

JEREMIAH 49:34-39 - The Prophecy against Elam: partially, its genuineness questioned by critics, espec. in terms of

BEWER

LANGE

Lange continued.

"The special date, too definite to be invented, favors Jeremiah's authorship... But why ~~soot~~ should include such a distant nation?.. Following Jeremiah's consistent position, he would be Nebuchad. But nothing is known of his campaign against Elam. However, acc. to Ezek.32:24 ff., in 586 the might Elamite warriors were in Sheol next to those of Assyria after a terrible defeat. About this time (v.34) the Persian king Teispes, the great grandfather of Cyrus, conquered Anshan = Elam. Jeremiah may have learned of this from reports of the exiles whose hopes had been aroused that Babylonia might be attacked and defeated and that they then might return home. If this is true, Jeremiah counteracted these hopes by insisting that the Lord Himself was Elam's foe. He was convinced that these events in Elam had nothing to do with Babylonia and Nebuchadnezzar. The verses may therefore ~~be~~ be Jeremiah's, but we cannot be sure. The prose lines of vv. 36, 39 are probably later than the poem.

... v.38, 'I will set my throne in Elam' Such a statement is very unusual and strange for the Lord and His throne of judgement. In 1:15, 43:10 it is used of thrones of human kings. The interpretation, the throne of my representative is not convincing. Probably ~~emad~~, I will make the throne of Elam desolate, which is in line with the following.

v. 39 bring against the captivity, restore the fortunes, cf. 46:26, 48:47, 49:6. This promise is also LXX, but in all instances it is a later addition.

"Elam is here mentioned as the representative of the more remote populations, beyond the Tigris, all those who are enumerated in the catalogue of nations beyond the Tigris in 25:25,26. M. Niebuhr assumes as certain a victorious war of Nebuchadnezzar with Elam between the ninth and twentieth years of his reign (Ass. u. Bab. S.212). In this, however, he relies not on positive historical testimony but only on inferences, the correctness of which may be disputed. We are further in no need of an actual overthrow of Elam by Nebuchadnezzar. The kernel of the prophecy is an idea which retains its truth even if Nebuchadnezzar had never made war on Elam.

Why Jeremiah chose Elam as the representative of the eastern nations is not apparent. Ewald's supposition that "the war-like Elamites had acted as auxiliaries shortly before in the deportation of Jeholachin and the first great deportation of the people, and ~~in the process~~ had shown themselves particularly cruel," does not appear to be well-founded. For 1. if the Elamites already served in the army of Nebuchad. they needed not to be subjugated; 2. the superscription affords no sure criterion of the date. For it is highly probable that it is

... the prophecies against the nations originally had place immediately after 25:, and ch.27 was connected directly therewith (w/out the intervention of 26), and the prophecy against Elam formed the conclusion of the oracle against the nations, and that original order, removed 27:1, and attached it, as a postscript, to the oracle against Elam. In this behalf the words "against Elam," had to be inserted. This alteration must have been made in very early times, for it makes itself felt in both the Hebrew text and in the LXX. only with this difference. that in the text, on which the LXX was based, the misplaced words still stood at the close of the word directed against Elam, so that this had a superscription and a postscript, while in our Masoretic recension the postscript, while in our Masoretic recension the postscript is made into the title by the assumption into it of the words אֶלְמָא - לְכַ

highly probable that it is placed here by mistake, as we shall see in v. 34. The prophecy does not mention Nebuchad. by name, and we must therefore regard it as of the same date as the others in ch. 46:- 49: against the nations (except 46:13 sqq, and 49:28=33).

the words אֶלְמָא - לְכַ  
... - (Kor)