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# LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

1/2/3pPos  | 1st/2nd/3rd person position
---|---
C  | common
CA  | BHS critical apparatus
CL  | Codex Leningradensis (in BHS version)
DSC  | Discourse
DSI  | Direct speech introduction
F  | Feminine
LXX  | Septuagint
M  | Masculine
MPS  | Multiple position shift (see 5.3)
MT  | Masoretic text
OT  | Old Testament
pl  | plural
P  | Person
N  | Number
G  | Gender
Pos  | Position
PNG-shift  | Is equivalent with a participant reference-shift with regard to the P-, N-, and G-position.
SESB  | Stuttgart Electronic Study Bible
sg  | singular
SPS  | Single position shift
SS  | Speech-situation (see 5.3)
VF  | Verbal form
0Qtl  | Clause type: Qatal clause
AjCL  | Clause type: Adjunct clause
Impv  | Clause type: Imperative clause
InfA  | Clause type: Infinitive Absolute clause
InfC  | Clause type: Infinitive Absolute clause
NmCl  | Clause type: Nominal clause
PtcA  | Clause type: Participle Active clause
PtcP  Clause type: Participle Passive clause
Voct  Clause type: Vocative clause
Way0  Clause type: Wayyiqtol clause without any elements following the predication.
WayX  Clause type: Wayyiqtol clause in which the predication is followed by an explicit subject (X).
Wey0  Clause type: Weyiqtol clause without any elements following the predication.
WeyX  Clause type: Weyiqtol clause in which the predication is followed by an explicit subject (X).
WQtl  Clause type: WQatal clause
WXQt  Clause type: WQatal clause in which an explicit subject (X) is placed between the Waw and the predication.
WxQt  Clause type: WQatal clause in which a clause constituent other than an explicit subject is placed between the Waw and the predication.
WxYq  Clause type: WYiqtol clause in which a clause constituent other than an explicit subject is placed between the Waw and the predication.
WXYq  Clause type: WYiqtol clause in which a an explicit subject is placed between the Waw and the predication.
xQtl  Clause type: Qatal clause in which a clause constituent other than an explicit subject is preceding the predication.
XQtl  Clause type: Qatal clause in which an explicit subject (X) is preceding the predication.
XxQt  Clause type: Qatal clause in which the predication is preceded by an explicit subject and an other clause constituent.
XxYq  Clause type: Yiqtol clause in which the predication is preceded by an explicit subject and an other clause constituent.
xYqt  Clause type: Yiqtol clause in which a clause constituent other than an explicit subject is preceding the predication.
XYqt  Clause type: Yiqtol clause in which an explicit subject (X) precedes the predication.
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**Introduction**

It has been known for decades, that in the field of biblical theology, there is an enormous plurality of competing and often mutually exclusive methodologies (e.g. literary criticism, form criticism, canon criticism, structuralism, new criticism, reader-response criticism, socio-political criticism, depth-psychological criticism ...) resulting in many different ideas of what the meaning of the text is. Whenever we find attempts of dialogue between the different methods, they are complicated and politicized as a result of a lacking awareness and explication of the foundation of one’s own methodological approach.

In general, such an attitude of reflecting upon the exegetic-methodological situation is rather scarce, especially in the Anglo-American world. When methodologies are examined they seem to be primarily judged in terms of functionality. This means to focus on what a specific methodology is able to produce. The present debate, therefore, especially focuses on the methodological aspect of teleology, i.e. on the result delivering functionality of a specific methodology. It loses sight of the importance of critically investigating methodological presuppositions, i.e. starting points. Let us elaborate to avoid misunderstanding. Most of the time, the reflection upon methodological functionality does not take place in ignorance of philosophical presuppositions. The point is, however, that these presuppositions are not deeply inquired.

James Barr stresses this observation in his critique on classical historical criticism by saying that “this day there does not exist any really clear and philosophically valid account of what traditional biblical criticism was doing!”

In his sensitivity to the situation, John Barton is aware of this

---

1 Representative for the discipline of Biblical theology, Albertz describes the present situation in Old Testament theology as follows:


4 For example, Hasel has given an insightful critical analysis of the methodological plurality within biblical theology in his Old Testament Theology: Basic issues in the Current Debate (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing, 1991). However, although he hits the crucial issue within the debate of his time by pointing out that “the distinction between what a text meant and what a text means is at the core of the most fundamental problem of OT theology” (p. 30) he still remains on the level of functionality and procedure. Although Hasel is critical enough to recognize the philosophical dimension that lies behind the problems of “what it meant” and “what it means”, he did not involve himself in a critical philosophical examination.

imbalance. He explains that the main problem of methodological plurality can not be exhaustively tackled by a mere comparison of the functionality and knowledge generating ability of methodologies. Barton asks for a thorough examination of the role of method as such. This conclusion targets at the very epistemological foundations of methodology, which Barton describes as the “metacritical” issue that demands proper and specifically philosophical analysis. However, like many other critical thinkers, Barton himself does not attempt to investigate the presuppositional level, as he does not consider himself to be an expert in the field of philosophy. Consequently, his main focus in the evaluation of methods still remains on the practical ability of methodologies to deliver relevant results, i.e. they remain functionality-oriented. An examination in terms of functionality helps to grasp the consequences, i.e. the results or ends of specific methodologies for biblical exegesis. It does, however, not get to the theoretical core, the origins and foundations of the diversity of exegetical results and is therefore in constant risk of unconscious subjectivity. The impact of the exercise of exegetical methodology on biblical theology is far too great as to limit our critical attitude to the watchword “what works is fine”. Finding ourselves in a Judeo-Christian tradition that is constantly attempting to improve its biblical understanding and the foundations of biblical theology we want to participate in the methodological quest.

Our post-modern mentality has made it possible to get methodologically fragmented. Everybody does his own thing. One chooses the method one likes. Every method – as long as it generates meaning – is welcomed. In fact, the pluralism of methods is regarded as enriching since it allows to maximize the production of meaning. Consequently, it seems that the economic aspect of exegesis (generating meaning) overrules the ethical responsibility of exegesis (doing justice to the text). Research is financed when it “relevantly” contributes to a complex and pluralistic society, which is considered as mirroring the relativity of our human cognitive condition. Within theology, research that concentrates on methodological reflection and data description is rather unpopular as it does not seem to sell on a market that is ruled by relevance obsession.

As this situation testifies to a paradigm shift that theology has gone through, we decide that we do not want to suppress our consciousness of our specific “Wirkungsgeschichte” in order to be consumed by this shift. We remain critical towards the celebration of methodological plurality within Old Testament exegesis and want to investigate phenomenologically both into the text as our main theological object and into the reader as the co-producer of textual meaning. Thus, our research wants to break the silence and chooses to run the risk of not being able to sell religious meaning in the end. The motivation for such a

---

6 Barton, 4.
7 Ibid.
8 The result is that Barton criticizes the different methodologies in regard to their applicational shortcomings and limitations. Unfortunately, he does not investigate the meta-critical issue that he considers the root of the entire problem (Ibid., 237.). Consequently, Barton’s suggestion is limited. Contrary to Hasel, he does not ultimately propose a new approach in methodology. Barton’s argument hints that the diversity of methods will only become a problem if a single method is perceived as “correct”, i.e. as the only way of approaching the human act of reading and understanding a text (Ibid., 246.). Thus, it is considered problematic to make a specific method exclusive and into an absolute. If the hermeneutical process as a whole had been critically analyzed much more far reaching and promising methodological considerations could be developed. Klaus Berger stresses this point with regard to the biblical historian “Die Konsequenzen dieser Selbstbesinnung [Berger refers to the critical metaphysical reflection] des Historikers auf seine eigenen Möglichkeiten könnten erheblich sein, insbesondere angesichts der häufig zu konstatierenden Überfremdung der Historie durch Metaphysik aufgrund mangelnder Lust oder Bereitschaft der Historiker, sich auf systematische Erwägungen einzulassen.” (Klaus Berger, Hermeneutik Des Neuen Testaments (Tübingen, 1999), 63.).
step does not stem from a philosophical obsession with method but from the very practice of reading the Old Testament text. The course of our thinking therefore is accompanied by the concrete biblical text as data and the awareness that different means of method lead to different results of meaning. To understand the procedure we are following and – even more – to understand the result of our research, the reader, on the one hand, needs to understand the data we are presenting and, on the other hand, he needs to understand our methodological reflections and instruments.

In order to clarify and to make tangible what we are talking about, we confront ourselves with a concrete textual phenomenon: participant reference shifts in the book of Jeremiah (see 0.1). This phenomenon constitutes an excellent case as it is omnipresent and at the same time often ignored in the exegetical tradition. Furthermore, this case demonstrates the plurality of interpretations calling us to investigate the exegetical processes that lead to such a diversity of opinions. This concrete textual phenomenon, then, serves as the case for our methodological research. But our case not only functions as a servant for methodological reflection. Our intention is to enable exegetical practice and not to remain on the theoretical level. Thus, as consequence of our methodological reflection, we suggest methodological instruments that serve the interpretation of our specific data-case without harming the text. The reader will understand that there is no understanding of method without data and that there is no understanding of data without method.

0.1 The Case – Person-, Number-, Gender-shifts: Data and Interpretation

In his influential work „Zur Komposition des Buches Jeremia“, Sigmund Mowinckel quotes Cornill as follows: “Diese Gestalt hat noch kein Mensch rationell zu erklären vermocht“⁹. “Diese Gestalt” refers here to the book of Jeremiah. Cornill’s statement proves true even today considering the wide disagreements about the interpretation of Jeremiah.¹⁰

When studying the book of Jeremiah, scholars encounter two basic problems:

1. On the one hand, a huge diversity is found in and between the written texts of the book, whether it is on the level of text-traditions (e.g. LXX-MT),¹¹ grammar (e.g. more and less clear textual hierarchies), genre (poetry, prose)¹², theme (judgment, promise), and composition (order-disorder).¹³

2. On the other hand, there is a huge diversity of reading strategies found in the commentaries on the book of Jeremiah. One of the first conclusions a student of the book of Jeremiah will draw is that the diversity of the written text does not correspond with the interpreted diversity of any

---

⁹ Cornill, quoted in Sigmund Mowinckel, Zur Komposition Des Buches Jeremia (Kristiania, 1914), 4-5.
¹¹ For an overview of the discussion between MT, LXX and 2Q/4Q see Georg Fischer, Jeremia : Der Stand Der Theologischen Diskussion (Darmstadt, 2007), 15-53.
¹² The genre diversity has initiated most of the exegetical debates with regard to the book of Jeremiah. For an overview of this debate see Siegfried Herrmann, Jeremia : Der Prophet Und Das Buch, Erträge Der Forschung (Darmstadt, 1990), 38-117.
¹³ Cf. Fischer, 17ff, 71.
reading. None of the commentaries focuses on all the diverse aspects of the text. In fact, it is especially the level of syntax and text-grammar – which is, to a great deal, responsible for the establishment of a discourse – that hardly finds any attention in commentaries. A critical examination of textual differences\(^\text{14}\), genre shifts\(^\text{15}\), rhetorical structures\(^\text{16}\) and historical reference\(^\text{17}\) is much more customary than the registering and quarreling with problematic features of discourse.

The following passage (Jer 21:11-14) explicates both problematic diversities. We will first formulate our perception of the written text and then the perception of the interpretations given by the different reading strategies:

---

\(^{14}\) This applies to commentaries in the tradition of McKane’s critical and exegetical commentary on Jeremiah (William McKane, \textit{Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jeremiah}, ed. John Adney Emerton and C. E. B. Cranfield, International Critical Commentary on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments (Edinburgh, 1986).).


0.1.1 Observations about the Written Text

The following problematic discourse phenomena are generated by this passage:

1. The first obstacle for the contemporary reader is found in clause number 47 (from now on cl#1 = clause number 1). While the predication (עש) is of plural character, its vocative subject (בּוֹדְדֵיה) in cl#47 is singular.

2. The second quotation (cl#49-65) contains further discourse-problems. In cl#54 we find a 3rd person/plural/masculine suffix (יִלַּדוּת), while it seems to refer to the same participant that was earlier referred to by 2nd person/plural/masculine imperatives (from now on Person = P [1P, 2P, 3P], Number = N [pl/sg], Gender = G [M/F]). The Masoretes obviously read the ketiv as erroneous and suggested a 2nd person/plural/masculine suffix in the qere.

3. Further, while in cl#55 the 2nd person position has been earlier referred to (cl#49, cl#50) with 2plM forms it now is referred to by a 2sgF suffix. As the formal identity of the 2nd person position did change, does this consequently mean that the participant to whom the 2sgF forms refer is different from the participant to whom the earlier 2sgM forms refer? It seems that the clause היִשָּׁה is a clear description of Jerusalem as participant and thus different from the 2P participant in cl#40-cl#50, which is clearly identified as בּוֹדְדֵיה or בּוֹדְדֵיה מְלֶכֶת יָוֵד ו. This can mean that either the third plus 2sgF suffix introduces a new discourse, thus marking a discourse shift, or that the third plus 2sgF suffix introduces a new participant into the same direct speech discourse.

4. The case gets more complicated as we find a plM participle with n-relativum in cl#59. The relativum seems to refer back to the 2sgF reference of cl#55, causing an NG-incongruence. However, the plM character could refer to the citizens of Jerusalem.
5. In cl#62, 2plM forms return (cf. cl#49-50). Thus an inconsistency with the previous 2sgF (cl#55) occurs. Do the forms refer to the participant from the beginning of the passage (cl#49, i.e., house of David/house of the king of Judah), or to Jerusalem and its citizens?

6. The previous question gets more complicated in cl#64-65, where the object of YHWH’s action is not any longer a 2P participant but a 3P participant referred to by 3sgF forms. Do the objects of YHWH’s action change? Is the F-characteristic of the 3sgF forms referring to Jerusalem in cl#55? But why does the discourse shift from 2P to 3P forms, creating a new speech situation (from now on “speech situation” = SS)? Is it because the new SS functions as marking a new direct speech or at least a discourse shift (from now on “discourse” = D)?

These are the types of observations and questions raised by a careful text-syntactical reading.

0.1.2 Observations about data-interpretation

When our reading is compared with the discussions found in the major commentary traditions, our general observation is confirmed that commentaries are not inquiring into text-syntactical matters as the basic part of the communication structure of any text:

1. Duhm is more concerned about the identity of שֵׁם הָעִם in cl#56 than about the many PNG-shifts. However, he notices the 2P-3P shift at the end of v14 (phenomenon vi), arguing that v13 consists of a “fremdes Citat” and therefore “Dass v. 14 die Suffixe in der 3.P. hat, fällt nicht auf, wenn v. 13 ein ihm fremdes Citat ist.”18

2. Thiel discusses the origin of the text but does not register any of our text-syntactical problems.19

3. Holladay does not register all the shifts but when he recognizes phenomena ii and iii, he does not regard them as disturbing the unity of the text.20 According to Holladay, the text unity is established by catchwords and not by making the grammatical reference features coherent.21 Thus he does not give closer attention to the shifts.

4. Lundbom generally does not pay any attention to the many shifts. Only the N-shift in cl#50 and the 3plM suffix in cl#54 catch his attention (phenomena i, ii). The N-shift in cl#50 is understood as “indicating that the entire royal house is being addressed, not just the king.”22 The P-shift (3plM suffix) in cl#54 is not interpreted as a scribal error (see qere and other multiple manuscripts) but functions rhetorically as repletion.23

5. Carroll states without much argumentation that there are different strata interwoven in this (text) passage (v11 is to be regarded editorial;24 vv13-14 is to be regarded as an independent fragment). However, the PNG-shifts do not play any role in the discussion of strata-recognition (he registers only phenomenon ii). The plM participle in cl#59 causing an N-incongruity with the

18 Duhm, 171.
19 Thiel, 240-242.
20 See Holladay, 575, 578.
21 Holladay, 575.
22 Lundbom, 111.
23 Ibid., 114.
25 Ibid., 415-416.
earlier 2sgF forms is explained as either referring to “the inhabitants of the city or part of an independent strand interwoven here with the poetry strand” or as being an “independent strand”.  

None of the commentaries systematically integrates a text-syntactical reading. Therefore, only sporadically PNG-shifts are discussed while the surrounding PNG-shifts are often ignored. When we find different commentaries discussing the same PNG-shift, they often present different interpretations (cf. Holiday’s and Lundbom’s explanation of phenomenon ii).

0.1.3 Conclusion: In Need of Understanding PNG-shifts

As the above example has indicated, seen from the perspective of the reading process, one of the greatest challenges of the book of Jeremiah is its many reference-shifts. A first superficial reading detects two different types of reference-shifts. On the one hand the PNG (person, number, and gender) identity of a participant often shifts unexpectedly, on the other hand an identical PNG identity is used in order to refer to two different participants. A careful scholarly but also a naive reading of Jeremiah show that these problematic reference-shifts are an omnipresent phenomenon that cannot be ignored and that demands an interpretation. The reading process is continuously disturbed by these shifts on two levels:

1. On the participant reference level, the reader is often without orientation about the identity of certain PNG-references, since it seems that one participant can be referred to by different PNG-configurations.
2. On the discourse level, the reader does not know on which discourse level the present discourse is to be read; are we reading a quote within a direct speech or a direct speech as a response to a preceding direct speech causing changes in PNG-configurations?

Being confronted by these two levels of problems, it is remarkable that the Targum tries to clarify many SS and speakers in the Psalms and prophetic literature by simply adding information not found in the MT or GT traditions. Jer 4:17-22 can serve as an example:

17 They have closed in around her like watchers of a field, because she has rebelled against me, says the Lord.
18 Your ways and your doings have brought this upon you. This is your doom; how bitter it is! It has reached your very heart.”
19 My anguish (יָעַש), my anguish (יָעַש)! I writhe in pain! Oh, the walls of my heart! My heart is beating wildly; I cannot keep silent; for I hear the sound of the trumpet, the alarm of war.
20 Disaster overtakes disaster, the whole land is laid waste. Suddenly my tents are destroyed, my curtains in a moment.
21 How long must I see the standard, and hear the sound of the trumpet?
22 “For my people are foolish, they do not know me; they are stupid children, they have no understanding. They are skilled in doing evil, but do not know how to do good.” (NRSV mirroring MT)

In Jer 4:19 the reader of the MT wonders about the identity of the “I” shouting “My anguish, my anguish! I writhe in pain!” In the preceding verses the 1st person position (from now on

26 Ibid., 416.
27 By way of example, one can refer to the many cases in which a nation can be referred to both by M and F forms. Moab and Israel are both referred to by M and F forms in Jer 48. Babylon is referred to both by M and F forms in Jer 50.
28 Jer 48:26-28 serves as a good example where within three verses two different participants are addressed by 2plM forms. In v26 we find the assaulter of Moab referred to by 2plM forms while in v28 Moab, as the defeated nation, is addressed by 2plM forms.
1pPos/2pPos/3pPos) is held by YHWH and in the following verses we find expressions that confirm that YHWH is still holding the 1pPos (e.g. “my nation”, “they do not know me” [both v22]); on the other hand, the reader has difficulty in connecting expressions like “suddenly my tents are destroyed” (v20) with YHWH, especially since in v26 YHWH is holding the 3pPos (“and all its cities were laid in ruins before the LORD”). The Targum solves this ambiguity in v19 by adding אֶרֶץ נְבֶא (“the prophet said”) before מִשְׁפָּעַת.

In contrast to the Targum, many modern translations that want to translate the MT as literally as possible do not have the option of added information being part of the translated text. However, although they leave the ambiguity of the SS, the beginning and end of a direct speech sections have to be marked as it is required by most modern languages. Direct speeches are marked by signs like “”, ; or subordinate clauses – all presupposing a clear beginning and end. Therefore, translations are obliged to make decisions and thus to interpret biblical texts. If the modern techniques of marking direct speech are not used, there do not remain direct speeches in the text for the modern reader. The need of marking direct speech and the ambiguity of the beginning and end of direct speeches in MT causes a major problem in the field of Bible translation. This can be simply seen in the fact of the fairly inconsistent direct speech marking between different Bible translations, e.g. Jer 20:10:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain #1</th>
<th>Domain #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ELB | Denn ich habe das Gerede von vielen gehört: Schrecken ringsum! Zeigt ihn an! Wir wollen ihn anzeigen! 
Alle meine Freunde lauern auf meinen Fall: Vielleicht läßt er sich verleiten, so daß wir ihn überwältigen und unsere Rache an ihm nehmen können. |
| LUO | Denn ich höre, wie mich viele schelten und schrecken um und um. sprechen alle meine Freunde und Gesellen, „Hui, verklagt ihn! Wir wollen ihn verklagen!“ 
Ob wir ihn übervorteilen und ihm beikommen mögen und uns an ihm rächen.“ |
| LUT | Denn ich höre, wie viele heimlich reden: Schrecken ist um und um! Wir wollen ihn verklagen! 
Alle meine Freunde und Gesellen, ob ich nicht falle: „Vielleicht läßt er sich überlisten, daß wir ihn bevorzucken können und uns an ihm rächen.“ |
| NBG | Want ik heb gehoord het gemompel van velen - schrik van rondom! - : 
Alle lieden met wie ik bevriend ben, loeren op mijn val: wellicht zal hij zich laten verlokken, zodat wij hem overmogen en wraak op hem kunnen nemen. |
| NIV | I hear many whispering, “Terror on every side! Report him! Let’s report him!” 
All my friends are waiting for me to slip, saying, “Perhaps he will be deceived; then we will prevail over him and take our revenge on him.” |
| RSV | For I hear many whispering: terror is on every side! “Denounce him! Let us denounce him!” 
say all my familiar friends, watching for my fall. 
"Perhaps he will be deceived, then we can overcome him, and take our revenge on him.” |
| NRS | For I hear many whispering: “Terror is all around! Denounce him! Let us denounce him!” 
All my close friends are watching for me to stumble. 
"Perhaps he can be enticed, and we can prevail against him, and take our revenge on him.” |

It can be seen that the different translations disagree upon where the direct speech after “For I hear many whispering” starts. The marking of the direct speech differs not only between traditions of Bible translations but even between revisions of earlier translations (cf. LUO-LUT, RSV-NRS). Many other examples can be given. Consequently, our problem is a problem of Bible-translation as well.29

29 Samuel A. Meier, Speaking of Speaking : Marking Direct Discourse in the Hebrew Bible, Supplements to Vetus Testamentum (Leiden, New York, 1992), 18. Even in Fischer’s “Stand der theologischen Diskussion” (Fischer, 94-95.) the problem is only
Despite the fact that these PNG-shifts are omnipresent, not much attention has been given to them in the studies of Jeremiah or biblical studies in general. Furthermore, the book of Jeremiah seems to be intensely more complex in regard to both discourse and reference levels than most other prophetic and poetic biblical literature. After Meier’s extensive analysis of direct speech markers he comments upon Jeremiah in this way:

“The means for marking DD in Jeremiah are the most varied, unpredictable, and, quite simply, chaotic of any book in the Hebrew Bible. Given the rapid changes of speaking voices, there is no guarantee that words in one verse clearly coming from God will continue into the next verse when no clues are available for identifying a voice.”

0.2 Overview of Interpretative Suggestions

Since PNG-shifts cannot be ignored completely, there have been some suggestions about the function and origination of these shifts. On the level of the exegetical practice (a), diverse suggestions have been made. On the level of language-systematic approaches (b), PNG-shifts have been treated in a limited way in classical grammars and are of little use for the practice of Bible translation. This explains why De Regt has tried to develop some constructive ideas for the craft of Bible translation. However, his work is limited and the suggested ideas are still in an initial stage of development.

Both on the level of exegetical practice as well as on the level of language-systematic approaches, a distributive investigation of the data is lacking. In the following section we will sketch an overview of the different available interpretations of PNG-shifts as they appear on both levels and conclude with De Regt’s proposal.

0.2.1 Exegetical Practice

Within the field of exegetical practice PNG-shifts have been approached either within the framework of diachronic studies, or within the framework of synchronic studies.

---

mentioned in close connection with Meier’s work. No other research is known (at least to us and Fischer) that would treat the problem properly.

30 Meier states about discourse-level problems, that only “fairly isolated aspects of the various problems that DD presents have received attention”, and no extensive investigations into ancient languages is to be found either (Meier, 1, 7.). In regard to the phenomenon of direct speech marking, Meier can be regarded as one of the first scholars investigating into these problems in a thorough way also for non-narrative texts. Besides Meier, Cynthia Miller has worked on the analysis of “quotative frames”. (See Cynthia Miller, “Introducing Direct Discourse in Biblical Hebrew Narrative,” in Biblical Hebrew and Discourse Linguistics, ed. Robert D. Bergen(Dallas, 1994); Cynthia Miller, ”Discourse Functions of Quotative Frames in Biblical Hebrew Narrative,” in Discourse Analysis of Biblical Literature : What It Is and What It Offers, ed. Walter Ray Bodine(Atlanta, 1995).) But her work so far was limited to narrative text-types. Consequently, the book of Jeremiah not only demands an analysis of DSC markers but even more an analysis of indirect speech markers as being part of the direct speech itself and not being part of a discourse-meta-perspective like דָּאָרְשֵׁי הַקְּדֻשָּׁה דָּאָרְשֵׁי הַקְּדֻשָּׁה or דברי אמן דָּאָרְשֵׁי הַקְּדֻשָּׁה. 31 Meier, 258.


32 When we speak about “distribution” we mean the “occurrence of language elements, and their positions relative to each other”. Arian J. C. Verheij, Grammatica Digitalis I Applicatio, vol. 11 (Amsterdam, 1994), 9.
In the 19th century, the idea that shifting the N-reference of a specific participant functions as one of the criteria for source criticism, rose in estimation and found many adherents within historical critical circles. Knobel was the first representative of this view, followed by Staerk and Steuernagel. Although their understanding was modified, it basically was methodologically applied by many exegetes until the end of last century.

In the course of time, critical voices became stronger. Although the existence of an N-shift could hint at the existence of a different redactional layer or source, Moshe Weinfeld expressed caution when stating that „not all of the interchanges of second-person singular and plural [...] can be explained on literary-critical grounds.“ Similar tones were heard even earlier in the appendix of the third edition of Wellhausen’s Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments, where he dissociates himself from his earlier use of the N-shift by explaining that the N-shift (Numeruswechsel) cannot automatically be used as a criterion for source-criticism. Lohfink quite clearly explains that the N-shift by itself, thus dissociated from other literary critical tokens, cannot function as a source critical tool at all. In his analysis he comes to the conclusion that there is hardly any convergence between the N-shift and other literary critical tokens, which leads him to (the) following formulation:

„Wir dürfen allerdings dann nicht die Stellen des Numerusumsprungs naiv für die Grenzlinien des Eingriffs des ‚Verfassers’ ansehen. [...] Alles in allem scheint die Verwertbarkeit des Numeruswechsels für die Quellenscheidung nicht sehr groß zu sein. Die Faszination des Wundermittels von ehemd verliert sich. Es ist wohl ratsam, auch andere Texte, in denen man nach Numeruswechsel Quellen zu scheiden pflegt, neu zu untersuchen.“

In the late 20th century, there was a trend towards being critical of approaches that interpret the biblical text by means of text-external categories. Both the historic-critical as well as the rhetoric-stylistic reading of N-shifts become suspicious. Begg tries to apply a text-immanent study to the N-shift problem in Deuteronomy which causes him to critique both historical-critical (esp. Steuernagel) as well as rhetoric-stylistic approaches (esp. Braulik) since both remain highly hypothetical. In his text-immanent study he concludes that the N-shifts in Deuteronomy function often as quotation-markers. As quotation-markers, they do “not rule out either the ‘literary-critical’ or the ‘stylistic’ explanation of the N-shift which goes

---

34 Often the N-shift discussion creates the impression that it is a rather young problem (Loersch, Hospers). However, as Begg proves, this impression does not fit to the facts (cf. Christopher Begg, "The Significance of the Numeruswechsel in Deuteronomy: The “Prehistory” of the Question," Ephemeridum theologicae Lovaniensis 55, no. (1979): 116f.). As the shifts disturb the communication process they have already been associated with scribal errors (e.g. ditography). Nevertheless, for a long time the PNG-shifts did not receive major attention through leading theologians and exegetes (e.g. Driver), giving the impression that the phenomenon of PNG-shifts resembles a rather contemporary problem.

35 See Ibid., 116, 119ff.


37 Wellhausen writes: "Die Anrede mit Du ist die Regel, die mit Ihr ist vereinzelt; sie beruht zum Teil auf Versehen [...] oder findet sich in Nachträgen [...]." (quoted in Begg: 123. This means that Wellhausen took distance from the rigid application of the Numeruswechsel as source critical marker in his later work.

38 Norbert Lohfink, Das Hauptgebot; Eine Untersuchung Literarischer Einleitungsfragen Zu Dtn 5-11, Analecta Biblica (Rome, 1963), 239-258.

39 Ibid., 241.


together with the quotation.” Begg’s study defends his theory that in many cases N-shifts can be interpreted as source-critical signs while the literary unit is not necessarily disturbed by them.

Especially with the critical work of Begg and others, it is remarkable that, within the source-critical paradigm, only the N-shift gets popular attention while the P-, G- or PG-shifts are not discussed as diachronic indicators.

### 0.2.1.2 Number-shift as indication of synchronic conventions

Among exegetes, we not only find those who are skeptical towards an uncritical use of the N-shift for the literary critical analysis but also those who do not see any diachronic quality in those shifts. Hospers claims to have proven that N-shifts that do not cause a participant-reference-shift are a usual phenomenon of the stylistic repertoire of the ancient deuteronomistic authors. In fact, they sometimes even strove for those N-shifts in order to emphasize essential theological insights. Further he shows how inconsistently the N-shift is used in literary critical studies. As it functions as a source-critical indication in the Pentateuch studies, it often does not in the studies of other biblical books since it does not work there as a category for investigating into the different strata. Moshe Weinfeld’s comparison with other Ancient Near Eastern texts shows that many N-shifts also occur in non-biblical treatise documents. Whenever they occur they function rhetorically (didactic effects) or as marking citations. Therefore, Weinfeld joins the criticism against the literary critical use of N-shifts:

“In sum, although in some cases the interchange of singular and plural address may indicate the existence of different layers, in general the interchange reflects stylistic variations introduced by the same author.”

McCarthy is more radical in his judgment as he shows that there are serious logical flaws in the argumentation for the literary critical use of the N-shift. He explains:

“How could the hypothetical redactor(s) grasp and develop brilliantly the theology of the source and yet stand unable to follow the forms of pronoun used? [...] There must have been a reason for the ‘Thou-you’ variation at the hands of the originators of the text which was meaningful to them.”

But to assume that within the synchronic approach to the phenomenon there is more unity to be found is mistaken. Braulik gives an overview of the diversity of attempted explanations:

---

42 Ibid., 29, 46.
43 Ibid., 43.
44 Johannes Hendrik Hospers, De Numeruswisseling in Het Boek Deuteronomium (Utrecht, 1947), 100.
45 Hospers explains that the use of singular sections in the book of Deuteronomy are obviously intended. The singular sections show that the post-exilic deuteronomistic authors relocated the center of the spiritual life and ethical responsibility from the collective identity of the people as a whole to the individual person:

“Hier is m.i. de gedachte van collectieve “volk Gods” geheel opgegeven en wordt de aparte individu toegesproken. Waarschijnlijk is hier de steeds meer veld winnende opvatting van de persoonlijk verantwoordelijkheid van invloed geweest, die men geheel uitgewerkt aantreft bij de profeet Ezechiel.” (Ibid., 102.)

46 Weinfeld, 15. and also Mark E. Biddle, Polyphony and Symphony in Prophetic Literature : Rereading Jeremiah 7-20, Studies in Old Testament Interpretation, vol. e (Macon, 1996), 118.
47 Ibid., 15.
48 Ibid., 16.
50 Ibid., 146-149.
1. König and Lindblom understand the N-shift as being grounded in syntactical norms and psychological motives.\(^{51}\)

2. Claburn suggests sociological motives for the use of the N-shift.\(^{52}\)

3. McCarthy and Braulik explain that the N-shift is caused by stylistic-functional and rhetorical considerations. By means of a high frequency of N-shifts literary climaxes are marked.\(^{53}\) By the repeated change of address a situation of intensity is created.\(^{54}\)

4. Braulik further shows that an N-shift can function as marking a citation and would therefore have a discourse-function. In such a case, the shift would not be grammatically accommodated to the situation in order to keep the citation recognizable for the reader/listener.\(^{55}\)

5. Hardmeier adds another interesting interpretation. He rejects the assumption of a „Sammlungskonglomerat von Einzelworten […] wie es eine an 'Brüchen und Spannungen’ orientierte Exegese stets getan hat“.\(^{56}\) In contrast he suggests that those shifts express a „typische, altorientalische Seh- und Denkweise“\(^{57}\) in analogy to the iconographic world „die von H. Frankfort mit dem Begriff der ‘multiplicity of approaches’ umrissen worden ist.“\(^{58}\)

   Hardmeier thus perceives a composition that attempts to integrate a multiplicity of aspects as being similar to surrealistic art.\(^{59}\) Although the composition might not suggest a grammatical coherent unity, it still can be understood as an integral whole. This can be achieved in two different ways. First, the different P forms referring to the same participant function either as “descending into” or “ascending from” a subjective participant position (participant in 2\(^{nd}\) person). In this case, objectivity is achieved by switching from 2P to 3P forms while subjectivity is achieved by shifting from 3P to 2P forms.\(^{60}\) Second, the different P forms can mark different discourse levels. Thus, SS shifts can function as discourse shifts hinting at the possibility of an “auf öffentliche Vorlesung hin angelegten [...] Rede”.\(^{61}\)

   The discourse function of “Redeausrichtungswechsel” does not necessarily exclude them from also functioning as source critical markers. Similarly to Begg, both the discourse style as well as the source critical marking can be simultaneously established through these shifts.\(^{62}\)

\(^{51}\) „Der kollektive Begriff <<Israel>> könne nämlich wie auch andere Kollektiva vor sich mit dem SG und danach mit dem PL konstruiert werden. Der nachfolgende PL könne in vielen Fällen einen detaillierenden oder frequentativen Sinn besitzen. Der Übergang von pl zu sg Anrede aber könne teils einer kollektivierenden, teils einer individualisierenden Tendenz folgen.“ Ibid., 147.

\(^{52}\) „Im Lauf der Entwicklung einer Gruppe von ihrer Frühphase als leidenschaftlicher Bewegung zu einer institutionalisierten Partei oder einem Establishment konnte das <<normale>> <<you>> durch ein <<thou>> ersetzt werden.“ Ibid.

\(^{53}\) Ibid., 149.

\(^{54}\) Ibid., 149-150.


\(^{57}\) Ibid.

\(^{58}\) Ibid.

\(^{59}\) Ibid.

\(^{60}\) Ibid.

\(^{61}\) Hardmeier: 24.

\(^{62}\) Ibid., 14-15.
Although the critical remarks of Weinfeld, McCarthy et al might be well taken, the multiplicity of suggestions for solving the N- and P-shifts are not made on the basis of a thorough distributive linguistic inquiry. Obscurity in this issue remains. This is especially true as it can be seen that mainly the N-shift is in focus of both synchronic and diachronic approaches to the problem. The G- and P-shifts are hardly recognized and discussed.\(^6^3\) However, they constitute the most serious discourse problems in Jeremiah. On what ground can those P/G-shifts be understood (literary-critical, rhetorical, text-grammatical)? This is the question to be asked and to be answered, if the dialogue between dia- and synchronic textual studies wants to be enhanced and some clarity achieved for the art of Bible translation. Beside this, a large amount of data is needed in order to allow for more objectivity in the development of explanatory frameworks.

### 0.2.2 Language-system approaches

Beside those exegetes whose sole literary critical explanations are with regard to N-shifts, the dominant grammatical authorities argue for synchronic functions of PNG shifts. Gesenius and König explain that an N-, G- or P-congruence is not always necessary as shown in the following situations:\(^6^4\)

1. If the predication (whether verbal or nominal) stands before the subject, it can be considered to be yet “indifferent” and is therefore not determined by the PNG characteristics of the subject.
2. If the addressed participant is formally singular but has a collective character, the predication can be in plural.
3. If the addressed participant is formally plural but has a singular reality (e.g. pluralis majestatis) the predication is singular.
4. If there is a formally feminine noun with a masculine meaning (Kohelet), its attribution or predication (whether nominal or verbal) can be masculine.
5. Animal names or technical names whether of M or F form can be predicated with sgF.
6. If a plural noun (specifically participles) expresses a group of individuals, the predication can be of singular character, since it functions distributively. In this way, more attention is given to the single individual as part of a collective.
7. The phenomenon that the reference to a participant can suddenly shift from one person into another is also recognized in poetic and prophetic psalms. A reason for this phenomenon is not given, however it is described as if it belonged to the rules of writing poetic and prophetic texts.\(^6^5\)

---

\(^6^3\) Even the exhaustive work of Watson does not deal with these PNG-shifts in specific. In contrast, he discusses the symmetric functions of G-use as forming gender patterns “to mark off a poem into stanzas”. However, the different types (gender parallelism, gender chiasm) as well as the different cases he discusses, do not cause a G-incongruenze. See Wilfred G. E. Watson, *Classical Hebrew Poetry: A Guide to Its Techniques*, T & T Clark Biblical Languages (London, New York, 2005), 52, 123-127. and Wilfried G.E. Watson, "Symmetry of Stanza in Jeremiah 2,2b-3," *Journal for the study of the Old Testament* 19 (1981).


\(^6^5\) Gesenius and Kautzsch, §144p.
Similarly Muraoka\textsuperscript{66} and Lettinga\textsuperscript{67} discuss other different incongruous cases which propose a certain normativity and regularity:

1. A singular noun can receive a plural attribution or predication if it is of collective nature (e.g. \(םיִּבְרֵיִּים\)). Further, its pronoun reference can be of plural form as well.

2. If a plural noun is to be regarded as a plural of excellence/majesty, its attribution and predication can be of singular form.

3. Pronouns in forms of suffixes can be of plM form although they refer to a 2plF or 3plF noun. This is especially true for later books like Chronicles.

4. The predications of 2plF participants can often shift from 2plF forms to 2plM forms.

5. When the predication precedes a feminine subject it is often of masculine form.

6. When the predication precedes a plural subject it is often of singular form. This is especially the case in prosaic and poetic literature.

7. If the subject consists of a constructus connection it can happen that the predication's N and/or G quality follows the N and G characteristic of the subject's nomen rectum. This is especially the case with \(לָוָּכְךָ\).

8. 3P nouns that are part (nose, ear, heart) of an 1P individual and that are suffixed with 1P or 2P forms are often predicated with the P-characteristic expressed in the suffix.

In contemporary approaches to grammar writing, Waltke/O'Connor\textsuperscript{68} as well as Van der Merwe/Naudé/Kroeze\textsuperscript{69} differ to a certain extent in their recent grammars from the classical approaches by Gesenius, Muraoka or Lettinga. The following explanations for incongruities are given:

1. The G-characteristic serves three different purposes: morphological systematization, semantics as extra linguistic reference and syntax. However, the main function is of syntactic or grammatical nature. Thus G-characteristics serve mainly the purpose of establishing text-coherence. When the grammatical form contradicts the G quality of the referent, the G -quality of its attribution or predication will often take the referent's "real" G (construction ad sensum). This not only applies to G but also to N. A sg noun that has collective character is often predicated with a pl. This is also the case of metonymy (cf. Gen 41:57).

Generally speaking, it is emphasized that the N-category is always actualized in a "language- and cultural-specific system". Therefore the N-category of Hebrew often does not match the N-categorization of western European languages.

2. Likewise Gesenius and Muraoka, it is explained that when the predication appears before the subject it does not necessarily agree in G nor in N but receives the simplest verbal form which often resembles 3sgM.

3. In a gender construction, the adjective can take the G-identity of the nomens rectum if it functions ad sensum as real subject in contrast to the nomen regens.


\textsuperscript{67} Jan Pieter Lettinga, T. Muraoka, and W. Th van Peursen, Grammatica Van Het Bijbels Hebreeuws, 11. ed. (Leiden, Boston, 2000), §68.

\textsuperscript{68} Bruce K. Waltke and Michael Patrick O'Connor, An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax (Winona Lake, 1990), §6.6., §7.1.

A look at the grammarians' handling of the problem shows that similar to the exegetical discussion, there is basically no focus on the P-shift phenomenon. This is the case since the classical grammatical approach is not so much concerned with text-syntactical problems, but sees the upper limit of grammatical description on the level of sentence-syntax. Thus, since the phenomenon of P-shifts appears on the level of clause connections, i.e. the text-level, it appears outside the scope of classical and popular grammars.

As mentioned earlier, the explanations given are limited in their practical use of Bible translation. Especially De Regt, who is involved in the practice of Bible translations, has tried to develop some ideas that should help translators to relate properly to the many encountered shifts:

1. With regard to N- and G-shifts De Regt comes to following conclusions:
   He argues that one participant can simultaneously operate under two different identities that can be distinguished in their N quality. This takes place in prophetic text where children (pl) are addressed in opposition to the mother (sg) while the latter is meant to refer to the nation/land.\textsuperscript{70}
   It is possible that two different participants refer to the same nation. The phenomenon that a specific generation of a nation or city is referred to in a different way than another generation of the same nation/city is typical for passages in the book of Jeremiah.\textsuperscript{71}

2. With regard to the many P-shifts, following explanations are given on (a) the discourse-grammatical level as well as on (b) the rhetorical level:
   a) 2P references serve the discourse organization as they can mark the beginning of prophetic texts when they accompany paragraph opening markers (e.g. \(ןכ, ב, י, וב, בא, י, וי, ו).\textsuperscript{72}
       There are also cases in which a P-shift can function as turning point in a text.\textsuperscript{73}
   b) The shift from 3P references to 2P references can cause an atmosphere of intensification to the reader.\textsuperscript{74} A 3P reference creates the impression of distance and non-involvement while a sudden 2P-shift creates a situation of confrontation and directness.\textsuperscript{75} Those effects help to put a participant in the spotlight (by means of a 3P-2P shift).\textsuperscript{76} This can be seen when Israel is referred to by a 3P form as part of a larger group (other nations) while suddenly Israel is placed into the spotlight when it is addressed unexpectedly by a 2P form. The spotlighting can also cause climaxes in the texts.\textsuperscript{77}

De Regt's suggestions are remarkable as they step out of line of the usual approach to PNG-shifts. However, his work must be regarded as a lonely voice without much impact on the exegetical practice.

\textsuperscript{70} Regt de, 216.
\textsuperscript{72} Ibid., 218. However in the book of Jeremiah De Regt does not observe this phenomenon too often. He believes that in Jeremiah textual paragraphs are not marked by person shifts but by the many direct speech introductions. (see Ibid., 229.).
\textsuperscript{73} Ibid., 221.
\textsuperscript{74} Ibid., 218-219.
\textsuperscript{75} Ibid., 231.
\textsuperscript{76} Ibid., 220.
One reason for this situation is that De Regt’s suggestions for making sense (out) of the many shifts have not yet been tested by text-critical studies and by a distributional analysis of a large amount of available shifts.

**0.3 Conclusion: Interpretative risks**

The search for explaining the phenomenon of PNG-shifts among present scholarly readers contrasts sharply with the original readers. Apparently, the early reader/writer did not feel the need of specifying which voice is speaking to and about which participant in which discourse.\(^78\) This not only applies to biblical literature but to ancient Semitic language artifacts in general where not much interest is shown in providing orientation for the reader in the labyrinths of direct speech compositions.\(^79\) In fact, it is a general feature of Semitic texts that their users are not interested in marking the close of a direct speech as it is done in modern texts.\(^80\) As we do not belong to the originally intended readers, the ethical call is to be heard that constant reservation needs to be exercised in order not to abuse the text by applying our own conventions to the interpretative activity. When this call is not heard we run the risk of either reconstructing editorial history in a highly speculative way or of maximizing the theological content\(^81\) of specific text phenomena by increasing the textual value of intention. In regard to PNG-shifts, it is tempting to search their origination in the intention of individual writers rather than in the general language conventions of the authors’ and editors’ time. In that case, the “fluctuation between the ‘I’ of the prophet and the ‘I’ of God” can be interpreted as intentional and expressing a “psychological dimension where the prophet identifies with Yahweh as God’s mouthpiece” as done by Engnell.\(^82\) One can arrive at such a conclusion if only an atomistic study of the prophet’s “I” and God’s “I” has been done, allowing to lose track of the general phenomenon, i.e. the lack of distinction that regularly appears in Hebrew poetry without regard of the identity of participants.\(^83\)

In order to overcome such shortcomings, we need to be aware that it is the connection of **data-information** and **method** that helps to bridge the gap between the present reader and the text. Consequently, the present different views on the PNG-shifts are related to (a) a lack of information and (b) methodological issues often remaining unreflected. Our aim therefore is to find an interpretative framework for PNG-shifts that can be applied to the large amount of data in a more consistent way than so far done. This aim cannot be accomplished without getting exposed to a serious methodological reflection (b’) as it helps us develop instruments of analysis and interpretation that allow a responsible treatment of the data. This aim will further not be accomplished without a massive collection of data on the text-syntactic level (a’) so that the lack of information can be overcome.

Such an approach is in sharp contrast with outlined exegetical practice and common language-systematic approaches of grammars. The latter shows that text-linguistic phenomena remain unreflected

---

\(^78\) Meier, 25.

\(^79\) Ibid., 320-322.

\(^80\) Ibid., 53-54.

\(^81\) Eep Talstra, *Solomon’s Prayer: Synchrony and Diachrony in the Composition of I Kings 8, 14-61*, Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology (Kampen, 1993), 21.

\(^82\) Meier, 209.

\(^83\) Ibid.
and un-commented as they are not a central part of syntax-oriented reflection. Our observation of the commentaries of different exegetical traditions with their presuppositional standpoints, shows that interpretations on PNG-shifts are not consistently applying the suggestions given by their respective schools. But even more surprising is the fact that most of the PNG-shifts are not even registered nor commented by any of the different commentary traditions. This fact confronts us with three different questions. First, what is the role of methodology when it comes to the interpretation of PNG-shifts in every single commentary tradition? Second, why do all commentary traditions neglect most of the PNG-shifts? Third, what is the nature of the data, i.e. does the most complete collection and description of PNG-shifts help to see patterns that are coherent in itself and therefore do not need to be brought into coherence by extra-textual categories? These three questions need to be addressed in the course of our research. Our study, then, chooses exegetes as its primary dialogue partners.

0.4 Research Procedure

Our case has made clear that the origin of the diversity between interpretations of the PNG-shifts cannot lie in the data themselves (they are the same for all) but in what is done with the data (method). Therefore the distinct acts of “registration” and “interpretation” of data need to be reflected in depth in order to uncover the methodological a priori that the “selection of registration” and “interpretation” presupposes. This situation determines the order of our research:

1. Structural relationship between the cognition and data:
   In order to be able to analyze the concrete interrelation between objective PNG-data, subjective PNG-data registration, subjective PNG-data interpretation and methodological presupposition, we need to analyze the structural relation between the text as phenomenon and the phenomenon of Reason in operation, which allows the registration and interpretation of data.
   a) Therefore, we first analyze the phenomenological structure of Reason in general.
   b) Then we analyze the phenomenological structure of the biblical text in general.
   c) As a further step, we investigate the different interpretations of textual phenomena by the different paradigms that operate within the past and present time of biblical methodologies.

   These steps allow us to investigate the methodological conditions and to argue for the need of a linguistic identification and description of PNG-shifts as our specific case and object of methodological action.

2. Identification and description of PNG-shifts:
   In the further course of our research, we consequently investigate the identification and description of PNG-shifts. This serves two purposes: on the one hand, a rich database is constructed which helps us to find out whether PNG-shifts are registered in the different
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84 A close investigation into these types of inconsistencies is found in chapter 3.
85 There are different aspects that cause methodological plurality. One of the aspects is the realm of epistemology too often neglected (Kevin J. Vanhoozer, Is There a Meaning in This Text? : The Bible, the Reader, and the Morality of Literary Knowledge (Grand Rapids, 1998), 284.). However, to make the epistemological question an absolute is dangerous, too. This danger is often seen in the works of systematic thinkers like Wolterstorff or Vanhoozer, who take the epistemological issues seriously but do not integrate the complexity (linguistic and historical) of the biblical texts into their discussion about hermeneutics.
86 “Reason” stands for the cognitive realm of meaning production as will be explained in detail in chapter 1.
commentary traditions and if this will be the case, how they are interpreted. This again serves as an excellent tool to critique commentary traditions not by our own subjective categories but by objective data. On the other hand, the collection of PNG-shifts allows us to register similarities and differences between the many PNG-shifts. Therefore, this second step in our research contains:

a) First, a linguistic analysis of the complete text of Jeremiah on its language-systematic level. A computer assisted text-syntactical analysis is chosen due to specific methodological considerations (see chapter 2). The results of this analysis can be accessed through the WIVU database and its implementation in the Stuttgart Electronic Study Bible (SESB).

b) Second, – on the basis of the earlier text-linguistic analysis - an identification and description of all contained PNG-shifts. Both identification and description of all PNG-shifts are stored into a database (Excel file) that allows for flexible searches and phenomenological categorization of shifts. This Excel file can be found on the attached CD giving the reader full access to all PNG-shift cases contained in the book of Jeremiah.

3. Confrontation with major commentary traditions:
   After having accomplished research step #1 and #2 we analyze the specific treatment of PNG-shifts among different major commentaries (Duhm, Thiel, Lundbom, Holladay, Carroll). As a consequence, we are able to investigate the methodological presuppositions that are at work in the different commentaries. This allows a criticism of the respective approaches chosen.

4. Investigation into the diachronic and synchronic origins of PNG-shifts:
   In order to place our analysis into a correct perspective for further analysis, we need to find out whether our phenomenon originates rather diachronically or synchronically. Consequently, it is important to search through the treatment of PNG-shifts in the dominant text traditions of Qumran (2Q13, 4Q70, 4Q71, 4Q72, 4Q72a, 4Q72b) and the Septuagint. The question to be addressed is how far text transmission effects the presence of PNG-shifts: Are the PNG-shifts in the Codex Leningradensis paralleled in the Qumran fragments and the Septuagint? In case of deviations, can strategies of overcoming PNG-shifts be detected? Further the analysis of doublets in Jeremiah should shed light upon the question whether the implementation of foreign text-material did affect the genesis of PNG-shifts. The answer to these questions helps us to place our interpretation on PNG-shifts into the proper synchronic and diachronic dimensions.

5. Interpretation on PNG-shifts:
   Before our own interpretation on PNG-shifts is suggested we engage in a phenomenological comparison with and organization of all detected PNG-shifts in order to see where there are similarities and differences. This allows us to detect patterns of shifts, thus deriving coherence from the object and, as far as possible, not from the subject. Finally, we are able to propose an interpretation of PNG-shifts with some remarks on method.

0.5 Presentation procedure

In the presentation of our research we will follow a different procedure in order to share the fruits and not the pain of our labor. This also means that much of the data we are working with is not made available in
printed form. Instead, our text-syntactical analysis of the book of Jeremiah can be accessed via the WIVU database which is integrated in the present release of the SESB (version 3). The architecture of the text-syntactical WIVU database is explained in chapter 3. Due to reasons of space and practicality a complete overview on all PNG shifts of the book of Jeremiah is also not part of this printed book. The attached CD, however, will give the reader full and interactive access to our PNG shift database in the form of an Excel file. The architecture of this database is explained at the beginning of chapter 5.

This book then, presents its research in the following order:

1. **Chapter 1:** In the first chapter we present our methodological reflections. They contain a general phenomenological analysis of the processes and interrelated entities that make interpretation possible (we will call this phenomenon “Reason”)

2. **Chapter 2:** After our methodological reflections, we are entitled to argue for the need of a text-linguistic analysis of the book of Jeremiah. This is an indispensable first step to be taken by any exegetical methodology, independent of their specific operative frameworks of interpretation. Our attitude towards data as well as our treatment of data receives a clear expression in this second chapter. The analytical instruments presented will, however, not be exhaustive for a “complete” interpretation of textual data. This is because we present our text-linguistic analysis not as a complete exegetical methodology. To propose a complete exegetical methodology cannot be part of this dissertation as it involves the construction of an interpretation of Reason, implying the research into the fields of ontology and epistemology.

3. **Chapter 3:** After our methodology is laid out we confront the different commentary traditions and their treatment of PNG-shifts with our PNG-shift database (see 5.2) and assess their interpretations by means of our hermeneutical framework as developed in chapter 1. This results in the detection of - what we explain in our methodological reflections - the final and the formal condition of each respective commentary tradition. The basic difference between diachronic and synchronic approaches becomes visible.

4. **Chapter 4:** Chapter 3 has set the floor for decision taking with regard to the diachronic or synchronic nature of PNG-shifts. In order to arrive at a conclusion in this matter, we investigate Jeremianic doublets, Qumran fragments and the Septuagint. The question will be answered to what extent the textual transmission process and redactorial activities are responsible for the presence of PNG-shifts. Our conclusion helps us to put our phenomenological analysis of PNG-shifts into a nuanced perspective of diachronic and synchronic dimensions.

5. **Chapter 5:** Finally, we analyze from a synchronic perspective the distribution of the different PNG-shift phenomena within the book of Jeremiah and propose specific PNG-shift interpretations. Here we will strongly depend on our PNG-shift database and its shift indexation. As a complete interpretation on all PNG-shifts is only possible if operated with a rather complete exegetical methodology, our interpretative results remain limited, as they focus, as far as possible, on those types of PNG-shifts that appear in large quantity, i.e. have a large distribution.

---

88 Cf. Chapter 1.1 “Introduction”.

A theological interpretation is avoided in order to remain truthful to our method and to avoid unnecessary speculation.

6. **Chapter 6**: As we have achieved our aim to find a responsible initial way (method) of dealing with our specific data-case, we do not end without pointing out implications for Bible-translation and exegetical methodology. We will conclude that “a priori” phenomenological description of the textual material in terms of grammar and text-grammar is a prerequisite for an ethical reading of the biblical text in general. Such reading can make a great difference in how a problematic case like ours (PNG-shifts) is interpreted. A text-syntactical approach as first methodological step bears the chance that much of what is first experienced as awkward by the modern reader can now be understood as pointing at a systematism inherent to the ancient Hebrew language practice contributing to the communicational potential of a text. Our case then proves to have functioned as an excellent starting point for our methodological quest, while the analytic tools developed on the basis of our hermeneutic reflections have been able to deliver meaningful exegetical results that are consistent with the analyzed textual data.

7. **Appendix-A, Appendix-B**: Our text-linguistic research in chapter 5 will make use of the Stuttgart Electronic Study Bible (SESB). Several conclusions will be based upon the results of our constructed SESB-syntax-queries. The query results will be displayed as screenshots in Appendix-A. In digital form (CD) Appendix-B will be made available. This appendix will present both our text-grammatical analysis of the entire book of Jeremiah as well as our detections of PNG-shifts. This appendix serves as reference point and allows further research.
1 **Methodological reflections**

So far, we have made some preliminary observations about the written text (Jeremiah 21:11-14) and about dominant reading strategies that stress our, at present, unsatisfactory methodological situation. Our concrete case of PNG-shifts shows that the text contains many discourse problems for the modern reader. While this is one of the central first impressions of a naive reading, this impression is generally not shared by the reading strategies of commentaries that we have compared. In our example, neither Duhm, Thiel, Holladay, Lundbom nor Carroll perceive the discourse problematic participant reference-shift as a major problem for the understanding of the text. Besides, the text phenomena that are commented by the different commentaries express a noticeable selectivity that seems to be governed by their respective preconceptions about the text. The text seems to be prevented from being read as a discourse. But do we really need to conclude that the text can only be read as a puzzlement of true or wrong statements not necessarily connected to each other? Which are the presuppositions operative behind the applied interpretational-frameworks that generate such conclusions? Where are these presuppositions derived from? Why do they cause such blindness towards the textual data?

These questions are usually not answered. Recently, however, there have been some attempts to explicate and discuss the different methodologies on a more fundamental level. Manfred Oeming has tried to develop a “hermeneutisches Viereck” that allows to place the different methodologies in a conceptual framework. This approach is possible through his analysis of the “Phänomenologie des Verstehens”. Such a philosophic-hermeneutical foundation has not yet been formulated in the works of Jonker, Talstra and Barton; they rather focus on the architecture of the exegetical processes, than on the involved epistemological frameworks. Oeming explains that the understanding of the Bible is to be related to the understanding of any communicational process. It is, therefore, important to investigate the structure of the communicational process in order to be able to discuss and place the different exegetical methodologies. Oeming’s framework identifies four different factors in any textual communication process: The author, the text, the reader and finally the subject matter. The subject matter is communicated via the text by the author and searched for in the text by the reader. The reader’s and the author’s subject matter are not necessarily identical.

Although we regard the phenomenological approach as promising, we consider Oeming’s introduction of the “hermeneutische Viereck” as too simplistic since it lacks a in-depth description of his four components. Therefore, a presuppositional meta-reflection on the different methodologies is not made possible in his work. Oeming only places the different methodologies in the different four operative factors of responsible interpretational activity without discussing their metaphysical backgrounds. Thus there is no critical reflection about history, epistemology and ontology in Oeming’s approach.
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90 Oeming, 6.
91 Ibid., 5.
92 Ibid.
93 Ibid.
94 Ibid., 175-184.
A deeper investigation into the communicational structure helps to clarify the structural reader-text relation, (i.e. more generally speaking) the subject-object relation, that is involved in any act of generating meaning (interpretation). In order to find a legitimate approach for analyzing our PNG-shifts, we need to investigate the phenomenological structure of the subject/reader–object/text relation in general. This is achieved by falling back on our earlier work, in which we tried to compare Fernando Canale’s phenomenological analysis of Reason with Herman Dooyeweerd’s analysis of theoretical thought and tried to develop it further. We should be able, then, to deduce a method of analysis that is reasonable and meaningful for the study of participant reference shifts.

1.1 Introduction

There are diverse opinions about the meaning of a text. The question, then, is how this diversity of meaning is generated. Such a question demands the prior analysis of meaning itself. When we speak about meaning we mean the structural phenomenology of meaning and not an ontological pre-defined concept of meaning. Therefore we want to inquire into the structure of meaning and into what is needed in order to construct or “find” meaning. Meaning as the result of interpretational activity necessitates the interrelationship between a subject and an object. We will call the phenomenological structure of the interrelationship between subject, object and meaning Reason. Thus, there is no meaning outside of Reason.

Consequently, Reason is not meant in its narrow sense as an ability that pertains to human beings, a typically human cognitive potential or characteristic. Reason goes beyond the intellectual activity or logical thought of the cognitive subject. The structure of Reason is not the structure of the epistemic; the interpretation of Reason is not epistemology. At this point, we introduce the analytic work of Canale. For Canale, the realm of Reason is much wider: Reason is what makes meaning possible. Reason, therefore, includes all processes and structures by which meaning is constituted. Thus, Reason is not limited to, but includes rational analytic thinking. Different levels, factors and aspects (may) pertain to Reason. Canale speaks of Reason as being a whole, and the processes and frameworks it entails as being parts. This is important to understand, because when we introduce the hypotheticity of Reason, we do not refer to epistemology alone, but to all levels and processes of Reason.

The primary function of Reason, then, is to create and formulate meaning, i.e. to provide unity and coherence for what surrounds us and what is in us – to provide unity and coherence to the variety of being (entities). In order to make this clearer, Canale explains, that Reason can be described as something which
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96 Fernando L. Canale, Back to Revelation-Inspiration: Searching for the Cognitive Foundation of Christian Theology in a Postmodern World (Lanham, 2001), 45 (footnote #1).
97 Canale universalizes Reason to coincide with human knowledge. However, he does not want to be misunderstood as absolutizing reason. The absolutization can only take place when it is made a particular capability of human beings. Consequently, Canale criticizes the absolutization of particular reason as observed in the history of philosophy and particularly in classical and modern interpretations of reason. Universalizing the notion of Reason is, then, contrary to the particularization that can be found in the history of philosophy, where human reason is absolutized over against other human capabilities.
enables the expression of “meaningful words”. According to Canale, meaning is always logical in the broad sense of the term. This is the case as it is partly the product of human organization of data according to a specific principle that functions as the logic of understanding. Which principle is chosen is a subjective matter but a structural necessity for the operation of Reason to produce meaning.

To analyze Reason, then, means to analyze the constitution of meaning as meaningful knowledge. In order to prevent the adoption of an ideological starting point, Canale specifies his question in terms of a formal analysis. What is structurally needed by Reason in order to construct meaning? Only a phenomenological analysis makes it possible to uncover the given structure of Reason apart from the actual interpretation of Reason.

In contrast to Canale, we explicate the analytical activity involved in our analysis: The “logical” principle - by which the phenomenological analysis of Reason is made possible - is the formal analytic manner of distinction and the formal analytic manner of synthesis. The formal analytic manner of distinction gives access to the different parts of the processes involved in the construction of meaning, whereas the formal analytic manner of synthesis allows to make the existing structural interrelations between the different parts explicit, contributing to the construction of meaning. An explanation of the possibility of formal analytic distinction and synthesis in opposition to the material analytic distinction and synthesis is needed because our analysis does not develop a material concrete interpretation of the subject-object relation and does, therefore, not propose a specific ontology and epistemology. Such proposal demands a material cognitive principle. However, our analysis is of formal, phenomenological nature and only wants to investigate the structural subject-object relation that serves as the background of any concrete proposal on ontology and epistemology. Therefore, our analysis claims to be of a universal nature as it restricts itself to the formal level of logic. Our analysis consequently suggests that only “material” logic (necessarily involved in the interpretation of Reason’s structure) is grounded in a subjectively chosen logical principle, “formal” logic, however, has universal character. Again, the description of the structure of Reason is not the formulation of a theory of Reason (which necessarily takes place in the development of any ideology). Only a phenomenological formal analysis will make it possible to uncover the given structure of Reason apart from the actual interpretation of Reason.

1.2 Phenomenology of the Subject-Object Relation

We believe that there is an urgent necessity for a structural analysis of Reason, because it is only on the basis of a good structural understanding that a theory of exegetical methodology can be built in the full awareness of its presuppositions. We will proceed with a phenomenological analysis that is based upon our earlier work.

---

99 Ibid.
100 If a formal analysis would not be possible, suspicion will rise about the claim that the result of our phenomenological analysis is not ideologically influenced.
101 “Material” logic operates on the structural precondition of “formal” logic. In contrast to “formal” logic it is grounded in a specific Being-interpretation.
1.2.1 A GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE SUBJECT-OBJECT RELATION OF REASON

In order to create meaning, Reason needs a subject and an object. Both a knower (subject) and a known (object) are needed.

This relational structure is a priori ontic condition for Reason. In any philosophical endeavor, the interpreted subject-object relation is a necessary foundation for a detailed construction of a philosophical system. Thus, the basic framework of Reason is the subject–object relationship; it is this relationship that is the center of meaning. In the cognitive realm, i.e. the structure of Reason, the subject-object relation is at work. Understanding is generated by this relation, in both its general and its specific sense. “At work” means that both, the subject and object, need to contribute to their relationship in order to create meaning. There are two directions because of the two perspectives that are at work: the perspective of the object (direction: object  subject) and the perspective of the subject (direction: subject  object). From the perspective of the object, the communication of its ontic properties to the subject takes place. In this perspective, the subject is essentially receptive. From the perspective of the subject, the subject creates a logical image/idea of the object through its interpretative, i.e. cognitive, activity that enables the subject to grasp the object and co-produce meaning. In this perspective, the subject is essentially active although its activity is epistemologically dependent upon the onticity of the object. The interpretative activity of the subject supposes a framework by which interpretation is possible. Consequently, the contribution of the subject to the subject-object relation is based on presupposition. This means that in order to generate meaning, the subject always contributes with some content in the form of an interpretational framework. This content basically entails a foundational understanding of the general or specific subject-object relation.

Further, the activity of the subject (interpretation: Creating an image of the object) is dependent on the activity of the object (communicating its properties to the subject). The activity of the object is not dependent on the activity of the subject. However, in order to establish meaning, the structure of Reason needs the a priori relationship of subject and object as mutually contributing sides.

1.2.2 FRAMEWORKS OF REASON AS PART OF THE SUBJECT-OBJECT RELATIONSHIP

The epistemic potentiality of the subject and the ontic properties of the object need to be complementary, that means they need to unite in the same Logos. This is why the concept of the epistemic (epistemology) must unite with the concept of the ontic (ontology). The subject-object relation is communicative when the concept of the epistemic (epistemology) and the concept of the ontic (ontology) are complementary. The presuppositional content which the cognitive subject needs in order to make sense of the received
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102 By “general” we mean the world in its totality, by “specific” we mean any chosen aspect of reality.
103 It must be kept in mind that we regard Reason in its broad sense as it is not to be located in the cognitive subject alone, but embraces the object as well. Reason is therefore structurally seen not subjective, but integrates the subjective and objective contribution to the establishment of meaning and knowledge.
ontic information of the object, demands some basic frameworks for interpretation. In the phenomenological analysis of the structure of Reason, three main frameworks can be detected on the most basic level: A concept of reality (ontological framework), a concept of knowledge including a concept of the functioning of cognition (epistemological framework), and a concept of a system that provides unity and guarantees coherence (theological framework). The formulation “epistemological framework” indicates that Reason structurally needs a concept of the epistemic (epistemology) as a part of its realm (framework). The “ontological framework” points to the structural need of Reason for a concept of the ontic (ontology). The theological framework holds the epistemological and ontological framework in unity and coherence. Thus, the structure of Reason demands that the ontic, the epistemic, and the theos need to be interpreted in order to make Reason function.104

1.2.2.1 Ontological framework

Since the ontological framework is not an independent constituent part of the structure of Reason but a prerequisite for the functioning of the epistemological framework, it makes sense to discuss it first.105

The concept of ontic reality needs to include an understanding of how a being (entity) relates to other beings (entities), the so called part-part relations, and how the diversity of beings relates to the whole of beings, i.e. to Being as their basic common characteristic, the so called part-whole relation. The concept of the ontic strives for unity and coherence among the diversity of beings in order to establish a meaningful understanding of the ontic. The term “ontological framework” thus refers to the necessity of interpreting the ontic and not to any specific ontology. Consequently, the ontological framework is in need of an interpretation (a specific ontology) in order to let Reason’s structure function. Such an interpretation is only possible through the import of the idea of origin and the idea of Being (as we will see below). Being as the ultimate ground of being allows (not originates) the existence of entities, i.e. it is a necessary attribute for the existence of being. The idea of origin of the diversity of entity-beings is structurally needed in order to establish a meaningful concept of the ontic unity and the idea of Being is needed in order to establish ontic coherence. The idea of origin and the idea of Being are expressed through the idea of the ultimate. Ontology therefore needs the idea of the ultimate in order to derive its concept of Being and origin from which flows coherence and unity.106 Consequently, the ontological framework on which the epistemological framework depends, is itself dependent on the theological framework, in other words:
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104 The ontological, epistemological and theological frameworks of the phenomenological structure of Reason should not be understood as referring to an existing concept of the ontic, epistemic, or theos but to the structural necessity of formulating a concept of the ontic, epistemic and theos. Reason necessarily works by the “logicalization” or conceptualization of the ontic, epistemic, and theos. The formal interrelations between the three frameworks are “empty”. The investigation into the formal characteristics of the three frameworks brings forth their structural interrelations.

105 The epistemological and ontological frameworks need to be complementary in order to have a relationship. Without an ontological framework, the potentiality of the subject cannot be activated. The subject is therefore dependent on the ontological framework and its complementarity. However, we will need to speak of the objects transcendence in two regards. On the one hand (a) the object exists in ontic independence from the subject and on the other hand (b) the object is open in the sense that it does not hide, but communicates its properties in the structure of Reason. Because of this, the ontological framework in a way transcends the epistemological framework. The ontic can exist without the subject’s logic, but the epistemological framework cannot exist without the conceptualization of the ontic as ontological framework. (see Glanz, 54.)

106 Canale, 35.
The ontological framework communicates the ideas of coherence and unity from the theological framework to the epistemological framework.

One of the main features of the object in Reason’s subject-object relationship is its trans-objectivity.

1.2.2.2 Epistemological Framework

The cognitive activity that aims to construct an image of the object demands an interpretational framework, also referred to as “categories”. The categories of the subject enable knowledge and the constitution of meaning. They are the necessary concepts to enable the understanding of reality as it appears, and are therefore of presuppositional character. Categories can be understood as schemes that are needed to place the properties communicated by the object. Without the categories of the subject, a subject-object relationship is, structurally seen, impossible. The content of the cognitive categories of the subject is prior to the subject-object relationship. This content originates from previous cognitive activity in subject-object relationships. What the subject has received in the past from the object, is stored inside the subject as presuppositions and projected on the immediate objects. The ontological framework then provides the categories for the constitution of Meaning and the definition of objectivity.

Presuppositions in their broad sense refer to all the contents that are in the mind of the subject when the subject knows. Every new cognitive experience is incorporated in the presuppositional categories already existing in the mind of the subject. These categories are not of logical character only, but involve the complete diversity of experience including sensations, social memories etc. In this sense, the subject projects the past into the present. Through the phenomenological analysis that uncovers the three necessary and therefore structural frameworks among the many contents in the cognitive activity of the subject, Meaning, generated by the subject’s cognitive activity, always assumes a basic interpretation of these three frameworks. It can be seen that the structure of Reason (that embraces both subject and object) includes the interpretation of Reason’s structure in the subject! This is crucial to understand the analysis: The epistemological framework of the structure of Reason includes an interpretation of the structure of Reason. To put it differently: The global structure of Reason includes a particular interpretation of the structure of Reason within the subject of Reason’s subject-object relationship.

The subject makes the subject-object relationship meaningful by applying its categories. In order to apply the three frameworks of Reason, they need to be made complementary through a basic common logic. Thus, the same logic needs to be applied to all of the conceptualizations of the ontic, the epistemic and the theos. As shown earlier, the concept of the ontic relationship in the interpretation of the ontological framework of Reason provides the basis for the categories of the epistemological framework. Through the ontological framework, Reason finds the ground for its systematic nature in the actual content that is given to Reason’s structure (interpretation of the ontic). This can simply be seen in the fact, that all interpretations of the epistemological framework (epistemology) have a formulated concept of what the “object” or “objectivity” is. These concepts of the object are clear expressions of an interpretation of the ontological framework that is prior to any subject-object relationship. In this context we
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understand that the ontological framework is necessarily implanted in the epistemological framework, since the former provides the latter with the basis for the necessary (epistemological) categories.

By the cognitive categories (i.e. three frameworks of Reason), unity and coherence are created in the process of creating images of the objects through the cognitive subject. This leads us to the important conclusion that although the epistemological framework is grounded in the ontological framework, the subject interprets the ontic.\(^{110}\) This means that the concept of the object finds its origin in the epistemic capacity of the subject – any concept is of epistemic character. Here the circularity of the structure of Reason can easily be seen: The epistemic and the ontic do not exist without each other.\(^{111}\) This circularity or inter-dependence stems from the relational character of Reason itself. In any analysis of Reason, the subject-object relation is uncovered as a basic presupposition. As Reason embraces both subject and object, the origination of meaning cannot be located in either the subject or the object. Meaning has an intrinsically interdependent and relational character.

1.2.2.3 Theological framework

We have seen that both, the ontological as well as the epistemological frameworks point beyond themselves to the realm of the theological framework holding the ontic and noetic presuppositions. Any particular reality feature and any particular concept of unity and coherence is structurally rooted in the idea of the ultimate or theos\(^{112}\) as that concept that expresses origin and Being. Since it is on this presuppositional level where both reality and our concept of reality receive their directive structure, this function of the theological framework will be referred to as Reason’s direction (idea of origin) and Reason’s setting (idea of Being).\(^{113}\)

1.2.2.3.1 Reason’s direction: About autonomy

The concept of theos is therefore the ground for every unity and coherence in the subject’s framework of interpretation.\(^{114}\) The cognitive categories that establish unity and coherence through the interpretative act of the subject are derived from the concept of the ontic reality whose unity and coherence is founded in the idea of the theos as its ultimate origin. One of the formal functions of the theological framework is to express a specific theos to have a status of independence in contrast to a dependent being that finds its
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\(^{110}\) This means that in regard to the epistemological framework we need a noetic presupposition that allows the order in the argumentation of the material structure of ontic reality (cf. Roy A. Clouser, The Myth of Religious Neutrality: An Essay on the Hidden Role of Religious Belief in Theories, revised ed. (Notre Dame, 2005), 15-16.). On the ontic side, the ontic presupposition functions as the autonomous starting point (resembling the theos part of Reason) for the ontic order, unity (part-part relations) and coherence (part-whole relations) of reality. On the epistemic side, the noetic presupposition functions as the autonomous starting point (also resembling the theos part of Reason) for the logical order, unity and coherence of our conception of reality.

\(^{111}\) Canale does not formulate this so clearly, but this conclusion flows naturally from his distinction between the “ground” and “form” of the systematic nature of Reason. The functioning of the systematic nature of Reason is determined by the epistemological framework, while the ground of the systematic nature of Reason is determined by the ontological framework.

\(^{112}\) Canale explains that “theos” is just the theological expression of the secular philosophical concept of “the One”. From a Christian perspective “the One” is called “theos” while from a secular perspective “theos” is called “the One”. Canale, 63 (footnote #1).

\(^{113}\) The term “Reason’s direction” is chosen as it refers to the direction given to Reason by Reason's origin (the subject, the object, and the possibility for their relationship). The “backward direction” to the self’s origin determines the understanding of Reason, the “forward direction” in the operation of Reason allows for further rational expression of Meaning.

\(^{114}\) Ibid., 48-49.
interpretation in the ontological framework. The structural independence of the theos guarantees the existence of ontic and epistemic unity. The formal ontic dependence on the idea of origin shows - in the relation of the ontological framework to the theological framework - that the ontic dependence is accompanied by a formal epistemic dependence on the idea of origin. Without a material starting point, meaningful explanations and conceptions about reality are impossible. Thus, the formal structural relation between the theological and ontological/epistemological frameworks – in regard to its part-part relationships – is of independence-dependence character. In the construction of any philosophical or scientific concept, this structural relation must necessarily be interpreted as it is recognized throughout the history of philosophy.

1.2.2.3.2 Reason's setting: About Being and foundational ontology

However, theos not only functions on the level providing Reason's direction which allows the being and the conception of the dependency relation between particular ontic objects. Theos also enables the necessary ontic part-whole relation and its interpretation through its expression of Being. Thus the idea of theos always co-occurs with an idea of Being. The meaning of Being can be found in the existence of every being, as they relate meaningfully in coherence and unity. However, Being is not understood as a container within which reality takes place but as “an overall quality shared by everything real”\(^\text{120}\). Being is “not a thing in which all other things have their being” and does not “appear or is given to us as a ‘thing’, but co-occurs with all things as a basic characteristic of their being”\(^\text{121}\). Being cannot be understood as origin of what-is but as adjunct to all that exists (including theos). Therefore, Being does not exist “by itself nor apart from what-is”\(^\text{122}\).

This is the right moment to return to our earlier observation of the formal inter-dependency of Reason's frameworks: Every framework depends on the other two frameworks. Although the theological framework formally serves as the source of coherence and unity for all concepts by articulating the interrelation between the frameworks of Reason, it is not independent. This does not imply that the theos is dependent but that the concept of theos is not independent, since it implies a basic ontological

---

\(^{115}\) See Clouser, 9-58.

\(^{116}\) Theos functions on a formal level as the independent origin of the dependent ontic reality as well as the origin of the epistemic ideas of coherence and unity. This is also true for pantheistic thought as Clouser has shown (see Ibid., 48-50.). Consequently, the relation between independence status of the theos versus the ontic and epistemic dependence status of creation has a universal formal character and needs to be interpreted. Contrary to Canale, who sees the theos formally only functioning as the source of articulating coherence and unity (cf. footnote no. 138), we, therefore, suggest that independence appears and can be argued for not only on the level of the interpretation of the formal components of Reason but on the level of the formal structure of Reason.\(^{117}\)

\(^{117}\) Compared to Clouser the theos on which the ontic and epistemic are dependent, functions as noetic and ontic primary belief (cf. Glanz, 84.).

\(^{118}\) We regard the conclusion for the need for an interpretation of this structural relation as Dooyeweerd's great achievement. As Geertsema shows, this structural understanding can stand independent of his specific argument he developed on the basis of his modal theory and within his dimensionality of Reason (cf. H. G. Geertsema, "Dooyeweerd on Knowledge and Truth," in Ways of Knowing: In Concert, ed. John H. Kok(Sioux Center, 2005), 85.).

\(^{119}\) Canale, 68..

\(^{120}\) Fernando L. Canale, Basic Elements of Christian Theology (Berrien Springs, 2005), §38 b.

\(^{121}\) Ibid., §38 a.

\(^{122}\) Byung-Chul Han, Martin Heidegger: Eine Einführung (München, 1999), 11, 13.

\(^{123}\) Canale, 71 (footnote #1 - here Heidegger is quoted).
content (Being) while serving as the ultimate expression of the ontological framework. That's why Canale's phenomenological analysis reveals foundational ontology as the ultimate cognitive reference in the structure of Reason.

All three frameworks (epistemo-logical, theo-logical, and onto-logical) are structurally built upon Logos as Being. Consequently, Logos itself lies beyond the interpretation of all three frameworks. What information must the minimum content of Logos be like? And where does that minimum content come from – where does the logic of the Logos come from? Canale tries to answer these questions by referring to Heidegger, who argues that “… -logy hides more than just the logical in the sense of what is consistent and generally in the nature of a statement […]. In each case, the Logia is the totality of a nexus of grounds accounted for, within which nexus the objects of the sciences are represented in respect of their ground, that is, are conceived.” It is very important that “ontology, however, and theology are ‘logies’ inasmuch as they provide the ground of beings as such and account for them within the whole. They account for Being as the ground of beings. They account to the Logos, and are in an essential sense in accord with the Logos, that is they are the logic of the Logos.” Consequently, we argue that the logic by which we conceptualize the ontic, epistemic and theos is grounded in a Logos that is basically identical with the ground of being as Being. If we want to find out what the content of that Logos is, we need to search for the nexus that is present in all three frameworks. We need to go beyond the three frameworks of Reason’s structure and search for what they share as a unity. Through the theological framework, all frameworks imply a logic whose categories are grounded in the basic interpretation of the ontic as Being, i.e. an interpretation of what is necessary for existence, i.e. foundational ontology. Because of their logical character, all three frameworks imply the same foundational ontology. Foundational ontology accounts for the complementarity of the frameworks. Here the phenomenological analysis arrives at its most foundational point. The Being as foundational ontology is the minimum content of being, and at the same time Being embraces all human concepts.

When we refer to Being as ground or foundation for any interpretation of Reason, it should only be understood as necessary condition for the generation of Meaning. Being should not be confused with the role theos is playing. Being is not the origin of the ontic but a basic adjunct for the possibility of being. Nevertheless, it can be said that Being as the primordial presupposition has the function of theos, in the sense, that coherence is established from it. The difference is that the dimensionality is not the logic by which all frameworks are interpreted but the Logos of the logic. This means that Logos goes beyond the theological framework that functions in the interrelation with the other frameworks of Reason as origin of coherence and unity. The Logos then finds expression within the concept of theos.

124 It is important to see that in the phenomenological structure theos cannot be seen as the origin of the ontic. Phenomenologically, theos needs to be seen as the principle of articulating the ontological and epistemological framework. The understanding of the theos as the origin of the ontic reality belongs to the “material” side of the formal phenomenological structure of Reason. Formally, the theos functions as an empty concept, that does not require the notion of creation.
125 Logos and Being are identical in Canale's work. (Glanz, 51.)
126 Canale, 52 (footnote #2).
127 Ibid., 51.
128 Ibid., 72-73.
129 By “primordial” Canale means the basic characteristic that conditions our understanding of what is real (Canale, §38.)
We can say that the concept of Being is the first and last concept on which all other concepts are built. There is no concept that can go beyond the concept of Being. The phenomenological analysis, therefore, finds the borderline between Being and the concept of Being. There is no reasoning beyond Being but all reasoning starts with a concept of Being. The concept of Being functions as an unconditional whole to which all the other cognitive categories and frameworks of Reason relate as parts. This is why there is a necessary minimum concept of Being at work in the interpretation of being. Present in every understanding of being, the concept of Being has an overarching meaning. The presence of Being as concept in the human mind is necessarily assumed in the constitution of all meanings and the interpretation of all the presuppositional frameworks of Reason. The very nexus of all three frameworks is found in foundational ontology, because the Logos shares in all of Reason’s frameworks. When the different concepts of the foundational ontological level of the structure of Reason are uncovered, we will discover the different contents it has been given in the history of philosophy.  

Reason’s systematic nature shows that the coherence of meaning flows from the concept of the whole (basic understanding of the ontic) to the concept of the part (understanding of an object) rather than the other way around. The phenomenological analysis of Reason reveals that the meaning of the whole is not only determined by the meaning of part-part relationships (whether on the level of dependent entities or the independent entity as theos). Rather, every part finds its own particular meaning in relation to the meaning of the whole. Consequently, the cognitive subject needs to be backed up by a basic understanding of the whole (i.e. a world view or cosmology) in order to establish a meaningful subject-object relation. Such a basic world view enables the subject to create a meaningful subject-object relation, because it can formulate a coherence and unified idea of the object. The concept of the theos, the theological framework, ultimately guarantees and articulates the complementarity of the subject-object relationship because the theos is the origin of this relationship.

As we recognize that theos not only functions by providing a noetic and ontic starting point (i.e. Reason’s direction) for beings as well as the conceptualization of the dependence-independence relationship of particular entities but also functions by providing an understanding of Being, we will use the term Reason’s setting to refer to this latter function. This function then allows to explicate the necessary inter-relatedness in terms of unity and coherence between all beings.

1.2.2.4 Reason’s hypotheticity: In need of material frameworks

Phenomenological analysis has arrived at two borderlines. Beyond the description of Reason’s setting and Reason’s direction, no further analysis is possible that goes beyond the ultimate ground of Reason’s phenomenology. Since no material interpretation can be derived from the formal structure of Reason, the self is responsible for providing its noetic activities with an idea of Reason’s setting and direction. It is the combination of the choice for foundational Being and for the foundational idea of origin that expresses the

---

130 In a further step of his phenomenological historical analysis, Canale shows what different interpretations have been suggested with regard to foundational ontology in the course of the history of philosophy. Time and timelessness are uncovered as the two possible interpretations of Reason’s dimensionality in which philosophy has thought so far. Such a historical analysis was necessary since a further phenomenological analysis would not have uncovered the material interpretation of Being. The material content of the interpretation of Being can only be discovered through a historical analysis (Canale, 85 [footnote #1]).

131 Ibid., 47.
primordial presupposition of Reason’s structure. The freedom of the subject then is expressed in its choice for its primordial presuppositions that will guide the course of its thinking.¹³²

The spontaneity of the subject is the most profound philosophical responsibility of the human subject. From a phenomenological point of view, it is in the formal structure of the self where the ontic and epistemic realms come together in a radical dependence on their common origin. This structural dependence of the concept of the subject on its origin emphasizes that self-understanding, being dependent on an understanding of the self’s origin (theos), is a basic formal condition of the structure of Reason. That the ontic and epistemic structurally come together in the subject implies that self-understanding - being dependent on an understanding of the self’s origin - directly influences ontological and epistemological conceptions and allows their unity.¹³³

Since the primordial presupposition both affects the unity and coherence of all three frameworks of Reason’s structure and is spontaneously chosen, we conclude that, at its very core, Reason is of a hypothetical character.¹³⁴ Hypotheticity thus, pertains to the whole of Reason’s structure. Consequently, we are right in stating that ultimate meaning is not grounded in knowledge in the strict sense of logical deduction, but in a “postulate” or “faith”.¹³⁵ This “postulate” or “faith” is necessary for Reason’s functioning and therefore part of Reason’s formal structure – which means that the self participates in a specific idea of theos. Foundational ontology and the idea of origin are the conditions of knowledge and build the ground floor of the whole rational system. It is this primordial presuppositional framework, brought to the subject-object relationship by the subject that predominantly determines the means and end of the process of creating an image of the object.

1.2.3 The hermeneutical task

In our view, the diversity of interpretations of a certain subject matter does not necessarily result from false reasoning or evidence. The structure of Reason makes us understand that the differently chosen dimensionalities of Reason partly determine the specific interpretational result. However, a detailed descriptive knowledge of the object of interpretation is necessary for a successful communication between object and subject. Consequently, true understanding and overcoming disagreements require both an analysis and evaluation of the deeper presuppositions operative in the interpretational framework of the subject, and thorough knowledge of the objective data. After the phenomenological investigation into the structure of Reason, the question why we disagree on an identical subject matter (e.g. PNGshifts in the

¹³² Ibid., 24, 73. The spontaneity of the subject, however, is not only responsible for the choice of the primordial presuppositions but also for the interpretation of all a priori conditions or hermeneutical presuppositions, i.e. the basic interpretation of Reason’s frameworks, that are required on the subject-side for the constitution of knowledge (see Ibid., 57.).

¹³³ Meaning implies the unity of the self since the diversity of being is not experienced antithetically but coherently. The formal description of the structure of Reason will consequently include the unity of the subject as a formal structural fact. The interpretation of this unity-subject-fact, however, is received from the theological framework since the idea of unity is to be located within the theological framework, as it originates there.

¹³⁴ Besides the primary choice for a definition of Being, the decision to choose one of the three frameworks as starting point for the interpretation of Reason is as well of purely religious character. The first religious decision, then, concerns Reason’s setting or primordial presupposition. The content of Reason’s setting will either be guessed by or revealed to the subject. The subject’s second religious choice concerns the formal direction of the circle of dependencies, rooted in the epistemological framework (e.g. Kant), the ontological framework (e.g. classical philosophers) or theological framework (e.g. Canale).

¹³⁵ Cf. H. Dooyeweerd, A New Critique of Theoretical Thought, 4 vols., vol. 1 (Lewiston, 1997), 11., and Canale, 56, 65, 73.
book of Jeremiah) calls for a hermeneutical investigation\textsuperscript{136}. The hermeneutical approach allows us to see the deeper motives behind conflicting interpretations and helps us to become aware of the foundational perspectives from which interpretations depart. Overcoming disagreement requires a careful review of the relevant evidence and rational processes (e.g. the [in]coherent application of the interpreted frameworks of Reason) through which we arrive at our conclusions. Such a careful analysis will help to uncover the different perspectives on the same subject matter.\textsuperscript{137}

\textbf{1.2.4 Method}

As the most foundational structure of Reason, the subject-object relation serves as the point of departure for the analysis of different interpretations.\textsuperscript{138} Human understanding moves from the interpreting subject to the issue or thing that is interpreted. The human act of interpretation therefore has a beginning, a movement and an end. The beginning is represented by the subject and its chosen interpretational perspective (presuppositions). The end is represented by a particular issue contained or expressed by the object, or the object in general.\textsuperscript{139} Consequently, the movement is the process by which the subject interprets the issue or object.

Any attempt to achieve understanding, whether in form of science, philosophy, or naive thinking, takes place within the structural relation between subject and object. We understand this relation as a methodological one: It is method that relates the subject with the object.\textsuperscript{140} As its most distinctive characteristic, method then, as “following a certain way”, needs to be understood as “Reason’s action”.

\textbf{1.2.4.1 Methodological conditions}

All knowledge, structured by the subject-object relationship, is thus the result of method as action. Canale claims that there is no meaning or knowledge outside of Reason. In order to understand the object we employ principles, rules, and procedures. For the sake of clarity, Canale introduces the concept of “method as action”.\textsuperscript{141} Method as action implies that method has the basic structure of action involving cause and condition. Action cannot take place without being caused or without certain conditions.\textsuperscript{142} The “cause” of the hermeneutical method is found in the subject. The subject’s causation is, however, not autonomous but dependent on and conditioned by the object. Canale detects three aspects that condition any method-action: the \textit{material}, the \textit{final}, and the \textit{formal}. The material aspect represents the data that are researched to understand a certain aspect of the object (subject matter). The material aspect is the material object under study, it is the object side’s condition of any method-action. The final aspect represents the specific aspect of the object (subject matter) that the subject tries to understand. Different subject matters can be approached by the study of a single object. The formal aspect deals with the hermeneutical patterns


\textsuperscript{137} Ibid., 8.

\textsuperscript{138} Ibid., 5.

\textsuperscript{139} Ibid.


\textsuperscript{141} Ibid., 370-371.

\textsuperscript{142} Ibid., 371-375.
that are used in order to process the material or data. The formal side is the subject’s interpretation of Reason as its condition of method action.

The variety of methods (ways) stems from the aspects of methodological conditioning (material, final, and formal). Canale distinguishes two categories of variety: *structural* variety and *hermeneutical* variety. The structural variety of methods is needed in order to do justice to the diversity of objects (material aspect) and subject matters (final aspect). The hermeneutical variety of methods points to the formal aspect of any act condition. The formal aspect is the hypothetical character of Reason’s structure and lies therefore fully on the subjective side as the subject’s contribution to the subject-object relation. The hermeneutical variety originates from the different interpretations of hermeneutical principles, i.e. the different interpretations of Reason’s framework. The formal aspect thus does not specifically belong to the essence of a scientific discipline, but to the very essence of human thinking.

**1.2.4.2 THE FORMAL CONDITION**

Along with Canale, influential-thinkers in the realm of theology point to the hermeneutical nature of the diversity of interpretations. People like Küng and Kuhn argue for the influential a priori structure of paradigms, which undergird scientific and theological pluralism. According to Küng, Kuhn, and others, these paradigms determine the results of theological and scientific work. Through the distinction between theological thinking and presuppositional a priori, they want to shift the theological dialogue from the doctrinal level to the a priori level of epistemology. Canale supports this shift, but recognizes that it does not yet give a full explanation for the variety of paradigms involved. The concept of paradigm does not yet represent the most fundamental level of Reason’s structure. As we have pointed out, the interpretation of the epistemological framework itself is dependent on foundational ontology as dimensionality of Reason. A real criticism of the theological discourse, a real uncovering of the hidden motives and decisions therefore requires an awareness of the content of the foundational ontological level.

Consequently, as the formal aspect of act-condition includes the interpretation of Reason’s frameworks, it contains Reason’s dimensionality as its *setting* and *direction*. This primordial level will be called level “system”. The system is the ultimate horizon and ground for the development of any paradigm.

We understand with Canale, Küng, and others, “paradigm” as the interpretation of Reason’s frameworks. There are two important theoretical distinctions in the formal aspect, referring to two presuppositional levels: The formal level of system and the formal level of paradigm.

1. On the level of system, i.e. Reason’s dimensionality (setting and direction), there is
   a) the formal condition of Reason: “Systematism”.
   b) and the material interpretation of this formal condition: “System”.

The formal condition of Reason expresses the systematic nature of Reason as Reason’s dimensionality. We are confronted with this systematic nature at the moment where we arrange the available data into a system according to a principle. This principle of arrangement then expresses the systematism of Reason and allows the development of a coherent view on the data observed.

---

144 Ibid., 199-200.
145 Ibid., 204-205.
2. On the level of the paradigm, we also find
   a) the formal condition: “Methodological matrix”
   b) and a material interpretation of this formal condition: “Paradigm”.

   The formal condition of the paradigm needs an understanding of how knowing functions (epistemology), of what can be known (ontology) and of what creates coherence between the two (theology), in order to have a clear viewpoint for the interpretational endeavor. This formal side or matrix needs to be identified and interpreted so that methodologies can be developed for the different subject-object relations.

   In analyzing any understanding, whether of scientific, philosophical, or naive character, we need to distinguish the three conditional aspects of method.\textsuperscript{146} The relation between the final and the material aspect is of great importance. However, the chosen object to study a specific subject matter can give a hint about what kind of formal aspect is involved.\textsuperscript{147} Further, awareness of the two different levels of the formal aspect, system and paradigm, provides orientation in the analysis of scientific results.

   The hermeneutical analysis must first uncover the final and material aspects and then search for the underlying paradigm of the methodology.\textsuperscript{148} When the epistemological, ontological, and theological perspectives of the paradigm and their determinist influence on the data within the conditions of the final and material inputs are understood, the analysis proceeds by searching the foundational ontology, that undergirds the paradigm. In the end, every hermeneutical investigation should strive to lay bare the chosen dimensionality of Reason and the source of that choice as either being faith in a final guess or faith in final revelation (cf. 1.2.2.4).

   The various theological disciplines with their various subject matters need to share the same interpretation of systematism and methodological matrix if they want to create real unity within structural diversity.\textsuperscript{149} There is an urgent call for presuppositional unity in the face of growing ideological diversity and the continuing fragmentation of the theological discipline. As ideological diversity increases, structural diversity is in danger of losing its independence and justification. A unified basic ontological foundation is needed in order to not lose the coherent structural diversity, i.e. the interdisciplinary connections between the different scientific enterprises.

### 1.3 Phenomenology of the Biblical Text as Object

The reflection so far has the purpose of understanding the structure of Reason and its effect on our interpretative activity. Understanding the processes of interpretation equips us with the tools for critically assessing the different treatments of PNG-shifts among commentators. However, our study so far has clearly shown that a thorough understanding of the object's phenomenology is a prerequisite, in order to do justice to the object of interpretation. We therefore investigate the phenomenological structure of the biblical text prior to any reflection upon the presuppositions (formal conditions) implemented in any of the interpretations of PNG-shifts of the different exegetical schools. Unless this is done, a clear distinction

\textsuperscript{146} Canale: 371-375.
\textsuperscript{147} Canale, 11-17.
\textsuperscript{148} Canale: 387-389.
\textsuperscript{149} Ibid., 375-387.
between the material, final and formal conditions of method is impossible. We therefore continue to answer the question of “What is the text as phenomenon?”. 

So far, we have spoken about the object in general; we now have in focus the material object of biblical exegesis in specific: The biblical text. When the exegete focuses on the biblical text, another question needs to be asked. Which biblical text? Do we focus on the biblical text of the Greek tradition, the Latin tradition, the Syriac tradition or the Hebrew tradition among others? Or do we first focus on reconstructing speculatively the most ancient version possible of the text, as if the earlier was the more valuable? Many decisions are possible – but on which ground? Is it a matter of authority (e.g. orthodox Christianity: LXX; protestant Christianity: MT), a matter of originality (the LXX text is much older than the Hebrew MT), or a matter of pragmatics (e.g. the LXX was the Bible of the first Christians and the Jews of the 1st century AD; the MT was the Bible of the Vulgata and the Protestant Christians in the time of reformation).

Regardless of the decision which text tradition or scholarly reconstructed text is taken, any chosen object is a concrete text, sharing the phenomena of a text. This is important to take into account, since first the biblical text as such is to be understood as phenomenon before we can come to a decision “which particular text” should be analyzed. Thus, when describing the text as phenomenon, we do not have in mind a concrete biblical text or text tradition. Rather, we attempt to describe the biblical text in abstracto as any biblical text. Through our description of the text as phenomenon, we become aware of the different aspects any biblical text contains, allowing us to chose both a specific concrete biblical text of a specific text-tradition, be it ancient or modern-critical, and a specific method for approaching the text.

1.3.1 Text as phenomenon

As we detect the different phenomena of the text, it is important to register that they do not exist independently from each other. It is difficult to explain one phenomenon in separation from the other phenomena as they refer to each other and depend upon each other. Therefore, certain overlappings in our description can be expected.

The graph below displays the different phenomena which the biblical text exists of. These phenomena are described briefly in the following paragraphs.
1.3.1.1 No text without language

It is essential to texts that they consist of language. Language belongs to the realm of communicative activity and has a systematic side (langue) and the pragmatic side (parole) of language competence. On the systematic side of language there are the rules of phonology, morphology and syntax. On the side of language competence, we find the selective application of the language system in the concrete communicative activity. Texts can only communicate well if both its author and its reader have some language competence, knowing how to apply the language system.

The question from where the language receives its systematic nature is answered differently by language theoreticians and language philosophers. It is a matter of the formal conditions applied, how the textual phenomenon of language is understood. Platonic influenced approaches argue for the human universality of language systematism.\(^{150}\) In contrast to the universalistic approaches, the phenomenon of language systematism has been interpreted by the formal condition of neo-Kantianism as well. Here, language systems are not conditioned by innate universals but by specific culturalizations, and are, therefore, by definition relative.\(^{151}\) We see that - dependent on the applied formal condition - the textual phenomenon “language” can be interpreted differently, which can affect the overall interpretation of textual meaning.\(^{152}\)

\(^{151}\) Ibid., 167-214.
\(^{152}\) As a good example for the dependency on a formal condition can serve Doukhan’s reflection on the common VSO (predication-subject-object) order in biblical Hebrew. Obviously, formally conditioned by the Sapir-Whorf thesis, he argues that the standard VSO order of Hebrew syntax reflects the predominance of “action” over “philosophical thought” (cf. Jacques Doukhan, Hebrew for Theologians : A Textbook for the Study of Biblical Hebrew in Relation to Hebrew Thinking (Lanham, 1993), 192-193.). Choosing the formal condition under which generative grammarians are operating, the language phenomenon of VSO order in Hebrew syntax will be interpreted in a different way. The Hebrew phrase order will be seen as a variation within the set of an
1.3.1.2 No text without meaning

When speaking about the meaning of a text, we need to specify the different types of meaning that can be identified with the idea of textual meaning. A phenomenological analysis of the interrelation of authors, texts and readers reveals a variety of meaning-types expressed through or with a text. The work of Van Woudenberg helps us to detect four different types that are present when we speak of the phenomenon of meaning as constitutive of the existence of the biblical text:\(^{153}\)

1. **Referential-meaning:** A text refers to something. Words and sentences receive their meaning as they refer to real or fictive entities and situations in and/or outside the text.\(^{154}\) The question to be asked in order to come to the referential meaning of a text is “Which entity and/or situation does this text/word refer to?” The nature of this question is both historic and text-linguistic.

2. **Functional-meaning (illocution):** A text fulfills a certain function. By means of a text the writer wants to achieve something. A text, then, performs a certain function (calling for repentance, declaring somebody guilty, informing about something, etc.). The question to be asked in order to come to the functional-meaning of a text is “What response does this text/sentence call for?” Again, the nature of this question is both historic and text-linguistic (e.g. participant tracking).

3. **Intentional-meaning:** An author has an intention with a text. The intentional meaning can be different from the functional meaning. An author who intents to mislead or lie to his readers will have a different intention than the function of his text expresses. The question to be asked in order to come to the intentional meaning of a text is “What are the author's intentions?” The nature of this question is of historic psychological character.

4. **Effective-meaning (perlocution):** A text has certain effects on something or somebody. The expression of a text has some “emotive effects” often rooted in the “way of speaking” and not in the “what of speaking”.\(^{155}\) The question to be asked, in order to come to the effective meaning of a text is “In which way does/did this specific text influence its readers?” The nature of this question is historic as well: What effect did this text have upon past and present readers?

In that sense, we follow Van Woudenberg's suggestion, that it is better not to use the word “meaning” in relation to texts but rather to speak about the the effect (perlocution) of the text, the referential power absolute universal grammar, being of no significance for the exercise of any world-view. No world-view difference, then, can be attached to the fact that we find languages that handle a VSO in contrast to a SVO order. See here Liliane M. V. Haegeman, *Introduction to Government and Binding Theory*, 2nd ed., Blackwell Textbooks in Linguistics (Oxford, Cambridge, 2005), 13-18; William D. O’Grady, Michael Dobrovolsky, and Francis Katamba, *Contemporary Linguistics : An Introduction*, Learning About Language (London, New York, 1997), 214-218.

On a more general level the function of finite verbal forms do receive different grammatical functions depending on the formal conditions that the grammarian applies. Classically, the verbal system of ancient and modern languages is understood from the Platonic and Aristotelian „tempus” perspective. Harald Weinrich, *Tempus : Besprochene Und Erzählte Welt*, 6th ed. (München, 2001), 11-12, 15. Weinrich shows, *how the interpretation of the grammatical* function of finite verbal forms is effected if the ancient formal condition is exchanged by the formal condition under which the existential philosophy of Bergson and Heidegger operate (temporal ontology). See Ibid., 16-17.

\(^{153}\) René Woudenberg van, *Filosofie Van Taal En Tekst* (Budel, 2002), 9-17.

\(^{154}\) This does not apply to all words, as some words (e.g. conjunctions) do not refer to any entity but have only syntactic function.

\(^{155}\) Ibid., 51-52.
of a text, the function (illocution) of a text or the intentions of the author. A text contains and generates different meaning-types. Consequently, methodology needs to make explicit what kind of meaning types it investigates in what way. As we will see in the following section the different meaning types are interrelated with different other being-aspects of the text.

1.3.1.3 No text without author

Texts not only consist of the component “language” or “meaning” but presuppose necessarily the existence of an author. However, although the text is in his mind, the author is not easily found in the text. The reason for this phenomenon is that the relation between the author and the text is not an ontic but an epistemic one. The onticity of the text does not lead us to the onticity of the author but to the material of parchment, papyrus, etc. Thus we cannot detect the author by means of a DNA analysis or fingerprints left on the textual documents we analyze. However, the ontic disconnection between text and author does not necessarily lead to the absence of the author (be that the writer, be that the divine inspirator of the writer), but only to the ontic absence of the author. Epistemically, the text still attests to the existence of his author by containing intentional and referential meaning. Detecting intentional and referential meaning allows – to a certain degree – the reconstruction of the epistemic world of the author.

As we speak about intention and reference we cannot do that without acknowledging that text production is a communicative act, demanding that an author and a reader share in a communicative situation as a “common location”. This common location consists of a linguistic infrastructure that allows the understanding of references and intentions (even if the author is the only reader of his text, he belongs to a community of language convention which allows his soliloquy). Consequently, the development of a text demands that there is a communicative commonness between author and reader.

There are basic aspects that establish this communicative commonness:

1. The linguistic system, i.e. the system of grammar, semantics and communication.
2. The pragmatic norms, i.e. the social competence of a specific realization of the language system.
3. The referential system, i.e. the world the text refers to (text-externally).

It is especially the latter that causes problems in the understanding of an ancient biblical text, since we do not share the text-external referential context with the author in an ontic sense. Although this referential context might possibly be reconstructed through archeological findings and other textual artifacts, it remains an epistemic and therefore hypothetical reconstruction. According to Ricoeur, the temporal distance causes three specific problems when reading an ancient text:

---

156 Ibid., 114.
158 A careful investigation of the relation between the speech generating act and the speech act can be found in Nicholas Wolterstorff, Divine Discourse : Philosophical Reflections on the Claim That God Speaks (Cambridge, New York, 1995).
159 It is important to keep the limitations in mind that come with any attempt of reconstruction independent of diachronic factors. As Grondin points out “Sprachangewiesenheit des menschlichen Denkens und die Einsicht in die Grenzen einer jeden sprachlichen Aussage” belong to the universal hermeneutical phenomena. See Jean Grondin, Einführung in Die Philosophische Hermeneutik (Darmstadt, 1991), 58, 75.
160 Ibid., 188.
161 Paul Ricoeur, Interpretation Theory : Discourse and the Surplus of Meaning (Fort Worth, 1976), 25-44.
1. Dissociation of the text from the author: The written text gets independent of the author’s intentions (autonomy of the text in regard to its author). The meaning of the text can no longer be controlled by the author.

2. Dissociation of the text from the group of readers: The difference between reader and listener allows a never ending history of interpreting a specific text. While a spoken text is read to a limited group of listeners (special target group), a written text can be read by anybody who has access to it. The question whether one can become a part of the target group often remains open.

3. Dissociation of the text from the referential system: The text cannot any longer refer to the situation/event/person that both, the author and the reader (in contrast to the speaker and the listener) share. The question whether one can become part of the referential context often remains open here as well.

All three points influence the perlocutionary potential (effect-meaning) of any ancient text. Therefore, the human author cannot have any longer direct influence on the perlocutionary result of his text. The specific content of the perlocutionary act is especially influenced by the referential system. The questions of the *Sitz im Leben*, the historic situation and the psychic condition of the author belong to this referential system. The role of the author as a constitutive component of the existence of the biblical text can be interpreted differently. Several understandings of the author's role have been developed in the history of reading. The main reasons for these dissimilar conceptions lie in the diverse applied formal conditions. We will elaborate on this later.

### 1.3.1.4 No text without context

As there is no autonomous author, the text – testifying the author's ontic condition – not only has the author as his originating context. The language and contents of text have a specific socio-cultural context which the author is part of. It is therefore important for any attempts of understanding not to explore the textual being aspect “author” without its interrelation with the text’s context. Here “context” should not be taken in its narrow sense of other parallel existing texts. Rather, the context refers to the political, historical, ideological and aesthetic embedding of a specific text. It is the context in this rather broad sense that establishes the outside-the-text-world of reference, i.e. *Sitz im Leben*. Since we receive most of our vocabulary, our grammar, phrases and idioms from our socio-historical context, neither writing nor reading are autonomous actions, i.e. context free. In this sense, post-structuralists and de-constructivists are not entirely mistaken. Language has been there before the author’s communicative act of text production. However, to postulate that authors are dead since neither they nor the reader can dominate language is an interpretation that rests on a specific interpretation of Reason's structure. Whatever Reason's interpretation turns out to be, phenomenologically, texts do not exist without authors. Thus, the meaning of text cannot be regarded as self-contained in the text only. “The meaning of a text is not something that is cut off from and made independent of the actions involved in producing and interpreting a text.” A text is therefore not understood by universal logics, but by historic investigation.

---


163 Wolterstorff, 172.

164 Walhout, 66.
This will help to clarify what is characteristic of a specific text (“das Eigene”) and what belongs to the common characteristic of the context (“das Gewöhnliche”). Thus, questions of the cultural-historical relative and the ideological absolute are placed within this aspect of the text as phenomenon. It is here where we can detect agreement and intense critique between biblical literature and non-biblical religions.

To do justice to this phenomenon, every methodology needs to allow the investigation of the context of a text. It is this central matter which has caused much of the present debate on historiography (cf. 1.4.1.4) and demands a critical assessment of material, final and formal conditions of method.

1.3.1.5 No text without “external” referentiality

A phenomenological description of a text always contains a referential structure. Words are necessary in order to establish the referential structure of a text. Two different referential structures characterize the being of texts: Internal and external references. The internal referential structure gives an immediate access to the reader. Relative pronouns, repetition of proper names, and personal pronouns create a web of references in the text contributing to the unity feature of a text. Here the referential system constitutes the world of the text. Thus language projects a world with its relational web. However, we do not mean the internal reference by the phenomenon of “external” referentiality, it will be discussed later (see 1.3.1.9). We rather point at the external referential structure between the text as signifier (signifié) and the author’s world as the realm of the signified (signifiant). This representational structure indicates the relationship between the projected world of the text and the actual (inhabited) world of the author whether fictive or real. However, when we talk about this specific referential structure, we want to keep distance from a philosophical pre-definition of reference and remain phenomenological.

The present structuralistic “denial of referentiality stems from the desire to avoid the metaphysical problems that focus on the relationship of language to reality.” It would far exceed the limitation of this dissertation to discuss the metaphysical problems at stake, but we nevertheless need to acknowledge that the text as phenomenon does raise this question, and this question belongs to the existence of the text. The

165 See Talstra, 21-23, 112-117.
166 Ibid., 17.
167 Ibid., 25.
168 Walhout, 74.
169 Our description of “external” reference should therefore not be confused with the classical idea of mimesis or modern idea of reference. In Plato’s and Aristotle’s perspective the world is imitated by a textual world. Thus the constructed text-internal world reflects the text-external world. However, with the modernistic epistemological framework, the real world is not approachable but only the sensible world. As a consequence, the idea of mimesis was transformed in modern literature studies by the idea of reference. Here, a text does not try to imitate reality but refers back to a state of affairs in the sensibly appearing world. The modern problem with mimesis is, that there are so many differing views of the actual world, how then can we say that the imagined world is an “imitation” of the actual world? Which actual world is meant? As long as the actual world was conceived as a stable and knowable entity, the concept of mimesis could flourish. With the post-modern loss of the autonomy of human ratio one tried to establish the autonomy of the text. The text then becomes independent of the relativity of the subject’s worldviews and traditional interpretations of the text. However, this is not the only reason for the departure of the classical reference-theory. Also the functional shortcomings of language philosophic theories of both the classical and modern period have motivated the development of new perspectives. See here Woudenberg van, 20-31.
170 Walhout, 73.
description of the phenomenon of reference should serve as a background for any deeper metaphysical reflections. Phenomenologically seen, language “designates objects or states of affairs in a descriptive way”\textsuperscript{171}, of what ontological nature these objects are, depends on the interpretation of Reason’s structure. We therefore do not use the classical understanding of mimesis but use “external referentiality” as describing the “designating function of language”\textsuperscript{172} – contrary to classical mimesis that is concerned with the relation between words and reality. The referentiality of the text then, does not necessarily need to represent the actual world but can also represent the possible world as well.\textsuperscript{173} Whatever hermeneutical (naive or sophisticated) formal conditions are at work, we need to acknowledge, on account of the phenomenological structure of Reason that the produced world of the text (or more limited: the world picture), as model of reality, could not be understood if the reader and author had not already a preconceived understanding of being and of the world. In that sense, the “actual world” is not - from our phenomenological perspective - the real world in the Aristotelian sense but the “interpreted, i.e. experienced world” of any subject. Consequently, the worlds that are projected in a text, whether fictional or not “can only be imagined in relationship to the actual world as the author experiences and construes it”\textsuperscript{174}.

Again, external referentiality as a phenomenon of the being of the text can receive different material interpretations. The platonic influenced understandings deviate to a large extent from structuralistic understandings as they contribute different formal conditions to their understanding of referentiality.

As mentioned above, referentiality is constructed by means of the semantic quality of words.\textsuperscript{175} Similar to paintings, they express a subject-matter. However, texts differ from paintings since their subject-matter is not communicated by the rational of painted images but by the rational of language. In order to have access to the connotative meaning of words, one needs to share in the specific Lebenswelt of the user of language - who is distant in our case. In regard to denotation, we have an easier access, since the reference of denotations can often be shared by present readers since they live in the same general world.\textsuperscript{176} Since both, connotation and denotation, can be complex, it is their specific arrangement in the syntactic structure of a sentence that narrows down and specifies the meaning of a word. Still under-determination is often present.

\textbf{1.3.1.6 No text without readers}

Although there are enough texts that are lost and are not read by their intended or unintended addressees, at least the author of the text was its first reader. In the context of biblical texts, we can speak about masses of past and present readers which have caused and allowed the dynamics of text-transmission and

\textsuperscript{171} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{172} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{173} Klaus Brinker, \textit{Linguistische Textanalyse Eine Einführung in Grundbegriffe Und Methoden}, Grundlagen Der Germanistik (Berlin, 2005), 110.
\textsuperscript{174} While in classic ideological conceptions the actual world as the real world was unchanging, in the post-modern conception of reference, the projected world of the text is unchanging, while the actual world of generations of readers is changing continuously (see Walhout, 77-78.). In that sense the authority of the text is re-established, since it is the text that has the potential to change our actual world, as we re-interpret our world, by means of the textual projected world. In that sense textual worlds can function as interpretative framework for our present world.
\textsuperscript{175} It must be kept in mind that not all words function as being referents. (See Woudenberg van, 23, 27.)
\textsuperscript{176} Cf. O’Grady, Dobrovolsky, and Katamba, 273-283.
text-reception as inherent phenomenon of biblical texts. In this sense, the presence of active readers is also found in the biblical testimony. However, we mean to describe the phenomenon of the necessary role of the reader for establishing a text as a text. In his reading process, the reader functions as an active constituent for the becoming of a text on two levels:

1. **Constituting referential meaning:**
   Section 1.3.1.5 shows that a text exists by its external referentiality. Words are tools to establish this referentiality. They must be used by the reader in order to activate the referential being aspect of the text. Meanings of words can change due to social, cultural, and religious context but this does not imply that the reader is free to project any world from the text. The establishment of referentiality is guided by several coherent meaning-producing dimensions of a text. These dimensions are established by syntax- and text-grammar (illocutions, deictic elements, discourse types, etc.) and include the text-internal referentiality (established by pronouns, proper names, etc.). If the reader’s projection is not guided by these dimensions of meaning, his reading will become illegitimate.

2. **Constituting grammatical meaning:**
   As the reader searches to be guided by grammatical devises he encounters grammatical under-determination as well. In those cases, the linguistic material is not able to establish its own grammatical determinacy. The reader actively needs to cohere the text at places where it does not determine itself. Textual under-determinacy as a part of every text – as post-structuralistic analysis has shown – calls for the active participation in creating a meaningful text. Thus, a text is per definition a coherent sequence of sentences. A text does not exist before the under-determinate gaps are necessarily overcome and cohered by the reader. In case of our PNG-shift phenomenon, we can say that they initially seem to be of under-determinate character calling for the active participation of the reader in order to create the text while reading Jeremiah. However, the reading needs to be responsible as it does not contradict the determinacy of a text when cohering its under-determinacy. The solution to the under-determinacy needs to match the text’s determinacy. In that sense “the necessary creative activity of the reader does not indicate that literature and meaning are essentially dependent upon subjective perception.”

Exegetical methodology consequently needs to make explicit the determinacy of a text as well as its under-determinacy. They serve as necessary prerequisites to enable the reader to fulfill his central functions by “responsibly” constituting coherence among the text material, that makes the text a text.

### 1.3.1.7 No text without telos

To describe *telos* as a textual phenomenon calls for clarification. “No text without telos” is not to be equated with “the (intrinsic) telos of the text”. At this point we speak about two different kinds of teloi:

- On the one hand the (intrinsic) telos *of the text*;
- On the other hand the telos *of the author*, noticed

---


through the text (if the author communicated well). This fundamental distinction is better understood when the phenomenon of “intentionality” and “action” is introduced.

As the author is the initiator, the beginning of communication, the text as means of communication resembles a written speech act. Any action receives its initiation on purpose,179 which also applies to the action of writing. Thus every text analyzed is supposed to have a more or less specific purpose by the author (asking, informing, promising, etc.).180 The speech action theory calls this dimension the “illocutionary force”.181 Through texts the author tries to influence the reader in a certain way within the process of communication. The purpose of having influence is an intentional act. In this sense, texts are instruments of intentional actions.182 Consequently, we can argue that the function of a text is received from the intention of the author, i.e. what he wants to accomplish by means of the communication-process.183 As I mentioned earlier, text-functionality and author-intentionality do not need to be identical.184 This is especially the case when the author wants to mislead the reader, by hiding his real intentions. In the case of the biblical text, the authors are not available anymore and most of the time, their real intentions cannot be reconstructed with certainty. In that sense, as no further historical investigation can be performed, the text – objectively seen - only contains text-functionality as the author’s intentionality remains hypothetical.

In order to discover text-functionality, we need to keep in mind that any communicative action has relational character and is therefore based upon relational norms. Within a speech community, these norms are expressed through grammatical and pragmatic rules. Thus the author’s intentions can only be accomplished when the author and the reader share the same understanding of a certain normativity of writing (and speaking). Only under these common conditions and rules, certain speech acts can be conducted. The socio-cultural conditioning of grammatical and pragmatic rules is relevant for the analysis of the locutionary and the illocutionary aspects of speech-acts. While the locutionary act consists of any grammatical correct expression and therefore is based upon the systematic conventions of language (phonology, morphology, syntax, text-grammar), the illocutionary act exploits the locution and attaches with the help of language competence (pragmatics) a specific functionality to the text. Any illocutionary act then presupposes a locutionary act. Thus, when we speak about text-functionality, we refer to the telos

179 Walhout, 120.
180 Every text contains many different illocutionary acts (e.g. recipes have an informative and appellative function). Nevertheless a text usually has one dominant illocutionary act (e.g. in recipes the appellative function is dominant); all the other different illocutions serve the dominant illocution of the text passage. Therefore, it is important to analyze the illocutionary structure of the text by means of segmenting the different existing illocutions and understanding their relations towards its other. The analysis of the illocutionary acts attempts to discover the textual structure as a hierarchical structure of speech acts. The dominant illocution reveals the main function of the text as communicative act (Brinker, 97-100.).
181 Walhout, 67.
182 Ibid., 90.
183 Bühler’s organon-model is still the basic tool for classifying textual functions (Karl Bühler, Sprachtheorie : Die Darstellungsfunktion Der Sprache (Stuttgart, 1999), §2. The model clarifies three basic functions of products of communication: (a) “Darstellungsfunktion” (symbolization of reality for the recipient), (b) “Ausdrucksfunktion” (symptomization of the inner self of the communicator for the recipient), (c) “Appelfunktion”(signalization to the recipient). Since our work does not attempt to analyze the functional structure of textual communication in depth but strives to describe the ontic being-structure of a text, we see the “Darstellungsfunktion” as belonging to the textual being-aspect “referentiality” and the “Ausdrucksfunktion” as belonging to the textual being-aspect “author”. The “Appelfunktion” is regarded as belonging to the textual being-aspect “telos”.
184 Brinker, 91, 101; Woudenberg van, 80.
that a text is supposed to achieve in a specific communicational situation for which it was designed. We
do not necessarily speak about the function the text has for the author, i.e. the author's telos. Text-
functionality is transported by the normativity of writing. But it is important to understand that the
illocutionary act (e.g. appellation) is not necessarily determined by or deducible from grammatical
formality (e.g. imperative) created by a locutionary act. The analysis of the illocutionary act then
necessarily transcends the grammatical analysis and enters the realm of pragmatics. Consequently, the
analysis of illocutionary acts demands language competence by which one knows how to use (pragmatics)
the rules and conventions that were established by a specific process of socialization with regard to the
systematism of language (grammar).

When it comes to the analysis of the main illocutionary functions of a text as a coherent unity, we not
only need some general information about the linguistic socialization-context of a specific text. The
answer to how the many illocutionary acts are organized, i.e. what are the main, minor or supportive
illocutions, in order to investigate the main illocution of a text, (i.e. the text-function), we often need to
know something about the interest and psychic condition of the author.\textsuperscript{185} Thus, not only knowledge
about the normativity of writing but also knowledge about the individual biographic context of both
authors and intended readers are needed in order to uncover the text-function in many cases.
Consequently, in relation to biblical texts, we often need to speak of the under-determination of the
illocutionary acts.\textsuperscript{186} Therefore, it is the reader's task to cohere the text on the basis of its grammatical
determinacy. The reader must use his knowledge about the characteristic grammatical constructions used
for the performance of speech acts. Usually, the interplay of mode, tense, number, person and gender
make a clause identifiable as specific clause-type which often indicates the related illocution (on clause
level we speak of minor illocution).\textsuperscript{187} On a higher scale of main illocutions the rhetoric design of a text
often needs to be brought in focus, as it often collects the different minor illocutions into a greater whole.

\textbf{1.3.1.8 No text without reception and transmission}

With regard to the biblical text, the contemporary reader needs to become aware that he is not the first
reader but that he stands in a centuries-old tradition of reception.\textsuperscript{188} This is an important
phenomenological aspect of biblical texts. It is this tradition of reception that allowed the tradition of the
text (selecting, translating, copying). The tradition of reception has also left its marks on the tradition of
the text. These marks are visible in the differences between ancient and modern manuscripts and
translations. To which extent the history has left its marks on the text is a matter of interpretation causing
much debate.\textsuperscript{189} The debate is characterized by the different interpretations of the function and character

\textsuperscript{185} Brinker, 97-98.
\textsuperscript{186} Van Woudenberg speaks about underdetermination when a certain sentence can have different illocutionary functions as he
explains by means of an example: „De uitspraak ‘Het is koud hier’ kan de illocutionaire kracht van een bewering, een
beschuldiging, een aanwijzing etc. hebben. We kunnen hier spreken van de onderdeterminering van de illocutionaire kracht door
de zinsbetekenis.” (Woudenberg van, 79.).
\textsuperscript{187} A 1P subject with a future tense predication often equals a proclamation; a 2P subject with an imperative tense predication
often equals a command.
\textsuperscript{188} Talstra, 13.
\textsuperscript{189} Hardmeier puts it well by saying “Die Frage ist nicht ob es Diachronie gibt oder nicht, sondern die methodische Frage, wie
„man den actus tradendi und seinen Niederschlag im traditum‘ auf die Spur kommt.” Christof Hardmeier, Textwelten Der Bibel
Entdecken : Grundlagen Und Verfahren Einer Textpragmatischen Literaturwissenschaft Der Bibel, 2 vols., Textpragmatische
of authors, redactors and copyists. The different interpretations are again influenced by the material condition of method (knowledge of data) and the final condition of method (specific interpretation that is given to Reason’s structure). According to Van Seters’ critical analysis of the idea of the redactor, we nevertheless need to acknowledge that the biblical text can have many additions and interpolations that it received in the process of transmitting the text.\textsuperscript{190} We can conclude from the material data so far that the tradition of readers did not only deliver the biblical text to us but also a large amount of biblical interpretation contained both in- and out-side the text.

The question then is, whether the contemporary reader should adhere the former understanding of the text. Is the past understanding more true just simply because it is closer to the time of the text genesis? Or are present attempts of understanding more true since they are more sophisticated and historically oriented? We observe a strong discrepancy between, on the one hand, the historical critical attempt to understand texts from the perspective of their original functionality and, on the other hand, the reception-tradition, which attempts to make texts of the past relevant for the present situation.\textsuperscript{191}

The traditional reading and understanding of the text is not only found in extra biblical literature, but within texts of the Old and New Testament as well. For the development of any exegetical methodology, the present reader requires “ein Nachgehen” of “leestraditie en traditieproces” in order to get acquainted with the rationality of the process of text tradition.\textsuperscript{192} If there is no text without reading, we need to register the importance not only of the \textit{act of making} but also of the \textit{use of texts}. Here we again enter the great world of the subject as reader but this time the subject is enclosed in the text as it is received through the process of tradition. To which extent and in what way the reception of a text is contained in the biblical text must be answered on the basis of the available data and the material interpretation of Reason.

1.3.1.9 No text without discourse

In the beginning we described “language” as a necessary constituent of the being, of a text, we now turn to the being of a text as discourse, leading to the question of “why language and discourse should be distinguished”. In classical grammars as well as in language systematic approaches, the sentence is considered to be the highest level of grammatical realization.\textsuperscript{193} The later 20\textsuperscript{th} century saw a change when communication-oriented approaches were developed by text-linguists. With “no text without discourse” we point at the need to take grammar beyond the syntax level.\textsuperscript{194} Consequently, we disagree with the classical attitude that beyond the sentence-level, textual unity is only established by means of rhetoric and pragmatics. Rather, we must point out that there is grammatical organization present beyond the sentence-level that enables the text to be. It is the text-grammar that systematically connects the sequence

\textsuperscript{190} John Seters van, \textit{The Edited Bible : The Curious History of the “Editor” in Biblical Criticism} (Winona Lake, 2006), 398.
\textsuperscript{191} Talstra asserts that “De bijbelse traditie is kennelijk niet gegroeid via historisch correct tekstgebruik. [...] binnen het Oude Testament is te zien dat de traditie groeit via toepassing en toeigening en niet via historische analyse.” (Talstra, 20-21.).
\textsuperscript{192} Ibid., 21.
\textsuperscript{193} Brinker, 13.
of sentences into a coherent unity, establishing the basis for any discourse. Thus a text which severely lacks coherent sentence sequences cannot be regarded as a text. Thus a sentence sequence is perceived as text when grammatical, thematic and functional coherence can be detected.

1. **Text-grammatical** coherence is established by means of the following elements:
   a) **Syntactic coherence:**
      i. Verbal form-coherence (action/time/perspective): They function by organizing narrative or discursive text units, creating units of foreground and background information, and giving a perspective into the past-present-future flux of time.
      ii. Conjunctions (and, also, or ...): Their copulative function brings the sequence of sentence into linear and hierarchical unity.
      iii. Adverbs (therefore, nevertheless, rather ...): They function by connecting clauses into a logical sequence.
   b) **Resumption:**
      The many types of resumption create the referential network that contributes to the grammatical coherence of the text as unity.
   c) **Semantic-contiguity:**
      Although two different words can refer to two different extra-linguistic objects, they establish relations of contiguity among each other as they can share specific semantics fields. Basically, we can distinguish between *logical* contiguity (e.g. cause-effect, aim-means, problem-solution), *ontic* contiguity (e.g. group-members, process-progression), and *cultural* contiguity (e.g. city-church, NL-EU). Systematic text-organization makes use of these contiguities to support textual coherence.

---

195 Brinker, 17.
196 A sentence is valence-theoretically defined (predication stays central) and consists of an illocutionary and propositional part. The sentence then needs to be considered as the central coherence-unit. It is the linear sequence of such units that has the potential to create textual coherence. (cf. Ibid., 18.)
When we judge a text as lacking coherence, we mean those texts that remain to a large extent incoherent after the reader has compiled the grammatical (syntax and text) determinacy and semantic contiguity patterns of a specific text (cf. 1.3.1.6). In those cases the text can be made meaningful only by the implementation of a large amount of subjective and highly hypothetical ideas about the origin and function of a text.
197 Ibid., 12.
198 The specific potential of verbs with regard to action/time/discourse-perspective differs among the different languages (Foley, 38.). However, what they all have in common is a potential to provide grammatical orientation within the reading process and thus contribute to the textual coherence.
199 With regard to biblical Hebrew Schneider has outlined the basic discursive functions of clause-types for narrative texts. His work has been further developed by Talstra and will function as an important aid to orientation for our own text-phenomenological study. See Eep Talstra, "A Hierarchy of Clauses in Biblical Hebrew Narrative," in *Narrative Syntax and the Hebrew Bible: Papers of the Tilburg Conference 1996*, ed. E. J. van Wolde, Biblical Interpretation Series (Leiden, New York, 1997).
200 Articles can establish textual-coherence as they mark language signs referring to something already known earlier in the text. It can also be that the article marks language signs referring to some text-external knowledge. Resumption can also take place through ana- and kataphoric pronouns (personal, relative, demonstrative, possessive, reflexive, ...) by means of a certain PNG congruency establishing a participant-reference coherence.
201 The use of semantic word groups does not exclusively refer to the lexical-text-internal information but can as well refer to the lexical-text-external information (that Melanie is also a teacher, is not told by the dictionary, but is extra-textual knowledge). In
2. **Thematic coherence:**
The text as discourse is not only established on the basis of the systematism of text-grammar. But text-grammar is used as a basis to notice the theme and function of a discourse. Technically seen, the discourse is established when a theme-coherence and text-function-coherence is connected to the grammatical organization of the text. By theme-coherence we understand the cognitive coherence being developed between sentences by their share in themes, subject matters, participants and propositions.  

3. **Functional coherence:**
By functional-coherence we understand the sequence of illocutions usually transported by locutions. These illocutionary acts relate logically to each other towards a hierarchy (main illocution and supportive illocutions) that co-establishes the textual unity.

These three levels contribute to the establishment of a text as discourse and are consequently a necessary constituent for the being of any text.

### 1.3.2 Summary

We have phenomenologically described the different aspects by which the biblical text exists. These aspects form the different possible final conditions for any exegetical methodology. Similar to the different constituents of Reason, the constituents for the being of the biblical text are interrelated as well.

---

that case we can distinguish between text-immanent and text-transcendent semantic relations being anchored in the encyclopaedic experience of the author.

---

202 Thematic organisation can take place via different techniques, among the most important we find: descriptive, narrative, explicative, argumentative techniques. The number of times a particular participant is referred to in a given text can often give a thematic orientation for the reader for determining main and minor subject-matters of a text.

203 See 1.3.1.9.

204 See 1.3.1.7.
The different constituents are interrelated in such a way that each aspect only exists by the presence of all other aspects.²⁰⁵

How these text phenomena are methodologically integrated is highly dependent upon the specific interpretation given to the structure of Reason. As an example, no responsible methodology ignores the aspect of the author as essential part of the text-being, but this text aspect will be interpreted differently as different hermeneutical presuppositions are chosen on the basis of the material interpretation of Reason. In order to become conscious of this relation between the material interpretation of the structure of Reason and the interpretation of the textual phenomena, we will sketch some examples in the next section. This enables us to develop our own methodological starting point for the analysis of PNG-shifts and our critical assessment of exegetical schools in their treatment of participant reference shifts.

²⁰⁵ The displayed arrows are examples of the interrelation of the different textual being-aspects.
1.4 Interpretations of Textual Phenomena (The Object from the Subject’s Viewpoint)

It is the task of the philosophy of history to describe what kinds of interpretations are given to the structure of Reason and can, therefore, not be fully carried out in our chapter on methodology. However, we need to sketch the main lines and discover its influences on the interpretation of textual phenomena. This step is indispensable for our critical assessment of interpretations of PNG-shifts by exegetical schools, as it will help us to trace the application of their formal condition.

1.4.1 Methodological Consequences of Reason’s Interpretation and the View on the Text as Object

There is a risk to simplify the relation between method, data and the interpretation of Reason. On the one hand, the simplification takes the shape of presenting methodologies as being determined by Reason’s interpretation, i.e. the formal condition of method is absolutized. This simplification can often be found in orthodox or rather fundamentalistic writings on method (cf. 2.2.4.2.). However, schools of exegesis are not understood properly when only reduced to their philosophical presuppositions. On the other hand, the simplification takes the shape of presenting methodologies as being determined by the data, i.e. the material and final condition of method (cf. 2.2.4.1.). This simplification can often be found in modernistic exegetical methods like the history of religion school. A critical examination of both methodological presuppositions and biblical data shows that methodologies are sometimes more, sometimes less influenced by the biblical data or philosophical presuppositions.

With this in mind we try to see how the formal condition of method (the interpretation and dimensionality of Reason) has influenced the interpretation of the textual being aspects as described in chapter 1.3. For our purpose, we are keenly interested in the phenomena of reference, author, reader and history.

1.4.1.1 The Doom of External Reference

When we speak about the doom of external reference, we do not mean the loss of mimesis but the different specific interpretations that have been given to this phenomenon of textual being. However, the structural signifier-signified relation can be interpreted differently. In biblical criticism, the understanding of the signifier-signified relation often directly effects the important structural relation of “what it meant and what it means”. The specific understandings of both relations are directly influenced by the formal condition of method.

---

206 See Klaus Popa, “Method, Data and Hermeneutical Presuppositions : A Limited Analysis of the Relation between Method, Data and Hermeneutical Presuppositions in Rhetorical Criticism, Rhetorical Critical School, Narrative Criticism and Text Linguistics.” (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, 2007), 134-144.

207 Barton, 21.

In the classical epoch, the Alexandrian and Antiochian treatments of the text delivered two different formal conditions for their biblical criticism. But both have in common that they operate on the basis of the initial reference-meaning of words as being of physical and extra linguistic nature.209

1. Alexandrian school:
The formal condition of the Alexandrian school cannot be understood without its Hellenistic source. After Greek philosophy has equated the divine with the rational logos, the divine nature of classical literature needed to be reinterpreted since it did not fit the philosophic ideas and ideals of morality, unity and aesthetics.210 Consequently, there was a need to re-interpret the naive understanding of the signifier-signified relation of traditional literature.211 This re-interpretation endeavored to rationalize the myth by a process of allegorization.212 In the reading practice of Philo, the mind-body duality of Greek ontology serves as an important part of his formal condition.213 Scripture is considered to be only the bodily expression of something that is much deeper and referring to timeless truth. Since religion deals with the spiritual and timeless realm of reality, scripture should not be taken literally.214 It then is the allegoric interpretation that gains access to the real (spiritual) word and message of the written word. In consequence, the literary word embedded in the syntactic organization is lost out of sight since the main focus is on the universality of allegory.215 Philo’s access to scripture was then adopted by the Christian Alexandrian tradition of reading as reflected in Origen’s typological works.

For Origen, typological reading of the OT law and messianic prophecies are clearly guided by Philo’s reading216. But he did not connect his formal condition explicitly with Greek ontology as he did with his theological standpoints that he believes to have derived from the NT (e.g. dissolution of OT law). Origen’s legitimizes typological reading, where a historic understanding of the text (e.g. prophecies) is not possible. Nevertheless, there is a tendency in Origen’s work to universalize the typologic-christocentric reading of the OT. Here we see that the literary meaning

209 Oeming, 12.
210 Oeming, 12.
211 Oeming, 8.
212 Although allegoric reading had been applied to the great Greek epics before the metaphysical change in Greek thought took place (in order to make relevant the great past for the present condition), it has later been used in an apologetic sense by Greek philosophy in order to legitimize the existence of traditional literature. The same use of allegory can be seen by Philo. See more detailed Grondin, 40-43.
213 Although Philo proposed that the allegoric reading should only be applied when the text itself would make explicit that an allegoric reading is needed, in his reading he makes the allegoric reading so prominent that he almost universalizes the allegoric interpretation.
214 In general - as Philo - the Stoa, until the patristic age, generally accepted that religion has to do with the symbolic realm of reality being something indirect and mysterious.
215 Ibid., 45.
of the biblical text is given up for the sake of Christian spirituality. As a consequence, the distinction between typological and allegorical reading is difficult to uphold. This tradition of reading is later systematised in Cassanius’ quadriga and used by Christian traditions for centuries.

2. **Antiochian school:**

Although the Alexandrian and Antiochian school unite in the material and final condition of exegetical action, they differ widely on the formal aspect of action. For Diodor of Tarsos, Theodor of Mopsuestia, Johannes Chrysostomos, and Theodoret on Kyrrhos, the meaning in the biblical text is not of allegorical-spiritual nature but of literary nature. The formal condition is not derived from Greek ontology with its body-soul dualism but from a temporal-supranaturalistic ontology. In consequence, the biblical text does not need to get spiritualized in order to become meaningful. The main focus is on the historical and grammatical reading backed by a strong defense of the literal reading of the text. This is, however, not always easily accomplished. Since the meaning is located in the text, the need of textual criticism plays an important role. The signifier-signified relation consequently is interpreted differently. In consequence, for the relation of “what it meant – what it means”, meaning is not generated by a spiritual actualization act but by remembrance as an act of participating in the historical path walked by God and his people. The Antiochian tradition is reanimated by the Protestant reformation, when a radical affirmation of ordinary temporal life and a dis-affirmation of the allegorizing of scripture takes place. There is a conscious attempt to return to a biblical formal condition in deciding to use the Bible’s temporal dimensionality of Reason as hermeneutical framework for exegetical work.

Thus, Luther, Melanchton and Flacius regard the study of rhetoric, dialectics and grammar as essential for reading (sensus literaris) correctly and not for speaking correctly (vs. allegory). The modern historical critical studies (hcm) follow the Antiochian tradition of reading.

3. **Augustinian school:**

The Augustinian reading plays an important role in the further development of the exegetical discussion. His way of interpretation cannot easily be assigned to one of the dominant classical readings. What distinguishes Augustine from Antioch as well as Alexandria is his introducing
the psychic reality to the process of interpretation. The differentiation between the psychic I (with its language of the heart) and its written texts (material reduction of the heart's expression) becomes essential, as every expression finds its motivation in something that is not expressed materially. The task, then, is to transcend the material reduction of the word in order to arrive at its psychic origin - the language of the heart. Finally, Augustine, adds to the art of text reading a further dimension to the signifier-signified relation: The idea that the psychic reality is to be regarded as the true origin and ultimate reference of words. In the further development of exegetical reflection, the reference relation to the psychic self and the “outside” world dominate the signifier-signified debate.

In the modern period, the textual phenomenon of mimesis experiences a further turn. The historical critical method (from now on also “hcm”) can only be understood on the basis of both the historic-grammatical method of the reformation on the one hand and the rationalism of the enlightenment period on the other hand. When obvious textual difficulties and contradictions are cohered in the Alexandrian tradition by means of allegory or typology and in the Antiochian tradition in a rationalistic/apologetic but supra-naturalistic way, it now is cohered with a rationalistic-naturalistic ontology. What has changed is basically the formal condition of action. In the field of systematic theology, the classical timeless Being conception becomes a dominant part of the discipline serving as Reason’s setting, while in the field of exegetical action, historicism replaces the idea of a personal God with his specific Heilsgeschichte and functions as Reason’s direction. In this way, Hegelian philosophy functions especially in the supplementary hypothesis as formal condition.

In consequence, the signifier-signified relation cannot be interpreted naively in favor of the spiritual reading of the literary text. The text no longer refers to the narrated history in real but to the socio-historical context of the origin of the text and its function. The “what it meant” is reconstructed by a rather naturalistic perspective as the most prominent historical critical principle of correlation shows. This has an impact upon the “what it means” side of the “what it meant – what it means” relation. Within the Christian setting, meaning cannot any longer be identified with “what it meant”. The world of “what it meant” is basically primitive, immoral and supra-naturalistic. The “what it means” then is an intellectual transition of “what it meant” into a meaningful theological concept that is of value for the present condition of human living. According to the naturalistic formal condition of the historical-critical method, “what it meant” is generated by historical reconstruction, and is of a descriptive nature, while itself is exercised. In this regard Augustine stands closer to the Antiochian tradition than to the Alexandrian tradition.

Taylor, 127-142.  
Grondin, 56-57.  
Canale, 390.  
Hasel, 11.  
Ibid., 30.
“what it means” belongs to the part of creative theological interpretation and is in contrast to “what it meant” of a normative nature, i.e. dogmatic nature.\textsuperscript{230}

With the Kantian revolution, the classical ontology of objective reality is given up. As a consequence, words no longer refer to external objective material realities but to subjective universally imagined realities. In this line, the Augustinian signifier-signified dimension was rekindled in the \textit{romantic epoch}, with Schleiermacher as most prominent representative. With the linguistic turn of \textit{postmodern thought}, the subjective universally imagined reality is given up which leads to the loss of a common, universal ground for the subjectively imagined reality. The human race no longer shared the same projection of reality causing “den Wegfall der Frage nach der Wahrheit sprachlicher Äußerungen”.\textsuperscript{231} This automatically led to the deconstruction of the role of the author. The meaning of words is not any longer controlled by a universal reference (whether of subjective or objective nature). Consequently, language is not any longer controllable, even not any longer controlled by references. Vanhoozer puts it this way:

“For Derrida, authorial intention is always frustrated by language rather than fulfilled by it. The language system is more fundamental than an author’s use of it. Language is as deep, and as powerful, as an ocean; and the speaker, like a swimmer, finds himself or herself carried along by currents beneath the surface. Far from enjoying mastery over the sign, the author, at best, only copes with them, and is dragged under and engulfed by them at worst.”\textsuperscript{232}

Signs do not refer any more to imitated things nor to imitated imaginations but to nothing else but other signs. This system of signs, then, is prior to any act of speaking and thinking. In a sense, language substitutes the metaphysical position of God.\textsuperscript{233}

\subsection{1.4.1.2 The doom of the author}

In the course of modern history, the Cartesian turn to the self has created a new interpretation of the author as constituent of textual being. As a direct consequence of the new formal condition of modernity, meaning gets equated with the author’s intention.\textsuperscript{234} In the supra-naturalistic formal conditions of the classical period (whether of Antiochian or Alexandrian nature) such an understanding of the author is not present. The meaning of linguistic expression is not of dominantly subjective character. The biblical texts

\textsuperscript{230} From the perspective of our phenomenological analysis of Reason we can see that the “what it meant” analysis is very much dependent upon \textit{Reason’s direction}. In the case of historical-critical-method neo-Kantian positivism is working as \textit{Reason’s direction}. The “what it means” is very much dependent upon \textit{Reason’s setting}. This can nicely be observed in the many OT theologies that operate with a timeless Being as \textit{Reason’s setting}. Here many theologians are involved in processes that are characterized by selectivity and abstraction of biblical data in order to arrive at a theology of normative meaning. Hasel has displayed the most characteristic OT theologies by studying critically the processes of selection and abstraction of the the leading OT theologians. See Gerhard F. Hasel, \textit{Old Testament Theology : Basic Issues in the Current Debate}, 4th ed. (Grand Rapids, 1991), 38-114.

\textsuperscript{231} Oeming, 64.

\textsuperscript{232} Vanhoozer, 59.

\textsuperscript{233} On this matter Vanhoozer quotes Derrida “Language has started without us, in us and before us. This is what theology calls God.” (Ibid., 71.). In the critical assessment of structuralistic thought one of the major concerns expressed is that structuralistic approaches to the text are meaningful as they disclose language’s systematism but the discovery of its true meaning and function is prevented. See here Ricœur, 30.

\textsuperscript{234} Vanhoozer, 25.
and their complex history testify that “original meaning” in the sense of the “author’s meaning” is not regarded as original enough.

As God seems to have the ultimate authority, the text might not any longer be fixed in the death of the author, but could dynamically live on in the existence of God, his Spirit, and his people. For the ancients, the text is not owned by the biblical prophets nor by the Greek philosophers as authors but by the ultimate reality, be it YHWH or LOGOS.

The individualization of the author leads to a new approach with regard to similarities of idiomatic expressions, word usage, and thought patterns in different books. While Jeremiah was written by Jeremiah/Baruch and Deuteronomy by Moses/Joshua, its common deuteronomistic language does no longer fit the modern understanding of the individual self. Cross-book thought patterns consequently refer to either specific supra-individual schools or cultures (here ideology overrules individuality) or they reveal the presence of a single author for a collection of books (cf. Noth).

1.4.1.2.1 From author to redactor

The distinction between writer and author is most important for the understanding of methodological issues in biblical exegesis. The introduction of the idea of the redactor as a key figure for the development of biblical books complicates the reading process, since a text not only contains mainly the intentionality of one author but of many individual redactors, who all leave their intentional marks within the text. As a consequence, reading the text as a communicative unity (with thematic coherence) becomes problematic. In order to allow that the intentions of the text are discovered, a clear concept of the redactor’s work is needed. But since such a unified definition has never been obtained, a unified method of discovering the intentionality of biblical texts is lacking as well.

---


236 The “redactors” of the proto-masoretic text are identified with the sopherim by Ginsberg and others. The masoretes were regarded as the preserver of the final product of the sopherim. See Seters van, 60-61, 109.

237 Van Seters has shown how different ideas of the redactor’s work were operative in exegetical methodologies. The following ideas can be crystallized:

- **Redactors as compiler of sources**: Here the redactor conflates different independent documents (see Documentary Hypothesis). The redactor’s intentionality is to be found in the sequence of arrangements of the different sources. But he does not add material by his own. Except the necessary conflations in order to connect different sources were needed. This understanding is represented in the beginning of the historical critical epoch. For Richard Simon the Pentateuch is a historical archive that was established by archivists. These archivists can be considered as “inspired” since they faithfully conserved the historical materials into a basically trustworthy archive. Similar to Simon Eichhorn operated with the idea of a “Sammler” who was responsible for the collection and arrangement of historical documents. However, Eichhorn allows numerous additions and glosses that were added to the Sammlung. Both Simon and Eichhorn think about the sources as written sources and are therefore to be considered as the founders of the “documentary hypothesis”.

- **Redactor as interpreter**: Here the redactor adds his own little interpretational marks to an existing text or to his compilation of sources (can be of oral and literary nature). In the development of history, one can also assume a multiplicity of redactors. This complicates contemporary literary-critical research and brought the concept of “Redaktionsgeschichte” into existence. The shift from the redactor as compiler towards the redactor as interpreter was introduced after the era of Simon and Eichhorn by De Wette. In that sense De Wette is much more critical than Simon and Eichhorn. For him historical criticism is not a means to discover the basic authentic written sources that have served as textual material for the compilational product. For De Wette the art of historical criticism concentrates on discovering the social, religious and ideological perspectives that different
Van Seters convincingly shows that the general idea of the hcm’s redactor of the historic-critical method is derived from the redacional work in the Renaissance, where the redactor’s work is closely connected with the printing industry and thus the applied concept of the biblical redactor is of an anachronistic nature. In Renaissance times, redactors are responsible for the production of standardized and authoritative texts that legitimizes a widespread distribution through the printing press. However, the text critical work of the ancient “redactors” has never been intended for the production of a standardized text. Ancient “editorial” work thus cannot be paralleled with standardization in the wider sense. All archeological findings – and even early documents of church history point to another direction, namely that the preservation of a text is regarded as more important than the production of an authoritative text. In antiquity, the one producing (editor) an ekdosis (public accessible text), does not make any additions, but serves as a preserver involved in textual criticism. Van Seters argues strongly that in antiquity, “Editors in the modern sense simply did not exist.”

Sources reflect. Further a critical analysis of the contained historical information was fostered in order to decide over fiction and realness of the textual report. As fruit of his studies De Wette arrives at the conclusion that most of the textual sources are not of historical but of mythological character, functioning as national epic material. In this way De Wette thought to be able to reconstruct the “inner spiritual development of Israelite religion” (Ibid., 209.): from simple belief to reflected belief.

Redactor as historian: Here the redactor is identified by explicit insertions and bears actually the character of an historian or author (Noth), who shapes textual material in such a way that it serves his understanding of history. The idea of De Wette, that textual material is reinterpreted and used “for quite specific ideological and theological purposes” finds its culmination in the idea of the deuteronomistic editor, who intervenes “more readily in the formation and shaping of the text.” (Ibid., 239-240.). The deuteronomistic redaction then turns out to hold a specific interpretation of Israel’s history.

Redactor as preserver: Here the redactor critically examines a text and changes it in such a way that it comes close to the original composition. Here the redactor is not at all an author.

238 Ibid., 242-243.
239 Van Seters argues that even the work of Origen and Jerome cannot be regarded as being motivated to create an authoritative standard text. This can be seen as they rather like to quote and refer to older, pre-critical and uncorrected text editions in their commentaries than referring to their own critical establishment of the biblical text. It was only in the course of church history that their work, after their death, influenced the standardization of the Christian text. See Ibid., 111.
240 Ibid., 62-63, 68. The standardization of the biblical text is more due to historical events than redactional work. In regard to the MT Van Seters states „This was not the result of stabilization or standardization of the proto-Masoretic family of texts but of the text that belonged to ‘the only organized group which survived the destruction of the Second Temple.’” see Ibid., 77, 110.
241 See Ibid., 58, 81.. In the ancient world we speak of three different types of “redactorial” work: Ekdo^s, Diado^s and Paradosis.
1. Ekdo^s is the text that was made public and stood not any longer in the control of the author. Such public editions were usually attached with a commentary and critical sigla, in order to discuss different readings. However the critical work was never intended to become the basis of book production, but served as a scholarly work. In that sense the ancient ekdo^s should not be mixed up with the modern “edition” (Ibid., 58.). The ancient ekdo^s never was regarded as an “authorized text” although it functioned as a standard or Vulgate version.
2. Diado^s: “has to do with the wider distribution of a single copy or exemplar of a text through multiple copies, viewed synchronically.” (Ibid., 16.).
3. Parados is: “refers to the process of text transmission through the recopying of the text from manuscript to manuscript, in the course of which the text undergoes certain changes, either deliberate or accidental.” (Ibid., 15.). Here the textual criticism of redactors tries to undo the changes in order to arrive at the most original manuscript that functioned as source of the copying process.

According to Van Seters, in the modern times all these three meanings got united in the practice of editorial work and therefore confused the idea of biblical “redactorial” work.

242 Ibid., 18.
1.4.1.2.2 Textual incongruity and formal conditions

Besides the critical analysis of the idea and role of the redactor, other prominent characteristics of source critical analysis in the historic-critical method reveal the formal condition at work. A critical look at the hcm’s focus on multiple divine names, double names, language variations, doublets/repetitions and other anachronisms as key arguments for source divisions shows that it is especially the new understanding of the author as individual that helps to suggest such an understanding. The historic-critical method is almost obsessed with finding individuality in the text and is supported by a rigid modernistic understanding of coherence. Comparative studies show that when different hermeneutical presuppositions are applied, different interpretations are possible without effecting the coherent unity of a text.243

Mainly influenced by the Homeric studies of the 18th and 19th century, textual criticism has become the servant of historical criticism until this day.244 After the discovery of the art of oral composition in the early twentieth century, however, the relation between textual criticism and historical criticism, developed in the early decades of the 20th century, has been severely attacked within Homeric studies.245 Some of the assumed contradictions and inconsistencies in the Homeric poems suddenly can be “explained by the circumstance of oral recitation”.246

Since oral composition is different to literary composition247 one can expect a different performance in those texts contrary to our modern text-conventions.248 It is this discovery of the oral impact on the

---

243 The following examples show how Hasel suggests synchronic interpretations of critical data, that is used for defending diachronic theories by historical-critical scholars. The main difference between Hasel’s suggestions and popular literary-critical suggestions lays in their different hermeneutical presuppositions they handle:

Multiple divine names and double names in the pentateuch: This phenomenon does not need to refer to the existence of different sources or redactions since the multiple usage of terms for deities and double names is known in other near-eastern cultures, that reveal a less strong tradition process (Hasel, 15-16.).

Variation in language and style in the pentateuch: Variations in language and style do not necessarily indicate different sources or redactions as no “objective criteria or controls for determining distinctive linguistic and stylistic characteristics of an author” exist. Consequently, “the assigning of sources or narrative strands on the basis of variations in language and style is an exercise in imaginative subjectivity” (Ibid., 16, 33.).

Doublets and repetitions in creation account: The idea that doublets and repetitions can be used as key evidence for different sources and redactions is contrasted by pointing out that it is a typical rhetorical style (“principle of complementation”) in Hebrew literature to add details and amplifications in subsequent repetitve textmaterial (Ibid., 17-20.).

Alleged contradictions in pentateuch: While the different conception of God (J-source, P-source) functions as source indicators in literary-critical approaches, it is argued in favor of the complimentary of these conceptions. (Ibid., 20-22.)

Aramaisms and Anachronisms: Aramaism cannot necessarily be used as indications of young dating (historical-criticism) since they have been found in Ugaritic text of the 2nd millennium B.C. as well, similarly other believed Anachronisms need to be treated carefully. (Ibid., 22-28.).

Prophecy: When a personal God is part of Reason’s dimensionality it is possible to allow prophecy in the sense of foretelling in contrast to the literary-critic sense of forth-telling (vaticinium ex eventu). The latter was developed within the context of historicism functioning as formal condition of interpretation where folk memories originate in sociological forces (Ibid., 37.).

247 Seters van, 347-348.

246 Ibid., 173-174.

246 Ibid., 175.

247 The ancient poet developed, integrated and composed a cycle of poems over years, this allowed for further development in their poems as well – also in their recording on paper. See Ibid.

248 Albin Lesky is quoted by Van Seters in this regard: „To speak of writing desk, scissors, and paste, is naturally, a blatant anachronism – but appropriate, it seems to me, to indicate the direction in which all suppositions of his kind tend. Philology
development of the biblical text that needs to awaken methodological awareness. In recent years, it is especially Hardmeier's research that has enlivened the conclusion that “Mündlichkeit ist literarisch fixiert worden und muss daher auch in seinen Redevollzügen nachvollzogen werden.”\(^{249}\) Textual differences should therefore no longer be explained predominantly by redactors.

According to van Seters' research, there is no “sufficient basis for using the notion of editors to explain the text-critical history of the text.”\(^{250}\) The fact that textual criticism is still used for the sake of historical criticism by textual critics can only be understood as an anachronistical reading into the textual diversities redactors developed in the 18\(^{th}\) and 19\(^{th}\) century.\(^{251}\) As a consequence, also canonical and inner biblical exegesis - as far as they build upon the idea of history of redaction - need to be considered to build upon false premises as well.\(^{252}\)

1.4.1.2.3 The self and the author

The modern focus on the self not only creates a different perspective on the author resulting in the presence of different redactors and the automatic disassociation of the “what it meant” from the “what it means”; the signifier-signified relation is also psychologically internalized. In the romantic movement, this internalization parallels the individualization of the subject, causing major communicational obstacles. The referential world is not any longer an objective or universal subjective world but the foreign inner mental construct of the other. Parallel to the romantic movement, this development is supported by the subjectivism (constructivism, perspectivism) of the post-Kantian era with its “universalen Primat des Mißverständnisses”\(^{253}\). The rationalist age has an optimistic attitude towards understanding (understanding is basically possible except the difficult/dark spots make it complicated), whereas the romantic age that follows has a skeptical attitude towards understanding. Here, the possibility of misunderstanding is, in a sense, universalized. Misunderstandings arise naturally while understanding calls for concentration and discipline. Hermeneutics, then, is not a tool for solving dark spots in the text but it is a universal necessity for any text passage. Thus, the call for method is a post-rationalistic call of modern hermeneutics. This all comes with the loss of an Archimedean standpoint and the turn to the self with its isolation, leaving a communicational gap between the self and the other.\(^{254}\)

For the romantic hermeneutics, however, it is not only the lack of an Archimedean standpoint but also the depth of the soul and the finiteness of our understanding that does not allow a final understanding. Understanding always needs to be continued, texts must be read again and again, not because the time of the reader has changed but because interpretation has never (in any age) come to a final understanding of any specific text.\(^{255}\)

\(^{249}\) Hardmeier, 4.

\(^{250}\) Seters van, 348.

\(^{251}\) Ibid., 346-347, 395.

\(^{252}\) Ibid., 390, 397.

\(^{253}\) Grondin, 107.

\(^{254}\) Ibid., 116.

\(^{255}\) As Gadamer has put it in his assessment on Schleiermacher: „die Texte unabhängig von ihrem Wahrheitsanspruch als reine Ausdrucksphänomene“ (Ibid., 109.).
The discovery of the self (picking up the Augustinian theme) thus plays an important role in the romantic hermeneutics (Schleiermacher). For him, interpretation is the reverse of speaking. While speaking starts in the soul, interpretation needs to find its end in the soul: “Gesucht wird dasselbe in Gedanken, was der Redende hat ausdrücken wollen”\textsuperscript{256}

Thus, going from the outside speaking to the inside thinking, the two sides that make linguistic expression possible are stressed:\textsuperscript{257}

1. Grammatical side: Expression takes place on the basis of participating in language conventions, i.e. grammar, having supra-individual character
2. Psychological side: Expression is more than the activation of language rules but is utilized by psychic motives of individual character

Whereas an understanding of the inside thinking is striven for, the psychic side receives the final attention for the hermeneutical activity.

The failure of the romantic program (Herder, Schleiermacher) and its psychological “Sich-Hineinversetzten” in the author caused a drastic shift of the interpretation of the phenomenon of the author. With its linguistic turn, the 20\textsuperscript{th} century saw language as the central problem in philosophical and hermeneutical Archimedean thought. For the new post-romantic formal condition, the signifier-signified relation is not any longer interpreted in the way that words either refer to objects in the external physical world or to the internal world of imagined objects of the self but to the linguistic world itself. The question of interpretation is explicitly connected with ontological questions. It is the chosen ontological point of view which decides the function and relation between the author and his text.

The modernistic immanent interpretation, i.e. independent of either the referential outer world or the intentionality of the author, recognizes the text as an independent object of art. Saussure, one of the founders of structuralism, distances himself from the idea that meaning is derived from pre-existing innate concepts, but that meaning only emerges in a system. Since there are different linguistic systems, each of them creating different sets of meanings, there is “no essential core of meaning, contrary to Kant, no fixed universal concepts.”\textsuperscript{258} Languages have organized the world arbitrarily into diverse concepts and categories. In this case, the meaning creating function of the author is radically undermined. Thus understanding a language can only be successful in its own terms as the author becomes an author not before he is subjected to a language.\textsuperscript{259} With this background, the Sapir-Whorf approach grew strong, in which it is the discovery of a specific language that permits the access to a world-view.\textsuperscript{260}

\textsuperscript{256} Grondin quoting Schleiermacher in Ibid., 104.
\textsuperscript{257} Ibid., 105.
\textsuperscript{258} Foley, 96.
\textsuperscript{259} Vanhoozer, 201.
\textsuperscript{260} Whorf concludes in his famous article “Linguistics As An Exact Science” (reprinted in Benjamin Lee Whorf and John B. Carroll, Language, Thought, and Reality: Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf (Cambridge, 1956), 220-232.) after having pointed out the new way of talking about facts in the scientific revolution of the late 19\textsuperscript{th} century:

“From this fact proceeds what I have called the 'linguistic relativity principle,' which means, in informal terms, that users of markedly different grammars are pointed by their grammars toward different types of observations and different evaluations of externally similar acts of observations, and hence are not equivalent as observers but must arrive at somewhat different views of the worlds.”
Over the years, the Sapir-Whorf and Chomskyan approach have balanced each other, both language and authors have newly received meaning generating function (cf. 1.3.1.2). Authors are given intentional power again but are not able to dominate the language entirely - as deconstructive criticism has shown – but need to acknowledge the systematism of language in order to communicate well.261

At this point we enter the realm of the listener, i.e. reader. While the reader does not read without any intention, the text is not written without any agenda either. Which agenda determines our interpretation? Is - with the distance of the writing moment - the encoding of the author's agenda still possible at all? Are there any rules of communication that are shared both by the author and by the reader? Can the search for “timeless” universal conventions be successful? It is obvious, that we cannot find any universals in human rationality. However, the existential phenomena of life are still shared (birth, aging, death, food, love, disappointment, etc.). And as texts are means of communication, they always search the existence of the other.

1.4.1.3 The doom of the reader

During the different epochs of history different interpretations about the responsibilities of the reader in his reading process have been present. In the classical approaches, the reader as subject is not understood as having a dominant contributory role in the process of textual meaning construction. The only hermeneutical requirement is to be spiritually. The focus is almost exclusively on the meaning of the text as object and the reader is considered to be able to have access to the meaning of the text. Meaning is exclusively generated by the text and the divine spirit that communicates the meaning to the reader. The reading subject in a sense remains unconscious of itself as partaking in a meaning-constructive role during the reading process. This does not mean that the self is not yet conscious of the self, but of the factor it plays when textual meaning is created. To put it differently, the self is not so much critically reflected during the process of meaning generation but more after textual meaning has been received and revealed to it.

In the objectivist modernistic approaches with its universalistic rationality of man, an investigation into the relativity of subjective presuppositions is not necessary either. This explains why the different commentaries of the historic-critical method focus on the reconstruction of the context of texts (source criticism) and their function (genre-criticism) within their respective Sitz im Leben without discussing the interaction of the text with the reader and his presuppositions.262 The historic-critical approach is followed by the explicit or implicit assumption of the un-readability of the textual discourse in its final form. There are mainly two consequences:

1. The naive reader is incapable of meaningful reading. Theology cannot be built upon the discourse of the final form. Instead, at the most, a history of theology can be uncovered on the basis of source-critical results.

_____

Foley describes this approach to language as influenced by the Neo-Kantian philosophy of the time. The widely accepted Neo-Kantian epistemology, then, explains how this type of “linguistic relativity” was well received in the beginning of the 20th century. See Foley, 193.

261 McKnight, 235.
262 Talstra, 220, 222.
2. The critical “cogito ergo sum” attitude tries to overcome the past traditions of readers and their reading process since it is that tradition-process of understanding that endangers the original meaning of the text.

Historicism with its determinative character then functions as the formal condition of the historic-critical method. The rationality of historicism is based on logical ideas that serve to uncover the socio-historically caused rationality of the different redactors.  

In the 20th century, this formal condition is rejected by thinkers like Heidegger and Gadamer. By both “wird der Historismus sozusagen auf sich selbst angewendet und damit in seiner eigenen Geschichtlichkeit, nämlich in seiner geheimen Metaphysikabhängigkeit sichtbar gemacht.”

The metaphysical formal condition of modernity is exchanged for a temporal Being conception (in Heidegger’s work). This change causes a redefinition of the task and function of the reader.

When Schleiermacher distinguishes between the inner spirit and linguistic expression as ontic relation, Heidegger sees the distinction between the before (man’s “Ausgelegtsein” as condition for action) and the after (man’s linguistic expression) as a distinction of basically temporal character. This has a direct effect upon the process of interpretation. Heidegger does not understand hermeneutics as something epistemological, i.e. simply as “verstehen” but as something existential, i.e. as “sich auf etwas verstehen”, “Sichauskennen”, “Seinkönnen in der Welt”, “verstehen als können”. This new kind of hermeneutics is of universal character since it not only hints at the modernistic rational faculty of man but at his being-entirety that is “ausgelegt” by the historical embedding. Understanding is then not to be considered as an option but as a necessity for living. This results in the sub-categorization of epistemic activity under the umbrella of universal hermeneutics.

With the rise of natural science, historic science was only to be legitimized if it makes explicit its method and presuppositions (Friedrich Jaeger and Jörn Rüsen, Geschichte Des Historismus : Eine Einführung (München, 1992), 62-63.). With this background historic science stood in the tension of either becoming positivistic (by following the procedures and ideas of natural science) or “dilletantisch” (by thinking that it is all random, narrative or chaotic) (Grondin, 119.). In the latter case historic science does not have a legitimation of existence. Although it might not be possible to extract the objective laws of history, Droysen stresses that science is called to explicate at least its subjective laws of method. Here Kant’s influence on Droysen becomes visible: The Dinge “an sich” are not accessible but the Dinge as they appear. As the appearance stands in direct relation to mental categories, the latter need to be identified and systematized. Thus, space and time do exist because man is both “geistig und sinnlich” (Ibid.).

While natural sciences concentrate on the “sinnliche Wahrnehmung” the historic sciences focus on the “geistige Wahrnehmung” as they try - comparable with a reading process – to understand the “Äußerung eines Inneren” (Ibid., 120.). According to Droysen, then, historic sciences are legitimized as they focus on the source, intentionality, or the inner self of all historic testimonies. It is this inner self that resembles the general spirit in the multitude of single testimonies. The existence of this general spirit only allows historic science as “Wissenschaft gibt es nur, wo zu dem Einzelnen, das die Empirie gibt, ein Allgemeines hinzutritt, das durch unseren forschenden Gedanken erkannt wird.” (Ibid., 121.). According to Droysen, this general, inner soul of history is of moral nature (sittlichen Mächte) as he observes its “steigernde Kontinuität der sittlichen Welt”, concluding in the sentence that “Die Geschichte ist ihrem Wesen nach ein Verstehen der sich fortschreitenden entwickelnden sittlichen Mächte” (Ibid., 121, 122.).

Habermas characterizes this new way of thinking as a reflective age in that sense as „es sich reflexiv als Weltenutung bewusst werden kann. Unser Wissen weiß um sich als Wissen, somit als Interpretation der Welt. [...] Erst bei dem modernen, entzauberten Weltbild treten die Wirklichkeitsdeutungen als Interpretation auf, die sich als solche zur Diskussion stellen und der Kritik aussetzen.“ quoted in Ibid., 27. 

For Heidegger understanding the world is based upon a prior survival experience in the world. Survival requiring skills demand an already “vorinterpretierte”, “ausgelegte” world. This is the ultimate fact of hermeneutics: “Unsere Entwürfe stehen zunächst nicht in unserer Wahl. Wir sind vielmehr in sie geworfen” see Ibid., 135-137.
According to Heidegger, however, the reader is not ultimately determined and caught by the “vorinterpretierte” world but can become conscious (Auslegung) of it and emancipate himself from it (Selbstaufklärung/Aus-ein-ander-legung). In such an act, freedom is acquired through a deconstruction of tradition, through which we have lived and survived in this world. Thus, one can get exposed to the “ursprüngliche Erfahrung des Daseins.” This is of crucial importance to the re-interpretation of the reader’s task and function. According to Heidegger, the classical procedure of first Auslegung and second Verstehen is reversed in first Verstehen and second Auslegung. The reader first needs to understand why he initially understands the text the way he does in order to become conscious of his own historic embedding. This critical investigation of one’s own embedding is a necessary prerequisite in order to recognize the text as something foreign and not to abuse it as if the text was one’s own expression. The critical self-reflection allows the possibility to control the hermeneutical influence of one’s own Ausgelegtheit. In fact, a constructive communication between the self’s presuppositions and the otherness of the text is created. Through the critical Auseinandersetzung with one’s own tradition, ein “Gewahrwerden des Daseins über die ihm zur Disposition stehenden Möglichkeiten” is granted. The existential historicity of being, then, is not a hindrance but a necessary condition for understanding.

Building upon Heidegger’s work, Gadamer continues with a critical attitude towards modernism and its methodological obsession. For Gadamer, the desperate search for methodology testifies the dilemma of historicism. Method seems to be the only help to reintegrate an absolute in the relativity of historicism. This phenomenon makes explicit that a classical metaphysics was active for which the strife for absolute and timeless truth was most important and therefore has been dominating exegetical methodology. In his conception, the reflection upon one’s own “Ausgelegtsein” -in Gadamers terms, “Wirkungsgeschichte”- does not lead to the same extent of freedom as in Heidegger’s thought. This is because it is not possible to fully detect one’s own embedding. Even at the moment when we become conscious of our Wirkungsgeschichte, we cannot transcend it. Grondin speaks here of “Wirkungsgeschichte ist mehr Sein als Bewußtsein, hegelisch gesprochen: mehr Substanz als Subjektivität.” These limitations, however, do not discourage from interpretative activity but are rather conceived as a motivation if the historical rootedness of the subject is compared with the determination of the metaphysical conceptions in classical and modern times. There, the thing in itself is, per definition, not open to our knowledge and the self is individualized into isolation causing epistemic and communicative obstacles.

In the further process of real understanding, the question needs to be asked how we can decide which of our preconceived ideas are to be accepted as “richtige Vorurteile” and which must be judged as misleading. Gadamer’s way to answer this question is consequently different from those of the positivists.

---

266 Ibid., 141.
267 Hermeneutics, according to Heidegger is therefore not any longer to be considered as a method of text interpretation (Schleiermacher, Dilthey) but as a call to uncover the structure (Geworfensein) that functions necessarily as prerequisite for any method.
268 Ibid., 153.
269 Ibid., 157.
270 For Gadamer the intrusion of method into the field of humanities was originated in Kant’s “Kritik der Urteilskraft”. In Kant’s work “Geschmack” was subjectified and aesthetisized. Ibid., 155-156.
271 Ibid., 163.
For him, the question cannot be answered by transcending the temporality of history in order to arrive at a rather timeless principle. Contrary, the temporal distance calls for utilization as we speak of the “Produktivität des Zeitabstandes”. The historical distance is accompanied by a distance of objectivity allowing for better ways of assessing, as one can see which “Vorurteile” endured and which did not. The past represents a “Gespräch über Sinn”, calling the present to participate, as interpretation is never a subjective one-way street but an inter-subjective discourse that requires the past and present other, in order to continue the process of “Sichverstehen”. As the reader becomes aware of his own “Wirkungsgeschichte”, it is part of his interpretational activity to discover the verbum interius of the analyzed text as the soul of the author and his participation in the “Wirkungsgeschichte”. As allusion to Augustine, Gadamer’s “Verstehen” is only possible if one tries “das Unaussgesagte, das innere Gespräch, mitzuvollziehen.” Such an understanding exceeds the modernistic conception of truth, where interpretation is reduced to the discovery of logical propositions. Heidegger’s “Verstehen” is much broader pointing at “Sichverstehen”.

1.4.1.4 The doom of history

The matter of context is central to the interpretation of the textual phenomenon of history. Which context operates as the referential world of texts? As we have discovered the influence of the formal condition of reading on the interpretation of important textual phenomena (mimesis, author, reader etc.), we are prepared to investigate the doom of the historic phenomenon of the biblical text.

Greek ontology, formal condition of the Alexandrian reading, “overcomes” history by allegory. The historical distance between reader and text therefore is rather unproblematic, since it does not detach the reader from meaning.

In contrast to the Alexandrian understanding, the Antiochian formal condition gives the historical aspect of the text a crucial role for the generation of meaning. The diachrony of the biblical books calls for a participation in the narrated “Heilsgeschichte”. Salvation, then, is not aiming at an ontic problem of man (salvation needs to overcome time) but at the moral degeneration of man (salvation needs to overcome sin).

As mentioned earlier, the historic-critical-method stands on protestant ground but works with the rationalistic formal condition of the enlightenment. To argue that the historic-critical proposals are based on philosophical presuppositions only is too simplistic. The problematic data that is retrieved through close reading and comparison of the different ancient textual traditions, raises critical questions that cannot be answered by reformational-protestant methodologies operating with the sola scriptura principle. Methodological development, therefore, is a necessity independent of the formal conditions.

---

272 Ibid., 159.
273 Ibid., 166.
274 Gabler’s famous inaugural lecture shows that the later description of the historic-critical method by Troeltsch is representative even for its very pioneers. Gabler argued as rationalist that biblical theology is “a purely historical discipline completely independent from dogmatics.” (Hasel, 16.) Later, De Wette combined Kantian philosophy with biblical theology and focused in his approach on the genesis and history of religion going through the stages of Hebraism, Judaism, and Christianity. This history or religion found its most famous representative in Wellhausen. Consequently, it is obvious that defenders as well as critics of the historic-critical method are clear on the fact that “faith and the historical-critical method have differing means of determining reality.” (Hasel quoting Krentz in Hasel, 82.).
applied. However, the specific interpretation that the historic-critical method gives to the text-external differences and to text-internal difficulties, reveals the formal condition under which the reading takes place. Other solutions working with different formal conditions could have been given, too, without abusing the data. One of the major principles expressed by the formal condition of the historic-critical method was the principle of correlation. This principle is derived from the historicist worldview:

"the phenomena of man's historical life are so related and interdependent that no radical change can take place at any one point in the historical nexus without affecting a change in all that immediately surrounds it."\(^{276}\)

This principle causes the methodological step

"that no text can be understood unless it is seen in terms of its historical context. This meant [...] (1) that no critical historian could make use of supernatural intervention as a principle of historical explanation because this shattered the continuity of the causal nexus, and (2) that no event could be regarded as a final revelation of the absolute spirit, since every manifestation of truth and value was relative and historically conditioned."\(^{277}\)

Although history is regarded naturalistically as a closed continuum, the hcm practice operates with a formal condition that allows the writer to refer to the external objective reality by means of words. This is one of the major critiques that challenged the hcm in the 21st century. One of the recent deviances is resembled by the history of religion school. For them, the biblical text cannot be considered as a reliable source for reconstructing the history of Israel.\(^{278}\) The formal condition of hcm cannot be considered as scientific since it presupposes the idealism of historicism. This idealism has proposed a fragmented text that refers to many different historical contexts, by which the researcher is able to reconstruct Israel's history. The specific text-context interpretation of the hcm calls for a re-interpretation. The history of religion school shifts away from the attitude that biblical historic information is valuable for the reconstruction of near eastern history. This has many reasons. The different factors of such a shift are not only found in the areas of biblical studies (literary criticism and archaeological method), theory of historic method, the accompanied frustration of the plurality of the many biblical theologies, and the "verblüffende Gesprächsunfähigkeit" between the schools.\(^{279}\) The major reasons are found in the area of philosophy, and here especially in the area of epistemology.\(^{280}\) These different factors cannot be seen as independent but as interactive, making a critical analysis difficult. This fact increases in complexity as in most times the presuppositions of applied methodologies are not made explicit.\(^{281}\) By pointing at the two factors that are central to the determination of the answer to the context-question, we will get a grasp of the influence of Reason's interpretation on the interpretation of the text as phenomenon.

\(^{275}\) See footnote #240


\(^{277}\) Hasel quoting Harvey in Hasel, 73.


\(^{279}\) Albertz, 6-7.


\(^{281}\) Kofoed states „that matters of method and presupposition have been largely overlooked in the debate over the epistemological and historiographical value of the biblical texts“. (Ibid., 247.)
The shift in historic studies is launched by the *Annales* School in the early 20th century. This new perspective one tries to move away from the ideologicalized historical perspectives, where man’s ideas shape the understanding of the development of history, towards a multidisciplinary, “positivistic-empirical-oriented history-writing.” 282 Here, economic, sociological and climatic information become much more important than monarchic annals. Therefore, the ideologically biased biblical texts can no longer function as a proper starting point for the reconstruction of history. 283 In this development, written artefacts are not able to serve as “hard data” any longer, since the subjectivity of (man’s) reason does not allow any narrative writing with objective referential character. 284 In fact, narrative writing within post-modern thought is considered as “non-referential”, i.e. the text does not refer to outside realities but to mental constructions. 285 Even if texts in general had the potential of referring to the outside world, this would not be true for the biblical text, since - from the perspective of available text-external data (hard data) - there is an enormous gap between the oldest found biblical documents and the time these documents profess to describe. 286 This is an argument that is mainly used by the history of religion school. Textual realities in general - but particularly in the case of biblical texts - are much more conceived as a response towards the socio-economic challenges the author is facing. This tendency has already been made prominent in the work of De Wette and Wellhausen although they are far from being post-modern literary theorists. After Wette and Wellhausen, however, history-writing develops into nothing else than fiction writing. 287 In the post-modern version of the sociological reading of the text, historical criticism has no place any more. 288 Diachronic readings are rather superseded by synchronic readings 289 which are often accompanied by the shift from author-oriented towards text-oriented and further reader-oriented readings. 290 Since the multi-disciplinary approach is not to be abandoned, the real discussion focuses on the question which role and value a written artefact has in the process of reconstructing the historic past as context. 291 This leads us to the epistemological realm of the problem. The epistemological condition under which the history of religion school operates, reflects basic Rankean presuppositions, as Schaper shows. 292

---

282 Ibid., 5, 11.
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284 Hardmeier, 2.
285 Kofoed, 13.
289 Kofoed, 21.
290 Hardmeier, 2.
291 In regard to the distinction between hard facts (Primärquellen) and soft facts (Sekundär-, Tertiärquellen) Schaper argues against the “Hierarchisierung der Quellen”. This is because in theology and often in archaeology the secondary and tertiary sources function as horizon for doing research in the field of primary sources. See Schaper.
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According to the Rankean positivism, it is possible to find the character of the driving power of historical development in the objective artefacts themselves, independent of the subjective, soft data, of ancient text writings. This is because the history writing is a highly subjective business, involving ideology, prejudice and political bias. With the empiricist-rationalistic formal condition, the reconstruction of truth, however, is possible on the basis of empirical studies that focus on objects that are not or less affected by the manipulating power of human ideological irrationality.

1.4.2 Summary

We have seen in which different ways structural phenomena of the biblical text as object can be interpreted. Besides this, we have seen that different foci among the different methodologies exist. As the hcm focuses especially on questions of text origin and text function, it is the reader response-criticism which focuses on the participation of the reader in the process of the generation of meaning. The reason for the development of different foci among the schools is not necessarily dependent upon their respective formal conditions but can be based on the final condition the researcher has in mind. The phenomenological structure of the text contains different phenomena which allow different final conditions. Where the diversity of methods, doing justice to the diversity of final conditions, is based on a diversity of formal conditions, it cannot be integrated into a methodological whole.

All the different ways receive their rational legitimation as long as the respective formal condition applied can be consistently adopted by the data of the biblical text. However, rational legitimation is not...

---

293 This strong empirical orientation has been critiqued by both out- and insiders in regard to the inadequacy of the quantitative method and the basic positivistic ideas steering the research methodology (cf. Kofoed, 8.). Schaper has argued that the Kopenhagen school is outdated since its perception of historical science was overcome in the 19th and 20th century by the works of Rickert and Droysen and the "wissenschaftstheoretischen" reflections of Max Weber. In the line of Kant they argued that there is not such a thing as a "materials Wahrheitskriterium". Objectivity is no longer attached to the objects but to the universal logic of the subjects. (see Max Weber, "Die 'Objektivität' Sozialwissenschaftlicher Und Sozialpolitischer Erkenntnis," in Gesammelte Aufsätze Zur Wissenschatllehre, ed. Johannes Winckelmann(Tübingen, 1982). It is this subjective universal logic which guarantees scientific consistency among the researchers (Ibid., 166.). In that sense soft-data is of as much value as hard-data as both are received subjectively. What matters is epistemic truth. Thus, epistemically true is, what is logically coherent whether it is of soft or hard data. Schaper then argues on the basis of a universal logic of subjects in order to justify historical criticism. But this can be criticised as well without being out-dated! The 20th and 21st century have shown that neither a Rankean positivism nor a Kantian idealism (universal logic of subjects) stands the critical phenomenological investigation where logic cannot any longer be seen as universal but as subjective as well. It is here where the minimalist schools come in with their post-modern understanding that history writing is by nature fiction and texts nothing else than "social constructs". At this point we see the contradictory splits of the Copenhagen school. The minimalist’s closeness to post-modernity is simultaneously contrasted by its distance from post-modernity. This is because deconstructivistic thinking does not have any place in their approaching of empirical data, since they operate with the assumption that hard-data creates its own coherence and meaning determination (see William A. Beardslee, "Poststructuralist Criticism," in Westminster John Knox Press, ed. Stephen R. Haynes and Steven L. McKenzie(Louisville, 1999), 254.).

In this regard not only “ideographical historicism” is suspect but also - on the other hand of the spectrum - the “nomothetically oriented positivism” (Kofoed, 27.). Both are subject to the same phenomenon as Kofoed has argued, since no “history is written without some kind of ‘grid,’ some larger narrative with all the oversimplifications and blind spots that entail, and either ‘camp’ in the battle between the maximalists and minimalists need to recognize the ‘path-dependent’ [...] character of their results” (Ibid., 110-111.). We have argued that it is this necessary grid that is developed on the grounds of Reason’s interpretation.

294 Nevertheless the methodological concentration on one of the textual phenomena reveals often the specific formal condition at work (cf. chapter 3).
the only value. In the ethics of science, proper methodologies do justice to the phenomenological structure
of Reason where they allow the possibility that the consistency of the interpretation is as far as possible
dominated by the nature of the data themselves and only secondarily by the subject’s intuition. Therefore,
it is important to become aware of the different formal conditions that are at work in the history of
exegesis in order to enable a critical distance towards them and allow a data-oriented approach.
We contradict our analysis of the structure of Reason if we intend to propose the possibility of an
objective interpretation. However, it is a matter of methodological ratio, that knows how and when to give
the object the chance to communicate its properties. Therefore, our next step is to develop analytical
instruments for an initial reading of the biblical text that allows to give the text a strong position for
communicating its “ontic” characteristics. We will argue that a phenomenological text-systematic
(grammer and text-grammer) reading of the biblical text as primary methodological step guarantees a
strong data-oriented exegesis where the consistency of generated interpretations is to a great extent based
on the data themselves. The application of such a phenomenological text-systematic reading generates our
PNG-shift database, giving us full access to our case. It is by means of this database and the hermeneutical
categories developed in this present chapter that a meaningful inquiry of the methodological conditions
under which Duhm, Thiel, Lundbom, Holladay and Carroll operate, is possible.
2 Proposal of Method: Analytical Instruments

As we have developed a phenomenological understanding of textual interpretation which includes the specific being-aspects of the biblical text and as we have investigated into the different interpretations on some of the important textual aspects, we have achieved a structural understanding of exegetical methodology as such. Our rather long discourse on method is paramount because diffusion is not only found in the general rather abstract discourse on method but in the very exegetical practice as well. The latter is clearly illustrated by our case of participant reference shifts in Jeremiah. Our general methodological reflection in chapter 1, then, must guide us in developing not only clarity on exegetical method but also tools that help us to deal responsibly with PNG-shifts.

In order to construct a specific method, we now need to interpret the structure of Reason which serves as hermeneutical framework (formal condition) for the interpretation of textual phenomena and the development of exegetical methodology. Yet, this major task can not be part of a single dissertation. However, as we strive for a methodology that satisfies the subjective and objective needs of Reason, this dissertation is an initial step of experimenting with the task before us. For our purpose we need to develop a first methodological step that allows a phenomenological analysis of PNG-shifts and a subsequent interpretative experiment. As we commit ourselves to the ethics of scientific work, we strive for an interpretation of the PNG-shifts that derives its consistency as far as possible from the data itself. We then try to receive the “ontic” information the text communicates and search for patterns that might suggest interpretations without the interference of any formal condition. As a consequence, our approach remains minimalistic and incomplete as it cannot arrive at a full interpretation, since it would demand the subjective contribution to a formal condition. Our analytic activity consequently will remain basically descriptive.

Our analysis of the being-structure of the biblical text raises following two questions:

1. Which of the being-aspects of the ancient text are accessible for the present reader? Do we for example have access to the author, the context, the reader or the referentiality of the time in which the text was written?

2. There are words, rhetoric styles, grammar, logic, graphemes, ideas, repetitions, contradictions found in the biblical text. The question then is which phenomenon refers to which being-aspect of the text. Does, e.g. a specific formulation in the book of Jeremiah refer to the individuality of the author/redactor (e.g. Noth)\(^{295}\), the idiomatic expression of a certain time and social class (e.g. Bright and Weippert)\(^{296}\), or the ideology of a school (e.g. Hyatt and Thiel)\(^{297}\)?\(^{298}\) Does a logical inconsistency in the text refer to rhetoric strategy or the presence of different sources?

As we try to relate to these two questions we introduce an important further phenomenon of the text that was implicitly present but that needs to be explicated at this moment. There is a temporal distance between the presence of our being and the age of the text. This temporal distance implies a cultural...

\(^{295}\) Talstra, 22, 32-33, 53.

\(^{296}\) Herrmann, 87, 93.

\(^{297}\) Ibid., 72, 82-83.

\(^{298}\) The same questions have been encountered in Talstra’s critical assessment of Noth’s “Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien”. See Talstra, 10.
distance, a historical distance and a language distance. In that sense the biblical text is not only foreign because it was written by somebody else, but because the written text is referring to a different world (signifier-signified relation) and contains a foreign – dead – language (language system-language competence relation). The question to the reader then is whether it is possible for his imagination to contextualize the ancient historic-cultural situation and convention, and to obtain an understanding of language-system and language-use.

We have seen that plurality of methodologies is not only caused by philosophical presuppositions and views on the text (formal condition) but also by the different being-aspects (final condition) by which the text exists (material condition). While we regard it as legitimate to only focus on one of these aspects we also see the risk of reductionism. This reductionism, however, is not caused by the text as object but by the formal and final condition at work!

The crucial question at stake is which textual phenomenon belongs to which textual being-aspect of the text. The difficulty in answering this question originates in the historical distance between the present reader and the written text. Since interpretation cannot do without answering that question, most of the exegetes apply philosophical presuppositions and textual views into their frameworks in order to be able to designate textual phenomena to their adequate being-aspects of the text.

At this very point our critical remarks are expressed. We regard it as utmost important to observe and describe a phenomenon in detail before identifying it with one of the aspects of the text as phenomenon. Thus, analytic description must come prior to interpretation.

2.1 General Remarks

We have seen that the being of biblical texts is complex. Besides this, there is a common agreement that most of the text’s being-aspects are not accessible any longer. Consequently, there is a need of hypothetical reconstructions both guided by the data available and the hermeneutical presuppositions we choose. The complexity of the text demands a complexity of methods which should be applied in a reasonable order. But in which order should such a methodological complexity be described?

The author of the text, the context of the text, the Sitz im Leben of the text, the genre conventions of the text - all remain in a temporal distance. Thus, the “Zurückgewinnung” of the author, the Sitz im Leben, the genre conventions, the rhetorical strategies and the historical situation of a specific text implies a high degree of necessary but hypothetical assumptions and speculations by the reader. Although we do agree to a certain extent - together with the modern exegetical methodologies described by Steck (classical historic-critical method) or Muilenberg (rhetorical criticism) - that a “Zurückgewinnung” is necessary when meaning is to be gained, we disagree with these methods on the order in which exegetical questions are handled. The reconstruction of the oral and written sources of a text prior to the study of

\[299\] Cf. 1.4.1 (p 36 in chapter 1). See also Oeming, 175-177.

\[300\] In a similar way Oeming talks about the risk of “Isolierung je eines Pols: Autor, Text, Leser oder Sache”, Ibid., 29.


the redactional molding and its theological content often runs the risk of overlooking text linguistic signals that operate and guide the reading of a text.\(^{303}\)

We also disagree with classical-dogmatic methods in their primary focus on meaning-construction. The primacy of the meaning-construction is most of the time highly determined by theological and philosophical preferences leading to the method of allegorization. Both, classical-dogmatic and modern-historical methods run the risk of losing the text as a linguistic corpus.

After our general investigation in the field of method in chapter 1, it is useful to start with what is available: The reader and the language systematic phenomena (language- and discourse systematism) of the biblical text. We therefore propose to give procedural priority to the linguistic analysis before literary analysis can be performed. This is the very aspect often undermined when we look at the commentary tradition. One rather chooses academic speculation about what is not available (cf. 0.1) than to start with what is available: The specific text as linguistic corpus. The analysis of the text-linguistic determinacy needs to be a prerequisite for interpreting the textual under-determination.\(^{304}\) We believe that the biblical text as phenomenon demands that the linear sequence of methods should be determined by two categorical oppositions in order to strengthen the rational contribution of the object and to minimize the manipulative power of the subject:

1. The immediately available vs. the temporally distant unavailable\(^{305}\)
2. The objective and structural vs. the subjective and designed\(^{306}\)

In this way, we limit subjective (from the arbitrary individual author) and speculative (from the unavailable past) data input, and make explicit the determinacy framework that functions as a controlling framework for any later speculation. Thus, in order to avoid a strong influence of a hypothetical reconstructed reference-system in the process of understanding from the very outset, we start with the analysis of the text as linguistic corpus. Not prior but secondary to the analysis of the text as linguistic system, the reference system and the hermeneutical actualization of the text will be analyzed.\(^{307}\)

### 2.2 Phenomenological reading: The initial methodological step

As the language- and discourse systematic phenomena of the text and its present reader are immediately available\(^{308}\) – our first reading process is guided by the linguistic markings of the text. We call this a *text-phenomenological reading*. Since one of the most important parts of the interpretational activity is the creation of coherence as a basis for meaning, the phenomenological reading does not try to undermine the own potential of the text to create coherence. In fact, the phenomenological reading of the text should help to detect both the obvious coherence/determinancy and incoherence/under-determinancy established

---

\(^{303}\) Talstra, 28-30, 81, 169.
\(^{304}\) Cf. 1.3.1.6.
\(^{305}\) Talstra, 115-116.
\(^{306}\) Ibid.
\(^{307}\) Ibid., 116-117.
\(^{308}\) Walton has pointed out that the classical pre-critical (primacy of meaning orientation: allegorical method) and modern critical methods (primacy of historical reconstruction: historical-critical methods) have in common that they “attempted to explain the textual problems by methodologies that looked for answers outside the text” (Timothy Walton, *Experimenting with Qohelet: A Text-Linguistic Approach to Reading Qohelet as Discourse*, ed. Janet W. Dyk, Amsterdamse Cahiers Voor Exegese Van De Bijbel En Zijn Tradities (Maastricht, 2006), 2.).
by the text. It is in this way that we agree with Walton's statement that “It is the text itself that is our best informant as to how it should be read.”\(^{309}\) A text-phenomenological approach is even more urgent when taken into account that the reader's naive assumption of basic readability of the book of Jeremiah on the one hand and our western paradigms of literary analysis on the other hand do not go well together. This is especially true with regard to the handling of quotations and participant tracking.\(^{310}\)

In order to clarify, we can say that there are two considerations that make us start with a text-phenomenological analysis, focused on the detection of language- and discourse-systematic elements. The one is of **systematic** the other of **pragmatic** character:

1. **Systematic consideration:** Language and discourse are only possible on the foundation of a system, i.e. grammar. The absence of rhetoric does not necessarily hinder the communication,\(^{311}\) but the absence of grammar renders impossible any communication at all. Even if we had a present text whose origination, socio-historical context etc. were known, we have to start with a text-grammatical analysis.

2. **Pragmatic consideration:** We need to start with what we have and possess – the systematism of language and discourse, since we do not have any access to the author, the rhetoric, the socio-linguistic background, etc. Otherwise, we will implant hypothetical reconstructions on our reading of the text too early.

With this clarification of our reading attitude as background, the text is approached in its present form. This leads to some different side-effects:

1. **We do not give any primacy to diachronic reading but to synchronic reading.** The nature of this primacy is, however, operational and not ideological.\(^{312}\) With the synchronic reading of the text we do not conclude that there is not any diachronic element present, but it enables us to describe the surface of the text much more objectively so that patterns - either caused by the process of writing (rhetoric, etc.) or re-writing (genesis of texts, etc.), by the content (ideology, etc.) or language (system, competence, etc.) - can be visualized. Consequently, only a synchronic phenomenological reading can uncover diachronic qualities of a text. Although the study of idiomatic expression (e.g. deuteronomistic language) is prominent in the studies on Jeremiah, we will not give them any primacy as thereby the grammatical coherence of the text can be lost sight of easily.\(^{313}\)

2. **Our search for meaning necessarily becomes secondary as well.** Not the reconstruction or construction of meaning is the primary focus but the phenomenological structure of the text. This does not mean that we abandon the textual being-aspect of meaning; nevertheless we regard

---

\(^{309}\) Ibid., 6.

\(^{310}\) Until the 19th century western literature as been dominated by narrative text over against dialogical texts while in Biblical and Semitic literature in general dialogues have a much more prominent role. See Meier, 5.

\(^{311}\) When the analysis of texts starts with the rhetorical critique first, the process of analysis can suffer from a severe lack of control, opening the floor for unwarranted speculation (Ibid., 16.).

\(^{312}\) Talstra, 83.

\(^{313}\) This is especially important in the context of Jeremianic studies where the diachronic (e.g. Rudolph, Hyatt, Thiel) and synchronic (e.g. Holladay, Weippert) readings deviate from each other to a great extent with regard to their interpretations of deuteronomistic idioms. Both, however, lose at sight that the text is possibly readable from a grammatical perspective even though one does choose a diachronic position.
meaning only to be attainable after the language and discourse-systematic structure of the text has been clarified.

Consequently, our focus does not lie on the interpretation but on the descriptive analysis with focus on systematization of encountered phenomena. This approach should not be misunderstood to be structuralistic which would imply the application of a clear formal condition. We reduce our systematic analysis on the phenomenon of grammar and do not intend to apply semiotics to our reading.

3. There is no necessity to choose a textual tradition as most reliable, original or authoritative. Such a choice is important but secondary — it can only be made after comparative studies of historical interest which presuppose a proper phenomenological study of every single text in order to allow a most complete comparison.

Consequently, our decision to analyze the MT text does not testify to any religious or theoretical preoccupation; our problem in focus was discovered basically in the MT text. Only after our text-phenomenological reading we will compare our findings with other text-traditions.

4. When we speak about “text-phenomenological” reading we exclude para-textual comments (e.g. petucha and setuma). It is important to give priority to the linguistic markers and not to the para-textual markers, since the para-textual markers are to be regarded as the interpretational result of the same - although earlier- struggle with the textual corpus and its discourse challenges.

5. In our specific case we need to be cautious in importing known discourse strategies and rules of non-Jeremianic literature into our reading and interpretation of the book of Jeremiah. This has basically two different reasons:

a) Meier has shown that the handling of quotations in biblical books is not uniform at all. Further, Meier calls into mind that investigations in Akkadian literature have led to the conclusion that a diachronic development can be found in the use of quotation marking. Therefore, one needs to be cautious with too easily adopting analytic results of biblical books or general studies in the analysis of a specific biblical book in matters of discourse techniques.

b) The composition of Jeremiah is highly complex and unique. In fact, the book of Jeremiah can be regarded as a relative “isolierte literarische Einheit”. This matter of fact demands that the book of Jeremiah “weitgehend aus sich selbst heraus interpretiert werden muß.”

We do not want to be misunderstood; we do not regard this decision of first approaching the text in its present form as a necessary step of a particular “superior” method of biblical exegesis. We do not propose a complete exegetical methodology. The development of such a complete methodology is a complex task as it must integrate the complexities of the object (text as phenomenon) and the subject (the reader).

---

314 Meier, 12.
315 Ibid., 222, 269, 323.
316 Direct speech markings are regarded as assisting in the dating of literary compositions. Further, “the evidence of the versions, alternative Hebrew traditions, and the diachronic variations of Hebrew within the Bible (Rooker 1990) converges in affirming that the Hebrew Bible is a palimpsest and hardly the expression of a single linguistic community.” See Ibid., 9-10, 15.
317 Herrmann, 101.
318 Ibid.
Therefore, this task must belong to the future. But on the basis of our methodological reflections (chapter 1) we regard the text-phenomenological reading as a necessary first procedure of analysis for any method of biblical exegesis.

A detailed language- and discourse-systematic analysis provides us with excellent data for our debate with past and present readers and helps us to enter the other different being-aspects of the text (author, meaning, context, etc.). Thus, this text-linguistic data serves as corrective boundary for any interpretational activities, reducing necessary assumptions to a minimum, restricting also the subject in its too early attempts to reconstruct meaning out of the text. In this way, the text as complex phenomenon can be given proper acknowledgment while being the object of biblical hermeneutics.

After all shifts have been registered, the text-phenomenological reading hence calls for an organization of the PNG-shift distribution. Shifts are then put into one group when they share concomitant features. When a categorization of PNG-shifts into groups is accomplished, an allocation to one (or more) of the different textual being-aspects (as described in 1.3) will also be possible. This allocation can take place without importing too much coherence-quality from the subject side of the fundamental subject-object relation, since in many cases our reading enables the data to make its own interpretational suggestions. The less a distributional categorization is possible the greater the need to determine the belonging (textual being-aspects) and function of PNG-shifts by implanting text-external, i.e. subjective criteria that allow a consistent interpretation.

Consequently, we are especially looking for those PNG-shift phenomena that can be categorized on a distributional basis. We do not disregard those PNG-shifts which are difficult to categorize formally and therefore, lack the possibility of establishing coherence from the data itself. However, we are aware that the interpretation of such shifts calls for a rather complete interpretation of Reason that we have not yet established. As mentioned above, this task belongs to the future.

2.2.1 The WIVU Database

In order to perform a language- and discourse-systematic analysis of the book of Jeremiah that does justice to our methodological considerations we have decided to work with the BHS text-corpus as analyzed in the WIVU database. The data-driven attitude of its analytic procedures makes working with the WIVU-database so attractive. Not grammars, text-linguistic opinions or rhetorical analysis rule the structure of the data but - as far as possible - the data itself. This allows in the end what Harmsen calls a “Context Free Grammar”. Therefore, it serves well our methodological attempt to derive the consistency of our interpretative experiment as much as possible from the data structure itself before subjective epistemic categories are needed in order to allow the act of interpretation.

---

319 Walton stresses “The types of exegetical questions that may be asked are determined by the boundaries of the text segment established by text-linguistic features. Later questions regarding literary source, forms or function should not ignore these limits. The relations already determined by linguistic features govern questions regarding the functional or rhetorical structure of the text.” Walton, 7.

320 Oeming, 177.


2.2.1.1 Database Architecture: Monad Dot Feature

In the study of biblical Hebrew from the perspective of linguistics as well as exegesis, we need what Doedens calls a “text-dominated database” that makes visible its intrinsic linguistic structure.\(^{323}\) It is needed in different regards. On the one hand, we need it in order to make our reading consistent and reliable in attempts to interpret an ancient text that contains a dead language.\(^{324}\) On the other hand, it is needed in order to successfully test existing theories/interpretations (grammars, text-models, valency-interpretations, etc.) of the text and develop them further.

Seeing these needs, it was Eep Talstra who, in 1977, started with the morphological coding of the MT at the faculty of theology at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam.\(^{325}\) With Talstra’s guidance, the Werkgroep Informatica (WIVU) was established and it developed the encoding of the clause level for all narrative books until 2007. Since 1988, the WIVU has been working together in close operation with Alan Groves (Westminster Theological Seminary) and Christof Hardmeier (Universität Greifswald).\(^{326}\) In cooperation with the Dutch and German Bible society, the WIVU developed the Stuttgart Electronic Study Bible (SESB) in which the WIVU database has been made available to the public.\(^{327}\)

The architecture of the WIVU database is explained by the Monad dot Feature model (MdF model).\(^{328}\) An extended introduction and discussion of the MdF model and the WIVU database can be found in Doedens’ dissertation.\(^{329}\) Here, only the most important features are introduced in order to argue our case.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>monad</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>word</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>text</td>
<td>Call</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>Ishmael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surface</td>
<td>call</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>Ishmael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part of speech</td>
<td>verb</td>
<td>pron</td>
<td>noun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>punct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phrase</td>
<td>form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clause</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sentence</td>
<td>mood</td>
<td>imperative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The text-dominated MdF model divides the sequence of the text into its indivisible units called monads. The sequence receives a numeric coding, thus every monad corresponds to a single position in

---

\(^{323}\) Crist-Jan Doedens, Text Databases : One Database Model and Several Retrieval Languages, Language and Computers (Amsterdam, Atlanta, 1994), 17.


\(^{326}\) Doedens, 261-264.

\(^{327}\) Talstra, Hardmeier, and Groves.

\(^{328}\) This model was developed by Doedens on the basis of the WIVU database.

\(^{329}\) Doedens.

\(^{330}\) Ibid., 56.
Consequently, the MdF database describes the text “as a string of positional entities”. Further, the MdF model regards a text as consisting of objects (a word, punctuation). These objects then can be of different object types (e.g. words, phrases, clauses, etc.). Each different type consists of a number of features (the amount of features can be unlimited). When we talk about features we mean specific functions an object type can contain (e.g. part of speech, gender, number mood, etc.). The MdF database architecture then allows the researcher to add new features to an object type if he thinks to have discovered a new function. As the upper table shows, monads represent the building blocks for any object. Consequently, every object in the text corresponds to a specific string of monad number/s. Objects can be identified by their type and their set of monads; in this way every object has its specific object ID.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deut 1:1</th>
<th>אַלּוֹ הַקָּבָרָה אֲשֶֽׁר בָּדָר מֵאָשֶׁר</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.surface</td>
<td>LH Ḥ DBRJM &gt;CR DBR MCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>type</td>
<td>lex_mo lex_mo lex_mo nom_end lex_mo root_forma lex_mo verb_end lex_mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surface</td>
<td>LH Ḥ DBRJM &gt;CR DBR MCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part of speech</td>
<td>dem_pro noun article noun conj verb proper noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lexical set</td>
<td>quotation-verbs piel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbal stem</td>
<td>perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nominal ending</td>
<td>JM absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>state</td>
<td>absolute absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number</td>
<td>plural plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender</td>
<td>masculine masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suffix F</td>
<td>absent absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suffix M</td>
<td>absent absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suffix G</td>
<td>absent absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phrase_atom</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>type</td>
<td>NP demo_n_pronoun NP_with_article ConjF VP NP proper noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clause_atom</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>type</td>
<td>nominal clause verbal clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relation</td>
<td>attributive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sentence_atom</td>
<td>half_verse number verse number chapter number book name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deuteronomium</td>
<td>1 3 1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

331 Ibid., 57.
332 Ibid., 82.
333 Ibid., 59-60.
334 Both the addition and subtraction of features are not inspired by theories but by research-intuition. During the analytic process the quality of suggested features improves heuristically. Neither does such an addition or subtraction change the order of the data itself, since the monad sequence cannot be manipulated.
335 Ibid., 64.
336 Ibid., 86-88.
In the WIVU database, the different object types are ordered hierarchically. We start with the object type “word” and end with the object type “sentence”. Every object type is then characterized by its own collection of features (object functions). Thus the object type “word” has the functions “gender”, “word class”, “number”, while the object type “clause” has the function “clause type”, etc. In the way the data is organized, it is possible to display and store the different relations that different object types have. One object can overlap (two objects have at least one monad in common), can consecute (one object consecutes another object either with or without [contiguous string of monads] gaping), or can be covered by another object (an object of a higher type can be formed from objects of a lower type). In this way, hierarchical relations are expressed by the objects and their relations towards each other. In order to determine how objects relate to each other it is necessary to define the first and last (left border and right border) monad of the object’s monad set. Thus, two objects are separated if the number of the last monad of an object is smaller than the number of the first monad of the next object.

The advantage of such a formal way of analysis is that the analyzed text can be used in order to describe and compare many different ways of analysis of the same text. This is why the WIVU database has been proven to be an excellent tool for testing existing theories and specific syntactical opinions but has shown itself also as a good tool for developing specific grammatical ideas based on the analyzed data.

2.2.1.2 DATABASE PRODUCTION: BOTTOM-UP

Since the basic ideas of the MdF model have been introduced we can explain the data-generation of the WIVU database. As the WIVU idea of analysis follows a bottom-up approach in order to prevent obtruding a complete grammatical system on the text, we need to slowly build up our analysis from the most elementary linguistic level of words and morphemes to the complex level of text-grammar.

A detailed description of this analysis procedure can be found in Harmsen’s work. Here only an overview is given in order to understand the procedure of our language- and discourse-systematic reading of Jeremiah, as it serves as the basis of our PNG-shift research. It illustrates what a text-approach looks like that attempts to come close to the object. In order to have more consistency and objectivity, the analytic procedures are always assisted by computer programs, if not full-automatized. The higher the level of analysis the more difficult it is and the more assistance the computer needs.

--

337 Ibid., 65-70.
338 Ibid., 72.
339 Doedens compares in his dissertation different linguistic surface structures by means of an MdF data design, Ibid., 73-82.
340 Anstey’s dissertation is an example hereof: Matthew Philip Anstey, Towards a Functional Discourse Grammar Analysis of Tiberian Hebrew (Canberra, 2006).
341 See Talstra: 98-105.
342 Harmsen, 10-141.
For its analysis, the BHS digitalized text of the WIVU does not use any masoretic annotations (except ketiv/qere information) or any divisions of chapters and verses as linguistic units. This is because the masoretic annotations and versification that help to guide the reader through the text are not primarily based on grammatical devices.\textsuperscript{344}

1. Word-level:
The analytic work starts at the morpheme level. Here, every MT graphical word is analyzed in order to separate it from its contained morphemes. On this level the computer needs to have access to a basic dictionary and the different existing suffix- and prefix-forms. Both, morphological information as well as word-feature information is derived from Köhler's and Baumgartner's bilingual Hebrew dictionary\textsuperscript{345}. This is the necessary first input. However, grammatical and syntactical information are not incorporated by consulting grammars at this level. Even at a higher level, the use of grammars or syntactical or even broader, linguistic theories is avoided. As far as possible, the organization of data is described and built up by the systematism contained in the data itself.

The reconstruction from morphemes to word is carried out by programs which use a set of rules that groups the morphemes together as a word. Every word is tagged according to its lexeme. Further, all available word-features are analyzed and stored: Part of speech (proper noun, verb, adverb, preposition,...), PNG, graphical and paradigmatic forms, verbal stem, lexical sets, etc.\textsuperscript{346}

\textsuperscript{343} Doedens, 89.
\textsuperscript{344} Ibid., 86, 92.
\textsuperscript{346} The complete list is visible in the Syntax-Search window of the SESB v3 under the element “word”.
2. Phrase-level:
Phrases are to be considered as a cluster of words that are governed by the word on the first position. What constitutes a phrase is not answered by specific linguistic theories but by intuitive hypothesis.\textsuperscript{347} If a phrase-pattern hypothesis fails it is abandoned; if it works it is kept and stored in the data.\textsuperscript{348} The patterns are based on part of speech information of the words and on the morphology of the words. By these patterns phrase atoms are defined. Thus, a clear bottom-up relation exists.

Usually, a phrase is equivalent with a phrase-atom, however, due to the phenomenon of embedding the notion of “atom” was introduced into the MdF model. Sometimes element A (be it a phrase, clause or sentence) is divided into two parts (A1 and A2) because another element B (be it a phrase, clause or sentence) splits A into two parts.\textsuperscript{349} By means of atom-counting it is still possible to describe phrases from a monistic viewpoint. Thus the linear sequence of the data itself is still respected. Due to the registration of defectiveness, the notification of the monadic sequence does not prevent the display of phrases that consists out of more than one phrase-atom. When there is not any defectiveness, a single phrase-atom equals a phrase, a clause-atom a clause, a sentence-atom a sentence.

After phrase boundaries are defined, all phrase atoms are marked. When a phrase consists of more than one phrase atom the phenomenon of defectiveness is present. The defective part is called “daughter” while its relational part is called “mother”. This is also the case when a phrase-atom contains sub-phrases, like a regens-rectum construction (regens becomes mother of the rectum becomes daughter). The connections between daughters and mothers are computed with

\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{347} Harmsen, 23.
\item\textsuperscript{349} 2 Kg 17:38 can serve as an example for embedding: 
trans: And the covenant, which I have made with you, you should not forget. 
\begin{itemize}
\item embedded clause#2-clauseatom#2: which I have made with you (אֲשֶׁר-חַתַּןְתִּי אֶת-עַם)
\item clause#1-clauseatom#3: you should not forget (לֹא אַחֲרֵיכְתַּנְתִּי)
\end{itemize}
\end{itemize}

In the above case the functional unit clause\#1 is interrupted by the functional unit clause\#2. Sequentially seen, it is only by means of connecting of the first part of clause \#1 (“and the covenant”) with its last part (“you should not forget”), that a well-formed linguistic unit is established as clause \#1.

From the perspective of the linear text sequence the last part of clause \#1 is not connected with the last part of that very clause but with the subsequent part (“which I have made with you”). This linear counting is necessary if the phenomenon of embedding is to be registered. The functional unit clause\#1 consequently exists of the sequential clause-atoms \#1+\#3. This phenomenon of embedding can be found also on the level of clauses and sentences.

The phenomenon of embedding is, however, only one specific case of defectiveness. Two atoms can often relate defectively although no gaping is present. This is the case with e.g. appositional phrases or specificational phrases. As an example Gen 7:16
will serve: 
trans: Male and female of all flesh came.
\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{348} 2 Kg 17:38 can serve as an example for embedding: 
\item\textsuperscript{350} 2 Kg 17:38 can serve as an example for embedding: 
\end{itemize}

In this particular case the functional unit \#1 consists of the atomic unit \#1+\#2. The phraseatom \#2 relates to phraseatom \#1 in terms of a specification. “Of all flesh” then relates defectively to “male and female”.

\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{347} Harmsen, 23.
\item\textsuperscript{349} 2 Kg 17:38 can serve as an example for embedding: 
\item\textsuperscript{350} 2 Kg 17:38 can serve as an example for embedding: 
\end{itemize}
the assistance of human intelligence and the established mother-daughter relations are categorized. In that way, information about phrase atom relations (appositional-, conjunctional-, parallel-, specificational-relation)\(^{350}\) and sub-phrase relations (adjunctive-, attributive-, demonstrative-, modifying-, parallel-, regens/rectum-relation) are stored.

Finally, each phrase atom is labeled with a specific phrase type (e.g. verbal phrase, noun phrase, prepositional phrase, etc.).\(^{351}\)

3. Clause-level:
A clause consists either of a single phrase or of a collection of phrases that gather around a predication (be it a verbal or a non-verbal phrase). A set of rules (intuitive-heuristically developed) on combinations of phrase-atom patterns results in a dictionary of clause-atoms. After the clause-atoms have been identified and the relation between clause and clause-atom has been registered, each clause-atom is labeled with its specific clause-type (e.g. We-Qatal, We-X-Qatal, Wayyiqtol, etc.)\(^{352}\).

After the clause-type information is added, the attention is given to the clause-atom relations. Clauses can stay in relationship with each other (e.g. attributive, predicative, resumptive, etc.)\(^{353}\).

These relationships can go over different distances. The specific distance as well as the type of relation is described and stored in the database in order to develop the hierarchy of the next level (sentence). Consequently, clause-atoms become sentence-atoms.\(^ {354}\) A sentence-atom, therefore, is defined by Harmsen as consisting:

“of one main clause atom and zero or more subordinate (A), defective (B) or parallel (C) clause atoms. A subordinate clause atom is a relative [...] or infinitive [...] relation, directly [...] or indirectly [...] connected with the main clause atom.”\(^ {355}\)

4. Sentence-level (syntactical parsing):
By a set of rules, the clause-atoms are related to sentence-atoms. Many definitions of sentence boundaries are still experimental. The most common clause openers that mark sentence-opening are ויהי, והיה, אם, ... and macro-syntactical signals like: עתה עתה, והנה and other lexeme-patterns like: למען, לעבל, על, כ.

5. Text-level:
One of the important features that establish textual coherence is the participant-reference structure. First-computations for participant references are tested. However, so far much has remained on the side of the analytic eye of the human subject to detect textual reference structures. This will be one of the important tasks to be performed in our confrontation with the PNG-shift phenomenon.

---

350 The typification of the different relations between phrase atoms is postponed until the computation of clause-atoms.
351 The complete list is visible in the Syntax-Search window of the SESB v3 under the element “phrase atom/phrase atom type”.
352 The complete list is visible in the Syntax-Search window of the SESB v3 under the element “clause atom/clause atom type”.
353 The complete list is visible in the Syntax-Search window of the SESB v3 under the element “clause/clause relation”.
354 Harmsen, 36.
355 Ibid., 40.
During the different analytic processes, we also encounter ambiguities. In such cases, there are different solutions: (a) Either the context gives the necessary information,\textsuperscript{356} or (b) a higher level of analysis gives the necessary information (in a sense: top-down), or (c) a guess of the analyst is required who will also store his annotations in the database in order to have anybody see or correct the rationality of the analyst’s decision. Since the understanding of the language system on all its levels increases intuitively during the parsing processes, adaptations are periodically implemented testifying that linguistic analysis “follows a life cycle”.\textsuperscript{357}

The bottom-up method produces hierarchical structures on the basis of distributional or formal elements from a lower level in order to describe a higher level. The advantage of the computer-assisted analysis is that such a complex task as reading, is unraveled and the display of the syntactical discourse organization is made much more consistent than any individual researcher could do.\textsuperscript{358} Besides this, the computer can read the text with focus on specific syntactical phenomena without being disturbed by the non-linear associative power of the human mind. Concepts and ideas - be they of a linguistic, literary, source/redaction-critical nature - can be verified/falsified. Furthermore, the search for specific phenomena can stimulate the development of solutions to textual challenges for the exegete, challenges as our specific PNG-shift problem.

\textbf{2.2.2 Specific procedure: Registration and collection of PNG-shifts}

For our specific research problem, the main focus will be the registration and phenomenological categorization of PNG-shifts. Since these shifts can only be registered within and between clauses, our analysis involves a complete computer assisted analysis of the Jeremiah-text on phrase- and clause-connection level.\textsuperscript{359} Our phrase- and clause-connection analysis generates information on three different levels:

1. The participant analysis tells us who is who.
2. The syntactic parsing tells us who is subject (1P) and who is object (3P, 2P) or direct addressee/complement (2P)
3. The discourse analysis tells us what to detect as narration, direct speech, and what as background or foreground of the discourse.

This information contributes to our identification of the different PNG-shifts. In order to develop a text-phenomenological analysis, we have set up linguistic parameters used by the computer in order to assist the reading of the texts. The features are presented in their decreasing significance (1. syntactic coherence; 2. participant-reference coherence; 3. semantic-contiguity coherence):\textsuperscript{360}

\textsuperscript{356} Ibid., 10.
\textsuperscript{357} Doedens, 95; Harmsen, 14.
\textsuperscript{358} This is also because the computational procedures are based on algorithms. Thus, every result of analysis is not derived from a complex human interpretative framework consisting of conscious and subconscious foreknowledge but from careful explication of rules. This allows for much more transparency. Therefore, Verheij can state that “the origin of every bit of information is traceable”. See Verheij, 9.
\textsuperscript{359} Because of the bottom-up approach, this analysis can only be carried out on the basis of the completed word-level analysis. The word-level analysis has been performed by the WIVU group in earlier years.
\textsuperscript{360} See also Talstra; Walton, 15-19.
1. **Syntactic coherence:**
   a) **Conjunctions (clause connections):**
      i. **Relative pronoun (subordination):**
         1. אשר-clauses connect to the immediately preceding clause.
         2. Attributive clauses connect to the immediate preceding clause.
      ii. **Asyndeton and Conjunction (those cases causing subordination):**
         1. Asyndetic clauses with a participle connect to the immediate preceding clause.
         2. אז, אם, אשר, בעבורי, וב, ו, כל, אף.
      iii. **Infinitive (subordination):**
         Infinitive clauses connect to the immediate preceding clause. Subordinate-clause relations are only continued, if subsequent subordinating markers (relative pronoun, conjunction, infinitive) are present.
      iv. **Coordinating markers:**
         Conjunctions (א, או, אם, ו, כי, על־כן) potentially cause co-ordinate relations: Whether a clause should be coordinated depends on two characteristics:
         1. Quality of correspondence: Kind of parallel features.
         2. Quantity of correspondence: Number of parallel features.
   b) **Adverbs:** אז, ??????
   c) **Action/time/perspective coherence:**
      i. **Clause class:**
         1. NmCl
         2. VbCl
         3. AjCl
      ii. **Clause types:**
         This includes the order and presence of clause elements:
         1. VbCl
            a. Tense
            b. +/- waw
            c. +/- X (incl. position)
         2. NmCl with dominant core element
            a. NP (det/undet)
            b. PtcP

---

361 An example for a subordinated clause that is introduced by a כי conjunction can be found in Jer 11:19:

362 An example with a coordinated clause that is introduced by a כי conjunction can be found in Jer 33:11:
c. PP

d. Adj

e. Interrog.

f. +/- waw

iii. Text types (mode of participant communication):
1. N = Narrative: wayyiqtol forms predominate
2. D = Discursive: yiqtol and Imp forms predominate, however no clear direct speech marking is present
3. Q = Direct speech: discursive clauses that have been introduced as direct speech

d) Position of predication/core-element in clause: Position and character of x

e) Syntactic construction based on lexical pattern:
   i. אם and ה
   ii. כי אם and על־כן

f) Frequent clause connections:
   i. WayX ← WayX
   ii. Way0 ← WayX
   iii. Way0 ← Way0
   iv. Way0 ← NmCl
   v. WayX ← W-X-Qatal
   vi. Way0 ← W-L>-Qatal
   vii. WayX ← W.Ptc.

g) Frequent paragraph marking:
   i. WayX
   ii. W-X-Qatal
   iii. Way with deictic element (reference to time and location)

2. Participant-reference coherence (participants and participant sets):
   a) New/Reintroduced/Continued participant(s)
   b) Repetition of lexemes/phrases
   c) Type of participant reference
      i. NPdet/NPundet
      ii. Personal pronoun/demonstrative pronoun
      iii. Pronominal suffix
      iv. Inflectional suffix

3. Semantic-contiguity coherence:
   a) use of key words
   b) use of synonyms or words sharing a semantic field

---

363 Determined (NPdet) and undetermined (NPundet) noun phrases can establish a reference to a former mentioned participant as Gen 11:1-9 shows (NPdet):

"אתם א버ם את תהליך וארם במשה ותשמשו לש פורים יתפזר כִּלָּהאָרִים. [...]"
As mentioned earlier, our completed language- and discourse-systematic reading of the book of Jeremiah has become part of the WIVU database and is available in the SESB v3. This language- and discourse-systematic reading of the 52 chapters of Jeremiah is the basis of our PNG-shift research. Such a text-linguistic reading opens the eyes for any participant reference shifts and makes the scholar sensitive for the communication of the objects ontic qualities (determination and under-determination existing in the text). Thus, the object “text” receives a much stronger position in the methodological subject-object relation, helping the reader to suppress his subjective intuition as far as needed. In that sense, our phenomenological text-systematic reading functions as foundation for the following three chapters of this book. Representative for the text-phenomenological reading our analysis of Jeremiah chapter 1 is displayed below:
3 Commentary Treatment of PNG-shifts

Because of our interest in exegetical methodology, our work has chosen exegeses as main dialogue partners. We are aware that a complete treatment of our phenomenon demands insights from experts in the fields of linguistic anthropology, literature, and Ancient Near Eastern scholars in order to have access to more comparative data. But this would go beyond the limited scope of this book. In this chapter, we aim at a critical portrait of the different commentary works of Duhm, Thiel, Lundbom, Holladay and Carroll and their respective treatment of PNG-shifts. These five outstanding scholars have been chosen because each of them developed a specific view on the text and developed a method of reading that has become representative for exegetical works on a more general scale. At the basis of our choice for these scholars stands our interest in their methodological conditions and how they operate behind the different interpretative activities with regard to PNG-shifts. Our hermeneutical framework (chapter 1) with its depiction of the formal and final conditions as the subject’s contribution to the subject-object relation will help to get a grip on the methodological side of the diverse exegetical works. The critical material that enables such a look will be generated by the comparison of our text-linguistically based PNG-shift database with the quantity and quality of PNG-shift registration in the different commentaries. Exploring the methodological conditions applied by the different exegeses gives a further insight into our own methodological approach as outlined in chapter 2.

3.1 Introduction

In order to get a meaningful analysis, we suggest organizing the different dominant and popular commentaries on Jeremiah according to their views on the readability of the text. By this, we have in mind the measure of willingness of each commentary to approach the text as a readable, i.e. coherent and meaningful text in its final “as it is” stage. The question to be answered is whether the respective commentary treats the text as a basically readable corpus or rather as a chaotic conglomerate of sentences and ideas. The issue of readability lies at the foundation of the methodological quest, as the measure of readability granted to the text usually reveals what is subjectively expected from the text in order to be readable. Consequently, matters of readability always come prior to matters of the investigation of meaning.

Among the above mentioned scholars, we see four different attitudes with regard to the readability of Jeremiah. We are aware that allocating each scholarly work to one of those attitudes outlined below bears disadvantages: Justice to individuality can never be achieved when categorizing.

1. **category: Modernistic fragmentation (sources):** Duhm (+ Mowinckel)

   There is no question that Duhm’s and Mowinckel’s works are the greatest pillars of a specific attitude towards the readability of the text. Duhm is the first who radically applied the literary-critical method in its source-critical form, as developed by Graf and Giesebrecht, to his reading of
Jeremiah. Duhm’s dominant sources can be classified by means of differences in language, literary styles, and themes into three sources:

i. Poetic parts (Q^A) originate from the dictations and sayings of the prophet Jeremiah. These sayings in chap 1-25 are basically the “Urgestalt des Jeremiabuches”. They contain the prophetic “I” and are detectable by the specific poetic intonations as “Vierzeiler von drei und zwei Hebungen”.

ii. Narrations and chronological information (Q^B), originated from Baruch the scribe

iii. Supplements to Jeremiah’s and Baruch’s writings (Q^C), consisting of sermons in the prose style. These supplements are added between the post-exilic period and the 1st century B.C. They basically contain the “דבר יהוה” sayings that have a synagogal character and express the scribes’ right to put words into the mouth of a former prophet that fit his ideas and sayings.

The classification into these three sources is also stimulated by the different participant references chosen for Jeremiah. 1P references dominate in chap 1-20 while in Baruch’s scroll the 3P references to Jeremiah are predominant. Duhm and later Mowinckel, see the poetic parts containing the 1P references as originating from the prophet. The prosaic parts (Baruch’s scroll), with their 3P references, are regarded as originating from somebody else than the prophet Jeremiah.

According to Duhm’s literary critical approach, the book grew over the centuries by the work of redactors, which affected its readability negatively:

“Das Buch ist also langsam gewachsen, fast wie ein unbeaufsichtigter Wald wächst und sich ausbreitet, ist geworden, wie eine Literatur wird, nicht gemacht, wie ein Buch gemacht wird; von einer methodischen Komposition, einer einheitlichen Disposition kann keine Rede sein.”

Duhm’s epoch-making classical commentary started to set the agenda for much exegetical investigation of the 20th century, and has been dominating the studies of Jeremiah until this day. In this regard Herrmann concludes that the

“Erträge der Forschung” am Buch Jeremia im letzten Jahrhundert müssen sich an Duhm messen lassen, und sie werden auf dem Hintergrund seiner Beobachtungen erst voll sichtbar in Zustimmung und Ablehnung.

The main object of our analysis is Duhm's commentary. Because of the close relation with Mowinckel's work, we also look at his work with respect to the composition of Jeremiah.
2. **category: Response (1st) to modernistic fragmentation (redaction):** Thiel

Thiel's work is of great importance for our analysis because he argues that of all the different methods that have been applied to the exegetical analysis of the book of Jeremiah it is “die redaktionsgeschichtliche Fragestellung als die dem Problem angemessenste”\(^{376}\). In this way he attempts to overcome the source-critical approach that has fragmented the book of Jeremiah to such an extent that the inner connections between the different sources (Q\(^A\), Q\(^C\), Q\(^D\)) cannot be detected any longer. It is by means of his redaction-critical approach that a door is opened to see the inner and meaningful connections between the different sources.\(^{377}\) Furthermore, his redaction-critical analysis from the perspective of the deuteronomistic editor is regarded as the most complete examination.\(^{378}\) Although Thiel assumes “post-dtr. Redaktionsstadien”\(^{379}\) they are of a limited kind and basically do not disturb the great redactional design of the deuteronomistic redaction. The redaction then tried to harmonize the different text-material used with their own addition in such a way that it “die Abgrenzungen aufgenommener Sammlungen verwischt haben könnte”\(^{380}\) This is the case especially for the chapters 11-25.

The intention of the deuteronomistic redaction is first and foremost found in the “Gerichtsbegründung” and the possible “Heilswende”, where the intended reader (Judah and its remnant)\(^{381}\) come to grips with the judgment that has lead to the situation they are facing now and receives a perspective on the possible future.\(^{382}\) Although Thiel works on a source-critical basis, the text of Jeremiah is - for the most part - regarded to be readable due to the editorial work of the deuteronomistic redactor.

We focus our attention on Thiel's two volumes on the deuteronomistic redaction of Jeremiah.\(^{383}\)

3. **category: Response (2nd) to modernistic fragmentation (art of speaking):** Lundbom; Holladay (+ Weippert)

In competition with the diachronic modernistic approaches strongly influenced by German exegetes, a counter-position began to raise its critical voice in the midst of the 20\(^{th}\) century stimulated especially in the English speaking world by Holladay and Lundbom. They basically do not agree on the temporal distinction between on the one hand the idiomatic language of Jeremiah and his time and on the other hand the idiomatic language of the deuteronomists and a later time. Although they do not disagree on the different types of language and style in the book of Jeremiah, they disagree on how to interpret them. This leads to following assumptions:

---

\(^{376}\) Thiel, 32.
\(^{377}\) Thiel, 118.
\(^{378}\) Carroll, 41. and McKane, xlviii.
\(^{379}\) Thiel, 282.
\(^{380}\) Ibid., 284.
\(^{381}\) Thiel, 113-115.
\(^{382}\) Thiel, 301-302.
\(^{383}\) Ibid; Thiel.
i. The prose section in Jeremiah reflects the prose forms of the 7th and 6th century. Therefore, the deuteronomistic prose language could have been the language of Jeremiah and Baruch as well.\(^{384}\)

ii. The book of Jeremiah is not necessarily to be seen as a complex compilation process with different redactional layers, since both the poetic and prosaic language share a similar set of vocabulary and could have been simultaneously used by Jeremiah and his generation.\(^{385}\) Consequently, the “sprachliche Differenzierung” is no longer equated with a “historische Differenzierung”.\(^{386}\)

The work of Lundbom and Holladay will be treated separately. Although they share in the same critique about the classical diachronic readings, they approach the readability of the text differently. While Lundbom’s reading is strongly influenced by his rhetorical analysis, Holladay’s reading is much more focused on the rhetoric macro-structure of the book (interrelation of prose and poetry sections) and on the historic authenticity that supports the idea of the book being readable in its final “as it is” stage.

We focus our attention on Lundbom’s three volume commentary and his dissertation;\(^{387}\) with regard to Holladay, our main attention is on his two-volume commentary.\(^{388}\)

4. **category: Postmodern fragmentation (history of redaction):** Carroll (+ Nicholson)

Carroll’s work represents a postmodern historical-critical reading of the book of Jeremiah. It dissociates from the modernistic source-criticism since for Carroll it is not convincing that canonical books are the product of a mechanical literary process as supported by the classical Quellenkritik.\(^{389}\) His post-modern attitude is also inspired by the fact that although there is a general agreement that the book of Jeremiah contains authentic material and was shaped by subsequent editorial activity, there is no unified perspective on the architecture and reading of Jeremiah.\(^{390}\)

Carroll, then, is well aware of the different presuppositions for creating a rational-meaningful coherence of the material on Jeremiah. Carroll does not believe that biblical data provides the ground for proving or disproving any exegetical result.\(^{391}\) But he distinguishes between a priori and a posteriori readings, i.e. reading that comes to the text with a dominant pre-understanding (a priori) and reading that comes to the text with only relative ideas, giving the text a dominant function in reshaping these ideas (a posteriori). This distinction additionally helps to understand to some extent Carroll’s critical perspective on classical source-criticism. It further allows to understand why the chaos within the book of Jeremiah (in Carroll’s perspective) becomes his

\(^{384}\) Herrmann, 87, 93.
\(^{385}\) Ibid., 88.
\(^{386}\) Ibid., 89.
\(^{387}\) Reference. Lundbom; Lundbom; Lundbom.
\(^{388}\) Holladay; Holladay.
\(^{390}\) Ibid.
framework of interpretation. While only the poetic parts of the book can be assigned to the authorship/speakership of the prophet,\textsuperscript{392} The prosaic parts of the book show some deuteronomistic influence but cannot be reduced to the hands of the deuteronomists as if there was a coherent text caused by the deuteronomistic editor.\textsuperscript{393} In contrast with Duhm, the incoherence is not without any function. It enables the reader to get in touch with the post-exilic debates and with diverse opinions and struggles that are stored in the book. The book as a whole and even the confessions of Jeremiah are not to be read as the expression of an individual prophet but as the expression of a tradition that uses the figure of a prophet to argue and debate their cases and issues.\textsuperscript{394} In the complexity of the tradition of reception - that constitutes the book to a great extent - it is not meaningful and even impossible to reconcile the different portraits on the prophet. Reason for this is the need of every tradition to respond differently to the prophet and his legacy because of the different context they were living in. The central question to which the redactional activity owes its dynamic is “How should a prophet behave in all manners of different situations”?\textsuperscript{395}

Carroll’s approach then, stands in sharp contrast to the works of Thiel, Holladay and Lundbom and will treat participant reference-shifts in its own way.

We focus our attention on Carroll’s commentary.\textsuperscript{396}

Our analysis of the treatment of PNG-shifts among different exegetes is based upon our own registration of PNG-shifts that is made possible by our text-phenomenological reading of Jeremiah. We have indexed a total of 585 shifts, in which the reference of a participant changes or in which a specific PNG quality is used to refer to at least two different participants. In our research, we have compared all these 585 shifts with the selected commentaries. The table below illustrates the distribution of these 585 shifts:

\textsuperscript{392} Ibid., 9, 11.
\textsuperscript{393} Carroll, 42.
\textsuperscript{394} Carroll explains: “The very great degree of development in the different narratives about the prophet also underwrites the view that the book is not about the historical Jeremiah but represents a multi-layered presentation of a prophet from the perspective of later generations. The double accounts demonstrate this development by telling the same story in different ways, so as to produce a multiplex picture of the prophet in relation to all the social strata of the community. Yet each story is significantly different, and various blocks of tradition have very distinctive portrayals of the prophet.” (Carroll, 28).
\textsuperscript{395} Ibid., 28-29.
\textsuperscript{396} Carroll.
In order to limit the size of this dissertation we do not discuss every single case of shift-interpretations in this chapter. However, access to all the data is possible via the attached CD (Excel file).

Our description of the shift-treatment of each scholar starts with a statistical overview on the number of shifts detected in the respective exegetical work in contrast to our own number of shift-detection.\textsuperscript{397} After this general statistical overview, we engage in a more detailed, but condensed description of the scholar’s shift-treatment. Finally, we evaluate each scholar and reveal the formal and final condition of method that must have operated in the interpretational activity. This gives more insight into the origin and nature of each chosen attitude of readability.

\textsuperscript{397} For presentational reasons we have chosen not to introduce the architecture of our PNG-shift database here. We regard it as more meaningful to place such an introduction at the beginning of chapter 5 (5.2).
3.2 Modernistic fragmentation and PNG-shifts (Duhm, Mowinckel)

3.2.1 Statistics

Of the 585 shifts, Duhm registers only 39 shifts as illustrated by the graph:

Duhm recognizes only 7% of all the shifts in the book of Jeremiah. Most of the shifts recognized by Duhm are P- (22) and G-shifts (12). Only three N-shifts are mentioned by Duhm.

3.2.2 Description

56% of Duhm’s shift registrations are P-shifts. Most of the P-shifts that Duhm detects are shifts from 1P to 3P or vice versa. The shift between the 2P and 3P position are not dominantly registered. According to Duhm, 30% of the G-shifts belong to grammatical conventions, referring to the Gesenius-Kautzsch grammar. The three N-shifts mentioned (3:19-20, 6:2-3, 17:4) are understood as errors (Duhm on 3:19-20 “versehentliche Einsetzung des Plurals”). Whether these errors are due to the transmission process or the work of the redactor/s is not discussed.

From the perspective of readability, Duhm’s shift-detection can be categorized in the following way (listed in quantitative order):

   
   In fourteen of the 39 cases (~ 35%), Duhm does not show any effort to explain the shifts registered but he simply judges them as problematic. From Duhm's perspective, this incoherence confirms that the book of Jeremiah cannot be seen as a “einheitliche Disposition”. His comments remain either on the level of registration or they consist of suggestions for correction. In both cases, however, the matter of shift-origin is not touched and no literary-critical explanation is given. In only five cases, Duhm's corrections lean on the LXX and are thus supported by one strand of text-tradition.

---

398 Gesenius and Kautzsch, §145.
399 Duhm, 42.

These cases differ from the previous category as Duhm does not judge the shifts neither as problematic or as unproblematic. He only makes his reader alert that the text contains a shift. We have the impression that his note about the shift should rather be taken as an unimportant marginal remark.

3. **Grammatical/pragmatical explanation (5: 2:14-17 [2x], 9:19, 44:25 [2x])**

Within this category, we find exclusively G-shifts. In three cases, Duhm refers to GK in order to explain the shift. Interesting for our observation is that Duhm suggests that a shift from M to F and vice versa can take place without the change of the addressed participant. This is the case with the entity of the nation Israel which can sometimes be addressed as male and sometimes as female entity. This is due to the fact that the Hebrew allows such a shift as Israel as “Volksname” is of male gender but as “Landesname” of female gender, according to Duhm.\[400\] This explanation is contrasted by Carroll who regards this phenomenon as a shift of social functions by which a participant relates to another.\[401\]


In the eyes of Duhm, there are some shifts that reveal the editorial inability of the redactor to create a coherent text. In most of the cases, Duhm explains that the redactor lost track of his own literary strategy. In 2:9-12, the redactor forgot that he intended to have YHWH speaking, which is the reason why he refers to YHWH in 3P instead of 1P. In 9:6-11, the redactor is so much obsessed by his own intentions that he misses to do justice to the discourse. Duhm explains:

> "In Wirklichkeit spricht natürlich der Autor selber. Aber er will ja Jeremias Reden vervollständigen, will also wohl Jeremia sprechen lassen und denkt nur in dem angenommen Pathos gar nicht daran, dass er ihn erst redend einführen müsste, und vor allem nicht daran, dass wohl er selber, aber nicht ein Prophet von Propheten Auskunft verlangen könne."\[402\]

According to Duhm, P-shifts can reveal that the redactors were “sehr ungeschickt” as they did not only originate in their obliviousness but also in their low literary rhetoric quality.\[403\]

5. **Due to citation (4:1-2, 11:13, 14:10, 21:13-14)**

In three cases, a P-shift is caused by a citation. Thus, by means of the P-shift, the citation is marked and made recognizable. It is within this line, that we understand Duhm’s comment on the P-shift in 21:13-14, when he explains that in case of the presence of a citation, the P-shift should be regarded as unproblematic.\[404\]


In three cases, Duhm regards a shift as hinting at a “Nahtstelle” of a secondary insertion. Consequently, shifts can mark diachronic traces, pointing at a later source-material.

7. **Transmission process (48:6)**

In one case, Duhm uses the presence of a PG-shift as an argument for his judgment that the text is “völlig verdorben”.\[405\] This seems to be in the line with most of his shift-treatments. In his

\[400\] Ibid., 21-22.
\[401\] See Carroll’s commentary on 2:2-3, 31:21 and his remark in: Carroll, 592.
\[402\] Duhm, 95.
\[403\] Ibid., 370.
\[404\] Ibid., 171.
\[405\] Ibid., 346.
approach shifts do not reveal intentionality or meaning (textual being-aspect “telos” or “meaning”), but are generally regarded as problematic.

8. **Art of redactor** (5:21-30)

Although Duhm is not clear in this matter, he expresses that the P-shift in 5:21-30 testifies that “w ir es v.21f. mit der Rhetorik des Schreibtisches zu thun haben”\(^{406}\). We can conclude that a P-shift can also be caused by the rhetoric of writing and does not necessarily need to be understood as an accident. However, it is remarkable that given this possibility, Duhm only once applies this interpretation to the P-shifts he registers.

### 3.2.3 Evaluation

We have seen that Duhm has a low shift-detection rate and that he generally considers PNG-shifts as problematic as they disrupt the readability of the text. Our observations on Duhm make us automatically wonder in what way his shift-treatment is conditioned by his method. In our evaluation, we make explicit Duhm's final and formal conditions that influence his specific shift-treatments.

#### 3.2.3.1 Final condition

We believe that the central reason for Duhm's general neglect of PNG-shifts lies in the fact that he does not approach the text fully as a discourse. His focus on the presence of semantic/thematic and metric coherence plays a much greater role than detecting the presence or absence of syntactic coherence or reference structures. This dominates to a great extent his final condition. A good example is Jer 14:7 where a P-shift takes place.

1. The word of the **Lord** that came to Jeremiah concerning the drought:
2. Judah mourns and her gates languish; they lie in gloom on the ground, and the cry of Jerusalem goes up.
3. Her nobles send their servants for water; they come to the cisterns, they find no water, they return with their vessels empty. They are ashamed and dismayed and cover their heads,
4. because the ground is cracked. Because there has been no rain on the land the farmers are dismayed; they cover their heads.
5. Even the doe in the field forsakes her newborn fawn because there is no grass.
6. The wild asses stand on the bare heights, they pant for air like jackals; their eyes fail because there is no herbage.
7. Although our iniquities testify against us, act, O **Lord**, (vocative), for your name’s sake; our apostasies indeed are many, and we have sinned against you.

By v 7, the discourse of the earlier six verses changes. The people of Judah and Jerusalem suddenly hold the 1pPos (in contrast to the 3pPos in v2) and YHWH holds the 2pPos position. Duhm does not recognize the P-shifts but the metrically problematic vocative. From a discourse perspective, this vocative co-establishes the P-shift, but in Duhm’s focus the vocative stands in its metric quality and not in its discourse grammatical quality.

A look at those cases in which Duhm provides an explanation or interpretation of PNG-shifts, makes clear that most of the shifts are understood redactionally and source-critically. With regard to the readability of the text, these shifts are usually considered problematic, revealing the inability of redactors or the intrusion of material (“secondary insertion”) that destroys textual coherence and unity. Mowinckel follows this line when he argues that because of the redactional work P-shifts are found. For him, the 1P references in his Q\(^{C}\) (3:6-13; 11:1-17; 18:1-12; 27; 32; 35) are caused by redactional work and are not

\(^{406}\) Ibid., 63.
original. The beginning of these sections are written with 1P reference as if it were a kingly edict. The pieces were originally a narrative text with 3P references. However, later redactors wanted to give the text passage more authority by exchanging the first and sometimes last part of the narration into a 1P discourse setting. This leads Mowinckel to the following conclusion:

“Wo also in einem Stücke die 3. Person mit der 1. Person wechselt, ist immer die 3. Person die präsumptiv ursprüngliche Form. Die 1. Person war für die Redaktoren und Abschreiber das natürliche; zu einer Änderung in die 3. Person hatten sie keinen Veranlassung.”

But since the discourse as being-aspect of the text is out of sight, more than 50% of Duhm's shift-detection remains unexplained, although he could have used them as additional argument for a fragmented text. In contrast, Duhm argues for the fragmentation by referring to the incoherence of genre, metre and word-use (idiomatic expressions).

From the perspective of readability, both Mowinckel and Duhm see the redactorial influence as generally problematic, hindering the text to become a book. Mowinckel regards the different oracles standing in no logic coherence as they are “durcheinander gewürfelt”. This all testifies to the „auffällige Planlosigkeit“ in relation to the total conception of the book.

The shifts caused by the transmission and tradition process, are regarded as negatively effecting the readability of Jeremiah. It seems as if Duhm understands history as a disturbing factor for the origin of the book of Jeremiah. This perspective is represented in his introduction to his commentary:

“Das Buch ist also langsam gewachsen, fast wie ein unbeaufsichtigter Wald wächst und sich ausbreitet, ist geworden, wie eine Literatur wird, nicht gemacht, wie ein Buch gemacht wird; von einer methodischen Komposition, einer einheitlichen Disposition kann keine Rede sein.”

In summary, we can say that the specific type of the treatment of PNG-shifts reveals clearly the final condition of Duhm's exegetical activity. The focus on the evolutionary aspect of the book of Jeremiah is limited to the observance of genre and phraseology excluding the dimension of discourse. The evolutionary dimension is so strong that even phenomena that could have been reasonably interpreted as

407 Mowinckel, 58. Mowinckel remains on the level of discussing the P-shifts and not the N- and G-shifts.
408 Ibid., 4. He explains:
“Die verschiedenen Orakel sind ganz lose und meistens ohne Verbindungsformeln aneinander gereiht. Und wo ein >>denn<< oder >>deshalb>> oder >>denn so sagt Jhwh>> zwei Stücke verbindet, zeigt es sich sehr häufig bei näherer Untersuchung, daß dieses Bindewort eben nur ein redaktionelles Bindewort, und dazu ein sehr unglücklich angebrachtes ist. Mangelnder Zusammenhang und große Widersprüche gehören daher zum Wesen der Prophetenbücher,...” (Ibid. )

Mowinckel has two complaints about the procedures of his time. First, he disagrees with the idea that the prophetic writings can be read as “logisch geordnete und gegliederte Schriften” (Ibid., 3; ibid., 33.). The first problem is caused by the misunderstanding of the prophetic oracles, while the second is based upon the misunderstanding that prophets were writing. The prophetic oracles are intrinsically not of logical well organized character in the form of an essay, but are of ecstatic enthusiastic origin (Ibid.). That means that a prophetic oracle moves

“nicht in Begriffen, sondern in anschaulichen Bildern, in halb mystischen Andeutungen, in krampfhaft zuckenden, lose aneinander gereihten Worten. Das echte Orakel hat keine Disposition, keine vorwärts schreitende Gedankenfolge; die Bilder, die charakteristischen Züge des geschilderten zukünftigen Zustandes sind kaleidoskopisch durcheinander gewürfelt.”

409 Ibid., 5.
410 Duhm, xx. In comparison with the LXX Duhm argues that the translation and redaction never finished; in spite of some attempts to organize its material, those were never fully carried out. In fact the translation of the Hebrew text into what would become the LXX was done in a stage where the book of Jeremiah was still not fixed but in the process of dynamic change. (see Ibid., xxi-xxii.)
belonging to other aspects of the phenomenology of the text (grammar/pragmatics, rhetoric, text-grammar) are reduced to this dimension of the Jeremiah-text. Consequently, the redactor is ambivalent being usually more harmful than skillful.

### 3.2.3.2 Formal Condition

Duhm's final condition serves as a good entry to his formal condition. The final condition makes clear that Duhm's approach to the text does not include the full being-aspect “discourse” as it excludes elements of syntactic coherence and resumption (chap 2, 1.3.1.9) and - as a direct consequence - cannot bring most of the PNG-shifts into focus. However, the reason why Duhm operates such a narrow final condition can only be answered from the perspective of the formal condition. Duhm's formal condition almost exclusively operates within the framework of literary criticism linked with a specific narrow view on the elements of textual coherence and cohesion. His methodology is embedded in the “wissenschaftlichen Grundüberzeugungen” of the 19th century. These foundations are built upon the epistemological frameworks of the enlightenment and operate under a new understanding of the self, culture, history, the divine and nature. Duhm's focus on rhetoric and thematic/semantic coherence (e.g. idiomatic expressions) reveals the dependency of the historic-critical methodology on the modernistic understanding of the self. Here, the unity of the self is isolated and personal identity is rather reflected by its self-generated expressions (choice of vocabulary, choice of rhetoric) than by a larger community to which it belongs to, or a divine being of which it is an image. This new understanding of the self directly affects the interpretation of the textual being-aspects “author” and “reception and transmission”. This narrow understanding of the self leads to the conclusion that deviations of vocabulary or rhetoric in a text testify to the hand of different authors/redactors.

Together with an “immanent” epistemology that no longer support a naive revelation of God controlling the prophet's writings and its transmission, the referential being-aspect of the text and the aspect of teleology is affected as well. As a consequence, Duhm does not view the book of Jeremiah as the product of an inspired Jeremiah (and Baruch), but as something that grew dynamically (also by means of

---

411 See Herrmann, S4. Thiel points out that Mowinckel was inspired by Wellhausen's source-criticism (Pentateuchkritik) as well as by Gunkel's form-criticism, since he tried to explain the book of Jeremiah on the basis of four existing written sources (Vorlagen). See Mowinckel, 67. This caused Mowinckel to look at the book of Jeremiah as a product of processes. (Herrmann, 17., Thiel, 12.) Later Mowinckel stood under the influence of the traditionsgeschichtliche Schule leading to a different view on his Q. Basically the various sources become different Traditionsmaterial while Q was regarded as words of Jeremiah in deuteronomistic form. Because of the tradition-process the distinction between “echt” and “unecht” cannot any longer be applied. I Ibid., 15.). In fact, the encounter with the traditionsgeschichtliche Schule reveals nicely how interpretation of data and the subject's interpretational horizon influence each other. Mowinckel brings Q closer to Q while he contrasts those two sources strongly before he got influenced by the traditionsgeschichtliche Schule.


413 Cf. 1.3.1.3, 1.3.1.8, 1.4.1.2, 1.4.1.4.

414 This line of thinking is further developed by Mowinckel who sees the textual realities best explained by assuming redactorial work that brought together different written sources. Those sources must have come from different authors since otherwise the author would have created “ein ganzheitliches Ganzes” (Mowinckel, 7.). The assumption of a redactor consequently allows a “literarkritische Analyse”. (Ibid., 14.).

415 Klaus Bockmühl, Atheismus in Der Christenheit : Die Unwirklichkeit Gottes in Theologie Und Kirche (Giessen, Basel, 1985), 21-26; Canale, 97-116.
redaction) through some post-exilic centuries and therefore contains only little of the real Jeremiah.\textsuperscript{416} The general modern turn-away from the classical understanding of divine revelation and Heilsgeschichte towards a rationalistic epistemology and Geschichtsphilosophie\textsuperscript{417} is reflected in the flourishing pentateuchal source-criticism of Duhm’s time. As Eichhorn is able to integrate in a meaningful way, the consequences of this new epistemological foundation into the textual phenomena of the book of Jeremiah, his work provides the foundation for Duhm’s and Mowinckel’s method.

Eichhorn believes that the disarray in the book of Jeremiah is due to Jeremiah himself, who prepared different successive editions.\textsuperscript{418} The first edition was prepared for the exiles in Babylon while the second was prepared for the exiles in Egypt. The latter version appeared in Palestine where it became the prototype of the MT. The different redactions, adaptations, and literary growth are understood from the framework of relevance as the text was adapted to the different needs of people in different times and contexts. This perspective is applied to the interpretation of the interrelation between MT and LXX.\textsuperscript{419} The reason for redactional activity, then, does not stem from an \emph{ad fontes} attitude but from an \emph{ad relevance} attitude; the needs of the people are more important than the original intentions of the prophetic words. As a consequence, the text needs to be approached rather from a sociological and anthropological perspective than from a classical “heilsgeschichtlichen” perspective. The a priori neglect of the idea of any original prophetic words in the book of Jeremiah on the one hand, and the understanding that the book of Jeremiah contains a continuous tradition of interpretation and the use of original prophetic oracles by later generations on the other hand, create a rather pessimistic view on the ability of exegetical methods for purposes of historic reconstruction. Within this context Mowinckel clarifies: “Es muß meines Erachtens zugegeben werden, daß es eine allgemein gültige Methode hier nicht gibt.”\textsuperscript{420}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{416} Thiel, 3, 5, 87.
\item \textsuperscript{417} See Löwith.
\item \textsuperscript{418} Johann Gottfried Eichhorn, \textit{Einleitung in Das Alte Testament}, revised and enlarged ed., 3 vols., vol. 3 (Leipzig, 1803), 154.
\item \textsuperscript{419} Mowinckel, 48.
\item \textsuperscript{420} Ibid., 4.
\end{itemize}
3.3 RESPONSE (1ST) TO MODERNISTIC FRAGMENTATION AND PNG-SHIFTS (THIEL)

3.3.1 STATISTICS
Thiel’s commentary works include only chapter 1-45. These 45 chapters contain 504 shifts of which only 17 are detected by Thiel (3% of 504 cases!). Thiel’s seventeen detected shifts are all P-shifts with exception of two cases (4:3-8 [NG-shift], 7:29 [G-shift]). This is remarkable as the chapters in which Thiel recognizes shifts also contain numerous N- and G-shifts.

3.3.2 DESCRIPTION
Thiel offers in sixteen of his seventeen registrations a reason for the existence of the shifts. Although he registers the fewest shifts in comparison with Duhm, Carroll, Lundbom and Holladay, he does not treat the cases as if they were marginal and could be left uncommented. The following explanations are given:

   In most cases, the origination of P-shifts is sought in the bad work of the redactor. This creates the idea that Thiel assumes that the redactor worked with much foreign material that needed to be adapted into a unified whole. However, in some cases the redactor did not cohere its sources to a unified whole leaving shifts behind. These imperfections help the exegete to detect editorial “Nahtstellen”. Such cases are commented by Thiel in the following way:
   "ein solcher Text kann keine originale Einheit darstellen. Der Stilwechsel wäre in einem überlegt konzipierten Text unerklärlich. Nur einer der beiden Stilformen, die 3. oder die 1. Person Jahwes, kann als ursprünglich in Frage kommen."421 (with regard to Jer 25:5-6)

   Generally shifts were intended by the redactor to create a coherence with the following text-passage that was integrated into the deuteronomistic work. In those cases, the SS of the

---

421 Thiel, 264.
integrated text material is already reflected in the previous text in order to smoothen the transition as the example shows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2pPos by Coniah</th>
<th>3pPos by Coniah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Jer 22:26-28    | "I will hurl you and the mother who bore you into another country, where you were not born, and there you shall die."
|                 | "But they shall not return to the land to which they long to return."
|                 | "Is this man Coniah a despised broken pot, a vessel no one wants? Why are he and his offspring hurled out and cast away in a land that they do not know?"

According to Thiel, the shift from 2pPos to 3pPos in v27 is intended by the deuteronomist redactor who wanted to prepare the integration of the secondary source in v28 with Coniah holding the 3pPos.

In 29:19 the redactor intended the shift in order to address the remnant in Judah as a specific audience. Thus, while we need to assume that the original text in v19 had “persistently sent to them” and “they would not listen” referring to the same 3P participant as in the previous verse, the redaction changed the 3pLM forms into 2pLM form in order to make the text address an other participant: “die im Lande gebliebenen Hörer.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3pPos general Judah</th>
<th>2pPos remnant in Judah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Jer 29:19           | "I will pursue them with the sword, with famine, and with pestilence, and will make them a horror to all the kingdoms of the earth, to be an object of cursing, and horror, and hissing, and a derision among all the nations where I have driven them, because they did not heed my words, says the Lord, when I persistently sent to you my servants the prophets, but you would not listen, says the Lord."

3. **Nahtstellen** (7:29, 11:11-13, 34:17-21)

In these cases, Thiel does not judge the ability of the redactor but argues that these cases allow the detection of different sources. This means that non-deuteronomistic material can be abstracted from a deuteronomistic context (7:29, 34:17-21),

4. **Writing mistake** (7:25, 7:25-26)

Thiel argues in these cases that the shift is probably caused by a “Schreibfehler” of either the redactor or a copyist. Therefore one should correct the respective form in order to cohere it with the passage.

5. **Participant shift** (4:1-8)

In the one case of 4:1-8, Thiel comments only about the difference in referring to the 2pPos between v1f and v3f. While v1 has 2sgF, v2 has 2pLM. Thiel understands this shift due to a participant shift. Not any longer Israel (2sgF) but the inhabitants of Judah and the city of Jerusalem are addressed (2pLM).

Most of the detected shifts are described in the first volume of his work on Jeremiah which treats chapter 1-25. In his second volume, treating chapters 26-45, only two shifts are registered. This difference

---

422 Thiel, 18.
423 Thiel, 125. and Thiel, 40-41. and see Thiel, 153-154.
424 Ibid., 124.
can be due to the fact that Thiel sees the first 25 chapters as a collection of words and sayings that are organized by a specific redactional design. From a language-systematic discourse perspective, the different sayings appear as rather loose segments of the text. The compositional design of the deuteronomistic redaction reveals the use of “Stichwortdisposition”, “Leitworte”, “Rahmenkomposition”, and “stilisierte Szenen jer. Verkündigung” in the first 25 chapters. Chapters 26-45 contain much more narrations and reports and establish therefore more discourse-coherence.

3.3.3 Evaluation

Although Thiel approaches the text from the perspective of its general readability and redactional unity, only a limited understanding of the being-aspects of the text is applied. Thiel approaches almost exclusively participant reference-shifts from a redaction-critical perspective and attributes the shift-phenomenon only to the textual being-aspect “author” (in Thiel's framework the author is the redactor). It is not inquired in how far the shift-phenomenon could also belong to other textual being-aspects like “language”, “discourse” or “teleology”. The reason for this is found in Thiel's methodological conditions.

3.3.3.1 Formal condition

At the beginning of Thiel's methodological considerations, Thiel sees the need for new approaches for the studies of Jeremiah. The old ways cannot any longer promise convincing results. The function, position and origin of the Q-material are still not convincingly explained as the ongoing debate testifies. Thiel's methodological shift is not so much motivated by new epistemological reflections (like Carroll's) but by the limited fruitfulness of the formal condition of the older literary-criticism that is negative about the readability of the book. Consequently, the Q-material that is regarded in the older source-critical and form-critical approaches as “spätere Ergänzungen” must undergo a new analysis by the application of a new hypothesis that serves as formal condition. Thiel's redaction-critical approach, then, operates under a different formal condition that assumes a “durchgreifenden redaktionellen Bearbeitung des Buches” giving the prose section a more reasonable place within the book. He assumes that the redaction of the book Jeremiah involved redactors who were able to imitate the style and form of the received sources so that both the integration of different text material and the additions of redactional compositions sounded similar to the character of the received sources. What we see is that Thiel's redactors had much freedom; they did not only string together the different sources but edited those sources and formulated them

---

425 Ibid., 284-286.
426 Ibid., 3-7.
427 Ibid., 33.
428 Ibid.
429 Ibid., 28.
430 Ibid., 28-29. Thiel's methodological movement is also reflected in the work of Herrmann who moves from source-criticism, tradition-criticism and form-criticism to the redaction-critical method (“eine von bestimmten Interessen geleitete Näharbeit”) on his study of Jeremiah (see Ibid., 27-28.)
431 Thiel explains: "Kurz, es ist damit zu rechnen, daß die Redaktion sowohl bei der Bearbeitung vorliegenden Materials als auch bei freien Kompositionen sich an Form und Stil der überlieferten Texte – seien es Sprüche, Ich- oder Er-Berichte – anlehnen und diese nachahmen konnten." Ibid., 41. However the function of the „Stilkriterium“ remains ambivalent, since it is also used for the identification of original material in contrast to editorial phrases within the poetic sections (Thiel states: “Auf eine stilistische Angleichung der Prophetenworte an ihren Kontext hat D verzichtet, zu unserem Glück, ist doch die Stildifferenz eines unserer wichtigsten Kriterien neben dem Sprachbefund” in Thiel, 105.).
sometimes in such a way that the original was not recognizable any longer. In this way, the basic intention of the deuteronomists could be accomplished by shaping the present art of living and creating a perspective for the future. It becomes clear that for Thiel, the book of Jeremiah is basically a coherent and readable book, purposefully designed.

A deeper investigation into Thiel's formal condition reveals that he most likely shares in the modernistic epistemological conditions like Duhm. Although his methodology is different from Duhm's, it cannot be regarded as more than an alternative within the same macro-hermeneutical framework that Duhm shares as well.

### 3.3.3.2 Final condition

As mentioned above, Thiel's methodology can be understood as a significant variation of the older literary-critical approaches (Duhm). The variation takes much more part on the level of the formal condition of method than on the level of the final condition. From the perspective of his final condition, he brings the so called “Sprachbefund” into focus. This “Sprachbefund” refers primarily to the phraseological quality of the text. It seems that vocabulary and cognitive themes serve almost exclusively as constituting textual unity. This is similar to what we can see in the works of Duhm and Carroll. This explains why much of his research is dedicated to the distribution of words and phrases. Words and phrases establish the unity of the text by means of the “Leitwortprinzip”, “Stichwortdisposition”, and “Rahmenkomposition”. Chronological concerns do not play a dominant role in Thiel's final condition. As text-grammar and resumption are not included in his “Zum Verfahren der Redaktion in Jer. 1-25”. This is also the reason why the problematic of the PNG-shifts is not mentioned at all, showing that it is not regarded as a major item of the redactional work. As a result, the many disturbing participant-shifts (from the perspective of the modern reader) are overlooked. Thiel's final condition is, then, too limited for a more inclusive analysis of the text. Since Thiel generally regards PNG-shifts as disturbing the unity of the text (cf. his comments on the seventeen shift registrations), his conclusion that the text is readable can only be explained by his narrow definition of the “Sprachbefund” as dominant element of his final condition. In general, this observation is shared by other scholars as well and has generated many critical comments about Thiel's deuteronomistic editor. The latter seems to work much more comprehensive and systematic than what a reading of the text allows. We can see this even when it comes to the “Redaktionsverfahren” of the “stilisierte Szene jer. Verkündigung”, where the four examples given (chap 11:1-12:6, 14:1-15:21, 18:1-23, 19:1-20:18) are not - with the exception of chap 11 - analyzed, from a perspective of discourse, although the specific redactional technique of producing a “stilisierte Szene jer.

---

431 Thiel, 283.
432 Herrmann, 83. The relation between the deuteronomists and Jeremiah is not necessarily seen in the way Hyatt does. For Thiel, it could also be that the deuteronomists tried to support Jeremiah's theology by refining his thoughts and expressions. (see Ibid., 86.)
433 Thiel, 93.
434 Thiel, 284-286.
435 This applies to the 1st and 2nd volume of Thiel's Jeremiah. See Ibid., 281; Thiel, 100.
436 Thiel, 283-289.
437 McKane, xlv, xlix.
Verkündigung” would demand such an analysis.\textsuperscript{438} This contrast is so intense that, even on a more general level, McKane writes against Thiel (and against Weippert):

\begin{quote}
no more is being done than the cataloging of isolated items of vocabulary (single words) common to the two areas being compared, there is a danger of assembling statistics which are insignificant or have only a minimal significance and are not capable of supporting the arguments into which they are pressed. This is so, even if the vocabulary in question occurs only or principally in the prose of Jeremiah, Deuteronomy, and the Deuteronomistic historical literature. It is reasonable to regard as a significant statistic, but to decide what kind of degree or significance is to be attached to it is a matter of the greatest difficulty. It may express affinities which are to be expressed in terms of a cultural and theological consensus and which are sufficiently broad not to be limited to one organized party or movement.\textsuperscript{439}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{438} Thiel, 287-288.

3.4 Response (2nd A) to Modernistic Fragmentation and PNG-shifts (Lundbom)

3.4.1 Statistics

Of the 585 shifts, Lundbom must have recognized 159 cases. Although his explicit registration rate is lower (66 cases) we assume that he must implicitly have registered some additional cases. We conclude this as he tries to argue for the original presence of a petucha/setuma as text-division marker where the only sign in the text, possibly supporting such a division, is a participant reference-shift. When the implicit registrations are also taken into account, Lundbom has a much higher registration rate than any other commentary we have investigated. His explicit recognition rate places Lundbom after Holladay's rate.

Most of the shifts recognized by Lundbom are P-shifts (ca 69). Besides this, he recognizes N-shifts (24) and G-shifts (20). The remaining numbers of shifts are those recognized but not analyzed more closely by explicating their PNG-nature.

3.4.2 Description

The best organization of Lundbom's observation and interpretation of shifts is to distinguish between explicit PNG-shift recognition and implicit PNG-shift recognition. In both his implicit (cf. 3.4.1) and his explicit recognitions, specific patterns of shift-treatments can be found. Before the different patterns are described, it is important to note that Lundbom treats the text in its final form and therefore gives great attention to the petucha/setuma markers as having text-organizing function.

1. Implicit PNG-shift recognition:
As already mentioned, the placement of a petucha/setuma plays an important text-organizing role for Lundbom. In most (55) cases of implicit shift-registration, the shift is accompanied by the presence of a petucha/setuma. That the petucha/setuma presence is the dominant reason for marking a new DSC or text unit is simply seen in the fact that no discourse-organizing function is attached to the participant reference-shift. No text-internal but para-textual signals (petucha/setuma) are given as if the text was only organized from the “outside” and not from the “inside”. In all cases, the text-organizing role of petucha/setuma is not supported by any other arguments. This is especially surprising when we see cases (4:8-9; 11:17-18; 14:18-19; 31:14-15; 22:27-28; 36:3-4) where Lundbom argues for the wrong masoretic placement of a specific petucha/setuma. In those cases where Lundbom's understanding of text-division disagrees with the petucha/setuma placements, he tries to argue against their use in the particular case (“the purpose of which is unclear”\textsuperscript{440}), thus weakening the function of the petucha/setuma in general. In other cases of discourse-shifts where the presence of a petucha/setuma would be expected, it is missing (2:2-3; 10:22-23; 10:24-25). In those cases he explains that “the demarcation of units must be determined solely on the basis of formal and rhetorical criteria.”\textsuperscript{441} One might wonder whether these formal and rhetorical criteria are text-external as well. Further, he argues, to some extent, against his own practice by emphasizing the relativity of petucha/setuma placements, pointing at the deviations of petucha/setuma locations in the different Hebrew manuscripts (e.g. 5:20). The role of petucha/setuma in Lundbom's work, therefore, is ambiguous.

b) **Participant identification**


Similar to Holladay, Lundbom often identifies the participants without employing any arguments. In a few cases, the participant reference-shift is accompanied by the arrangement of formal stanzas (e.g. 31:12-14) or a petucha/setuma placement (e.g. 15:9-10). These accompanying phenomena could be understood as a possible rationale for the shift reason. But such a suggestion is not given by Lundbom.

ii. **With argument** (14:14-17; 15:6-9; 15:5-9; 29:19)

In the five cases in which Lundbom makes use of arguments for his participant identification, he once uses a reference to Rudolph as argument (14:14-17) and once a reference to Kimchi (29:19). In two further cases, he argues on the basis of the present grammatical coherence for the identification of the participant while in two other cases (16:8-9; 30:5-6) the rhetorical argument of intimation at the end of a DSC (16:8-9) and inclusion (30:5-6) is used in order to make sense of an identification.


\textsuperscript{440} Lundbom, 434.

\textsuperscript{441} Lundbom, 256-257.
In many cases where a P-shift is present, we find that Lundbom is, without explicating the participant reference shift, detecting a domain shift from prose to poetry or vice versa. In all cases, the shifts are not explicited and their function is not explained. The domain shifts are often accompanied by a placement of petucha/setuma but this is not always the case (e.g. 48:13-14).

d) Discourse shift-markers
i. **ה א as messenger formula** (50:32-33; 15:15-19; 25:7-8)
In four cases, Lundbom argues that the **ה א demarcates a new section**. However, the argumentation is always introduced by a reference to the presence of a petucha/setuma. The sequence the argumentation takes reveals the prime importance of the petucha/setuma placement for textual organization. First, the petucha/setuma, secondly the **ה א as direct speech introduction**.

ii. **ד giorno and verbal forms functioning as DSC-shift markers** (32:3-6; 32:35-36; 44:6-7; 49:14-19)
In only four cases, Lundbom argues for specific DSC shift-markers. Among them we find **ד giorno and the shift of a verbal form as explicitly marking a new DSC**.

e) Rhetoric
i. **Alternation of speakers** (5:2-3)
In 5:2-3, Lundbom argues for a specific rhetoric technique that alternates the participants as speakers without explicitly introducing the new speaker. But he keeps his explanation so general that the shift itself is not even mentioned.

ii. **Summary** (23:30-33)
In one case, the explication of the 2P position in the text (not explicitly mentioned by Lundbom) is explained as the summary of the discourse.

iii. **Title** (2:30-31; 13:8-12; 24:3-4)
In three cases of participant reference-shifts, Lundbom suggests that the text makes a transition from the title section to the discourse section.

iv. **י in 3:21-22**
In one case, Lundbom argues for the **י formula as marking a DSC**.

f) Secondary insertion
i. **Without explanation** (18:17-18; 11:11-13)
In only two cases, Lundbom suggests secondary insertions where a participant reference-shift is present. However, he does so without explicit reference to the PNG-shift. In both cases, arguments are not employed. In 11:11-13, he refers to other exegetes (Janzen, Rudolph, McKane) that also suggest a secondary insertion. However, this link is rather ironic since he suggests secondary insertion in only three cases while the other cases he argues against Rudolph and the others by discrediting them.

ii. **With explanation** (5:14)
In 5:14, Lundbom argues that the function of the insertion is to connect different text-parts with each other. The presence of the participant reference-shift is not mentioned.
g) **Shift due to content-shift** (6:26-27, 46:3-7)

In two cases of participant reference-shifts, a shift in theme is understood as marking a new section in the text. Although the thematic shift is accompanied by a participant reference-shift, the latter is not mentioned. However, we see that Lundbom struggles with the identity of the addressed participant in the new text-section thus testifying that he must have been aware of the PNG-shift. In the two cases where a thematic shift marks a discourse-shift (according to Lundbom), no petucha/setuma underline the segmentation. This testifies the significant role that a thematic coherence receives in his understanding of textual organization.

2. **Explicit PNG-shift recognition:**
   In none of the 20 cases in which Lundbom detects a participant reference-shift, does he explain its function or origin! Although he has much to say about the rhetoric structure and literary design of the text, he is completely silent about the role of PNG-shifts for text-organization.
   More surprisingly is the fact, that he argues against the emendations that are suggested by other exegetes (e.g. 49:11; 48:20;) without offering any interpretation or solution to the problem.
   Even more surprising is, that although arguing against emendations, and applying a synchronic reading, he overlooks textual signals that would help him in the majority of the cases to come up with a good textual justification of his synchronic reading.

   b) **Rhetoric**
      i. **Detachment** (15:5-9; 15:6-9)  
         In two cases, 3P-2P shift is interpreted as a “detachment” with rhetorical function. Lundbom explains that the “third person is also used throughout, which is more detached than direct speech”\(^{442}\)
      ii. **Inclusio** (22:26-27)  
         In one case, Lundbom interprets the 2P-3P shift as forming an inclusio with an earlier text segment that has the participant referred to as 3P. However, he does not explain exactly its function but seems to be satisfied to have found the rhetoric structure of an inclusio.\(^{443}\)
         Participant reference-shifts can serve as inclusion. This is the case when a single participant is included in another participant, thus becoming a member of a group. Although Lundbom likes to speak here of intention, he does not explain what exactly is intended.\(^{444}\)

\(^{442}\) Ibid., 724.  
\(^{443}\) Lundbom, 154-155.  
\(^{444}\) Ibid., 157.
iv. End of poem (13:22-23)
In 13:22-23, the sg-pl shift is explained as “an end-of poem shift in the addressee – from a personified Jerusalem to residents of the city”.

v. Self-reference (29:4)
In 29:4, the 1sgC pronoun in the ימשר -clause is legitimized by “in divine ‘thus says the Lord ‘ formulas, a divine ‘I’ is perfectly acceptable” Lundbom does not legitimize the case by a functional interpretation but by the fact that this phenomenon appears several times.

vi. Metonymy (26:2)
The obvious participant reference (P-C )shift in 26:2 is understood as functioning as a metonymy where cities stand for people.

vii. Question-answer style (22:7-9)
The PNG-shifts is once argued to belong to the rhetorical type of the question-and-answer dialogue.

viii. Intentionality without explanation (44:25)
Lundbom sees in the G-shift in 44:25 intentionality but then keeps silent about the content of the intention.

ix. Concluding remark (5:21-31)
In one case (5:21-31), the 3P-2P is regarded as introducing a concluding remark.

x. Shifting due to metaphors (3:19-20)
In 3:19-20, Lundbom argues that the shift is accompanied by a shift of metaphors (from father-son to husband-wife). However, he does not link this metaphor-shift directly to the G-shift.

In eleven cases of participant reference-shifts, Lundbom mentions the shifts but neither explains their function nor origin. He only identifies the participant addressed.

d) Grammar and pragmatics
i. Grammar (3:5; 9:19; 17:4; 48:6)
In four cases Lundbom registers the shift and argues that they can be explained from a grammatical perspective. Either the form is read as an archaic form that allows a different interpretation of the conjugation (17:4, 48:6), or shows that an M-suffix can be used as referring to an F-predication (1x), or that a 2sgM predication should be

---

445 Lundbom, 684.
446 Lundbom, 350. He also refers to the other cases in which an ימשר-clause contains a 1sgC pronoun: 23:2a; 25:8; 29:21; 29:31.
447 Ibid., 286.
448 Ibid., 127.
449 Lundbom, 165-166.
450 Lundbom, 317.
451 Gesenius-Kautzsch explains: "Vermöge einer Erschaffung in der Differenzierung der Geschlechter, die auch anderwärts zu beobachten ist [...] und die vermutlich aus der Volksprache in die Büchersprache überging, beziehen sich nicht selten Maskulin-Suffixe (bes. im Plural) auf weibliche Substantiva;" in Gesenius and Kautzsch, §1350.
read as 2sgF (1x) by referring to Gesenius-Kautzsch. It is interesting that in all four cases we find the same suggestions given by either Holladay, Carroll or WBC. It seems that the knowledge of the work of others can have a negative effect on one’s own innovative potential.

ii. Pragmatics (15:1; 23:36-37)
Lundbom argues that the shift from pl to sg can be understood as shift towards generalization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jer 23:36-37</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2pl</td>
<td>But “the burden of the Lord” you shall remember ( obras והל ) no more, for the burden is everyone’s own word, and so you pervert ( אמרה 헤ל ) the words of the living God, the Lord of hosts, our God.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2sg</td>
<td>Thus you shall ask ( אמרה ) the prophet, “What has the Lord answered you?” or “What has the Lord spoken?”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Surprisingly, Lundbom does not list and/or recognize more of these shifts towards generalization as there are many similar phenomena of pl-sg shifts.

In another case, Lundbom argues that it is possible to have a sg predication with a compound subject.

e) **PNG-shifts as DSC shift marker** (4:4-5; 13:23-25)
In two cases, Lundbom argues that the shift introduces a new section in the text. Unfortunately, he does not explain how this technique of introducing works. This is especially unfortunate, since we do not see any relation in our two cases between the succeeding text passages.

f) **Petucha and Setuma** (4:12-13; 5:21-31)
In two cases, Lundbom judges the absence of petucha/setuma as problematic and simultaneously mentions the presence of a PNG-shift. It seems that the participant reference-shift is understood as marking a discourse shift which would demand the placement of either a petucha or setuma. Unfortunately, however, Lundbom does not discuss these particular participant reference-shifts but leaves the case with identifying the addressed participants.

g) **Correction without argument** (28:10)
Unlike other commentaries, Lundbom engages basically in no attempts to correct the final text with regard to participant reference-shifts. There is only one case in which he changes the gender of a suffix. Although he does not employ arguments for his correction shift, the purpose obviously lies in establishing coherence with an earlier reference.

h) **Historic gap** (45:3-4)
In one shift-case, Lundbom argues that one needs to imagine a time lapse between the one

---

452 Lundbom’s argument in this specific case, however, is rather weak since Gesenius-Kautzsch does not really introduce an argument for the 2sgF interpretation when saying “weil die 2. Sing. Fem. schon vorher hinreichend bezeichnet war” (Ibid., §69r.).

453 Lundbom’s suggestion can be supported by a SESB syntax-search. Holladay suggests in contrast to Lundbom that  מַשֵּׁי should not be translated as compound subject but as “Moses or Samuel” (Holladay, 439.).
and the other text section, which would explain the discourse division. Lundbom’s suggestion is similar to the suggestions by other commentators (cf. Van Selms).  

### 3.4.3 Evaluation

Lundbom’s treatment of participant reference-shifts stands in a stark contrast to Duhm’s, Thiel’s and Carroll’s work. He not only detects many more shifts but he also considers them as unproblematic when he investigates in their origin and function. Since there is no doubt about the internal consistency of his work, the reason must be sought in his methodological condition. Both formal and final condition should also help to understand why the participant reference-shifts are almost exclusively interpreted (when interpreted) as rhetorical features and not as grammatical means of discourse or markers of different sources (Thiel’s “Nahtstellen”).

#### 3.4.3.1 Formal condition

Lundbom’s formal condition cannot be understood without Muilenburg’s legacy. Muilenburg led the way from form-criticism to rhetorical-criticism. In his influential article “Form Criticism and Beyond” he argues that the “Stilkritik” is only limited since it operates under text-external categories. The purpose of exegesis, however, must be the study of the individuality of a text. Therefore, text-internal signals of rhetorical design need to be detected in order to get access to the intentions and opinions of their authors and redactors. This approach called for further synchronic studies with focus on the author as textual being-aspect. Influenced by Muilenburg and Holladay, Lundbom makes a large contribution to rhetorical-criticism with his dissertation and by writing his three-volume commentary on Jeremiah. In his commentary work, he starts directly with the assumption that the “book of Jeremiah contains the legacy of Jeremiah the prophet” and expresses “one of the best profiles of any figure in the ancient world”. While he puts emphasis on the individuality of the author/redactor as textual being-aspect, he also stresses the being-aspect “teleology” with focus rhetoric. He can do so as he assumes that the genres of the book of Jeremiah (prose and poetry) “are controlled by canons of ancient Hebrew rhetoric, taught at a rhetorical school in Jerusalem during the eighth- to sixth centuries B.C.” This rhetorical school influenced the writing of a great amount of Deuteronomy, Lamentations and the deuteronomistic history, so that Lundbom assumes that Jeremiah learned the craft of his writing in that school. Jeremiah then, is regarded as a skilful poet, well trained in the rhetoric in his day compared with the best Greek and Roman rhetoricians. As Lundbom expresses a rather orthodox standpoint with regard to the textual being-aspect “reference” in taking the book with its historical references as accurate, he assumes that Jeremiah must have worked as a great preacher of the Josianic reform. Consequently, Lundbom dispels radically the idea of a deuteronomistic redaction. Duhm’s and Carroll’s view of the book as standing in great disarray

---

456 Lundbom dedicated his dissertation to Muilenburg. See also Lundbom, vii. and Lundbom, 68-85,157; Lundbom; Lundbom.  
457 Lundbom, 57.  
458 Lundbom, 113; Lundbom, 67.  
459 Lundbom, 92.  
460 Ibid., 121-122.  
461 Lundbom, 284.
is judged as basically anachronistic, since strategies of compositional coherence are different in the modern and in the biblical-ancient world of writing. While to the modern mind, chronological sequence is one of the many important items of building compositional coherence, the coherence of the book of Jeremiah is of different inner logic and therefore experienced as alien. Lundbom finds ancient principles of organization within the book.

Although Lundbom does not neglect redactional work in the book of Jeremiah he regards it as minimal. The alterations and textual changes due to the transmission process and redactional work are not regarded as numerous and massive. Lundbom assumes that the present form of the MT version is close to the version at the beginning of the exile in regard to its basic outline. Because of the specific characteristic of the rhetorical devices found, Lundbom concludes that the book of Jeremiah experienced two basic stages. The first is an oral stage (poems in chap 1-20), the second is the written stage in which Jeremiah's life is narrated.

Lundbom's formal condition allows to approach the text as readable and to a great extent historically trustworthy. In which way this influences his final condition is seen below.

3.4.3.2 Final condition

Lundbom's formal condition enables a basically synchronic reading of the text while assuming a basic compositional unity with a fair measure of readability (from a non-modernistic perspective). Lundbom's reading practice, however, is not activated before the text has not been segmented in its readable units. The segmentation is therefore generally not a product of reading but usually consists in registering petuchas/setumas as formal non-linguistic marker. Although rhetorical structures (e.g. inclusio, chiasm, parallelism) can function as segment markers, in most of the cases, the petucha/setuma markers serve practically as an almost ultimate guide for segment marking. Although Lundbom stresses that they should

---

462 Lundbom, 85.
463 Lundbom suggests the following ancient strategies (Ibid., 86-91.):
1. Chronology can be the backbone of a compositional sequence.
2. A specific genre can be the backbone of a compositional sequence. In that case different writings belong to the same genre and are grouped together. This can be done despite the fact that the writings can come from different times and are of diverse themes.
3. A specific topic or theme can function as unification principle, even though it might contradict the chronology or genre of the different texts.
4. Texts can be collected around the same SS (chap 21-23 – Jeremiah talking to the monarchy), independent of the thematic trend or their temporal commonness.
5. Catchwords can function as connecting different discourses as well as different literary units.Ibid.
464 Lundbom explains: “It is historical biography written down by Baruch very soon after the events themselves took place. Whatever contribution the community made to this material – if it made any at all – was minimal. In any case it is not significant enough for the material to be called legend.” Lundbom, 6, 118.
465 Ibid., 118. For Lundbom, Baruch is responsible with his knowledge of the deuteronomistic ideas and their rhetorical techniques, for the overall redaction of the book Jeremiah. (Ibid., 119.) One of the functions of Baruch's compositions was to use them in the temple setting for public readings.( Ibid.) In that way Baruch can bring closer the ideas of Deuteronomy to the people who have been "removed in time if not in spirit from the Mosaic Age"( Ibid.). In that sense Jeremiah becomes the new Moses. Further Lundbom argues that there must have been an oral state of the material in which Jeremiah formed many of the structures contained in the later written form.
466 Lundbom, 16-21; Lundbom, 73.
not “be taken as infallible guides”\textsuperscript{467}, he still emphasizes their importance by pointing out that they are at least as old as the Qumran fragments and belong to the oldest manuscripts and must therefore be regarded as generally reliable.\textsuperscript{468} This shows that Lundbom’s final condition is much dominated by a focus on the formal segmentations and the rhetorical making of the text as we have it.

In his actual reading, Lundbom is guided much more by rhetorical devices and semantic contiguity than by the grammaticality of the clause sequence and their resumptive elements. The basic units he works with are not discourse units (e.g. dialogues, narrations) but formal literary units of colons, consisting of not more than five words.\textsuperscript{469} Colons are grouped into lines, when they consist of two (bi-colon) or three (tri-colon) colons. Lines build stanzas by which whole text segments are constructed. The rhetoric structure and semantic relations contained in these colons and stanzas establish a well designed literary structure on the text. Lundbom explains that “rhetorical structures are controlling structures for collections of speeches and collection of other material about Jeremiah which go together to make up the composite work now known to us as the book of Jeremiah.”\textsuperscript{470}

The fact that most of Lundbom’s explicit registered participant reference-shifts are not explained stands in great contrast to his focus on textual details. While many textual features are elucidated, his identification of participants in the presence of PNG-shifts does not employ any arguments. On the level of semantic contiguity and rhetoric structures, there is great attention and careful arguments given, while on the side of textual cohesion and text grammar, assumptions and superficial reading are testified. The latter point is intensified when we look at his use of the petucha/setuma markers. They seem to be the overall solution for text organization making further considerations about text-grammar and text-cohesion needless. As his literary-synchronic reading of the text discovers rhetorical micro- and macro-structures everywhere, it is remarkable that only 19 of the 159 shifts are understood rhetorically! Their rhetorical interpretation takes place randomly and does not allow a conventionalization of PNG-shifts from a rhetoric perspective. Although Lundbom’s formal condition allows to bring textual cohesion on the level of text-grammar in focus, his final condition is dominated by a narrow perspective on the textual being-aspects. His dominant focus on the literary design of the text, then, is the reason why he overlooks most PNG-shifts and treats them one-sided when attempts of interpretation are made. In his work matters of literary design overrule text-syntactical matters.

\textsuperscript{467} Lundbom, 74.
\textsuperscript{468} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{469} Lundbom, 20.
\textsuperscript{470} Ibid., 21.
3.5 Response (2nd B) to Modernistic Fragmentation and PNG-shifts (Holladay)

Similar to Lundbom’s shift registration, we need to distinguish between implicit and explicit participant reference-shift registrations in Holladay’s commentary of Jeremiah. We can assume many implicit shift registrations where Holladay identifies participants in the context of PNG-shifts. He must have recognized the shifts demanding an identification of the participants in the new established SS. Our analysis, then, will also include those cases where an implicit recognition of PNG-shifts seems obvious.

3.5.1 Statistics

Of the 585 shifts, Holladay registers 125 shifts. Of the 125 cases 91 are explicit registration. The explicit registration-rate is much higher than in any other of the commentary works investigated.

![PNG-shift registration Holladay vs. database](image)

The overall statistics shows that Holladay recognizes 21% of all the shifts contained in the book of Jeremiah. Most of the shifts recognized by Holladay are P-shifts (~ 63). Besides this he recognizes N-shifts (14) and G-shifts (13). The remaining numbers of shifts are those that are recognized but not analyzed more closely by explicating their PNG-nature.

3.5.2 Description

Similar to Duhm, Thiel, Lundbom and Carroll, Holladay does not operate with a clear framework of PNG-shift categorization. The advantage of Holladay’s work, however, is that he registers explicitly many more shifts than other exegetes enabling us to investigate his intuition much better. We try to describe his dealing with the shift-phenomena in two ways. First, we try to describe Holladay’s general attitude (ethical aspect) in his interaction with the PNG-shifts. Second, we show what different types of interpretations he suggests when dealing with PNG-shifts.

3.5.2.1 Holladay’s Ethical Stance:

1. Identification
In many cases (33), PNG-shifts are not explicitly mentioned. However, it is evident that Holladay is aware of the shifting since he re-interprets the speaker or addressee.\(^{471}\) It is ostentatious that in most of the cases in which he identifies the speaker (e.g. Jeremiah, YHWH, people, etc.) he does it without the deployment of arguments. This is even more surprising as in our own analysis, at least 15 of the 34 cases are definitely not self-evident cases but hinder - because of their text-linguistic complexity - an easy identification of participants. This creates the impression that Holladay is rather self-confidently identifying speakers and audiences without the needed sensitivity to textual details as they are not part of his identifications.

b) **Identification with argument** (4:6-7; 4:19-26; 5:2-3; 5:6-7; 5:12-13; 6:4; 8:13-14; 8:14-17; 8:20-21 [2x]; 9:15-16 [2x]; 13:8-12; 16:8-9; 17:5-10; 17:9-12; 23:9-11; 30:5-6)

In eighteen cases, Holladay uses arguments for his identification of speakers. The arguments are either based upon (a) thematic connections (5:6-7; 17:9-12) identifying a speaker by the present thought coherence or specific topic; or (b) by linguistic arguments (4:6-7; 4:19-26; 5:2-3; 5:12-13; 6:4; 9:15-16; 16:8-9; 23:9-11) where Holladay mostly takes a יכ as יכ recitativum, which marks a new DSC and changes the direct speaker; (c) or Holladay identifies the speaker on the basis of other text-material (8:13-14; 8:14-17; 8:20-21 [2x]; 9:15-16; 13:8-12; 17:5-10; 30:5-6). When a speaker is not identified in the text in focus, the allocation of text-material to a specific participant as speaker is still accomplished when similar or identical expressions in other text passages are explicitly identified with a certain speaker.\(^{472}\)

2. **Registrations with correction**


   In 19 cases of PNG-shifts, Holladay corrects the text. In fourteen of these cases (5:14; 5:15; 5:16-17; 5:19; 9:4-5; 11:18; 17:1; 17:4; 21:12; 28:10; 46:16; 48:6; 48:15; 49:2), he employs a specific argument for his correction, namely the need of referential coherence. Thus, the fact that a textual correction establishes the needed coherence is reason enough for Holladay - and it is usually the only reason – to correct the text. It remains, however, unclear how strong the argument of a “need of referential coherence” really is in the eyes of Holladay, as in other cases he regards it as unnecessary to overcome grammatical incoherencies in order to establish textual unity, since in his vision, the text is not constructed in modern scholarly terms.\(^{473}\)

   b) **Without argument** (3:14-18; 3:19-20; 9:20-21; 48:27; 50:05)

   Among the nineteen cases of PNG-shift registrations that are followed by corrective suggestions, five cases are not supported by any arguments.

---

\(^{471}\) This is the case in 7:15-16. Here he explains: The verse begins with the “transitional expression ‘as for you’ (וְאַתָּה, masculine singular), shifting the address from the people of Judah to Jrm.” Holladay, 252.

\(^{472}\) Jer 8:20-21 contains such an example. See Ibid., 291.

\(^{473}\) Ibid., 575.
3. **Registration without correction**
   

   In thirteen cases, Holladay registers the PNG-shifts, discusses them and displays the different interpretative positions taken by the different leading exegetes. However, he withdraws from making a final decision and explanations. This stands in stark contrast to the many cases in which he most easily identifies participants and speakers although the textual facts make it difficult to suggest a final solution.

b) **Registration: Without explanation/interpretation** (2:2-3; 15:6-9; 23:2-3; 30:8; 30:8-9)

   In five cases, Holladay registers PNG-shifts but neither deals with them nor comments them any further.


   In five cases, Holladay judges the shift as “strange”, “awkward”, “odd” or “curious”. These cases are interesting because it seems that they could easily be explained from a distributive language-systematic or discourse-systematic perspective.

Having looked at the ethical stance of Holladay in the categories “identification”, “registration with correction” and “registration without correction”, we conclude that there is a quite visible tension between his self-assurance when interpreting and correcting the final text and, at the same time, his awareness of the limitation of the modern reader. On the one hand, we see Holladay’s intense trust in his *intuition* as exegete; he seems to know exactly who is speaking and what the structure of the discourse looks like without employing any arguments. We often need to conclude, however, that the text-material is more complex than to allow any simple and premature conclusions. On the other hand other shift-cases show that his hesitations to offer interpretations or assessments are so strong that even in cases that seem to be rather simple he withholds from interpretations and explanations. Within the category “identification”, Holladay usually does not explicitly mention any PNG-shift, this is different within the category of “registration with correction” and “registration without correction”. While in the category “registration-correction” Holladay expresses his self-assurance, this attitude is contrasted when it comes to the category “registration without correction”. In the latter, it seems that he is unwilling to further get into details as he does not feel able to tackle the problems in the shift-phenomena.

3.5.2.2 **Holladay’s shift interpretations:**

In most cases (84) of Holladay’s implicit or explicit registration, he either identifies the speaker or undoes the shift without much focus on the relation between textual discourse and PNG-shift. This means that except in ten instances, all cases that are mentioned under the ethical stance of Holladay are not part of the shift-explanatory notes in his commentary. Only 38 of the 125 shift registrations of Holladay (implicit or explicit) receive an explicit rationale. Although the expressed rationale functions in the background of a few of his identifications or corrections, it is not visible that they also work as a general framework of PNG-shift treatments in Holladay’s exegetical work. The following categorization attempts to give an overview of the 38 cases that receive a rationale in his work:
1. Diachrony
   In twelve cases, Holladay argues for a diachronic origin of the PNG-shifts. In 7 (11:13; 11:17; 12:13; 18:11-12; 21:1-8; 29:19; 51:20) of the 12 cases he argues that the secondary addition is visible because the coherence of participant reference (PNG) is broken. A secondary addition does not necessarily need to have a problematic effect on the reading process. In contrast, it can have text-constructive functions as well as the case in 11:17 shows. Here Holladay argues that the secondary insertion connects the previous and following verses.474
   In 3 (22:5-6; 51:36-45; 51:52-57) of the 12 cases, Holladay detects that the text material is secondary because it can be found in other text passages of Jeremiah or Isaiah (51:36-45). The remaining two cases (29:21; 11:1-3) are claimed to be secondary without the use of arguments.

   b) **Text transmission** (6:6; 13:18-20; 33:6-9)
   Holladay assigns three cases of shifts to scribal errors that accompany the text-transmission process, resulting in the loss of coherence of participant reference. In only one case (13:18-20), he does not elaborately explain what must have caused the shift but only assumes a case of dittography.

2. Synchrony
   a) **Grammar**
      i. **DSC shift markers**
         1. יֹֽכֶן (Jer 4:6-8; 4:19-26; 9:15-16; 16:8-9; 23:9-11)
            In five cases, Holladay regards a יֹֽכֶן as יֹֽכֶן recitativum. The יֹֽכֶן then either starts a new DSC or is used within a DSC for the purpose of marking a new quotation.
         2. יַֽכָּֽה (Jer 6:4)
            Although Holladay is not explicit in 6:4, we must assume that Holladay interprets the placement of יַֽכָּֽה as introducing a new direct speech. יַֽכָּֽה then functions as DSC-shift marker.475
         3. **Vocative** (5:2-3)
            Jer 5:2-3 is the only case in which Holladay interprets the presence of a vocative as a sign for marking a new DSC.476
         4. **Shift in clause construction** (5:12-13)
            In one case, Holladay argues that the clause-construction shift from predication-subject order into subject-predication order indicates a shift of speaker.477

---

474 Ibid., 348.
475 See Holladay on 6:4 in Ibid., 206.
476 Ibid., 174.
477 Ibid., 185, 187.
ii. **No Shift after grammatical re-reading** (3:5; 5:21-31; 9:19)

In four cases, Holladay registers the obvious PNG-shift but does not regard it as problematic from a grammatical perspective. For example, the G-shift in 9:19 is explained from the perspective of König’s syntax, where the preference of masculine verbal forms to feminine verbal forms is regarded as common.\(^{478}\) The P-shift in 5:21-31 is explained as a shift in reference occurring elsewhere by referring to König’s Syntax as well.\(^{479}\) Especially in the latter case, we think that Holladay is inconsequent, since not all of the shifts in vv21-31 are extended vocatives!

In the case of 15:1 where we have a compound subject (thus pl subject) and a sg predication, Holladay argues that the sg predication has an alternative force on the \(\text{ו}^1\) of the compound construction by explaining: “Though the Hebrew says literally 'Moses and Samuel', the conjunction doubtless has alternative force [...]; and the singular verb reinforces that impression.”\(^{480}\), causing to translate “Moses or Samuel”.\(^{481}\) However, in most cases such an understanding is not applied in Holladay’s own work.\(^{482}\)

b) **Rhetoric**

i. **Self reference** (4:1-2; 12:11-12)

A 1P-3P shift is understood as establishing a self-reference in two cases.

ii. **Quality-shift** (7:29; 46:19)

In two instances, Holladay explains that a G-shift does not cause any change in the addressed participant but alters the focus on a specific quality of a particular participant. Thus, in 46:19, he explains that with the 3sgF form that causes a grammatical incongruity with בָּֽזְזָה (referred to in M earlier in the text), “the address to Egypt as a female” makes “the image shifts to that of a heifer”\(^{483}\). In a similar way, he approaches the use of the F gender in 2:10-37 to address the house of Israel (referred to in M earlier in the text). Holladay explains this M-F-shift as underlining the accusation that Israel received as a result of its untruthfulness. The shift into F addressing then, functions as describing Israel in terms of harlotry.\(^{484}\) Consequently, a G-shift could highlight a specific character, role or quality of an participant.

iii. **Greeting formula** (12:13-14; 29:4)

In two cases, an obvious P-shift within a DSI is reread in such a way that the clause-atom that causes a shift is understood as not being part of the DSI but of the DSC.\(^{485}\)

---

\(^{478}\) Ibid., 314; König, §205. König refers to the G-incogruency among verbal forms only. This, however, is not the case in Jer 9:19 where the incogruency is established by a 2plM suffix.

\(^{479}\) Holladay, 195.

\(^{480}\) Ibid., 439.

\(^{481}\) Holladay explains: “Though the Hebrew says literally 'Moses and Samuel', the conjunction doubtless has alternative force [...]; and the singular verb reinforces that impression.” in Ibid.

\(^{482}\) E.g. 26:21 (Holladay, 101.); 36:19 (Ibid., 252.); 38:1 (Ibid., 266.); 39:4 (Ibid., 269.).

\(^{483}\) Ibid., 331.

\(^{484}\) Holladay, 67.

\(^{485}\) Ibid., 391; Holladay, 132, 138.
Thus says the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel, to all the exiles whom (נשא) I have sent into exile from Jerusalem to Babylon.

Build houses and live in them; plant gardens and eat what they produce.

In the two cases he tries to argue from a genre perspective, explaining that the clause atoms that contain the participant reference shifts are conventional formulas at the beginning of the DSC. But his references to Lachisch Letter no.2 and some Aramaic letters are not able to explain the presence of the attributive נשא clause that entails the P-shift.

iv. **Question-Answer scheme** (10:2-6; 22:8-9)

By reference to Long’s “schemata” and to Assyrian Annals, Holladay argues that the missing introduction of the shifting DSC is a typical genre feature. The missing DSIs belong to the general features of hymns. However, it is surprising that he does not use this argument more often as many of these “un-introduced” DSC-shifts can be found.

v. **Part-whole** (6:23)

Only once Holladay explains an N-shift (sg-pl) with “Jer evidently wanted to emphasize both the unity of the enemy and his numerosness”\(^\text{486}\). This seems to be a reasonable explanation. Surprisingly, he does not apply it more often. This could affirm the general observation we have made that specific solutions or critiques are only mentioned if they are also mentioned in other commentaries. Thus, as a specific idea does not need to stem from the own analytic work but from a tradition or an exegetical “social” practice, explaining that the very idea does not become part of one’s own interpretative framework.

vi. **Irony** (46:14-15)

In 46:14-15, the pl-sg shift (according to the analysis of Holladay) is understood as creating an ironic moment.\(^\text{487}\)

Where a pl entity should have been addressed by pl forms but sg forms are used instead, an effect of in-appropriation is caused functioning as ironic moment.

\(^{486}\) Holladay, 219.

\(^{487}\) Holladay, 327.
vii. *Inclusion (15:11-14)*
In 15:11-14, the sg-pl shift is used in order to broaden the number of the addressed. Not any longer a single participant alone but him being included in a greater collection of participants is addressed.\(^{488}\)

viii. *Contemporalization (2:6-7)*
In 2:6-7, a 3pPos-2pPos shift is explained as “hint of contemporaneity [...] for you, the hearers, are still the recipients of the land.”\(^{489}\) Thus a P-shift has the function to identify the object of speaking (3P) participant with the listener/reader (2P) of the discourse.

ix. *Superscription (21:10-11)*
In 21:10-11, the shift-causing clause is understood as superscription on the basis of other text-material.\(^{490}\)

### 3.5.3 Evaluation

The fact that more than 20% of Holladay’s shift registrations are explained and solved from a synchronic perspective (grammar, rhetoric) reveals Holladay’s reservation towards diachronic ideas. The fact that another 20% of Holladay’s PNG-shift registration are not interpreted but only described reveals his hesitation to come up with diachronic solutions. This impression is strengthened by those cases where he registers the awkwardness of a shift but often argues explicitly against a diachronic resolution to the phenomenon. Further, the fact that in about 20 % of the cases Holladay overcomes the shift by changing verbal forms, suffixes or entire clauses in order to establish coherence with the textual context shows, that he expects a readable text. Textual problems are not so much due to redactional activity but rather caused by the text-transmission process. Otherwise, he would not cohere the shift cases but use them as arguments for redactional work. These observations hint at Holladay’s conditions of method.

### 3.5.3.1 Formal condition

Holladay’s formal condition stands in stark contrast to the presuppositions of Duhm, Thiel and Carroll. As the latter – and here especially Carroll – argues that a historical and biographical reading is not possible any longer, Holladay investigates into the historical setting of the diverse text-materials and credits much of the writings to the person of Jeremiah.\(^{491}\) Assuming – like Lundbom – that the book of Jeremiah is rather to be approached as a large intended whole,\(^{492}\) he needs to interpret the interrelations between prose and poetry sections from an anachronistic perspective. His work, then, is based on the assumptions that both, prose and poetry, share identical and similar expressions. His interpretation of these formal relations suggests, that the prosaic sections contain expressions taken from the poetic
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section, so that these expressions happen to be poetic prototypes for their prosaic use. This is supported by the later studies by Weippert, Watts and Stulman.

Weippert, who represents in many ways Holladay’s methodological approach, is much more explicit about her formal condition. She intends to free the interpretation of the prosaic section from the presuppositions of the “Deuteronomiumforschung des 19. Jahrhunderts”. Weippert tries to explain that the research agenda set with Duhm’s commentary has not led to any unity among the exegetes within the last 70 years. Therefore, it makes sense to operate with a different research agenda and a changed formal condition. As a consequence, the new formal condition delivers exegetical results that clearly reject any idea that tries to argue for the deuteronomistic origin of the prosaic style in the book of Jeremiah. On the contrary, both Holladay and Weippert see in the poetry in Jeremiah the prototype of prose, and come to the conclusion that lexical relations between Jeremiah and the deuteronomistic literature do not hint at their literary dependence but at their contemporaneity. In fact, there is often eine “Übernahme (of Lexems) unter gleichzeitiger Umkehrung ihres ursprünglichen Aussagegehalts”.

In regard to the overall composition of the book of Jeremiah, one comes to the conclusion that the prosaic material is not of redactional nature. Although redactorial influence should not be excluded, Weippert states, being representative for Holladay’s formal condition, that “Grundsätzlich sollte man sich wohl den Gesamtumfang der Redaktion viel bescheidener vorstellen, als das bisher geschieht.”

### 3.5.3.2 Final Condition

The formal condition explains why only a few PNG-shifts are understood diachronically. While Holladay and Lundbom share to a great extent their formal condition, their final condition differs with respect to their shift-treatment. Not only does Holladay have a much higher explicit shift-registration rate, he also handles a larger variety of PNG-shift functionality and originality. The book of Jeremiah is not only read with emphasis on rhetoric (e.g. Lundbom), but also historically, and as a discourse. Consequently, Holladay’s approach tries to do justice to much more textual being-aspects. Since he brings the “author”-aspect into focus, he is able to allocate different shifts to the realm of rhetorics. The awareness of the language-aspect helps him to assign some shifts to the realm of language-systematism (grammar and pragmatics). While the text is approached as a discourse as well (from a synchronic perspective [sf. Holladay’s formal condition]) most of Holladay’s interpretations of PNG-shifts that are not accompanied with arguments (30%) are pictured to construct lively dialogues between Jeremiah, YHWH and other participants. Consequently, much of the book of Jeremiah is read dialogically. The interaction of textual participants is much more dominating his commentary than the works of Thiel, Duhm or Carroll. While
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in (post)modern synchronic approach, the textual being-aspect “reference” is often out of focus, Holladay's historic reading allows him to assign diachronic value to many more shifts than Lundbom.

The fact that many shifts are corrected shows that by all sensitivity to the text, Holladay expects a strict PNG-coherence from the discourse and does not critically inquire how much of this expectation origins rather in the modern language practice than in the ancient Hebrew way of speaking and writing. Due to his multi-aspectual final condition, Holladay pays much more attention to textual details than his colleagues. However, his interpretation and conclusion receive their rationale almost as often from the subjective horizon as the more diachronic oriented commentaries do. Further, although his analysis is much more sensitive to text-syntactical matters, it still falls into the same low rate of yield as the other commentaries when compared with the results of a proper phenomenological analysis.

In a sense Holladay – and with him Weippert - can be accused of holding a rather fundamentalist “Gesamtauffassung”, but the fact that Herrmann explains that he is able to connect his fundamentalist beliefs with the literary critical results of present-day research and his overall conception as reasonable, pleads for the scholarly excellence of Holladay. By this, we do not mean that he is less subjective but that he achieves a high score of harmony between the analyzed text-data and his intuitions no less than Carroll or Thiel.
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3.6 Postmodern Fragmentation and PNG-shifts (Carroll)

3.6.1 Statistics

Carroll registers only 26 shifts of the overall 585 shifts, i.e. 5% of all the shifts contained in the book of Jeremiah.

Most of the shifts recognized by Carroll are P-shifts (11) and G-shifts (8). Besides this, we find some N-shifts (3) and the registration of participant changes that are not marked by a change of PNG-reference characteristics (4).

3.6.2 Description

Carroll’s treatment of PNG-shifts is generally unsystematic and makes it difficult to describe it without getting into the details of single cases. We attempt to place his registered cases into the four categories of (i.) “registration without conclusion”, (ii.) “interpretation without explanation”, (iii.) “interpretation with explanation” and (iv.) “ideas on function and origin”. The latter category will receive some further sub-categorization.

1. Registration without conclusion (5:12-13, 6:9-10, 11:18, 12:4-5, 28:10, 47:7, 48:15)

   In seven of the 27 cases of Carroll’s PNG-registrations, he only recognizes the problem and reports in five of the seven cases what other commentary traditions have done with the phenomenon. In three of the seven cases, Carroll stresses the under-determination of the texts. In such cases, we find expressions like "the text is too allusive to allow one definitive meaning,"501 or "the lament in 18-19 does not provide adequate information for identifying speaker or those spoken about"502 or “It is difficult to see how either analysis is produced from these verses
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without assuming a good deal of post-biblical theological reflection in the handling of the text." When he suggests an interpretation, he speaks cautiously using conjunctive formulations.


In nine of the 27 cases, Carroll treats a PNG-shift by either correcting it (4x), or claiming that the shift is not problematic (1x) or by simply identifying the participants of the specific PNG-reference characteristic.

In two of the nine cases, he follows the text of the LXX and in two other cases, he follows the masoretic qere. But the LXX or qere is not used so much as arguments (linguistic, text transmission, grammar), but as reference points “cf. LXX”.

The ease with which Carroll arrives at his interpretations is surprising. This is remarkable since especially in the first category “registration without conclusion”, Carroll is too hesitant to interpret into any direction, although the cases of the first category share the same under-determinate character as the cases of “interpretation without explanation”. This gives the impression that Carroll is rather arbitrary or/and intuitively investigating the PNG-shifts.

3. **Interpretation with explanation** (5:14)

In one case, Carroll overcomes a P-shift (2plM – 3plM) by changing the 2plM form of v14a into a 3plM form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jer 5:14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2plM = the people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car. changes into 3plM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2sgM = the prophet (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3plM = the people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore thus says the Lord, the God of hosts.
Because of your (pl) speaking (דְּרָקִים) this word.
Now (הנה) I am making my words in your (sg) mouth (דַּבֵּר) a fire, and this people wood, and the fire shall eat them (לַכְּנַחיא).

With the 2sgM form in v14b, Carroll defends his change self-confidently “in order to differentiate between the ‘you’ of 14b and the ‘them’ of 14a.” However, he does not support his explanation with text-critical (no ancient text-tradition has such a variant reading) or language systematic arguments (no comments about the בָּהֵן).

4. **Ideas on function and origin**

In a few cases, Carroll presents some ideas about possible functions and origins of some PNG-shifts.

a) **G-shift as shifting of social function of participant** (2:2-3, 31:21)

Carroll sees in two of the G-shifts a specific function. When the gender of a participant is changing, it has the function to bring a different social status into perspective. This seems to apply especially to participants that are qualified as nations. A nation, then, can be addressed in masculine referring to its social state as legal institution. When it is addressed in feminine one refers to the social competence of being truthful (“virgin”) to her “husband” (God) or to the analogical social function of being a victim of war/abuse (raped). Although placed in a somewhat different context (not with explicit regard to PNG-shifts), Carroll’s following explanation supports this observation:
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"In the poems about the destruction of city and nation the feminine is an image of the raped and violated nation - the victim [...] The shift in the gender of the metaphors used of the relationship between Yahweh and Israel is characteristic of the biblical writer's use of imaged drawn from family and communal life for describing the shared life of deity and people. Israel is both Yahweh's mistress (wife) and son - the only loved by him."

b) **Discourse marking** (23:09-11, 23:36-37)
In two cases, Carroll sees a participant change (P-C) accompanying a discourse-shift. In these cases, it is interesting that the participant reference-shift itself is never used as argument for the discourse-marking. Instead of the participant reference-shift, semantic observations are used as argument for the discourse shift.

c) **Redaction process** (15:15-18, 16:8-9, 45:3-4)
In one case (45:3-4), a shift is regarded as marking a later addition (v4). The argument applied is simply a reference to Wanke.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jer 45:3-4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2pPos = Baruch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pPos = Baruch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3pPos = Baruch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Thus says the Lord, the God of Israel, to you, O Baruch:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you said,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Woe is me! The Lord has added sorrow to my pain; I am weary with my groaning, and I find no rest.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Thus you shall say to him,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Thus says the Lord: I am going to break down what I have built, and pluck up what I have planted—that is, the whole land.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is easy to argue that the 2P-3P shift marks a secondary addition, however, it could also be that we miss a DSI-clause that introduces v4. To miss a DSI could either be because of diachronic reasons (v4 is a later addition) or a DSI was skipped because of e.g. haplography or because the writer wanted to establish a sense of communicational immediateness for the reader/listener.

In the two other cases (15:15-18, 16:8-9), the central focus of Carroll lies in arguing against the a priori identification of Jeremiah with the 1sgM (15:15-18) and 2sgM (16:8-9) forms. With regard 16:8-9 he argues that the N-shift (2sgM-2plM) cannot be taken as a shift from the prophet (2sgM) to the nation (2plM) as usually understood in orthodox readings. Rather one needs to detect in this shift an attempt of later redactors who wanted to stimulate such identification, while originally both forms (2sgM, 2plM) refer to the nation.

According to Carroll the formulation יכריס עשו ביבInternalServerError of the lament spoken in 15:15-18 by the 1P participant indicates that in the early versions of Jeremiah a group of pietists rather than the prophet Jeremiah has been identified with the 1P forms. Obviously Carroll thinks that later redactions have tried to identify the 1P forms with the prophet and remove the marks hinting at the group of pietists. The cases in chap 15 and 16 therefore, should not be taken as containing two different 1P and 2P participants but as marking later additions.

d) **Grammatical possibility** (48:6)
In one case Carroll argues that a G-shift (2plM-3plF) should not be regarded as problematic as the 3plF verbal form can be read with an energetic ending. Carroll refers here to Freedman, who other commentators also refer to when it comes to this specific case in 48:6. Consequently, the form should not be analyzed as 3plF but as 2plM. It is, however,
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remarkable that this kind of sophisticated solutions is very much absent in the analysis and interpretation of most of the PNG-shifts. We cannot but assume that the reference to Freedman’s solution accidentally took place. By this we mean that Carroll uses it only because this solution is mentioned in other commentaries. The solution does not reflect his own hermeneutical perspective that strives for synchronistic language-systematic solutions but testifies rather the influence of consulted commentaries.

3.6.3 Evaluation

Our observations on Carroll’s shift treatment are similar to what we have described about Duhm. Both have in common that they register only a fraction of the contained participant reference-shifts in Jeremiah. Further, most detected shifts are not discussed in depth but only mentioned as an aside. However, the general opinion about these shifts is that they are distorting. In contrast to Duhm, Carroll recognizes even fewer shifts and relates shifts less frequently with diachronic backgrounds (inability of redactor, source critique, text-transmission). Our observations help to ask questions about the conditions of Carroll’s methodology. In what ways does his final and formal condition impede his shifts registration? Why is there no interest in the possible rhetorical or language systematic origin of participant reference-shifts?

We now depict the dependencies between Carroll’s shift treatment and his methodological conditions.

3.6.3.1 Formal condition

Carroll is aware of the reader as necessary textual being-aspect. The creation of a rational-meaningful coherence of the material in/of Jeremiah is only possible when the reader imposes his own set of presuppositions on the text.\(^\text{508}\) With full awareness of the relativity of human rationality, he explains that different presuppositions create different reasonable and defensible ideas about the coherence of the text.\(^\text{509}\) He therefore continues to argue for a necessary choice for presuppositions and their inherent relativity, admitting that any interpretative choice will not find sufficient conclusive “objective” arguments in order to prove the truth of one’s own position or to disprove the position of somebody else.\(^\text{510}\) This testifies well his post-modern epistemological sensitivity. Every “exegete must produce a reading of the text consistent with the inconsistencies of the book and dependent on sophisticated interpretative judgments.”\(^\text{511}\)

Being aware of the necessary subjective input of the reader, Carroll stresses the importance of an a posteriori reading of the text over an a priori reading. While in the latter a pre-understanding of the text dominates the interpretation of it, an a posteriori reading will give more weight to the incoherence present in the text. An a posteriori reading will make “the problems of the composition and editing of the book [...] the key to the interpretative approach to Jeremiah.”\(^\text{512}\) Additionally, his post-modern skepticism about the modernistic approaches of historical criticism brings him to the conclusion that it does no longer appear meaningful to invest or believe in the possibility of the reconstruction of the origins and original
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sources of the book of Jeremiah. With this regard, Carroll quotes Fohrer saying “It is probably hopeless to try to reconstruct an original scroll.”\(^\text{513}\) Thus, questions like “Who was Jeremiah at all?” “Into which time was his original speaking intended?”, do not play any role any longer since they are “futile and irrelevant”.\(^\text{514}\) A mature reading then, must focus on the debates found in the text; the inconsistencies should not be used in order to reconstruct history but to report the diversity in the post-exilic debate.

Carroll’s methodological considerations explain his antipathy to the work of Skinner\(^\text{515}\) and others who invest into a biographical reading of Jeremiah. It explains further his sympathy with Nicholson’s work that has strongly influenced Carroll’s own research.

According to Carroll, Skinner’s work is an excellent example of an orthodoxy a priori reading where the book is taken as a trustworthy and authentic source for the depiction of the life of the historical Jeremiah.\(^\text{516}\) Carroll tries to establish a contra-position on the basis of an a posteriori reading.\(^\text{517}\) According to him, we do not find the historic Jeremiah but the debate of the tradition about him.\(^\text{518}\) Especially the idea that the poetic parts are the product of the prophet is challenged by stressing that there is no argument for such a dogma and such an approach neglects the fact that it is the redactional framework that attributes the poems to the prophet.\(^\text{519}\) If the redactional framework is removed the figure of Jeremiah will disappear as well.\(^\text{520}\) Carroll rather likes to link the poems with situations than with a specific author.\(^\text{521}\)

Like Nicholson, Carroll has his suspicion about the modernistic a priori exegesis and shares some of his conclusions. Nicholson asks to what extent it is adequate to analyze the text with the classical literary-critical method, being based upon a preoccupation with literary evolution.\(^\text{522}\) The question whether there might be some other (additional) creative processes involved leads him to the consideration that there is a great
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\(^{517}\) Carroll holds against Skinner the following views:

1. The prose in the language of the historical books cannot be used for proving their individuality. The same applies to the confessions which resemble the rhetoric of the psalm or Job and should therefore not be read as individualistic. (Carroll, 8-9.)

2. The prose and poetry sections do not consistently share the same themes and thoughts. The same is the case with double accounts. Poetry and prose do also not depict a coherent vision on Jeremiah. In the poetic parts of the book, the prophet appears solitary and weak. In the narrative part Jeremiah has powerful friends, and appears as an influential person. (Ibid., 8.)

3. Judah and Jerusalem are not pictured consistently in the book of Jeremiah. Jer 2-25 is rather hostile towards Judah and Jerusalem while Jer 30-31 (and some further exceptions) holds a friendly attitude towards them. Something similar can be seen with regard to the Babylonians, who are regarded as friends in Jer 27-29 and as enemies in Jer 50-51. (Ibid.)

4. Besides certain verses, phrases and motifs, great differences between LXX and MT indicate clearly redactional work. (Ibid., 10.) These many differences suggest a rather long transmission history, which explains the many corruptions in the MT text. (Carroll, 54-55.)
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Nicholson understands that the word of YHWH was again and again reapplied and newly interpreted by the different communities in the flow of time. He concludes that the biographical material does not primarily serve historical or biographical purposes but didactic ones. In this way the book of Jeremiah is basically a book that contains post-Jeremianic sermons to the exiles expressing an interpretation of Jeremiah’s ministry and message.

As Carroll agrees with these conclusions, his exegetical activity operates with the understanding that the contained redactional work must become the message itself. Carroll dissociates from Nicholson in so far that he would not see the prose sections as a coherent message to the exiles but rather seeing the inconsistencies of the prose as reflecting the diversity and plurality of the exilic and post-exilic situation. The book of Jeremiah is therefore not an expression of an individual/s or a school/s but it is the expression of entire generations in their diverse traditions. Carroll explains:

“An overview of my approach would be that the book of Jeremiah is a metaphor of the redactional and community activity which produced it.”

Although Carroll follows a “redaktionsgeschichtliche” method as exercised in the diachronic studies of the late 19th and 20th century, he differs from the modernistic approaches of Mowinckel, Rudolph and Thiel as his exegesis is not dominated by an historic interest about the origin and work of the prophet.
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Jeremiah.\textsuperscript{530} Any attempt of historic reconstruction of the pre-exilic time is abandoned. This is not only due to the fact that he critiques the overestimated potential of rational reconstruction but also because the prophecies are to be regarded as vaticinium ex eventu and suffer therefore from a high rate of subjective projection into the past. The book’s internal references about historic time must therefore be understood as “Traditionselemente”.\textsuperscript{531} A relative dating of the book, then, takes place strata-wise, depending on the interests and debates expressed in a strata and is matched with the historical situation in which such debate most probably took place.\textsuperscript{532}

3.6.3.2 Final condition

Carroll’s formal condition has a direct influence on his final condition. As the text cannot refer to one single author, redactor or school of thought, the textual-being aspects of author, teleology, transmission, discourse, context, reference and meaning cannot be accessed without ambiguity. In consequence, it is easier to de-construct the interpretations of Jeremiah than to argue for one. Carroll’s work is rather focused on the registration of inconsistencies than on the effort to invest in disclosing common themes that could function as the book’s backbone.

The fact that participant reference-shifts do not play any important role points at the fact that Carroll’s formal condition in consequence regards a discourse analysis as meaningless. The fact that PNG-shifts are not used as arguments for a fragmented text hints at the classical exegeses by which Carroll’s reductio-critical presuppositions are influenced. The latter regards primarily phraseology, semantic contiguity, genre and thematic coherence as constituting the unity of a text. Syntactic coherence, resumption or the historic-chronological quality of expressions are underrated. This is the reason why participant reference-shifts do not play a great role in a method that makes “editorial inconsistency [...] an important principle for interpreting the Bible and especially the book of Jeremiah”.\textsuperscript{533} Carroll’s final condition then leads to two observable tensions:

1. **Opinion vs. argument:**
   On the one hand, Carroll holds the opinion that the text contains many sources, additions and adaptations, while on the other hand, he is ignorant of most of the PNG-shifts, potentially serving as excellent argument for the lack of coherence in the text. Even worse, in most of his cases of shift-detection (23 of 26 cases) he keeps silent about their possible diachronic value that could serve as argument against the readability of the text as discourse. In many of the cases where shifts are present but not registered by Carroll, the transition or incoherence (without him referring to the reason: no PNG-shift registration) is explained by means of genre-shifts while diachronic arguments could have been derived if the PNG-shifts had been recognized.

2. **Silence vs. dominance:**
   On the one hand, we see that many of Carroll’s registered shifts do not receive any further attention by explaining their origin, correcting them or interpreting their function. One comes to the conclusion that Carroll is rather hesitant to add further comments as he himself is unsure
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about the phenomenon. On the other hand, we find a self-confident, dominant voice in his commentary when different registered shifts are corrected without much explanation. It is difficult to trace the origin of such a tension. But it seems, that Carroll's general ignorance of the discursive dimension of the text explains why he does not see the need of explaining further PNG-shift phenomena. Therefore, his silence is not to be interpreted as hesitation or sensitivity to the dangers of interpretation but much more as a consequence of discourse-ignorance. When corrections are conducted it is either because of masoretic notes, the LXX, or because of his view of a multi-fragmented text.
3.7 Conclusion

Our analysis of the PNG-shift treatments in the different commentaries supports our initial observation (cf. 0.1.2) that (a) only a small number of PNG-shifts is recognized (more than the half of Duhm's and Lundbom's recognitions are implicit!), let alone interpreted, and that (b) in those cases in which PNG-shifts are treated it is done diversely by the different exegetical approaches as the following chart shows:

On the X axis, the chart shows the different exegetes whose work has been discussed. The various colors represent the different categories of shift-treatments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>treatment category</th>
<th>explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>registration without commenting</td>
<td>Shift cases are mentioned but not described in detail. Nothing is said about their role in the text, whether they are problematic or unproblematic for the reading process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>registration without interpretation</td>
<td>Shift cases are registered and described in more detail. However, the shifts are not interpreted with regard to their function or origin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participant identification with argumentation</td>
<td>The participants before and/or after the shift are identified. Their identification is supported by arguments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participant identification without argumentation</td>
<td>The participants before and/or after the shift are identified. Their identification is not supported by arguments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language: grammar/pragmatic +</td>
<td>Shift cases are understood from the perspective of the textual being-aspect &quot;language&quot;. The shift is interpreted as positive (+) in the sense that it is an expression of the language systematism. The origin of the shift is found in the practice of language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language: grammar/pragmatic -</td>
<td>Shift cases are understood from the perspective of the textual being-aspect &quot;language&quot;. The shift is interpreted as negative (-) in the sense that it contradicts the language norm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teleology: rhetoric +</td>
<td>Shift cases are understood from the perspective of the textual being-aspect &quot;teleology&quot;. The shift is interpreted as positive (+) in the sense that it is an expression of the rhetoric expertise of the author. The origin of the shift is found in the artistic ability of the author.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teleology: rhetoric -</td>
<td>Shift cases are understood from the perspective of the textual being-aspect &quot;teleology&quot;. The shift is interpreted as negative (-) in the sense that it is an expression of the inability of the author to express himself by artistic means.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>author/reader: redactor +</td>
<td>Shift cases are understood from the perspective of the textual being-aspect &quot;author/reader&quot;. The shift is interpreted as positive (+) in the sense that it is an expression of the editorial work of the redactor. In that sense the redactor holds the function of an author as well as a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
reader of the material he is editing. The origin of the shift is found in the editorial ability of the author.

**author/reader: redactor -**

Shift cases are understood from the perspective of the textual being-aspect “author/reader”. The origin of the shift is found in the poor (-) editorial ability of the redactor. The origin of the shift is found in the editorial ability of the author.

**discourse: text-grammar +**

Shift cases are understood from the perspective of the textual being-aspect “discourse”. The shift is interpreted as positive (+) in the sense that it is an expression of the discourse-architecture of the text. The sub-category “text-grammar” means, that the shift is understood as belonging to a text-grammatical element that constitutes the discourse. The origin of the shift is found in the grammaticality of text-grammar and functions as an organizing element of the discourse.

**discourse: text-grammar -**

Shift cases are understood from the perspective of the textual being-aspect “discourse”. The shift is interpreted as negative (-) in the sense that it disturbs the discourse-architecture of the text. The quality “negative” is given in those cases where no other reason for the origin or function of that shift is given.

**reception and transmission +**

Shift cases are understood from the perspective of the textual being-aspect “reception and transmission”. The shift is interpreted as positive (+) in the sense that it is an expression of the reception- and transmission process. The origin of the shift is found in the incidental mistakes scribes perform when copying texts.

**reception and transmission -**

Shift cases are understood from the perspective of the textual being-aspect “reception and transmission”. The shift is interpreted as negative (-) when the exegete explicitly states that the shift was not caused in the reception- and transmission process, but keeps silent about any other possible way of understanding the function and origin of the shift.

The graph shows that most of the textual being-aspects are not part of the interpretative horizon. PNG-shifts are generally understood within the four being-aspects “language”, “teleology”, “reception and transmission”, and “discourse”. It becomes also visible that – and this applies especially to Duhm, Carroll and Lundbom – most of the PNG-treatments are not text-phenomenologically categorized, as they are either only mentioned (registration without comment), commented but not interpreted (registration without interpretation), or the new SS, caused by the shift, is just clarified by participant identification.

On the basis of the data on which the chart is based we can conclude:

1. Thiel but also Duhm approach their PNG-shifts (interpreted) especially from the text-phenomenological being-aspect “author/reader” (redactor +). This attitude matches well with their formal and final conditions.

2. Lundbom approaches PNG-shifts especially from within the text-phenomenological being-aspect “teleology” (rhetoric +). He understands the functionality of PNG-shifts almost exclusively to belong to the field of rhetoric.

3. Holladay has a broader understanding of the text phenomenology and in addition he brings the textual being-aspects “discourse” (text-grammar +/-) into focus. This allows a wider variety of shift interpretations.

4. When it comes to participant-identification, it is especially Lundbom and Holladay who are outspoken. Duhm and Carroll are not that eager to clarify the identity of text-internal references. This expresses also to some extent their opinion about the readability of the text. They are more active in clarifying the text-external references (textual being-aspect “reference”). They almost exclusively identify exilic and post-exilic text-external entities as being referred to in the text.
5. Our study shows that Lundbom and especially Holladay think more multi-aspectual when approaching PNG-shifts than Duhm, Carroll and especially Thiel. Besides this, Holladay has the highest explicit registration rate.

Our closer look at the different final and formal conditions brings us to some important conclusions about exegetical methodology in general. The following paragraphs summarize our findings.

3.7.1 Thematizing the Absence of PNG-shifts

The exegetical debate of Duhm, Thiel, Carroll, Holladay and Lundbom concentrates upon a limited set of six themes that stand in correlation to each other:

1. *Poetry and prose*
   The main agenda of Duhm and his followers as well as Holladay and his followers is how the poetry and prose section relate to each other. Although it might not be the main research question of Carroll, Thiel and Lundbom, it clearly influences tremendously their discussion and exegetical outcome. Thus the poetry-prose relation is an omnipresent theme in the exegetical work of all analyzed commentaries.

2. *Phraseology/idiomatic expression*
   The focus on the “deuteronomistic” expressions in Thiel’s, Carroll’s and Holladay’s/Weippert’s works is dominant and sets the main agenda in the research of Thiel and Weippert. Although the deuteronomistic expressions cannot be seen to be independent of the poetry and prose theme, one cannot reduce the one to the other (see Weippert’s, Holladay’s or McKane’s work). For analytic reasons, genre and phraseology must be studied independent of each other before interdependencies are searched.

3. *Historiography vs. reception-history focus*
   The extent to which the person of Jeremiah and his actions, as described in the book, are historical plays the central role in Holladay’s and Carroll’s work. Both represent two extremes: While Carroll rejects the possibility of historical reconstruction of the life of Jeremiah and his time, Holladay’s work is much focused on a historiographical interpretation of the book of Jeremiah. The theme of the historic value of the book of Jeremiah, connected to the poetry-prose and phraseology/idiomatics discussion, is omnipresent in the work of all exegetes independent of the position they take.

4. *Unity vs. chaos*
   All exegetes elaborately discuss the question about the coherence of the book of Jeremiah in their works. While Duhm and Carroll represent the impossible readability of the book, Thiel and Lundbom argue for a basic unity of the book. However, the whole matter of readability is approached from the perspective of phraseology and rhetoric, not from the perspective of text- or discourse-grammar. Unity and chaos are the only matters of cognitive thematic coherence, semantic contiguity and rhetoric design as parts of the textual being-aspect “author”, “meaning” and “teleology”.

5. *Competence of redactor vs. redactor as problem*
   Although not always a dominant item, this theme is not neglected by the more synchronic focused exegetical work (Holladay, Lundbom). While on the one hand the redactor is seen as a
competent artist (Thiel), others regard his work as the reason for textual in-coherence (e.g. Carroll).

6. **Origin: Dia/anachrony vs. synchrony**
While none of the scholars neglects the presence of diachrony/anachrony in the book of Jeremiah, much of the exegetical work is dedicated to the task to uncover the amount of diachrony. Great disagreement can be found here. While Lundbom, Holladay and Thiel argue for much less diachronic influences after the book has been edited/written, Duhm and Carroll see diachrony as the basic characteristic of the book of Jeremiah. While the matter of origin is often intertwined with the theme of “historiography vs. reception-history”, Thiel’s work shows that the one cannot be reduced to the other and must be recognized as a separate theme.

The outlined themes are so dominant, that PNG-shifts – where recognized – are generally fitted into one of the upper categories. Our analysis shows that the omnipresence of PNG-shifts as a basic characteristic of the book of Jeremiah has not been able to disturb the exegetical concentration on the omnipresent phenomenon of the prose and poetry presence or the omnipresent “deuteronomistic” expressions in the book of Jeremiah. It seems that the focus then is dominated by the exegetical tradition of the last 100-150 years causing a constriction within the final conditions. As the omnipresence of the prose-poetry dichotomy and the omnipresence of the “deuteronomistic” expressions have dictated research questions and exegetical themes into the very formulations of final and formal conditions, the PNG-shifts do not dominate the exegetical enterprise anywhere.

### 3.7.2 Critique

The above outlined contrasts lead to a critique about the attitude taken towards the interaction between the final and formal conditions.

The formal condition is always influenced by an a priori of intuition (subjective side) and the communicated ontic qualities of the object (objective side). The latter is usually reflected to some extent in the final condition of method. In our analysis we have seen that the object is given only a limited influence on the formation of the formal conditions. In addition, the different operated final conditions are dominated by such a narrow perspective about the text and its phenomenology, that other objective qualities of the text are excluded, even though they have an omnipresent character!
This narrow view leads to a rather closed system of interaction between final and formal condition with only a limited variety of possible methodological approaches. The exegetical object, then, is often obviously studied in such a reductionistic way, that the resulting interpretations become questionable:

1. Duhm: Duhm works exclusively within the framework set by the presuppositions of the 19th century, where lexical statistics are able to explain the textual history and Sitz im Leben. Correctly, Weippert critiques “Das bedeutet aber nichts anderes, als daß man isolierte Sprachelemente ohne Berücksichtigung ihres Aussagegehaltes als Grundlage der Eruierung literarischer Abhängigkeitsverhältnisse beansprucht.”

Duhm’s limited final condition enforces his one-sided conclusions.

2. Carroll: Carroll reduces his focus almost exclusively on the appearing fragmentations of the text and its kaleidoscopic redaction so that the question of genesis and reception of the final form (literarische Endgestalt) is not addressed. Consequently, the question remains unanswered how the many different diverse and “thematisch disparater Textteile [...] dann so angeordnet wurden und [...] es zum jetzt als Ganzes vorliegendem Buch kam”.

3. Thiel: Thiel is so much focused on his “Sprachbeweis” that his argumentative power is highly misleading as McKane points out that “we err when we suppose that these processes are always susceptible or factional explanation, or that they must necessarily contribute to a thoughtful, systematic redaction.” Although assuming textual unity, his obsession with the “Sprachbeweis” hinders him to investigate in other fields that contribute to textual unity (e.g. text-grammar).

4. Lundbom: Lundbom is so much obsessed with the “Scheinobjektivität seiner stilistischen Beobachtungen” that important other exegetical questions (origin/reception, exegetical meaning) are fully out of sight.

5. Holladay: Holladay and especially Weippert exclusively analyze phrase patterns and specific valency patterns. However, Weippert does not analyze the communicative structure of the text beyond the phrase and clause level. This is why there is not found any treatment nor recognition...
of PNG-shifts in Jeremiah in her treaties of Jer 7, 18, 21, 34. Only “Wortstatistik” is in focus. While Holladay sees a dominant dialogical character in the book, his focus remains on the interrelation of poetry and prose, which hinders him to study the dialogical architecture of the text.

Although it is justified and often necessary to limit one’s focus on a selection of the textual object, the later works of all exegetes show that there is hardly any broadening up in their treatment and judgments about the book of Jeremiah as a whole. Our observation further shows that this rather reductionist exegesis is accompanied by another phenomenon. We observe among the exegetes – independent of final and formal condition – a discrepancy between the exegetical steps of registration and interpretation. With regard to PNG-shift treatments, interpretation is much more dominant than registration and phenomenological description. This is also seen in the fact that references to specific shift-distributions lack as arguments in all commentaries. Data as a controlling factor for interpretation plays only a minor role.

When the final conditions do not lead to better results, the formal condition is altered (see Thiel or Weippert) with new intuitive ideas. This methodological change happens without essentially changing the narrow content of the final condition. This can be nicely seen in the work of Weippert who operates under a radically changed formal condition but shares to a great extent the same final condition (e.g. role of phraseology) with Thiel and other deuteronomists whom she opposes.

Our observations also testify that most exegetes (Lundbom might be an exception) implicitly operate with the assumption that the coherence and unity of a text is derived from modern standards of writing. Hermann’s critique of synchronic readings falls within this assumption:


We have seen that the greatest change that can take place within the definition of the final condition is a new hierarchy of finalities. The latter can be seen in the work of Lundbom, who gives rhetoric a much more prominent place than it has received in the work of Duhm and others. However, rhetoric was never

---

539 Minor and irrelevant exceptions can be found. These cases are tested for their deuteronomistic potential and are therefore analyzed on the level of phraseology within the sentence boundaries. Weippert’s discussion of יֶעָר (sg) with pl predication exemplifies such an exception. The 31 occurrences of יֶעָר with pl predication are used as an argument against the deuteronomistic conception as this construction appears only four times in what is classically regarded as deuteronomistic literature. See Weippert, 97. In the few other cases of PNG-shift registrations, they are only discussed in footnotes while no attention is given to their role in the discourse. See e.g. Ibid., 181 (footnote #5).

540 McKane holds against Weippert and Thiel that if “no more is being done than the cataloguing of isolated items of vocabulary (single words) common to the two areas being compared, there is a danger of assembling statistics which are insignificant or have only a minimal significance and are not capable of supporting the arguments into which they are pressed. This is so, even if the vocabulary in question occurs only or principally in the prose of Jeremiah, Deuteronomy, and the Deuteronomistic historical literature. It is reasonable to regard as a significant statistic, but to decide what kind of degree or significance is to be attached to it is a matter of the greatest difficulty. It may express affinities which are to be expressed in terms of a cultural and theological consensus and which are sufficiently broad not to be limited to one organized party or movement.” (McKane, xliv.). See also Herrmann, 100.

541 Ibid.
absent in the final condition of the exegetical work Lundbom opposes. In the end, our analysis of PNG-shift treatments tells us more about the final than about the formal condition!

Summing up, the formal condition is altered not so much on the basis of new ontic information (e.g. PNG-shifts) but on the basis of the unsuccessful outcome of the operated former final conditions. We believe that the reason why new ontic information has not been able to influence the set-up of formal conditions is to be found in the conservative dealing of the final condition, which hinders to see the text and its communicated ontic characteristics more effectively.

We see our critique joining the rather general but still sharp judgment of Herrmann who does not see all the research in the book of Jeremiah to lead to a consensus. One of the main reasons is “die Festlegung der einzelnen Forscher auf Positionen, die ihnen als Argumentationsbasis dienen, die aber als solche nicht zweifelsfrei zu begründen sind.”542 In this context, Herrmann admits that the different great and influential commentaries published in 1986 by Holladay, Carroll and McKane are all scholarly soundly worked and of high quality, however, they only differ on the level of their presuppositions and not essentially on the level of their research focus/topic (final condition).543

We have inquired and tested the diverse exegetical PNG-shift treatments on the basis of our hermeneutical framework (chapter 1) and the available data (PNG-shift database), that was generated by our text-syntactical reading (chapter 2). Besides the basic ignorance to PNG-shifts in commentaries, we have observed a surprising lack of interest in discourse analysis in all exegetical works. Although participants are often identified in the work of Holladay and Lundbom, no arguments are supplied. This means that even where the connection between PNG-shifts and participant-identification is made, it is done without any investigation into their relation and its effect upon the coherence and unity of the text. The dominant role plays the semantic value of participant references, their discourse organizing function is out of sight. Our text-syntactical reading has amplified the implications of our case (cf. 0.1). It proves to be an excellent tool for explicating textual discourse structures, referential “problems” and interpretational inconsistencies. From this follows that not only an abstract reflection on exegetical tools (chapter 2) suggests a grammatical and text-grammatical reading of the text as initial step of exegesis but also the fruits of such a reading emphasize the importance a text-syntactical reading. It is only by means of such a phenomenological text-systematic reading that the subject can develop interpretations that are consistent with the data the text as object has communicated via its being-aspects “language” and “discourse”. As an instrument such a reading prevents the subjective interpretational activities from ignoring the objective boundaries set by the text.

As the main influence of PNG-shifts targets directly into the field of text coherence, they need to be studied primarily within the field of discourse-analysis. This field of study, however, is absent in all of the exegetical works, regardless of more synchronic or more diachronic oriented, regardless of more source-critical or redaction-critical oriented, and regardless of the text being considered as designed to be a unity or considered as being chaotic. Since the diachronic value of PNG-shifts has always played a major role in the work of our analyzed commentaries, we will first clarify, whether objective reasons can be found to support the hypothesis that participant reference-shifts originate from the editorial processes or the

542 Ibid., 165-166.
543 Ibid., 167.
process of text copying (chapter 4). If a text-critical analysis cannot support such claims, we will approach the omnipresent phenomenon of PNG-shifts from within the realm where it causes the most problems: syntax and discourse (chapter 5). In chapter 5, then, we will attempt to free the studies of Jeremiah from conservative approaches and allow to go new ways of interpretation where data registration plays the dominant and controlling role over interpretation.
4 PNG-SHIFTS AND THE TEXTUAL BEING-ASPECT “RECEPTION AND TRANSMISSION”

4.1 INTRODUCTION

Our phenomenological reading of the text with the purpose of finding text-immanent patterns of discourse organization first in order to explicate the presence and lack of coherence in a text, always has the different being-aspects of the text in mind. Each phenomenon found in the text demands a responsible attribution to one of the textual being-aspects or in some cases a combination of them. With regard to participant reference-shifts, the question is to which of the different textual being-aspects they need to be attributed. The last chapter has shown that the exegetical traditions most often prefer the textual being-aspect “reception and transmission”, “language” and “teleology”.

This chapter will investigate the possible relations between the textual being-aspect “reception and transmission” and the phenomenology of the PNG-shifts in order to find out whether the origin and functionality of participant reference-shifts must be approached from the perspective of text evolution (source-criticism, redaction-criticism). The results of this inspection determine the agenda of our further research, as it becomes clear whether an analysis of the interrelation between participant reference-shifts and the textual being-aspects “language”, “teleology” and “discourse” is needed. We regard this order – first “reception and transmission” before analyzing possible relations between PNG-shifts and other being-aspects – as meaningful because of the following reasons: The different shift-interpretations (chapter 3) show that the interpretative horizon is determined by the synchrony-diachrony debate. In order to develop our own perspective on this debate with regard to the phenomenon of PNG-shifts, we consider it as inevitable to investigate the reception and treatment of PNG-shifts within the different ancient text-traditions first. It is therefore important to see how PNG-shifts were received and treated in the process of text-production and text-transmission.

When the historical realm of production and transmission is investigated, there is always a risk of subjective theory forming. In order to minimize the subjective input of the scholar, we decide to remain truthful to our phenomenological attitude also in this regard. On two levels, an objective insight into the realm of text-production is to a certain extent possible:

1. Investigating the intertextual doublets and their effects on PNG-shift behavior allows an objective registration of source dependencies and techniques of implementation without depending heavily on source-critical hypotheses. The rather historic-critical approaches to the Jeremiah text have understood the PNG-shift as often originating in the bad work of redactors implanting different sources into the text.\(^\text{544}\) An analysis of the impact of intertextual doublets on the existence of PNG-shifts, therefore, allows an examination of the historic-critical treatment of PNG-shifts and proposes whether PNG-shifts should be regarded as problematic from a synchronistic perspective or not.

2. Comparing our PNG-shift registration based on the Codex Leningradensis (from now on CL), representing the Masoretic text-tradition (“Masoretic text” from now on MT)\(^\text{545}\) with the Septuagint text and Qumran fragments of Jeremiah, we are able to see whether the PNG-shifts

\(^{544}\) Cf. 3.2, 3.3, 3.6.

\(^{545}\) The older masoretic Aleppo Codex and the younger masoretic Bombergiana are not consulted in this study.
are considered to be problematic when attempts of resolving them become visible. Similar to the phenomenon of intertextuality, we do not operate on the basis of a specific literary-critical hypothesis but remain phenomenological. We therefore do not participate in any “ping-pong-Spiel” in which one literary critic argues for one direction of the literary dependency while the other argues for the opposite direction. In our studies, we are cautious not to make any direction claims from where and in which manner the ball started moving on the table.

In this chapter, we first investigate the realm of intertextuality and then we compare the available Qumran fragments and the Septuagint tradition with our PNG-shift findings in the CL.

4.2 PNG-shifts and Intertextuality

Our analysis is based only on our own detection of the 585 participant reference-shifts on the one hand and Parke-Taylor’s phenomenological research on doublets and recurring phrases in the book of Jeremiah on the other hand. According to Parke-Taylor, the book of Jeremiah contains 70 sets of sets of doublets and recurring phrases. With “set of doublets” we refer to all textual references that contain the same material:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner 1</th>
<th>Partner 2</th>
<th>Partner 3</th>
<th>Partner 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jer 18:16</td>
<td>Jer 19:8</td>
<td>Jer 49:17</td>
<td>Jer 50:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>making their land a</td>
<td>And I will make this</td>
<td>Edom shall become an</td>
<td>everyone who passes by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>horror,</td>
<td>city a horror, a thing</td>
<td>object of horror;</td>
<td>Babylon shall be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a thing to be hiessed</td>
<td>to be hiessed at;</td>
<td>everyone who passes by</td>
<td>appalled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at forever.</td>
<td>everyone who passes by</td>
<td>it will be horrified</td>
<td>and hiss because of all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All who pass by it are</td>
<td>it will be horrified and</td>
<td>and will hiss because of</td>
<td>her wounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>horrified</td>
<td>will hiss because of all</td>
<td>all its disasters.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and shake their heads.</td>
<td>its disasters.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The phrase “they hiss at [xy]” can be found in four different places in Jeremiah. They constitute one set of doublets. The different places in which the phrases occur are referred to as partners, who make up the specific set of doublets. Each of the 70 sets receives an ID (e.g. setID04, setID05, etc.) for easier reference and analysis. Each setID is described in more detail in our database that is attached as CD.

As the graph shows, the majority of the 70 sets contains two partners (64x) while in some cases we have three partners (4) and four partners (2).

Recurring text-material can be of large (sequence of clauses) or small content (sequence of phrases) and can build sets whose partners are either inside or outside of the book of Jeremiah. As the example above shows a set of doublets whose four partners are all found within the book of Jeremiah, the following example consists of one partner in Jeremiah and the other one in Isaiah:

---

546 Fischer, 131.

We compared all our PNG-shift cases with the Parke-Taylor’s registration of doublets. Where a co-occurrence can be testified we ask the question

1. whether our registered shift coincides with the occurrence of a doublet. In those cases, the doublet must contain a PNG-shift or the first line of the text-material that follows the doublet must cause a shift. The following table shows such a case:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>setID 04</th>
<th>partner1</th>
<th>partner2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:28b</td>
<td>people=2pPos</td>
<td>people=3pPos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parallel:</td>
<td>for you as many gods in your time of trouble;</td>
<td>parallel:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people=2pPos</td>
<td>if they can save you,</td>
<td>people=2pPos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people=2pPos</td>
<td>in your time of trouble;</td>
<td>people=2pPos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people=2pPos</td>
<td>Why do you complain against me?</td>
<td>people=2pPos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people=2pPos</td>
<td>You have all rebelled against me,</td>
<td>people=2pPos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people=2pPos</td>
<td>says the Lord.</td>
<td>people=2pPos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. whether all or only a limited number of doublet-partners coincide with a PNG-shift. Such a distinction helps to inquire into the possibility of a “bad” redaction. A case in which one partner “causes” a shift while the other does not, could suggest that the non-PNG-shift causing partner is the original source and the PNG-shift causing partner is a secondary insertion. The previous example illustrates such a case.

3. whether a PNG-shift is contained within a doublet. The following table contains such a case:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>setID 25</th>
<th>partner1</th>
<th>partner2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15:13-14</td>
<td>people=2pM</td>
<td>people=2pM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:03-04</td>
<td>people=2pM</td>
<td>people=2pM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The Lord said: Surely I have intervened in your life for good, [...] 12 Can iron and bronze break iron from the north?</td>
<td>The sin of Judah is written with an iron pen; [...] 2 while their children remember their altars and their sacred poles, [...] 3 on the mountains in the open country. Your wealth (2sgM) and all your treasures I will give for spoil as the price of your sin throughout all your territory. 4 By your own act you shall lose the heritage that I gave you, and I will make you serve your enemies in a land that you do not know (2sgM), for in my anger a fire is kindled that shall burn forever against you (2plM).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 14 | I will make you serve your enemies in a land that you do not know (2sgM) and that you do not know (2sgM), for in my anger a fire is kindled that shall burn forever against you (2plM). | 1 Thus says the Lord: Cursed are those who trust in mere mortals [...]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>partner1</th>
<th>partner2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jer 50:16</td>
<td>Isa 13:14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Cut off from Babylon the sower, and the wielder of the sickle in time of harvest; all of them shall return to their own people, and all of them shall flee to their own land. | Like a hunted gazelle, or like sheep with no one to gather them, all will turn to their own people, and all will flee to their own lands.
4.2.1 General Observation

In 22 sets of the 70 sets (i.e. 31%), at least one partner is found outside of the book of Jeremiah. This means that either the book of Jeremiah borrowed from an external source or Jeremiah served as a source for another text.

All of the 70 sets of doublets in Jeremiah co-occur with registered PNG-shifts. As a result 121 of the 585 PNG-shifts contain doublets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PNG shifts</th>
<th>585 shift cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no shift caused by both partners</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shift caused by at least one partner</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no shift caused by at least one partner</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caused by both partners</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>co-occurring cases of doublets</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unclear cases</td>
<td>559</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, that does not automatically mean that the doublets cause PNG-shifts as a more detailed analysis will show. While all sets co-occur with PNG-shifts, there are still 464 cases (79%) of PNG-shifts without any obvious doublets or recurring phrases.

In the 21% of the cases (93 PNG-shifts) where doublets and recurring phrases co-occur with PNG-shifts, most of the sets (55 of the 70 sets) do not coincide with the exact position of a PNG-shift. In five set cases (8 PNG shifts) the demarcations of at least one of the partners coincides with a shift while the demarcations of at least one other partner of the same set does not coincide with the shift. Further, in five of the 70 set cases (11 PNG-shifts), the demarcations of all partners of a set coincide with shifts. In the five cases left (9 PNG-shifts), it is unclear whether the demarcation of a doublet coincides with the present shifts.

The distribution of doublets and their relation to PNG-shifts makes clear that in general the implantation of foreign text or speech material does not cause any PNG-shifts as the foreign material is contextualized into the PNG-structure of the present context. With regard to those cases where the demarcation of doublets coincides with PNG-shifts a closer look is needed.

On this general scale, we must conclude that the origin of 559 of the total 585 PNG-shift cases (i.e. 96%), cannot be ascribed to the phenomenon of intertextuality. The following section will look in detail at those 28 PNG-shift cases (8+11+9) where the demarcation of a doublet coincides with a participant reference-shift.

---

548 Examples will be given on the next pages.
4.2.2 Detailed Observations

4.2.2.1 Shifting and Non-shifting by Doublet Partners (7% of 70 sets)

In four set-cases that consist each of two partners each, one of the two partners co-occurs with a shift. Additionally, in one set-case with four partners, one of the four partners co-occurs with a shift. Although it is clear that we have a case of recurring text-material in those five cases, it remains within the area of speculation which of the partners needs to be regarded as secondary insertion and which partner needs to be regarded as original. Besides this, one should be aware that a rigid understanding of original and secondary in terms of writing would be wrong-headed as we need to assume a strong impact of oral tradition and techniques in the original and secondary usage of recurring phrases. Further, it can be as well that the original source, be it of spoken or written nature, is not present in any of the set-partners.

We now have a closer look at those four cases that consist of two partners (setID: 04, 49, 60, 67)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>setID 04</th>
<th>partner 1</th>
<th>partner 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2:28b   | As a thief is shamed when caught, so the house of Israel shall be shamed— they, their kings, their officials, their priests, and their prophets, who say to a tree, “You are my father,” and to a stone, “You gave me birth.” For they have turned their backs to me, and not their faces. But in the time of their trouble they say, “Come and save us!” | "Then the cities of Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem will go and cry out to the gods to whom they make offerings, but they will never save them in the time of their trouble. For your gods have become as many as your towns, O Judah: and as many as the streets of Jerusalem are the altars to shame you have set up (שְׂמָתְתָה), altars to make offerings to Baal. As for you (止め), do not pray for this people, or lift up a cry or prayer on their behalf, for I will not listen when they call to me in the time of their trouble."
| people=3plM | people=2sgM | people=3plM | people=2sgM |
| people=2sgM | for you have as many gods as you have towns, O Judah. | for you have as many gods as you have towns, O Judah. | for you have as many gods as you have towns, O Judah. |
| people=2sgM | Why do you complain against me? You have all rebelled against me, says the Lord. | "There is no one to save from your hand, for your iniquities are great."

In partner1, the clause “for you have as many gods as you have towns, O Judah” does not cause a PNG-shift with the previous nor following text section. This is, however, different in Jer 11:13. In v13, the object of YHWH’s speaking – his people – is no longer referred to in 3plM but in 2sgM. A second shift can be noted at the end of the recurring phrase where the participant is no longer addressed as 2sgM(ך) but as 2plM (ם - you have set up).

One could speculate about the shift contained in v13 of partner2 by assuming that partner1 contains the original context of the recurring phrase which was implanted into the context of partner2, resulting in two shifts, namely right before and right after the recurring phrase. However, such a speculation does not take into consideration that there would remain a shift in 11:13 from 3plM to 2plM if the recurring phrase was missing. Of course, one could argue that the v13b “and as many as the streets of Jerusalem are the altars to shame you have set up, altars to make offerings to Baal” is also an addition.

Looking at the context of partner1, we recognize that there is a similar shift from 3P-2P, although it is not caused by the recurring phrase. In v26, God’s people are referred to in 3P (בֹּקֶץ וּלְעָנָהָ מַלִּכְיוֹת שָׁרוּ הָא מָה תּוֹרָה) while we find a shift into 2sgM in v28. We, then, must conclude that although there is no direct shift caused by the doublet in partner1 it contains the same kind of shift of partner2. This observation must alert our analysis especially since we find more cases where a shift from 3P to 2P takes...
place in the absence of any obvious recurring phrase. This means that the PNG-shift in partner2 does not necessarily need to be approached from a source-critical or redaction-critical (e.g. "bad" redaction) perspective. To overstress our point, the 3P-2P shift could have been present independent of diachronic reasons.

Our case, then, allows different interpretations, be they of diachronic or synchronic nature. Unless there is any distributional analysis, it will not be possible to attribute this shift to any textual being-aspect like "teleology" (rhetoric), "reception and transmission" (sources, redaction), or "discourse" (text-grammar).

Partner1 does not cause a PNG-shift as v35a is already in a context that refers to YHWH in 3P. This is different in partner2, where the shift from 1P into 3P is caused by an attributive clause sequence that characterizes YHWH. However, when arguing that partner2 is of a secondary nature we ignore that it is a normal phenomenon and part of Hebrew pragmatics that an attributive clause dissociates from the previous 1P participant which it describes (e.g. Jer 46:18, 51:57; Am 5:27; ).
If grape-gatherers came to you (ך), would they not leave gleanings? If thieves came by night, even they would pillage only what they wanted. But as for me, I have stripped Esau bare, I have uncovered his hiding places, and he is not able to conceal himself. His offspring are destroyed, his kinsfolk and his neighbors; and he is no more. Leave your orphans, I will keep them alive; you that live in the clefts of the rock, whose dwelling is in the heights. You say in your heart, "Who will bring me down to the ground?"

"Though you soar aloft like the eagle, though your nest is set among the stars, from there I will bring you down, says the Lord. Pillage and Slaughter Will Repay Edom's Cruelty"

If thieves came to you, if plunderers by night —how you have been destroyed!— would they not steal only what they wanted? If grape-gatherers came to you (ך), would they not leave gleanings?

How Esau has been pillaged, his treasures searched out! Edom=2sgM

Like lions they shall roar together; they shall growl like lions' whelps. When they are inflamed, I will set out their drink and make them drunk, until they become merry and then sleep a perpetual sleep, says the Lord. I will bring them down like lambs to the slaughter, like rams and goats.

Listen!—a cry from Babylon! A great crashing from the land of the Chaldeans! For the Lord is laying Babylon waste, and stilling her loud clamor. Their waves roar like mighty waters, the sound of their clamor resounds; for a destroyer has come against her, against Babylon; her warriors are taken, their bows are broken; for the Lord is a God of recompense, he will repay in full. I will make her officials and her governors, her duresses and her warriors; they shall sleep a perpetual sleep and never wake, says the King, his name (מו) is the Lord of hosts.

The recurring text of partner1 coincides with an N-shift (2plM [יקו] into 2sgM [ך]) while the reference to the 2P participant remains constantly in sgM in the text of Obadiah. It could be a possible explanation that the importation of foreign text-material has caused the N-shift. However, the 2plM imperatives in v8 of partner1 refer clearly to a pl participant (inhabitants of Dedan) while the identity of the 2sgM is not made explicit. The reader could also understand the 2sgM forms as referring to Esau or Edom as a nation. The latter option communicates to the reader that the pl form refers to the many inhabitants while the sg form addresses the nation to which the inhabitants belong to. Whether this case, then, demands a synchronic or diachronic interpretation depends on a distributional analysis of these phenomena.

The partners differ in the position of the doublets and their contextual embedding. V39 stands in a context where the parallel text-material refers to Babylon as a whole while in v57 it refers to the leaders of Babylon. There is no shift in partner1 while partner2 has a shift when the 1P reference to YHWH (v57a) changes into a 3P reference (יָשֵׁם). However, with reference to our remarks on setID49, this shift from 1P to 3P in an attributive clause is part of the pragmatics of the Hebrew language. Our observation, then,
does not express any clear case where the importation of foreign text-material causes a PNG-shift. Besides this, it is difficult to discuss in this case matters of primary and secondary sources as the partners are in such a close connection.

| setID 31 |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| **Partner1**      | **Partner2**      | **Partner3**      | **Partner4**      |
| 18:16             | 19:08             | 49:17             | 50:13             |
| "But my people have forgotten me, they burn offerings to a delusion; they have stumbled in their ways, in the ancient roads, and have gone into bypaths, not the highway, making their land a horror, a thing to be hissed at forever. All who pass by it are horrified and shake their heads." | "And in this place I will make void the plans of Judah and Jerusalem, and will make them fall by the sword before their enemies, and by the hand of those who seek their life. I will give their dead bodies for food to the birds of the air and to the wild animals of the earth. I will make this city a horror, a thing to be hissed at; everyone who passes by it will be horrified and will hiss because of all its disasters. And I will make them eat the flesh of their sons and the flesh of their daughters, and all shall eat the flesh of their neighbors in the siege, and in the distress with which their enemies and those who seek their life afflict them." | "The terror you inspire and the pride of your heart have deceived you, you who live in the clefts of the rock, who hold the height of the hill. Although you make your nest as high as the eagle's, from there I will bring you down, says the Lord. 17 Edom shall become an object of horror; everyone who passes by it will be horrified and will hiss because of all its disasters. 18 As when Sodom and Gomorrah and their neighbors were overthrown, says the Lord, no one shall live there, nor shall anyone settle in it. 19 Like a lion coming" | "Though you rejoice, though you exult, O plunderers of my heritage, though you frisk about like a heifer on the grass, and neigh like stallions, your mother shall be utterly shamed, and she who bore you shall be disgraced. Lo, she shall be the last of the nations, a wilderness, dry land, and a desert. Because of the wrath of the Lord she shall not be inhabited, but shall be an utter desolation; everyone who passes by Babylon shall be appalled and hiss because of all her wounds. Take up your positions around Babylon, all you that bend the bow; shoot at her, spare no arrows, for she has sinned against the Lord." |

Of the four partners, only partner3 and partner4 contain a shift from 2P to 3P. However, the phrase "will hiss" as a recurring phrase cannot be accused of causing this P-shift. Before the recurring phrase appears, the shift has already taken place (partner3:v17a, partner4:v13a). It is important to recognize that the recurring phrase is used in different contexts (partner1: hissing at my people; partner2: hissing at Jerusalem; partner3: hissing at Edom; partner4: hissing at Edom). This testifies to a rather liberal use of text-material already used, allowing different contextualization.

These five cases show that while it remains open which partners are of a secondary or primary nature, the integration of recurring texts (be it primary or secondary) fits well the context of all five text passages. This testifies that the writer/redactor seemed to be rather free to contextualize foreign text-material meaningfully. This freedom of contextualization on the level of content (recurring phrases are applied to Edom, Babylon and Jerusalem) suggests that contextualization does also take place on the level of grammar. The next paragraphs show whether such a suggestion can be supported.
4.2.2.2 Shifting caused by all partners (7% of 70 sets)

In five set-cases, all partners of a set contain shifts. All five sets (set ID: 18, 25, 40, 47, 55) consist of two partners:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>setID 18</th>
<th>partner1</th>
<th>partner2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:14</td>
<td>Who is wise enough to understand this? To whom has the mouth of the Lord spoken, so that they may declare it? Why is the land ruined and laid waste like a wilderness, so that no one passes through? And the Lord says: Because they have forsaken my law that I set before them, and have not obeyed my voice, or walked in accordance with it, but have stubbornly followed their own hearts and have gone after the Baals, as their ancestors taught them. YHWH = 3sgM, people = 3plM</td>
<td>In the prophets of Samaria: I saw a disgusting thing: they prophesied by Baal and led my people Israel astray. YHWH = 3sgM, proph. = 3plM, people = 3plM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>setID 18</th>
<th>partner1</th>
<th>partner2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:14</td>
<td>Therefore thus says the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel: I am feeding this people with wormwood, and giving them poisoned water to drink. people = 3plM, YHWH = 3sgM</td>
<td>I am going to make them eat wormwood, and give them poisoned water to drink. YHWH = 3sgM, proph. = 3plM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In both cases, the YHWH introduces a discourse-shift by finalizing the former DSC section. This causes a 1sgC-3sgM-1sgC reference shift (YHWH). The content of both parallel text-material is similar although the SS is a little different. While in 9:14 the nation is judged in its entirety, only the false prophets are judged in 23:15. Consequently, the text-material is contextualized without causing any grammatical in-congruence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>setID 25</th>
<th>partner1</th>
<th>partner2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15:13-14</td>
<td>Woe is me, my mother, that you ever bore me, a man of strife and contention to the whole land! I have not lent, nor have I borrowed, yet all of them curse me. YHWH = 3sgM, people = 3sgM, people = 3sgM, people = 2sgM</td>
<td>The sin of Judah is written with an iron pen; with a diamond point it is engraved on the tablet of their hearts, and on the horns of their altars, while their children remember their altars and their sacred poles, beside every green tree, and on the high hills, on the mountains in the open country. Your wealth and all your treasures I will give as plunder, without price, for all your sins, throughout all your territory. people = 3sgM, people = 2sgM, people = 3sgM, people = 2sgM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>setID 25</th>
<th>partner1</th>
<th>partner2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15:13-14</td>
<td>The Lord said: Surely I have intervened in your life for good, surely I have imposed enemies on you in a time of trouble and in a time of distress. people = 2sgM</td>
<td>By your own act you shall lose the heritage that I gave you, and I will make you serve your enemies in a land that you do not know, people = 2sgM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In both cases, a shift from 2sgM to 2plM is found within the parallel text-material (partner1: יְהוָה יִרְאוּ נַפְשׁוֹ; partner2: יְהוָה יִרְאוּ נַפְשׁוֹ). The shift does not cause any reference-shift but both, the sg and pl forms, address God's people. The parallel text-material, however, does not cause any grammatical incoherence in form of a PNG-shift with the previous and following textual context. As we need to assume that at least one of the two recurring text-materials must be of a secondary nature (with all the possible varieties [textual insertion, originally oral insertion, general cultural saying]) it is remarkable that it was not regarded as necessary to correct the 2sgM-2plM shift within the source material. Together with the fact that the shifts take place in different moments in each partner, we can testify a liberty to change foreign text-material while at the same time this liberty did not see the need to overcome the contained N-shift but to place it at a different position in the text section.

Both partners are part of the same “question-answer” scheme. This set supports again our observation that foreign text-material (whether partner1 or partner2 is the secondary source) is deliberately changed and contextualized: Partner1 refers to the fall of Jerusalem while partner2 refers to the destruction of the land. Although none of the partners causes a PNG-shift, they contain an N-shift. In partner1, the “great city” is referred to in singular while the explanation given in v9 accuses a plural entity for the destruction (יִכְבָּר נַפְשׁוֹ). A similar shift is found in partner2 where the destroyed land is referred to in singular but
the explanation for the destruction in v24 accuses a plural entity (יָבָה אֲלֵיתָא). Although these sets demonstrate the exercised liberty of contextualizing foreign text-material (whoever partner is of a secondary nature), the N-in-congruence contained in the parallel text-material is retained. Obviously, the shift is not regarded as problematic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>setID 47</th>
<th></th>
<th>partner1</th>
<th>partner2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30:10-11</td>
<td>46:27-28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| people=3plM | "On that day, says the Lord of hosts, I will break the yoke from off his neck, and I will burst his bonds, and strangers shall no more make a servant of him. But they shall serve the Lord their God and David their king, whom I will raise up for them." | "I will hand them over to those who seek their life, to King Nebuchadrezzar of Babylon and his officers. Afterward Egypt shall be inhabited as in the days of old, says the Lord."
| Israel=2sgM | "Therefore let Moab wail, for his pride is there, and for his haughtiness of heart."
| Jacob=2sgM | "Therefore I wail for Moab; I cry out for all Moab; We have heard of the pride of Moab; his boasts are false."
| Moab=3sgM | "I will hand them over to those who seek their life, to King Nebuchadrezzar of Babylon and his officers. Afterward Egypt shall be inhabited as in the days of old, says the Lord."
| outcast=3plM | "As for you, have no fear, my servant Jacob, and do not be dismayed, O Israel; for I am going to save you from far away, and your offspring from the land of their captivity. Jacob shall return and have quiet and ease, and no one shall make him afraid."

Both partners contain exactly the same P-shift (partner1: [v9] תְּנַבֵּד אֲלֵיתָא; partner2: [v26] תְּנַבֵּד אֲלֵיתָא). If we assume that one of the two partners is primary - we do not find this recurring phrase anywhere else in the OT - and if we conclude that there are P-shifts even in original texts that do not suffer any interruption and inconsistencies due to unskilled secondary insertions, the origin of the P-shift must be explained from a non-diachronic perspective. The shift from 3P to 2P also occurs more often in those text passages where recurring text-material cannot be attested. A distributional study is required to find a reasonable basis for an interpretative suggestion in this case.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>setID 55</th>
<th></th>
<th>partner1</th>
<th>partner2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48:29-33</td>
<td>Isa 16:6-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| inhab.=2plM | "Leave the towns, and live on the rock, 0 inhabitants of Moab! Be like the dove that nests on the sides of the mouth of a gorge."
| Moab=3sgM | "We have heard of the pride of Moab, of his loftiness, his pride, and his arrogance, and the haughtiness of his heart."
| ??=1plC | "I myself know his insolence, says the Lord; his boasts are false, his deeds are false."
| ??=1plC | "Therefore I wail for Moab; I cry out for all Moab; We have heard of the pride of Moab; his boasts are false."

549 SetID 47 has a third partner in 1 King 9:8-9 that is not mentioned in Parke-Taylor’s work. This partner contains a similar shift from referring to sg entities in the first part of the parallel text-material (v8: “this land […] this house”) while referring to a pl entity in the second part of the parallel text-material (v9: “because they have forsaken…”).
For the people of Kir-heres I mourn.
32 More than for Jazer I weep for you,
Your branches crossed over the sea,
upon your summer fruits and your vintage the destroyer has fallen.
33 Gladness and joy have been taken away from the fruitful land of Moab;
I have stopped the wine from the wine presses;
no one shouts with shouts of joy; the shouting is not the shout of joy.
34 Therefore I weep with the weeping of Jazer for the vines of Sibmah;
I drench you with my tears, O Heshbon and Elealeh;
for the shout over your fruit harvest and your grain harvest has ceased.
10 Joy and gladness are taken away from the fruitful field;
and in the vineyards no songs are sung, no shouts are raised;
no treader treads out wine in the presses; the vintage-shout is hushed.
Therefore my heart throbs like a harp for Moab,
and my very soul for Kir-heres.
When Moab presents himself, when he wearies himself upon the high place,
when he comes to his sanctuary to pray, he will not prevail.

The texts in Jeremiah and Isaiah are slightly different. While the immediate preceding context of the parallel text-material in partner 1 addresses Moab as 2P (v28: כֹּחָר יַעֲרֵי כִּינְסָרָה לֻחָר יָזֶר), it is referred to within the recurring text-material in 3P. In partner 2 the clauses preceding the recurring text-material address the outcasts of Moab as 3P. While there is a clear relation between the inhabitants of Moab and Moab as a nation (partner 1), as well as between the outcasts of Moab and Moab as a nation (partner 2), only partner 1 distinguishes between the inhabitants/outcasts and the nation by means of a 2P-3P shift. In that sense the text of the doublet causes a shift in Jeremiah while it does not in Isaiah. From a “reception and transmission” perspective one could assume that Isaiah is the source of Jeremiah 48:29-33 and was implemented in Jeremiah without contextualizing the source material grammatically to the target context (inhabitants of Moab hold 2pPos). However, a further comparison between the partners makes clear that the parallel text-material in Jeremiah and Isaiah contains a 1sgC-1plC-shift (partner 1: v29 vs. v30; partner 2: v6 vs. v9). Consequently, even if one assumes the parallel-material in Jeremiah as secondary, and explains the shift as being caused by the implementation of foreign text-material, the 1sgC-1plC-shift in both partners remains unexplained.

The comparison testifies once again the freedom with which the writer/redactor changed his primary source while at the same time the 1sgC-1plC-shift was not regarded as problematic. When we assume that partner 2 contains the primary source, it does not appear convincing to charge the redactor for the 2P-3P shift caused in partner 1, especially since we see the freedom with which the book of Jeremiah is deliberately changing the source material from the book of Isaiah. From this follows that it would be strange that this same freedom is not applied by the redactor for grammatically cohering the source material with its contained 1P reference-shift.
4.2.2.3 **No shifting by any partners (79% of 70 sets)**

Besides the ten described cases (in 4.2.2.1 and 4.2.2.2), there are 60 cases of doublet sets left. In five cases (7%), we are not sure whether a shift is contained or caused and have therefore attached a “?” to these cases in the database. The other 55 cases (79% of all 70 doublet sets) do not show any shift causation. Most of the cases confirm the deliberate use of foreign text-material and show clear marks of contextualization. We will only discuss a few set-cases as examples of contextualization and deliberate use:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>setID</th>
<th>partner1</th>
<th>partner2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Isa 48:34-39</td>
<td>Isa 15:02-07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

48:34-39

Gladness and joy have been taken away from the fruitful land of Moab;
I have stopped the wine from the wine presses;
no one treads them with shouts of joy;
the shouting is not the shout of joy.

Heshbon and Elealeh cry out; as far as Jahaz they utter their voice, from Zoar to Horonaim and Eglath-shelishiyah. For even the waters of Nimrim have become desolate.

And I will bring to an end in Moab, says the Lord, those who offer sacrifice at a high place and make offerings to their gods.

Therefore my heart moans for Moab like a flute, and my heart moans like a flute for the people of Kir-heres; for the riches they gained have perished.

For every head is shaved and every beard cut off; on all the hands there are gashes, and on the loins sackcloth.

On all the housetops of Moab and in the squares there is nothing but lamentation; for I have broken Moab like a vessel that no one wants, says the Lord.

How it is broken! How they wail! How Moab has turned his back in shame! So Moab has become a derision and a horror to all his neighbors.

My heart cries out for Moab; his fugitives flee to Zoar, to Eglath-shelishiyah.

The abundance they have gained and what they have laid up they carry away over the Wadi of the Willows.

The texts of both partners are different. The parallel text-material does not cause any shifts. It still remains unclear whether Jeremiah makes use of Isiah or vice versa. In both cases one can conclude, that there was a deliberate use of the source. The placement of the source material differs to a great extent from its original context. Together with the majority of our examples we can see that the implementation of foreign text-material does not cause incoherence in form of participant reference-shifts in the text. PNG-shifts then must rather be approached from the perspective of the textual being-aspects “teleology”, “language” or “discourse”. The following examples will support such a further procedure.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>setID 62</th>
<th>49:19-21</th>
<th>50:44-46</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>partner1</td>
<td>1 Edom shall become an object of horror; everyone who passes by it will be horrified and will hiss because of all its disasters. 2 As when Sodom and Gomorrah and their neighbors were overthrown, says the Lord, no one shall live there, nor shall anyone settle in it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partner2</td>
<td>4 Like a lion coming up from the thicket of the Jordan against a perennial pasture, I will suddenly chase Edom away from it; and I will appoint over it whomever I choose. For who is like me? Who can summon me? Who is the shepherd who can stand before me? 5 Therefore hear the plan that the Lord has made against Edom and the purposes that he has formed against the inhabitants of Teman: Surely the little ones of the flock shall be dragged away; surely their fold shall be appalled at their fate. 6 At the sound of their fall the earth shall tremble; the sound of their cry shall be heard at the Red Sea.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both partners are almost identical with the only major difference that partner1 refers to Edom while partner2 refers to Babylon. This is another good example that proves the freedom of contextualization that the writer/redactor had. While the parallel text-material does not cause any shift in either partner1 or partner2, it contains the same shift: In the beginning YHWH is referred to with 1sgC forms but in the later part the reference shifts to 3sgM forms. Obviously, the shifts are not regarded as problematic and do not call for any corrective actions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>setID 57</th>
<th>48:40-41</th>
<th>49:22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>partner1</td>
<td>&quot;How it is broken! How they wail! How Moab has turned his back in shame! So Moab has become a derision and a horror to all his neighbors. 49 For thus says the Lord: Look, he shall swoop down like an eagle, and spread his wings against Moab; 50 the towns shall be taken and the strongholds seized. The hearts of the warriors of Moab, on that day, shall be like the heart of a woman in labor. 51 Moab shall be destroyed as a people, because he magnified himself against the Lord. 52 Terror, pit, and trap are before you, O inhabitants of Moab! says the Lord.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partner2</td>
<td>10 Therefore hear the plan that the Lord has made against Edom and the purposes that he has formed against the inhabitants of Teman: Surely the little ones of the flock shall be dragged away; surely their fold shall be appalled at their fate. 11 At the sound of the capture of Babylon the earth shall tremble, and her cry shall be heard among the nations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both partners do not cause any shift. In contrast to partner2, partner1 introduces the recurring material with יְהֹוָה יָעֵ֣שׁ כֹּ֛הֵן as DSI. The different placement of the recurring material again proves that there is much liberty involved for contextualizing the doublets: In partner1 the eagle covers Moab in partner2 he covers Bozra/Edom.
See, I am against you, O inhabitant of the valley, O rock of the plain, says the Lord; you who say, “Who can come down against us, or who can enter our places of refuge?”

I will punish you according to the fruit of your doings, says the Lord; I will kindle a fire in its forest (יה), and it shall devour all that is around it.

I am against you, O arrogant one, says the Lord God of hosts; for your day has come, the time when I will punish you.

The arrogant one shall stumble and fall, with no one to raise him up, and I will kindle a fire in his cities (יוו), and it will devour everything around him.

Thus says the Lord of hosts: The people of Israel are oppressed, and so too are the people of Judah; all their captors have held them fast and refuse to let them go.

Therefore thus says the Lord: See, I am laying before this people stumbling blocks against which they shall stumble; parents and children together, neighbor and friend shall perish.

Thus says the Lord: See, a people is coming from the land of the north, a great nation is stirring from the farthest parts of the earth.

They grasp the bow and the spear, it is cruel and they have no mercy, their sound is like the roaring sea; they ride on horses, set in array as a warrior for battle, against you, O daughter Zion (יון ת־צ ב).

We have heard news of them, our hands fall helpless; anguish has taken hold of us, pain as of a woman in labor.

Do not go out into the field, or walk on the road; for the enemy has a sword, terror is on every side.”

Therefore wild animals shall live with hyenas in Babylon, and ostriches shall inhabit her; she shall never again be peopled, or inhabited for all generations.

As when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah and their neighbors, says the Lord, so no one shall live there, nor shall anyone settle in her.

See, a people is coming from the north; a mighty nation and many kings are stirring from the farthest parts of the earth.

They grasp bow and spear, they are cruel and have no mercy. Their sound is like the roaring sea; they ride upon horses, set in array as a warrior for battle, against you, O daughter Babylon (ל†ב ת־ב ב).

The king of Babylon heard news of them, and his hands fell helpless; anguish seized him, pain like that of a woman in labor.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>city=3sgF</th>
<th>partner1</th>
<th>partner2</th>
<th>Deut 28:53</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>people=3plM</td>
<td>And I will make this city a horror, a thing to be hissed at; everyone who passes by it will be horrified and will hiss because of all its disasters.</td>
<td>It shall besiege you in all your towns until your high and fortified walls, in which you trusted, come down throughout your land; it shall besiege you in all your towns throughout the land that the Lord your God has given you.</td>
<td>people=2sgM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people=3plM</td>
<td>And I will make them eat the flesh of their sons and the flesh of their daughters (יִהְיֶהוּ בָּשַׁר בְּנוֹת), and all shall eat the flesh of their neighbors in the siege, and in the distress with which their enemies and those who seek their life afflict them.</td>
<td>Even the most refined and gentle of men among you will begrudge food to his own brother, to the wife whom he embraces, and to the last of his remaining children, giving to none of them any of the flesh of his children whom he is eating, because nothing else remains to him, in the desperate straits to which the enemy siege will reduce you in all your towns.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:9</td>
<td>Then you shall break the jug in the sight of those who go with you, and shall say to them: Thus says the Lord of hosts: So will I break this people and this city, as one breaks a potter’s vessel, so that it can never be mended.</td>
<td>In Topheth they shall bury until there is no more room to bury.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both texts stand in a similar content-context (curse). However, the SS is different. In partner2, the cursed one stands in 2pPos (שָׁנֶה בְּנוֹתֵיכֶם) while in partner1 the cursed one stands in 3pPos (יִהְיֶהוּ בָּשַׁר בְּנוֹת). Again, texts seem to be also contextualized on the level of grammar since the context of partner1 is in 3P while the context of partner2 is in 2P.

### 4.2.3 Conclusion

Our detailed observation of intertextuality and its relation to PNG-shifts brings more clarity with regard to the diachronic and synchronic potential of PNG-shifts. In general, the insertion of foreign text-material is not responsible for causing any PNG-shifts. A vast majority of sets reveals the text-producer’s great flexibility and liberty in order to contextualize foreign material both to content (e.g. different participant is addressed) and grammar (PNG characteristic of references are changed). The text-producer’s sensitivity to the text-material in combination with the liberty taken, contradicts the argument within historical-critical circles that PNG-shifts are often caused through secondary insertions. In only a few cases (less than 2% of 585 PNG-shifts) where the demarcations of recurring text-material coincide with a PNG-shift a text-critical solution could be suggested.

Our intertextual study demonstrates that the textual-being aspect “reception and transmission” can not offer a rational for the presence of PNG-shifts. Our hypothesis then is, that participant reference-shifts must be attributed to the textual-being aspects “language”, “discourse” and “teleology” where they receive their rational and functionality. Consequently, chapter 5 will investigate the distributional character of PNG-shifts in order to find out whether the framework “teleology”, “language”, or “discourse” offers some interpretations that are more consent with the data found.

### 4.3 PNG-shifts and text-tradition

Intertextuality is not the only data that gives some insight into the relationship between participant reference-shifts and textual reception and transmission. Especially the Qumran fragments and the Greek version of Jeremiah give insight into the textual evolution of the CL as final text and the relationship
between the different text-traditions. As a consequence, we further investigate whether participant reference-shifts play a role within the textual being-aspect “reception and transmission”. We search to find answers to questions like “Does the CL reveal a change in its PNG-shift treatments with regard to the older Qumran fragments and the older Greek text?”,”Can a further development in PNG-shift handling with regard to the older witnesses be testified in CL?”,”Does the Greek text try to overcome PNG-shifts, suggesting that PNG-shifts were received as problematic for the reading process?”,”Do Qumran fragments deviate from CL with regard to PNG-shifts, suggesting that other Hebrew text traditions regarded PNG-shifts as problematic?” The following pages try to develop an answer to these questions before we will enter into a distributive synchronic analysis of all 585 PNG-shifts in chapter 5.

4.3.1 Codex Leningradensis and Qumran Fragments
Especially the Dead Sea Scrolls found in Qumran are of specific interest for us as it is obvious that they testify that the transmission of texts can be complex and can involve more than just the literary copying of manuscripts. Although it remains unclear whether the Qumran texts prove editorial activity it cannot be neglected that the fragments bear signs of the transmission process. Our question consequently is to what extent this transmission process effected the existence of PNG-shifts.

There are six Jeremiah fragments found in Qumran: 2Q13, 4Q70, 4Q71, 4Q72, 4Q72a and 4Q72b. While 2Q13 can be dated back to the early Christian era, the other five fragments belong to the oldest found in Qumran and are dated between 2nd and 1st century BC. With the exception of 4Q71 and 4Q72a, the relation to the CL as masoretic text (from now on MT) is clear: There is a distinct closeness to the MT tradition as portrayed by CL. A judgment about 4Q71 and 4Q72b is much more difficult. On the basis of the preserved text-material, 4Q72a shows similarities with the LXX against the MT. But at the same time, these fragments have similarities with the MT against the LXX as well. As 4Q71 most probably lacks - together with the LXX - the same verses in Jer 10 it is argued that this fragment follows the LXX text-tradition in contrast to the MT. However, the spacing of 4Q71 contradicts the length of both the LXX text as well as the MT text making the case more complex. Fischer correctly argues that the conclusion that 4Q71 follows the LXX text-tradition is only based upon the absent text-material. Besides this, different qualitative critiques have been expressed against the primacy of the LXX or/and the closeness of the LXX with regard to 4Q71. All this makes us conclude that a final and detailed judgment about the text-critical relation between the MT, the LXX and Qumran fragments is not possible since it necessarily needs to draw on hypothetical presuppositions, as past research has shown. This is, however, unproblematic for our own endeavor. The factual message of the Qumran fragments is sufficient for us: There are marks of

550 Fischer, 33.
551 Seters van, 346-350.
552 This has been the popular interpretation basically launched by Janzen and then popularized by Tov. See Fischer, 23, 33; Emanuel Tov, Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, 2nd revised ed. (Minneapolis, Assen, 2001), 314-327.
553 See Fischer, 24; Eugene Charles Ulrich, Qumran Cave 4. X, the Prophets, Discoveries in the Judaean Desert (Oxford, 1997), 174-175.
554 Hubmann finds a high degree of variability in the LXX that cannot be deduced to a different Hebrew Vorlage (Fischer, 34.). Schenker registers circular thinking in the arguments of Janzen and Tov (Ibid., 36.). While Soderlund’s and Levin’s text-critical studies conclude that in the end the proto-Jeremianic material stands closer to the MT/CL than to the Greek LXX (Ibid., 37.).
555 Cf. Ibid., 49-50; Seters van, 332-340, 346-350.
deviation visible both with regard to the MT as well as with regard to the LXX text-tradition. This fact helps us to shed light on the treatment of PNG-shifts in deviating fragments by answering the question whether the differences reveal significant deviations with regard to the PNG-shift phenomenon. In the case of any differences, we will not speculate about the primary or secondary nature of one text-tradition over the other but remain descriptive. Our phenomenological analysis, then, clarifies whether text-traditions favor or disfavor these shifts more than the MT.

The Qumran fragments of the Jeremiah text cover the following MT/CL passages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qumran Fragment</th>
<th>MT/CL Passage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2Q13 (2QJer)</td>
<td>13:22 – 2Q70 (4QJer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q71 (4QJer)</td>
<td>7:15–19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q72 (4QJer)</td>
<td>7:1–2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q72a (4QJer)</td>
<td>9:7–15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q72b (4QJer)</td>
<td>10:9–14; 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q72k (4QJer)</td>
<td>22:3–16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q72l (4QJer)</td>
<td>26:10?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.3.1.1 General Observation

Since many Qumran fragments are seriously distorted, we only use those fragment sections that are exploitable. The comparative analysis works with our PNG-shift database and the Qumran reconstructions as found in 15th volume of “Discoveries in the Judean Desert”.

Our research shows that 78% of all 585 registered PNG-shifts in the MT/CL do not have any co-existing Qumran fragment for comparison. The remaining 22% (131 cases) have a parallel in the Qumran fragments. We have not only looked at those Qumran fragments that correspond with our text-material as we were interested in to what extent the Qumran texts deviate from those MT/CL passages without any PNG-shifts. The question would thus be answered whether Qumran fragments contain shifts additionally to the MT/CL. The following chart gives an overview on the interrelation of Qumran and the CL with regard to participant reference-shifts:

---

556 For example: While column 15 of 2Q13 (Jer 24-25) does not contain enough material to make any judgment in any direction, column 14 of 2Q13 (Jer 13:22) does allow so although it contains only 4 letters. This is because the first two letters קני are clearly belonging to the word נומני testifying the same shift that was registered in the MT/CL (1sgC to 2sgF).

In our comparative study four categories are used:

0−: Used for all those Qumran texts that do not deviate (“0”) from the MT/CL text (with regard to PNG-shift registration). Additionally, they do not contain any sort of PNG-shifts (“−”) as the text is only available in a limited form and thus not stretching far enough to mirror the corresponding MT/CL text with its participant reference-shift.

0+: Used for all those Qumran texts that do not deviate (“0”) from the MT/CL text (with regard to PNG-shift registration) as they also contain the same PNG shift (“+”) as the MT/CL.

1−: Used for all those Qumran texts that deviate (“1”) from the MT/CL text (with regard to PNG-shift registration) by means of not containing a PNG shift (“−”) in contrast to the MT/CL.

1+: Used for all those Qumran texts that do deviate (“1”) from the MT/CL text (with regard to PNG-shift registration) as they contain a PNG shift (“+”) in contrast to the MT/CL.

The table above shows that in 114 cases the PNG-shifts found in the MT/CL are also found in the Qumran fragments and their reconstructions. In only five cases (1x “1−”, 4x “1+”) where Qumran fragments parallel the MT/CL text, deviations with regard to participant reference-shifts are registered! In two further cases, the Qumran text contains a participant reference-shift in addition to the registered shifts in the MT/CL. This means that in only seven cases Qumran deviates from the MT/CL! Consequently, we observe on a general level that the MT/CL contains the same PNG-shifts as the Qumran fragments. With two exception, we further observe that Qumran fragments in comparison with MT/CL do not contain additional PNG-shifts.

With a deviation of only 1%, our general observation must be that PNG-shifts of any kind are not regarded as problematic in the Qumran fragments independent of the text tradition they represent. Participant reference-shifts are present in the oldest Hebrew manuscripts as well as in the medieval ones testifying that the CL must belong to an old Hebrew text-tradition.
### 4.3.1.2 Detailed Observation

For a more qualitative judgment, a close look is needed at those cases where deviations can be testified between Qumran and the MT/CL.

#### 4.3.1.2.1 Qumran Type 1-

**48:29-30 and 2Q13:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT/CL</th>
<th>2Q13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>שמענו ישמע נא נוא ניא עבתר לאו וביד לאו וביד נעשנה</td>
<td>LXX has ἤκουσα, “I have heard.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have heard (1plC) of the pride of Moab he is very proud of his loftiness, his pride, and his arrogance, and the haughtiness of his heart.</td>
<td>Hear (2plM [imp]) of the pride of Moab he is very proud of his loftiness, very high is his pride, and he is no more and his arrogance, and the haughtiness of his heart.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אני יודע (1sgC) היותו בחרות לאו וביד לאו ואיננ</td>
<td>She has (3sgF) not accomplished anything</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know (1sgC) his insolence, declares the L ORD; his boasts are false, they have (3plC) not accomplished anything.</td>
<td>She (3sgF) not accomplished anything</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the MT/CL version of 48:29-30, there is a 1P-shift from pl (שמעון) to sg (v30). The question to the reader is whether the participant referred to with the 1P forms is identical or not. On a semantic level, “שמע” (pl) and “ידע” (sg) are similar. The 1plC form could hint at YHWH’s self-understanding that he belongs to a greater group of observers. This is an argument not to shift participants at the moment where the N-shift (with PG-stability) takes place. On the other hand, the text so far also allows the possibility of referring to different participants despite the PG-stability (1C).

2Q13 does not contain any 1P-shift as it simply has the imperative 2plM שמע נא instead of שמעון in v29 and therefore deviates from the MT/CL (“1”).

If the MT/CL represents the earlier Vorlage of 2Q13 one can argue that the Qumran fragment solves the shift-problem by changing the verbal form of שמע. If the MT/CL is a later development on the basis of 2Q13 the shift could be a scribal error. Both conclusions are speculations on the basis of the possible “reception and transmission” being-aspect. But since our case is an exception to the vast majority of PNG-shift similarities between the MT/CL and Qumran, one needs to be careful to draw such text-critical conclusions.

---

558 Instead of a 1plC form the LXX has a 1sg aorist form in v29a (ἠκουσα οἴδην Μωαβ). As a consequence the reader finds YHWH in the 1pPos both in v29 as well as in v30.
4.3.1.2.2 *Qumran type 1+

#1: Jer 31:02-03 and 4Q72

From a phenomenological perspective, 4Q72 has exactly the same text as in the MT/CL and therefore belongs to the type 0+. However, due to the fact that the problematic first clause of v3 is corrupted beyond reconstruction there is room for speculation that could support a 1+ categorization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT/CL</th>
<th>4Q72</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[הכ אם ראה ושם [ע]ל [ש[ו]ד]ר ב[ול]ד] [וע]י</td>
<td>... ... ... ... ... ... ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Thus says the Lord: grace found in the wilderness a people going for finding his rest, Israel (or better: when Israel sought for his rest)]</td>
<td>[Thus says the Lord: grace found in the wilderness] a people going for [ ... ... ... ... ... ...]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus says the Lord: grace found in the wilderness a people who survived the sword who survived the s[world] (ך) the 1pPos functioned as 3sP, as it makes the reader believe that YHWH is in the 1pPos in the following DSC. However, in the first clause of v3 in the MT/CL (_movא לא ראה [ך]ו, YHWH holds the 3P position while the 1pPos (ך) is held by some other participant (Israel?: Jeremiah?)). This contradicts the discourse expectation of the reader. The second clause of v3 is even more surprising (_אבת עהל אחشاب[ך]ו) as it shifts the 1P position to YHWH. The SS of the second and third clause of v3 fulfill the expected SS of the reader after having read the DSI in v2. Consequently, it is the first clause of v3 that is problematic. Its absence would also lead to the disappearing of the P-shift.

The fact that in 4Q72 the first clause of v3 cannot be reconstructed engenders speculations especially since the LXX renders an *αὐτῷ (to him) for י. Thus, The 4Q72 might deviate from the SS of MT/CL as it could contain something like ירהו י. If the Qumran fragment was similar to the LXX κύριος πόρφυρα θρηνητον αὐτῶι, there would not be a P-shift anymore and the reader's discourse expectations would be met. However, these considerations cannot be supported by data.

#2: Jer 48:25-28 and 2Q13 (M-F shift)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CL</th>
<th>2Q13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>נՁשנה קר מאמב ור[ז]ז [רשבר[ך]] אָס הוֹ[ך]</td>
<td>[ד]［מע］עש כר[ז]ז [רשבר[ך]] אָס ［ך］וֹ[ך]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The horn of Moab is cut off, and his (3sgM) arm is broken, declares the Lord.</td>
<td>The horn of Moab is cut off, and his (3sgM) arm is broken, declares the Lord.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

599 Different attempts in solving the distortion from a reader’s perspective are offered. Holladay suggests that the writer/redactor adapts to Ex 3:16 and thus, here exists a direct quote that is not cohered into the context (Holladay, 280.). Bozak and Dahood read the י in as “to him,” citing a few other occurrences of functioning as 3sgM suffix (Barbara A. Bozak, *Life Anew: A Literary-Theological Study of Jer. 30-31*, Analecta Biblica (Rome, 1991), 75; Mitchell J. Dahood, *Psalms*, 3 vols., The Anchor Bible (Garden City, 1966), 376.).
In v25, Moab is referred to in M (יֵבְשָׁם) both in the MT/CL and 2Q13. Later in the course of the discourse of 2Q13, Moab is referred to in F in v26 (זָהָב לָכֶם) as well as in v27 (זָהָב לָכֶם). Although the MT/CL does not contain this G-shift in the same section, it contains the same G-shift some verses earlier. In 48:15 and 48:20, the MT/CL shifts the G quality in its addressing of Moab (v15: M [שְּבָד] and F [וֹאֵר]; v20: M [הָרָב] and F [חִיתָא]). Independent of text-critical speculations, it can be said that on a phenomenological level, 2Q13 deviates from the MT/CL with regard to the participant-references to Moab, but at the same time both contain a G-shift at different sections of the text. Thus, even if the one corrected the shift of its source in the process of transmission it did not involve efforts in dissolving all G-shifts.

The above CL/2Q13 text comparison contains further shifts that will be discussed in the following paragraphs (#3-#5).

#3: Jer 48:26-28 and 2Q13 (2P-3P shift)

For the MT/CL, Moab is explicitly referred to in 3sgM (e.g. וָעֲשָׂרָה) in v26 but shifts into a 2sgM addressing in v27 (e.g. קִנֵּה). The following 2plM imperative in v28 (עֵשֶב) seems to be a variation of the previous 2sgM addressing of Moab. While the pl forms could refer to the inhabitants of Moab, the sg forms could refer to Moab as a nation.

A comparison with 2Q13 shows that the text deviates in v26 as well as in v28:

1. In v26, Moab is not consequently referred to in 3sgM like in the MT/CL but is referred to in 3sgF (יֵבְשָׁם) and in 3sgM (e.g. יָשָׂרָה). This allows us to stress that in the Qumran fragments, the G-shift is not regarded as problematic.
2. In v27, 2Q13 also shifts from the 3pPos into the 2pPos when Moab is addressed. However, in contrast to the MT/CL, it again contains a G-shift in its addressing Moab (M [לָכֶם] to F [לָכֶם]).
3. While in v28, the MT/CL shifts from 2sgM to 2plM, 2Q13 does not seem to shift at all. Moab is addressed in the end of v27 as 2sgF (יֵבְשָׁם) as well as in v28 (יֵבְשָׁם).

We, then, conclude that there are also deviations between the MT/CL and 2Q13 with regard to PNG-shifts, but these have to do more with the position of PNG-shifts than with the existence of them: Both texts contain a similar amount of shifts although the location of the shifts' operation differs.
#4: Jer 48:26-28 and 2Q13 (2plM form referring to two different participants)

With regard to the MT/CL, we find two grammatical identical imperative forms (2plM) in v26 (יהורחא) and v28 ( ammon). However, each imperative addresses another participant (v26: enemies of Moab; v28: citizens of Moab) without any explicit marking of discourses that would signal the reader that a new SS enters the reading process.

2Q13 deviates – according to its reconstruction - from the MT/CL in the second imperative in v28 (the first imperative in v26 is identical with the MT/CL) – as it does not contain an 2plM ( ammon) but an 2sgF imperative form ( revolver). Consequently, 2Q13 does not have any problem of addressing two different participants with the same grammatical forms. However, it is risky to argue, that this case shows how the 2Q13 solves a reference problem (assuming primacy of the MT/CL), or that it shows that a scribal error was inserted during the transmission process of the MT/CL (assuming primacy of 2Q13).

#5: Jer 48:27 and 2Q13 (M-F shift)

In v27, Israel seems to be referred to both in M (היכל) and in F (משכן). In the MT/CL, this grammatical incongruence is solved through the qere suggestion changing the המשכן into האמה. However, a comparison with the shifting gender addressing of Moab in the MT/CL (e.g. in v15 M [שד] and F [ укра], or in v20 M [וב], and F [מע]) something similar could be possible with Israel as participant as well.

A comparison of the MT/CL with 2Q13 shows that there is the same basic incoherence in addressing Israel as F and M. However, the incoherence is the other way around! While the MT/CL has first the M- (היכל) and later the F- (משכן) addressing, 2Q13 has first the F- (היא) and later the M - (משכן) addressing. If 2Q13 had kept the היכל predication of the MT/CL, the incoherence would have been overcome. But it seems that 2Q13 is as little concerned as the MT/CL about overcoming the mixed gender addressing of Israel and Moab. In case that there is a text-traditional relation between the two texts, one being primary to the other, it can be concluded that in the evolutionary process of text production the G-shift was seen as to be retained by whatever means. The sequence of the shifting played a minor role as the major concern was that certain participants remain referred to both in F and M.

4.3.1.2.3 SPECIAL CASE: JER 10:10-12 AND 4Q71

Although for us, the 4Q71's passage of Jer 10:10-12 belongs into the category 0– as there is not any obvious PNG-shift deviation, it deserves some more detailed description especially in its relation to the LXX.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT/CL (NRSV)</th>
<th>LXX (NETS)</th>
<th>4Q71</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Hear the word that the Lord speaks to you (יהוה), O house of Israel.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Hear a word of the Lord that he spoke to you ( serde), O house of Israel.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
dismayed at them.  
1 For the customs of the peoples are false; a tree from the forest is cut down, and worked with an ax by the hands of an artisan;  
2 because they are afraid of them bto their faces,  
3 because the precepts of the nations are vain; there is a tree from the forest, cut down, a work of a craftsman, and a molten image.  
4 They have been beautified with silver and gold; they fastened them with hammers and nails, and they shall not be moved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Their idols are like scarecrows in a cucumber field, and they cannot speak; they have to be carried, for they cannot walk. Do not be afraid of them, for they cannot do evil, nor is it in them to do good.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beaten silver is brought from Tarshish, and gold from Uphaz. They are the work of the artisan and of the hands of the goldsmith; their clothing is in blue and purple; they are all the product of skilled workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrought silver it is—they will not walk.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 Beaten silver will come from Tharsis, gold of Mophas and a hand of goldsmiths—works of craftsmen all; they will clothe them in blue and purple.

10 But the Lord is the true God; he is the living God (ye-he-véq) and the everlasting King. At his wrath the earth quakes, and the nations cannot endure his indignation.

11 Thus shall you say to them: The gods who did not make the heavens and the earth shall perish from the earth and from under the heavens.

12 It is he who made the earth by his power, who established the world by his wisdom, and by his understanding stretched out the heavens.

13 When he utters his voice, there is a tumult of waters in the heavens, and he makes the mist rise from the ends of the earth. Lightning he makes for the rain, and he brought up a quantity of water was in the sky, and he brought up clouds from the end of the earth lightnings he made into rain, and he brought out light from his storehouses.

14 Every man is stupid and without knowledge; every goldsmith is put to shame by his idols, for his images are false, and there is no breath in them.

15 They are worthless, a work of delusion; at the time of their punishment (ḥamás) they shall perish.
With regard to the MT/CL, there is a PNG-shift in 10:10-12: The 2pPos (2sgM) held by YHWH in vv 6-7 (מָצַא הָעָן יְהֹוָה) shifts in v10 where YHWH is referred to in 3sgM (וַיִּקָּח הָעָן). In addition, the appearance of the 2pM predication in v11 (וְיַעֲנֵהוּ) emphasizes that the 2pPos is no longer held by YHWH. The sudden appearance of the 2sgM form in v6 and the sudden 2pM form in v11 make the reader lose his orientation in the discourse organization of the chapter.

A comparison with the 4Q71 fragments shows that vv 4-11 received a different structure and could have been arranged differently than in the MT/CL. If the latter is assumed, 4Q71 seems to follow the text tradition of the LXX. In the LXX, v9 comes before v5b while vv6-8 and v10 are missing. This is most interesting since it is especially vv 6-8 which cause a PNG-shift and interrupt within the discourse. Further, vv 10-11 also create a PNG-shift. These problems are overcome in the LXX and in case of a similarity between 4Q71 and the LXX, this Qumran fragment would also have an unproblematic discourse architecture in comparison with the MT/CL.

A further reading of 4Q71, however, disturbs this latter conclusion. In v15, a 1sgC predication with YHWH as subject (וַיְקַדְּשֵׁהוּ) causes a PNG-shift since YHWH has been predicated as 3sgM in the preceding verses (e.g. v13). This shift is not contained in the MT/CL (םֹתַרְפֵּהוּ) nor the the LXX (ἐπισκοπῆς αὐτῶν). Therefore, independent of our conclusion with regard to the text-traditional interrelationship between 4Q71 and the LXX, we must conclude that in any case, 4Q71 contains a similar discourse problem as the MT/CL although with a delay of 4-5 verses.

This observation fits well with our earlier conclusion: Qumran fragments might deviate in matters of PNG-shift locations but not in matters of the existence PNG-shift.

4.3.1.3 Conclusion

A close look at the 1+ and 1- types supports our observations on a more general scale. Almost all Qumran fragments (96%) are in full agreement with the PNG-shift situation of the MT/CL. The existence as well as the absence of PNG-shifts in Qumran fragments are identical to the MT/CL. Consequently, the PNG-shift phenomenon is omnipresent both in the MT/CL and in several Qumran fragments. Independent of the position one likes to take with regard to the text-critical relation between these different texts, a clear statement can be made: Whether (a) some Qumran fragments are prototypical to the MT/CL or (b) the MT tradition is prototypical to certain Qumran fragments we do not see any tendency to overcome the PNG-shifts found in any prototypical text (48:29-30 and 2Q13 are the only exceptions). In case of a third option (c) where a text-critical independence between the MT/CL and the Qumran texts is present, our comparison shows that PNG-shifts are likewise prominent and omnipresent in all MSS independent from each other.

Our detailed look at the 1- and 1+ types shows that in two cases a shift in a Qumran fragment (in our case G-shift) exists in addition to the shift situation in the MT/CL. In two other cases, the G-shift location in the MT/CL is not identical with the G-shift location in the specific Qumran fragment; we therefore draw the conclusion that the order of the shifts plays a minor role as the main concern is that certain participants remain referred to both in F and M. However, a PNG-shift deviation from the MT/CL is very seldom. In one of the five 1+ cases, it is only by means of speculation that the 1+ typification can be applied as the phenomenological reality of the fragment suggests a 0+ classification.
Besides these phenomenological judgments, a qualitative suggestion can be done: The neglectable deviations of PNG-shifts in the different texts (CL vs. Q) stand in a stark contrast to the clear text differences on other levels that need explanations from a text-critical standpoint. Our findings then support our conclusion drawn earlier on the basis of our intertextual study: a data-oriented explanation of PNG-shifts from the perspective of the textual-being aspect “reception and transmission” is not possible. Our findings rather suggest that a meaningful approach to PNG-shifts can only take place in the realm of the being-aspects “language”, “teleology”, and “discourse”. To what extent a comparative study with the Greek text-material strengthens this conclusion is seen in the following paragraphs.

4.3.2 **Codex Leningradensis and the Septuagint – Comparison of Jeremiah Texts**

The comparative study of the LXX and the MT/CL is of great value when questions of textual history need to be addressed. This is because the great codices (Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, Vaticanus) are not only 500-600 years older than the Hebrew CL but deviate also strongly from it.\(^{560}\) With many omissions and textual changes of the LXX it lacks 1/6\(^{th}\) of text-material contained in the CL.\(^{561}\) Besides this, many significant differences in formulations can be found and the composition of chapter 26-52 is of a drastic different organization compared to the CL.\(^{562}\)

In our own study, we have basically reduced our comparative perspective on the issue of participant reference-shifts. The major task for us is to answer questions like “How does the LXX compare to the participant reference-shifts in the MT/CL?”, “Does the LXX overcome those shifts?”, “Is the Greek text presented of better readability, more consistent in its textual coherence or does it show a similar presence of participant reference-shifts?”

The textual basis for our comparison is the eclectic “Handausgabe” of the Göttinger Septuagint project edited by Rahlfs and Hanhart.\(^{563}\) Besides this, we have made use of Tov’s “Parallel aligned Hebrew and Greek Texts of Jewish Scripture”\(^{564}\) and Stipp’s “Textkritische Synopse zum Jeremiahbuch”.\(^{565}\)

4.3.2.1 **General Observation**

We compared all 585 participant reference-shifts that we detected in the MT/CL with the Greek text of Jeremiah. One of the first observations is that not all shift are comparable. This is due to different reasons. On the one hand, the LXX omits some sections of the MT/CL text while on the other hand much Greek text-material is so different to the MT/CL text that it is not qualified for a comparison. Additionally, the language differences bring some inherent limitations for a full shift-comparison. This affects especially the G-shifts. While we register many G-shifts in the Hebrew text we find only a few in the Greek text. This, however, is not because the Greek “corrects” the Hebrew incoherence but rather because the Greek simply does not have a G-differentiation when finite verbal forms or first and second person pronouns are used. Consequently, 13% of all MT/CL-shifts cannot be compared to the LXX text.

---

\(^{560}\) Michael Tilly, *Einführung in Die Septuaginta*, Einführung Theologie (Darmstadt, 2005).

\(^{561}\) Fischer, 17.

\(^{562}\) Ibid.


The table shows that 67% of the MT/CL-shifts are contained in the LXX as well, while in only 16% of the cases the Greek text deviates from the participant reference-shifts in the MT/CL. On a general scale we can say that the great differences between the LXX and the MT/CL version of the book of Jeremiah (organization of the book, amount of text-material) are not paralleled by the phenomenon of participant reference-shifts. In fact, one of the common features of both text traditions is the fact that participant reference-shifts are popular and widely present in the texts.

4.3.2.2 Detailed Observation

As visible in the table above, we have categorized the comparative material in a similar way to the Qumran fragments:

0: Used for all those LXX texts that do not deviate (“0”) from the MT/CL text (with regard to PNG-shift registration) as they also contain the same sort of PNG-shift at the same positions within the respective discourse.

0~: Used for all those LXX texts that do not deviate (“0”) from the MT/CL text (with regard to PNG-shift registration) in the sense that they also contain the same PNG-shift as the MT/CL but it is found in a different position of the respective discourse (“~”).

1~: Used for all those LXX texts that deviate (“1”) from the MT/CL text (with regard to PNG-shift registration) by means of not containing a PNG-shift (“~”) in contrast to the MT/CL.

566 We regard only those cases as comparable that do not “add” or “omit” clauses to the MT text even though this might result in overcoming a participant reference-shift. Such substantial changes automatically fall into the category “not comparable” since it remains speculative what the motivation for the addition or omission could have been. Only those cases where the modifications are taking place within the clause boundaries are considered belonging to the comparable material. Consequently our analysis focuses on changed pronouns, verbs, clause-types and clause constituents.
1+: Used for all those LXX texts that do deviate (“1”) from the MT/CL text (with regard to PNG-shift registration) as they contain a PNG-shift (“+”) in addition to the MT/CL. We only analyzed those Greek text passages that run parallel to the Hebrew passages that contain a participant reference-shift. Therefore, the amount of 1+ cases is limited and will increase when all Greek passages are taken into account.

We first have a look at the 0/0~ cases and then the 1~/1+ cases are brought into perspective.

4.3.2.2.1 LXX Type 0 and 0~

In most of the cases (397) of a participant reference-shift, the shift is placed at the same position as in the MT/CL (0 type). Jer 5:25-26 represents those cases:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT/CL</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| people=2pPos | "Your iniquities have turned these away, and your sins have deprived you of good."
| people=3pPos | "Your acts of lawlessness have turned these away, and your sins have distanced good things from you, because impious ones were found among my people, and they set traps to ruin men, and they would catch them."

The example shows that both, the MT/CL and the LXX, contain a shift from 2pPos to 3pPos. Until the first clause of v26 the people are addressed by 2plM forms while they hold the 3pPos in v26.

However, we also have eighteen 0~ cases\(^{567}\) where the same participant reference-shifts take place in both, the MT/CL and the LXX, but the shift position deviates from each other as shown in Jer 4:17-18:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT/CL</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>maφαιρεῖς σέ παρά τα κακά ταύτα, λέγει κύριος.</td>
<td>ως φολάσσοντες φίλην εγένοντο ἐπ' αὐτήν κύκλῳ, ὅτι ἐμοῦ ἠμέλησας, λέγει κύριος.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὡς φολάσσοντες φίλην εγένοντο ἐπ' αὐτήν κύκλῳ, ὅτι ἐμοῦ ἠμέλησας, λέγει κύριος.</td>
<td>ὁτι ἐμοῦ ἠμέλησας, λέγει κύριος.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the MT/CL and the LXX, the reference to Israel shifts from 3sgF forms to 2sgF forms. However, in the MT/CL, the shift does not take place earlier than in v18 where the 2sgF suffixes are used, whereas in the LXX the shifts take place already in the second clause of v17.

---

Jer 6:23-26 contains another case where the shifts are positioned in the Greek at different locations than in the MT/CL:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT/CL</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21. They grasp the bow and the javelin, he is cruel and they have no mercy, their sound is like the roaring sea; they ride on horses, he is equipped like a warrior for battle, against you, O daughter Zion!</td>
<td>They will grasp bow and spear; he is bold and he will show no mercy; his sound is like a roaring sea; on horses and chariots he will draw up in battle order like a fire, for battle against you, O daughter Zion!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In both text-traditions, the reference to the assaulter shifts between pl and sg forms. While the MT/CL text shifts from pl to sg to pl and again to sg, the Greek contains only one shift from pl to sg.

Jer 30:20-22/24 illustrates a more complex case:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT/CL</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20. And thee, O daughter of Jerusalem, be not afraid: how can I give thee counsel? to return to me? quoth the Lord.</td>
<td>Καὶ εἰσελθοῦσαί σε οὐλος αὐτῶν ὡς τὸ πρότερον, καὶ τὰ μαρτύρια αὐτῶν κατὰ πρόσωπον μου ορνοθήσονται καὶ ἐπιπέδειμαι τοὺς διέξεις αὐτῶν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. How art thou lifted up, O inhabitant of Zion! to return to me?</td>
<td>ἡμᾶς οὕτως ἐξέλεξα καὶ συνάξοντος αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐξέλεξαν καὶ συνάξοντος αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐπιπέδειμαι πρὸς μέν ὑμᾶς· ὅτι τίς ἐστιν αὐτοῦ, ὃς ἐδωκεν τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ ἐσχήνιν τῶν ἡμῶν γνώσασθαι αὐτά.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The MT/CL text contains a 3P-2P shift in v22. While in vv20-21 the people of God are referred to by 3sgM forms they are referred to by 2plM forms in vv22-24. Although the LXX does have the same shift from 3sgM forms to 2plM forms, the shift does not take place until v24. This is due to the fact that v22 is missing. Assuming that the LXX is based on a proto-masoretic text that contains v22, the Greek text would prove that its translation comes close to the free activity of editing (v22 is dropped) while at the same time the participant-shift is not regarded as problematic as it is mirrored in v24. Further, one can observe that the Greek adds to the P-shifts N-shifts in the 3P section (3sgM and 3plM pronouns), feeling free to shift between sg and pl forms when addressing the people of God in v20-21.
Our examples confirm on the one hand that the Greek text does not overcome participant reference-shifts while on the other hand a certain freedom with regard to the placement of participant reference-shifts can be found. The latter is of course only the case, if the LXX's Vorlage belongs to the proto-masoretic text-tradition. In case the LXX is not based on a proto-masoretic text it still can be said that the large amount of participant reference-shifts that were integrated into the translation were not received as problematic for whatever reason.

### 4.3.2.2 LXX Type 1- and 1+

Our observations about the freedom of the translators/redactors with regard to the 0~ cases are supported when analyzing the 1+ cases. Where the LXX “overcomes” a participant reference shift, it nevertheless does not allow the conclusion that PNG-shifts are considered as problematic. Jer 46:16-17 shows that the LXX does not contain the MT/CL contained P-shift but an N-shift that cannot be found in the MT/CL:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT/CL</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2plM</td>
<td>“He caused many to stumble and one fell over the other, and they said, “Come, let us go back to our own people and to the land of our birth, because of the destroying sword.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2plM</td>
<td>“Give Pharaoh, king of Egypt, the name “Braggart who missed his chance.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3plM</td>
<td>“And your multitude was weak and fell, and each kept saying to his fellow, “Let us rise up and return to our own people and to our fatherland, because of the Greek dagger.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3plM</td>
<td>“Call the name of Pharao Nechao, king of Egypt, Sason-esbi-emodi.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the LXX, the Egyptians hold consistently the 2pPos, whereas they are predicated in the MT/CL by a 3pM form in v16 and by a 2pM form in v17. The Greek text, however, addresses the Egyptians once by a sg pronoun (σου) and once by a pl predication (καλέσατε). Thus, although the Greek “avoids” the MT/CL shift it “adds” its own shift.

A similar independence from the MT/CL with regard to the position and types of shifts can be seen in Jer 5:15-18:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT/CL</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3plM</td>
<td>“I am going to bring upon you a nation from far away, O house of Israel. It is an enduring nation, it is an ancient nation, a nation whose language you do not know, nor can you understand what they say.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3plM</td>
<td>“Their quiver is like an open tomb; all of them are mighty warriors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3plM</td>
<td>“They shall eat up your harvest and your food; they shall eat up your sons and your daughters; they shall eat up your flocks and your herds; they shall eat up your vines and fig trees.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sgM</td>
<td>“Behold, I am bringing upon you a nation from far away, O house of Israel, says the Lord, a nation [the sound of] whose language you will not understand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sgM</td>
<td>“All are strong, and they shall devour your harvest and your food, and they shall devour your sons and your daughters, and they shall devour your sheep and your bull calves, and they shall devour your vineyards and your fig trees.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The MT/CL shifts refer to the house of Israel by first a 2plM form (יָכוֹנוֹת) and then throughout two and a half verses by 2sgM forms (e.g. יְתַחְדָּשׁ). But even in those days, says the Lord, your God, I will not make a full end of you. In the case that the MT/CL resembles the Hebrew Vorlage of the LXX, the shift deviation must have had other reasons than correcting incoherent participant reference-shifts that were found in the Vorlage. Otherwise, there would not be found any shifts at all in the LXX passage.

In all cases of the 1– type where a participant reference-shift is “overcome” in the LXX, the text is constructed more coherently from the perspective of the modern reader. The following examples represent such cases:

**Jer 4:1-2 ("corrected" P-shift)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT/CL</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>מַעֵרָתָן עִירֵי־לֵבָנָה לְמַעָרָתָן תֹּאֶבֶת אֶל־מַעָרָתָן שָׂפֹאָה מָשָׂאָה</td>
<td>ἔαν ἐπιστραφῇ Ἰσραὴλ, λέγει κύριος, πρὸς με ἐπιστραφῆσαι—ἐὰν περιέλῃ τὰ βεβλώματα αὐτὸν ἐκ στόματος αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ προσώπου μου εὐλαβῆσαι.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἅν εἴη καὶ ὃποῖος Ἰσραήλ μετὰ ἀληθείας καὶ ἐν κρίσει καὶ ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ εὐλογηθήσοντι αὐτῇ ἐξίληται καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ ἀλογίσουσιν τῷ θεῷ ἐν ἱεροσολυμίᾳ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the MT/CL, the reference to Israel unexpectedly shifts from 2sgM forms in vv1-2a to 3sgM forms in vv2b. The LXX does not have this shift at all and consistently refers to Israel by 3sg(M) forms.

**Jer 30:8 ("corrected" P-shift):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT/CL</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>הַכְּבָד בָּטַח לָאָמ נִזְיָה אֱלֹהִים תַּשְׁרֵי נַפְשֵׁי יָדָיו</td>
<td>ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἑσείνη, εἶπεν κύριος, συντρίψω τὸν ζωγόν ἀπὸ τοῦ γραπτοῦ αὐτῶν καὶ τοὺς δεσμοὺς αὐτῶν σφραγίσω, καὶ σωκέρω μὴ ἀλλορίσοις.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συγκροτήσω τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐκ τοῦ λόγου τοῦ τοῦ προφήτη τοῦ υἱοῦ Ἰερουσαλήμ. דְּעָרָם:</td>
<td>On that day, says the Lord, I will shatter a yoke from off their neck, and I will burst their bonds, and they shall no more work for foreigners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The disturbing 2sgM-3sgM shift contained in the MT/CL is not present in the LXX. The Greek refers to God’s people consistently with 3plM forms.

Not only are P-shifts “corrected” in the LXX but also N- and G-shifts as the following examples show:

**Jer 5:15-17 ("corrected" P-shift):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT/CL</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>יֵקְדוֹשׁ מִי־מַעְצָם בָּטַח לָאָמ נִזְיָה אֱלֹהִים תַּשְׁרֵי נַפְשֵׁי יָדָיו</td>
<td>ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἑσείνη, εἶπεν κύριος, συντρίψω τὸν ζωγόν ἀπὸ τοῦ γραπτοῦ αὐτῶν καὶ τοὺς δεσμοὺς αὐτῶν σφραγίσω, καὶ σωκέρω μὴ ἀλλορίσοις.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַעֵרָתָן עִירֵי־לֵבָנָה לְמַעָרָתָן תֹּאֶבֶת אֶל־מַעָרָתָן שָׂפֹאָה מָשָׂאָה</td>
<td>ἔαν ἐπιστραφῇ Ἰσραὴλ, λέγει κύριος, πρὸς με ἐπιστραφῆσαι—ἐὰν περιέλῃ τὰ βεβλώματα αὐτὸν ἐκ στόματος αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ προσώπου μου εὐλαβῆσαι.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἅν εἴη καὶ ὃποῖος Ἰσραήλ μετὰ ἀληθείας καὶ ἐν κρίσει καὶ ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ εὐλογηθήσοντι αὐτῇ ἐξίληται καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ ἀλογίσουσιν τῷ θεῷ ἐν ἱεροσολυμίᾳ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| On that day, says the Lord, I will shatter a yoke from off their neck, and I will burst their bonds, and they shall no more work for foreigners. |
| make a servant of him | make a servant of them. |
The Hebrew text contains an N-shift as both, a pl (ניָ֣רְךָ) and a sg (ניָ֣רְךָ) form, refer to the assaulter. This incoherence is not found in the LXX where the assaulter is only associated with a pl predication.

Jer 48:15 ("corrected" G-shift):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT/CL</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἐκλεκτοὶ νεανίσκοι μαχητοῦ συνετοῦ οὐκ ἐπιστρέψει κενή.</td>
<td>ὤλετο Μωαβ πόλις αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐκλεκτοὶ νεανίσκοι αὐτοῦ κατέβησαν εἰς σφαγήν.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Hebrew refers to Moab with two 3sgM forms (ניָ֣רְךָ, בַּ֥ר וָּמֹאָ֖ב) and one 3sgF form (ניָ֣רְךָּ). This incoherence is not present in the Greek as there are only 3sg(M) forms referring to Moab.

The impression taken from the upper 1- examples could suggest that the LXX reveals attempts to solve the problem of PNG-shifts. However, two major reasons prevent such a conclusion: on the one hand the large amount of 0 (total of 397), 0~ (total of 17) and 1+ (total of 15)\(^{568}\) cases contrast the 1- cases (total of 80) and show that PNG shifts are not at all systematically overcome.\(^{569}\) In contrast, they are cultivated independently of the masoretic text tradition. On the other hand we will see in chapter 5 how many of the Hebrew shifts receive their rationale from idiomology (5.4.1.4) and the rules of Hebrew pragmatics (5.4.2.4, 5.4.2.10). Since the idiomology and pragmatics within the Septuagint Greek are different, many of the CL/MT shifts are not part of the Greek text simply due to language reasons but are listed here in the 1- category.

4.3.2.3 Conclusion

We do not need to take a standpoint about the nature of the Hebrew Vorlage of the LXX, when concluding that there is a plurality of at least 397 shifts, suggesting that participant reference-shifts were not problematic to the translators and redactors of the Septuagint.

---

\(^{568}\) This number increases at the moment where participant reference-shifts are studied in the LXX independently of the CL/MT.

\(^{569}\) So far we have only compared those Greek text passages that run parallel to our 585 detected CL/MT shifts.
In case the LXX is a translation of a proto-masoretic text that resembles the participant reference-shifts of the CL, we conclude that the scribes were free in their activity of translating and editing when considered that the Greek text is much shorter and the organization of the text-material is much different from the MT/CL. However, we cannot observe a dominant activity of correcting PNG-shifts. In fact, similar to our findings with regard to inter-textuality and Qumran fragments, the LXX seems to act freely with regard to the *position* of PNG-shifts but not with regard to their *existence*. They rather make use of the phenomenon at their own discretion.

In case the Hebrew Vorlage contains the same shifts as the LXX, we assume that participant reference-shift are not only unproblematic within the MT/CL tradition but in different Hebrew texts as well.

The origin and function for participant reference-shifts, therefore, should not be predominantly searched in the realm of text-transmission and text-evolution as they seem to belong to other textual being-aspects.

4.4 **Summary**

Our intertextual studies and text-traditional comparisons have made clear that a meaningful interpretation of the phenomenon of PNG-shifts cannot be based on text-critical considerations. If this is still done, it reveals how one's formal condition overrules the material condition to a great extent. Our analysis shows that the data itself clarifies that PNG-shifts cannot primarily originate from the processes of redaction or text-transmission. Although both, the Qumran fragments and the LXX, contain some deviations with regard to the *position* of PNG-shifts, the very *existence* of PNG-shifts in CL, Qumran, and the LXX – in the presence of great textual differences between the text-traditions – points out that PNG-shifts rather belong to the realm of language-pragmatics and the craftsmanship of writing than to the lack of competence on the side of a redactor or scribe. This demands even more a phenomenological text-linguistic reading; not only for testing the viability of diverse exegetical solutions but for finding data-oriented solutions for apparent discourse problems.

After we have excluded that PNG-shifts belong to the textual-being aspect “reception and transmission” we need to search out whether our 585 shifts are of a language specific *systematic* nature in contrast to the *chaotic* nature that diachronic studies usually assign to them. Finding patterns in the distribution of the various PNG-shifts helps us to attribute shifts to a systematic order they belong to. As notified earlier, these orders can either belong to the textual being-aspects “language”, “teleology” or “discourse”. Our next necessary step, therefore, demands a synchronic, phenomenological and distributional analysis of all registered PNG-shifts in CL.

The results of this distributional analysis will shed “critical light” on the different methodological perspectives taken with regard to the interpretation of participant reference-shifts. Additionally, a phenomenological interpretation promises to equip the reader to become a skilled partner of the ancient writer, as he will be able to understand how participant reference-shifts were used within the craftsmanship of writing. Such an understanding finally helps building a functional understanding of PNG-shifts.
5 Distribution and Interpretation of PNG-ShIFTS

5.1 Introduction

Our studies in the field of intertextuality (4.2) and text-tradition (4.3) have shown that participant reference-shifts cannot be treated meaningfully from a dominant diachronic perspective of text-transmission and text-evolution. Other explanations for the origin and function of shifts must be found.

Our suggestion that the origin and function of participant reference shifts should also be analyzed from the perspective of the textual being-aspects “language”, “teleology” and “discourse” is supported by the phenomenological comparison of the MT/CL with the LXX. This comparison indicates that many PNG-shifts and participant reference incoherencies that both texts have in common must be of a language- and discourse-systematic nature. The following examples clarify this observation.

Pl references to לֶאָד

In most cases, the sg participant לֶאָד is predicated in the Hebrew by pl forms. The same can be observed in the Greek text with the participant λαὸς. The following table is representative for a large amount of such cases:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT/CL</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:13</td>
<td>ὅτι δὲ δοὺς πονηρὰ ἐποίησαν ὁ λαὸς μου ἑμὲν ἐγκατέλιπον, πηγὴν ὑδάτος γείσης, καὶ ὄρεξαν ἐναυτοῖς λάκκους συντετριμμένους, οἴῳ οὖν δυνήσονται ὑδῷ συνέχειν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:19</td>
<td>ἔσμεν δὲ πάντες ἅν οἷς μὲν χρήσις ἦ πρὸς τὴν ἁπάντησιν, οἷς δὲ εἰσέλθησαν ἡ παρὰ τῇ χειρί προσέσχον τὸν καρπὸν ἀποστροφῆς συντετριμμένος, οἴῳ οὖν δυνήσονται ὑδῷ συνέχειν.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pl references to ἀνήρ

In many cases, the sg participant ἀνὴρ is predicated or referred to in the Hebrew by pl forms. The same can be observed in the Greek text with οἶκος Ἰσραηλ. The following table is representative for a large amount of such cases:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT/CL</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5:15</td>
<td>ἵδιοι ἐγὼ ἐπάγω ἐν τῇ χειρὶ ἡμῶν οὐδένας πόρρωθεν, οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:6</td>
<td>ἔξω καθὸς ὁ καταμένει σῶς αὐτοῦ οὐ δυνάμεθα τοῦ συνεχεῖν ὕδωρ συνέχειν. οἰκὸς Ἰσραὴλ:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

יש as pl and sg

In the MT/CL, a distributive יש is usually predicated with pl forms and suffixed by sg forms. The same incoherence is portrayed in the Greek texts where ἔκαστος stands for יש and is referred to by pl predications and sg pronouns. The following table is representative for a large amount of such cases:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT/CL</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:15</td>
<td>ὁμολογοῦν ἔκαστος τὸν θρόνον αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὰ πρόθυρα τῶν πυλῶν Ἴερουσαλήμ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:3</td>
<td>υπομονοῦσαν ἔκαστος τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Compound subjects being predicated by sg forms
In many cases, the Hebrew text predicates compound subjects by sg forms which is also the case in the Greek text:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT/CL</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15:1</td>
<td>'Eln steh Moses kai Samueph prò prosopou mou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38:1</td>
<td>Kai èkouseen Sarafatias ulôs Mathan kai Godelias ulôs Pashchor kai Ioschhal ulôs Seleumou tois lógois</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distributive analysis of הַיּוֹן יְהוָה shows that the phrase is usually surrounded by a context in which YHWH holds the 1pPos. This is exactly the same in the Greek text. Therefore, neither in the Greek nor in the Hebrew version of Jeremiah the הַיּוֹן יְהוָה or φησίν κύριος and λέγει κύριος can be understood as closing a discourse. They rather seem to function as macro-syntactical markers emphasizing that YHWH is still speaking and holds the 1pPos. Some representative examples can be found in the table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT/CL</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13:25-26</td>
<td>23:12-13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DSC-shift indicators
Often a DSC-shift appears in the MT/CL when a participant reference-shift is accompanied by certain phenomena. Prominent co-occurring phenomena are imperatives, shift- of clause-types, or interrogatives. We describe this phenomenon in detail later in this chapter. So far we can say that similar to this observation the Greek text engages the same combinations of co-occurring phenomena with regard to participant reference-shifts when DSC-shifts are indicated. Only a limited list of examples is given in the tables below:

Imperatives indicating a DSC-shift:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT/CL</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:23</td>
<td>πῶς ἔρεις ὦκ ἐμανθήνη καὶ ὀπίσω τῆς Βασαὶ ὦκ ἐπορεύθης; ἰδὲ τὰς ὄδοις σου ἐν τῷ πολυνανδρίῳ καὶ γνώθι τί ἐποίησας, ὥς ἐπελάθοντο τὰς ὄδοις σου ἕξω τῶν ἀναμνήσας τὰς ὀδόν τοῦ Ισραήλ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:21-22</td>
<td>23:12-13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Jer 2:23, the participant holds first the 1pPos (v23a) while later he holds the 2pPos due to the imperative use (v23b). In Jer 3:21-22, the participant holds first the 3pPos (v21) while later he holds the 2pPos due to the imperative use (v22). The imperative forms that co-occur with the PNG-shift constitute a new discourse in which a new SS is established.

Clause-type shifts indicating a DSC-shift:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT/CL</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2:6-7  | "καὶ οὐκ εἶπαν Ποῦ ἔστιν κύριός ὁ ἄναγγελός ὃς ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου ὁ καθοδηγηθεὶς ἡμᾶς ἐν τῇ ζῆσθαι ἐν γῇ ἄπειρῳ καὶ αἴρετῳ, ἐν γῇ ἄνυδρῳ καὶ ἀκάρπῳ, ἐν γῇ, ἐν ἃς οὐ διώκησαν εἰς αὐτῇ οὐδὲν καὶ οὐ κατωκήσαν εἰκετ ὁλὸς ἀνθρώπων; καὶ εἰσῆγαγον ὑμᾶς εἰς τὸν Κάρμηλον τοῦ φαγεῖν ὑμᾶς τοὺς καρποὺς αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰ ἀγαθὰ αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰσῆλθε καὶ ἐμαται ἡ γῆν μου καὶ τὴν κληρονομιάν μου ἐθέσθη εἰς βδέλυγμα."
| 26:9   | "ὁ οἶκος οὗτος, τὴν γῆν μου καὶ τὴν κληρονομιάν, καὶ ἔξεκκλησίσαρ ὁ λαὸς ἐπὶ Ιερεμίαν ἐν οἴκῳ κυρίου."

It seems the wayyiqtol (CL)/aorist (LXX) forms function as narrative verbal forms that break with the preceding direct speech that contains predominantly discursive verbal forms like yiqtol and xQtl (CL)/present and future tenses (LXX) or verbal forms that hint at background information within the direct speech (xQtl and WxQtl [CL]; aorist participle [LXX]).

Interrogatives indicating a DSC-shift:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT/CL</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:31-32</td>
<td>(\text{καὶ ἀκούσατε λόγον κυρίου καὶ παρθένος αὐτῆς καὶ παρθένος τὴν στπεθεδείη αὐτῆς, ἰ δὲ λαὸς μου ἐπελευθέρω ἃ μερια, ὃν οὐκ ἔστιν ἀρθής.})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:6-7</td>
<td>&quot;εἰ διὰ τοῦτο ἐπαινεῖν αὐτοῦς λέον ἐκ τοῦ δρόμου, καὶ λόκος ἐως τῶν οἰκῶν ὑλεθηκέναι αὐτοῖς, καὶ πάροικος ἔγρηγήσαν τὰς πάλιν αὐτῶν πάντες οἱ ἐκπορευμένοι αὐτοῖς ἐπειδὴ οἱ ἐπιλήφθαι αὐτῶν, ἵσταν αὐτοὺς ἀνέβαιν ἐν ταῖς ἀποστροφαῖς αὐτῶν. καὶ τοῦτοι οἱ οἶκοι θεοὶ γένομαι σοι; οἱ οὐσί σοι ἐγκαταλείπουν με καὶ οὕτω πρὸς ὑμᾶς οὐδὲν θεοῖς καὶ καταλήγειν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἐμοιχύνεται καὶ ὑμῖς ἀνάγκα ποινῶν κατέλευσαν.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sudden appearance of the interrogations co-occur with the participant reference-shift and seem to help introducing a new SS and herewith the closure of the previous discourse.

The above examples show that our comparative analysis between the MT/CL and the LXX not only serves to exclude a predominant diachronic approach when interpreting PNG-shifts but further suggests that a serious amount of shifts seems to express a systematism that is not only present in the Hebrew but also in the Greek text. The question therefore is which textual being-aspect this systematism belongs to.
Does the systematism take place within the being-aspect of “language” (grammar, pragmatic), “teleology” (e.g. rhetoric), or “discourse” (e.g. text-grammar)?

The examples above show different types of shifts. There are some shifts within the clause or sentence boundary while other shifts are established within a complex sequence of sentences. These differentiations suggest that shifts that are established within the boundary of a clause or sentence revealing a specific systematism, should be interpreted primarily within the framework of syntax. The shifts that are established within the larger sequence of sentences and reveal a systematism as well, should be approached from the frameworks of “discourse” (text-grammar) and “teleology” (e.g. rhetoric). Our analysis therefore starts with the distributional analysis of shifts that exist within the sentence boundary and attempts to answer the question whether those shifts reveal regularity instead of irregularity. If they testify regularity, we can conclude that the many PNG-shifts in the book of Jeremiah support the readability of the text on the sentence-level and should not be taken as arbitrary. In the next step, we find out how far shifts beyond the sentence boundary can still be described in systematic terms. If this is the case, we can argue that the PNG-shifts in Jeremiah do not hinder the unity of the text but rather support it as the placement of shifts is not chaotic but follows rules not only on the level of language pragmatics and grammar but also on the level of text-grammar and rhetoric. This would imply that PNG-shifts in general cannot be used for testifying the “chaos” of the book Jeremiah but rather reveal the regularity of the used language and a meaningful design of the text of Jeremiah.

According to our bottom-up approach, the processes of data-registration and data-indexation need to be performed before a synchronic distribution-based interpretation of PNG-shifts on sentence- and text-level can be achieved. Our research, then, takes the following steps:

1. **Data-registration and Data-indexation:** Participant reference-shifts are registered on the basis of a complete phenomenological text-syntactical analysis of the entire book of Jeremiah (cf. chap 2). The registered participant reference-shifts are then indexed on the basis of the formal qualities of each shift. This indexation makes a distributional analysis possible since common features of different shifts can be searched. The distribution of shifts is determined by organizing shifts into groups when some dominant characteristics are shared.

2. **Data-interpretation:** On the basis of the shift-distribution, the functional interpretation of the different groups of shifts can take place. First, shifts within the sentence boundary are analyzed. Later, shift-groups that transcend the sentence boundary are inquired. The first proves the order/dis-order of the sentences in Jeremiah with regard to participant reference-shifts while the second clarifies the same on the text-level.

This chapter first describes our system of data-registration and data-indexation before the final step of interpretation is taken.

### 5.2 System of Data-Registration and Data-Indexation

The PNG-shift registration is based upon a phenomenological text-syntactical analysis of the book of Jeremiah. This analysis results in a text-hierarchy as the following excerpt of Jer 11:11-13 illustrates:
This text-hierarchy helps to register and index participant reference-shifts. A careful reading of the above text passage reveals two PNG-shifts (3plM-2sgM shift in cl#65; 2sgM-2plM shift in cl#66). In the DSC of cl#55-63, God’s people were referred to in 3plM taking the 3pPos. In cl#64, the addressing changes abruptly into 2sgM forms and Judah is referred to with a vocative (cl#65). In cl#66, the text shifts from 2sgM forms into a 2plM predication. It seems that the same participant is being referred to by both forms.

Both shift registrations are stored in a database where a description is attached to them. The following table shows the registration of the first shift of Jer 11:11-13 into the database:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PNG identity (P-E)</th>
<th>Participant identity (P-C)</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Clarity degree</th>
<th>Co-phenomena</th>
<th>Text-tradition</th>
<th>Interpretations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>VF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>VF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows the most important entry possibilities of the database. The different categories are explained in the table below:

**A/B: P/N/G/VF**
The PNG-characteristics and occasionally the involved verbal form (VF) of the participant reference is registered on both sides of the shift ("A" the pre-shift form, "B" the shift-causing form).

**Position**
Shifts can take place at different positions of a discourse. Does the shift take place in the beginning, in the middle, or at the end of a DSC? The answer to this question is put into this column. In our case we assume that the shift takes place in the middle of the direct speech.

**Co-phenomena**
When a shift is accompanied with other phenomena, e.g. כי or an imperative it is noted here. In the example of Jer 11:11-13, it is noted that the 3pPos stands in a judgment context while the 2pPos stands in an explanatory context. Besides this, the כי co-occurs with the 2pPos section.

**Txt**
The exact chapter and verse(range) that contains the registered shift is found here.
As the database is stored in an Excel file it is possible to organize the data interactively according to our needs. In this way we can easy access specific PNG-shifts that have certain phenomena in common.

---

570 Holladay, 354.
571 Thiel, 154.
572 McKane, 242.
573 Lundbom, 625.
575 The excel file consists of two separate sheets. One sheet is named “PNG-shift phenomenology” while the other one is named “PNG-shift functionality”. The first sheet contains all shift cases with their phenomenological characteristics. The second sheet contains our function oriented interpretation of all shifts. The excel file allows for an interactive sorting of marked columns. A
5.3 Remarks on Presentation Procedure

We start investigating into the shifts within the sentence boundaries before we analyze the shifts that can only be detected in a greater context of clauses. However, it is difficult to create a meaningful overview of all registered PNG-shifts. This is due to the fact that there are many combinations between P, N, and G-shifts. The same participant can be referred to in 1plM, 2sgM, 2sgF, 3sgM, 3sgF, 2plM, 3plM. In order to guarantee readability, we reduce our discussion of shifts to a limited amount. A complete overview of PNG-shifts with variations from the discussed shifts can be found in the database attached as CD.

Our interpretation of shifts is divided into two parts. The first part deals with the so called SPS while the other deals with MPS. With SPS (single position shift) we mean those shifts where only the N-, or the G-, or the P-position shifts; one position shifts, the other two remain stable. SPS are contrasted with MPS (multiple position shift) where a participant reference shift is indicated by the shifting of two or all three positions at once.

The following text gives an example of MPS and SPS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPS</th>
<th>Jer 3:12-13</th>
<th>MPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2sgM</td>
<td>[...] Return (משביח, משלו), faithless Israel (ממשלת ישראל), says the Lord.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2plM</td>
<td>I will not look on you (ברצים) in anger, for I am merciful, says the Lord; I will not be angry forever.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Only acknowledge your guilt (👚, עליי ש.PLAIN) that you have rebelled (بيلם) against the Lord your God (באלוהי), and scattered your favors (ברצים) among strangers under every green tree, and have not obeded (שמעתי) my voice, says the Lord.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It seems reasonable to start with SPSs as they form our archetypes of the different variations and combinations of PNG-shifts found in the MPS category. The interpretation of SPS and MPS shifts is each subdivided into those shifts within the sentence boundary and those beyond the sentence boundary. The unit of organization beyond the sentence-level we call text-level.

In total, we have registered 434 SPSs in contrast to 151 MPSs. This means that about 74% of all PNG-shifts are SPSs while 26% are MPSs.

---

Notes:
- Shifts from a common form to an M- or F-form or vice versa are not interpreted as G-shifts. Thus a participant reference-shift from 1sgC to 3sgM is regarded as a SPS and not as a MPS.
- single column but also column combinations (up to three columns) can be sorted (in Microsoft Excel and OpenOffice Calc see “Data/Sort”). In this way one can, for example, easily get access to all 2P-3P SPSs in the “PNG-shift phenomenology” sheet or to all self-reference cases in the “PNG-shift functionality” sheet.
5.4 Interpretation of “single position shifts” (SPS)

5.4.1 SPS within the sentence boundary (sentence-level)

One of the first observations made is that within the SPSs (applies also to MPSs) hardly any P- and G-shift take place within the boundary of a sentence. N-shifts are the most common shifts within the limits of a sentence.

5.4.1.1 N-shift: sg=pl

The first examples show N-shifts within the 2pPos. Other examples within the 3pPos are added.

In Jer 3:12, the נַפְשׁתוֹ הִשְרִים (שֶׁרֶם) is addressed both as sgM (נַפְשׁתוֹ) and plM (נַפְשׁותָם).

12 Go, and proclaim these words toward the north, and say: Return (שָׁבוּ), faithless Israel (נַפְשׁותָם), says the Lord. I will not look on you (נַפְשׁוּ) in anger, for I am merciful, says the Lord; I will not be angry forever.

In the further discourse of v13, the participant נַפְשׁותָם is addressed again as sg in v13a – this time not in M but in F – while v13b shifts back into a pl addressing (נַפְשׁותָם). While the second shift is an MPS (2sgF-3plM), it is also within the boundary of one sentence.

Jer 17:4 contains a similar example:

3 Your wealth (לִשׁוֹנֶיךָ) and all your treasures (לִשׁוֹנָךְ) your high places (מַחֲצֵיכָם) I will give for spoil as the price of the sin throughout all your territory (מַחֲצָיכֶנָה).

4 By your own act (לָא) you shall lose (לִשׁוֹנֶךָ) your heritage (לִשׁוֹנָךְ) that I gave you (לָא), and I will make you serve (לִשׁוֹנוֹ) your enemies (לִשׁוֹנָךְ) in a land that you do not know (לִשׁוֹנוֹ) for you have kindled (לִשׁוֹנָךְ) a fire in my anger that shall burn forever.

In vv3-4a, the 2pPos is referred to with 2sgM forms. In v4b, however, the 2pPos is referred to by a 2plM suffix (לְשׁוֹנוֹם). Since the 1pPoss is present in vv3-4 and since the topic of the discourse is the same within these verses, the reader does not assume a DSC-shift. Rather, he concludes that the 2pPos can be referred to both by sg and pl forms. When addressed in singular, the nation is brought into focus as a single entity; when addressed in pl, the focus is on the plurality of individuals that constitute the nation as a single unity.

N-shifts can also be found on the 3pPos as Jer 49:31 shows:

31 Rise up, advance against a nation at ease, that lives secure (sgM), says the Lord, no gates or bars are for it (לָא), who are living (לִישׁוֹנֶן) alone.

In v31, we find the 3sgM suffix (לָא) referring to Kedar (nomad tribe); however, in the last clause of that verse the predication belonging to Kedar (nomad tribe) has the 3plM form (לִשׁוֹנֶן). The 3sgM form in v31b (לָא) is in congruence with the predication in v31a.

Similarly, Jer 6:23 shows that a participant is both identified by pl- as well as sg-characteristics:

577 The critical apparatus comments only on the 2sgF-2plM shift in 3:13, and suggests instead of the 2plM form a 2sgF form. The sg verbal form can also be found in the Syriac and Peshitta.

578 The critical apparatus suggests to change the 2plM predication with LXX° and the Targum into a 3sgF predication (“and a fire is kindled in my anger”).
Thus says the Lord: See, a people (עם) is coming from the land of the north, and a great nation (עם רוח), is stirring from the farthest parts of the earth.

They grasp ( 순간) the bow and the javelin, he (הוא) is cruel and they have no mercy (דרות), their sound is like the roaring sea; they ride (קרבוב) on horses, equipped like a warrior for battle, against you, O daughter Zion!

The above text shows that the enemy of God's people is described in v23 both in terms of sg (הוא) and pl (רוחם) forms.

A case of pl- and sg-addressing of גוי in the 3pPos can be found at different places like Jer 7:28:

You shall say to them: This (ה) is the nation (גוי) that did not listen to (קשיש) the voice of the Lord their God, and did not accept (לקחת) discipline; truth has perished; it is cut off from their lips.

Although the sg demonstrative pronoun (ה) is used, the predications are of pl form. This is also the case when the predications precede the subject:

This nation are transgressing my covenant (Judg 2:20)

Our research has found a list of words with sg quality that can be referred to by pl forms. Among them is the earlier mentionedעם. With the help of the Emdros search engine579 in combination with the WIVU database, as implemented in the SESB, it is possible to retrieve these incoherencies. In this way, a meaningful overview on some of the PNG-shift phenomena within the sentence boundary is possible:

### 5.4.1.1.1 #1 עם IN SG WITH PL PREDICATION

There are nine cases, in which עם as sg is predicated with a pl form within one clause.580 Jer 2:31 contains such a case:

And you, O generation, behold the word of the Lord! Have I been a wilderness to Israel, or a land of thick darkness? Why then say (אמרון) my people (עם), “We are free, we will come to you no more”?

In all cases,עם is in a determined state as it is either prefixed with the ה article (עם) or suffixed with 1sC (עם). This is not only true for Jeremiah but also for the rest of the OT. Most of the time,עם precedes the predication but exceptions can be found as well (2:31; 50:6). In Jeremiah, עם (sg) is predicated with pl forms (9x) as well as with sg forms (10x). In comparison with the rest of the OT, Jeremiah has a slightly higher percentage of pl predication than the other books (see Appendix-A: SESB screenshot no1).

### 5.4.1.1.2 #2 בית ישראל IN SG WITH PL PREDICATION

The phrase בית ישראל appears eight times as single participant in clauses in Jeremiah. It functions syntactically either as a vocative581 or as a subject582. In both cases, the formally sg-participant is referred to by pl forms.

---

579 See http://emdros.org/.
581 3:20, 5:15, 10:1, 18:6 2x.
In case of vocative (10:1):

 Hear (משמ) the word that the Lord speaks to you (琯כパソコン). O house of Israel (ביהן יהודא).

The example shows that both the predication in clause#1 as well as the suffix in clause#2 (ظهور ידה_concatenation) refer to the vocative.

In case of subject (48:13):

Then Moab shall be ashamed of Chemosh, as the house of Israel (ביהן ישראלי) was ashamed (בוש) of Bethel, their confidence (ממסחת).

In clause#2 the predication ובש and the suffix מבשק are of a pl nature and refer both to הבית ישראלי.

In 2:26, the pl-reference of the formally sg-phrase might receive a rationale:

As a thief is ashamed when caught, so the house of Israel shall be ashamed (הבוש) – they, their kings, their officials, their priests, and their prophets.

The elliptic clause (ביהן מלכיהם שריים ונתמיכים בויאריהם) with its parallel sub-phrases refers to the predication (הבוש) of the previous clause. By this, one can read an identification of הבית ישראלי with הבית ישראלי bánhמלכים שריים ונתמיכים בויאריהם. This case is understood as a collective term containing many sub-participants (them, kings, princes, priests, prophets).

Several queries run over the Old Testament show that the pl predications or suffix of הבית ישראלי is not exceptional but normal. In fact, within the boundary of a clause, there is not found a single sg prediction or suffix in the OT. The construction of הבית ישראלי as vocative with a 2pl suffix in the previous clause is typical to Jeremiah and Ezekiel and could not be found anywhere else in the OT (see Appendix-A: SESB screenshot no2).

5.4.1.1.3 #2b בית יהודא IN SG WITH PL PREDICATION

The phrase הבית יהודא appears twice as single participant in the clauses of Jeremiah. In agreement with הבית ישראלי it is only predicated with pl forms. This finds support in other parts of the OT (e.g. 2 Sam 2:7, 10) and seems to be the behavior of many הבית constructions in regens position (e.g. הבית יהודא עליון in Jos 18:5; הבית יהודא in Judges 1:23; הבית אתא in 2 King 8:18).

Not only do we find an N-shift within a clause with regard to the addressing of a הבית construction. This also takes place across clause-boundaries within a complex sentence. Such a case can be found in Jer 21:11-12:

וحياة מלך יחוד
ושמע בריחות
בית זון
מה אמר יהוה

While the הביתMelch (clause#1/דד, הבית (clause#3) is of sg form the predication in clause#2 is referring back/forward to it in pl (משמ).
However, there are also sg predications of ḫבב constructions found (e.g. יִשְׁמַע יָבֵא פָרֹתָה in Gen 45:2; יִשְׁמַע יָבֵא פָרֹתָה in 2 Sam 7:29) which are, in comparison to the pl predications, far fewer.

5.4.1.1.4 #3 כְּהל in SG with PL Predication

In 31:8, we find the clause כְּהל מִכְּלָל יָשִׁיבָה (אֲשֶׁר) קָרָא ("a great company will return here"). Several queries reveal that the sg כְּהל is explicitly predicated only three times in the OT while in all cases the predication is of pl form (here כֶּל לֹא). In general, it can be said that when we find pl predications, which are far fewer compared to the pl predications, are found (e.g. יִשְׁמַע יָבֵא פָרֹתָה in Gen 45:2; יִשְׁמַע יָבֵא פָרֹתָה in 2 Sam 7:29) which are, in comparison to the pl predications, far fewer.

5.4.1.1.5 #4 מָני in SG with PL Predication

In 33:13, the clause מָני (אֲשֶׁר) שָׂמַעְתָּם (עַל) אָסָף ("the flock shall again pass") shows the formal sg מָני being predicated as pl (שָׂמַעְתָּם). In the Old Testament this seems to be the rule for those cases in which מָני is explicitly suffixed in sg, the predication has the pl form. The only exception is found when מָני appears in an enumeration. In those cases, a sg predication is used.

5.4.1.1.6 #5 דָּמַי in SG with PL Predication

In 47:2, the clause דָּמַי (אֲשֶׁר) בָּלַע (עַל) לֶאַרְכָּה (This is even more interesting as the following sentence runs parallel to it containing a sg predication:

Although the participant shifts from דָּמַי (אֲשֶׁר) בָּלַע (עַל) לֶאַרְכָּה to דָּמַי (אֲשֶׁר) בָּלַע (עַל) מִכְּלָל לֹא. One would rather expect that the pl semantic value of מִכְּלָל לֹא has such an influence on its predication that it receives rather a pl form than a sg form if compared to the first clause with מָני שָׂמַעְתָּם. As a pl predication of the sg מָני cannot be found anywhere else in Jeremiah or the OT, this case must be read as an exception. With the semantic parallel in the second clause, it could be that the פֶּלֶת of clause#2 is anticipated in clause#1 reading it like "every (בֶּלֶת) man should cry out".

5.4.1.1.7 #6 מְלַא in SG with PL Predication

A construction with מְלַא has already been mentioned in the previous observation. In 8:6, we find מְלַא in its sg form an explicit subject position being predicated by a sg form and at the same time it is referred to by a pl suffix within the boundaries of a single clause:

I have given heed and listened, but they do not speak honestly; no one repents of wickedness, saying, “What have I done!” All of him (בֶּלֶת) turn (עָבָר) to their own course (בָּלַע), like a horse plunging headlong into battle.

Both the sg and pl addressing of מְלַא מְלַא are possible. In general, it can be said that when we find pl predications, pl suffix can usually be registered (e.g. יִשְׁמַע יָבֵא פָרֹתָה in 2:29). Sg predications can be found when there is a sg suffix (see the case in 8:6) or a sg attributive extension of the מְלַא מְלַא (e.g. מְלַא מְלַא).
"everybody who will pass her will be terrified" in 18:16). The latter is a common construction and must be understood as belonging to the general language practice (see Appendix-A: SESB screenshot no3). When the attribution contains pl reference, היה is predicated in pl.

5.4.1.8 #7 יש נ in sg with pl predication

In general, the noun יש נ appears in the book of Jeremiah as an adjunct in sg form relating in all of the cases (25x) to pl predications. Jer 26:3 shows such a case:

3 It may be that they will listen, all of them, and they will turn (복 jap) a man (יש נ) from his evil way (מזרע), that I may change my mind about the disaster that I intend to bring on them because of their evil doings.

Interestingly, all cases have a complement (20x) or object (5x) phrase that contains a sg suffixed word as the above example shows (מזרע). The suffix is always of sg form and refers back to יש נ. Thus we have the awkward situation that יש נ is referred to within one clause in pl verbs and sg suffixes. A look throughout the OT confirms that this is the normal language use (see Appendix-A: SESB screenshot no4).

5.4.1.9 #8 Extension and condensation

The above list of cases in which sg participants are referred to in pl predications is restricted. It can only be applied to the limited set of mentioned words (#1-#7). Next to this list, it seems to be possible in some cases that a single individual can be referred to in sg and pl forms if certain conditions are present as Jer 38:16 shows:

16 So King Zedekiah swore an oath in secret to Jeremiah, “As the Lord lives, who gave us our lives, I will not put you to death or hand you over to these men who seek your life.”

King Zedekiah includes himself into a larger group (“gave us our lives”) by using the pl form “our”. The shift from the pl (נו) to the sg (יש נ) stresses that he understands himself as an individual part of the larger 1P-group. We suggest to call this particular move from pl to sg “condensation”.

These types of shifts are to a large extent retrievable by means of SESB syntax queries when the shift takes place within the boundaries of a single sentence (see Appendix-A: SESB screenshot no5). Not only on the 1P level the phenomenon of extension and condensation can be observed. The following cases show extension/condensation-shifts on the 2P level as well. Likewise, these shifts are retrieved by means of SESB syntax queries (see Appendix-A: SESB screenshot no6).

In Jer 2:26, the N-shift leads to the extension of a participant:

26 I will hurl you (ך נ) and your mother (ך נ) who bore you (ך נ) into another country, where you were not born (ך נ), and there you shall die (ך נ).  

While the king holds the 2pPos by being addressed in 2sgM forms in the beginning of v26, he is associated with the 2plM forms in v26b (ך נ). Obviously, the king’s mother joined the 2pPos resulting in the change of the 2P grammatical characteristics from sgM to plM. A sg participant, therefore, can be addressed by pl forms when it joins another participant during the discourse.

Something similar can be seen in 36:19:

19 Then the officials said to Baruch, “Go (ך) and hide (רָגְשָה), you (לָהָ) and Jeremiah, and let no one know where you (לָהָ) are.”

In v19a, Baruch is addressed as sg participant (לָהָ) while at the moment when he is joined by Jeremiah he is addressed no longer in sg but in pl (לָהָ) terms. This phenomenon can be observed at different places (e.g. 37:18).

Our hypothesis, then, is that we speak of “extension” where the text continues to address an individual but integrates him into a group which he is part of. Where the shift moves from pl to sg we speak of “condensation”.

5.4.1.2 N-shift: compound subject (pragmatics)

In several cases, it is possible that a compound subject, having per definition a pl character, is associated with a sg predication. We find such a case in Jer 49:23:

23 Concerning Damascus. Confounded is ( Paísח) Hamath and Arpad, for (כ) they have heard (שָׁמַע) bad news; they melt (נָחָל) in fear, in the ocean is fear, it cannot (ליָבָר) be restful.

In v23, “Hamat and Arpad” function as a compound subject but are referred to by a 3sgF predication ( Paísח). However, the continuation of the sentence predicates the same participant “Hamat and Arpad” by a 3pl form ( Paísח). Generally, a compound subject receives a sg predication when the predication precedes the subject in the clause (264x in the OT; 15x in Jer⁵⁹²; see Appendix-A: SESB screenshot no7).

Jer 15:1 serves as another example:

1 Then the Lord said to me: Though he stood ( יהוה) Moses and Samuel (מֹשֶׁה וֹאָבָדוֹ) before me, yet my heart would not turn toward this people. Send them out of my sight, and let them go!

The compound subject Moses and Samuel (מֹשֶׁה וֹאָבָדוֹ) are predicated with a sg form (יהוה).

In Jer 43:2, the compound subject is understood in pl terms despite the fact that a sg predication is present:

2 And he said (דָּמָר) Azariah son of Hoshaijah and Johanan son of Kareah and all the other insolent men, they said (אֲנָבוֹת) to Jeremiah, “You are telling a lie. The Lord our God did not send you to say, ‘Do not go to Egypt to settle there’;

The first clause assigns a sg predication (דָּמָר) to the compound subject while the second clause assigns a pl participle (אֲנָבוֹת) to the compound subject after its elements have been listed.

Although a sg predication following the compound subject is by no means the rule, it should not be considered exceptional as well, as too many cases can be found (35x in OT, 4x in Jer⁵⁹³). The general ratio between sg and pl predication of compound subjects in the OT leans towards sg predication of a total of 299 cases in contrast to a total of 188 cases of pl predication – independent of their position with regard to

⁵⁹³ 5:30; 6:7; 14:15; 35:9.
the subject. Similar to the sg predications it is generally more common that the pl predication of a
compound subject precedes the subject (119x) than following it (69x).

5.4.1.3 N-shift: scribal error

Within the realm of the N-shifts in general, we have only one clear case of scribal error. In our opinion,
the N-shift of Jer 49:11 belongs to the textual being-aspect “reception and transmission”:

11 Leave your orphans (יהו�), I will keep them alive; and let your widows (ואלהיתך) trust (שׁבית) in me.

While we find consistently a 2sgM addressing in the beginning of the verse, the final predication
(שׁבית) in 2plM causes an incoherence on two levels. First, an N-shift (sg-pl) can be detected and second,
the 2plM form does not fit the 3P subject (וֹנִיתך) as a 3plF predication is needed. In the light of the
overall registered PNG-shift phenomena as well as in comparison with the LXX (καὶ χῆραι ἐπ' ἐμὲ πεποίθασιν [וניתך]), one must conclude that שׁבית shows the presence of a scribal error.

5.4.1.4 N-shift: idiomology

In many cases, we find sg and pl references connected to the sg ישא as Jer 51:6 and 51:45 show:

6 Flee from the midst of Babylon, save your lives (חָפְלַת), each of you (אֶשׁ אָדַתנָא)!
Do not perish because of her guilt, for this is the time of the Lord’s vengeance; he is repaying her what is due.

45 Come out of her, my people! Save your lives (חָפְלַת), each of you (אֶשׁ אָדַתנָא),
from the fierce anger of the Lord!

The 2plM predication (חָפְלַת) as well as the 3sgM suffix (תּוּשָא) relate to the sg ישא. A broader look at
the phenomenon clarifies that the formulation ישא אָדַתנָא needs to be regarded as an idiomatic
expression that is often used in the OT.

5.4.1.5 P-shift: self-reference

There are many cases in Jeremiah where YHWH as participant holds the 1pPos as well as the 3pPos within
one and the same sentence as Jer 11:17 shows:

17 The Lord of hosts, who planted you, has pronounced (דבר) evil against you,
because of the evil that the house of Israel and the house of Judah have done,
provoking me (卻לדת) to anger by making offerings to Baal.

In v17a, YHWH is referred to by a 3sgM predication (דבר). In the end of the verse, however, he is
referred to by a 1sgC suffix (לָקַמְת) in an adjunct clause belonging to the very sentence where YHWH is
referred to as 3sgM!

Jer 12:14 contains a similar case:

14 Thus says (אמר) the Lord concerning all my evil neighbors (שׁנֵים) who touch the
heritage that I have given (יְהוָה) my people (שבים) Israel to inherit:

594 A possible rationale for this mistake could be that the redactor/scribe wrote/copied while having the dominance of the 2pPos in
mind and while forgetting that the final clause of v11 demands another participant than the 2P participant adressed so far.
The first clause of v14 refers to YHWH with a 3sgM predication (וָאַסֵּא) but within this clause the complement phrase suffixes YHWH by a 1sgC form (נָפַשׁ). The 1P reference is continued in the following clauses. YHWH then is identified both with the 3pPos as well as with the 1pPos.

An identical case is found in the same chapter in v21:

An SESB syntax query that searches for all sentences that contain two clause atoms (second clause atom is attributive) containing in the first atom a 3P predication (וָאַסֵּא) although in the attached relative clause (introduced by the particle כָּל) in v21b, YHWH is suffixed with a 1sC form (נָפַשׁ)! An SESB syntax query that searches for all sentences that contain two clause atoms (second clause atom is attributive) containing in the first atom a 3P predication and in the second atom 1P suffix shows four cases of this phenomenon in Jeremiah\(^{596}\) and one in Isaiah\(^{597}\); besides, there are no other cases containing exactly the same phenomenon. Therefore, we must conclude that it is a special feature of Jeremiah\(^{598}\).

In many cases the speech of YHWH, holding the 1pPos, is interrupted by the phrase מְזוּזָה מָה שְׁמוֹ. The construct state of מָה שְׁמוֹ presuppose a 3pPos of מְזוּזָה as nomen rectum. This has led to the interpretation that מְזוּזָה שְׁמוֹ functions as a closing marker of direct speeches of YHWH. However, the investigation into the position and PNG-texture around מְזוּזָה שְׁמוֹ leads to another conclusion. In the majority of cases, מְזוּזָה שְׁמוֹ is surrounded by clauses that explicitly address YHWH in the 1pPos. Additionally, the clauses before and after מְזוּזָה שְׁמוֹ appear to belong most of the time to the same direct speech. מְזוּזָה שְׁמוֹ should therefore rather be regarded as a macro-syntactical marker and explicates that YHWH is still speaking and holding the 1pPos. Jer 2:9 represents many similar text passages\(^{599}\):

\[\begin{align*}
\text{Therefore once more } & \text{ I accuse you, says the Lord (וָאַסֵּא), and I accuse your children's children.} \\
\text{Mְזוּזָה שְׁמוֹ then puts YHWH in the 3pPos within a discourse that contains YHWH in the 1pPos. Our hypothesis is that the speaker (YHWH) makes use of that expression to remind the reader/listener in an objective way (YHWH=3pPos) that he is still speaking and demanding attention.}
\end{align*}\]

**5.4.1.6 P-shift: Subjectivization**

In a few cases, a participant can be referred to both by 3P and 2P forms within one sentence as shown in Jer 17:1

\[\begin{align*}
\text{The sin of Judah is written with an iron pen;}
\end{align*}\]

\(^{595}\) Other examples of a 1P=3P equation within one sentence can be found in Jeremiah 14:15, 23:2, 29:4, 29:21, 42:9.

\(^{596}\) 14:15, 23:2, 29:4, 29:21.

\(^{597}\) Isaiah 45:1.

\(^{598}\) Some caution must however be kept, because there are no other books available for the syntax search. The query result - in that sense - shows only that in the historic books we do not find any of these cases. The search results are based on the present state of the WIVU database, that does not yet include a functionalistic text-syntactical interpretation of the writings, minor prophets, and Ezekiel.

with a diamond point it is engraved on the tablet of their hearts (לוחם), and on the horns of your altars (מחקותך).

In v1, Judah is identified with a 3plM suffix (לוחם) as well as with a 2plM suffix (מחקותך).

Another example is found in Jer 22:24:

24 As I live, says the Lord, even if King Coniah son of Jehoiakim of Judah were the signet ring on my right hand, even from there I would tear you (ךנן ת א) off

In v24a, the King Coniah holds the 3pPos. However, the last clause of v24 addresses the king with a 2sgM suffix (ךנן קות). The identity of the 1pPos (YHWH) remains stable throughout the clauses, affirming that we are still in the same direct speech. It seems that in the 3P section, the discourse tries to describe a fictive situation (“ring on my right hand”) while in v24b the descriptive setting is left and a personal message of antipathy is transmitted. The 3P context, then, is much more objective (here: fictive description) while the 2P-section addresses the subjective, inner emotional life of a participant (here: YHWH’s anger).

Not enough P-shifts can be registered to allow a proper functional analysis. On the basis of Jer 22:24 we can only assume that the shift from 3P to 2P might express a shift from objective description to subjective expression. To what extent this can be supported will be seen later (cf. 5.4.2.7).

5.4.1.7 G-SHIFT: SHIFTING RELATIONAL-ROLE

In a few cases we find participants referred to by feminine and masculine forms (predication, pronoun) within one sentence. Jer 48:15 contains such a case:

15 Moab is destroyed (דרש) and her towns (双双) have come up, and the choicest of his young men have gone down to slaughter, says the King, whose name is the Lord of hosts.

The first clause of v15 predicates Moab with a 3sgM verbal form (דרש) while the second clause suffixes Moab with a 3sgF form (双双). Although it can be assumed that there is a textual mistake and follow the suggestion of the critical apparatus to change the suffix into 3sgM, it has to be taken into consideration that the text continues to refer to Moab both by M and F forms (v18 addresses Moab in 2sgF) as v20 demonstrates:

20 Moab is put to shame (ובתש), for it is broken down (מתכ), wail and cry! Tell it by the Arnon, that Moab is laid waste.

In the first two clauses of v20, we find Moab referred to both by M (בתש) and F (מתכ) forms within one sentence.

It seems that Moab can be conceived as playing a feminine and/or masculine role. This suggestion is supported by the wider context where Moab is viewed on the one hand as a prostitute that is unfaithful to YHWH (female role) and on the other hand as a nation among others (male role). Due to the lack of data on the sentence-level our suggestion remains hypothetical.

5.4.1.8 CONCLUSION

We have seen different shift-phenomena within the boundaries of a sentence. While there are not enough G- and P-shifts that would help to form a clearer understanding with regard to their function and origin, the manifold N-shifts speak for themselves: Most of the diverse N-shifts are known from the descriptions of classical grammars and testify that the many N-shifts on the sentence level are not disturbing the flow
and unity of the discourse. They rather prove that the clauses and sentences in Jeremiah are well designed and follow the standard rules of syntax-grammar and pragmatics as they can be traced in other OT books as well.

To what extent our observations and interpretative hypotheses of P- and G-shifts (e.g. “subjectivization”, “relational role”) can be supported on the text-level needs to be investigated next. If P- and G-shifts appear more frequently beyond the sentence, i.e. on the text-level, it is possible to draw a more certain conclusion about their origin and function. It depends on the nature of their distribution whether they benefit or harm the textual coherence of Jeremiah on the text-level. The question to be answered is whether we still find some regularity and orderliness beyond the sentence-level.

5.4.2 SPS BEYOND THE SENTENCE-BOUNDARY (TEXT-LEVEL)
A first overview on all SP-shifts reveals that most of the shifts are P-shifts. G-shifts constitute the smallest group while the number of N-shifts falls between the two.

5.4.2.1 N-SHIFT: SG=PL601
We have seen above (5.4.1.1.1) that within a clause the sg ש can be predicated by pl forms. This is also true across the sentence boundary.602 Jer 2:13 contains such a case:

13 for my people (יִשְׂרָאֵל) have committed (שָׁעַר) two evils: they have forsaken (לָשָׁו) me, the fountain of living water, and dug out cisterns for themselves, cracked cisterns that can hold no water.

In the clause following שָׁעַר, the predication (לָשָׁו) clearly refers back to the participant in the previous clause. The N in-congruency which is not only established by the predication can also be created by a later suffix as Jer 6:27 shows:603

The 2plM suffix (רִדָּחִים) clearly refers to the sg שָׁעַר.

It is not only true for שָׁעַר that a group as entity can be addressed by sg and pl forms on the text-level. Any other entity that represents a group consisting of many individuals can be addressed both by sg and pl forms. This can be seen in Jer 5:17 with its N-shift between sentences:

15 I am going to bring upon you a nation (גוֹי) from far away, O house of Israel, says the Lord. It is an enduring nation, it is an ancient nation, a nation whose language you do not know, nor can you understand what they say.
16 His quiver (תּוֹחֵן) is like an open tomb; all of them are mighty warriors.
17 And it shall eat up (לָכְכֶן) your harvest and your food; they shall eat up (לאלָכְכֶן) your sons and your daughters; it shall eat up (לאלָכְכֶן) your flocks and your herds; it shall eat up (לאלָכְכֶן) your vines and your fig trees; it shall destroy (יָכֹל) with the sword your fortified cities in which you trust.

601 The other two cases (29:26-28; 38:16) fall into the earlier category “extension”.
602 See also 6:19; 18:15.
603 Further cases in 14:16, 18:15, 23:22.
In 5:15, the text speaks about the one גוי which will destroy the country. This participant is constantly referred to as sg in v15-v17a. However, the parallel construction of the second clause of v17 refers to the participant in pl (לוכד). By using the same lexeme אכל in parallel constructions throughout v17 it makes impressively clear that the same participant is referred to as sg as well as pl.

Jer 24:5-6 gives another example on the position of the 3rd person:

5 Thus says the Lord, the God of Israel: Like these good figs, so I will regard as good the exiles from Judah (הלך יודע), whom I have sent away from this place to the land of the Chaldeans.

6 I will set my eyes upon them (מעיחס) for good, and I will bring them (מלחב), and not tear down; and I will plant them (נחשבים), and not pluck up.

The object of YHWH’s acting is the sg חלד יוהוד. However, in v6 the חלד יוהוד is referred to in pl (see pl suffixes).

Besides N-shifts on the 3pPos, we find similar cases among N-shifts in the 2pPos as Jer 48:26-28 shows:

26 Make him drunk, because he magnified himself against the Lord; let Moab wallow in his vomit; he too shall become a laughingstock.

27 Israel was a laughingstock for you (ךל,), though he was not caught among thieves; but whenever you spoke (יך), of him you shook your head (דז נד ת).!

28 Leave (לילוב) the towns, and live (לשבת) on the rock, O inhabitants of Moab! And be like (לחיפה) the dove that nests on the sides of the mouth of a gorge.

In v27, Moab is addressed as 2sgM. The 2plM imperative of v28 consequently seems to be a variation of the previous 2sgM addressing of Moab. The shift from 2sgM to 2plM can be explained as shifting from the general addressee (nation Moab) to those who Moab comprises (Moabite citizens).

We also find such cases in the 1pPos as Jer 2:27 displays:

who say (אמרים) to a tree, “You are my father,” and to a stone, “You gave me birth.” For they have turned their backs to me, and not their faces. But in the time of their trouble they say (אמרה), “Come and save us!”

The impression is created that in the first two quotations the people of God address the idols as an individual whole and remain therefore sg (e.g. “my father”) in the speech section. In the third quotation, the reference to the God’s people explicates that they consist of a plurality of individual people (“us”). The shift from sg to pl brings the many individuals that constitute the people into focus. While the N quality shifts between the speeches, the N quality of the predication that introduces the speeches remains pl (ואמרת, אמרה). This supports our earlier conclusion that a participant can be referred to both in sg as well as in pl terms if the participant is a group-like entity.

604 The critical apparatus proposes making the N-incongruency congruent by changing the pl forms in sg forms. In contrast to this suggestion many translations translate all verbal forms in pl. See, e.g. the NRSV:

16 Their quiver is like an open tomb; all of them are mighty warriors.

17 They shall eat up your harvest and your food; they shall eat up your sons and your daughters; they shall eat up your flocks and your herds; they shall eat up your vines and your fig trees; they shall destroy with the sword your fortified cities in which you trust.
Some cases seem to have a sg-pl shift in order to adapt to the employed metaphorical language. Jer 46:3-7 contains an example where the use of metaphorical description could have influenced the N-characteristic of a participant:

5 Why do I see them (הָיוּ) terrified? They have fallen back; their warriors are beaten down, and have fled in haste. They do not look back—terror is all around! says the Lord.

6 The swift cannot flee away, nor can the warrior escape; in the north by the Euphrates they have stumbled and fallen.

7 Who is this (חָיָה), rising (הָעַל) like the Nile, like rivers whose waters surge?

8 Egypt rises (הָעַל) like the Nile, like rivers whose waters surge. And it said (רָעָה), Let me rise, let me cover the earth, let me destroy cities and their inhabitants.

The above case shows how the addressing of the sg Egypt from plM references in v5 (הָיוְם, אֵרָוְעָה) shifts to sgM references in v8 (יאס, יָמָנוֹ). Together with the shift we find the shift to metaphorical language in v7-v8. The question raised in v7 targets at a comparison with the sg Nile (יאס) and a sg participant (ני). It is in coherence with this question that v8 refers to Egypt as a sg participant in coherence with the semantic context and the N-context of the question in v7. Thus, the N addressing not only seems to focus on the N quality of the referred to participant but could also focuses on making the N addressing coherent with the explicitly named metaphor that is to be identified with the referred to participant.

Another case that could support the above observation is Jer 4:3-8:

3 For thus says the Lord to the people of Judah and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem: Break up your fallow ground, and do not sow among thorns.

4 Circumcise yourselves to the Lord, remove the foreskin of your hearts, O people of Judah and inhabitants of Jerusalem, or else my wrath will go forth like fire, and burn with no one to quench it, because of the evil of your doings.

5 Declare in Judah, and proclaim in Jerusalem, and say: Blow the trumpet through the land; shout aloud and say, “Gather together, and let us go into the fortified cities!”

6 Raise (אָשַׁר) a standard toward Zion, flee for safety (קָרָב), do not delay (קָמִר), for I am bringing evil from the north, and a great destruction.

7 A lion has gone up from its thicket, a destroyer of nations has set out; he has gone out from his place to make your land (ךָגְצָר) a waste; your cities (ךָיְרָי) will be ruins without inhabitant.

8 Because of this put on (קָדָשַׁתָּן) sackcloth, lament (פָּסַר) and wail (יָאמַר) (וֹסַל): “The fierce anger of the Lord has not turned away from us.”

Vv3-6 and v8 show the nation explicitly addressed by 2plM forms (e.g. the imperatives in v6 and in v8). It is only v7 that does not contain any 2plM but only 2sgM forms. Although the reader does not see any need to identify the 2P participant of v7 differently than the 2P participant of the contextual verses it is remarkable that the 2sgM forms appear at the exact moment when we find metaphorical lion comparison (the “lion who has gone up from its thicket”). The metaphorical introduction of the sg lion seems to have changed the addressing behavior of the discourse.

5.4.2.2 N-shift: extension and condensation

In the above category “sg=pl”, the group and its constellation is in focus. The examples show that a group can be referred to by sg as well as pl forms. The sg forms refer to the unity of the group while the pl forms stress that the group consists of different individuals.
The category “extension and condensation” relates to “sg=pl” phenomenon, however, not the group but a specific individual and its social belonging are in focus. These examples show that one individual can be referred to both by pl and sg forms when it has a social belonging. On the basis of the analyzed data, our hypothesis is that the pl reference emphasizes the social affiliation of a specific participant (extension) while the sg reference stresses its individuality (condensation). Jer 21:7 exemplifies this mechanism:

> Afterward, says the Lord, I will give King Zedekiah of Judah, and his servants, and the people in this city—those who survive the pestilence, sword, and famine—into the hands of King Nebuchadrezzar of Babylon, into the hands of their enemies, into the hands of those who seek (מַמְצִית) their lives. He shall strike them down with the edge of the sword; he shall not pity (חָסְרו) them, or spare (חָוַל) them, or have compassion (רַע).

In the end of v7, we find some sg predications (e.g. הבּוֹש) although its subject is of pl character (e.g. נבּעךְדִּרְש). The reader understands from the flow of the discourse that the sg predications refer to Nebuchadrezzar who has been mentioned in a compound construction (תִּשְׁפָּחֵהוּ נֵבְעֹכֶדְרִשְׁו). Thus, a group is condensed to a single part (Nebuchadrezzar) by choosing sg predications instead of pl ones.

In a special way, condensation and extension of participants play a role with relation to the generations of a nation/people. One of the challenges the book of Jeremiah contains, when addressing God’s people, is to know whether the nation as such or a specific generation of that nation is referred to. Jer 7:24-26 contains such a case:

> Yet they did not obey (שָׁמֵעָה) and not did they incline (שָׁמְעָה) their ear, but, in the stubbornness of their evil heart (לְבָנָה), they have been (צָכְרָה) in their own counsels, and looked backward rather than forward.

> From the day that your ancestors (אֲבֹאֲבֹתָם) came out of the land of Egypt until this day, I have persistently sent all my servants the prophets to you (אֲבֹאֲבֹתָם), day after day;

> Yet they did not listen (שָׁמֵעָה) to me, or pay attention (שָׁמְעָה) with their ears, but they stiffened (צָכְרָה) their necks. They did worse (שָׁמַיב) than their ancestors (אֲבֹאֲבֹתָם) did.

In vv24-26, two different participants are referred to by either holding the 2pPos or the 3pPos. In v24, we have the ancestors of the present generation holding the 2pPos (אֲבֹאֲבֹתָם). Although it remains to a certain degree unclear, it seems that the second 2P reference in form of the 2plM suffix in v25b (אֲלִיכֵהוּ) does not refer to the present generation but to the nations in general as the clause expresses that God’s messengers have been sent continuously. This means that a 2pPos can refer to two different entities that stand in relation to a nation. While one 2pPos can be held by a specific generation of that nation the other 2pPos can be held by that nation in general.605

A similar observation can be made in Jer 2:5-7:

> Thus says the Lord:

> What wrong did your ancestors (אֲבֹאֲבֹתָם) find in me that they went (לָכוּ) far from me, and went (לָכוּ) after worthless things, and became (כָּכָהוּ) worthless themselves?

---

605 De Regt suggests that the reference to nations in the prophetic writings should be understood as „transgenerational“. The nation then can be addressed not only as social whole but as consisting of several generations that can be differentiated. The reference to the different generations can be explicated by the use of specific PNG-qualities. See Regt de, 216, 224, 229.
They did not say (אמרוה), "Where is the Lord who brought us up from the land of Egypt, who led us in the wilderness, in a land of deserts and pits, in a land of drought and deep darkness, in a land that no one passes through, where no one lives?"

I brought you (אבתם) into a plentiful land to eat its fruits and its good things. But when you (אמרו) entered you defiled (явление) my land, and made (ישראל) my heritage an abomination.

The above text passage illustrates how one nation is split into different generations (past and present generation). The past generation is referred to by 3sgM forms in vv5-6 (e.g. אמרו) while the present generation is addressed by a 2plM suffix (אבתם). In v7, there is an awkward shift as the 2pPos cannot be identified anymore with the present generations as the vocabulary used refers to the past generation. However, since the past generation is not available as a dialogue partner anymore the reader concludes that the 2pPos refers rather to the nation in general and not anymore to one specific generation. In a sense we could say that the 2pPos in v7 refers to the nation in general which is represented by a specific present generation.

5.4.2.3 N-shift: indicating DSC-shifts

Our N-shift distribution forms another group of N-shifts that seem to function as DSC-shift indicator as Jer 29:21-24 shows:

21 Thus says the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel, concerning Ahab son of Kolaiah and Zedekiah son of Maaseiah, who are prophesying a lie to you (אמרו) in my name: I am going to deliver them into the hand of King Nebuchadrezzar of Babylon, and he shall kill them before your eyes (ה princípio).

22 And on account of them this curse shall be used by all the exiles from Judah in Babylon: “The Lord make you like Zedekiah and Ahab, whom the king of Babylon roasted in the fire,”

23 because they have perpetrated outrage in Israel and have committed adultery with their neighbors’ wives, and have spoken in my name lying words that I did not command them; I am the one who knows and bears witness, says the Lord.

24 To Shemaiah of Nehelam you shall say (אמרו):

25 Thus says the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel: In your own name you sent a letter to all the people who are in Jerusalem, and to the priest Zephaniah son of Maaseiah, and to all the priests, saying,

In v24, we find a shift in the addressing of the 2pPos. In the previous verses, this position is referred to by 2plM forms (e.g. V21 אמרו,לעפצם), however, in v24 it is addressed by 2sgM form (אמרו). There is no use of 2sgM forms in any verses previous to v24. Besides this, a new participant "Shemaiah" is introduced. The reader assumes therefore a shift from the Gola in 2pPos to Jeremiah in 2pPos and exiting the different DSC levels of the first part of the chapter up to v23. This becomes especially clear in the following verses that show a temporal distance between v23 and v24.

That an N-shift can signal a DSC-shift is also seen in Jer 5:19:

18 But even in those days, says the Lord, I will not make a full end of you (לאבתם).

19 And when you say (אמרו), “Why has the Lord our God done all these things to us?” you shall say (אמרו) to them (לאבתם), “As you have forsaken me and served foreign gods in your land, so you shall serve strangers in a land that is not yours.”
The above text shows how the text changes its addressing as it directs its speech to a new 2P identity (2sgM) and distances simultaneously the former 2pPos (where (held by the people)) into a 3pPos (ה).606

Jer 7:15-16 operates similarly:

15 And I will cast you (ך) out of my sight, just as I cast out all your brothers (ך), all the offspring of Ephraim.

16 As for you (ך), do not pray (ך) for this people, do not raise a cry (ך) or prayer on their behalf (ך), and do not intercede (ך) with me, for I will not hear you (ך).

From vv3-16, God’s people are addressed as 2P by 2plM forms. In v16, a 2sgM pronominal form (ך) is used in order to refer to the 2pPos. In the earlier section of chap 7, the 2sgM forms are used only in v2607 for addressing Jeremiah. As a further signal for a changed discourse serves the 3plM addressing of the people (ך) that have been addressed in the earlier discourse by 2plM forms. Therefore, the reader identifies not only the 2sgM pronoun in v16 as addressing Jeremiah but also as belonging to the discourse level of v2.

Our hypothesis then is that an N-shift can indicate a DSC-shift when the new discourse makes explicit reference to the new participants at its very beginning (a nominal clause "ך" is followed by an explicit 2sgP predication) and when the reference to an earlier participant is explicitly changed as well (see בָשָׂם).

Jer 10:2-6 shows a double-change throughout the discourse:

2 Thus says the Lord (ך): Do not learn (ך) the way of the nations, or be dismayed (ך) at the signs of the heavens; for the nations are dismayed at them.

3 For the customs of the peoples are false: a tree from the forest is cut down, and worked with an ax by the hands of an artisan;

4 people deck it with silver and gold; they fasten it with hammer and nails so that it cannot move.

5 Their idols are like scarecrows in a cucumber field, and they cannot speak; they have to be carried, for they cannot walk. Do not be afraid (ך) of them, for they cannot do evil, nor is it in them to do good.

6 There is none like you (ך), O Lord; you (ך) are great, and your name (ך) is great in might.

In v6, there is an interruption with the previous discourse on two levels. First, the addressing of the 2pPos changes from 2plM forms (e.g. נָתַן) to 2sgM forms (e.g. בָשָׂם). Second, YHWH is explicitly in the 2pPos (ך נָתַן כָּלָּמֶשׁ חֶן) and not any longer implicitly in the 1pPos as he is in vv2-5 (see DSI in v2 נָתַן “ך”). Here, the DSC-shift is accompanied with the same phenomenon as in the earlier examples as it makes explicit the new 2P participant by addressing him at the very beginning of the new discourse. This explication with its N-difference to the previous holder of the 2pPos signals that the DSC-shift is strong enough so that the speaker-shift (1pPos-shift) in v6 does not need to be explicated.

606 Although the critical apparatus suggests changing ך into a 3plM form (ך) the fact that the other MSS and text traditions do not change it proves that it did not disturb the minds of the translators and copyist, thus fitting in the possible range of writing styles. Besides this the suggestion of the critical apparatus does not overcome the problem but only coheres the 2P references in v19.

607 1 The word that came to Jeremiah from the Lord:

2 Stand in the gate of the Lord’s house, and proclaim there this word, and say, Hear the word of the Lord, all you people of Judah, you that enter these gates to worship the Lord.
Not only on the 2pPos and 3pPos can N-shifts indicate a DSC-shift. Jer 4:12-13 shows how N-shifts within the 1pPos can also indicate a DSC-shift:

11 At that time it will be said to this people and to Jerusalem: A hot wind comes from me out of the bare heights in the desert toward the daughter of my people, not to winnow or cleanse—
12 a wind too strong for that. Now it is I who speak in judgment against them.

The Nifal construction in the first clause (רָגָמְמָה - "it will be said") hides the identity of the speaker of the subsequent discourse (4:11-??). Nevertheless, in the following clauses the identity of the 1pPos is given to YHWH and the “daughter of my nation” is referred to by 3plM forms. This identification gets disturbed in 4:13 where the 1pPos (נוֹדֵעַ) is given to the nation which is referred to by 1plC forms! Remarkably, the shift is accompanied by the interjections הָגָנֶה and אָוִי.

In several cases it can be observed that the participant reference-shifts often co-occur with interjections like הָגָנֶה or אָוִי when a DSC-shift is launched.

There is a similar case in Jer 8:19-21:

19 Hark, the cry of the daughter of my people (בוּרֵמָה) from far and wide in the land: “Is the Lord not in Zion? Is her King not in her?” “Why have they provoked me to anger with their images, with their foreign idols?”
20 “The harvest is past, the summer is ended, and we are not saved.”
21 For the hurt of the daughter of my people (בוּרֵמָה) I am hurt, I mourn, and dismay has taken hold of me.

In v19b, YHWH holds the 1pPos (יֵלָהוּ). This position is given to the nation in v20 (אֵזֶה לְצִיּוֹן). Together with the content of v20 and the shift in addressing the nation (in v19b=3plM [ָהֶקָטָע] תֶעְבָּר בַּא); in v20=1plC) there is good reason for the reader to see a different discourse level expressed in v20.

The 1plC-1sgC N-shift in v21 indicates a participant-shift as well. The reason for the reader’s conclusion is the fact that (a) with v21 the same addressing form in v19b and earlier verses(1sgC) is found again and that (b) the same 3P participant בָּרֵמָה is present in v19 and v21. Thus, due to the semantic and formal parallels, the N-shift in v20 and v21 is read as causing a participant-shift entailing a DSC-shift.

5.4.2.4 N-SHIFT: PRAGMATICS

When a sg form represents a pl phenomenon, some N-shifts appear to express a form of generalization. In Jer 10:14 and 51:17, a sg word is referred to by a pl suffix:

14 Everyone is stupid and without knowledge; goldsmiths are all put to shame by the idol (פָּסֵק); for its image (מְפָשְׂק) is false, and there is no breath in them (בָּם).

The sg פָּסֵק is a generalization as it is suffixed with a 3plM form at the end of the verse (בָּם). Due to the פָּסֵק representing the many מְפָשְׂק, the pl (בָּם) and sg (פָּסֵק) suffix referring to the sg מְפָשְׂק do not contradict each other.

There is enough data available to support our intuition, but we suppose that this way of generalization is part of Hebrew pragmatics.

5.4.2.5 P-SHIFT: INDICATING DSC-SHIFTS

Much more frequently than N-shifts, P-shifts seem to indicate DSC-shifts. The following examples will accentuate this:
In Jer 16:19-21, a 2P-1P shift signals a DSC-shift:

19 O Lord, my strength and my stronghold, my refuge in the day of trouble, to you shall the nations come from the ends of the earth and say:
Our ancestors have inherited nothing but lies, worthless things in which there is no profit.
20 Can mortals make for themselves gods? Such are no gods!
21 Therefore (ןכ), I am surely going to teach them, this time I am going to teach them my power and my might, and they shall know that my name is the Lord.

The above text passage shows a shift of participants that are holding the 1pPos. While in v19 an unknown participant is identified with the 1pPos and YHWH is identified with the 2pPos ("to you shall the nations come"), v21 gives the 1pPos to YHWH ("I am surely going to teach them") who is no longer addressed by a 2sgM form. The shift is accompanied by different phenomena. On the one hand, we find an interrogative clause in v20 that brings the previous DSC (the saying of the nations in v19b) to an end; on the other hand, the ןכ in v21 shifts from the earlier descriptive and appraisal discourse to a different type of discourse style: a concluding discourse type. On the basis of these phenomena and the 2P-1P shift with regard to YHWH, the reader assumes a DSC-shift. Whether v20 and v21 belong to the same DSC still remains unclear.

In Jer 20:10-11, we find a collection of 1P-3P shifts that seems to signal DSC-shifts:

10 For I hear (שמעתי) many whispering:
"Terror is all around! Denounce him! And let us denounce (נהדו) him!"
All my close friends (לומם) are watching for me to stumble (ליע).  
"Perhaps he can be enticed (נתמה), and we can prevail (נחל) against him, and take our revenge (נוקטונ) on him (מנע)."
11 But the Lord is with me (אות) like a dread warrior; therefore my persecutors (רדפי) will stumble (לשל), and they will not prevail (לך). They will be greatly shamed (שב), for they will not succeed (שביה). Their eternal dishonor will never be forgotten.

The DSC section in v10 appears to be interrupted or ended with the clause “All my close friends are watching for me to stumble” since the 1pPos is not any longer of a pl nature as it is in the earlier DSC of v10 (נדה) nor does the logic of the content of “All my ...” fit the context of the previous DSC. This is the reason why the reader thinks that the “All my ...” clause in v10 is a discourse interruption.

In v10b, we find the same SS as in the first DSC, in terms of grammatical-reference coherence (both have 1pC and 3sgM forms) as well as in terms of content-cohesion (revenge and discrimination). This seems to be evidence enough for the reader to identify the speakers of v10b not with Jeremiah but with his persecutors.

As the discourse continues a new SS is encountered in v11, since the 1pC forms are not continued but exchanged by 1sgC forms (e.g. רון). As the 1pPos in v10b is identified with the persecutors of Jeremiah and the 3pPos with Jeremiah (e.g. יdbName) and as its reference structure has changed in v11 – the former 3pPos (Jeremiah) now has become the 1pPos and the former 1pPos has now become the 3pPos – a new DSC is expected. Thus, both the shifts on the semantic level as well as the grammatical level (the N quality [sg and pl] are not any longer identified with the previous P quality [1P, 3P]) causing a clear DSC-shift despite the fact that a DSI is missing.
It is important to list a few different P-shifts that seem to indicate a DSC-shift in order to get an overview on the different co-occurring phenomena. The distribution of these co-occurring phenomena can play an important role for our hypothesis that DSC-shifts can be indicated by PNG-shifts.

In Jer 11:7-8, we find a DSC-shift that is not only indicated by a P-shift but also by a shifting in its semantic texture:

7 For I solemnly warned your ancestors when I brought them up out of the land of Egypt, warning them persistently, even to this day, saying, Obey (שמעו) my voice.
8 Yet they did not obey (שמעו) or incline their ear, but everyone walked in the stubbornness of an evil will. So I brought upon them all the words of this covenant, which I commanded them to do, but they did not.

The DSC of the end of v7 ("Obey my voice.") is implicitly exited with v8. The reason is that the participant that holds the 2pPos in the DSC of v7 (שמעו) is referred to in v8 by 3plM forms. However, not only does the P-shift signal a DSC-shift but also semantic logic represented by the negation (אל) of שמעו that was used un-negated (שמעו) in the end of v7.

In a similar way Jer 26:4-7 points out the DSC organizing function of “semantic logic”:

4 Say (אומר) to them,
5 This is what the Lord says:
If you do not listen (אסリアル chưaמש) to me and follow my law, which I have set before you,
[...] then I will make this house like Shiloh, and I will make this city a curse for all the nations of the earth.
7 The priests and the prophets and all the people heard (שמעו) Jeremiah speaking these words in the house of the Lord.
8 And when Jeremiah had finished (הוא ננ Westbrook) speaking all that the Lord had commanded him to speak to all the people, then the priests and the prophets and all the people laid hold of him, saying, "You shall die!

The people in their entirety are predicated in v4 by a 2plM form (אסリアルahu) while they hold the 3pPos ( sınıf) in v7. This shift indicates a DSC-shift together with the following observations: (1) The prophet Jeremiah holds no longer the 2pPos as in v4a but is “distanced into” the 3pPos. (2) The 1pPos is no longer present, indicating that there is no speaker and thus no DSC anymore. (3) From v7 on, the verbal form changes from discursive xYtl, Wqtl, WxYq into the narrative WayX clause types (4) (רשע) and י流动性 in v4 is contrasted with the י流动性 in v7.

DSC-shifts are not only signaled by P-shifts in combination with shifts in semantic texture or resumption. A P-shift can also be accompanied by a shift of clause-types obviously indicating a DSC-shift as Jer 36:3-4 shows:

3 It may be that when the house of Judah hears of all the disasters that I (אנים) intend to do to them, all of them may turn from their evil ways, so that I may forgive (למחשה) their iniquity and their sin.
4 Then Jeremiah called (אישר) Baruch son of Neriah, and Baruch wrote (כתב) on a scroll at Jeremiah’s dictation all the words of the Lord that he had (דיבר) spoken to him.

V3 is part of a DSC between YHWH (1pPos) and Jeremiah (2pPos) that begins in v1. While in v3 YHWH holds explicitly the 1pPos (אנים) this changes in v4 where YHWH holds the 3pPos (דיבר).
Together with the shifting of the participants P-position there also is a shift in terms of verbal forms. While v3 contains two xYqtl and one WQtl clause as typical clauses of a DSC, v4 shifts into the narrative clause type Way (2x). Additionally, the subject is referred to explicitly in the first and second clause of v4 (WayX).

Together with the other phenomena (clause-type-shift, explication of subject and the present N-shift), the P-shift indicates a DSC-shift.

As the discourse continues a similar shift appears:

5 And Jeremiah ordered Baruch, saying, “I am prevented from entering the house of the Lord; so you go yourself (והוא הנמן וsetContent), and on a fast day in the hearing of the people in the Lord’s house you shall read (והוא לפני וה样) the words of the Lord from the scroll that you have written (והוא לפני וה행위) at my dictation (והוא לפני וה행위). You shall read them also in the hearing of all the people of Judah who come up from their towns.

6 It may be that their plea will come before the Lord, and that all of them will turn from their evil ways, for great is the anger and wrath that the Lord has pronounced against this people.”

8 And Baruch son of Neriah did (והוא לפני וה행위) all that the prophet Jeremiah ordered him (והוא לפני וה행위) about reading from the scroll the words of the Lord in the Lord’s house.

The DSI in v5 sets the SS of the following DSC where Jeremiah holds the 1pPos (והוא לפני וה행위) and Baruch is identified with the 2pPos (והוא לפני וה행위). In v8, this identification changes as both Jeremiah and Baruch hold the 3pPos (Jeremiah: והוא לפני וה행위; Baruch: והוא לפני וה행위). This causes an SS-shift that coincides with a DSC-shift. The rationale of this conclusion is found in the fact that the P-shift is accompanied with the VF-shift and the explication of the subject “Baruch son of Neriah”. While vv4-7 have a number of xYqtl and xQtl clauses dominating the DSC, v8 shifts into the narrative VF Way. The re-introduction of Baruch with the WayX clause (והוא לפני וה행위) stresses the break of the discourse.

The same composition of DSC-shifts can be found many times. Three further examples support this observation:

Jer 26:9:

9 Why have you (והוא לפני וה행위) prophesied in the name of the Lord, saying, ‘This house shall be like Shiloh, and this city shall be desolate, without inhabitant’?

And all the people gathered (והוא לפני וה행위) around Jeremiah in the house of the Lord.

In v9a, Jeremiah is predicated by a 2sgM form (והוא לפני וה행위) while holding the 3pPos in the final clause of v9. The people hold implicitly the 1pPos in v9a and also in the final clause of the verse. The fact that the 1pPos, i.e. the speaker, is absent in combination with the fact that Jeremiah is referred to differently can be reason enough for a DSC-shift. However, the final confirmation of a DSC-shift is the clause-type shift from discoursive xQtl, xYqt and WXYq clause-types to the narrative WayX clause type (והוא לפני וה행위) in the end of v9 informing the reader that the text has left the former DSC.

Jer 28:16-17:

16 Therefore thus says the Lord: I am going to send you off (והוא לפני וה행위) the face of the earth. Within this year you (והוא לפני וה행위) will be dead, because you have spoken (והוא לפני וה행위) rebellion against the Lord.”

17 And Hananiah, the prophet, died (והוא לפני וה행위) in that same year, in the seventh month.
In v15, Hananiah is referred to by holding the 2pPos (e.g. ממלך). However, in v17 this has changed as Hananiah is referred to by a 3sgM predication (יְהוָה). Furthermore, the clause-type shift into the narrative WayX plus where Hananiah is again explicitly mentioned and the time reference in v17 (“in that same year...”) help to mark the completion of a DSC section.

Jer 42:20-21 affirms our observation:

7 The Lord has said to you (םֹלֵךְ), O remnant of Judah, Do not go (גַלְגַל) to Egypt. Be well aware (יְדִיעָה) that I have warned (יִנְהַה) you (םֹכֶּךָ) today
18 that you have made a fatal mistake. For you (םֹאתָם) yourselves (שָׁלְחֲנֵהנָם) sent me (אָרָא) to the Lord your God (אֱלֹהֵיכֶם), saying,
Pray (רְחֹפֶלֶךָ) for us (עֹבֵרֶךָ) to the Lord our God (אֱלֹהֵינוּ), and whatever the Lord our God (נַעֲנֵנוּ) says, tell (יִגֵּנוּ) us (נֶּא) and we will do (יִשְׁתַחוּ) it.
19 So I have told (אָרָא) you (שםֹכֶךָ) today, but you have not obeyed (שָׁמַתָּה) the voice of the Lord your God (אֱלֹהֵיכֶם) in anything that he sent me (שָׁלְחַנְנִי) to tell you (אֱלֹהִים).

The above text passage shows in v20b the DSC of the remnant of Judah who address Jeremiah by 2sgM forms (e.g. ספּרָה) and themselves by 1plC forms (e.g. בּעֵד). The SS of v21, however, is of a different structure, as the 1pPos is not any longer held by the people but by Jeremiah (יָגָד) and vice versa (the 2pPos is not any longer held by Jeremiah but by the people [ךָךְ]). Besides this shift, the reader recognizes that on the one hand the SS of v21 is identical with the SS of vv19-20a, and that on the other hand the SS of v21 is breaking with the DSC type of clauses found in v19 and v20 (xQtl, xYtl, Imp) by using a Way clause (וּרְאָדְךָלָכָםוֹיָמָה).

5.4.2.6 P-shift: self-reference
We have already listed a few cases in which a participant can be referred to both by 1P and 3P forms within the boundaries of a sentence. For those cases we have suggested the shift-function of self-reference. While there are hardly any P-shifts on the sentence level, our suggestion cannot be supported by a wider range of data distribution on syntax-level. This is, however, possible on the text-level. The simultaneous addressing of YHWH with 1P and 3P forms is found much more frequently in a chain of sentences as indicated in Jer 29:7:

7 But seek the welfare of the city where I have sent (יֹעַרָה) you into exile. Also pray (רְחֹפֶלֶךָ) to the Lord (יִנְהַה) on its behalf, for in its welfare you will find your welfare.

YHWH is in the 1pPos (םֹלֵךְ) except for the last part of the verse where he is referred to as holding the 3pPos (יָגָד). A syntactic SESB search reveals that in all cases where the verb לְלָכַשָּל שָׁלְחֲנֵהנָם (to pray) is directed to an entity, this entity is always qualified as JWHW in a complement position and never replaced by a 1sgC suffix. Consequently, when Gods demands his people to pray to him he objectifies himself by using a 3P reference (“pray to YHWH”) instead of remaining consistently in the 1pPos by saying “pray to me”.

Also even larger text segments show the phenomenon of self-reference as Jer 23:16-21 shows:

16 Thus says the Lord of hosts:
Do not listen to the words of the prophets who prophesy to you; they are deluding you. They speak visions of their own minds, not from the mouth of the Lord.
17 They keep saying to those who despised me (םֹלֵךְ)}
“the word of the Lord is peace; it shall be well with you”; and to all who stubbornly follow their own stubborn hearts, they say, “No calamity shall come upon you.”

18 For who (יְהֹוָה) has stood in the council of the Lord so as to see and to hear his word (דבר)? Who has given heed to his word so as to proclaim it?

19 Look, the storm of the Lord! Wrath has gone forth, a whirling tempest; it will burst upon the head of the wicked.

20 The anger of the Lord will not turn back until he has executed (תֹּשַׁע) and accomplished (שָׁלַק) the intents of his mind (לב). In the latter days you will understand it clearly.

21 I did not send (לָשׁוֹתָה) the prophets, yet they ran; I did not speak (דבר) to them, yet they prophesied.

22 But if they had stood in my council (בכון), then they would have proclaimed my words (דברי) to my people (עם), and they would have turned them from their evil way, and from the evil of their doings.

In v16a, we find a DSI which predicts YHWH as the speaker of the following DSC. However, except in v17a, (לאה) YHWH remains in the 3pPos during vv18-20. In v21, YHWH suddenly holds the 1pPos again (e.g. יְהֹוָה). This is unexpected - while reading the discourse, the reader has almost forgotten that actually YHWH is the speaker of the discourse because YHWH is referred to continuously by 3p forms so far. The shift from the 1P to the 3pPos in v18 is accompanied by the conjunction that introduces an argument/explanation to the ridiculousness of the expressions done by the people in v17. Thus, it seems that with the move from a descriptive DSC (they speak, they keep saying, they say) to an explanatory DSC, the addressing of YHWH changes as well into a more objective reference attitude (away from the subjective "I" to the objective “he”).

Another good example is found in Jer 32:28-35:

28 Therefore, thus says the Lord:
I am going to give this city into the hands of the Chaldeans and into the hand of King Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon, and he shall take it.

29 The Chaldeans who are fighting against this city shall come, set it on fire, and burn it, with the houses on whose roofs offerings have been made to Baal and libations have been poured out to other gods, to provoke me to anger.

30 For the people of Israel and the people of Judah have done nothing but evil in my sight from their youth; the people of Israel have done nothing but provoke me to anger by the work of their hands, says the Lord (יְהֹוָה)

31 This city has aroused my anger and wrath, from the day it was built until this day, so that I will remove it from my sight

32 because of all the evil of the people of Israel and the people of Judah that they did to provoke me to anger—they, their kings and their officials, their priests and their prophets, the citizens of Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem.

33 They have turned their backs to me, not their faces; though I have taught them persistently, they would not listen and accept correction.

34 They set up their abominations in the house that bears my name, and defiled it.

35 They built the high places of Baal in the valley of the son of Hinnom, to offer their sons and daughters to Molech, though I did not command them, nor did it enter my mind that they should do this abomination, causing Judah to sin.

The entire text passage refers to YHWH in the 1pPos (except the יְהֹוָה phrase). Further, the text passage contains the same theme, vocabulary, clause-types and SS, be it before or after the יְהֹוָה phrase.

608 Of the 24 occurrences of the verb יְהֹוָה in the OT YHWH or the Name of YHWH are the object in 19 cases. Exceptions are Jer 33:24 (my people), Deut 32:19 (them—the people), Isa 60:14 (Jerusalem), Prov 15:5 (father’s instruction) and Lam 2:6 (king and priest). This makes us conclude that it is most likely that the 1sgC suffix of יְהֹוָה is rather to be identified with YHWH than with Jeremiah.

phrase. Thus, the reader does not have any reason to interpret נאמונתיה as indicating the termination of the DSC in v30 and v31 as a part of a new and different DSC.

An investigation in all text passages that contain a נאמונתיה phrase shows that the great majority of all cases surrounds the נאמונתיה with a reference to YHWH in 1pPos. This leads to the conclusion that in most cases where נאמונתיה appears in the discourse, YHWH holds the 1pPos even if this is not explicitly done610 as Jer 50:33-35 shows:

33 Thus says the Lord of hosts: The people of Israel are oppressed, and so too are the people of Judah; all their captors have held them fast and refuse to let them go.
34 Their Redeemer is strong; the Lord of hosts is his name. He will surely plead their cause, that he may give rest to the earth, but unrest to the inhabitants of Babylon.
35 A sword against the Chaldeans, says the Lord (נאמונתיה), and against the inhabitants of Babylon, and against her officials and her sages.

In v33, a DSC starts in which the reader expects YHWH to be speaking. However, all explicit references to YHWH are in 3sgM forms. It is only by the נאמונתיה expression in v35 that the reader is sure that YHWH is speaking and holding implicitly the 1pPos. Thus, the presence of 3sgM forms and the presence of נאמונתיה show that we have a self-reference (YHWH) within this DSC.

When we approach certain N-shifts on the text-level, more data is available to support our hypotheses about self-reference.

5.4.2.7 P-shift: subjectivization

We have already suggested that the P-shift serves as subjectivization but we have not yet been able to support it due to the lack of 2P-3P-shifts on the sentence-level. On the text-level, many more cases can be found in which participants are addressed both by 2P- as well as 3P-forms within one DSC. When a participant is first referred to by 3P forms and in the course of the discourse by 2P forms (within the boundaries of a single DSC) we describe this phenomenon as a subjectivization. Jer 12:13 will clarify this phenomenon:

13 They have sown (עַשַּׁה) wheat and have reaped (קָזָה) thorns, they have tired (לְוַלַּי) themselves out but profit (לְיָוע) nothing.
   And get ashamed (שָׁוַע) of your harvests (מַחְמְדָּאָרִים) because of the fierce anger of the Lord.

In v13a, God’s people are referred to by a 3pl predication and therefore are identified with the 3pPos. However, in v13b the people have taken the 2pPos by means of a 2plM imperative (רֹשַׁע) and suffix (מַחְמְדָּאָרִים). In case v13 is not corrupt it would mean that the addressing of one participant can rapidly change without necessarily changing the discourse setting.611

The function of such a shift should be searched in the different theme we find in the 3P and 2P section of this verse. In the 3P section we find clearly a descriptive passage explaining what has gone wrong in the past. In contrast, the 2P section asks for an appropriate response to the past by confronting the participant directly. The shift into 2P forms, then, can be understood as a personal closure and climax for the passage.

610 Such cases, however, are rare.
611 The LXX has throughout the entire verse God’s people addressed by 2pl forms (σπείρατε πυροὺς καὶ ἀκάνθας θερίσατε· οἱ κλῆροι αὐτῶν οὐκ ὠφελήσουσιν αὐτούς· αἰσχύνθητε ἀπὸ καυχήσεως ὑμῶν, ἀπὸ ὀνειδισμοῦ ἔναντι κυρίου.)
That a 3P-2P shift can take place within a DSC can be seen in Jer 11:18 as well:

> It was the Lord who made it known to me (יְהֹוָה),
> and I knew;
> then you caused me to see (יָדִיעָהוּ) their evil deeds.

In v18a, YHWH holds the 3pPos but in 18b, there is a shift towards the 2pPos. While the addressing of YHWH changes, the 1pPos is not altered. Beside the stability of the 1pPos, we also find that at the semantic level the predication of clause#1 and clause#3 is identical as well (והם, ידוע). The stability on the level of the 1pPos and the level of the semantic value of the predications suggest that all three clauses are part of the same DSC.

In order to investigate further into the function and meaning of such shifts, Jer 44:27-29 is helpful:

> I am going to watch over them for harm and not for good; all the people of Judah who are in the land of Egypt shall perish by the sword and by famine, until not one is left.
> And those who escape the sword shall return from the land of Egypt to the land of Judah, few in number; and all the remnant of Judah, who have come to the land of Egypt to settle, shall know whose words will stand, mine or theirs!
> This shall be the sign to you, says the Lord, that I am going to punish you in this place, in order that you may know that my words against you will surely be carried out.

In vv27-28, the people of God are referred to as holding the 3pPos. In this section we find a prophetic description of the judgment. In v29, the people suddenly hold the 2pPos. This shift causes an intimation where YHWH explains the seriousness of the previous prediction. Thus, the objective prophetic view of judgment is brought into a dialogue for the purpose of clarification.

In a similar way, there is a P-shift in Jer 50:23-24:

> How the hammer of the whole earth is cut down and broken! How Babylon has become (יָדִיעָהוּ) a horror among the nations!
> You set a snare (יָתַקְשָׂה) for yourself (ךָלְךָ) and you were caught (ךָלַעַד), O Babylon, but you did not know (יָדִיעָהוּ) it; you were discovered (נְצַאתָה) and seized (נְצַאתָה), because you challenged (יָתַקְשָׂה) the Lord.

In v24, we find a clearly descriptive verse that objectifies Babylon into the 3pPos (יָתַקְשָׂה) also by the use of a metaphorical comparison (hammer). This distance is given up in v24 where Babylon is directly addressed by 2sgF forms (e.g. יָתַקְשָׂה). The reader can conclude that the descriptive part with the 3sgF references in v23 is interrupted by the directive part with 2sgF references for the purpose of explanation. Thus, the abstract 3sgF description/result/product of the defeat of Babel is explained with the help of the personal 2sgF references illustrating the means/process that has lead to such destruction.

5.4.2.8 P-shift: objectivization

The 3P-2P shifts with their subjectivizational quality can be reversed by 2P-3P shifts. In those cases we speak of an objectivization of a participant that has been addressed earlier by 2P forms as shown in Jer 4:1-2:

> If you return (נְבָאָה), O Israel, says the Lord, if you return (נְבָא) to me, if you (נְבָאָה) remove your abominations (נְבָאָה) from my presence, and do not waver (נְבָאָה),
> and if you swear (נְבָאָה), “As the Lord lives!” in truth, in justice, and in uprightness, then nations shall be blessed by him (נְבָאָה), and by him (נְבָאָה) they shall boast.
Throughout vv1-2a, Israel is addressed by 2sgM forms (e.g. `שבך`) holding the 2pPos. However in v2b the addressing shifts suddenly in 3sgM forms (e.g. `בו`). As the shift cannot be due to a quotation from Gen 22:18 – if that would have been the case we would not have any P-shift here\(^{612}\) - it rather seems that the purpose lies in the effects of the shift on the reading process; namely that the promise of God is of objective quality and can truly be expected if a positive response is given to the dialogical 2P section. The P-shift then, does not cause a DSC-shift as YHWH holds the 1pPos both in v1 and v2.

Jer 44:4-5 contains a similar case:

4 Yet I persistently sent to you (нные) all my servants the prophets, saying, “I beg you not to do this abominable thing that I hate!”

5 And they did not listen (שמעת) or incline (שקעת) their ear, to turn from their wickedness (崧עת) and make no offerings to other gods.

In v4a, the 2pPos is explicitly held by the people of God. However, in v5a the reference has shifted into a 3plM forms. The beginning of v5 (“And they...”) connects back to the previous clauses and describes the consequences of and responses to the initial activity of God described in v4! The 3P section stands as if it is an in-disputable fact that does not allow any dialogue (2P) any more.

Something similar can be observed in Jer 8:8-9:

8 How can you say (מהора),
in fact, see, lying has been done by the false pen of the scribes!

9 The wise shall be put to shame, they shall be dismayed and taken; since they have rejected the word of the Lord, what wisdom is in them?

The beginning of v8 creates the impression of starting a directive communication (“how can you say”) with a 2P participant referring to the scribes. But the discourse shifts directly into a distant communication with the participant in v8b (“lying has been done by the false pen of the scribes”) in order to judge and comment the content of the quotation in “we are wise...”. In the further discourse of v9, this distant communication is continued in order to contrast the direct quotation of the participant with the Lord’s prophetic perspective (“The wise shall be put to shame ...”).

The architecture of vv8-9, then, leaves the impression that YHWH introduces his prophetic description of judgment over the convict by first addressing him personally. The judgment, then, is presented in a dynamic way in a dialogue setting.

Jer 13:23-25 further illustrates how subjectivization and objectivization relate to each other:

22 And if you say in your heart,
Why have these things come upon me?”
it is for the greatness of your iniquity that your skirts are lifted up, and you are violated.

23 Can Ethiopians change their skin or leopards their spots?
Then also you (сильך) can do (ילתך) good who are accustomed to do evil.

24 I will scatter them (בהף) like chaff driven by the wind from the desert.

25 This is your lot (חלה), the portion I have measured out to you (מדיה), says the Lord, because you have forgotten me and trusted in lies.

26 I myself will lift up your skirts (שלח) over your face (נעור), and your shame (בינון) will be seen.

---

\(^{612}\) Gen 22:18
After the leopard metaphor in v23a, the people are addressed by 2plM forms (וגם). This changes in v24 where YHWH pronounces the judgment he will bring over his people referring to them by a 3plM form (ויכל) instead of a 2plM form. This interruption becomes more surprising when in v25 the nation, as convict, is again addressed in the 2Pos (by 2sgF forms). Interestingly, due to the P-shift, there is a focus-shift in the discourse. The 3P section describes the judgment that will come over the nation as an objective fact, while the 2P section before introduces the judgment by rhetorical questions and explains the justified judgment in the 2P-section following to the nation in a personal way.

The tendency to shift into 3P forms when describing future events as factual and not negotiable to a participant that has been addressed by 2P forms within the same DSC can be seen more often, for example in Jer 46:27-28:

27 But as for you (הנה), my servant Jacob, and do not be dismayed (חשי), O Israel; for I am going to save you (מעשׂו) from far away, and your offspring (בנה) from the land of their captivity. Jacob shall return (שב) and have quiet and ease, and no one shall make him afraid.

28 As for you (הנה), my servant Jacob, says the Lord, for I am with you (כן) . I will make an end of all the nations among which I have banished you (נשׁחתה), but I will not make an end of you ( למען)! I will chastise you (חרץ) in just measure, and I will by no means leave you unpunished (אני).

While both Jacob and Israel are addressed by 2sgM forms in v27b and throughout v28 by means of predicates (e.g. חשי), suffixes (e.g. בנה) and pronouns (e.g. לישראל), v27b predicates Jacob in a 3sgM form (שב). The 3sgM section differs from the 2sgM section as it focuses on the redemptive result or state, thus emphasizing the future of Jacob/Israel as nation; whereas the 2sgM sections focus on the redemptive process and activity, thus emphasizing the relational process of YHWH with Jacob/Israel as counterpart.

Further, the 2P sections express much more emotional vocabulary (e.g. do not fear, I am with you) while the 3P section chooses objective vocabulary (e.g. absence of 1P). Likewise, the passage in Jer 30:10-11 shifts into 3P references to a formerly 2P addressed participant when a future result of redemption becomes part of the discourse:

10 “So do not fear, O Jacob my servant; do not be dismayed, O Israel,’ declares the Lord. ‘I will surely save you out of a distant place, your descendants from the land of their exile.

Jacob will return (שב) and he have peace (שלום) and he will not worry (שלום), and no one will make him afraid.

11 I am with you and will save you,’ declares the Lord. ‘Though I completely destroy all the nations among which I scatter you, I will not completely destroy you. I will discipline you but only with justice; I will not let you go entirely unpunished.’

In a similar way Jer 34:17-21 operates:

12 Therefore, thus says the Lord:

You (stants) have not obeyed (מעשיו) me by granting a release to your neighbors and friends; I am going to grant a release to you (שב), says the Lord, a release to the sword, to pestilence, and to famine. I will make you (חטאת) a horror to all the kingdoms of the earth.

13 And those who transgressed my covenant and did not keep (ようになった) the terms of the covenant that they made (краת) before me, I will make like the calf when they cut it in two and passed between its parts:
In v17 God’s people hold the 2pPos (2plM forms). In vv18-20, it changes into 3plM forms (e.g. יָכְמוּ). However, in v21b the reference form shifts back into 2plM (םִּתיֵלָם). A comparison between the 2P and 3P sections suggests that a more objective character of judgment is gained by the 3P section as the dialogue partner (2pPos) is not available any more but puts into distance. The judgment becomes so certain that YHWH shifts from the dialogue with the convict to talking about the convict. Following that line of thinking the section of 3P forms can - to a certain extent- even be suggested to be the climax of the judgment talk in v17.

That a 3P section is used for argumentative purposes can be shown in Jer 17:12-13:

12 O glorious throne, exalted from the beginning, shrine of our sanctuary! O hope of Israel! O Lord! All who forsake you shall be put to shame; those who turn away from you shall be recorded in the underworld, for they have forsaken the fountain of living water, the Lord.

While vv12-13a address YHWH by 2sgM forms, he is referred to in v13b holding the 3pPos ("they have forsaken the Lord"). The particle י linking the 3P section with the 2P section introduces the argument/justification for the judgmental expressions in the previous clauses. As a consequence, the impression is created that the 3P section is used in order to achieve a more objective quality that justifies the subjective and rather emotional judgmental expressions.

Jer 3:14-18 shows a tendency to describe a future state by means of prophetic language rather in a 3P than in a 2P context:

14 Return (שובו), O faithless children, says the Lord, for I am a master over you (כככ); I will take you (אֲחָטֵב), one from a city and two from a family, and I will bring you (אֲחָטֵב) to Zion.
15 I will give you (לב) shepherds after my own heart, who will feed you (אֲחָטֵב) with knowledge and understanding.
16 And when you have multiplied (בו) and increased (וֹתֵב) in the land, in those days, says the Lord, they shall no longer say (רו"מ), "The ark of the covenant of the Lord." It will not raise above the heart, and they will not remember (רו"מ) it, and they will not care (קִנֶּה) for it, nor shall another one be made.
17 At that time Jerusalem shall be called the throne of the Lord, and all nations shall gather to it, to the presence of the Lord in Jerusalem, and they shall no longer stubbornly follow (לְכַלּא) their own evil heart (לב).
18 In those days the house of Judah shall join the house of Israel, and together they shall come from the land of the north to the land that I gave your ancestors for a heritage.

The above text passage contains 2plM references to the people of God in vv14-16a. However, in the second part of v16a, we find a 3plM reference (יָכְמוּ) to the people that seems to continue even after the DSC (e.g. יָכְמוּ). While the 2P section focuses on the future activities performed by the people, the 3P section describes the future attitude of the status, position or attitude the people will have. This
objectivization could at the same time function as shifting from one generation (the present one) to another generation (a former one) of the same people in v16b.

We have seen earlier that the use of metaphorical comparisons can influence the addressing of a participant. It seems that not only the N-shift can be influenced by metaphorical language but also the P-shift as found in Jer 5:24-28:

24 They do not say (ארם) in their hearts (_Froma),
   “Let us fear the Lord our God, who gives the rain in its season, the autumn rain and the spring rain, and keeps for us the weeks appointed for the harvest.”
25 Your iniquities (סוותיך) have turned these away, and your sins (חטאיכים) have deprived you (_subset) of good.
26 For scoundrels are found among my people; they take over the goods of others. Like fowlers they set a trap (שפכים); they catch (ехבים) human beings.
27 Like a cage full of birds, their houses ( необходимости) are full of treachery; therefore they have become great (לגדים) and they have become rich (טוענים).
28 They have grown fat () and sleek. They know no limits in deeds of wickedness; they do not judge with justice the cause of the orphan, to make it prosper, and they do not defend the rights of the needy.
29 Shall I not punish them for these things? says the Lord, and shall I not bring retribution on a nation such as this?

In v24 God’s people are referred to by 3plM forms (e.g. אמרה). This changes in v25 where they are addressed by 2plM suffixes (e.g.нятиеיך). At the moment where the fowler image is used in v26, the addressing shifts back into 3plM forms (e.g. ת锶יך).

Again v24 with its 3P section contains a “phenomenological”, objective description of God’s people while the 2P section in v25 brings the people closer into the DSC of YHWH explaining them the misfortune of their agricultural activity in a personal way. This intimation, however, is given up in the following verses where the metaphorical comparison initiates an objectivization of God’s people.

Our hypothesis about subjectivization and objectivization is strongly supported by the above examples but still need to “control” our thesis on the basis of the MPS distribution.

5.4.2.9 P-shifts: indicating 1P centric SS-shifts within a DSC

We have seen that PNG-shifts can indicate a DSC-shift. Excluding the cases of objectivization and subjectivization, ending a specific SS and starting a new SS has, so far, been equivalent with going from the one DSC to the other. However, among 2P-3P/3P-2P shifts there are many cases where this equation cannot necessarily be applied. In these cases, our hypothesis is that the SS-shift does not automatically cause a DSC-shift.

When a DSC-shift takes place, the speaker, holding the 1pPos, and the addressee, holding the 2pPos, usually change. In the cases of “1P centric SS-shifts” it is only the addressee that changes, not the speaker in his/her 1pPos. Furthermore, two different participants hold the 2pPos position and subsequently both stand in the same “physical” communicational distance to the speaker. Since the 1pPos is not effected by the SS-shift, we speak of an “1P centric SS-shift”.
Jer 6:6-8 contains such a case:

6 For thus says the Lord of hosts:
Cut down (תֵּ NSNumber) her trees (עֵץ); cast up (ﬠֹﬠִּﬠִﬠ) a siege ramp against Jerusalem.
This (ܢHighest) is the city that must be punished; there is nothing but oppression
within her (לֹּﬠ Phonetic).

7 As a well keeps its (מַﬠֵﬠ Phonetic) water fresh, so she keeps fresh (ﬠֵﬠ Phonetic) her wickedness
(כֶﬠ Phonetic); violence and destruction are heard within her (בּ Phonetic); sickness and wounds
are ever before me.

8 Take warning (לָﬠ Phonetic), O Jerusalem, or I shall turn from you (סָﬠ Phonetic) in disgust, and
make you (לָﬠ Phonetic) a desolation, an uninhabited land.
Thus says the Lord of hosts:
Glean thoroughly as a vine the remnant of Israel; like a grape-gatherer, pass
your hand again over its branches.

After the DSI in v6, the reader expects YHWH as speaker of the following verses (vv6b-8). This
expectation is met in v7 as well as in v8 where 1P references are present. Throughout vv6-8, the 1pPos,
then, is constantly held by YHWH. It is the DSI in v9a that changes the P-position of YHWH (3pPos) and
demarcates also the end of the direct speech of vv6b-8.

While the 1pPos remains stable, the 2pPos changes during the direct speech of vv6b-8. In vv6b-7 the
assaulter of Jerusalem is addressed by 2P forms (e.g. לָﬠ Phonetic) and Jerusalem holds the 3pPos being referred to
by 3sgF forms (e.g. בּ Phonetic). In v8, however, Jerusalem suddenly holds the 2pPos being referred to by 2sgF
forms (e.g. לָﬠ Phonetic).

The larger setting of chap 6 offers a reason for this “distancing” and “bringing close” of different
participants within one direct speech. In vv18-19 it seems that all the different groups of the whole earth
are present and potentially available as 2P communication partner of YHWH while at the same time
standing in the same “physical” distance to him:

18 Therefore hear, O nations, and know, O congregation, what will happen to them.
19 Hear, O earth; I am going to bring disaster on this people, the fruit of their
schemes, because they have not given heed to my words; and as for my teaching,
they have rejected it.

While YHWH is the center of the direct speech, he addresses the different participants, giving
commands and counsel. The rhetoric effect is a certain simultaneity of cause and effect. The fact that the
warning communicated to Jerusalem in v8 takes place simultaneously with the command to the oppressor
to besiege Jerusalem in v6b-7 illustrates vividly the seriousness of the situation: There is not any time left
to decide anymore, judgment is not any longer foretold, it is executed in this moment.

A similar case can be found in Jer 5:7-10 where two different 2P/3P 613 participants are addressed while
the identity of the 1pPos remains the same:

7 How can I pardon you (לָﬠ Phonetic)? Your children (לָﬠ Phonetic) have forsaken me, and have sworn
by those who are no gods. When I fed them to the full, they committed adultery
and trooped to the houses of prostitutes.
8 They were well-fed lusty stallions, each neighing for his neighbor’s wife.
9 Shall I not punish them for these things? says the Lord; and shall I not bring
retribution on a nation such as this?
10 Go up (לָﬠ Phonetic) through her vine-rows (ﬠָﬠ Phonetic) and destroy (ﬠָﬠ Phonetic), but do not make
(ﬠָﬠ Phonetic) a full end; strip away (ﬠָﬠ Phonetic) her branches (ﬠָﬠ Phonetic), for they (ﬠָﬠ Phonetic) are
not the Lord’s.

613 Whether the participant is in the 2P or 3pPos depends on the chosen text-hierarchy.
Throughout all verses, YHWH keeps holding the 1pPos. In v7 God’s people are addressed in 2sgF forms (e.g. וְלֹ). In v10 two things take place: On the one hand the 2pPos is given to the assaulter of God’s people while the object of their assault is God’s people, which are suffixed by 3sgF forms (יהוּדָּה) and by a 3plC form (יהוּדָּה). 1P centric SS-shifts then establish as sort of theater situation, in which different participants appear and disappear on stage. The art of communication is also not a dialogue but much rather a “multilog”.

Similarly to our cases indicating DSC-shifts, the two examples here show that the 1P centric SS-shifts are also accompanied by imperatives, obviously functioning as indicators of the SS-shift.

5.4.2.10 P- SHIFT: PRAGMATICS

A pl imperative form directly followed by a pl cohortative is a common phenomenon in Jeremiah. In those cases, a pl participant is addressed by both forms (imperative [2P] and cohortative [1P]). Jer contains such a case:

14 Why do we (ואוה) sit still? Gather together (▾אוה), let us go (כָּבָא) into the fortified cities and perish there; for the Lord our God has doomed us to perish, and has given us poisoned water to drink, because we have sinned against the Lord.

In the first clause of v14 we find a 1plC pronoun (ואוה). However, the 1plC reference is interrupted by the 2plM imperative (כָּבָא) in the following clause that refers to the same participant. This becomes clear as the third clause (let us go into the...) resumes the 1plC reference of the first clause while simultaneously continuing the call of the imperative clause to the same participant.

Jer 51:9 serves as a further example:

9 We healed (אוה) Babylon, but she could not be healed. Forsake her (כָּבָא) and let us go (כָּבָא) everybody to his own country; for her judgment has reached up to heaven and has been lifted up even to the skies.

The first clause of v9 refers to – similarly to the case in Jer 8:14 – a participant in 1pPos (אוה). In the continuation of v9, we find an imperative clause (כָּבָא) followed by a cohortative clause (כָּבָא). Because of the semantic relation between בּוֹז and הָלֵךְ, the reader understands the 2plM and 1plC form referring to the same participant.

Jer 35:11 serves as a final example:

11 But when King Nebuchadrezzar of Babylon came up against the land, we said, ‘Come (וה), and let us go (כָּבָא) to Jerusalem for fear of the army of the Chaldeans and the army of the Arameans.’ That is why we are living in Jerusalem.”

The fact that the imperative (וה) and cohortative (כָּבָא) make use of the same lexeme, and the fact that the text function of both clauses (appeal) are identical show that the addressed participant is identical. The manifold cases of 2plM and 1plC equation by means of the described phenomenon (imperative-cohortative) suggests that it belongs to the language-pragmatics of OT Hebrew. Fifty percent of all cases,
however, are found in the book of Jeremiah. This can be explained on the basis of the many calls that are contained in the book of Jeremiah.

**5.4.2.11 G-shift: shifting relational role**

Within the category of G-shifts, we find cases in which a participant can be referred to both by M and F forms. Within the boundary of a sentence we have already given two examples. We have suggested that the origin for this shift could be found in the different social functions a participant performs within its relation to other participants. While some functions are related to a feminine gender (e.g. Israel the wife of YHWH), others are related to a masculine gender (e.g. Israel battles against Babel). Jer 3:12-13 clarifies how this shifting of relational roles is manifested:

12 Go, and proclaim these words toward the north, and say: Return (משבח), faithless Israel (ישראל), says the Lord.
I will not look on you (בוחר) in anger, for I am merciful, says the Lord; I will not be angry forever.
13 Only acknowledge (יודע) your guilt (פשע), that you have rebelled (פשעה) against the Lord your God (יוסף), and scattered (יתר) your ways (דרך) among strangers under every green tree, and you have not obeyed (שמעתי) my voice, says the Lord.

Besides the G-shift, the above text contains an N-shift as well. The shift combination (MPS) will be addressed later. In the 2pPos, a G-shift between the 2sgM cohortative of v12 (משבח) and the 2sgF predications and suffix in v13 (איה, שרי) is registered. As Israel is qualified as faithless (faithless=F) in the first clause of the DSC of v12, the reader can expect F predications and suffixes. Since not only the cohortative form משבח but also subsequent references to Israel are expressed in M the reader assumes that Israel can be referred to both by M and F forms. The rationale for the G-shift can be found in the relational role that Israel takes when addressed. In v12 Israel is clearly described not as a nation as such but as a marriage partner. Thus the relational function has changed with the F-addressing to Israel from being a nation to being the wife of God as appearing in different passages like 3:20:

20 Instead, as a faithless wife leaves her husband, so you have been faithless to me, O house of Israel, says the Lord.

Jer 48:27 contains another example where Israel is referred to both by M and F forms:

27 Israel was a laughingstock (יבש) for you, though she was not caught (תמכאה) among thieves; but whenever you spoke of him you shook your head!

In the first clause of v27, Israel is predicated by an M-form (יהוה). In the second clause, Israel is predicated by an F-form (יוסף). This grammatical in-congruence is solved by means of the qere suggestion (qere=יבשה). However, a comparison with the gender addressing of different nations like

---

64 A participant equation between 2plM imperatives and 1plC cohortatives can be found in the following verses throughout the OT: Gen: 37:20; 37:27; 1 Samuel: 9:9; 11:14; 2 Samuel 15:14; 2 Kings 7:4; Isaiah: 2:3; 2:5; Jeremiah: 4:5; 6:4; 6:5; 8:14; 18:18; 20:10; 31:6; 33:11; 48:2; 51:9; 51:10; Hosea 6:1; Obadiah 1; Micah 4:2; Psalm 83:5.

However, there are cases in which the DSI that precedes the DSC (while the DSC contains the order of 1st imperative and 2nd cohortative) could suggest that the 2plM and the 1plC forms do not necessarily refer to the same participant but the speaker of the DSC first excludes himself from the addressee by using 2plM imperatives and later includes himself in the addressee by using 1plC cohortatives. The following cases could suggest such a possibility: Gen: 42:2; 44:25-26; 1 Samuel 11:14; 2 Samuel 15:14; 2 Kings 7:9; Jonah 1:7; Nehemiah 2:17. Since none of these types can be found in Jeremiah one either needs to conclude that Jeremiah handles a different type or that he implicitly uses the same type as in the 7 cases listed here.
Moab\textsuperscript{645} or Babylon who are both referred to by F and M forms within one single DSC, proposes that something similar is possible with the participant “Israel”.

Jer 51:20-28 contains a case where Babylon is addressed by F as well as M forms:

13 You who live (שַׁבְעֵית) by mighty waters, rich in treasures, your end (נָעַר) has come, the thread of your life (מַעַן) is cut.
14 The Lord of hosts has sworn by himself: Surely I will fill you (מָלָאךְ) with troops like a swarm of locusts, and they shall raise a shout of victory over you (עֲלֵיהֶם).
[...]
15 I am against you (מְלַאכְךָ), O destroying mountain, says the Lord, that destroys the whole earth; I will stretch out my hand against you (נְעַר), and you roll you down (מַעַן) from the crags, and make you a burned-out (נַחַת) mountain.
16 No stone shall be taken from you (מְפֹקָד) for a corner and no stone for a foundation, but you shall be (קִזְבּוּ) a perpetual waste, says the Lord.

In vv13-14 we find Babylon addressed by 2sgF forms while in vv25-26 Babylon is addressed by 2sgM forms.

We have suggested that the different G-qualities of a participant can refer to its different relational functions. In those cases where a participant has different names, each of these names often emphasizes one of the different relational roles the participant holds. The different G quality of the names, then, can also have an effect upon the addressing of a particular participant as Jer 46:11-14 shows:

11 Go up (שָׁעַר) to Gilead, and take balm, O virgin daughter Egypt (בָּנוֹת הָעֲדָם). In vain you have used (עַרְבָּי) many medicines; there is no healing for you (רֹוק).
12 The nations have heard of your shame (כֹּל), and the earth is full of your cry (קְרֵי); for warrior has stumbled against warrior; both have fallen together.
13 The word that the Lord spoke to the prophet Jeremiah about the coming of King Nebuchadrezzar of Babylon to attack the land of Egypt:
14 Declare in Egypt, and proclaim in Migdol; proclaim in Memphis and Tahpanhes; Say, “Take your stand (כֹּל בָּנוֹת) and be you ready (יַחְדָּו), for the sword shall devour those around you (כְּבָר).”

In the above text passage, Egypt holds the 2pPos. A look at vv11-12 shows that Egypt is addressed by F forms (e.g. רֹוק). This changes with v14 where it is addressed by M forms (סָפַר). The explicit naming of Egypt as נָעַר in v11 explains why the references are of F-quality. The name emphasizes Egypt's vulnerability in its relation to its neighbors. Further the F addressee takes place in the context of YHWH speaking (cf. v5: נָעַר עַל) to Egypt as a father. In v14 the speaker shifts from YHWH to the prophet Jeremiah which brings also a shift in the social relation between speaker and addressed (Jeremiah is not the “father” of Egypt). While the speaker shift in v14 entails that Egypt is no longer explicitly named as נָעַר, the shift to M-forms could be explained by the matter of fact that Egypt is not any longer referred to via the metaphor “virgin daughter” but directly as a nation. Thus the different gender-qualities of the names of participants consequently affect the reference structure of a certain participant. It seems reasonable that certain names of participants are used only by specific speakers, since the relational status of a participant differs in the diverse communicational settings.

\textsuperscript{645} See 5.4.1.7
5.4.2.12 G-SHIFT: INDICATING DSC-SHIFTS

We have already seen some examples where P- and N-shift indicate DSC-shifts. Although not common, G-shifts appear to have similar effects as seen in Jer 26:18-19:

18 “Micah of Moresheth, who prophesied during the days of King Hezekiah of Judah, said to all the people of Judah: ‘Thus says the Lord of hosts, Zion shall be plowed (שָׁנֵה) as a field; Jerusalem shall become (שָׁמַע) a heap of ruins, and the mountain of the house a wooded height.’

19 Did King Hezekiah of Judah and all Judah actually put him (שָׁמַע) to death? Did he not fear (אָשָׁר) the Lord and entreat the favor of the Lord, and did not the Lord change his mind (לֶךֶר) about the disaster that he had pronounced against them? But we are about to bring great disaster on ourselves!”

The 3pPos is referred to by both sgF and sgM forms. While the 3sgF forms in v18b refer to Zion the 3sgM forms in v19 refer to Micah. The reader concludes this on the basis of the following considerations:
(1) Micah is referred earlier in v19a by 3sgM forms which could mean that the SS of v19 is identical with the SS of v18a. (2) The absence of Zion and Jerusalem in v19 hints at a different DSC compared to v18b. (3) An interrogative clause as we find it in the beginning of v19 often accompanies a DSC-shift. G-shifts, then, can help indicating DSC-shifts.

5.4.2.13 G-SHIFT: SCRIBAL ERROR

In two cases we regard it as likely that a G-shift must be interpreted as a scribal error and therefore belongs to the textual being-aspect “reception and transmission”.

Jer 28:10:

10 Then the prophet Hananiah took the yoke (מֻנְתָה) from the neck of the prophet Jeremiah, and broke it (בַּשָּׁמַע).

The yoke in v10 belongs to the F-class of nouns. However, the suffix in the second clause of v10 (בַּשָּׁמַע) is masculine. Following the suggestion of CA in reading a F suffix (בַּשָּׁמַע) makes good sense.

Jer 44:25:

25 Thus says the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel:
You and your wives (שְׁנִי) have accomplished (נָשָׁפָה) in deeds what you declared in words, saying,
‘We are determined to perform the vows that we have made, to make offerings to the queen of heaven and to pour out libations to her.’
By all means, keep your vows and make your libations!

We assume that the 2plF predication in the second clause of v25 (נָשָׁפָה) is mistaken. The predication should have the 2plM form as normal compound subjects do. It is possible that the scribe was influenced by the presence of the שְׁנִי (your wives) as last part of the compound subject placed just before the predication.

5.4.3 CONCLUSION

We have seen with regard to the SPSs that N-shifts placed within the boundary of a sentence are most of the time of a normative quality and seem to have clear functions. Our analysis of the distribution of G- and P-shifts on the text-level has created the same result: The different types of participant reference-shifts reveal patterns that seem to be governed by regularity. Our hypothesis is that these rules originate in the textual being-aspect “language” (N-shifts on sentence-level [e.g. sg=pl]), “discourse” (P-shifts and N-shifts
on text-level [e.g. indicating DSC-shift]) and “teleology” (P-shifts, G-shifts on text-level [e.g. objectivization, shifting of relational role]).

Consequently, with regard to SPSs, the coherence of the text of Jeremiah is - generally speaking - not disturbed by participant reference-shifts on the sentence-level nor on the text-level. Due to the systematism of PNG-shifts they should be rather regarded as supporting and constructing the unity of the text. A few minor exceptions⁶¹⁶ support this conclusion.

Our analysis of SPSs generates many classifications allowing a deeper insight in the phenomena as such and their function in particular. In our opinion, the investigation of the different SPSs has created a rather clear perspective on the divers possible functions. As the above graph shows, all three positions (P, N, G) can cause a DSC-shift. Further, all positions have some cases that reflect scribal errors. Besides this, both P- and N-shifts can be expressions of pragmatic norms and can cause 1P centric SS-shifts. The rest of our suggested functions is of such a specific nature that they can only be assigned to one specific position-shift:

- P-shift: Self-reference, objectivization/subjectivization, idioms
- N-shift: sg=pl, extension/condensation
- G-shift: Relational role

Most of the SPSs are within the P- and N- position. While most of the N-shifts are explained by pragmatics, most of the P-shifts indicate DSC-shifts. A complete overview on the functional distribution shows that the DSC-shift is predominantly followed directly by those shifts that can be explained pragmatically. After those two classifications follow “sg=pl”, “self-reference” and the category of “objectivization”. The functions “relational-role” and “extension/condensation” do not appear that frequently. The classification “scribal error” is least frequent.

A further important observation we have made is that DSC-shifts, 1P centric SS-shifts, as well as the objectivization and subjectivization shifts are not triggered by a SPS alone but mostly occur with a context of different phenomena:

---

⁶¹⁶ See 5.4.1.3, 5.4.2.13.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPS</th>
<th>contextual phenomena</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DSC-shift</td>
<td>At the front of the clause containing the SPS stands:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Interrogation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-&gt;<em>לע</em> or יכ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Interjection like <em>לע</em> or יכ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Imperatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Way-clause disrupting the previous discursive clause-types</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Explicit introduction of a participant (often already present in the previous DSC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Further phenomena accompanying the SPS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The SS must be different to the SS of the previous DSC. Often this can be a complete reversal of the previous SS (2P becomes 3P and 3P becomes 2P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- lpPos is allocated to a different participant compared to the previous DSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Identical SS can be found in the text section that stands before the previous DSC and is not part of it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Semantic parallels with text section that stands before the previous DSC and is not part of it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Time markers proofing a temporal distance to the previous DSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Absence of a participant that is present in the previous DSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- DSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1P centric SS-shift within DSC</td>
<td>The identity of the lpPos remains the same in the different SSs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Despite the fact that the SS which the SPS is part of is different to the SS of the previous DSC, the participants can have the identical communicational distance to the speaker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Imperatives at the front of the clause containing the SPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Reverse of previous SS (2P becomes 3P and vice versa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectivization</td>
<td>The identity of the lpPos remains the same in the different SSs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Similar/related content in both SSs; often the 2P section contains the same theme but has more emotional vocabulary while the 3P section contains more fact-oriented vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 3P section is often in judgment/prediction context and can form the climax of a passage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 2p section is often in an explanatory and appealing context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- יכ can introduce the 3P section as argument for the emotional expressions found in the 2P section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjectivization</td>
<td>The identity of the lpPos remains the same in the different SSs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Similar/related content in both SSs; often the 2P section contains the same theme but has more emotional vocabulary while the 3P section contains more fact-oriented vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 3P section is often in judgment/prediction context and can form the climax of a passage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 2p section is often in an explanatory and appealing context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- יכ can introduce the 2P section for explaining the judgment described in the 3P section</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In many cases, not all contextual phenomena are present but usually, by means of the presence of more than one phenomenon the reader can conclude that the present SPS can be assigned to one of the four functions (DSC-shift, 1P centric SS-shift, objectivization, subjectivization).

### 5.5 Interpretation of “Multiple Position Shift” (MPS)

Our interpretation of participant reference-shifts is not complete without analyzing the distribution of MPSs. With MPS we mean those shifts where a combination of the N-, G- and P-position shifts; at least two of the three positions need to shift. Since our database regards common forms as a specific G value also 1sgC-3sgM shifts (e.g. “I have announced against you” - “spoke the Lord”) are strictly speaking considered as MPS-shift. However, since such a strict understanding would contradict the *ad sensum* state of affairs, we have decided to regard a shift from common forms to masculine/feminine forms and vice versa as non-shifts.
Our phenomenological reading registered a substantial amount of 151 MPSs in contrast to 585 overall shifts. A critical comparison of SPSs and MPSs either weakens or strengthens our hypotheses about the various SPSs.

However, our study on MPSs uncovers patterns that mirror our SPS findings. The functional SPS-categories outlined above appear in combinations when a single MPS is present. Jer 2:14-17 serves as an example:

14 Is Israel a slave? Is he (הוא) a homeborn servant? Why then has he become (ה) plunder?
15 The lions have roared against him (יו ל), they have roared loudly. They have made his land (溹) a waste; his cities (יו צ) are in ruins, without inhabitant.
16 Moreover, the people of Memphis and Tahpanhes have shaved you (יו מל) bold.
17 Have you not done (יהי) this unto yourself (ך) by forsaking the Lord your God (ישראל), while he led you (ך גו) in the way?

In vv14-15, Israel is referred to by 3sgM forms (e.g. הוא) whereas it is addressed by 2sgF forms (e.g.しかי) in vv16-17. It is on the level of P (3P-2P) as well as on the level of G (M-F) where we detect the shifting. The G-shift puts Israel again back into the wife/covenant partner image that has already been used in the beginning of the chapter (v2) and thus functions on the level of shifting its “relational-role”. In our opinion, the P-shift functions as “subjectivization” since it brings the people who are objectively described in vv14-15 into a SS where a direct address (vv16-17) is established.

The “subjectivization” can be regarded as the dominant function in comparison with the “relational-role” shifting, since we think that the SS-shift is caused more by the P- than by the G-shift. Depending on the shift of the three formal elements P, N, and G, different functional categories are activated. The following table displays the different combinations of functions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>P (1,2,3)</th>
<th>N (sg,pl)</th>
<th>G (C,M,F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>DSC-shift</td>
<td>DSC-shift</td>
<td>DSC-shift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>function</td>
<td>1P centric SS-shifts</td>
<td>1P centric SS-shifts</td>
<td>shifting relational role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>self-reference</td>
<td>pragmatics</td>
<td>scribal error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>objectivization</td>
<td>sg=pl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>subjectivization</td>
<td>extension/condensation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pragmatics</td>
<td>idiomatics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>scribal error</td>
<td>scribal error</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although MPSs always function in at least two different categories, we believe that in most cases one of the functions is more dominant (e.g. subjectivization is more dominant than the shift of relational-role). This allows to index each MPS in terms of its most dominant functional category.

The results of our investigation of MPSs show that the diverse hypotheses derived from our SPS study are supported. As MPSs support the outcome of our SPS-analysis we emphasize the idea that the book of Jeremiah reveals on sentence- as well as on discourse-level a normative use of PNG-shifts. PNG-shifts are, then, not to be regarded as a problem for the text to become a text. On the contrary, they fundamentally contribute to the being of the text and its readability. The following paragraphs provide for each suggested PNG-shift function a selection of examples that clarify that our SPS-hypotheses are supported by the distributional analysis of the more complex MPSs.
5.5.1 Indicating DSC-shift (SS=DSC)

Most of the MPSs function as indicators of DSC-shifts. Here, the change of the SS initiated by the MPS results in a change of the DSC. We have seen that generally a participant reference-shift is not the only sign by which a DSC-shift can be recognized but rather functions as a “co-marker” together with other signals. As it is to be expected that the strongest signal initiating a DSC-shift is a DSI. Cases like Jer 29:8-10 can be found en masse:

8 For thus says the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel: Do not let the prophets and the diviners who are among you deceive you, and do not listen to the dreams that they dream,
9 for it is a lie that they are prophesying to you in my name; I did not send them, says the Lord.
10 For thus says the Lord: Only when Babylon’s seventy years are completed will I visit you, and I will fulfill to you my promise and bring you back to this place.

In v10 we find YHWH referred to in 3sgM. This then indicates a shift from the previous addressing of YHWH as 1sgC in v9. The fact that v10a contains a DSI and that the SS of this DSI is identical with the DSI in v8a establishes the same DSC level between v10a and v8a. Therefore, v10a clearly signals a DSC-shift with regard to v9.

Later in the chapter in vv15-16, we find the combination between DSI as well as an SS that is identical with a previous SS by which a DSC is indicated:

10 For thus says the Lord: Only when Babylon’s seventy years are completed will I visit you (אבתה), and I will fulfill to you my promise and bring you (עליבום) back to this place. [...]
11 I will let you (כָּל) find me, says the Lord, and I will restore your fortunes (пущен) and gather you (שכינה) from all the nations and all the places where I have driven you (듯ת), says the Lord, and I will bring you (כותב) back to the place from which I sent you (אבתה) into exile.
12 Because you ( zostaćים) have said, “The Lord has raised up prophets for us (לע) in Babylon,”—
13 Thus says the Lord concerning the king who sits on the throne of David, and concerning all the people who live in this city, your brothers (ראשיכים) who did not go out with you (אבתה) into exile:

In v15b the exiles hold the 1pPos (לע) while in v16b it is 2pPos (e.g. נ続いて). This shift is caused by a DSC-shift introduced in v16a with a DSI. Further, the addressing of the Golah in v16b is identical with the one in vv10b-15a proposing a return to the upper DSC-level.

When a DSC-shift is not indicated by a DSI, we find elements that often co-occur with a DSI. These elements can be imperatives, vocatives, interrogatives, or particles like יכ or לה. In the following five subdivisions we show how these elements help to indicate a DSC-shift in the absence of a DSI.

5.5.1.1 Imperatives as DSC-shift indicator

Imperative expressions are common openers of direct speeches (see Appendix-A: SESB screenshot no8). In Jeremiah we find more than 30 cases in which an imperative form starts the DSC after a DSI617 and six

---

cases in which an infinitive absolute – functioning as an imperative – opens the DSC after a DSI. In Jer 31:7, we find one of these cases in which a DSI is followed directly by couple of imperative clauses:

6 For there shall be a day when sentinels will call in the hill country of Ephraim: “Come, let us go up to Zion, to the Lord our God.”
7 For thus says the Lord: Sing aloud with gladness for Jacob, and raise shouts for the chief of the nations; proclaim, give praise, and say, “Save, O Lord, your people, the remnant of Israel.”

This phenomenon is also representative for the larger OT where we find about 700 cases while most of them are present in the narrative sections. Our analysis shows therefore that imperative forms can also function in the absence of a DSI as a DSC-opener signaling that a DSC is superseded by another one. The following cases give an overview on this phenomenon:

Jer 18:18-21

18 Then they said, “Come, let us plot against Jeremiah — for instruction shall not perish from the priest, nor counsel from the wise, nor the word from the prophet. Come, let us bring charges against him, and let us not heed any of his words.”
19 Give heed to me, O Lord, and listen to what my adversaries say!
20 Is evil a recompense for good? Yet they have dug a pit for my life. Remember how I stood before you to speak good for them, to turn away your wrath from them.
21 Therefore give their children over to famine; hurl them out to the power of the sword, let their wives become childless and widowed. May their men meet death by pestilence, their youths be slain by the sword in battle.

The imperatives in v19 refer to a different participant than the formal identical ones in v18. Further, there is a clear distinction between the participants holding the 1pPos and 2pPos in v18 (2pPos: Enemies of YHWH and 1pPos: Jeremiah; 2pPos: YHWH). In addition, the content of vv19ff seems to be a clear response to the thoughts expressed in v18. With these observations the reader interprets the imperative in v19 as indicating a DSC-shift.

Jer 2:23 illustrates another case where imperative forms open a new DSC without a preceding DSI:

23 How can you say, “I am not defiled, I have not gone after the Baals”? Look at your way in the valley; know what you have done— a restive young camel interlacing her tracks, a wild ass at home in the wilderness, in her heat sniffing the wind! Who can restrain her lust? None who seek her need weary themselves; in her month they will find her.

In v23a we find God's people in the 2pPos. The subsequent DSC gives the 1pPos to the people. When in v23b the imperative forms appear the reader knows that he is back on the DSC-level of the DSI in v23a (how can you say). The reason for this conclusion is found in the combination of the imperative forms that function here as a DSC-shift indicator, and the SS that is established in v24 as it is identical to the SS in the DSI in v23a.

---

618 Gesenius and Kautzsch, §113bb.
In Jer 4:11-14, the imperative of v14 signals a DSC-shift without the presence of a DSI:

14 At that time it will be said to this people and to Jerusalem: A hot wind comes from me out of the bare heights in the desert toward the daughter of my people, not to winnow or cleanse—
15 a wind too strong for that. Now it is I who speak in judgment against them (יִהְיֶהוּ). (וְ) 16 Look! He comes up like clouds, his chariots like the whirlwind; his horses are swifter than eagles— woe to us (וַעֲשֶׂלוּ), for we are ruined (שָׁרָדְו)! 17 Wash your heart (שָׁלַשׁ), clean of wickedness, o Jerusalem, so that you may be saved. How long shall your evil schemes lodge within you?

In vv11-12, Jerusalem and its people hold the 3pPos ((skור). In v13v – due to the direct speech of the people – the position shifts into 1P. In v14 the previous DSC abruptly ends with an imperative (בכש) and re-addresses Jerusalem with the 2pPos opening a new DSC.

5.5.1.2 Vocatives as DSC-shift indicator

A DSC-shift is also often indicated by the presence of a vocative. In Jer 38:8-9 a vocative starts a DSC while being announced by a DSI:

8 So Ebed-melech left the king’s house and spoke to the king,
9 “My lord king (אריהם), these men have acted wickedly in all they did to the prophet Jeremiah by throwing him into the cistern to die there of hunger, for there is no bread left in the city.”

However, there are cases in which a DSI is absent and the presence of a vocative is the only indicator that suggests a DSC-shift. This is the case in Jer 16:16-19:

16 I am now sending for many fishermen, says the Lord, and they shall catch them; and afterward I will send for many hunters, and they shall hunt them from every mountain and every hill, and out of the clefts of the rocks.
17 For my eyes are on all their ways; they are not hidden from my presence, nor is their iniquity concealed from my sight.
18 And I will doubly repay their iniquity and their sin, because they have polluted my land with the carcasses of their detestable idols, and have filled my inheritance with their abominations.
19 O Lord, my strength and my stronghold, my refuge in the day of trouble (יהוה צדך, ישותי, חכם הער), to you shall the nations come from the ends of the earth and say: Our ancestors have inherited nothing but lies, worthless things in which there is no profit.

In vv16-18, YHWH is identified with the 1pPos. In v19 YHWH is identified with the 2pPos addressed by means of a vocative (יהוה ויבשא נאם ב ücret). Consequently, it is this vocative form that introduces the new SS and signals the DSC-shift together with the participant reference-shift.

We find a similar case in Jer 17:10-12:

10 I the Lord test the mind and search the heart, to give to all according to their ways, according to the fruit of their doings.
11 Like the partridge hatching what it did not lay, so are all who amass wealth unjustly; in mid-life it will leave them, and at their end they will prove to be fools.
12 O glorious throne, exalted from the beginning, shrine of our sanctuary! (שם יבוש ממל產品 ממקהש) 13 O hope of Israel! O Lord! ( commodo ישראל תמים) All who forsake you (ונברך) shall be put to shame; those who turn away shall be recorded in the underworld, for they have forsaken the fountain of living water, the Lord.

In v10, the 1pPos is held by YHWH. In vv12-13, the identity of the 1pPos has changed by means of two vocatives (בכש בברל, commodo ישראל יִהְיֶה) into the 2pPos. It makes most sense to the reader to identify with the 1plC suffix in v12 (מכשור) with the people. YHWH is referred to by 2sgM forms, thus holding the 2pPos.
The use of vocative forms for explicitly forming a new SS, suggests to the reader that a new DSC has been introduced.

Jer 20:6-7 contains a further example:

4 For thus says the Lord: I am making you a terror to yourself and to all your friends; and they shall fall by the sword of their enemies while you look on. And I will give all Judah into the hand of the king of Babylon; he shall carry them captive to Babylon, and shall kill them with the sword.
5 I will give all the wealth of this city, all its gains, all its prized belongings, and all the treasures of the kings of Judah into the hand of their enemies, who shall plunder them, and seize them, and carry them to Babylon.
6 And you, Pashhur, and all who live in your house, shall go into captivity, and to Babylon you shall go; there you shall die, and there you shall be buried, you and all your friends, to whom you have prophesied falsely.
7 You have enticed me (יְנַעַת), O Lord, and I was enticed; you have overpowered me, and you have prevailed. I have become a laughingstock all day long; everyone mocks me.

In v6 as well as in v7, we find a vocative. The vocative in v6 does not seem to break the preceding DSC as the SS between vv4-5 and v6 are identical. This is different from the vocative in v7. Although the vocative does not stand at the very beginning of the new DSC (preceded by יְנַעַת), it contributes to the indication of the DSC-shift. The vocative strengthens the repositioning of YHWH as he holds the 2pPos in v7 and no longer the 1pPos. The vocative in v7 consequently contrasts the vocative in v6 signaling the reader that there is a DSC-shift.

A DSC-shift can be signaled by a vocative that does not take the first position of a clause as Jer 14:2-7 shows:

2 Judah mourns and her gates languish; they lie in gloom on the ground, and the cry of Jerusalem goes up.
3 Her nobles send their servants for water; they come to the cisterns, they find no water, they return with their vessels empty. They are ashamed and dismayed and cover their heads,
4 because the ground is cracked. Because there has been no rain on the land the farmers are dismayed; they cover their heads.
5 Even the doe in the field forsakes her newborn fawn because there is no grass. The wild asses stand on the bare heights, they pant for air like jackals; their eyes fail because there is no herbage.
6 Although our iniquities (יֶנִּיעַת) testify against us, O Lord, act, for your name’s sake; our apostasies (משׁבְּתֵבָת) indeed are many, and we have sinned (אָנָּנוּ צֶּרֶת) against you.

In vv2-6, there is neither a 1pPos nor a 2pPos. In a descriptive way, the situation of the country with its inhabitants (whether men or animals) is reviewed. In the 3pPos, different participants find their places: the people, farmers, king, mighty ones, gates, Jerusalem, etc. With this SS in background, v7 is disruptive. Suddenly, a 1pPos is introduced and identified with the people (יְנַעַת - perhaps Jeremiah is speaker and identifies with the 1pIC group) who have been referred to in 3P previously, further YHWH is addressed in the 2pPos by means of a vocative.

However, it is unusual for a vocative to indicate a DSC-shift in a later position in the clause. Usually, the vocative is positioned as one of the first elements of the clause.

5.5.1.3 Interrogatives as DSC-shift indicator

As we have seen, imperatives can signal the beginning of new DSCs together with DSIs but also in the absence of DSIs. In a similar way, interrogatives can function as DSC-shift indicators in combination with
a DSI but also in absence of a DSI. In Jer 32:3, we find a case where a DSC-shift is introduced by a DSI
(Zedekiah had said) and opened by means of an interrogative (נִשְׁגֹּד):

where King Zedekiah of Judah had confined him. Zedekiah had said,
"Why (נִשְׁגֹּד) do you prophesy and say: Thus says the Lord: I am going to give this
city into the hand of the king of Babylon, and he shall take it;

However, in many cases, an interrogative opens a new DSC without being preceded by a DSI. The
following examples clarify this phenomenon:

In Jer 2:35-36, an interrogation introduces a DSC without the presence of a DSI:

you say, “I am innocent; surely his anger has turned from me.” Now I am
bringing you to judgment for saying, “I have not sinned (נִשְׁגֹּד).”

How (נִשְׁגֹּד) lightly you gad (נסח) about, changing your way (נָשָׁפַת)! You shall be put
to shame (נִשְׁגֹּד) by Egypt as you were put to shame by Assyria.

The 1pPos in the last DSC of v35b is held by God’s people (נִשְׁגֹּד). However, in v36, they are
addressed by 2sgF forms (e.g. המְדֹח). This shift from 1P to 2P is introduced by the use of the interrogative
נִשְׁגֹּד opening a new DSC. In addition to the interrogative, the reader finds his understanding of the new
DSC situation confirmed as the SS of v36 is identical with the SS of the DSIs in v35 (“you say”, “Now I am
bringing you to judgment for saying”) that introduce the speaking of the people.

Jer 31:18-20:

Indeed I heard Ephraim pleading: “You disciplined me (נִשְׁגֹּד), and I took the
discipline; I was like a calf untrained. Bring me back (נִשְׁגֹּד), and I will
return, for you are the Lord my God (נִשְׁגֹּד לֹא אֲזַנְתִּי).

For after I had turned away I repented; and after I was discovered, I struck my
thigh; I was ashamed, and I was dismayed because I bore the disgrace of my
youth.”

Is (נִשְׁגֹּד) Ephraim my dear son? Is he the child I delight in? As often as I speak
against him, I still remember him. Therefore I am deeply moved for him; I will
surely have mercy on him, says the Lord.

In vv18-19, YHWH is addressed in the 2pPos (e.g. לֹא אֲזַנְתִּי) while Ephraim holds the 1pPos.
However, in v20, the SS changes as YHWH holds the 1pPos and Ephraim the 3pPos. Together with this
shift, we find an interrogative נִשְׁגֹּד at the very beginning of the new SS. Supported by the fact that the SS of
v20 is identical with the earlier SS in v18 (“Indeed I heard Ephraim pleading”), the reader understands
that the DSC of vv18b-19 is left in v20 and the new DSC introduced by an interrogative.

Jer 23:25-26:

I have heard what the prophets have said who prophesy lies in my name, saying,
“I have dreamed, I have dreamed!”

How long (נִשְׁגֹּד)? Will the hearts of the prophets ever turn back—those who
prophesy lies, and who prophesy the deceit of their own heart?

In v26, the previous DSC (“I have dreamed, I have dreamed!”) is not continued. This is concluded
by the reader through different observations. First, v26 does not contain any explicit 1P -references any
longer. Second, a or any other conjunction lacks that would connect the first clause of v26 to the last
clause of v25. Third, following the communicational logic and the semantic structure of vv25-26 makes
clear that the SS of v26 must belong to the SS of v25a and not to the SS of v25b. Finally, the interrogative
נִשְׁגֹּד at the very beginning of v26 helps to indicate that the reader enters a new DSC in v26.
Jer 8:13-14:

13 When I wanted to gather them (םגpees), says the Lord, there are no grapes on the vine, nor figs on the fig tree; even the leaves are withered, and what I gave them (יםל) has passed away.

14 Why (הלむ) do we (קנת) sit still? Gather together, let us go (בואנ) into the fortified cities and perish there; for the Lord our God (לאלוהים) has doomed us (רדען) to perish, and has given us (יוישק) poisoned water to drink, because we (המשך) have sinned against the Lord.

The SS of v13 with YHWH in the 1pPos and the people in the 3pPos is set upside-down in v14 where the people hold the 1pPos and YHWH the 3pPos. The DSC-shift is indicated and introduced by the interrogative הלמה together with the participant reference-shift in v14a.

5.5.1.4 יכ PARTICLE AS DSC-SHIFT INDICATOR

Not only can imperative forms introduce a DSC but also particles like יכ. In Jer 2:35, the particle יכ stands at the beginning of a DSC that is introduced by a DSI:

35 you say, “Yes (יכ), I am innocent; surely his anger has turned from me.” Now I am bringing you to judgment for saying, “I have not sinned.”

Similarly, a יכ can introduce a DSC without the presence of a DSI.

Jer 23:17-18

17 They keep saying to those who despise the word of the Lord, “It shall be well with you”; and to all who stubbornly follow their own stubborn hearts, they say, “No calamity shall come upon you.”

18 Well (יכ), who has stood in the council of the Lord so as to see and to hear his word? Who has given heed to his word so as to proclaim it?

In v18, the DSC “No calamity shall come upon you.” of v17b is interrupted. The dissimilar content of v18 with regard to the last DSC of v17 clarifies this interruption. The new DSC is introduced by יכ which serves as an exclamation in this context. For the reader, it appears to function similarly as the previous case.

The יכ not only appears as an interjection/exclamation but also as having syntactical function. In this function it can also disrupt a DSC and start an new one that is often linked to a former DSC with an identical SS. Such a case is found in Jer 43:1-3:

1 When Jeremiah finished speaking to all the people all these words of the Lord their God, with which the Lord their God had sent him to them,

2 Azariah son of Hoshaijah and Johanan son of Kareah and all the other insolent men said to Jeremiah, “You are telling a lie. The Lord our God did not send you to say, ‘Do not go to Egypt to settle there’;

3 but (יכ) Baruch son of Neriah is inciting you against us, to hand us over to the Chaldeans, in order that they may kill us or take us into exile in Babylon.”

The last DSC of v2 “Do not go to Egypt to settle there” is interrupted by the use of יכ in v13. While the people hold the 2pPos in the last DSC of v2, they hold the 1pPos in v3. The same position is implicitly held by the people in “You are telling a lie. The Lord our God did not send you to say” in v2b. Thus, while the SS of v3 is incongruent with the last DSC of v2, it is coherent with the DSI of that last DSC of v2. The יכ introducing the new SS serves consequently as a first indicator of the new DSC.
Something similar is observed in Jer 27:16:

16 Then I spoke to the priests and to all this people, saying, Thus says the Lord:
Do not listen to the words of your prophets who are prophesying to you, saying,
“The vessels of the Lord’s house will soon be brought back from Babylon,” because
(יִהְיוּ) they are prophesying a lie to you.

From the perspective of the communicational logic of v16, the י of the last clause of v16 connects back to “Do not listen to the words of your prophets ...” supplying it with the necessary argument. Additionally, the SS of the י clause and the SS of v16a are identical.

י functions in a similar way in Jer 27:9-10:

9 “You, therefore, must not listen to your prophets, your diviners, your dreamers,
your soothsayers, or your sorcerers, who are saying to you, ‘You shall not serve
the king of Babylon.’
10 For (יִהְיוּ), they are prophesying a lie to you, with the result that you will be
removed far from your land; I will drive you out, and you will perish.

The last DSC of v9 “You shall not serve the king of Babylon” is interrupted by the use of י in v10. V10 contains a different SS as the 1pPos is implicitly held by the wrong prophets (“who are saying to you”) while the 1pPos is held by YHWH in v10 (“I will drive you out”). The SS of v10 also creates a coherence with the SS of v9a that functions as the DSI of “You shall not serve the king of Babylon”.

The particle י can be translated in different ways depending on the context. On a more general level, י can be translated as “fact is such and so”. It seems that on this general level, י has the potential to function as an indicator of a DSC-shift independent of its precise contextual meaning.

5.5.1.5 הָנְנִי PARTICLE AS DSC-SHIFT INDICATOR

In several cases, the DSC is introduced by a form of הָנְנִי after the DSC has been announced by a DSI. e.g. Jer 1:9:

9 Then the Lord put out his hand and touched my mouth; and the Lord said to me,
“Behold I ( Annunci) have put my words in your mouth.

הָנְנִי, however, can introduce a new DSC without a preceding DSI. The following examples show this:

Jer 2:35:

35 you say, “I am innocent; surely his anger has turned from me.”
See I ( Annunci) am bringing you to judgment for saying, “I have not sinned.”

In the DSC of v35a, God's people hold the 1pPos while YHWH holds the 3pPos. This SS changes in the second part of v35 where YHWH suddenly holds the 1pPos and the people the 2pPos. The DSC-shift that comes with this SS-shift is introduced by הָנְנִי.

A similar case is found in Jer 3:4-5:

4 Have you not just now called to me, “My Father, you are the friend of my youth–
5 will he be angry forever, will he be indignant to the end?” See ( Annunci) you have
spoken, and you have done all the evil and you prevailed.

Again in vv4b-5a, YHWH is in the 2pPos and the people in the 1pPos. הָנְנִי in v5b introduces a different DSC where the SS of vv4b-5a is reversed as YHWH now holds the 1pPos and the people the 2pPos.

620 On a most general level י refers to a state of affairs. See Carl Martin Follingstad, Deictic Viewpoint in Biblical Hebrew Text : A Syntagmatic and Paradigmatic Analysis of the ParticleKi (Dallas, 2001), chap 5-9.
In Jer 49:4-5, a form of הָיְתָה again indicates, together with the participant reference-shift, a DSC-shift:
4 Why do you boast in your strength? Your strength is ebbing, O faithless daughter. You trusted in your treasures, saying, “Who will attack me?”
5 See I (יְהֹוָה) am going to bring terror upon you, says the Lord God of hosts, from all your neighbors, and you will be scattered, each headlong, with no one to gather the fugitives.

The DSC in v4b comes to an abrupt end when in v5a יְהֹוָה opens a new SS. V5 contains the reversed SS (1P: YHWH; 2P: people) with regard to v4b (1P: people; 2P: YHWH).

The above examples show that הָיְתָה is usually not the only sign that guides the reader in the DSC-structures of a text. Often, the coherence between a new SS and a former SS help to understand that הָיְתָה initiates a new DSC.

5.5.1.6 DEICTIC ELEMENTS:
In several cases we observe that temporal deictic elements can indicate and introduce new DSCs. Below, we see examples of three different deictic elements signaling, together with a PNG-shift, a DSC-shift without the presence of a DSI:

In Jer 42:14-15 יְהֹוָה functions as an indicator of a new DSC:
14 and saying, ‘No, we will go (בָּאתָם) to the land of Egypt, where we shall not see (רָע) war, and we will not hear (נָאשׁ) the sound of the trumpet, or be hungry (רָע) for bread, and there we will stay (נִישָׁתָם),’
15 And now (וְהָאָשָׁה) hear (נָאשׁ) the word of the Lord, O remnant of Judah. Thus says the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel: If you are determined to enter Egypt and go to settle there,

The DSC of v14 is discontinued in v15a. The new DSC is introduced by יְהֹוָה and accompanied by an explicit SS-shift as the people do not hold the 1pPos any longer (e.g. בָּאתָם) but the 2pPos (נִישָׁתָם).

In Jer 4:8-9, we find a יְהֹוָה phrase introducing a new DSC:
8 Because of this put on sackcloth, lament and wail: “The fierce anger of the Lord has not turned away from us.”
9 On that day (יָמֵי הָיוֹם), says the Lord (יְהֹוָה), courage shall fail the king and the officials; the priests shall be appalled and the prophets astounded.
10 Then I said, “Ah, Lord God, how utterly you have deceived this people and Jerusalem, saying, ‘It shall be well with you,’ even while the sword is at the throat!”

In the DSC of v8b, the people hold the 1pPos while YHWH holds the 3pPos. However, in v9a the 1pPos is given to YHWH as the יְהֹוָה יָמֵי הָיוֹם testifies. The new DSC starts with the phrase יְהֹוָה יָמֵי הָיוֹם which introduces the new SS where the 3pPos is filled explicitly by the king, the officials, the priests and the prophets. Not only does the phrase יָמֵי הָיוֹם signal a new DSC but indicates a new paragraph as well.621

In Jer 11:17-18, we find the deictic יִשָּׂרָאֵל indicating the distance between two DSCs:
17 The Lord of hosts, who planted you (יִשָּׂרָאֵל), has pronounced evil against you (יִשָּׂרָאֵל), because of the evil that the house of Israel and the house of Judah have done, provoking me (יָמֵי הָיוֹם) to anger by making offerings to Baal.
18 It was the Lord who made it known to me, and I knew; back then (יֵשָׁתָם) he showed me

621 E.g. Deut 26:1, 28:1, 30:1.
But I was like a gentle lamb led to the slaughter. And I did not know it was against me that they devised schemes, saying, “Let us destroy the tree with its fruit, let us cut him off from the land of the living, so that his name will no longer be remembered!”

In v17, YHWH holds the 1pPos (יִהְנֶֽה) while in v18 he holds the 3pPos (רְדֶשְׁנָֽו). The 2pPos in v17 is held by the enemies of Jeremiah, while they hold the 3pPos in v18. In addition to this SS-shift, there is the presence of the temporal deictic יָֽהַמְּלַֽהְוָ֥ם which not only creates a distance between the two different DSCs but also creates a temporal distance between the DSC of v17 and the event referred to in v18 (רְדֶשְׁנָֽו מְשַׁלְּלָ֥הוֹם).

5.5.1.7 CLAUSE-TYPE SHIFT

Our investigation into the phenomenology of SPSs has suggested that a clause-type shift can function as DSC-shift indicator as well. The same is true within the category of MPSs. Jer 1:8-9 contains such a case:

7 And the Lord said (יָֽהָֽדֵֽל) to me (יְֽצִירָ֥ה), “Do not say, ‘I am only a boy’; for you shall go to all to whom I send you, and you shall speak whatever I command you.
8 Do not be afraid (יָֽהֲדֵֽל) of them, for I am with you to deliver you, says the Lord.”
9 And the Lord put out (חֲשִׁלָּֽה) his hand and touched (עָנָֽה) my mouth (יְֽפָֽר; ) and the Lord said (רָאָֽיָֽה) to me, “Now I have put my words in your mouth.

In v8, the 1pPos is held by YHWH while the 2pPos is held by Jeremiah. The text-type of v8 is discursive as we have a xYqt clause-type (וַיְֽצִירָֽה). The discursive setting is interrupted by the WayX clause-type (וַיְֽהַמְּלַֽהוֹם) in v9, which introduces a narrative text-type. Herewith, the narrative level of v7 is resumed (רָאָֽיָֽה רְדֶשְׁנָֽו) where the identical SS can be found (1pPos: Jeremiah; 3pPos: YHWH).

That narrative clause-types standing in contrast to previous discursive clause-types can also indicate a DSC-shift seen in Jer 28:6-10:

6 and the prophet Jeremiah said, “Amen! May the Lord do so (xYqt); may the Lord fulfill (Yqtl) the words that you have prophesied, and bring back to this place from Babylon the vessels of the house of the Lord, and all the exiles.
7 But listen (Imp) now to this word that I speak in your hearing and in the hearing of all the people.
8 The prophets who preceded you and me from ancient times prophesied war, famine, and pestilence against many countries and great kingdoms. 9 As for the prophet who prophesies peace, when the word of that prophet comes true, then it will be known that the Lord has truly sent the prophet.”
10 And the prophet Hananiah took (וַיִּקָּחֵֽה יָֽהָֽמְּלַֽהוֹם) the yoke from the neck of the prophet Jeremiah, and broke it.

The vv6-9 are dominated by discursive clause-types like Yqt and Imp. The presence of the WayX in v10 changes this text-type situation into a narrative one indicating a DSC-shift. This is supported by the altered SS (vv6-9: 1P is held by Jeremiah and the 2P by Hananiah; v10: 3pPos is held both by Hananiah and Jeremiah).

The following two cases confirm our observation:
Jer 2:6-7:

6 They did not say, “Where is the Lord who brought us up from the land of Egypt, who led us in the wilderness, in a land of deserts and pits, in a land of drought and deep darkness, in a land that no one passes through (וְיָֽהַמְּלַֽהוֹם), where no one lives (וְיָֽהַמְּלַֽהוֹם)?”
7 I brought (וַיִּקָּחֵֽה) you into a plentiful land to eat its fruits and its good things. But when you entered you defiled my land, and made my heritage an abomination.
In the DSC of v6, we find a NmCl clause-type, two PtcA clause-types and WxQtl and xQtl clauses that indicate the text-type as discursive. The Way0 clause-type in v7 discontinues the text-type of v6 as it turns to narration. The narrative clause-type in v7a indicates in combination with a changed SS (v6: YHWH holds the 3pPos; v7: YHWH holds the 1pPos) the new DSC.

Jer 32:7-8:

7 Hanamel son of your uncle Shallum is going to come to you and say, “Buy (imp) my field that is at Anathoth, for the right of redemption by purchase is yours.”
8 And then came (וַיָּאוֹת) to me my cousin Hanamel into the court of the guard, in accordance with the word of the Lord, and said (וַיֹּאמֶר) to me, “Buy my field that is at Anathoth in the land of Benjamin, for the right of possession and redemption is yours; buy it for yourself.” Then I knew that this was the word of the Lord.

The discursive text-type of v7b (see the use of imperative) is discontinued by the narrative clause-types in v8a (וַיֹּאמֶר,...). This clause-type shift indicates a new DSC and is supported by the fact that the P-position of Hanamel in the SS of v8a (3P) is different from in the SS of the DSC of v7b (2P) and identical with the position held in the DSI of v7a.

5.5.1.8 PNG-coherence with former DSC

The previous examples have shown that, together with certain indicators like imperatives, clause-type shifts, or particles like י or כ, the indication of a new DSC often occurs with the establishment of a SS-coherence with an earlier DSC. However, there are cases in which the establishment of a SS-coherence functions as the only signal of a DSC-shift. Jer 4:14-18 contains such an example:

14 O Jerusalem, wash your heart (לִימָנוּ) clean of wickedness so that you may be saved (לָבָשֵׁנָה). How long shall your evil schemes (לֹא) lodge within you (לְתַלְּמֵיהּ)?
15 For a voice declares from Dan and proclaims disaster from Mount Ephraim.
16 Tell (וָתַא) the nations, “Here they are!” Proclaim (וְנָשִׁית) against Jerusalem, “Besiegers come from a distant land; they shout against the cities of Judah.
17 They have closed in around her (לִצְנוּ) like watchers of a field, because she has rebelled (לִבְגֵר) against me, says the Lord.
18 Your ways (לִבְגֵר) and your doings (לִבְגֵר) have brought this upon you (לָבְּשֵׁנָה). This is your doom (לָבָשֵׁנָה); how bitter it is! It has reached your heart (לְתַלְּמֵיהּ).”

From the perspective of a phenomenological reading process Jerusalem is addressed as a sgF participant in vv14-18. However, the P-position of Jerusalem switches during the text. In v14, Jerusalem holds the 2pPos, while in vv16-17 Jerusalem holds the 3pPos. In v18, the references to Jerusalem have turned back into 2P forms. It is difficult to relate the role and position of v15 in the context of the discourse. V15 could still be part of the discourse of v14 but could also belong to the direct speech of v16. Regardless of the different possible opinions about the position and function of v15 the consistent 3sgF reference to Jerusalem in vv16-17 suggests that these verses belong to one discourse. The sudden shift between 3sgF forms in v17 in the 2sgF form in v18 is the only phenomenon that indicates an interruption...

---

622 Carroll speculates whether Jerusalem is really addressed in v18. He rather suggests that the 2sgF forms refer to the cities of Judah (Carroll, 165.). However, no text-phenomenological arguments are used for supporting his hypothesis.

623 In our opinion v15 is not part of the discourse of v16. Rather the imperatives of v16 opens a new discourse. Such an understanding is supported by the many cases where imperatives stand and the beginning of a new discourse (see 5.5.1.1).
of the DSC of vv16-17. As the SS of v18 is identical with the SS of v14, the reader concludes that v18 indicates the end of the DSC of v17 while opening a new DSC that continues on the level of v14.

A similar observation can be found in Jer 8:6:

6 I have given heed and listened, but they do not speak (נבה) honestly; no one repents of his wickedness (ותלעתה), saying, “What have I done!” All of them turn to (עשר) their own course (בשרים), like a horse plunging headlong into battle.

The 1pPos of the DSC "What have I done" is held by the participant that receives the 3pPos in the earlier DSC (דיבור). The DSC of "What have I done" is discontinued with the following clause "All of them turn to their own course". The reason for this discontinuation lies in the fact that an SS-coherence with the DSI of v6a is established (3pM forms: דיבור, עשורים). The connection between the DSI of v6a and v6b by means of the SS-coherence is also supported on the semantic level as the phrase "all of them turn to (שער) their own course (בשרים)" expresses the same thought as the phrase "What have I done (עשוי) in v6a.

Jer 12:16 serves as a final strong example:

16 And then, if they will diligently learn (למדו) the ways of my people, to swear (לplural) by my name, “As the Lord lives,” as they taught (למדו) my people to swear (לplural) by Baal, then they shall be built up in the midst of my people.

But if any nation will not listen, then I will completely uproot it and destroy it, says the Lord.

The DSC "As the Lord lives" in v16a is discontinued by the following clause ("as they taught..."). The discontinuation is established through (a) the SS-shift between "As the Lord lives" and the following clause and (b) the SS-coherence between the DSI of "As the Lord lives" and the clauses that follow "As the Lord lives". This SS-coherence is underlined by the semantic relations established by the predication of swearing (לplural) and learning (לplural) expresses the same thought as the phrase "What have I done (עשוי) in v6a.

5.5.1.9 COMMUNICATIONAL LOGIC AND SEMANTIC CONTIGUITY

Our SPS-analysis (e.g. 5.4.2.3) suggests that in some cases the most dominant indicator for a new DSC is the interruption of logical and/or semantic coherence with the previous DSC. This observation is supported by several MP -shifts as found in Jer 8:11:

11 They have treated the wound of my people carelessly, saying, “Peace, peace,” And there is no peace (לא שלום)!

The phrase "Peace, peace," with its negation expresses a logic opposition to the directly preceding DSC ("Peace, peace," and indicates a discourse-shift although any kind of DSI is absent.

A similar behavior can be found in Jer 22:21:

21 I spoke to you in your prosperity, but you said, “I will not listen (לא אשקם).” This has been your way from your youth, for you have not listened (לאשמעתי) to my voice.

The DSC of v21a (“I will not listen”) is discontinued in v21b. On the one hand, the SS of v21b changes with regard to the “I will not listen”-DSC and establishes a link of coherence with the first clause

64 Although not referring to this reference-shift both Holladay and Craigie assume a shift of speakers between v17 (YHWH) and v18 (prophet Jeremiah). See Craigie, Kelley, and Drinkard, 77; Holladay, 141.
of v21a. Together with this SS-phenomenon, there is a semantic parallel of predications (אַשְׁפִּיט, שֶׁמֶשׁ). The fact that these predications are of different P-characteristic signals the DSC-interruption.

In Jer 2:8, we do not find any logical or semantic interruption between the new DSC and the directly preceding DSC but a logical or semantic coherence between the new DSC and the DSI of the preceding DSC:

8 The priests did not say (רֶוֶץ אָמַר), “Where is the Lord?” Those who handle the law did not know me (לֹא לֹא דָּעָה); the rulers transgressed against me; the prophets prophesied by Baal, and went after things that do not profit.

In the DSI of v8a, the priests are in the subject position. After the following DSC („Where is the Lord?“) the priests are referred to by „those who handle the law“ as this relates semantically to the position of a priest. Besides this, both, the DSI in v8a and the discourse that follows after the DSC of “Where is the Lord?”, contain an xQtl-clause with a negated predication (יִכְנִע, שֶׁמֶשׁ). Thus, the DSC-shift is indicated both by the semantic and the syntactic-logical coherence established in v8b.

Other important indicators of DSC-shifts are logical connections between pairs of words. Jer 23:32-33 gives such an example as verbs for asking and answering entertain a logical relation of communication:

32 See, I am against those who prophesy lying dreams, says the Lord, and who tell them, and who lead my people astray by their lies and their recklessness, when I did not send them or appoint them; so they do not profit this people at all, says the Lord.

33 When this people, or a prophet, or a priest asks (ךָל תָּשׁ), you, “What is the burden of the Lord?” you shall say (יָשָׁם) to them, “You are the burden, and I will cast you off, says the Lord.”

In v33a the DSI makes use of שָׁאֵל as predication. שָׁאֵל has a logical relation with אמר or ענה as the counterpart of asking. After the DSC has followed the DSI in v33a, the clause יָשָׁם establishes the expected counterpart to שָׁאֵל and therefore interrupts the preceding DSC (“What is the burden of the Lord?”). Further, the SS of יָשָׁם is identical with the SS of שָׁאֵל as the 2sgM form refers in both cases to Jeremiah and the implicit 1pPos is held by YHWH.

5.5.2 Indicating 1P Centric SS-shifts within a DSC

On the basis of some SPS-cases (cf. 2.4.2.9) we have concluded that PNG-shifts do not necessarily indicate a DSC-shift. This also applies to MPSs. Thus, although the SS changes, the DSC does not. We claim that in such cases different SSs exist within one DSC, since the 1pPos continues speaking. One of the phenomena of a 1P centric SS-shift, then, is that the 1pPos is held by the same participant(s) but that different participants exchange the 2pPos.

The signals of an 1P centric SS-shift are the same elements that potentially indicate a DSC-shift. Jer 48:26-28 shows a case where an imperative starts a new SS:

26 Make him drunk (בְּשָׁבִיבוֹ), because he magnified himself against the Lord; let Moab wallow in his vomit; he too shall become a laughingstock.

27 Israel was a laughingstock for you (כָּל), though he was not caught among thieves; but whenever you spoke (יָרָץ) of him you shook your head!

28 Leave (שָׁבוּ) the towns, and live (שַׁבֵּן) on the rock, O inhabitants of Moab! Be (יִרְבֹּשְׁתָּם) like the dove that nests on the sides of the mouth of a gorge.
In vv26-27, the 2P forms (imperative and 2sgM suffixes) refer to the assaulter of Moab who then holds the 2pPos, while Moab holds the 3pPos. However, in v28, the SS is reversed with the use of imperatives as the citizens of Moab suddenly hold the 2pPos. While the imperatives in v26 and v28 address different participants, the 1pPos is implicitly maintained by YHWH who gives the commands. Therefore, the imperatives in v28 indicate a new SS within the larger DSC.

This phenomenon is also found in Jer 49:28-31:

28 Concerning Kedar and the kingdoms of Hazor that King Nebuchadrezzar of Babylon defeated. Thus says the Lord: Rise up (קומו), advance (לו ע), against Kedar! And destroy (ודד) the people of the east!
29 Take their tents and their flocks, their curtains and all their goods; carry off their camels for yourselves, and a cry shall go up: “Terror is all around!”
30 Flee (נום), wander (נון) far away, hide (יקומ) in deep places, O inhabitants of Hazor! says the Lord (הוהי). For King Nebuchadrezzar of Babylon has made a plan against you and formed a purpose against you.
31 Rise up (קומו), advance (לו ע) against a nation at ease, that lives secure, says the Lord (הוהי), that has no gates or bars, that lives alone.

In the above passage, different participants are referred to by same grammatical forms, i.e. imperatives (cf. V28b with v30a). In v28b the imperatives address the assaulter of the Kedarites who hold the 3pPos. In v30a, the Kedarites are addressed by the imperatives and the assaulter is put in the 3pPos. The SS of v28 is re-established in v30 as the imperatives run parallel to the imperatives in v28b. The fact that the יי הוהי is present throughout the verses shows that YHWH constantly holds the 1pPos. Thus, the imperatives do not indicate any DSC-shifts but SS-shifts within the frame of a larger speech.

A similar situation is found in Jer 50:11-14:

10 Chaldea shall be plundered; all who plunder her shall be sated, says the Lord.
11 Though you rejoice, though you exult, O plunderers of my heritage, though you frisk about like a heifer on the grass, and neigh like stallions,
12 your mother shall be utterly shamed, and she who bore you shall be disgraced. Lo, she shall be the last of the nations, a wilderness, dry land, and a desert.
13 Because of the wrath of the Lord she shall not be inhabited, but shall be an utter desolation; everyone who passes by Babylon shall be appalled and hiss because of all her wounds.
14 Take up (כו רע) your positions around Babylon, all you that bend the bow; shoot (דו) at her, spare no arrows, for she has sinned against the Lord.
15 Raise (וריין) a shout against her from all sides, “She has surrendered; her bulwarks have fallen, her walls are thrown down.” For this is the vengeance of the Lord: take vengeance (ונקמה) on her, do (שע) to her as she has done.
16 Cut off ( крови) from Babylon the sower, and the wielder of the sickle in time of harvest; because of the destroying sword all of them shall return to their own people, and all of them shall flee to their own land.

In the vv11-12, the inhabitants of Babylon hold the 2pPos whereas the 3pPos is held by the mother of Babylon. The reader develops the idea that the relation between mother and children is not to be understood as a relation between earlier and later generations but as a relation of generality (mother as single origin) and particularity (fruits/partakers in the mother). With this idea in mind, the reader does

---

625 The imperatives in 49:30 refer to the Kedarites (more precise: the inhabitants of Hazor). However, there is also a chance that the imperative forms address the inhabitants of Hazor. In such a case the text would shift from the enemies as being addressed in v31 in 2pM to the inhabitants of Hazor in v32 (see discussion in Holladay, 384.).
not have any problem with referring to the nation of Babel as the mother of Babel. The idea of nation and the idea of mother seem to be synonymous.

At the beginning of v14, however, the imperative form redefines the 2pPos as it is no longer held by the Chaldeans but by the assaulter of Babylon. The Chaldeans now hold the 3pPos.

In Jer 51:20-28, we not only see the presence of an imperative but also of יְנֹסindicating an SS-shift:

20 You are my war club, my weapon of battle: with you I smash nations; with you I destroy kingdoms;
21 with you I smash the horse and its rider; with you I smash the chariot and the charioteer;
22 with you I smash man and woman; with you I smash the old man and the boy; with you I smash the young man and the girl;
23 with you I smash shepherds and their flocks; with you I smash farmers and their teams; with you I smash governors and deputies.
24 I will repay Babylon and all the inhabitants of Chaldea before your very eyes for all the wrong that they have done in Zion, says the Lord.
25 See (יְנֹס), I am against you, O destroying mountain, says the Lord, that destroys the whole earth; I will stretch out my hand against you, and roll you down from the crags, and make you a burned-out mountain.
26 No stone shall be taken from you for a corner and no stone for a foundation, but you shall be a perpetual waste, says the Lord.
27 Raise (אֲשָׁר) a standard in the land, blow (עוֹקֵד) the trumpet among the nations; sanctify (נָעֲשֶׂה) the nations for war against her, summon against (נַעֲשֶׂה) her the kingdoms, Ararat, Minni, and Ashkenaz; appoint (נִשָּׂא) a marshal against her, bring up (שָׁנָה) horses like bristling locusts.
28 Sanctify (נָעֲשֶׂה) the nations for war against her, the kings of the Medes, with their governors and deputies, and every land under their dominion.

In vv20-23, Babel constantly holds the 2pPos whereas YHWH holds the 1pPos. While YHWH continues to hold the 1pPos in v24, Babel now holds the 3pPos and the 2pPos is given to the Jewish people. By means of the יְנֹס in v24, the 2p- and 3p-positions are again changed and Babel holds the 2pPos anew.

The use of the imperative in the beginning of v27 creates a new SS-shift as the 2pPos is redefined. The 2pPos is no longer held by Babel but by the foreigners who launch the assault against Babel. Babel moves back in a 3pPos.

5.5.3 Objectivization
Self-references as seen in 5.4.2.6 function basically as objectivization. Besides the 1sgC–3sgM shift (SPS), the most dominant shifts for an objectivization are the ones from 2sgF to 3plM and from 2plM to 3sgF. We first list some cases of 2sgF-3plM shifts and then a case of a 2plM-3sgF shift:

Jer 15:5-7:
5 Who will have pity on you (ךָא), O Jerusalem, or who will bemoan you (ךִּל)? Who will turn aside to ask about your welfare (ךָא)?
6 You (ךָא) have rejected (ךָא) me, says the Lord, you are going (ךָא) backward; so I have stretched out my hand against you (ךִּל) and destroyed you (ךָאץ) – I am weary of relenting.
7 I have winnowed them (ךָא) with a winnowing fork in the gates of the land; I have bereaved, I have destroyed my people; they did not turn (ךָא) from their ways (ךָאץ).
In vv5-6, the 2pPos is held by Jerusalem which is addressed by 2sgF forms (e.g. בְּשַׁדַּי בָּעָל). Here, Jerusalem is accused and judgment is pronounced to it personally (v6). In v7 we find a metaphorical description of the judgment. However, the object of the judgment is no longer the 2pPos but a 3pPos referred to by 3plM forms (e.g. מָשְׁרָה). For the reader, there is no doubt that the judgment described is identical with the judgment proclaimed in v6. If the judgment is identical, how can the shift from 2P to 3P be explained?

We understand the 2P-3P-shift as objectivization. The shift, then, is caused by a rhetorical technique in which the speaker tries to distance herself from the intimacy of the SS of vv5-6. The motivation of this “distantiation” or objectivization can be found in the intention to make the announced judgment an absolute and not debatable. Thus, we are not in a court-situation of direct speech anymore, but in the announcement-situation of absolute speech.

The shift from sgF to plM can be explained by the fact that in the announcement of the judgment not the anonymous generality of a sg participant but the individuals are referred to. The shift from F to M is explained through the shift from sg to pl. The many individuals that constitute the participant “Jerusalem” (F) are now brought into focus with 3plM forms.

Jer 11:17:

15 What right has my beloved (וֹדֵדִי) in my house, when she has done vile deeds? Can vows and sacrificial flesh remove from you (שָׁבַלְתָּה) your doom? Can you then exult (שָׁבַלְתָּה) ?
16 "A green olive tree, fair with goodly fruit" the Lords has called your name (שָׂמֵךְ); but with the roar of a great tempest he will set fire to it, and its branches will be consumed.
17 The Lord of hosts, who planted you (אות), has pronounced evil against you (שָׂמֵךְ), because of the evil that the house of Israel and the house of Judah have done (שָׂמֵךְ), provoking me to anger by making offerings to Baal.

In vv15-17a, it becomes clear that by using 2sgF, the imagery of YHWH’s wife (וֹדֵדִי) is used for his people. While in v17a the judgment upon the 2pPos is announced (שָׂמֵךְ), v17b justifies the coming judgment upon YHWH’s wife by the clause “because of the evil [...] they have done”. The object of YHWH’s judgment moves from the 2pPos into the 3pPos as a 3plM predication is used (שָׂמֵךְ). Again, the singular entity (sgF) consists of an individual collectivity (plM). While the judgment is spoken over the 2P-participant by means of 2sgF forms, it is legitimized by addressing the object of God’s judgment no longer by 2P but by 3P forms. In this way, the legitimation of the judgment receives objective character (objectivization).

Jer 21:12:

11 To the house of the king of Judah say: Hear (שָׁמֵךְ) the word of the Lord,
12 O house of David! Thus says the Lord: Execute justice (יִנְשָׁבֵד) in the morning, and deliver (שָׁבִיבֵּה) from the hand of the oppressor anyone who has been robbed, or else my wrath will go forth like fire, and burn, with no one to quench it, because of their evil doings (שָׂמֵךְ).

In vv11-12a, 2pPos (house of David) is addressed by 2plM predications (e.g. נִשָּׁבֵד). However, in v12b the 2P participant is suddenly referred to by a 3plM suffix (שָׂמֵךְ). Again, the legitimation of a possible judgment over a 2P participant takes place in an objective 3P setting.
The case in Jer 21:14 shows that 2plM-3sgF shifts are possible as well:

13 See, I am against you (ךלנ) , O inhabitant of the valley, O rock of the plain, says the Lord; who say, “Who can come down against us, or who can enter our places of refuge?”

14 I will punish you ( småךלע) according to the fruit of your doings ( småךלע), says the Lord; I will kindle a fire in her forest (бытעה), and it shall devour all that is around her (םבעכה).

After the inhabitants of the valley have been referred to by a 2sgM suffix (ךלנ) in v13, 2plM references ( småךלע, småךלע) are continued in v14a (see more about this shift-type in 5.4.2.1). The 2P participants will receive punishment because of their evil doings. In v14b, the shift from 2plM forms into a 3sgF suffix disassociates the participant in order to bring the announcement to an objective status.

The use of metaphorical descriptions can affect the addressing of a participant and cause a PNG-shift serving as objectivization as Jer 2:25-28 shows:

25 Keep your feet (ךלד) from going unshod and your throat (ךלנ) from thirst. But you said (ךלנ), “It is hopeless, for I have loved strangers, and after them I will go.”

26 As a thief is shamed when caught, so will be ashamed (ישו) the house of Israel shall — they, their kings, their officials, their priests, and their prophets,

27 who say to a tree, “You are my father,” and to a stone, “You gave me birth.” For they have turned (נן) their backs to me, and not their faces. But in the time of their trouble (םשע) they say (ךלנ), “Come and save us!”

28 But where are your gods (ךלד) that you made (ךלשע) for yourself (ךל)? Let them come, if they can save you (ךל), in the time of your trouble (ךל); for the amount of your cities (ךל) is like the amount of your gods (ךלד), O Judah.

In vv25-28, the participants “house of Israel” and “Judah” are interchangeable (cf. V26b-v28a). In v25 and v28, God’s people hold the 2pPos (in v25 by means of 2sgF [house of Israel] and in v28 by means of 2sgM forms [Judah]). In vv26-27, the house of Israel has the 3pPos by means of 3plM forms. This interruption, however, is introduced by a metaphorical comparison (“as a thief is ashamed, so will be ...”). Since metaphors (here in specific “thief”) have the character of being not present (2P) but distant (3P) they might invite the “disassociation” of the participant as well, moving the house of Israel into the 3pPos in vv27-28. From a functional perspective, one could argue that this distancing helps to give an objective legitimation of the subjective invitation to become sensible to the own state of affairs in v25. The objective and descriptive intersection is closed with the return to 2P forms in v28.
5.5.4 Subjectivization

Subjectivizations as a reverse to objectivizations, relate in a similar way between sgF and plM forms. Jer 30:20-24 contains a good introductory example:

20 His children (וָלַיָּם) shall be as of old, his congregation (עַדְוֹתָה) shall be established before me; and I will punish all who oppress him (מַלְשְׁנָה).
21 His prince (אֵלִיִּים) shall be one of his own (מִמְפָּנָה), his ruler (מִמְמָמָה) shall come from their midst; I will bring him near, and he shall approach me, for who would otherwise dare to approach me? says the Lord.
22 And you ( metic) shall be my people, and I will be God for you (לֹא). 23 Look, the storm of the Lord! Wrath has gone forth, a whirling tempest; it will burst upon the head of the wicked.
24 The fierce anger of the Lord will not turn back until he has executed and accomplished the intents of his mind. In the latter days you will understand (בַּתּוֹן) this.

God’s people have been referred to by 3sgM forms in vv20-21. In v22, it changes into the 2plM form. The N-shift is explained as having a “sg=pl” background while the P-shift is to be explained on the background of subjectivization. This subjectivization is supported by the phraseology which focuses on the relationship between YHWH and his people.

Jer 48:4-6:

1 Concerning Moab. Thus says the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel: Alas for Nebo, it is laid waste! Kiriathaim is put to shame, it is taken; the fortress is put to shame and broken down; [...] 4 “Moab is destroyed (משָרִי)!” her little ones (עָשִׂיְיְהָה) cry out.
5 For at the ascent of Luhith they go up weeping bitterly; for at the descent of Horonaim they have heard (תָּמַשְׂנָה) the distressing cry of anguish.
6 Flee (סו נ!) Save (טו ל‡ מ!) yourselves (ום כ‡ פ‡ נ!) Be like a wild ass in the desert!

In v4, Moab is referred to by a 3sgF predication and suffix. In v4, the 3plM predications refer to either the inhabitants of Moab or to the inhabitants of the Moabitian city Luhit. The whole section of vv1b-5 is of a descriptive nature as Moab and its cities hold the 3pPos. The shift between sg and pl in vv4-5 creates a functional “sg=pl” distinction between the entity of a city/country/nation and its inhabitants. The imperatives in v6 cause a subjectivization as the descriptive discourse in vv4-5 is ended.

Chapter 48 contains another subjectivization in vv13-14:

12 Therefore, the time is surely coming, says the Lord, when I shall send to him decanters to decant him, and empty his vessels, and break his jars in pieces.
13 And Moab is ashamed (שָׁפָט) of Chemosh, as the house of Israel was ashamed of Bethel, their confidence.
14 How can you say (רָמַתָה), “We are heroes and mighty warriors”?
15 The destroyer of Moab and her towns (יה רע) has come up, and the choicest of his young men (יְחָטִיר) have gone down to slaughter, says the King, whose name is the Lord of hosts.

626 See Bo Reicke and Leonhard Rost, Biblisch-Historisches Handwörterbuch; Landeskunde, Geschichte, Religion, Kultur, Literatur, 4 vols., vol. 2 (Göttingen, 1962), 1110.
Similar to 48:4-6, there is a shift from 3P to 2P in vv13-14. In v13, Moab is referred to by a 3sgM predication (הם). This changes through the 2plM predication in v14 (ספירות) as it refers to the Moabites as well. Again, the text turns from a descriptive writing about Moab into a directive writing to Moab.

Besides the 3sg-2pl shifts, we also have 3plM-2sgM and 3plM-2sgM shifts:

Jer 2:27-28:

28 As a thief is shamed when caught, so will be ashamed (הבישה) the house of Israel shall – they, their kings, their officials, their priests, and their prophets, 29 who say to a tree, “You are my father,” and to a stone, “You gave me birth.” For they have turned (מען) their backs to me, and not their faces. But in the time of their trouble (מענה) they say (אני), “Come and save us!”

But where are your gods (אלהיכם) that you made (מעשית) for yourself (לך)? Let them come, if they can save you (מענה); for the amount of your cities (עיר) is like the amount of your gods (אלהיכם), O Judah.

The descriptive way of speaking about God’s nation in vv26-27 is changed into a subjective way of speaking to God’s nation in v28, as a subjective response to the objective description in 2:26-27. The subjectivization has the purpose to involve the people into a dialogical situation that demands a response and therefore an awareness of responsibility.

Jer 11:11-13:

11 Therefore, thus says the Lord, assuredly I am going to bring disaster upon them ( האלהיכם) that they cannot (ישלחו) escape; though they cry out (מענין) to me, I will not listen to them ( אלהיכם).

12 Then the cities of Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem will go (כללכ) and cry out (מענין) to the gods to whom they make (מעשית) offerings, but they will never save them (מענה) in the time of their trouble (מענה).

13 For (וכם) your gods ( אלהיכם) have become as many as your towns (עיר), O Judah; and as many as the streets of Jerusalem are the altars to shame you have set up (משתחבות), altars to make offerings to Baal.

The people of God hold the 3pPos in vv11-12. The use of ווכם initiates a SS-shift in which the people suddenly hold the 2pPos referred to by 2sgM (e.g. אלהיכם) and 2plM (שמשקם) forms. While the 3P-section in vv11-12 describes objectively the future judgment situation, in v13 the 2P-section gives reason for this future scenario in a personal way by means of subjectivization.

In Jer 2:14-17, Israel is compared with a slave and referred to by 3sgM forms; however, at the moment when the symbolic language ceases, Israel is referred to by 2sgM forms:

14 Is Israel a slave? Is he (ณา) a homeborn servant? Why then has he become (aciente) plunder?

15 The lions have roared against him (רעיה), they have roared loudly. They have made his land (ארץ) a waste; his cities (עיר) are in ruins, without inhabitant.

16 Moreover, the people of Memphis and Tahpanhes have shaved you (ראשיכם) as vertices/crown of head.

17 Have you not brought (מענית) this upon yourself (לך) by your forsaking (שפך) the Lord your God ( אלהיכם), while he led you (מאיבך) in the way?

In vv13-15, Israel is kept at a distance both by the use of 3sgM forms as well as by the use of metaphors. In vv16-17, with its shift into the 2pPos, Israel is not any longer a distant vague participant
but is present in reality reinforced by a shift from imagery (lions) to real objects (Memphis and Tahpanhes).

5.5.5 **SG=PL**

We have seen earlier that a single participant can be of both a sg and pl nature. Therefore, within a discourse, the N-characteristic can be switched while referring to only one participant. Such a case can be found in Jer 21:13-14:

13 See, I am against you (ךיִּלָּגָא), O inhabitant of the valley, O rock of the plain, says the Lord; you who say, “Who can come down against us, or who can enter our places of refuge?”

14 I will punish you (םיכָלֵע) according to the fruit of your doings (םיכָלֵע לָע), says the Lord; I will kindle a fire in its forest, and it shall devour all that is around it.

In v13, Jerusalem is addressed by a 2sgF suffix (ךיִּלָּגָא). In v14, the “content” of Jerusalem, i.e. the inhabitants of Jerusalem are addressed by means of 2plM suffixes (םיכָלֵע לָע). In both cases, the same participant is referred to. However, the reference is focused on differently. In v13, Jerusalem is addressed as a whole single entity while in v14, the focus is on all the individuals of which Jerusalem as a whole consist. With this shift, the sin of Jerusalem does not remain abstract but becomes very concrete as the origin of evil action is found on the individualistic level. The individual cannot hide behind the city as a social organization.

Jer 49:5 contains a similar case:

4 Why do you boast (ךיִּמַּחַת) in your strength? Your strength is ebbing, O faithless daughter. You trusted in your treasures, saying, “Who will attack me?”

5 I am going to bring terror upon you (ךיִּלָּג), says the Lord God of hosts, from all your neighbors (ךיִּבְעַר), and you (ךְֶלֶתָחַת) will be scattered, each headlong (שַׂמָּכֶב), with no one to gather the fugitives.

6 But afterward I will restore the fortunes of the Ammonites, says the Lord.

Throughout the verses, the 2pPos is referred to by 2sgF (ךיִּלָּג) and 2plM suffixes (ךְֶלֶתָחַת לָע) which all refer to the same participant (Ammonites). While the sgF references address the nation of the Ammonites as a whole, the plM reference focuses on the individual person which this participant exists of. The focus on the individual by means of the sg-pl shift is emphasized through the phrase clause that each single person is brought into focus. The announced terror, then, is not only experienced in a general way (sg) but is part of the experience of many real persons.

The above examples have shown sg-pl shifts within the 2P-level. However, sg-pl shifts can be found on the 3P-level as well as Jer 33:6 shows:

5 The Chaldeans are coming in to fight and to fill them with the dead bodies of those whom I shall strike down in my anger and my wrath, for I have hidden my face from this city because of all their wickedness.

6 I am going to bring her (לה) recovery and healing; I will heal them (בראשית) and reveal to them (לה) abundance of prosperity and security.

In v6a, we find a 3sgF suffix (לה) referring to “this city” (v5b). While the sgF participant is the object of healing and recovery, the following clause parallels this phraseology but has 3plM suffixes as object (בראשית ללה). This parallelism shows that the 3sgF and the 3plM forms refer to the same participant. Healing, then, is not only available for the city as such, but for each individual which the city consists of.
With regard to Babylon, Jer 51:64 serves as an example:

63 When you finish reading this scroll, tie a stone to it, and throw it into the middle of the Euphrates,
64 and say, 'Thus shall Babylon sink (שׁבַע), to rise (נָשַׁב) no more, because of the disasters that I am bringing on her (נָשָׁב). And they will become tired (שׁוּב).’
Thus far are the words of Jeremiah.

In v64b, Babylon is referred to as a sg entity (e.g. יְהוָה). However, the final clause of the direct speech (“And they will become tired”) contains a pl predication (נָשָׁב) addressing Babylon. It seems that with this shift, no longer the anonymous whole but the individual many are brought into focus.

In Jer 13:22-23, the use of a metaphor influences the N quality by which a participant is referred to:
22 And if you say (יֵרָא) in your heart (לְבַנְת), “Why have these things come upon me?” it is for the greatness of your iniquity (שׁוּב) that your skirts (שׁוּב) are lifted up, and you heels (שׁוּב) are violated.
23 Can Ethiopians change their skin or leopards their spots? Then also you (ם) can do (שׁוּב) good who are accustomed to do evil.

It is possible that the N quality of the metaphor (leopards are of pl character) influences the addressing of the people. In v22, the Kushite nation is addressed by sg forms. But through the use of the metaphorical comparison, the addressing shifts to pl forms bring the many individual Kushites into focus.627

5.5.6 Shifting relational role

Within the category of objectivization and subjectivization, we have already seen the G-shift operation. However, the G-shift has always functioned within the sg=pl category as the F-gender was present only in combination with the sg-number and the M-gender only with the pl number. In Jer 3:19-20, we find a case where the F-gender is present both in sg and pl:
19 I thought how I would set you (הָיָשָׁר) among my children, and give you (לְבַנְת) a pleasant land, the most beautiful heritage of all the nations. And I thought you would call (שׁוּב) me, My Father, and would not turn from (שׁוּב) following me.
20 Instead, as a faithless wife (נְבֵן אַם) leaves her husband, so you have been faithless (שׁוּב) to me, O house of Israel, says the Lord.

Vv19-20a make use of the woman-imagery (e.g. הנְבֵן אַם) and address the people by 2sgF forms. If the woman-imagery had not been applied, the addressing could have taken place with 2sgM forms as well. In v20b, the addressing then shifts into 2plM (נְבֵן מִי) as no longer is the individual “wife” addressed but the many individuals that “make” the “wife”.

The upper example is a rare case. We find more G-shifts (independent of the sg=pl category) in combination with P-shifts. The following examples can be given:

Jer 2:14-17:

14 Is Israel a slave? Is he (נְבֵן) a homeborn servant? Why then has he become (שׁוּב) plunder?
15 The lions have roared against him (שׁוּב), they have roared loudly. They have

627 However, it is difficult to proof this in this specific case as the reason for shifting from sg to pl could be that the masculine only allows a pl as generalization. Jerusalem cannot be plF, nor is a Kushit or Leopard a sgF.
made his land ( אשר ) a waste; his cities ( יערים ) are in ruins, without inhabitant.
Moreover, the people of Memphis and Taapanes have shaved you ( חוטה ) bold.
Have you not done (ipation) this unto yourself ( כ ), by forsaking the Lord your God
( אלהי ), while he led you ( מלך ) in the way?
In vv14-15, Israel is referred to by 3sgM forms (e.g. الزمن ), while in vv16-17, it is addressed by 2sgF forms (e.g. ייך ). On both P (3P-2P) and G (M-F) level we detect a shift. This G-shift puts Israel again back into the wife/covenant partner-image that has already been used in the beginning of the chapter (v2).
Further, the G-shift to feminine is motivated by the language of v16, where the description of cutting hair is borrowed from the imagery of a pagan prostitute.

Jer 49:14-19:

14 I have heard tidings from the Lord, and a messenger has been sent among the nations: "Gather yourselves together and come against her ( עיר ), and rise up for battle!"
15 For I will make you ( כלכלה ) least among the nations, despised by humankind.
16 Your terror (מטה) beguiles you ( עלי ) and the pride of your heart ( ז tốc ) have deceived you, you who live in the clefts of the rock, who hold the height of the hill. Although you make your nest (שך ) as high as the eagle’s, from there I will bring you down ( ירות )", says the Lord.
17 Edom shall become ( אמרה ) an object of horror; everyone who passes by her ( עיר ) will be horrified and will hiss because of all her disasters ( מעמה ).
18 As when Sodom and Gomorrah and their neighbors were overthrown, says the Lord, no one shall live there, nor shall anyone settle in her ( הארץ ).
19 Like a lion coming up from the thickets of the Jordan against a perennial pasture, I will suddenly chase Edom away from it; and I will appoint over her ( אוליה ) whomsoever I choose. For who is like me? Who can summon me? Who is the shepherd who can stand before me?

In v14, Edom is referred to by a 3sgF suffix ( עיר ). However, in vv15-16 it is addressed by 2sgM forms.

In v17, however Edom is suddenly referred to by 3sgF forms. Despite the fact that the passage contains a P-shift, Edom can be addressed both by F- and M-forms. It can only be supposed that the different social roles of Edom are activated by means of the chosen G-reference. An F-reference, then, would refer to its function as wife which betrays YHWH.

Jer 50:26-32:

26 Come against her ( עיר ) from every quarter; open her granaries ( תבואות ) ; pile her up ( לפי ) like heaps of grain, and destroy her ( הארץ ) utterly; let nothing be left of her ( עיר ).
27 Kill all her bulls ( פרה ), let them go down to the slaughter. Alas for them, their day has come, the time of their punishment!
28 Listen! Fugitives and refugees from the land of Babylon are coming to declare in Zion the vengeance of the Lord our God, vengeance for his temple.
29 Summon archers against Babylon, all who bend the bow. Encamp all around her ( עיר ) ; let no one escape. Repay her ( עיר ) according to her deeds ( כמות ), just as she has done ( עשתה ), do to her ( עיר ) —for she has raised arrogance ( עיר ) against the Lord, the Holy One of Israel.
30 Therefore her young men ( נוער ) shall fall in her squares ( בורות ), and all her soldiers ( חשקם ) shall be destroyed on that day, says the Lord.
31 I am against you ( דלת ), O arrogant one ( עיר ), says the Lord God of hosts; for your day ( יומם ) has come, the time when I will punish you ( קרבנ ).
The arrogant one (יָדוֹ) shall stumble and fall, with no one to raise him (וֹ) up, and I will kindle a fire in his cities (בֵּיתֵיהוֹ), and it will devour everything around him (כַּפָּרָיו).

The above passage contains many MPSs. For our purpose, we only have a look at the reference-shift with regard to Babel. In 50:26-32, the participant Babel is referred to in three different ways. In vv26-30, Babel is constantly referred to by 3sgF forms. In v31, Babel is addressed by 2sgM forms and in v32 by 3sgM forms. The 3P-2P-3P shift is not part of our attention but the G-shifts between F (vv26-30) and M (vv31-32). In the F- as well as in the M-sections Babel is qualified by the same root lexeme רדד (v29: רדָד; v31/v32: רדַד) confirming the participant identity of the F- and M-references. The reason for such a G-shift can only be found in the functional difference of Babylon when referred to by F- or M-forms. When addressed by F-forms, Babylon serves as the partner of God, when addressed by M-forms, Babylon is referred to as a nation as such.

In two cases, we find the G-shift being accompanied by N-shift while the P quality remains stable:
Jer 49:4-6:

4 Why do you boast (מַעֲמַק) in strength? Your strength (מַעֲמַק) is ebbing, O faithless daughter (מַעֲמַק הַשָּׁבָט). Who (נֶ) trusted in her treasures (מַעֲמַק), saying, “Who will attack me?”
5 I am going to bring terror upon you (מַעֲמַק), says the Lord God of hosts, from all your neighbors (מַעֲמַק), and you will be scattered (מַעֲמַק), each headlong, with no one to gather the fugitives.
6 But afterward I will restore the fortunes of the Ammonites, says the Lord.

In 49:4-6, YHWH is identified with the 1pPos. The 2sgF forms (e.g. מַעֲמַק) refer to Ammon as daughter (מַעֲמַק). However, in v5b, we find a 2plM verbal form (מַעֲמַק). With the 2sgF forms, the “daughter Ammon” (v4) is addressed as a single entity with the specific social role of a daughter YHWH. The 2plM predication refers to the many individuals of which the “daughter” consists of.

Jer 51:36-45:

36 Therefore thus says the Lord: I am going to defend your cause (יִרְבָּכְךָ) and take vengeance for you (יִרְבָּכְךָ). I will dry up her sea and make her fountain dry;
37 and Babylon shall become a heap of ruins, a den of jackals, an object of horror and of hissing, without inhabitant.
38 Like lions they shall roar together; they shall growl like lions’ whelps.
39 When they are inflamed, I will set out their drink and make them drunk, until they become merry and then sleep a perpetual sleep and never wake, says the Lord.
40 I will bring them down like lambs to the slaughter, like rams and goats.
41 How Sheshach is taken, the pride of the whole earth seized! How Babylon has become an object of horror among the nations!
42 The sea has risen over Babylon; she has been covered by its tumultuous waves.
43 Her cities have become an object of horror, a land of drought and a desert, a land in which no one lives, and through which no mortal passes.
44 I will punish Bel in Babylon, and make him disgorge what he has swallowed. The nations shall no longer stream to him; the wall of Babylon has fallen.
45 Come out of her (אַבֵּא), my people! Save your lives (אַבֵּא), each of you, from the fierce anger of the Lord!

The above text-passage refers to God’s people both by 2sgF (v36) and 2plM forms (2plM). The reason for the sgF addressing in v36 is to picture the people as a single unity/entity and reflects their special social role as the beloved of YHWH. The plM forms in v45 bring the individuals which the nation consists of into focus.
5.5.7 Contextual introduction between DSI and DSC

Usually one expects directly after a DSI the announced DSC. The DSI then sets the definition of the SS for the coming DSC. However, in some cases the text following the DSI does not belong to the DSC and therefore its SS identity is not received from the DSI. The following two examples are given:

Jer 21:1-4:

1 This is the word that came to Jeremiah from the Lord (תִּקְרָר אֲדֹנָי אֲלֵיהָ נָא, אֶל יְהוָה), when King Zedekiah sent to him Pashhur son of Malchiah and the priest Zephaniah son of Maaseiah, saying,
2 "Please inquire of the Lord on our behalf, for King Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon is making war against us; perhaps the Lord will perform a wonderful deed for us, as he has often done, and will make him withdraw from us."
3 Then Jeremiah said to them:
4 Thus you shall say to Zedekiah: Thus says the Lord, the God of Israel: I am going to turn back the weapons of war that are in your hands and with which you are fighting against the king of Babylon and against the Chaldeans who are besieging you outside the walls; and I will bring them together into the center of this city.

While there is a DSI at the beginning of v1, the DSC does not start until after v2. V1b and v2 much more contextualize the speech of YHWH in its historic setting.

Something similar can be found in Jer 14:1-10:

1 The word of the Lord that came to Jeremiah concerning the drought:
2 Judah mourns and her gates languish; they lie in gloom on the ground, and the cry of Jerusalem goes up.
3 Her nobles send their servants for water; they come to the cisterns, they find no water, they return with their vessels empty. They are ashamed and dismayed and cover their heads.
4 Because the ground is cracked. Because there has been no rain on the land the farmers are dismayed; they cover their heads.
5 Even the doe in the field forsakes her newborn fawn because there is no grass.
6 The wild asses stand on the bare heights, they pant for air like jackals; their eyes fail because there is no herbage.
7 Although our iniquities testify against us, act, O Lord, for your name's sake; our apostasies indeed are many, and we have sinned against you.
8 O hope of Israel, its savior in time of trouble, why should you be like a stranger in the land, like a traveler turning aside for the night?
9 Why should you be like someone confused, like a mighty warrior who cannot give help? Yet you, O Lord, are in the midst of us, and we are called by your name; do not forsake us!
10 Thus says the Lord concerning this people: Truly they have loved to wander, they have not restrained their feet; therefore the Lord does not accept them, now he will remember their iniquity and punish their sins.

In v1, the DSI introduces a speech of YHWH. However, vv2-9 do not contain the speech of YHWH but rather the speech of Jeremiah and the people. It is not until v10 that the expected speech of YHWH starts. Probably due to the long delay, the DSI is repeated in v10a.

5.5.8 Summary

Our analysis of MPSs supports our findings with regard to SPSs. According to the distributional grouping of MPSs, we suggested different functional interpretations that offer a meaningful and data-oriented solution. Most shifts can be...
interpreted within the framework of these interpretations. The graph on the right shows our suggested functional MPS distribution.

As a direct consequence of the MPS-analysis, our preliminary conclusions about the possible text-constructive function of PNG-shifts can be made definite. The analysis of PNG-shifts on the sentence-level have proven that most shifts follow the rules of classical Hebrew grammar and language use.\textsuperscript{628} On the text-level, most shifts follow a regularity originating either from text-grammar or rhetorical structure. Consequently, PNG-shifts should not be regarded as a textual problem but its omnipresence should rather be taken as supporting the reading process in its cooperation to construct the being of the text.

The above graph displays the clarity-degree of all shift-functions (SPS and MPS). In most of the cases, we are able to assign an MPS clearly to one dominant functional category (orange), while in some cases, we do not regard an MPS as a strong case for its functional indexation (yellow). In a few cases, our analytic process is not able to arrive at a strong conclusion (green) but our intuition makes us believe that the specific case functions within the assumed functional category although strong arguments might be absent.

5.6 Conclusion

Our investigation resulted in a diverse interpretation of PNG-shifts. A reduction to a dominant single function of PNG-shifts does not do justice to this omnipresent phenomenon with its diverse co-occurring phenomena. Such a reduction, however, takes place in many exegetical works as our analysis of exegetical traditions has shown. Traditionally, one gives rather privilege to a PNG-shift interpretation that fits one’s overall understanding of the structure and genesis of the book of Jeremiah. This has led to the dominance of a redaction-critical understanding of PNG-shifts in the work of Thiel and to the dominance of a rhetorical understanding of PNG-shifts in the work of Lundbom. In contrast, our analysis shows that PNG-shifts can function within different textual being-aspects:

\textsuperscript{628} Cf. 0.2.2.
1. **Language (syntax-grammar, pragmatics):** Some of the distributive types of SPSs (N-shifts) show that a PNG-shift is only recognized if one understands that in the systematic of the OT Hebrew language a specific word can function not as subject but as adjunct within the syntax and must therefore be translated differently. This is, for example, the case with the word יש. The clause יש ירש ואש מארב, מרים in Jer 26:3, consequently, should not be translated as “And a man [subject] will return [pl predication causing N-incongruency] from his evil path” but as “And everybody [adjunct] will return [pl predication causing no N-incongruency] from his evil path”.

In most of the cases, PNG-shifts operate within the realm of pragmatics. This is clearly the case in those passages where an imperative is directly followed by a cohortative at the beginning of a DSC.

2. **Discourse (text-grammar):** As we have seen, most of the shifts serve as DSC-shift indicators. Consequently, they function much more as a guide to the reading process of the reader than that they disturb it. The reader usually receives in addition to the PNG-shift several further signals that help him/her to make the transition from one DSC into another during his reading process. The following table gives a complete overview of those co-occurring signals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DSC-shift</th>
<th>contextual phenomena</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| At the front of the clause containing the SPS/MPS: | • Interrogatives  
• י or יָנ  
• Interjection like הנה or וי  
• Imperatives  
• Vocatives  
• Way-clause disrupting the previous discursive clause-types  
• Explicit introduction of a participant that is present in the previous DSC in a different P-position. |
| Further phenomena accompanying the SPS/MPS: | • The SS must be different to the SS of the previous DSC. Often this can be a complete reversal of the previous SS (2P becomes 3P and vice versa)  
• IpPos is allocated to a different participant compared to the previous DSC  
• Identical SS can be found in the text section that stands before the previous DSC and is not part of it  
• Semantic parallels with text section that stands before the previous DSC and is not part of it  
• Time markers proving a temporal distance to the previous DSC  
• Absence of a participant that is present in the previous DSC  
• DSIs |
| 1P centric SS-shifts within DSC | • The identity of the IpPos remains the same in the different SSs  
• Despite the fact that the SS of which the SPS/MPS is part of is different to the SS of the previous DSC, the participants can have the identical communicational distance to the speaker.  
• Imperatives at the front of the clause containing the SPS shift  
• Reverse of previous the SS (2P becomes 3P and vice versa) |

When we speak about the indications of DSC-shifts, we mean, on a more fundamental level, the indication of SS-shifts that cause a DSC-shift. However, as we have seen, PNG-shifts causing an SS-shift do not necessarily indicate a DSC-shift but can signal the presence of different SSs within one DSC (1P centric SS-shifts). The indication of such SS-transitions is accompanied by a collection of identical signals for co-marking the DSC-shifts. Especially imperatives that co-occur with PNG-shifts indicate an 1P centric SS-transition within a DSC.

The fact that DSIs are often missing when PNG-shifts indicate a DSC-shift has a specific effect on the reader. Whether intended by the author/redactor or not, the reader experiences the
different DSCs much more directly when the DSIs are missing. He becomes much more a participant of the communicational setting of the text and is integrated as an insider to the speech situation. Not being introduced to the different DSCs causes a feeling of nearness and presence. However, this nearness is in constant risk if the reader is not aware of the diverse functions of PNG-shifts and causes him to get rather disturbed in his reading as he lacks communicational orientation.

3. **Teleology (rhetoric):** Especially the functions of objectivization, subjectivization, sg=pl and the shifting of relational roles seem to be part of the craft of rhetoric. The writer or speaker can play with the measure of relatedness of a participant as he can be drawn near into dialogue by means of subjectivization or can be “distanced” as he becomes the object of a dialogue unable to respond or resist. The following table gives an overview on the phenomena that appear when objectivization/subjectivization takes place:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contextual phenomena</th>
<th>P (1,2,3)</th>
<th>N (sg,pl)</th>
<th>G (C,M,F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Objectivization**  | • The identity of the 1pPos remains the same in the different SSs  
• Similar/related content in both SSs; often the 2P section contains the same theme but chooses more emotional vocabulary while the 3P section contains more fact-oriented vocabulary  
• 3P section is often in a judgment/prediction-context and can form the climax of a passage  
• 2p-section is often in an explanatory and appealing context  
• מ can introduce the 3P-section as argument for the emotional expressions found in the 2P-section | | |
| **Subjectivization** | • The identity of the 1pPos remains the same in the different SSs  
• Similar/related content in both SSs; often the 2P section contains the same theme but chooses more emotional vocabulary while the 3P section contains more fact-oriented vocabulary  
• 3P section is often in a judgment/prediction context and can form the climax of a passage  
• 2p section is often in an explanatory and appealing context  
• מ can introduce the 2P section for explaining the judgment described in the 3P section | | |

The rhetorical skill of shifting social roles by means of using specific G-characteristics for addressing a participant helps the writer/speaker to raise awareness for the different relational qualities and responsibilities of a specific participant. With the help of an N-shift, the writer/speaker can foreground and background the responsibility of the individual who is part of a greater group and so often wants to hide his own shortcomings behind the anonymity of that group.

The following table gives an overview of all different functions that a PNG-shift potentially can have:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible function</th>
<th>P (1,2,3)</th>
<th>N (sg,pl)</th>
<th>G (C,M,F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • DSC-shift      | • DSC-shift (DSC=SS)  
• 1P centric SS-shift  
• Self-reference  
• Objectivization  
• Subjectivization  
• Pragmatics  
• Scribal error | • 1P centric SS-shift  
• Fragmentics  
• Idiomatics  
• Sr=pl  
• Extension/condensation  
• Scribal error | • DSC-shift (DSC=SS)  
• Shifting relational role  
• Scribal error |
Which of those functions is activated depends on the context and its co-occurring phenomena as explained above. The distribution of the different functions applying to all PNG-shifts is seen in the graph below:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DSC-shift</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>egocentric SS-shift</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-reference</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>objectification/subjectification</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pragmatics</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idiomatics</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part-whole [sg-pl]</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relational role</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extension/condensation</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scribal mistake</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

With these results at hand, some of the doublets encountered in chapter 4 can now be understood in a more meaningful way. To illustrate this, we will again have a look at the setID 04:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>partner1</th>
<th>partner2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:28b</td>
<td>11:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people=3plM</td>
<td>people=3plM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And to a stone, &quot;You gave me birth.&quot;</td>
<td>as your towns, O Judah; and as many as the streets of Jerusalem are the altars to shame you have set up (ם†תָּמ), altars to make offerings to Baal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And in the time of their trouble they say, &quot;Come and save us!&quot;</td>
<td>For your gods have become as many as your towns, O Judah; and as many as the streets of Jerusalem are the altars to shame you have set up (ם†תָּמ), altars to make offerings to Baal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people=2sgM</td>
<td>people=2sgM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But where are your gods that you made for yourself?</td>
<td>As for you (ָה), do not pray for this people, or lift up a cry or prayer on their behalf, for I will not listen when they call to me in the time of their trouble.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let them come, if they can save you, in your time of trouble; for you have as many gods as you have towns, O Judah.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people=2sgM</td>
<td>people=2sgM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why do you complain against me? You have all rebelled against me, says the Lord.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In contrast to partner1, the parallel text material in partner2 causes a 3plM-2sgM shift. This shift could be interpreted from a source-critical or redaction-critical standpoint as marking a “Nahtstelle”. We have already expressed our doubts about such a conclusion in chapter 4 since we find a similar shift in partner1 but not at the position of the possibly implanted source (parallel-material). Thus, if a historical critical solution is applied to partner2, it would be consistent to assume also a secondary insertion in partner1 in v28 since this verse changes the former 3plM references into 2sgM references.

Our functional interpretations of SPSs and MPSs, however, suggest that the shift from 3plM to 2sgM is not a problem of the text that originates in the inability of a redactor, but serves as a subjectivization (3P-2P) of the people and shifts from the focus on the individuals constituting the group to the group as a single entity (pl-sg). The same applies to partner1. This does not at all rule out the possibility that the parallel material in partner2 is of a secondary nature, but it emphasizes that even in the case of a secondary insertion, this insertion does not harm the textual unity but rather fits the rhetorical
design that is found frequently in the whole book. To exaggerate our point: There is a good chance that in case the parallel text-material is of a secondary nature and refers to Judah in 3plM forms – not disturbing the contextual reference structure – the redactor would change the secondary material and change the 3plM reference into a 2sgM reference in order to create his rhetorical effect!

The second shift from 2plM to 2sgM in partner2 that marks a DSC-shift is not imprudently but follows the rules of a DSC-shift marking since at the beginning of the first clause of v14, the new 2pPos participant is explicitly marked by the fronted personal pronoun (הָוָה). Several other doublets (e.g. setID 40 and 47) could be re-interpreted meaningfully with the help of our suggested functional interpretation of PNG-shifts.

With regard to our comparative study on the MT/CL and the LXX, our suggested PNG-shifts interpretations explain why the LXX mirrors most of the participant reference-shifts as contained in the MT/CL. Especially those cases where both text-traditions share the existence of the same shifts but differ in their position (e.g. Jer 5:15-18) suggest that the LXX was aware of the diverse functionality of PNG-shifts and made use of it with the freedom that can be testified elsewhere in the translation. Of course, such a conclusion is only possible if we assume a “Vorlage” that was similar to the CL. Independent of such an assumption, the overall similarity (both in terms of quantity and quality) of the Greek and Hebrew PNG-shifts, suggests - on the basis of our distributional analysis - that not only the Hebrew but also the Greek text did regard participant reference-shifts as unproblematic. The Greek text, then, makes use of basically the same shift functionality as the Hebrew version of Jeremiah.

After we have analyzed the diverse PNG-shift interpretations of major exegetical schools and uncovered their formal and final methodological condition in chapter 3, we have demonstrated that PNG-shifts cannot be interpreted meaningfully from a diachronic perspective (chapter 4). In this chapter, we have shown that the omnipresent phenomena of participant reference-shifts on sentence- and text-level reveal a normative behavior that appears to serve as a backbone of the literary structure of the book of Jeremiah. Generally, PNG-shifts play rather a constructive than a deconstructive role in the reading activity. However, when the different functional roles of PNG-shifts are not known the text appears as a chaotic kaleidoscope of prophetic words and other secondary sources.

Our data research and its outcome now allows to draw some conclusions about the nature of the text and its relation to Bible translation and exegesis and brings us back to our initial methodological intent. Our research, then, is concluded by bringing its results into a methodological focus in our last and final chapter.
6 Conclusions on PNG-shift Interpretation and Methodology

We have come to the end of our study. Our case of PNG-shifts has illustrated the methodological challenges that biblical exegesis is facing. We have seen that the different popular exegetical methodologies have a problem recognizing especially when it comes to the text-linguistic phenomena that belong to the textual being-aspect “discourse”. This has negative effects on the overall interpretation of a text or book to a great extent since the discursive backbone of its architecture is often not understood. Our case uncovered further that no interpretational unity is found when now and then exegetes detect and interpret PNG-shifts. Since the textual data is the same for all scholars we concluded that their interpretational diversity hints at the diversity of methodological conditions under which they operate. We therefore decided to reflect upon the methodological conditions of exegesis (chapter 1) before we approach the PNG-shift phenomena naively. We constructed a hermeneutical framework after investigating the epistemic conditions of the subject (exegete) and the ontic conditions of the biblical text as object. This framework allowed to understand and assess the diversity between the different exegetical works as their final and formal methodological conditions were uncovered (chapter 3). But we did not only increase our faculty of judgment on the basis of our methodological reflections. Chapter 1 also helped to establish a meaningful basis for the construction of analytic tools (chapter 2) that strengthen the objective role of the text in the exegetical processes. We argued that the computer-assisted phenomenological text-linguistic reading does not coincide with a complete exegetical methodology, but that it is required as a first exegetical step for any exegetical method. In our case such a reading allowed for a complete registration of PNG-shifts in the book of Jeremiah, leading to the development of a database. In cooperation with our hermeneutical framework this database facilitated and deepened our assessment of the commentaries of Duhm, Thiel, Lundbom, Holladay and Carroll (chapter 3). We saw that the phenomenon of PNG-shifts is approached from different textual being-aspects. Most synchronic approaches find the meaning of PNG-shifts in the being-aspect “teleology”; whereas most diachronic approaches find the meaning and origin of participant reference-shifts within the being-aspect “transmission and reception” or “author/reader” (redactor). Investigating into the doublets of Jeremiah and their effect on participant reference coherence as well as our comparative studies on Qumran fragments and the LXX, revealed, that PNG-shifts do not predominantly belong to the being-aspect “reception and transmission” (chapter 4). Our text-critical studies then have helped to develop a deeper understanding about the interrelation of language and the processes of transmission and redaction. Against the background of our text-critical studies it has become clear that our case can be approached meaningfully only from within the textual being-aspects “language”, “discourse” and “teleology”. Consequently, a synchronistic text-linguistic analysis of the different shift distributions has become necessary (chapter 5). The PNG-shift database gave us organized access to the phenomenon, allowing a phenomenological categorization of most shifts which served as an important tool for our observations. The text-linguistic analysis showed that – with regard to PNG-shifts - neither on the sentence nor on the text-level major irregularities can be found. On the sentence-level we were able to assign most shifts to the being-aspect “language” as they follow grammatical rules and pragmatic norms. Shifts beyond the sentence-boundary could be assigned either to the textual being-aspect “discourse” (e.g. DSC-shift, 1P centric SS-shift) or “teleology” (e.g. objectivization/subjectivization, shifting relational role). Generally speaking, we found out that most of the shifts function on discourse-level or within the realm of rhetorics.
Our interpretation of shifts tried to remain independent of specific theories about the origin, composition or function of the book of Jeremiah but claims to be guided – as long as possible – by the phenomena itself. This does not enable us to provide a final solution. The last word on the matter of PNG-shifts functionality has not been said. But for now we have tried to speak consistently and coherently as far as rendered possible by the different phenomenological distributions.

Although our analysis has led to the formulation of specific rules and functions of shifts, it must be noted that there are still some cases where our rules and functions cannot be applied. This is either due to diachronic matters or due to the fact that a specific shift phenomenon is distributed in a too limited way, impeding an interpretation on the basis of data. Therefore, although we believe that our functional understanding helps the reading process, the rules outlined in chapter 5 must be applied carefully and critically.

Our study has not only contributed to the clarification of exegetical methodology but has also helped to shed new light on our case: participant reference-shifts do not disturb textual coherence and unity per se but even contribute to the readability of the text as the distribution of the diverse PNG-shifts reflects the language competence and writing skills of the writer/redactor. Some general methodological conclusions of our studies as well as some specific implications for reading and translating the book of Jeremiah are outlined in this concluding chapter.

6.1 IMPLICATIONS FOR READING AND TRANSLATING JEREMIAH

Our study has not drawn any theological conclusions about the book of Jeremiah. The interrelation of the omnipresent PNG-shifts and the theology of judgment and salvation in the book of Jeremiah, its portrait of God, or the picture of the religious identity of Israel and Judah have not been studied yet. Our study has not drawn any historical conclusions either, presenting a conception about the origin and reception of Jeremiah as a book. Although our text-critical study (chapter 4) focused on the influence of history on participant reference-shifts, it was of a limited scope since it only pointed out which arguments cannot be used for certain historical conclusions. Although we believe to have shown that PNG-shifts are rather expressing the art of writing than a problematic history with diverse redactions and transmissions, we need to be clear that this does not at all exclude diachronic elements – of whatever dimension. Even if a discourse-analysis proves the text-syntactical coherence of a text, it still can – speaking with Thiel – contain “sprachbefundlich Brüche”. Text-syntactical coherence does not exclude phraseological incoherence and phraseological coherence does not exclude text-syntactical incoherence.

In our opinion we cannot generate a historical understanding or theological conceptions on the basis of our results without becoming too speculative. Further studies into the field of method and data are needed. Engaging in the next exegetical steps would demand an interpretation of the phenomenology of Reason on the one hand and comparative studies between the PNG-shifts of Jeremiah and other biblical as well as non-biblical Ancient Near Eastern literature on the other hand. The first helps to interpret the phenomenology of the object “biblical text” (see 1.3, 1.4) and gives the different being-aspects of the text (e.g. teleology, reception-transmission, reference) a functional role in the interpretation of textual phenomena. The second enables the exegete to distinct between what is common according to the Ancient Near Eastern literature and what is special in the style and themes of the writing of Jeremiah.629 There will

629 Talstra, 113.
be clarity about whether participant reference-shifts are special to the book of Jeremiah, a general feature of poetic/prophetic biblical literature, or even a common phenomenon in other Ancient Near Eastern literary artifacts as well. Our work so far, then, must be understood as a prerequisite for the philosophico-hermeneutical and exegetical work ahead.

However, our findings do give some insight about a dominant characteristic of the textual nature of the book of Jeremiah. This insight, then, must influence our future exegetical studies. The book of Jeremiah contains participants that are engaged in a dynamic way in the direct speeches of YHWH and the prophet. In many sections of Jeremiah, the text creates the impression that when YHWH or the prophet is speaking a whole parliament of dialogue partners with many different parties is present. In a sense, the book of Jeremiah opens a complex turbulent parliamentary session. YHWH or the prophet addresses the parliament as a whole or just certain parties – if not single individuals who relate to the one or other party.

Since the addressing changes vividly by means of subjectivization/objectivization, no party and no individual can lean back and listen “objectively” as an “observer” to the speech of YHWH or the prophet. The chance or “danger” of being drawn into the conversation by a direct address is always present. No participant can rest, at any time and fully unexpected one can become the discourse partner of the divine voice. The divine voice is not at all a sober and objective voice. By means of the G-shift (shifting relational role) it not only approaches the different parties in their formal “parliamentary” function e.g. as nations of the world, but also in their “private” roles with regard to their covenant-relation with YHWH.

This dynamic change of dialogue partners is grounded in the complex and unstable situation of the world. Not only did Israel and Judah go astray, but also Moab, Edom, Egypt, Babylon, the Philistines, Damascus, etc.; judgment is not only spoken against Israel and Judah but also against any other nation. And the complexity even increases when some participants are called to execute the judgment (Babel) as well. Matters of responsibility are complex and so are the divine speeches.

But the reader not only encounters a versatile divine voice. Many DSC-shift chains display a vivid dialogue between different discourse partners as well. A whole party or a single individual can respond to the divine voice. The prophet can get off the divine speaker’s desk, join the parliament and interrupt or even oppose the divine voice. Parties as well as single individuals can talk to each other creating the impression of a parliament without the discipline to coordinate speeches and responses – a revolutionary atmosphere is tasted. The complexity increases when the reader becomes aware that not only the present but also the “past” “world” is present in the parliament. The parliamentary dialogue partners are not only the living ones but the dead ones as well (e.g. Jer 7:24-26).

This dynamic shift of references effects the reader as well. When the reader understands the different PNG-shift functions, he experiences the many lacks of DSIs as drawing him into the parliamentary situation. Since he is often not informed explicitly about the identity of the present speakers, he can easily imagine being a potential dialogue partner within the parliamentary session as well. The lack of DSIs creates in him the impression of being part of the discourse, inside the parliament. DSIs are only needed for “outsiders” not able to attach a certain voice to a specific participant. While being part of the communication situation, the question is automatically triggered to which parliamentary party the reader belongs. The reader is challenged by the discussion about right and wrong, responsibility and guilt, compassion and anger at the heart of the dynamic discourses to take a firm stand on his position.

The many alternating speeches, the lack of DSIs, as well as a lack of “outside the parliament”-information in the text, bring the parliament and its communicational activity to the forefront. The
author/redactor is not dominant; his opinion, judgment and interpretation often are absent. In that sense, there is no static position outside the discourses as an orientation point for the reader. This causes the reader to listen well to the different voices in order to arrive at his own judgment and find his position within this complex situation. To some extent the Jeremianic reading experience could be compared to the reading of the Socratic dialogues or the writings of Kierkegaard where different opinions and ideas are placed without the presence of an organizational, evaluative objective voice. The reader is called to get involved into a didactic and dialectic process. In this “physically” unordered communicational situation, the reader however is “linguistically” guided in his process of listening. Through “oral” markers and signals that help him identifying beginning and ending of speeches he is not lost in the turbulence of the parliamentary session. The results of our text-linguistic study in chapter 5 have made that clear.

This turbulence of communication as an essential characteristic of the nature of the text should be reproduced in any Bible translation. Where this turbulence is not transported into the translated text, not only is one of the distinctive elements of the book of Jeremiah (585 PNG-shifts!) lost, but, as a direct consequence, the reader is unable to accomplish his “insider” role and its consequences. The reader rather becomes a distanced and neutral observer of the vivid situation. As a consequence, the reader remains passive, hindered to arrive at the awareness of his own responsibility in taking a stand. Unfortunately, the reader of translations often finds himself in such a distanced position as the dynamic of the discourses of Jeremiah are “translated away” as some of the examples below show:

### 12:13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NRSV</th>
<th>Our translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>They have sown wheat and have reaped thorns, they have tired themselves out but profit nothing. They shall be ashamed of their harvests because of the fierce anger of the Lord.</td>
<td>They have sown (עֵשֶׂה) wheat and have reaped (רָכְבָה) thorns, they have tired (לְתָכַלּוּ) themselves out but profit (לְויָע) nothing. And get ashamed (болшo) of your harvests (מִתְבַּחֲרִיקוֹן) because of the fierce anger of the Lord.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 30:20-24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NRSV</th>
<th>Our translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I will restore the nation’s ancient power and establish it firmly again; I will punish all who oppress them. Their ruler will come from their own nation, their prince from their own people. He will approach me when I invite him, for who would dare come uninvited? They will be my people, and I will be their God. I, the Lord, have spoken.”</td>
<td>His children (בָּנָי) shall be as of old, his congregation (נַהֲרָדָה) shall be established before me; and I will punish all who oppress him (לְקַחְיָא). His prince (אֲדָרִיא) shall be one of his own (מָמְנוֹן), his ruler (מִשְׁפָּה) shall come from their midst; I will bring him near, and he shall approach me, for who would otherwise dare to approach me? says the Lord. And you (אֲדַלּא) shall be my people, and I will be God for you (לְכָכִי).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

where the Hebrew text is: 12:13, 30:20-24
21:13-14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shift-function:</th>
<th>NIV</th>
<th>Our translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Objectivization | "I am against you, Jerusalem, you who live above this valley on the rocky plateau, declares the Lord— you who say, "Who can come down against us, or who can enter our places of refuge?"
"I will punish you as your deeds deserve, declares the Lord. I will kindle a fire in your forests that will consume everything around you."

"See, I am against you (ךיָ֣י לָגָּא), O inhabitant of the valley, O rock of the plain, says the Lord; who say, "Who can come down against us, or who can enter our places of refuge?"
"I will punish you (םיכֹּג לֶע) according to the fruit of your doings (םיכֹּג לֶע לֹע), says the Lord; I will kindle a fire in her forest (הropolis), and it shall devour all that is around her (סֵבֵיקָה)."

44:4-5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shift-function:</th>
<th>GNT</th>
<th>Our translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Objectivization | "I kept sending you my servants the prophets, who told you not to do this terrible thing that I hate.
"But you would not listen or pay any attention. You would not give up your evil practice of sacrificing to other gods."

"Yet I persistently sent to you (םיכֹּג לֶע) all my servants the prophets, saying, "I beg you not to do this abominable thing that I hate!"
"And they did not listen (עלָּמַת) or incline (טוּה ה) their ear, to turn from their wickedness ( SHIPPING) and make no offerings to other gods."

The above cases are representative for hundreds of other cases in popular translations where the original participant reference-shift was skipped and the text smoothed according to our modern understanding of discourse-writing.

While translations have the tendency to “polish” the original text into a “better” text, smoothing textual “problems”, literary critics have the tendency to explicate the problems of the text and stress the absence of a meaningful readability of the text. But at the same time, textual “problems” are not studied phenomenologically when they are of a text-syntactic nature. This hinders a critical re-evaluation of one’s judgment about the readability of Jeremiah. If Duhm had engaged into such a phenomenological study, 21 of his 39 explicit shift-registrations could have been explained according to our outlined functional PNG-shift categories. That means that in contrast to 39 shift-cases, interpreted by Duhm as disturbing the readability of the text, 21 of them can be understood as supporting the readability of the text! Similar observations can be made about Thiel’s 17 shift-registrations of which at least twelve should not be interpreted source-critically, as breaking the coherence of the text but rather as contributing to the unity of the text. The same applies to Carroll. Jer 51:9 contains a nice example where Carroll’s dominant formal condition in combination with the lack of a distributional analysis of shifts, prevents him from approaching the text in a fair way:

9 [... ] Forsake her (נָבָּא/רָפָא/יַעֲקֹבָּא/אֵקָתָאִלְפָּוֹמָא оֹעַָהַו), and let us go (וָאָלָע/אֵפָלָוָמָא), each of us, to his own country; [...].

The MT/CL text shows a sequence of first an imperative (נָבָּא) and second a cohortative (וָאָלָע) form. As we have shown, such a sequence is a common feature of Hebrew and used often in the book of Jeremiah (cf. 5.4.2.10). However, Carroll is not registering the language-pragmatic side of the Hebrew text but rather its deviation from the LXX. Instead of a 2plM imperative followed by a 1plC cohortative, the LXX contains two 1pl subjunctives (εγκαταλιπομεν and ἀπέλθωμεν), functioning as cohortatives.

630 Cf. our database contained in the CD attached to this book.
631 Cf. our database contained in the CD attached to this book.
632 Carroll, 838-839.
According to Carroll, then, the formal incoherence in the MT/CL text reveals a textual problem. Since, in that case, the LXX is considered as less corrupted - because grammatically more coherent - he suggests to “correct” the Hebrew text by exchanging the imperative בָּהָ with a cohortative form.

Consequently, on the one hand, our study implicates that a text-linguistic analysis of the text, as initial part of the exegetical process, helps to register a large amount of important textual features that are often overseen. In our case, such features suggested a synchronistic interpretation of PNG-shifts in contrast to the widely held literary-critical opinions. We can assume that, with regard to other phenomena that have been approached so far predominantly from literary-critical perspectives, similar results can be achieved when a text-linguistic reading is performed.

On the other hand, our findings implicate that Bible translations should try to creatively transport the communicational nature of the book of Jeremiah with its special effects on the reading experience into their target text. If the translation “simplifies” its original source the reader will probably miss major effects of the original text, hindering him to get involved in a critical assessment of his own identity.

Our phenomenological study should influence any speculation about the composition and function of the book of Jeremiah. Reading Jeremiah should not be dominated by a feeling of distractedness but of excitement. As most shifts serve as traffic signs in the reading process, the reader is able to experience much more intensely the dynamics of the discourse. The many shifts of speakers, quotations and styles create an atmosphere of liveliness through the many dialogues and communicational layers. Lundbom has characterized Jeremiah’s rhetoric as a “rhetoric of descent”634. What he means to say is that the speaking of Jeremiah “begins at a distance and gradually comes closer until it is right upon you.”635 This observation fits well into the effects of many of our observed PNG-shifts.

6.2 Methodological conclusions

The results of our phenomenological text-syntactical reading of Jeremiah as a necessary working step prior to any other exegetical activities have proven itself to be fruitful. A text-syntactical reading with focus on the distribution of the encountered formal phenomena (of whatever kind), enables the scholar to register textual coherence and incoherence in a much more consistent way than a skilled reading with focus on semantic relations or rhetorical patterns. These text-syntactical readings open the floor for further diachronic and synchronic studies as illustrated in our work. The results of such a reading serve as a critical partner for the scholar when involved in interpretative activities as they bear great potential for falsification and verification of exegetical results.

However, our methodological reflection must be continued. While our work has laid a good foundation we are well aware that further methodological reflection is needed if we strive for a comprehensive exegetical methodology. First of all, we need to formulate a material interpretation of Reason. This enables us to interpret the phenomenological textual being-aspects from an ideological perspective and as a consequence, leads to the construction of a comprehensive exegetical methodology.

With regard to the available classical tools for exegetical work, like grammars and dictionaries, we discovered their limited use for our research. Meta-syntactical issues that play a role when text-syntactical

633 Fischer, 79.
634 Lundbom, 116.
635 Ibid.
observations are made, are not in their scope. Additionally, the classical works that are concerned about meta-syntactical text-organization are usually works on rhetoric where text-grammatical issues are basically overseen. Therefore, we would like to emphasize that the use of bottom-up text-syntactical databases like the WIVU database are of great importance, if a critical reading of biblical texts or an evaluation of interpretations is to take place. We hope that our study on participant reference-shifts fosters the heuristic processes that dominate the life and improvement of such bottom-up databases. We suggest that a further enrichment of the WIVU database should not only include a phenomenological registration (e.g. 2sgM-3sgM) but also, where possible, a functional interpretation (e.g. objectivization) of the encountered participant reference-shifts. We would like to suggest the following abbreviations that could be used in the encoding process of computer programs when tagging the form and function of PNG-shifts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2=3</td>
<td>2p=3</td>
<td>Participant holds 2pPos as well as 3pPos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3=2</td>
<td>3p=2</td>
<td>Participant holds 3pPos as well as 2pPos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1=3/3=1</td>
<td>1p=3</td>
<td>Participant holds 1pPos/3pPos as well as 3pPos/1pPos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s=p</td>
<td>1p=1</td>
<td>Participant is referred to in sg and pl forms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p=s</td>
<td>1p=1</td>
<td>Participant is referred to in pl and sg forms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s=p/p=s</td>
<td>1p=1</td>
<td>Participant is referred to in pl/sg and sg/pl forms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F=M/M=F</td>
<td>1p=1</td>
<td>Participant referred to in F/M and M/F forms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=3/3=2</td>
<td>1p=1</td>
<td>Participant referred to in 3pPos as well as in 2pPos.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>obj</td>
<td>2p=3</td>
<td>For those cases where an objectivization from 2P&gt;3P takes place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sub</td>
<td>3p=2</td>
<td>For those cases where a subjectivization from 3P&gt;2P takes place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slf</td>
<td>1p=3</td>
<td>For those passages where a self-reference is present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ext</td>
<td>3p=3</td>
<td>For those cases where a singular individual extends his identity by means of an N-shift, integrating himself into a larger group (e.g. 1sgC &gt; 1plC).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cds</td>
<td>2p=1</td>
<td>For those cases where a singular individual condensates his identity by means of an N-shift, focusing upon his distinctiveness from the group to which he belongs (e.g. 1plC &gt; 1sgC).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-w</td>
<td>1p=1</td>
<td>For those cases where the focus shifts from the group as a sg whole towards the plurality of its members and vice versa (sg=pl/pl=sg).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rlt</td>
<td>1p=1</td>
<td>For those cases where by means of a G-shift a different relational role of a participant is brought into focus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ess</td>
<td>1p=1</td>
<td>For those cases where an IP centric SS-shift is present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dss</td>
<td>1p=1</td>
<td>For those cases where a new DSC is introduced without being preceded by a DSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ser</td>
<td>1p=1</td>
<td>For those where a scribal error has most likely caused a shift.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idi</td>
<td>1p=1</td>
<td>For idomatic cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prg</td>
<td>1p=1</td>
<td>For pragmatic cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>???</td>
<td>1p=1</td>
<td>For those cases where an obvious interpretation of a shift is lacking.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the case of Jer 12:13, a tagging of the computer-assisted Hebrew database that includes our suggestion could be displayed in the following way:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Tag</th>
<th>Morphology</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3pl-</td>
<td>0Qtl &lt;&lt; NmCl</td>
<td>? 56</td>
<td>3.....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\text{N }\text{M} \text{C} \text{I}}}}]</td>
<td>\textit{They}</td>
<td>\textit{have sown wheat}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\text{W} \text{x} \text{Q} \text{t} \text{L}}}}]</td>
<td>\textit{and}</td>
<td>\textit{have reaped thorns}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\text{N} \text{X} \text{L} \text{W} \text{C} \text{I}}}}]</td>
<td>\textit{they}</td>
<td>\textit{have exhausted themselves}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3plM</td>
<td>xYqt &lt;&lt; 0Qtl</td>
<td>? 59</td>
<td>5.....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\text{L} \text{I} \text{O} \text{Y} \text{Q} \text{t} \text{L}}}}]</td>
<td>\textit{but}</td>
<td>\textit{they profit nothing}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2plM</td>
<td>3=2 Impv</td>
<td>&lt;&lt; xYqt</td>
<td>?Q 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\text{B} \text{C} \text{W} \text{C} \text{I}}}}]</td>
<td>\textit{be ashamed of your harvests}</td>
<td>because of the anger of the Lord.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The inclusion of both formal and functional information into the WIVU database would help scholars to get easy access to the distribution of PNG-shift types and their functional interpretation. Since the formal and functional information would be stored separately, it will be possible to formulate purely formal as well as purely functional queries. Furthermore, complex queries that combine formal and functional information can be constructed as well.
ABSTRACT

It appears to be a common phenomenon in the OT texts that the references to participants are unstable with regard to their gender, number and person characteristics. As a consequence, textual coherence is constantly at risk from a modern perspective. This applies especially to prophetic and poetic texts. While, for example, within the speech of YHWH in Jer 50:26-40 Babel is referred to in 3sgF (Babel=she) during the first clauses, the dialogue proceeds with addressing Babel in 2sgM (Babel=you [masculine]) before it switches back into 3sgF (Babel=she) forms and then continuing with 3plM references (Babel=they). As a consequence it is often unclear to the reader whether the reference to a participant has shifted because a new participants was introduced, or because the speaker has shifted, or because the speaker is no longer speaking to the same dialogue partner. Within the reading process the reader is constantly asking questions like “Who is speaking?” and “Who is addressed?”. This book, then, brings the generally ignored but omnipresent textual phenomenon of participant reference shifts into focus.

In this book we decide to discuss the phenomenon of participant reference shifts as they appear in the book of Jeremiah. Since this book contains almost 600 of these shifts it delivers enough data for getting at grips with the phenomenon and allowing a meaningful data-oriented analysis.

In our analysis of the phenomenon we pursue two aims. On the one hand, we let the few but diverse comments about the origin and function of these participant reference shifts by different exegetical traditions cause an investigation into the ontological and epistemological foundations of exegetical methodology. On the other hand, our exegetical interest will analyze the distributions of the shift phenomena in the book of Jeremiah phenomenologically in order to derive patterns and suggest possible, data-oriented functions of these shifts in the book of Jeremiah.

In the first chapter we present our methodological reflections. They contain a general phenomenological analysis of the processes and interrelated entities that make interpretation possible, a phenomenological description of the biblical text and a representation of the different and conflicting interpretations given on some of the most important phenomena of the biblical text.

After our methodological reflections, we are entitled to argue in the second chapter for the need of a text-linguistic analysis of the book of Jeremiah. This is an indispensable first step to be taken by any exegetical methodology, independent of their specific operative frameworks of interpretation. Our attitude towards data as well as our treatment of data receives a clear expression in this second chapter. However, the presented analytical instruments, which will visualize the text-grammatical structure of the text, will not allow for a “complete” interpretation of textual data. This is because we present our text-linguistic analysis not as a complete exegetical methodology. To propose a complete exegetical methodology cannot be part of this dissertation as it involves the construction of an interpretation of Reason, implying the research into the fields of ontology and epistemology.

After our methodology is laid out we confront in the third chapter the different commentary traditions and their treatment of PNG-shifts with our PNG-shift database (see 5.2) and assess their interpretations by means of our hermeneutical framework as developed in chapter 1. This results in the detection of - what we explain in our methodological reflections - the final and the formal condition of each respective commentary tradition. The basic difference between diachronic and synchronic approaches becomes visible.
Chapter 3 has set the floor for decision taking with regard to the diachronic or synchronic nature of PNG-shifts. In order to arrive at a conclusion in this matter, we investigate Jeremianic doublets, Qumran fragments and the Septuagint in the *fourth chapter*. The question will be answered to what extent the textual transmission process and redactorial activities are responsible for the presence of PNG-shifts. Our conclusion helps us to put our phenomenological analysis of PNG-shifts into a nuanced perspective of diachronic and synchronic dimensions.

Finally, in the *fifth chapter*, we analyze from a synchronic perspective the distribution of the different PNG-shift phenomena within the book of Jeremiah and propose specific PNG-shift interpretations. Here we will strongly depend on our PNG-shift database and its shift indexation. As a complete interpretation on all PNG-shifts is only possible if operated with a rather complete exegetical methodology, our interpretative results remain limited, as they focus, as far as possible, on those types of PNG-shifts that appear in large quantity, i.e. have a large distribution. As a result we will argue that most shifts have a synchronic function. While many shifts function on the level of syntax-grammar, others have a discourse organizing function, signaling the reader the beginning of new dialogues or modification of dialogues and guiding the reader through the text material. Besides the syntax- and text-grammatical nature of participant reference shifts, shifts can also function on a rhetorical level. Here the role of participants as well as the distance between speakers and the addressed ones can be changed dynamically.

In our final *sixth chapter* we point out some of the implications our study has for Bible-translation and exegetical methodology. We will conclude that “a priori” phenomenological description of the textual material in terms of syntax-grammar and text-grammar is a prerequisite for an ethical reading of the biblical text in general. Such reading can make a great difference in how a problematic case like ours (participant reference-shifts) is interpreted. A text-syntactical approach as first methodological step bears the chance that much of what is first experienced as awkward by the modern reader can now be understood as pointing at a system inherent to the ancient Hebrew language practice contributing to the communicational potential of a text.
**NEDERLANDSE SAMENVATTING**

**Vertaling Titel:** Wie spreekt? Wie wordt aangesproken? Een kritische studie over de condities van exegetische methodologie en haar consequenties voor de interpretatie van grammaticale verwijzingsverschuivingen naar tekstuele spelers in het boek Jeremia

Het schijnt in OT teksten geen ongewoon gebruik te zijn dat de formuleringen van verwijzingen naar spelers binnen een tekstgedeelte voortdurend van persoon, getal en geslacht kunnen veranderen. Door deze verschuivingen in de formulering neemt, vanuit hedendaags perspectief, het risico op frictie in de interne samenhang van de tekst toe. Dit is met name van toepassing bij profetische en poëtische teksten. In bijvoorbeeld de rede van JHWH, in Jer 50:26-40, wordt in de eerste zinnen naar Babel verwezen in 3sgF (Babel=zij [vrouwelijk enkelvoud]), terwijl dezelfde rede later naar Babel verwijst in 2sgM (Babel=jij), voordat er weer terugverwezen wordt in 3sgF (Babel=zij [vrouwelijk enkelvoud]). Uiteindelijk verschuift er binnen de rede de verwijzing naar Babel naar 3plM (Babel=zij [mannelijk meervoud]). Voor de lezer is de reden van deze verschuiving in formulering niet altijd duidelijk. De vraag is of de herformulering wellicht komt doordat er een nieuwe gesprekspartner is geïntroduceerd, doordat een ander is gaan spreken of doordat de spreker zich niet langer tot dezelfde dialoogpartner richt. In het leesproces vraagt de lezer zich derhalve voortdurend af “Wie spreekt?” en “Wie wordt aangesproken?”. Dit boek richt zich op dit, veelal genegeerde, doch duidelijk aanwezige fenomeen van verschuivingen in de formulering van verwijzingen naar spelers binnen een tekst.

In dit boek wordt het fenomeen van grammaticale veranderingen in verwijzingen naar spelers binnen een tekst besproken zoals deze voorkomen in het boek Jeremia. Aangezien dit boek bijna 600 van deze verschuivingen bevat, levert het voldoende data op om het fenomeen gedegen en vanuit de data zelf te analyseren.

De analyse van dit fenomeen streeft twee doelstellingen na. Aan de ene kant het onderzoek naar de ontologische en epistemologische fundamentele van exegetische methodologie. Dit vanwege enkele, doch uiteenlopende, opmerkingen vanuit verschillende exegetische tradities over de veranderingen in grammaticale verwijzing. Aan de andere kant wordt, vanuit exegetische interesse, de distributie van de verschuivingen in het boek Jeremia fenomenologisch geanalyseerd, om derhalve de herformuleringen te profileren en mogelijke datageoriënteerde functies van deze verschuivingen in het boek Jeremia te kunnen duiden.

Het eerste hoofdstuk geeft de methodologische beschouwing weer. Het bevat een algemene fenomenologische analyse van de processen en onderlinge verbanden in de tekst die interpretatie mogelijk maken, een fenomenologische beschrijving van de Bijbelse tekst en een weergave van de verschillende en in tegenspraak met elkaar zijnde interpretaties die worden gegeven aan enkele van de meest belangrijke fenomenen van de Bijbelse tekst.

Na de methodologische beschouwingen, geeft het tweede hoofdstuk de redenen aan voor tekstlinguïstische analyse van het boek Jeremia. Dit is een essentiële eerste stap die genomen moet worden door elke exegetische methodologie, onafhankelijk van de specifieke methodologie waarbinnen de interpretatie plaatsvindt. De opvatting van de data alsmede ook de verwerking van de data wordt in dit hoofdstuk duidelijk uiteengezet. Desalniettemin bieden de besproken analytische instrumenten, welke de tekstgrammatikale structuur van de tekst in beeld brengen, geen ruimte voor een “volledige” interpretatie
van de tekstuele data. Dit omdat de tekstlinguïstische analyse niet als een compleet exegetische methodology is aangeduid. Het beargumenteren van een volledig exegetische methodology kan geen deel uitmaken van deze dissertatie omdat dit zou betekenen dat ook de interpretatie van de verschillende elementen van Rationaliteit in kaart zou moeten worden gebracht; wat onderzoek in de ontologie en epistemologie impliceert.

Nadat de methodology is uiteengezet bespreekt het derde hoofdstuk de specifieke uitleg van de verschillende exegetische tradities van de PNG-verschuivingen (P=person/persoon, N=number/getal, G=gender/geslacht) met de PNG-verschuivingen database (zie 5.2) en worden deze interpretaties vanuit het hernementeit kader, zoals besproken in hoofdstuk een, geëvalueerd. Dit resulteert in het vaststellen van de finale en formele condities – welke in de methodologische beschouwing zijn uiteengezet – van elke respectievelijke exegetische traditie. Het fundamentele verschil tussen diachronische en synchronische benaderingen komt hiermee naar voren.

Hoofdstuk drie legt de basis aan voor een besluitvorming met betrekking tot de diachronische of synchronische aard van de PNG-verschuivingen. Om tot een conclusie hieromtrent te komen, onderzoekt hoofdstuk vier de Jeremiaanse doubletten, fragmenten uit Qumran en de Septuaginta. Hiermee wordt de vraag behandeld in hoeverre de overdacht van de tekst en de redactionele input verantwoordelijk zijn voor de PNG-verschuivingen. De conclusie hiervan draagt ertoe bij om de fenomenologische analyse van de PNG-verschuivingen in een genuanceerd perspectief van diachronische en synchronische dimensies te plaatsen.

Ten slotte wordt, in hoofdstuk vijf, de distributie van de verschillende PNG-verschuivingen in het boek Jeremia vanuit een synchronisch perspectief geanalyseerd en worden specifieke interpretaties voor de PNG-verschuivingen behandeld. Hierbij wordt nadrukkelijk gesteund op de PNG-verschuivingen database en haar indexatie van de verschuivingen. Daar een volledige interpretatie van alle PNG-verschuivingen alleen mogelijk is als gewerkt wordt met een naar verhouding volledige exegetische methodology, blijven de interpretatieve resultaten beperkt, daar zij zich richten, voorzover als mogelijk, op die typen van PNG-verschuivingen die in grote mate voorkomen, i.c. een hoge distributiegraad hebben. Hiermee wordt beargumenteerd dat de meeste verschuivingen een synchronische functie hebben, welke de lezer erop attenderen dat een nieuwe dialoog aanvangt of dat de dialoog zelf verschuift; om de lezer door de tekst heen te begeleiden. Naast de syntactische en tekstgrammatische aard van de grammaticale veranderingen in de verwijzingen, kunnen verschuivingen ook functioneren op het retorische niveau. Hierdoor komt er dynamiek in de rol van de deelnemers in de dialoog alsook in de afstand tussen spreker en geadresseerde.

In het laatste gedeelte, hoofdstuk zes, worden enkele implicaties van deze studie voor Bijbel vertalingen en exegetische methodology uiteengezet. Er wordt geconcludeerd dat een “a priori” fenomenologische beschrijving van de tekst, in termen van syntaxisgrammatica en tekstgrammatica, een voorwaarde is voor een ethische lezing van de Bijbelse tekst in zijn algemeenheid. Zulk een lezing kan een groot verschil maken in hoe moeilijke kwesties als de grammaticale veranderingen in verwijzingen worden geïnterpreteerd. Een tekstsyntactische benadering als eerste methodologische stap draagt de kans met zich mee dat hetgeen eerst als vreemd overkomt bij de hedendaagse lezer juist begrepen kan worden als verwijzend naar een systeem dat eigen is aan het antieke Hebreeuwse taalgebruik welk bijdraagt aan het communicatief potentieel van de tekst.
APPENDIX-A (SESB SCREENSHOTS)

SESB screenshot no1

In Entire Database:

Clause 1

Unordered Group 1

Phrase 1: Function = Subject
  Subphrase 1: Type = Noun + Number = singular + Article
  Word 5: (Lemma = "the")

Word 6: (Lemma = "in")
  Subphrase 2: Type = Adjective + Article
  Word 7: (Lemma = "the")

Phrase 2: Function = Predicate
  Word 5: (Lemma = "the")

SESB screenshot no2

In Entire Database:

Clause 2

Word 1: Paradigmatic Pronominal Suffix = (to Imp, p.2b) — Highlight

Clause 1

Unordered Group 1

Phrase 1: Type = Noun + Noun + Function = (Frontal, Frontal, Vocative) — Highlight
  Subphrase 2: Type = (Noun of Frontal, Noun of Frontal) — Not Present
  Word 5: (Lemma = "in")

Word 6: (Lemma = "the")
  Subphrase 2: Type = (Noun of Frontal, Noun of Frontal) — Not Present

Word 7: (Lemma = "to")

SESB screenshot no3

In Entire Database:

Sentence 1

Clause 1

Clause Main 1

Phrase 1: Function = Subject — Highlight
  Word 5: (Lemma = "in")

Gap 1 — Highlight

Clause 2: Constituent Relation = Adjective

Clause Main 2

Phrase 2: Function = Predicate — Highlight
  Word 5: (Lemma = "in")

Word 6: (Lemma = "the")
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SESB screenshot no7

In Entire Database:

Clause 1

Phrase 1: Function = Predicate — Highlight

Word 1: (Part of Speech = verb AND Number = singular)

Phrase 2: Function = Subject — Highlight

Subphrase 1: Type = (Daughter of Parael, Mother of Parael)
Appendix-B contains our text-grammatical analysis of the entire book of Jeremiah as well as our PNG-shift database.
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