

THE AIMS OF JEREMIAH: A STUDY OF THE EVIDENCE FOR, AND THE
SUBSTANCE OF, THE SHIFT IN JEREMIAH'S THINKING BETWEEN THE
COMPOSITION OF THE FIRST AND SECOND SCROLLS

Susan Slater

A Thesis
in
The Department
of
Religion

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts at
Concordia University
Montréal, Québec, Canada

July 1983

© Susan Slater, 1983

ABSTRACT

THE AIMS OF JEREMIAH: A STUDY OF THE EVIDENCE FOR, AND THE
SUBSTANCE OF, THE SHIFT IN JEREMIAH'S THINKING BETWEEN THE
COMPOSITION OF THE FIRST AND SECOND SCROLLS

Susan Slater

This thesis examines one central segment of the history of Jeremiah's thought. It begins with the recent study of W. L. Holladay, "The Identification of the Two Scrolls of Jeremiah," (Vetus Testamentum 30, 4 1980), which is a development of part of an earlier study, The Architecture of Jeremiah 1-20 (Lewisberg & London, 1976). This study claims, primarily on grounds of rhetorical structure, to discover the original Jeremiah scroll in Jeremiah 1-10, and to distinguish the additions to it that were made in the second scroll, after 604 BCE. The additions, Holladay argues, reveal a profound shift in Jeremiah's thinking: the foreseen doom which Jeremiah had hoped would be averted by repentance, after 604 becomes inevitable and in need only of spiritual acceptance.

Holladay's argument is first assessed in itself: the rhetorical analysis, the thematic contrasts found between redactional units, the move to historical hypothesis. Second, Holladay's argument is compared to that of two other recent researchers, Rudolph and Bright. The purpose of this is to see to what extent Holladay's argument is supported by recent historical scholarship in Jeremiah, which approaches the same material from differing perspectives. Finally, the thesis reaches

conclusions regarding both Holladay's argument and regarding the fruitfulness of this type of historical research.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I have been very grateful throughout this project for the support, direction and vigilance of my thesis supervisor, Dr. Sean McEvenue. I take this occasion to express my thanks to him.

I would also like to acknowledge with gratitude the assistance of the Loyola Jesuit Community of Montreal, who financed the typing and reproduction of this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES	vi
<u>Chapters</u>	
I INTRODUCTION	1
II CRITICAL REVIEW OF HOLLADAY'S ARGUMENT	15
Introduction	15
Holladay's Rhetorical Analysis	18
Jeremiah 1	18
Jeremiah 2	21
Jeremiah 3	24
Jeremiah 4:1-4	30
Jeremiah 4:5 - 6:30	31
Jeremiah 4:5 - 6:30 and 8:14 - 10:25	32
Further Exploration	39
The Connection Between 4:5 - 6:30 and 8:14 - 10:25: Conclusions	50
The Move to Historical Hypothesis	52
The Historical Hypothesis	54
Application of the Historical Criterion	57
Holladay: Conclusions	59
III RUDOLPH'S ANALYSIS OF JEREMIAH 1-10	63
Jeremiah 1:4-19	65
Analytic Summary	65
Relation to Holladay	67
Jeremiah 2	70
Analytic Summary	70
Relation to Holladay	72
Jeremiah 3 - 4:4	73
Analytic Summary	73
Relation to Holladay	75
Jeremiah 4:5 - 6:30	76
Analytic Summary	76
Jeremiah 4:5-31	77
Jeremiah 5:1-31	78
Jeremiah 6:1-26	81
Jeremiah 6:27-30	82
Relation to Holladay	82
Jeremiah 7:1-15	85
Analytic Summary	85
Relation to Holladay	87

Jeremiah 7:16 - 8:3	88
Analytic Summary	88
Relation to Holladay	89
Jeremiah 8:4 - 9:25	90
Analytic Summary	90
Relation to Holladay	94
Jeremiah 10:1-25	95
Analytic Summary	95
Relation to Holladay	96
Conclusion	97
Jeremiah 1-6: Relation Between the	
Analyses of Rudolph and Holladay	97
Chapters 7-10: Relation Between the	
Analyses of Rudolph and Holladay	99
Conclusions: Probable <u>Urrolle</u> Content	99
IV BRIGHT'S ANALYSIS OF JEREMIAH 1-10	101
Introduction	101
Jeremiah 1:1-19	106
Analytic Summary	106
Relation to Holladay	107
Jeremiah 2:1-3, 14-19, 4-13,	
20-37	108
Analytic Summary	108
Relation to Holladay	109
Jeremiah 3:1-5, 19-25, 4:1-4,	
3:6-18	110
Analytic Summary	110
Relation to Holladay	111
Jeremiah 4:5 - 6:30	111
Analytic Summary	111
Relation to Holladay	114
Jeremiah 7:1-34, 8:1-3	116
Analytic Summary	116
Relation to Holladay	117
Jeremiah 8:4 - 10:25	118
Analytic Summary	118
Relation to Holladay	120
Conclusion	121
V CONCLUSIONS	124
A. The Contents of the Two Scrolls as	
Evidence For a Shift in Jeremiah's	
Thinking	125
The Argument in Review	125
The First Scroll: Contents	
and Design	127
The First Scroll: Evidence	
About Jeremiah	129

The Second Scroll: Contents and Design	132
The Second Scroll: Evidence About Jeremiah	133
Areas of Significance For Future Research	134
B. The Larger Context: Historical Jeremiah Research	136
NOTES	140
WORKS CITED	148
APPENDICES:	
I TIMETABLE OF EVENTS SURROUNDING BABYLONIAN EXILE	150
II FIRST AND SECOND SCROLL MATERIAL IN JEREMIAH 1-10	151

LIST OF FIGURES

1	Inclusion Between 2:2 and 2:31-32	23
2	Meaning-Inclusive Parallels Between 4:5 - 6:30 and 8:14 - 10:25	36
3	Verbal Links Between 5:7 and 9:1	42
4	Verbal Links Between 4:19-22 and 10:19-21	47

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The quest of the historical Jeremiah, like that of the historical Jesus in many respects, has come along a rocky road in the last century of historical biblical scholarship.¹ Just as the reader of the New Testament gospels spontaneously feels that Jesus is there accessible to him or her, so the reader of the Jeremiah-book feels -- especially in certain parts -- that in it Jeremiah is accessible. In both cases the accessibility involves a substantial historical component: biographical details, details of internal conflicts and assents.

This impression arises from the nature of these texts: they claim to tell us about Jesus, or about Jeremiah, about what each said, did, and how he felt. In the Jeremiah-book, specifically, the personal pronoun "I" is much more frequent and material narrating events in the prophet's life is much more extended, than in the other biblical prophetic books. The Jeremiah-book also contains the so-called "confessions" of Jeremiah; personal laments appearing to express the prophet's most intimate conflicts. Finally, the extensive references to dates and specific events in the Jeremiah-book relate the materials they introduce to the historical movement outside the text, giving the impression that the two may mutually cast light upon one another.

In the case of the Jeremiah-book, this impression of historical accessibility given by the internal evidence is heightened by the

existence of other extensive literary witnesses to the history of the period: the historical narrative of 2 Kings, and the Babylonian Chronicles and administrative documents most prominently, as well as fragments such as the Lachish Ostraca.²

It is not surprising, then, that over the past hundred and more years, a number of biblical scholars have written commentaries on the Jeremiah-book that are best described as "lives-of" Jeremiah, portraying his life in intimate biographical and psychological detail.³ (The same phenomenon, of course, was present in scholarship about Jesus.)⁴

Other scholars, also interested in reading the Jeremiah-book to learn about Jeremiah, nonetheless focussed their historical study first on the development of the text, and especially on source-critical problems. Mowinckel in particular, was responsible for developing the source hypothesis (from the observations of Duhm) that is by and large still accepted or at least debated, today.⁵ He found three main sources in the Jeremiah-book. The first source, A, was composed of Jeremiah's own speech. The second source, B, was made up of narrative about Jeremiah. The third main source, C, consisted in Jeremiah's speech in Deuteronomistic redaction, i.e. most of Jeremiah's prose speech. Rudolph also stands in this tradition of scholarship, using and to some extent developing the work of Mowinckel in his literary approach to historical analysis.⁶

John Bright further developed the source classifications of Mowinckel, by arguing convincingly that the "prose sermons" of Jeremiah (Mowinckel's C) were not Deuteronomistically edited as Mowinckel had maintained, but were rather records of the "gist" of Jeremiah's words on the occasions referred to, preserved and redacted by Jeremiah's

disciples.⁷ In his analysis of the Jeremiah-book generally, he proceeds from an initial literary appropriation of a text to a historical comment. For Bright, as for those other historical-critical scholars, the main purpose of criticism was "allowing the prophet to speak";⁸ and there is no doubt expressed regarding the possibility of this.

❶ Much of the drift of recent scholarship in the Jeremiah-book, again as in the gospels, has been towards a focus on the tradition that formed the book itself, and away from the figure of the historical Jeremiah. This shift has been justified by both negative and positive judgments of possibility.

First, it is argued by some that the Jeremiah sensed in different parts of the book is not historical but a product partly of literary form, partly of community needs. So Nicholson argues (against Bright primarily) that the prose of the Jeremiah-book (Mowinckel's B and C) is in fact Deuteronomistically redacted, is shaped in its content by the unique religious needs of the Babylonian exilic community, and is not a presentation of Jeremiah's own position.⁹ So Reventlow, seeing Jeremiah as a cultic functionary, has argued that the "prophetic I" in Jeremiah, especially in the "confessions," reflects cultic situations in the Temple, liturgies in which "I" was formally required, and therefore does not at all reflect the prophet's personality.¹⁰ So Gerstenberger and Gunneweg argue that the "confessions" are redactional compositions.¹¹ So Wanke, in the "biographical" parts of the book (Mowinckel's B) finds not one, but two Jeremiahs who are, in his judgement incompatible and the products of different literary forms.¹² So Thiel has argued that the whole book is Deuteronomically redacted.¹³ First, then, Jeremiah himself has on various fronts been judged inaccessible.

Second, a positive interest has arisen in the history of the text's transmission; an interest not simply in service of isolating genuine Jeremiah material, the ipssissima verba, but rather an interest in understanding the formative role on the scripture exercised by the tradition that produced it.¹⁴ Nicholson's book, Preaching to the Exiles, for example, takes the focus off Jeremiah to relocate it on the exilic community that he sees as responsible for the transmission of the prose about Jeremiah.

This revaluation of the final text can only be seen as a positive development. Likewise, a critical attitude towards sources can only be welcomed as hard-earned fruit of earlier historical criticism. At the same time, as too often, the affirming of one project's value has advanced through the disparagement of another project's value. I would judge as premature both the judgment of Jeremiah's inaccessibility and the related turn away from him in the process of turning towards the tradition.

In the shift of attention to the formative tradition, something happened to the way historical probabilities were weighed. Critical methodology was practiced as methodical skepticism.¹⁵ The weight of probability was shifted away from Jeremianic composition or historical reference, towards transformative influence of the formative community. In other words, one has now to demonstrate not that a text is secondary or not a dependable witness, but that it is Jeremianic or a historically dependable witness. So, Nicholson will argue that Jeremianic vocabulary in the prose material does not argue for his composition of, or even direct influence in the text, but only for some underlying sayings of his in the tradition.¹⁶ He further argues that the differences in "vocabulary and peculiar expressions" between the prose sermons and the poetic material of the Jeremiah-book are such that "both blocks of

material cannot reasonably be regarded as coming from the same person."¹⁷

And yet, surely the weight of responsibility remains with Nicholson, for him to demonstrate that in the case of poets who also write prose, their prose is regularly and observably like their poetry in ways that are not evident between the poetry and prose of the Jeremiah-book.¹⁸ Now, in a book that presents itself as a collection of Jeremiah's words, that probably reached something near its final form within fifty years of the prophet's preaching, and in which Jeremiah himself probably contributed to the early redaction -- it seems ridiculous to deny a central position to the prophet himself, and an initial probability in favour of his composition of the material it contains.

Moreover, concern with the formative tradition should not obliterate the fact that the words of Jeremiah are in fact foundational to it. His words were preserved as significant and as confirmed by the course of history, and when they were added to, it was because of the weight already attached to them. It is, in addition, unlikely that his words would be distorted to the point that the contemporary reader or listener could not distinguish between Jeremianic main-line, and secondary insertion, since the book would have largely been put together for audiences who had heard Jeremiah, and who knew what he had said.¹⁹

I am, in other words, arguing for both the possibility and the desirability of a continued interest in the prophet himself. The turn towards the impact of the formative community on the development of the Jeremiah-book, need not -- and should not -- proceed exclusive of an interest in the impact of Jeremiah himself on that development.

At the same time, as the above discussion has suggested, it is necessary that appropriate historical methodology be used in pursuing

knowledge of Jeremiah. From this perspective it does not seem likely that the "psycho-biographical" commentaries on the Jeremiah-book, characterised by a naive appropriation of sources, will be of much use.²⁰ The contributions of historical critics such as Mowinckel, Rudolph and Bright, though, constitute valuable precedents to any new efforts, and should be kept in mind.²¹

Ben Meyer, in his recent re-opening of the historical-Jesus question, offers an extended discussion of methodology; parallels already noted between historical-Jesus and historical-Jeremiah research suggest that his discussion could fruitfully be applied to the present inquiry.²²

Most central to Meyer's discussion is the definition he adopts of history, not as event, but as "knowledge of event," i.e. understanding of the "thought or purpose that charged it." The "historical fact" from this perspective is the term rather than the starting point of the inquiry and comprehends both the "what" and the "why" of the event. Human intentionality is, then, made of central concern, and the historical inquiry therefore proceeds technically in terms of interpretation of individual intentions and explanation of the "confluence of variously related intentions" in an event.²³ Three related points, according to Meyer, are implicit in this assertion:

(1) that history focusses on human action which, by contrast to natural process, is original and unpredictable though potentially familiar, thanks to the historian's own rational consciousness; (2) that human purpose is regularly an important determinant of human action; (3) that what goes forward in time does so out of the interaction of purposes informing a panoply of instruments.²⁴

So it is that Meyer is able to re-open the question of the historical Jesus, not in terms of a chronology but in terms of a study of his purposes. Hence his title, "The Aims of Jesus." It is conceivable,

likewise, to re-open the largely closed historical-Jeremiah question in terms of "the aims of" Jeremiah. This should be more specifically articulated. For a person such as Jeremiah, i.e. a prophet, "aims" are most centrally embodied in a sense of vocation, or call from God. The focus of such an inquiry, then, would be on Jeremiah's vocational self-understanding. This would involve both Jeremiah's understanding of what was going forward in Judah, and his understanding of his role in it; all in terms of Yahweh's direction.

To sum up, then, the methodological shift in focus, i.e. to "aims," proposed by Meyer for the historical study of Jesus, offers a potentially fruitful angle for the historical study of Jeremiah, which I have argued -- against certain trends in recent scholarship -- is an important pursuit. My project in this thesis is to look at a recent example of historical scholarship in the Jeremiah-book that concludes, in effect, to a shift in the "aims" of Jeremiah, with a view to evaluating its success.

I propose to look at a recent revival of a question officially laid to rest by John Bright in 1964: that of the two scrolls in Jeremiah. Chapter 36 of the Jeremiah-book narrates the composition by Jeremiah of a scroll of his sayings, its destruction, and its rewriting with additions. Needless to say, speculation about the contents of these two scrolls has occupied the minds and pens of most Jeremiah scholars. There has, however, resulted little agreement, and Bright, in the introduction to his commentary on Jeremiah wrote: "Now it is futile ... to speculate regarding the precise contents of this scroll; commentators who do so are indulging in guesswork."²⁵ W. L. Holladay, nonetheless, has claimed to be able to differentiate between the contents of the first and second scrolls in the first ten chapters of Jeremiah on the basis, primarily,

of rhetorical structure, and, secondarily, of thematic contrast.²⁶ Thus far we have a study in the compositional history of the book of Jeremiah. But Holladay draws a further conclusion in his article, about a shift in Jeremiah's vocational self-understanding precipitated proximately by the rejection of the first scroll. The dimensions of the shift concluded to by Holladay, briefly, are these: whereas Jeremiah had previously uttered his words of destruction as warnings with the hope of provoking repentance and averting doom, and whereas he had previously understood his role as one of mediation between Yahweh and his people, he now felt repentance to be utterly rejected and doom to be irrevocable, and he understood his role as one of communicating/announcing Yahweh's judgment.

My proposal in this thesis is to examine Holladay's argument, for the final purpose of confirming, refuting, or modifying his conclusions to the shift in Jeremiah's aims. In order to do this, I will compare Holladay's method and conclusions with those of Rudolph and Bright, two veteran workers in the Jeremiah-book, to see to what extent their conclusions overlap and their methodologies reinforce Holladay's. Both Rudolph and Bright bring a keen literary awareness to the Jeremiah-book. Rudolph is especially strong in discerning thematic and redactional continuities. Bright, for his part, focusses serious attention on the dating of individual texts. Both, of course, try to divide the text in places corresponding to unit divisions within the text. The divisions of the text are the first question of importance. Holladay's rhetorical criticism looks for the devices used to link units. To know exactly what is being linked, and even to establish the existence of links, as opposed to random occurrences, it is necessary to know where units begin and end. In comparing Holladay and Rudolph, then, an important question

will be whether the units discerned by Rudolph to be linked thematically correspond to those linked by Holladay on rhetorical grounds. In comparing Holladay and Bright, an important question will be whether the dates assigned by Bright permit the scroll assignments made by Holladay. Of course, it will always be important to exercise judgment about the foundational implications of each scholar's method and judgment.

Preparatory to launching the search for the two scrolls, it would be useful to recall the evidence for their existence. Basically, this is contained in the narrative of Chapter 36. Norbert Lohfink's literary and historical analysis of this material serves the present purpose admirably, evaluating the intention of the source, coming to a conclusion about the historicity of the account, and elaborating on its historical references.²⁷ The following survey of his analysis, then, serves the dual purposes of evaluating Chapter 36 as a dependable source, and of reviewing -- and to a certain degree establishing -- what is known of the events affecting the scroll's composition and reception. His presentation moves from literary criticism to historical criticism, following the principle he establishes, that the former should always precede the latter.

Lohfink's analysis of the literary structure of Chapters 26 and 36 (which he identifies as parts of the same narrative) shows that they are really concerned with the legitimation of certain members of the king's court, those belonging to the family of Shaphan. The purpose of the narrative, which focusses on "the fate of Yahweh's word" during Jehoiakim's reign, is to point out that these men recognised the importance of Jeremiah's words, called them to the attention of Jehoiakim, and tried to dissuade him from destroying the scroll.²⁸

The narrative of Jer. 26/36, Lohfink observes, proceeds structurally

by means of narrative sections introduced by date references. Examination of the action and of the structure of the narrative, though, does not "unlock" the significance of the date references; they contribute nothing to the dynamic of the narrative. This means that they therefore probably functioned as memory cues to the audience, eliciting recollections of commonly known events.²⁹ All of this makes probable, then, that a scroll was actually narrated, read, destroyed, in a sequence that began in 605 BCE.

Lohfink next turns to a consideration of the composition and public reading of the scroll, in a broader historical perspective. Concretely this involves trying to understand the substance of the memory cues intended by the date references. He has already argued that the MT text of the third date reference in the Jeremiah 26/36 narrative, Jer. 36:9, should be emended. The MT gives this reference as the fifth year of the reign of Jehoiakim. The LXX gives this reference as the eighth year of Jehoiakim's reign, and Lohfink maintains that this reading must prevail, as lectio difficilior. The later reader would have been confused by the lapse of four years between the composition and reading of the scroll.³⁰

He then tries to "unlock" the significance of the date references. The first, in 26:1 is to the beginning of Jehoiakim's reign (609). As a memory cue this date refers simply to the early realisation that Jehoiakim's reign was marked not only by new pro-Egyptian foreign policy, but also by exploitation and arrogance. (Jehoiakim was, after all, placed on the throne by the conquering Egyptians in 609.) It certainly appears that reform was abandoned with the appointment of Jehoiakim by the Egyptians. Jeremiah, Lohfink claims, shifted at this point from being a loyal "co-worker" in the Josianic reform, to an accuser

and prophet of doom.³¹

The second date reference, in 36:1, is to the fourth year of Jehoiakim's reign (605). Lohfink points out that it was in the summer of this year that Nebuchadnezzar beat the Egyptians at Carchemish: "the conquest of all Syria-Palestine was but a matter of time."³² Jehoiakim and his advisors faced a crucial question: whether to submit to Babylon or whether to stand with Egypt against Babylon.

Jeremiah saw Yahweh at work in Nebuchadnezzar's move against the Egyptians, Lohfink maintains (giving 46:2-12 as a reference.) In this situation, debarred from the Temple himself, he drew together his oracles in a scroll to be read during a fast day, in a last effort to prevent war with the Babylonians. Lohfink speculates that the fast day would have been called in connection with the crisis of political decision facing Judah at the time, as, for example, a national day of repentance at the beginning of war. (The exact meaning of the term "fast day" is uncertain as it is a hapax legomenon in texts before the post-exilic period.)³³

Now the war did not materialise. Jehoiakim became Nebuchadnezzar's vassal in 604 (2K 24:1), presumably after his defeat of Ashkelon in that year. That is why, Lohfink submits, the scroll did not get read in that year. The fast day itself was probably not held.³⁴

The third and final date reference, found in 36:9, is to the ninth month of the eighth year of Jehoiakim's reign (601). This is the year in which the political situation first changed in Judah. Nebuchadnezzar had a difficult encounter with the Egyptians. His forces were so depleted that he had to go home, and could wage no wars for the next year, but rather had to concentrate on rebuilding his troops. This was probably the signal to Jehoiakim for rebellion. Things went well at first; it

will be remembered that Nebuchadnezzar's father died in 600, thus further delaying his return to active campaigns. In 597 Nebuchadnezzar returned, and Jehoiakim was dead even before his arrival.³⁵

In December of 601, though, Nebuchadnezzar was apparently beaten. Either people were wondering whether they ought to rebel, writes Lohfink, or the rebellion had taken place already and they were preparing for war. In any case, a national fast day was called. This, then, was the setting in which Baruch read Jeremiah's scroll. So, writes Lohfink, "when the reader read of the ninth month of Jehoiakim's eighth year, he had this situation before his eyes."³⁶

After going through Lohfink's interpretation of the historical data, it becomes quite understandable how Jehoiakim's burning of the scroll could have represented the end of hope for Jeremiah, as Holladay will argue. Disaster concretely meant the wasting of the land by Nebuchadnezzar. And Nebuchadnezzar had no motivation for such aggression, unless Judah rebelled. Without rebellion, then, there was not explicit threat. The threat perceived by Jeremiah if Judah rebelled, should probably be understood in terms of Jeremiah's vision of Nebuchadnezzar's role as Yahweh's instrument. It should also be recognised that rebellion meant, not political independence -- at least not for long, but concretely, a return to Egyptian vassalage, which had originally signalled the falling-off from the Josianic reform under the unsympathetic leadership of Jehoiakim. (The idea of an "alliance" between Egypt and Judah, given their disproportionate strengths and recent history, is ludicrous, somewhat reminiscent of the relationship proffered to the unfortunate Oysters by the Walrus and Carpenter of Wonderland fame.)³⁷

Lohfink's analysis, then, confirms Chapter 36 as a dependable

historical witness. He sees it as a kind of partisan journalism designed to further the political ends of the Shaphan-family in exile. As such, it was nonetheless offering an interpretation of actual events, occurrences of common knowledge.

It can be said with strong probability that a scroll of Jeremiah's words was dictated in 605 for the immediate purpose of averting war with the Babylonians, and read in the Temple in 601 in the hope of averting rebellion against the Babylonians; that it was destroyed by Jehoiakim in rejection; and that Jehoiakim's rejection was seen as heralding certain doom. The concern of the Shaphan-family to exculpate its members in this event is an indication of the crucial significance they attached to it.

At least, then, in looking for the scrolls we may judge that we are not chasing a figment of academic imagination. The decisive significance attached by the Shaphan-family to the event of its reading and rejection, suggests that it might in fact have had the same significance for Jeremiah, as Holladay will maintain.

In pursuing the investigation into Holladay's argument for the identification of the two scrolls, and thence for a shift in Jeremiah's vocational self-understanding, the following order will be observed. A critical review and evaluation of Holladay's argument will follow immediately in Chapter Two. Chapters Three and Four will deal respectively with the contributions of Rudolph and Bright to the study of the portion of the Jeremiah-book dealt with by Holladay, and the significance for Holladay's argument of their contributions. Chapter 5 will offer the conclusions of this thesis. Specifically, it will offer a synthesis of the judgments to that point regarding the assignment of material to first and second scrolls, preparatory to an attempt to study

a segment of the history of Jeremiah's thought: the genuineness and dimensions of the shift proposed by Holladay. On the basis of these conclusions regarding Holladay's argument specifically, some final reflections will be offered that aim at further answering the questions about the possibility and value of "historical-Jeremiah" research, with which the present investigation was introduced.

CHAPTER II

CRITICAL REVIEW OF HOLLADAY'S ARGUMENT

Introduction

"The Identification of the two scrolls in Jeremiah,"¹ attempts to fulfill the mandate of its title primarily through rhetorical criticism, and secondarily, through historical criticism. This article starts from the conclusions of a previous rhetorical structural work, The Architecture of Jeremiah 1-20,² although in some cases these have been modified.

Holladay's method of rhetorical analysis aims at establishing the existence of unified structures in extended bodies of text, on the basis of a variety of "rhetorical" signals. According to Holladay, these signals are primarily mnemonic in function; quite possibly they were sensed, rather than deliberately implanted by the author or redactor. They consist in such things as "repetitions, parallels, and contrasts in words, phrases and syntax."³ While the procedure is a form of literary analysis, the final goal is historical: to reach an understanding of the composition process of a book.

In the case of Chapters 1-10, Holladay is betting that the composition process has at its foundation the first scroll, and -- one step up -- the second. He points out that for Jeremiah to have dictated a scroll twice, -- the second time with additions, the material must have had a shape in his mind.⁴ (Holladay does not address the possibility of

previous literary records). Holladay defines the scope of his investigation as the first ten chapters of Jeremiah, because it seems unlikely that they would not have been in the early scrolls, since they contain many "words of 'evil' against Israel and Judah."⁵ Also, Chapters 11-20 seem to be skeletally structured by the "confessions," with much more secondary material than is apparent in Chapters 1-10. Both the higher level of secondary material and the fact that the skeletal structure seems to be something other than the first scroll, make these chapters an improbable hunting ground for first scroll rhetorical structure.⁶

Holladay develops from the direct historical concern with the book's composition, a historical concern of a different kind: the history of the development of Jeremiah's understanding of his vocation, in relation to his understanding of the course of events in Judah. He notices thematic contrasts between units distinguished on rhetorical grounds, and finds them to correspond to the thematic movement of Chapter 36, which relates the circumstances of the composition of the two scrolls. He proposes the thematic movement in that chapter as accurately interpreting the historical event: the shift from threats in the service of conversion in the composition of the first scroll, to threats of irrevocable doom after its rejection, captures for us the occasion and cause of Jeremiah's loss of hope for the aversion of doom.

This insight becomes a criterion in distinguishing between first and second scroll material, thus furthering the movement towards an understanding of the composition process of the text. In its application, then, the criterion says that passages affirming the possibility of repentance are first scroll, while those affirming irrevocable doom are second scroll. It is decisive for Holladay's judgments, especially in

passages that appear low in rhetorical evidence.

My primary concern with Holladay's presentation is its historical critical component: I want to know if Jeremiah experienced a shift such as Holladay proposes, and equally, I want to know how we can go about identifying and verifying such shifts. Nevertheless, the dependence of this component on his rhetorical critical conclusions makes it necessary to examine and evaluate Holladay's presentation in its entirety, up to the point where the shift he hypothesizes in Jeremiah is established as a historical criterion. It should be noted that the subsequent application of this criterion to the identification of the two scrolls is, on the whole, not of interest to the present investigation, which focusses finally on the historical hypothesis about Jeremiah.

Now the rhetorical argument as we find it in the article is more or less a selective report on the findings of Architecture. To evaluate them then, I propose also examining his (more developed) rhetorical critical work in the book itself. Needless to say, this will remain a selective procedure, because the book is itself a mass of tersely reported detail, most of which would simply lead us off the track. It is a task that is also somewhat complicated by the fact that in the book he proceeds chapter by chapter, whereas in the article Holladay hops here and there over the first ten chapters, as the clues lead him.

I will follow the order of presentation of Architecture for the portion of Holladay's argument that is primarily rhetorical, i.e. his initial treatment of Chapters 1-4:4, focussing next on the portion of his argument that is central in both the article and the book: the relations between 4:5 - 6:30 and 8:14 to 10:25, which are the cornerstone of his rhetorical argument. In dealing with the more specific

development of his historical argument, the order of presentation of "Two Scrolls" will be followed.

Holladay's Rhetorical Analysis

Jeremiah 1

Central to Holladay's argument about the place of Chapter One in the basic strata of the Jeremiah book is the observation that the root $\gamma\chi$ ✓ occurs in 1:6,7 and then again in 2:2 and 3:4,24.⁷ He argues that 1:4-10, the call proper, is "welded" onto "the original material" of Chapters 2 and 3 by this word root, and takes this as evidence that the call proper is the initial unit at the beginning of the process of collection.⁸

By contrast to vv. 4-10, vv. 11-19 have no verbal links with the material following them, and so are tentatively excluded by Holladay from the first scroll. The existence of a break between vv. 4-10 and vv. 11-19 is commonly recognised in Jeremiah scholarship, being most obviously evidenced by an inconsistency in v. 13 -- "and the word of Yahweh came to me a second time." Had the call in vv. 4-10 been counted, it would have been the third time. It is not surprising, then, that Holladay should also find grounds for separating these verses from the earliest collection. At the same time, keeping in mind that we are dealing with a composite text composed as late as 605 BCE, it is not clear that he is right, either.

In Architecture Holladay had suggested that vv. 11-14 were linked to vv. 4-10 by the occurrence in both of the root $\gamma\chi$ (vv. 10,11,12,13). There are several other links between vv. 4-10 and vv. 11-19, both thematic and verbal. First, 11-16 continues in the same vein of visionary experience as vv. 4-10. This is made formally apparent in the repeated introductory phrase: "The word of Yahweh came to me ...

saying" (vv. 4.11.13). Both passages, moreover, share an interest in the actualisation of Yahweh's word (vv. 6,7,9,12).

Second, there is a discernable relation between verses 4-10 and 17-19, in their mutual focus on the commissioning of Jeremiah. This is made formally apparent first by the verbal links between vv. 9-10 and v. 18:

"See, I give ... this day."

18	See	I give (יָהִי) you this day	
9	Behold	I place (יָהִי)	my words in /your mouth.
10	See I have set	you this day	

In verses 9-10 the three elements of the parallel (see, I give you, this day) occur over two lines and not in the same order, but the complementary parallel between vv. 9 & 10 sets them together in linking with v. 18 — as I have tried to illustrate in the above diagram. Each of the three elements has a parallel in the same place in one of the two verses — 9-10.

The third link of this kind between vv. 4-10 and vv. 11-19 is the recurrence of a phrase in vv. 8 and 19: "for I am with you to come to your rescue — Yahweh's word."

A fourth verbal link between vv. 4-10 and vv. 11-19, but whose thematic continuity is not immediately apparent, is the occurrence of מַמְלָכוֹת (kingdoms) in vv. 10 and 15. All these links establish a continuity between vv. 4-10 and vv. 11-19, but there is also significant discontinuity in the way they are used.

First, concern with the actualisation of Yahweh's word in vv. 4-10 focusses on its proclamation (6,7,8,9). In vv. 11-16, in contrast, the

concern focusses on its performance by Yahweh. That is to say that what Yahweh was concerned with getting said, in vv. 4-10, he is concerned with getting done, in vv. 11-19.

Second, the focus of Yahweh's word itself would seem to have changed. This can be seen in the sharply contrasting uses of one of the words implicated in it, in the two passages. In v. 10, as part of his commissioning, Jeremiah is set $\text{לְעַלְיוֹת וְלִשְׁמֹרֶת}$, "over," or "against" "kingdoms and nations" to "pluck up and break down," etc. This commission should doubtless be read in continuity with his appointment (v. 4) as a "prophet to the nations" and it seems probable that Judah is included in the designation "kingdoms and nations." In v. 15 the clans of the "kingdoms" of the north are going to come against (לְעַלְיוֹת) the walls of Jerusalem and against Judah's towns. The kingdoms now are clearly to be understood in a sense exclusive of Judah, and they are the active force in Yahweh's performance of his word, rather than the receptors of it. They will themselves, it seems, be doing the "plucking up and breaking down."

Third, the commissioning, ("I give you this day ...") initially with reference to Yahweh's words and being set over -- or against -- nations and kingdoms, in later verses refers to a strengthening of Jeremiah's defenses against his own people.

Verses 11-19, with its verbal links to vv. 4-10, shifts the meaning/significance of the narrative of Jeremiah's call. It seems as if, in the light of those later verses, Jeremiah's position לְעַלְיוֹת nations and kingdoms, "to pluck up and break down," etc. must be seen in terms of a directive force. Verses 4-10 alone leave the impression that the nations over (or against) which Jeremiah is set will themselves be

plucked up and broken down. Verses 11-14 and particularly vv. 15-19 make it clear that these nations will actually, in response to Yahweh's call, be plucking up Jerusalem. By the end of the chapter, then, the reader is left with an understanding of Jeremiah's vocation that involves working in some directive capacity with the nations, under Yahweh, and against the people of Jerusalem.

How do these word links and shifts in word use reflect on the process of composition in Chapter One? It seems clear that vv. 4-10 and vv. 11-19 are rhetorically connected. Since the first scroll was itself a composite text, it seems premature to exclude verses 11-19 from the early rhetorical structure Holladay sees effective here. The verbal link in 1:6,7 could be effective for all of 1:4-19. After all, Chapters 2 and 3 are certainly composite, and the occurrences of $\gamma\delta\checkmark$ in 2:2 and 3:4,24 are seen by Holladay as "welding" all the material in these chapters together (with the exception of 3:6-12a which he sees as secondary).

It also seems probable that vv. 11-19 were composed at a later date than vv. 4-10, and were placed after the call narrative by Jeremiah as some type of comment on it or interpretation of it.

As the discussion of probabilities at the level of compositional process moves towards a discussion of Jeremiah's intentions in composing 1:11-19 and in placing it where he did, it engenders further probabilities proper to historical criticism. It seems probable that Jeremiah experienced a shift in his vocational self-understanding, and that that shift modified his understanding of his original call. When this particular shift occurred is less certain.

Jeremiah 2

Holladay, in Architecture, refers to 2:5 - 3:25 as the "Harlotry

Cycle."⁹ He means by this title that this material forms a block unified by the theme of harlotry. The term "cycle" is used by Holladay to indicate his uncertainty of the nature of the relations between the units of this block of material; whether, for example, they are the several stanzas of one poem, or separate poems linked together.¹⁰ Within the "Harlotry Cycle," Holladay distinguishes two halves, each with its own internally coherent rhetorical structure (2:5-37, 3:1-25).¹¹

The verses immediately preceding the "Harlotry Cycle," 2:2-3, are referred to as the "Seed Oracle" by Holladay, presumably because of the occurrence of זרע in 2:3. He claims that these two verses are independent of the surrounding material and function as a rhetorical map for the material in 2:5 - 3:25 and 4:5 - 6:30, with 2:2 containing word links to the "Harlotry Cycle" and 2:3 containing word links to the "Foe Cycle" which follows in 4:5 - 6:30.¹²

We are specifically concerned at this point with the first half of Holladay's "Harlotry Cycle" (2:5-37), and its proposed relation to his "Seed Oracle" (2:2-3).

The relationship proposed by Holladay between 2:2 and 2:5-37 then, consists in the following verbal links:

- a) 2:2 "I (Yahweh) remember"
2:32 "forget ... forgotten me (Yahweh)"
- b) 2:2 "bride"
2:32 "bride"
- c) 2:2 "your following (לך gal) me in the wilderness in a land not ..."
2:5 "you went after (לך gal) worthlessness"
2:6 "He who leads us (לך gal) in the wilderness in a land not ... and not."¹³

The rhetorical evidence shown by Holladay, does not, in my judgment, support his interpretation either of the separate existence of the

so-called "Seed Oracle" or of the extent of the first half of the "Harlotry Cycle."

First of all, some of the evidence he adduces can hardly qualify as such: הָלַךְ is an extremely common word, occurring -- often several times -- in almost every chapter of the Jeremiah-book; its occurrences here cannot be seen as significant for rhetorical structure.

Second, Holladay has overlooked some significant evidence: two further occurrences of מִדְבָּר (wilderness) in 2:6,24. Now this is not an uncommon word either, but four occurrences of it within one chapter is uncommon.

These adjustments to the evidence as presented by Holladay, yield persuasive indications of a strong inclusion between 2:2 and 2:32 as shown in Figure 1 below.

2:2	I (Yahweh) remember	
		bride
		wilderness
2:6		wilderness
2:24		wilderness
2:31		wilderness
2:32	My people have forgotten	bride

Figure 1: Inclusion Between 2:2 and 2:31-32

Figure 1 indicates three verbal links between verses 2 and 31-32, occurring in inverse order, as well as two further occurrences of "wilderness." Now there is another occurrence of "forget" in v. 32, before "bride," which appears to disturb the symmetry. The symmetry, though, is really constituted by a conjunction of opposites with two terms -- subject and verb: "I remember (v. 2) ... my people have

forgotten (v. 32)."¹⁴ The occurrence of the verb alone, then, does not in fact interfere with the major link.

The relation between 2:2 and 2:31-32, then, seems to be constituted by a strong triple inclusion with inverse ordering of words. The outside pair, a conjunction of opposites, marks in fact, the theme of Chapter 2: I (Yahweh) remember, but my people have forgotten. Additionally contributing to the symmetry of the unit are the two further occurrences of "wilderness," in verses 6 and 25 respectively.

This shift in perception of the rhetorical structure has two main consequences for Holladay's argument. The first consequence is that verses 33-37 fall outside the strongly marked inclusion, and would therefore not seem to be part of the preceding material. To the extent that the basic rhetorical structure here is being hypothetically posited as that of the first scroll, 2:33-37 are probably not part of it. Moreover, they correspond in tonality to material Holladay will judge to be characteristic of the second scroll, offering no hope of salvation: "for Yahweh has spurned those you've trusted,/No success will you gain thanks to them" (2:37, Holladay's translation).

The second consequence is that 2:2-3 do not show any sign of functioning independently of the surrounding material, but appear rather to be very much part of the unit continuing to 2:32. This, of course, raises the question of whether it has any of the "map" function Holladay ascribes to it, and if so, how. This will have to be considered in treating Chapter Three.

Jeremiah 3

Holladay, in Architecture, sees Chapter 3, minus the prose material (vv. 4-11, 15-18, 24b) as the second half of the "Harlotry Cycle" that

he judged to begin in 2:4 and as rhetorically controlled by 2:2-3, the "Seed Oracle."¹⁵ If this is so we would expect in Chapter 3 to find certain similarities of rhetorical structure with Chapter 2. Specifically we would expect, first, to find comparable symmetry, namely with the emphasis located at either end of the unit, as in the threefold inverted inclusion between 2:2 and 2:32. Second, we would expect to find in Chapter 3 a comparable relation to the "Seed Oracle," namely one that constitutes an essential part of the overall structure of Chapter 3. Our expectations in this regard, however, are not met.

In order to demonstrate the symmetry of Chapter 3 as discovered by Holladay, we have first to look at some of the questions he asks in coming to terms with the unit. First, "how much of the MT of 3:1-25 is to be included" in the basic structure of this chapter? Verses 1-5 and vv. 19-23 are immediately accepted by Holladay as non-problematic. He sees most of vv. 24-5 as also being included, accepting the poetic core of these verses as recognised by Rudolph. (The material omitted by the judgment is "flocks and herds, sons and daughters"). The real problem is presented by vv. 6-18, "a mixture of materials." Most of vv. 6-18 are excluded by Holladay because of their apparent exilic provenance. Of these verses Holladay retains the material in vv. 12b - 14a (minus "under every green tree") which he sees as a short poem with an inclusion on *אֵל*.¹⁶

Before continuing with Holladay's argument, an observation should be made about his treatment of vv. 12b - 14a. There is evidence that militates against these verses being one poem as he maintains. Rudolph points out that whereas 3:6-13 focus on Israel, 3:14-17 focus on Judah, as is evident from the words "Zion ... ark ... Jerusalem" found in these

latter verses.¹⁷ It can, moreover be noted that verse 14a uses $\alpha\iota\epsilon$ with a different meaning than does 12b. Verse 12b uses $\alpha\iota\epsilon$ in the sense of "conversion," whereas 14a appears to refer to a physical "return." On the basis of these observations it would seem advisable to leave verse 14a out of the "short poem" discovered by Holladay.

Having dealt with the question of how much of the text should be included in his consideration, Holladay next faces the question of the ordering of the text. Specifically, are vv. 12b - 14a (actually vv. 12b-13) not secondary to the structure of the "Harlotry Cycle?" Verses 6-18 as a whole appear to intrude between verses 5 and 19; there is an ironic contrast between the uses of $\kappa\alpha\lambda\omega$ (call) and $\pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho$ (father) in these verses, that would be effective if the two sections were next to one another. In vv. 4-5 the people call Yahweh "my Father" while continuing to do wrong, while in vv. 19-20 Yahweh expresses the expectation he had held that the people would say "'my Father' and do right." A further ironic contrast is noted by Holladay in the mention of the "polluted" land in vv. 1 and 2 and the mention of the "pleasant land" in v. 19.¹⁸ To the connections noted by Holladay should be added the observations that 3:1 opens with a discussion of a faithless wife, while 3:20 closes with Yahweh's claim that Israel has been to him as a faithless wife; and that 3:4-5 and 3:19 both focus on the Father-Son relationship between Yahweh and Israel. Verses 1-5 and verses 19-20, then, are definitely connected to one another. But, claims Holladay, there is a structural alternative to their immediate juxtaposition that should be considered. That is an A-B-A'-B' pattern, in which alternate sections refer to one another.¹⁹ We have already seen that vv. 1-5 ("A" in this model) and vv. 19-20 ("A'" in this model) refer to one another. The key question remains

whether vv. 12b - 13 ("B" in this model) and vv. 21-25 ("B'" in this model) also make such reference.

Holladay judges that they do so, supporting his claim primarily by a "chiasmus in assonances" that he sees between 12b plus 14a and v. 22.²⁰ Now this "chiasmus" is disqualified on two fronts. First, we have already argued for the exclusion of v. 14a from consideration as part of the short poem beginning in 12b. Second, to come up with the chiasmus Holladay has to ignore three other occurrences of the root לשׁוּב in v. 12b and v. 22, which can hardly be done. There does remain a clear relation between 12b-13 and v. 22 in their parallel uses of לשׁוּב , though. In v. 12b we find $\text{לשׁוּבָה מִשׁוּבָה}$, and in v. 22 we find $\text{לשׁוּבָה מִשׁוּבָה יִשְׂרָאֵל}$.

Further connections can be noted between vv. 12b-13 and vv. 21-25. Verses 12b-13 call upon Israel to acknowledge their guilt (קִיּוּם), expressed primarily as a failure to obey Yahweh's voice ($\text{לֹא שָׁמְעָה בְּקוֹל יְהוָה}$), and vv. 21-25 are a confession of guilt (חַטָּאת), which closes with the specific acknowledgement by the people that they have not obeyed Yahweh's voice ($\text{לֹא שָׁמְעָה בְּקוֹל יְהוָה}$). Verse 22a, containing the לשׁוּב link with 12b, is a reiteration of the invitation to return, and v. 21 introduces the invitation, with the repentant cries of the people. In both places the reference is to Israel. The A-B-A'-B' structure would, then, seem to be effective in Chapter 3. This means that vv. 19-20 are not an interrupted continuation of vv. 1-5, but instead, are parallel sections A and A'. Similarly, the invitation to return that is introduced in v. 21 and that cumulates in the people's confession of guilt in vv. 22b-25 should be read in continuity with vv. 12b-13, with which it forms the B and B' parallel sections.

Finally, Holladay supports his claim that vv. 12b-14a are in the

right place by noting its connections to the material around it. Most persuasive of these connections is one with the preceding section, vv. 1-5. In v. 5 the people ask, "Will he be angry forever?" (וְלֹא יִכְרֹחַ לְעֹלָם). and in v. 12b Yahweh reassures the people, "I will not be angry forever" (וְלֹא יִכְרֹחַ לְעֹלָם).

Having examined Holladay's analysis of the rhetorical structure of the basic material in Chapter 3, we are prepared to return to the initial question of this section, that of the relations between Chapter 3 and Chapter 2, and Chapter 3 and 2:2-3.

Chapter 3 has shown a symmetry very different from that of Chapter 2; a strong A-B-A'-B' pattern. We are disappointed, then, in our expectation that Chapter 3, as the second half of Holladay's proposed "Harlotry Cycle" would have a symmetry parallel to Chapter Two, the first half of the cycle. Holladay's argument for the connection between Chapter 2 and 3 is left, then, to rest solely on verbal links, and these are not very persuasive. He proposes that the occurrences of קָרָא (2:17,18 twice, 23,33,36; 3:2, 13,21), וָעַל (2:35, passim 3), וָעַל (2:26,36; 3:24,25), in both chapters constitute rhetorical links, between the two chapters.²¹ In fact, all the occurrences of וָעַל in Chapter 2 are from 2:33-37, the material that was shown to be outside of the rhetorical structure of Chapter 2. These occurrences can be seen as a reason for inserting 2:33-37 before Chapter 3, but not as links between the two chapters as a whole. One of the two occurrences of וָעַל in Chapter 2 also comes from 2:36, and so is of no weight, and the other is not enough on its own to rhetorically link the two chapters. Finally, קָרָא is too common a word, occurring throughout Chapters 2-7 to build upon it an argument for rhetorical unity between Chapters 2 and 3. There is, further, an inclusion seen by Holladay

between the occurrences of "fathers" in 2:5 and 3:25. This is very weak evidence, and can hardly be seen as more than a link such as we might expect from adjoining units, with related concerns.

The most obvious argument for the separateness of the two chapters remains the fact that their internal structures do not tend to each other, but are rather almost entirely self-contained and internally oriented. I do not, then, see evidence for the relation of these two chapters as "halves" of the same "cycle."

This judgment is reinforced by an evidence difference in thematic focus between the two units. Chapter 2 focusses quite strongly on the accusation of guilt, while Chapter 3 focusses equally as strongly on the question of repentance and return. The two themes are obviously related, and one can see why they would have been juxtaposed, and to some degree linked. At the same time, though, they are not the same.

There remains the question of the relation of Chapter 3 to Holladay's "Seed Oracle," 2:2-3. The relationship between Chapter 3 and 2:2-3 does not appear very significant. In fact the relation of Chapter 3 to 2:2 is independent of its essential rhetorical structure; in Chapter 2 it was inseparably bound up in it. The links between Chapter 3 and 2:2 consist mainly of the link on the root γ that has been found to connect rhetorically the first three chapters of the Jeremiah-book. In this sense they are not even exclusively links with 2:2, but also with 1:6,7: they are of a more general focus. There is also a link between "forget Yahweh" (3:21) and "I remember" (2:2), but of course this link exists more strongly with 2:32 (forgotten me).

The discovery of the A-B-A'-B' rhetorical structure in Chapter Three, essentially independent of both 2:2-3 and 2:4-32, compels us to

conclude that Holladay's argument regarding the relations of these chapters is incorrect. Neither the "Seed Oracle" nor the "Harlotry Cycle" as proposed by Holladay can be said to exist; Chapters 2 and 3 are rhetorically separate, although linked as part of the same overarching rhetorical unity that began in Chapter 1.

Jeremiah 4:1-4

Holladay sees this brief passage as being distinct from both the preceding and the following material. Its separation from the preceding material in Chapter 3 is justified on the persuasive grounds that the link on $\gamma\delta\zeta$, which unifies the first three chapters, occurs last in 3:24. This occurrence forms both an inclusion with the previous occurrence of $\gamma\delta\zeta$ in 3:4, and a link with its previous occurrences in 2:2 and 1:6,7. The beginning of Chapter 4, then, would seem to lie outside the material linked by $\gamma\delta\zeta$. The separation from the following material, 4:5 - 6:30 is justified on the, again, persuasive grounds of the shift in tonality that occurs in the material at this point, a shift to vivid battle scenes.

The material in 4:1-4 shares material with both the preceding and the following material, though, and Holladay sees it as functioning as a "bridge" between the materials of chapters 1-3 and the battle scenes of 4:5 - 6:30.²² So 4:1 shares $\gamma\delta\zeta$ with Chapter 3, and 4:2 anticipates 5:2 ("and they say, 'By the life of Yahweh,' do they not? No -- they are swearing falsely.")

It could be added to Holladay's presentation, that 4:1-4 actually effects the bridge from the first three chapters to those following at the thematic level as well as at the purely rhetorical. It does this by opening with the subject of repentance, $\gamma\delta\zeta$, closing with the subject of Yahweh's destructive anger, and establishing a relationship between the two, such

that the former was a condition for the aversion of the latter: "If you return, O Israel, Says the Lord, /to me you should return (v. 1) ... lest my wrath go forth like fire, and burn with none to quench it, because of the evil of your doings (v. 4)." Certainly the approaching foe of 4:5 - 6:30 can be seen in terms of Yahweh's anger at the people's failure to repent. The material in fact contains interpretive comments which encourage this reading (4:8, cf. 4:18).

In 4:1-4, then, attention is shifted from the related matters of guilt and repentance which dominated Chapters 2 and 3 respectively, to the threatened consequences of a failure to repent, which vividly materialise in 4:5 - 6:30.

Jeremiah 4:5 - 6:30

Jer. 4:5 - 6:30, treated as one section in "Two Scrolls," composes the bulk of what Holladay refers to as the "Foe Cycle" in Architecture.²³ By this title he means that this material is bound together as a complex by a thematic focus on the "Foe," and by reinforcing rhetorical structures. The term "cycle," specifically, is used by Holladay to refer to blocks of material, the nature of whose units he is not certain.²⁴

The thematic continuity, more specifically, is found by Holladay to be constituted to a significant degree of repetitions: 6:1 and 4:5-6 share "blow the trumpet," "raise a signal," "flee for safety"; 6:9 and 5:10 share a focus on "destructive work with the metaphorical vineyard Israel."²⁵

The rhetorical structure discovered by Holladay is signalled by groupings of imperatives that alternately are found to make up and to begin sections. So 5:1, 5:10, 5:20 contain imperatives with no others nearby and are said to begin sections. By contrast, 4:5ff and 6:1ff

contain comparatively steady streams of imperatives. This contrast suggests to Holladay some type of a-b-a' structure for the "Foe Cycle" as a whole, in which 4:5-30 and 6:1-30 — with their concentration of imperatives — are a and a' respectively, and 5:1-29 — with its comparative sparseness of imperatives — is b.²⁶ Interestingly, Rudolph posits a similar structure on the thematic level (see below, pp. 82-83).²⁷

The a-b-a' pattern formed by the concentrations of imperatives in Chapters 4 and 6 of the "Foe Cycle," and their relative sparseness in Chapter 5, yields, in Holladay's analysis, to a more elaborate pattern formed by the thematic focusses of the imperatives that he finds to demarcate sections:

- (A) 1. Battle Orders (4:5-31)
- (B) 2. Orders that Turn Attention to Wisdom (5:1-9)
- (C) 3. Metaphorical orders, to destroy the vineyard Israel (5:10-17)
- (D) 4. The "Lesson" of Yahweh the Schoolmaster (5:20-29)
- (A') 5. Again Battle Orders (6:1-8)
- (C') 6. Again Metaphorical Orders, to Glean the Vineyard Israel (6:9-15)
- (B') 7. Again Orders that turn attention to Wisdom (6:16-30).²⁸

The repetitions among the passages (as seen above) yield an overall A-B-C-D-A'-C'-B' pattern, with "section (4) as the unparalleled middle term, the climactic passage" (455). This overall pattern is characterised by Holladay as "symmetrical"²⁹; in fact it can only be called a loose correspondence. What symmetry can be seen is in the a-b-a' pattern he finds in the groupings of imperatives: a symmetry we will find also discovered by Rudolph on thematic grounds.³⁰

Jeremiah 4:5 - 6:30 and 8:14 - 10:25

Holladay's next concern, in "Two Scrolls" is to demonstrate the similarities between 4:5 - 6:30 and 8:14 - 10:25. Now it should be recognised that the burden of Holladay's rhetorical-critical case rests

on the connection between 4:5 - 6:30 and 8:14 - 10:25, and the nature of that connection. This connection was his first clue to the possible contents of the second scroll; he noticed that the material in 8:14 - 10:25 seemed to have been added on to the material in 4:5 - 6:30. The nature of this connection shaped his expectations about second scroll material, and with further support, developed into a historical hypothesis; he found the material in 8:14 - 10:25 characteristically to be bleaker in its outlook, offering no hope for the aversion of doom, than the material it supplements in 4:5 - 6:30. This connection, moreover, remains his most substantial piece of evidence for the shift he hypothesizes between the scrolls.

Holladay in Architecture refers to 8:14 - 10:25 as the "Supplementary Foe Cycle," thus indicating its connection with the "Foe Cycle." In 8:14 - 10:25, as in 4:5 - 6:30, Holladay finds the material to be organized through groupings of imperatives. He discovers in the units defined by these groupings, an A-B-A' scheme: "1) Battle scenes that turn attention to wisdom (8:4 - 9:8), 2) The call to the women to lament (9:16-21), 3) again battle scenes (10:17-25)."³¹ Holladay judges this symmetry comparable to that in 4:5 - 6:30.

This assertion, that 8:14 - 10:25 and 4:5 - 6:30 are comparable in their symmetries, is tenuous since the A-B-A' structure is found in each on different grounds. In 4:5 - 6:30 Holladay derives the A-B-A' symmetry from concentrations of imperatives in the A and A' sections and their relative sparseness in the B section, while in 8:14 - 10:25 the "comparable" structure is derived on the grounds of thematic contrasts.

(Rudolph's observation of the A-B-A' thematic movement in 4:5 - 6:30 will prove to resolve this difficulty).

Holladay goes on to claim that these organisational parallels are massively reinforced by a series of verbal links between 4:5 - 6:30 and 8:14 - 10:25. He lists a series of nineteen links between words and phrases which occur seldom or not at all elsewhere in the Jeremiah-book.³² The link he cites in "Two Scrolls" is between beginning verses of both cycles, 4:5 and 8:15; and he sees it as paradigmatic for the relation between the two cycles:

in 4:5 the appeal to gather in the fortified cities is an appeal to seek safety, whereas in 8:14 the appeal repeats the words of 4:5 only to affirm ironically that the people will perish in the fortified cities -- the situation has grown worse.³³

In 8:14 - 10:25, then, the material of 4:5 - 6:30 is paralleled, but a much bleaker mood prevails, maintains Holladay: one of inescapable doom. Holladay proposes that the contrasting block of material in 8:14 - 10:25 will prove to be part of the second scroll.

Given the central importance for Holladay's argument of the connection he posits between 4:5 - 6:30 and 8:14 - 10:25, it seems worthwhile to examine his list of nineteen parallels more closely. The simple existence of parallels, needless to say, does not necessarily establish significantly later composition: it could be primarily a rhetorical balancing device. Neither does it establish a difference in tonality between the two sections. We may, then, question the substantiality of the parallels: are they exclusively formal parallels, or are they also meaning-inclusive parallels?³⁴ If they are meaning-inclusive also, is there an observable difference in tonality?

Examination of these parallels will prove to reinforce Holladay's

argument. Most of the parallels he finds are not only formal but also meaning-inclusive; and most of these meaning-inclusive parallels also show a difference in tonality such as that proposed by Holladay as characterizing the relation of the two cycles.

I have found it useful to demonstrate my findings schematically (figure 2 below), through a selective expansion of the chart of links between 4:5 - 6:30 and 8:14 - 10:25 offered by Holladay himself.³⁵ I have only included in the chart those of Holladay's proposed connections that I found to be meaning-inclusive, since, of course, they are the only ones in which a difference in tonality could meaningfully be asserted. Parallels number 2,3,4,8,10, being purely formal have therefore been omitted.³⁶ The first three columns of my figure 2, then, are taken from Holladay's chart: the substance of the link, the verses linked, and the occurrences of the linking word, phrase, or image elsewhere in the Jeremiah-book. To these I have added a column each for the specification of meaning-inclusive parallels, and differences in tonality, with a further space for a summary of differences/similarities in tonality.

Some interpretive comments about figure 2 are in order. First, the majority (eight) of the meaning-inclusive links discerned by Holladay did contain a difference in tonality such that one member was in a context of more extreme and unavoidable danger and absence of hope for reprieve, comparative to the other. Usually the linking member from 8:14 - 10:25 represents the more extreme text, which is consistent with Holladay's evaluation. In some cases, though, the reverse is true: no. 9, between 5:11 and 9:1; no. 11, between 4:22 and 9:2; no. 12, between 6:28 and 9:3; no. 14, between 6:27,29 and 9:6; all contain the more extreme context in 4:5 - 6:30. The first clear observation about this is that all the milder

1. hā'as ^e pū w ^e nabō(ā) 'el 'arē hammibār	8:14	4:5	no other //s in Jer.
5. ys' niphal, "be saved"	8:20	4:14	otherwise in Jer.: Jer. to Yahweh Yahweh 17:14; eschatological promise 23:6, 33:16, 30:7 (ironic?)
6. seber plus 'ammi	8:21	6:14	8:11 is a doublet; this combination not otherwise in Jer.
7. (high emotion) has seized (hazq hiphil) us/me: 6:24 sarā plus -nū; 8:21 sammā plus -nī	8:21	6:24	otherwise in Jer.: 49:24, 50:43
8. n'p, "commit adultery"	9:1	5:7	otherwise in Jer.: 13:27 (noun), 23:10, 14; 3:7-11 (midrash); 7:9 (Temple Sermon); 29:23 (letter to the Exiles)
9. bgd, "deal treacherously"	9:1	5:11	otherwise in Jer.: 3:20, 12:1,6
11. 'ōtī lō' yadā'ū	9:2	4:22	not otherwise in Jer. (even in nonpausal form)
12. rākil, "slanderer"	9:3	6:28	not otherwise in Jer.
13. mimā, "treachery"	9:5,7	5:27	not otherwise in Jer.
14. bhn and srp, "refine"	9:6	6:27, 29	srp not otherwise in Jer.
15. women making mourning (in a variety of vocabulary)	9:19	6:26	no other passages in Jer.
16. 'ōlāl parallel to bahūrīm, plus hūs	9:20	6:11	not otherwise in Jer.
17. 'arm ^e nōt, "palaces"	9:20	6:5	otherwise in Jer.: to be rebuilt 30:18; pal. of Jerus. 17:27; pal. of Damascus 49:27
19. 'ohel, "tent," parallel to y ^e rfi'ōt, "curtains," with add pual followed by an expression for "stupid" (4:22 sakal, 10:21 b'r)	10:20f	4:20, 22	not otherwise in Jer.

Meaning Inclusive	Dif. in Tonicity	Summary of Differences/Similarities in Tonicity
X	X	Whereas the summons to flee into the fortified cities is a bid to seek safety in 4:5, in 8:14 it is an ironic statement of the hopelessness of the situation: "that we may die there."
X.	X	In 4:14 repentance is urged that the people "may be saved." In 8:20 salvation is something awaited and not received: "the harvest is past, the summer is ended, and still we are not saved." Hope is diminished.
X		Both 6:14 and 8:21 refer to "the wound of ... my people" as unhealed, and in the context of certain doom.
X	X	The emotion of 6:24 is anticipatory: the people are gripped by anguish at the rumour of the approaching foe. The emotion of 8:21 regards a <u>fait accompli</u> : the prophet is gripped by dismay at the wound of his people (cf. 8:21, same unit, "the slain of my people.")
X		In both 5:7 and 9:1 the people's adultery is reason to take action, without provoking firm statement of such action. For Yahweh in 5:7 it is reason to punish, for Yahweh in 9:1 it is reason to leave his people.
X	X	In 9:1 the people's treachery is motivation for Yahweh to leave his people. In 5:11 it is the reason behind the command to destroy utterly the vineyard Israel-Judah.
X	X	In both 4:22 and 9:2 the people's ignorance of Yahweh is associated with a propensity for evil, which in 9:2 is a reason for Yahweh to leave his people, but in 4:22 leads to a harsh statement of irrevocable doom, in 4:28 (same unit).
X	(X)	Both 6:28 and 9:3 portray the whole people as involved in slander. In 6:28, though, this leads to a statement of Yahweh's utter rejection of the people. In 9:3 this is motivation for Yahweh to leave his people. The shift in tonality exists, then, in the association of treachery in 6:28, with the definitive rejection of the people.
X		Both 5:27 and 9:5,7 complain of the falseness of the people. 5:27 and 9:7 imply a relational context (5:27 — house, 9:7 — neighbours).
X	X	Both 6:27,29 and 9:6 refer to the "refining" and "testing" of the people. In 9:6, though, the reference is brief and reluctant: "What else can I do?" In 6:27,29 the reference is extended and harsh: "refuse silver they are called, for Yahweh has rejected them" (30).
X (but not formal)	X	Both 6:26 and 9:18 refer to women/a woman mourning because of their destruction, but in 6:26 the destruction is anticipated whereas in 9:20 (same unit) it is actual: "death has come into our windows."
X		In both 6:11 and 9:20 the reference is to some violence hitting the "children in the street" and the "young men."
X	X	Both 6:5 and 9:20 refer to violence against the "palaces" of Judah. 6:5, though, is in the context of a warning (see 6:8, same unit), while 9:20 refers to a <u>fait accompli</u> .
X	X	The contrasts and similarities between 10:20f and 4:20,22 are extensive enough to merit separate treatment (pp. 45-49 below).

Figure 2: Meaning-Inclusive Parallels Between 4:5 - 6:30 and 8:14 - 10:25

references from 8:14 - 10:25 occur in 9:1-6, part of a unit extending from 9:1-8. The second pertinent observation is less clear, constituting a look ahead at Holladay's conclusions: all the more extreme references in 4:5 - 6:30 come from passages Holladay will assign to the second scroll (4:19-27, 5:10-17, 6:27-30), on the basis, primarily, of irrevocability of doom in these passages.³⁷

Five of the meaning-inclusive parallels noted in figure 2 did not include a difference in tonality: no. 6, between 6:14 and 8:21; no. 8, between 5:7 and 9:1, no. 11, between 4:22 and 9:22, no. 13, between 5:27 and 9:5,7; no. 16, between 6:11 and 9:20. The parallel members of both numbers 6 and 16, come from units that Holladay later assigns to the second scroll.³⁸ Again, then, Holladay saw those passages as containing material characteristic of 8:14 - 10:25. Interestingly, numbers 8,11,13 all connect with 9:1-8. More will be said below of the parallels noted in numbers 8 and 13. For the moment it suffices to note that 5:7 (no. 8) and 5:27 (no. 13) come from material extending from 5:1-9 and 5:21-29 respectively, and ending with the same couplet as does 9:8: "Shall I not punish them for these things? says Yahweh;/and shall I not avenge myself for a nation such as this?"

In all this discussion of meaning-inclusive parallels, with relations to one another somehow deviant from those anticipated by Holladay, 9:1-8 plays a starring role. It is the unit from which came all the milder parallel members in 8:14 - 10:25. It is the unit from which came three of the five parallel members in 8:14 - 10:25 that do not show a difference in tonality with their matching pairs in 4:5 - 6:30. It shares a couplet with two of these last, 5:1-9 and 5:21-29.

We can conclude, then, that the material of 9:1-8, with its

relatively mild tonality, is characteristic of 4:5 - 6:30. It has links with material in 4:5 - 6:30 characteristic of 8:14 - 10:25, i.e. material showing doom as inevitable; and thus seems to participate in a structure linking 4:5 - 6:30 and 8:14 - 10:25 together. This is not only a confirmation, but also a significant refinement of Holladay's argument. And if 8:14 - 10:25 is composed of additions to 4:5 - 6:30, as it is; and if these additions characteristically reflect a more desperate situation, as they do; it seems highly probable that it is part of the added material that distinguished Jeremiah's second scroll from his first.

Further Exploration

a) Identifying the position of 9:1-8 in the first scroll

Exploration of the connections noted by Holladay between 4:5 - 6:30 and 8:14 - 10:25 brought attention to the question of the relation of 9:1-8 to 4:5 - 6:30. Further exploration of this is demanded, and although it may appear to be a digression now, it will prove to yield significant consequences for the composition of the two scrolls, and their contents.

The question, concretely, to ask of 9:1-8 is that of its original position in the first scroll. That verse 8 shares a couplet with the last verses of 5:1-9 and 5:21-29 has already been noted. It should, at this point, be remembered that 5:10-17 and 18-19 are seen by Holladay as second scroll material and exilic insertion respectively.³⁹ This means that 5:1-9 and 21-29 would have been next to one another in the first scroll. (Verse 20 is an editorial introduction). Since the three units in question are of approximately the same length, the question arises of whether or not they once formed together a three-section block of material with refrains. The phrasing of the question is deliberately vague with regard to the form of this three-part unit. The concern of

this investigation extends only as far as determining whether or not 9:1-8 formed a unit with 5:1-9 and 5:21-29, in the service, finally, of understanding the composition process in this material. Further judgments of form would have to be made on the basis of a study of the poetics of Jeremiah which, to my knowledge, has not yet been written. The question, as posed, will prove to be answered in the affirmative.

There is substantial evidence of parallel thematic structure within the sections, and of thematic progression among the sections, all of which is reinforced by a persuasive series of verbal links that further bind the sections. This evidence will combine with what we already know of the three sections -- i.e., that they end with the same refrain, that they are of approximately equal length, that the first two sections (5:1-9, 5:21-29) were next to one another in the first scroll -- to assure us of their previous compositional unity.

First, then, let us look at the evidence for parallel thematic structure within the units.

All three sections begin with a programmatic statement (5:1, 5:21, 9:1) which is followed by a description of the people's sin (5:2-5, 5:22, 9:2-6), followed in turn by a statement interpreting an ill as the consequence of the people's sin (5:6, 5:23-25, 9:7). Each unit then has a second description of the people's sin (5:8, 5:25-28, 9:7), and of course, each then closes with the same rhetorical question: "Shall I not punish them, says the Lord, and shall I not avenge myself on a nation such as this?" (5:9, 5:29, 9:8).

Although these three sections share parallel thematic structures, as we have seen, and a common thematic development, as we will see, their differentiations are also significant in determining their participation

in the proposed three part unit.

Chapter 5:21-29 is the most reflective section, on the whole, reflecting on the magnitude of Yahweh's power, and the seriousness of the people's error in not recognising it. We will see that it is not as extensively linked to 5:1-9 and 5:21-29 as they are to each other. At the thematic level also, whereas 5:1-9 and 9:1-8 focus on knowledge of Yahweh, 5:21-29 focusses on fear of Yahweh. We find, then, an overall A-B-A' rhetorical structure in these three units. There is, besides the symmetry of thematic focus just mentioned, a progressive thematic development and intensification among the sections. First, we can see broad developments between the first and third sections. The first section, 5:1-9, starts with the search for honesty and the third section, 9:1, begins with a desperate complaint about its certain absence. This is structurally apparent in 5:1b and 9:1b.

5:1 עֹשֶׂה נֶחֱם ע'
 נִוְלָחַ עֲבָדָיו

9:1 אֲנִי כֹסֵף וְאֶבְרָתָם
 אֲנִי כֹסֵף וְאֶבְרָתָם

One who does the commandments
and seeks truth

for they are all adulterers
a company of treacherous men

Yahweh sought one person obedient to the commandments and he found everyone engaged in idolatry. (Adultery is to be understood here as apostasy).⁴⁰ He sought one person who pursued truth and he found "a company of treacherous men." Similarly, in 5:7 the people are said to have left Yahweh, and in 9:1 Yahweh expresses, in the light of his reflections, his desire likewise to leave them.

Second, we can see thematic development throughout all three sections. The people's failure to tremble when struck by Yahweh is noted in 5:1-9 (v. 3; וְלֹא יִרְאוּ), and 5:21-29 reflects on that failure in terms

of an absence of the fear of Yahweh evident in the people's not trembling (v. 22 כִּלְיָהוּ). In 5:21-29 the failure to fear Yahweh is related to the presence among the people of treacherous men (vv. 23,26-28), and 9:1-8 develops at length the treachery and distorting tongues of the people (vv. 25:7).

Finally, 9:1-8 contains the only formal prophetic speech in the three sections, introduced in 9c: "Therefore thus says the Lord of Hosts." The judgment voiced after this introduction provides a climax for the three part unit, the final condemnation of the people's failure to know and fear Yahweh, and of their wholehearted treachery towards one another.

The evidence for literary unity provided by the structural parallels within the sections, and the thematic symmetries and developments among the sections, is substantially confirmed by verbal links among the three sections.

We will first look at the connections between the first and third sections, 5:1-9 and 9:1-8. Most striking is the triple verbal link between 5:7 and 9:1: יִשְׁכְּבוּ, יִשְׁאָלוּ, יִתְדַבְּרוּ in 5:7 are matched by בָּדַדְתִּים, עָלְתֶם, וְנִשְׁכַּחְתֶּם in 9:1 (see Figure 3 below).

5:7 אִי כִּנְיָהוּ אֶשְׁכּוּחַ-עִי
בְּיָדְךָ עָלְתִּי וְשָׁבַדְתָּ בְּסֵא אֲשֶׁרִים
וְאֶשְׁבַּע אֹתָם וְיִשְׁכְּבוּ
וּבֵית כֹּזֵב יִתְדַבְּרוּ

9:1 מִי יִתְנַחֵי בְּטִגְרֵי טָלוֹן אֲרָחִים
וְאֶעֱלֶבֶה אֶת-עַמִּי וְאֶשְׁכַּח מֵאִתָּם
כִּי כָלָם מִשְׁכָּחִים
עֲזָרְתָּ בְּסֵאִים

5:7 "How can I pardon you?
Your children 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
harlots."

9:1 "O that I had in the desert
a wayfarers' lodging place,
that I might leave (forsake)
my people
and go away from them!
For they are all adulterers,
a company of treacherous men."

Figure 3: Verbal Links Between 5:7 and 9:1

The third link, יָדָד and אָדָד is made of two different verbal roots, but with marked assonances. יָדָד is a rare word in the Hebrew Bible, with eight occurrences, four of which are in the Jeremiah-book. This is the only occurrence of יָדָד in the Jeremiah-book with the meaning of collectively gathering. The other occurrences (16:6, 41:5, 47:5) all refer to a ritual incising of the skin. All of this makes it very probable that the link of יָדָד in 5:7 with אָדָד in 9:1 is not fortuitous.

סָבַח is not a common word in the Hebrew Bible (thirty-three occurrences) but it is a popular part of Jeremiah's early vocabulary (nine occurrences). אָבַח, on the other hand, is a very common word in the Hebrew Bible, including twenty-two occurrences in Jeremiah.

What makes this link so persuasive is the occurrence, in order, of all three word-links, in both places within one verse. Clearly the beginning of 9:1 is intended to provoke the memory of the description of the people's sin in 5:7. Just as the people abandoned him (5:7), Yahweh would now like to abandon them (9:1) for their sinfulness.

Another persuasive link between the first and third units is between the sequence יָדָד, אָדָד, סָבַח, אָבַח, in 5:2-3a and 9:2. There are no other occurrences of אָבַח סָבַח in the book of Jeremiah, although יָדָד has several. Again, it is the combination which is especially persuasive.

The first and third sections are also linked by a fairly strong thematic focus on knowledge of Yahweh or lack thereof evident in the following phrases:

5:4	סָבַח יָדָד בָּרַק יְהוָה	("They do not know the way of Yahweh")
5:5	הָעַם יָדָד בָּרַק יְהוָה	("They know the way of Yahweh")
9:2	אֲתִי אֵין יָדָד	("They do not know me.")
9:5	מִדָּעַי בָּעֵת אֲתִי	("They refuse to know me.")

We turn now to a consideration of the verbal links between the first and second sections, 5:1-9 and 5:21-29. The major link is between לִדְרֹסָם (5:3) and לִדְרֹסָם (5:22). לִדְרֹס is not a very common Hebrew Bible word, with forty-five occurrences divided between meanings of labour pains and trembling. It (לִדְרֹס) has only three other occurrences in the Jeremiah-book, in 4:19,31; and 51:29. The link is probably deliberate; it has a thematic continuity with 5:1-9. In 5:3 the prophet says, "You struck them, but they did not tremble." 5:22 explores this phenomenon. How could it be so? "Do you not fear me? says Yahweh, that you do not tremble before me?" It is notable, as mentioned above, that whereas 5:1-9 and 9:1-8 have a strong thematic focus on knowledge of Yahweh, 5:21-29 focusses equally on fear of Yahweh (see also verse 24).

The other two verbal links between 5:1-9 and 5:21-29 are between words that are common, both in Jeremiah and in the Hebrew Bible generally, and they serve here mainly to confirm the link already affirmed. First, then, 5:1 and 5:26 are linked by אֶחָד (5:1) and אֶחָד (5:26). This is reinforced by a contrast: 5:1 is Yahweh's command for Jeremiah to seek if he can find an honest, truth seeking man; 5:26 begins "for evil men are found among my people," and continues in the same vein. Second, לֹדַעַן , which occurs in 5:4 and 5, occurs also in 5:28 in both nominal and verbal forms (לֹדַעַן, לֹדַעַן). It remains for us to consider the verbal links between the second and third sections, 5:21-29 and 9:1-8. Both sections contain הִטָּהֵר - 9:1-8 three times (vv. 5,7) and 5:21-29 once (v. 27). This is not a common biblical word (thirty-nine occurrences). It is part of a specialised vocabulary that is found mainly in the psalms (fourteen occurrences -- often psalms of complaint) and often in proverbs (eight occurrences). It is rare in the prophetic literature, with no more than

one or two occurrences in each book. Jeremiah is the exception with four occurrences — all of which are situated in these verses. It is not likely a chance connection.

There are, additionally, supporting links between 5:21-29 and 9:1-8 between common words. First, ^לנָסַח in 5:23 links with אָנָה in 9:1 in a way comparable with the link on גָּחַח between 5:7 and 9:1 (see above p. 42). Just as Yahweh's people have gone from him, so he longs to go from them. Second, the concern with sins of speech prominent in 9:1-8 is anticipated in 5:21-29 as is evidenced in the occurrence of גָּבַר יָדָא in 5:28 and גָּבַר אֶת־כָּא in 9:4 and גָּבַר אֶת־כָּא in 9:7.

This exploration began with the observations that 5:1-9, 5:21-29, 9:1-8, all end with the same refrain, that they are of approximately equal length, and that 5:1-9 and 5:21-29 would have been immediately juxtaposed in the first scroll. To these have been added observations of parallels in thematic structure within each of the three sections, symmetry in the thematic preoccupations of the three sections, and progression of thematic development throughout the three sections. These further observations were reinforced by the discovery of substantial verbal links among the three sections. This accumulation of evidence indicates the answer to the question that initiated this exploration, that of the original place of 9:1-8 in the first scroll. The multiple connections between 5:1-9, 5:21-29, 9:1-8 only make sense if all of the three sections were side by side in the first scroll. We can affirm with some confidence, then, that these sections shared a literary unity in that first scroll.

b) Chapter 4:19-22 and Chapter 10:19-21: part of an extended inclusion?

In figure 2 it was noted that the verbal links between 4:19,22 and

10:20ff were extensive and complex. There are in fact further links between those passages, such that the passages as a whole are clearly parallel. The parallel material is, specifically, 4:19-22 and 10:19-21. Figure 4 below illustrates all the parallels.

The words indicated with an intermittent line are not verbally the same. At the same time, their occurrence in the same place in both passages and their mutual identification of stupidity with alienation from Yahweh, encourages their being treated as parallels. The parallel between אֲחִי־נִי (4:19) and $\text{חֲסִדִּי...חֲסִדִּי}$ (10:19) is also not verbal. The parallel is constituted rather by similarities in assonance, and related meanings of the two words (4:19, "I writhe in pain," 10:19, "my hurt, my wound.")

It need hardly be said that the parallel between 4:19-22 and 10:19-21 is meaning-inclusive. Both passages are complaints of suffering associated with scenes of destruction, and follow the same sequence: exclamation of pain and distress (4:19, 10:19a); identification of pain with desolation (4:20a, 10:19b); description of the desolation in terms of destroyed tents and curtains (4:20b, 10:20); and a pronouncement regarding the cause of the desolation, that identifies it as resulting from the stupidity of the people or shepherds in their alienation from Yahweh (4:22, 10:21).

There is also a difference between the tonalities of the two passages, although it is not, apparently, that identified by Holladay as differentiating the two scrolls. The scene in 4:19-22 is explicitly martial, and more vivid and immediate. Its focus is on the experience of war itself. The scene in 10:19-21 is reflective, focussing more on the effects of the devastation. The difference, to be explicit, is that 4:19-22 deals with the pain of witnessing destruction, whereas 10:19-21 deals with the pain of living in the ruins. The latter passage shows evidence of

4:19 My anguish, my anguish! I writhe
in pain! (אֶחָדָה)
 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 follows hard on disaster
 (breaking - שָׁבַר) the whole land is laid waste
 (destroyed - נִשְׁמָה)
 Suddenly my tents (אֹהֶל) are
 destroyed (נִשְׁמָה),
 my curtains (רֵצִיזִית) in a moment.

21 How long must I see the standard,
 and hear the sound of the
 trumpet?

"For my people are foolish,
they know me not;
 they are stupid children, (כֹּסְלִים)
 they have no understanding
 They are skilled in doing evil,
 'but how to do good they know not."

10:19 Woe is me because of my hurt! (breaking -
 שָׁבַר)
 my (wound - חֲכָה) is grievous
 But I said, "Truly this is an affliction
 (wound - חֲכָה)
 and I must bear it."

20 My tent (אֹהֶל) is destroyed (נִשְׁמָה),
 and all my cords are broken;
 my children (בָּנִי) have gone from me,
 and they are not;
 there is no one to spread my tent (אֹהֶל)
 again,
 and to set up my curtains (רֵצִיזִית).

21 For the shepherds are stupid,
 and do not inquire of the Lord;
therefore they have not prospered,
 and all their flock is scattered.

Figure 4: Verbal Links Between 4:19-22 and 10:19-21

post-597 composition, making apparent references to the first deportation: "my children have gone from me, and they are not; ... for the shepherds are stupid, ... and all their flock is scattered." The extended parallels between 4:19-22 and 10:19-21 suggest a compositional dependency between them. Specifically, 10:19-21 would seem to be derived from 4:19-22, for three reasons. First is the fact, mentioned above, that it appears to reflect a later situation than that in 4:19-22. Second, some of its imagery seems to be drawn from 4:19-22 without having been also well rooted in its new context. In 10:20b "curtains" are mentioned as one of the things that will need replacing as a result of the devastation, without having been mentioned in 10:20a as one of the things destroyed. The destroyed curtains seem to come from 4:20, where they are mentioned as one of the things destroyed. Third, 4:19-22 is firmly imbedded in 4:19-28. It has a larger context, to which -- as part of the Jeremiah-book -- it seems to be native. A passage such as 4:19-22 has little conceivable place on its own in either of the scrolls, because it is private in its focus, rather than proclamatory. In 4:19-28, though, it has been pressed into the service of preparing the climactic announcement of certain doom in 4:28. The later unit, 10:19-21, is not well linked to its immediate textual context, and appears to have no function in the whole unit other than to provide a link with 4:19-21. For these reasons, then, it would seem to be dependent on 4:19-21.

The question of the significance of the parallels between 4:19-22 and 10:19-21 remains to be addressed. Their respective positions near the beginning of the "Foe Cycle" (4:5 - 6:30) and near the end of the "Supplementary Foe Cycle" (8:14 - 10:25) suggests a role of some type of inclusion for them, especially since we have already strong evidence

that 4:5 - 6:30 and 8:14 - 10:25 were bound together in the second scroll (since inclusions are used to demarcate the beginnings and endings of units.) The possibility of 4:19-22 and 10:19-21 functioning as an inclusion raises the question of whether there might not be a further inclusion nearer the opening and closing limits of the composite cycle. In fact, there is one, between 4:5-8 and 10:22. Within 10:22 are contained eight words whose roots are also found in 4:5-8: $\text{סל}, \text{כז}, \text{כר}, \text{גל}, \text{כא}, \text{גטט}, \text{קו}, \text{קל}.$ None of the words are uncommon, but their concentration is persuasive. Significantly, Rudolph argues that 10:22 is a composite verse, without indicating any awareness of its parallels with 4:5-8.⁴¹ It would appear probable that 10:22 was composed specifically to provide a link with 4:5-8 and placed at the end of the "Supplementary For Cycle" to indicate its conclusion.

The links between 4:5-8 and 10:22 are comparable with those already identified between 4:19-22 and 10:19-21, inasmuch as in both cases the material from Chapter 10 is derived from that in Chapter 4. In both situations we see material added at the end to balance material already existing near the beginning.

In 4:5-8 and 10:22, 4:19-22 and 10:19-21, then, we appear to have extended parallels intended to mark the beginning and ending of a second scroll unit, composed of first scroll material and additions. Why would Jeremiah make an inclusion with 4:19-22 rather than with some of the material intervening between 4:5-8 and 4:19-28? Perhaps, because 4:19-28 was his first major addition to the first scroll material and he wanted to build it solidly into the structure of the new scroll.

The Connection Between 4:5 - 6:30
and 8:14 - 10:25: Conclusions

Holladay argued for a connection between 4:5 - 6:30 and 8:14 - 10:25 such that the material in 8:14 - 10:25 supplemented the material in 4:5 - 6:30, was substantially linked to it, and was typically of a more desperate tone, excluding the possibility of averting doom. He further proposed that the two levels of composition are in fact those of first scroll and the additions to it that differentiated it from the second scroll. The above investigations of his argument have certainly confirmed his overall hypothesis, substantially refining it in the process.

In particular, the contrasts in tonality proved mainly to be as Holladay had predicted, and investigation of those cases which deviated from his prediction furnished evidence of the procedure by which the two blocks of material were joined. Specifically, a segment of material from 4:5 - 6:30 was found to have been placed in the middle of 8:14 - 10:25 (9:1-8). Material from the later corpus was placed in 4:5 - 6:30 (4:19-28; 5:10-17; 6:9-15, 27-30), most often with direct links to 9:1-8. The whole composite was then bound with two extended inclusions, between 4:5-8 and 10:22, 4:19-22 and 10:19-21 respectively.

The segment of material displaced to 9:1-8 was discovered originally to have been part of the material in 4:5 - 6:30, by its establishment as one part of a three part unit made up of 5:1-9, 5:21-29, and 9:1-8. Being approximately of the same length, the three passages were discovered also to share a refrain, a thematic structure, a progressive thematic development and substantial verbal links. The whole unit has the tonality identified by Holladay as characteristic of 4:5 - 6:30, and therefore can tentatively be identified as part of the first scroll, in anticipation of

Holladay's next step.

The identification of this three part unit allowed a better understanding of the make-up of the first scroll structure in 4:5 - 6:30. The first scroll material in these chapters comprehends most of the battle scenes in Chapters 4 and 6, punctuated in Chapter 5 by the three part reflection on Yahweh's inability to find among his people any knowledge or fear of him or any respect for neighbor, and his consequent lack of any option but that of punishment. This A-B-A' structure is very much in continuity with what we know of 4:1-4, the "bridge" between Chapters 2-3 and Chapters 4:5 - 6:30. It effected the transition between the earlier focus on idolatry and the approaching focus on scenes of destruction, by identifying the destruction as the potential fruit of Yahweh's fierce anger, should his people continue unrepentant. In the overall structure of 4:5 - 6:30, then, we find again an overt connection between the approaching foe and the people's unrepentant hearts.

Besides contributing to our understanding of the first scroll, the identification of the three part unit in 5:1-9, 5:21-29, 9:1-8 cast light on Jeremiah's procedure in adding the second scroll material to that of the first scroll. Rather than just tacking it on at the end, Jeremiah deliberately interwove the second scroll additions with the structure of the first scroll by placing first scroll material in the midst of the later additions, and also -- as we saw above -- by placing later material (4:19-28; 5:10-17; 6:9-15,27-30) in the midst of the first scroll. In the process, the structure of the first scroll was altered. This in turn says something about his intentions in the second scroll. He interwove the earlier and later material so that the earlier material also would be read in the light of the later, no longer as possibility but as confirmed

certainty of doom. Holladay accordingly claims that after the rejection of the first scroll Jeremiah experienced a shift in his understanding of his earlier material: "any words of judgment..., previously understood only as a divine possibility, must now be heard as having been set in process by Yahweh, irrevocably."⁴²

The Move to Historical Hypothesis

Holladay's treatment of Chapter 7:1-20 represents the beginning of his movement from rhetorical data towards a historical hypothesis. He is interested, first, in establishing 7:1-20 as historically dependable data, second, in pointing out the strong thematic contrast between vv. 1-15 and 16-20, and third, in identifying that contrast with that established between 4:5 - 6:30 and 8:10 - ~~10:25~~

To establish vv. 1-15 as historically dependable data, Holladay first argues for Jeremianic authorship, and second, supports the historical reference of the text. Holladay's argument for Jeremianic authorship addresses an opposing argument for Deuteronomistic authorship.⁴³ He appeals to "quite distinctive rhetoric" found in these verses to make his case.

Thus ytb hiphil "do good" (vs. 3,5) is not Deuteronomistic, nor is the pairing of "ways" and "doings" (vs. 3,5). It is true, the triad "stranger, orphan and widow" is found in Deuteronomy, but if Jeremiah wished to cite a legal norm of this sort, he could hardly have avoided using the phrase. The phrase "walk after other gods" (vs. 6,9) is likewise Deuteronomistic, but then the shorter phrases "walk after" (in religious contexts) and "alien gods" are found in Jeremiah's poetry as well (ii 5,8,23,25, v 19). The discourse in vv. 3-15 contains some highly unusual syntactical constructions. Thus one finds the interrogative h^a- followed by a series of independent infinitive absolutes in v. 9, a construction without parallel elsewhere in the OT — the nearest parallel is Job xl 2, where the interrogative particle is followed by one independent infinitive absolute, if the text there is correct. Then at the end of v. 11 one finds gam- plus the subject pronoun plus hinneh followed by a perfect verb; the only parallel to this sequence that is at all relevant is Gen. xlii 22. It is clear that the passage

which purports to contain the Temple Sermon is not "monotonous" or "repetitive" but is concise and has a carefully designed structure. There is nothing here that suggests exilic authorship or late reflection on an earlier event, and much here that suggests immediacy and emotion, particularly irony. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the passage offers what Jeremiah said on that occasion.⁴⁴

Having argued (and quite forcefully) for Jeremianic authorship, Holladay next supports the historical reference of the text, and the importance of the event it refers to, by noting that it left a "double deposit" in the book of Jeremiah. The narrative version of the Temple Sermon can be found in Chapter 26. With the historical dependability of the Temple Sermon defended, Holladay notes that one of its most striking aspects is "the clear hope expressed there that the people will change their ways for the better, and that if they do, Yahweh is willing to stay with them in the land (vs. 3,7)."⁴⁵

He then notes the strong contrast with vv. 16-20. Like vv. 1-15, these verses have a distinctive style

without a high level of Deuteronomic phraseology and with quite striking rhetoric: the use of, *ên* with suffix and participle in both vs. 16 and 17, the use of *h^a*-interrogative in verses 17 and 19, and the contrasting context of *k*'s *hiphil* in verses 18 and 19.⁴⁶

The implication again, is that they were probably written by Jeremiah. But unlike vv. 1-15 they show a very negative outlook on the future. Jeremiah is forbidden to intercede for the people with Yahweh. Yahweh has made an irrevocable decision to destroy the land (7:20): the phrasing of the decision is strikingly similar to 4:4, except that there it is preceded by - "lest." That which was an incitement to repentance in 4:4, then, has become the unavoidable future of Judah.

On the basis of his argument to this point, Holladay announces his suspicions that:

the Temple Sermon in 7:3-15 typifies the assumption of the first scroll, offering a hope that repentance will change the intention of Yahweh, while the prohibition to Jeremiah against intercession typifies the assumption of the second scroll.⁴⁷

Now the basis in Holladay's argument for this judgment consists primarily in the establishment of the relationship between 4:5 - 6:30 and 8:14 - 10:25, and the identification of the contrast between 7:3-15 and 7:16-20 with that emerging from his first comparison of 4:5 - 6:30 and 8:14 - 10:25.

Closer examination of the relationship posited by Holladay between 4:5 - 6:30 and 8:14 - 10:25 proved to support his claims, and to refine them considerably. A review of the other modifications made to Holladay's rhetorical analysis of Chapters 1 - 4:4 would be in order here, before moving into the more specifically historical part of his argument. So, 1:4-19 was found to form a rhetorical unit, opening the possibility that the link (78) between 1:6,7 and 2:2; 3:4,24 was effective in attaching the whole of Jeremiah 1:4-19 to the following material. Chapter 2:33-37, on the other hand, was found to lie outside the rhetorical structure of Chapter 2. The "Seed Oracle" was found not to exist, and Chapters 2 and 3 were found not to be two halves of the same cycle. With these confirmations of and modifications to Holladay's argument, we are ready for his historical hypothesis.

The Historical Hypothesis

In a concrete move to establish the contrast between 4:5 - 6:30 and 8:14 - 10:25, and 7:1-15 and 7:16-20 as a historical indicator, Holladay appeals to the narrative in Chapter 36 of Jeremiah.⁴⁸ It is from this chapter that the notion of the existence of first and second scrolls is drawn. Holladay notes that the two scrolls are described in Chapter 36 precisely in terms of the contrast he has discovered. The first scroll

is commissioned and read with the hope of bringing about the repentance of the people. After Jehoiakim himself burns it in rejection, though, the certainty of doom is affirmed, and his rejection is answered with an oracle of doom against him personally. The second scroll is commissioned, containing all the words of the first scroll, and "many more like it."

Holladay sees no reason to doubt that Chapter 36 contains an account of the moment of the shift from warning to inevitable doom. He does not engage in a literary analysis of Chapter 36, or question its primary interest. This is a serious flaw in Holladay's historical methodology. It is an uncritical use of a source whose interests prove to be quite distant from Holladay's interests in it, as Lohfink's analysis has shown (Chapter One above).⁴⁹ Uncorrected, it makes the rest of his argument, based on the strength of his historical criterion, questionable.

Norbert Lohfink's literary-historical analysis of this material dealt with in Chapter One, in fact proved to demonstrate the high probability of Chapter 36 making accurate historical reference to the events that it describes. In brief review, his argument is that (a) the narrative in 26/36 is structured by date references, but (b) these date references explain nothing about the narrative itself, so therefore (c) the date references must refer to occasions that were common knowledge to the readers. From this perspective, the narrative in Chapters 26/36 is an interpretation of commonly known events from the perspective of a group of people involved in those events, i.e. the Shaphan-family.⁵⁰ And according to that perspective, Jehoiakim's rejection of the scroll intended to move him to repentance, firmed the certainty of doom in Jeremiah's proclamation.

With this judgment, then, we can firm up our commitment to first and second scroll structures. The structure of the first scroll as we can see

it now, would include most of Chapters 1 - 7:15. After legitimating the prophet's authority, in Chapter 1, it moves on to a discussion of the people's guilt in Chapter 2 and of the need and possibility of repentance in Chapter 3. Chapter 4:1-4 -- a transitional unit -- changes tack, shifting the emphasis from the need for repentance to the consequences to follow from continued unrepentance. These, of course take on, in 4:5 - 6:30 the shape of destruction wrought by "the foe from the north," Nebuchadnezzar's Babylonian army. Even within the heart of the battle scenes, though, the emphasis is placed on the people's failure properly to relate to Yahweh: Chapter 5, between the battle scenes of Chapters 4 and 6, would have been composed of the three-part reflection on the people's failures in this respect. The scroll closes with 7:1-15, the "Temple Sermon," in which the connection between doom and the people's failure, that dominated the poetic material, is articulated positively as a conditional proposition: "Amend your ways and your doings, and I will let you dwell in this place." This positive articulation would make a suitable conclusion to the first scroll, offering a "way out" of the devastation threatened in the previous chapters.

The second scroll contained all the above, but with additions that radically shifted the overall message. It added 7:16-20, with its message of certain doom, to 7:1-15, thus obscuring any hope that might have been drawn from the Temple Sermon. Jeremiah further added the material in 4:19-28; 5:10-17; 6:9-15, 27-30; 8:14 - 10:25, with its overwhelming atmosphere of destruction, interweaving the later material with the battle scenes in 4:5 - 6:30 so that the possibilities of devastation contained in the earlier material became confirmed certainties, all to be read in the narrowing perspective of ever approaching destruction.

Application of the Historical Criterion

Having established the contrast between hope for repentance and inescapable doom as a criterion for distinguishing between the first and second scrolls, Holladay next concentrates on applying it to particular texts in Jeremiah 1-10.⁵¹ This process is generally not of interest to the present investigation, since the broad outlines of the first and second scrolls have already been drawn on the basis of Holladay's observations to this point, and since our primary concern is with verifying Holladay's argument for a shift in Jeremiah's understanding of Judah's future, and in relation to that, his own vocation. We will not get involved with Holladay's assignment of questionable texts, or texts whose assignment depends almost exclusively on the application of Holladay's historical criterion. These latter consist mainly of 7:21-28,30-34, 8:4-13. There will always be debate in the application of a criterion, and it is not particularly our business here to get involved in it. Instead we will mainly review cases where previous evidence can be confirmed, and in more detail, cases where the conclusions of this investigation differ significantly from Holladay's.

Briefly, then, 5:10-17, 6:9-15, 6:27-30 are as we had anticipated assigned by Holladay to the second scroll. We had seen that they formed part of the structure by which Jeremiah built the second scroll additions onto the first scroll core.

Two further cases are of interest to us, since we differ from Holladay in our judgments regarding them.

First, 9:1-8 is assigned by Holladay to the second scroll. It shares refining and assaying imagery with 6:27-30 which Holladay also assigns to the second scroll. It should be noted, though, that those

<

references in 9:1-8 are reluctant and comparatively undeveloped, whereas in 6:27-30 they are bitter and part of an extended image which leads to an expression of the people's utter rejection: "Refuse silver they are called, for Yahweh has rejected them." We have seen that 9:1-8 in all probability was originally situated next to 5:21-29. It is worth pointing out that 5:10-17, as part of the second scroll would not have stood between 5:1-9 and 5:21-29: the three sections (5:1-9, 5:21-29, 9:1-8) would have formed one unit together (vv. 18-19 are secondary, v. 20 is an editorial introduction).

Second, 1:11-19, tentatively assigned by Holladay to the second scroll on the basis of his exclusion of it from the basic rhetorical structure of Chapters 1-3, is confirmed by him as second scroll material, now on the basis of fire imagery in it that he finds to be common in second scroll material, (specifically the word נִיחַ "fanned," v. 13), and on the basis of Jeremiah's preoccupation with his own role in vv. 17-19, which he also finds to be common in second scroll material. It must be stated that both these grounds are weak in the absence of rhetorical evidence and evidence of irrevocable doom.

There is not sufficient evidence to justify a second scroll assignment of 1:11-19. It should be pointed out, on the question of changes in understanding of prophetic role, that Jeremiah in all probability experienced several. The shift evident in 1:11-19 is to an adversarial relation with the people of Judah, to an explicit awareness of Yahweh's intention for Judah as including the impact of international hostilities, and to an awareness of his role as involving the proclamation of the directions of these hostilities. Given the probability that the first scroll had to do with warning the people of Judah to submit to the Babylonians, all of this

can be presumed as part of Jeremiah's self-understanding at the time of the first scroll.

This in turn suggests that when we come to study Jeremiah's shifting self-understanding directly, in Chapter 5, we shall probably have to speak more in terms of growing awarenesses or, perhaps, of a series of shifts.

Holladay: Conclusions

The purpose of investigating Holladay's case for the identification of the two scrolls in the Jeremiah-book was primarily to verify the basis of his claims for a shift in Jeremiah's understanding of Judah's future and of his own role in bringing that future. This basis was a rhetorical-critical analysis, which led to a hypothesis about the composition-process in Jeremiah 1-10.

Holladay's rhetorical analysis has, as he claimed, proved a fruitful avenue into the composition process of the Jeremiah-book. It does suffer, to a certain extent, from imprecision in identifying evidence, which leads at times to a failure to recognise it or use it fully. The fourfold distinctions between purely formal rhetorical tags and parallels and meaning-inclusive tags and parallels, was introduced in an effort to compensate for this. Similarly, the systematic investigation into the "difference in tonality" averred by Holladay between parallel material from 4:5 - 6:30 and 8:14 - 10:25 was a fruitful effort to make these parallels speak more clearly.

Partially because of these methodological imprecisions, which led to a neglect of some evidence, partially because of misinterpretations of the evidence found, Holladay's results required emendations in a number of particulars. These primarily concerned his treatments of 1:11-19, 2:33-37, the relations of Chapters 2 and 3 and 2:2-3, and 9:1-8. So 1:11-19 was

seen not necessarily to be outside the basic rhetorical structure of Chapter 1; 2:33-37 was shown in fact to lie outside the rhetorical structure of Chapter 2; 2:2-3 was shown not to exist independently from the following material and not to have a controlling relation with the poetry of Chapter 3. Chapters 2 and 3 were found, largely as a result, not to be rhetorically bound. Finally, 9:1-8 was discovered to be first scroll material that earlier formed a three-section unit with 5:1-9 and 5:21-29, in the first scroll. None of these shifts, however, cast Holladay's basic hypothesis into doubt. In fact, they served to reinforce his claims by refining his argument.

Most convincingly, the rhetorical evidence in 4:5 - 6:30 and 8:14 - 10:25 points clearly to both the original separate existence of the bulk of 4:5 - 6:30 and the deliberate "welding" onto it of 8:14 - 10:25. In this particular Holladay's argument was refined to the point that many details of this process became apparent. It was established that 9:1-8 had, in the first scroll formed a three-section unit with 5:1-9 and 5:21-29. Jeremiah displaced the third section to 9:1-8 to bind this later material to the earlier, and also inserted later material (i.e. 5:10-17, 6:9-15, 6:27-30) into 4:5 - 6:30 -- often with links to 9:1-8 -- to perform the same function. A tonal contrast was discovered between material original to 4:5 - 6:30 and the later material in 8:14 - 10:25, such that the earlier material threatened doom in the hope of provoking repentance, while the later material offered only inescapable doom.

Jeremiah's close binding of the earlier and later material was seen to bring about the domination of the blacker perspective of the later material over the earlier material. The tonal contrast was obscured, and only certain doom could be read from the final scroll.

That this tonal contrast was not peculiar to 4:5 - 6:30 and 8:14 - 10:25 Holladay established by noting the same contrast between 7:1-15, the Temple Sermon, and 7:16-20, the prohibition of intercession, which he argued are both of Jeremianic composition.

The same contrast was noted in the narrative of Chapter 36, between the hope for the people's repentance expressed in the commissioning of the first scroll and the certainty of doom announced after its destruction by Jehoiakim.

By induction, the contrast between the two blocks of secondarily attached materials was identified with that described in Chapter 36, and hence with that between the first scroll and the additions to it in the second scroll, and this contrast was established as a criterion for distinguishing between the two scrolls. To say this is implicitly to affirm the shift in Jeremiah that produced this contrast, which affirmation is explicitated by Holladay: Jehoiakim's destruction of the first scroll destroyed in Jeremiah all hope for the aversion of tragedy. Doom became inevitable, and his own prophetic role shifted as a result. The specific dimensions of this shift will be studied in Chapter Five.

In any historical argument, independent verification is preferable. The works of Rudolph and Bright -- both earlier than Holladay, will be reviewed in the following pages, to see how much, and in which respects, their findings confirm those of Holladay, through different routes. The work of Rudolph, which will be examined next, focusses to a high degree on thematic continuities and breaks, which Holladay in his rhetorical analysis is very erratic in treating. Similarly untreated by Holladay, although in this case because they lay outside the boundaries proper to his rhetorical analysis, are details of conventional form, such as

"introductions" and "oracular formulae." These also are prominent in Rudolph's treatment, and while Holladay does refer occasionally to Rudolph's work, he does not consistently take it into account. The next chapter will focus, then, on presenting Rudolph's treatment in the form of an analytic summary, and on working through the impact of his conclusions on Holladay's argument.

CHAPTER III

RUDOLPH'S ANALYSIS OF JEREMIAH 1-10

Rudolph has a significant voice in informing the evaluation of Holladay's work. His book comprehends and contributes to, the decisive historical-critical research of Duham and Mowinckel on the Jeremiah-book.¹ It contains the foundations, then, which must be addressed by anyone wanting to make a serious claim to advancement in knowledge of the Jeremiah-book.

The orientation of Rudolph's work is basically historical-critical: Rudolph is finally most interested in what Jeremiah himself experienced and said, and in which circumstances. In pursuing this interest he moves consistently from an analysis of the text that is generally literary, to historical hypothesis and judgments of historical probability. The literary analysis includes isolation of unit, classification according to form of prophetic speech, distinction of voices within a unit, discussion of thematic concerns and style, and discussion of textual disputations. The historical hypothesis is drawn from data provided by these literary investigations -- moving, in a particular unit, for example, from literary form to a specific source and Sitz im Leben,² based on a correspondence between these former and Rudolph's external knowledge of the historical situation. Specific historical indicators both are used in and emerge from this move to hypothesis.

Rudolph's work is significant for a discussion of Holladay's thesis

at three general levels, then: the literary, the historical, and the movement from the one to the other.

Regarding the Urrolle specifically, Rudolph disclaims the possibility of discovering its contents (XVII), although he does often offer judgments about specific passages. These judgments are only the beginning of Rudolph's significance for the present investigation, and in fact often prove to be among his less substantial contributions. Speaking generally, we can abstract five areas of concern from Rudolph's procedure that will surface at different moments in our evaluation of Holladay's argument. First, Rudolph's isolation of the unit in connection with his discussion of form of speech is significant for Holladay's division of the text of Chapters 1-10. Second, Rudolph's discussion of thematic concerns and style is significant for Holladay's discovery of thematic contrasts between units. Third, Rudolph's discussion of sources is significant to Holladay's assignment of material as secondary or original to Jeremiah. Fourth, Rudolph's discussion of Sitz im Leben is significant -- indirectly -- for Holladay's assignment of material to one or other of the scrolls. Fifth, and more generally, the progression in specific cases from literary data to historical hypothesis in Rudolph is significant for the same progression in Holladay.

In dealing with Rudolph, I have found it useful to present an analytic summary of his presentation before treating its impact on Holladay's argument. This manner of proceeding has a certain awkwardness, but it seemed necessary for a complete presentation. The material is organized, in any case, so that all conclusions are contained in the sections dealing with the relation of Rudolph's presentation to that of Holladay. (The same procedure will be followed in dealing with Bright in Chapter Four Below).

Jeremiah 1:4-19

Analytic Summary

The unit is entitled "The Authentication of the prophet as Yahweh's representative" by Rudolph, and he divides it as follows (pp. 3-11):

- 1:4-10 The Call
- 11-12 Der "Wacholder" (properly "almond"; German here has a pun
corresponding to that in the Hebrew)
- 13-16 The boiling kettle
- 17-19 "Speak what I command you."

Verses 4, 11, 13, Rudolph notes, have new introductions.

Formally, vv. 4-10 are treated as a vocation narrative, one standing in sharp contrast to the more elaborate reports of Isaiah and Ezekiel. Verses 11-12 and 13-16 are not seen by Rudolph as "pure visions," but rather as strong suggestions that imposed themselves on the prophet from his environment while he was still in the first excitement of his call. Verses 17-19 are a synthetic closing section with connection to both vv. 4-10 and vv. 11-16. (An implicit recognition that the two "visions" are not completely independent from one another is evident in Rudolph's treatment). The unit as a whole forms an introduction to the oracles that follow.

Thematically, vv. 4-10 focus on the nature and historical significance of Jeremiah's call: it is from eternity, it is to speak Yahweh's words, it is of international significance. Verses 11-13 articulate Yahweh's continued support of his word, that word spoken through Jeremiah. Verses 13-16 regard the "Foe from the North" threatening as a consequence of the people's idolatry and apostasy; these verses give us the first indication of the content of Jeremiah's message. Verses 17-19 are thematically synthetic (i.e. composed of themes from the two preceding sections) with connections to vv. 4-10 that consist in commissioning and admonishing the

prophet, and connections to vv. 11-16 that consist in the darker, more serious content: the assumed need for defense from his people in vv. 17-19, understandable in view of the threatening nature of his proclamation, and Yahweh's intention to fulfill it, in vv. 11-16.

Rudolph's historical discussion focusses here — for us most significantly — on the question of textual composition. What was Jeremiah's intention in placing this material in this place in the Urrolle? Verses 4-10 provide the prophet's authentication, authorising him to speak the oracles that follow. Verses 11-12, a consolation for Jeremiah personally, provide a heavy threat to the hearers: behind the oracles that they are about to hear stands Yahweh, with full intention to fulfill them. By placing vv. 13-16, the "boiling kettle/foe from the north" here, Jeremiah was saying that the threat from the North that he had long felt, remained unabated, and (implicitly) that Nebuchadnezzar was its immanent fulfillment. (Rudolph's observation that Nebuchadnezzar would, in 604, be spontaneously recognised as the "foe from the north" has further implications for the history of the scroll's composition, that will be weighed later). In his discussion of Chapter 2, Rudolph will further suggest that vv. 13-16 predict the themes of Chapters 2-6, namely idolatry and the "foe from the north." Verses 17-19, by their synthesis, provide the unit with coherence. They also, by their reiteration and sharpening of the commissioning, prepare the hearer for the beginning of the body of the scroll — the actual proclamation. The unit as a whole was placed by Jeremiah at the beginning of the Urrolle to "authenticate himself as Yahweh's prophet, and his word as Yahweh's word" (p. 10). There is no serious questioning by Rudolph of the belonging of any of this material to the first scroll.

Relation to Holladay

Holladay and Rudolph both see vv. 4-10 as the basic call section, followed by two visions beginning in v. 11. While Rudolph has the second vision ending in v. 16 followed by concluding verses in vv. 17-19, though, Holladay has the second vision ending in v. 14, followed by "expansion, largely in prose" in vv. 15-19.³

Rudolph's demonstration of the synthetic relation of vv. 17-19 to the rest of 1:4-10, 11-16, makes it highly probable that these verses (vv. 17-19) form a separate, closing section to the chapter. Holladay presumably separates vv. 15-19 from the preceding verses because of the oracle beginning in v. 15 — not clear grounds for doing so, especially since we are dealing with texts acknowledged as composite. Rudolph's division seems the best founded in the text.

Although he failed to note it explicitly, Rudolph's discussion of themes does show a contrast between vv. 4-10 and vv. 11-19 such as that found by Holladay: vv. 11-19 are more sombre than vv. 4-10. Holladay, for his part, fails to take account of the chapter's compositional unity as discerned by Rudolph. Holladay's affirmation of the absence of links between vv. 11-19 and the following material seems relevant only if vv. 11-19 are established as separate from vv. 4-10. Otherwise, the link in 1:6,7 with 2:2; 3:4,24 (יָחַד), can be seen as connecting the whole unit, 1:4-19 with the following material.

Partly as a consequence of their differences in the matter of compositional unity, Rudolph and Holladay also differ in their historical judgments. Having demonstrated the chapter's compositional unity (primarily based on the relation of vv. 17-19 to 1:4-16), Rudolph gives a coherent account of the individual sections in terms of the prophet's

intentions in composing the Urrolle. (Now the issue may be clouded by the fact that Rudolph does not seem to consider the question of the second scroll here, so does not even consider the possibility of compositional unity being at the second scroll level). Both Holladay and Rudolph let us down in this discussion, Holladay by not noting the connections between vv. 4-10 and vv. 11-19, and Rudolph by not considering the second scroll redacted by Jeremiah.

Given that 1:4-19 form a redactional unit, then, the question remains of whether it is a first scroll or a second scroll unit. The answer to this question hinges on judgments regarding the dating of vv. 11-19, and regarding their suitability as first scroll material.

The bitterness of vv. 11-19 as compared to vv. 4-10 is probable evidence of their later original date of composition (against Rudolph). At the same time, these verses contain no clear statement of inevitable doom, such as those found, for example, in 4:28 and 6:30. The description of approaching destruction is here no more extreme than that in the portions of the "foe from the North" material in 4:5 - 6:30 that was judged by Holladay to be of first scroll origin (e.g. 4:5-8). Now if we could demonstrate clearly that 1:11-19 is rhetorically separate from the surrounding first scroll material in 1:4-10 and 2:1-32, we would have grounds for assigning it to the second scroll. In fact, though, we have no evidence of rhetorical discontinuity. Without strong corollary rhetorical data, then, the relative bitterness of 1:11-19 is not in itself evidence of second scroll composition.

Rudolph observed that the "foe from the north" referred to in vv. 13-16, would in 604 have been recognised as Nebuchadnezzar (p. 10). Norbert Lohfink, as we saw in Chapter One, claims that the scroll was

composed in 605 in the face of Jehoiakim's possible defiance of Nebuchadnezzar — its reading was averted by Jehoiakim's submission to Nebuchadnezzar, and read in 601 when Jehoiakim was meditating rebellion.⁴ If those were indeed the occasions of the scroll's composition and reading — and in my judgment Lohfink's case is very well made — then the issue of the Babylonian foe would be the motivating and central issue for the scroll. And in that case, the setting of a vision-oracle about the "foe from the north" — recognisable to all as Nebuchadnezzar — in the introduction to the first scroll, would be eminently suitable. In vv. 11-12, the hearers are, in effect, threatened that Yahweh will accomplish his word. In vv. 13-16 they hear a word that they can see already being accomplished in the figure of the Babylonians, and one that provides the motivating concern of the scroll.

A final corroboration of this argument is that Holladay himself does assign some of the other "foe from the North" material occurring in Chapters 1-10, to the first scroll.⁵ Even he, then, does not see it as necessarily thematically unsuited to the first scroll.

At this point in our investigation, then, 1:4-19 is shown to be a redactional unit with contrasts in form and theme between vv. 4-10 and vv. 11-19, which are evidence of different moments of original composition, and may be evidence of significantly later composition of 1:11-19, but which are not evidence for second scroll composition. The "foe from the north," thematically prominent in vv. 13-16, would have been an eminently suitable way of opening the first scroll. There is in all of this, no strong evidence for second scroll composition of the redactional unit, and some substantial evidence of the suitability of its contents to the first scroll. We may judge, then, that 1:4-19 is probably a first

scroll composition, and that 1:11-19 may be much later than vv. 4-10, although we cannot establish a strong probability of that on the present evidence.

This judgment necessitates a qualification of Holladay's argument that Jeremiah's shift in his understanding of his vocation occurred in a moment of time at the rejection of the first scroll. We have evidence that he saw himself as standing in an adversarial relationship with the people at the time of the first scroll's composition. This suggests that we should rather be speaking of a continuum in Jeremiah's shifting understanding of his vocation, or perhaps a series of shifts; more extended consideration of this matter will be reserved for a point when our evidence is more complete (see Chapter 5 below).

Jeremiah 2

Analytic Summary

2:1-37 is entitled "Jeremiah's oldest proclamation" by Rudolph, for reasons we will look at later (pp. 11-21). The unit is further divided, as follows:

- 1-2a Superscription
- 2b-13 Israel's wicked/worse barter
- 14-19 The consequences of apostasy
- 20-28 And that calls itself Yahwhism! (Jahwedienst)
- 29-37 The deliberate (bewuste) Neglect of Yahweh

The thematic unity and progression seen by Rudolph is evident in the titles he has given to the individual sections. In vv. 2b-13 Israel leaves Yahweh for nothingness, in vv. 14-19 the consequences of her leaving are explored; vv. 20-28 qualify the apostasy with the incredulous note that the apostates still see themselves as following Yahweh, and 29-37 return directly to the neglect of Yahweh. There is some confusion in the title given by Rudolph to the whole unit. This ~~name~~ is clearly a

critical abstraction emerging from his scholarly interests with the unit rather than from the unit's thematic concerns. The subsections, by contrast, are named according to predominant thematic concerns, and these names show a progression of the theme throughout the unit. The coherence of the unit, evidenced in the progression of concerns in the names of its sections, should be evident in its title, and is not in Rudolph's. The unit could, for example, be better called, "Yahweh's complaint: Israel has abandoned him."

Rudolph notes, regarding the relation of the whole unit to 1:4-19, that the foe from the north (1:13-15) is not yet being discussed, but that rather, 1:16 is being developed — the falling away to other gods (p. 11).

That last thematic note, of course, provides for us the passage into Rudolph's historical discussion, being in effect an observation about the structuring of the Urrolle. He sees Chapter 2 as following from Chapter 1:4-19 here as in the Urrolle. Another note made by Rudolph, that has bearing on the history of composition here, regards the superscription, vv. 1-2a, which, he claims, should be understood in the light of 36:5-6, where Jeremiah instructs Baruch to read the scroll in the Temple "in the hearing of all the people in Yahweh's house." Verse 2a, then, according to Rudolph, announces the beginning of the proclamation for which the hearers were prepared in 1:4-19; it is the beginning of the Urrolle proper (p. 11).

Rudolph also discusses the relative situation in Jeremiah's prophetic career of the material in Chapter 2 — the title he gives to the chapter states his conclusion. That this chapter contains Jeremiah's oldest proclamation is evident to him primarily from the pre-Deuteronomical circumstances presumed by the material (p. 11). Rudolph

does not specify what these circumstances are: perhaps he is referring to the widespread pursuit of other gods, as in v. 8 (Baal), v. 27 (rock and tree), and alien cultic practices, as in vv. 23-25 and v. 20 (harlotry). One might, in that case, though, see this as material generated during the Deuteronomic reform as a part of the drive to centralise and purify the worship of Yahweh. Rudolph also supports his judgment of an early date with 2:18, which shows Assyria still as a political power. This means the text was written before Jehoiakim's time. (Jehoiakim took up his reign under Egyptian vassalage, and continued it under Babylonian). Only v. 16 and vv. 32f are seen by Rudolph as having been first added by Jeremiah during Jehoiakim's reign, in the process of dictation referred to in 36:4 (p. 11).

Relation to Holladay

Rudolph differs from Holladay in his division of the text, but in such a way as to reinforce the corrections to Holladay's analysis that were made in Chapter Two (see above, pp. 21-24). Specifically, he treats vv. 2-3 as part of the overall unit. On another matter, the inclusion of vv. 33-37 in the unit, Rudolph corresponds with Holladay; we have seen, though, that there is strong evidence for excluding these verses from the unit.

Rudolph makes several contributions to our understanding of the place of Chapter 2 in the Urrolle. First, he points to the superscription, 2:1 (totally ignored by Holladay), as indicating the beginning of the Urrolle proper, basing his judgment on its correspondence to the instruction given of 36:5-6: "in the hearing of all the people in the Lord's house." Second, he sees Chapter 2 as being attached to Chapter 1, specifically as a development of 1:16, the "falling away to other gods."

By this reading Chapter 1 is a preparation for the actual message of the scroll, which comes in Chapter 2. In particular, Rudolph mentions that 1:13-16 give us our first clues about what Jeremiah's message will be. Third, Rudolph finds evidence of redactional activity in Chapter 2 during the reign of Jehoiakim, i.e. verses 16 and 32, which make reference to international political tensions of that time. Now the first scroll was also composed during Jehoiakim's reign, and while that reign did extend from 609-597 BCE, the facts that the composition of the scroll provides an occasion for literary activity on pre-existing oracles, and that the scroll shows increasing evidence of having had a strongly political interest, motivate us to see these additions with Rudolph, as having been made at the time of the 605 dictation.

Jeremiah 3 - 4:4

Analytic Summary

Rudolph divides 3:1 - 4:4 into 3 units, as follows (pp. 21-29):

- | | |
|------------|--|
| 3:1-5 | The Right to Return to Yahweh excluded |
| 3:6-18 | The Return Home of North and Southern kingdoms |
| 3:19 - 4:4 | Return Home to Yahweh through Repentance |

Chapter 3:1 has a new introduction, Rudolph points out, although one that is garbled in the text as we have it. 3:6 also has a new introduction, 3:19 - 4:4 are separated on thematic grounds: they could not be a continuation of 3:18 because in that case, Yahweh could not accuse the people of faithlessness (v. 20) so soon after the invitation to return home, of vv. 6-18. 3:19 - 4:4 are seen by Rudolph as a continuation of vv. 1-5.

He claims to discern a structure in these verses such that 3:1-5, 19-20 form the first 4 strophes, 3:21 begins a reversal, with 4 more strophes occurring up to 4:4. Rudolph has these verses divided into 4 line strophes, with the breakdown coming as follows: v. 1, 2-3a, 3b-5, 19-20,

21-22, 23-24, 25 - 4:2, 4:3-4.

It is not clear to me that all the strophes in fact fall as he sees them: v. 22, for example, contains part of a speech by Yahweh and the beginning of a speech by the people. It seems probable that the people's speech should begin a new strophe. Moreover, Holladay has shown the transitional character of 4:1-4, between the material in Chapter 2-3 and that in 4:5 - 6:30. The link on 78 binding the first three chapters together (1:6,7; 2:2; 3:4,24) also reinforces the probability that the unit should be seen as ending in 3:25.

Thematically, as is evident from the titles given them by Rudolph, the three units are connected by the thread of return/conversion embodied in the word ל. As is also evident from their titles, 3:1-5 and 3:19 - 4:4 focus on the conversion meaning of ל, while 3:6-18 clearly includes a physical return in its focus.

Chapter 3:6-18 is further subdivided by Rudolph on thematic grounds. He points out that while vv. 6-13 invite Israel to return, the words "Zion," "ark," "Jerusalem," make it clear that vv. 14-17 invite Judah to return. The attitude to Judah in vv. 6-13 does not make such an invitation probable as a continuation of those verses. Verse 18, finally, goes against all the preceding material, speaking of a return of Israel and Judah at the same time, whereas the invitation of vv. 6-13 and vv. 14-17 were clearly issued on separate occasions. Verse 18, then, is meant to join vv. 6-13 and vv. 14-17 together by picking up on their common theme of homecoming (pp. 23-25).

Rudolph notes the connection in content between Chapter 2 and 3:1-5 (which he separates because of the new introduction in 3:1). He takes this connection as an indication of the contemporaneity of the two pieces

in Jeremiah's Anfangszeit, and as an indication of the place of 3:1-5 in the Urrolle (p. 21).

In his historical reflections about the composition of this material Rudolph concludes that because of the exilic overtones of vv. 14-17, only vv. 6-13 can be considered for a place in the first scroll; still, at least vv. 14-17a are quite possibly Jeremianic. Rudolph points out that although the first scroll was addressed to Judah while vv. 6-13 appear to address Israel, these verses would be meaningful in Judean ears: the invitation to Israel to return in those verses is really a way of accentuating Judah's shameful behavior. While, for that reason, Rudolph finds 3:6-13 as suitable Urrolle material, he cannot say where in that scroll it might originally have been located (p. 24).

Relation to Holladay

Rudolph and Holladay differ substantially about the structure of Chapter 3; although both read vv. 6-18 as an exilic redaction, Holladay judges vv. 12b-14a to have participated in the earlier structure of the surrounding material in vv. 1-5 and vv. 19-25. On the basis of this judgment, it will be remembered, Holladay came up with an A (vv. 1-5)-B (vv. 12b-14a)-A' (19-20)-B' (21-25) structure in this material, which was found substantially to be supported by rhetorical evidence. Rudolph sees an eight stanza poem in this material, which excludes vv. 6-18 entirely, and which extends up to 4:1-4. The extensive parallels found between vv. 12b-13 and vv. 21-25, the occurrence in 3:24 of the last verbal link on וְיָשָׁב, and the clearly transitional function of 4:1-4, make Holladay's argument the stronger here.

Rudolph's discussion of the exilic redaction of vv. 6-18 provides something that was missing in Holladay's argument, i.e. evidence of such

redaction in the evidence in the arrangement of those verses. He pointed out, specifically, that whereas vv. 6-13 were addressed to Israel and vv. 14-17 were addressed -- on a separate occasion -- to Judah, someone joined them through v. 18, which speaks of a common return of Israel and Judah, and from a clearly exilic context.

On the question of the larger structure of the book, Rudolph's argument lends support to the judgment that Chapters 2 and 3 are rhetorically separate, as was argued in Chapter Two against Holladay. He notes that there is a new introduction in 3:1, a device which indicates a new grouping of materials. He further notes in Chapter 3 a thematic focus on 212 that distinguishes it from Chapter 2. He interprets the connections in subject matter between Chapters 2 and 3 as an indication of contemporaneity of composition. Rudolph, with other commentators, sees a concern with idolatry as one of Jeremiah's earliest themes. Bright will, in this connection, appeal to an influence from Hosea in the early Jeremiah.

Jeremiah 4:5 - 6:30

Analytic Summary

Rudolph treats 4:5 - 6:26 as three separate units, although he recognises that they form together a complex thematically united around "the approaching foe." Holladay treats 4:5 - 6:30 in one block; since our purpose is comparison with him, Rudolph's treatment of the three units (4:5-31, 5:1-31, 6:1-26) will be given together before their relation to Holladay is discussed. Rudolph's treatment of 6:27-30 will also be mentioned here, since that passage is too short to merit separate attention, and since Holladay does treat it in continuity with the preceding material.

Jeremiah 4:5-31

This unit is entitled "War is at Hand!", by Rudolph. While he does not further divide the material into sections, he does distinguish the material as follows in the course of his treatment: vv. 5-8, 9-12, 13-18, 19-21, 23-26, 27-29, 30-31 (pp. 29-33). Rudolph sees the structure of this unit as providing a dramatic build-up:

kleine Abschnitte, die uns sofort mitten in die kriegsnot hineinführen, zum Teil scheinbar abrupt nebeneinandergestellt, aber doch eine grosse Einheit bildend und deutlich auf Steigerung angelegt: von der ersten Kunde vom Nahn des Feindes (5ff) bis zum Todesschrei der Hauptstadt (31). (p. 29)

The short, apparently unconnected pieces, coupled with thematic intensification, contribute to the highly dramatic movement of this chapter — a kaleidoscope of progressively more terrible images. Rudolph detects, in addition to the collage of battle images, sub-theme in this chapter: responses to an implicit "Why?" The answer to this question surfaces here and there — it is Yahweh's judgment (v. 12b), divine anger (v. 26b), because of Judah's "ways and doings" (v. 18), because she has "Rebelled against me, says Yahweh" (v. 17b) (cf. 11/12a, 22, 14a) (pp. 31, 33).

At the historical level of his discussion, Rudolph tries to account for a serious contradiction in the material of Chapter 4: v. 14a would seem to indicate that Yahweh would still be willing to improve things in the case of a last minute conversion of the people, while v. 28, on the other hand, speaks in terms of an "irrevocable decision to destroy" (p. 31). Rudolph takes this latter reference as a sign that Jeremiah had himself given up any hope for such an eleventh hour conversion on the people's part, maintaining that v. 14a reflects Yahweh's theoretical willingness still to forgive (pp. 31, 33). This contradiction is, of

course, that noted by Holladay as characterizing the difference between the two scrolls. Rudolph's attempt to resolve the contradiction will be discussed later, in that connection.

Jeremiah 5:1-31

This unit is entitled "Why the War?" It is further subdivided by Rudolph as follows: vv. 1-6, 7-11, 12-17, 26-29, 18, 19, 20-25, 30-31 (pp. 33-39). Verses 18-25 are judged by Rudolph not to belong to the framework of Chapter 5, because of thematic discontinuities that will be discussed below.

Rudolph sees vv. 1-6 and vv. 7-11 as structurally parallel, with the distinction that vv. 1-6 is a dialogue, while vv. 7-11 is Yahweh's speech throughout: both move from guilt to destruction and end with a reiteration of guilt. Verses 12-17 also contain a shift of speaker, beginning with a rebuke-speech spoken by the prophet (vv. 12-13) and ending with a doom-speech spoken by Yahweh. Verses 26-29 are a speech by Yahweh to the prophet. Verses 30-31 are an authentic announcement of doom, articulated in a tense question.

In material of this complexity it is undeniably difficult to distinguish where units begin and end. It is important to try to discern a principle of organisation. I would suggest that this is one area in which Rudolph's methodology leaves him at a disadvantage comparative to Holladay. It focusses on large formal markers and thematic continuities that are useful in indicating larger units, but that can respectively be largely absent and indiscriminately present in the smaller passages of large complexes. Holladay's discovery that this material seems to be structured by clusters of imperative plurals, seriously challenges Rudolph's

division of Chapter 5.⁶ Normally, this discussion would be further pursued below, in relating Rudolph's analysis to that of Holladay. In this case, however, Rudolph's analysis is so directly challenged that it seems impossible to evaluate it on its own without at the same time allowing it to be addressed by the alternate assertions of Holladay's argument.

The imperative plurals in Chapter 5 occur only in vv. 1,10,20-21, yielding divisions as follows: vv. 1-9,10-17 (18-19 are secondary additions), 20-29. Verses 30-31 are clearly separate, an announcement of doom, as Rudolph states (p. 37). Holladay is not certain when it was added.⁷ These divisions are supported by the new evidence discussed in Chapter Two above (p. 40) that the thematic structures of vv. 1-9 and vv. 21-29 are parallel, culminating in a common refrain.

Rather than reading vv. 1-9 as a section, though, Rudolph sees v. 7 as a new introduction; he reads the second occurrence of "pardon" as a new beginning rather than as a connection with the preceding material. But there seems no reason to separate vv. 7-9 from the preceding material: Yahweh has sought a reason to pardon, failed to find one, identified that failure with a present ill, and in v. 7 he frustratedly asks how he could have pardoned the people, given their behavior. The following facts argue for setting the boundaries of the first section as vv. 1-9: that (a) there is no reason to make a separation at v. 7, (b) v. 9 must be a conclusion since the same words occur twice elsewhere (5:29, 9:8) and appear to be a refrain, (c) v. 10 begins a new sequence of action with a new imperative, and different imagery. Similarly, I cannot find adequate foundation for Rudolph's division between vv. 11 and 12. They appear to be part of the same thought, and there is a connection in imagery between the material preceding v. 11 (v. 10), and that following v. 12 (v. 14): the branches

stripped away in the destruction of the vineyard Israel in vv. 10, are connected to the idea of the people as wood in v. 14. I would, then, argue for the constitution of vv. 10-17 as one section, supported again by the evidence of imperative plurals in vv. 10 and vv. 20-21.

Verses 18,19 and 20 seem appropriately dealt with by Rudolph as exilic insertions (vv. 18,19) and editorial addition (v. 20) respectively. Since his treatment of vv. 21ff proceeds largely on thematic grounds we will reserve its consideration for the moment.

Thematically, Rudolph judges 5:1-31 to be united by the question of the reason for the war: The "why" that was raised here and there in Chapter 4 is brought out as the major issue in Chapter 5 (p. 33). He separates vv. 20-25 from the framework of Chapter 5 on thematic grounds: the threat here is not war, but rather appears to be some natural tragedy that has already occurred. The linking idea between vv. 20-25 and the body of Chapter 5, is that of a misfortune interpreted as a consequence of the people's sinfulness. (Verse 20 might be an addition, based on 4:5, designed to make clear that vv. 21-25 are directed at those remaining in Judah, rather than the exiles).

Now this exclusion of 5:20-25, and its separation from vv. 26-29, should be questioned. The occurrence of the imperative plurals in vv. 20 and 21 argue strongly for their being material intrinsic to the unit. The lack of further imperative plurals after v. 21 argues for it beginning the last unit in Chapter 5, i.e. one extending from vv. 21-29.

Further, the threat of war in Chapter 5 is most embodied in 5:10-17, which, we have argued in Chapter Two, was not part of the first scroll. It, then, should be seen as the addition, rather than vv. 20-25. Apart from vv. 10-17 the only reference to war comes in the oblique references

of v. 7, couched in animal imagery. This oblique reference to an immanent or perhaps ongoing series of attacks, is not nearly on a scale with the utter destruction and blood-chilling strangers of vv. 10-17. In addition, this reference in v. 7, to a military threat, functions in the same way in vv. 1-9 as does the reference in vv. 24-25 to the natural disaster, apparently a drought. Both are ills brought on by the people's sinfulness. Rudolph notes that this is specifically what links vv. 20-25 to Chapter 5, but he does not see that this sinfulness, rather than the war, is the dominating element in the chapter.

Rudolph's position regarding Chapter 5 has, then, been challenged from two perspectives: his division of the material, and his estimation of the significance of war as a thematic focus, in the chapter's basic structure.

Jeremiah 6:1-26

This unit is entitled "Once again, War-pain and War-guilt." It is further divided as follows (pp. 39-45):

- 1-8 The destruction of Jerusalem through the foe from the North
- 9-15 Jerusalem's Unrepentance
- 16-21 Jerusalem has no excuse
- 22-25 Concluding piece - (Schlussabschnitt)
- 26 (not dealt with)

Thematically, the unit is a resumption of the intensifying battle scenes of Chapter 4, after the interpretive interlude of Chapter 5 (p. 39). Chapter 4 began with the call to seek shelter in the fortified cities and ended with the terrified scream of Jerusalem. Chapter 6 focusses exclusively on Jerusalem, beginning with the call to flee from the midst of Jerusalem — the capital city herself is no longer safe. Verses 1-8, then, depict the destruction itself. Verses 9-15, Rudolph

claims, set a kind of *ritardando* into the structure of the chapter, substantiating the claims of v. 6f that only sin and wickedness were to be found in Jerusalem. Verses 16-21 assert the inevitability of doom, since Jerusalem is without excuse. Verses 22-25 are the conclusion, not only of this unit but also of the whole "foe from the North" material of Chapters 4-6; it refers back to 4:5f, 5:15, and 6:1-8.

Rudolph's historical discussion in this chapter turns around the identification of the "foe from the North," which is only of secondary interest to the present inquiry.

Jeremiah 6:27-30

Rudolph entitles this unit "The Outcome of Jeremiah's Word" (pp. 45-46). Formally, these verses are a dialogue, with Yahweh initiating speech in v. 27, and Jeremiah answering him in vv. 28-30. The overall meaning of the unit is clearly an indication of Jeremiah's evaluation of his work to this point, and, Rudolph comments, "it is desolate enough" (p. 45).

Of great interest is Rudolph's note that the form of v. 27 is reminiscent of 1:5 in Jeremiah's vocation narrative: "Zum Propheten gehört also auch das Prüfen, nicht bloss das Verkündigen" (p. 45). In this short unit, then, we find an explicit re-articulation of Jeremiah's vocation, and from his own lips. This will further be developed in Chapter Five, as part of the more properly historical phase of this investigation.

Relation to Holladay

Rudolph finds an A-B-A' pattern in the thematic movement of 4:5 - 6:26: from scenes of battle, to a reflection on the cause of destruction, and back to battle scenes. Holladay also discovered such a pattern in

the same material, but on the basis of concentrations of imperatives.⁸

The imperatives, then, are concentrated in the battle scenes in 4:5-31 (A) and 6:1-26 (A'), and are less frequent in 5:1-29 (B). Rudolph adds to this appreciation of thematic symmetry an awareness of progressive intensification through the material, in the foe's increasing proximity to Jerusalem: in Chapter 4 the foe is approaching and people are urged to flee to the fortified cities, but by Chapter 6 people are fleeing from the midst of Jerusalem itself (p. 39).

Structurally, Rudolph's division of the material in these chapters agrees with Holladay's in Chapters 4 and 6, and differs radically in Chapter 5. Both scholars make a division at the end of Chapter 4, Rudolph only subdividing to identify the short battle images that make up the "large unity" (p. 29). In the division of Chapter 5 there is substantial disagreement between the two scholars, but, as argued above, Rudolph's division at this point seems incorrect, especially in view of the evidence mustered in Chapter Two for the relation of 5:1-9 and 5:21-29. There are only minor differences in their respective divisions of Chapter 6.

Holladay treats vv. 16-26 as one section, and Rudolph as two. Rudolph closes the unit at 6:26, while Holladay closes it at 6:30, but will later withdraw vv. 27-30 from the first scroll structure of that chapter; he shows, then, awareness of its separateness.

Rudolph, as did Holladay, reflects on the historical significance of Jeremiah's apparent loss of hope. His comment regarding the contrast between 4:14 and 4:28, i.e. between Yahweh's potential willingness to pardon and an announcement of irrevocable judgment, calls to attention a thematic contrast also noticed by Holladay. Rudolph sees this as a problem and tries to account for it by identifying 4:28 as an expression of

Jeremiah's personal despair, and 4:14 as Yahweh's position. Both verses, though, are Yahweh-speeches; there being no grounds in the text for Rudolph's distinction, the probability is that they were written on different occasions. This, of course, is the option embraced by Holladay. Holladay's further hypothesis is that 4:28 is later, of course, and in fact illustrates the definitive theme of the second scroll.

Of perhaps more specific interest at the historical level, is a comparison between Rudolph and Holladay's judgments regarding assignment of material to the scrolls. Both scholars agree in seeing 4:5 - 6:26 as a complex that is primarily of first scroll composition, and that is redactionally linked by rhetorical devices to the preceding material. Both note the links in 4:1-4 to both the preceding and following material.

Rudolph further has suggested a link between 1:11-16 where, he says, we have the first clues to the content of Jeremiah's message — and the material in Chapters 2-6. By his reading, Chapters 2 and 3 develop the "falling away to other gods" of 1:16 (p. 11). Although he does not mention it explicitly, it follows implicitly that 4:5 - 6:26 then develop the "foe from the North" of 1:13-15.

Rudolph's analysis of the overall thematic movement in these chapters has, then, contributed substantially to our understanding of Holladay's "Foe Cycle", reinforcing the A-B-A' structure found by Holladay in the clusters of imperatives. His recognition of the contrast between v. 14 and v. 28 as something that needs accounting for reinforces Holladay's conviction that there are two levels in the text to be dealt with. Finally, Rudolph's analysis concurs with Holladay's in the judgment that 4:5 - 6:26 are firmly bound into the structure of the first scroll.

Jeremiah 7:1-15

Analytic Summary

Rudolph entitles this unit "The Temple Sermon," and does not further subdivide it (pp. 47-50). There is a new introduction in the third person in 7:1, the last before 11:1. Chapters 7-10, then, according to Rudolph are redactionally united (p. 47). Formally, the material in 7:1-15 is written in prose, of a style characterised by Rudolph as "long-winded" and "reminiscent of the Deuteronomist" (p. 47). The combined evidences of third person introduction (contrasting with the first person narrations of 1:4, 11, 13; 2:1; 3:1, 6, 11) and prose composition persuade Rudolph that the "Temple Sermon" is not part of the collection of Chapters 1-6.

At the thematic level, Rudolph asserts that 7:1-15 clearly contains the speech summarized in Chapter 26: "Jeremiah called for reform (7:3, 5 = 26:3, 13) and threatened with the fate of Shilo (7:12-14 = 26:6)" (p. 47). The leitmotif of this material, according to Rudolph, was correctly assessed by Volz to be "What gives shelter" (p. 48). The Temple alone does not. This position challenged the belief that Yahweh would not under any circumstances forsake his temple: Yahweh will only remain with the people if they make his stay possible through their conduct. Verses 5f. give the conditions of Yahweh's stay. Verses 8-11 develop the wickedness of taking refuge in the Temple while living immorally. The Temple Sermon reaches its climax in vv. 12-15: "so little is the temple a shelter for the unholy people, that it will rather itself fall into destruction" — as did Shilo — if the peoples' heart does not change (p. 49). Verse 15, finally, extends the destruction to include the scattering of the people.

Rudolph's historical discussion of this unit is extended and moves on several fronts. He treats the questions of the unit's history of

composition, its historical context, its belonging to the Urrolle.

First, Rudolph does not think Jeremiah wrote this unit as it now stands: it is not written in poetry as is most of his other material, and prose materials of the same "longwinded" and "Deuteronomistic" characteristics occur elsewhere in the book. In other words, according to Rudolph, 7:1-15 is not the exception to poetic texts that makes the rule, it is part of an entirely separate prose phenomenon (p. 47). The weakness of Rudolph's argument here should be noted. Had this been the only prose text in Jeremiah, he claims, he would have considered the possibility that Jeremiah committed this speech to prose because of its central importance. The existence of other such prose texts dissuades him of this. It is obvious, though, that the existence of other such texts in the Jeremiah-book could equally be evidence that such material is properly Jeremianic.

Because the additions and expansions within the text do not allow exclusion, and because their removal does not leave a poetic text, Rudolph judges that 7:1-15 is not a re-working of Jeremiah's actual words into sermon form. Rather, the text probably is based on the words of Jeremiah, but as passed through a distinct (friend) personality (so Mowinckel) (p. 47). The "additions and expansions" are not specified by Rudolph, but one wonders, if they cannot be excluded, how he arrived at that classification of them.

Rudolph does not doubt that 7:1-15 is based on the words of Jeremiah: not only is there the second testimony of Chapter 26 for the historicity of the speech, but also the central assertion, that the Temple does not give shelter, would never have been made in Deuteronomic circles. It runs counter to the Deuteronomic attitude to the Temple. In other words, the idea could not have originated in the circles that apparently are

responsible for the text's redaction.

Verse 15 is judged by Rudolph not to have been part of the Temple Sermon as delivered by Jeremiah, since it introduced the issue of the exile, while the Temple Sermon focussed, precisely, on the Temple. Moreover, Chapter 26, which relates the event of the sermon's delivery, makes it evident that the sermon ended with the comparison with Shilo -- at that point Jeremiah was mobbed by the crowd, so he did not have a chance to say anything more! (p. 49). Verse 15, then, is an exilic addition.

Second, Rudolph develops the theme in its historical context. From 26:1 we know that the Temple Sermon was delivered at the beginning of Jehoiakim's reign. The question of the security to be derived from association with the Temple was current because of the general insecurity of the times, and compounded by what had brought on this insecurity: Josiah had left the shelter of the Temple, and died.

Kein Wunder, dass ein Gefühl der Unsicherheit im Volke Platz griff, und dass man sich um so stärker an die einzige verbleibende Garantie für Jahwes Hilfe klammerte, an den Tempel, aus dessen Schutz Josia sich nicht ungestraft entfernt hatte. Das dreimalige ... "der Tempel Jahwes" (4) malt die Inbrunst und Leidenschaft, mit der man sich gegenseitig die Wirksamkeit dieses Schutzmittels versicherte Aber Jer heisst das "Lügenworte": sie setzen voraus, dass Jahwe unter allen Umständen sein Heiligtum nicht im Stich lassen werde. (p. 49)

Finally, the same evidence that led Rudolph to distinguish 7:1-15 from the collection of Chapters 1-6, leads him as a consequence, to judge that it is not part of the Urrolle.

Relation to Holladay

Rudolph and Holladay agree regarding the extent of the Temple Scroll and that it is fundamentally Jeremianic. Holladay, however, in agreement with Weippert,⁹ concludes that Jeremiah himself actually composed this material. His argument (see pp. 52-53 above) is based on a "distinctive

rhetoric" in 7:1-15, that is not characteristically Deuteronomistic, that suggests neither "exilic authorship" nor "late reflection on an earlier event"; and that in fact does suggest "immediacy and emotion."¹⁰

Holladay's argument on this point is very convincing, and is in fact partially supported by J. V. M. Sturdy's analysis of Nicholson's Preaching to the Exiles, the most prominent recent proposal of the Deuteronomistic redaction of the "prose sermons."¹¹ Rudolph's argument is overshadowed here; in fact some of its weaknesses have already been detailed. Holladay's judgment, then, bears the weight of probability, with the exception of v. 15, which does suggest exilic authorship.

In other areas, Rudolph's articulation of the theme of the Temple Scroll -- including conditions under which Yahweh would stay, corresponds to Holladay's thematic treatment. His dating of the speech in the beginning of Jehoiakim's reign allows on a strictly temporal level the inclusion of this material in the first scroll that Holladay advocates.

Jeremiah 7:16 - 8:3

Analytic Summary

7:16 - 8:3 is entitled "Cultic Abuse" by Rudolph (pp. 50-55). It is further sub-divided as follows: vv. 16-20, 21-28, 7:29 - 8:3. Rudolph determines the ending of the unit to be in 8:3 because of a "break in meaning" at that point, and because of the extension of the predominantly prose text to that point (p. 50). He sees 7:16 - 8:3, then, as part of a piece of Deuteronomically redacted material extending from 7:1 - 8:3. The Temple Sermon ends in verse 15; it reaches its logical climax there, and as mentioned above, we know from Chapter 26 that Jeremiah got no further than his parallel between the Temple and Shilo (v. 15 is an exilic addition). Verses 16 ff, moreover take up an issue of private

interest between Yahweh and Jeremiah — the prohibition of intercession.

Thematically, 7:16 - 8:3 is united by a concern with cultic abuses. So, the prohibition of intercession in vv. 16-20 is substantiated with cultic abuses. Verses 21-28 deal with legitimate sacrifice itself as an object of aversion to Yahweh: obedience, not sacrifice, is what he asked from the fathers in the desert. Here, any cult is seen as illegitimate. In 7:29 - 8:3 there is a return to the direct treatment of cultic abuses, this time in powerful connection with the destruction of the land.

Rudolph's historical discussion here focusses extensively on the historical background of the cultic abuses mentioned, which is not of significance to a comparison with Holladay. He also makes some comments about the redactional history of this material: 7:1-15 and 7:16 - 8:3 were put together by the Deuteronomic editor by the linking theme of cult. 7:16-20 in particular, really of originally private significance, would have been included by the Deuteronomic editor because of its mention of cultic abuses. Chapter 7:29, in poetry, is seen by Rudolph as a Jeremiah-quotation inserted by the editor.

Relation to Holladay

While Holladay treats v. 29 on its own, Rudolph includes it with the following material (7:29 - 8:3). Holladay also treats 7:30-34 separately and 8:1-3 not at all. Apart from these differences the two scholars agree in the divisions of 7:16 - 8:3. Chapter 7:30-34 are also seen by Holladay as Jeremianic; here again he and Rudolph do not correspond. Chapter 8:1-3, on the other hand, is judged by both to be secondary. At this point it becomes clear that the major factor accounting for their different divisions of the material, is Holladay's belief that some material is Jeremianic and needs to be separated from

the rest.

With the exception of 7:29, then, Rudolph sees the material in 7:16 - 8:3 as Deuteronomic. Holladay differs from him in seeing Jeremianic compositions here, on the strong basis of the maintained distinctive rhetoric in vv. 16-20 and vv. 21-28, and on the weaker basis of thematic correspondences with second scroll material in vv. 30-34.

Now vv. 30-34 and their relation to the surrounding material need to be further investigated. I would argue that 7:30-34, 8:1-3 are secondary insertion, and that 8:4ff was earlier connected with 7:21-28.

First then, 7:30-34 and 8:1-3 share a focus on corpses and cultic perversions, all couched in sensational imagery. And 8:1-3 is recognised by both Holladay and Rudolph as subsequent to Jeremiah. I am arguing further, that 7:30-34 is the beginning of the material that continues in 8:1-3.

Second, there appears to be a connection between the material preceding 7:30-34 (7:21-28) and 8:4-12. Both sections share a thematic focus on the willful disobedience of the people. In addition 7:28 contains the same introductory phrase as 8:4: וְאִמְרָת אֱלֹהִים. The continuities between 7:30-34 and 8:1-3, and those between 7:21-28 and 8:4-12 argue, then, for the original connection of 7:21-28 to 8:4-12 and the subsequent insertion of 7:30-34 and 8:1-3.

Jeremiah 8:4 - 9:25

Analytic Summary

In 8:4 original Jeremiah material begins again, claims Rudolph, observing though, that whereas in Chapters 2-6 it had been presented in continuous, connected passages, in 8:4 and following we have a juxtaposition of shorter pieces. (This is an observation of potential

significance for the history of the composition of the scrolls). He divides 8:4 - 9:25 into nine short units, which will be treated together here because he sees them as rhetorically united (pp. 55-65). They are as follows:

- | | |
|-------|--|
| 8:4-7 | The Incomprehensible Conduct of the people |
| 8-9 | The False Torah |
| 10-12 | = 6:12-15 |
| 13-17 | No grapes on the vine! |
| 18-23 | Lament over the wound of the people |
| 9:1-8 | The corruption of the people |
| 9-21 | Summons to lament |
| 22,23 | The true glory |
| 24,25 | The worthlessness of circumcision |

In dealing with these shorter units Rudolph finds it useful to abstract the ones that are thematically related, to treat them together, and to examine the connections of the remaining material to them (p. 55).

Rudolph is, essentially, proposing here the rhetorical structure of 8:4 - 9:25. (Somewhat characteristically, in most places he does not explain how he arrived at the divisions of sections that he names, but only how they are related). So 8:4-7, 13-17, and 9:1-8 form a kind of thematic skeleton focussing on "the total failure of the people in religious and moral matters," which theme provides a suitable continuation of 7:1 - 8:3 to which they are redactionally linked (p. 55). (I have argued above that 7:30-34, 8:1-3 do not participate in the original structure of this material. The link, then, is between 7:28 and 8:4). Chapter 8:8-9 (plus the secondary additions to it in vv. 10-12¹²) are connected to vv. 4-7 by a catchword (know -- v. 7, wise -- vv. 8,9). Thematically they are unconnected, vv. 4-7 dealing with the whole people and vv. 8-9 dealing with the failures of the wise. Chapter 8:18-23 are inserted before 9:1 on the same basis (O that my head -- 8:23, O that I had -- 9:1).

Thematically, again, they are unconnected. 8:18-23 laments the wound of the people with deep sympathy, while in 9:1-8 the prophet is lamenting the people's corruption from his own perspective. The lament in 9:9-21 can be seen as depicting a more specific fulfillment of the punishment threatened in 9:8. The secondary nature of the whole conception can, Rudolph claims, be seen from the fact that 9:8 is a later addition -- a 'fact' he does not establish. In view of the relation established between 9:1-8 and 5:1-9, 21-29, and of the role established for 9:1-8 in the rhetorical structure of this material (pp. 39-45, 50-52 above), it would seem -- on the contrary -- that Rudolph's observation of the thematic centrality of 9:1-8 in this material rather reinforces the original nature of this conception. Chapter 9:22-23 and 24-25, according to Rudolph, would make equal sense if they occurred in reverse order (i.e. if 24-25 came before 22-23). Because of the looseness of their connection to the preceding material, he judges it best not to speculate on how they came to be in their present place.

Rudolph's historical considerations here are multiple. First he considers the Urrolle question. In his treatment of 9:9-21 Rudolph refers for the first time to the existence of a second scroll. He sees the assignment of this material as depending on the date assigned to it. 8:18-23 Rudolph judges, is too sympathetic to be part of the Urrolle. (Rudolph noted earlier that the Urrolle was composed of words against Israel and Judah: doom oracles). The rest of the material in 8:4 - 9:25, Rudolph feels, is suitable Urrolle material -- with the exception of the secondary material.

A comment is necessary regarding this new criterion of "sympathy," introduced by Rudolph in support of his judgment that 8:18-23 could not

have been in the Urrolle. This criterion is really a corollary to Rudolph's judgment that the Urrolle was composed of words against Jerusalem and Judah. Rudolph derives this criterion from 36:5, Yahweh's instruction to Jeremiah to write down all the words he had spoken \int Jerusalem and Judah (or Israel and Judah -- the text is disputed). Unfortunately the appropriate translation of \int is uncertain. The RSV translates "against" (with Rudolph), John Bright translates "concerning," and the text bears both translations. The uncertainty of the text's meaning in this respect makes it an unsuitable basis for the central characteristic of Urrolle material.

Even if the text's meaning were clear in this respect, its use as a criterion for discerning Urrolle material would be severely limited since it does not provide grounds for discerning between first and second scroll materials. The second scroll was after all said, also in Chapter 36, to be composed of all the words of the first scroll plus "many similar words." If then, we draw our criterion for discerning the scrolls from their description in Chapter 36, we will not be able to distinguish between them: they were presumably both composed of words "against" or "concerning" Jerusalem (or Israel) and Judah.

The second of Rudolph's historical considerations that are of interest to us occurs in his discussion of 8:13-17. Rudolph notes that the absence in it of a warning to return probably indicates that this material was composed at a later date than the "foe from the North" material of Chapters 4-6 (p. 59).

Of further interest is Rudolph's observation about the differences in the compositional structure of Chapters 2-6 and 8:4 - 9:25. He observed that whereas Chapters 2-6 were composed of connected longer

passages, 8:4 and following are, rather, a juxtaposition of shorter pieces without thematic continuity. This difference in structure might bespeak a difference in process of composition that would be significant in identifying the extents of the two scrolls. The first scroll was composed as a unity. Material specific to the second scroll did not have an independent literary structure, but was made up, rather, of additions to the first scroll. The shorter less connected pieces have the characteristics of supplementary material, such as we would expect to find in the second scroll.

Relation to Holladay

The divisions of the text made by Rudolph and Holladay differ significantly, although there is substantial overlapping.

So, for example, Rudolph sees vv. 13-17 as a unit, while Holladay presents vv. 14-17 together. Again, Rudolph sees 8:18-23 and 9:1-8 as two units, while Holladay places 8:18 - 9:5 together as two speeches.

Of greater interest for this discussion are Rudolph's historical considerations. He interprets the absence of a warning to return in 8:13-17 as an indicator of lateness. Holladay, of course, does the same — with the difference that he develops this indicator into a criterion for distinguishing between the two scrolls by claiming Jehoiakim's rejection of the first as the occasion for Jeremiah's loss of hope.

Rudolph and Holladay differ greatly in their assignment of material in 8:4 - 9:24 to the two scrolls. Rudolph for the first time indicates his awareness of the existence of the second scroll, by assigning 8:18-23 to it. But this criterion is almost the reverse of Holladay's — he finds it too sympathetic with the people to be in the first scroll, which was supposed to consist of doom oracles. This could,

he claims, have been written by a Heilsprophet. Besides 8:18-23 and the secondary material (9:11-15 and here, 8:10-12), Rudolph sees no reason that 8:4 - 9:25 should not be part of the first scroll. Holladay, of course, assigns all this material to the second scroll, largely on the basis of hopelessness and related irrevocable doom. It would appear that Rudolph's observations about the compositional/rhetorical structure of the material, as discussed above, militate against his conclusions and in fact favour Holladay's. The combination of a thematically disjointed structure and of extreme immanence of disaster make it probable that this material (minus the secondary passages) is original to the second scroll.

Jeremiah 10:1-25

Analytic Summary

This material is divided into three units by Rudolph (pp. 65-71) as follows:

- 10:1-16 Yahweh and the gods
- 17-22 Gather up your bundle
- 23-25 Jeremiah's prayer

Verses 1-16 are widely recognised as a secondary exilic addition. Since there is no question of its being in either scroll Rudolph's treatment of it will not be dealt with further.

Verses 17-22 were joined with 9:9-21 by catchwords, Rudolph points out (גָּדַעַן 9:21; נָסַעַן 10:17), before the intervening material in 9:22-25 and 10:1-16 was inserted. This material, then, is a continuation of the unit begun in 8:4 and (looking ahead) it extends to 10:25. Verse 22 is dubious and best excluded: v. 22b follows poorly from v. 22a, it is "compilatory" in character (p. 69). The summons in vv. 17-18 is based on a divine speech, and is answered by the people in vv. 19-20 with a lament about the collapse. The prophet resumes speech in v. 21, addressing the

question of guilt.

Rudolph situates this material as later than 9:9-21, but before the first deportation: "At this time" (v. 18) with reference to "slinging out the inhabitants of the land" indicates to him that no one has yet been deported, and that the city is under siege for the first time, i.e. in 597.

Verses 23-25, Jeremiah's prayer, is not further subdivided by Rudolph. Verse 25, Rudolph points out, is from Psalm 79 and, he claims, it was clearly not placed there by Jeremiah. It contradicts Jeremiah's opinion that the heathen nations were executing Yahweh's judgment on his people. Verses 23-24, writes Rudolph, are the prophet's prayer for his people, "with whom he felt as one throughout" (p. 70). Thematically the prayer focusses on "human inability to do the right unaided" (p. 70). Jeremiah asks Yahweh to remember this, and to punish gently because of this. In the present text the prayer follows, and responds to the doom of the deportation in verses 17-21 (excluding v. 22). Rudolph finds it impossible, though, to say whether that occurrence was what originally elicited this prayer. He excludes it from the Urrolle on the basis of an incompatibility between its substance and that expected in the Urrolle. Rudolph elsewhere pointed out that 11:1 begins a new redactional unit. Jeremiah's prayer, then, closes the redactional unit that opened in 7:1, on a moving, reflective note.

Relation to Holladay

Holladay situates this material in the second scroll on the basis of his historical criterion. This judgment would fit in with Rudolph's assignment of a date around 597 for 10:17-22, as seen above. To the extent that Rudolph cannot see 10:23-25 in the Urrolle, he can also be seen as corresponding with Holladay's second scroll assignment of this

material.

Of further interest is Rudolph's observation that 10:17 is a continuation of the material in 8:4 - 9:21, specifically linked by the occurrences of the root ḥōc in 9:21 and 10:17. This corresponds with Holladay's treatment of the material in 8:14 - 10:25 as one block of material, although Holladay begins the unit in 8:14 rather than 8:4.

Conclusion

Rudolph's Profile of the Urrolle

Rudolph's presentation proved significant especially in terms of redactional-structural and thematic discussions. So, Chapters 1-6 emerge as a well-defined redactional unit composed of sizeable and thematically linked units. Chapter 1 is introductory, having a place in the Urrolle as the prophet's authentication. The scroll proper begins with the superscription in 2:1 and unfolds in Chapters 2-6 with a focus first on idolatry (Chapters 2 - 4:4), and second on the foe from the north (4:5 - 6:30): the two themes introduced in 1:13-16, where the content of the prophet's message is first mentioned. Chapter 7:1 begins a second redactional unit which extends to 10:25 - 11:1 has a new introduction. Chapters 7:1 - 8:3 are seen by Rudolph as Deuteronomic redaction. Urrolle material picks up again in 8:4, although now in redactional continuity with 7:1 - 8:3. The material from this point on, in contrast with the 1-6 collection, is made up of short pieces joined by catchwords rather than themes. Rudolph still assigns most of the material from 8:4 - 10:25 to the first scroll, on thematic grounds.

Jeremiah 1-6: Relation Between the Analyses of Rudolph and Holladay

a) redactional unity

Rudolph's demonstration of the tightness of Chapters 1-6 as a

redactional unity provides, in this investigation a corroboration on thematic and structural grounds for Holladay's argument to that effect on grounds of rhetorical structure. We have seen that Rudolph finds a thematic forecast (in 1:13-16) of the contents of Chapters 2-6, which indicates the connection of 1:4-19 to the following material. His observation that the superscription of 2:1 is to be understood with reference to the dictation ordered in 36:5 reinforces the probability that the material linked in Chapters 1-6 is that found in the first scroll dictated by Jeremiah. We may judge it highly probable, therefore, that Chapters 1-6, minus certain additions (dealt with below) form the first part of the Urrolle, and possibly most of it.

b) contents

The judgments made by Holladay regarding contents of the Urrolle in Jeremiah 1-6 were emended somewhat in the process of comparison. So, 1:4-19 was shown by Rudolph to be a redactional unit, and one which was well suited as a whole to the Urrolle. In fact, vv. 13-16 contain Rudolph's thematic "map" to Chapters 2-6. Holladay's lack of evidence for rhetorical discontinuity, then, is compounded by Rudolph's evidence for thematic continuity, leading to the conclusion that 1:11-19 appear to be part of the Urrolle. Arguing against both Holladay and Rudolph, I withdrew 2:33-37 as Urrolle material. Chapter 3:6-13 was shown by Rudolph to be potentially Urrolle material on thematic grounds, but Holladay's exclusion of most of 3:6-18 from the present redactional structure of Chapter 3:1-25 is given substance by Rudolph's argument which is based on evidence for the redactional process in 3:6-18.

Chapters 7-10: Relation Between the Analyses of Rudolph and Holladay

a) 7:1-20

Holladay's detailed argument for Jeremianic authorship in 7:1-20 was maintained in the comparison with Rudolph's observations, which were somewhat casual. Consequently, Holladay's judgment of first scroll identity for 7:1-15 was not challenged. Rudolph's judgment that 7:1-15 is based on an original Jeremiah-speech delivered at the beginning of Jehoiakim's reign, in fact, gives oblique support to Holladay's position.

b) 8:4 - 10:25

Rudolph's observations about the contrast between the compositional structures of Chapters 1-6 and 8:4ff cast confirmatory light on the probable structures of the two scrolls. Chapter 8:4ff have the structure of additions, being thematically unconnected and linked only by repeated words. Chapters 1-6, in contrast, stand as a compositional unity (not without its own additions, of course). This in the present comparison, supports and is supported by Holladay's assignment of the material in 8:14ff to the second scroll.

Conclusions: Probable Urrolle Content

The probability, at this point, seems that the Urrolle occupies the main body of 1:1 - 7:15 minus principally 2:33-37; 3:6-12a, 14-18; 5:10-17; 6:9-15, 6:27-30. These are probably additions to the first scroll made soon after its destruction during its rewriting.

Rudolph and Holladay: Historical Criteria

Both Rudolph and Holladay proceeded in their Urrolle investigations by trying to identify redactional structures: Holladay through rhetorical structures, and Rudolph through formal and thematic connections and breaks. There was little overlap, on the other hand, between their

criteria specifically for determining whether material was proper to the Urrolle. Rudolph takes his cue from 36:4, which refers to "words of evil against Jerusalem and Judah." He, therefore, is looking for oracles of doom of relevance to Judah, including Jerusalem. The limitation of this criterion is largely that it does not provide grounds for distinguishing between first and second scroll materials. It was additionally found to be based on a text whose meaning is controverted (see above pp. 92-93).

Holladay, of course, has quite a different approach. He expects the first scroll texts to be milder in content, at least to the extent of admitting a hope that repentance would avert disaster. Rudolph does speak of the texts that do not offer hope as later, but he does not like Holladay tie the loss of hope to the burning of the first scroll. It is, therefore, not the crucial difference for him.

We have seen that Rudolph's analysis, based substantially on an awareness of literary form and thematic structure, supports the accuracy of Holladay's overall hypothesis. This is so even though the two scholars approach the Urrolle question itself quite differently. Rudolph's analysis has also helped in the re-evaluation of some of Holladay's judgments about specific texts and blocks of material, as was discussed above. The next step of this investigation is to take the cumulative results of the combined analyses of Holladay and Rudolph, and compare them with the findings of John Bright, author of the most recent major commentary on the Jeremiah-book. This will be done in Chapter Four below.

CHAPTER IV

BRIGHT'S ANALYSIS OF JEREMIAH 1-10

Introduction

John Bright's volume on Jeremiah in the Anchor Bible series has a clear goal in view: to allow the prophet "to speak ... over the gap of years and the barrier of language, with as much clarity as possible" (p. V).¹ To cover those two distances, the book focusses primarily on historical reconstruction and adequate translation. The historical concern itself is directed by serious consideration for the prophet's own self-understanding and intention, which of course relates back to Bright's primary goal.

Bright finds it difficult to discern any principle of arrangement in the Jeremiah-book (pp. LVI-LX). He characterises it, and the prophetic books in general, as anthologies brought together by successive editings over a long period of time, and of which logical or chronological progression should not be expected (p. LXXIX). Topical arrangement is sometimes apparent, but not consistently. Adding to the confusion, he notes, is the fact that the book contains various types of material -- poetic sayings, biographical prose, prose discourses, mingled through the book "in grand disarray" (p. LX).

He finds it certain that the first steps in the book's composition were accomplished by Jeremiah, having particularly in mind the scroll composed in 605, although he thinks it futile to speculate on the scroll's

contents (p. LXI). Of the materials presently found in the book, Bright judges that the poetic oracles and the biographical material may be used confidently as sources originating respectively from Jeremiah, and from someone near to him (pp. LXIX-LXX). The prose discourses, while not the prophet's own compositions, reflect the "gist" of his sayings, reached fixed form before the middle of the exile, and are not — properly speaking — Deuteronomistic (pp. LXX-LXXII).

The confusion that Bright finds in the organisation and diversity of sources in the Jeremiah-book has direct impact on his estimation of the difficulty of the task of re-constructing Jeremiah's career and message (p. LXXX). Such reconstruction is difficult, also because of the paucity of clearly dateable material for the years before 609, and the sketchiness of such material after that year. At the same time, Bright judges, one's understanding of Jeremiah hinges on the date one assigns to the various texts, because of the interpretation of the text differs according to the date assigned it.

An initial look at Bright's treatment of Chapters 1-10 of the Jeremiah-book show how his goal and general approach translate into concrete procedures. His first step is to separate the units. This is done primarily on thematic grounds. This would seem to result from Bright's inability to discern principles of arrangement other than topicality. At this point, he sometimes offers an hypothesis regarding the occasion/date of the preparation of the thematic unity. The unit is then sub-divided on various grounds: a break in the "line of thought" which is later resumed (e.g. 3:1-5, 19-25, 4:1-4; 3:6-18), shift in speakers or person of address (e.g. 2:2-3, 14-19; 4-13), irreconcilable historical allusions (e.g. 2:1-3, 14-19; 29-37). Because his main goal is to let the prophet

speak, and because of his inability to discern consistent principles of the arrangement in the text, Bright sometimes re-arranges texts, re-constituting what in his judgment were earlier units, interrupted in the composition of the book. So, for example, in Chapter 2, vv. 1-3, 14-19, form one subdivision, while vv. 4-13 form another.

Finally, Bright comments about the dating of the sub-divisions, while also discussing their concerns, and the implications of various dates for Jeremiah's career. This, of course, is central to his project of letting the prophet "speak." In order to actually approach an understanding of Jeremiah, according to Bright, it is necessary to date the sub-divided units as a first condition for their interpretation.

If possible, Bright will date a text on the basis of a date provided within it (e.g. 7:1-15). If none is given, historical allusions provide degrees of probability corresponding to their clarity (e.g. 2:16). He attempts to interpret ambiguous historical allusions by linking them to other internal evidence. One significant technique he uses is to date such an ambiguous text by reference to a text of more certain date with which it has thematic continuity (e.g. 5:26-31, 7:1-15).

Basic historical indicators used by Bright in dating texts include:

1. The degree of prominence in an oracle of threatened punishment, its immediacy, specificity, and/or inevitability, is an indicator of lateness (e.g. in 6:1-8, v. 8 suggests early composition) (cf. p. 49).
2. Predominant focus on reform, and/or Hoseanic influence is an indicator of earliness of composition (e.g. 3:1-5, 19-25, 4:1-4) (cf. p. 26).

3. Negative attitude towards the religious establishment indicates a date of composition after Jeremiah's disillusionment with Josiah's reform, i.e. the beginning of Jehoiakim's reign, perhaps the end of Josiah's (e.g. 6:9-15, esp. v. 14) (cf. p. 50).

Bright's disinterest in the text's arrangement in the process of his historical analysis constitutes, I would argue, a methodological flaw in his procedure. He has a tendency to view the text's arrangement as an obstacle separating the reader from the prophet, and therefore re-arranges it if he finds that useful, in an effort to re-discover the individual oracles and poems of which it was composed.

I judge this to be a methodological flaw because understanding the arrangement of a text is a part of the appropriation of a source, part of the literary criticism that properly precedes historical criticism. The Jeremiah-book is our only avenue to the prophet Jeremiah. In not attending to its arrangement we in fact obscure the data that make possible the controlled approach to a historical understanding of the prophet's message. This would be true even if the text's arrangement were judged to be primarily a secondary effort: it would remain necessary to discern the redactor's intention in arranging material, in order to discern between that and the material's original intention, between primary source and secondary re-interpretations. In the case of the Jeremiah-book this is especially true, since — as Bright himself affirms — Jeremiah had a substantial part in its composition. In ignoring the arrangement of that text, then, we are very seriously ignoring the historical prophet.

Bright's failure to come to terms with the text as a mediator of the prophet, prevents him in many cases from making controlled historical judgments. This happens, concretely, because he is forced to turn too

soon from the text to the history of the period.

A comparison between the approaches of Bright and Rudolph clarifies this point. Rudolph deals with thematic concern in continuity with literary structure, and moves from there to historical hypothesis.² Bright deals with thematic concern in direct continuity with historical hypothesis, and this latter extends primarily to a concern for dating the text. This dating of the text is often accomplished on the basis of historical indicators (see above) whose validity Bright does not establish for the reader. For the reader at least, then, these historical indicators remain suppositions, and this severely limits Bright's ability to make controlled historical judgments. If the premises of a historical inference are suppositions, the conclusion can only be a supposition.³ Because Bright does not establish the validity of his historical indicators from the text of the Jeremiah-book, which is after all our only source for the prophet, the reader of his commentary is often left without grounds for evaluating his conclusions, and he himself often holds back from a clear statement of probabilities.

I have argued that in order to arrive at historical knowledge when dealing with a source, one has first to come to terms with the nature and presentations of the source. While some of Bright's comments show a recognition that access to the prophet can be made only through the text, he does not seem to translate this recognition into its methodological consequence, namely, that literary criticism at the redactional level, must precede historical criticism. The text as it stands does not constitute controlled historical data in itself. Literary criticism permits access to historical data with controls that render it possible to move from data to fact as defined by Ben Meyer, i.e. as including both the "what"

and the "why" of an event, and as constituting the term of historical investigation (see discussion in Chapter One, p. 6 above).⁴

This weakness in Bright's procedure often has the effect of making his argument less persuasive than those of either Holladay or Rudolph. At the same time, it should be recognised that in those areas in which Bright and Holladay agree, the arguments of both scholars will mutually be reinforced: Holladay's argument begins with the arrangement of the text and so compensates for the absence of its adequate consideration by Bright.

Bright's work remains of value in investigating the Jeremiah-book. His significance for the evaluation of Holladay's argument will lie more with its specifically historical component than with its literary component, which focusses on extended rhetorical structures not perceived by Bright. His division of the text will, of course, remain of interest to this investigation, based as it is on a live awareness of continuities and discontinuities with the text, thematic and other.

The first question addressed to Bright's analysis, then, will be whether his divisions, made primarily on thematic grounds, correspond to those discovered by Holladay primarily on rhetorical-structural grounds. The second question will be whether the dates assigned to various texts by Bright, permit their inclusion in the scroll they are assigned to by Holladay. The third question will address the degree of correspondence between the particular historical indicators used by Bright to determine relative dates, and the fundamental shift seen by Holladay between the first scroll and second scroll material.

Jeremiah 1:1-19

Analytic Summary

Bright entitles this first unit "Jeremiah's Call and Commission"

(pp. 3-8). He further subdivides it as follows:

- 1:1-3 Superscription of the Book
- 4-10 Jeremiah's Call
- 11-16 Two Further Visions
- 17-19 The Divine Charge, and Promise

He notes that it is not an original unit: the two visions in vv. 11-16 were originally separate. This on the basis of v. 13, "the word of Yahweh came to me a second time," although it is the third time that the word of Yahweh came to him in that chapter. Verses 17-19, though, Bright notes, carry forward the thought of the call-account, and may have originally continued and concluded vv. 4-10. Bright here fails to notice that vv. 17-19 also carry forward the thought of vv. 11-16, as Rudolph has observed.⁵ They cannot, then, have originally concluded just vv. 4-10.

Little is offered in terms of dating. Bright observes that according to the superscription, the call occurred in 627, and suggests that the whole chapter may have been brought together as an introduction for the first scroll in 605. It is unclear whether Bright sees the superscription as functioning for this first scroll specifically, or for a larger portion of the collection.

Relation to Holladay

Bright differs from Holladay in his suggestion that the whole of Chapter 1 may have been brought together as an introduction for the first scroll. Holladay assigns vv. 11-19 to the second scroll; we have seen, though, that he is probably wrong in this respect. Bright's judgment, then, at least regarding vv. 4-19, is confirmed both by the initial investigation of Holladay's argument in Chapter Two, and by the comparison with Rudolph in Chapter Three.

Jeremiah 2:1-3, 14-19, 4-13, 20-37

Analytic Summary

The second unit defined by Bright is united by the theme of "The Indictment of the Nation's Sin" (pp. 9-18). He further divides it as follows:

2:1-3,14-19	Unfaithfulness to Yahweh and Its Dire Consequences
4-13	Unparalleled Forgetfulness of the Divine Grace: Yahweh's Case Against His People
20-28	Lust for Foreign Gods: The Sin that Cannot be Hid
29-37	A Fate Richly Deserved

The chapter is dominated by a charge of flagrant apostasy and tones of pleading, warning and contention. It is not a single poem: the argument leaps around, there are sudden changes in person, and there are historical allusions indicating that it could not all have been written at the same time. The bulk of the material is from the earliest period of Jeremiah's ministry and gives a good impression of his preaching before the completion of Josiah's reform.

Bright argues that 2:2-3,14-19 form a single poem: vv. 4-13 have their own introduction, "interrupt the line of thought" in vv. 2-3, and the person of address in them is second masculine plural, in contrast with the second feminine singular in vv. 2-3, and vv. 14-19 (p. 17). For this reason he has re-arranged these materials in the text. I would criticize Bright's procedure here on two grounds. First, his re-ordering of the text obscures its own structure, even if it allows access to an earlier unit. Second, and most important, his re-ordering does not do justice to the complexity of the relations between the sections. For example, while it is true that vv. 14-19 continue the thematic focus of vv. 2-3 on Israel's protection by Yahweh, or lack thereof, it is also true that vv. 4-13 continue the thematic focus of vv. 2-3 on the passage through the

desert, and the association of fruitfulness with that time (vv. 6,7). Again, his discussion of the relations within this material in terms of continued thoughts, indicates, in my judgment, a misapprehension of the nature of poetic material, which proceeds just as much by thematic association as by thought; this misapprehension also prevents Bright from considering poetic structures in which the most connected material is not immediately juxtaposed but is rather arranged in some symmetrical relationship, such as A-B-A' or A-B-A'-B'.

Bright's historical reflections in this chapter are interesting and, generally, parallel those of Rudolph regarding the same material. He notes that while v. 16, referring to Assyria as a world power, must have been composed at the beginning of Jeremiah's ministry, v. 18, referring to Judah's humiliation at Egyptian hands in 609, indicates that the poem was given its present form in Jehoiakim's early years.

Bright further suggests that the collection of the poems in this chapter may well have been done by Jeremiah in connection with the scroll of 605. Chapter 2, he notes, carries forward the thought of Chapter 1, in the sense that Jeremiah is now doing what he was called to do.

Relation to Holladay

In Chapter 2 Bright and Holladay come to very much the same conclusions. Both situate it in the first scroll, Bright even finding editorial activity indicating its revision in the early years of Jehoiakim, something also noted by Rudolph. Holladay, Rudolph, and Bright agree in assigning all of 2:1-37 as one unit, to the first scroll. It seems probable, nevertheless, that vv. 33-37 of this chapter are separate from the basic structure of Chapter 2, in view of the extended inclusion discovered between vv. 2 and 31-32 (see pp. 23-24 above).

Jeremiah 3:1-5, 19-25; 4:1-4; 3:6-18

c

Analytic Summary

Bright entitles this next unit "A Plea for Repentance" (pp. 19-27).

He further subdivides it as follows:

- 3:1-5 The "Adulterous Wife": the Need for True Repentance
19-25
- 4:1-4
- 3:6-18 The Two Bad Sisters: Hope for Northern Israel and Appended Sayings

This section is composed of two originally separate units, claims Bright, which he has separated "in the interests of clarity." Chapter 3:6-18 is a predominantly prose segment which, he judges, interrupts the poem that occupies the rest of the unit. This segment as a whole was given its shape after 587, from which time date vv. 16-18. Bright claims that vv. 14-15, though usually seen as a later addition addressed to Israel, could just as well have been spoken to Northern Israel, a prose parallel of 12b-13. There is no reason to doubt that vv. 6-12 date from the time of Josiah, as they explicitly state.

The poem shows similarities to Hosea, notes Bright, and is unquestionably a sample of Jeremiah's preaching before 622 when Josiah's reform began. Not only is the dominant theme of the adulterous wife borrowed, but there are actual verbal similarities, perhaps quotations (Jer. 3:22 - Hos. 14:1,4; Jer. 4:3 - Hos. 10:12). It is reform preaching. The tone of the passage also suggests an early date. Sin is "charged and admitted" (3:24f) which reaches back through all the past -- there is no mention of reform, failed or not (p. 26). Catastrophe does not seem immanent. Rather, divine wrath is presented as an undefined threat -- contingent and avoidable.

Relation to Holladay

It is interesting to note the overlap here between Bright's indicators for dating and those found by Holladay as a result of his rhetorical structural work. Especially significant is Bright's association of an early date with catastrophe that is neither immanent nor unavoidable, but whose announcement, rather, is a warning.

Despite this overlapping perception in the area of criteria, though, there is disagreement between Bright and Holladay regarding this chapter. Holladay views all the prose material (3:6-11,14-18) as later, to the point, even, of excluding it from the second scroll, while Bright sees vv. 6-15 as relatively early. Holladay and Bright both see vv. 6-18 as an interruption in the unit that begins in 3:1, a judgment shared by Rudolph (see above pp. 73-74). Holladay had further argued that vv. 12b-14a were part of the essential structure of Chapter 3, and that the unit ended in v. 25, rather than 4:4. We concluded, after comparison with Rudolph, that v. 14a should be omitted (see pp. 25-26 above), but that Holladay's conclusions were otherwise probable. (Notably, Holladay himself omits v. 14a in "Two Scrolls.")

Jeremiah 4:5 - 6:30

Analytic Summary

The next unit defined by Bright is seen by him as an editorial unit composed of "series of originally separate sayings," that develop the theme of solemn warning sounded in 4:3-4 (p. 33). The required repentance did not come, so the Day of Judgment will! He treats this unit in three chapter-long segments for convenience's sake. Beyond this initial evaluation of 4:5 - 6:30, Bright does not betray any sense of shape or development in this unit, thematic or otherwise.

Following Bright's presentation, this material will be dealt with in the chapter-long segments that he distinguishes. Comparison with Holladay will be made after all three segments have been dealt with.

Chapter 4:5-31 (pp. 28-34) is divided by Bright as follows:

- 4:5-10 Alarm! Invasion is Coming!
- 11-18 The Stormwind of Judgment
- 19-22 Jeremiah's Anguished Cry: Yahweh's Complaint
- 23-28 The Awful Day of Judgment: a Vision and an Oracle
- 29-31 Daughter Zion's Death Agony

According to Bright, none of the material in Chapter 4 can be dated with precision. He notes that although it is graphic, it is not necessarily composed in the midst of battle, but may rather reflect both the "premonition of disaster" that haunted Jeremiah for years, and conventional symbolism and phraseology used to describe the Day of Yahweh (p. 34). It is worth noting that this judgment is supported by another indicator used by both Bright and Holladay: avoidability of disaster. Verse 6b intimates some degree of avoidability -- "get to safety!" and in Bright's next section (vv. 11-18) v. 14 clearly sets the desperate scenario in the function of a warning.

Chapter 5:1-31 (pp. 35-42) is divided by Bright as follows:

- 5:1-9 The People that Cannot be Pardoned
- 10-19 False Security: The Terrible Foe
- 20-31 Rebellion, Injustice, Complacency

While he states that 5:1-9 cannot be dated with precision, Bright judges that the fact that the disaster "though certain, does not seem to be immanent, and is still theoretically avoidable would argue against placing it too late" (p. 41). He suggests a date in Josiah's reign or at the very beginning of Jehoiakim's.

Chapter 5:10-19, Bright observes, form a complex with beginning and editorial conclusion (vv. 10,18) sounding the theme, "not ... a full

end" (p. 42). The material is highly composite, vv. 10-14 being apparently made up of originally separate fragments, vv. 15-17 as an originally separate poem, and vv. 18-19 as a prose conclusion, presumably of exilic date. Verses 15-17 are found probably to have been composed during the first part of Jehoiakim's reign, because the foe sounds like the Babylonians.

The dating of vv. 15-17 in the early part of Jehoiakim's reign seems tenuous. That is when Nebuchadnezzar was first emerging on the international scene. This oracle seems suitable for any time up to the actual siege of 597. In any case we should keep in mind that even the probable dating of vv. 15-17 in the early years of Jehoiakim's reign would not establish the dating of vv. 10-17, i.e. the pre-exilic component of this material, as a whole. Since the material is composite, we have to look for the historical moment of its latest piece. Indeed, if we apply the historical index of avoidability and immanence of disaster that Bright has used to date early material, the certainty and immanence of the disaster shown in vv. 10-14 argue for a later date. (In fact, that mood does not really shift in vv. 15-17).

Bright reads vv. 20-31 as a unit, although again a composite one, further divided into an introductory formula (v. 20) a poem (vv. 21-5) leading without break to an originally separate poem (vv. 26-9), to which is appended a further brief fragment (vv. 30-31). The abuses described in vv. 26-31 "are similar to those denounced in the Temple Sermon, uttered just after Jehoiakim took the throne" (p. 42). This material, then, may have been composed at about the same time, or even in the late years of Josiah's reign.

Chapter 6:1-30 (pp. 43-51) is divided by Bright as follows:

- 6:1-8 Jerusalem Besieged: A Warning
- 9-15 "Filled with the Wrath of Yahweh"
- 16-21 Elaborate Ritual No Substitute for Obedience
- 22-26 Again: the Terrible Invader from the North
- 27-30 Jeremiah, "Assayer" of His People.

Verses 1-8, according to Bright, cannot be dated with precision, but the fact that disaster can still be avoided if the people will "take warning" may indicate the poem as one of the fairly early ones of its type.

Verses 9-15, again, according to Bright, cannot be dated with precision, although he notes that v. 14 "clearly reflects post-reformation complacency," when both priest and people felt their actions had guaranteed them a peaceful and protected relationship with God (p. 50). This simply means that it was probably composed at some time after Jeremiah experienced his disillusionment with the reform, whether that be in the later years of Josiah's reign or the early years of Jehoiakim's reign.

Bright places vv. 16-21 probably in the latter part of Josiah's reign, not long after his reform. Regarding vv. 22-26, he finds it "not impossible that this poem was originally composed in the course of a barbarian threat late in Josiah's reign, ... and that it later found a new and more terrible fulfillment as the Babylonians advanced through Syria and Palestine in 605/4" (p. 50).

Verses 27-30 present to Bright the possibility of composition after the 597 deportation, although he admits that some "earlier calamity" such as that of 609 might have been in view (p. 51).

Relation to Holladay

Since Bright does not expose the logic behind his division of the

material in 4:5 - 6:30, it is difficult to discuss his differences with Holladay. In 4:5-31 Bright and Holladay differ substantially. In Chapter 5, however, the only difference between the two is that Holladay leaves vv. 30-31 out entirely, as secondary. Holladay and Bright correspond almost exactly in their divisions of Chapter 6, the only difference being that Holladay reads vv. 16-26 as one unit, instead of Bright's two (vv. 16-21, 22-26).

Bright's suggestions about the dating of the material in 4:5-31 correspond, mainly, to Holladay's scroll assignments. So the material about the coming of the foe (5-18, 29-31) is seen by Bright as probably fairly early, while the "'confessional' bits" (p. 34), especially vv. 19-21 are probably late, even at the moment of attack. He is not too clear about where vv. 22, 23-28 fall in this, so his dating is of limited significance to us here, since we are interested in the date of the composite passage extending between vv. 19-28, rather than the date of one of its component parts. Holladay assigns vv. 5-18, 29-31 to the first scroll and vv. 19-28 to the second.

Bright's suggestion of a date in Josiah's reign or very early in Jehoiakim's for 5:1-9 is consistent with Holladay's placing of this piece in the first scroll. Holladay assigns 5:10-17 to the second scroll, on the basis of his criterion of irrevocable doom. This assignment is not seriously challenged by Bright, who offers a tentative date only for vv. 15-17, and not for vv. 10-17 as a whole.

Bright's dating of 5:20-31 and 6:1-8 is consistent with Holladay's assignment to the first scroll of this material (minus 5:30-31). Chapter 6:1-8, tentatively dated by Bright as "post-reformation" (p. 49) -- in the later years of Josiah or early years of Jehoiakim -- is assigned

by Holladay to the second scroll. In this case, though, Bright's post-reformation assignment is really only useful in determining an approximate date before which these verses were probably not composed. It does not tell us how soon or long after the reformation these verses were composed.

Holladay treats 6:16-26 as a structural unit, placing it in the first scroll. This is supported by both Bright's dating of the texts in Josiah's reign, and his suggestion of the intensified significance of vv. 22-26 in the light of the events of 605/4 — just the time when the first scroll is supposed to have been composed.

Verses 27-30, as mentioned above, are assigned by Holladay to the second scroll. Bright also finds a late date probable for these verses.

In Bright's discussion of the dating of these texts, two of his historical indicators surface. First (regarding 5:1-9 and 6:1-8), Bright states that the fact that disaster is not immanent and is still theoretically avoidable argues against a late date. This is very interesting, as it corresponds to the contrast found by Holladay between texts distinguished on structural grounds, and which he also develops into a criterion for dating.

Second (regarding 6:9-15), Bright uses "post reformation complacency" (p. 50) as an indicator of composition after Jeremiah's disillusionment with the reform. This indicator seems to provide a way of distinguishing another turning point in Jeremiah's vocational self-understanding and may indirectly serve in establishing the contents of the first and second scrolls.

Jeremiah 7:1-34; 8:1-3

Analytic Summary

The next unit defined by Bright is the "Temple Sermon and Appended

Sayings" (pp. 52-59). He further divides the material as follows:

- 7:1-15 The "Temple Sermon"
- 16-20 The Cult of the Queen of Heaven
- 21-28 Yahweh Demands Obedience, Not Sacrifice
- 29-34 The "Valley of Slaughter"
- 8:1-3 Astral Worship and Its Awful Punishment

Thematically, Bright finds this material is connected by a concern with cultic abuses. While composed of various originally separate shorter units, it constitutes as a whole one of the "prose discourses" of the book of Jeremiah (p. 58).

The Temple Sermon itself was delivered shortly after Jehoiakim took the throne (cf. Chapter 26). The record of the Temple Sermon found in 7:1-15, as part of a prose discourse, does not in Bright's judgment preserve the actual speech delivered on that occasion. Bright does consider the prose discourses to contain reliable reports of the "gist" of Jeremiah's words on the occasions they refer to, though (p. LXXII). This means that they remain useful, in his judgment, for documenting Jeremiah's thought at a given time, and therefore remain useful as potential evidence in the question of a pre/post 605/4 shift. Nonetheless they are not considered by him to be potential first scroll material.

The rest of the material in Chapter 7 and 8:1-3, according to Bright, was probably also composed at the beginning of Jehoiakim's reign, or even near the end of Josiah's reign, because of the references to empty sacrifice and pagan rites. Chapter 7:29-34 especially, may even refer to sins of Manasseh's reign.

Relation to Holladay

Holladay divides the material in roughly the same way as Bright except that he extends the unit beginning in v. 21 to v. 29, and consequently begins the next unit at v. 30. He does not deal with 8:1-3 at

all, viewing it as secondary. Verses 1-15 he places in the first scroll, the rest of the material is assigned to the second scroll.

The crucial difference between Holladay and Bright here is, of course, the matter of Jeremianic authorship. Bright does support Holladay's position to a certain extent: he is the classic proponent of the thesis that the prose discourses are not Deuteronomistic but, rather, are the work of Jeremiah's disciples, and reflect the "gist" of his words on a given occasion (p. LXXII).⁶ Holladay takes that argument further in this particular case: not only is 7:1-28 not Deuteronomistic, it shows no evidence of "later reflection on an earlier event" and therefore no evidence of composition by another hand than Jeremiah's.⁷

If the material was written by Jeremiah, then, as seems probable, the question of dates of composition again becomes an issue of significance for placement in one of the scrolls. While both Bright and Holladay see the Temple Sermon as early (beginning of Jehoiakim's reign, as according to Chapter 26), they disagree markedly regarding the rest of the material in 7:16 - 8:3. While Bright sees all this material as coming from early in Jehoiakim's reign, or late in Josiah's reign (and some even earlier), Holladay sees it mainly as second scroll — post 604 — and sees 8:1-3 as an exilic addition. In Chapter Three evidence was adduced for the secondary insertion of 7:30 - 8:3 (p. 90 above), which supports Holladay's position regarding 8:1-3. The hopeless tonality of the rest of this material reinforces the probability of Holladay's position.

Jeremiah 8:4 - 10:25

Analytic Summary

The next unit defined by Bright centers on the theme of "An Incurable People and Their Tragic Ruin" (pp. 60-74), and is further

divided by him as follows:

- 8:4-12 Headlong to Ruin, Blindly Complacent
- 13-17 Terror and Black Despair
- 18-23 Jeremiah's Passionate Grief
- 9:1-8 Jeremiah's Despair at His People's Depravity
- 9-15 Jerusalem's Ruin -- with a Prose Explanation
- 16-21 A Dirge over Jerusalem
- 10:17-25 The Coming Exile: Lament and Intercession

The material omitted here, in 9:22-25 and 10:1-16, is characterized by Bright as "miscellaneous" and dealt with separately (pp. 75-80). Since none of it is dealt with by Holladay, and since Bright himself finds 10:1-16 to be exilic and the rest of the material questionably Jeremianic, it will not further be dealt with.

Bright notes that the material running from 8:4 through 10:25 is generally "rather miscellaneous in character." In this judgment, of course, he corresponds to Rudolph's parallel observations about the thematic discontinuities in this material (see pp. 90-91 above). Bright does not assign dates to all the material in these chapters, presumably because its "miscellaneous" character often makes it difficult to situate historically. Bright's divisions are based on poems or complexes of poems in this material. Within 8:4-12, Bright observes that vv. 10-12 repeat (with variations) 6:12-25 and may originally have been spoken in another context, probably in the period shortly after Josiah's reform. It will be remembered, again, that Rudolph similarly claimed that 8:10-12 were secondary here, and in their original context in 6:12-15.

This period is suggested to Bright by the reflection in it of Jeremiah's post-reform attitude. It should be suggested, in response to Bright, that the negative attitude to the reform is a useful historical indicator only in setting the terminus ad quo. In other words, while we may be able to judge by it that a text was composed after Jeremiah's

disillusionment with the reform, we cannot really say how long after that shift it was composed, unless we postulate yet another shift to provide a terminus ante quem.

Regarding 8:18-23 Bright feels that one cannot be certain about the date of composition, but finds it probable that "these words were wrung from him (Jeremiah) as disaster actually struck"; around 598/7 (p. 65).

Chapter 9:1-8 form a traditionary unit, probably from a relatively early period in Jeremiah's ministry — perhaps the beginning of Jehoiakim's reign or earlier — before disaster was immanent. Interestingly, Bright here notes in passing some similarity in form between 9:1-8 and 5:1-9, 21-29, which were discovered above (pp. 39-45) to be part of the same literary unity. The material in vv. 9-15 is judged by Bright to be composite; two fragments in vv. 9 and 10, are followed by a prose commentary which is apparently exilic.

Verses 16-21 form a dirge that was perhaps "uttered on the very eve of the siege and deportation of 598/7" (p. 73), as was probably, the oracle in 10:17-18. Verses 17-18 an oracle, open the dirge in vv. 17-25. Bright reads vv. 19-21 as a soliloquy, and v. 22 as an ejaculation regarding the appearance of the foe. Of verses 23-25, "Jeremiah's prayer," Bright judges v. 25 probably to be later.

Relation to Holladay

It should be recognised that of all Bright's observations regarding this material, the most important is that it is miscellaneous in character. In this judgment Bright corresponds to Rudolph's comparable judgment about this material, and lends support to Holladay's claim that this material is proper to the second scroll on grounds of thematic discontinuity. Because of the tentative nature of his comments regarding

this section, a detailed comparison between Bright and Holladay does not seem profitable here. It suffices to add the note that Bright generally agrees with the late dates presumed by Holladay for this material.

Conclusion

Bright's division of the text, assignment of dates, and historical criteria, then, seem generally consistent with Holladay's conclusions. Most of the differences between Bright and Holladay regarding the division of the text are related to the fact that Bright was looking for the smallest original units, and had therefore more of a tendency to break down what might be units at the redactional level, and even to re-arrange the text.

Two significant differences in assignment of dates should be noted. First, Bright dates 1:11-16 before 605, and tentatively assigns the same date to 1:17-19. This material is assigned by Holladay to the second scroll (post-601), but we have seen in the preceding chapters strong evidence that Holladay is mistaken. Bright's judgment adds further support to that evidence. Second, Bright dates 9:1-8 in the beginning of Jehoiakim's reign or even earlier, while Holladay assigns it to the second scroll. Again, we have seen strong evidence that 9:1-8 was in fact part of Jeremiah's first scroll, and Bright's early dating adds further support to that evidence. In this particular, notably, Bright also reinforces the discovery, above, of the literary unity between 5:1-9, 21-29 and 9:1-8, by observing their formal similarity.

Bright and Holladay also differ, of course, on the matter of source assignation in the prose discourse in 7:1 - 8:3. Holladay sees 7:1-15, 16-20 as Jeremianic compositions, assigned respectively to the first and second scrolls. Bright, while denying Deuteronomistic authorship,

nonetheless maintains that the composition is not Jeremianic. In this matter we have found Holladay's argument the more convincing.

In the area of historical indicators there is some significant correspondence between Bright and Holladay which serves to mutually confirm their positions. Bright uses a priori the degree of immanence and unavoidability of disaster as an indicator of lateness of date. He applies it only in its negative aspect: when disaster seems neither immanent nor unavoidable, the text is probably early. He also notes that "graphic" battle scenes may be derived from the prophet's long-term nightmare of disaster, and conventional vocabulary, and are not in themselves indicators of late composition. Apparently, for Bright, the qualities of immanence and unavoidability have to be seen operating in tandem. This combination of criteria, i.e. immanence and unavoidability of disaster, emerges in Holladay's structural analysis as a means of distinguishing between material proper to the first and second scrolls.

It is worth commenting further on the major axis around which Bright organises texts historically, i.e. the shift he postulates in Jeremiah's attitude to the Josianic reform in the beginning of Jehoiakim's reign or the end of Josiah's reign. As observed above, the problems with Bright's application of this shift to the text as an indicator of date, is the absence of a terminus ad quem. Within the material composed after this shift, Holladay's thesis of a later shift provides a terminus ad quem which allows for more refined use as an historical index of the shift postulated by Bright.

Comparison between Bright and Holladay has proven fruitful for the presentations of both scholars, then. Holladay's prior attention to the text provided confirmation for those of Bright's historical indicators

which corresponded to his own findings. Inversely, Bright's conclusions, although based on criteria he does not establish for the reader, prove to reinforce Holladay's thesis.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

This thesis opened with reflections about the possibility and value of "historical-Jeremiah" research, and with a proposal to look more closely into such research through an evaluation of Holladay's recent attempt to rediscover the contents of the two scrolls in the Jeremiah-book. Holladay's project was found suitable for such an evaluation since it terminates in historical judgments about a shift in Jeremiah's self-understanding, and since it arrives at these judgments on the basis of a literary appropriation of the text, i.e. Holladay's "rhetorical criticism."

The investigation of Holladay's argument that formed the core of our proposal is now practically complete; its findings need to be summarised, and, on the basis of these findings, conclusions about the historical-Jeremiah need to be drawn. These conclusions fall under two major headings: (a) conclusions specifically regarding our evaluation of Holladay's argument, and (b) conclusions, in the light of our evaluation of Holladay's argument, regarding the questions with which the investigation opened, those of the possibility and value of historical-Jeremiah research.

The first set of conclusions will primarily represent the answer to the question, "What evidence for a shift in Jeremiah's thinking is given by the contents and designs of the two scrolls in the Jeremiah-book?" These conclusions will be preceded by a review of the emendations made to

Holladay's argument in the course of this investigation, and also, quite predictably, will point beyond the present investigation to suggest future ground for productive research into the development of Jeremiah's aims, and to indicate the more significant implications of our findings for future research.

A. The Contents of the Two Scrolls as Evidence
For a Shift in Jeremiah's Thinking

In the concluding step of this evaluation of Holladay's argument, then, I intend to bring together in a primarily historical context, previous discussions about different aspects of the functioning of the two scrolls as evidence for a shift in Jeremiah's thinking. It should be noted that in the process of evaluating Holladay's argument, inevitably perhaps, we subjected it to multiple modifications and refinements in its particulars. Many of these emerged from the comparative perspective of the works of Rudolph and Bright; some became apparent in the initial analysis of Holladay's presentation. Before discussing the contents of the two scrolls synthetically, then, it would be useful to review our most significant findings at each stage of this investigation.

The Argument in Review

Holladay's rhetorical-critical argument and the historical criterion he derives from it, studied in Chapter Two of this thesis, were found generally to be well based in the text. The corrections that were made in both his method and its application were found to strengthen his central affirmations, that: (a) the structure of the two scrolls are discernable in Jeremiah 1-10; (b) a difference in tonality is evident between the material of the two scrolls, such that the threatening possibilities of the first scroll became confirmed certainties of destruction in the

second, and (c) that this difference in tonality represents a shift in Jeremiah's own understanding in which Jehoiakim's burning of the first scroll can be seen as an axial point.

The principle emendations made to Holladay's presentation were the inclusion of 1:11-19 and 9:1-8 in the first scroll, the exclusion of 2:33-37 from the first scroll; and the judgment that Chapters 2 and 3 do not form a literary unit. Additionally, the ways in which links were used between 4:5 - 6:30 and 8:14 - 10:25 became much clearer through our application of more specific distinctions in differentiating between them.

Holladay's argument was corroborated on the whole by Rudolph's division of the text and by the structures found by him within the first ten chapters of the Jeremiah-book. In particular, Rudolph noted that the superscription of 2:1 stands in continuity with 36:5, and that Chapter 2 as a whole shows evidence of rhetorical activity during Jehoiakim's reign; both observations argue that Chapter 2 is part of the Urrolle, and the superscription of 2:1 suggests that it marks the beginning of the Urrolle proper. Chapters 4-6 have an A-B-A' thematic progress that is matched on the stylistic level by the A-B-A' clustering of imperatives discerned by Holladay. The material in 8:4 - 10:25 appears to be composed of loosely connected additions, which supports its second scroll assignment by Holladay.

One of Rudolph's observations proved to militate against a particular point in Holladay's argument. His observation that 1:13-16 forecast the contents of Chapters 2-6 makes it probable that 1:11-19, the unit of which they are a part, were part of the Urrolle, since they appear to contain a map of its basic structure. His demonstration of the literary unity of 1:4-19 compounds this probability.

Bright's analysis, while of less impact than that of Rudolph, was also found generally to correspond to Holladay's findings, in his larger divisions and his dating of texts, and also in his use of historical indicators that Holladay also uses. Most notable of these was his judgment that the degree of immanence and certainty of disaster in a given text is an indication of its lateness, which shows a substantial correspondence to Holladay's criterion of irrevocable doom.

The shift established in Jeremiah's vocational self-awareness and in his related understanding of Judah's future, then, is that proposed by Holladay. We have found his conclusions to be correct in their central affirmations, although his method, and hence his interpretation of data were not always as clear as they could have been.

The First Scroll: Contents and Design

As a result of our investigation we arrived at a fairly clear outline of the First Scroll's probable contents and design. It begins with the introductory materials in 1:4-19, which focus primarily on the prophet's authentication, but which, in 1:13-16, also forecast the central focus of the scroll, i.e. the foe from the North, threatening because of the people's disobedience. This introductory material is in prose, with the exception of Yahweh's words. Chapter 2:1, with its superscription, begins the first scroll proper, with a charge of the people's disobedience (vv. 1-32). This is followed in 3:1-5, 12b-13, 19-25, by an invitation to convert (and a liturgy of repentance). The material in these first three chapters is, additionally, bound together by the occurrences of $\gamma\delta$ in 1:6,7; 2:2, 3:4,24.

Chapter 4:1-4 was seen to be transitional. It effects a shift from the focus on the people's religious failings in Chapters 2-3 to a focus

on the threatening consequences of their continued disobedience, in 4:5 - 6:30. It does this by specifically identifying the threat of violence with the threat of Yahweh's anger, bursting out against his unrepentant people. This violence materialises in 4:5 - 6:30 as the approaching foe, who at the time of the scroll's writing would be easily identified as Nebuchadnezzar who was becoming an increasingly threatening presence. This material in 4:5 - 6:30 forms the heart of the scroll, referring directly to the issue which occasioned its writing, that of the impact of Nebuchadnezzar's advance on Judah.

Now even at the heart of the scroll we found the scenes of destruction to center around a three-part reflection on the people's religious and moral failings, which are clearly associated with the cause of the destruction. Each of the three parts ends with Yahweh asking himself what choice he has but to destroy, given the behavior of his people (5:1-9, 21-29; 9:1-8).

The first scroll probably concluded with 7:1-15, the Temple Sermon. In this unit the conditional reprieve hinted at in the preceding poetic material, is articulated directly in prose: "amend your ways and your doings and I will let you dwell in this place." This material, then, formally offers an escape from the pervasive threats of doom in 4:5 - 6:30, and forms an eminently suitable conclusion to the First Scroll. It both comprehends the interdependent themes of religious/moral failing and threatened destruction, and provides a kind of formal inclusion with Chapter 1, the introduction, which, with the exception of Yahweh's words, is also in prose.

We find, then, in the probable structure of the First Scroll, both coherent literary unity and coherent thematic progression that is in

continuity with what we know from its content and from its historical context of the intention that produced it.¹ It should be noted that the affirmation of literary unity is not a denial of the composite nature of the unity. The first scroll seems quite clearly to have been composed of previously existing material, but in such a way as to form a new unit.

The First Scroll: Evidence About Jeremiah

What understanding can we draw from this material of Jeremiah's vision of the future of Judah and of his own role in that future? First, Jeremiah saw that Judah's future was to unfold under Babylonian domination, but he also saw the possibility of this being a gracious subjugation. In trying to understand this we should keep in mind that Judah was living under Egyptian domination at the time, that the Egyptians were not only the classical "bad guys," but that they had gained their current upper hand by the slaying of Josiah, whose reform had been meant as a return to pure religion. They had, moreover, enforced their rule by placing Jehoiakim, an Egyptian sympathiser with none of Josiah's reforming zeal, on the throne. In Jeremiah's eyes, then, Nebuchadnezzar could have looked much as Cyrus would later look to the exiled Judeans: the hand of Yahweh active for his people's redemption. In this case, though, the alienation was domestic, so Yahweh would be acting for his people's purification (cf. Jer. 25:1-14).

Again, in trying to understand Jeremiah's situation, we should remember that political autonomy for Judah was probably not a real possibility. The relative autonomy known by Judah in the last years of the Assyrian Empire, was precisely due to the fact that that empire was overextended and losing its grip on its vassal states. Judah was in the situation of having to choose wisely its political loyalties, so as not to have them forcibly chosen for her, at greater cost. Jeremiah can be

seen as addressing this inevitably controversial issue.

We can also see from the first scroll something of how Jeremiah understood his own rôle in the future of Judah. It most obviously included an attempt to provoke a recognition in the people of the path along which Judah's future lay, and to spur their repentance. I say this is most obvious, because the first scroll arose out of, and is deeply formed by, that intention.² Jeremiah saw himself as mediating between Yahweh's purposes and the people's attitudes, urging them to change. His first job would have been to persuade them that they were in need of repentance, that the current pro-Egyptian regime did not represent an expression of Yahweh's emerging intentions for Judah, as could dramatically be illustrated by the fact that he (Yahweh) was in the process of changing the political scene all over the Near East, through the unflagging advance of Nebuchadnezzar.

It should be stressed that we can get a distorted picture of the prophet's intentions and activity if we do not remember that we have in the Jeremiah-book only one side of what was evidently a controversy in Judah. That is to say, if everyone had agreed with Jeremiah, his word would not have been so generally rejected. For some people the reforms of Josiah, with their centralisation of the cult in Jerusalem and their destruction of local shrines, would have appeared the falling-away, and the return to more diverse practices which was allowed under the reign of the pro-Egyptian Jehoiakim would then have seemed like a return to safer religious practice, and a letting up of repression.³

Chapters 37-44 of the Jeremiah-book give an explicit account of a later point in this controversy, which, as we have seen, involved questions of political allegiance intertwined with questions of religious

practice. These chapters have been evaluated by Lohfink as being of the same genre, and in fact of the same authorship, as the narrative in Jeremiah 26 and 36. This genre is a kind of partisan journalism which he names "historical short-story," and which he characterises as basically dependable in its accounts, although promoting a favourable interpretation of the actions of the Shaphan-family in the events it describes.⁴ We can, then, take this later account of extreme conflict as basically dependable, and we can assume that the conflict did not emerge full-blown at that late point (587 B.C.E.) only, but that it developed over the years, and as the political situation became more extreme.

We have evidence for this conflictual relationship between Jeremiah and the people he was called to speak to from quite early in his career, and we can see that this relationship grew increasingly bitter as the certainty of doom was affirmed in Jeremiah's mind. Already in Jeremiah 1:11-19 (first scroll material) we can see that Jeremiah sees himself as set in some sense against the people of Judah; in 1:17 he is made into a fortress against them, in order that they may not harm him. Even the earliest call narrative shows that Jeremiah's work will involve at least overseeing conflict: "to pluck up and to break down, to destroy and to overthrow"; and only then "to build and to plant."⁵

This evidence adds an important nuance to Holladay's discovery of the shift in Jeremiah's thinking after Jehoiakim's rejection of the first scroll. We now see that this shift was an axial point in a developing relationship that had previous and subsequent movements. It did not issue out of the void, but was rather a turning point in an already conflict-ridden relationship.

As a consequence of our understanding of Jeremiah's position at the

time of the first scroll's composition, we must assert, with Holladay, that any words of judgment in it are only to be understood as statements of "divine possibility," conditional upon the people's failure to repent, and intended to provoke that repentance.⁶

The Second Scroll: Contents and Design

The second scroll, as we now understand it, contains all the material in which disaster is presented as immanent and certain, if not actual. The added material is found both in the midst of the first scroll material, and in a block at the end of it. We have seen that it was added in such a way as to form a new unity, and to alter the meaning of the first scroll texts. The tentative hope they offer for avoidance of disaster disappears when they are juxtaposed with texts expressing Yahweh's utter rejection of his people and their certain doom. Chapters 2:33-37, 4:19-28, 5:10-17, 6:9-15, 27-30 are the additions that were discerned in the body of the first scroll. Chapter 7:16-20, added to the tentatively hopeful conclusions of the first scroll, is a striking example of hope eliminated. The complete rejection Yahweh expresses for his people is based on their complete idolatry: the implication is that they did not amend their "ways" and their "doings." All hope is forgotten. The other material added at the end of the first scroll is firmly bound to the earlier material in 4:5 - 6:30 by an extended series of links. Notably, we discovered that one of the sections of a three-part unit that had been next to 5:21-29 in the first scroll, was displaced to 9:1-8 in the second scroll, where it helped link that later material back to the earlier material in 4:5 - 6:30.

Further striking evidence of the extent to which the second scroll material was bound to that of the first scroll was found in a series of

two inclusions near the beginning and ending of the composite body of material extending from 4:5 - 6:24: between 4:5-8 and 10:23 and 4:19-28 and 10:19-21 respectively.

The Second Scroll: Evidence About Jeremiah

What understanding can we draw from this material of Jeremiah's vision of the future of Judah and of his own role in that future? For Judah, Jeremiah saw only violent, inevitable destruction, as we can see by his juxtaposition of statements of tentative hope with statements of utter desolation (e.g. 7:1-15, 7:16-20). Judah, having rejected Yahweh, was rejected by him.

Jeremiah also experienced a shift in his own vocational self-understanding. Since the relation between Yahweh and his people was broken, it only remained for him to participate in the administration of judgment. Rudolph points out the formal similarities between 1:5 and 6:27: these later verses are also of vocational import.⁷ Yahweh appoints Jeremiah as a "refiner and assayer" of his people. Not simply appointed to proclaim Yahweh's word any more, Jeremiah is an administrator of judgment. As such Jeremiah concludes that the people cannot be refined, that they are irretrievably corrupt, "refuse silver."

The tone of these few verses also shows us the development of the conflictual relationship with the people that Jeremiah had felt from before the composition of the first scroll. This relationship is now polarised. Not simply protected against the people, as in 1:17, Jeremiah now participates in Yahweh's active offensive against them.

As mentioned above, the material of the Jeremiah-book has a wider historical context that aids in its historical interpretation. We can see that Jeremiah was participating in a debate that broke down along

political lines as well as religious ones, since these overlap considerably in a world in which God is considered to be actively controlling the course of events. We can identify the controversy in terms of pro-Babylonian versus pro-Egyptian factions. Within this framework, we can see that Jeremiah was asserting, against the Egyptian sympathisers, that the course of history favoured Nebuchadnezzar, and that submission to him was inevitable, Yahweh's will for Judah.

Areas of Significance For Future Research

The conclusions of this investigation are of significance for future research in this area in a number of ways. First, Holladay has established a new indicator for dating Jeremiah-texts, and this has been confirmed by our study. Texts in which doom is seen as inevitable can reliably be dated after 601, the year in which Jehoiakim rejected the first scroll. Inversely, texts in which doom is seen as conditional and avoidable may be dated before 601.

Second, we have seen in the relationship of 4:5 - 6:30 to 8:14 - 10:25, a particular instance of Jeremiah's technique in supplementing a composite body of material. Rather than just tacking the second scroll additions on at the end of the first scroll, he deliberately interwove the later materials with the material of the first scroll by placing first scroll material in the midst of the later additions (9:1-8), and also by placing later materials (4:19-28; 5:10-17; 6:9-15, 27-30) in the midst of the first scroll. The device of rhetorical parallels (including hook words) was used to bind the earlier and later materials together. Two multiple inclusions were also set around the composite text to reinforce its unity. This technique is also used in Chapter 2, between vv. 2 and 32. In both instances the inclusions are formed of multiple

elements, although in Chapter 2 the elements are ordered palistrophically.

The effect of this technique is to make of the second scroll not an early text plus additions, but a new literary unit. We saw that the tenor of the first scroll texts was altered by their juxtaposition with the more sombre second scroll material. The whole composite is made to proclaim the people's sin, Yahweh's rejection, Judah's certain and immanent doom. This happens largely because the first scroll was primarily conditional in its thrust. It spoke of what would happen if the people repented; what, if they continued in their folly. The second scroll resolves the condition by making it clear that the people have not repented, that they are in fact too corrupt for repentance; and so, that the negative consequences threatened for disobedience will certainly be actualised.

Finally, we have established a segment of the central development of Jeremiah's aims, in their historical context. Future research may expect Jeremiah's further development to continue in directions already evidenced. We have touched upon one example of this in discussing Jeremiah's increasingly conflictual relationship with the people between the first and second scrolls (compare 1:17-19; 6:27-30); we saw the extreme polarisation of that relationship evident in Jeremiah 37-44, which relates events of 587 BCE, some fourteen years after Jehoiakim's rejection of the first scroll.

There is further evidence of related development in another area of Jeremiah's vocational self-understanding. Texts such as Jeremiah 24:1-10; 29; 34:1-7, suggest the possibility of a further development in Jeremiah's thought, from the stark announcement of inevitable doom characteristic of the second scroll material that was composed in response to Jehoiakim's

rejection of the first scroll, to the integration of eleventh hour submission to the Babylonians and acceptance of exile, into a larger salvific scheme. The complete cataloguing of such texts, their literary and historical analysis, and their integration into the emerging lines of the aims of Jeremiah, remains for a future project.

B. The Larger Context: Historical Jeremiah Research

Our confirmation of the shift in Jeremiah's self-understanding is also an affirmation of the possibility of fruitful inquiry into the historical Jeremiah. Now it cannot be denied that the process through which we have made our way is long and complicated in comparison to the brevity of our findings. The question arises rather prominently of whether the fruit justify the labour, that is, of the value of such research. (It should, of course, be remembered that the fact that our project here was the verification of a literary-historical argument, a kind of inspection, made it much longer and more involved than would otherwise be the case.) To answer the question posed above, I propose a more specific question: What does this add to our reading of the Bible? The answer, as I understand it, is compound.

Let us begin by naming the fruit of our labour. Our conclusions consist in a better understanding of Jeremiah -- an exceptional individual in a unique relation to God, the foundational figure of the Jeremiah tradition -- and his religious/vocational experience at an historical moment which had profound consequences for the development of the biblical tradition as a whole.

This understanding has compound results for our reading of the Bible. First, by deepening our understanding of the central aims of the foundational figure of the Jeremiah-book, and of his vision of the times, it

inevitably deepens our understanding of the book as a whole.

Second, because Jeremiah's vocational self-understanding was so much bound up with the contemporary course of Judah's history, we have a deeper understanding of the enduring interpretation of one of the crucial moments in Judah's history: that of the fall of Jerusalem, and the exile which followed it. It was in response to this experience of abandonment by Yahweh that the biblical traditions developed the broad outlines in which we know them.⁸ Our understanding of Jeremiah, then, indirectly contributes to our understanding of the development of the Canon, by contributing to our understanding of the experience behind that development.

Third, our understanding of Jeremiah's experience of his vocation provokes in us a confrontation with our own understanding of our historical responses to God and our own awareness of goals and responsibilities. We are drawn into a dialectic about fundamental suppositions in these central matters, that will result in judgments of our continuity and/or discontinuity with the experience of Jeremiah, as adopted and affirmed by the biblical tradition. We are, then, propelled into a comparative explication and evaluation of our religious and vocational experiences as a final step in our appropriation of Jeremiah's religious experience.

The question of the impact of historical research on our reading of the Bible rests finally on the issue of history as a contemporary mode of knowing. This is another issue into which the "historical-Jesus" debate has preceded us. Ben Meyer and Hans K  ng from their diverse specialisations of scripture scholarship and systematic theology both argue that historical pursuit of Jesus is necessary because we are irreversibly historically-minded people.⁹ On the same grounds, I would argue, historical pursuit of Jeremiah is a necessary component of our biblical

inquiry.

My generation has grown up in a time when the hero is no longer fashionable, when we are ever aware of the continuity between individuals and their surrounding culture, and when — perhaps for this reason — we are accustomed to thinking of history in depersonalised terms, in terms of the developments of collectivities, "traditions." In such an ambience, study of one person whose goals shaped his life and had impact on his society can hope to provide an important counterpoint to our sometimes overwhelming consciousness of collective influences. It reminds us that individuals, while formed in a social context, can also participate decisively in the formation of their societies.

Jeremiah's attempt to alter the destructive course of Judah's future by fostering a change in the people's hearts was not a success. If we are not surprised at this, it is probably because such direct success does not seem to typify what we know of prophetic experience. (The story of Jonah, of course, makes a joke of this: when the people do repent in response to Jonah's warnings, he is angry!) Jeremiah's success lies in the fact that his words, read later, offered an interpretation of Judah's devastation to those who had experienced it, that struck home. Through his words people were able to grasp something of what had happened to them, and to see it in its historical development. In retrospect, Jeremiah's interpretation of the times was confirmed. For this reason his words were preserved and developed as central to the biblical tradition's understanding of the cataclysmic and formative events of Judah's experience of Babylonian subjugation.

Our attempt to see into Jeremiah's developing understanding of the times is, in effect, an attempt to grasp what it was that kept his words

alive for the people of Judah. Because we are lacking the historical immediacy that they had, we have to work for every insight into the historical moment that we get. That such insight is even possible, though, justifies the effort. At a time when historical awareness seems to bring mostly a sense of alienation from the sources of our traditions, we have found it capable of bringing some intimacy.¹⁰

NOTES

Introduction

¹The parallels between historical-Jesus and historical-Jeremiah research were noted by E. Gerstenberger, "Jeremiah's Complaints — Observations on Jer. 15:10-21," Journal of Biblical Literature 82 (1963): 393-408, p. 393 n. 4. D. K. Jobling developed the similarities explicitly in "The Quest of the Historical Jeremiah: Hermeneutical Implications of Recent Literature," Union Seminary Quarterly Review 34 (1978): 3-12. (Jobling's survey is the major source for my review of recent trends in Jeremiah research.)

²For a discussion of external sources for this period of Judah's history, see Gaalyah Cornfeld, Archaeology of the Bible, Book by Book (New York: Harper & Row, 1976), Pt. IX: Jeremiah, Lamentations, esp. pp. 167-177.

³Jobling ("Quest," p. 3) refers to the following list of authors of such commentaries, offered by Gerstenberger ("Complaints," p. 393): Th. K. Cheyne (1888); J. Skinner (1922); G. A. Smith (1929:4); Th. C. Gordon (1931); A. C. Welch (1951:2); J. Ph. Hyatt (1958); Sheldon H. Blank (1961). Jobling sees the work of Skinner as most typical of the genre.

⁴For a critical review of the development of historical-Jesus research, see B. Meyer, The Aims of Jesus (London: SCM, 1979), Chap. 2: "A Review of the Quest," pp. 25-59.

⁵S. Mowinckel, Zur Komposition des Buches Jeremias (Oslo [Kristiana]: J. Dybwad, 1914). B. Duhm, Das Buch Jeremia, Erklärt, Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament (Tübingen & Leipzig: J. C. B. Mohr, 1901).

⁶W. Rudolph, Jeremia, Handbuch zum Alten Testament 12 (1947), second edition (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1958).

⁷J. Bright, "The Date of the Prose Sermons of Jeremiah," Journal of Biblical Literature 70 (1951): 15-35, also Jeremiah, Anchor Bible (New York: Doubleday, 1965).

⁸Bright, Jeremiah, p. v.

⁹E. W. Nicholson, Preaching to the Exiles: A Study of the Prose Tradition of Jeremiah (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1970).

¹⁰Reventlow, as presented by Jobling, "Quest," p. 3.

¹¹Gerstenberger and Gunneweg, as presented by Jobling, "Quest," pp. 4-6.

¹²Wanke, as represented by Jobling, "Quest," p. 5.

¹³Thiel, as represented by Jobling, "Quest," p. 4, and subsequently, Die Deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 26-45, WMANT 52 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 1981).

¹⁴This shift towards the tradition, of course, represents in part an attempt to come to terms with Canon, and changing notions of Scripture. The most complete statement of its position is B. Childs, Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), especially Part One, "The Old Testament: Introduction."

¹⁵Meyer discusses methodological skepticism with reference to historical-Jesus scholarship. See Aims of Jesus, pp. 81-84.

¹⁶Nicholson, Preaching to the Exiles, pp. 25-26, 28-32. Nicholson's argument here is not for the improbability of Jeremianic composition, but rather for the plausibility of Deuteronomistic composition. We find sentences such as: "His [Miller's] argument ... that the differences in vocabulary between the prose in Jeremiah and the Deuteronomistic literature render the view that the former was composed by the Deuteronomists untenable, is not compelling, for, as we shall see, the peculiarly Jeremianic vocabulary in the sermons can be explained on the grounds that whoever composed them was working on the basis of authentic material from the prophet himself which has been incorporated wholly or partly in the present sermons" (pp. 25-26).

¹⁷Nicholson, Preaching to the Exiles, p. 26.

¹⁸Bright, Jeremiah, p. LXXIII, commented (before Nicholson's book): "My own view is that, in spite of undeniable verbal differences, the contrast between the Jeremiah of the poetry and the Jeremiah of the prose (and, one might add, between Jeremiah and the Deuteronomists) has been, by many scholars at least, badly exaggerated."

¹⁹Nicholson argues that the "Deuteronomists' manner of handling traditional materials elsewhere in the Bible, argues for the plausibility of their having done something similar with the Jeremianic material" (pp. 29-30). Apart from the fact that "plausible" is only a small advance towards "probable," Nicholson's argument falls on the fact that the latest

material he refers to is a prophecy of Isaiah, whereas the Jeremiah material was familiar in its original form to large numbers of people. See also Bright, Jeremiah, LXXII, "one wonders if it is not, to put it mildly, unlikely that any major distortion of Jeremiah's career and message could have been perpetrated at a time when hundreds of people who know him well still lived."

²⁰The term "psycho-biographical" is Joblings. "Quest," p. 3.

²¹Interestingly, J. V. M. Sturdy has recently re-instated Bright's hypothesis of the non-Deuteronomistic redaction of the prose sermons by showing that: (1) all of the "impressive array of parallels" between the prose sermons and Deuteronomistic literature, to which any weight could be attached, come from Deuteronomy 28, where is a late addition to the book, with links to other biblical books as well; (2) there is also serious disagreement in "theological outlook" between the two bodies of literature on matters of central importance, i.e. the monarchy and the Temple. "The authorship of the 'prose sermons' of Jeremiah," Prophecy: Essays Presented to G. Fohrer (Berlin & New York: de Gruyter, 1980), pp. 143-150.

²²Meyer, Aims of Jesus, see especially Chap. IV, "Jesus and Critical History," pp. 76-94.

²³Meyer, Aims of Jesus, p. 78. For the discussion of historical fact, which Meyer adopts from Collingwood, see p. 87. See also p. 19.

²⁴Meyer, Aims of Jesus, p. 79.

²⁵Bright, Jeremiah, p. LXI.

²⁶W. L. Holladay, "The Identification of the Two Scrolls of Jeremiah," Vetus Testamentum 30, 4 80: 452-467.

²⁷Norbert Lohfink, "Die Gattung der Historischen Kurzgeschichte in den letzten Jahren von Juda und in der Zeit des Babylonischen Exils," ZAW 90 (1978): 319-47. The main purpose of this article, as the title makes evident, is to define a literary genre. The historical investigation is corollary.

²⁸*Ibid.*, pp. 323, 337-8.

²⁹*Ibid.*, p. 326.

³⁰*Ibid.*, p. 324.

³¹*Ibid.*, pp. 326-7.

³²Ibid., pp. 327-8.

³³Ibid., p. 327, n. 24.

³⁴Ibid., p. 328.

³⁵Ibid., p. 328.

³⁶Ibid., p. 328.

³⁷Lewis Carroll, "The Walrus and the Carpenter."

Chapter II

¹All subsequent references to this article will be abbreviated to "Two Scrolls."

²William Holladay, The Architecture of Jeremiah 1-20 (Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 1976). All subsequent references to this work will be abbreviated to Architecture.

³Holladay, Architecture, p. 21.

⁴Holladay, "Two Scrolls," p. 453.

⁵Ibid., p. 454.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Ibid.

⁸Ibid.

⁹Holladay, Architecture, p. 31.

¹⁰Ibid.

¹¹Ibid., p. 35.

¹²Ibid., p. 32.

¹³Ibid., pp. 30-34.

¹⁴I am differing here from Holladay, who sees the symmetry as existing between "I (Yahweh) remember" (v. 2), and "forget me (Yahweh)" (v. 32). Ibid., p. 32.

¹⁵Ibid., pp. 31-34, 46-54.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 48.

¹⁷Rudolph, Jeremiah, pp. 23-24. Holladay changes his position in "Two Scrolls," omitting v. 14a from the "basic stratum" of Chapter 3. ("Two Scrolls," p. 455).

¹⁸Holladay, Architecture, p. 49.

¹⁹Ibid.

²⁰Ibid., p. 50.

²¹Ibid., Chapter 3, pp. 35-54, throughout.

²²Holladay, "Two Scrolls," p. 454. See also Architecture, p. 55.

²³Holladay, Architecture, Chap. 4, pp. 55-105. "Two Scrolls," pp. 455-56.

²⁴Holladay, Architecture, p. 31. See our more detailed exposition above, p. 22.

²⁵Holladay, "Two Scrolls," pp. 455-456.

²⁶Ibid.

²⁷Rudolph, Jeremiah, pp. 29, 33, 39.

²⁸Holladay, "Two Scrolls," p. 455.

²⁹Ibid.

³⁰Rudolph, Jeremiah, pp. 29, 33, 39.

³¹Holladay, "Two Scrolls," p. 456. Architecture, Chap. 6, pp. 106-124.

³²Holladay, Architecture, pp. 108-9.

³³Holladay, "Two Scrolls," p. 456.

³⁴This distinction is equally applicable to rhetorical tags within the same unit, which gives us a fourfold distinction among rhetorical indicators, as follows: (1) purely formal tag -- a form or word root recurring within a unit; (2) purely formal parallel -- a word root recurring between units; (3) meaning-inclusive tag -- a form or word root recurring within a unit, with a significant degree of shared meaning in the use of the word and the context in which it is used; (4) meaning-inclusive parallel -- a word root recurring between units, with a significant degree of shared meaning in the use of the word, and the context in which it is used.

³⁵Holladay, Architecture, pp. 108-9.

³⁶For ease of verification, I will give here the verses in these cases, that Holladay judges to contain parallels: 2) 4:15 and 8:16; 3) 4:13, 6:23 and 8:16; 4) 4:24 and 8:16; 8) 5:7 and 9:1; 10) 5:2 and 9:2.

³⁷Holladay, "Two Scrolls," pp. 459-61.

³⁸Ibid.

³⁹Ibid., p. 460. Holladay does not ever mention 5:18-19. Hence my judgment that he views these verses as secondary.

⁴⁰See similar usages in passages discussed by Bright (Jeremiah, pp. 25, 39, n. 7).

⁴¹Rudolph, Jeremia, p. 69.

⁴²Holladay, "Two Scrolls," p. 466.

⁴³This argument was first formulated by Mowinckel. It is accepted by Rudolph and challenged by Bright. Its most recent advocate is Nicholson. See Preaching to the Exiles.

⁴⁴Holladay, "Two Scrolls," p. 457.

⁴⁵Ibid.

⁴⁶Ibid.

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 458.

⁴⁸Ibid.

⁴⁹Lohfink, "Historischen Kurzgeschichte." See our more detailed exposition, pp. 9-13 above.

⁵⁰Ibid., pp. 337-342.

⁵¹Holladay, "Two Scrolls," pp. 459-463.

Chapter III

¹Rudolph, Jeremia; Duhm, Das Buch Jeremias; Mowinckel, Zur Komposition des Buches Jeremias. All subsequent references in this chapter to Rudolph's text will be made in parentheses at the end of sentences.

²See, for example, his discussion of the relation of the text of Chapter 2 to Jeremiah's actual oracles, pp. 20-21.

³Holladay, Architecture, p. 29.

⁴Lohfink, "Historischen Kurzgeschichte," pp. 326-8.

⁵Holladay, "Two Scrolls," p. 465. Holladay assigns 6:16-26 to the first scroll.

⁶Ibid., p. 455, and Holladay, Architecture, pp. 64-66.

⁷Holladay, "Two Scrolls," p. 426.

⁸Holladay, Architecture, pp. 64-66.

⁹Helga Weippert, Die Prosareden des Jeremiabuches, BZAW 132, referred to in Holladay, "Two Scrolls," p. 456.

¹⁰Holladay, "Two Scrolls," p. 457.

¹¹J. V. M. Sturdy, "Authorship of the 'Prose Sermons'."

¹²Chapter 8:10-12, Rudolph notes, are the same as 6:12-15, and the latter occurrence would seem to be the earlier context for these verses.

Chapter IV

¹Bright, Jeremiah. All subsequent references in this chapter to Bright's text will be made in parentheses at the end of sentences.

²Rudolph, Jeremia. See for example his treatment of 4:5-31, pp. 29-33.

³For a discussion of historical inference, see Meyer, Aims of Jesus, pp. 81-83.

⁴Ibid., p. 87. Meyer here is following Collingwood.

⁵See pp. 65-66 above.

⁶John Bright, "The Date of the Prose Sermons in Jeremiah," JBL 70 (1951): 15-35.

⁷Holladay, "Two Scrolls," p. 457.

Chapter V

¹See Lohfink, "Historischen Kurzgeschichte," pp. 327-328.

²Ibid.

³See 2 Kings 18:19-25 for an example of this position, albeit argued by an Assyrian. This view is also exemplified in Jer. 40:15-19.

⁴Lohfink, "Historischen Kurzgeschichte," p. 337.

⁵Jeremiah is in this aspect of his calling similar to Ezekiel, who prophesied only doom until the fall of Jerusalem, after which he spoke words of salvation.

⁶Holladay, "Two Scrolls," p. 466.

⁷Rudolph, Jeremia, p. 45.

⁸See James A. Sanders, Torah and Canon (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972).

⁹Meyer, Aims of Jesus, pp. 58-59; Hans Kung, On Being a Christian, trans. Edward Quinn (Glasgow: Collins, 1978), pp. 132-33, 164.

¹⁰The journal Interpretation devoted its April 1983 issue (Vol. 37, No. 2) to the area of Jeremiah-research. At that time this thesis had already been submitted, and it was therefore not possible to include a discussion of this newest material. Of special interest, though, is the note that W. L. Holladay is one of the contributors, in an article that reinforces his argument about the identification of the two scrolls in Jeremiah, while also discussing the whole term of Jeremiah's prophetic career. His thesis remains basically the same, although he has changed his position about the assignment of some particular passages, and although he has accepted Lohfink's 601 BCE. date for the reading of the first scroll. Holladay is currently involved in preparing a commentary on the Jeremiah-book for the Hermeneia series. See "The Years of Jeremiah's Preaching," Interpretation, 37 2 (April 1983), pp. 146-159.

WORKS CITED

Works in the Area of Jeremiah-Research

- Bright, John. "The Date of the Prose Sermons in Jeremiah." Journal of Biblical Literature 70 (1951): 15-35.
- Bright, John. Jeremiah. Anchor Bible Series. New York: Doubleday, 1965.
- Duhm, Bernhard. Das Buch Jeremia Erklärt. Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament, XI. Tübingen and Leipzig: J. C. B. Mohr, 1901.
- Gerstenberger, E. "Jeremiah's Complaints: Observations on Jer. 15:10-21." Journal of Biblical Literature 82 (1963): 393-408.
- Gunneweg, A. H. J. "Konfession oder Interpretation im Jeremiahbuch." Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche 67 (1970): 395-416.
- Holladay, William L. The Architecture of Jeremiah 1-20. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 1976.
- Holladay, W. L. "The identification of the two scrolls of Jeremiah." Vetus Testamentum 30 (4 1980): 143-150.
- Jobling, D. K. "The Quest of the Historical Jeremiah: Hermeneutical Implications of Recent Literature." Union Seminary Quarterly Review 34 (1978): 3-12.
- Lohfink, Norbert. "Die Gattung der 'Historischen Kurzgeschichte' in den letzten Jahren von Juda und in der Zeit des Babylonischen Exils." Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 90 (1978): 319-47.
- Mowinkel, S. Zur Komposition des Buches Jeremias. Oslo [Kristiana]: J. Dybwad, 1914.
- Nicholson, E. W. Preaching to the Exiles: A Study of the Prose Tradition in the Book of Jeremiah. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1970.
- Reventlow, Henning Graf. Liturgie und prophetisches Ich bei Jeremia. Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1963.
- Rudolph, Wilhelm. Jeremia. Handbuch Zum Alten Testament 12. reprint ed. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1958.
- Sturdy, J. V. M. "The authorship of the 'prose sermons' of Jeremiah." Prophecy: Essays presented to G. Fohrer. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1980.

Thiel, Winfried. Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 1-25.
Wissenschaftliche Monographien für die Alt- und Neuen Testament 41.
Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1973.

Thiel, Winfried. Die Deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 26-45.
Wissenschaftliche Monographien für die Alt- und Neuen Testament 52.
Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 1981.

Wanke, G. Untersuchungen Zur Sogenannten Baruchschrift. Beihefte zur
Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 122. Berlin:
Walter de Gruyter and Co., 1971.

Other Works

Childs, Brevard. Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture.
Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.

Meyer, Ben. The Aims of Jesus. London: SCM, 1979.

APPENDIX I*

TIMETABLE OF EVENTS SURROUNDING BABYLONIAN EXILE

- 640 Josiah to throne (31 years)
- 627 Jeremiah's call
- 622 Book of Law found -- Deuteronomic (Josianic) Reform
- 609 Battle of Megiddo, Josiah killed
- 609 Jehoahaz to throne (3 months)
Imprisoned in Egypt
- 609 Jehoiakim placed on throne by Pharaoh Necho (11 years)
Paid tribute to Necho
- 605 Battle of Carchemish, Nebuchadnezzar (Babylonian) beats Egypt
- 604 Nebuchadnezzar takes Ashkelon
- 604 Jehoiakim transfers allegiance to Babylon
- 600 Jehoiakim rebels (withholds tribute)
- 597 Nebuchadnezzar takes Jerusalem. Jehoiakim dead before his arrival
- 597 Zedekiah placed on throne by Nebuchadnezzar (11 years),
Jehoiakim deported to Babylon
- 597 First deportation
- 588 Zedekiah rebels
- 587 Jerusalem falls
- 587 Exile in Babylon
- 538 Edict of Cyrus (Persian)
- 537 Beginning of return to Judah

*Selected from Ernst Vogt, "Zeittafel," in Josef Schreiner, ed. Wort und Botschaft (Würzburg: Echter-Verlag Würzburg, 1967).

APPENDIX II

FIRST AND SECOND SCROLL MATERIAL IN JEREMIAH 1-10

<u>First Scroll</u> <u>(edited in 605 BCE.)</u>	<u>Second Scroll</u> <u>(edited after 601 BCE.)</u>	<u>Neither</u> <u>(later material)</u>	<u>Uncertain</u>
1: 4-10			
11-19			
2: 1-32			
	2:33-37		
3: 1-5			3: 6-12a
12b-13			14-18
19-25			
4: 1-4			
5-8			
13-18	4: 9-12		
29-31	19-28		
5: 1-9	5:10-17		
		5:18-19	
21-29			5:20
			30-31
6: 1-8	6: 9-15		
16-26	27-30		
7: 1-15	7:16-20		
	21-29		
		7:30-34	
		8: 1-3	
	8: 4-12		
	14-23		
9: 1-8	9: 9-10		9:11-15
	16-21		22-25
	10:17-25	10: 1-16	