

Jeremiah's Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Growth of a Tradition
Eibert Tigchelaar - KU Leuven

1. The book of Jeremiah

In Jeremiah research there are widely diverging opinions about the composition of the book of Jeremiah. This holds true for one's models of growth and composition. Those range from attribution of the book (or most of it) to Jeremiah, and the scribes surrounding him, to series of successive accretions to the text throughout a longer period of time (various forms of the so-called rolling corpus theory), to redactional additions to and editions of the entire book. This also goes for the dates connected to the composition or its versions. Those span from soon after Jerusalem's fall up to the Maccabean era. And it applies to the assessment of the relationship between the shorter form of the book as attested in the Septuagint, and the longer form as transmitted through the Masoretic tradition.

The major contribution of the Judaean Desert Jeremiah fragments¹ is that they demonstrate that some of the differences between the Greek and the Masoretic text did not result from the process of translation into the Greek, or during the Greek transmission, but were already found in Hebrew texts which could have served as a Vorlage for the Greek translator. We now have three fairly small fragments from different manuscripts—4Q71 (4QJer^b), 4Q72a (4QJer^d), and the Schøyen fragment—that are in some ways closer to the shorter (LXX) version than to the longer MT version.

It remains difficult, though, to assess the implications of these three fragments, since most scholars interpret the evidence to fit their own models, and 4QJer^b has accordingly been interpreted by Pierre-Maurice Bogaert and Emanuel Tov as confirmation of the two literary editions hypothesis,² by William McKane as evidence of the rolling corpus model,³ and by, e.g., Jack Lundbom

¹For a list of the presently known materials, cf. Appendix 1: Judean Desert manuscripts and fragments of the book of Jeremiah

²Pierre-Maurice Bogaert, "Les mécanismes rédactionnels en Jér 10,1-16 (LXX et TM) et la signification des suppléments" in *Le Livre de Jérémie: Le prophète et son milieu, les oracles et leur transmission* (BETL 54; Leuven: Peeters, 1981; expanded second edition 1997), 222-38 and Emanuel Tov, "Some Aspects of the Textual and Literary History of the Book of Jeremiah," *ibid.*, 145-67.

³William McKane, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jeremiah: Introduction and commentary on Jeremiah I-XXV* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1986), 220. See also his "The History of the Text of Jeremiah 10,1-16," in *Mélanges bibliques et orientaux en l'honneur de M. Mathias Delcor* (ed. A. Caquot et al.; AOAT 215; Neukirchen: Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1985), 297-304.

as evidence of later textual corruption.⁴ On the basis of what I see as the scrolls evidence, I will highlight three features.

First, because of the very fragmentary nature of the three LXX-like fragments, we cannot simply assume with Tov “that the complete scrolls of 4QJer^{b,d} would also have agreed with the LXX in the chapters which have not been preserved.”⁵ This assumption is based on the possible but not necessary model of two distinct and variant literary editions. For example, we have no textual evidence of the different LXX arrangement of the Foreign Nations Oracles in our manuscript.⁶

Second, five out of the seven manuscripts are not aligned exclusively to either the MT or the LXX text. This holds for variants on the word level, while 4QJer^b and 4QJer^d also have unique variants on the level of phrases, different from both MT and LXX.⁷ In other words, from a literary-critical perspective there may be a clear-cut distinction between MT and LXX, but on the text-critical level the distinction is fuzzier than one would like to expect.

Thirdly, and for the topic of this conference the most relevant, the limited evidence which we do have, does not attest to an ongoing literary growth of the text of the book of Jeremiah after the early second century BCE.⁸ This lack of evidence may be a result of the fragmentariness of the material. Or we may have to assign it to the trend towards fixation of its text. In the case of Jeremiah, the apparent absence of development of the scriptural text may also be related to the focus on specific topics, which are elaborated in new works.

I will therefore not zoom in on the biblical Jeremiah manuscripts. Instead, I will discuss the growth of Jeremianic traditions in other Judaean Desert texts, and relate these both to scriptural and to other important contemporary texts, especially *Jubilees*. I will start with a few narrative

⁴Jack R. Lundbom, *Jeremiah 1-20* (Anchor Yale Bible 21A; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999), 581-82: “fails to inspire confidence in the LXX and 4QJer^b text, which seem clearly to be in disarray after v 4 (Cornill on the LXX: ‘very corrupt and in a mutilated condition’) ... the MT is far and away the better text”

⁵E. Tov, “The Contribution of the Qumran Scrolls to the Understanding of the LXX,” in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (SVT 72; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 285-300, at 294. Reprint of the original version in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings* (ed. G. J. Brooke and B. Lindars; SBLSCS 33; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 11-47.

⁶Given that 4QJer^d (Jer 43[50]:2-10) has a textually mixed character, one should consider the possibility that it came from a scroll which had the LXX sequence, and thus came from close to the end of the scroll. The short distance between the protrusions at the top of the scroll could confirm this assumption, but the distance between these protrusions alone is not strong enough material evidence to confirm the LXX sequence for this scroll.

⁷For the mixed character of 4QJer^d see Appendix 2: The mixed textual character of 4QJer^d.

⁸The palaeographic dating of 4Q70 (with a “protomasoretic” textual character), between ca. 225 and 175 BCE, is in conflict with the suggestion made by scholars like Adrian Schenker, Christian Amphoux, and Arnaud Sérandour, that the long MT form is a mid-second century reworking of the shorter form attested in the LXX. Cf., e.g., Adrian Schenker, “La rédaction longue du livre de Jérémie: doit-elle être datée au temps des premiers Hasmonéens?” *ETL* 70 (1994): 281-93, who dates the long recension in 140 BCE.

fragments that deal with the figure of Jeremiah, and then discuss the composition of what is now called *Apocryphon of Jeremiah C*. I argue that the work, or at least one of its manuscripts, is a collection, including earlier materials such as the Thebes oracle that is found in a different form in Nahum 3. A basic question throughout the discussion will be to what extent these later texts introduce new materials, or expand traditions that are initiated by the scriptural Jeremiah, such as Jeremiah as second Moses, the transformation of the seventy-years tradition of Jer 29 into a much broader jubilean chronology, and the use of Jer 31's "new covenant" in other Dead Sea scrolls.

2. Fragments dealing with the figure of Jeremiah

In the case of the very fragmentary Jeremiah materials,⁹ both John Strugnell, the originally appointed editor, and Devorah Dimant, who published most of the texts, were at a loss. In multiple cases one cannot be sure about the correct assignment of fragments to manuscripts, about the sequence of the fragments within manuscripts, about the relation of manuscripts to literary works, or about possible forms of those works. It is now clear that five manuscripts contained the same historical apocalypse apparently connected to Jeremiah, and this is the only part that preserves a largely consecutive and intact text.¹⁰ Yet, we do not know whether these five manuscripts all were copies of the same work or collection, and how the text of other manuscripts relates to this Jeremiah composition, which Dimant calls *Apocryphon of Jeremiah C*. For example, Dimant suggests that 4Q390 was part of the same composition,¹¹ and 4Q384 probably was not even a Jeremianic work. I disagree on both accounts.

⁹In the DJD series, apart from biblical manuscripts, eight manuscripts have received a name connected to Jeremiah, namely 4Q383 (4QApocryphon of Jeremiah A), 4Q384 (4QApocryphon of Jeremiah B), and 4Q385a, 4Q387, 4Q388a, 4Q389, 4Q390, and 4Q387a (4QApocryphon of Jeremiah C^{a-f}). Three other manuscripts might also have been connected to Jeremianic materials, namely 4Q470 (4QText Concerning Zedekiah), 4Q483 (4QNarrative D), and 6Q12 (6QApocr Prophecy). Only three of those manuscripts mention Jeremiah, namely 4Q383 in a phrase *וְאֵנִי יִרְמִיָּה*; 4Q385a referring to *יִרְמִיָּה הַנְּבִיא*; and 4Q389 *בֶּן חֲלֻקִּיָּה*. Two texts refer to Tahpanhes, namely 4Q384 and 4Q385a.

¹⁰In the DJD edition, and in Kipp Davis, *The Cave 4 Apocryphon of Jeremiah and the Qumran Jeremianic Traditions* (STDJ 111; Leiden: Brill, 2014), textual overlaps within this apocalypse section are recorded between 4Q385a, 4Q387, 4Q388, and 4Q389. To these one should add overlaps with 4Q387a, one identified by Elisha Qimron (4Q387a 5 par 4Q385a 1a-b ii) and two more by the present author (4Q387a 3 par 4Q389 2; 4Q387a 4 par 4Q389 5). Cf. for details the forthcoming revised *Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*.

¹¹The relation of 4Q390 to the (other?) five *Apocryphon of Jeremiah C* manuscripts is strongly mooted. Dimant insists that 4Q390 belongs to the *Apocryphon*, whereas scholars, including the present author, have argued on material, linguistic, or content grounds that it does not. For a nuanced survey and discussion, cf. Davis, *Cave 4 Apocryphon*, chapter 4.

Because of these uncertainties, I will turn to manuscripts and compositions later, but start by briefly looking at the few fragments that speak about Jeremiah.¹² The two largest sections are on 4Q385a frag. 18¹³ in two consecutive but fragmentary columns, which can be related to Jer 40 and 43-44, dealing respectively with Jeremiah going along with the captives from Jerusalem to Babylon up to a certain river, and with Jeremiah being in Tahpanhes, rebuking those who fled from Jerusalem to Egypt. A third fragment, 4Q389 1, may refer to a public reading of a writing or letter of Jeremiah at the river Sour. These poorly preserved narrative fragments give witness to some traditions that are not found in the book of Jeremiah, but in other Jeremianic or Baruch texts: Jeremiah accompanying the deportees to Babylon up to the Euphrates, and exhorting them, or Baruch's reading of a writing at the river Soud. With respect to details these traditions in part run counter to the descriptions in Jer 39-44 and 51—which themselves are inconsistent—and the idiom of the fragments only rarely corresponds to Jeremiah's. See, e.g., the verb שבה rather than גלה, the noun שבויים instead of גלות, or the verb הכה used with Nebuzaradan. There are though a few correspondences with Jeremianic phrases, like the juxtaposition of רנה ותפלה (Jer 7:16; 11:14; 4Q385a 18 ii 4). From this I draw the conclusion that, by and large, these sections are not directly dependent on the text of Jeremiah, but ascribe traditions to the figure of Jeremiah with diverging details and in other words. What then is the purpose of these fragments?

There are two important related aspects of these Jeremianic fragments. The first, and observed by other scholars, is that they “portray Jeremiah in terms like Moses” and introduce an exhortation to keep the covenant, study God's statutes, and keep his commandments. Lutz Doering sums this up in one word: Torahparänese. Of course, there are already parallels between Jeremiah and Moses within the book of Jeremiah, but here we have new analogies with a specific function. In the book of Jeremiah, the prophet Jeremiah urges the exiles in Babylon to endure for the completion of Babylon's seventy years until the eventual restoration. In contrast, his prophecy to those who fled to Egypt offers no hope. Here, however, Jeremiah gives the exiles, like Moses the Israelites at Horeb, instructions for a pious life that is centered around God's covenant and his commandments. In those fragments the prophet is presented as teacher.

¹²On these fragments, cf. especially Devorah Dimant, “An Apocryphon of Jeremiah from Cave 4 (4Q385^b = 4Q385 16),” in *New Qumran Texts and Studies* (ed. G. J. Brooke; STDJ 15; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 11-30; George J. Brooke, “The Book of Jeremiah and Its Reception in the Qumran Scrolls,” in *The Book of Jeremiah and Its Reception* (ed. A. H. W. Curtis and T. Römer; BETL 128; Leuven: Peeters, 1997), 183-205; Lutz Doering, “Jeremia in Babylonien und Ägypten: Mündliche und schriftliche Torahparänese für Exil und Diaspora nach 4QApocryphon of Jeremiah C,” in *Frühjudentum und Neues Testament im Horizont Biblischer Theologie* (ed. W. Kraus and K.-W. Niebuhr; WUNT 1.162; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 50-79; Doering, “Jeremiah and the ‘Diaspora Letters’ in Ancient Judaism: Epistolary Communication with the *Golah* as Medium for Dealing with the Present,” in *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library* (ed. K. De Troyer and A. Lange; SBLSS 30; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005), 44-72; Dimant, “From the Book of Jeremiah to the Qumranic Apocryphon of Jeremiah,” *DSD* 20 (2013): 452-71.

¹³For text and translation of the texts, cf. Appendix 3: *Apocryphon of Jeremiah C* texts mentioning Jeremiah.

A second aspect of the growth of tradition in these fragments is that of Jeremiah and lament. In 4Q385a 18 ii 2-5, Jeremiah at Tahpanhes does not intercede on behalf of those who asked him to, but instead laments (ויהי מקונן) over Jerusalem.¹⁴ The use of קונן, not found in the book of Jeremiah, links the tradition to 2 Chron 35:25 which tells how Jeremiah utters a lament over Josiah, but here the function is different. No more than a few words of a fragment remain, and we have to construct a cotext and a meaning. If Jeremiah's lamenting is connected to the preceding refusal to intercede, and has Jer 42-44 as background, then the lament underscores the end of hope: the audience, including Jeremiah himself, will not see Jerusalem anymore. Such a reading is suggested by the paragraphing, where the lament ends the paragraph. However, if we read on, and connect the paragraphs, running from the refusal to intercede to lament, and then further to exhortation, then, within the larger narrative, Jeremiah's lament anticipates, and perhaps even enables, the possibility of a new future. A weeping Jeremiah is also found in 4Q383 frag. 1.¹⁵

Even more than the narrative and geographical differences, these apparent transformations of Jeremiah's function are critical for assessing the growth of the tradition. Were those reshaping derived from reading and interpreting the text of the book of Jeremiah, or an intentional corrective expansion of the figure of Jeremiah? In a similar vein one may wonder whether Jeremiah's going with the deportees to the river (Euphrates?) originated in existing traditions, or was created as part of the remodeling of the figure of Jeremiah.

3. A Jeremianic Collection

These narrative Jeremiah fragments of 4Q385a and 4Q389 can be assigned to manuscripts that also contain sections of an historical apocalypse, of which the period from Nebuchadnezzar up to the Hasmonaeans is fairly well preserved. Yet, the place of these fragments within their respective manuscripts, and within the literary composition is difficult to determine. Dimant imagined these fragments as the literary framework of the apocalypse: at the beginning the public reading of a writing from Jeremiah, son of Hilkiyah (4Q389 1); at its end Jeremiah's exhortations (4Q385a 18 i-ii). In his edition, Qimron switches the bookends,¹⁶ and Davis speculates about still other possibilities.¹⁷

On material grounds, I place the just-discussed narrative fragments 4Q385a 18, and the immediately preceding fragments 4Q385a 14-17, at the end of 4Q385a, just like Strugnell and Dimant

¹⁴Admittedly, there are a few words lost in between ויהי מקונן and על ירושלים.

¹⁵4Q383 frag. 1, lines 2-4 of which I read as follows:

ואני ירמיה בכו אב[כה ... בנות] 2
ענה בארץ לוא נוש[בה ...] 3
על אשר העדותי[...] 4

2 And I, Jeremiah, we[ep] bitterly [...] 3 ostriche[s], in an uninha[bited] land [...] 4 because I have witnessed [...]

¹⁶Elisha Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew Writings. Volume Two* (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi Press, 2013), 95-100.

¹⁷Davis, *Cave 4 Apocryphon*, 83, 90-93.

do. But if one arranges the fragments in that order, then what is the literary character of the text? Dimant viewed the entire composition as an apocalypse within a narrative framework. The apocalypse describes Israel's history from exodus, through exile and the Hasmonaeon time, and perhaps up to the eschaton. Some words ("their waters of life," and "the tree/the garden of life"¹⁸) would depict an endtime paradisiacal scene. However, immediately after these words follows a new paragraph with the so-called quotation or rewriting of Nah 3:8-10 on the fall of Thebes. And apparently, immediately after this oracle, in the following column after some lost lines,¹⁹ continued the narrative of Jeremiah accompanying the deportees to the river.

This so-called quotation of Nahum²⁰ is one of the keys for my interpretation of the fragmentary manuscript 4Q385a as containing a "Jeremianic collection." 4Q385a 17 ii 4-9 has a Nahum text that repeatedly differs from the MT, but closely corresponds with that of the Septuagint, to such an extent that we can talk about two versions. Crucial is that the LXX has a double reading of the first stich, one corresponding with that of MT, the other with that of this fragment, thus attesting to different forms of the oracle. The MT introduction "Are you (i.e., Nineveh) better than Thebes (No Amon)" embeds the conquest of Thebes in a prophecy about the end of Nineveh. The 4Q385a introduction "Your portion has been prepared, O Amon" has a different addressee and lacks the Nineveh context. On the basis of the variant readings, repeatedly consisting of synonyms, I propose for a double tradition of this literary block that circulated independently.²¹ However, regardless of one's interpretation of the relation to Nah 3, the 4Q385a text does not relate in a clear manner to either what precedes or to what follows. The 4Q385a Thebes section is separated from the preceding text by a paragraph break. This may suggest that the end of the text consisted of an appendix or collection of things not found in the book of Jeremiah, but nonetheless connected to Jeremiah. The inclusion of the 4Q385a version of this oracle in a Jeremianic text may be related to

¹⁸It is difficult to decide whether the text in 4Q385a 17 ii 3 read **גן החיים** or **עץ החיים**, and it is possible that one reading has been corrected to the other. The problems of this reading extend to the different reading and construction of the preceding letters.

¹⁹Based on the assumption that frag. 17 ii and 18 i represent successive columns. This assumption cannot be proven, but is built on the observation that, given the photographic evidence of PAM 40.963, one of the top fragments of the conglomerate frag. 18 (the one with **מלפני יהוה**) apparently had been attached to frags. 16a and 17b, and that those three fragments, even though not entirely of the same form, may represent three convolutions of the scroll (Dimant's statement in DJD 30:159, that "they were on top of the pile" is possible, but not entirely exact.)

²⁰For the text, cf. Appendix 4: Nahum 3:8-10 in different forms. Note that at several places, I read differently than either Dimant in the DJD edition, or Qimron in his edition (2:89) do.

²¹Contra Devorah Dimant, "A Quotation from Nahum 3:8-10 in 4Q385 6," in *The Bible in the Light of Its Interpreters: Sarah Kalmin Memorial Volume* (ed. S. Japhet; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1994), 31-37 [Hebrew] and in part also contra Menahem Kister, "A Common Heritage: Biblical Interpretation at Qumran and Its Implications," in *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. M. E. Stone and E. G. Chazon; STDJ 28; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 101-11, at 107-8 n. 26. I stand much closer to Heinz-Josef Fabry, *Nahum* (HtHKAT; Freiburg: Herder, 2006), 202 who briefly refers to two text traditions, without further elaboration.

Jeremiah's oracle on the judgment of Egypt, which plausibly was seen to be fulfilled by Antiochus IV's invasion of Egypt.²²

This example of an oracle in two different forms, one in MT Nahum, and one in the Jeremianic Collection of 4Q385a, in two different wordings that apparently were both known by the Septuagint translators, conforms to one of the compositional or redactional techniques discovered in the Hebrew Bible. In the preceding columns we have other unknown oracular materials, which are, however, too small and fragmented to be analyzed.²³ From the perspective of manuscript philology, it cannot be determined whether the Jeremianic blocks in the 4Q385a appendices belonged to a fixed Jeremianic Collection, or whether 4Q385a constituted a kind of *Sammelhandschrift*, and was more extensive than the other manuscripts.

4. The *Jeremiah Apocalypse*

A central part of the Jeremianic collection of 4Q385a and the major preserved part in the other manuscripts is the "Jeremiah Apocalypse." This text is, like many other historical apocalypses, written as a first-person divine discourse, addressed to a second plural audience, using past tense for descriptions of pre-exilic events, and future tense for those after the destruction. Initially, before Dimant associated the apocalypse with the Jeremiah fragments, she referred to this apocalypse as a Pseudo-Moses text. But if the apocalypse was attributed to the prophet Jeremiah, does it then connect and extend elements from the book of Jeremiah, or only expand the figure of the prophet Jeremiah?

On the whole, neither the apocalypse nor the other parts of the collection have a typically Jeremianic phraseology, but occasionally we find expressions similar to those from the book of Jeremiah, such as *כאשר עשו הם ומלכיהם כהניהם*, "as they did, they and their kings, their prophets" (4Q385a 18 i 10; cf. Jer 44:17) or *ארץ שבים*, "the land of their captivity" (Jer 30:10/46:27; 4Q385a 18 i 7) And while the text has a quotation from or correspondence to Amos (cf. the wording of Amos 8:11 used in 4Q387 3 8-9), and the oracle similar to Nahum 3:8-10, no comparable example from Jeremiah has been preserved.

However, we do encounter, in a composite text consisting of three columns of the Jeremiah Apocalypse,²⁴ some concerns that connect the work to the book of Jeremiah. This goes first for the interpretation and specification of Jeremiah's seventy years, here interpreted as ten jubilees, and connected, as in 2 Chron 36:21 with the sabbaths of the land which have to be made up.²⁵ Second, both the book of Jeremiah and the Jeremiah Apocalypse are critically concerned with the Jerusalem priests and kings, and their relation to the cult. And perhaps thirdly, the Jeremiah Apoc-

²²For this possible historical context, see Dimant, in DJD 30:158-59.

²³This also holds true if one places frags. 15 ii - 16 and 17 i in one and the same column, like Davis and I do.

²⁴4Q387 1 + 2 i; 2 ii; 2 iii + 3 supplemented with text from other manuscripts.

²⁵4Q387 1 8 *בהשמה את שבתותיה* "and the land] paid off its sabbaths by being desolate." 4Q387 2 ii 2-4 "I will not respond to their inquiry because of the trespass [wh]ich [they] have trespassed against [me,] until the completion of ten jubilees of years."

alypse shows, in some of its broken oracular parts, an interest in and specific statements about foreign nations. However, those are terribly damaged, which makes it hard to judge whether we still have the narrative prose of the divine discourse of the Jeremiah Apocalypse, or alternatively other poetic oracles included in the Jeremianic Collection.

The Jeremiah Apocalypse's interpretation of Jeremiah's seventy years is another key to the understanding of the work. Here we do not have the distance between text (seventy years) and interpretation (a longer period of time), as in Dan 9, but a simple substitution of the seventy-year period of Babylon with a ten-jubilee period of fulfilment of one's sins. The completion of ten jubilees of years is identified with the period of fulfilment of the Israelites' iniquity (respectively שלם Hiphil and Piel and שלמוּת). Yet, this ten-jubilee period is only one of the periodizations in the Jeremiah Apocalypse, which has repeated references to numbers of years, the completion of days, generations, and perhaps even the division of periods (4Q385a 11 i). While in Dan 9-12 the seventy-year motif is interpreted as a cipher, in this Jeremiah Apocalypse it is reinterpreted and elaborated as a major theme of the tradition.

5. *Jeremianic Corpus*

Within the Jeremiah Apocalypse and the Jeremianic Collection there are connections with the book of Jeremiah, but also many close relations to the text of *Jubilees*, especially to those sections which sometimes are regarded as expansions, such as chapters 1, 6, and 23. This goes for a series of lines in 4Q387 1 which correspond closely to *Jub.* 1:10-12, having in common "abandoning my statutes ... the festivals of my covenant" ... "profaned" ... "sacrificed to the goat-demons"²⁶ ... "violated everything deliberately." Especially important is the common motif of forgetting the festivals. Other phrases can be connected to *Jub.* 23. For example, 4Q387 2 ii 10-11 "And the children of Israel will cry out because of the heavy yoke in the lands of their captivity— and there will be none to deliver them" is very similar to *Jub.* 23:24: "they will cry out and pray to be rescued from the power of the sinful nations, but there will be none to deliver them." The most striking correspondence is the shared statement that "one will fight with one another regarding the law and the covenant" (4Q387 3 8 and *Jub.* 23:19). To this one can add that the Jeremiah Apocalypse (4Q387 2 iii 4) refers to the angels of enmity, the מלאכי המשטמות, reminding one of the שר המשטמה of *Jubilees*.

Given such connections, we may also reimagine the character of 4Q384, a collection of small papyrus fragments. Because of the phrase אֵל תַּחֲפֹנֵן, the manuscript has been associated with Jeremiah, and called Apocryphon of Jeremiah B. The other small fragments have no obvious connection to either Jeremiah or Egypt, but mention, in 9 2, the מחלקות העתים, "periods of time," as well as "transgressions" (in 9 3). There is no overlap with the Jeremianic Collection, and the material characteristics (papyrus and a low text density) probably rule out that it was part of a full copy of the Collection. Nonetheless, I propose that the few remains may suggest a comparable Jeremianic text describing different time periods. Also, we may recognize or construe a so-called Jeremianic corpus, consisting of multiple works and traditions that have multiple shared features, in

²⁶The often verbatim correspondence also suggests that 4Q387's שעירים may have been the Hebrew word in *Jub* 1:11, which was then rendered in Ethiopic *Jubilees* as demons.

this case a literary connection with both the figure of Jeremiah and the worldview and language of *Jubilees*, or, more specifically, the final edition of *Jubilees*.

More problematic is 4Q390, which Dimant argues is another copy of the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah C*, because of several unique shared phrases and because of its genre and content. As mentioned above, most scholars have contested her identification. Some qualify it as a Moses apocryphon, Qimron calls it a Jubilean eschatology, and it has been characterized both as a rewriting of *Jubilees*²⁷ and as a variant literary edition of the Jeremiah Apocalypse.²⁸ It also shares unique collations with the *Damascus Document* 8 such as *התגבר להון ולבצע* (CD 8:7 and 19:19; 4Q390 2 i 8) and *להסגירם לחרב* (CD 1 17; 4Q390 2 i 4). God's word to the addressee in 4Q390 1 3 "my ways which I command you (sg.) so that you may warn them" would be fitting both for Moses and for Jeremiah. However, the phrase "like everything that Israel *did* (*עשו*) in the first days of its kingdom," displays a perspective after these first days of the kingdom, and therefore probably would fit better with a Jeremianic text than with a Mosaic one.

Given the fragmentariness of the texts, it is difficult to assess which other fragments or works may have been related to the book or figure of Jeremiah.²⁹ The most interesting is 4Q470 (*Text Mentioning Zedekiah*), frag. 1 which describes what probably is the renewal of the covenant between God and Israel, in a fragment which features the angel Michael and King Zedekiah. This suggests an interpretive association of Jer 23:5-6 with the name *יהוה צדקנו* together with Jeremiah's announcement of a new covenant (31:31-34). The preserved text only features the word "covenant" and not "new," but the Jeremianic concept of a new covenant or covenant renewal is one of the continuing and expanding features in later traditions.

6. The growth of Jeremianic traditions

Some of the elements of Jeremianic tradition are (within the scrolls) restricted to the Jeremianic Corpus. This goes for the transformation of the figure of Jeremiah, who is not found in other texts.

A much broader expansion is found for Jeremiah's "seventy years," taken up in the book of Daniel as seventy weeks, but in the Jeremiah Apocalypse as ten jubilees, thus connecting the weeks to the jubilean periodization of history. The Jubilean periodization of all times of history and the underlying concept of "periods of time" are not Jeremian, but the different kinds of periodization have merged in several texts.

Another Jeremianic tradition expanding beyond the Jeremianic corpus is that of the idea of the new covenant of Jer 31:31-34, which turns up in different forms in the Dead Sea Scrolls cor-

²⁷Todd R. Hanneken, "Status and Interpretation of Jubilees in 4Q390," in *A Teacher For All Generations: Essays in Honor of James C. VanderKam* (ed. E. F. Mason; SJSJ 153; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 407-28.

²⁸In Kipp Davis' original Ph.D. thesis "Re-Presentation and Emerging Authority of the Jeremiah Traditions in Second Temple Judaism" (Ph.D. thesis Manchester, 2009). Note, however, that Davis, has modified this view in his *Cave 4 Apocryphon*.

²⁹Possible candidates would be 4Q463 (*Narrative D*) and 6Q12 (*Apocryphal Prophecy*). These texts both use language describing the exile and refer to jubilee.

pus. Within the corpus, the focus on the combination of a renewed covenant *and* torah is found explicitly in 4Q470 only. In the Dead Sea scrolls the terminology of a new covenant is attested in a few other texts (such as the *Damascus Document*, *Rule of Blessings*, and the *Festival prayers*). However, the idea of a new covenant has been transmitted indirectly, through the transformations of Ezek 36 and especially Ps 51, with an emphasis on the creation of a new spirit and a right inclination which allows one to observe the commandments, a notion that is also found prominently in Moses' prayer in *Jub.* 1 but not preserved in the fragmentary Jeremianic corpus.

This Jeremianic corpus, with the figure of Jeremiah mirroring that of Moses, and with its verbal and conceptual correspondences with *Jubilees*, invites us to consider the relationship between second-century BCE Jeremianic and Mosaic discourses.³⁰ One might approach this question by asking from which perspective 4Q390 would be either a Mosaic or a Jeremianic text, or by comparing *Jub.* 23 with the Jeremiah Apocalypse. One possible difference could be the Jeremianic Collection's political concern with royal and priestly leadership and with the relationship to specific foreign nations, as opposed to *Jubilees*' attention to internal relationships between Israelites as different from the nations. This difference then, might also be reflected in the different emphases on either new covenant in Jeremianic texts or new spirit in *Jubilees*.

7. Jeremiah's scriptures and the Dead Sea scrolls

For biblical scholars the possibility of two simultaneously copied and read variant literary versions of Jeremiah has been very exciting, but often also the end of concern with the Jeremianic tradition. Scrolls scholars have remarked on the small number of copies in the collection, the absence of pesher commentaries on Jeremiah, and the limited number of quotations.³¹ Jeremiah's main importance would be the idea of the seventy years (and more broadly the periodization of history) and the notion of the renewal of the covenant, and occasional other uses.

For us, the question is how Jeremiah was interpreted, and how it shaped meaning or inspired generations of tradents of the text. One possible reading is indicated by the Jeremianic frag-

³⁰For the terminology and conceptualization of Mosaic (and other) discourses in Early Judaism, cf. Hindy Najman, *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism* (SJSJ 77; Leiden: Brill, 2003).

³¹On the quotations of and allusions to Jeremiah, see several articles by Armin Lange, namely "The Text of Jeremiah in the War Scroll from Qumran," in *The Hebrew Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. N. Dávid et al.; FRLANT 239; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht), 95-116; "The Textual History of The Book of Jeremiah in Light of its Allusions and Implicit Quotations in the Qumran Hodayot," in *Prayer and Poetry in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature: Essays in Honor of Eileen Schuller on the Occasion of Her 65th Birthday* (ed. J. Penner, K. M. Penner, and C. Wassen; STDJ 98; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 251-84; "The Covenant with the Levites (Jer. 33:21) in the Proto-Masoretic Text of Jeremiah in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *'Go Out and Study the Land' (Judges 18:2): Archaeological, Historical and Textual Studies in Honor of Hanan Eshel* (ed. A. M. Maeir, J. Magness, and L. H. Schiffman; SJSJ 148; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 95-116.

ments where Jeremiah the prophet of judgment and hope also becomes the leader and teacher of torah. From that perspective the book of Jeremiah becomes another witness to the Torah.

Appendix 1: Judean Desert manuscripts and fragments of the book of Jeremiah

According to the official publications, there are six Jeremiah manuscripts from the caves at Qumran. Specifics can be found in the official DJD editions, in volume 3 (2Q13 published by Maurice Baillet) and volume 15 (five Cave 4 Jeremiah manuscripts published by Emanuel Tov). There are multiple discussions of these manuscripts. Cf., e.g., Armin Lange, *Handbuch der Textfunde vom Toten Meer. Band 1: Die Handschriften biblischer Bücher von Qumran und den anderen Fundorten* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 297-324, including a brief survey of the history of research, and extensive bibliography. In the table below, some basic data are presented (the qualification “semimasoretisch” is Lange’s):

siglum	name	preserved contents	textual character	palaeographical date
2Q13	2QJer	parts of Jer 42-48	“semimasoretisch”	first half 1st c. CE
4Q70	4QJer ^a	parts of Jer 7-22	proto-masoretic	“225–175 BCE” (Cross)
4Q71	4QJer ^b	1 frag.: Jer 9:22-10:21	Vorlage LXX-like	“first half 2nd c. BCE” (Tov); “Hasmonaeon” (Puech)
4Q72	4QJer ^c	parts of Jer 4-33	“semimasoretisch”	late first c. BCE
4Q72a	4QJer ^d	1 frag.: Jer 43:2-10	in part LXX-like	as 4Q71
4Q72b	4QJer ^e	1 frag.: Jer 50:4-6	like MT	Hasmonaeon

In addition to these Qumran Jeremiah manuscripts, there are at least four other Jeremiah fragments in private hands, presumably also from the Judaean Desert, though probably not from Qumran.

collection	siglum	name	contents	textual character	palaeographical date
Schøyen	DSS F.116	DSS F.Jer1	Jer 3:14-19	Vorlage LXX-like	middle/late Hasmonaeon
Green	DSS F.195	DSS F.Jer2	Jer 23:6-9	unknown to me	not seen
FJCO	DSS F.156	DSS F.Jer3	Jer 48:29-31	too small (3 words)	2nd half 1st c. BCE
? (USA)			Jer 24:6-7	too small (4 words)	not seen

The Schøyen fragment will be published by Torleif Elgvin and Kipp Davis in the Fall of 2015. The tiny Princeton Dead Sea Scrolls Project - Foundation on Judaism and Christian Origins (FJCO) fragment, which previously was part of the Ink and Blood collection, is depicted on the internet (<http://www.inkandblood.com/the-collection/item-detail.php?PRKey=4>), and will be published together with the Azusa Pacific University collection of fragments. The Jer 24:6-7 fragment has been described by Esther and Hanan Eshel, in *Meghillot* 5-6 (2007): 275-76, who suggested it may be part of 4Q72. I have no further details about the Green Collection fragment.

Appendix 2: The mixed textual character of 4QJer^d

4Q72a (part)

	אתנו ב[בל ¹]לא ש[מע] יחנן] וכל [שרי הח[יל]ם וכל	2
	העם בקול יהוה לשבת בארץ יהודה [ויק[ח]י חנן] וכל ש[רי ה[ח]ילם את כל שארית	3
	יהודה] ◦ [] ◦ ⁶ את הגברים] ו[את הנש[י]ם ואת הטף ואת בנות	4
	המלך ואת כל הנפש אשר הני[ח] נבזרדן את גדליה בן אחיקם ואת ירמיהו הנביא	5
	ו[את ברוך בן נריה ⁷ ויבאו א[רץ מצרים כי לא שמעו בקול יהוה] ו[יבאו תחפחס	6
	⁸ ויהי דבר יהוה אל ירמיהו] בתחפחס לאמר ⁹ קח בידך אבנים גדלות וטמנתם	7
] אשר בפתח בתחפחס לעיני אנשים יהודים <i>vacat</i>	8
43:4 (2)	M בן קרח + LXX יחנן	
43:5 (3)	M בן קרח + LXX יחנן	
43:6 (5)	M רב טבחים + LXX נבזרדן	
43:6 (5)	M בן שפן + LXX אחיקם	
43:6 (5)	LXX * > M [כל]	
43:7 (6)	LXX * > M א[רץ]	
43:9 (7)	LXX * σεαυτῶ M בידך	
43:9 (8)	M אנשים יהודים LXX ἀνθρώπων Ἰουδα (= אנשי יהודה?)	
43:5 (4)	M; <i>Iouda</i> אשר שבו מכל הגוים אשר נדחו שם לגור בארץ יהודה LXX] ◦ [] ◦ [... יהודה ...] <i>Iouda</i> τούτους ἀποστρέψαντας κατοικεῖν ἐν τῇ γῆ LXX ; the DJD reading <i>Iouda</i> אשר שבו מכל הגוים אשר שם is not possible given available space between purported ῥ and שם. Janzen reconstructed שם [מצר]ים אשר בפתח בתחפחס.	
43:7 (6)	M, LXX + LXX ו[יבאו]	
43:9 (8)	M, LXX אשר בפתח בית פרעה בתחפחס LXX אשר בפתח בתחפחס	

Appendix 3: *Apocryphon of Jeremiah C* texts mentioning Jeremiah

3.1. 4Q385a 18 i

	<i>vacat</i> [1
	ויצא [ירמיה הנביא מלפני יהוה]	2
	[וילך עם ה]שבאים אשר נשבו מארץ ירושלים ויבאו	3
	[לרבלה? אל]מלך בבל בְּהִכּוֹת נְבוּזַרְדַּן רַב הַטַּבָּחִים	4
	[בעם אל]הים ויקח את כלי בית אלהים את הכהנים	5
	[החרים?]ובני ישראל ויביאם בבל וילך ירמיה הנביא	6
	[עמהם עד]הנהר ויצום את אשר יעשו בארץ שביא[ם]	7
	[וישמעו] בקול ירמיה לדברים אשר צוהו אלהים	8
	[]אשמרו את ברית אלהי אבותיהם בארץ	9
	[בבל]כאשר עשו הם ומלכיהם כהניהם	10
	[]...[וי]חלל[ו] ש[ם] אלהים ל[טמא]?]	11

1 [...] *Blank* 2 [...] Jeremiah the prophet [went out] from before YHWH 3 [and he went with the] captives who were led captive from the land of Jerusalem, and they came 4 [at Riblah, to] the king of Babylon. When Nebuzaradan the captain of the guard had struck 5 [the nation of G]od, he took the vessels of the house of God, the priests, 6 [the nobles,] and the Israelites, and he brought them to Babel. And the prophet Jeremiah went 7 [with them up to] the river, and commanded them what they should do in the land of [their] captivity. 8 [And they obe]yed Jeremiah with respect to the things that God had commanded him 9 [...] keeping the covenant of the God of their fathers in the land 10 [of Babylon, ...] what they had done, they, and their kings, their priests 11 [and their princes?] ... [and they] profan[ed the na]me of God, by [defiling]

3.2. 4Q385a 18 ii

	בתחפנס א[שר בארץ מצרים?]	1
	[ויאמרו לו דרוש] נא בעדנו לאל[הים]	2
	[להם ירמיה]ל[בלתי דרוש להם לאלה]ים ושאת בעדם	3
	[רנה ותפלה ויהי ירמיה מקונן]. [קינות?]	4
	[על ירושלים] <i>vacat</i> [ויהי דבר יהוה אל]	5
	[ירמיה בארץ תחפנס אשר בארץ מצ]רים לאמר דבר אל	6
	[בני ישראל ואל בני יהודה ובנימיים כ]	7
	[יום יום דרשו את חקותי ואת מצותי שמ]רו	8
	[אחרי פ]ס[ילי הגוים אשר הל]כו אחריהם אבותיכם כי	9
	[לא יושי]עו[ל]כם ו[.....] לא .]	10

1 in Tahpanes, wh[ich is in the land of Egypt ...] 2 and they said to him: [“Please] inquire [of G]od [on our behalf” ...] 3 Jeremi[ah] to them, that he would not inquire for them of Go[d, or offer on their behalf] 4 supplication and prayer. And Jeremiah was lamenting ov[er ... laments?] 5 [ov]er Jerusalem. *Blank* [And the word of YHWH came to] 6 Jeremiah in the land of Tahpanes, which is in the land of Egy[pt ... to] 7 the Israelites and to the Judahites and Benjaminites [...] 8 “Seek daily my

ordinances, and ke[ep] my commandments [*not going*] 9 after the idols of the peoples [after] which we[nt your fathers, for] 10 [t]he[y] will not save [...] not [...]

3.4. 4Q389 1

	ה בארץ י]	2
	ובקשו על כ]	3
	כל הנשאר בארץ מצ]	4
	י רמיה בן חלקיה מארץ מצר]	5
	שלו] שים ושש שנה לגלות ישראל [ג/ו] קראו הדרבים]	6
	במעמד ה	ב] י שראל על נהר סור	7

2 [...] in the land of J/I[...] 3 [...] and they pleaded for [...] 4 [...] all who remained in the land of E[gypt ...] 5 [...] Je]remiah son of Helkiah from the land of Egyp[t ...] 6 [thi]rty-sixth year of the captivity of Israel they read the words [...] 7 in [... I]srael at the river Sour *Blank* while were standing [...]

Appendix 4: Nahum 3:8-10 in different forms

4Q385a 17 ii 4-9 DJD	Nahum 3:8-10 MT	Nahum 3:8-10 LXX Göttingen	4Q385a 17 ii 4-9 Tigchelaar
היכן חלקך	הַתִּיטְבִּי מִנָּא	ἄρμοσαι χορδῆν,	היכן חלקך
אמון	אָמוֹן	Ἀμων	אמון
ה[ש]כנה ביארי[ם]	הַיִּשְׁבָּה בִּיאָרִים	ἡ κατοικοῦσα ἐν ποταμοῖς,	ה[טמ?][א]נה ביארים
מים סביב לך	מִים סְבִיב לָהּ	ὕδωρ κύκλω αὐτῆς,	מים סביב לה
ח[ילך] ים	אֲשֶׁר־תֵּיל יָם	ἥς ἢ ἀρχῆ θάλασσα	ר[אשה] ים
ומים חמ[תך]	מִים חוֹמָתָהּ:	καὶ ὕδωρ τὰ τείχη αὐτῆς,	ומים חמ[תה]
כוש מצר[ים] עזמה[ם]	כּוּשׁ עֲצָמָהּ וּמִצְרַיִם	καὶ Αἰθιοπία ἢ ἰσχύς αὐτῆς καὶ Αἴγυπτος,	כוש מעז[ה] ומצרים[?]
ואין קץ לברוח[יד]	וְאֵין קֶצֶה	καὶ οὐκ ἔστι πέρας τῆς φυγῆς,	ואין קץ לברוח[?]
לוב בסעדך	לּוּב וְלוּבִים הֵיוּ בְּעִזְרָתְךָ:	καὶ Λίβυες ἐγένοντο βοηθοὶ αὐτῆς.	לוב בסעדך
והיא בגולה תלך בש[בי]	גַּם־הִיא לְגִלָּהּ הֶלְכָה בַּשָּׂבִי	καὶ αὐτὴ εἰς μετοικεσίαν πορεύσεται αἰχμάλωτος,	והיא בגולה תלך בש[בי]
ועלליה י[רטש]ו[י] [בראש] הר[ים]	גַּם עַלְלִיָּהּ יִרְטְשׁוּ בְּרָאשׁ כָּל־חוֹצְוֹת	καὶ τὰ νήπια αὐτῆς ἐδαφιοῦσιν ἐπ' ἀρχὰς πασῶν τῶν ὁδῶν αὐτῆς,	ועלליה י[רטש]ו[י] [בראש] ש[ק]ים
ועל [נכבדיה ידו] גורל	וְעַל־נִכְבְּדֶיהָ יָדוּ גוּרָל	καὶ ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ ἔνδοξα αὐτῆς βαλοῦσι κλήρους,	ועל [נכבדיה ידו] גורל
וכל [גדול]יה בזק[ים]	וְכָל־גְּדוֹלֶיהָ רְתָקוּ בַּזְקִים:	καὶ πάντες οἱ μεγιστάνες αὐτῆς δεθήσονται χειροπέδαις.	וכל [גדול]יה בזק[ים]

Translation of Tigchelaar:

Your portion has been prepared, O Amon, who is hidden(?) by the Niles.
 Waters are around her, her head is the sea, and waters her wall.
 Cush is her strength, and Egypt (?), and there is no end to flight.
 Libya is your help, but she will go in exile, into captivity.
 Her babies shall be dashed at the head of streets,
 and for her honoured ones lots will be cast and all her great ones in chains