, in which case the link between this verse and 15:12 is more tenuous.} Again, why would these verses from chap. 1 be inserted into the confession material of chap. 15 and not another chapter containing such material? The divine encouragement of the doublet, fortifying Jeremiah against his opponents, would fit more convincingly within the confession material of 11:19-23,
where such opponents (i.e. the men of Anathoth) are featured prominently, unlike chap. 15, which references Jeremiah’s opposition in passing only (v. 15; cf. v. 10). In brief, all arguments point toward the doublet twin of 1:18-19 as the duplicate.
### TABLE 4.19

THE DOUBLET OF JER 15:20 // JER 1:18-19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 a...a b και δοσω se b c...c</td>
<td>a...a 20 b b c...c</td>
<td>18 a δου ^a b τεθεικα se b c εν τη ση ερων η ερα ^c</td>
<td>a a 18 b b c c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g τω λαω τουτω e...e f...f</td>
<td></td>
<td>g ω παλιν χυραν g h...h</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h...h ω i τεχο χυρον χαλκον i g</td>
<td></td>
<td>h...h kα i ω i τεχο χαλκον χυρον g i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>και πολε ησουσι j προ σε kαi ου η δυνωνται προ σε διοτι ετα σοου εi k του σοζειν se k</td>
<td></td>
<td>19 καi πολε ησουσι j se l kαi ου η δυνωνται προ σε διοτι ετα σοου εγω e i k. k</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 και εξαιρεσθαι se ει χειρο πονηρον...</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 του εξαιρεσθαι se λαει κυριο l</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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b…b  Minor synonymous variation (different verb form): , “And I will make you” (perfect with converting vav; 15:20 M G) / , “I have made you” (perfect; 1:18 M G) – the change in tense does not significantly change the meaning of this text; though with c…c below it temporally harmonizes the doublet with its secondary context. Also, note the different Greek words used to translate this word: δόσω (15:20) / τέθεικά (1:18).

c…c  Synonymous variation (intra-textual addition; +/- “today”): this addition to 1:18 harmonizes the text of the duplicate temporally with 1:10 where the same word is used (cf. b…b). Zeigler considers the pleonastic rendering of in the G of 1:18 (ἐν τῇ σήμερον ἡ μέρα) to be a secondary development.430

d  Synonymous variation (transposition) and minor innovation (intra-textual addition): the opponents against whom Jeremiah is fortified are listed at the beginning of 15:20 but in the middle of 1:18-19. The transposed elements are marked with a dashed box in the synopsis above. The lists of opponents differ greatly between the twins. In 15:20 the opponents simply consist of , “this people.” In 1:18, we find more specificity: in addition to mentioning the , “people of the land” (which could be counted as a synonymous variant), the list includes two entities by name: , “the kings of Judah,” and , “its princes,” two groups found together in lists many times in Jeremiah (e.g. 2.26; 4.9; 8.1; 17:25; 24:1). This new specificity alters the meaning of the doublet’s text, specifying in more detail who among the people of Judah are Jeremiah’s adversaries.

e…e  Synonymous variation (post-duplication addition): in addition to the pluses of 1:18-19 noted in d that are common to G and M, 1:18 M also uniquely includes the phrase , “upon the whole land” (G represents only with πᾶσι). Its absence in 1:18 G suggests that phrase is a post-duplication insertion. Moreover, some scholars judge the plus in M to be a poor fit and so omit it.431 The other entries in this list of opponents are marked with the preposition ; the use of in such a context appears awkward. Granted the phrase’s secondary status, at an earlier stage the list in 1:18 probably began with = πᾶσι τοῖς βασιλεῖς Ἕλληνων, “to all the kings of.”

429 Holladay, Jeremiah 1, 43.

430 Ziegler, Beiträge zur Jeremias-Septuaginta, 89.

431 E.g. Volz, Der Prophet Jeremia, 11; Holladay, Jeremiah 1, 23.
Minor innovation (post-duplication, intra-textual addition): alongside e...e, M also uniquely includes the phrase מכהניה, “against its priests.” The mentioning of priests without their usual counterpart “prophets” raises suspicion, since these two groups are quite frequently listed together (e.g. 2:8, 26; 4:9; 5:31; 6:13; 8:1; 13:13). Most scholars appreciate the inclusion of מכהניה as an intra-textual addition from similar lists of officials found throughout Jeremiah (e.g. 2:26; 32:32). Its absence in 1:18 G suggests it was added after the moment of duplication.

Minor innovation (intra-textual addition): in 15:20 (M and G) Jeremiah is made to be חומת נחשׁת сфמא, “a fortified wall of bronze;” this phrase is more or less represented in 1:18 M and G (see i below). Additionally in 1:18, we encounter the new, parallel image of Jeremiah being made to be עיר מבצר, “a fortified city” a phrase not found in 15:20. While both readings convey the same sense, i.e. that the figure Jeremiah will be able to withstand the assaults of his enemies, the identification of Jeremiah as a fortified city creates a contrast between the prophet and the city of Jerusalem mention in 1:15.

Minor innovation (post-duplication addition): in addition to the parallel plus of 1:18 described in g...g, M uniquely includes the parallel phrase ובברזל, “and to be an iron pillar.” For several reasons, many see this plus as secondary: 1) an iron pillar does not fit with the defensive imagery of fortress and wall; 2) iron and bronze are paired in the Old Testament thirty times, and so the occurrence of the word bronze in the phrase of 1:18 may have invited the insertion of a parallel phrase containing the word iron; 3) the phrase is missing in G. Parke-Taylor believes the phrase was added in response to the description in Jer 52:17 of the destruction of the bronze pillars of the temple; Jeremiah, an Iron pillar, will outlast even the temple. If so, and this seems to me to be the best explanation, the gloss in 1:18 reflects a version of Jeremiah already containing the historical appendix of Jer 52.


432 Janzen, Studies in the Text of Jeremiah, 36; Holladay, Jeremiah 1, 23; Jüngling, “Ich mache dich zu einer ehernen Mauer,” 5, without providing justification, is an exception to this trend.


agreement of 1:18 G with 15:20 M and G against 1:18 M suggests the word “fortified”
was dropped after the moment of duplication. It may have been viewed as a
redundancy—following after —and intentionally omitted by a scribe to balance
the parallel phrases ( // // ) into two-word cola. In the Masoretic pointing, we also encounter a variation in number (sing. / plur.), namely
“walls of” in 1:18 and “wall of” in 15:20. Yet, since this vocalization is late,
this variation is artificial; the defective spelling could be vocalized as or .
There is no need for more involved explanations such as the suggestion that the plural
form in 1:18 has an “intensifying” function.

Scribal error (omission of preposition in 1:19 G)

Synonymous variation (+/- , “to save you”): 15:20 preserves a double
reading that is not found in 1:19 ( ). The larger phrase, in which these
readings are nested (“For I am with you, says the Lord, to save / to deliver you”), is found
in various places in Jeremiah (1:8, 17 [G]; 30:11; 42:11). The various instances of the
phrase display both readings, with found in 1:8 and 1:17 (G), in 30:11,
and both readings in 42:11. This phrase seems to be an example of traditional material
whose written form was not entirely fixed (cf. variation in below). Given the
agreement of 15:20 M and G against 1:18-19 M and G, the double reading was omitted,
perhaps unconsciously, at the moment of duplication.

Scribal error and minor synonymous variation (transposition):
, “and to deliver you, says the Lord.” (15:20 M, 1:19 G and M [with transposition of the
divine speech formula]) / καὶ ἔξαρπεσθαί σὲ ἐκ χειρὸς … (= … ) “And to save
you out of the hand…” (15:21 VG). The shorter reading in 15:21 G is best explained as
resulting from haplography; after writing the scribe’s eye inadvertently skipped
three words to the similar looking at the start of v. 21. The transposition of
in M of 1:19 has no bearing on the larger phrase’s meaning. The phrase occurs
several times in Jeremiah, and the position of the divine speech formula therein is not set
(cf. 30:11). The variation observed here and in suggests that this phrase was part of
the scribes’ memorized repertoire of traditional phrases whose expression in writing
could take many forms.

435 Against the potential counter argument that the agreement of 1:18 G with 15:20 M and G is due
to the PDHarm of the Greek text, we note that in the doublet twins in G the word ὀχυρόν (a Greek
equivalent to “fortified”) is not found in the same position, coming after χαλκὸν “bronze” in 1:18 (and
15:20 M) but before this word in 15:20 G. If harmonization was his goal, the responsible scribe would
surely have standardized the word order.

436 Cf. Volz, Der Prophet Jeremia, 11, understands the plural here “um das Massige, Intensive u.
a. auszudrücken.”

### TABLE 4.20

TRANSLATION OF JER 15:20 // JER 1:18-19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Jer 15:20</strong></th>
<th><strong>Jer 1:18-19</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>And ______ I will make you ______, against this people, to be a fortified wall of bronze. They will fight against you, but they will not overpower you, for I am with you, to save you and to deliver you, says Yhwh.</td>
<td>And Look! I [myself] have made you this day to be a fortified city [and to be an iron pillar]438 and to be a fortified wall of bronze. Against all [the land, against] the kings of Judah, its princes [its priests] and against the people of the land. They will fight against you, but they will not overpower you, for I am with you, says Yhwh, to deliver you.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The duplicate contains three instances of minor synonymous variation (underlined with a dotted line) including a small transposition, four occasions of synonymous variation (underlined with a dash line) including a larger transposition, as well as two minor innovations (underlined with a solid line). The duplicate uniquely and innovatively (1) specifies the identity of the person Jeremiah’s adversaries and (2) describes him as a “fortified city” which invites a comparison of the prophet with the city

---

438 Words in brackets were added after the moment of duplication.
of Jerusalem mentioned in 1:15. While these innovations introduce new entities to the doublet’s text, they do not radically alter the function of the doublet. It continues, though with greater intensity, to portray Yhwh’s support of his prophet who faces hostility. Many of the duplicate’s alterations, including moments of synonymity and innovation, serve to harmonize the text of the doublet with its secondary context. We classify this doublet as a *paraphrase with minor adaptation*.

4.3.1.4 Rationale for Duplication

As noted above, it is probable that when the book of Jeremiah came to include confession and B material which highlighted the prophet’s struggle with his countrymen, need arose for updating the introductory chapter of Jeremiah so that it would continue to reflect the entire scope of the book. The lines of 15:20—drawn from Yhwh’s response to one of Jeremiah’s confessions—would meet this need. Moreover, these lines most likely stood out as an apt source for duplication because these lines and the first chapter share several thematic and lexical links.439 The opening declaration of 15:20, “and I will make you,” echoes the prophet’s initial call in 1:5, “I appoint you.” The description of Jeremiah as a “wall” (in 15:20) invites a comparison of the prophet with the walled city of Jerusalem whose bulwark is noted in 1:15. And the formulaic assurance of divine presence and deliverance in 15:20—“for I am with you to save you and to deliver you, says Yhwh”—is repeated almost verbatim in 1:8 (and 1:17 G). Along with these lexical links, chap. 1 and the immediate context of 15:20 (i.e. v. 19) share

some thematic similarities: both contexts have in view Jeremiah’s vocation as a prophet and his need for perseverance. In 15:19, in response to Jeremiah’s confession in 15:15-18, Yhwh reminds the prophet of his calling and iterates what that calling requires: he must turn away from his difficult circumstances and turn toward Yhwh. Comparably in chap. 1, the deity presents Jeremiah with his calling and in v. 17 charges him to persist in that calling. In both contexts, the text of the doublet serves to articulate how the prophet will be able to fulfill his vocation and why perseverance is possible; Yhwh will fortify Jeremiah and bless him with his presence so that none will be able to overpower him (see function below). In other words, in addition to the strong lexical ties between 15:20 and chap. 1, the text of the former was probably selected for duplication because that text, when conscripted in chap. 1, would accomplish similar work there as in chap. 15. Finally, the wording of 15:20 was likely added to chap. 1, because as we will see momentarily, this wording heightens the meaning of the chapter through vertical reading.

4.3.1.5 The Duplicate’s Divinatory Function

Attention may now be given to the divinatory functions that the doublet plays within its secondary context. Attending to these functions will also require us to address the ways the doublet has been adapted to fit its new location. Within chap. 1, the language of the doublet serves both a large-scale structural function—filling out the scope of chap. 1 to enhance the chapter’s introductory nature—and a smaller-scale interpretative function—addressing concerns particular to chap. 1 and amplifying this chapter’s meaning. The large-scale function of the doublet has already received some
attention above. Most of the following comments pertain to the smaller-scale interpretative functions not yet discussed.

The verses of the doublet aside, chap. 1 lacks explicit reference to the stiff resistance Jeremiah will face from his people—leaders and laity alike. It is true that the possibility that the prophet might be afraid is raised in vv. 8 and 17, but these verses do not articulate why such would be the case. Given the prominence of the theme of adversity within Jeremiah’s confession and B material, it probably behooved the scribe to append to the book’s first “introductory” chapter material from the confessions that foreshadowed this theme. This is to say, the addition of the doublet functions to complete the introductory nature of the book’s opening chapter.

The doublet also serves to address unresolved questions tacitly raised by the first chapter. First, in the chapter, Yhwh twice tells the prophet not to fear (vv. 8 and 17). Specifically, Yhwh orders his servant not to fear “them”—

\[
\text{אָל־תירא מפניהם, v. 8 and אָל־תחת מפניהם, v. 17—}\]

yet, to whom this word “them” refers is left unspecified. Second, it is not entirely clear why it is reasonable to suggest that Jeremiah could avoid being afraid.

The text of the duplicate in vv. 18-19 answers both of these questions. First through vertical reading, the doublet reveals the identity of Jeremiah’s opponents, i.e. to whom the pronoun “them” refers. Originally, the doublet did not specify exactly who these enemies were. We are told simply that Jeremiah is to stand up “to this people”

\[440\]

At best, from 1:15 we could suppose that the “them” mentioned in v. 17 refers to Jerusalem and the cities of Judah.
who “will fight against [him]” (15:20). Within chap. 15, the only likely antecedent is the vague reference to Jeremiah’s persecutors (אלו) in v. 15 (or perhaps v. 10, in which the prophet complains of those who curse him [למקללו]). The duplicating scribe appears to have found the lack of specificity unsatisfying, and used the moment of duplication as an opportunity to spell out in detail the identity of Jeremiah’s opponents. In place of the reference to “this people,” the scribe mentions “the people of the land” (עם הארץ) and, going further, specifies that Jeremiah’s opposition will include “the kings of Judah” (מלכי יהודה) and “its princes” (שׂריה). The fact that the scribe added these detail demonstrates that he or she was especially concerned with identifying Jeremiah’s opposition. Upping the ante, an even later scribe elected to count Judah’s priests among the list of Jeremiah’s personal enemies (see textual analysis above).

Simultaneously, by adding this expanded version of 15:20, the scribe also amplifies the chapter’s meaning—intensifying why the prophet has reason for fear. Apart from the doublet, in the opening chapter, the prophet is given the difficult task of being a “prophet to the nations” in v. 5 and v.10 and is implicitly handed the daunting task of prophesying the doom of his city and country in vv. 15-16. Both of these assignments are perhaps reason enough for fear, hence the repeated command in v. 8 and v.17 not to be afraid. Yet, with the addition of the doublet, the cause of Jeremiah’s fear is increased—in addition to his dreadful mission, the prophet must now anticipate opposition from crown and town.

Thus, the qere’.

441 Thus, the qere’.
Second, through vertical reading, the text of the doublet answers the question why the prophet’s fear can be averted. Early in chap. 1 before the doublet, Yhwh offers his servant grounds for confidence: “I am with you to deliver you, says the Lord” (v. 8). Then in vv. 15-17, as mentioned, Jeremiah is handed the daunting task of announcing judgment to his own people. Following the description of this unnerving task, more encouragement would not be out of order. Perhaps in part for this reason, the responsible scribe elected to conclude the chapter with the encouraging words of the doublet which incidentally echo the promise of divine “Mitsein” from v. 8 “I am with you to deliver you.”

As it now stands, the doublet in 1:18-19 functions to plant the final words of Jeremiah’s commissioning on the sure ground of Yhwh’s initiative. Through vertical reading, it answers—more emphatically than v. 8—the looming question of why Jeremiah need not be afraid. The Lord will make Jeremiah to be a “fortified wall of bronze” ( ) against whom his adversaries will not prevail.

Once more, we are able to confirm that the duplicating scribe intended the doublet to serve this purpose. For right at this point, the scribe expanded the doublet’s text, adding that Yhwh will make Jeremiah to be not just a wall, but also a fortified city ( ). This detail was added intra-textually from v. 15 where Jerusalem is presented as

---

442 The threat in v. 17, that Yhwh would break the prophet should he falter, does not seem helpful psychologically. In short, ending the introduction on this note seems unsatisfying and alarming. Some scholars (e.g., Holladay, Jeremiah 1, 43) believe v. 17 was added to chap. 1 in conjunction with the inclusion of vv. 18-19. Even so, ending the chapter with vv. 14-16, describing Jeremiah’s daunting task, would not be any less troubling.

443 With the insertion of the doublet’s text into chap. 1, the promise of v. 8—that Yhwh “will be with you to deliver you”—is transformed into a refrain. Allen, Jeremiah, 31, assigns the repeat line a “resumptive function.” As G attests (1:17), another later scribe tripled the refrain.
a fortified city. As a consequence of this harmonization, a strong contrast is may be made between Jerusalem and the prophet through vertical reading. Unlike Jerusalem—whose fall is inevitable—Jeremiah, though besieged by his country folk, is unassailable. The walls of Jerusalem will be breeched; Jeremiah will stand firm. A later scribe solidified Jeremiah’s position further, buttressing the metaphors of wall and city with the third metaphor of an “iron pillar” ( ).

Finally, we can recognize two more minor ways that the doublet was adapted with chap. 1 in mind. The scribe replaced the future tense “and I will make you” with the perfect “I have made you,” ( ) thereby harmonizing the verb with the form found in v. 5. In one move, he or she also inserted the adverb “today” ( ) drawn intra-textually from v. 10. Both alterations align the doublet with chap. 1 temporally, thus underscoring the reality that there is never a moment when Jeremiah is not suited for his daunting task. Taken together, these two minor adaptations work with the larger additions just discussed to amplify the chapter’s meaning. Moreover, they testify to the duplicating scribe’s use

444 Carroll, Jeremiah, 109; Holladay, Jeremiah 1, 44; Parke-Taylor, The Formation of the Book of Jeremiah, 38.

445 It seems probable that this iron pillar was added not just to reinforce Jeremiah’s status, but to create a further literary contrast between iron-clad Jeremiah—who survives 587 B.C.E.—and the more fragile bronze pillars of the Jerusalem temple mentioned in Jer 52:17 as objects torn down in the Babylonian onslaught. As noted in the textual analysis above, Parke-Taylor, The Formation of the Book of Jeremiah, 38, wonders whether two pluses in 1:18 (“iron pillar” and “[Jerusalem’s] priests”) reflect the same anti-priestly bias.

446 A third minor variation entered the text of 1:18 after the point of Jer”, the insertion of the pronoun “I.” As noted in the textual analysis above, this 1st person pronoun balances out the 2nd person pronoun “you” in v. 17; cf. Holladay, Jeremiah 1, 43; Fischer, Jeremia 1-25, 141. In this way, emphasis is placed on the thematic shift from Jeremiah’s responsibility in vv. 15-17 to Yhwh’s contribution in vv. 18-19.
of vertical reading and intra-textual harmonization to enhance the meaning of his revelatory text.

To summarize, the text of the doublet—outfitted with extra synonymous variation and innovation and adapted to suit chap. 1—specifies and thereby intensifies the identity of Jeremiah’s opposition, all the while heightening the sense of Jeremiah’s well-being in the face of this opposition. In this way, the expanded doublet completes the prophet’s commissioning by filling a perceived lacuna of chap. 1; i.e., it clarifies why Jeremiah should have confidence in the face of his daunting mission. These divinatory operations executed by the duplicate—answering unaddressed questions tacitly raised by its context and of amplifying that context’s meaning—should be familiar by now. Our analyses of the previous doublets brought many examples of such operations to light. However, the present doublet also serves a second and hitherto unique function: the doublet reinforces the large-scale structure of the book. The doublet rounds out chap. 1, capping this introductory chapter with lines from the confession material that point toward the motif of Jeremiah’s suffering at the hands of his people. In this way, the first chapter comes to reflect more completely the various themes of the book as a whole and fulfills its role as an introduction of the book.

4.3.2 Text #7: Shall I not Punish for These Things? (Jer 5:9 // Jer 5:29 // Jer 9:8)

4.3.2.1 Preliminary Considerations / Textual Analysis / Duplication Technique

The texts of Jer 5:9, 5:29, and 9:8 are virtually identical. All three contain the same pair of rhetorical questions, with no significant variation. For this reason, we are unable on textual grounds to determine which triplet is original. Without solving this
question, we will attempt to discern the function that each triplet plays in its given context. Since the three triplets are virtually identical, one column of text is sufficient for analyzing the triplet’s text.

TABLE 4.21
THE DOUBLET OF JER 5:9 // JER 5:29 // JER 9:8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| “Shall I not punish them for these things?” says the LORD; “and shall I not bring retribution on a nation such as this?”
| a     | *Minor synonymous variation* (+/– preposition and pronoun): “I will punish” (5:9 M G; 5:29 M G; 9:8 G) / “I will punish them” (9:8 M) – The preposition + pronoun, may have been added to 9:8 M after the moment of duplication since it is missing in G. The alternative possibility that G has been harmonized toward 5:9, 29 is doubtful because of c…c below.
| b     | *Non-significant variant* (+/– conjunction)
| c…c  | *Synonymous translation*: the Hebrew phrase “with a nation,” is rendered in G ἐν ἔθνει, “with a nation,” in 5:9 and 5:29 but ἐν λαοί, “with a people,” in 9:8 – the variant translations are synonymous. This difference casts doubt on the hypothesis that the Greek translation of 9:8 was harmonized toward that of 5:9 and 5:29.

Here we encounter an example of *verbatim repetition*. Of the three variants, the first is likely a post-duplication development, the second is non-significant, and the third is simply due to synonymous translation.

---

447 NRSV.
4.3.2.2 Rationale for Duplication / Divinatory Function of the Duplicate

Since this tripled text contains no significant variants, it is difficult to establish the duplicator’s intentions with total certainty. Still, paying attention to the placement of each triplet in its particular context gives us a good sense of the triplet’s intended function. Macchi proposes that the triplet plays a unifying function, tying together similar sections of Jeremiah’s poetry. He observes that the tripled text consistently comes at the conclusion of “déviations morales populaires” and counts the repetitions of this phrase as one example of a text duplicated into “un cadre thématique quasi identique” which—along with several other examples—reflects “…une volonté éditoriale de placer des points de repères recurrents.”\footnote{Macchi, “Les doublets dans le livre de Jérémie,”121.} Such “markers” serve to emphasize the coherence and structure of the book.\footnote{Ibid.}

While this analysis may be true of many of Macchi’s examples of doublets which are found in nearly identical settings, it is unclear how applicable or useful this analysis is for our triplet of 5:9 // 5:29 // 9:8. While the various contexts of the three occurrences of the triplet do follow depictions of the people’s immorality—as Macchi maintains—it would be a stretch to describe the three contexts as almost identical. True, the contexts of 5:29 and 9:8 have some similarity—both speak of the people’s deceitfulness (\footnote{Macchi, “Les doublets dans le livre de Jérémie,”121.} cf. 5:27 and 9:2-5, 7)—but the emphasis of the two contexts is notably different: the former is concerned with the exploitation of others for greedy gain (5:26-28), whereas the latter focuses on lying (\footnote{Macchi, “Les doublets dans le livre de Jérémie,”121.} 9:2, 4) and slander (\footnote{Macchi, “Les doublets dans le livre de Jérémie,”121.} 9:3). Moreover, both of these contexts are markedly distinct from
that of 5:9. There the chief concern is the people’s idolatry (5:7) and lust (5:7-8). In spite of these differences, one could still argue that all three do fit within the loose category of depictions of the people’s moral deviation. This category, however may be too unspecific to be of much use; for descriptions of such deviation in general are featured in many places in Jeremiah’s poetry: for example, idolatry in 2:20, 26-28; 9:13-14; exploitation and greed in 6:13, not to mention lying (שׁקר) in 6:13, slander (רכיל) in 6:28 and deceit (תרמית) in 8:5. If strengthening the unity of the book was the main purpose of the triplet’s multiplication, we are left to wonder why—given the existence of these other similar locations—the refrain was recopied only twice. Assigning the triplet the overarching unifying function of emphasizing the coherence and structure of Jeremiah is thus only moderately illuminating on its own.

More useful is Brueggemann’s assessment that our tripled text—which is comprised of paired rhetorical questions—is an example of a literary device used throughout Jeremiah and which is drawn from the sapiential tradition. Each occurrence of this device consists of two questions, the first beginning with the interrogative ה and the second with the conjunction אם. The effect of this literary device is to impress upon the reader the naturalness of the given rhetorical questions’ implied answers. Our text asks, “Shall I not punish for these things ( אלה)” The expected answer is, “Yes, most naturally.” In sum, in all three of its settings the triplet functions to demonstrate that divine punishment is the reasonable and logical outcome of Judah’s behavior.


451 Holladay, Jeremiah 1, 181-82, understands אלה to refer to the direct object, Yhwh’s people, rendering the question, “Shall I not punish these [people].”
Here we find an explanation for why our refrain is attracted to descriptions of Judah’s moral depravity, as Macchi observers. Throughout the poetry of Jeremiah, descriptions of Judah’s sin are (not surprisingly) occasions for explaining why Judah will suffer (and has suffered) punishment. Our refrain is simply one example of such an explanation. This is the only setting in which our refrain would make sense. After all, the demonstrative "these things," found in the refrain, requires a description of punishment-inducing immorality as an immediately adjacent antecedent. This is to say, the repetition of the refrain may have more to do with the desire of divining scribes to spell out the connection between Judah’s suffering and Judah’s pre-exilic depravity than to reinforce the book’s coherence as a unified work (though these motivations need not be considered mutually exclusive).

While the repetition of the triplet’s refrain may not have a macro-scale unifying function, it may serve a smaller-scale structural purpose in each of its three contexts. We will now consider the placement of each triplet in order. With regard to the first, the occurrence of the triplet in 5:9 is slightly redundant. Verse 7 already offers the sapiential rhetorical question, “How can I pardon you?” with the implied answer, “You certainly cannot.” In other words, prior to v. 9, the naturalness of punishment is already established. Even before this, v. 6 sets in plain view the logicality and inevitability of Judah’s impending destruction: ruin will come, “because their transgressions are many,

452 E.g., Jer 2:17, 19; 5:7, 25; 6:15b.

453 NRSV.
their apostasies are great;” and vv. 1, 4-5 emphasize the complete absence of just
citizenry who would stay the hand of God. Put briefly, while the triplet in v. 9 reinforces
the logic of vv. 6 and 7, its function in this setting does not seem necessary.

Instead, in its context, v. 9 appears to play an important structural role. Chapter 5
may be arguably broken into three units—5:1-9, 10-19, and 20-31—each one of which
begins with a new plural imperative. According to this schematic, the first occurrence
of the triplet marks the conclusion of the chapter’s first unit. The refrain works well as a
conclusion to this first unit. As mentioned, it agrees with sense of the unit, reinforcing
the impression that Judah’s punishment is a natural and inevitable outcome. The refrain
also smooths over what would otherwise be a rough transition from v. 8—describing
Judah’s sexual brokenness—to v. 10—which opens a new section unconcerned with such
brokenness. Thus, it could be argued that the refrain was included in v. 9 primarily to
mark the end of a unit. As we will see, the refrain in 9:8 also marks the end of a unit,
though this is not the case with 5:29. To this second case we will now turn.

Toward the end of the same chapter, we arrive at the second occurrence of the
triplet in 5:29. Given the placement of the first occurrence of this triplet at the close of its
respective section, we might expect this second occurrence to follow suit. Instead, the
second occurrence comes not at the end of the unit, but a few verses shy of it. As it
stands, our text comes between an incrimination of the wealthy (vv. 26-28) and an

454 NRSV.
455 Allen, Jeremiah, 72.
indictment of the prophets and priests (vv. 30-31).\textsuperscript{456} A new poetic unit—introduced by another plural imperative—begins only after v. 31 (6:1 Eng.). Thus, we cannot assign this occurrence of the refrain the same structural purpose as the first.

Yet, the second occurrence is not void of structural importance. The refrain’s double rhetorical questions structurally balance another set of double questions found within the refrain’s poetic unit in v. 22.\textsuperscript{457} These rhetorical questions ask if the people of Judah fear Yhwh. The questions are fishing for the obvious answer: “Yes, of course! What could be more natural?” The following verses, however, itemize a heap of evidence to the contrary: the people show no sign of the expected reverence (vv. 23-28). At this juncture, v. 29 raises a new set of rhetorical questions—those of our triplet—which form an opposing pair with the questions of v. 22. Once again, our text emphasizes the naturalness of divine punishment. Yet, in this context—following vv. 23-28, where Judah perversely rejects the natural and expected fear of Yhwh—the reasonableness of punishment is heightened. As Brueggemann writes, “…the intent of the rhetorical question [in v. 29] is to establish the normalcy and naturalness of punishment after the normalcy and naturalness of fear of Yahweh is rejected in vs. 22 [and the verses that follow].”\textsuperscript{458} Thus, while the occurrence of the refrain in 5:29 does not

\textsuperscript{456} Coming directly after the incrimination of the wealthy in vv. 26-28, the placement of the refrain in v. 29 creates some disjunction. As Carroll, Jeremiah, 189, notes, following this incrimination we would expect a pronouncement of judgment against these unjust individuals in particular. Instead, our triplet delivers a universal rebuke; the nation as a whole is worthy of condemnation.

\textsuperscript{457} See discussion in Brueggemann, “Jeremiah’s Use of Rhetorical Questions,” 365.

\textsuperscript{458} Ibid.
exhibit the same structural function as its occurrence in 5:9, it does play a structurally-
significant role within its literary unit.

When we draw our attention to the final occurrence of the triplet in Jer 9:8 (9
Eng.), we find that the refrain once more marks the end of a poetic unit. Brueggemann,
however, finds tension in the placement of refrain in this context.\textsuperscript{459} The refrain, he
explains is redundant after v. 6 (7 Eng.). This verse, announcing Yhwh’s intention to
refine and test his people, responds to an extended discussion of this people’s
deceitfulness (Jer 9:1-5 [2-6 Eng.]). Focus on the people’s deceitfulness resumes in v. 7
[8 Eng.], after which sits our triplet in v. 8 (which for the third time implies that divine
punishment is the natural consequence of Judah’s behavior). Since judgment has already
been pronounced in v. 6, Brueggemann considers the questions of v. 8 superfluous and
supposes that the verse was inserted here accidently.\textsuperscript{460} In fact, however, we should view
v. 6 as the disjunctive element. First, this verse breaks up an otherwise continuous litany
of charges against Judah’s falsehood. Recall that v. 7 resumes the description of
deceitfulness begun in the first five verses. Second, v. 8 occupies the correct hinge
between poetic units: Jer 9:1-8, offering a protracted description of Judah’s
deceitfulness, may be clearly distinguished from the following unit which depicts the
country’s punishment (vv. 9-10 [10-11 Eng.]). In light of these two points, we confirm
that the occurrence of the refrain in chap. 9—like its first occurrence in 5:9—marks a
structural division, coming at the end of a poetic unit.

\textsuperscript{459} Ibid., 366.

\textsuperscript{460} Ibid.
To summarize, the function of the triplet is not entirely consistent in its three occurrences. All three do share the rhetorical purpose of turning descriptions of Judah’s sin into precipitants of divine punishment. And in two cases, 5:9 and 9:8, the refrain marks the end of a textual unit. The instance in 5:29, however, lacks this last purpose and in its stead plays a rhetorical role, balancing a set of sapiential questions which imply the logicality of the fear of Yhwh, and thereby heightening the sense of the naturalness of divine punishment in this absence of such fear. Most importantly, the small-scale structural role of ending a textual unit is unlike any function so far observed in our analyses of the previous doublets. Moreover, unlike several of the other doublets, the triplet does not have the exegetical function of addressing unanswered questions raised by its respective contexts.

4.3.3 Text #8: Look! A People from the North (Jer 6:22-24 // Jer 50:41-43)

4.3.3.1 Preliminary Considerations

The consensus of scholarship identifies 6:22-24 as the original and 50:41-43 as the duplicate.\textsuperscript{461} This consensus is built on two pillars: first, the extensive oracle against Babylon in which our duplicate twin is situated (50:2-51:58) is a tapestry stitched out of language and themes threaded elsewhere in Jeremiah’s book; thus, it is not unreasonable to assume our present doublet is also secondarily woven into chap. 50. Second, it makes

chronological and theological sense to appreciate the second occurrence of the doublet (50:41-43)—which anticipates the punishment of Babylon for their violence—as a response to the first occurrence (6:22-24)—where it is Babylon’s violence that is anticipated.462 Such a response fits thematically within chaps. 50-51, chapters in which the reversal of Babylon’s fate is featured prominently. In fact, if the doublet of 50:41-43 is the revised twin, its revision functions as an embodiment of the theme of reversal that dominates these chapters: an oracle authorizing Babylon’s violence is transformed into an authorization of Babylon’s punishment (see below).

462 The motif of punishing a nation after it has been employed as an agent of punishment is known outside of Jeremiah (e.g. Isa 10:5-18).
4.3.3.2 Textual Analysis

TABLE 4.22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22 ἵδο Ῥω ἔρχεται</td>
<td>22 ἵδο Ῥω ἔρχεται</td>
<td>41 ἵδο Ῥω ἔρχεται</td>
<td>41 ἵδο Ῥω ἔρχεται</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a ἀπὸ βορρᾶ</td>
<td>a ἀπὸ βορρᾶ</td>
<td>a ἀπὸ βορρᾶ</td>
<td>a ἀπὸ βορρᾶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b καὶ ἕθνη</td>
<td>b καὶ ἕθνη</td>
<td>b καὶ ἕθνη</td>
<td>b καὶ ἕθνη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c...c</td>
<td>c...c</td>
<td>c...c</td>
<td>c...c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐξεγερθοῦνται ὑπὸ ἑσχύτου τῆς γῆς</td>
<td>ἐξεγερθοῦνται ὑπὸ ἑσχύτου τῆς γῆς</td>
<td>ἐξεγερθοῦνται ὑπὸ ἑσχύτου τῆς γῆς</td>
<td>ἐξεγερθοῦνται ὑπὸ ἑσχύτου τῆς γῆς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 τόξον καὶ βίβυνην</td>
<td>23 τόξον καὶ βίβυνην</td>
<td>42 τόξον καὶ βίβυνην</td>
<td>42 τόξον καὶ βίβυνην</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d κρατοῦσιν</td>
<td>d κρατοῦσιν</td>
<td>d κρατοῦσιν</td>
<td>d κρατοῦσιν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἵπποι</td>
<td>ἵπποι</td>
<td>ἵπποι</td>
<td>ἵπποι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἄρα ἐλεῖσε</td>
<td>καὶ ἄρα ἐλεῖσε</td>
<td>καὶ ἄρα ἐλεῖσε</td>
<td>καὶ ἄρα ἐλεῖσε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e παρατάσσεται</td>
<td>e παρατάσσεται</td>
<td>e παρατάσσεται</td>
<td>e παρατάσσεται</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f πῶρ εἰ</td>
<td>f πῶρ εἰ</td>
<td>f πῶρ εἰ</td>
<td>f πῶρ εἰ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g πόλε ὑπὸ</td>
<td>g πόλε ὑπὸ</td>
<td>g πόλε ὑπὸ</td>
<td>g πόλε ὑπὸ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πρὸς σὲ θύγατερ</td>
<td>πρὸς σὲ θύγατερ</td>
<td>πρὸς σὲ θύγατερ</td>
<td>πρὸς σὲ θύγατερ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h Σιων</td>
<td>h Σιων</td>
<td>h Σιων</td>
<td>h Σιων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i καὶ χεῖρ μία</td>
<td>i καὶ χεῖρ μία</td>
<td>i καὶ χεῖρ μία</td>
<td>i καὶ χεῖρ μία</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j ὅπου ἔχει</td>
<td>j ὅπου ἔχει</td>
<td>j ὅπου ἔχει</td>
<td>j ὅπου ἔχει</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k ὁ ἱπποὺ</td>
<td>k ὁ ἱπποὺ</td>
<td>k ὁ ἱπποὺ</td>
<td>k ὁ ἱπποὺ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l ὃς ἔχει</td>
<td>l ὃς ἔχει</td>
<td>l ὃς ἔχει</td>
<td>l ὃς ἔχει</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὠδίνε ὧ τικτούσῃ</td>
<td>ὠδίνε ὧ τικτούσῃ</td>
<td>ὠδίνε ὧ τικτούσῃ</td>
<td>ὠδίνε ὧ τικτούσῃ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a Synonymous variation (post-duplication intra-textual addition): “from the north” (6:22 G; 50:41 M G) / “from the land of the north” (6:22 M) – although both forms of this phrase are common to Jeremiah—the fuller form being found in 3:18, 10:22, 16:15, 31:8, and 50:9 and the more concise form in 1:14, 4:6, 6:1, 13:20, 15:12, 46:20, 47:2, 50:3, and 51:48—the fuller form, with one exception (Zech 2:10 [6 Eng.]), is characteristic of Jeremiah alone. In contrast, the shorter form occurs throughout Hebrew scriptures over thirty times. To a certain degree, the two forms are interchangeable, for in addition to 6:22—where both forms are attested—both forms also occur in 31:8; M has the long form while G has the short form. The agreement of 6:22 G with 50:41 M and G suggest that the phrase in 6:22 M was expanded after the moment of duplication. Alternatively, the Greek text of 6:22 may betray intentional PDHarm with 50:41 G, but this contention is unlikely on the basis of b below.

b...b Synonymous variation, PDHarm, and non-significant variant (sing. / plur.): * “and nations” (= καὶ ἐθνη; 6:22 G) / “and a great nation” (6:22 M; 50:41 M G). The absence of the adjective “great” in 6:22 G suggests that this adjective is not original to 6:22, and that the adjective was added to the duplicate in 50:41 at the moment of duplication to intensify the doublet’s text. If so, its presence in 6:22 M reflects PDHarm. Note that the presence of in 50:41 may have invited a later scribe to add the plural form of this adjective to 50:9 where a line very similar to 6:22 already stood; in 50:9 M we read of “an assembly of great nations from the land of the north,” who, like the nation and people of our passage are stirred up ( ) by Yhwh against Babylon. The adjective is missing in 50:9 G, and thus may have been inserted into 50:9 from 50:41 after the moment of duplication. The variant plural form ἐθνη found in G of 6:22 probably arose from scribal noise after the moment of duplication; the singular form found in M is more appropriate since in 6:22 the word references Babylon. The different readings are synonymous.

c...c Minor innovation (addition): 50:41 (M G) includes , “and many kings” against 6:22 (M G). Bellis supposes that this insertion reflects the view that the Medes would conquer Babylon: the Medes were “an empire composed of many peoples, each of which had its own ruler or king.” If so, this addition would tether the moment of duplication to around 550 B.C.E., when Cyrus conquered the Medes, after which knowledge of historical Median political structures perhaps would be hard to come by. With below, this addition dramatically alters the meaning of the doublet. Along with

463 Cf. Janzen, Studies in the Text of Jeremiah, 60. Alternatively, the adjective may also have been lost in 50:9 through haplography (homoeoteleuton: of of ) in which case the influence may have gone the other direction, from 50:9 to 50:41 (i.e., the presence of in the duplicate may have been inspired by in 50:9).

this innovation, the following verb in 50:41 was updated from 3rd masc. sing. ("it is stirred") to 3rd masc. plur. ("they are stirred").

d Synonymous translations: in seven places we encounter different but synonymous Greek translations of the same Hebrew text. These differences do not change the meaning of the text. For our purposes, these differences undermine the possibility that the Greek texts of the doublet have been intentionally harmonized toward each other. They do not eliminate the possibility of unintended harmonization due to the interference of a mental text.

e Non-significant variants: in four places we find singular and plural forms freely interchanged across the doublet’s versions. Such diversity is only compounded when one considers the variant readings of other Hebrew manuscripts. This confusion in forms reflects the fact that the antecedent of these words—i.e. the people from the north—may be described either collectively—as a singular group—or individually as many persons. These differences are not counted as significant.

f Scribal error: "they ride" (6:23 M; 50:42 M G) / καὶ ἄρχον, “and chariots” (6:23 G) – the reading in Greek probably arose by error: the verb was misread as the noun “chariot.”

g Scribal error: “man” (M of 6:23 and 50:42) / πῦρ = אֵשׁ, “fire” (G of 6:23 and 50:42). Twice the Greek text represents a misreading of the Hebrew. The possibility that both misreadings happened independently seems low. One could argue that the mistake happened once and from there influenced the reading of the other. Yet, on the basis of d above, it appears deliberate harmonization of the Greek texts was not a factor. The influence must have been unconscious. Reading as was probably invited by the occurrence of the latter in Jer 4:4, or it simply attests to the loss of a yod. Emerton’s suggestion that the kaph in should be deleted is unnecessary and is contradicted by the presence of the kaph in VG (ὡς = ).

465 At a later point, after the moment of duplication, the gloss “and many kings” was also added to 6:22 in order to harmonize this verse with 50:41. This evidence of post-duplication harmonization opens up the possibility that the doublet twins have been harmonized after the moment of duplication in other ways; e.g. see b…b above. The Hexaplaric recensions witness to the addition of the phrase ἕως καὶ βασιλείᾳ πολλοί in 6:22; ms 86 marks the phrase with attesting to a later Hebrew manuscript that also contains this phrase in 6:22; cf. Ziegler, Jeremias, 181.

466 Holladay, Jeremiah 1, 219.

467 Cf. ibid.

Major innovation: “Zion” (6:23 M G) / “Babylon” (50:42 M G) – with one word, the entire meaning of the doublet is altered. The replacement word “Babylon” harmonizes the doublet with its new context, a long oracle directed against Babylon.

Major innovations: along with the replacement of “Zion” and the addition of “Babylon” above, one verb form and three pronouns have been replaced to reflect new antecedents:

“The king of Babylon heard” replaces “We have heard;” “our hands” is replaced by “his hands” and “[anguish] seizes us” by “[anguish] seizes him”—the last two both referring again to the king of Babylon.

4.3.3.3 Duplication Technique:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6:22-24</th>
<th>50:41-43</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Look! A people comes from the north and a ______.nation is stirred up from the ends of the earth. Bow and spear they wield. They are cruel and have no mercy. Their voice is like the roaring sea. And upon horses they ride. Arrayed like a man for battle against you O Daughter Zion. <strong>We hear</strong> the report of it. <strong>Our</strong> hands fall helpless. Anguish seizes us. Pain like a woman in labor.</td>
<td>Look! A people comes from the north and a great nation and many kings are stirred up from the ends of the earth Bow and spear they wield. They are cruel and have no mercy. Their voice is like the roaring sea. And upon horses they ride. Arrayed like a man for battle against you O Daughter Babylon. <strong>The king of Babylon hears</strong> their report. <strong>His</strong> hands fall helpless. Anguish seizes him. Pain like a woman in labor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The duplicate twin has been radically changed through one crucial major innovation: the reference to Zion is replaced by a reference to Babylon (underlined with a double line), transforming the whole text from an oracle against Judah into an oracle.
against Babylon. Along with this innovation we see four more related major innovations, one minor innovation (underlined with a single line), and a single synonymous variant (underlined with a dotted line); no instances of minor synonymous variation are detected. These characteristics mark the duplicate as a loose citation with major adaptation.

4.3.3.4 Rationale for Duplication

As mentioned above, the text of 6:22-24 is only one of several that were added intra-textually to the extensive oracle against Babylon (chaps. 50-51). There appears to be good reasons for why these verses in chap. 6 were one of the texts selected for duplication in these chapters. Much of the language of 6:22-24 already reverberates in chaps. 50-51. For example, the image of a foreboding people coming from the north in 6:22 is found in 50:3, 9, and 51:48. The language of 50:9 in particular has many points of contact with our doublet’s text: both speak of a nation (or nations) ([גוי] ) being stirred up (עור) by Yhwh and of that nation being arrayed (ערך) for battle and armed with weapons (bow and spear in 6:23; arrows in 50:9).\(^{469}\) Additionally, the duplicate and its environs in chap. 50 are linked by the repeated use of the verbal root (“to be strong,” “to wield”) in 50:42, 43 (= 6:23, 24) and in 50:33, 34, 42, 43.\(^{470}\) Finally, as we will see below, the text of the doublet was well suited to function as an example of the major theme of reversal ever-present in the lengthy oracle against Babylon.

\(^{469}\) Holladay, *Jeremiah 2*, 401, sees 50:9 as being directly inspired by 6:22-23.

On another note, the terminus of the doublet seems explainable; verse 24 is the logical end of the doublet’s thought unit, and, as Kessler suggests, the contents of v. 25—an imperative to avoid open places—if carried over into chap. 50 would contradict the urgent motif of fleeing the city that recurs frequently in the Babylonian oracle (50:3, 8, 16, 28; 51:6).\textsuperscript{471} For these reasons, the duplicating scribe limited the doublet to vv. 22-24.

Less certain is the reason why the text of the doublet was inserted in its particular location—toward the end of chap. 50—splitting in two another doublet borrowed from the oracle against Edom (49:18-21 // 50:40, 44-46). Bellis finds the insertion of the doublet’s text at this point in chap. 50 to be logical, a necessary structural element in the readily-outlined literary architecture of vv. 33-46.\textsuperscript{472} The insertion of our doublet, she argues, addresses an implied question raised by the description of Babylon as a wilderness in vv. 39-40, namely, “what events will lead up to Babylon’s desertion?” Additionally, she explains, placing the doublet before v. 44 allows the content of v. 44—i.e. a disclosure of Yhwh’s participation in the attack of Babylon—to shine as the culmination of the chapter’s progression.

While useful as a synchronic description of vv. 33-46, as a diachronic explanation for the text’s formation, Bellis’s suggestions are not entirely satisfying. The structure of these verses, as outlined by Bellis, hardly seems necessary. For instance, if placed after either v. 44 or v.45a, the doublet would work just as well if not better. Placed after v. 44—in which Yhwh declares that he may appoint against Babylon anyone he chooses—our doublet, announcing the advent of the enemy from the North, would be fitting. Or

\textsuperscript{471} Kessler, \textit{Battle of the Gods}, 101.

again, if placed after v. 45a—which states that Yhwh has a “plan” for Babylon—the doublet would serve as an illustration of that plan. As it stands now, this line in v. 45a lacks a clear description of this plan, and thus—against Bellis’s impression—could be described as being structurally incongruous. Also, the insistence that v. 44 serves as a culmination of the chapter needs qualification. Bellis acknowledges that the theme of divine involvement in the attack of Babylon is not unique to the v. 44 but finds emphasis in vv. 25 and 31-32 (we could also add vv. 13, 18, 24); but we cannot agree that “divine participation is nowhere as explicit as in 50:44.”

The comparison in v. 40 of Babylon with Sodom and Gomorrah, cities which God (אלהים) overthrew, seems a sufficiently explicit disclosure of divine involvement to counter Bellis’s suggestion. In short, we must look for another explanation for the insertion of the duplicate into its current locale.

A more cogent argument, though still speculative, is the suggestion that our duplicate has found a home in the middle of vv. 40, 44-46—verses duplicated from the Edom oracle—in order to resolve tensions created when these earlier verses were inserted. To consider this possibility, let us take up the subject of the doublet’s function in chap. 50.

4.3.3.5 The Duplicate’s Divinatory Function

There are three possible divinatory functions of the doublet of 6:22-24 // 50:41-43. First, as was just suggested, our doublet may play an important exegetical role in its

---

particular location pressed between the verses borrowed from the oracle against Edom.\textsuperscript{474}

Those verses seeded the end of chap. 50 with the images of the barrenness of Sodom and Gomorrah (v. 40) and of the thickets of the Jordan (v. 44)—images geographically \textit{apropos} to Transjordan Edom but alien to Babylon. As we will see, these images clash to a certain degree with the overall makeup of the Babylonian oracle. It appears that our duplicate was strategically placed between these images in order to mitigate their incongruities.

Consider first the tension created in chaps. 50-51 by the allusion to Sodom and Gomorrah. Babylon will be uninhabited, we read, “as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah and their neighbors, says the LORD…” (50:40).\textsuperscript{475} Everywhere else in the oracle we hear of a coming military invasion, a theme repeated like the steady beat of a war drum (vv. 3, 9, 14-15, 21-22, 29-30, 35-37); enter a reference to Sodom and Gomorrah—cities that met annihilation by an act of God—however, and the drumming threat of military invasion is drowned out by the higher pitch of supernatural intervention. Perhaps for this reason, our doublet—with its militaristic imagery—was enlisted at this point to reprise the theme of armed invasion. Lest the reader (or hearer) have any doubt, the \textit{aftermath} of God’s leveling of Sodom and Gomorrah—and not the leveling itself—is the chief point of comparison between that horrific miracle and Babylon’s finale.

\textsuperscript{474} It is possible that the doublet of 49:18-21 // 50:40, 44-46 originated in the oracle against Babylon and is secondary in the oracle against Edom; cf. Parke-Taylor, \textit{The Formation of the Book of Jeremiah}, 157. If so, the argument of this section would need to be adjusted only slightly, and one would still have to explain why the text of 6:22-24 was inserted in chap. 50 adjacent to references to Sodom and Gomorrah and to the Jordan.

\textsuperscript{475} NRSV.
Along the same lines, Jer 50:44—a verse also borrowed from the Edomite oracle—portrays Babylon’s foreboding threat as a lion lurking in the relatively lush flora of the Jordan River. The leonine image works well in an oracle against Edom, which is situated not far from Jordan’s banks. Yet, in an oracle against Babylon, the metaphor creates some geographical incongruity. Babylon sits a great distance away from the Jordan on the opposite side of the Arabian Desert. The reference to the Jordan could be viewed as an identification of the geographical origins of Babylon’s assailers. However, elsewhere in chaps. 50-51, the vanquishers of Babylon are identified as the Medes (51:11, 28) or at least said to arise from the North (50: 3, 9, 51:48);476 either way, the Jordan lies in the wrong cardinal direction. Once more, the imagery duplicated from the Edom oracle hangs askew against the backdrop of chaps. 50-51. Perhaps also for this second reason, a scribe saw need for realignment, a need met by our oracle from 6:22-24. Our doubled text reassures that out of northern lands—not the distant west—Babylon’s nemesis will descend. As was the case with the reference to Sodom and Gomorrah, our doublet clarifies the main point of the leonine image; this image depicts the vulnerability of Babylon and not the origins of its foe.

476 The theory of Brevard S. Childs, “Enemy from the North and the Chaos Tradition,” JBL 78 (1959): 187–98, that biblical references to an enemy from the north develop a mythological as opposed to geographical significance, is not relevant here. Although Childs counts the reference in 50:41 as an example of the phrase used mythologically, there is no reason to suppose so. Childs so counts this use of the phrase on the basis of the occurrence of the Hebrew root רעשׁ, “to shake,” in 50:46, a verse which Childs, ibid., 195, sees as a “conclusion” to the doublet, even though between them are two intermittent verses and v. 46 is actually constituent of an entirely different doublet taken from the oracle against Edom (Jer 49:18-21 = 50:40, 44-46), into which the doublet of 50:41-43 (= 6:22-24) was inserted. Moreover, as mentioned above, the insertion of the phrase “and many kings” in 50:41 at the moment of duplication may have been added to strengthen the identification of the people from the North with an actual historical referent, namely, the Medes.
We cannot confirm that such exegetical work—clarifying the import of references to Sodom and Gomorrah and to the lion of the Jordan—was expected of 6:22-24 when the scribe made his or her duplication. Yet, these proposals help explain why our doublet landed where it did toward the end of chap. 50 in the middle of another doublet. The utility of our proposal suggests its probability, and we should give them due consideration in the course of our evaluation of the doublet’s function.

Putting aside the question of why our doubled text was placed precisely where it was, there are at least two other functions of the doublet that require our attention. These functions are more of a rhetorical and theological nature. First, as flagged above, our doublet embodies a major theme of the Babylonian oracle, namely the great reversal of Babylon’s fate.477 First broached in 50:15, calls for vengeance against Babylon and for repaying her in due kind haunt chaps. 50-51: “Do to her as she has done” (50:15); “Repay her according to her deeds; just as she has done, do to her” (50:29); and, “for [Yhwh] is a God of recompense, he will repay in full” (51:56).478 Within this milieu, our doublet—in its adapted form—answers the call to deal with Babylon as she has dealt. Originally, the text of our doublet served as a divine sanction of Babylon’s invasion of Judah. It announced the arrival of Nebuchadnezzar’s armed forces—agents of Yhwh’s wrath—who had come to execute Yhwh’s will. Yet, in a great role reversal, a later scribe coopted this text rewriting it with Babylon no longer as the aggressor but as the helpless victim. In this way, the familiar words of the doublet were transformed into a divine


478 NRSV; see also, 51:6, 11, 36.
sanction and announcement of Babylon's undoing. Thus the secondary application (and transformation) of the doublet actually embodies the theme of reversal (and vengeance) resounding in chaps. 50-51. In the process of adapting the text from 6:22-24, the duplicating scribe enacted this reversal, treating Babylon in the same way that she treated others. The same bow and spear that Babylon wielded against others are now (in the duplicate) wielded against her. In a word, the doublet’s text functions in its new context as an actualization of the Babylonian oracle’s crucial theme, namely, the complete reversal of Babylon’s lot.

Shifting to consider one more additional function—once again a theological and rhetorical function—our doublet assists in underscoring a significant theological point of emphasis raised by the long read of Jeremiah, from beginning to end. Noted by many exegetes, the oracle against Babylon contains a plethora of words and phrases found earlier in oracles confronting Judah. For example, both Judah (1:14, 15; 4:6; 6:1, 22; 10:22) and Babylon (50:3, 9, 41; 51:48) are threatened by an enemy from the north; both lands are headed for desolation (Judah in 4:7, 27; 5:30; 6:8; 8:21; 9:10; 10:22, 25; 18:16; 19:8; and Babylon in 50:3, 13; 51:26, 29,41, 43); and both face divine punishment (Judah in 5:9, 29; 6:6, 15; 8:12; 9:8; 11:22; 14:10; and Babylon in 50:18, 31, 44;


\[481\] In M only.
51:27,44, 47, 52). Hill has catalogued an extensive list of similar verbal repetitions that heighten the perception that Babylon is intentionally being related to Judah. According to Hill, such repetition and reapplication of words from earlier oracles is one mechanism through which the book portrays Babylon, not as Judah’s enemy, but as Judah’s twin. The two nations stand guilty before the same God and are subject to the same divine punishment.

This portrayal of Babylon as a “parallel figure” to Judah is reinforced in other ways. To give one example, the description of Babylon’s fall in 50:6-19 is framed by a refrain referencing first Judah’s contrition (v. 4) and second the pardoning of Judah’s iniquity (v. 20). When Babylon’s wrongdoing is described in theological terms requiring the vengeance of Yhwh, it also is referred to as iniquity (“in her iniquity”) (51:6). In sum, Hill concludes, through casting Babylon in Judah’s mold, the people of Judah—even in their moment of celebration of “the demise of Babylon”—must confront their own sinfulness and deserved punishment.

---

482 In M only.
483 Hill, *Friend or Foe*, 177-80.
484 Ibid., 172-80. With these comments, Hill has in mind the form of the oracle against Babylon in M—a form in which the comparison of Babylon with Judah articulated here and in the following paragraphs is intensified. Yet, the references cited here and below are attested by G (and thus Jer⁷⁰), which indicates that Hill’s comments are largely illuminative of Jer⁷⁰ as well as V⁶⁴.
485 Ibid., 173.
486 Ibid.
487 Cf. 50:14 M, where Babylon’s wrongdoing is considered “sin” (חטא) committed “against Yhwh.” Similar statements are made of Judah in, e.g., 3:25; 8:14; 16:10; 40:3, 23.
488 Hill, *Friend or Foe*, 180.
For our purposes, we need only to pay attention to how our doublet fits into this theological comparison of the two nations. First, our doublet (along with another, namely 10:12-16 // 51:15-19) is not simply a borrowing of disparate language and phraseology from earlier Judean oracles, but that of a whole oracle-length unit left intact. As such, our doublet plays a larger role in establishing the comparison of Judah and Babylon. Second, to extend Hill’s line of thought, upon encountering the description of the faltering of Babylon’s hope in the face of invasion within the text of the doublet, the Judean reader (or hearer) was invited not to gloat over Babylon’s fall, but to ponder anew Judah’s own frailty before the invasion of 587 B.C.E. In this way, exulting over Babylon’s collapse is cooled by humble recognition of one’s own culpability and vulnerability.

In summary, we have identified three possible divinatory functions of the doublet. The first—solving exegetical puzzles raised by the duplication and insertion of material from the Edomite oracle into the end of chap. 50—helps untangle why our doublet was twisted into the middle of the threads of the Edomite oracle; though we cannot on the basis of textual variants confirm that this function was intended. The second function—actualizing a significant theme of chaps. 50-51—is more certain. The deliberate adaptations of the doublet in its secondary form—i.e., altering the oracle to address Babylon instead of Judah—are readily explained upon the discovery of this significant theme. Finally, the last-mentioned function—strengthening the comparison of Babylon with Judah, a comparison already present in chaps. 50-51—appears undeniable. While the purpose of this comparison is hard to confirm, Hill’s proposal is highly convincing: the duplicate should be seen as having a theological purpose of commanding Judean
contrition and humility even as Judah’s greatest foe meets its waterloo. Thus, with the present doublet, we encounter two new divinatory functions—(1) what we could call actualizing exegesis and (2) the reinforcement of a theological theme—and possibly another instance of a doublet addressing smaller-scale interpretative problems present in the doublet’s secondary context—a function assigned to several of the doublets previously discussed.

Once more, we here encounter a duplicate that functions in ways unlike the other duplicates of this study. It is possible that this duplicate shares with many of the others an exegetical function of interpreting its context. Yet, the two novel functions outlined above—actualizing a theological point made by the duplicate’s context, and strengthening a theological theme of the book as a whole—are dissimilar from any that we have seen so far.

4.4 Conclusion

On the basis of the above analyses of doublets from Jeremiah, we may draw out a few implications. First, though we have considered only a sampling of the doublets found in the book, we have gathered overwhelming evidence that the duplicating scribes arranged the units of their divinatory texts with careful intention. In each case considered above, the scribe placed the duplicate in a precise position in order to generate new meaning through vertical reading. In many cases, such vertical reading is complemented by the harmonization of the doublet’s text toward its secondary context. Furthermore, we encountered three occasions when the scribe radically adapted a doublet’s text so that it would address an entirely new subject (23:5-6 // 33:14-16; 48:40b, 41b // 49:22 // 6:22-24)
The two latter cases exemplify Jewish scribal equivalents to reapplication by analogy, where the doublet’s text was appropriated to address a new subject having an analogous relationship to the text’s original subject: (a) in the case of 48:40b, 41b // 49:22, the text is reapplied from one enemy of Judah to another; and, (b) in the case of 6:22-24 // 50:41-43, the text is reapplied from one transgressor against Yhwh (Judah) to another (Babylon). On the basis of these observations, two conclusions seem undeniable: 1) like the scribes of Mari and the scribal scholars of the ancient Near East, the Jewish scribes who transmitted Jeremiah played an active role in the process of divination; and 2) both groups of scribes, those in the Near East and those of Judean descent, made use of categorically similar techniques of textual divination, namely, literary generation and reapplication by analogy. In the final chapter of this study, we will explore these conclusions in greater detail. First, we must address the implications of another observation that has surfaced in our study of Jeremiah’s doublets.

Our analyses of Jeremiah’s doublets also reveal a fascinating range (and even disparity) of creative license taken by the scribes responsible for these doublets. First, we note that the doublets of Jeremiah were created through a wide variety of duplication techniques ranging from verbatim repetition (5:9 // 5:29 // 9:8) to loose citation with major adaptation (6:22-24 // 50:41-43) to paraphrase with minor adaptation (1:18-19 // 15:20). Second, and of greater importance, we observed that the functions served by each duplicate differed from example to example. For instance, the doublet of 6:13-15 // 8:10b-12 uniquely functions in its secondary context to introduce two themes that dominate that context. The doublets of 23:5-6 // 33:14-16 and 30:10-11 // 46:27-28 are both added to the Book of Consolation perhaps in order to magnify this book’s function
as a repository of hope-filled oracles. For its part, the doublet of 48:40b, 41b // 49:22 displays a unique theological function harmonizing Yhwh’s treatment of Moab with that of Edom. When we consider doublets added to Jeremiah at an early epoch, we encounter more diversity in doublet function. The duplicate of 1:18-19 (// 15:20) helps complete the introductory purpose of chap. 1. The triplet of 5:9 // 5:29 // 9:8 serves on two occasions to mark the end of a textual unit. And finally, the doublet of 6:22-24 // 50:41-43 contributes to the theological identification of Babylon as a mirror of Judah. Given this wide diversity of function (and secondarily of duplication technique), it is not immediately obvious that all of the doublets unique to \( V^M \) should be attributed to the same scribal hand, nor those of \( Jer^+n \) to a single reviser. Instead the diversity of technique and function invites a different conclusion, namely that multiple scribal hands were involved in the creation of first \( Jer^+n \) and second of \( V^M \). In defense of this conclusion we also recall our observation that in two cases a duplicate, while part of a larger plus of \( V^M \), could be distinguished from the remainder of this plus on the basis of differences in function (not to mention of duplication technique). The duplicate of 33:14-16 (// 23:5-6) and that of 48:40b, 41b (// 49:22) both serve an exegetical function that is contradicted by other verses added to their respective contexts in \( V^M \) (33:17-26 and 48:45-47, respectively). This observation strongly suggests that the hand responsible for each doublet was not responsible for the other secondary additions to the doublet’s context. Lastly, we note that the \( Tendenz \) of the doublet of 17:1-4 (// 15:12-14)—imagining the exile as unending—stands in some in tension with that of 30:10-11 (46:27-28) and of 33:14-16 (// 23:5-6), both of which guarantee a return from exile. Once more, it seems unlikely that the same scribal hand created all three of these
doublets. In summary, our analyses of Jeremiah’s doublets suggest that \( V^M \) (and \( Jer^n \) by extension) may not be the result of one revising scribe in a single compositional moment. This realization, in turn, brings back into the foreground questions about the adequacy of the Two-Edition theory. As we will see in the next chapter, a reexamination of the textual data of Jeremiah alongside the results uncovered in this chapter invites a reappraisal of Tov’s theory.

489 As noted above, we are not completely confident that 17:1-4 is an addition of \( V^M \) (haplography could explain its absence in G), in which case this observation is not relevant for the present argument.
CHAPTER 5:

THE FINAL STAGES OF JEREMIAH’S FORMATION RECONSIDERED

In the previous chapter, we observed that the doublets of Jeremiah exhibit a diversity of functions, reflect different duplication techniques, and in a few cases express points of view that stand in tension with each other or with the perspective expressed by other long pluses of $\text{V}^\text{M}$. These observations raise questions about the utility of Tov’s Two-Edition theory, which attributes virtually all of the additions of $\text{V}^\text{M}$, including the later doublets as a group, to a single “editor.” In light of these observations, this chapter offers a fresh evaluation of the textual differences existing between $\text{V}^\text{G}$ and $\text{V}^\text{M}$ (and those existing between each and $\text{Jer}^\text{n}$). On the basis of this evaluation and the results of the previous chapter, the present chapter explains why the Two-Edition theory is not completely convincing and requires significant refinement. While we consider several different kinds of textual evidence, particular attention is paid to the expansion and addition of headings to prophecies, the filling in of personal names, and the expansions of “C” diction.

Furthermore, the Two-Edition theory is based on a now antiquated dichotomy between “editors”—who produce the major stages of a book’s literary growth (i.e., “editions”)—and “scribes” (i.e. copyists)—who simply transmit such editions. As noted in the introduction, more contemporary understandings of scribal practice and of the formation of ancient texts call into question the accuracy of this dichotomy. Thus, to
properly describe the formation of the book of Jeremiah, we must first consider more nuanced categories of scribal revision besides “edition” and “transmission.” The goal of the opening section of this chapter will be to articulate such categories (or better, degrees of scribal revision). With these new categories in mind, we will commence our fresh evaluation of the textual variants of Jeremiah in the second section of the present chapter.

Ultimately, we will conclude that assigning all the changes of $V^M$ vis-à-vis $Jer^+$ to a single “editor” acting in one compositional moment is both unwarranted and unnecessary. It is unwarranted because it does not account for all of the textual data mined by Janzen and others.$^{490}$ Attributing all of the additions of $V^M$ to one “editor” is also unnecessary because these same data may be explained in a more satisfying and convincing way. As we will see, compelling reasons exist for considering $Jer^+$ and $V^M$ not as “editions” (or what we will call multidimensional revisions) but as accidentally preserved snapshots of an ongoing process of incremental revision and of occasional larger-scale revision.$^{491}$

$^{490}$ Furthermore, it overlooks the actual conclusions reached by Janzen in his own study; rather than seeing $V^M$ as an edition, John G. Janzen, Studies in the Text of Jeremiah (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1973), 68, concludes that the textual data of Jeremiah’s variant forms demonstrate that $V^M$ is simply many more generations further removed from $Jer^+$ than $V^G$.

$^{491}$ Thus, this study takes a mediating position between Tov—who assigns virtually all textual changes to two “editors”—and McKane, who assigns all such changes to ongoing incremental revision: cf. William McKane, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jeremiah, Volume 1: Introduction and Commentary on Jeremiah I-XXV, ICC (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1986), lxxxi-lxxxii. McKane, ibid., writes: “Here a comparison of MT and Sept. reveals how the Hebrew text has developed and shows that we are not encountering a systematic, comprehensive scheme of editing, but exegetical additions of small scope, operating within limited areas of text. This exegetical expansion or commentary is triggered by a verse or a few verses of pre-existing text, and it is this procedure which is indicated by the term ‘rolling corpus.’ Such triggering or generation necessarily has a piecemeal character: the pre-existing Hebrew text, as represented by Sept., has generated a kind of expansion which does not serve the ends of a thoughtful, all-embracing redaction or a superintending, theological tendency.” Without accepting all of his conclusions, we find common ground with the assessments of Hermann-Josef Stipp, Das masoretische und alexandrinstische Sondergut des Jeremiabuches: Textgeschichtlicher Rang, Eigenarten, Triebkräfte, OBO 136 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994), 140, who writes that short text form represented by $V^G$
5.1 An Evaluation of Tov’s “Editor”

Before we begin our reassessment of the textual differences of $V^M$ and $V^G$, we must discuss the inadequacy of Tov’s conception of “edition” and offer in its place alternative categories of scribal revision. As mentioned in chap. 3, Tov attributes the formation of $\text{Jer}^{en}$ and of $V^M$ to two subsequent editors (editor I and editor II) who were responsible for creating two successive “editions” of Jeremiah in isolated compositional moments (edition I $\approx \text{Jer}^{en} \approx V^G$; and edition II $\approx V^M$). With this attribution of the two forms of Jeremiah to “editors,” Tov assumes the existence of a stiff division of labor between “editor” and “scribe,” by which he means “copyist.” With regard to Jeremiah, Tov writes: “The anonymous author of edition II was not a scribe, as we are not dealing with scribal phenomena, but he was an editor who produced one of the stages of the literary growth of the book.”

Elsewhere, Tov articulates his assumption clearly, writing:

*Editions…involve major changes, additions, and transpositions; the writers who produced them are termed *editors*. The *textual* transmission, performed by *scribes* for each edition, starts *after* that edition was completed. Scribes involved in this process did insert changes into the text, but to a smaller degree than editors.*

$(= \text{Jer}^{en})$, rather than being an early “edition” of the book of Jeremiah, is “einer Blitzlichtaufnahme eines Körpers in Bewegung vergleichbar” springing from “einem allmählichen, eher unsystematischen Wachstum.” For Stipp, the special readings of $V^M$ also do not form a systematic revision. Thus, Stipp advises against referring to $V^G$ and $V^M$ as “editions” but as “Textformen” or “Texttypen.”


Tov’s assumption can be challenged from different angles. On the purely semantic level, we would want to refer to both figures as scribes, albeit scribes with different responsibilities—e.g., “editing” (or better, “revising”) scribes and copyist scribes, respectively. Furthermore, we may want to heed the concerns raised by Van Seters with regard to the use of the term “editor” in modern scholarship. We could perhaps refer to Tov’s editor as a reviser, or more precisely as a multidimensional reviser (see below).

Semantics aside, our main point of contention with Tov’s assumption is the artificial picture of textual growth implied by this division of labor. For books like Jeremiah, Tov assumes that the (“final”) literary history of such books consists entirely of a few (in the case of Jeremiah, two) isolated “editorial” moments of dramatic change—which resulted in new “editions”—between which the text was relatively stable. Recall that Tov assigns almost all of the differences and additions of $V^M$ to one editor in one compositional moment. Thus by editor, Tov does not simply imagine a scribe (to use our term) who revises one aspect of a text by itself, say its chapter structure alone (what we would call a single-dimensional revision), but one who alters multiple aspects at the same time: e.g., structure, headings, content, etc. Thus, we could describe Tov’s editor as a multidimensional reviser.

---

Not considered is the possibility that different aspects were altered by different revisers. It appears that for Tov the only two options on the table are edition (or multidimensional revision) and transmission. If these were the only alternatives available, Tov would be correct to describe Jeremiah’s development as a succession of “editions.” However, on the basis of our fresh perspective of ancient scribes, we must now consider the possibility that texts like Jeremiah grew not only through isolated moments of dramatic change but also more gradually either through a series of more-limited revisions (in the hands of many revising scribes), through ongoing incremental revision (defined below), or through some combination of all three. In fact, when the textual data of Jeremiah are reevaluated with these other categories (or degrees) of scribal revision in mind, the Two-Edition theory seems far from certain. In the following section we will define and distinguish different degrees of revision.

5.2 Degrees of Revision: Multidimensional Revision, Single-Dimensional Revision, and Incremental Revision

When analyzing the textual variants of a given manuscript, these variants can be assigned to one scribe or to multiple scribes. If one were to credit a group of variants to a single scribe, there should be reason to do so. Helpful here is Ulrich’s analysis of the

---

495 The seeds of doubt of the Two-Edition theory were already planted in Tov’s writing. Although insisting that a single figure was responsible for virtually all of the differences detected in VMM, Tov had to admit that his editor II was frequently inconsistent and unsystematic in his rewriting of edition I; see: Tov, “Some Aspects of the Textual and Literary History of the Book of Jeremiah,” 151; furthermore, in one case—Jer 10:6-8—Tov, ibid., 154, n. 27, allowed an expansion of VMM to come from a hand later than editor II.
different kinds of textual variants that occur in variant manuscripts. Ulrich divides textual variants into four categories: 1) orthographic differences, 2) individual textual variants, 3) isolated insertions, and 4) patterned sets of similar (and substantial) textual changes that form new “editions.” Of interest to us is how Ulrich defines this fourth category and distinguishes it from the second and the third. For Ulrich, a group of textual changes falls into category four when as a group these changes form a “coherent pattern” which reflects a common motivation. In other words, such textual changes are “systematic.” In contrast, textual variants that do not form a clear and discernible pattern, but are more “random” in nature, would count as either individual textual variants or isolated insertions. Importantly, when a group of variants form a coherent pattern and reflect a common motivation, it is possible that these variants stem from the systematic revision of one scribal hand in one compositional moment, what we could call single-dimensional revision. For Ulrich, there is no doubt; the presence of such “patterned sets” of textual variants is indicative of a new systematically revised “literary edition,” that is,
“an intentional reworking of an older form of the book for a specific purpose or
according to identifiable editorial principles,” a reworking created by a “major” reviser.500

Ulrich surveys many examples of biblical books that survive in multiple variant
forms and which appear to have been systematically revised by a major scribal figure
(and thus are illustrative of single-dimensional revision). In each case, single-dimensional
revision is suspected because of the presence of textual variants that form a coherent
pattern. To illustrate, one form of the book of Exodus—the common text of
4QpaleoExodm and the Samaritan Pentateuch—contains two different patterned sets of
pluses (vis-à-vis the Masoretic Text).501 The first set reflects the principle that every
occurrence of a divine command in the biblical narrative should be matched with a
 corresponding narration of that command’s fulfillment, and vice versa.502 On the basis of
this principle, a (revising) scribe added explicit commands and explicit command
fulfillments when one or the other was perceived to be lacking. The second patterned set
reflects the scribal tendency to harmonize similar sections of scriptural texts with each

Biblical Narratives and Reflections on Determining the Form to Be Translated,” in The Dead Sea Scrolls
and the Origins of the Bible, Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature (Grand Rapids, MI:
Eerdmans, 1999), 35, provides a fuller definition, writing: “By double [or variant] literary edition I mean a
literary unit – a story, pericope, narrative, poem, book, and so forth – appearing in two (or more) parallel
forms in our principal witnesses, which one author, major redactor, or major editor completed and which a
subsequent redactor or editor intentionally changed to a sufficient extent that the resulting form should be
called a revised edition of that text” (emphasis mine). Important for our purposes, Ulrich ascribes
systematic change to a single individual. Again, in The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Compositional
Development of the Bible, 30, Ulrich ascribes each “new edition” to a single figure, whom he describes as an
“author/redactor/scribe/priest/teacher.”

502 For an analysis of 4QpaleoExodm, see: Judith E. Sanderson, An Exodus Scroll from Qumran:

502 As Ulrich, The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Compositional Development of the Bible, 29,
explains: “Commands not matched by reports of the execution of those commands are repeatedly supplied
with an expansion explicitly reporting the execution; and conversely, Moses’ words to Pharaoh not
anticipated with God’s command to speak those words are repeatedly supplied with an expansion providing
the wording of that command.”
other, a tendency perhaps revealing of a desire for such scriptural texts to form a coherent whole. As Ulrich explains, with this form of Exodus:

[w]e find a text intentionally expanded by systematic harmonization – by taking other parts of scripture and placing them virtually word-for-word in a new, related context, sometimes from nearby places in Exodus, sometimes from parallel passages in Deuteronomy.⁵⁰³

It is the systematic nature of these two sets of pluses that cues us to the possibility of single-dimensional revision. Had the pluses attested by the common text of 4QpaleoExodusᵐ and the Samaritan Pentateuch been of entirely different kinds and lacking a common motivation, these pluses would be classified as isolated insertions or as individual variants, and we would have no reasons to suspect that they stem from a single scribal hand.

While Ulrich’s method for determining the presence of what we are calling single-dimensional revision has laid down crucial groundwork, another level of precision is required. For, as will become clear momentarily, the presence of systematic textual variants—that is, variants that form a coherent pattern and reflect a common motivation—are a necessary but often insufficient indicator of single-dimensional revision, i.e. revision of a text by a “major” scribe in one compositional moment. For one to conclude that a group of textual changes constitute a single-dimensional revision, it is necessary that these changes are systematic. However, as we will see, some systematic changes can also be the result of the efforts of multiple scribes each replicating the same kind of textual change over many manuscript generations. Thus, recognizing the

presence of systematic change, while necessary, is not always sufficient for determining that single-dimensional revision has occurred.

To illustrate this insufficiency, we may consider a couple of examples from Jeremiah. First, the book of Jeremiah contains a number of headings to prophecies. Seven or eight of these headings were added to (or expanded in) $V^M$. For instance, in \(V^M\) (against \(V^G\)), chap. 2 is introduced with the added heading:

“And the word of Yhwh came to me, saying;” again, in 47:1 of $V^M$ the heading to the oracle against the Philistines was expanded from 

\[= \xi \tau \omega \alpha \lambda \lambda \omega \rho \varsigma \alpha \nu \]\n
“concerning the Philistines” in $Jer^n (= V^G)$ to

“The word of Yhwh which was to Jeremiah the prophet concerning the Philistines before Pharaoh struck down Gaza.” Importantly, headings to prophecies very similar to these new headings of $V^M$ are found throughout $Jer^n$. In fact, the identical heading added to 2:1 in $V^M$ is found in five places in $Jer^n$ (1:4; 1:11; 13:8; 16:1; 24:4); and, the first half of the expanded heading of 47:1 in $V^M$, replicates a heading employed three times in $Jer^n$ (14:1; 46:13; 49:34). This is to say, both 2:1 and 47:1 form a patterned set with other groups of headings found in $Jer^n$.

Moreover, both are variation of a standard heading widely attested in $Jer^n$:

“And the word of Yhwh came to Jeremiah, saying” (29:30; 32:26; 33:1, 19, 23; 34:12; 35:12; 36:27; 37:6; 42:7; 43:8). If we did not possess multiple forms of

\[V^M\] uniquely includes headings (or expanded versions of headings) in Jer 2:1-2; 7:1-2; 16:1; 27:1; 46:1; 47:1; 50:1 (the last counted by Janzen, not Tov); see discussion in Tov, “Some Aspects of the Textual and Literary History of the Book of Jeremiah,” 152–53; and Janzen, *Studies in the Text of Jeremiah*, 111–14, under the heading “introductory sentences.” To this list of seven, one could add an eighth: Jer 49:34.
Jeremiah—by which we now distinguish $V^M$ from $\text{Jer}^+\text{n}$—and if the presence of systematic change was (incorrectly) deemed a sufficient indicator of single-dimensional revision, we might easily assume (a) that both 2:1 and 47:1 were added at the same time as the other headings just listed with which they form a patterned set, or even (b) that all of Jeremiah’s headings were added in the same compositional moment. Yet, since we do have two forms of the book in our possession, we have conclusive evidence that groups of headings that form patterned sets were not inserted into the book all at once in a single moment of revision but rather were added on at least two different occasions. In sum, the presence of multiple instances of the same kind of revision (in this case, the insertion of identical headings) does not indicate that all of the instances occurred simultaneously.

To offer a second illustration, the same conclusion can be drawn from an analysis of the insertions of C diction (i.e. diction characteristic of C material) into the book of Jeremiah. By Stulman’s count, $V^M$ contains eighty-two new instances of C diction (hereafter, $C^+$); $\text{Jer}^+\text{n}$, for its part, already boasts two hundred thirty such instances (hereafter, C$^-$). As discussed in greater detail below, $C^+$ consists almost entirely of C diction repeated elsewhere in C. Once again, save for our knowledge of multiple forms of Jeremiah, we might assume (like many twentieth-century scholars) that all of these instances of C diction stem from a single revising scribe—even a “Deuteronomistic editor”—in an isolated composition moment.

---

An illustration from Jeremiah’s C material exemplifies how easily this wrong assumption can be reached. The large plus of Jer 11:7-8 (in $V^M$) was stitched together out of several “Deuteronomistic” phrases characteristic of C material. To mention only three of these phrases, the large plus contains: (1) the phrase “in the day I brought them up from the land of Egypt” (11:7), a phrase occurring in different variations around twenty times in D and DtrH; $^{506}$ (2) the command “listen to my voice” (11:7), found in D and DtrH more than forty times; $^{507}$ and (3) the indicting words “and they each walked in the stubbornness of their heart” (11:8), which is a variation of Deut. 29:18 [Eng. 19]. $^{508}$ Importantly, these three Deuteronomistic phrases are also found (with some synonymous variation) numerous times in C: we find the first phrase in Jer 7:22, 25; 11:4; 16:14 // 23:7; 34:13; $^{509}$ the second in Jer 3:13; 7:23, 28; 11:4; 18:10; 32:23; $^{510}$ and the third in Jer 7:24 and 16:12. $^{511}$ Since the exact “Deuteronomistic” phrases employed in Jer 11:7-8 are repeated throughout C, we might have no reason to doubt that these phrases of C were added by the same “Deuteronomistic” hand who added these phrases to C on the same occasion. After all, these phrases—along with C material as a whole—form a coherent pattern and reflect common motivations: for instance, they (a) add to Jeremiah a parenetic
tone, (b) reframe the oracles of Jeremiah in terms of obedience to Yhwh and the “Deuteronomistic” interpretation of Judah’s history, and finally (c) unify Jeremiah with the “Deuteronomistic” corpus of nascent Jewish scripture.

Yet, this conclusion, based on the appreciation of an apparent “patterned set,” would be fallacious. Historical accident—e.g., the survival of multiple forms of Jeremiah—has disabused us of the assumption that systematic revision must be attributed to one scribal figure acting in one time and place. As demonstrated by these two illustrations—the examples of headings to prophecies and of C diction—we must be careful to distinguish single moments of revision from multiple occurrences of the same kind of revision, which may look identical.

Once we realize that what looks like a unified single-dimensional revision may in fact consist of multiple occasions of revision of the same kind, we are primed to appreciate another possibility—namely, that what appears to be single-dimensional revision may actually consist of many repeated instances of incremental revision. By *incremental revision*, we mean ongoing, isolated textual changes (usually expansion), which—while stemming from multiple scribes over many manuscript generations—as a group form a coherent pattern and reflect a common motivation. With the category of incremental revision, we acknowledge the fact that what looks like single-dimensional revision may have this appearance only by way of the gradual accumulation of similar though isolated textual changes. Telling the two apart is not always easy. For example, suppose for the moment that the eight additional (or expanded) headings to prophecies found in $V^M$ were not added by a single reviser, but were inserted one at a time by seven different scribes over the course of many manuscript generations. Apart from the
accidental survival of these hypothetical manuscripts, we would be unable to determine on literary evidence alone how many scribes were involved.

Fortunately, in some cases, the possibility of incremental revision is substantiated by empirical textual data. Once more, an example from Jeremiah will suffice. The pluses of $V^M$ include numerous occasions of expanded names and titles. For example, in seventeen places the name “Jeremiah” in $J^R$ is expanded to “Jeremiah the prophet” in $V^M$; and eleven times the title “king of Babylon” in $J^R$ is glossed as “Nebuchadrezzar, the king of Babylon” in $V^M$. At first glance the high volume of name and title expansions such as those in $V^M$ appears to betray the hand of a single reviser, who systematically enlarged names and titles throughout Jeremiah. Upon closer inspection, however, we cannot be certain if this appearance is actually the case. From an analysis of the unique pluses of $V^G$, we know that the expansion of names and titles in Jeremiah occurred gradually and occasionally in the course of the book’s transmission: in Jer 32:1, $V^G$ against $V^M$ expands “Nebuchadrezzar” in $J^R$ to “Nebuchadrezzar, king of Babylon;” again in Jer 51:33, $V^G$ adds a reference to the Babylonian king lacking in $V^M$ (and presumably $J^R$); in Jer 21:3, $V^G$ has “Zedekiah, king of Judah” in place of in ($= J^R$); in Jer 36:2 “Josiah, king of Judah” ($V^G$)

---


513 See Janzen, Studies in the Text of Jeremiah, 139–41. In five of these eleven cases, we find a variant spelling of the king’s name, “Nebuchadnezzar” (Jer 27:6, 20; 28:11, 14; 29:3); see discussion below.
stands in for in $V^M (= Jer^{*n})$; and $V^G$ reads “Jeremiah” in 36:18 where $V^M (= Jer^{*n})$ has Ø (the relevant verb is 3rd masc. sing.).

Of great significance, three of the five name/title expansions of $V^G$ are identical to name/title expansions encountered in $V^M$: the expansion of “Nebuchadrezzar” to “Nebuchadrezzar, king of Babylon” is found in $V^M$ in 35:11; 37:1; that of “Zedekiah” to “Zedekiah, king of Judah,” in $V^M$ in 32:4 (cf. 37:1, 17); and the specification of the subject “Jeremiah,” where $V^G$ has Ø, in $V^M$ in 1:11; 37:14, 16, 17; 38:6 (x2); 40:6. Thus, the same forces that led to the expansion of names and titles in $V^M$ were also at work, to a much more limited degree—in the formation of $V^G$. The name and title expansions of $V^G$ are isolated insertions—happening only five times—and are not part of a large-scale revision of the book. Since names and titles are occasionally expanded by scribes in the normal course of a text’s transmission, it would not be surprising to find that the amount of expanded names and titles in a given text increases with time. After many generations of manuscripts, the number of names and titles expanded through such ongoing, incremental revision could be substantial for a text like Jeremiah. Such a text, however, would have the appearance of a text that had been systematically expanded by a single reviser. In other words the limited presence of expanded names and titles in $V^G$ suggests that the larger quantity of name and title expansions of $V^M$ may simply be a consequence of $V^M$’s greater temporal separation from $Jer^{*n}$ than $V^G$. Put succinctly, the appearance of systematic revision does not necessarily indicate that single-dimensional revision has taken place.

To recap, we have seen the importance of distinguishing first, large-scale single-dimensional revision from multiple (smaller-scale) occurrences of the same kind of
single-dimensional revision, and second, single-dimensional revision from incremental revision. Now we must consider a third analogous distinction between single-dimensional revision and what we are describing as *multidimensional revision*. The former denotes the systematic revision of one aspect of a text by itself, such as the restructuring of the chapters of Jeremiah. The latter refers to the systematic revision of multiple textual aspects at the same time, such as the restructuring of the chapters of Jeremiah and say the inclusion of headings to prophecies. Distinguishing between these two scribal operations is vital, since we cannot automatically assume all of the different “patterned sets” of textual variants detected within a given text occurred during one compositional moment. This is to say when a text has been systematically revised in various types of ways, three possible explanations should be considered: (1) all of the revisions occurred at the same moment and by the same hand, in which case we are speaking of a multidimensional revision; (2), each of the types of revision originated at different literary stages and by different revising scribes, in which case we are dealing with a series of discrete single-dimensional revisions; or (3), some combination of (1) and (2); i.e. two or more types of revision stem from one reviser, with the remainder coming from different moments of revision. Applied to Jeremiah, if we, like Tov, are to attribute all of the disparate types of textual changes constituent of $V^M$ to a lone multidimensional reviser (Tov’s “editor II”), there should be compelling reason to do so. If such reason is wanting, we must admit the limits of our knowledge and leave the matter unsettled. Keeping in mind these three degrees of revision—multidimensional, single-dimensional, and incremental (not to mention multiple instances of single-dimensional revision)—we
may proceed with our fresh evaluation of the types of textual variants found in the manuscripts of Jeremiah.

5.3 Reevaluation of the Types of Variants Found in Jeremiah

If we are to understand how $\text{JM}$ developed out of $\text{Jer}^n$—and subsequently how $\text{Jer}^n$ itself took shape—we must be careful not to attribute hastily every observable change to a single (multidimensional) reviser, when in fact other explanations may account for the same data in a more convincing way. For this reason, we must establish criteria by which we may distinguish multidimensional revision from single-dimensional revision and multiple instances of single dimensional revision, and all three from incremental revision. The following criteria may assist us in this endeavor:

(#1) radical changes that necessarily occurred in a single moment—such as the restructuring of the chapters of Jeremiah—constitute a single-dimensional revision;

(#2) a set of textual variants that form a coherent pattern and reflect a specific motivation may be grouped together as systematic type, and as such is likely indicative of single-dimensional revision, unless #3 applies;

(#3) when a type of textual change is known to occur piecemeal and to accumulate gradually within texts as a result of ongoing scribal activity, one may suspect the presence of incremental revision; often adjudicating between incremental revision and single-dimensional revision (or multiple occurrences of single-dimensional revision) may not be possible;

(#4) in many cases, the likelihood of single-dimensional revision corresponds in part to the pervasiveness of the given patterned set of textual variants; e.g., a textual change that occurs thirty times is more likely due to single-dimensional revision than one that occurs two or three times only;

(#5) when from textual evidence we may determine that a given text has undergone the same kind of systematic revision more than once—that is, multiple occurrences of the same kind of revision—the possibility is opened that what appears to be a single occurrence of that kind of revision may itself be composite,
i.e., consisting of multiple moments of revisions (and perhaps incremental revision);

(#6) one may distinguish multidimensional revision from discrete moments of single-dimensional revision when one is able to demonstrate that multiple types of systematic changes occurred at the same compositional moment; otherwise, one must acknowledge that multiple types of changes attested in a text could be indicative of several distinct stages of revisions, especially when #7 applies;

(#7) when a text contains multiple types of systematic changes that are known to occur independently from each other in other comparable texts, it is possible that these different types of systematic changes arises from different moments of revision.

As we will see, when the types of textual variants of Jeremiah are reevaluated according to these criteria, some types may arguably be considered constituent of single-dimensional revision; many others, however, are either identifiable as incremental revision or are of indeterminable origin.

With this set of criteria in mind, we may now turn to reevaluate the types of textual variants found in Jeremiah. As our starting point, we will begin with the list of types of textual variants (namely, pluses) that Tov assigns to his “editor II:”

(a) “headings to prophecies”
(b) “repetition of sections” (or, duplication) 514
(c) “addition of new verses and sections” (including the addition of C material) 515
(d) “addition of new details”
(e) “free rewriting”
(f) occasions of “clarification”
(g) “homogenizing additions”
   (1) “personal names” (or, expanded names and titles) 516

514 Also discussed by Janzen, Studies in the Text of Jeremiah, 91–96, 134.
516 As mentioned, the filling in of personal names is one type analyzed extensively by Janzen; cf. Studies in the Text of Jeremiah, 69–86, and Appendix A, 139–55.
While this list of types of textual variants is very useful, not all the items on the list are equal in nature. Some of the items listed as discrete types identify patterned sets of textual variants which reflect a common motivation. Other items, however, consist of more general or miscellaneous groupings that do not constitute a discrete systematic type of textual change, and thus by Ulrich’s analysis, should be counted as “isolated insertions” or “individual textual variants” rather than as being indicative of revision. Falling into this latter category are items (c) “addition of new verses and sections,” (d) “addition of new details,” (e) “free rewriting,” (f) “clarification,” and (h) “contextual clarifications.” This is to say, five of the nine items listed as types by Tov are not patterned sets of variants, but consist of some combination of isolated insertions and individual variants. As such, they actually point away from the thesis that virtually all of the expansions of $V^M$ constitute a new multidimensional revision of Jeremiah (i.e., “edition II”).

The four remaining items on the list do appear to form patterned sets and thus are better candidates for classification as discrete types of textual change (rather than loose groupings of isolated insertions / individual variants). That said, these types are once again uneven. Type (b) “repetition of sections” (i.e. duplication) groups together a small number of pluses that share a common mechanic—namely the creation of a doublet. Yet,

---


518 The addition of C material, included in this grouping, requires further discussion. See below §5.3.5.
as we encountered in the previous chapter, the later doublets that make up this type are dissimilar in function as well as in duplication technique, and thus, in spite of their commonality as doublets do not constitute a systematic type. Also, while types (a) “headings to prophecies,” (g) “homogenizing additions,” and (i) “amplified formulas” all appear to be systematic, the first, (a), consists of a few examples only while both (g) and (i) have numerous instances. In the following section, we will analyze these three remaining types in greater detail. Along with these types, we will also examine the addition of C material, a subtype grouped under (c) “addition of new verses and sections,” since this subtype in particular is considered as primary evidence of revision by Tov.

5.3.1 Addition and Expansion of Headings to Prophecies

As discussed above, headings to prophecies were added to Jeremiah on at least two different occasions—with seven or eight headings being added or expanded in VM to supplement the numerous headings already existing in Jer²⁶. This observation opens the possibility that the new and expanded headings of VM were not added at the same moment, but may themselves represent multiple occasions of revision or incremental revision (criterion #5). The likelihood of this possibility seems greater when one appreciates that the individual headings grouped together in this type do not share all of the same functions, and thus are not necessarily a patterned set. The headings added or expanded in VM play different functions including: 1) narrating the revelation of the divine word with either the verb “to be” or “to speak” (sometimes utilized simply to mark the beginning of a textual unit); 2) identifying the prophet by name; 3) specifying the oracle’s audience; 4) specifying a historical setting; and 5) specifying a
geographical setting. Each heading has at least one of these functions; but no one heading has all five, and the combination of functions played by each varies from heading to heading. Yet, by paying attention to which headings have which functions, an interesting pattern emerges that likely proves not only that these headings come from different compositional moments, but also that some were added before the OAN were rearranged, and thus before the creation of Tov’s “edition II,” yet after the text traditions of $V^M$ and $V^G$ parted company.

To assist us in our analysis of the additional and expanded headings of $V^M$, the following table displays the different combinations of functions played by the different headings added or expanded in $V^M$. Preexisting functions found in $Jer^{+n}$ are marked with the symbol “$Jer^{+n}$” while new functions unique to $V^M$ carry the symbol “$+V^M$.”

**TABLE 5.1**

**EXPANDED AND ADDITIONAL HEADINGS OF $V^M$**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>The revelation of divine word</th>
<th>The name of the prophet (Jeremiah)</th>
<th>The oracle’s audience</th>
<th>A historical setting</th>
<th>A geographical setting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:1-2</td>
<td>$+V^M$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:1-2</td>
<td>$+V^M$</td>
<td>$+V^M$</td>
<td>$Jer^{+n}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$+V^M$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:1</td>
<td>$+V^M$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27:1</td>
<td>$+V^M$</td>
<td>$+V^M$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$+V^M$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46:1</td>
<td>$+V^M$</td>
<td>$+V^M$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47:1</td>
<td>$+V^M$</td>
<td>$+V^M$</td>
<td>$Jer^{+n}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$+V^M$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49:34</td>
<td>$+V^M$</td>
<td>$+V^M$</td>
<td>$Jer^{+n}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$+V^M$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50:1</td>
<td>$Jer^{+n}$</td>
<td>$+V^M$</td>
<td>$Jer^{+n}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As this table indicates, the headings added or expanded in \( V^M \) exhibit a diversity of combinations of functions. Yet, one pair of headings, 47:1 and 49:34, share the same combination of functions. These two headings have a few more characteristics in common: first, both introduce one of the OAN; second, they are expansions of preexisting headings; and three, they are both expanded in the exact same way. The heading of the oracle against the Philistines (Jer 47:1), was expanded from the short form

* “concerning the Philistines” \( (= \text{ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀλλοφύλους} \text{ G}) \) in \( J_{er^+}^n \), to the much longer form

“the word of Yhwh which came to Jeremiah the prophet to the Philistines before Pharaoh struck Gaza” \( (V^M) \). In terms of function, the heading was enlarged from merely specifying the following oracle’s audience to narrating the revelation of the divine word, specifying the prophet by name, and providing a historical context.

As mentioned, the heading of the oracle against Elam (49:34), was expanded in the exact same way as the heading of the Philistine oracle, from the same short form

* “concerning Elam” \( (= \text{τὰ Αιλά} \text{ G}) \) in \( J_{er^+}^n \), to a much longer form

“the word of Yhwh which came to Jeremiah the prophet to Elam at the beginning of the reign of Zedekiah, king of Judah, saying” \( (V^M) \). Like that of the Philistine oracle, the expanded

\[519\] In G the phrase \( (25:13 = 25:14 \text{ G}) \) is incorrectly taken in G as the part of the “original” heading to the oracle against Elam, which as a unit reads \( ἃ \text{ ἔπροφητευσεν Ιερες} \alpha \text{ ἐπὶ τὰ ἔθνη τὰ Αιλά} \text{ “which Jeremiah prophesied against the nations of Elam.” Originally however, the phrase was connected to the previous verse describing a “book” containing Jeremiah’s words against the nations; cf. William McKane, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jeremiah. Volume 2: Introduction and Commentary on Jeremiah XXVI-LII, ICC (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1996), 1109; Anneli Aejmelaeus, “Jeremiah at the Turning-Point of History: The Function of Jer. XXV 1-14 in the Book of Jeremiah,” \textit{VT} 52 (2002): 476.
heading of the oracle against Elam has an enlarged function: in Jer+n, the heading only specified the oracle’s audience; in VM, it also narrates the revelation of the divine word, specifies the prophet by name, and offers a historical context. Since both headings were expanded in identical ways, we may describe these two headings as a patterned set.

Alongside these two expanded headings in VM, we may want to consider a third, that of the oracle against Babylon (50:1). This heading has a number of things in common with the previous two: first, it also introduces one of the OAN; second, in VM it is an expansion of a preexisting heading; and third it is expanded in a similar way to these first two. In Jer+n, this third heading reads:

* “the word of Yhwh which he spoke against Babylon” (= λόγος κυρίου ἐλάλησεν ἐπὶ Βαβυλῶνα G).

In VM we find the expanded form:

“The word which Yhwh spoke to Babylon, to the land of the Chaldeans in the hand of Jeremiah the prophet.” The earlier form identifies the oracle’s audience and narrates the revelation of the divine word. In its expanded form, the heading describes the oracle’s audience in more detail and, like the previous two headings (47:1; 49:34), also names Jeremiah as the prophet.⁵²⁰ Although, in contrast to the previous two headings, the expanded heading in 50:1 does not specify a historical context (though such a context is offered in 50:2), its overall similarity with the previous two remains.

This similarity becomes more pronounced when one considers the remainder of the headings of the individual oracles of the OAN. In Jer+n, prior to the expansion of

---

⁵²⁰ Wilhelm Rudolph, Jeremia, HAT 12 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1947), 258–59, argues that the added reference to the land of Chaldeans indicates that Babylon as a region, and not just Babylon the city, is subject to the divine judgment of the following oracle.
these three headings (47:1; 49:34; 50:1), the majority of the OAN had the identical (short) form, namely + the nation being addressed. In addition to 47:1 (*) and 49:34 (*) mentioned above, we find four more short forms in Jer\textsuperscript{n}: 48:1 “concerning Moab;” 49:1 “concerning the Ammonites;” 49:7 “concerning Edom;” 49:23 “concerning Damascus.” Longer headings, of various degrees of complexity, are found in the OAN in four places in Jer\textsuperscript{n}: (1) as mentioned, the older heading of the oracle against Babylon (50:1)—before its expansion—specifies the oracle’s audience and narrates the revelation of the divine word; (2) the heading of the oracle against Kedar and Hazor (49:28) mentions the oracle’s audience and specifies a historical context (קדר ומלכות חצור אשׁר הכה נבוכדראצר מלך־בבל);

(3) the first heading of the oracle against Egypt (46:2) includes the oracle’s audience and a historical context (למצרים על־חיל פרעה נכו מלך מצרים אשׁר־היה על־נהר־פרת בכרכמישׁ א建设用地 נבוכדראצר מלך בבל בשׁ הכתובת הרביעית ליהויקים מלך יהודה);

(4) the second heading of the oracle against Egypt (located eleven verses after the first; 46:13) narrates the revelation of the divine word, mentions the prophet by name, and specifies a historical context (הדבר לוקו יוהו אלירמיהו)

521 Here we follow the qere’: \textit{ Nebuchadrezzar }; ketib: \textit{ Nebuchadrezzar }.

522 Slightly abridged from NRSV to reflect a shorter reading in Jer\textsuperscript{n} which lacks the gloss “son of Josiah” ( ) of \textit{ l\textsuperscript{M} }.
The word which Yhwh spoke to Jeremiah, the prophet, concerning the coming of Nebuchadrezzar, king of Babylon, to strike the land of Egypt”\(^{523}\).

We mention this second heading of the oracle against Egypt last because this heading is the most similar to the expanded headings of the oracle against the Philistines (47:1) and of the oracle against Elam (49:34). These latter two headings—in their expanded form—replicate the same functions of this second heading of the Egyptian oracles. Thus, this second heading likely served as a model for the latter two when they were expanded.

In light of this observation, one wonders what relationship the oracle against Egypt has with the oracle against the Philistines and Elam. Moreover, when we consider the distribution of long and expanded headings in the OAN in \(V^M\), a number of other questions arise. The following table displays the distribution of long and short forms for \(Jer^*\) and \(V^M\) (according to the ordering of the OAN in \(V^M\)):

\(^{523}\) In G, in place of \(\text{ἐν χειρὶ Ιερέῳ} (=\) \(\text{ביד ירמיהו} \); cf. 50:1.
TABLE 5.2
HEADINGS TO THE ORACLES AGAINST THE NATIONS
IN THE ORDERING OF $V^M$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heading</th>
<th>$Jer^{*n}$</th>
<th>$V^M$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Egypt: 46:2 (26:2 G)</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philistines: 47:1 (29:1 G)</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Long (expanded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moab: 48:1 (31:1 G)</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammonites: 49:1 (30:1 G)</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edom: 49:7 (29:8 G)</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damascus: 49:23 (30:12)</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elam: 49:34 (25:14b G)</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Long (expanded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babylon: 50:1 (27:1 G)</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Long (expanded)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the basis of this distribution, one may question why only the headings of the oracles against the Philistines, against Elam, and against Babylon were expanded in $V^M$. As noted above, the expansions of the first two clearly form a coherent pattern; but why would a scribe be interested in expanding the headings of these two smaller oracles? Elam in particular is an obscure locale, lying beyond the geographical horizon of Judah and mentioned only once in Jeremiah outside of the oracle against Elam (25:25) and only twenty-one times in the rest of Hebrew scriptures. That the second heading of the oracle against Egypt served as a model for the heading of the oracle against the Philistines makes some sense, since the two are positioned next to each other (both in terms of

---

$^{524}$ The oracle against the Philistines (47:1-7) is seven verses long only; the oracle against Elam (49:34-39) is even smaller, at five verses in length. In contrast, for example, the oracle against Edom (49:7-22) is sixteen verses long and the oracle against Moab (48:1-47) is forty-seven verses long.
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geography and in terms of chapter arrangement in $V^M$). Why this heading should serve a model for the heading of the oracle against Elam, however, is not clear.

The beginning of an answer to these questions becomes apparent when one considers the distribution of long and short headings not in the ordering of the OAN in $V^M$, but in the more original ordering found in $Jer^{+n} (= G)$. Consider the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heading</th>
<th>$Jer^{+n}$</th>
<th>$V^M$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elam: 49:34 (25:14b G)</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Long (expanded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt: 46:2 (26:2 G)</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt: 46:13 (26:13 G)</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babylon: 50:1 (27:1 G)</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Long (expanded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philistines: 47:1 (29:1 G)</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Long (expanded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edom: 49:7 (29:8 G)</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammonites: 49:1 (30:1 G)</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damascus: 49:23 (30:12)</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moab: 48:1 (31:1 G)</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Short</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When one considers the ordering of the OAN in $Jer^{+n}$, suddenly a pattern emerges. The three expanded oracle headings along with two previously expanded oracle headings (those of the oracles against Egypt) correspond to the first five oracles of the collection. This clustering of five of the six oracles with longer headings at the beginning of the collection does not appear to be accidental but invites explanation. Here we will propose a likely solution.
At the time of Jer\textsuperscript{M}, the book of Jeremiah contained ten oracles addressing foreign nations listed in a seemingly random order.\footnote{It is beyond the scope of this study to discuss scholarly opinions of the ordering of the OAN in G ( = Jer\textsuperscript{G}).} While, a few of these oracles had informative headings mentioning details such as a specific historical context, the majority were simply introduced with an uninformative short heading ( + the addressee). In particular, the first oracle of the collection addressing a more obscure foreign power, Elam, possessed a short, unremarkable heading. At a later point, in the manuscript tradition of M—after this tradition parted ways with that of G—a scribe started a process of expanding the headings to the OAN. Using the second heading to the oracle against Egypt as a model, the scribe began expanding the oracle headings starting from the top of the collection. The scribe succeeded in expanding the heading to the Elam oracle, that of the Babylonian oracle, and the heading to the Philistine oracle, so that the first five heading were all informative. Then, for some reason, the process of heading expansion came to a halt.\footnote{One possibility worth considering is that the book of Jeremiah, due to its length, was divided in half and written on two scrolls. It could be the case that headings were expanded in the first scroll of Jeremiah but not in the second. If the first scroll ended with oracle against the Philistines (29:7), which comes at an approximate half-way point of the book, only the first five OAN would have been expanded (i.e., if they were not already expanded). The remaining OAN, coming after the oracle against the Philistines in Jer\textsuperscript{M}, would have been found on an entirely different scroll, and for this reason would not have been expanded with those of the first scroll. While this possibility is admittedly speculative, it finds support in the fact that the text of G has been thought to be the product of two translation moments (thus, H. St. John Thackeray, “The Greek Translators of Jeremiah,” \textit{JTS} 4 (1903): 398–411) or of a translation and a revision (thus, Emanuel Tov, \textit{The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch: A Discussion of an Early Revision of the LXX of Jeremiah 29-52 and Baruch 1:1-3:8}, HSM 8 (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press for Harvard Semitic Museum, 1976)). In either case, a textual seam is detected somewhere between Jeremiah 29 and 30. For a recent discussion of the bisectioning of Jeremiah, see: Albert Pietersma, “An Excursus on Bisectioning Jeremias,” n.p. [cited 27 June 2015]. Online: http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/nets/edition/jeremias-excursus.pdf. I am grateful to my colleague Brandon Bruning for suggesting this possibility to me.} At a still later point, a different scribe elected to rearrange the OAN into a more logical ordering—the ordering of \textit{t\textsuperscript{M}}—tracing the geographical arrangement of the nations addressed by the oracles.
of the nations along the Fertile Crescent from west to east. In doing so, this second scribe inadvertently scattered the original clustering of oracles with expanded headings so that they were no longer concentrated at the beginning of the collection.

Importantly, if this explanation is correct, we would then have evidence suggesting that the revising scribe who expanded these headings is not the same figure who rearranged the order of the OAN, since this second figure appears unaware of the first figure’s efforts. In other words, it would be difficult to attribute both the expansion of these oracle headings and the rearrangement of the OAN to Tov’s “editor II.”

At this point it may be useful to return to the remaining additional or expanded headings to prophecies in $V^M$ to see if they form a coherent pattern or reflect a common motivation. For convenience, we repeat in the following table the different combinations of functions of the remaining additional or expanded headings of $V^M$: 281
TABLE 5.4
EXPANDED AND ADDITIONAL HEADINGS IN \( V^M \) REVISITED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The revelation of divine word</th>
<th>The name of the prophet (Jeremiah)</th>
<th>The oracle’s audience</th>
<th>A historical setting</th>
<th>A geographical setting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:1-2</td>
<td>(+V^M)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(+V^M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:1-2</td>
<td>(+V^M)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(+V^M)</td>
<td>(\text{Jer}^\text{a})</td>
<td>(+V^M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:1</td>
<td>(+V^M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(+V^M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27:1</td>
<td>(+V^M)</td>
<td>(+V^M)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(+V^M)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46:1</td>
<td>(+V^M)</td>
<td>(+V^M)</td>
<td>(+V^M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As this table indicates, the remaining added or expanded headings of \( V^M \) display a bewildering variety of combinations of functions. This variety may be highlighted by a comparison of the headings of 7:1-2 and 16:1. Beginning with the latter, the heading added to 16:1 serves to narrate the revelation of the divine word only (‘

, “and the word of Yhwh came to me, saying”). In contrast the expanded heading of 7:1-2, while narrating the revelation of divine word like 16:1, goes further by specifying the prophet by name and by placing the following C material of chap. 7 within a specific location (namely, the temple), which harmonizes the setting of this material with that of chap. 26 (a chapter already sharing verbal similarities with chap. 7):

\[527(\ )\]

The word that came to Jeremiah from Yhwh: Stand in the gate of the house of Yhwh, and proclaim there this word, and say, (‘Hear the word of

\[527\] The original wording of the heading in \( \text{Jer}^\text{in} \), placed in parentheses, already specifies the oracle’s audience.
Yhwh), all you people of Judah, you that enter these gates to worship Yhwh.

Importantly, while both 7:1-2 and 16:1 appear to share one function—narrating the revelation of the divine word—this element actually accomplishes different work in each passage: in the case of 16:1, the narration marks 16:2ff as a new textual unit distinct from the preceding verses of chap. 15; in the case of 7:1-2, however, the verses of 7:3bff were already clearly demarcated as a textual unit prior to this heading’s expansion. In Jer+\textsuperscript{n}, 7:3bff are distinguished from the preceding verses of chap. 6 by the more original introductory phrase: “Hear the word of Yhwh, all of Judah; thus says Yhwh” (7:2-3a). Thus, while both 16:1 and 7:1-2 can be grouped together as part of the same “type” (i.e., as headings), they have significantly different forms that serve notably different functions. This is to say, they do not reflect the same specific motivations, and so, in spite of their commonality, perhaps should not be grouped together as a \textit{systematic} type.

To consider one final example, the heading of 46:1 serves a completely unique function introducing the OAN as a whole:

“The word of Yhwh which came to Jeremiah the prophet concerning the nations.” The creation of this heading is inherently linked to the transposition of the OAN from the middle of the book to the end. In its original position, the OAN were introduced by 25:13, which refers to words of judgment…

\footnote{528 See previous note.}
“…written in this book that Jeremiah prophesied against the nations.” 529 Once separated from this introduction in 25:13 and relocated to the end of the book, the OAN required a new introductory verse. The heading of 46:1 was created for just this purpose and in this regard serves a structural function not shared by the other headings added to V^M. For this reason it would not be unreasonable to attribute both the heading of 46:1 and the relocating of the OAN to one multidimensional reviser acting in a single compositional moment (criterion #6). While it is possible that this same reviser was responsible for adding or expanding some of the headings of V^M, we do not have any reason to assume this is the case. As noted, these headings as a whole do not reflect a uniform purpose or combination of purposes, but serve various functions within their respective literary settings. Therefore, though these headings may be classified as a unified type of textual change, we cannot describe them as systematic and consequently lack reason for attributing them to one reviser. Moreover, the only headings that form a patterned set—namely those of 47:1, 49:34, and 50:1—most likely stem from a scribe whose version of the OAN still followed the ordering of Jer^G (= G), and thus is arguably not the scribe who relocated the OAN to the end of the book of Jeremiah. 530

529 M ends with the variant reading “against all the nations.” Note that the last five words ( ) in G are incorrectly taken as the part of the “original” heading of the oracle against Elam, which as a unit reads ἐπροφήτησεν Ἰερεμίας ἐπὶ τὰ ἐθνα τὰ Αιλα “which Jeremiah prophesied against the nations of Elam.” See: n. 519 above.

530 Such is the case unless we are to suppose that the scribe who rearranged the OAN and the scribe who moved them to the end of the book are two different figures.
5.3.2 Expanded Names and Titles

Under the type (g) “homogenizing additions,” there are two subtypes. The first, expanded names and titles (or “personal names”), has already been discussed above. It was noted that $V^M$ contains a high frequency of expanded names and titles; this high frequency suggests that the expansion of names and titles is constituent of a single-dimensional revision (criterion #4). Yet, it was also pointed out that $V^G$, to a much more limited extent, contains its own unique expanded names and titles, which suggests that $V^G$ (like $V^M$) represents a text form that developed from $Jer^{++}$ (a suggestion supported by the limited presence of other textual features in $V^G$ as we will see). Importantly, the limited presence of filled-out names in $V^G$ demonstrates that expanded names and titles can and do accumulate gradually through incremental revision (criterion #3). Consequently, the high frequency of expanded names and titles in $V^M$—while resembling a single-dimensional revision—may actually betray the efforts of many generations of scribes. For this reason we cannot automatically attribute all of these expansions to a single reviser in a single compositional moment.

In fact, the case for considering the expanded names and titles of $V^M$ as the result of incremental revision (and perhaps smaller-scale instances of single-dimensional revision) can be strengthened. For, once again, a close examination of the relevant data undermines the systematic appearance of this type of textual variant. At this point, we must examine and evaluate why Tov attributes all of the expanded names and titles of $V^M$ to a single reviser (“editor II”). This second “editor,” Tov argues, continued a practice of expansion begun by “editor I.” Yet, the second editor’s plan of expanding names and titles contrasts with the strategy of expansion employed by his predecessor. The first
editor, Tov explains, followed a discernible rule: “editor I mentioned the full name or title of the person when he was introduced for the first time in a given unit, but in subsequent references he referred to him in a shortened form.”531 Afterwards, editor II, while continuing the process of filling in names, did so without regard to editor I’s strategy. Instead editor II, “was prone to mention, as much as possible, the personal names in their full form…”532 That editor I followed a discernible rule implies that the occurrence of filled-in names and titles in Jer4n is systematic. And since editor II is thought to have “continued” editor I’s practice, his filling-in of names may be viewed as systematic even though he strayed from editor I’s strategy. Unfortunately, however, both of these suggestions cannot be supported by a careful assessment of the data.

First, in contrast to Tov’s assertion about the strategy of editor I, in most instances the full name or title of an individual occurs randomly and only occasionally conforms to the pattern articulated by Tov. To illustrate, consider the example of the name Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon.” In Jer4n, Tov’s rule is followed in Jer 24:1; 32:1; 34:1; 39:1; 44:30; 46:2; 49:28; 52:4. For each of these eight occasions, the employment of the full name of Nebuchadrezzar corresponds to the first occurrence of the name within the given section. Yet, in at least eleven places in Jer4n, the first occurrence of the king’s name in a given section comes in its short form

532 Ibid., 159–60.
Additionally, in *Jer* the long form of the name twice occurs in the middle of a text unit after the first occurrence of the name: Jer 43:10; 51:34. In short, while Tov’s observation accounts for some of the data, it does not do justice to the overall picture of the presentation of the Babylonian monarch’s name in *Jer*. Besides this example of Nebuchadrezzar, we could entertain several others. For now, however, we may conclude that the occurrence of full names and titles of individuals in *Jer* does not appear to be the work of an “editor” following a discernible rule as Tov supposes, since there are more exceptions than examples of this rule. Instead, what we find is the unsystematic and occasional inclusion of full names and titles which suggests that these names and titles were added not all at once, but piecemeal in the hands of many scribes.

Second, upon examining the pluses of *VM*, we find that the addition of new and expanded names and titles of individuals follows the same unsystematic and occasional pattern of insertion as we find in *Jer*. Contrary to Tov’s suggestion, we do not find evidence of an editor filling out names and titles “as much as possible,” though, admittedly, this description is probably too vague to confirm or deny. Furthermore, the evidence points toward incremental revision (and one isolated occasion of smaller-scale single-dimensional revision) as opposed to pervasive large-scale, single-dimensional revision.

533 Besides these eleven instances, occurrences of the short form of the name in 38:3 and 42:11 could be counted, though in both cases it is unclear if the occurrence should be counted as part of a longer textual unit beginning earlier in the text: Jer 38:3 could represent the fourth occurrences of the name in a textual unit beginning in 37:1; similarly, Jer 42:11 could be part of a unit beginning in 41:1 and stretching until 43:13. Given this possibility, I have not included these verses within the list of examples given.
By way of illustration, we will once again consider the case of King Nebuchadrezzar. In $V^M$, the king’s name is expanded or added seventeen times.\(^{534}\) In forty-one instances, however, the monarch’s name is not expanded.\(^{535}\) Even if one scribe acting alone is responsible for filling in and adding the name in seventeen places, we must conclude that this scribe’s technique was more random than systematic. We could hardly call the scribe’s work a revision. Given the unsystematic nature of the expansions to the Babylonian king’s name, it seems much more likely that we are here witnessing a gradual scribal practice of filling in names, a practice already at work in $\text{Jer}^\text{en}$ and in the formation of $V^G$.

Moreover, all doubts may be laid to rest, when one considers the issue of the orthography of the Babylonian king’s name. As Janzen highlights, the variant spellings of Nebuchadrezzar’s name incontrovertibly point away from a single moment of revision.\(^{536}\) Throughout $V^M$, the monarch’s name is spelled according to its original orthography——, “Nebuchadrezzar” (with a resh in the penultimate syllable)——

\(^{534}\) The name is expanded from $\text{מלך־בבל}$ to $\text{נבוכדראצר}$ in Jer 21:2; 27:6; 27:20; 28:11,14; 29:3; 29:21; 32:28; 46:13; 49:30; 50:17. Twice the name is enlarged from $\text{מלך־בבל}$ to $\text{נבוכדראצר}$: Jer 35:11; 37:1. Twice more the short form, $\text{מלך־בבל}$, is added to $V^M$: Jer 21:4; 25:12. And, two more times, the full name, $\text{נבוכדראצר}$, is added: 21:7; 22:25. The name is also included as a part of large additions of $V^M$ in at least fourteen places: Jer 25:1, 9, 11, 26; 27:12, 17; 28:3; 29:1; 38:18; 46:26; 52:12, 28, 29, 30; and possibly six more, though Janzen is uncertain if these six were lost by $V^G$: Jer 39:5, 6(2x), 11, 13; 52:3; in three places Janzen is confident that the text is not an addition but was lost by $V^G$: Jer 27:8, 13; 52:15. See Janzen, *Studies in the Text of Jeremiah*, 139–41; an explanation of his notation system is found on 155.

\(^{535}\) The Babylonian king’s name is left in its short form in Jer 20:4; 21:10; 27:8, 9; 11, 14; 28:2, 4; 29:22; 32:2, 3, 4, 36; 34:2, 7, 21; 36:29; 37:17, 19; 38:3, 17, 22, 23; 39:3(2x); 40:5, 7, 9, 11; 41:2, 18; 42:11; 50:18, 43; 51:31; 52:9, 10, 11, 12, 26, 27.

twenty-nine times, sixteen of which are pluses in \(V^M\).\(^{537}\) However, eight times—all of which are pluses in \(V^M\) and which are densely packed into couple of chapters (Jer 27:6-29:3)—we find the king’s name with its later, more familiar Hebrew spelling: “Nebuchadnezzar” (with a nun replacing the first resh).\(^{538}\) If a single revising scribe inserted all of the pluses of \(V^M\) containing the name of Nebuchadrezzar, we would have to explain why, after employing standard orthography for several chapters, the scribe suddenly shifted to use a later spelling for a few brief chapters only to revert to the traditional spelling for the remainder of the book. The much simpler and cogent explanation is that the insertions of the monarch’s name in \(V^M\) reflect two distinct textual developments. As Janzen concludes, the eight occurrences of the later orthography—clustered into a few chapters—probably stem from a later and isolated scribal reworking of these chapters.\(^{539}\) The filling in of Nebuchadrezzar’s name with the name’s original orthography, on the other hand, is likely the result of a more “sporadic process.”\(^{540}\) As we noted above, we know from \(V^G\) that references to Nebuchadrezzar were occasional added to the text of Jeremiah through isolated insertions; and thus the higher presence of

\(^{537}\) Janzen, ibid., 139–41, provides a chart of every instance of the name Nebuchadrezzar / Nebuchadnezzar

\(^{538}\) Jer 27:6, 8, 20; 28:3, 11, 14; 29:1, 3.

\(^{539}\) Moreover, as noted by Janzen, Studies in the Text of Jeremiah, 213, and S. R. Driver, An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament (New York: C. Scribner’s, 1913), 272, note. This section of Jeremiah (27:1-29:19) contains nonstandard spellings of several names ( for ; for ; for ; for ), which also suggests that this section of Jeremiah was treated differently than its surrounding material.

\(^{540}\) Janzen, Studies in the Text of Jeremiah, 70.
insertions of the name Nebuchadnezzar in $V^M$ may also reflect ongoing, but gradual incremental revision (criterion #3).\textsuperscript{541}

In summary, an analysis of the variant spellings of the Babylonian king’s name reinforces the conclusions reached above: 1) since names and titles are expanded in a limited way in $V^G$, the higher frequency of such expansions in $V^M$ may also be due to incremental revision; and, 2) there is nothing systematic about the expansion of names in either $Jer+$ or $V^M$—on the whole they do not follow a discernible pattern, but occur randomly throughout the book. All this to say, we have no reason to attribute such expansions to a single revising scribe in one compositional moment. The presence of expanded names and titles in $V^M$, $V^G$, and $Jer+$ undoubtedly reflects an ongoing scribal practice of incremental revision and perhaps the occasional smaller-scale revision.

5.3.3 Intra-Textual Harmonization

The second subtype catalogued under (g) “homogenizing additions” identifies what we have called intra-textual harmonization (or, Tov’s “contextual additions”). This type of textual change was mentioned briefly in chap. 3.\textsuperscript{542} As we noted, the pluses of $V^M$ contain two hundred and twenty-five cases of intra-textual harmonization. Importantly, the pluses of $V^G$ also display unique occasions of intra-textual harmonization (around forty instances).\textsuperscript{543} While the harmonization of $V^G$ is qualitatively less substantial than that of $V^M$—we do not see, for example, lengthy expansions of several lines which

\textsuperscript{541} See section §5.2 above.

\textsuperscript{542} See §3.2.2.3 above.

\textsuperscript{543} Janzen, Studies in the Text of Jeremiah, 211 n. 83.
occasion the harmonizing expansions of $V^M$ (e.g., 7:28-29; 11:7-8; 27:17-18)$^{544}$—the instances of harmonization of $V^G$ do reveal that the same mode of scribal creativity that produced $V^M$’s harmonization can be manifested in more limited and unsystematic ways.$^{545}$ The more-limited intra-textual harmonization of $V^G$ suggests that the harmonization of $V^M$ may also be due to ongoing limited scribal expansion or perhaps incremental revision ($=$criteria #3). In any case, the majority of instances of intra-textual harmonization in either $V^G$ or $V^M$ do not form patterned sets, and thus cannot be attributed to occasional moments of single-dimensional revision, let alone to one large-scale instance of single-dimensional revision.

5.3.4 Amplified Formulas

As Tov explains, Jer$^{40}$ (“edition I”) “contained several formulaic expressions,” such as $כה אמר יהוה$ , “Thus says Yhwh,” and $נאם יהוה$ , “says Yhwh,” which were “often added in edition II [$V^M$], so that this edition presents a fuller use of these formulas than edition I.”$^{546}$ Yet, these same formulaic expressions are also counted among the pluses of $V^G$ to a more limited extent. For instance, the formula $נאם יהוה$ occurs uniquely seventy times in $V^M$,$^{547}$ the same formula is uniquely found in $V^G$ eight times.$^{548}$ Once again, the

---

$^{544}$ Ibid., 67.

$^{545}$ Ibid., 67–68.


$^{547}$ By Janzen’s count, $נאם יהוה$ occurs in M one-hundred seventy-five times; if one subtracts the one-hundred and two instances also found in G and three instances in G lost through haplography, one arrives at our number of seventy times.

more limited presences of this textual feature in $V^G$ demonstrates that such formula may be added to a text gradually through ongoing incremental revision, and thus the higher frequency of such formula in $V^M$ may also be the result of incremental revision (criterion #3). We cannot automatically conclude, then, that the amplified formulas of $V^M$ are indicative of one pervasive single-dimensional revision.

5.3.5 Additions of C Material

Finally, we must also consider on its own terms the multiplication of C Material in $V^M$—which Tov catalogues under (c) “addition of new verses and sections” and to a lesser extent under (i) “amplified formulas”—since this type of expansion is considered by Tov as primary evidence of the Two-Edition theory. Tov’s belief in the existence of “editor II” appears to be based in part on his faith in the hypothetical “Deuteronomistic editor” of $Jer^rtn$. The person responsible for $V^M$ appears to have continued his predecessor’s practice of inserting into Jeremiah words and phrases reflective of the Deuteronomistic tradition, and thus must have been an editor like the editor accredited with $Jer^rtn$. Here, Tov follows the lead of a number of scholars in identifying Jeremiah’s C material not as a literary source, but as a redactional layer usually ascribed to a single reviser. For, as Tov explains, this C material is “trop fragmentaire et trop dispersé dans le texte” to be considered an independent source. Instead, a reviser “ajouta ses propres remarques aux sections de A et B” and thereby formed edition I. Tov’s innovation was

---

549 See §3.1.2 above.
551 Ibid.
to propose that this layer of C material actually consists of two layers, an earlier layer
found in Jer—in i.e. attested by both V and V—(hereafter, C), and a second layer
constituent of the expansions of V (C). Noting that both edition I and edition II include
similar layers of C material, Tov surmises that edition II, like edition I, must be the work
of an editor (or, as we would say, a reviser). Replicating the redactional techniques of
editor I, editor II also inserted his own remarks throughout A and B and added a second
layer of C material drawn independently from Deuteronomy. In short, the existence of
two discrete layers of C material testifies to the existence of two (Deuteronomistic)
“editions” of the book of Jeremiah. Once again, a detailed examination of the material at
hand presents a more complicated picture. Two significant problems with Tov’s
hypothesis emerge, which we will now consider.

5.3.5.1 Problem #1: The Dissimilarity of the Two Layers of C Material

First, upon closer inspection, the two layers of C material are actually markedly
dissimilar, and thus it is incorrect to attribute the second layer to a reviser on analogy
with the attribution of the first layer to the hypothetical reviser, “editor I.” L. Stulman’s
study of Jeremiah’s C material is highly relevant here. Upon examining the second
layer of C material found in V, Stulman determined that C contains almost no new C
diction but consists almost entirely of words and phrases drawn from C. Of the eighty-
two new instances of C material added in V, C contributes only six new words or
phrases; the other seventy-six (or 92%) are duplications borrowed directly from C.


553 For what follows, see ibid., 138–40, 145–46.
sometimes from the same chapter.\textsuperscript{554} Moreover, of the sixty-seven Deuteronomistic words or phrases of C—i.e. those that are also found in the DtrH and/or D—only twenty-eight are employed in C\textsuperscript{+}, all but three of which are derivative of C. In other words, C\textsuperscript{+} does not consist of newly coined diction, but is almost entirely dependent upon traditional language already found in Jeremiah; and—contrary to Tov’s suggestions—C\textsuperscript{+} is not directly dependent upon DtrH or D (except in three isolated cases) but repeats Deuteronomistic language only as an accident of the process of duplicating Jeremianic material in general. Furthermore, those responsible for C\textsuperscript{+} showed no preference for Deuteronomistic diction: of the eighty-two additions of C diction in C\textsuperscript{+}, only twenty-six (or 32\%) come from DtrH or D. The remainder (fifty-six out of eighty-two, or 68\%) consists of phrases and words which—while traditionally described as C material—are found in Jeremiah only. In contrast, C is much denser with Deuteronomistic diction, employing this diction in one hundred fifty-two out of two hundred thirty instances of C diction (or 66\%). Stulman concludes:

\begin{quote}
C\textsuperscript{+} is obviously enamored of the rhetorical style of C, which it imitates and even intensifies. But C\textsuperscript{+} has no special eye for [Deuteronomistic] diction, and evidently no particular interest in it; otherwise it would surely have chosen this language in particular to replicate.\textsuperscript{555}
\end{quote}

The important implication is that the “redactional layers” of C\textsuperscript{+} and C are only superficially similar. C\textsuperscript{+} is not a second Deuteronomistic layer as Tov supposes.\textsuperscript{556} It is

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{555 Ibid., 139.}
\footnote{556 Ibid., n. 4, writes, “Our finds do not support those of E. Tov, who has argued that C\textsuperscript{+} has undergone a Deuteronomistic redaction. Our judgment holds true not only for the MT pluses to the prose sermons (= C\textsuperscript{+}) but also for the MT pluses to the remaining strata in the book….”}
\end{footnotes}
not even redactional in the sense implied by Tov. C⁺ simply consists of steady
duplication of existing Jeremianic material. Restated, whereas C is highly inter-textual,
C⁺ is almost exclusively intra-textual. In this regard, C⁺ is simply another manifestation
of the intra-textual harmonization discussed above. In all probability, the process of
duplication that produced C⁺ is merely a continuation of the gradual scribal practices that
had already created the ubiquitous duplications and redundancies that mark Jer⁴⁰ as a
whole. Even granted the existence of editor I, on the basis of a comparison of the two
layers of C material, we would have no grounds for postulating the existence of a second
“editor” who was to have executed the same revisional technique as his predecessor.

5.3.5.2 Problem #2: The Disunity of the C

This problem is not the only challenge facing Tov’s hypothesis that the C
material, as two redactional layers, evinces the existence of two editors. A close
examination of Jeremiah’s C material also destabilizes the assumption that C is itself a
unified redactional layer. As Stulman demonstrates, the C material of Jer⁴⁰ is unevenly
Deuteronomistic. For the following data, see: Stulman, The Prose Sermons of the Book of Jeremiah, table 13 on
133–35.
(Jer 27:1-22; 33:1-26). Such passages are marked as C by virtue of being non-biographical prose (and thus neither A nor B material), and because at the later (and more familiar) stage of VM these passages had accumulated some Deuteronomistic diction characteristic of C material, and thus had the appearance of being standard C material. The implication of this observation is that sections of Jeremiah typically identified as C material may develop their Deuteronomistic signature only secondarily as a result of incremental revision. That is to say, material that by all appearances is Deuteronomistic, may have acquired this semblance only gradually with the piecemeal inclusion of Deuteronomistic glosses.

Moreover, the origin of such Deuteronomistic glosses is not always certain. When expanding the text of Jeremiah, scribes occasionally introduced phrases and words from DtrH or D. Yet upon entering into the stream of Jeremianic tradition, such language could be duplicated numerous times within the Jeremiah corpus in the course of normal scribal intra-textuality without direct borrowing from DtrH or D. In fact, most of the Deuteronomistic diction added to the two passages just listed (Jer 27:1-22; 33:1-26) is utilized elsewhere in C. Thus these additions do not necessarily stem from direct borrowing from DtrH or D, but may be understood simply as manifestations of ongoing scribal intra-textuality.

---

558 I do not count Jer 39:15-18 which does not contain Deuteronomistic diction at either stage Jer* or stage VM. At most this passage in VM contains one instance of non-Deuteronomistic diction and thus probably should not be included in the list of C material.

559 Following Robert R. Wilson, “Poetry and Prose in the Book of Jeremiah,” in Ki Baruch Hu: Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical and Judaic Studies in Honor of Baruch A. Levine, eds. Robert Chazan, et al. (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1999), 413–27, we prefer to describe C material as “non-biographical prose” as an alternative to the frequently used descriptor “prose sermons,” in order to avoid drawing conclusions prematurely about this material’s function and form.
Consider the case of Jer 27:1-22. This passage contained zero instances of Deuteronomistic diction at the stage of \( \text{Jer}^{+\text{n}} \); though by the time of \( V^M \) a single Deuteronomistic addition—“why should this city become a waste”\(^{560}\)—had been added to v. 17. Yet, this addition was undoubtedly drawn intra-textually from elsewhere in Jeremiah (\( \text{Jer}^{+\text{n}} \)) where fuller instantiations of this phrase are found several times.\(^{561}\) For this addition reflects formulations of this phrase that are found in Jeremiah alone; both the reference to “this city” (i.e. Jerusalem), and its description as a “waste,” are definitely drawn from elsewhere in Jeremiah. The reference to “this city” reflects the formulation of the phrase in 19:8;\(^{562}\) and the inclusion of “waste” mimics the word’s use in occurrences of the phrase in 25:9, 18; 44:6.\(^{563}\) These particular formulations of the phrase are not found outside of Jeremiah.\(^{564}\) Thus, the insertion of the phrase in 27:27 is a manifestation of intra-textuality and not of direct borrowing from DtrH or D. In other words, the C material of 27:1-22 acquires its thin Deuteronomistic veneer as a consequence of intra-textual scribal expansions only.


\(^{561}\) Instantiations of the phrase are present in \( \text{Jer}^{+\text{n}} \) at 19:8; 25:9; 44:6. 8, 12 (cf. 24:9; 25:18; 26:6; 42:18). The phrase is also added in \( C^\text{r} \) in Jer 29:18. Also, the occurrence of this phrase in 25:11 was expanded in \( V^M \) with the inclusion of the word “waste” probably in light of 25:9.

\(^{562}\) Jer 19:8 reads: “And I will make this city a horror and a hissing; all who passes by it will be horrified and will hiss because of all of its blows.”

\(^{563}\) Jer 25:9 “and [I will] make them a horror and a hissing and an everlasting waste;” Jer 25:18 “to make them a waste, a horror, a hissing and a curse;” Jer 44:6 “and they became a waste and a horror.”

\(^{564}\) Cf. in contrast versions of the phrase in Deut 28:25, 27; 1 Kgs 22:19.
The same could be said for Jer 33:1-26. As mentioned, for this passage, C contains no Deuteronomistic diction, while in C+ four instances of such diction are found. One instance, the Deuteronomistic phrase "behold the days are coming" (v. 14), was added to C as an accident of the larger intra-textual duplication of Jer 23:5-6 (= Jer 33:14-16) in VM. The second added Deuteronomistic phrase, "I will establish the [good] word which I spoke" (v. 14), is likely borrowed from Jer 29:10 and 32:42. The other two cases of Deuteronomistic diction in Jer 33:1-26—which stand within one of the few substantially large additions of verses of VM (vv. 17-26)—represent two of the three isolated instances of direct borrowing from DtrH and/or D in C+. As argued further below, occasional—and not systematic—inter-textuality with DtrH and D is to be expected if C+ is the product of gradual scribal growth as opposed to Deuteronomistic redaction. Furthermore, the large addition of verses to which this diction belongs is exceptional in its substantial length, and thus may be a special (and relatively isolated) case of scribal growth that requires a special explanation. If so, the direct borrowings from DtrH and D witnessed within this plus—which is highly unusual for C+ (occurring one other time only)—may be exceptions that prove the rule. In any case, as these examples of C material reveal, Jeremianic non-biographical (and

---

565 Stulman’s phrase #43; The Prose Sermons of the Book of Jeremiah, 38. See discussion of the duplicate of 33:14-16 in chap. 4 §4.2.3.

566 Stulman’s phrase #15; ibid., 34.

567 See discussion in chap. 4 §4.2.3.

568 According to Stulman, The Prose Sermons of the Book of Jeremiah, 37, the employment of (v. 24; Stulman’s phrase #31) in reference to Israel’s “election as Yhwh’s covenant people” is also found in Deut 4:37; 1 Kgs 3:8 (cf. Deut 7:6, 7; 10:15; 14:2); and variations of the phrase (v. 17; Stulman’s phrase #32), stand in 1 Kgs 2:4; 8:25; 9:5.
non-Deuteronomistic) prose can and does acquire its Deuteronomistic tone with time as a result of ongoing scribal intra-textuality and occasional inter-textuality.

On the basis of this summation, it could be the case that what we recognize as C material in \textit{Jer}^{+a} is also the result of ongoing scribal intra-textuality and inter-textuality (cf. criterion #3). A number of passages of C material illustrate this possibility. Between the two ends of the spectrum described above—C material saturated with Deuteronomistic diction and C material lacking it entirely—we encounter other possible densities of Deuteronomistic diction. Several C passages in \textit{Jer}^{+a} contain only one or a few instance(s) of Deuteronomistic diction. In these passages, the development of the C material may be analogous to that of the two cases considered above (Jer 27:1-22; 33:1-26): an otherwise non-Deuteronomistic section of non-biographical prose acquires its Deuteronomistic flavor as scribes mimic phrases and verses from Jeremiah that happen to be Deuteronomistic in the course of regular intra-textual scribal expansion (or as they occasionally insert phrases from DtrH or D).

Let us consider three examples of C material that have a particularly low density of Deuteronomistic diction in \textit{Jer}^{+a}: Jer 18:1-12; 22:1-5; 45:1-5. For all three passages, the few examples of Deuteronomistic diction contained therein can be explained in their entirety as intra-textual borrowing of Deuteronomistic language already present in C. The first passage, Jer 18:1-12, possesses four Deuteronomistic phrases only. The phrase
\[\text{"listen to my voice"}^{569}\ (v. 10),\] is utilized in C five other times: 7:23, 28; 11:4; 32:23; 35:8. Given this high rate of repetition, how should we account for the sixth

\footnote{569 Stulman, \textit{The Prose Sermons of the Book of Jeremiah}, 33: phrase #1.}
occurrences of this phrase? We could posit that a single scribe—borrowing directly from DtrH or D—inserted all of these occurrences at the same time. On the other hand, we could ascribe these occurrences to multiple scribes who each individually borrowed directly from DtrH or D. Yet, as argued above, the phrase would need to be borrowed directly from DtrH or D only a single time for it to enter into the stream of Jeremianic tradition. Once inserted into Jeremiah, the phrase could be repeated countless times by scribes without reference to DtrH or D. Indeed—as C+ attests—the phrase was inserted independently at a later stage in 11:7 probably from 11:4 (where it already stood in C+). 570

It is very reasonable, then, to consider that the occurrence of this phrase in Jer 18:10 might also reflect limited scribal intra-textuality.

A similar scenario could explain the three other Deuteronomistic phrases of Jer 18:1-12:  \[ \text{“do that which is evil/right before my eyes”} \] 571 (v. 10), occurs in C at 7:30, 32:30; 34:15; \[ \text{“to turn from his evil way”} \] 572 (v. 11) is found in C at 25:5; 35:15; cf. 26:3; 36:3,7; and, \[ \text{“the men of Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem”} \] 573 (v. 11) stands in C at 11:2, 9; 17:25; 32:32; 35:13. It is possible, then, that the non-biographical prose of Jer 18:1-12 developed its Deuteronomistic character only as a result of scribal intra-textuality, and thus we cannot automatically assume that it is part of a Deuteronomistic redactional layer of Jer+n.

570 The Deuteronomistic plus of 11:7-8 is discussed in chap. 4 §4.1.3.


572 Ibid., 34: phrase #12.

573 Ibid., 38: phrase #41.
For our second example—the prose oracle of Jer 22:1-5—we could tell the same story. This oracle is composed almost entirely of diction found elsewhere in Jeremiah. For the ensuing discussion, consult the following table of Jer 22:1-5 and its Jeremianic sources (common elements are underlined):
TABLE 5.5

JEREMIAH 22:1-5 AND ITS SOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jer 22:1-5</th>
<th>Jer 17:19a, ...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Jer 17:20 (cf. 7:2 in C+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Jer 21:12a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Jer 7:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Jer 17:25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As this table indicates, the text of Jer 22:1-5 is almost entirely pieced together out of material found elsewhere in Jeremiah. The oracle proper opens in v. 2 with a command to speak to the people, “who enter these gates.”

---

574 G reads: καὶ ὁ οἶκός σου “and your house.”
575 G also has καὶ ἔστησεν “and do not act impiously.”
576 Thus the ketib; qere’:
577 Minus in G.
578 Stulman, *The Prose Sermons of the Book of Jeremiah*, 43: phrase #83
same language in C at 17:20; moreover, scribes added this phrase to Jer 7:2 in C⁺, and thus this phrase is part of the scribes’ active repertoire. In the next verse (22:3), the oracle calling the king and people to

\[
\text{do justice and righteousness, and rescue from the hand of the oppressor the one who is robbed,}\]

is simply an adaptation of the preceding poetry in Jer 21:12. Additionally, the main substance of v. 4—

\[
\text{... then will enter into the gates…kings who sit upon the throne of David, riding upon a chariot and horses}\]

—are also found earlier in Jeremiah, once again in chap. 17 (v. 25). The rest of the oracle, namely v. 3, consists of two Deuteronomistic phrases repeated elsewhere in Jeremiah:

\[
\text{do not oppress the stranger, orphan, or widow}\]

\[
\text{do not shed innocent blood.}\]

These phrases could have been drawn directly from DtrH or D. Yet, given the highly intra-textual nature of the passage as a whole, it would not be surprising if these two phrases simply have an intra-textual origin. As indicated in the table above, these same phrases (with inconsequential synonymity) are used in tandem and in the same order in Jer 7:6 in C. For this reason, and because Jer 22:1-5 is not otherwise Deuteronomistic, we must not assume that these verses are part of a Deuteronomistic redaction. The Deuteronomistic

---

579 Ibid, 44: phrase # 92
580 Cf. Ibid., 40: phrase #58.
581 Ibid., 34: phrase #13.
582 The first phase, with some variation, is found in Deut10:18; 24:17; 27:19 (the triad, in various orders, is also found in Deut 14:29; 16:11, 14; 24:19, 20, 21; 26:12, 13); and the second in Deut 19:10, 13, 21:8; 2 Kgs 21:16; 24:4.
583 The second phrase is also found in 19:4 in C.
semblance of this oracle is very likely an accident of the scribal tendency to form new oracles out of Jeremiah stock.

For a third example, consider Jer 45:1-5. This passage is completely free of Deuteronomistic diction, save a single phrase in v.5: “...a phrase used repeatedly in C: 11:11; 19:3; 35:17; cf. 19:15; 39:16. We could insist that this non-biographical prose belongs to a Deuteronomistic redaction; but since it contains hardly any Deuteronomistic diction, and since the one Deuteronomistic phrase it does contain could easily have been grafted in intra-textually from the phrase’s prevalent usage elsewhere in Jeremiah, and since we know that comparable non-Deuteronomistic prose oracles can and do acquire Deuteronomistic diction over time, we must not be hasty to interpret Jer 45:1-5 as inherently Deuteronomistic. We must leave open the possibility that its Deuteronomistic quality is a secondary scribal development.

As these three cases (Jer 18:1-12; 22:1-5; 45:1-5) demonstrate, Jeremianic material in C that is often thought to be Deuteronomistic may exhibit this signature only as a consequence of piecemeal and ongoing, incremental revision and need not be explained as the result of a Deuteronomistic redaction of the book. Thus, while C bears witness to the supplementation of Jeremiah by the Deuteronomistic tradition—through ongoing, limited scribal inter-textuality, and perhaps even through a significant Deuteronomistic revision—C as a whole cannot be identified as a unified redactional layer. Granted this conclusion, we may add that the steady accumulation of

Deuteronomistic diction in C+ can be understood as the continuation of a process that in part created C. All things considered, Tov’s case for considering V^n to be the work of an “editor” on analogy with the attribution of Jer^n to a comparable editor falls on two fronts. C+ in V^n is too dissimilar from C in Jer^n to be described as a continuation of the latter. And, C itself is likely not a unified redaction layer, but attests to the gradual intra-textual (as opposed to inter-textual) accumulation of Deuteronomistic diction that probably also produced C+.

5.4 Conclusion

In light of our reevaluation of the types of changes constituent of V^n, it is apparent that the Two-Edition theory, while a significant contribution to Jeremianic studies, requires extensive recalibration. It seems apparent that Jeremiah probably experienced a number of moments of revision. For example, a multi-dimensional reviser—in one compositional moment—reordered the OAN of Jeremiah and added the new heading to the OAN in 46:1. The repeated insertion of the later spelling of Nebuchadnezzar’s name in Jer 27:6-29:3 is likely due to a (limited) single-dimensional revision—as these insertions form a coherent pattern. Lacking however, is a compelling reason to ascribe both of these revisions, let alone all such moments of revision evinced by V^n, to a single multidimensional reviser in one compositional moment, such as Tov’s editor II. Moreover, many of the individual groupings of pluses identified by Tov as discrete types do not actually form coherent patterns and seem to lack a single motivation, and thus are decidedly not systematic. Thus, there is no reason to classify them as anything other than isolated insertions or individual variants. The remaining
types of textual variants—headings to prophecies, expanded names and titles, intra-textual harmonization, amplified formulas, and additions of C material—do conform (to different degrees) to specific patterns and thus seem to be the results of single-dimensional revisions. Upon closer inspection, however, the origin of each of these types is shown to be more complicated. In general, these types are the product of a combination of ongoing incremental revision and occasional smaller-scale, single-dimensional revision.

In many cases, it seems likely that the processes of incremental revision and smaller-scale moments of single-dimensional revision that produced the expansions of $V^M$ are also responsible for the formation of $Jer^{*n}$. The text of $Jer^{*n}$, like that of $V^M$, exhibits many of the same textual features that are constituent of the occasions of incremental revision of $V^M$ and $V^G$. Consequently, $V^M$ and $Jer^{*n}$ should not be described as two subsequent multidimensional revisions (i.e., “editions” in Tov’s parlance), but as accidentally preserved snapshots of a steady and ongoing process of limited scribal expansion, incremental revision, and of occasional, smaller-scale revision.

The picture of the formation of Jeremiah offered in this chapter coheres extremely well with the conclusions of the previous chapter on Jeremiah’s doublets. There we concluded that there was good reason to believe Jeremiah’s later doublets did not originate in a single moment of revision but perhaps reflect the hands of many scribes. Also, in two cases we saw that when a duplicate stood adjacent to a large plus in $V^M$, the duplicate and the large plus did not seem to come from the scribe, but reflected conflicting scribal motivations.
Finally, we note that this picture of Jeremiah’s formation offered here presents a picture of early Jewish scribes actively engaged in the process of divination and the formation of revelatory texts. The text was not expanded in two major compositional moments, but gradually in the hands of many divining scribes. In the following chapter we will compare the practice of these Jewish scribes to that of the divining scribes of the ancient Near East.
CHAPTER 6:

THE PRACTICE AND VOCATION OF ANCIENT JEWISH SCRIBAL SCHOLARS

In this chapter we will consider what the formation of the book of Jeremiah can tell us about the ancient Jewish scribes who composed and transcribed the book. In particular, the scribal divinatory technique of duplication highlights many significant aspects of scribal practice which are in turn illuminative of the vocation of ancient scribes. Doublets both mark occasions when scribes produced a “copy” of an existing text and moments of textual divination, when scribes created new revelation through reapplication by analogy, vertical reading, and harmonization. For this reason, our examination of Jeremiah’s doublets can inform our understanding of how scribes reproduced texts and functioned as diviners. We begin by reviewing several significant features of ancient Jewish scribal practice uncovered in our analyses of Jeremiah’s doublets: namely, duplication technique, synonymity, innovation, intra-textuality and inter-textuality, organization and structuring, and post-duplication textual developments such as post-duplication harmonization. From there we shift to consider how ancient Jewish scribes, like their ancient Near Eastern counterparts, functioned as “inspired” contributors to revelatory texts.
6.1 Summary of Ancient Jewish Scribal Practice in Light of Jeremiah’s Doublets

6.1.1 Duplication Technique

In the first place, doublets provide us with a chance to study the various ways scribes “copied” their master texts. Although in chap. 4 we examined only eight examples of doublets in extensive detail, we offer here a preliminary assessment of the duplication technique reflected by the remaining twenty-eight doublets of Jeremiah. The following table charts the duplication technique of these remaining doublets along with the eight already analyzed. In the following table, the three early discussed in chap. 4 are underscored with a single line, and the other five later doublets discussed in that chapter are marked with a double line. The doublet of 15:12-14 // 17:1-4 is starred with an asterisk since scribal error may account for the absence of 17:1-4 in G. Two more later doublets (24:8-10 // 29:16-20 and 39:4-10 // 52:7-16), are marked with a double asterisk to indicate that they were not examined in detail in chap. 4.\textsuperscript{585}

\textsuperscript{585} The doublet of 24:8-10 // 29:16-20 while not represented in G also may have been lost through scribal error.
As this table indicates, both the later doublets, unique to $V^M$, and those common to $V^G$ and $V^M$ display a large variety of duplication techniques. The scribes responsible for creating both $Jer^*$ and $V^M$ could approach the task of producing a “copy” of an existing text with a wide range of creative license. The presence of many instances of verbatim repetition and verbatim repetition with minor or major adaptation demonstrates the remarkable precision with which scribes could reproduce a text. While creating a doublet (within a larger text) and producing a fresh copy of an entire text as a whole are categorically distinct enterprises, the practice of scribes in creating exact duplicates, or
exact duplicates with intentional innovations, speaks to their ability to transmit a given
text through many manuscript generations without introducing changes. In many cases,
we encounter a four-fold agreement of a doublet’s wording in M and G for both doublet
twins, bearing witness to the potential fixity of Jeremiah’s text when not subject to
revision (incremental or otherwise) or to scribal error. This potential for fixedness gives
us confidence that occasions of synonymity and innovation observed in the text of a
given doublet largely stem from the moment of duplication and not from the subsequent
period of the text’s transmission (though see below for post-duplication developments).

Importantly, the precision required for verbatim repetitions of all kinds (i.e. with
or without adaptation) suggests that duplicating scribes sometimes relied on the direct
consultation of written exemplars when creating a duplicate. This suggestion seems near
certain when one considers the sizable verbatim doublet of 10:12-16 // 51:15-19, a
doublet consisting of over fifty words. While a scribe probably could hold such a text in
memory, the scribe responsible for this doublet clearly exerted great care to create an
exact replica. The absence of even unintended synonymity, a feature which frequently
occasions duplication (see below), invites the conclusion that the responsible scribe relied
on more than his or her memory.

On the other end of the spectrum we note the numerous instances of paraphrase.
In some moments, scribes were at liberty to restate a text without concern for the text’s
exact wording. The presence of sizable amounts of synonymous variation in these
doublets could indicate that in these cases the responsible scribes gave precedence to
their memorized mental text rather than to a written exemplar when producing such
doublets. This suggestion in turn raises the possibility that some instances of
synonymous variation were not intentional, but an unconscious consequence of the more fluid nature of mental texts.

The likelihood of this possibility is readily illustrated. Take the doublet of Jer 30:10-11 // 46:27-28. As discussed in chap. 4, the text of the doublet was clearly attracted to its secondary context of chap. 30 by the presence of common lexemes and imagery; and we observed that the duplicate was expanded and harmonized with chap. 30 by the inclusion of the verb “to save you.” This moment of harmonization suggests that the duplicator was able and willing to rewrite the doublet’s text in light of its new context. This conscious textual change contrasts with another change that appears to have been unconscious. The scribe (seemingly inadvertently) replaced the verbal phrase “I have driven you” from 46:28 with “I have scattered you” in 30:11. In doing so, the scribe overlooked a potential lexical connection with 30.17, where Judah’s enemies are said to consider Judah to be “the one driven away. Since the scribe was concerned to unite the duplicate with its context and intended the duplicate to interpret its surroundings via vertical reading, it seems unlikely that the scribe would have replaced the original verbal phrase with its synonym on purpose. Instead, this substitution probably occurred unconsciously and as a consequence of the scribe’s reliance on a mental text in which the exact wording of the verbal phrase was not fixed.

6.1.2 Synonymity

As this last discussion reveals, synonymity is a common feature of ancient Jewish scribal practice. In our analysis of the eight doublets in chap. 4, we encountered fifteen
instances of (major) synonymous variation, these being concentrated in the six non-
verbatim doublets. Such synonymity may involve the addition, omission, replacement,
or transposition of the original text. Yet, in the majority of cases (nine out of fifteen),
synonymity led to the expansion of the text, consisting of additions of one to three words
(we will discuss the expansionist tendency of duplication in the following section on
innovation). Four of these nine additions occurred after the moment of duplication,
which indicates that synonymity occasionally affected the text of Jeremiah in the process
of transmission.

The doublets of 30:10-11 // 46:27-28 and 1:18-19 // 15:20—the only paraphrases
examined in detail in chap. 4—each contain four examples of synonymous variation. An
even greater density of synonymous variation can be witnessed in other doublets of
Jeremiah. Consider, for instance, the doublet of 32:4 // 34:3 presented in the following
table (post-duplication additions—i.e. readings in not found in G and not likely lost by
scribal error—are placed in brackets):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post-Duplication Additions</th>
<th>Synonymous Omission</th>
<th>Synonymous Replacement</th>
<th>Synonymous Transposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:18 (x3)</td>
<td>1:19</td>
<td>15:14</td>
<td>30:10; 11; 49:22; 50:41 (x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:11; 30:10-11; 49:22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:22-24 // 50:41-43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

586 Minor synonymous variation is found in four doublets with between ten and fourteen instances
50:41-43; and the only instance of minor synonymous variation detected in 5:9 // 5:29 // 9:8 is a post-
duplication phenomenon.

587 Synonymous additions are found in 1:18 (x3); 8:11; 30:10, 11; 49:22; 50:41 (x2); synonymous
omission are limited to 1:19; 15:14; 30:10; synonymous replacements occur in 1:18 and 30:11; and, a
synonymous transposition is found in 1:18.

588 The four examples of post-duplication synonymous additions are found in 1:18 (x2); 49:22;
50:41. The synonymous omission of 15:14 may also be post-duplication.
TABLE 6.2
SYNOPSIS OF JER 32:4 // JER 34:3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>32:4</th>
<th>34:3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[     ]___</td>
<td>[     ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>______-</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>589</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to being a minor adaptation (32:4 is written in 3rd person sing. while 34:3 is written in 2nd person sing.), the doublet also displays four occasions of synonymous variation (underlined with a dashed line), not to speak of two moments of minor synonymous variation (marked with a dotted line). These four occasions involve the addition, subtraction, or transposition of nine words. When one considers that the doublet’s twins share only ten words in common, the doublet’s high density of synonymity can be more fully appreciated. In spite of such synonymity, the gist of the doublet remains the same; in both twins, Zedekiah’s capture by Nebuchadrezzar is guaranteed by Yhwh. From this example we see that scribes could approach the task of creating a copy of a text with a considerable degree of creativity. As a jazz musician may improvise the melody of a song—adding chromatic passing notes, embellishing its phrasing, and varying its rhythm—without compromising the tune’s integrity and

589 Thus the qere’.
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recognizably, so certain “scholarly” Jewish scribes could re-perform a text with new verbal embellishments and turns of phrase without altering the essence of the text’s meaning.\textsuperscript{590}

6.1.3 Innovation

Along with synonymity, innovation is a regular feature of ancient Jewish scribal practice as attested by Jeremiah’s doublets. As the table 6.1 above indicates, eight of Jeremiah’s doublets are classified as minor adaptations while another fourteen are classified as major adaptations. Five of the doublets analyzed in chap. 4 are adaptations, either minor or major. Within these five we encounter twelve minor innovations and eleven major innovations.\textsuperscript{591} All eleven major innovations are replacements; in each case a reference to an original addressee is supplanted by a reference to a new addressee. Of the minor innovations, two in 1:18 are post-duplication additions. The rest, arising from occasions of duplication, include three replacements (17:3, 4; 33:16), one omission of three words (33:15), and six additions of varying length. Three of these additions are relatively short, consisting of two (1:18; 50:41) or three words (1:18). One is six words long (17:4), and two are substantial: the innovative addition of 17:1-3a is twenty-five words long and that of 33:14-15a is sixteen words in length. This is to say, innovation—like synonymity—frequently contributes to the expansion of the doublet’s text. As a consequence, for doublets displaying synonymity and especially innovation

\textsuperscript{590} Cf. the use of the Jazz metaphor in Carr, \textit{Writing on the tablet of the Heart}, 41.

\textsuperscript{591} Minor innovations are found in 1:18 (x4); 17:1-3a, 3b, 4 (x2); 33:14-15a, 15b, 16; 50:41. Major innovations are seen in 33:15, 16 (x3); 48:40b, 41b; 50:42, 43 (x4).
the duplicate twin is usually more expansive than the original twin. The following table charts the net growth of the text each doublet:

### TABLE 6.3

THE EXPANSION OF DUPLICATES IN JEREMIAH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doublet</th>
<th>Duplication Technique</th>
<th>Net growth of duplicate compared to the original</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:18-19 // 15:20</td>
<td>Paraphrase with minor adaptation</td>
<td>+ 7 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:9 // 5:29 // 9:8</td>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:13-15 // 8:10b-12</td>
<td>Loose citation</td>
<td>+ 1 word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:22-24 // 50:41-43</td>
<td>Loose citation with major adaptation</td>
<td>+ 5 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:12-14 // 17:1-4</td>
<td>Loose citation with minor adaptation</td>
<td>+ 26 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:5-6 // 33:14-16</td>
<td>Repetition with major adaptation</td>
<td>+ 15 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30:10-11 // 46:27-28</td>
<td>Paraphrase</td>
<td>– 2 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48:40b, 41b // 49:22</td>
<td>Loose citation with major adaptation</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As this table demonstrates, in five out of eight cases, the duplicate was longer than its original. This observation lends credence to the general rule that texts tend to grow over time. A more exhaustive survey of Jeremiah’s doublets would need to be undertaken before one could draw more specific conclusions about the relationship of synonymity and innovation with the textual growth of duplication.

6.1.4 Intra-Textuality and Inter-Textuality

Another important feature of scribal practice highlighted by our analysis of Jeremiah’s doublets is intra-textuality. Five of the eight duplicates surveyed display at least one instance of intra-textuality. In contrast, only one duplicate (17:1-4), exhibits
inter-textuality. That duplicate includes three allusions to D and/or DtrH. Altogether, the five intra-textual duplicates display thirteen occasions of intra-textuality.  

In many cases, the intra-textual element was borrow from the duplicate’s immediate context, sometimes only a few verses away; other intra-textual elements echo verses a little further off, though still no more than a chapter away; and, on the more distant end of the spectrum, we find a phrase borrowed from a context seventeen chapters away. Still other intra-textual elements are not in fact a reference to a specific text, but are simply a reflex of language common to Jeremiah. These later examples bear witness to the existence of a (memorized?) repertoire of stock Jeremianic language. In the process of duplication, a scribe could on occasion draw from this repertoire in the creation of a duplicate. As we saw above, these occasional borrowings from Jeremianic stock can be unconscious (see the discussion of the addition of in 30:11 above). Other borrowings from Jeremiah stock are clearly intentional (e.g., the insertion of in 30:11 and the insertion of in 33:14). In

592 In addition to these thirteen, we encounter three moments of post-duplication intra-textuality (“priest” in 1:18; “land [of the north]” in 6:22; “it will go up” in 49:22), which illustrate the limited continuation of intra-textual exchange throughout the transmission of the book of Jeremiah.

593 The reference to a fortified city in 1:18 echoes the city in 1:15, three verses earlier; in 17:4 the concept of inheritance ( ) is mentioned six verses earlier; also in 1:18, the word “today” ( ) comes from 1:10, eight verses earlier; and the reference to “daughter of my people” in 8:11 anticipates the use of this title ten verses later in 8:21.

594 The reference to the “good word” ( ) in 33:14 echoes the “good” ( ) promised sixteen verses earlier in 32:42—though this could also be a reference to the “good word” of 29:10; similarly the promise of Jerusalem dwelling in safety ( ) in 33:16 is anticipated by the same promise in 32:37, twenty-three verses earlier.

595 Jer 33:15 echoes a phrase used only twice in the Hebrew Bible, i.e., in Jer 50:4, 20.

chap. 4, paying attention to these instances of intentional intra-textuality gave us insight into the scribe’s motivations. In addition to such intra-textual dependence, the inter-textual references to D and DtrH in 17:1-4 attest to scribal awareness of the Deuteronomistic tradition.

As a whole, the intra-textual (and inter-textual) elements of Jeremiah’s duplicates likely reflect the development of the Jewish notion of a unified corpus of scripture. Through intra-textual exchange, a composite (and seemingly disorganized) text such as Jeremiah—written over many generations and reflecting multiple historical contexts—becomes self-referential and acquires a higher degree of cohesion. Similarly, moments of inter-textuality help transform a diverse collection of religious texts into a unified, coherent body scripture.

6.1.5 Scribal Organization and Structuring

The scribal practice of duplication also reflects a larger scribal initiative to organize and structure the book of Jeremiah. In several cases, the practice of duplication corresponds with what we could call repository building. This is to say, the book of Jeremiah contains several collections or repositories of similar material that are constructed in part out of duplicated material. A clear example is Jeremiah’s Book of Consolation (Jer 30-33); here scribes have gathered together the vast majority of Jeremiah’s hope-filled oracles, oracles which look beyond the destruction of Judah (and Israel) and which anticipate return from exile and restoration. Importantly, two of our later doublets (23:5-6 // 33:14-16; 30:10-11 // 46:27-28) were created as scribes took hope-filled oracles from elsewhere in the book and recopied them in (what we now recognize as) chaps. 30-33.
This process of building a repository of hopeful oracles by compiling salvation oracles from elsewhere in Jeremiah likely began before the development of $V^M$. Already at the stage of $\text{Jer}^\text{sn}$, the Book of Consolation contained a number of doublet twins, two of which were copied from other parts of Jeremiah and added to the Book of Consolation probably because of their positive connotations.

For example the text of 17:26 imagines a time when all of Judah will come to the temple to worship Yhwh:

And people shall come from the towns of Judah and the places around Jerusalem, from the land of Benjamin, from the Shephelah, from the hill country, and from the Negeb, bringing burnt offerings and sacrifices, grain offerings and frankincense, and bringing thank offerings to the house of the LORD597

The list of toponyms—Judah, Jerusalem, Benjamin, Shephelah, the hill country, and the Negeb—employed in this text serves to symbolize the ubiquity of the envisioned, favorable future of Judah. Significantly, a paraphrase of this same list of toponyms is found not once, but twice in the Book of Consolation.598 Both times the slightly reworded list is employed in a way analogous to its use in 17:26, i.e. to describe the ubiquity of a favorable future: in 32:44 the list illustrates the pervasiveness of a future economic prosperity, and in 33:13 the list emphasizes the widespread extent of a coming restoration of husbandry. While it

597 NRSV.

is unclear which triplet is the original, at least one of the two triplets found in the Book of Consolation is necessarily secondary. Thus, at least one of the two (and possibly both) illustrates how duplication contributed to the proliferation of hopeful oracles in chaps. 30-33 prior to $V^M$.

To give another example, in Jeremiah we encounter a triplet which describes the cessation of the sounds of prosperity and peace in Judah; no longer will the people of Judah hear the voices of mirth, gladness, the bridegroom, and the bride (7:34; 16:9; 25:10). In Jer 33:10-11, however, we find a dramatic reversal of this triplet. There we read:

...  

Thus says the LORD: In this place...there shall once more be heard the voice of mirth and the voice of gladness, the voice of the bridegroom and the voice of the bride, the voices of those who sing...“Give thanks to the LORD of hosts, for the LORD is good, for his steadfast love endures forever!”

This text is a major adaptation of the earlier triplet. As the cessation of the four voices symbolizes the destruction of Judah, so their renewal symbolizes Judah’s restoration. This example is slightly different from the other doublets added to chaps. 30-33 mentioned above; it is a duplication of a foreboding oracle rather than one that is hopeful. Still, the contents of the oracle—the fourfold reference to joy-filled voices—made it a suitable candidate for the Book of Consolation. By the merits of this reference, the tripled text was recast in a positive mold and added to the growing compendium of hopeful oracles of chaps. 30-33. In sum, duplication contributed to the compilation of

599 NRSV.
hope-filled oracles in chap. 30-33 not only in the formation of $V^M$ but also earlier in the
development of $\text{Jer}^{\text{an}}$. Through such moments of compilation, chaps. 30-33 came to
function as a repository of hopeful messages associated with Jeremiah.

Duplication also contributed to repository building in the oracle against Moab (Jer
48:1-47) and the oracle against Babylon (Jer 50:1-51:58)—the two longest oracles of the
OAN. With regard to the first, we observed that the duplicate of 48:40b, 40b (// 49:22)
was not the only element grafted into the Moabite oracle from elsewhere. As we noted,
at the stage of $\text{Jer}^{\text{an}}$ this oracle already contained a sizable amount of inter-textual
material borrowed from the oracle against Moab in the book of Isaiah.\footnote{600} The Moabite
oracle of Jeremiah also shares with the book of Isaiah the intertext of Jer 48:43-44 // Isa
24:17-18, though which twin is secondary is not certain. Furthermore, at the later stage
of $V^M$, we see alongside the duplicate of 48:40b, 41b a second expansion extracted from
other oracles against Moab found in Num 21:27-29 and 24:17. Thus the duplicate of
48:40b, 40b is only a small piece of a much larger process of compilation that formed the
lengthy oracle against Moab.

The same story can be told about the oracle against Babylon. In chap. 4, we
considered the duplicate of 50:41-43 (// 6:22-24) by itself. Yet, the oracle against
Babylon contains another five intra-textual duplicates,\footnote{601} as well as three instances of
inter-textuality which stem from oracles against Babylon found elsewhere in Hebrew

discussion in chap. 4 §4.2.5.
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prophecy. Without discussing these cases in detail, we may conclude that the practice of duplication corresponds and contributes to a larger scribal project of creating collections of similar material. Such repository building demonstrates the scribes’ awareness of a basic structure of the book of Jeremiah.

Briefly we also gesture toward the duplication of 15:20 in 1:18-19. As discussed above, this moment of duplication enhanced the introductory nature of Jeremiah’s first chapter by filling out the compass of that chapter, adding a reference from Jeremiah’s confessions to an otherwise largely comprehensive introduction. While the compilation of this introductory chapter is not based on the similarity of the material collated in that chapter, the attempts of the scribes to create a comprehensive introduction also signals their sensitivity to an overarching structure of the book.

Scribal efforts to organize and structure the book of Jeremiah may be detected in another observation about the placement of the book’s doublets. In addition to their employment in repository building, duplicates regularly reinforce literary structures of the book. We often find duplicates situated perfectly on literary fault lines where other, earlier textual seismic activity can be detected. Of the duplicates analyzed in chap. 4, the majority are either inserted into a demonstrable literary seam or, in their placement, follow structural markers of Jeremiah’s text of that are suggestive of such literary seams.

For example, the duplicate of 1:18-19 (//15:20) comes at the very end of Jeremiah’s introductory chapter between the last introductory material—calling Jeremiah to complete his prophetic mission without hesitation (1:17)—and the beginning of the

---

first poetic sections of the book (2:2ff).\textsuperscript{603} This is to say, the duplicator appears to have appreciated and followed this preexisting boundary between chaps. 1 and 2. The duplicating scribe did not, for instance, slip this material somewhere in the middle of chap. 1. The duplicate of 17:1-4 (// 15:12-14) takes a similar course. We find this insertion situated perfectly between a discrete oracle—which contrasts the fate of Judah with that of the nations and which anticipates a show of divine might (16:16-21)—and a seemingly unrelated unit of wisdom material which is fashioned in part after Psalm 1 (Jer 17:5-11).

The duplicate of 33:14-16 (// 23:5-6) follows suit. This duplicate is placed exactly at the end of the Book of Consolation (chaps. 30-33). Moreover, it occupies a literary fault line frequented by other moments of duplication: as mentioned above, the previous verse (33:13) is likely a duplicate copied from 17:26 or perhaps 32:44; and the verses preceding this verse (33:10-12) also constitute a duplicate (cf. 7:34 // 16:9 // 25:10). Thus, the scribe responsible for 33:14-16 was not the first to tag duplicate material onto the end of the Book of Consolation, but followed the lead of his or her scribal predecessors. This scribe was also not the last, since at a later moment 33:14-16 was supplemented by another secondary addition, namely, 33:17-26. All this to say, the Book of Consolation was repeatedly expanded as one scribe after the next affixed intratextual material to the end of this book.

In addition to these examples of scribes following what are demonstrably literary fault lines in their insertion of doublets, we also mention two duplicates whose placement

\textsuperscript{603} VG, and so Jer*, lacks the heading of 2:1, and thus 1:19 is followed immediately by 2:2.
shows scribal sensitivity to structural markers. As discussed in chap. 4, twice the tripled refrain "‘Shall I not punish them for these things?’ says the LORD; ‘and shall I not bring retribution on a nation such as this’,”604 comes at the end of a small textual unit (5:9 completes the unit of 5:1-9 and 9:8 that of 9:1-8). In a similar manner, the duplicate of 30:10-11 (// 46:27-28) was inserted right before the phrase “Thus says Yhwh.” In both cases, the responsible scribe seems to have been sensitive to preexisting structural markers of the book of Jeremiah, and utilized these markers as literary seams in which to insert duplicate material. To recap, the placement of several duplicates in Jeremiah demonstrates that scribes were both attentive to the book’s structural cues and were aware of existing literary fault lines. These structural and revisional seams provided scribes suitable contexts in which to insert their doubled material. In summary, the placement of duplicates in Jeremiah illustrates the role scribes played in the structuring and organization of the book. Duplication both assisted in the process of repository building and in the reinforcement of literary seams and structures.

6.1.6 Post-Duplication Harmonization and Textual Development

Before discussing the divinatory dimension of ancient Jewish practice, we must consider one final textual feature of scribal practice that occasioned our analyses in chap. 4. This feature, however, is not descriptive of the process of duplication, but of the period of transmission following the moment of duplication. In several places we encountered post-duplication harmonization, when, after the moment of duplication, later scribes rewrote one duplicate twin in light of the other. The following list catalogues five

---

604 NRSV.
instances of significant\textsuperscript{605} post-duplication harmonization (PDHarm) detected in our analyses of chap. 4:

\begin{itemize}
  \item 6:13 M the ordering of \( \text{ and } \) = 8:10b M \( \neq \) 6:13 G
  \item 6:15 M + = 8:12 M \( \neq \) 6:15 G; 8:12 4QJer\textsuperscript{a}
  \item 6:22 M + = 50:41 M G \( \neq \) 6:22 G
  \item 15:14 M – * = 17:4 M \( \neq \) 15:14 G (\( \kappa\upsilon\kappa\lambda\varsigma\vartheta \))
  \item 23:6 M = 33:16 M \( \neq \) 23:6 G (I\( \omega\)\( \sigma\)e\( \delta\)e\( \varepsilon\)k)
\end{itemize}

Importantly, a quick survey of Jeremiah’s remaining doublets yields several more examples of PDHarm:

\begin{itemize}
  \item 7:16 M the ordering of \( \text{ and } \) = 11:14 M G \( \neq \) 7:16 G
  \item 7:16 M = 11:14 M G \( \neq \) 7:16 G (\( \kappa\alpha\delta\ \iota \varepsilon\chi\varsigma\upsilon\))
  \item 21:12b M + \textsuperscript{606} = 4:4b M G \( \neq \) 21:12b G
  \item 30:23 M … = 23:19 M G \( \neq \) 30:23 G (\( \delta\upsilon \delta\upsilon\gamma\eta\)
    \( \kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\upsilon\ \varepsilon\zeta\iota\lambda\theta\varepsilon\nu \theta\upsilon \ \omega\delta\eta\)
    \( \varepsilon\zeta\iota\lambda\theta\varepsilon\nu \ \omicron\rho\gamma\eta\)…)
  \item 34:3 M + \( \approx \) 32:4 M G ( \( \approx \) ) \( \neq \) 34:3 G
  \item 49:17 M = 19:8 M G; 50:13 M G \( \neq \) 49:17 G (\( \sigma\upsilon\rho\iota\epsilon\iota\))
\end{itemize}

All of these examples taken together illustrate an important dynamic of text transmission. As time passes similar texts may be harmonized toward each so that their similarity is heightened. A duplicate that begins as a paraphrase may eventually, through PDHarm, become a loose citation or even a repetition of its original. Additionally, these examples—together with the moments of post-duplication synonymity and post-duplication innovation—illustrate that texts continued to develop even if minimally after moments of revision such as occasions of duplication.

\textsuperscript{605} Not counted here are instances of non-significant variation which could reflect PDHarm.

\textsuperscript{606} Following the g\( \text{ere}'\); the ketib reads \textquotedblleft their deeds."
6.2 Scribal Divination in the Book Jeremiah and in the Ancient Near East

In this chapter, we have considered various characteristics of the practice of ancient Jewish scribes. Importantly, the text of Jeremiah was from its inception a revelatory text. It began in part as a compilation of prose and poetic oracles associated with the historical prophet Jeremiah and grew as scribes interpreted this text and folded their interpretations into the text itself. For this reason, the various features of scribal practice manifested in the process of duplication (and described in the first part of this chapter) are not simply literary techniques, that is, techniques through which scribes form literary texts. Since the text of Jeremiah is essentially a revelatory text, these features are in fact tools of divination, means of discerning the deity’s will anew in established records of divination. In this section we consider how Jewish scribes utilized vertical reading and harmonization (techniques of literary generation) as well as reapplication by analogy to create new revelation, and we compare these practices with the execution of textual divination in the ancient Near East.

6.2.1 Literary Generation in Jeremiah and the ancient Near East

When a scribe expands a divinatory text through duplication, that moment of duplication marks an occasion of textual divination, when an existing word of revelation is reapplied to a new secondary context. In the process of duplication, the responsible scribe sometimes adapted the doublet’s text altering its subject matter and/or changing its addressee so that the doublet’s text would speak to a new or hypothetical, historical horizon. These adaptations contributed to the creation (or discovery) of new revelation. Yet, new revelation was also generated simply through the process of placing the text of the doublet into a fresh environment. Once so inserted, the doublet’s text would both
interpret its surroundings and be interpreted by its surroundings in a process we have termed *vertical reading*. In addition to becoming subject to vertical reading, the text of the doublet would often be harmonized toward its secondary context, an interpretive move that frequently makes explicit (to a certain degree) the fresh revelatory insight intended by the duplicating scribe.

As we witnessed in chap. 4, ancient Jewish scribes could accomplish various divinatory tasks through vertical reading and harmonization. Through these means, the details of a duplicate could echo and reinforce aspects of the secondary context. When a secondary context appeared to raise certain questions left unaddressed by that context, details of the duplicate could provide an answer. Similarly, the duplicate could fill perceived lacunae of the secondary context. In some places, details from the duplicate provide specific examples of matters mentioned only generally in the secondary context. In other places, the duplicate serves to broaden or generalize details of the secondary context. And on some occasions, aspects of the secondary context are significantly reinterpreted by the duplicate’s perspective.

In our examination of the oracle reporting letters from Mari and of the oracle collections from Assyria, we encountered examples of vertical reading and harmonization that accomplished the same kinds of divinatory tasks. For example, in *ARM* 26 199, the identity of the deceitful party mentioned by the prophetess of Dagan of whom Zimri-Lim should be aware is specified through vertical reading as the man of Ešnunna. In a similar vein, several of the oracles collected together in SAA 9 no. 1 require vertical reading to be understood. Oracles 1.1, 1.4 and 1.8 (and possibly 1.7) refer to unnamed enemies of Esarhaddon. Details in 1.2 and 1.6, however, provide a specific historical context in
which these enemies can only be Esarhaddon’s brothers and their supporters who contended with him for the throne. As in the case of ARM 26 199, vertical reading enables the reader to identify the otherwise unspecified opponent to the king (cf. the moments of specification via vertical reading in Jer 1:18-19; 8:10b-12; 17:1-4; 33:14-16).

To consider another point of comparison, lacuna filling is witnessed in ARM 26 237 (cf. lacuna filling in Jer 1:18-19; 17:1-4; 30:10-11; 33:14-16). There an enigmatic dream is recounted, though without interpretation and without offering advice to follow. These lacunae are tacitly addressed by an oracle positioned immediately after the dream report in the same letter. Through lexical links binding the dream report to the following oracle (and perhaps created via harmonization), the addressee of this letter (Zimri-Lim) was invited to interpret the dream through the following oracle—an oracle which offers Zimri-Lim) clear and certain advice.

Akin to examples from Jeremiah (e.g. 17:1-4; 33:14-16), we also see an instance of harmonization which significantly reinterprets the meaning of a reported oracle. The version of the prophetess of Dagan’s oracle in ARM 26 199 ends on a stricter note than the versions found in ARM 26 197 and 202. These latter two end with an assurance of deliverance. The former, however, concludes with a warning that the king “should not take an oath without consulting god.” The words of this warning were copied directly from another oracle included in the same letter (ARM 26 199). In this way, the prophetess’s oracle is harmonized with its literary context. As a result, the oracle is transformed from an assurance of deliverance into a word of caution.

More occasions of vertical reading and harmonization from the ancient Near East could be presented, but the examples offered above are sufficient to demonstrate that
vertical reading and harmonization served similar divinatory functions both in our examples from the ancient Near East—the oracle reporting letters from Mari and the Neo-Assyrian oracle collections—and in the occasions of duplication from the book of Jeremiah analyzed in chap. 4. Through the intentional collecting and arrangement of oracles, the letter writers of Mari, the scribal scholars of Neo-Assyria, and the “scholarly” Jewish scribes responsible for Jeremiah exploited the divinatory potential of their respective literary genres. Wherever multiple, disparate oracles may be arranged and presented as a single text, the possibility of vertical reading and harmonization exists. The letter format from Mari, the Neo-Assyrian oracle collection, and the Hebrew prophetic book all have this potential. For all three, the literary form invites and enables the generation of new revelation, a process we refer to as literary generation. In sum, although the book of Jeremiah is formally distinct from both the oracle-reporting letter from Mari and the Neo-Assyrian oracle collection, the duplicates of the book of Jeremiah attest to the same kinds of generative techniques, namely, vertical reading and harmonization.

6.2.2 Reapplication by Analogy in Jeremiah and the Ancient Near East

Finally, we note that instances of duplication regularly coincide with moments of reapplication by analogy. In one sense, all occasions of duplication are moments of reapplication insofar as they are texts taken from one context and put to work in another. In a more particular sense, reapplication refers to the process of drawing out a further implication, i.e. interpretation of an existing omen on the basis of its existing interpretation, or what we are calling reapplication by analogy. The particular analogy
governing a given instance of such reappplication is often discernible and may be articulated as an exegetical/divinatory principle.

In our inquiry into textual divination in chap. 2, we encounter various examples of reapplication by analogy. For instance, we considered an omen (OBE 1 ob. 6) interpreting a hole found on a certain section of “presence” that was first interpreted as an indicator that a fully loaded boat would sink, and then by analogy, that a pregnant woman would die in labor. Behind this reapplication is the divinatory assumption that a loaded boat may serve as a metaphor for a pregnant woman. To mention one more example, the oracle collection of SAA 9 no. 1 contains a series of oracles which, while originally referring to Esarhaddon’s rise to power, now serve to buttress his crown prince Ashurbanipal’s claim to the throne. In this case the analogous life circumstances of the two rulers invited the reapplication of the series from father to son. Importantly, we see a comparable exercise of reapplication by analogy in the creation of doublets.

For example, in Jeremiah, we encountered an oracle against Judah reapplied against Babylon (6:22-24 // 50:41-43). This instance of duplication reflects a theological assumption that both nations have an analogous relationship to Yhwh; both are answerable to Judean deity and are judged by the same standard. If Yhwh punishes Judah for sin, Babylon by analogy will receive the same sentence. This theological assumption is found in chaps. 50-51 outside of the doublet. As noted in chap. 4, Babylon’s behavior is described in theological terms as iniquity (עון) requiring divine retribution (נקמה) (51:6). On the basis of this assumption, it follows that an oracle of judgment originally addressed to Judah (i.e. 6:22-24) may be reapplied to Babylon (thus, 50:41-43), a nation having an analogous status before Yhwh.
A similar rationale can explain the applicability of lines from the oracle against Edom to both the oracle against Moab and the oracle against Babylon. As we saw in chap. 4, the text of 49:22 (referring to Edom) was reemployed in 48:40b, 41b to address Moab; and that of 49:18-21 and of 49:26 (both also referring to Edom) were likely reenlisted in 50:40, 44-46 and 50:30, respectively, to address Babylon. In both cases material addressing one foreign enemy of Judah is recycled for another foe. Such reapplication seems to be guided by the principle that a revelation pertaining to one national enemy may be applied to another. In short, Edom, Moab, and Babylon each have an analogous relationship to Judah.

To consider one more example very briefly, the doublet of 17:25 // 22:4 provides an illuminative example of reapplication by analogy. The text of the doublet in its two contexts functions like an omen apodosis applied to two different protases. The “protasis” of 17:24 considers one possible scenario, namely, that the people of Judah obey Yhwh and keep certain Sabbath regulations. The “protasis” of 22:3-4a considers another comparable, possible scenario, to wit, that the Judean king obeys Yhwh and practices justice. A certain scribe must have considered these two situations to be analogous, for the apodosis of one was reapplied to the other. For both, the fulfillment of the stipulations stated in the protasis is to have the same result: the continuation of the

---

607 The possibility that the both doublets are original to the oracle against Babylon and secondary to the oracle against Edom could also be considered; cf. Parke-Taylor, *The Formation of the Book of Jeremiah*, 157–58. Solving this question is not relevant for our purpose here: the same exegetical / divinatory principle may explain the reapplication of these doublets regardless of which text is original.

608 This doublet is discussed in Parke-Taylor, *The Formation of the Book of Jeremiah*, 65–68.

609 For our purposes we need not determine which twin is the original and which is the duplicate.
Davidic dynasty.\textsuperscript{610} Jeremiah 17:25 reads:

\begin{quote}
("then there shall enter by the gates of this city kings who sit on the throne of David, riding in chariots and on horses, they and their officials, the people of Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem…")\textsuperscript{611}.
\end{quote}

The same consequences are found in 23:4:

\begin{quote}
("then through the gates of this house shall enter kings who sit on the throne of David, riding in chariots and on horses, they, and their servants, and their people.")\textsuperscript{613}.
\end{quote}

Moreover, in both texts the following verses consider the opposite scenario—i.e., the nonfulfillment of these stipulations—and its consequence. These two converse protases are given similar, but not identical, apodoses. While these apodoses do not make a doublet, as is the case in 17:25 // 22:4, they do communicate roughly the same message, albeit in different forms: prose in 17:27 and poetry in 22:6-7. In the prose of 17:27, the nonfulfillment of Sabbath observation will lead to the burning down of Jerusalem’s palaces:

\begin{quote}
("Then I will kindle a fire in its gates; it shall devour the palaces of Jerusalem and shall not be
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{610} The apodosis of 17:25 is supplemented by another in 17:26; this supplement, as mentioned above, is itself a triplet text with 32:44 // 33:13.

\textsuperscript{611} NRSV.

\textsuperscript{612} Thus the \textit{ketib}; \textit{qere’}:

\textsuperscript{613} NRSV.
In the poetry of 22:6-7, the nonfulfillment of royal justice will lead to the burning down of the king’s palace:

6 For thus says the LORD concerning the house of the king of Judah: You are like Gilead to me, like the summit of Lebanon; but I swear that I will make you a desert, an uninhabited city. 7 I will prepare destroyers against you, all with their weapons; they shall cut down your choicest cedars and cast them into the fire.

In this poetry, the references to “Lebanon” and to “choicest cedars” allude to a sobriquet of the king’s resident, i.e. “the house of the forest of Lebanon,” a name reflecting the material used in the construction of the palace, that is, cedars harvested from Lebanon. Thus, following each use of the doublet of 17:25 // 22:4 for a distinct protases, we find another reapplication, but of a similar concept expressed in different forms rather than of a second doublet. In summary, in a few cases, duplicates were created when a scribe understood two contexts to be analogous, and on the basis of this analogy reapplied text from one context to the other. In such cases, we encounter the Jewish scribal equivalent to the divinatory technique of reapplication by analogy observed in divinatory texts from the ancient Near East.

---

614 NRSV.
615 Thus the ketib. The qere’ reads .
616 NRSV.
617 Cf. 1 Kgs 7:2, 10:17, 21; 2 Chr 9:16, 20; cf. also Isa 7.2. For discussion, see: Holladay, Jeremiah 1, 579.
6.3 Conclusion: Ancient Jewish Scribal Scholars

To draw our final conclusions, in this study of the formation of the book of Jeremiah we have observed that the book of Jeremiah, in its final stages, was likely not the result of two large-scale and subsequent, multidimensional revisions (i.e. “editions”), but rather the product of a combination of a few occasions of more limited multidimensional revision, more frequent moments of single-dimensional revision, and extensive incremental revision and isolated variants. Consequently, we must ascribe the formation of Jeremiah not to two “editors” but to many generations of scholarly scribes who were active contributors to the process of divination. Through careful study of the creative practices of these scribes—in particular their creation of doublets—we may conclude that they were highly educated, holding in their memory an impressive repertoire of traditional material and capable of executing a variety of divinatory techniques.

Moreover, as we have seen in this chapter, the divinatory techniques utilized by these ancient Jewish scribes are readily comparable to those exercised by both the letter writers from Mari and the Neo-Assyrian scribal scholars. In spite of extensive differences of time, place, and genre, the book of Jeremiah was created through a process of textual divination similar to that which produced the oracle-reporting letters of Mari and the Neo-Assyrian oracle collections. For this reason it would not be unreasonable to propose that the diving scribes of Second Temple Judea who formed the book of Jeremiah were entrusted with a scholarly vocation comparable to the vocation of scribal scholars in the ancient Near East. Both groups of scribes were authorized, “inspired” conduits of divine revelation.
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