Israel Constructs its History

Deuteronomistic Historiography in Recent Research

edited by
Albert de Pury, Thomas Römer
& Jean-Daniel Macchi

theological debate of which the Old Testament is the proceedings.[29] Exegesis should not harmonize differences, nor transform its difficulties into pious platitudes. The hypothesis of a 'DtrH' encourages the second set of intentions but hardly the first. It must be abandoned.

IS THERE A DEUTERONOMISTIC REDACTION IN THE BOOK OF JEREMIAH?

Thomas Römer

1. *Jeremiah and the Deuteronomists: The Contribution from the History of Research*[1]

1.1. *The Discovery of the Dtr Phenomenon in Jeremiah*

Since the works of de Wette and of Ewald, the presence of redactions of a 'Deuteronomistic' (Dtr in what follows) type in the historical books as well as in the Pentateuch has been the subject of scientific debate. The Dtr phenomenon appeared ever larger, in relation to the book of Jeremiah, exegetes soon took note of the presence of texts strongly resembling, in their style as well as in their themes, Deuteronomy or Dtr texts. For Kuenen, that observation simply meant that the redactors of the historical books were 'men of the same mind as Jeremiah, knowing and imitating his writings'.[2] But towards the end of the nineteenth century, such an explanation was no longer sufficient to satisfy historico-critical exegesis. It was Bernhard Duhm (1847–1928) who set forth, in his commentary on Jeremiah,[3] the thesis of a Dtr redaction of this book, leaving to the 'historical Jeremiah' only some 60 short poems. From then on, it became necessary to explain the presence of the 'Dtr' texts in the book of Jeremiah.

1.2. *The Elaboration of a 'Documentary' Theory for the Book of Jeremiah*

S. Mowinckel[4] proposed a theory that had an enormous influence on subsequent research. This was strongly inspired by the documentary

---

1.   Cf. also the history of the research in the present volume.

2.   A. Kuenen, *Histoire critique des livres de l'Ancien Testament.* I. *Les livres historiques* (Paris: Michel Lévy Frères, 1866), p. 428.

3.   B. Duhm, *Das Buch Jeremia* (KHAT, 11; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1901).

4.   S. Mowinckel, *Zur Komposition des Buches Jeremia* (Oslo: Jacob Dybwad, 1914).

theory triumphant at that time in research on the Pentateuch. The Scandinavian scholar actually distinguished four sources from which the book of Jeremiah had taken form:

> The 'A' source: a collection of Jeremiah's oracles, contained in Jeremiah 1–25, and compiled by a redactor R^A in Egypt.
> The 'B' source: the biography of Jeremiah, contained in Jeremiah 19–20* and 26–44*, compiled by a redactor R^B between 580–480.
> The 'C' source: the prose discourses, written in a Dtr style: Jeremiah 7; 11; 18; 21; 24; 25; 32; 34; 35; 44, compiled by a redactor R^C about 400 in Babylon (or eventually in Palestine).
> The 'D' source: the collection of salvation oracles in Jeremiah 30–31, whose origin and date Mowinckel did not specify. (The final additions to the book would be found in the oracles against the nations in Jeremiah 46–52.)

Mowinckel explains the relation between the three main sources by making use of the redactional theory concerning the formation of the Gospels. The relation between B and A would be comparable to that existing between Mark and 'Q', the relation between C and A-B would correspond to that of John in relation to the Synoptic Gospels.

We should note that for Mowinckel the C source is situated in the middle of the Persian period.[5] This document in Dtr style contained only the public discourses of the prophet, and their insertion into the whole book was due to some redactor whose motives remain obscure.

1.3. *The Transformation of a Source into a Compilation*
Subsequently Mowinckel's model was modified. It was realized that the Dtr style was not limited to just the prose discourses, but also appeared within the oracles (for example, 23.1-8) and in the narrative sections (for example, ch. 36). Bright noted: 'When B opens his mouth, he talks like C'.[6]

Starting from these observations, 'D' will be transformed into a compilation, especially due to the works of J.P. Hyatt and W. Rudolph.

---

5.   According to Mowinckel, C presupposes the definitive ideology of Judaism, and is therefore later than Ezra; cf. *Zur Komposition des Buches Jeremia*, pp. 39, 48-51.

6.   J. Bright, 'The Prophetic Reminiscence: Its Place and Function in the Book of Jeremiah', in *Biblical Essays 1966. Proceedings of the 9th Meeting 'Die Ou-Testamentiese Werkgemeenskap in Suid-Afrika' in Pretoria* (Stellenbosch: Ou-Testamentiese Werkgemeenskap,1966), pp. 11-30 (17).

As early as 1942,[7] Hyatt considered that the 'Deuteronomic Editors' would have wanted, at a later date, to make Jeremiah a supporter of Josiah's reform. In a 1951 article,[8] he specified that 'the "school" of writers we call the Deuteronomists' was at the same time responsible for the edition of the Dtr historiography and for that of Jeremiah 1–45. Rudolph, in his 1947 commentary, took up Mowinckel's model and terminology but gave them a more 'conservative' aspect.[9] As for 'C', he envisages the possibility that its author could be the principal compiler of the book.[10]

The idea of one or several Dtr redactions of Jeremiah henceforth dominated research. In the English-speaking world, it was made popular by E.W. Nicholson,[11] who insisted on the omnipresence of the Dtr ideology and style in the 'prose sermons', as well as in the so-called biographical texts. According to him, these texts find their *Sitz im Leben* in the preaching and teaching addressed to the exiles in Babylon.

1.4. *Questioning and Confirmations*
This consensus was however contested by a minority of exegetes who considered that the so-called Dtr character of certain texts corresponded to a *Kunstprosa*, a language very widespread in Judah during the seventh and sixth centuries BCE.[12] On this view, there is nothing to

---

7.   J.P. Hyatt, 'Jeremiah and Deuteronomy' (1942), in L.G. Perdue and B.W. Kovacs (eds.), *A Prophet to the Nations: Essays in Jeremiah Studies* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1984), pp. 113-27.

8.   J.P. Hyatt, 'The Deuteronomic Edition of Jeremiah' (1951), in Perdue and Kovacs (eds.), *A Prophet to the Nations*, pp. 247-67. Cf. also his commentary, *The Book of Jeremiah* (IB, 5; New York: Abingdon Press, 1956), pp. 775-1142.

9.   W. Rudolph, *Jeremia* (HAT, I/12; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1947, 3rd edn, 1968). According to Rudolph, B was written by Baruch, and C is often based on the authentic words of Jermiah. Jer. 30–31 belongs to an independent source, but forms part of A, as do a certain number of the oracles against the nations.

10.   'Es ist nicht ausgeschlossen, daß der Verfasser der C-Stücke zugleich der Hauptredaktor des Jeremiabuches war' (*Jeremia*, p. xx).

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

12.   Cf. J. Bright, 'The Date of the Prose Sermons in Jeremiah' (1951), in Perdue and Kovacs (eds.), *A Prophet to the Nations*, pp. 193-212. J. Holladay, especially in his monumental commentary: *Jeremiah 1. A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah Chapters 1–25* and *Jeremiah 2. A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah Chapters 26–52* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986–1989); H. Weippert, *Die Prosareden des Jeremiabuches* (BZAW, 132; Berlin

prevent attributing the 'C' texts to the prophet himself who would simply have had recourse to the same language as the editors of the Dtr historiography. It is in this way that H. Weippert rejects any Dtr influence, considering the prose discourses as the words of YHWH directly transmitted by the prophet. Independently of the theological prejudices which such a view implies, the thesis of a *Kuntsprosa* available for whoever wished to utilize it presents a problem. It hardly takes into account the diversity of styles and concepts within the book of Jeremiah itself and the parallels between certain texts of Jeremiah and those of the Dtr historiography are too close to be explained solely by recourse to a common language.

It is to W. Thiel that the credit is due for having tried to demonstrate in detail the presence of a Dtr redaction in Jeremiah.[13] That redaction (present in Jer. 1–45) presupposes, according to him, the Dtr historiography (DH). It actually seems that the Dtr redaction of Jeremiah cites DH on several occasions, and this right from ch. 1, where Jeremiah is, in the account of his vocation, presented as the worthy successor of Moses (cf. Jer. 1.7, 9 with Deut. 18.18). Like DH, 'Dtr Jeremiah' is pre-occupied with the explanation of the fall of Judah and by the question if there is a future for the people of the covenant. Such a future is only possible if the people return to the foundation of their relation with YHWH (namely, the Deuteronomic Torah). The sermons giving alternatives (*Alternativpredigen*) in Dtr Jeremiah are to be understood in this sense (Jer. 7.1-15; 22.1-5; 17.19-27). As for style, Thiel notes that Dtr Jeremiah uses the same stereotypical turns of phrase as the redactors of DH; 'Dtr' phraseology limited to the book of Jeremiah appears to be created from Jeremianic phrases. Thiel dates the Dtr redaction of Jeremiah after the death of Jehoiachin (cf. Jer. 22.25-27) and before the end of the exile (about 550) and locates it in Judaea.[14] Thiel also remarked

and New York: W. de Gruyter, 1972).

13. W. Thiel, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 1–25* (WMANT, 41; Neukirchen–Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1973); *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 26–45* (WMANT, 52; Neukirchen–Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1981).

14. The localization of the Dtrs in Palestine is still quite popular in present research; its basis seems to be a footnote in M. Noth's *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien: Die sammelnden und bearbeitenden Geschichtswerke im Alten Testament* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 3rd edn, 1967 [1943]); English translation: *The Deuteronomistic History* (JSOTSup, 15; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1981), p. 110 n. 1; such a localization seems to me to be not too

that the Dtr redaction of Jeremiah was not the last intervention in the book. Thus, the announcement of judgment in 16.10-13, typically Dtr, is 'corrected', even 'neutralized' in the present text of Jeremiah by vv. 14-15, which assume the presence of a post-Dtr redaction (or Dtr^2). Thiel's survey, with results often agreeing with Hyatt's intuitions,[15] seemed to have definitively demonstrated the existence of a Dtr redaction in Jeremiah, in immediate local and temporal proximity with DH. That vision of the formation of Jeremiah is introduced in a number of commentaries.[16] However, the consensus was only apparent.

2. *Two Recent Challenges*

2.1. *The 'Dtr Redaction' of Jeremiah—a Research Pipe Dream?*

To demonstrate the presence of a Dtr redaction in Jeremiah, scholars especially emphasized the identical vocabulary and turns of phrase between the DH and Jeremiah. But, as Pohlmann and others[17] point out, Dtr style is very easy to imitate and is met with up to the New Testament period. All we have to do is think of the books of Ezra–Nehemiah and Chronicles, of texts like Zechariah 1; Jonah 3; Daniel 9; Baruch 1–3, and even Acts 7.[18] Furthermore, the 'pluses' of the MT in comparison with the *Vorlage* of the LXX[19] are often composed of Dtr phrases, thus

logical in relation to the 'Golah-centrism' of many Dtr texts. Furthermore, the Dtr milieu was probably that of the intelligentsia who were deported by the Babylonians to Babylon.

15. Cf. the very handy synopsis established by S. Herrmann, *Jeremia: Der Prophet und das Buch* (EdF, 271; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1990), pp. 80-81.

16. Cf., for example, the commentary of D.R. Jones, *Jeremiah* (NCB; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992).

17. K.F. Pohlmann, *Studien zum Jeremiabuch: Ein Beitrag zur Frage nach der Entstehung des Jeremiabuches* (FRLANT, 118; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978), pp. 16-18; H.-J. Stipp, *Jeremia im Parteienstreit: Studien zur Textentwicklung von Jer 26,36-43 und 45 als Beitrag zur Geschichte Jeremias, seines Buches und judäischer Parteien im 6. Jahrhundert* (Athenäum Monographien Theologie; BBB, 82; Frankfurt: Hain, 1992), pp. 39-41.

18. Cf. T. Römer and J.D. Macchi, 'Luke, Disciple of the Deuteronomistic School', in C.M. Tuckett (ed.), *Luke's Literary Achievement* (JSNTSup, 116; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), pp. 178-87.

19. These 'pluses' are dated to the Persian period (Y. Goldman, *Prophétie et royauté au retour de l'exil: Les origines littéraires de la formation massorétique du livre de Jérémie* [OBO, 118; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck

showing that the presence of Dtr texts in Jeremiah in no way implies that these should be considered contemporaneous with DH. Pohlmann, in his analysis of Jeremiah 24 and 37–44, identified in the book of Jeremiah a redaction with an ideology favourable to the Babylonian Golah (cf. in particular the vision of the good and bad figs in Jer. 24). The segregationist tendency expressed in these texts makes them appear to be contemporaneous with the work of the Chronicler. Pohlmann envisages therefore a date about 400 BCE. We should immediately note that this analysis remains a partial one to the extent that Pohlmann does not discuss Dtr texts like Jeremiah 7; 11, and others.[20]

However, the questions raised by Pohlmann remain valid. Can we furthermore gather together all the texts with a Dtr appearance under just one redaction? R.P. Carroll, for his part, while attributing an important role to these Dtr circles for the production of the book,[21] notes: 'So few of the elements constituting the book are datable, and the social background of many of them equally obscure, that the book may represent many and various political movements from the fall of Jerusalem to the Greco-Roman period'.[22] He compares the situation reflected by the book of Jeremiah to that of primitive Christianity, which is characterized by a cohabitation of several interpretations of the 'Jesus event'.[23]

& Ruprecht, 1992]), the Hellenistic period (H.-J. Stipp, *Das masoretische und alexandrinische Sondergut des Jeremiabuches: Textgeschichtlicher Rang, Eigenarten, Triebkräfte* [OBO, 136; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994], pp. 142-43), even the Hasmonaean period (P. Piovanelli, 'La condamnation de la diaspora égyptienne dans le livre de Jérémie [*JrA* 50,8–51,30 / *JrB* 43,8–44,30]', *Trans* 9 [1995], pp. 35-49; A. Schenker, 'La rédaction longue du livre de Jérémie doit-elle être datée au tèmps des premiers Hasmonéens?', *ETL* 70 [1994], pp. 281-93).

20. In his book *Die Ferne Gottes—Studien zum Jeremiabuch* (BZAW, 179; Berlin and New York: W. de Gruyter, 1989), Pohlmann criticizes in passing the analyses of these chapters by Thiel, without however proposing an in-depth argument.

21. 'Whose interests are promoted by this construction of the book? Deuteronomistic circles are the most likely candidates for locating an ideology of the word which would serve their purposes in the second temple period' (*Jeremiah* [OTL; London: SCM Press, 1986], p. 78). He also envisages 'post-Deuteronomistic circles'.

22. R.P. Carroll, *Jeremiah* (OTG; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989), p. 107.

23. Cf. R.P. Carroll, *From Chaos to Covenant: Uses of Prophecy in the Book of Jeremiah* (London: SCM Press, 1981), pp. 25-26.

The questioning of the idea of a coherent Dtr redaction is presented differently in W. McKane's commentary. After a detailed analysis of Jeremiah 1–25, he concludes that the book of Jeremiah came into existence owing to successive and continual additions of which the last stage is composed of the MT.[24] McKane sums up the formation of Jeremiah with the image of a 'rolling corpus'. A poetic nucleus (which is not necessarily Jeremianic) can give rise to ('trigger') the composition of other texts in verse, or can lead the redactors to create ('generate') some prose texts, without these processes necessarily having in view the comprehensive edition of the book or important parts of it.

McKane returns in a certain way (using a better argumentation) to the position of Duhm at the beginning of this century. Is everything in that case to be redone? Are the Dtr texts in Jeremiah beyond all systematization? To these questions another problem is to be added: that of the 'ideology' of the Dtr texts of Jeremiah compared with those of the DH.

2.2. A Family Quarrel? Are the Deuteronomists of Jeremiah opposed to the Deuteronomists of Deuteronomy–2 Kings?

It has long been wondered that DH, unlike 2 Chronicles, does not mention Jeremiah. H.-J. Stipp and others interpreted this omission as a sign of the hostility of the redactors of DH towards the prophet.[25] In that case, must the thesis still be supported according to which the book of this same prophet would have undergone one or several Dtr redactions? For some authors, the Dtr family was divided into two main factions: that which edited DH and that which dealt with the book of Jeremiah. According to Hardmeier, the account of 2 Kings 18–19 (Jerusalem miraculouly spared from the Assyrian assault) shows that the Dtrs supported an ideology of a 'Zionist' or royal type, convinced of the inviolability of the temple, even after the catastrophe. Since their heroes

24. 'MT is to be understood as a commentary or commentaries built on pre-existing elements of the Jeremianic corpus' (W. McKane, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jeremiah* [ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1986], I, p. lxxxiii).

25. H.-J. Stipp, 'Probleme des redaktionsgeschichtlichen Modells der Entstehung des Jeremiabuches', in W. Gross (ed.), *Jeremia und die 'deuteronomistische Bewegung'* (BBB, 98; Weinheim: Beltz Athenäum, 1995), pp. 225-62 (232); C. Hardmeier, 'Die Propheten Micha und Jesaja im Spiegel von Jeremia xxvi und 2 Regum xvii–xx. Zur Prophetie-Rezeption in der nach-josianischen Zeit', in J.A. Emerton (ed.), *Congress Volume. Leuven 1989* (VTSup, 43; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1991), pp. 172-89 (188-89).

are Hezekiah and Josiah, they are hoping for the restoration of the Davidic dynasty.[26] These 'hardliners'[27] would have been in bitter opposition to the pro-Babylonian policy of the Shaphanites,[28] who would be the Dtr editors of Jeremiah and the minor prophets. In such a context, Albertz understands the (Dtr) discourse on the temple (Jer. 7), denouncing the confidence of the people in this place and explaining its destruction owing to the disobedience of Judah to the Torah, as a polemic against the vision of the temple in DH.[29] Stipp goes further and notes 'a deep trench between the redactors of DH and the authors of the Dtr passages in Jeremiah'.[30] If such inconsistency really exists between DH and Jeremiah, is it still possible to speak of a common milieu?

The challenges that I have just presented risk disrupting considerably what exegesis considered as established on the subject of the formation of the book of Jeremiah. They necessitate two inquiries. First, the questioning of a coherent Dtr redaction obliges us to raise the question of the compositional intentions of an eventual Dtr redaction. The second issue is that of the ideological and theological differences between the book of Jeremiah and DH. Do these differences exist, and in the event of an affirmative response, how must they be explained?

3. *Two Inquiries*

3.1. *Does a Dtr-Constructed Redactional Objective Exist in Jeremiah?*
The book of Jeremiah in its present form[31] can easily be subdivided

---

26. Hardmeier ('Die Propheten Micha und Jesaja') suggests seeing partisans of Ishmael, murderer of Gedaliah, in these Dtrs, but in doing so we are dealing with an out-and-out novel.

27. This is Hardmeier's term ('Die Propheten Micha und Jesaja', p. 187).

28. Hardmeier ('Die Propheten Micha und Jesaja') and Stipp ('Probleme des redaktionsgeschichtlichen Modells') consider 2 Kgs 19.2-7 as a polemic against the exhortation to submit to Babylon, very prevalent in the Jeremianic tradition (cf. Jer. 21.2-10; 37.9-10).

29. R. Albertz, 'Die Intentionen und Träger des deuteronomistischen Geschichts-werks', in *idem* (ed.), *Schöpfung und Befreiung* (Festschrift C. Westermann; Stutt-gart: Calwer Verlag, 1989), pp. 37-53 (46). Cf. earlier F.K. Kumaki, *The Temple Sermon: Jeremiah's Polemic Against the Deuteronomists (Dtr 1)* (Ann Arbor and London: University Microfilms International, 1980), who considers Jer. 7 as a pol-emic of the prophet Jeremiah against the Dtrs of the time of Josiah.

30. Stipp, 'Probleme des redaktionsgeschichtlichen Modells', p. 232.

31. For convenience and out of habit I base myself on the Masoretic Text. The different arrangement in LXX Jeremiah especially concerns the place of the oracles

---

according to the following units: after the introduction (Jer. 1: date, vocation and visions), a first unit, Jeremiah 2–6, contains a collection of oracles, mainly in verse, announcing the enemy from the North and calling on the recipients to change their conduct; ch. 7 (the first discourse on the temple) introduces a unit going as far as Jeremiah 24, gathering together discourses and lamentations, symbolic acts and the 'confessions'. These various genres are all concerned with the difficult announcement of the judgment. The vision of good and bad figs con-cludes this section with the announcement of salvation for a small group (the deportees of 597). Jeremiah 25 can be described as a 'turning point', resuming the themes of chs. 7–24 and preparing for what follows. The following unit goes from ch. 26 to ch. 35 and is introduced by the second version of the discourse on the temple (Jer. 26). In these chapters, announcements of salvation predominate. The conclusion in Jeremiah 35 can be compared to Jeremiah 24: it is a matter again of a promise made to a small group (the Rechabites). Jeremiah 36 (the burnt scroll, the counter-reform of Jehoiakim) introduces the narrative part of the book (often called 'the passion of Jeremiah': the conflicts of the prophet with Zedekiah, his imprisonment, the fall of Jerusalem, his forced descent into Egypt, followed by the sermon against the Egyptian diaspora). This unit ends with the announcement of salvation addressed to an individual: Baruch (Jer. 45). There follow the oracles against the nations (Jer. 46–51) and the historical appendix (Jer. 52; cf. 2 Kgs 24.18–25.30).

The reminder about the organization of the book makes apparent a certain desire for structuring, especially in the case of the two central parts, with both beginning with a discourse on the temple (Jer. 7 and 26) and ending with a promise of salvation to a restricted group (Jer. 24 and 35). This plan, established on the synchronic level, will never-theless be of use in detecting the eventual intentions of a Dtr redaction. We are actually going to see that these structurally important chapters are strongly marked by the Dtr style that, as we have seen, is character-ized by a certain number of stereotyped turns of phrase.[32]

---

against the nations. If LXX has preserved the 'original' plan of Jeremiah, which is quite possible, it would change nothing in the Dtr compositional intentions (ignor-ing the oracles against the nations), as I will try to demonstrate.

32. Cf. the lists in M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and Deuteronomic School* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972) and Bright, 'The Date of the Prose Sermons in Jeremiah', appendix A.

The main themes in these phrases are: obedience or disobedience in response to the voice of YHWH, the warning against the veneration of 'other gods', the uninterrupted sending of the prophets, 'servants of YHWH', the recalling of the coming out of Egypt, the covenant concluded (with the ancestors), the gift of the land (to the ancestors), the sins of the ancestors, and so on. Of course, the mere inventory of this phraseology does not demonstrate the existence of a structured Dtr redaction. However, the distribution of some of these formulas in the book of Jeremiah can suggest the existence of such a redaction.

Let us take the example of the gift of the land to the ancestors. This phrase, which plays a large role in DH,[33] appears for the first time in Jeremiah in ch. 7 (vv. 7 and 14),[34] which is probably Dtr,[35] and its final attestation is found in 35.15. In these two chapters, the gift of the land to the ancestors is envisaged conditionally (obedience to YHWH),[34] and it is met again a third and final time in Jer. 25.5-6:[36] 'If every one of you turn back from your evil behaviour…then you will remain[37] on the land that I[38] have given to your ancestors…' In the same way, Jeremiah 25

33. Cf. for this point and for the following T. Römer, *Israels Väter: Untersuchungen zur Väterthematik im Deuteronomium und in der deuteronomistischen Tradition* (OBO, 99; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990), pp. 368-70 and 441-43.

34. Jer. 3.18 speaks of the land 'given for a heritage' (נחל in place of נתן) and belongs to a passage that is generally considered to be a post-exilic addition forming part of the final retouches to the book; cf. Thiel, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia I–25*, p. 92; McKane, *Jeremiah*, pp. 76-77.

35. An attempt to reconstruct an 'authentic' oracle reworked by the Dtrs has often been made, but this is hardly possible, as T. Seidl has very well demonstrated: 'Jeremias Tempelrede: Polemik gegen die joschijanische Reform? Die Paralleltraditionen Jer 7 und 26 auf ihre Effizienz für das Deuteronomismusproblem in Jeremia befragt', in Gross (ed.), *Jeremia und die 'deuteronomistische Bewegung'*, pp. 141-79; and J.P. Floss, 'Methodische Aspekte exegetischer Hypothesen am Beispiel von Theo Seidls Beitrag zur "Tempelrede" ', in Gross (ed.), *Jeremia und die 'deuteronomistische Bewegung'*, pp. 181-85.

36.

אם היטיב תיטיבו את דרכיכם ואת מעלליכם		7.5
שובו נא איש מדרכו הרעה ומרע מעלליכם		25.5
שבו נא איש מדרכו הרעה והיטיבו מעלליכם		35.15

37. We find in Jer. 25 a paronomasia with the roots שוב and ישב, quite comparable to that produced by שוב and שבה in 1 Kgs 8.46-48.

38. According to the LXX; the MT has 'YHWH'. For the priority of the LXX, cf. most recently G. Wanke, *Jeremia. I. Jeremia 1,1–25,14* (ZBK.AT, 20,1: Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1995), p. 224.

expressly refers to Jeremiah 7[39] and already prepares for the statements of Jeremiah 35.[40] We get the impression that Jeremiah 7, 25 and 35 function as 'pillars' of the Dtr composition of Jeremiah. It is hardly conceivable that the relations between these three chapters would be a simple result of chance.

Within the whole of Jeremiah 7–35, other connections become evident. Jer. 11.1-13 is a long Dtr sermon[41] taking note of the breach of the covenant by the people being addressed who are reproached for returning to the sins of 'their first ancestors'[42] (האבות הראשנים, 11.10). Despite the Dtr insistence on the theme of the ancestors, the latter are not characterized as ראשנים in the Dtr literature[43] except in this place. In the book of Jeremiah this phrase is only understandable in connection with the other key text on the covenant, Jer. 31.31-34. This text, whose Dtr character seems difficult to call into question,[44] functions, on the

39. Cf. 7.13//25.3-4; 7.25//25.4; 7.24, 26//25.4; 7.6, 9//25.6; 7.18-19//25.6-7; 7.34//25.10-11; cf. also the synopsis in Römer, *Israels Väter*, p. 459.

40. Cf. in particular 25.3-6 and 35.14-15 and the synopsis in Thiel, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 1–25*, p. 267.

41. Cf. for example McKane, *Jeremiah*, pp. 244-46; Wanke, *Jeremia*, p. 119.

42. This quite uncommon phrase probably refers in the Dtr context to the 'original sin' of the people, namely, the veneration of the golden calf; cf. for more details, T. Römer, 'Les "anciens" pères (Jér 11,10) et la "nouvelle" alliance (Jér 31,31)', *BN* 59 (1991), pp. 23-27.

43. Just one other text in the Old Testament has the same construction, Isa. 43.27: חטא הראשון אביך. Job 8.8 puts דר רישון and אבות parallel. In Deut. 19.14; Isa. 61.4; Qoh. 1.11 ראשנים is used to designate ancestors in general; Lev. 26.45 mentions a covenant concluded with the ראשנים after the Exodus; Ps. 79.8 is quite close to Jer. 11.10, since it speaks of עונת ראשנים.

44. In spite of numerous attempts to attribute Jer. 31.31-34 to the prophet Jeremiah, the Dtr character of this pericope can, in my opinion, scarcely be contested (cf. especially S. Herrmann, *Die prophetischen Heilserwartungen im Alten Testament: Ursprung und Gestaltwandel* [BWANT, 85; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1965], pp. 179-81; 195-97; S. Böhmer, *Heimkehr und neuer Bund: Studien zu Jeremiah 30–31* [Göttinger Texte und Arbeiten, 5; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976], pp. 75-77; Thiel, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 26–45*, pp. 24-26). C. Levin (*Die Verheissung des neuen Bundes in ihrem theologiegeschichtlichen Zusammenhang ausgelegt* [FRLANT, 137; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985], p. 60) detects four layers (Dtr and post-Dtr) in these verses; this appears to me too complicated. He is right all the same in considering v. 33, which announces the inscription of the Torah in the heart of each one (cf. the tension between 'the days are coming', v. 31a and 'after these days' in v. 33a), as a late addition. Verse 34 could be situated on the same redactional level.

compositional level, as the response to the report of Jer. 11.10-12 and takes up again word for word the phrases of Jer. 11.4 and 10:

לא כברית אשר כרתי את אבותם ביום...להוציאם מארץ מצרים 31.32a
בריתי אשר כרתי את אבותם 11.4 ביום תוציאי אותם מארץ מצרים 11.10

In the same way the recalling of the breaking of the covenant in 31.32b clearly refers to 11.10.

אשר המה הפרו את בריתי 31.32b
הפרו...את בריתי 11.10

If Jer. 11.1-13 and 31.31-34* can be understood as the two poles[45] of the Dtr reflection on the *berît*, we understand as well that the utilization of the adjective ראשון in 11.10 refers ahead to חדש in 31.31. This pair 'old [first]–new' is found frequently in exilic texts.[46] Isa. 42.9 is especially interesting: הראשנות הנה באו וחדשות אני מגיד: 'See, the former things have passed, and now I announce new things'. In Jer. 31.31-34, it is in comparison with the ancestors that the 'newness' of the covenant is described. Just as in Deut. 5.3, the ancestors symbolize the past in order to insist on the fact that the covenant in question will be 'present'.[47] In the case of Jer. 31.31-34 that means: the covenant will be new because God does not take into account the ancient times to which the אבותם הראשים of 11.10 referred. Thus this unique phrase is at the service of a bipolar structure by means of which the Dtr editors of Jeremiah seek to link together the explanation of the catastrophe and the hope of a new beginning.

Other examples of the compositional bonds between the different Dtr texts of Jeremiah could be added to the remarks that I have just set out (for example, Jer. 7.21-24 'prepares for' 11.1-5; Jer. 30.1-3 and Jer. 31.31-34 frame the Dtr edition of the 'book of consolation').[48] It seems

---

In that case, Jer. 31.31-32 can scarcely be considered as going beyond the ideology of a Dtr horizon, as has recently been suggested; cf. G. Fischer, 'Aufnahme, Wende und Überwindung dtn/r Gedankengutes in Jer 30f.', in Gross (ed.), *Jeremia und die 'deuteronomistische Bewegung'*, pp. 129-39).

45. It is in relation to Jer. 11 that the surprising conclusion of 31.32 makes sense: ואנכי בעלתי בם can be understood as an allusion to לקטר לבעל in 11.13: Israel has served Baal while forgetting that its 'true Baal' is YHWH.

46. Isa. 42.9; 43.19; 48.6; 62.2; 65.17; 66.22; Jer. 31.22; Ezek. 11.19; 18.31; 36.26; Lam. 3.23.

47. For the interpretation of this text, cf. Römer, *Israels Väter*, pp. 45-53.

48. Cf. N. Lohfink, 'Die Gotteswortverschachtelung in Jer 30–31', in L. Rup-

---

therefore that the idea of a coherent Dtr redaction of Jeremiah must be recognized. This first redaction, however, did not necessarily include the whole book in its present form. We have seen that Jeremiah 7, 25 and 35 constituted the three pillars of Dtr Jeremiah, and they could really mark out the extent of the first Dtr redaction of the book which would comprise the two large sections 7–24 (25)—(25) 26–35. A number of observations confirm this possibility. First, as I have mentioned, the formula of the gift of the land to the ancestors is found for the first time in Jer. 7.7 and for the last time in 35.15. Several typically Dtr phrases are attested only within this portion of Jeremiah. קרא ולא ענה is found only in 7.13, 27 and 35.15; היטיב מעלליכם occurs in 7.3, 5; 18.11; 26.3 and 35.15; the introductory formula 'the word that came to Jeremiah from YHWH' is used only between 7.1 and 35.1.[49] Jeremiah 7 is the first, Jeremiah 35 the last of the prose discourses constructed according to the same plan.[50]

In this perspective, L. Stulman's study[51] provides some supplementary arguments. His charts show that the Dtr phrases that are attested both in Deuteronomy–2 Kings and in Jeremiah are found in 77 per cent of the cases within these chs. 7–35. On the other hand, the turns of phrase declared 'Dtr' in the research, but limited to Jeremiah, appear in 56 per cent of the cases outside of this collection. Stulman's analysis confirms the thesis of a Dtr redaction of Jeremiah closely linked to DH, and extending from Jeremiah 7 to 35. H. Cazelles and C. Levin have moreover envisaged Jeremiah 35 as the conclusion of a Dtr or exilic redaction of Jeremiah.[52] Furthermore, the collection Jeremiah 2–6[53]

---

pert *et al.* (eds.), *Künder des Wortes* (Festschrift J. Schreiner; Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1982), pp. 105-19 (106).

49. In 44.1 'from YHWH' is missing. For the occurrences cf. Pohlmann, *Studien zum Jeremiabuch*, p. 167.

50. Cf. Nicholson, *Preaching to the Exiles*, p. 34.

51. L. Stulman, *The Prose Sermons in the Book of Jeremiah: A Redescription of the Correspondences with Deuteronomistic Literature in the Light of Recent Text-critical Research* (SBLDS, 83; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), pp. 33-44.

52. Cf. H. Cazelles, 'La production du livre de Jérémie dans l'histoire ancienne d'Israël', *Masses ouvrières* 343 (1978), pp. 9-31 (24-25); Levin, *Die Verheissung des neuen Bundes*, p. 158.

53. For the redactional history of this section, cf. in particular M. Biddle, *A Redaction History of Jeremiah 2:1–4:2* (ATANT, 77; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1990) and R. Liwak, *Der Prophet und die Geschichte: Eine literar-historische Untersuchung zum Jeremiabuch* (BWANT, 121; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1987).

bears no traces indicating a Dtr redaction. In the same way, the accounts of Jeremiah 37–52 are not really typically Dtr.[54] The whole of Jeremiah 1–44 (45)[55] is consequently due to one or several late Dtr (Dtr[2] Jeremiah) or post-Dtr redactions. In Jeremiah 1 (dating and vocation), a mixture of Dtr style and post-exilic prophecy can be observed;[56] at the end of the book, chs. 43–44 seem to express the situation of a well installed Egyptian diaspora: these texts probably reflect, therefore, the context of the Persian period.[57] Finally, the redactional work on the book will have continued at least until the end of the Hellenistic period, as the differences between the LXX and the MT especially indicate.[58]

Let us return now to the problem of the link between the first Dtr redaction of Jeremiah and DH. As we have seen, some authors postulate an almost insurmountable opposition between Dtr Jeremiah and DH. But an examination of the key Dtr texts of Jeremiah makes that thesis difficult to support.

Thus, the sermon of Jeremiah 11 on the covenant prescribed for the ancestors (cf. Judg. 2.20) at the time of the coming out of Egypt (11.3-4) corresponds to the wording of DH. The idea that *berît* and exodus are closely linked is also found in the Dtr redaction of the historical books, as Deut. 29.24 and 1 Kgs 8.21 show. Obedience to the *berît*, to which Jeremiah 11 commits the people, without any doubt alludes to the *berît* concluded with Israel by Moses, as appealed to in the book of Deuteronomy. It is a matter therefore, on the literary level, of an explicit

---

54. Cf. below.

55. I shall not go into the problem here of the oracles against the nations.

56. Cf. S. Herrmann, *Jeremia* (BKAT, 12.1; Neukirchen–Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1986), pp. 52-55.

57. Cf. A. de Pury and T. Römer, 'Terres d'exil et terres d'accueil. Quelques réflexions sur le judaïsme postexilique face à la Perse et à l'Egypte', *Trans-euphratène* 9 (1995), pp. 25-34 (30-31).

58. At this level, it becomes extremely difficult to know whether it is a matter of an intervention with a comprehensive design or simply occasional corrections. Here the thesis of the 'rolling corpus' (McKane) finds its justification. A special problem is presented by the many doublets within the book, showing the complexity of the redactional process; cf. on this point the contribution of J.D. Macchi, 'Les doublets dans le livre de Jérémie', in A. Curtis and T. Römer (eds.), *The Book of Jeremiah and its Reception. Le livre de Jérémie et sa réception* (BETL, 128; Leuven: University Press and Peeters, 1997), pp. 119-50.

---

reference to the book of Deuteronomy;[59] this constitutes the perspective from which Jeremiah 11 depicts an anti-history of salvation for which the addressees bear the whole responsibility.

The Dtr version of the vision of the good and bad figs is characterized by the idea that the punishment by YHWH of the people implies the removal of all the inhabitants of Palestine[60] (24.8-10; cf. also Jer. 25.11, Dtr). This same ideology is found at the end of DH (cf. 2 Kgs 25.21 and 25.26)[61] and in a certain way as well in the prayer of 1 Kings 8.[62]

We must come back to the central text in the discussion of Dtr ideology in the book of Jeremiah, namely, the discourse on the temple of Jer. 7.1-14 (15).[63] This text, which has played an important role in the discussion of the 'historical Jeremiah', is clearly a production of Dtr redactors,[64] leaving no possibility of reconstructing an authentic oracle.[65] But can we say, with Stipp and others, that this text rejects the temple and is opposed to the cultic theology of DH?[66] The structure of the text is that of a sermon in the form of an alternative. After an introduction, v. 3 sums up the aim of the text: 'Amend your ways…and I will let you dwell in this place'. There follow two sections that present an alternative to the hearer. The first section (vv. 4-7) begins with an exhortation ('Do not trust in lying words'), followed by a 'citation' of

---

59. The allusions in Jer. 11 to the book of Deuteronomy are many. Some examples: the appeal 'to listen to the voice of YHWH' and the covenant formula in v. 4 and in v. 5 is a combination of Deut. 7.8 and 8.18. The announcement that YHWH is going to bring upon Israel the words of the covenant (v. 8 MT), even disaster (v. 11), means the realization of the potentiality of the curses in Deut. 28.15-69.

60. Cf. Pohlmann, *Studien zum Jeremiabuch*, p. 28.

61. Verse 21 notes that 'Judah was deported far from its land', and v. 26 concludes the first version of DH with the descent of the rest of the people (who according to v. 26 no longer belonged to 'Judah') to Egypt, thus realizing the last curse of Deut. 28.68.

62. Verse 46 speaks of the exile of the sons of Israel without envisaging the population left in the country.

63. Verse 15 is probably an addition (cf. Rudolph, *Jeremia*, p. 54). Without this verse, the two parts of the discourse both end with a recalling of the gift of the land made to the ancestors (v. 7 and v. 14).

64. The list in Stulman (*The Prose Sermons in the Book of Jeremiah*, pp. 33-44) brings to light 92 Dtr turns of phrase in Jer. 7.1-15.

65. For the history of research and the Dtr character of this text, cf. recently Seidl, 'Jeremias Tempelrede'.

66. Cf. below.

these words, then the following verses define a condition expressed in prescriptions which are both social (do not oppress, etc.) and cultic (do not run after other gods). At the end of the announcement of this condition, we meet again the promise of v. 3: 'then I will make you dwell[67] in this place', a place identified as the 'land I have given to your ancestors'. The second section (vv. 8-14) takes up again the vocabulary of the first section, but passes to specifics: in place of 'do not trust in lying words', we find in v. 8: 'Here you are, relying on lying words'. The social and cultic prescriptions become accusations (for example, the fact of running after other gods, v. 9). In v. 2, those addressed have been summoned to listen; v. 13 says on the contrary 'you have not listened', and introduces the announcement of judgment: just as the ancient sanctuary of Shilo has been destroyed, YHWH will do the same to 'the place[68] that I have given to you and your ancestors' (v. 14).

This structure makes it clear that the goal of the discourse is not criticism of the temple as sanctuary.[69] It is a popular magical and blind confidence in the temple that is denounced; vv. 10-11, in characterizing the temple as the place where the שם of YHWH has been proclaimed (cf., for example, 1 Kgs 8.29-30), show a high esteem for the temple.[70] Jeremiah 7 wishes above all to explain the reason for the destruction of the temple by linking up its cult to the obedience to the Deuteronomic Torah. It is because the ethical and cultic prescriptions of Deuteronomy have not been respected that the destruction of the temple and the deportation have been produced. For the Dtrs of Jeremiah, the temple is not important as a place of ritual sacrifices (cf. Jer. 7.22), but as a privileged place where Israel can invoke the one who brought them out of Egypt and the one who is to be honoured by respect for the *berît* (cf. Jer. 10.24 and Deut. 5.33). It follows that there is no tension between the theological conception of Dtr Jeremiah and of DH. T. Seidl states it

---

67. It is necessary to retain in vv. 3 and 7 the MT as the more difficult reading against Aquila and the Vulgate which read 'I will dwell with you'. For the 'authentic Jeremiah' the MT causes a problem, but not for the situation of the Dtr redactors.

68. Jer. 7 maintains a certain ambiguity as regards מקום, which can mean at the same time the country and the temple (the two gifts from YHWH to the people). Such use of מקום occurs also in Deuteronomy; cf. 1.30-31; 9.7; 11.4-5; 26.9; 29.7.

69. Cf. Carroll, *Jeremiah* (OTL), p. 209: 'The sermon is not a statement against the temple worship'.

70. Cf. E. Holt, 'Jeremiah's Temple Sermon and the Deuteronomists: An Investigation of the Redactional Relationship between Jeremiah 7 and 26', *JSOT* 36 (1986), pp. 73-87 (75).

---

very clearly: 'Jer. 7 does not show any difference with the deuteronomic law or with the Deuteronomistic History. On the contrary, there is a convergence with the deuteronomi(sti)c corpora of the OT, concerning central themes and intentions.[71]

This convergence can also be emphasized on the redactional level. Jeremiah 7 seems to me to be conceived as a guarantor of DH's key text on the temple, namely, 1 Kings 8, the great prayer of Solomon at the time of the inauguration of the sanctuary. These two chapters refer to one another on different levels. Both discourses envisage and explain the destruction of the temple and the exile; the two texts weave a close link between the temple, the city and the land (cf. 1 Kgs 8.48). In DH the phrase about the gift of the land to the ancestors appears for the first time in 1 Kings 8, in Jeremiah for the first time in Jeremiah 7. 1 Kings 8.34 wonders as Jer. 7.7 does about the conditions that Israel must fulfil in order to dwell in 'the land given to the ancestors'. In 1 Kgs 8.36 as in Jer. 7.3, 5 it is a question of 'good ways' in which the addressees are called to walk. And in a general way, 1 Kings 8, like Jeremiah 7, deals with 'good utilization' of the temple. The possibility of the destruction announced by Solomon (1 Kgs 8.46-51) is confirmed by the prophecy in Jer. 7.8-15. Such links demonstrate a wish to put DH and Dtr Jeremiah in contact.[72] There is not therefore competition but rather concordance! This acknowledgment is valid for all the great Dtr texts in Jeremiah. Thus Rendtorff has underlined for Jer. 25.1-13 the 'clear connections with the summary Deuteronomistic interpretation of the history of Israel in II Kings 17'.[73] It seems consequently that the Dtr sermons in Jeremiah play the same compositional role as the 'chapters of reflection' (according to Noth's terminology) in DH. Furthermore,

---

71. Cf. Seidl, 'Jeremias Tempelrede', p. 175: 'Jr 7 zeigt keinerlei Divergenz zum deuteronomischen Gesetz oder zum DtrG, konvergiert vielmehr mit den klassischen deuteronomischen und deuteronomistischen Textkorpora des AT in zentralen Themen und Anliegen'.

72. Other parallels can be found: for example, 1 Kgs 8.29 and Jer. 7.10; the importance of the coming out of Egypt: 1 Kgs 8.21, 51 and Jer. 7.22 (this verse is not, strictly speaking, part of the temple discourse, but of the large unit 7.1–8.3 that can be considered a Dtr vade mecum of good and bad worship). We may also recall that Jer. 7 has many parallels with 2 Kgs 17, another key DH text (2 Kgs 17.3//Jer. 7.22; 2 Kgs 17.14//Jer. 7.24; 2 Kgs 17.16-17//Jer. 7.9, 31; 2 Kgs 17.18//Jer. 7.15, and so on).

73. R. Rendtorff, *The Old Testament: An Introduction* (London: SCM Press, 1985), p. 204.

the fact that the end of DH (2 Kgs 24–25) and Jeremiah 52 deal with the same events[74] shows that at a given moment the Dtr school wanted to establish 'cross-references' (Lohfink) between the two literary units.[75] However, the question of the absence of the prophet Jeremiah in 2 Kings 24–25 remains open. What is the reason therefore for this 'prophetic silence'[76] of DH with regard to Jeremiah?

3.2. *How Is Jeremiah, Missing from DH, Transformed into a Spokesperson for Dtr Ideology?*

The absence of Jeremiah from DH is explained, according to Koch, by the fact that the historical Jeremiah had announced an irreversible judgment, which could not be accepted by the Dtr redactors. This thesis presents a double problem: the criteria allowing for the reconstruction of the 'authentic' message of the prophet are at least ambiguous. Can it be postulated that the oldest texts of Jeremiah contain only announcements of calamity, as Pohlmann, for example, claims?[77] And can we be sure that the first edition of DH would have had as a priority the intention to bring a message of hope to its addressees?[78] Koch's solution is therefore weighed down with too many hypotheses.

We have seen that there is no ideological difference between DH and Dtr Jeremiah.[79] However, such is not the case for certain texts that seem

partially to reflect the 'historical Jeremiah', or to speak more prudently, another tradition on Jeremiah, especially chs. 32 and 37–43. The symbolic act of Jeremiah 32 (the buying of a field by Jeremiah) receives in v. 15b[80] the following interpretation: 'Houses and fields and vineyards will still be bought in this land'.[81] Here, the hope is very clearly nourished that life is going to continue in Judah in spite of the first (and the second?) deportation. Such a view is opposed to that of DH according to which 'Judah was deported entirely from its land' (2 Kgs 25.21; cf. also 25.26 where all the people remaining leave Palestine and make for Egypt). According to Jer. 39.14 and 40.2-6, the prophet chooses to remain with the non-exiled population in Judah, which implies the continuity of the relation between YHWH and the people in the land (cf. again 27.11). In these texts, we can observe with Seitz 'hopes for continued existence of the remnant community in the land'.[82] According to 40.6, Jeremiah becomes an adviser to Gedaliah, the governor installed by the Babylonians. 40.10-12 describes the prosperity of the community in the land: the people who took refuge with neighbours returned and benefited from an overabundant harvest, which is evidently the sign of a divine blessing. But these notices are missing in 2 Kings 25. The text of DH even seems to want to 'downplay the potential rule of Gedaliah'.[83] DH's reticence in comparison with the Jeremianic tradition can thus be explained by the fact that this tradition in its pre-Dtr form was clearly situated on the side of the non-exiles (39.14; 40.6; 42.10).[84] C.R. Seitz has shown that the nucleus of

---

74. This is not the place for a discussion on the complex relations that exist between these chapters; cf. on this subject C.R. Seitz, *Theology in Conflict: Reactions to the Exile in the Book of Jeremiah* (BZAW, 176; Berlin and New York: W. de Gruyter, 1989), pp. 266-69.

75. N. Lohfink, 'Gab es eine deuteronomistische Bewegung?', in Gross (ed.), *Jeremia und die 'deuteronomistische Bewegung'*, pp. 313-81 (360).

76. Cf. K. Koch, 'Das Profetenschweigen des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks', in J. Jeremias and L. Perlitt (eds.), *Die Botschaft und die Boten* (Festschrift H.W. Wolff; Neukirchen–Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1981), pp. 115-28.

77. Pohlmann, *Die Ferne Gottes*, pp. 115-17. Pohlmann goes still further by stating that only the texts announcing calamity without referring to YHWH form part of the ancient nucleus (p. 181). The idea of a late 'Yahwisation' of the judgment oracles seems to me to misjudge the very essence of biblical and semitic prophetism in general.

78. Let us recall that for Noth, the Dtr editor wanted to draw up a report of failure without any perspective on the future. This thesis was subsequently criticized, but this discussion is far from being closed.

79. If we accept Noth's thesis on the intention of DH, we could see the announcement of Jer. 31.31-34 contradicting the report of failure by DH. That apparent contradiction disappears if we situate Dtr Jeremiah a little later than DH

(as is done, for example, by Thiel, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion*).

80. According to the very critical Levin, we have here the trace of a word of the historical Jeremiah; cf. *Die Verheissung des neuen Bundes*, p. 159.

81. In the following verses, which probably belong to a Dtr redaction, this perspective is changed in favour of the Golah.

82. Seitz, *Theology in Conflict*, p. 223.

83. Seitz, *Theology in Conflict*, p. 217. According to Seitz, for the DH the only legitimate head is Jehoiachin (2 Kgs 25.27-30). This assertion depends on the (Nothian) thesis according to which these verses form the conclusion of the exilic edition of the DH. This view does not inevitably compel acceptance; cf. for example R.E. Friedman, 'From Egypt to Egypt: Dtr[1] to Dtr[2]', in B. Halpern and J. Levenson (eds.), *Traditions in Transformation: Turning Points in Biblical Faith. Essays Presented to Frank Moore Cross, Jr.* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1981), pp. 167-92.

84. Cf. K.F. Pohlmann, 'Erwägungen zum Schlusskapitel des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerkes. Oder: Warum wird der Prophet Jeremia in 2. Kön. 22–25

Jeremiah 37–42 (together with some other texts) could have formed a 'scribal chronicle', written by a member of the community remaining in the land who relates the events of 597–587 from the perspective of the population remained in the land.[85] The situation of the non-exiled is legitimated by the figure of Jeremiah. The descent into Egypt in 43.7 (which forms, according to Seitz, the original end of this chronicle)[86] is described as an action contrary to the will of God for whom life must continue in Judah (42.12). It is after the final deportation of 582 that this text would have arrived in Babylon where it would have been adapted to the perspective of the exiled, indeed even the Deuteronomists.

We can thus propose the following thesis for the 'Deuteronomization' of the Jeremianic tradition: the redactors of DH and the 'historical' Jeremiah (even certain traditions circulating in regard to him) are in conflict about the significance of the exile. Because of Jeremiah's position in favour of the non-exiled population, DH omits mentioning him (unlike Chronicles).[87] The Dtrs nevertheless could not totally ignore this prophet. Consequently, they compiled a Dtr version of Jeremiah 7–35*[88] insisting on the conformity of the message of the prophet with Dtr thought, without however speaking of his 'biography'. From the time when this biography or chronicle was known among the exiles as well, a second Dtr redaction of Jeremiah (Dtr² Jeremiah), showing some stylistic and ideological differences from DH and Dtr Jeremiah,[89]

nicht erwähnt?', in A.H.J. Gunneweg and O. Kaiser (eds.), *Textgemäss: Aufsätze und Beiträge zur Hermeneutik des Alten Testaments. Festschrift E. Würthwein* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979), pp. 94-109.

85. Seitz, *Theology in Conflict*, especially pp. 282-96. For Seitz, it is a matter of an eyewitness of the events, perhaps a member of the Shaphanite family (p. 285: 'though it cannot be established with absolute certainty').

86. Cf. his chart, p. 283.

87. This fact is a supplementary argument in favour of my thesis. As S. Japhet showed, the Chronicles have an indigenous vision of the origins of Israel, unlike Ezra–Nehemiah (cf. 'Composition and Chronology in the Book of Ezra–Nehemiah', in T.C. Eskenazi and K.H. Richards [eds.], *Second Temple Studies*. II. *Temple Community in the Persian Period* [JSOTSup, 175; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994], pp. 189-216).

88. As I have already emphasized, it is within these chapters that the Dtr style is most pronounced, unlike chs. 2–6 and 37–43.

89. For more details, cf. Römer, *Israels Väter*, pp. 422-91.

was imperative. It integrates the chs. 2–6*[90] and 37–43* with the help of chs. 1 and 44–45 and frames the new edition of Jeremiah, revised and corrected, with the leitmotif of the disobedience of the ancestors (2.5 and 44.9).[91] This theme shows a certain scepticism in the face of the optimistic attempts at restoration. We can therefore situate this second Dtr redaction in the Persian period. Let us mention again the fact that Dtr² Jeremiah transforms the Dtr formula of the 'land given to the ancestors' into that of the 'Torah given to the ancestors' (44.10);[92] this formula could express the interests of a Golah transformed into a diaspora, for which the Torah becomes the means par excellence to speak of the relation between YHWH and Israel. For this redaction, the status of the prophet Jeremiah can only be defined in relation to this written Torah, as Jeremiah 36 clearly shows, and this gives to the 'scribal chronicle' of Jeremiah 37–43 a new perspective for interpretation.[93]

4. *By Way of a Conclusion: The Scroll and the Prophet (Jeremiah 36)*

Despite the repeated attempts to utilize Jeremiah 36 as a historical document,[94] it should first of all be read as a theological statement[95] seeking to interpret the reasons for the catastrophe and to define that status of the prophetic word in the face of a written support. This account of the burnt scroll has numerous parallels with the account of the scroll found in 2 Kings 22–23.[96] It matters little to us here to know

90. It is a matter of an independent collection that has probably been subjected to a specific redaction before being integrated into the 'great book' of Jeremiah; cf. Liwak, *Der Prophet und die Geschichte*.

91. Cf. also 3.25; 7.26; 17.23; 34.13. 16.11 and 23.27 belong to Dtr Jeremiah.

92. Cf. Römer, *Israels Väter*, pp. 467-70.

93. For the redactional framing of chs. 37–43 by ch. 36 and chs. 44–45, see in particular Seitz, *Theology in Conflict*, pp. 289-91: 'Chs. 36 and 45 are made to function together as framing units' (p. 289). Cf. also Stipp, 'Probleme des redaktionsgeschichtlichen Modells', p. 254, who speaks of a 'Dtr sound, but post-Dtr text-group'.

94. Cf. recently K. Seybold, *Der Prophet Jeremia: Leben und Werk* (Urban Taschenbücher, 416; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1993), pp. 29-30.

95. Cf. especially Carroll, *Jeremiah* (OTL), pp. 662-68.

96. Cf. C.D. Isbell, '2 Kings 22–23 and Jer 36: A Stylistic Comparison', *JSOT* 8 (1978), pp. 33-45; Carroll, *Jeremiah* (OTL), pp. 663-64; G. Minette de Tillesse, 'Joiaqim, repoussoir du "Pieux" Josias: Parallélismes entre II Reg 22 et Jer 36', *ZAW* 105 (1993), pp. 352-76.

about the literary dependence of these two accounts;[97] what is important is the fact that the two texts should be read and understood in relation to each other.[98] The two accounts are linked together around the 'publication' of a written text, previously unknown to the people and the king (Josiah in 2 Kgs 22, Jehoiakim in Jer. 36). The scroll is transmitted to the king in 2 Kgs 22.8 by the secretary Shaphan; in Jer. 36.11-19, it is also the Shaphanite family that plays the intermediary role. The message of the book is characterized by the root רעה (2 Kgs 22.16; Jer. 36.31) and by the following announcement: 'Great is the anger (and the wrath) of YHWH' (2 Kgs 22.16; Jer. 36.7). The announcement of the divine wrath calls for a reform, a conversion to avoid the disaster (2 Kgs 23.1-25; Jer. 36.3, 7). The reaction of the two kings is described in an antithetical way: Josiah tears (קרע) his clothes, a visible sign of his repentance (2 Kgs 22.11, 19); Jehoiakim and his servants do not tear (לא קרעו) their garments (Jer. 36.24). Josiah listens (שמע) and this listening implies obedience (2 Kgs 22.11, 18, 19), while Jehoiakim listens without listening (Jer. 36.24). Josiah burns the objects for illegitimate worship (we find seven times the root שרף for five different objects: 23.4, 6, 11 [2×], 16, 20). Jehoiakim on the contrary burns the book (שרף in 36.25, 27, 28, 29, 32).[99] After these reactions, Josiah is rewarded with the announcement of a burial 'in peace' (22.20),[100] unlike Jehoiakim who is denied at the same time a successor and a burial (36.30).

It follows therefore that the two texts contrast two archetypes of behaviour in the face of the divine word and that they can be read as two accounts of reform and anti-reform. Josiah shows in an exemplary

97. According to Isbell, Jer. 36 depends on 2 Kgs 22–23; Minette de Tillesse defends the reverse relation.

98. In 2 Kgs 22–23, a second Dtr redaction in the Persian period can be detected, inserting the motif of the book that was found; cf. on this subject T. Römer, 'Transformation in Deuteronomistic and Biblical Historiography: On "Book-Finding" and other Literary Strategies', *ZAW* 109 (1997), pp. 1-11.

99. Contrary to what Isbell states ('2 Kings 22–23 and Jer. 36'), the number of attestations is not identical in the two texts.

100. It has often been observed that this announcement is in tension with the death of Josiah on a battlefield (2 Kgs 23.29). Verse 30 notes however that he was buried in his tomb, and in a (post-)exilic perspective בשלום has probably been understood in the sense that the king did not have to live through the cataclysm of 597–587; cf. E. Würthwein, *Die Bücher der Könige: 1 Kön. 17–2 Kön. 25* (ATD, 11.2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984), pp. 451-52.

way what should be done to avoid the catastrophe: Jeremiah 36 shows that this chance was not taken.[101] 2 Kings 22 and Jeremiah 36 can however also be read as reflections on the relation between the prophetic word and the book. In Jeremiah 36, Jeremiah is absent from the actual account (v. 5: there was an 'obstacle'); he appears only in the prologue and the epilogue. The central stake is the obedience in regard to the דברי הספר (36.22). The same phrase appears in 2 Kgs 22.16, where the oracle of the prophetess Huldah consists of a confirmation and an exegesis of the words of the book. The prophets are in retirement in relation to the book, which means that the two accounts insist on the priority of the book in relation to the prophetic word (Jer. 36 also ends with the production of another book). If 2 Kings 22 and Jeremiah 36 come from a Dtr milieu, they can therefore be considered as an attempt at a 'taking over' of the prophetic milieu by the Dtr scribes. This is in accordance moreover with the idea (whose origin is perhaps 'Dtr')[102] according to which the Persian period would imply the end of prophecy (cf. Dan. 9.24; *B. Bat.* 12b).[103]

For the book of Jeremiah, ch. 36 forms in some way the outcome of the Dtr transformation of the prophet. After having been transformed from a prophet for those not exiled into a Dtr preacher (Dtr Jeremiah), Jeremiah now becomes (Dtr[2] Jeremiah) the producer and the guarantor of the book that will give to post-exilic Judaism the means *par excellence* to find its identity. Jeremiah 36 is therefore also the account of a transfer of authority: the written word has replaced the prophet. 36.32 speaks of 'many other words' that were added to the new book edited by Jeremiah and Baruch,[104] which is probably an allusion to other Dtr and post-Dtr redactional interventions. But that is another story…

101. This is why Jer. 36 is dated to 605, the year of the battle of Carchemish whose outcome definitively made the Babylonians the dominant power in the ancient Near East. The oracles of Jer. 4–6 announcing the arrival of the enemy from the North are going to be realized; cf. Carroll, *Jeremiah* (OTL), p. 663.

102. Cf. R.F. Person, *Second Zechariah and the Deuteronomic School* (JSOTSup, 167; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), pp. 193-99, who refers especially to Jer. 23.33-40 (Dtr).

103. 'From the day when the temple was destroyed, divine inspiration was taken away from the prophets and given to the wise' (*B. Bat.* 12b).

104. An edition that corresponds in our terminology to Dtr[2] Jeremiah.