Josiah's Reform and Jeremiah's Scroll

Josiah's Reform and Jeremiah's Scroll

Historical Calamity and Prophetic Response

Mark Leuchter

CONTENTS

FOREWORD

The present monograph is based upon research for a PhD dissertation I completed at the University of Toronto in May 2003. I am reticent, though, to say that this work is an adaptation of the dissertation. Much has indeed changed, many ideas have been reconsidered, and features that received only slight discussion in the dissertation have taken on far greater importance in the present study. If nothing else, this process proved to me just how significantly the redaction history of a document bears upon the development of a particular ideological trajectory.

Most of the research behind this monograph was conducted while I held the Ray D. Wolfe Fellowship in Jewish Studies at the University of Toronto from 2002 to 2003. It was an honor to work with such inspiring and supportive scholars as those in the Jewish Studies faculty, the Department of Near and Middle Eastern Civilization, and the Centre for the Study of Religion (my home department for my years of graduate study). I am particularly thankful to David Novak, Kenneth Green, and Derek Penslar, who gave me the opportunity to contribute to their program as an instructor, and to my friend David Miller, who taught me much about the world within and beyond the halls of academia. I am also very grateful to Jim Dicenso and Thomas McIntire, who guided me as a graduate student toward my current field of research, and to the late Gerald Sheppard, a caring teacher and wonderful scholar who is sorely missed.

I am indebted to many colleagues and mentors who helped me shape my ideas over the last several years. Brian Peckham served as my dissertation director and graced me with his encyclopedic knowledge, warmth, and encouragement, and I owe him more than I can adequately express herein. I also must thank Peter Machinist for his many helpful comments on my early manuscript, and Marc Brettler, Mark Smith, Gary Rendsburg, and Baruch Halpern for their consistent support and availability. I am deeply grateful for the insights of Bernie Levinson, Bill Schniedewind, Boyd Barrick, Joyce Rilett Wood, Jeff Geoghegan, and Ben Sommer, and to Steve Weitzman and Hindy Najman who offered advice and much needed perspective as I prepared this work for publication.

I also must extend my deep gratitude to the staff at Sheffield Phoenix Press, especially David Clines and Ailsa Parkin, for their assistance in bringing this work to fruition. For the typesetting and copy-editing, I thank the ever-cheerful Duncan Burns of Forthcoming Publications (whose patience and diligence were nothing short of inspirational).

Finally, I must thank my family. It is from them that I drew my initial intellectual inspiration, spending countless Friday evenings debating issues over Shabbat dinner or exploring the relevance of Haggadah passages while convened around our family's Seder table every Passover. This book is dedicated to them.

Author's Note: The Tetragrammaton will be rendered 'Yahweh' or ′ה, depending on the context of the discussion. All dates are BCE unless otherwise noted.

When biblical passages are being *compared*, the chapter and verse information will precede the text and be followed by a long dash; otherwise, whenever the passage reference is not clearly indicated in the discussion leading up to a biblical quotation, the chapter and verse will be information placed within parentheses following the text.

ABBREVIATIONS

ABD	David Noel Freedman (ed.), *The Anchor Bible Dictionary* (New York: Doubleday, 1992)
AB	Anchor Bible Series
AfO	Archiv für Orientforschung
AOAT	*Alter Orient und Altes Testament*
ASTI	*Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute*
BA	*Biblical Archaeologist*
BAR	*Biblical Archaeology Review*
BASOR	*Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*
BJS	*Brown Judaic Studies*
BR	*Bible Review*
BSA	British School of Archaeology in Iraq
BZ	*Biblische Zeitschrift*
BZAW	*Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
CRBS	*Currents in Research: Biblical Studies*
DH	The Deuteronomistic History
E	Elohist
FOTL	The Forms of the Old Testament Literature Series
HAR	*Hebrew Annual Review*
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
HUCA	*Hebrew Union College Annual*
IB	*Interpreter's Bible*
IDB	G.A. Buttrick (ed.), *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* (New York/Nashville: Abingdon, 1962)
IEJ	*Israel Exploration Journal*
IOS	*Israel Oriental Studies*
IOSCS	*International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*
J	Yahwist
JAAR	*Journal of the American Academy of Religion*
JANES	*Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society*
JAOS	*Journal of the American Oriental Society*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JCS	*Journal of Cuneiform Studies*
JHS	*Journal of Hebrew Scriptures (http://purl.org/jhs)*
JJS	*Journal of Jewish Studies*
JNES	*Journal of Near Eastern Studies*
JNWSL	*Journal of Northwest Semitic languages*
JSOT	*Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*

JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series
JSS	*Journal of Semitic Studies*
LXX	Septuagint
MT	Masoretic Text
OAN	Oracles against the Nations
OBO	Orbis biblicus et orientalis
OTE	Old Testament Essays
OTL	Old Testament Library
OTS	*Oudtestamentische Studiën*
P	Priestly tradition
SAA	*State Archives of Assyria*
SBAB	Stuttgarter biblische Aufsatzbände
SBLDS	SBL Dissertation Series
SBLMS	SBL Monograph Series
SBLSBS	SBL Sources for Biblical Study
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology
TLZ	*Theologische Literaturzeitung*
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
VTSup	Vetus Testamentum, Supplement Series
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
ZA	*Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*

INTRODUCTION

> For you have as many cities as you have gods, O Judah. (Jer. 2.28)

This quote, applied to the population of Judah, might easily be lifted and applied to the population of scholars who have attempted over the years to analyze the book in which it appears, which is to say that there are as many theories concerning the book and person of Jeremiah as there are theorists. We hear a confluence of voices in every direction, arguing for the text's fidelity to or independence from the prophet's ideas, or the ascription of various passages to the prophet or to later writers. We find scholars who see a distinct order to the Jeremianic corpus and others who see it as chaotic. Some see a unity to various blocks while others see discordant editorial layers. There are those who see texts that speak to an early period of Jeremiah's career, those who argue for a later period of his activity, and those who are reticent to say anything about the relationship between the prophet and the texts at all.

There is only one basic consensus at the center of this maelstrom of discourse, and that is that the text in question is commonly associated with an ancient Israelite prophet named Jeremiah. Any investigation of the book of Jeremiah must therefore take into account the eponymous figure behind it, however one might understand the relationship between the literature and the prophet. Mowinckel's old source paradigm[1] is useful in distinguishing the various forms of literature in the book but does not account for the degree to which the other materials directly relate to authentic Jeremianic tradition, if not directly to the prophet himself. Bright took this issue into account in his study of the parenetic prose (Mowinckel's C source) by arguing that the passages in question reflect Jeremianic thought, preserved by his tradition circle and employing the literary standards of the late seventh–sixth centuries BCE.[2] Muilenberg made a similar proposal by attributing the shaping of the book for the most part to Baruch,[3] while Nicholson argued that much of the discourse results from Deuteronomistic expansion that took place within

---

1. S. Mowinckel, *Zur Komposition des Buches Jeremia* (Kristiania: J. Dybwad, 1914).
2. J. Bright, 'The Date of the Prose Sermons of Jeremiah', *JBL* 70 (1951), pp. 15-35.
3. J. Muilenberg, 'Baruch the Scribe', in J. Durham and J.R. Porter (eds.), *Proclamation and Presence: Old Testament Essays in Honour of Gwynne Henton Davies* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1983 [repr. of 1970 edn]), pp. 215-38.

the exilic Babylonian community with the aim of keeping the Jeremianic voice alive.[4]

Despite these differences, the majority of these scholars tend to agree that the prophet Jeremiah somehow stood behind the traditions in his book to one degree or another. Historical reconstruction was not necessarily the only interest of scholars studying the book of Jeremiah, but it remained a dependable staple. Recent trends into the study of the book have moved in a very different direction.

Literary Criticism of the Book of Jeremiah

Many scholars begin and end their analysis of Jeremiah with a consideration of the text and the text alone, irrespective of the historical forces or writers behind it. This can be a worthwhile endeavor, as advances in the field of literary criticism are important to understanding how the book of Jeremiah works as literature. There are countless textures, codes, ciphers, and symbolic valences within its chapters, and literary analyses can lead to a fruitful appreciation of how those elements function. These types of studies come to important conclusions concerning the formal relationship between the book of Jeremiah and other biblical texts (or non-biblical literary works), but scholars who engage the text in this manner often conclude that historical reconstructions are not worthwhile, as the text cannot reveal anything beyond itself. Information concerning dates, events, places, and individuals are viewed not as historical resources but strictly as literary *topoi*. This view extends not only to the text as a witness to history but also to any attempt to account for the chronology of the text's development. In essence, this scholarly trend tells us that we must divorce any presumptions about Jeremiah the man from the literary work bearing a similar name. A recent article by M. Kessler articulates this perspective as applied to the oracles against Babylon found in Jeremiah 50–51:

> Because this is not history, it will be more fruitful if we de-emphasize historical questions…if we wish to serve the faithful community best, we should try to shape the picture that is consistent with the literature itself… We cannot arrive at the prophet's *ipsissima verba* or paint a portrait of the historical Jeremiah. Reading numerous commentaries and their judgments about what is 'authentic' and what is not, or what could be Jeremiah speaking, and what could not possibly be him, becomes not only tiresome, it provides no help in understanding the text.[5]

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

5.   M. Kessler, 'The Function of Chapters 25 and 50–51 in the Book of Jeremiah', in A.R.P. Diamond, K.M. O'Connor, and L. Stulman (eds.), *Troubling Jeremiah* (JSOTSup, 260; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), pp. 64-72 (72).

Kessler is correct insofar as the sacred vitality of the text to confessional communities must go beyond its ascription to specific writers or temporal periods. Certainly, Jeremiah 50–51 is not 'history' in any sense, and religious readings of the text need not be encumbered by the endeavor to date verses or chapters, or draw information from them that sheds light upon events of the past. Critical readings, however, must make room for the possibility that such endeavors are worthwhile. A text need not be historiographic in nature in order to provide historical information, yet the trend in modern scholarship concerning the book of Jeremiah has been to move away from such inquiry. The volume in which Kessler's statement appears (entitled *Troubling Jeremiah*) is dominated by scholarly works that highlight the multidimensionality of the Jeremianic corpus as a work of literature, not as a historical resource. This moves A.R.P. Diamond, one of the volume's editors, to state in his introductory comments that the one contribution to the volume addressing the history of the text and the prophet's role in shaping it represents an anomaly.[6] Diamond concludes his introduction with the following thoughts:

> Taken together, the essays in this volume press for an end to 'innocent' readings of Jeremiah…the turn to Jeremiah as a social semiotic discourse presses for an end to 'innocent' biblical theology readings that have companioned historical-critical orthodoxy in one fashion or another.[7]

Diamond's comments are offered in the service of looking to the Jeremianic text in symbolic ways, and there is much to be gained from such an approach. Yet to imply that historical-critical methods are simplistic ('innocent') is to reduce the value of the scholarly attempt to understand history and, consequently, to rely on an ancient text such as the book of Jeremiah as a historical resource. The text has its own voice, to be sure, but is the search for the concerns of its author or authors truly an 'innocent' endeavor, that is, an endeavor lacking real depth? Are historical-critical inquiries unable to yield results demonstrating the rich textures of the text at hand?

A major voice in the tradition of scholarship that has moved away from attempts to understand Jeremiah the man through Jeremiah the book is that of R.P. Carroll. Carroll's thorough studies of the book are predicated upon his contention that any attributions of texts to the prophet himself 'tend to harmonize discrete levels of tradition…by harmonizing contradictory and contrary elements'.[8] Carroll points out that the editorial presentation of the

---

6. A.R.P. Diamond, 'Introduction', in Diamond, O'Connor, and Stulman (eds.), *Troubling Jeremiah*, pp. 15-32 (25). Diamond refers to this essay (a redaction-critical study of Jer. 2–6 by M.A. Sweeney) as 'unrepentant historicism', though he does acknowledge the merit of such an inquiry.

7. Diamond, 'Introduction', p. 32.

8. R.P. Carroll, *From Chaos to Covenant* (New York: Crossroad, 1981); for the above-mentioned quote, see his *Jeremiah: A Commentary* (OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1986), p. 35.

book yields a deliberately constructed image of the prophet himself.[9] This is a reasonable assertion, but the same can be said about *any* historical personage who stood behind a work of literature related to that individual's name in later times. This does not obviate the role that subsequent shapers of the tradition may have had, but it also does not eliminate the historicity of the eponymous figure associated with it.[10] Carroll argues that, upon removing Jeremiah from the editorial complex of chs. 2–25, the prophet remains significant in only 'a few' of the narratives in the book.[11] The 'few' narratives, he claims, are Jeremiah 26; 28; 32.1-15; 35; 37; 38; 40.1-6; 42, and 43.1-7—these hardly number only a few, and most of these are pivotal in ascertaining the historical context for the other narratives and the poetic and prose addresses.

Carroll's antipathy to easy answers to problematic texts in the Jeremianic corpus is, to be sure, commendable. However, the *de facto* elimination of Jeremiah from the text is itself too easy a solution to the problems with which Carroll is concerned. It precludes consideration of the turbulent Judean history of the late seventh through early sixth centuries and their impact upon Jeremiah, his peers, his followers, his opponents, and the formation of texts that pertain to them.[12] It seems precipitous to excise Jeremiah from the mix. Carroll, by contrast, has opted to resist considering evidence that might at the very least reveal rhyme or reason and possibly provide a viable historical background to some of the material or the circumstances of its composition.[13] Indeed, the same volume that houses Kessler's comment contains various statements made by Carroll in his own contributed essays.[14] We should first consider a declaration of critical principles that typifies Carroll's lack of confidence in viewing the Jeremianic text as little more than a collection of generic literary *topoi*:

> I do not imagine or believe that the book of Jeremiah was written by the prophet Jeremiah or by the scribe Baruch…the anonymous poems constituting the bulk of the book of Jeremiah do not strike me as being the single

---

9. Carroll, *Jeremiah*, p. 36.

10. We need only look to the annals of the Neo-Assyrian kings for an analogue (e.g. Sennacherib's depiction of the siege against Jerusalem in 701, Sargon II's report of the fall of Samaria, etc.). Though they bear the mark of scribal formation, it seems too dramatic to marginalize the monarchs themselves from the formation of the text in the manner that Carroll proposes with regard to the Jeremianic corpus.

11. Carroll, *Jeremiah*, p. 36.

12. See P.J. King, *Jeremiah: An Archaeological Companion* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993), for an archaeological context for much of the Jeremianic materials.

13. R.P. Carroll, 'The Book of J: Intertextuality and Ideological Criticism', in Diamond, O'Connor, and Stulman (eds.), *Troubling Jeremiah*, pp. 220-43 (240).

14. Carroll, 'The Book of J'.

output of one writer who can in turn be identified as the prophet Jeremiah…
Cycles of material in the book reveal a conscious rearrangement and organization of material—disrupted by time, transmission, and further redactional transformation—which can hardly owe anything to the imagined historical circumstances of an equally imagined prophet.[15]

In another essay, appearing in the same volume, Carroll goes on to offer a concise but even more dramatic statement:

Whatever the more sanguine commentators on Jeremiah may say and think, I am still of the opinion that the book of Jeremiah is a very difficult, confused and confusing text. *I refuse not to be confused by it*.[16]

These statements raise a number of important issues that traditional scholarly readings must reckon with when engaging the text. It seems counterproductive, however, to adopt Carroll's approach as the fundamental guideline for embarking on a critical examination. It is a giant leap from admitting that the text possesses disparate literary features to claiming that it is historically impenetrable and tells us nothing about the authors to whom it is credited (and, by implication, that we should not bother trying to ask questions in that regard). In fact, Carroll himself provides all the evidence necessary to recognize the very crippling limitations of his approach, as the first statement cited above follows upon an introductory note at the outset of yet another article in the same volume:

This essay was first delivered as a paper to the Composition of Jeremiah Consultation meeting at the AAR/SBL Annual Meeting in Washington in 1993… two different published versions of it have appeared in quite distinctive publications and, as this version will demonstrate, it is still evolving…so what appears here will be an admixture of the original paper (in its varied forms) and my *rereadings and revisions* of it in the light of my own current thinking… I will, however, stick very close to the form and content of the paper(s) as given in Washington…in order to maintain a strong continuity between what I said in the early 1990s and what will appear in this the latest and final version of my thoughts…[17]

The irony is difficult to ignore. On one hand, Carroll asserts that his own message has undergone dramatic revisions, has appeared in different publications over a number of years, but nevertheless reflects an integrated trajectory of thought. On the other hand, Carroll denies the viability of the very same elements at work within the Jeremianic corpus: he maintains, strenuously, that the various revisions and editions of Jeremiah make it well-nigh

---

15. Carroll, 'The Book of J', pp. 226-28.
16. R.P. Carroll, 'Halfway through a Dark Wood: Reflections on Jeremiah 25', in Diamond, O'Connor, and Stulman (eds.), *Troubling Jeremiah*, pp. 73-86 (75 [Carroll's italics]).
17. Carroll, 'The Book of J', p. 221 (Carroll's italics).

impossible for the researcher to draw any information concerning the histori-
cal world behind the text. As he states elsewhere, 'the prophet is lost to the
scribe', that is, any figures traditionally associated with the composition of
the Jeremianic literature (i.e. Jeremiah and Baruch) have been divorced from
a place of serious consideration by virtue of the stages of redaction at the
hand of scribes that Carroll suggests date from dramatically later periods.[18]
By this very logic, a scholar living centuries from now who comes across
Carroll's essays in *Troubling Jeremiah* would be entitled to argue that Carroll
never wrote them (especially if the different versions had by then been dis-
covered), the editors credited on the cover of the volume never had anything
to do with the material within, and the material within can offer no useful
insights into the world of biblical scholarship in the late twentieth century.

It is curious to note the similarities between the position advocated by
Carroll and fundamentalist/literalist readings of biblical texts, one of the
approaches that Diamond suggests are 'innocent'.[19] Mediating factors such
as datable linguistic features and subtle literary adjustments are removed
from consideration and replaced by an overriding belief system that imposes
monolithic preconceptions upon the text. It is irrelevant as to whether these
preconceptions are born from the conviction that the text tells us nothing
about the actual people and events it discusses (Carroll's perspective) or if
the text is to be taken as absolute truth (the fundamentalist/literalist reading).
The *text alone* speaks, not its historical authors, and in both cases it is
divorced from the sociological, political, or otherwise historical circum-
stances in which it was born.[20]

Discounting the benefits of engaging these factors does not seem to con-
stitute a sound critical method; consciously to exclude the pertinent historical
evidence from an analysis of the Jeremianic text is irresponsible, assuming
one is at all interested in why it was written and who wrote it. We possess a
book that speaks about a prophet named Jeremiah, and many other charac-
ters and episodes. The basic historicity of those characters and episodes is no
longer in doubt,[21] and we should not hesitate to work with the assumption
that Jeremiah, too, was a historical personage related to the episodes reported
in the book bearing his name.

---

18.   R.P. Carroll, 'Something Rich and Strange: Imagining a Future for Jeremiah
Studies', in Diamond, O'Connor, and Stulman (eds.), *Troubling Jeremiah*, pp. 423-43
(432). Carroll's suggestion that the materials in the Jeremianic corpus derive primarily
from the Hellenistic period ('The Book of J', p. 231) must be abandoned entirely in light
of recent examinations of lexical and syntactical features of late Biblical Hebrew from
the fourth century and the Biblical Hebrew from the seventh–mid-sixth centuries, which
possess marked differences; see below.

19.   Diamond, 'Introduction', p. 32.

20.   I am indebted to Baruch Halpern for this observation.

21.   See below.

Methodological Issues and Approaches

Several essential questions confront any examination into the history of the book of Jeremiah and the light it may shed on the events of the past. Chief among these questions is the relationship between the prophet and the Deuteronomistic tradition, a relationship that is confirmed by the common themes and lexemes shared by the book of Jeremiah and the Deuteronomistic works but still left with a fair degree of ambiguity. Was the literature associated with Jeremiah appropriated by the Deuteronomists, or did it grow out of a common background? Was Jeremiah an advocate of Deuteronomy or an opponent? In either case, is the answer to be found (or at least addressed) in the poetry of the book as distinct from the prose or in tandem with it? In essence, what texts within the book may be relevant to an understanding of what the prophet thought and how his book developed in relation to the book of Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History (DH)?

Serious examinations of these issues have been undertaken by W. McKane.[22] McKane's theory of a 'rolling corpus' is an attractive model for understanding the development of the book of Jeremiah, and there is in fact no reason to deny that this process is indeed responsible for the variegated material in the text,[23] which he believes involves Deuteronomistic matters but also later reflexes. Pivotal to McKane's thoroughgoing work is a comparison of the various textual traditions (MT, LXX, Vulgate, Qumran, etc.), and his ICC commentaries are a precious resource for scholars interested in the variants between and within units of Jeremianic texts. A potential difficulty arises from McKane's approach, however, and that is the presupposition that apparent tensions within the text require deletion or emendation. McKane's approach mutes significant structural and hermeneutical features within the corpus pointing to continuity with Jeremiah's own prophetic perspectives and implications. For example, McKane readily emends Jer. 27.1 to point overtly to Zedekiah's reign rather than to Jehoiakim's reign, concluding that the reference to Jehoiakim is drawn from 26.1, which echoes virtually identical terms in every other regard. The wrong king's name reflects, in his view, a textual corruption.[24] Chronologically speaking, McKane's proposed emendation is correct, as the circumstances addressed in ch. 27 relate to the deportation of the Judean elite to Babylon in 597, which marked the beginning of Zedekiah's tenure on the throne. Nevertheless, a sustained polemic against Jehoiakim obtains in the oracles generally ascribed to the prophet himself and certainly brackets the expanse of text in which ch. 27 appears (chs. 26–36). Jeremiah 27.1 may serve a hermeneutical or polemical purpose

---

22. W. McKane, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jeremiah* (ICC; 2 vols.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1986–96).

23. See McKane, *Jeremiah*, I, pp. l-lxxxiii, for discussion.

24. McKane, *Jeremiah*, II, p. 685.

with its reference to that king. As W.L. Holladay and B.D. Sommer have convincingly argued, ch. 27 is part of a literary unit that should in large part be attributed to Jeremiah's own authorship;[25] if this is the case, then we have an example of the rolling corpus in action at the hand of the prophet himself, with a later text drawing upon the themes of earlier oracles, subsuming the new material within the sacral legitimacy of the old.

McKane's work also often precludes the possibility that the apparent tensions within the text may be the result of design as opposed to a 'process of untidy accumulation'.[26] Here, the rhetorical-critical method advocated by J.R. Lundbom reveals additional dimensions to compositional units that McKane does not discern.[27] Lundbom sees much of the complexity of the book as the result of careful composition and editorial structuring, replete with meaning. As such, he views the Jeremiah tradition as arising not from a long process of random expansion and redaction but from a much smaller circle of authors, chief among them being Jeremiah himself, who evidences a knowledge of rhetorical techniques common to ancient scribes.[28] A major accomplishment of Lundbom's work is that the distinction between poetry and prose as separate literary sources is diminished: the same rhetorical techniques one encounters in poetic materials surface in the parenetic prose (*inclusio*s, chiasms, etc.), suggesting common authorship in many cases. Lundbom here joins Holladay, who has long advanced the idea that Jeremiah expressed himself in poetry and prose.[29]

The implications of these rhetorical analyses are supported by the studies of R.E. Friedman and H. Weippert, who both examine lexical evidence found in poetic and prose passages.[30] For Weippert, the parenetic materials

25. W.L. Holladay, *Jeremiah 2: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah Chapters 26–52* (Hermeneia; Minnesota: Fortress Press, 1989), pp. 114-18; B.D. Sommer, 'New Light on the Composition of the Book of Jeremiah', *CBQ* 61 (1999), pp. 646-66 (661-63).

26. McKane, *Jeremiah*, I, p. 240.

27. J.R. Lundbom, 'The Double Curse in Jeremiah 20.14-18', *JBL* 104 (1986), pp. 589-600; 'Rhetorical Structures in Jeremiah 1', *ZAW* 103 (1991), pp. 193-210; *Jeremiah: A Study in Ancient Hebrew Rhetoric* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1997 [repr. of 1975 edn]); *Jeremiah 1–20* (AB, 21A; New York: Doubleday, 1999); *Jeremiah 21–36* (AB, 21B; New York: Doubleday, 2004); *Jeremiah 37–52* (AB, 21C; New York: Doubleday, 2004).

28. Lundbom, *Jeremiah 1–20*, p. 92.

29. W.L. Holladay, 'Jeremiah and Moses: Further Observations', *JBL* 85 (1966), pp. 18-27. See also his more recent discussion 'Elusive Deuteronomists, Jeremiah, and Proto-Deuteronomy', *CBQ* 66 (2004), pp. 55-77 (68).

30. R.E. Friedman, 'The Deuteronomistic School', in A. Beck *et al.* (eds.), *Fortunate the Eyes That See: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebration of his Seventieth Birthday* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), pp. 70-80; H. Weippert, *Die Prosareden des Jeremiabuches* (BZAW, 132; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1973).

are analyzed and revealed to possess a metrical structure that facilitates a direct delivery to an audience close in diction to the prophet's poetry.[31] She therefore concludes that the prose must come from Jeremiah himself.[32] On linguistic grounds alone, it is difficult to draw specific conclusions about which of these passages may fall under this category, but Weippert's perspective raises the possibility that at least some of the prose passages may be credited to the prophet and do not simply derive from a Deuteronomistic redaction. Friedman offers a more tenable position regarding the lexemes in the book of Jeremiah, namely, that the Jeremianic tradition is genetically tied to the Deuteronomistic collections,[33] but constitutes an intermediary developmental stage.[34] Thus the principal Jeremianic tradents and the Deuteronomists should not be viewed as wholly unrelated. Rather, the traditions are intertwined, sharing a common approach in terms of both style and language and, as the present study will attempt to demonstrate, a consistent ideological trajectory that addresses specific and identifiable historical circumstances.

Redaction Criticism and the Deuteronomistic Redaction of Jeremiah

The linguistic and rhetorical approaches to analyzing the book of Jeremiah help to identify the probable historical background to any given unit of text, and it is here where the formal commonalities between the Jeremianic and Deuteronomistic literature prove to be most revealing. Ascribing at least some common heritage to both the Deuteronomistic and Jeremianic discourse firmly places the parenetic prose within the late seventh through mid-sixth centuries, the same period that saw the composition of Deuteronomy and the DH. The same conclusions may be applied to the narratives in the book of Jeremiah, which share linguistic commonalities with those of the DH that eventually dissipate with the onset of the Persian period.[35] The principal form of the book of Jeremiah derives from the period on which it comments, but critical examinations must then evaluate the degree to which historical information has been informed by a political or theological agenda. This pertains not only to the narrative material within the book, but also the

31. Weippert, *Prosareden*, pp. 46-48, 66, 75.
32. Weippert, *Prosareden*, pp. 228-34.
33. The term 'Deuteronomistic' will be employed throughout this study to refer to both the historiographic material spanning Joshua–Kings (the 'Deuteronomistic History' or 'DH') as well as the book of Deuteronomy (alternately referred to herein as 'the Deuteronomic Torah'). I will periodically employ the term 'Deuteronomic' in distinction from 'Deuteronomistic' for purposes of referring to specific passages or literary units.
34. Friedman, 'The Deuteronomistic School', pp. 78-80.
35. See F. Polak, 'The Oral and the Written: Syntax, Stylistics and the Development of Biblical Prose Narrative', *JANES* 26 (1998), pp. 59-105, for a detailed discussion.

oracles, which may address more than one period and audience in their current form. The reason for this multidimensionality is very clearly to be found in the book's redactional layers, but this does not automatically imply that it was originally an independent work redacted by an external group of Deuteronomists.

A brief consideration of popular theories regarding a 'Deuteronomistic' redaction is thus in order. Both J.P. Hyatt and M. Weinfeld pointed out that characteristic phrases and ideology in the parenetic prose may also be found in Deuteronomy and the DH.[36] To this end, W. Thiel has formed a detailed argument that the book's current shape and content is largely informed by a Deuteronomistic redaction, based on the identification of word-strings, characteristic Deuteronomistic phrases, and the presentation of Jeremiah as a Deuteronomistic prophet.[37] Thiel's position has gained wide acceptance and has been subject to several adjustments, such as that of T.C. Römer, who argues that the Deuteronomistic redaction occurred in two stages: one yielded chs. 7–35, the other resulted in a broader work, chs. 1–45.[38] Redactional markers and recurring language generally serve as the basis for such evaluations, and critics advocating a Deuteronomistic redaction have done a service to scholarship by demonstrating how these markers tie the book together. In light of the rhetorical and linguistic analyses cited above, however, there is no reason to assume that the book's redactions should be attributed to a group unrelated to the writer(s) of the original oracles.[39] C.J. Sharp's recent study of language in texts often identified as 'Deuteronomistic' reveals that the relationship between the book of Jeremiah and the Deuteronomistic works is not simply a matter of a Deuteronomistic redaction but possesses a far more organic, dialogical connection.[40] While there is undoubtedly a Deuteronomistic valence in the book, it should not be attributed in a *de facto* manner to a Deuteronomistic redaction.

36. J.P. Hyatt, 'The Deuteronomic Edition of Jeremiah', in L.G. Perdue and B.W. Kovacs (eds.), *A Prophet to the Nations: Essays in Jeremiah Studies* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1984), pp. 247-67; M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), pp. 27-32, 138-46.

37. 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).

38. T.C. Römer, 'How Did Jeremiah become a Convert to Deuteronomistic Ideology?', in L.S. Schearing and S.L. McKenzie (eds.), *Those Elusive Deuteronomists: The Phenomenon of Pan-Deuteronomism* (JSOTSup, 268; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), pp. 189-99.

39. See S.A. Kaufman, 'Rhetoric, Redaction and Message in Jeremiah', in J. Neusner, E. Frerichs and B. Levine (eds.), *Judaic Perspectives on Ancient Israel* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987), pp. 63-74.

40. C.J. Sharp, *Prophecy and Ideology in Jeremiah* (New York/London: T. & T. Clark International, 2003), pp. 1-39, 157.

   The entire question of redaction criticism as applied to the book of Jeremiah might benefit from readjustment. Rather than proposing a redaction that imposed a parenetic tradition over an older poetic collection, we should consider the possibility that some parenetic units may have been composed *alongside* the developing poetic tradition before the book was given a discernible shape. It is true that some parenetic prose texts have very likely been secondarily inserted into a poetic context, but this need not be true of every prose exhortation. As will be argued in the present study, the early formation of the book of Jeremiah involved the redaction of *both* poetic and prose sources into a more comprehensive collection, and this method may be detected in subsequent stages of the book's growth. This raises the question: When was this comprehensive collection initiated?

   Few other biblical texts draw attention to their own development the way that the book of Jeremiah does. It is an assortment of collections that constantly form and dissolve their own boundaries and parameters (e.g. Jer. 1.1–25.13a; 27–29; 30–33; 26–45; 51.64; 52).[41] This speaks to conscious redaction and expansion, something the book fully discloses in the narrative report of 36.32. The same chapter also informs us that this expansion was based on a single, definitive collection of Jeremiah's oracles composed in 605. The present study is concerned with the historical background to the composition of this first scroll, known among scholars as Jeremiah's *Urrolle*.

The Question of the Jeremiah's Scroll (The Urrolle)

Scholars have long been divided on the possibility of reconstructing the *Urrolle*, with some attempting to identify key texts that would have comprised its verses and others skeptical about its very existence.[42] Among the former group, investigations have emphasized rhetorical, historical, and thematic features throughout the Jeremianic texts often ascribed to the prophet himself, identifying the presence of these features in additional texts of debatable authorship but which are given a pre-605 date within the prophetic corpus itself. The latter group, by contrast, assumes such an endeavor to be relatively futile, viewing a large number of those texts as deriving from much later hands (and often credited to Deuteronomistic authorship).[43] New

41.   See also the discussion by Sharp, *Jeremiah*, p. 160.

42.   For an overview of scholarship on the matter of Jer. 36, see Lundbom, *Jeremiah 21–36*, pp. 582-612; J.A. Dearman, 'My Servants the Scribes: Composition and Context in Jeremiah 36', *JBL* 109 (1990), pp. 403-21 (403-405, nn. 1-6); L.G. Perdue, 'Jeremiah in Modern Research', in Perdue and Kovacs (eds.), *A Prophet to the Nations*, pp. 1-32 (21-22).

43.   For an argument concerning the Deuteronomistic provenance of the chapter's current shape, see Thiel, *Jeremia 26–45*, pp. 49-51 (though he views the redactional incursions as limited); Nicholson, *Preaching to the Exiles*, p. 43.

theories of authorship and development over the last 30 years have tended to support this latter perspective, suggesting that rhetorical and thematic similarities are the result of secondary accretion and, therefore, unable to reveal historical information concerning the prophet's own hand in shaping the book. As such, the search for the prophet's *Urrolle* has dissipated somewhat in more recent scholarship. This is unfortunate. If the scroll did exist, its identification would reveal much about not only the growth of the larger Jeremianic corpus but also the historical circumstances alluded to at various points throughout its pages. It is certainly true that style and agenda inform the shape of Jeremiah 36,[44] but this does not preclude the presence of historical information, and the narrative concerning the composition of the *Urrolle* may indeed be rooted in actual events.[45] Ancient historiography is rarely ever a matter of objective journalistic reporting or the mere chronological recounting of events from an unbiased perspective, but ancient historiographic accounts are still valuable sources for understanding those events.

We must take seriously the details that present themselves as historical within the text of Jeremiah, though we should not confuse this with viewing the texts as historically accurate. Other texts from this period, such as the Deuteronomistic account of Josiah's reign in 2 Kings 22–23, blur the lines between ideological literature and historical accuracy. Likewise, the Deuteronomic Torah associated with Josiah's reign functions not in any strict literal sense but as a transformative system, adjusting older law codes to resonate at a frequency that addressed a late seventh-century audience in the same breath as Moses' exhortation to the wilderness generation of the late thirteenth century.[46] It is the rhetoric of metaphor that dominates these works, recasting the history of the nation according to its ideological parameters.[47]

44. See, e.g., C.D. Isbell, '2 Kings 22.3–23.4 and Jeremiah 36: A Stylistic Comparison', *JSOT* 8 (1978), pp. 33-45.

45. See Dearman, 'My Servants the Scribes', pp. 417-20, for the presence of verified historical elements within the chapter. See also Lundbom, *Jeremiah 21–36*, p. 298; N. Avigad, 'Hebrew Seals and Sealings and their Significance for Biblical Research', in J.A. Emerton (ed.), *Congress Volume: Jerusalem, 1986* (VTSup, 40; Leiden: Brill, 1988), pp. 7-16 (11-12). C.J. Sharp points to a discourse within the chapter that address both historical and hermeneutical concerns ('Take Another Scroll and Write: A Study of the LXX and the MT of Jeremiah's Oracles against Egypt and Babylon', *VT* 47 [1997], pp. 487-516 [508-509]).

46. For the method of lemmatic literary transformation employed by the scribes of Deuteronomy, see B.M. Levinson, *Deuteronomy and the Hermeneutics of Legal Innovation* (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997).

47. The metaphorical bend in the DH is elucidated in R.L. Cohn's analysis of the tale of the Man of God and the Old Prophet in 1 Kgs 13 in his article 'Literary Technique in the Jeroboam Narrative', *ZAW* 97 (1985), pp. 23-35 (32-33). This might also apply to the presentation of Solomon in the DH; see M.A. Sweeney, 'The Critique of Solomon in the Josianic Edition of the Deuteronomistic History', *JBL* 114 (1995), pp. 607-22.

Nevertheless, these texts reveal a remarkable degree of information concerning the social and political world of the scribes who generated them, and the same may be said with respect to the Jeremianic materials currently under consideration.[48]

Jeremiah the Scribe

We encounter much evidence in the book that connects Jeremiah to the Josianic scribal circles on the level of membership. Two critical passages in Jeremiah 29—which may be ascribed to the prophet himself—are instructive. In the first case (Jer. 29.5-7), the prophet redeploys the warfare rules of Deut. 20.5-10 for the purpose of quelling potential insurrection among the Judean deportees taken to Babylon in 597.[49] The laws are reapplied, but this reapplication presupposes their legitimacy and the prophet's recognition of their authority.[50] The manner in which the prophet achieves this goal is a parade example of the hermeneutical strategy characteristic of the Deuteronomic Torah and its reuse of the lemmas and lexemes of the Covenant Code.[51] Thus the prophet not only demonstrates familiarity with and deference to the content of the Deuteronomic legislation, but also a familiarity with the compositional methods of the scribes who generated it.

The second case (Jer. 29.10) involves Jeremiah's famous 70-year prophecy, which draws upon an Assyrian royal inscription from the reign of Esarhaddon (681–669), a text known to the Jerusalemite *literati*.[52] The use of the Esarhaddon inscription in 29.10 is intimately bound to a once-independent Jeremianic literary corpus geared specifically for the Judean deportees, which concluded with another reference to the Esarhaddon inscription (the *atbash* codes in ch. 51). In both cases, Jeremiah employs the

---

48. A wealth of scholarly attention has been devoted to this matter, with the most convincing arguments pointing to strong Assyrian influence among Jerusalemite scribes of Josiah's era (or later) who possessed a knowledge of and concern for northern Israelite traditions. Among other examinations, see Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*; M.A. Sweeney, *King Josiah of Judah: The Lost Messiah of Israel* (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001); J.C. Geoghegan, '"Until this Day" and the Pre-Exilic Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History', *JBL* 122 (2003), pp. 201-27.

49. See A. Berlin, 'Jeremiah 29.5-7: A Deuteronomic Allusion?', *HAR* 8 (1984), pp. 3-11 (8-11).

50. Jer. 29.5-7 might well be an example of what M. Fishbane calls 'qualifying exegesis' (*Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* [New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985], p. 232).

51. Levinson, *Deuteronomy*, *passim*.

52. See M. Leuchter, 'Jeremiah's 70-Year Prophecy and the ששך/לב קמי *atbash* Codes', *Bib* 85 (2004), pp. 503-22, for a detailed discussion of Jeremiah's reliance upon the Esarhaddon inscription and the implications of its use in his oracles.

hermeneutical logic of the Josianic scribes, relying upon the lemmas of the Assyrian material but providing them with a new sacral context in his work.[53]

Additional elements point to Jeremiah's scribal education and training, reflecting a deep understanding of Mesopotamian religious literature and culture atypical of other prophets who factored the menace of Assyria into their oracles. Jeremiah's call shows influence of Mesopotamian royal traditions,[54] 4.26 and 10.1-16 demonstrate the prophet's familiarity with the Akkadian language and Mesopotamian cultic praxis,[55] and the prophet's familiarity with Aramaic is evident in 10.11 and 25.10, the latter of which points to the prophet's reliance upon the norms of Assyrian political dispatches.[56] We therefore have bountiful material unique to the Jeremianic corpus that identifies the prophet as having received scribal training.[57] If Jeremiah was trained as a scribe in Jerusalem in the seventh century, we should not be at all surprised to find Deuteronomistic-type material in his book. He would have likely been a peer of the Josianic scribes responsible for that form of literary expression, and perhaps even a contributor to its canon. Thus in a sense, Bright's assertion that the parenetic prose in the book of Jeremiah is the result of the period's scribal stylistic conventions is correct,[58] but the matter is much more complex and firmly bound to the person of the prophet than Bright had thought. In essence, J. Muilenberg's assertion that Jeremiah's age was a 'scribal age' finds very concrete expression in the prophet's own choices and methods of discourse.[59]

In the Jeremianic corpus, the prominence of text emerges over the medium of oral proclamation; oral modes of discourse are not ignored or forsaken, but it is the written word that plays the most significant role in the prophet's corpus, in keeping with the social realities surrounding him and even preceding him.[60] From the beginning of his activity, Jeremiah recognizes the

53. Leuchter, 'Jeremiah's 70-Year Prophecy', pp. 518-19.

54. Sommer, 'New Light', p. 655. See also S.M. Paul, 'Deutero-Isaiah and Cuneiform Royal Inscriptions', in W.W. Hallo (ed.), *Essays in Memory of E.A. Speiser* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968), pp. 180-86.

55. See the respective discussions in Chapters 5 and 7, below.

56. See A. Lemaire, 'Jérémie xxv 10b et la stèle araméenne de Bukan', *VT* 47 (1997), pp. 543-45. Lemaire suggests that the form of the verse is dependent upon the political language represented by an inscription from the reign of Esarhaddon.

57. So also J.R. Lundbom, 'Baruch, Seraiah, and Expanded Colophons in the Book of Jeremiah', *JSOT* 36 (1986), pp. 89-114 (107-108); *Jeremiah 1–20*, p. 92.

58. Bright, 'The Prose Sermons', pp. 26-27.

59. Muilenberg, 'Baruch the Scribe', p. 217.

60. See Dearman, 'My Servants the Scribes', p. 421. For the shift to a text-based culture, see B. Halpern, 'Jerusalem and the Lineages in the Seventh Century BCE: Kinship and the Rise of Individual Moral Liability', in B. Halpern and D. Hobson (eds.), *Law and Ideology in Monarchic Israel* (JSOTSup, 124; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), pp. 11-107 (77-81).

significance of word-play, puns, and allusions that speak as much to visual vehicles as they do to aural ones,[61] and it is through the reading of his texts and the actual appearance of the words on the page that their principal meaning is often realized. But this reading must be placed against the panoply of a broader historical and social context—inclusive of the various works of literature that emerged therein—in order for the background of the Jeremianic text to be fully appreciated.

Jeremiah and Josiah's Reform

Biblical texts were not written casually, for Israel's was primarily a conservative culture that resisted new works boasting authority.[62] Rather, they arose from pressing historical circumstance,[63] whether in terms of composition, expansion, or redaction. Such was the purpose of the Deuteronomistic literature, which achieved its penultimate form during the reign of Josiah and guided that king's political and religious reform as Assyrian hegemony waned in the last quarter of the seventh century.[64] Such was also the purpose of the Jeremianic texts, which arose during one of the most turbulent eras in Israelite history, and in some ways, the last turbulent era. While one cannot

---

61. Sweeney, *King Josiah*, p. 232.

62. See Levinson, *Deuteronomy*, pp. 144-57, for the uphill battle facing scribes interested in generating new literary traditions in Israel. Such compositions generally were facilitated only by dramatic social paradigm shifts and historical events; see Halpern, 'Jerusalem and the Lineages', pp. 59-81.

63. So also Halpern, 'Jerusalem and the Lineages', pp. 49-77, 79-91, especially 85-89.

64. Despite the salient points discussed by E. Ben Zvi regarding the difficult situation that would have confronted Josiah in mounting a reform program ('History and Prophetic Texts', in M.P. Graham, William P. Brown, and Jeffrey K. Kuan [eds.], *History and Interpretation: Essays in Honour of John H. Hayes* [JSOTSup, 173; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993], pp. 106-20), the book of Deuteronomy and the DH point to that king's intentions to carry out such a reform. Y. Hoffman demonstrates that evidence within exilic historiography argues very strongly in favor of such a reform actually being carried out, regardless of forces weighing against its success ('History and Ideology: The Case of Jeremiah 44', *JANES* 28 [2000], pp. 43-51). The position adopted in the present study is that Josiah's scribes composed and redacted a great amount of literature in order to construct a comprehensive Deuteronomistic religious program. See F.M. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973), pp. 274-89; Sweeney, *King Josiah*, pp. 170-77; Geoghegan, '"Until this Day"' (though Geoghegan identifies the DH as deriving from the Josianic era, he stops short of ascribing its composition to Josiah's scribes); R.D. Nelson, 'The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History: The Case is Still Compelling', *JSOT* 29 (2005), pp. 319-37. For a convenient overview of scholarship on Deuteronomy, see M. Weinfeld, 'Deuteronomy', in *ABD*, II, pp. 168-83.

ignore the current shape of larger units and the role they play in the book, the recognition that Jeremiah's work is rooted in actual history must guide our attempts to identify the smaller parts within the larger units and their thematic/theological transformation as the prophet's corpus grew over time. The identification of the intended audience at any particular stage of the text's history is important in determining the original message behind the textual units in question, the eventual development of those texts, and, at times, of Jeremiah's own theological perspectives or preferences. The Deuteronomistic connections in the book invariably lead us to ask whether or not Jeremiah was active during Josiah's reform, and if so, what might his role have been?

N. Lohfink, U. Shroter, and M.A. Sweeney have provided us with studies that identify key texts that pertain to the earliest days of the prophet's activity.[65] These scholars have made the case that Jeremiah was an integral part of Josiah's reform program, and Sweeney in particular has drawn attention to the Jeremianic texts that reflect Josiah's ambitions in the north against the threat of an Assyrian–Egyptian alliance.[66] Lundbom also views Jeremiah as active during Josiah's reign, but not before the emergence of Deuteronomy in 622; even then, Lundbom suggests, the prophet may have been disillusioned by Josiah's reform from an early period.[67] All of these perspectives are critical to understanding the prophet's post-Josianic career, which (it will be suggested below) carries forward the impulse of Josiah's reform but channels it in a significantly different direction.

Here, Sharp's analysis demands consideration, for it has elucidated many shortcomings concerning scholarly presuppositions on the issue of the Deuteronomistic texts and Jeremiah as related literary corpora.[68] Sharp points to problems with examples in the DH and Deuteronomy that ostensibly constitute influences on the presentation of Jeremiah as a Deuteronomic prophet, noting that Jeremiah behaves quite differently from those prophets and their forebear, Moses. Well-noted parallels between the Mosaic and Jeremianic call narratives (such as the word phenomenology of Deut. 18.18//Jer. 1.9), the standards of prophetic legitimacy (Deut. 18.20), the parenetic form of address, and so on, can no longer be cited on their own as evidence of a

---

65.   N. Lohfink, 'Der junge Jeremia als Propagandist und Poet. Zum Grundstock von Jer 30–31', in P.-M. Bogaert (ed.), *Le Livre de Jérémie: Le prophète et son milieu. Les oracles et leur transmission* (Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium, 54; Leuven: Peeters Press, 1997 [original, 1981]), pp. 351-68. Shroter provides an alternative to Lohfink's analysis ('Jeremias Botschaft für das Nordreich, zu N. Lohfinks Überlegungen zum Grundbestand von Jeremia xxx–xxxi', *VT* 35 [1985], pp. 312-29); see also Sweeney, *King Josiah*, pp. 208-33.

66.   Sweeney, *King Josiah*, pp. 223-25.

67.   Lundbom, *Jeremiah 1–20*, pp. 109-10.

68.   Sharp, *Jeremiah*, pp. 125-56.

redactor's shaping of the Jeremiah tradition according to Deuteronomistic concepts. Though Sharp's conclusions are different than those in the present study,[69] her work addresses the need to re-evaluate the Deuteronomistic valences one senses in the Jeremianic text. New evidence is indeed required if we are to establish some connection between the book of Jeremiah and the development of the Deuteronomistic works beyond the level of form, style, or theme. This must apply equally to any attempt to discern the thoughts and convictions of Jeremiah himself and his position on the reform policies of Josiah.

The goal of this examination is to identify the political and historical circumstances that would have led Jeremiah to compose the *Urrolle* so central to the narrative of Jeremiah 36 and, indeed, to the ideology of the book of Jeremiah itself. These circumstances would have arisen in the wake of Josiah's death, but their immediate antecedents are very strongly connected to Josiah's reform program in the last quarter of the seventh century. In turn, the ideological antecedents to the king's reform themselves derive from before the rise of the Israelite monarchy in the late eleventh century. 'The crux of the biscuit' (to borrow a phrase from the musician Frank Zappa) is the book of Deuteronomy, which refracts these older traditions through a decidedly Josianic lens. Our investigation must therefore begin with the traditions from the pre-monarchic Shiloh sanctuary that would eventually be assimilated into Deuteronomy by Josiah's scribes and projected over an Israel that Josiah wished to reclaim (or, perhaps, invent) with the help of the prophet from Anathoth.

---

69.   Sharp advocates the position that the Jeremianic corpus evidences a 'pro-*golah*' stratum within many oracles often assigned to Jeremiah. Though there is undoubtedly a perspective in the oracles that benefits a group taken to Babylon, the position taken in the present study is that this perspective comes from the prophet himself in the oracles of the pre-605 period, and does not necessarily reflect an external voice interpolated into the text.

1

THE ZOPHIM AND JURISPRUDENCE AT SHILOH

The Centrality of Shiloh in the Development of Israelite Religion

The disparate nature of social typologies in ancient Israel has given rise to endless speculation and repeated attempts at classification.[1] While scholars have been able to flesh out the features of broader groups with varying degrees of success, the devil is clearly in the details, as sub-groups constantly surface that demand more specific attention during the course of a given investigation.[2] Tradition circles and tradition centers are equally multi-faceted, even when they intersect, and arriving at a working understanding of one or the other (or both) invariably leaves many stones unturned. The Shiloh sanctuary and the figures associated with it represent one such intersection that has received a great deal of attention in recent years,[3] producing a rich understanding of its towering role in the development of Israelite religion. Any attempt to understand the career of the prophet Jeremiah must take account of the influence of the Shiloh sanctuary and its tradition, not only because of his personal ties to the Shilonite circles, but because of the paramount position the Shiloh tradition obtained in the evolution of the prophetic tradition leading up to his activity. The tensions that reverberate throughout the book of Jeremiah are ultimately attributable to the tensions

---

1. See L.L. Grabbe, *Priests, Prophets, Diviners, Sages: A Socio-Historical Study of Religious Specialists in Ancient Israel* (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press, 1995), for an overview of scholarship on this subject.

2. A re-evaluation of prophetic roles and features is dealt with by R.R. Wilson in *Prophecy and Society in Ancient Israel* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980); on the problem of classification, see J.R. Linville, 'On the Nature of Rethinking Prophetic Literature: Stirring a Neglected Stew (A Response to David L. Petersen)', *JHS* 2 (1999), article 3, <http://www.jhsonline.org>.

3. On this subject, see especially D.G. Schley, *Shiloh: A Biblical City in Tradition and History* (JSOTSup, 63; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989); R.E. Friedman, *Who Wrote the Bible?* (New York: HarperCollins, 1997), pp. 70-88. See also A. Jenks, *The Elohist and North Israelite Traditions* (SBLMS, 22; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977), pp. 101-106.

that developed among the various groups that were influenced by the Shiloh tradition over a long period of time; our examination into the career of Jeremiah must therefore begin long before his period of activity, in the earliest detailed accounts of life at Shiloh in ancient Israel.

As an early epicenter of juridical, scriptural, and cultic activity,[4] Shiloh established the prototype of normative theology for both north and south, its priesthood bracketing the rise and fall of Israel's kings and indeed the entirety of Israel's life in the land.[5] The Shiloh tradition certainly involved figures beyond the strictly priestly realm, though, whose presence resonates throughout the expanse of biblical text whether via explicit reference or via implication.[6] The Zophim, who appear in a number of texts ranging from the Psalms to prophetic oracles, are one group tied to Shiloh in both ways, and it will behoove us to engage in a brief survey of the texts that contain references to them in order to gain some additional insight into what role they played at the Shiloh sanctuary.

The Location רמתים צופים

We are told in the opening chapter of 1 Samuel that Shiloh was located in the region of רמתים צופים, in the hill country of Ephraim, and ensuing chapters suggest rather strongly that Samuel's activity, known throughout the nation, was localized in that region throughout his lifetime.[7] It is instructive in this regard to look at the narrative of 1 Sam. 9.5 and its nearby passages—Saul happens upon 'the Land of Zuph' and his servant is already familiar with the area's resident איש אלהים, Samuel, and his widespread reputation. The region, however, is never mentioned by name in earlier accounts of

---

4. See B. Halpern, 'The Uneasy Compromise: Israel between League and Monarchy', in B. Halpern and J.D. Levenson (eds.), *Traditions in Transformation: Turning Points in Biblical Faith* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1981), pp. 59-96 (76-77); Halpern discusses the role of the Shiloh priesthood as the central pre-monarchic juridical authority in the Israelite hinterland. See also I. Finkelstein, *Shiloh: The Archaeology of a Biblical Site* (Tel Aviv University Monograph Series, 10; Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, 1993), for an overview concerning periods of occupation. See also Schley, *Shiloh*, pp. 165-83.

5. See Cross, *Canaanite Myth*, pp. 195-215. The Shiloh priesthood characterized the early days of Israel's life in the land (as Cross suggests) and was a significant theological force at its end and beyond via Jeremiah's activity (Jer. 1.2; 40–44).

6. Other Mosaic cult centers existed in the pre-monarchic era and beyond (see Judg. 18.30-31; 1 Sam. 8.2; see also Cross, *Canaanite Myth*, pp. 198-201), but the Shiloh tradition, which competed against these variants, is presented as the only legitimate option in the pre-monarchic period (according to Judg. 18.30-31). If the Judges text is the result of a later (seventh-century) hand (so Sweeney, *King Josiah*, pp. 118-24), it evidences a retrospective evaluation of two competitive Mosaic traditions and suggests the persistence of the Shiloh tradition and its eventual dominance during the Josianic period and beyond.

7. 1 Sam. 7.16-17; 19.18-24; 25.1 (compare with 9.22-27).

Samuel's activity, even in the definitive list of areas where Samuel ministered to the people in 1 Sam. 7.16-17. If the closing list in 1 Samuel 7 accurately records the locations of significance in Samuel's career[8]—and the encounter with the nation's first king would certainly qualify—then 'the Land of Zuph' must be a variant term for one of the locations mentioned in these verses. Ramah stands out as the prime candidate, as Samuel extends his hospitality to Saul and his servant during their stay in the area (1 Sam. 9.22-25), hardly a gesture he could have made at the administrative centers Mizpah and Gilgal or the cult site Bethel. That Samuel possesses property in this region suggests he is more than just a guest or welcome transient; 'the Land of Zuph' is clearly Samuel's homeland, that is, Ramah, wherein the Shiloh sanctuary was located.[9] Given the proximity of Benjamin to the foothills of Ephraim, it is no surprise that Saul and his servant, searching for his father's donkeys, wandered into the nearby region.[10] 'The Land of Zuph' and 'Ramah' therefore both function as abbreviations of their counterpart extensions in the formal place-name רמתים צופים. Yet nowhere else in the biblical narrative does one geographic location possess two independent abbreviations, each of them referring to only one part of the formal name, and to the apparent exclusion of the other.

The name רמתים צופים defies normative linguistic construction.[11] If the two words were meant to be one composite place name, then we would

---

8.   The list may function as a retrospective midrash on places where Samuel's influence loomed large: Gilgal as the site of Saul's inauguration (1 Sam. 11.14; 12), Mizpah as the locus of his major act of intercession to invoke Yahweh's aid against the Philistines (1 Sam. 7.3-14), and Ramah as his home base of sorts, where he engaged in adjudication. The reference to Bethel may seem anachronistic (since no other text tells us that Samuel was active there) but it suggests that, at an earlier time, Mosaic juridical practices held jurisdiction over the Bethel sanctuary, as suggested by Judg. 4.4-5 (Deborah is located between Ramah and Bethel). This is consistent with the traditional practice of social justice in ancient Israel; see Levinson, *Deuteronomy*, pp. 110-23.

9.   1 Sam. 1.1-9. Shiloh was close enough to Ramah's residential district for Hannah to visit the shrine unaccompanied.

10.   Israelite settlements during the eleventh century were confined to a relatively narrow and condensed region in the Transjordanian hinterland; see L.E. Stager, 'Forging an Identity: The Emergence of Ancient Israel', in M.D. Coogan (ed.), *The Oxford History of the Biblical World* (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998 [paperback edn]), pp. 95-102, for a survey of settlement patterns.

11.   D.A. Robertson (*Linguistic Evidence in Dating Early Hebrew Poetry* [SBLDS, 3; Missoula, MT: Society of Biblical Literature, 1972], p. 101) argues for the final *mem* of צופים as arising from dittography and for its deletion, resulting in the reading 'there was a certain man from Ramathaim, a Zuphite [צופי] from the hill country of Ephraim'. The term צופי would thus functions as a social moniker, identifying Elkanah as a 'Zuphite'. This reading is compromised, however, by the phrase בן צוף אפרתי that occurs at the end of 1 Sam. 1.1, which serves just such a function; see below.

encounter something more like רמת צופים.[12] Such is not the case, where רמתים possesses a final form, not unlike מחנים in Gen. 32.3.[13] In both cases, the name-form refers to one region characterized by two elements: in the case of מחנים, the construct refers to the respective camps of Jacob and Laban. רמתים would probably therefore refer to two elevated spaces in keeping with its location in the hill country of Ephraim. The construct of the first term precludes its absorption into the word צופים, and a 'slash' is therefore intimated between the two terms, that is, רמתים/צופים. These names refer to the same location (the region surrounding the Shiloh sanctuary) but whereas רמתים refers to topography, צופים seems to relate to a group of people located in the vicinity. 1 Samuel 1.1 identifies Elkanah, Samuel's father, as a Zuphite (בן צוף) in terms of his social identity. It is possible, then, that these terms were eventually used for different purposes, one expressly geographical (רמה/רמתים) and the other social (צוף/צופים).

The social dimension indeed seems to be in operation in 'the Land of Zuph' of 1 Sam. 9.5. Considering the basis of the narrative's *Sitz im Leben* in the clan system,[14] we might guess that it is a reference to the geographical territory claimed by a specific clan, as suggested by Elkanah's extended identification in 1.1.[15] Clans, however, were fixed in specific regions;[16] while the retrospective note in 7.16-17 informs us that Samuel traveled throughout a number of close geographical regions, his mobility contrasts with the sedentary elements of clan life. Indeed, in the pre-Deuteronomistic strata of the Saul narratives,[17] Saul's authority is demonstrated by the exceptional unity of the tribes and clans moved beyond the boundaries of their homeland territories under his leadership.[18] A clan ostensibly situated in the highlands of Ephraim would not boast extended membership in a region as far away as

---

12. Such is indeed the case with רמת גלעד in 1 Kgs 22.3, a standard construct involving a plural adjectival form of the first term attached to the second.

13. The construct establishes the dual nature of the object in reference, evident in other biblical phrases referring to a dual form, for example, פעמים ('twice') or שנתים ('two years').

14. The pre-Deuteronomistic level of the Saul narrative reflects the features of the rural clan system typical of pre-monarchic Israel. See Stager, 'Forging an Identity', pp. 97-102, 112-16; see also Halpern, 'Jerusalem and the Lineages', pp. 41-59, for a detailed description of the shift from clan to urban-based society in the eighth–seventh centuries BCE. The original composition of the Samuel narrative predates this shift; see G. Rendsburg, 'Some False Leads in the Identification of Late Biblical Hebrew Texts: The Case of Genesis 24 and 1 Samuel 2.27-36', *JBL* 121 (2002), pp. 23-46.

15. See Stager, 'Forging an Identity', pp. 101-102.

16. Stager, 'Forging an Identity', pp. 101-102.

17. See N. Na'aman, 'The Pre-Deuteronomistic Story of King Saul and its Historical Significance', *CBQ* 54 (1992), pp. 638-58.

18. See 1 Sam. 11.7.

Ephrathah,[19] the geographical origin of Elkanah and a Judean city (identified as Bethlehem in Gen. 35.19). The Zophim, of which Elkanah seems to be a member, may therefore not be a clan but rather a social class or type, with a home base of sorts at Shiloh. If the Land of Zuph refers to a social group not strictly defined by narrow kinship ties, then Elkanah would have been able to come from a fairly remote location but be counted among their ranks upon settling in the area.[20]

Social Typology and the Term צוף

It should be mentioned that later textual traditions support the separation of the word צוף in 1 Sam. 1.1b from any clan-based system. The pointing in the text of the phrase בֶן צוף differs from the usage of בֶן in the personal names pertaining to Elkanah's actual lineage: whereas the list of his ancestors employ the term בֶן ('son of') with a *dagesh* marking in the letter *beth*, בֶן צוף appears without a *dagesh*. The בֶן in this last instance might therefore be understood not as 'son [of]' but rather as 'member [of]',[21] in distinction from the other instances of the term at work in 1 Sam. 1.1 that contain the *dagesh* marking and are clearly genealogical in nature. In this case, 1 Sam. 1.1b would be better understood as: 'Elkanah son of Jeroham son of Elihu son of Tohu, an Ephrathite Zopheh'.[22]

We ought not be surprised at the connection between an Ephrathite Zopheh such as Elkanah and his colleagues in Shiloh, the resting place of the Ark of the Covenant: Ps. 132.6 identifies Ephrathah as a location where the circles at Shiloh concerning the Ark were well known,[23] and it is David, himself an

19.   The LXX reads 'Ephraimite' in 1 Sam. 1.1 and many scholars take the MT אפרתי, 'Ephrathite', as a misprint. However, the phrase should be read as it appears in the text due to a connection between the Shiloh tradition and the city of Ephrathah (see below).

20.   For the retention of this practice in a seventh-century text, see Deut. 18.1-8.

21.   See also Amos 7.14 for a similar occurrence of the term in reference to prophetic guilds.

22.   This is likely not a scribal accident on the part of the Masoretes in light of the other later traditional readings of 1 Sam. 1.1 discussed below, as well as the diverse biblical material concerning the term צופה and its application in various contexts. Moreover, the rhetoric of social classification is attested elsewhere in a similar regard; see W.M. Schniedewind, *The Word of God in Transition: From Prophet to Exegete in the Second Temple Period* (JSOTSup, 197; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), p. 37 n. 18.

23.   Cross sees this as reflecting evidence of Ephrathah being a clan in the region of Kiriath jearim, based on lineages in the Chronicler's work (*Canaanite Myth*, pp. 94-95 n. 16). However, given the Chronicler's proclivity for reshaping genealogical traditions, we must hesitate before making such an identification, and rather take the Chronicler's reference as ancillary support to the discussion concerning some connection between

Ephrathite,[24] who brings the Ark to Jerusalem, making it the successor of Shiloh.[25] That another Levitical group (of explicitly Mosaic origin) derives from Ephrathah is evidenced by the brief reference in Judg. 17.7, though this Mosaic line is depicted as illegitimate in contradistinction to those at Shiloh.[26] This connection between Ephrathah and Shiloh may have played a part in Samuel's selection of David as Saul's monarchic successor, and thus there may already have existed a link between the territories of Judah in the south and the Ephraimite hill country of the north.[27] If so, David's political maneuvers to unite the northern tribes with Judah built upon a connection established by the Zophim at an earlier time.

The Function of the Zophim

The question, then, is who were these Zophim, and what activities characterized their identity? The term translates as 'watchmen' in 1 Sam. 14.16, referring to Saul's military guard, but a military application seems to be a rather remote possibility in the context of 1 Samuel 1 or 9. Here, later textual/exegetical traditions offer clues, presented as permutations of the phrase רמתים צופים. The *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* offers a telling reading of 1 Sam. 1.1:

> There was a certain man from Ramah, of *the disciples of the prophets*, from the mountain[s] of the house of Ephraim. (*Targ. Ps.-J.* 1 Sam. 1.1 [emphasis added])

Here, רמתים ('Ramah') is distinct from צופים, which is not represented in the verse at all; the phrase 'the disciples of the prophets' stands in its place. The LXX presents another reading which, like the Targum, splits the phrase רמתים צופים:

Shiloh, Ephrathah, the Ark cult, and the polity of Judah. For the Chronicler's use of genealogies, see Y. Levin, 'From Lists to History: Chronological Aspects of the Chronicler's Genealogies', *JBL* 123 (2004), pp. 601-36.

24. Gen. 35.19; 1 Sam. 17.12. David is an 'Ephrathite from Bethlehem', which implies a distinction in the tenth century between the geography and populace that may not have factored into earlier traditions.

25. For an overview, see Schley, *Shiloh*, pp. 65-99, 161-63.

26. See n. 6 above concerning Judg. 18.30-31.

27. The ties between the populations in the regions surrounding Shiloh and the city of Ephrathah may be the result of out-migration typical of Iron I population shifts (see C. Meyers, 'Kinship and Kingship: The Early Monarchy', in Coogan [ed.], *The Oxford History of the Biblical World*, pp. 165-205 [180-83]). A migrating population from Ramah, establishing a new settlement in Ephrathah, would have no doubt retained a retinue of religious figures or at least ideas from their place of origin.

> There was a certain man of Ramah, a Zuphite of the hill country [of Ephraim]. (LXX 1 Sam. 1.1)

In this case, the 'Zuphite' of the LXX parallels 'the disciples of the prophets' in the Targum. The Talmud as well retains a tradition concerning the Elkanah text:

> He was one of 200 seers, *Zophim who prophesied* to Israel. (*b. Meg.* 14a [emphasis added])

While these texts cover a fairly broad period of time, they all agree that the Zophim constituted a social class or type, and two of these texts (the Targum and the Talmud) identify them as a prophetic group.[28]

The medieval exegete David Kimḥi drew attention to Ezek. 3.17 and 33.7, both of which refer to Ezekiel as a Zopheh, to solidify the Targumic and Talmudic traditions.[29] In the context of the Ezekiel passages, the term 'Zopheh' is presented as a type of prophet, and the translation of the word itself—'watchman'—suggests that that role involved some type of examination or scrutiny. The Ezekiel passages, however, do not tell us anything else about the Zophim—their distinguishing characteristics in contrast to other prophetic types or terms (נביא, חוזה, etc.) go unmentioned. It may be that by Ezekiel's time there was no effective difference between the various terms and their roles; such would certainly seem to be the case by the time of the comment in 1 Sam. 9.9.[30] But during the time of Elkanah and Samuel, the Zopheh—like the other prophetic types—must have played a distinct role.

An important clue concerning this role can be found in Hosea, who contrasts the term צופה with the term נביא in a dramatic manner:

> The prophet (הנביא) is a fool, the man of the spirit is mad! For the multitude of your iniquity, the enmity is great. The Zopheh of Ephraim is with my God (צופה אפרים עם אלהי); as for the prophet, a fowler's snare is in all his ways, and enmity in the house of his God. (Hos. 9.7b-8)

---

28. See M. Fishbane, 'Rabbinic Mythmaking and Tradition: The Great Dragon Drama in *b. Baba Batra* 74b–75a', in M. Cogan, Barry L. Eichler, and Jeffrey H. Tigay (eds.), *Tehilla le-Moshe: Biblical and Judaic Studies in Honor of Moshe Greenberg* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1997), pp. 273-83, for a discussion on the preservation of pre-canonical, biblical traditions in later Rabbinic texts.

29. See the discussion by J. Weingreen, *From Bible to Mishna* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1976), pp. 4-7.

30. This passage suggests that early use of the term נבא, different from the Mosaic-type prophet of Deut. 18.15-18, applied to archaic, ecstatic prophecy, something considerably different from the role Samuel plays as a רואה/איש אלהים in 1 Sam. 9–10 (see below for additional discussion on this compound typology). We see from the note in 1 Sam. 9.9 that terminological and perhaps functional distinction was already alien to the intended audience of the Deuteronomistic authors.

For Hosea, it is the צופה whom God establishes as a true prophet among the unworthy nation, whereas the נביא is derisively labeled insane.[31] In this passage, we may detect echoes of the struggle over the meaning of the term נביא that had been settled by the time Deuteronomists wrote the note in 1 Sam. 9.9. Hosea is distancing himself from the charismatic and ecstatic type of behavior (possession by the divine 'spirit') that characterized archaic prophecy, the type depicted in 1 Sam. 10.10-12; the prophet refers to this episode directly in Hos. 9.9 as an example of shame and sin.[32] Hosea 9.7b-8 suggests quite strongly that, in Hosea's opinion, the archaic נביאים were obsolete, the Zophim were true prophets, and the technical term נביא should now be applied to the Zophim and to himself, a member of their ranks,[33] rather than to the ecstatics. It is clear by the end of Hosea's book that prophecy is to be associated only with the Mosaic type (Hos. 12.13; see Num. 12.6-8 for Moses as a non-ecstatic type of prophet). If Hosea's work was well known by the seventh century,[34] it is no wonder that later prophets such as Ezekiel would view the terms צופה and נביא as synonymous, when the inter-prophetic polemics would have long shifted gears to much different matters.[35]

It is also significant that while Hosea views the descent of the divine spirit as an outmoded claim to prophetic legitimacy, his own authority as a prophet is characterized by the descent of the divine דבר, the primordial force that instigates history into expression through the transpiring of events.[36] It is

31.   Scholars such as Wilson who associate the term נביא with Ephraimite prophecy in general miss the symmetrical contrast between the two parts of this passage. Wilson in particular understands the first part of the verse to be Hosea quoting his detractors, since, Wilson maintains, he is clearly an Ephraimite נביא (see Wilson, *Prophecy and Society*, pp. 226-31, especially 229-30). This is likely not the case, however, if Hosea draws a distinction between the two terms.

32.   Wilson (*Prophecy and Society*, pp. 228-30) states that the Gibeah reference is ambiguous, but if Hosea is criticizing ecstatic modes of prophecy in the preceding two verses (9.7-8), then the meaning of v. 9 emerges with greater clarity.

33.   Hosea must have been familiar with the older, pre-Deuteronomistic sources of the Saul narrative, where ecstatic prophecy was celebrated and presented as a legitimate basis for Saul's power (1 Sam. 10.12), hence his criticism in Hos. 9.9. We therefore see in Hosea the beginnings of what would become a later author's position in transforming the older Saul narratives into their present form (1 Sam. 10.12 and 18.24 place the original aphorism in 10.11 in a negative context), *contra* Na'aman, 'The Pre-Deuteronomistic Story of King Saul', pp. 641-42.

34.   See Sweeney, *King Josiah*, pp. 256-72.

35.   For the exilic ideological factions that would inform the religion of the Restoration era community, see P.D. Hanson, 'Israelite Religion in the Early Post-Exilic Period', in P.D. Miller, P.D. Hanson, and S.D. McBride (eds.), *Ancient Israelite Religion: Essays in Honor of Frank Moore Cross* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987), pp. 485-506.

36.   See 1 Sam. 1.23 for the term דבר as a historical reflex; see also below.

this דבר that characterizes Samuel's prophetic legitimacy at Shiloh, standing behind the process whereby he generates מׁשפטים, juridical rulings reflecting the divine will (1 Sam. 3.19-21; 7.6; 8.11; 10.25). The relationship between the דבר and מׁשפט is found in the Pentateuchal E source as well; the Covenant Code in Exodus 21–23, identified as a collection of juridical rulings (Exod. 21.1), refers back to Exod. 19.7 (an older J text), which narrates the moment where Moses brings the divine דברים down to the people as the basis of the laws which will eventually be delineated.[37] Such an understanding of the דבר in the E text is not surprising given E's origins among the circles at Shiloh.[38] In both cases, though, it is juridical intercession at the hands of a Mosaic prophet that constitutes the active nature of covenantal sustenance. Both E and Hosea associate true prophetic authority with Moses (Hos. 12.13), and thus the castigation of other forms of prophecy in Hosea's work (i.e. those that do not further Mosaic legal objectives and which do not associate with the דבר behind the laws themselves) becomes a matter of theological orthodoxy.

Hosea's sentiments are echoed in the writings of Jeremiah, who reminds his audience that Yahweh established Zophim to guide the nation, but to no avail (Jer. 6.17). Jeremiah 6 deals with the repercussions of Israel's abrogation of its legal-covenantal responsibilities, made explicit in v. 19b:

> They have not listened to my words (דברי), and they have rejected my Torah (תורתי).

Here, Jeremiah employs similar language to that found in Hos. 8.1, which also equates covenant with law.[39] It is in his reference to the Zophim, however, that Jeremiah employs the additional terminology of the Sinai narrative—the Zophim are depicted as having urged the nation to listen to the ritual trumpet (קול ׁשופר),[40] which the nation has deliberately ignored. Furthermore, Jeremiah tells us that Yahweh 'raised up' (והקמתי) these Zophim, a term found in Deut. 18.15 and again in Deut. 18.18, which quotes Yahweh

---

37. Exod. 21.1 reads 'And these are the rulings that you will place before them (תׁשים לפניהם)'; Exod. 19.7, after an issuance of general covenantal words to Moses atop the mountain (in vv. 4-6) reads: 'And Moses placed before them (ויׁשם לפניהם) all the words that Yahweh commanded him'.

38. See Friedman, *Who Wrote the Bible?*, pp. 70-88; Jenks, *Elohist*, pp. 101-105.

39. The fact that Hosea employs the term 'my covenant' (בריתי) while Jeremiah employs the term 'my Torah' (תורתי) suggests only that Jeremiah is writing after the emergence of the Deuteronomic Torah in the year 622, and has infused the Hosean rhetoric with a Deuteronomic consciousness.

40. Exod. 19.16-19 provides the liturgical context for Jeremiah's use of the term, which is a reference to the covenant/revelation at Sinai. See M. Leuchter, 'The Literary Strata and Narrative Sources of Psalm xcix', *VT* 55 (2005), pp. 20-38 (33).

telling Moses that he will 'raise up (אקים) a prophet from among their brethren like you' (i.e. Moses) after he has passed on.[41]

In both Jeremiah and Hosea, then, the Zophim are tied to Mosaic tradition: true to the translation of the term in 1 Sam. 14.16, they are watchmen or guardians, but their role is covenantal and legal, not militaristic. The association with juridical processes typified in the Pentateuchal narratives by Moses suggests that Hosea, Jeremiah, and the Josianic authors of the Deuteronomic Torah were drawing from an older tradition from Shiloh, evident especially in the shared terminological references in Jer. 6.17 and Deut. 18.15 and 18.[42]

Subtle evidence concerning the identity of the Zophim is also found in Ps. 19.8-11, although from a different perspective than that of Hosea and Jeremiah:

> The Torah of Yahweh is [more] perfect than the fullness of the soul.
> The Testimony of Yahweh is [more] certain than simple wisdom.
> The Rules of Yahweh are [more] upright than the happiness of the heart.
> The Commandments are [more] pure than the enlightenment of vision.
> The Fear of Yahweh is [more] pure than eternal endurance.
> The laws of Yahweh (מֹשְׁפְטֵי ה׳) are true and righteous in unison (צדקו יחדו)
> They are more precious than gold or fine jewels, and sweeter than honey,
> Or the honeycomb [protected by its] guardians (נפת צופים).

This litany speaks to the conservative orthodoxy of Zadokite ideology, as do a significant number of the Psalms and their concern with Yahweh's laws as a finite collection inherently associated with their circle of tradition—virtually every instance of the מֹשְׁפְט terminology in the Psalter is coupled with the word צדק or a related variant. Such is the case in Psalm 19 as well, where the מֹשְׁפְטֵי ה׳, as a unified collection, fall under Priestly jurisdiction (צדקו יחדו in v. 10). The following verse addresses only these מֹשְׁפְטִים—for the preceding verses are syntactically independent of each other and v. 10—stating ultimately that they are sweeter than the honey from the abode of (implied) busy honeybees, rendered in the Hebrew as נפת צופים.

---

41. Wilson (*Prophecy and Society*, p. 162 n. 52), points to the passive verb forms in Deut. 18.15 and 18 as an indication of a succession of prophets, not to a lone figure. See also C.R. Seitz, 'The Prophet Moses and the Canonical Shape of Jeremiah', *ZAW* 101 (1989), pp. 3-27 (5).

42. See 1 Sam. 1.23. Elkanah intimates that Samuel's life at Shiloh, which will begin upon his weaning from Hannah, represents the establishment of the divine word (דבר); it is not a spoken utterance but an unrealized event that is destined to unfurl over time. The association of the term יקם with the term דבר speaks to a specific theology rooted among the Shiloh tradents. The association of the דבר terminology (Jer. 6.19) with the Zophim in 6.17 cannot be coincidental, given Jeremiah's own ties to Mosaic prophecy (1.9; 15.1) and Shilonite circles (1.1; 7.12, 14; 11.21-23; 32.6-15).

The poetic language in Psalm 19 obscures what may in actuality be a polemic directed against the Mosaic Zophim. Throughout the Psalter, we encounter similar sentiments, veiled in poetic language, that reveal a tension between Levite and Zadokite groups.[43] If the משפט process finds its origins among the Mosaic circles at Shiloh,[44] then the uniform association of the terms משפט and צדק in the Psalter may be an attempt to dissociate the Levite circles from the משפט theology and appropriate it for Zadokite purposes.[45] It is particularly instructive that Psalm 19 does so through an explicit reference (however poetic in presentation) to the צופים.

A similar derisive reference to the Zophim is made much more explicitly in Ps. 37.32-33:

> The Zopheh is wicked to the righteous (צופה רשע לצדיק), and seeks to slay him.
> Yahweh will not leave him in his [the Zopheh's] hand,
> Nor condemn him when he is judged (בהשפטו).

The Zadokite author responds to the threat of the Zopheh by saying that Yahweh will not abandon him or his kin, or inflict wickedness upon them when the Zopheh engages in judgment (בהשפטו). We find once more the espousal of a Zadokite understanding of the משפט process and an overt association of it with the Zopheh as an ideological adversary. As articulated in

---

43.   So Cross, *Canaanite Myth*, pp. 198-206, concerning Pentateuchal tradition.

44.   1 Sam. 7.6 informs us that Samuel 'judged' (וישפט) Israel at Mizpah, though Samuel does not engage in the military action typical of the other major savior-judges in the book of Judges who precede him. Rather, his actions consist of interceding on behalf of the people to Yahweh (v. 9), evoking the deity's intervention on the battlefield (vv. 10-11), and interpreting the event via a symbolic monument and accompanying statement (v. 12). The term וישפט should thus be better understood as '[he] generated a משפט', a declarative ruling establishing distinct theological parameters based on an interpretation of the event. See G.E. Mendenhall, 'Samuel's "Broken Rîb": Deuteronomy 32', in D.L. Christensen (ed.), *A Song of Power and the Power of Song*: *Essays on the Book of Deuteronomy* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1993), pp. 169-80; Mendenhall suggests that Deut. 32 derives from this very event (p. 176). In both of these cases, the Song and the משפט of 1 Sam. 7.12 arise from interpreting history in light of Yahweh's involvement, ultimately ascribing the victory and the allowance for Israel's ongoing existence to Yahweh over and above what the nation deserved. Samuel's analytical-juridical act in 1 Sam. 7 is of theological importance in the developing understanding of the covenant between the nation and Yahweh, but it is prefaced by several משפטים set directly at the Shiloh sanctuary, most notably the implied משפט proclaimed by Samuel to Eli in 1 Sam. 3 and the longer משפט proclaimed by the anonymous איש אלהים in 1 Sam. 2.27-36. Like the משפט at Mizpah, these other משפטים pertain to an historical issue—the corruption of the Elides—and establish the nature of Yahweh's will in addressing it.

45.   The terminological pairing does occur in other texts, such as Deuteronomy and Jeremiah, not directly stemming from Zadokite ideology, but the משפט terminology also functions on its own in these texts. The Psalter, on the other hand, severely restricts the independent occurrence of משפט.

v. 33, the משפט process of the Zophim is invoked and apparently stands as an affront to the 'righteous' Zadokite. This only points to the weight of the association that the author is trying to dissolve. The Zophim are intimately tied to the term משפט, and in light of the prophetic and narrative traditions considered above, the dynamic was juridical in nature.

The Prophetic and Juridical Character of the Zophim

The foregoing examination reveals several important features of the otherwise elusive Zophim. They were a prophetic group with members in various regions but were based in Ramah; they were affiliated therein with the Shiloh sanctuary and the Ark of the Covenant. They operated in distinction from the archaic נביאים in terms of ecstatic behavior, which matches their identification as Mosaic-type prophets. Finally, their activity was associated with the משפט process to such a degree that the author(s) of the Zadokite Psalms (in wanting to present divine law as uniquely Zadokite) found it necessary to castigate them. We might thus see similarities between the Zophim and the prophetic characteristics of Samuel himself: Ramah is his home, he generates משפטים at Shiloh (1 Sam. 3.18) and elsewhere (1 Sam. 7.6-14; 8.11; 10.25), and, though he presides over the archaic נביאים, he does not engage in ecstatic behavior (1 Sam. 19.18-24). Rather, he is a רואה in terms of insight into historical circumstances and an איש אלהים when he declares how Yahweh will affect them.

We may conclude, then, that the Zophim functioned similarly to Samuel. That is, the Zopheh and the רואה/איש אלהים were one and the same, and engaged in the process of generating משפטים as ways of making Yahweh's will a matter of public policy. Here, we must draw a distinction between the רואה, who has insight into a circumstance, and a חוזה, who receives a vision of a highly symbolic and mystical nature. This distinction is blurred in later periods, resulting in the use of the רואה terminology by Ezekiel (e.g. Ezek. 1.1), but we should note that, in the Samuel narratives, Eli's inability to judge Israel is connected to his lack of insight: the last we learn of Eli before his death is that he was unable to 'see' (לראות) in 1 Sam. 4.15. Indeed, his lack of analytical insight is what leads him to misjudge Hannah in 1 Sam. 1.12-14, and seems to result in his lax reprimand to his sons in 2.22-25—he 'heard' of his sons' transgressions, but could not intuit the full ramifications of such apostasy and was therefore unable to issue a משפט to address the situation. That job was left up to the anonymous איש אלהים of 2.27-36. A similar משפט is also reportedly delivered by Samuel in 3.18, implying that Samuel had more in common with the anonymous איש אלהים than with Eli in terms of insight, and indeed, the revelation to Samuel is described in 3.15 as a מראה, an 'insight'. It is this prophetic insight into historical circumstance that allows Samuel to be deemed a רואה (9.9, 11, 19). From that insight, he

is able to communicate what he intuits, taking on the role of an איש אלהים (9.6) by proclaiming משפטים (3.18 in narrative report; 7.7-14; 8.9; 9.27 in reference to דבר אלהים; 10.25; 12.1-25).

Thus, as demonstrated by Hos. 9.7-9, the Zophim operated in distinction from the archaic נביא, though the material in 1 Sam. 10.10-12 and 19.18-24 suggests quite strongly that these prophetic types complemented each other at one point in time: the archaic נביא provided the ecstatic cultic divine presence through possession by the divine 'spirit', and the Zopheh provided insight into the ecstatic events and the history surrounding them via consulting the divine דבר.[46] These insights are apparently both conceptual and programmatic in nature and rather than being private revelations, they are always *proclaimed*.[47] This typology applies elsewhere in relation to Shiloh as well. Though likely a literary creation of the Deuteronomist, the anonymous איש אלהים of 1 Sam. 2.27-36 is cast as a Zopheh, and it is significant that the משפט he delivers is meant to rectify the corruption of the Elides. The משפט proclaimed by the איש אלהים, just like those generated by Samuel, is established to preserve the sanctity of the covenant between the nation and their deity, that is, to secure the proper expression and understanding of Yahweh in history. In this sense, the איש אלהים guards the integrity of the nation by generating new theological policies to preserve the vitality of the old.

The Zophim and Israelite Historiography

The historiographic narratives in the DH appear to consistently cast Israel's prophets in a similar typological manner; some of this may be ascribed to actual characteristics these prophets possessed or exhibited, but the uniformity of circumstances points to deliberate redaction. Thus following Samuel we find Nathan, who declares an extensive משפט extolling the Davidic covenant in 2 Samuel 7 (though voiced in a poetic form)[48] that places Davidic

---

46.   If Samuel is the 'father' of the band of ecstatic prophets in 1 Sam. 10.12 (cf. 1 Sam. 19.20), then it is possible that individual Zophim presided over bands of archaic נביאים. Such would have then been the case with Elijah (who apparently presides over the נביאים saved by his servant Obadiah in 1 Kgs 18.4; the נביאים of 1 Kgs 18.20 may also have been under his charge). It may be that the criticism in Hos. 9.7-9 arises from a period where this traditional hierarchy was disrupted and the two groups, determined to sustain an active role in the religious life of the nation, vied against each other for authority or authenticity as prophetic movements.

47.   1 Sam. 3.15, 18. This episode provides a model for the internal experience that may have served as the motivation for the public proclamation of משפטים in the other chapters.

48.   Though Nathan is obviously connected to the Davidic/Jerusalem circles, he would have operated at a time when Jerusalem inherited the Shiloh tradition (a king from

rule within Israel's ongoing covenantal life. We then encounter Ahijah ('the Shilonite', no less, in 1 Kgs 11.29-39), whose recognition of Solomon's foibles no doubt led him to declare Jeroboam fit for rule over the north; his function does not differ from that of Samuel, nor of the briefly mentioned Shemaiah (1 Kgs 12.22-24), overtly referred to as an איש אלהים.[49] Jehu b. Hanani conveys the משפט of Yahweh to Baasha (1 Kgs 16.4); Elijah declares it to Ahab (1 Kgs 21.17-27), and his showdown at Mt Carmel evokes the imagery and language of the related narratives concerning Moses and Samuel,[50] with overt ties to Sinai surfacing in later Elijah narratives.[51] Elisha follows suit with Jehu (2 Kgs 9), and we should note that both Elijah and Elisha are referred to as אנשי אלהים (1 Kgs 17.18; 2 Kgs 1.9-10; 4.7, 9, 16, 21, 22, etc.). While later hands may have shaped the Elijah–Elisha traditions,[52] such terminological associations lie at the heart of the narratives and seem to be rooted in historical memory. It is also worth noting that in several cases, there is an overlap between the purely prophetic, juridical, and priestly roles of the Zophim: Samuel and Elijah engage in cultic activity alongside their oracular roles, incorporating sacrifice into their paradigm of intercession (1 Sam. 7.10; 9.13-14, 19; 13.9-14; 1 Kgs 18.30-38). The same standards of behavior are applied to Eli, though it is clear that he falls short

Ephrathah, the Ark of the Covenant, and Abiathar, an Elide). It stands to reason that Nathan would take on the mantle of the איש אלהים to complete the picture, and indeed his activity bears much more in common with Ephraimite prophecy than with typical Judean prophetic norms or methods (see Wilson, *Prophecy and Society*, pp. 264-66). We should note that the specifics of Nathan's oracle in 2 Sam. 7 lend support to Solomonic interests and are probably the result of the propaganda generated by Solomon's court in ratifying David's ascent; on this, see B. Halpern, *David's Secret Demons: Messiah, Murderer, Traitor, King* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), pp. 391-406. Even this subsequent composition, however, presupposes that Nathan engages in Zuphite behavior.

49.   Wilson (*Prophecy and Society*, p. 187) does not see Ephraimite features in Shemaiah's behavior, but as mentioned above, he is identified as an איש אלהים and declares a משפט, both consistent with Zuphite tradition.

50.   Compare 1 Kgs 18.37-38 to 1 Sam. 7.9-10 and Exod. 19.19. In all three cases, Yahweh's 'answer' results in the acceptance of his will among the observers.

51.   See especially 1 Kgs 19.8-18. Though Wilson rightly identifies the Elijah–Horeb episode as an association with Moses (see Wilson, *Prophecy and Society*, pp. 197-200), we should note that he is portrayed as being part of Mosaic *tradition* rather than as the receiver/bearer of new revelation. In contradistinction to the fantastic legal/phenomenological events at Sinai in the Pentateuch, Elijah's experience at Sinai is decidedly devoid of the same sacred phenomena. Rather, his role as a Mosaic prophet rests in continuing to declare the will of Yahweh in the manner of his predecessors, all of whom follow Mosaic norms. The revelation at Sinai is not limited to one place or time but is sustained via Zuphite action throughout history.

52.   For the pre-Deuteronomistic shaping of the Elijah narratives, see M. White, *The Elijah Legends and Jehu's Coup* (BJS, 311; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), pp. 3-43.

of the mark in enforcing cultic orthodoxy or securing oracular insights. Thus the Zophim reflect a composite type of figure often associated with Levitical heritage.[53] They are priestly, they proclaim juridical rulings, and they preside over the people or monitor the standards of behavior expected of Israel's kings.

The various texts, ideologies, and laws that emerge from the Shiloh tradition are synthesized into a final and comprehensive juridical/theological system in the literature of the Josianic period, chief of which is the juridical system in Deuteronomy. Deuteronomy 17.8–18.22 forms a small pericope dealing with the proper development and execution of the דבר as a juridical process.[54] It concerns itself with the relationship between various spheres of jurisprudence and is founded upon earlier texts and traditions that address similar issues.[55] These older traditions are subordinated to Deuteronomic ideology, with particular emphasis placed on the role of the דבר as the vehicle that transforms the sources. Pivotal to this transformation is the identification and indeed codification of roles within the Josianic-era legal system, based in large part upon the norms of jurisprudence original to the Shiloh tradition.

---

53. So also Schley, *Shiloh*, p. 166.

54. Levinson (*Deuteronomy*, pp. 98-143) has made a convincing case for the pre-exilic origin of this pericope, *contra* N. Lohfink, 'Die Sicherung der Wirksamkeit des Gotteswortes durch das Prinzip der Schriftlichkeit der Tora und durch das Prinzip der Gewaltenteilung nach den Ämtergesetzen des Buches Deuteronomium (Dt. 16,18–18,22)', in his *Studien zum Deuteronomium und zur deuteronomistischen Literatur I* (SBAB, 8; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1990), pp. 305-23, who dates the pericope to the exile. Levinson also presents evidence contrary to scholars who maintain that at least part of the pericope, Deut. 17.2-7, originally belonged to Deut. 13 (see G.E. Wright, 'Deuteronomy', in *IB*, II, pp. 436-37; Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, p. 92; P.E. Dion, 'Deuteronomy 13: The Suppression of Alien Religious Propaganda in Israel during the Late Monarchical Era', in Halpern and Dobson [eds.], *Law and Ideology in Monarchic Israel*, pp. 147-206). These positions do not consider the hermeneutical dimensions of the pericope's current position in the text. Moreover, Sweeney discusses the political centrality of these verses in the formation of the Josianic state (*King Josiah*, pp. 161-63).

55. Principally, the text re-works older juridical laws in the Covenant Code (Exod. 21.6; 22.7-8) and additional pre-centralization practices involving the administration of justice (Num. 5.16, 18, 30; 27.5; 1 Sam. 7.15-17).

2

THE DEUTERONOMIC TRANSLATION
OF SHILONITE JURISPRUDENCE

Just as the Josianic-era historiographers responsible for assembling the DH patterned the history of prophecy according the Shilonite–Zuphite model, the Josianic scribes responsible for the Deuteronomic Torah incorporated Shilonite juridical theology into its chapters. The Shilonite circles had been marginalized from Jerusalemite politics for over three centuries (1 Kgs 2.26); the Deuteronomic legislation constitutes an attempt to restore their ideological legacy to a central locus in the literature of the Josianic court. As observed earlier, the process of sacral jurisprudence at Shiloh appears to have been dialogical in nature: such is the nature of 1 Sam. 7.5-12 and 1 Samuel 8, where the people approach Samuel with a request, followed by Samuel interceding with Yahweh and bringing back the divine response. Likewise, the introduction to the Covenant Code (Exod. 20.14-17) reports that this collection of post-Decalogue Israelite law derived from the people prodding Moses to intercede on their behalf with Yahweh. We find similar examples of this phenomenology in Deut. 5.4-5, which states that *all* revelation arises from this same process.[1] The pericope of Deut. 17.8–18.22 represents the apex of this theology, and contains a careful weaving of Shilonite methods and ideas into its framework.

The Juridical Dynamics of Deuteronomy 17.8-13[2]

The pericope to which Deut. 17.8-13 belongs properly begins in 16.18, wherein we are informed that each municipality is to have official juridical

---

1.   Notably, Deuteronomy claims that Moses' intercession from the beginning of the revelation at Sinai does not diminish Yahweh's direct address to the people, as the deity stands 'face to face' with the nation (Deut. 5.4).

2.   While Deut. 16.18–17.7 establishes the general principle that Mosaic authority excludes variant/aberrant forms of jurisprudence in every district, we will focus our attention on the passages that address the theological mechanics behind the process of law at the central court in relation to those regional districts and the responsibilities of those directly tied to that process. Levinson (*Deuteronomy*, pp. 117-27) points out that these verses divest regional jurisprudence of any autonomy.

figures (שפטים ושוטרים) stationed in the village gates. These figures consti-
tute state agents charged with administering national law on the local level;[3]
the identity of these agents will be discussed below. For the moment, we
should consider the sociological implications of establishing such officers.
In the pre-Josianic period, local jurisprudence was an independent venture,
presided over by the village elders. Deuteronomy imposes a different system
upon the village populations in the hinterland by making local judges federal
figures, pushing aside the elders.[4] As such, local jurisprudence is not abro-
gated, but it is subordinated to national norms and a monolithic adherence to
Deuteronomic policy. Deuteronomy 17.8-9 admits that the written form of
Deuteronomy with which these agents are charged may at some point prove
to be insufficient. This, in turn, necessitates consultation with authoritative
figures in the central court:

> If there arises a matter too difficult for you in judgment, between blood and
> blood, between plea and plea, and between stroke and stroke, matters of
> controversy within your gates, then you shall arise, and go to the place which
> Yahweh your God shall choose. (Deut. 17.8-9)

The legal dynamic established in these verses suggests a system where the
extant corpus of law leaves room for interpretation by the regional adminis-
trators. From the perspective of the Josianic authors, the corollaries generated
by local jurists were legitimate so long as they fell into categories defined by
the Deuteronomic law code. It is only when an issue arises that cannot be
readily categorized by existing regional jurisprudence, such as indicated in
Deut. 17.8, that additional steps must be taken. The Deuteronomic Torah
was thus geared to be open to further evaluation and application on both the
regional level (made clear by the term שעריך) and on the national level
(made clear by the allusion to a central court). This implication is made

---

3. See Leuchter, 'Jeremiah's 70-Year Prophecy', p. 512 n. 31, for a discussion.
4. Levinson (*Deuteronomy*, pp. 125-27) discusses the silence in Deut. 16.18 concern-
ing the traditional juridical role of the elders. Instead, regional justice is administered by
state officials, and regional juridical traditions are no longer capable of independent devel-
opment. However, Levinson (p. 127) assumes that these officials are chosen independ-
ently by the regional population, following similar suggestions made by S.D. McBride,
'Polity of the Covenant People: The Book of Deuteronomy', in Christensen (ed.), *A Song
of Power*, pp. 62-77. McBride and Levinson are correct to see a corollary between
regional and central juridical figures, but the systematized and official nature of the
central juridical figures suggests a similar official dimension or status among the regional
judges, not a popular designation. On this, see M. Weinfeld, 'Judge and Officer in Ancient
Israel and in the Ancient Near East', *IOS* 7 (1977), pp. 65-88. Weinfeld's analysis of offi-
cial terminology points to royal/central affiliations among the regional officers. Sweeney
(*King Josiah*, p. 161) suggests a Levitical/priestly component to this affiliation. Sweeney's
suggestion provides a likely alternative to the identity of the regional juridical figures—
the local Levites—who have otherwise been divested of independent cultic authority.

explicit in vv. 9-10, which informs us of the steps one must take in obtaining a rule of judgment:

> And you shall come to the Levitical priests (הכהנים הלוים), and to the judge (השפט) who shall be (יהיה) in those days; and you shall inquire; and they shall declare to you the word of ruling (דבר המשפט). And you shall do (ועשית) according to the word they shall tell you from the place which Yahweh shall choose; and you shall observe to do (ושמרת לעשות) according to all that they shall teach you.

The concerned party must bring his case to the class of Levitical priests and to a figure referred to as 'the judge (השפט) that shall be (יהיה) in those days'. The verb יהיה is singular in form and refers not to the Levitical priests but to the judge, highlighting the shifting identity of the latter (an individual office). The judge of Deut. 17.9 seems to be the national counterpart to the regional שפטים of Deut. 16.18, but the verse also presupposes an important difference between the regional jurists and the central judge: the judge of Deut. 17.9 has greater authority by virtue of access to divine revelation.[5] This suggests that the central judge possesses unique qualities inherent to his office that relate specifically to legal innovation and expansion (the דבר המשפט), deriving from divine interaction. Verse 10 emphasizes that this proclamation is expressly programmatic by using the term עשה twice in the same verse. The image of the central judge seems to conform to that of the Zopheh, who also proclaimed divine will in a programmatic manner. This tip of the hat to the Shiloh tradition is, however, worked into a larger juridical nexus, and the Zuphite figure now has a specific station in a single central locale, namely, Jerusalem.

The placement of the judge strictly within the vicinity of Jerusalem obviously involves interaction with Jerusalem's priests, who would have been the traditional purveyors of law before the Deuteronomic legislation. Deuteronomy mediates between these two typologies: both the Zopheh-as-judge and the Jerusalem priests must function together properly to create new rulings. In v. 11, we find a powerful statement on the relationship between the Deuteronomic Torah, the Levitical priests and the judge of v. 9:

> According to the law (התורה) which they shall teach you (יורוך), and according to the ruling (המשפט) which they shall tell you (יאמרו לך), you shall do (תעשה); you shall not turn aside from the word (דבר) which they shall declare to you, to the right or to the left. (Deut. 17.11)

Josiah's scribes here employ important structural parallelisms. The first half of the verse establishes the relationship between the terms תורה and משפט, associating the former with teaching (יורוך) and the latter with speaking

---

5. Levinson, *Deuteronomy*, p. 129.

(יאמרו לך). The term תורה in this verse should not be read as 'instruction' but as a reference to a corpus of law—most probably the Deuteronomic law code itself—which must be taught to the people inclusive of the new משפט. If there is continuity from the Shiloh tradition to the Deuteronomic circles then we should look to the Levitical priests as those responsible for teaching the תורה;[6] the judge, therefore, must be the figure who has proclaimed the משפט. Notably, both the תורה and משפט are qualified together as the דבר declared to the petitioner, and both are to be regarded as compatible, programmatic, and binding via the architecture of v. 11:

> According to the law (התורה) which they shall teach you, and according to the ruling (המשפט) which they shall tell you,
>
> *you shall do* (תעשׂה);
>
> you shall not turn aside from the word (הדבר) which they shall declare to you, to the right or to the left.

We thus find in v. 11 a detailed explanation and qualification of v. 10, evidencing the apodictic/casuistic formal structure found throughout the Deuteronomic Torah.[7] While v. 10 speaks of acting in accordance with the דבר, v. 11 tells us what constitutes that דבר: the teaching of the תורה and the proclamation of the משפט. Verses 10-11 form a micro-chiasmus, highlighting the nature of the דבר and its centrality to the newly proclaimed juridical policies:

> v. 10:   …the *word* they shall tell you (הדבר)
>   …and you shall observe to *do* (לעשׂות)
>   according to all *that they teach you* (יורוך)
> v. 11:   …the torah (תורה) *that they teach you* (יורוך)
>   [and the משפט that they shall proclaim to you]
>   …you will *do* (תעשׂה)
> …the *word* that they shall tell you (הדבר)

It is notable that an otherwise perfectly structured chiasmus is somewhat offset by the inclusion of the phrase 'and the משפט that they shall proclaim to you'; משפט cannot be dissociated from תורה, regardless of structural concerns.[8] While this disrupts the symmetry of the micro-chiasmus in vv. 10-11,

---

6.   So Halpern, 'Compromise', pp. 76-77, 80-84.

7.   Sweeney (*King Josiah*, p. 160) notes that the apodictic element pertains broadly at the beginning of the unit beginning in Deut. 16.18, but it permeates the smaller sub-units as well.

8.   This creates a strict definition of Torah independent of other attempts at categorization, particularly that of the Wisdom literature (see Prov. 1.8; 3.3; 4.2; 6.20, 23; 28.9). See also Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, pp. 244-74, for a discussion of the 'wisdom substrata' in the Deuteronomic Torah. Weinfeld's conclusions must be viewed in light of the central position taken by the Torah term in Deut. 17.8-13,

it fuses both verses together as one unit, which consequently becomes the thematic apex of a transformative macro-chiasmus in Deut. 17.8-13:

> v. 8:   law among the people [segmentary] (בשעריך)
> v. 9:   juridical authority of the Levitical priesthood and Judge (השפט, הכהנים הלויים)
> vv. 10-11:   the central unit (משפט, תורה, דבר)
> v. 12:   juridical authority of the [Levitical] priesthood and Judge (השפט, הכהן)
> v. 13:   law among the people [collective] (כל העם)

The terminological associations are obvious and deliberate. The entire passage is concerned with providing a model for establishing the foundational legal ideology and then allowing for a system whereby it may be expanded in an official, licensed manner. We may imagine that the charge in Deut. 31.10-13 to read the law publicly every seven years is related to the process of expansion mandated by Deut. 17.8-13. It would provide an opportunity for each community to receive an updated official version of the Deuteronomic lawcode, complete with all the new cases that had been brought to the central court in the intervening period. The public updating of the law every seven years is in fact implied within Deut. 17.8-13 via its outer chiastic frame, which identifies how the individual case will eventually become a matter of monolithic national policy:

> v. 8:   …matters of controversy within your gates (בשעריך).
>
> v. 13:   And all the people (כל העם) shall hear, and fear, and do no more presumptuously.

The address in v. 8 is second person singular in form and is thus an individual address, but directed to *every* individual, or, every individual region. Verse 13, by contrast, employs a third person form and thereby ties the regional districts (שעריך in v. 8) to the entire nation (כל העם in v. 13). While this completes the chiastic parallel—since both refer to the people *en masse* —the regional isolation in the former verse is assimilated into the national

---

subordinating the Wisdom dimensions to the sacral/juridical aspects of the centralized cult and judiciary. As such, his position that Torah is identified with wisdom (p. 256) must be qualified: the association is there, but it is not a matter of equivalency. Scribes, typically associated with schools of wisdom and exegesis (see Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, pp. 23-27) are behind the text, but Mosaic law is the theological centerpiece, not wisdom; scribes in the Josianic court are thereby more closely associated with Mosaic law than with wisdom (so Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, p. 85). See E.W. Heaton, *The School Tradition of the Old Testament* (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), pp. 105-14 (106-107), for the refocusing of scribal rational consciousness in Deuteronomic literature towards the application of law rather than the precepts of wisdom. This matter will be discussed further in Chapter 3, below.

unity of the latter. The playing field is leveled, in a sense: every regional municipality is subject to the matters of national importance that arise from every other regional municipality, since those matters have been qualified by the central court. But in each and every case, the new laws must be proclaimed through the judge at the central court and taught/preserved by the Levitical priests stationed therein.

The Subordination of the King: Deuteronomy 17.14-20

Bearing this in mind, we must examine the passages following Deut. 17.8-13, which plot out the role of the various administrative figures directly associated or dissociated with this juridical system, chief among these being the king (17.14-20). The choice of the Josianic scribes to tackle this figure first after literally laying down the law serves several purposes, both polemical and propagandistic:

> When you shall come into the land which Yahweh your God gives you, and possess it, and dwell therein, and say: 'I will set a king over me, like all the nations that are round about me', you shall indeed set a king over you whom Yahweh your God shall choose; from among your brethren shall you set as king over you; you may not put a foreigner over you, who is not your brother. Only he shall not multiply horses for himself, or cause the people to return to Egypt so that he should multiply horses; for Yahweh has said to you, 'You shall not return that way again'. Neither shall he multiply wives for himself, so that his heart will not turn away; neither shall he greatly multiply to himself silver and gold. And it shall be that, when he sits upon the throne of his kingdom, he shall write for himself a copy of this law in a book before the Levitical priests. And it shall be with him, and he shall read it all the days of his life, so that he may learn to fear Yahweh his God, to keep all the words of this law and these statutes, to do them, that his heart will not be lifted up above his brethren, and that he turn not aside from the commandment, to the right or to the left, so that he may prolong his days in his kingdom, he and his children, in the midst of Israel. (Deut. 17.14-20)

The ideal king depicted in the text is the polar opposite of Solomon,[9] and the passage clearly contributes to the critique of Solomon running through other

---

9.   So also Sweeney, *King Josiah*, pp. 161-62. One should recognize the literary position of the Law of the King, though, in the juridical pericope; it is centrally situated, between the rules concerning the court (17.8-13) and the qualifications concerning the priests and prophetic figures (18.1-22). Levinson (*Deuteronomy*, pp. 109-27) has demonstrated that the locus of 17.2-7 in its current position relates to the assignment of specific types of processes to different official spheres of activity; the same logic results in the locus of 17.14-20. Though the king is prohibited from generating law, the literary sequence of the pericope suggests that the king is nonetheless integral to the process of jurisprudence and that his proper role involves the issues addressed in the surrounding

parts of the Deuteronomistic works.[10] An additional purpose of the law of
the king, however, surfaces in the claim that the king must be a native Israel-
ite (מקרב אחיך in v. 15). While some scholars have pointed out that this may
be a reference to Solomon's handing over of the northern Israelite territories
to Phoenician rule,[11] it also appears to be a reaction to the experience with
Assyria from which Judah was emerging.[12] The law bars a foreign king from
interfering with Israelite law and prohibits the Israelite from accepting the
hegemony of such a king.[13] Monarchy must strictly resist imperialism, and
the Israelite king must stand against the forms of governance that involved a
slighting of Yahweh through allegiance to any other form of overlord.
Indeed, the only suzerain fit for Israel is its own deity,[14] who speaks through
the Deuteronomic law and the licensed amendments generated in the central
court. As such, Israel's king must abide by that system of law as a sign of
fealty. Thus we encounter the closing verses of the unit, which envision the
king sitting and learning the law administered to him by the Levitical priests;
that this follows the system described in Deut. 17.8-13 suggests that the king
is to adhere not only to the extant Deuteronomic legislation, but to whatever
new laws are proclaimed by the central judge and subsequently taught by the
priests. The royal covenant is subordinate to Mosaic law, and thus the king
is subordinate to divine rulings mediated through Mosaic figures. Deuteron-
omy 17.14-20 effectively takes the king out of the juridical equation, at least
within the world of the text.[15]

material. From a hermeneutical perspective, the text may relate to the proper position of
the king in redefining the identity of officers in the central court, the regional juridical
centers, and the qualifications of the Levitical and prophetic figures involved. In other
words, the content of 17.14-20 may prohibit the king from generating laws, but the posi-
tion of 17.14-20 demonstrates that the king may determine the identity of those who are
allowed to do so, a meta-textual dynamic legitimizing Josiah's sponsorship of the reform
that led to the composition of the Deuteronomic Torah itself.

  10. Sweeney, 'The Critique of Solomon', pp. 615-17.
  11. Sweeney, *King Josiah*, p. 162.
  12. W.M. Schniedewind offers a similar evaluation regarding the larger Deuter-
onomic reform (*How the Bible Became a Book*: *The Textualization of Ancient Israel*
[Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004], p. 108).
  13. R.H. Lowery, *The Reforming Kings*: *Cult and Society in First Temple Judah*
(JSOTSup, 120; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), pp. 154-55.
  14. Note the influence of the Vassal Treaties of Esarhaddon (VTE) on the form of the
Deuteronomic Torah, as observed by Weinfeld (*Deuteronomy 1–11*, pp. 7-9; *Deuteron-
omy and the Deuteronomic School*, pp. 82-138). It is no coincidence that the legislation
which prohibits Assyrian-style imperialism is so strongly influenced by the very literary
works that secured Assyria's imperial position over its vassals. By adopting the discourse
style of the VTE, Deuteronomy precludes any other competitor (such as Assyria) from
attempting to establish hegemony by the same rhetorical means.
  15. Sweeney (*King Josiah*, p. 162) notes that 17.14-20 do not limit the king's ability
to make *executive* decisions based on the law, though he cannot generate laws himself.

The Agents of the Juridical Establishment:
Levitical Priesthood in Deuteronomy 18

The elimination of the king from juridical proceedings raises the issue of the relationship between the other offices traditionally understood by scholars to be defined by the juridical pericope of Deut. 17.8–18.22.[16] Upon removing the king from the mix, we find an apodictic/casuistic relationship between the figures mentioned in 17.8-13 and those of ch. 18. As will be discussed below, the general reference to Levitical priests in the former passage corresponds to the specific rules concerning Levites in Deuteronomy 18, and the general reference to the judge corresponds to the specific rules concerning (Mosaic) prophetic intercession. Neither of these classifications or associations should be surprising. The very term הכהנים הלוים which permeates Deuteronomy obviously would relate to legislation concerning Levites, and, as we have already seen, the role of the central court judge is patterned, phenomenologically, upon the behavior of the Zophim who were already tied to prophetic heritage of a distinctively Mosaic sort. What is significant is the manner in which the presentation of these figures establishes new theological and political paradigms that channel older traditions in dramatically new directions, and for very specific rhetorical purposes.

The legislation concerning the Levites in Deuteronomy appears to provide a surrogate system of sustenance in the face of the closure of the rural cult. Deuteronomy provides two obvious options: a welfare program for 'the Levite in your gates' who is to be cared for along with the underprivileged,[17] and the opportunity to come to Jerusalem to minister at the Temple. Deuteronomy 18.1-5 identifies what a Levite can expect to receive upon migrating to Jerusalem:

> The Levitical priests, all the tribe of Levi, shall have no portion or inheritance with Israel; they shall eat the offerings of Yahweh made by fire, and his inheritance. And they shall have no inheritance among their brethren; Yahweh is their inheritance, as he has spoken to them. And this shall be the priests' due from the people, from those that offer a sacrifice, be it an ox or sheep,

This is a far cry from David's day, when the king was able to institute new laws (1 Sam. 30.22-24), but the polemic is more properly anti-Solomon, as it is Solomon who attempts to settle matters unaccountable under extant law by virtue of personal wisdom rather than by deferring to Mosaic intercession (1 Kgs 3.16-28).

16. Most scholars see Deut. 17.8-13 as referring to different figures from those covered in ch. 18. As Levinson points out (*Deuteronomy*, pp. 98-143), the entire pericope deals with the central court and thus all the figures dealt with are loosely related to each other by virtue of literary/hermeneutical theme. However, as I hope to demonstrate below, the principal figures discussed in 17.8-13, the Levitical priests and the judge, relate directly to those discussed in ch. 18, which delineates their phenomenological dynamics.

17. Sweeney, *King Josiah*, p. 163.

that they shall give to the priest the shoulder, and the two cheeks, and the maw. The first-fruits of your corn, your wine, and your oil, and the first of the fleece of your sheep, you shall give him. For Yahweh your God has chosen him out of all your tribes, to stand to minister (שרת) in the name of Yahweh, him and his sons for all days. (Deut. 18.1-5)

It is clear that sacrifice plays a significant part in the Temple activity; this is presupposed by the discussion of the tithe that is due to the priests. Still, the material leading up to this legislation has focused more on jurisprudence than on sacrifice, and the current discourse concerning the Levite must provide some insight into the legal dynamics. The ensuing legislation in Deut. 18.6-8 carries additional dimensions that relate to this juridical context:

And if a Levite comes from any of your gates (מאחד שעריך) out of all Israel, where he sojourns, and comes with all the desire of his soul unto the place which Yahweh shall choose, then he shall minister in the name of Yahweh his God, as all his brethren the Levites do, who stand there before Yahweh. They shall have the same portions to eat, beside that which is his due according to the fathers' houses.

These Levites who live in the satellite communities beyond Jerusalem are able to come to the central sanctuary to become Levitical priests like those depicted in Deut. 17.8-13 and 18.1-5 and become part of the juridical process at the central court. That these Levites are inherently able to execute this role once they make the move to Jerusalem suggests an analogous role in the satellite communities. A task as crucial as the proper administration of Torah could hardly be tackled without prior familiarity and background.[18] Verse 6 specifies that these Levites reside in the city gates (מאחד שעריך אשר הוא גר שם), the locale of regional legal rulings (17.8). Similarly, 16.18 specifies that the regional court officials reside within the city gates; it is likely that these officials were none other than the Levites referred to in 18.6-8. The transfer of regional juridical authority to local Levites would certainly help facilitate the acceptance of central authority among the regional municipalities by allowing established religious figures to retain an administrative position. We may find here echoes from the clan system, where Levitical priestly figures were affiliated with regional shrines and, one would imagine, regional legal traditions.[19] In 18.1-8, the Levites from the local shrines are

18. Fishbane (*Biblical Interpretation*, p. 84) addresses scribal training as a feature of Israelite priesthood, though the training pertains more to a role as a copyist as distinct from that of an exegete.

19. So Halpern, 'Compromise', pp. 76-77, 84. Halpern's argument (pp. 81-84) that the content of Deut. 17.8–18.22 originates (at least in theme) during the early shift to monarchy as Samuel's Levitical-priestly stipulations for accepting a king is attractive in relation to the otherwise elusive 'rule concerning the monarchy' in 1 Sam. 10.25. But whatever the form of this legislation, it would have been transformed by the Josianic

subordinated to Deuteronomic norms, but it is worth noting that while the shrines may have been eliminated (see Deut. 12), the Levitical orders have not. The Deuteronomic Torah may thus eliminate *independent* Levitical authority, but not Levitical authority itself; rather, it is portrayed as part of the dynamic between regional and national legal spheres.[20] If the regional Levites are identified with the juridical officials of 16.18 who replace the traditional village elders, then the Deuteronomic calls to support the local Levite represent a method of income for their juridical services.[21]

 Deuteronomy 18 then goes on to address the casuistic parallel for the judge in 17.8-13. This figure, as we have already seen, behaves like a Zopheh in terms of (juridical) intercession, but the Josianic authors of this unit go to great lengths to make clear that nobody else may ever lay claim to this position. Just as 17.14-20 made abundantly clear that the king could not in any sense possess juridical responsibilities, 18.9-14 specifies that figures from non- or pre-Deuteronomic religious culture were likewise excluded from the sacred court.[22] Verse 9 prefaces the detailed list of illegal cult figures and practices by defining them, first and foremost, as foreign (תועבת הגוים), a sure sign that they were anathema to late seventh-century Israelite identity.[23] The verse also supports the need for the adoption of Josianic/Deuteronomic policy, since it is clear that the ancestors of the seventh-century audience *did*

authors into the current Deuteronomic text. For the pre-Deuteronomistic juridical authority of local Levites, see Levinson, *Deuteronomy*, pp. 111-16.

    20.   The objections voiced by R.K. Duke to this passage as a mandate for rural Levites' participation at the Jerusalem sanctuary is based on readings of the term שרת from postexilic sources, which functioned under a dramatically different sociological paradigm ('The Portion of the Levite: Another Reading of Deuteronomy 18.6-8', *JBL* 106 [1987], pp. 193-201 [199]). See the critique by M.S. Smith, *The Pilgrimage Pattern in Exodus* (JSOTSup, 239; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), pp. 257-58 n. 122.

    21.   The lack of access to the tithe is one of Sweeney's primary arguments concerning the marginalization of the Levitical orders (*King Josiah*, pp. 152-53). However, their employment as juridical officers would provide compensation if they operated under royal auspices and received subsidies. In this regard, Weinfeld's observation ('Judge and Officer', p. 84) that the terminology in Deut. 16.18 is expressly royal in its contextual background suggests that this was indeed the case and implies a relationship between the regional jurists of that passage and the Levites of 18.1-8. This matter will be examined in greater detail in a future study.

    22.   Weinfeld (*Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, p. 268) identifies Deut. 18.9-12 as part of the wisdom substrata, but the larger context is juridical and prophetic in scope (see J.R. Lundbom, 'The *Inclusio* and Other Framing Devices in Deuteronomy i–xxviii', *VT* 46 [1996], pp. 296-315 [309-12]).

    23.   See B. Halpern, 'Brisker Pipes than Poetry: The Development of Israelite Monotheism', in Neusner, Frerichs, and Levine (eds.), *Judaic Perspectives on Ancient Israel*, pp. 77-115 (97-98, 101-102). Halpern discusses the 'alienating' tendency in the crystallization of Israelite monotheism that reaches a fervor in the seventh century.

employ these methods right up to Josiah's reign.[24] The divine directive in vv. 9-14 to abstain from necromancy, divination, child sacrifice, and so on, must have upset the religious sensibilities of Josiah's subjects.[25] The regional Levites are typologically separated from these corrupt figures, though their proximate position in the text suggests a pre-Deuteronomistic connection between them.[26] The legislation in vv. 9-14 matches that of Deuteronomy 12: the text outlaws institutions that were a well-entrenched feature of traditional Israelite religious life and community, thereby redefining the standards of Israelite identity according to Deuteronomistic ideology alone.

The Agents of the Juridical Establishment: Mosaic Prophecy in Deuteronomy 18

This brings us to the culmination of the juridical pericope, and arguably the central passage in the book of Deuteronomy. Deuteronomy 18.15 discusses the institution of the Mosaic prophet:

> A prophet from your midst, from your brethren (מקרבך מאחיך) like me will Yahweh your God raise up for you; to him you shall hearken.

In contrast to the bogus foreign forms of intermediation in the preceding verses, the Mosaic prophet is raised up by Yahweh from among Israelite ethnic circles (מקרבך מאחיך, v. 15). Verse 15, then, associates variant forms of Yahwism—which doubtlessly included the forms delineated in vv. 9-14 —with the abrogation of covenantal fidelity to Yahweh as Israel's national God. Pluralism is effectively nullified under the threat of heresy, which encompasses forms of tradition standing against that of Deuteronomy. The use of the kinship language in this context (מקרבך מאחיך) serves an emphatic and polemical purpose, recalling as it does the law concerning the

---

24. Levinson, *Deuteronomy*, p. 145.

25. This is preserved most concisely and directly in the remarkable passage in Jer. 44.15-19 (polemical in tone as it may be), but it is also evident in the traditions concerning Manasseh (2 Kgs 21.1-7, 16), a proximate precedent to Josiah, as well as the reference in 2 Kgs 23.10 that Josiah destroyed the Tophet in the Valley of Hinnom, suggesting the cessation of recent activity. Older traditions as well preserve the memory of these practices as common—Judg. 11.34-40 portrays Jephthah sacrificing his own daughter in fulfillment of his vow, an act that would have been proscribed by Deut. 18.10, and 1 Sam. 28.8-25 has Saul engaging the services of a necromancer, likewise proscribed in Deut. 18.11. Finally, divination is well attested in pre-Deuteronomic biblical traditions (Deut. 33.8; Josh. 7.16-18; 1 Sam. 14.17-19).

26. Wilson (*Prophecy and Society*, p. 160) points out that Deut. 18.1-8 makes no mention of traditional divination practices associated with the Levites; their function is brought under the rubric of prophetic authority by being divested of any competing qualities in terms of facilitating contact with the divine.

king in Deut. 17.15 and the charge that governance cannot in any way toler-
ate foreign influence. As some scholars have noted, the nature of ethnicity
and kinship is redefined in Deuteronomy. The law discards 'the ideology and
language of kinship' and 'the individualization imposed by Deuteronomy'
and attempts 'to impose a common code of moral indignation throughout the
country, a cultural identity that outstrips the obligations of kinship…in its
claims on individual loyalty'.[27] Deuteronomy 13.7-12 makes this abundantly
clear by identifying covenantal obligation as adherence to the law above and
beyond kinship ties. The language of 18.15 specifies that true kinship is
rooted in a communal acceptance of the law, and that all legitimate offices
derive from this community in contradistinction to competing groups who
are either apostates (13.7-12) or foreign typologies (18.9-14).[28]

It is thus significant that vv. 16-17 define the parameters of the true
prophetic office in terms of the *community* delineated by adherence to the
Deuteronomic law:

> *According to all that you desired of Yahweh your God in Horeb* in the day of
> the assembly, saying, 'Let me not hear again the voice of Yahweh my God, and
> let me not see this great fire any more, so that I shall not die'. And Yahweh said
> to me, '*They have said well that which they have spoken*'. (Deut. 18.16-17)

Here we encounter a reference to Deut. 5.22, which states that the Mosaic
intercession at Sinai/Horeb was a communal request, and all subsequent
revelation (including the dramatic redefinition of kinship in Deuteronomy) is
a result of this request. The reference in 18.16-17 creates an *inclusio* of sorts
with 5.18-29, where Moses explains how the ensuing text is an official expla-
nation of earlier revelation at Sinai, and the discourse of ch. 18. Though the
casuistic purpose of 18.15-18 is to identify the judge of 17.8-13 as a Mosaic
prophet, the invocation of 5.22 at this point in the chapter gives that judge
the stamp of Sinaitic authority and 'traditional'[29] communal approval: not
only is the judge a Mosaic prophet whose office was commissioned at Sinai/
Horeb, but the people themselves had asked for the creation of this very
office. As a result, *any laws generated through the juridical process of Deut.
17.8-13 possess the same degree of authority as any laws generated by
Moses because they are part of the same Sinaitic impulse of revelation*.[30]
This is further suggested by a recurrence of the דבר terminology in 17.9-11
and 18.18:

27.   Halpern, 'Jerusalem and the Lineages', pp. 71, 75.
28.   Lowery, *The Reforming Kings*, p. 154.
29.   'Traditional' insofar as the people's ancestors are credited with requesting what
would eventually be presented as the Deuteronomic legislation.
30.   See Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1–11*, p. 324. Weinfeld notes that Moses' interces-
sory role in Deut. 5.22 pertains to additional revelation beyond that which the nation has
already encountered.

Deut. 17.9-11—…and they shall declare to you the word of ruling (דבר המשפט). And you shall do according to the word (על פי הדבר)…you shall not turn aside from the word (הדבר) that they shall tell you…

Deut. 18.18—And I will raise up for them a prophet from among their brethren like you, and I will put my words in his mouth (ונתתי דברי בפיו).

The text thereby establishes the central position of the Mosaic office in relation to the juridical process of 17.8-13. To drive the point home, 18.18 ascribes this statement to Yahweh himself, and vv. 19-20 specify that every Israelite will be compelled to follow the words of the Deuteronomic prophet/ judge, mandated already at Sinai.

This brings us to the final verses of the pericope, which direct our attention to the role of the people in reacting to the words of the Mosaic prophet. Verses 21-22 address the uncertainty concerning the recognition of a Mosaic prophet, which is as much a matter of intellectual evaluation as it is an issue of covenantal fidelity:[31]

And if you say in your heart, 'How shall we know the word which Yahweh has not spoken?' When a prophet speaks in the name of Yahweh, if the thing follows not, nor comes to pass, that is the thing which Yahweh has not spoken; the prophet has spoken it presumptuously; you shall not be afraid of him. (Deut. 18.21-22)

Recognizing the Mosaic prophet is as important as hearing, studying and teaching the words this prophet speaks. Non-Mosaic prophets, who are in fact not prophets at all,[32] are to be rebuked, according to v. 22. Thus the final focus of the juridical pericope is not the governor but the governed, as it is up to them to affirm the Mosaic prophet as a matter of covenantal fidelity.

This implies a profound meta-textual dimension concerning Mosaic prophecy. The readers of Deut. 18.15-22 are being asked to consider the Mosaic prophet of their time, but vv. 21-22 imply a *retrospective* evaluation —legitimacy is based upon looking back to see if the words take effect. Yet if the judge in the central court is a Mosaic prophet, and the משפט he or she generates is to be implemented throughout the nation, then the need to know is indeed immediate.[33] The pressure is such that the audience of these verses

31.   The term בלבבך echoes the commandment to engage and study the law in Deut. 6.5.

32.   The rhetorical features of the Deut. 13/Deut. 18 *inclusio* (Lundbom, 'The *Inclusio*', pp. 309-12) create this qualification (i.e. the non-Mosaic prophet in 18.21-22 is equated with the non-Yahweh prophet in 13.2-4). See also Levinson, *Deuteronomy*, p. 145.

33.   J. Tigay (*Deuteronomy: The JPS Torah Commentary* [New York: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1989], pp. 177-78) discusses the problem of waiting to determine whether the candidate for Mosaic authority is validated through the

cannot wait to see if the words of this prophet will come true before putting them into action, yet vv. 21-22 clearly call for retrospection.[34]

   To this end, we must remind ourselves of one very important rhetorical element: the words of this text, while addressing a seventh-century audience, are presented in a thirteenth-century context, and the seventh-century reader is thus made aware of a 600-year history that is presented as having emerged from these words. We have already seen that through the internal syntactical dynamics of Deut. 18.15-18, the text legitimizes all those following in Moses' prophetic footsteps.[35] While the Deuteronomic Torah certainly establishes Moses as the fountainhead for legitimate prophecy, 18.21-22 invites the audience to consult a larger historical work that preserves the record of earlier prophets: the Josianic DH.[36] It is only through the study of this history that the readers of 18.15-22 can establish whether the current claimant to Mosaic authority is truly speaking the divine דבר akin to those who came before.

---

eventuation of his word. The text in vv. 15-20 contains an enormous degree of immediacy and insistency concerning the affective nature of the divine word communicated through the prophet, and any evaluation of the text runs into the difficulty posed through the standards of qualification in vv. 21-22 in terms of the ready implementation of the juridical process. The uncertainty of the status of the prophetic utterance is unacceptable if the juridical system is to function, yet the text makes clear that reticence in following the utterance results in dire consequences. Additional elements must assist in qualifying the potential Mosaic prophet beyond those provided by the current text.

   34.   Lohfink's evaluation of this verse ('Die Sicherung', pp. 313-14) and the broader pericope of 16.18–18.22 as exilic allows for the temporal distance and theoretical status of the passage to function as a self-contained literary unit demanding retrospection. However, Sweeney (*King Josiah*, pp. 160-63) has demonstrated the Josianic provenance of this pericope, and thus the demand for retrospective evaluation again highlights the limitations of the current text in the same breath as it stresses its invariability.

   35.   So also Wilson, *Prophecy and Society*, p. 162 n. 52; Seitz, 'The Prophet Moses', p. 5.

   36.   Friedman ('The Deuteronomistic School', p. 78), B.M. Levinson ('The Reconceptualization of Kingship in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History's Transformation of Torah', *VT* 51 [2001], pp. 511-34), G.N. Knoppers ('Rethinking the Relationship between Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History: The Case of Kings', *CBQ* 63 [2001], pp. 393-415), and many other scholars have argued for separate authorship (or sponsorship) of the Deuteronomic Torah and DH, citing the discrepancy between the concept of kingship in both (Friedman, however, takes issue on the grounds of chronology rather than conceptual ideology, as he dates the Deuteronomic law code to an earlier period). Sweeney (*King Josiah*, pp. 161-64, 168-69), however, demonstrates that the Law of the King in Deut. 17.14-20 empowers the monarch's ability to make decisions on how Deuteronomic law is to be executed, and points out that the couching of Josianic interests in Mosaic language guarantees the king's ability to consolidate power by making the royal agenda a matter of Mosaic revelation.

The Deuteronomic Juridical Process and 2 Kings 22–23

The scribes who composed/redacted the Josianic-era DH harmonized the words of these prophets, which often possess lexical and thematic commonalities.[37] The DH could thus provide the precedents necessary to qualify the rulings of the judge at the central court as authentically Mosaic if the current message was consistent with older messages. This, in turn, could support Josiah's interests by highlighting past problems or celebrating positive accomplishments. Such a historical document is not without precedent; it was certainly the norm for an ancient Near Eastern royal court to possess detailed literary works related to the ruler or dynasty of the period. Such was the case with the previous Israelite kings, both Ephraimite and Judean, from the dawn of the monarchic period.[38] The difference, however, is that previous royal literature did not possess the transformative scope of the Josianic DH, which harmonized and incorporated the discordant sources into one didactic work that expressed the ideas of the Deuteronomic Torah. Every significant moment and figure relating to Israel's history in the land was examined through this lens and typologically evaluated for better or for worse.

This literary work was meant to be accessible to the public for a purpose directly relating to the law that was to guide their daily lives.[39] If the

37. This is typically characterized by the lengthy theological exhortations found throughout the DH, including 1 Sam. 2.27-36; 12; 1 Kgs 11.29-39; 13.1-10; etc. In all of these episodes, prophets are used to give a voice to the Deuteronomist's interests, and all share common themes. The *locus classicus* of the Deuteronomistic perspective regarding a unified prophetic voice throughout Israel's history is 2 Kgs 17.7-23.

38. White (*The Elijah Legends*, *passim*) discusses this as a fundamental feature of Jehu's ninth-century rise to power, but the practice goes back much further. The Davidic court history preserved in 1–2 Samuel (see Halpern, *David's Secret Demons*, *passim*) and the pre-Deuteronomistic Saul narratives (see Na'aman, 'The Pre-Deuteronomistic Story of King Saul') possess this dimension in terms of legitimizing David's and Saul's respective claims to legitimacy.

39. This is certainly a shift in perspective from the regional traditions fostered at local popular shrines (Jenks, *Elohist*, p. 15). This argument has been taken up more recently by R.K. Gnuse ('Redefining the Elohist', *JBL* 119 [2000], pp. 201-20), though Gnuse postulates a seventh-century origin for the Elohist traditions. Finally, W.D. Whitt ('The Jacob Traditions in Hosea and their Relation to Genesis', *ZAW* 103 [1991], pp. 18-43) makes the plausible case for Jacob traditions at the Bethel sanctuary serving as the basis for the references in Hosea (though his conclusion that the Jacob material in Genesis is subsequent to Hosea seems too dramatic). These earlier methods of regional traditional development were likely brushed aside by the domination of Assyria in the eighth–seventh centuries and their predilection for erecting stelae to make their accomplishments and policies a matter of broad public awareness; see J. Börcher-Klähn, *Altvorderasiatische Bildstelen und vergleichbare Felsreliefs* (Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1982), pp. 202-203,

seventh-century audience of Deut. 18.21-22 was being asked to examine the record of history (the parameters of which were ostensibly set by the Moses of Deuteronomy), then the Josianic DH was poised to provide calculated answers to questions concerning Yahweh's demands.

It is fitting, then, that this history, the litmus test for Deuteronomic ideology, ends with an account of one such Mosaic figure, Huldah (2 Kgs 22.14-20), whose משפט is directly inspired by the Deuteronomic Torah itself.[40] As preserved in the narrative of 2 Kings 22–23, Josiah's great merit rests not only in his observance of the laws found in the Deuteronomic Torah but also in his pious response to the משפט (compare, for example, Ahab's response to Micaiah b. Imlah in 1 Kgs 22). The fact that the Torah becomes the ספר הברית of 2 Kgs 23.2 implies a dynamic between the laws in the book found by Hilkiah and their application through the משפט delivered by Huldah. The laws of the past become the symbol of the covenant for the future through their legitimate expansion by a Mosaic prophet. Huldah, for her part, is vindicated within the narrative as a legitimate Mosaic prophet by virtue of the history in the pages preceding her episode; she proclaims to Josiah what has indeed already happened once before to the north because they had ignored the words of Mosaic prophets (2 Kgs 17.7-23) and what might happen to Judah should her words and the newly discovered Torah go unheeded.

The inter-textual referencing is by no means unidirectional. Just as Deut. 18.15-22 directs the reader to the historical material of the Josianic DH, the narrative of 2 Kings 22–23 overtly takes on the very features of Deut. 17.8-13: the discovery of the Deuteronomic Torah (ספר התורה, 2 Kgs 22.8-11) corresponds to the unresolved דבר of Deut. 17.8 (כי יפלא ממך דבר). This תורה is brought forward by Hilkiah, a (Levitical) Priest, the same figure who teaches/preserves the תורה in Deut. 17.9/12.[41] The question of its

for a list of stelae erected by Sargon II to record various military activities in the West Semitic regions. Weinfeld (*Deuteronomy 1–11*, pp. 7-9; *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, pp. 82-138) has demonstrated the close similarities in form between the Deuteronomic discourse and Assyrian treaty forms uniformly applied during the reign of Esarhaddon. It is thus quite likely that the Josianic DH functioned similarly, as a public historical (textual) monument asserting the treaty-covenant of the Deuteronomy Torah as applicable in every Israelite municipality over against the earlier fragmented and isolated tradition complexes.

40.   See B. Halpern and D. Vanderhooft, 'The Editions of Kings in the Sixth–Seventh Centuries', *HUCA* 62 (1991), pp. 179-244 (222-29). Halpern and Vanderhooft argue against the exilic provenance of Huldah's oracle and point to its proper place as part of the Josianic DH.

41.   Typologically, and even literally, Hilkiah is a 'handler of the law' of the sort suggested by Jeremiah (Jer. 2.8), though the Jeremianic reference is decidedly negative and reflects a circumstance later than (and separate from) the emergence of the Torah in Jerusalem in 622.

expansion and application is put to rest by the מֹשׁפּם of Huldah, who matches the judge of Deut. 17.9/12. That the entire affair relates to the דבר, the structural heart of Deut. 17.8-13, is suggested by end of 2 Kgs 22.20: 'and they returned [the] דבר to the king'. Finally, Josiah's subsequent actions after hearing Huldah's oracle constitute a direct parallel to the person who expunges the evil from within the community in Deut. 17.12 (ובערת הרע מישראל). Josiah 'expunged' (בער) apostasy from his realm in 2 Kgs 23.24.[42] While being mindful of the inter-textual rhetorical strategies, we should note the propagandistic element: the representatives of the regions in Deut. 17.8 have been replaced by the royal emissaries, and the regional population that hears the ruling in Deut. 17.12 is replaced by Josiah himself. Despite the Law of the King in 17.14-20 and the institution of Mosaic law as the national standard, Josiah's interests remain at the heart of the matter.

---

42.   Friedman (*The Exile and Biblical Narrative* [HSM, 22; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981], p. 8) discusses Josiah's fulfillment of laws found in Deut. 17.8-13. The parallel structure, however, goes beyond that which Friedman covers, and creates a coda of sorts: the Josiah episode in the DH refers one back to the heart of the Deuteronomic juridical pericope and indeed the functional heart of the Deuteronomic Torah, lending the Josianic reign a similar trans-historical and trans-literary dimension fitting of quasi-mythological status. It is for this reason that the ספר התורה becomes the ספר הברית in 2 Kgs 23.2—the new covenant emerges out of the foundation myth just as the old covenant emerged out of the mythic dimensions of the Exodus/Sinai event (though Schniedewind suggests that the 'scroll of the Covenant' in 2 Kgs 23.2 is a deliberate reference to the old Covenant Code [*How the Bible Became a Book*, pp. 112, 126]). For additional intertextual features shared by Deuteronomy and 2 Kgs 22–23, see R.E. Friedman, 'From Egypt to Egypt: Dtr 1 and Dtr 2', in Halpern and Levenson (eds.), *Traditions in Transformation*, pp. 167-92 (171-73).

3

JOSIAH'S NORTHERN AGENDA

The recasting of the laws and juridical system in Deuteronomy was intended to provide a surrogate social order in Josiah's realm following the death of Assurbanipal in 627 and the weakening of Assyrian hegemony.[1] This may have allowed Josiah to reclaim a short-lived independence for his realm, but the experience with Assyria had facilitated a paradigm shift that precluded Josiah from restoring the norms of the pre-Assyrian Israelite society.[2] This paradigm shift had begun two generations earlier under Hezekiah, and in both cases, the history, culture, and religion of northern Israel made a powerful impression upon the literature these kings sponsored.

The Admixture of Ephraimite and Judean Populations

Twenty years after the fall of the northern kingdom in 721, Assyria turned its sights to Judah following Hezekiah's withholding of tribute, which constituted an act of rebellion. This was no doubt influenced by the death of Sargon II in 705, which Hezekiah must have viewed as an opportunity to assert independence after years of vassalage.[3] To carry out his revolt and prepare for retaliation, Hezekiah engaged in a massive urbanization project within Judah's borders, leading him to sponsor a literary campaign that yielded new standards for morality, social identity, and law.[4] This religious

---

1. On dating Assurbanipal's death to 627, see G.W. Ahlström, *The History of Ancient Palestine from the Palaeolithic Period to Alexander's Conquest* (ed. D.V. Edelman; JSOTSup, 146; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), p. 751; Lowery, *The Reforming Kings*, p. 191 n. 1; Bright, *History of Israel*, p. 317; A. Malamat, *History of Biblical Israel: Major Problems and Minor Issues* (Culture and History of the Ancient Near East, 7; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2001), p. 287; J.M. Miller and J.H. Hayes, *A History of Ancient Israel and Judah* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1986), pp. 381-82.

2. For a brief overview of Assyrian political influence on Judah, see M. Cogan, 'Judah under Assyrian Hegemony: A Re-examination of *Imperialism and Religion*', *JBL* 112 (1993), pp. 403-14.

3. See Lowery, *The Reforming Kings*, pp. 142-47, for the political background to Hezekiah's reform leading up to 701.

4. The presentation of Hezekiah in the DH is that of a prototype model which anticipates Josiah's emergence. N. Na'aman notes that the Josianic Deuteronomists seized

and social reform program was effectively marginalized when Manasseh ascended the throne, as that king opted to restore social organization to the Judean hinterland (albeit in a limited way) and permit the practice of traditional religion that had been muted, but not demolished, during Hezekiah's reign.[5] A more effective plan of suppression would obtain only under Josiah, which necessitated the vilification of Manasseh and the identification of his fifty-five years of peace as fifty-five years of apostasy (2 Kgs 21.1-9, 16).[6]

The paradigm shift under Hezekiah, however, was not only experienced by rural Israel and its cult. The character of the urban elite changed significantly during the period of the northern emigration to Judah after Israel's fall in 721. The presence of Ephraimite refugees, which doubtlessly included scribes, made a significant impact on the formulation of Judean literature,

upon the records from Hezekiah's reign and shaped the pertinent events to establish continuity between Josiah and Hezekiah ('The Debated Historicity of Hezekiah's Reform in the Light of Historical and Archaeological Research', *ZAW* 107 [1995], pp. 179-95 [190-91]). However, Na'aman also challenges the historicity of Hezekiah's cultic reforms as presented in the text (pp. 193-95; see also Ben Zvi, 'History and Prophetic Texts', pp. 107-10). While Hezekiah's efforts may have focused on sociological concerns rather than cultic reform, the text's presentation of that king accurately reflects the religious ramifications of Hezekiah's urbanization program, even if the Josianic scribes amplified it for rhetorical purposes later (Halpern and Vanderhooft, 'The Editions of Kings', pp. 239-43). For Hezekiah's program of urbanization, see Halpern, 'Jerusalem and the Lineages', pp. 41-59; W.M. Schniedewind, *Society and the Promise to David* (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 52-58; Lowery, *The Reforming Kings*, pp. 142-61. Textual evidence within Deuteronomy supports the Josianic development of Hezekian literature. Levinson points to the degree to which Josiah's scribes have re-worked an earlier version of that law code, that is, the exegesis of Deut. 13 in Deut. 17.2-7 (*Deuteronomy*, pp. 107-37). This differs from the Deuteronomic re-working of the Covenant Code—which the Deuteronomists sought to displace—insofar as the earlier laws of Deut. 13 remain part of the same literary work in which the exegesis of Deut. 17.2-7 appears. The continuity established between these two literary strata mesh well with the presentation of Hezekiah as an antecedent to Josiah, and suggest that there was indeed some ideological continuity between (some of) the scribal circles working beneath both kings (see below). For an overview of the historical features of Hezekiah's reform, see W.B. Barrick, *The King and the Cemeteries: Toward a New Understanding of Josiah's Reform* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2002), pp. 144-50.

5.   Barrick, *The King and the Cemeteries*, pp. 150-52; H. Tadmor, 'The Period of the First Temple, the Babylonian Exile, and the Restoration', in H.H. Ben-Sasson (ed.), *A History of the Jewish People* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1976), pp. 146-48; Ahlström, *The History of Ancient Palestine,* pp. 735-40; Lowery, *The Reforming Kings*, pp. 169-71, 182-85 (Lowery discusses the Deuteronomistic evaluations of Manasseh's policies).

6.   2 Kgs 21.10-15 are generally viewed as exilic interpolations into an older account, though Sweeney notes that the older account has also been subjected to minute redactional accretions (*King Josiah*, p. 59). For the association of outlawed practices with Manasseh's reign, see Barrick, *The King and the Cemeteries*, p. 95.

historiographic or otherwise, as these refugees were brought into the infra-structure of Jerusalem and its satellite communities.[7] That the northern refugees left their impression most firmly on the urban centers of Judah is evidenced in Micah's critique of the Jerusalemite elite in Mic. 1.5:

> For the transgression of Jacob is all this, and for the sins of the house of Israel. What is the transgression of Jacob? Is it not Samaria? And what are the high places of Judah? Are they not Jerusalem?

Micah euphemistically identifies northern refugees (Jacob) with the broader house of Israel now represented in Judah and Jerusalem.[8] The religious cul-ture of both is equated with the devastation of Samaria, an earlier event that Micah recalls to powerful polemical effect. While the reference to Samaria (the royal capital of the north) may be employed for emphatic purposes, this passage may suggest that many of the northern refugees that Micah addresses were once prominent members of the Samarian elite. Micah's most impas-sioned castigation against the northerners in Judah and Jerusalem is heard in Mic. 3.1-4:

> And I said: Hear, I pray you, you heads of Jacob, and rulers of the house of Israel: is it not for you to know justice?… *Then shall they cry unto Yahweh, but he will not answer them; he will hide his face from them* at that time, according as they have wrought evil in their doings.

Micah here invokes the language of two traditions associated with northern heritage: the covenantal dialogue of the Moses and Samuel traditions, and the imagery of Deut. 32.20, where Yahweh claims he will 'hide his face' from his unworthy people.[9] Micah's awareness of these traditions may be

---

7.   Schniedewind, *Society and the Promise to David*, pp. 54, 57-58.

8.   Schniedewind also points to Mic. 3.9-12 as part of this invective (*Society and the Promise to David*, p. 58).

9.   For the covenant dialogue model as original to the northern Moses/Samuel tradi-tions, see Leuchter, 'Psalm xcix', pp. 30-33. Deut. 32 is notoriously difficult to date, though recent examinations are suggestive. P. Sanders (*The Provenance of Deuteronomy 32* [Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996], p. 413) points to northern diction in the poem (see also G.A. Rendsburg, *Linguistic Evidence for the Northern Origin of Selected Psalms* [SBLMS, 43; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990], pp. 73-75, 78-81) and persuasively argues for a pre-exilic date (p. 432). M. Thiessen ('The Form and Function of the Song of Moses [Deuteronomy 32.1-43]', *JBL* 123 [2004], pp. 401-24) accounts for the presence of stan-dard Hebrew forms by identifying the poem as a liturgy given to regular performance over a broad period of time. These studies support the suggestion of Robertson that the poem originates sometime in the eleventh–tenth centuries BCE (*Early Hebrew Poetry*, p. 155), a general view espoused by Mendenhall as well ('Deuteronomy 32'). For the place of the poem in Isaiah traditions datable to the eighth century, see R. Bergey, 'The Song of Moses (Deuteronomy 32.1-43) and Isaianic Prophecies: A Case of Early Inter-textuality?', *JSOT* 28 (2003), pp. 33-54.

ascribed to their place in the liturgical discourse common to both Ephraimite and Jerusalemite tradition—Jerusalem's Israelite pedigree was, after all, built by David upon Shilonite tradition and thus upon a repository of Ephraimite thought.[10] However, it may also be the case that these traditions had been brought to Jerusalem by the northern refugees after 721, and were embraced by Hezekiah and the administrators of his literary program for diplomatic purposes.[11] The prominence given to northern tradition would be a suitable target for a rural Judean such as Micah, who was forcibly brought into Jerusalem from his hometown of Moresheth and who likely viewed Hezekiah's resistance to Assyria as a misguided repetition of a Samarian mistake. But for Hezekiah, the adoption of northern liturgical and historical traditions was sound policy for a nation that housed Ephraimite refugees and which was soon to face a military threat similar to what the north experienced twenty years earlier.

There can be little doubt that the Ephraimite valences in Deuteronomy and the DH owe their presence, in no small part, to the northern tradents in Jerusalem against whom Micah railed in Hezekiah's day. Scholars have long noted that the Deuteronomistic authors worked on *textual* sources that demonstrate a good deal of literary sophistication; while oral traditions may have been at the root of many of these sources, their redaction was a literary enterprise.[12] As such, these traditions would have been preserved by Ephraimite

10.   See above, Chapter 1.

11.   For a general consideration of Ephraimite influence in biblical material, see H.L. Ginsberg, *The Israelian Heritage of Judaism* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1982). See also Rendsburg, 'False Leads', p. 45.

12.   The E narrative regarding Jacob, for example, bears much in common with oral traditions concerning the patriarch but diverges in a number of important respects; see Whitt, 'The Jacob Traditions', pp. 18-43. See also B. Halpern, 'Levitic Participation in the Reform Cult of Jeroboam I', *JBL* 95 (1976), pp. 31-42 (36-37), for the northern monarchic origins of Judg. 17–18. For a study of the early Jeroboam literary tradition in its pre-Deuteronomistic state, see M. Leuchter, 'Jeroboam the Ephratite' (*JBL*, forthcoming). Fishbane notes the political dimensions of northern scribes from an earlier era (*Biblical Interpretation*, p. 26 n. 11). M. White has demonstrated the literary rather than oral nature of the northern traditions pertaining to the reign of Jehu and the presentation of Elijah (*The Elijah Legends*, p. 43), which focused especially upon the Moses/Sinai traditions (pp. 3-11) that would eventually inform the Deuteronomistic discourse. Geoghegan's recent discussion of the Deuteronomistic interest in northern Levites coupled with the detailed knowledge of Josianic Judah ('"Until this Day"', pp. 225-26) may reflect northern lineage roots of some of the scribes responsible for this literature as it emerged in Josiah's time. That Geoghegan posits a Levitical identity for the author(s) poses no problem to the current discussion, as it is to be expected that northern state officials would have included members who possessed cultic responsibilities (i.e. northern Levites, despite the Deuteronomistic argument that northern shrines did not employ Levites; see Halpern, 'Levitic Participation', pp. 31-35). As in Jerusalem, the cult of the north fell under the jurisdiction of royal administration (Amos 7.13).

scribes or other learned officials who eventually took up residence in Jeru-
salem. The redaction of these sources in subsequent periods points to the
influence of these literate northerners among the *literati* of Jerusalem, who
viewed this Ephraimite material as wholly applicable to Judah. Such was the
position adopted by Hezekiah, whose amalgamation of Ephraimite and Jeru-
salemite literary traditions fit the demographic needs of the community over
which he ruled. The population in Judah by 705–701 was essentially a group
of displaced citizens, both Ephraimite and (rural) Judean, who were herded
into the urban centers of Judah for their own protection against Assyria.[13]
While Manasseh's policy of rural repopulation may have eventually allowed
for a moderated return to the rural hinterland,[14] this was not an easy option
for the northerners who resided in Jerusalem. Even if northern refugees had
been settled in the rebuilt hinterland, the strictures of the Judean clan system
would have prohibited them from integrating into the hinterland village
population.[15] The northern refugees would have remained urban fixtures.

The Rift between Sages and Scribes in Jerusalem

In all of this, the infrastructure of the Jerusalem scribal class would have
been profoundly altered. Scribal responsibility in ancient urban centers was
largely bound to the elite families of those cities and the local royal culture.[16]
The Jerusalem scribes of earlier periods would have been charged not only
with maintaining the historical records of the royal court but also with fos-
tering its wisdom teachings that were imported into Jerusalem during the
reign of Solomon.[17] The late eighth through late seventh centuries, however,

---

13.   Halpern, 'Jerusalem and the Lineages', pp. 41-59.

14.   Halpern, 'Jerusalem and the Lineages', pp. 60-61; Barrick, *The King and the
Cemeteries*, pp. 150-52; Ahlström, *The History of Ancient Palestine*, pp. 735-40; Tadmor,
'The Period of the First Temple, the Babylonian Exile, and the Restoration', pp. 146-48.

15.   For an overview of the clan system dynamics, see Halpern, 'Jerusalem and the
Lineages', pp. 49-59. It is likely that lineage structures indeed survived (see Levin, 'From
Lists to History') but the literature and ideology emanating from Jerusalem in the eighth–
seventh centuries presents alternatives to these structures as a safeguard against their
potential destruction.

16.   See the catalog of references by J.P.J. Olivier, 'Schools and Wisdom Literature',
JNWSL 4 (1975), pp. 49-60; J.C. Greenfield, 'The Wisdom of Ahiqar', in J. Day, Robert
P. Gordon, and H.G.M. Williamson (eds.), *Wisdom in Ancient Israel: Essays in Honour
of J.A. Emerton* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), pp. 43-52; Muilenberg,
'Baruch the Scribe', pp. 229-30; E. Lipiński, 'Royal and State Scribes in Ancient Jeru-
salem', in J.A. Emerton (ed.), *Congress Volume: Jerusalem, 1986* (VTSup, 40; Leiden:
E.J. Brill, 1988), pp. 157-64 (161-64).

17.   See T.N.D. Mettinger, *Solomonic State Officials: A Study of the Civil Government
Officials of the Israelite Monarchy* (Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1971); Fishbane, *Biblical*

presented the royal court in Jerusalem with new circumstances both in terms of demographics and international relations. The wise men of Jerusalem were useful in collecting and codifying Jerusalemite sacral traditions (e.g. 'the men of Hezekiah' in Prov. 25.1), and indeed Hezekiah's historiography attempts to establish connections between that king and Solomon.[18] But this historiographic work would only serve as part of a broader literary campaign that reveals a change in Jerusalem's politics and the role of its sage-scribes.[19] The protests of Isaiah against the sages of Jerusalem suggest that the prophet already recognized that old standards of counsel were not advantageous, politically or theologically, in the face of the Assyrian crisis.[20] The wisdom tradition was most secure when the status quo was to be maintained or when native traditions were to be re-established,[21] and Hezekiah's reign was characterized by major population shifts and international tensions never before encountered in Israel. That 'the men of Hezekiah' set out to preserve wisdom literature is suggestive of its tenuous position in that king's court; the principal emphasis of the Hezekian literature dealt not with wisdom but with the reformulation of law and cult according to the merging of northern and southern traditions.[22]

The wisdom tradition of the Jerusalem sages would have been celebrated in the wake of the city's miraculous survival of Sennacherib's siege in 701, and Manasseh's subsequent capitulation to Assyria would have permitted the sage-scribes to return to their traditional capacities in matters of politics

Interpretation, pp. 25-32; A. Lemaire, 'Wisdom in Solomonic Historiography', in Day, Gordon, and Williamson (eds.), *Wisdom in Ancient Israel*, pp. 106-18; Lipiński, 'Royal and State Scribes', p. 159.

18.   Halpern and Vanderhooft, 'The Editions of Kings', pp. 206-207.

19.   Schniedewind, *Society and the Promise to David*, pp. 59-71.

20.   There is a diversity of opinion on the relationship between Isaiah and the wise men of Jerusalem, but there can be little doubt that the prophet stood against their role in Jerusalemite politics of the last decades of the eighth century. See J. Jensen, *The Use of tôrâ by Isaiah: His Debate with the Wisdom Tradition* (CBQMS; Washington: Catholic Bible Association, 1973). For a recent overview, see H.G.M. Williamson, 'Isaiah and the Wise', in Day, Gordon, and Williamson (eds.), *Wisdom in Ancient Israel*, pp. 133-41.

21.   *Pace* Fishbane (*Biblical Interpretation*, p. 32), who notes scribal activity in abundance during periods of national restoration. Two flaws may be detected in this qualification. First, Fishbane's equation of scribes with the wise sages is based in part on later biblical traditions that speak to dramatically different theological and political circumstances than those of the eighth–seventh centuries (p. 35). Second, Fishbane cites the Josianic reform as a period of national restoration, but Josiah's reform is better understood as a purge of traditional Judean religion and the creation of new standards of cult, society, and theology. The literature regarding Josiah is, as we have seen, largely propagandistic in support of innovation, not restoration (Levinson, *Deuteronomy*, pp. 144-50).

22.   Schniedewind, *Society and the Promise to David*, p. 71; Halpern, 'Jerusalem and the Lineages', pp. 75-83.

and diplomacy.[23] This is not surprising when we consider the commonalities shared by Jerusalem's wise men and those of the Mesopotamian rulers who controlled Judah throughout most of the seventh century.[24] Following the waning of Assyria's power after Assurbanipal's death, however, Josiah picked up where Hezekiah had left off, re-engaging the Ephraimite traditions and reworking them into an even more comprehensive literary system standing against the imperial influence of the waning Assyria.[25] This, too, would have an adverse effect on the role of the sages in Jerusalem and their scribal/administrative position. The polemic against Solomon (to whom Jerusalem's wisdom tradition is first credited) in the Josianic-era compositions would sustain this effect,[26] and the wisdom substratum running through Deuteronomy evidences an attempt to subordinate the Jerusalem wisdom tradition to the Ephraimite discourses within that book (including the Shiloh tradition).[27] Though the wisdom circles of Jerusalem would have retained a position in the royal court, it is not their scribal voice that is heard in Deuteronomy or the DH.[28] Rather, it is an Ephraimite voice that speaks most loudly, one

23.   On Manasseh's Assyrian capitulation, see I. Provan, V. Phillips Long, and T. Longman III, *A History of Biblical Israel* (Louisville, KY/London: Westminster/John Knox Press, 2003), pp. 274-75; Ahlström, *The History of Ancient Palestine*, pp. 735-40.

24.   Muilenberg, 'Baruch the Scribe', p. 230.

25.   Schniedewind argues for a sharp distinction between the reforms of Hezekiah and Josiah on the grounds that Josiah's reforms served the interests of a rural Judean population rather than an urban elite, and that whereas Hezekiah embraced northern tradition, Josiah rejected it (*Society and the Promise to David*, pp. 96-97; *How the Bible Became a Book*, p. 108). The nature of Hezekiah's reform was certainly not the same as that of Josiah (so also Lowery, *The Reforming Kings*, pp. 212-16), but the literature shaped by Josiah's scribes attempts to establish Hezekiah as a pious antecedent to Josiah (as noted above) and argues for continuity between these kings and their policies. Finally, as discussed in the previous chapter and as will be further discussed below, northern tradition was not rejected by Josiah's tradents but worked into a system that could allow for its application to a 'greater Israel' in Judah and the former northern kingdom. G.N. Knoppers (*Two Nations under God: The Deuteronomistic History of Solomon and the Dual Monarchies* [HSM, 53; 2 vols.; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994], II, pp. 240-46) discusses the approach to northern iniquities in the DH: the leadership is invalid, but the people are not.

26.   Sweeney, 'The Critique of Solomon'.

27.   See Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, pp. 158-78, for the role of wisdom language within Deuteronomy.

28.   So also Lowery, *The Reforming Kings*, p. 214; D.M. Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature* (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), pp. 134-36, who notes the distinction between the Deuteronomistic tradition and the Wisdom tradition in Jerusalem. See also Weinfeld (*Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, pp. 177-78), who views the scribes behind the DH as part of the Jerusalem wisdom tradition. Lemaire ('Historiography', p. 107) notes that with the exception of one reference in the ancient Song of Deborah (Judg. 5.19) wisdom terminology is absent in the DH beyond the texts associated with David–Solomon.

that was given a forum first during Hezekiah's reign and then again, more prominently, under Josiah.[29] An eventual political division in Josiah's court between pro- and anti-Egyptian factions suggests that the lines between scribal groups became increasingly more pronounced.[30] Those responsible for the Deuteronomistic corpus and its consistent aversion to all things Egyptian (a very Ephraimite characteristic[31]) would naturally stand against those more closely bound to Jerusalem's Solomonic institutions such as the wisdom tradition and political alliance with Egypt (1 Kgs 3.1).[32]

The centrality of Jerusalem in the Josianic literature is an amalgamation of the old Zion tradition that derived from the time of David and Solomon and the diversity of traditions deriving from Ephraimite circles. Josiah's scribes make clear that Jerusalem is special to Yahweh because it is the last bastion of proper (and older) Ephraimite tradition, replete with its preoccupation with the Exodus from Egypt.[33] The Jerusalem scribes of Josiah's reign make use of the wisdom tradition of Jerusalem, but align themselves more dramatically with northern traditions of covenant, law, and prophecy that

29. Lowery, *The Reforming Kings*, pp. 212-16. For further discussion, see M. Weinfeld, 'The Emergence of the Deuteronomic Movement: The Historical Antecedents', in N. Lohfink (ed.), *Das Deuteronomium: Entstehung, Gestalt und Botschaft* (Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium, 68; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1985), pp. 76-98; *idem*, *Deuteronomy 1–11*, pp. 44-50.

30. See J.A. Wilcoxen, 'The Political Background of Jeremiah's Temple Sermon', in A.L. Merrill and T.W. Overholt (eds.), *Scripture in History and Theology: Essays in Honor of J.C. Rylaarsdam* (Pittsburgh: The Pickwick Press, 1977), pp. 151-65.

31. The prominence of the Exodus tradition in Deuteronomy further identifies the perspective as Ephraimite in provenance (even though the manner of literary execution is Jerusalemite). The departure from Egypt is the defining feature of Israel's allegiance to Yahweh; see Deut. 4.44-45; 6.12; 7.8, 18; 8.14; 9.12, 26; 10.19, 22; 16.12; 17.16; 24.18; 26.5-8. For a comparison of the Exodus tradition in Ephraimite and Judean culture, see Y. Hoffman, 'A North Israelite Typological Myth and a Judaean Historical Tradition: The Exodus in Hosea and Amos', *VT* 39 (1989), pp. 169-82.

32. Lowery notes the Deuteronomistic aversion to foreign alliances of any kind (*The Reforming Kings*, pp. 207-208), especially Egypt (which in Lowery's view is a cipher for Assyria [p. 155]).

33. See Hoffman, 'The Exodus in Hosea and Amos'. The earliest historiographic traditions identify Ephraimite culture as the first-order society, with Judah and Jerusalem rising only in the late eleventh century under David. On the origins of the Zion tradition in the time of David/Solomon, see J.J.M. Roberts, 'The Davidic Origin of the Zion Tradition', *JBL* 92 (1973), pp. 329-44; *idem*, 'Zion in the Theology of the Davidic–Solomonic Empire', in T. Ishida (ed.), *Studies in the Period of David and Solomon and Other Essays* (Tokyo: Yamakawa-Shuppansha, 1982), pp. 93-108; *idem*, 'The Enthronement of Yahweh and David: The Abiding Theological Significance of the Kingship Language of the Psalms', *CBQ* 64 (2002), pp. 675-86. See also T.N.D. Mettinger, 'Yahweh Sabaoth—The Heavenly King on the Cherubim Throne', in Ishida (ed.), *Studies in the Period of David and Solomon*, pp. 109-38 (128-35).

were to extend over all Israel in the king's day as it had in the pre-monarchic period.[34]

A rift thus developed between scribal groups as early as Hezekiah's reign. One was bound to the old Jerusalemite ideals of Solomon, and the other emulated different Ephraimite ideologies in the service of isolating Judah from foreign influence and allegiances. For these latter scribes, Jerusalem's institutions (be they royal, priestly, or wisdom-based) were to be informed by northern modes of prophetic discourse.[35] It is for this reason that the literary legacy of the prophetic voices in the north (Amos and Hosea) were edited to address the south during Hezekiah's time,[36] and why the Deuteronomic laws emanating from Jerusalem in Josiah's day are given such a profoundly Shilonite character and Mosaic seal of approval. The lesson of northern history, finally articulated in the literature of Josiah's scribes, was itself a *torah* ('instruction') for Josiah's subjects to learn from in contradistinction to the *torah* tradition of the sages.[37] For the time being at least, the sages of Jerusalem would have to wait on the sidelines as the Deuteronomists promulgated Josianic policy.

Josiah's 'Reunification' of North and South

While Hezekiah attempted to incorporate the northern elite into the Judean urban infrastructure, Josiah attempted a massive territorial expansion, including a reclaiming of the former northern kingdom beyond the limited northern regions already under Judean control.[38] Josiah's interest in expanding

34. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1–11*, pp. 44-50, despite his view that Jerusalemite sages are the authors of the document. See also A. Rofé, 'The Strata of the Law about the Centralization of Worship in Deuteronomy and the History of the Deuteronomic Movement', in *Congress Volume: Uppsala, 1971* (VTSup, 22; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1972), pp. 221-26.

35. It is worth noting that the scribal families most closely associated with the Deuteronomistic literature possess discernible genealogies that emerge only during Hezekiah's reign. For the Hezekian date of the scribal genealogical origins, see Dearman, 'My Servants the Scribes', pp. 418-19; W.B. Barrick, 'Dynastic Politics, Priestly Succession, and Josiah's Eighth Year', *ZAW* 112 (2000), pp. 564-82 (575-78); Lundbom, *Jeremiah 21– 36*, p. 299 (Lundbom provides a genealogy but no dates, though his genealogical reconstruction matches those of Barrick and Dearman).

36. Instructive here is the final sentiment of Hos. 14.10, calling the 'wise' to heed the prophet's words. Hosea is elsewhere concerned with the folly of wisdom in the north, something that must have affected the understanding of his prophecies in later Jerusalem. See A.A. Macintosh, 'Hosea and the Wisdom Tradition: Dependence and Independence', in Day, Gordon, and Williamson (eds.), *Wisdom in Ancient Israel*, pp. 124-32.

37. So also Jensen with respect to Isaiah (*The Use of tôrâ*, p. 120).

38. See M. Heltzer, 'Some Questions concerning the Economic Policy of Josiah', *IEJ* 50 (2000), pp. 105-108 (106, 108). Heltzer notes that inscriptional evidence identifies

his borders and re-incorporating the north into the political fold was prag-
matic in nature; the literature which expressed the way in which this was to
be carried out (i.e. Deuteronomy and the DH) preserve the language of the
older traditions in order to facilitate the king's political ambitions.[39] This
would certainly speak to the northerners of Ephraimite stock who still
remained in the former northern kingdom, and might even appeal on some
level to the mixed populations settled there by the Assyrian monarchs who
were taught 'the ways of the god of the land' (2 Kgs 17.26-27). The synthe-
sis of disparate ideas and institutions achieved in the text of Deuteronomy,
particularly with respect to the judicial system, had to be applied as a
common platform in both the south and the north in order to ensure proper
control and uniform standards of religion and society.

The account in 2 Kings 23 of Josiah's reform has long been recognized as
a report of the implementation of Deuteronomic centralization: the elimina-
tion of the high places in the Judean countryside as far north as Gibeah in
Benjamin demonstrates the imposition of Deuteronomic law in the regions
beyond Jerusalem.[40] As well, the detailed depiction of Josiah's destruction of
Bethel serves as the bookend to 1 Kings 13 (where it is established by Jero-
boam b. Nebat), casting Josiah as the successor not only to the Davidic
throne in Judah but to the northern dynasties as well.[41] 2 Kings 17.24-28
attests to the ongoing importance of Bethel to the regional populations under
Assyrian hegemony, and thus the destruction of the shrine, as many scholars
have noted, signifies Josiah's usurpation of Assyria as the dominant power
in the north.[42]

The Passover festival reported in 2 Kgs 23.21-23, though taking place
after Josiah's reported incursion into the north, would have factored heavily
into his northern ambitions. As noted earlier, Deuteronomy supplanted old
kinship or ethnic boundaries and established new sociological parameters
that were entirely contingent upon adherence to the law. This law constituted

territory in the former northern kingdom as having fallen under Judean control by 630;
Josiah's annexation of the north later in his reign would be facilitated by such territorial
control (*pace* Ben Zvi, 'History and Prophetic Texts', pp. 113-18).

39.   Though Levinson has demonstrated that this language was dramatically reworked
(*Deuteronomy*, *passim*).

40.   For an analysis of the narrative of 2 Kgs 22–23, see N. Lohfink, 'The Cult Reform
of Josiah of Judah: 2 Kings 22–23 as a Source for the History of Israelite Religion', in
Miller, Hanson, and McBride (eds.), *Ancient Israelite Religion*, pp. 459-75; Sweeney,
King Josiah, pp. 40-51.

41.   See Sweeney, *King Josiah*, pp. 173-74.

42.   Sweeney, *King Josiah*, p. 86; B. Oded, 'Judah and the Exile', in J.H. Hayes and
J.M. Miller (eds.), *Israelite and Judaean History* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press,
1977), pp. 435-88 (466-68); I. Finkelstein and N.A. Silberman, *The Bible Unearthed*
(New York: The Free Press, 2001), pp. 283-91.

the covenant, with no quarter given to any other forms of tradition, and this would have important implications for the northern population Josiah wished to control. The scope of Josiah's covenant allowed for the admixture of northern Israelites and foreigners brought by Assyria to be included into the 'people of Israel' proper through adherence to Deuteronomy.[43] Josiah's Passover, in a sense, was meant to forge a new nation just as the Exodus had done centuries before.[44] But the effectiveness of the Passover ceremony rested on the success of the application of the law it was meant to affirm, and this, in turn, required effective agency on the level of regional administration.

The Classification of Northern and Southern Priesthoods

The centralization efforts in Judah were by and large complete according to the narrative of 2 Kings 23. While 23.9 reports that the regional priesthoods of the former high places did not join the central sanctuary in Jerusalem, they nonetheless took part in the covenant ceremony by partaking of the *mazzot* 'among their brethren':

> Nevertheless the priests of the high places did not come up to the altar of Yahweh in Jerusalem, but [or, better, until; see below] they ate unleavened bread (כי אם אכלו מצות) among their brethren (בתוך אחיהם). (2 Kgs 23.9)

A reading of this verse as a refusal of the reform is inconsistent with the glowing evaluation of Josiah and the thorough nature of his successes.[45] Josiah's failures are muted, not overtly expressed.[46] Rather, it suggests compliance with the dynamic of Deut. 18.1-8 and the implied administrative role of the regional Levites in Deut. 16.18-20, in support of the statement in 2 Kgs 23.25 that the *entire* Torah of Moses was fulfilled. 2 Kings 23.9 is a proleptic reference to Josiah's Passover celebration according to the Deuteronomic legislation, and the verse attempts to present it as thoroughly

---

43.   See 2 Kgs 23.3-4. Schniedewind notes that the phrase 'the book of the Covenant' appears only in the 2 Kings passage and Exod. 24.7 (*How the Bible Became a Book*, pp. 112, 126). The reference in 2 Kings overtly identifies Deuteronomy as the true 'book of the Covenant' rather than the older Covenant Code (as it is indeed the Deuteronomic laws that are carried out in the ensuing narrative), pointing to the authors' desire to replace the latter with the former (Levinson, *Deuteronomy*, pp. 149-50).

44.   This ethnic/cultural diversity aspect of Josiah's program is not without precedent; the old 'mixed multitude' tradition in such passages as Exod. 12.38 and Num. 11.4-10 paved the way for the king's ambitions, as earlier concepts of nationhood involved an admixture of populations.

45.   Such a reading is offered by Lundbom, *Jeremiah 1–20*, p. 110.

46.   The non-mention of the failure of the reform itself is the classic example of this technique. See Chapter 5 below for a discussion.

successful in the communities beyond Jerusalem.[47] The grammatical features
of 2 Kgs 23.9 suggest that the administration of the Deuteronomic Passover
legislation in the rural villages was a prerequisite for these Levites eventu-
ally to be free to migrate to Jerusalem. The phrase כי אם implies condition-
ality in other contexts, and addresses the need of these former high-place
Levites to subordinate their affiliation to Deuteronomic ideology, perhaps as
a pledge of allegiance.[48] That these Levites partake of the Passover cere-
mony 'among their brethren' (בתוך אחיהם) recalls the same Deuteronomic
language that identifies the king as being from within the same community
of brethren (מקרב אחיך in Deut. 17.15), that is, the covenantal community of
which all regional populations were part.[49] Given the centrality of the
Levites in Deuteronomy 18 to Josiah's program of reformed jurisprudence,
the inclusion of these rural priests into the account is meant to signify their
acceptance of its principles.[50]

The Account of the Annexation of the North

The account of Josiah's reform in 2 Kings 23 thus addresses the different
Judean priesthoods under the rubric 'Levitical Priests': the priests in Jerusa-
lem (vv. 2-4) and the Levites of the Judean high-places, purged of potential
ritual iniquity through the Deuteronomic legislation (vv. 5-9). This is consis-
tent with the general purpose of Deuteronomy, for just as broader ethnic/
kinship qualifications were to be leveled, so were ethnic/kinship differences
between priests. At v. 15, however, the account switches gears with the term
וגם, redirecting attention from Judah to the northern territories as a separate

---

47. For prolepsis as an editorial/compositional device, see B. Peckham, 'Writing
and Editing', in Beck *et al.* (eds.), *Fortunate the Eyes That See*, pp. 364-83 (369-71). On
the significance of the term *mazzot* as part of the Josianic fusion of prior tradition, see
Levinson, *Deuteronomy*, pp. 53-97. Friedman's reading of the passage as a reference to
Levites in Jerusalem who did not serve cultic functions but who benefited from the tithes
(*The Exile and Biblical Narrative*, p. 29) is possible, but in light of the regional role of
Levites suggested in Deuteronomy and the merging of the *mazzot* term with the Deuter-
onomic Passover tradition, it is more likely that the passage testifies to Levites remaining
in the local sphere and administering the Passover festival in the satellite communities.

48. See the detailed discussion by Barrick, *The King and the Cemeteries*, pp. 189-93.

49. Lowery, *The Reforming Kings*, pp. 153-55; Halpern, 'Jerusalem and the Line-
ages', pp. 73-75.

50. *Pace* Sweeney (*King Josiah*, pp. 150-54), who points out that the role of the
Levites is significantly curtailed by the Deuteronomic legislation. The general emulation
of Levitical norms in the Deuteronomic Torah point to their institutionalization within the
expanded state-run society; the Levites would have been called upon to administer
regional adherence to Deuteronomic law, though their role was now divested of inde-
pendent cultic authority (so also Halpern, 'Jerusalem and the Lineages', p. 79).

venture.[51] Though some northern territory was already under Judean control by the time of Josiah's reform,[52] the account of Josiah's assault on Bethel and Samaria in vv. 15 and 19-20 presents his annexation of the north as an exercise in theological zeal and, one would imagine, military bravado:

> Moreover (וגם) the altar that was at Bethel, and the high place which Jeroboam the son of Nebat, who made Israel to sin, had made, also that altar and the high place he broke down; and he burned the high place and stamped it small to powder, and burned the Asherah… Moreover (וגם) all the houses of the high places that were in the cities of Samaria, which the kings of Israel had made to provoke, Josiah took away, and did to them all the acts that he had done in Bethel. And he slew all the priests of the high places that were there upon the altars, and burned men's bones upon them; and he returned to Jerusalem. (2 Kgs 23.15, 19-20)

Some of Josiah's dealings at Bethel as reported in 2 Kgs 23.15-20 appear to have arisen more from propagandistic need than as an historical chronicle. An older historical account may well have been editorially augmented. Many scholars have noted that the וגם terms constitute a redactional incursion into the text,[53] interrupting as they do the *waw*-consecutive constructs that characterize the chapter and provide structural unity to the events depicted therein. Verse 15 in particular is full of stereotypically Deuteronomistic themes and language (a polemic against Jeroboam, mention of the demolition of the high places and the Asherah icon), and indeed an intertextual connection is made between Josiah's actions with the Bethel altar and Moses' demolition of the Golden Calf in Deut. 9.21:[54]

> 2 Kgs 23.15—…and he *burned* (וישרוף) the high place and *stamped it small to powder* (הדק לעפר).

> Deut. 9.21—And I took your sin, the calf which you had made, and *burnt* (ואשרוף) it with fire, and beat it in pieces, grinding it very *small*, until it was as fine as *powder* (לעפר עד אשר דק).

2 Kings 23.15 contains an overt ideological focus, striving to make the demolition of the Bethel altar into the seventh century equivalent of Moses' own demolition of the Golden Calf in Deuteronomy 9 and Exodus 32. This is not surprising, as the inauguration of the Bethel altar under Jeroboam was

51. Sweeney, *King Josiah*, p. 43.

52. Heltzer, 'Some Questions', pp. 106-108; Barrick, *The King and the Cemeteries*, p. 38.

53. B.O. Long, *2 Kings* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), p. 276; J. Van Seters, 'The Deuteronomistic History: Can it Avoid Death by Redaction?', in T. Römer (ed.), *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2000), pp. 213-22 (219); Barrick, *The King and the Cemeteries*, p. 48.

54. So also Friedman, *The Exile and Biblical Narrative*, p. 9.

the basis for the old Golden Calf polemic in Exodus and its later Deuteronomic parallel.[55] 2 Kings 23.15-20 attempts to make the demolition at Bethel the opening act of a thoroughgoing defilement of northern religious fixtures, but this is achieved by transforming the original purpose of an account which likely pertained to Josiah's acts of ritual defilement in *Judah*, not the regions surrounding the Bethel shrine in the former northern kingdom. The original form of the account probably did not include 2 Kgs 23.15 or 19-20. These verses frame 2 Kgs 23.16-18, part of the older narrative underlying the chapter, and relating to Josiah's defiling the cultic establishments near Jerusalem:[56]

> And as Josiah turned, he viewed the graves that were there in the mount; and he sent, and took the bones out of the graves, and burned them upon the altar, and defiled it, according to the word of Yahweh which the man of God proclaimed, who proclaimed these things. Then he said, 'What monument is that which I see?' And the men of the city told him, 'It is the grave of the man of God, who came from Judah, and proclaimed these things that you have done against the altar of Bethel'. And he said, 'Let him be; let no man move his bones'. So they let his bones alone, with the bones of the prophet that came out of Samaria. (2 Kgs 23.16-18)

Divorced of the framing material that demonstrates clear signs of redactional work, these verses fit nicely into a narrative set in Judah and simply suggest that Josiah had fulfilled the prophetic word.[57] This older Judean account does note, though, that Josiah engaged in *some* destructive activity at Bethel (v. 17). Thus v. 15 and vv. 19-20 may be secondary redactional incursions into an older narrative, but they are not necessarily fallacious. It appears that Josiah did indeed enact some aggression against the religious infrastructure of the north. Why, though, was the account of the king's northern activity only secondarily grafted onto an older narrative, and in such a truncated fashion? The deliberate reference in 2 Kgs 23.15 to Deut. 9.21 infuses this protracted account with a theological dimension, but upon considering the weight of northern tradition woven through Deuteronomy and the rest of the DH, one would expect the account of Josiah's northern expedition to be far

---

55. See G.N. Knoppers, 'Aaron's Calf and Jeroboam's Calves', in Beck *et al*. (eds.), *Fortunate the Eyes That See*, pp. 92-104; Leuchter, 'Jeroboam the Ephratite' (section 4).

56. This is achieved through v. 15, which states that the king went to Bethel in the north, and vv. 19-20, which relate that Josiah continued his activity in the region of Samaria before returning to Jerusalem. Both v. 15 and vv. 19-20 begin with וגם, marking their redactional nature. For a detailed analysis of these redactional features and of 2 Kgs 23.16-18 as relating to activity in Judah, see Barrick, *The King and the Cemeteries*, pp. 46-50.

57. In its pre-redacted form, Barrick suggests that the graves of the 'man of God' and the 'prophet that came out of Samaria' are none other than the tombs of Amos and Hosea respectively, both located near Jerusalem (*The King and the Cemeteries*, pp. 217-21).

more dramatic and detailed, not simply attached in the manner of a redactional footnote and filled out by borrowing a report of events that originally took place in Judah.

The king's reform activity in the north must have met with considerable difficulty which the writers did not want to highlight. Much of this arose from significantly different sociological and political elements in the north of Josiah's day. The ensuing verses demonstrate the continuity in policy towards this population in terms of Deuteronomic centralization—the elimination of the regional high places in the north (v. 19) would certainly have involved the same motivation as those in the south. The policy toward the northern priesthood, however, is far different. Unlike the regional priesthoods of Judah, the northern priests are not given the chance to participate in the Deuteronomic program, nor are they seen as fit to be included into a broad sacral caste; they are slaughtered and burnt as human 'offerings' on the altars (2 Kgs 23.20). Thus while Judah retained a regional Levite caste to allow for the implementation of Deuteronomic legislation in the satellite communities, the north is completely purged of a regional sacral caste paralleling that of the Judean Levites. The implication here is that the north was legitimate,[58] but northern priesthoods were not, perhaps by virtue of their establishment by the Assyrian overlords.[59] This would follow the purpose of the treaty form in the Deuteronomic Torah: the people of Israel could have but one suzerain, Yahweh, and the acceptance of priests established by Assyrian rule would challenge that suzerainty.

The north thus presented a significant problem for Josiah. The influence of the Bethel altar and priesthood demonstrates the reliance of the populace upon their religious leadership, which also implies their reliance upon Assyrian socio-political structures. Unlike Judah, which had been a vassal state, the northern territories were Assyrian provinces, the population was a mixed bag of nations and ethnicities, and as 2 Kgs 17.29-33 points out, each sub-population retained their native religious traditions. The 'return' to an Israelite system of governance (let alone an Israelite system of faith) would hardly be a return at all for most of the north, and would in fact disrupt the social stasis that had been in place for the better part of a hundred years. The only members of the northern population with any residual memory of

---

58. Knoppers, *Two Nations under God*, II, pp. 240-46.

59. The extensive Deuteronomistic polemic against Bethel and the north are conjoined; 2 Kgs 17.24-28 presents its ultimate position as little more than an Assyrian cult site; it is the Assyrian king who 'commands' the presence of the priest at Bethel, not Yahweh (v. 27). See G. Frame, 'The "First Families" of Borsippa during the Early Neo-Babylonian Period', *JCS* 36 (1984), pp. 67-80, for Assyria's sponsorship of local cults. On the political symbolism behind the destruction of the shrine, see Sweeney, *King Josiah*, p. 232.

autonomy would have been the meek rural Israelites left behind in the wake of the Assyrian conquest who did not seek refuge in Judah for whatever reason,[60] and they would certainly have retained older forms of Israelite religion that ran counter to Deuteronomic ideology.[61] According to the account in 2 Kgs 23.15-20, all of these religious systems were eradicated in one fell swoop, with no transitional period or means of compromise.[62]

From the purely political point of view, such an extreme course of action was certainly warranted. Assyria had not yet fallen, and its influence, while weakened, would not have completely waned.[63] It is no wonder that Deut. 17.15 and 18.9-20 specify that kingship and religious leadership could never be anything but native Israelite: Assyrian governance and Assyrian-sponsored religious figures were still a viable and familiar option. But in enacting his exorcism, Josiah would have been confronted with another problem, namely, the absence of regional sacral leaders through whom the Deuteronomic juridical policies could be implemented.[64] The problem could not be solved through ad hoc political appointment: Levitical figurehood was not a mere office that could be assumed. 1 Kings 12.31 presupposes the need for Levitical heritage in the assumption of ceremonial religious responsibility,[65] and 2 Kgs 17.32 tells us that the post-721 religion of the north was defiled by the foreign émigrés to the northern territories; any Ephraimite Israelites remaining in the north who did once possess Levitical heritage would have been deemed unsuitable. Josiah's slaying of the northern priestly figures casts them in strong contradistinction to the Levites of the high places in

---

60. That a number of Israelites remained behind after the deportation of 721 is not in doubt (see H. Donner, 'The Separate States of Israel and Judah', in Hayes and Miller [eds.], *Israelite and Judaean History*, pp. 381-434 [433-34]). However, the ideology of 2 Kgs 17.7-23 makes clear that the kingdom, as a legitimate covenantal entity, was eradicated.

61. See Halpern, 'Jerusalem and the Lineages', pp. 66-69; for a detailed study of the emergence of self-conscious monotheism, see Halpern's 'Brisker Pipes than Poetry', pp. 82-101.

62. Though the account projects some of Josiah's Judean reform actions onto the north (vv. 16-18; see above), the framing material in vv. 15/19-20 attest (in summary fashion) to significant northern cultic dismantling.

63. For an overview of Assyria's waning but surviving presence and the Egyptian–Assyrian alliance that had formed by 616, see Oded, 'Judah and the Exile', pp. 463-69; Finkelstein and Silberman, *The Bible Unearthed*, pp. 281-90; Ahlström, *The History of Ancient Palestine*, pp. 750-59.

64. See again the parallelism between the priestly figures in Deut. 17.8-13 and the Levites of 18.1-8.

65. This statement, however, derives from a polemical strategy, for Halpern has argued convincingly that at least some of Jeroboam's priests were Levites ('Levitic Participation', pp. 31-35). Nevertheless, the sentiment expressed in 1 Kgs 12.31 attests to the belief that Levitical heritage was a priestly prerequisite.

Judah, who were made 'brethren' of the Jerusalemite priests by the Levitical leveling in Deut. 18.1-8. In order for the reunification of the north and south to take place, a regional Levitical order in the north would need to be counted among the 'brethren' of the Jerusalem Levitical priests to extend effectively Deuteronomic authority over the northern population.

The Shilonite Priests of Anathoth

While the Deuteronomic Torah assumed a familiar treaty form, casting Yahweh as the new suzerain, the shift from Assyrian ecumenical religious policy to the exclusionary theology of Deuteronomy would have been a big pill for the disparate northern populations to swallow,[66] and the logistical difficulties in implementing central Deuteronomic authority without regional religious leaders would have made the task nearly impossible. Josiah had one viable option, and that was to enlist the aid of Levites who possessed northern heritage and urge them to serve his interests in the north.[67] For this reason, the king turned to the Shilonites of Anathoth. It was they who were responsible for the E material that formed the foundation of Deuteronomic tradition,[68] it was they who were most closely tied to Mushite lineage and who set the sacral agenda in the pre-monarchic period,[69] it was from their tradition that the model of Deuteronomic prophecy was drawn, and it was ultimately they who would be able to help fill the Levitical void in the north.

It is possible that part of Josiah's plan to incorporate the Shilonites of Anathoth into his program involved their re-occupation of the Shiloh sanctuary in the Ephraimite hill country. Archaeological records indicate that Shiloh was partially rebuilt and re-occupied to a certain degree in the eighth–seventh centuries, which may in part reflect the king's interest in the site as

66. In this sense, the choice offered in Deut. 30.15-20 appears to carry with it political connotations, advocating allegiance to Josiah/Yahweh rather than a weakened but still-existing Assyrian overlord. This concern is amplified in later oracles from Jeremiah (see below, Chapter 5).

67. This is supported by Geoghegan's observation that the Josianic DH has a special interest in northern Levites ('"Until this Day"', p. 226); the work may have been composed as part of an appeal to these groups.

68. Friedman, *Who Wrote the Bible?*, pp. 70-88; Jenks, *Elohist*, pp. 101-105. See also Levinson, *Deuteronomy*, pp. 11-22.

69. Cross, *Canaanite Myth*, pp. 195-215. See also the note in Judg. 18.30-31 contrasting another Mosaic line with that of Shiloh, arguing for the legitimacy only of the latter. This detail likely has very early origins (Halpern, 'Levitic Participation', pp. 36-37) but its usage here speaks to the Deuteronomists' interest in Shilonite centrality. M. Haran ('Shiloh and Jerusalem', *JBL* 81 [1962], pp. 14-24 [20-22]) identifies the Shiloh shrine as the basis for later literary presentations of the Tabernacle, and it is at Shiloh where the Ark is immediately lodged in the conquest traditions concerning Joshua, identifying the locale as an early administrative center (cf. Josh. 18.1, 8-10; 22.7-34).

an administrative center (though not as an active cult site).[70] Other important northern religious sites were also partially re-occupied at this time, and a Josianic interest in these sites would account for this renewed activity.[71] The rebuilding of Shiloh would possibly mend the rift caused by Solomon's expulsion of Abiathar from Jerusalem centuries earlier,[72] as well as providing a corrective statement on their treatment by Jeroboam, who excluded them from his cult after they had supported his rise to power (1 Kgs 11.29-39).[73]

In addition, since Shilonite religious iconography and ritual traditions were brought to Jerusalem during David's reign,[74] the restoration of Shiloh would solidify links between Josiah and David, whose legendary glory Josiah sought to recover. Relatively early poetic and narrative traditions indeed portray Judah and Jerusalem as the places where the Shiloh tradition would eventually be realized;[75] thus Josiah's appeal to the Shilonites fit well with the general interest in Israel's ancient traditions found throughout Deuteronomy and the DH. Finally, the rebuilding of Shiloh would fit in nicely with the lack of any mention in the Josianic DH of Shiloh's destruction. This would suggest to later readers that authority naturally and peacefully shifted to Jerusalem as the result of the rise of the Davidic monarchy under Yahweh's blessing, all the while allowing for central Jerusalem authority to be implemented in the north by a supportive and genetically related religious institution at Shiloh.

70.   See Finkelstein, *Shiloh*, p. 389. The site would not have been restored to an active cultic status if the re-occupation is to be attributed to Josiah's venture into the north.

71.   See G.E. Wright, *Shechem: The Biography of a Biblical City* (New York: McGraw–Hill, 1965), p. 166. The account of the old site at Mizpah as the Babylonians' choice for the new regional administrative center in 2 Kgs 25.23 suggests that the locale was already functional by the early sixth century; its history as an ancient religious/administrative site (1 Sam. 7.15-17) would make it an ideal location for the stationing of Josianic agents in the north.

72.   1 Kgs 2.26. See Sweeney, *King Josiah*, pp. 108-109, for a treatment of this motif in the Josianic literature; see also R. Nurmela, *The Levites: Their Emergence as a Second-Class Priesthood* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), pp. 21-24. Nurmela leaves the question of the Abiathar/Solomon rift open, though Halpern demonstrates that Abiathar's siding with Adonijah over Solomon was natural given Adonijah's legitimate claims to the throne. Solomon's rejection of the Shilonite priests represented by Abiathar was a political move meant to consolidate his less-legitimate basis of power (Halpern, *David's Secret Demons*, pp. 395-406, especially pp. 398-401). The marginalization of Mosaic tradition also cleared the way for Solomon to replace it with royal-centered ideology, claiming for himself the rights to sacred jurisprudence based on the sanctification of ancient Near Eastern wisdom tradition (see 1 Kgs 3.5-28), a position that had hitherto been occupied by Mosaic tradents.

73.   See Leuchter, 'Jeroboam the Ephratite', concluding comments.

74.   2 Sam. 6.12-19. David engages in similar practices already associated with Shiloh (compare 2 Sam. 6.14 with Judg. 21.21 and 1 Sam. 2.18). See Schley, *Shiloh*, pp. 161-63.

75.   See Leuchter, 'Psalm xcix', pp. 30-36; Schley, *Shiloh*, pp. 161-63.

A text from the sixth century lends support to these proposed seventh-century initiatives. Jeremiah 41.5 reports that after the destruction of Jerusalem, men from Shechem, Samaria, and Shiloh made the trek south towards the ruins of Jerusalem. That the men are in mourning at the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple, and that they have brought items for sacrifice despite the Temple's destruction, suggests that they considered themselves Israelites. The text implies that, to a certain degree, Josiah did manage to establish or re-establish a sense of Israelite identity among members of the northern population who accepted Deuteronomic centralization. Shechem, Samaria, and Shiloh were important northern locales, all of them played major roles in earlier Israelite history, and all appear to have been of interest to Josiah.[76] Jeremiah 41 preserves a tradition that these communities were still standing and that the people were committed to the Jerusalem cult, and this may have been the result of Josiah's efforts in these northern cities. Whether this tradition is historical or not cannot be easily determined, but the author of the account presents a scenario that must reflect a reality regarding the veneration of Jerusalem and the Temple among some northerners.

Significantly, 2 Kings 23 does not expressly state that Josiah rebuilt or reclaimed any of these locales. Rather, after taking the time to demolish the northern religious infrastructure, he simply returns to Jerusalem (23.20), and not another word is said about the north. 2 Kings 25.25, the shorter parallel account to Jeremiah 41, similarly remains silent on this issue. The mention of all three sites in a retrospective text such as Jeremiah 41, combined with the relative silence concerning these places in the propagandistic narrative of 2 Kings 23, implies that Josiah's northern ambitions, while initialized, were not realized. Under such circumstances, it is not surprising that the king's venture into the north is recounted in such a limited manner in 2 Kgs 23.15/19-20.[77]

Despite the disappointment and its obvious theological/polemical interest, Jeremiah 41 provides independent testimony to the details concerning Josiah's ambitions in the north, particularly with regard to Shiloh. Given the scope of the reform, the Ephraimite sensitivities and the Levitical focus of the DH and Deuteronomy, the polemic against Solomon, the void caused by the purging of the northern priesthoods and finally the archaeological evidence concerning the re-occupation of Shiloh, it follows that Josiah would

---

76. The influence of the Shiloh tradition in Deuteronomy and the DH has been discussed above (Chapters 1–2). Archaeological evidence points to a Josianic presence at Shiloh (Finkelstein, *Shiloh*, p. 389) and Shechem (Wright, *Shechem*, p. 166), and the Shechemite religious traditions are pronounced in Deuteronomy (Rofé, 'The Strata of the Law'; Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1–11*, pp. 10-13). Finally, the protracted redactional note in 2 Kgs 23.19-20 points to Josiah's Deuteronomic purge in Samaria.

77. More on this will be discussed below, Chapter 5.

appeal to the Shilonites and offer them a return to their old prestigious position in the service of his interests.[78] But the king would also have known that this would not be an easy sale. Great diplomacy would be needed to mend fences between the Shilonites and the monarchic circle in Jerusalem, which in turn demanded a suitable diplomat.

78.   Though Geoghegan's observations point to a wider engagement of the northern Levites ('"Until this Day"', p. 226), the old paramount position of Shiloh in the premonarchic period (Halpern, 'The Uneasy Compromise', pp. 76-77) would place a higher premium on Shilonite involvement in an attempt to restore the north to authentically Israelite rule.

4

THE APPEAL TO THE NORTH

Jeremiah as a Josianic Agent

Information preserved in the book of Jeremiah sheds light on why the prophet would have been selected by Josiah to serve as a diplomat to the Shilonites specifically and the north more generally. Jeremiah is presented as one of the 'the priests of Anathoth' (Jer. 1.1),[1] and the village is again identified as his hometown later in the book (32.6-15). Besides the information in the superscription, his oracles identify him as a Levitical figure,[2] and he overtly classifies himself as following in the footsteps of archetypal northern Levites such as Samuel and Moses (15.1). His language resonates with Ephraimite terms and themes, demonstrating his familiarity with northern tradition. Nevertheless, his writings reveal a deep understanding of Jerusalemite tradition, Deuteronomic and otherwise, and his style and skill as a writer suggests strong associations with the scribal guild in that city responsible for the Deuteronomistic works.[3] Indeed, the compositional methods of these scribes characterize those of the prophet in many places throughout the book of Jeremiah.[4] The prophet would have thus been familiar with the prophetic corpus inherited and redacted by Josiah's scribes and the historical and legal materials they similarly developed;[5] the variety of poetic and prose forms in

---

1. Jeremiah is also identified as 'the son of Hilkiah' (v. 1). This may or may not imply a connection with the Hilkiah of 2 Kgs 22.8. Wilson (*Prophecy and Society*, pp. 222-23) posits the possibility of Hilkiah and others in 2 Kgs 22–23 as members of an Ephraimite Levitical heritage.

2. M.A. Sweeney, 'Review of Martti Nissinen, C.L. Seow and Robert K. Ritner, *Prophets and Prophecy in the Ancient Near East*', *Review of Biblical Literature* (2005) [<www.bookreviews.org>]. See also Jer. 11.3-5, which is patterned upon Deut. 27, a ceremony over which Levites are to preside (see below, Chapter 8).

3. Lundbom, *Jeremiah 1–20*, p. 92; *idem*, 'Baruch, Seraiah', pp. 107-108; Leuchter, 'Jeremiah's 70-Year Prophecy', pp. 513-14.

4. Lundbom, *Jeremiah 1–20*, p. 92; see also Lundbom's, 'The *Inclusio*', for similar rhetorical devices to those in the book of Jeremiah.

5. See Sweeney, *King Josiah*, pp. 170-77.

these sources would have no doubt left an impression upon Jeremiah, and the continuity of theme and language in various passages in the book may be attributed to his profound familiarity with these variegated traditions.[6]

For these reasons, Jeremiah would have stood out as a prime candidate for addressing the Shilonites and the northern populations with memories of Israelite heritage or a learned familiarity with it. The strategy for choosing such an 'insider' to be a propagandist finds an antecedent in Judah's earlier experience with Assyria. 2 Kings 18 presents the tale of the Rabshakeh addressing the Jerusalemites of Hezekiah's day, though the episode as it currently stands reflects the position of the Josianic Deuteronomists.[7] The contents of his speech are bold and disturbing, but the text includes a unique element that would on first glance seem superfluous, namely, that the Rabshakeh voices his address in Hebrew ('the Judean language' in 2 Kgs 18.28). Foreigners speak with Israelites in military and diplomatic narratives throughout the DH, but only the Rabshakeh speaks in Hebrew. The oddity of this detail suggests its authenticity, and, as some scholars have speculated, the Rabshakeh himself may have once been a northern Israelite deported to Assyria, who scaled the ranks of the Assyrian military.[8] While his speech has been shaped for rhetorical purposes,[9] the historical memory of this episode must ring true to a certain degree,[10] and it is reasonable to assume that sending a former Israelite to harangue, taunt, threaten, and tempt his Jerusalemite cousins might have been a method of Assyrian psychological warfare. This

---

6. Holladay views Jeremiah's facility with both poetry and prose as arising from the prophet's identification with the Deuteronomic Moses, who communicates in both forms ('Elusive Deuteronomists', p. 68). This is a reasonable assertion but only constitutes one aspect of Jeremiah's self-understanding, informed as it was by a larger prophetic heritage (H. Lalleman-de Winkel, *Jeremiah in Prophetic Tradition: An Examination of the Book of Jeremiah in the Light of Israel's Prophetic Traditions* [Leuven: Peeters, 2000], pp. 202-208, 235-40) and the scribal training that would have made him familiar with these diverse forms of discourse. See R.C. Culley, 'The Confessions of Jeremiah and Traditional Discourse', in S.M. Olyan and R.C. Culley (eds.), *A Wise and Discerning Mind: Essays in Honor of Burke O. Long* (Providence, RI: Brown University, 2000), pp. 69-81. The prophet's training and familiarity with these disparate forms of expression likely influenced his own compositional style(s).

7. See the discussion by E. Ben Zvi, 'Who Wrote the Speech of the Rabshakeh and When?', *JBL* 109 (1990), pp. 79-92.

8. See M. Cogan and H. Tadmor, *II Kings* (AB, 11; New York: Doubleday, 1988), p. 230.

9. Ben Zvi, 'The Speech of the Rabshakeh', pp. 90-92. See also D. Rudman, 'Is the Rabshakeh Also among the Prophets? A Rhetorical Study of 2 Kings xviii 17-35', *VT* 50 (2000), pp. 100-110.

10. Ben Zvi, 'The Speech of the Rabshakeh', p. 92. For the neo-Assyrian background to this episode, see J.S. Holladay, 'Assyrian Statecraft and the Prophets of Israel', *HTR* 63 (1970), pp. 42-45.

episode in specific, and the strong influence of Assyrian culture on Judah more generally, may have inspired Josiah to select Jeremiah for similar purposes, that is, to preach a Josianic message to his northern brethren just as the Rabshakeh had preached an Assyrian message two generations earlier.

The Early Call Narrative and the 'Nations' of the North

A Josianic date for Jeremiah's oracles has been the subject of much scholarly debate. Many scholars do not look to Josiah's reign as a likely period for Jeremiah's activity, and view the prophet's critical rhetoric throughout the book as a subsequent reaction to the failure of the Josianic reform.[11] Some would accept the possibility of Jeremiah being alive during Josiah's reign, but argue that he would have been too young to begin an active prophetic career during this time, and certainly would not have been a proper propagandist for the Josianic court.[12] Much of this relates to the prophet's call narrative, which does date him to Josiah's reign (Jer. 1.2) but which identifies him as a 'youth' (נער in 1.6). The argument is that even if Jeremiah intuited a prophetic call in his youth, he would not have been able to act on it years later, after the time of Josiah's reign, or perhaps towards its tail end.[13] This position is limited, though, by the way in which scholars read the term נער. While the term does mean 'youth' in a number of contexts, it also carries a ceremonial or social dimension characteristic of an individual's status as a pre- or low-level initiate into a sacral or administrative office.[14] Such is the sense of the term as it is employed by Solomon in 1 Kgs 3.7:

> And now, Yahweh my God, you have made your servant king instead of David my father; and I am but petty youth (נער קטן); I know not how to go out or come in.

Here, Solomon encounters Yahweh in a dream, and the term 'petty youth' is employed for rhetorical purposes, that is, to present Solomon's humbleness before Yahweh. But it is clear that the term 'youth' here contains a ritualistic dimension, as it is followed by the ceremonial phrase 'go out/come in' (see Deut. 31.2; Josh. 14.11). Solomon was no child when he assumed the throne, and the violent manner in which this was accomplished certainly could not be

---

11.   See Perdue, 'Jeremiah in Modern Research', pp. 5-6.

12.   See, e.g., Holladay, *Jeremiah 2*, pp. 24-26; Lundbom, *Jeremiah 1–20*, p. 109. As discussed in the introduction to the present study, however, Sweeney, Lohfink, and Shroter see Jeremiah as active as a propagandist during Josiah's reign, and the texts they have examined will be discussed below.

13.   Lundbom, for example, suggests that the prophet received his call in 627 and accepted it in 622 (Lundbom, *Jeremiah 1–20*, pp. 107-109).

14.   Avigad, 'Hebrew Seals', pp. 10-11.

credited to a 'petty youth' in terms of a reference to age.[15] Thus Jeremiah's similar protest in the call narrative need not relate to the prophet's chronological age as much as his ceremonial status. The prophet may have been a young man during Josiah's reign, but then again, so was Josiah. The king was only twenty-six when he began his reforms according to the account in 2 Kings 22 and only twenty-one according to the parallel account in 2 Chronicles 34. The opening of Jerusalem to rural Levites in Deut. 18.6-8 may reflect a reality that preceded its codification, and this would account for Jeremiah's presence in Jerusalem during Josiah's reform. In all likelihood, Josiah and Jeremiah would have been contemporaries and associates.[16]

We should therefore take seriously the date of the superscription in Jer. 1.2, which relates that the prophet was active from the earliest period of Josiah's reform, that is, the king's thirteenth year (627) as witnessed by the 2 Chronicles 34 account.[17] Jeremiah 1.3 is clearly a secondary expansion, a retroactive updating of the call narrative to apply it to the reigns of subsequent kings as the book of Jeremiah grew over time. The initial stratum, though, would have been Josianic in date and geared to the sensitivities and sensibilities of Jeremiah's northern audience. The attitude of this audience would have been anything but welcoming. The northern population was, as we have seen, an admixture: remnants of Ephraimite Israel mixed with Babylonians, Cutheans, and others in the wake of Samaria's destruction in 721 (2 Kgs 17.24).[18] These communities may have preserved some memory of life under their one-time native rulers, but for a century they had known only Assyrian hegemony and social order. And while the Shilonites had found an ally hundreds of years earlier in David, they had suffered exile

15. Halpern suggests that Solomon was in his early to mid-20s by the time of his accession (*David's Secret Demons*, pp. 239-40).

16. Barrick ('Josiah's Eighth Year', pp. 581-82) notes the mentorship of the priestly and scribal circles to Josiah in his youth. Prominent members of these social circles appear to have familial relationships with Jeremiah (Wilson, *Prophecy and Society*, p. 234).

17. The superscription to Jeremiah's call narrative is quite similar in form to that of Amos, Hosea, Micah, and Zephaniah. This may represent the deliberate attempt to situate Jeremiah's words to the north within a venerable prophetic tradition and is in good keeping with the aims and activity of the Josianic court scribes responsible for the redacted corpus (Sweeney, *King Josiah*, pp. 179-84, 311-13). See H.G. Reventlow, *Liturgie und prophetisches Ich bei Jeremia* (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1963), pp. 24-77, for a discussion of the common form of Jeremiah's call within the larger history of Israelite prophecy. A.H.J. Gunneweg has argued that the commonality of form does not necessarily constitute a monolithic understanding of individual missions; see his 'Ordinationsformular oder Berufsbericht in Jeremia I', in G. Müller and W. Zeller (eds.), *Glaube, Geist, Geschichte: Festschrift für Ernst Benz zum 60. Geburstage am 17. November 1967* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1967), pp. 91-98.

18. For an overview of Assyrian deportation policies, see J. Pečírková, 'The Administrative Methods of Assyrian Imperialism', *Archív Orientální* 55 (1987), pp. 162-75 (168-69).

under Solomon and remained marginalized from the Jerusalem cult for centuries.[19] Neither the Shilonites nor the other northerners would have given a Jerusalemite prophet the benefit of the doubt, even if that prophet possessed northern or Shilonite heritage. Jeremiah would have faced hostility from both camps, and both would certainly have been suspicious of his thinly disguised Josianic propaganda.

The call narrative addresses both of these problems in a number of ways. First is the specific manner of the prophet's call, voiced in rather striking terms:

> And the word of Yahweh came to me, saying, 'Before I formed you in the belly I knew you, and before you came forth out of the womb I sanctified you; I have appointed you a prophet to the nations'. (Jer. 1.4-5)

These verses have been the cause of much speculation in terms of the broader meaning and shape of the book of Jeremiah,[20] yet it serves a very clear purpose. By claiming that Yahweh called him before birth, Jeremiah counters any accusations that he was merely a Josianic puppet and that his mission to the mixed populations of the north and to Anathoth were mandated by Yahweh beyond ordinary time or history.[21] But this esoteric element is made overt: Jeremiah's sacred mission, one that goes beyond plain matters of politics, involved the addressing of an audience beyond the precincts of Jerusalem

19. For the Davidic support of the Shilonites, see P.K. McCarter, *I Samuel* (AB, 8; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1980), pp. 350-51; Leuchter, 'Psalm xcix', pp. 34-35; Schley, *Shiloh*, pp. 162-63.

20. W.L. Holladay (*Jeremiah 1: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah Chapters 1–25* [Hermeneia; Minnesota: Fortress Press, 1986], pp. 25-27, 32-34) argues for the integrity of v. 5a to the original layers of the call narrative and sees the passage as a reference to his birth. Holladay's understanding of v. 9, the reference to Deut. 18.18, as part of the same compositional layer (p. 36) leads him to the late dating of Jeremiah's birth and earliest activity (see his 'The Background of Jeremiah's Self-Understanding: Moses, Samuel, and Psalm 22', in Perdue and Kovacs [eds.], *A Prophet to the Nations*, pp. 313-24 [321-24]). Lundbom sees the call narrative as redactional, shaped after a good number of additional materials had been composed (*Jeremiah: A Study in Ancient Hebrew Rhetoric*, p. 48) but considers much to be ascribed to the prophet (*pace* Carroll, *From Chaos to Covenant*, p. 49).

21. *Contra* Lundbom, *Jeremiah: A Study in Ancient Hebrew Rhetoric*, p. 48; and *idem*, 'The Double Curse'. E. Lewin ('Arguing for Authority: A Rhetorical Study of Jeremiah 1.4-19 and 20.7-18', *JSOT* 32 [1985], pp. 105-19 [116-17]) follows Lundbom's argument that the call narrative is composed subsequent to Jer. 20.14-18 and makes a solid case for its rhetorical function in the larger book as a legitimizer of Jeremiah's position between Yahweh and the people. However, Lundbom's own reading does not account for Jeremiah's work under Josiah at such an early period, and therefore does not consider the call narrative as the primary composition to which Jer. 20.14-18 is a response. On this see Holladay, *Jeremiah 1*, pp. 561-66 (though Holladay's dating of the call narrative is later than what I am proposing here, the structural/rhetorical features yield the same results).

and Judah. The language of these verses reveals that the interests of the Josianic court as voiced by Jeremiah are not limited to Judah but applicable to the mixed population of the north—truly, 'the nations'—as subjects to a Davidic king.[22]

Such a reconstruction counters the position that the 'nations' in v. 5 results from a broad Deuteronomistic redaction also responsible for the 'nations and kingdoms' in v. 10, both addressing exilic ideology under the rule of Baby-lon.[23] If these verses had both resulted from a single redaction, then we would also find the 'nations and kingdoms' phrase in v. 5 in order to balance its parallel in v. 10. The alternative, by contrast, would be a *single* mention of 'nations and kingdoms' in the call narrative which would have provided a comprehensive retrospective summation of the prophet's career and audi-ences. Rather, we encounter only a surface similarity between the lexemes of vv. 5 and 10, the second of which takes its lexical cue from the first.[24] The prophet's word to foreign nations and kingdoms would find ultimate expres-sion in the OAN section of the Jeremianic corpus in its mature form, but it would not pertain to the prophet's earliest concern with 'nations' during the Josianic period. The proposal advanced here—that the reference to the 'nations' in v. 5 alludes to the admixture of populations in the north that Josiah wished to dominate—should therefore stand as the likely intention of this verse's composition.

The addressing of the 'nations' is presented as an essential element from the outset of the prophet's career. Israel's ethnic composition incorporated, over a period, mixed multitudes of foreigners (e.g. Exod. 12.38). Uriah the Hittite in 2 Samuel 11 reflects this very tradition, assuming a position in Israelite society even while retaining Hittite ethnicity. Under Josiah, how-ever, the engagement of foreign status and the leeway afforded by the mixed multitude tradition was taken in an entirely new direction. As observed earlier, Israelite 'ethnicity' according to Deuteronomy is defined by adherence to the law, not by old kinship lineages or social divisions. Consequently, the Deuteronomic tradition categorizes traditional Israelite religious practices as completely foreign, identifying family deities as foreign 'baals', eradicating

---

22. Sweeney, *King Josiah*, pp. 173-75.

23. For a discussion of the 'nations' reference as part of a Deuteronomistic redaction of the call narrative, see S. Herrmann, 'Die Bewältigung der Krise Israels', in H. Donner, R. Hanhart, and R. Smend (eds.), *Beiträge zur alttestamentlichen Theologie: Festschrift für Walther Zimmerlo zum 70. Geburstag* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977), pp. 164-78; Thiel, *Jeremia 1–25*, pp. 62-79. Carroll points out that the chiasmus in ques-tion here is 'modified' (*From Chaos to Covenant*, p. 48) but does not recognize that that this modification creates not a chiasmus but a continuation into a more comprehensive literary unit.

24. Holladay (*Jeremiah 1*, pp. 34-46) rightly sees the relationship between the 'nations' reference in Jer. 1.5 and 'nations and kingdoms' in v. 10 but argues for the origi-nality of both verses to the same compositional layer in the call narrative.

the Asherah cult and its iconography, and outlawing the existence of rural shrines as unsuitable for true Israelites. The old understandings of ethnicity and culture were radically disrupted. By the same token, the king's annexation of the north and demolition of its religious infrastructure suggests that the mixed populations therein could be counted as Israelites if they could adhere to the Deuteronomic concept of law and covenant. It is for this reason that Deuteronomy presents itself so strongly as a new but official understanding of the conditions for national identity, with Moses articulating the 'true' standards by which one could consider oneself an Israelite. Deuteronomy 5.2-3 reads:

> Yahweh our God made a covenant with us in Horeb. Yahweh did not make this covenant with our fathers, but with us, even us, who are all of us here alive this day.

Family lineage structures are nullified in this passage; the covenant at Horeb was not made to earlier generations that could be traced and delineated through genealogies. It was made directly with the individuals hearing and adhering to Deuteronomy. Following this remarkable declaration is, of course, the recitation of the Decalogue with its increased emphasis on the Exodus tradition (Deut. 5.6, 14), an idea that is woven throughout the Deuteronomic legislation.[25] The Exodus had previously been the hallmark of Israelite identity, and this idea is sustained in Deuteronomy but qualified through Moses' proclamation that the covenant begun by the Exodus and expressed at Horeb is fulfilled only through adherence to his exhortation on the plains of Moab. This applied hermeneutically both to Moses' audience within the text and the implied audience *of* the text (Deut. 5.3: '…us, even us, who are all of us here alive this day').[26] Adherence to the Torah was more important than earlier understandings of ethnicity or kinship because adherence to the Torah now *defined* ethnicity and kinship (according to Deut. 13.7-12). Jeremiah's mission to the nations of the north (Ephraimite or otherwise) presupposes this very doctrine.

The Interpolation of Shilonite Prototypes into the Call Narrative

Having made his Josianic mission to the mixed populations of the north a matter of covenantal significance, Jeremiah then turns to the matter of Shilonite reluctance to consider a Jerusalemite message. After encountering the word of Yahweh in v. 5, Jeremiah replies with his own reticence and reports the divine response:

---

25. See above, p. 57.
26. So also B.M. Levinson, 'The Hermeneutics of Tradition in Deuteronomy: A Response to J.G. McConville', *JBL* 119 (2000), pp. 269-86 (285).

> Then said I, 'Ah, Yahweh God, behold, I cannot speak; for I am a youth
> (נער)'. But Yahweh said to me, 'Say not, "I am a youth"; for to whomsoever I
> shall send you, you shall go, and whatsoever I shall command you, you shall
> speak'. (Jer. 1.6-7)

The refusal in v. 6 is evocative of other prophetic refusals to the divine call
(thereby situating Jeremiah within a well-entrenched pattern of behavior), but
the נער terminology more clearly identifies a specific tradition. The term is
deployed to create associations between Jeremiah and Samuel, who is simi-
larly identified as a נער before taking on the mantle of prophetic respon-
sibility (1 Sam. 2.11, 18; 3.1, 8).[27] But the response of Yahweh also evokes
the call of Moses to lead the nation:

> Jer. 1.7—…to whomsoever I shall send you (ואשלחך) you shall go…
>
> Exod. 3.10—…and I will send you (ואשלחך) to Pharaoh…

It is perhaps no coincidence that Moses' call in Exodus 3—an Elohistic/
Shilonite tradition—is also closely associated with foreign nations:[28]

> And I have come down to deliver them out of the hand of the Egyptians, and
> to bring them up out of that land…unto the place of the Canaanite, and the
> Hittite, and the Amorite, and the Perizzite, and the Hivite, and the Jebusite.
> (Exod. 3.8)

Jeremiah's allusions to the Samuel and Moses traditions declare that
Jeremiah's Josianic mission falls under familiar categories. History is called
as a witness to Jeremiah's legitimacy, but history is subordinated to the cur-
rent prophetic word. The superscription identifies the entire call narrative as a
דבר ה', a divine message articulated through the written text akin to those of
Jeremiah's prophetic antecedents.[29] As such, the literary structure of the early
call narrative elucidates how Jeremiah's mission mediates between the Shilo-
nite traditions and the Jerusalemite message:

> Jer. 1.1-2   Superscription binding Jeremiah to Jerusalem tradition
>
> *Jer. 1.4-5*   *The scope of Jeremiah's current mission*
>
> Jer. 1.6-7   The appeal to Shilonite/Ephraimite tradition

---

27. See also Avigad, 'Hebrew Seals', pp. 10-11, for the term's appearance in admin-
istrative contexts.

28. For Exod. 3 (and E more generally) as a Shilonite document, see Jenks, *Elohist*,
pp. 101-105; Friedman, *Who Wrote the Bible?*, pp. 70-88. For additional commonalities
between the call of Moses and that of Jeremiah, see W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1* (Hermeneia;
Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), p. 97.

29. See Amos 1.1; Hos. 1.1; Mic. 1.1. This phrase also appears throughout the catalog
of Ephraimite prophecy; see Wilson, *Prophecy and Society*, pp. 145-46.

Deuteronomy reflects the Josianic harmonization of disparate northern traditions in a Jerusalemite environment, and Jer. 1.1-7 reflects the same impulse.[30] The structure of these verses identifies Jeremiah's charge from Yahweh as the central feature, suggesting that the prophet's ensuing oracles (and perhaps the prophet himself) represent a bridge between Jerusalemite and Shilonite/Ephraimite interests. The ensuing material in the call narratives likely derives from Jeremiah as well, but appears to address a subsequent period.[31] These narratives presuppose dramatic adversity and an unavoidable political cataclysm speaking to the obliteration of traditions and monarchic institutions rather than a hermeneutical merging of ideas under Josiah. It is therefore likely that Jer. 1.1-7 (excepting v. 3) constitute the original introduction to Jeremiah's early oracles to the north, qualifying the ensuing discourse as an authentic prophetic exhortation. Our discussion must therefore turn to the materials in the book of Jeremiah that best fit this historical and literary context, namely, Jeremiah 30–31.

The Earliest Northern Oracles: Jeremiah 30–31

Redaction-critical studies have identified passages in Jeremiah 30–31 that are best seen as having been composed during the Josianic period in terms of syntactical markers and language,[32] the latter of which points to a northern audience as opposed to the passages that seem to relate to an audience of Judean heritage.[33] It is worth noting that 30.2, original to the early layer of these chapters, identifies them as a 'book'.[34] By the Josianic period, the literary record of earlier prophecy had largely been worked into distinct books, with which the superscription in Jer. 1.1-2 has much in common.[35] Like the early material in the call narrative, the early layers of Jeremiah 30–31 involve strategies meant to harmonize ideological differences between Jerusalemite and northern perspectives on history, politics, social organization, and theology. The oracles emerge from a distinctively literary culture; the early call narrative was thus likely the introduction to a brief but carefully constructed

30.   See Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1–11*, pp. 10-13, 44-57; Geoghegan ('"Until this Day"', pp. 225-27) notes that the Deuteronomist consciously harmonizes disparate traditions of both northern and southern provenance, though it is clear that the resulting DH is especially concerned with northern Levitical heritage.

31.   See below, pp. 149-52.

32.   See Sweeney, *King Josiah*, pp. 208-33; Lohfink, 'Der junge Jeremia', pp. 351-68; Shroter, 'Jeremias Botschaft', pp. 312-29.

33.   For an overview, see Sweeney, *King Josiah*, pp. 225-33.

34.   Sweeney (*King Josiah*, p. 231) identifies 30.2 as original to the early compositional layers of the text. It would later be applied to the 'book of comfort' now spanning Jer. 30–33 (Lundbom, *Jeremiah 1–20*, pp. 97-98).

35.   Sweeney, *King Josiah*, pp. 179-84, 311-13.

literary corpus, textualizing long-standing traditions from both Ephraim and Judah.[36]

The merging of northern and southern traditions begins in 30.4-9, which presents the return to Davidic rule as the breaking of a yoke from the neck of the estranged Israel:

> And these are the words that Yahweh spoke concerning Israel… For thus says Yahweh, 'We have heard a voice of trembling, of fear, and not of peace. Ask now, and see whether a man does labor with child; wherefore do I see every man with his hands on his loins, as a woman in labor, and all faces are turned into paleness? Alas, for that day is great, there is none like it; and it is a time of trouble for Jacob, but out of it shall he be saved. And it shall come to pass in that day', says Yahweh of hosts, 'that I will break his yoke from off your neck, and will burst your bonds; and strangers shall no more make him their bondman; but they shall serve Yahweh their God, and David their king, whom I will raise up unto them'.

This passage provides insights into the circumstances surrounding Jeremiah's mission if the prophet was indeed first active c. 627. The death of Assurbanipal in that year must have sent shockwaves throughout the Assyrian empire, evoking various reactions. Josiah clearly viewed the Assyrian king's passing as an opportunity to reclaim a degree of independence, and indeed the language throughout the passage presupposes a Judean consciousness.[37] The 'yoke' imagery is typically tied to foreign domination;[38] the breaking of this yoke by a Davidic king in Jer. 30.8-9 is best viewed as Josiah's bid for authority against the waning Assyrian presence in the north. This passage, however, suggests that the desire for autonomy from Assyria was not prevalent in the north. The Assyrian vassal states retained a degree of independent political cohesion, but the provinces were completely subsumed within Assyria itself.[39] Imperial instability would leave these provinces considerably more vulnerable and less socially cohesive than the vassal states.[40] The dramatic language in vv. 5-7 reveals the degree of northern hysteria, but the salvation of Yahweh through the Davidic king (i.e. Josiah) in v. 9 presents them with a substitute for the fallen Assyrian monarch.

---

36. For the choice to present prophecy as a textual collection above mere oral proclamation, see J. Schaper, 'Exilic and Post-Exilic Prophecy and the Orality/Literary Problem', *VT* 55 (2005), pp. 324-42 (329-31, 334-39).

37. The image of men going through the pains of childbirth, however, recalls Hos. 13.13; the reference to this Hosean passage suggests an end to the period of strife Hosea had earlier proclaimed. See below for additional discussion regarding the prophet's use of Hosea.

38. See C. Wolfe, 'Yoke', in *IDB*, IV, pp. 924-25.

39. Pečírková, 'Administrative Methods', pp. 164-71.

40. Pečírková, 'Administrative Methods', pp. 174-75.

Jeremiah continues with references to the earlier Israelite dispersions and subjugation under Assyria (vv. 10-17). The Assyrians are characterized as the 'lovers' of the north (מאהביך in v. 14),[41] but the lovers have abandoned her, calling her 'a wasteland' (or 'wounded') without anyone to care for her (צִיּוֹן היא דרשׁ אין לה in v. 17).[42] The *double entendre* is rather thinly veiled, insofar as the neglect of the Assyrians qualifies the north as fit for redemption through Zion, and the same ideology persists in Jeremiah 31. Jeremiah 31.1-5 once again presents salvation for Ephraim as the result of reunification with Zion after recalling the marital nature of Israel's relationship with Yahweh, its early virginal status, the perfection of its days in the wilderness, and the promise of restoration:

> Thus says Yahweh, 'The people that were left of the sword have found grace in the wilderness, even Israel, when I go to cause him to rest. From afar Yahweh appeared to me: I have loved you with an everlasting love (אהבת עולם אהבתיך); therefore with affection have I drawn you. Again will I build you, and thou shall be built, O virgin of Israel; again shall you be adorned with your tabrets, and shall go forth in the dances of them that make merry. Again shall you plant vineyards upon the mountains of Samaria; the planters shall plant, and shall have the use thereof. For there shall be a day, that the watchmen shall call upon the mount Ephraim, "Arise, and let us go up to Zion, to Yahweh our God".' (Jer. 31.1-5)

This unit demonstrates lexical affiliations with Jer. 30.14, insofar as Yahweh is now revealed to be Israel's true lover (אהבת עולם אהבתיך in v. 2). Here, however, the combination of sexual imagery, the emergence from the wilderness, and the mention of fertile vineyards points to the Hosea tradition:

> For she is not my wife, neither am I her husband; and let her put away her harlotries from her face, and her adulteries from between her breasts, lest I strip her naked, and set her as in the day that she was born, and make her like a

---

41.   The אהב terminology in this context is a matter of political allegiance (see 1 Kgs 5.15 for an analogue), eventually to be replaced by covenantal allegiance to Yahweh in Deut. 6.5 (ואהבת את ה' אלהיך); see Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1–11*, pp. 7-9. The implication here is that association with other political 'lovers' is an abrogation of the covenant, an idea that will take more substantial shape in subsequent oracles.

42.   H. Jacobson points to an apparent difficulty with the literal translation of this passage as 'for they have called you "Banished: she is a wasteland (צִיּוֹן), no one cares for her"' and the very clear Zionistic *double entendre* formed by 'wasteland', such as in Isa. 25.5 and 32.2 ('Jeremiah xxx 17: צִיּוֹן היא', *VT* 54 [2004], pp. 398-99). His reading of the *double entendre* as referring first to Zion and then, via the wordplay, to a wasteland fits the later use of this oracle following the deportation of 597 (Leuchter, 'Jeremiah's 70-Year Prophecy', pp. 519-20), but within the context of an early northern oracle, the statement appears to be rhetorically placed in the mouth of Assyria, who had by then waned and left the northern regions wanting for leadership and order. In this case, the first impression of the term is that Assyria views the north as a wasteland, but the *double entendre* points ahead to restoration through Zion as depicted in the ensuing verses.

wilderness, and set her like a dry land, and slay her with thirst. And I will not have compassion upon her children; for they are children of harlotry. For their mother has played the harlot, she that conceived them has done shamefully; for she said, 'I will go after my lovers (אהבי), who give me my bread and my water, my wool and my flax, mine oil and my drink'… And I will lay waste her vines and her fig-trees, whereof she has said, 'These are my hire that my lovers (אהבי) have given me'; and I will make them a forest, and the beasts of the field shall eat them. (Hos. 2.4-7, 14)

Jeremiah invokes Hosea's chastisement of Israel, but demonstrates that the time has come for Israel to *return* from the desert, restore her relationship with Yahweh, and to replant her vineyards—the period of her chastisement has come to an end. Jeremiah's reference to Ephraim as an 'untrained calf' is particularly significant in establishing continuity with Hosea:

Jer. 31.17—I have surely heard Ephraim bemoaning himself, 'You have chastised me, and I was chastised, as an untrained calf; turn me, and I shall be turned, for you are Yahweh my God'.

Hos. 8.5-6—Your calf, O Samaria, is cast off… For from Israel is even this: the craftsman made it, and it is no God; the calf of Samaria shall be broken in shivers.

Hosea claimed that the bull cult would bring calamity upon the north, and Jeremiah declares that while this calamity had indeed come to fruition, it was now finished.[43] Israel had learned its lesson and was ready for restoration. The concern with the bull cult would not have spoken only to the northerners of Ephraimite heritage. As observed earlier, the Bethel shrine was fully functional throughout the period of Assyrian hegemony. Its cultic traditions were preserved and sponsored by Assyria, and taught to all the foreigners settled in the former northern kingdom by a Bethel priest (2 Kgs 17.27-28). Jeremiah 31.17 and the invocation of Hosea's critique speak not only to Ephraimites but to the mixed population of the region who had grown accustomed to the 'ways of the God of the land' (2 Kgs 17.26-27) as symbolized by the Bethel shrine.

It is clear, then, that these oracles were conceived with the broad northern population in mind, but they are punctuated strategically with references both

43. See Halpern, 'Brisker Pipes than Poetry', pp. 90-91; Cross, *Canaanite Myth*, pp. 198-99. Jeroboam's use of the bull/calf imagery is an attempt to infuse the Bethel and Dan shrines with an ancient cultic authenticity. The recurring Deuteronomistic polemic against Jeroboam is certainly at work here in the Jeremianic text, suggesting that under Josiah, the north would no longer be tainted by Jeroboam's sin (Sweeney, *King Josiah*, p. 227; see further Knoppers, *Two Nations under God*, II, pp. 240-46). This would also intimate a central role for the Shilonites of Anathoth given the tradition preserved in the DH that Shiloh and its circles stood in opposition to these sites (Judg. 18.30-31; 1 Kgs 13.1-10; 14.7-16).

overt and implicit to Shilonite heritage and concerns. The prophet's reliance on Hosea falls under this category, as the latter was also likely bound to the Shilonite priesthood and stood against (northern) monarchic institutions.[44] Jeremiah employs terms that appear to fit well the idea of northern priestly figures accepting a new ruler. The first of these references is found in Jer. 30.18:

> Thus says Yahweh, 'Behold, I will turn the captivity of Jacob's tents (אהלי יעקוב), and have compassion on his dwellings (משכנתיו); and the city shall be built upon its own mound, and the palace (ארמון) shall sit upon its [process of] judgment (משפטו)'.

The combination of the אהל/משכן terminology in this verse immediately recalls the similar pairing in Num. 24.5:

> How goodly are thy tents, O Jacob (אהליך יעקב),
> thy dwellings, O Israel (משכנתיך ישראל).

This early poetic passage was worked into the Balaam narrative in Numbers 22–24, and was likely deployed to address the influx of Ephraimite refugees during the reign of Hezekiah.[45] Jeremiah 30.18 appears to follow a similar pattern, addressing Ephraimite cultic terms, though it is clear that they are to be subordinated to the 'city' and 'palace', that is, Jerusalem and its royal institution. What is notable is that Jerusalem, central though it may be, is presented as founded upon a משפט process or ideology. While this might simply refer to the 'manner' of Jerusalem, the invocation of the northern terminology in the same verse and the general preoccupation with northern tradition throughout Jeremiah 30–31 suggest that the משפט process in question is that associated with the Zophim of Shiloh, something that would strongly inform the Deuteronomic legislation that emerged in Jerusalem a few years later. The implication is that while Jerusalem is central to the restoration of the north, the Shiloh tradition is central to Jerusalem.

The Shiloh connection is further developed a few verses later in Jer. 30.21:

> 'And their prince (אדירו) shall be of themselves, and their leader (משלו) shall proceed from the midst of them; and I will cause him to draw near (הקרבתיו), and he shall approach (נגש) me; for who is he that has pledged his heart to approach (לגשת) me?', says Yahweh.

The political terminology (אדירו/משלו) here is paralleled by priestly language (קרב/נגש); some scholars have argued that the political terms reflect

---

44. See S.L. Cook, 'The Lineage Roots of Hosea's Yahwism', *Semeia* 87 (1999), pp. 145-62 (154-59). See also Jenks, *Elohist*, p. 117.

45. For the antiquity of these poetic Balaam oracles, see B.A. Levine, *Numbers 21–36* (AB, 4A; New York: Doubleday, 2000), pp. 231-32. Levine dates the oracle to the early ninth century, commensurate with Israel's political dominance in Gilead during that time.

Josianic hegemony, while others focus on the priestly terms and argue instead for a late exilic or postexilic compositional context involving the reconstituted Jerusalem cult.[46] Yet neither position adequately addresses the purpose of these terms. The political terminology involves leadership and governance but not kingship, which goes unmentioned; the verse's overt priestly language thus seems to suggest that priestly figures are to take roles as local leaders among the broader northern population. This corresponds precisely with what would obtain in the Deuteronomic legislation, with Levites acting as regional agents of the Josianic court, creating a federal system where satellite populations follow centrally derived law (which, as implied in Jer. 30.18, is founded on Shilonite ideology). The relationship between the contents of Jer. 30.21 and its literary context suggests once again that the Shilonites are essential to the restoration of the north.

A final example of Shilonite referencing within Jeremiah 30–31 appears in 31.14,[47] which refers to Rachel, the matron of the north, weeping over the loss of the northern tribes:

> Thus says Yahweh, 'A voice is heard in Ramah, lamentation, and bitter weeping (תמרורים), Rachel weeping for her children; she refuses to be comforted (מאנה להנחם) for her children, because they are not'.

In this verse, Jeremiah refers both to the E narrative of Jacob mourning the apparent death of Joseph (וימאן להתנחם in Gen. 37.35)[48] and Hosea's condemnation of Ephraim (הכעיס אפרים תמרורים in Hos. 12.15), though the context pertains to restoration rather than loss and to repentance rather than apostasy. It is significant that the use of these sources reflect the central role of the Shilonites: Rachel's children included not only Joseph (Ephraim/ Manasseh) but *Benjamin* as well, and she cries from *Ramah*, the home-region of Shiloh (see 1 Sam. 1.1; 7.17). The implication is that Rachel's weeping concerns the lost northerners as well as the Shiloh priesthood residing in the Benjaminite town of Anathoth. The recurrence of the term תמרורים in 31.20

---

46. Parke-Taylor (*Formation*, p. 70) criticizes Lohfink's argument ('Der junge Jeremia', p. 357) that the texts are early propagandistic works for Josiah, and points out the difficulty of reading the term אדיר as a reference to Josiah in light of the priestly נגש terminology that appears in the same verse and the cultic term עדה in v. 20. Carroll (*Jeremiah*, p. 583) also recognizes that the term applies to a cultic figure rather than a royal one. However, Carroll and Parke-Taylor do not recognize the need to direct these texts to the Shilonites, who certainly qualify for the priestly/cultic figurehood that both these scholars favor.

47. This verse is numbered Jer. 31.15 in some manuscripts.

48. See L. Luker, 'Rachel's Tomb', in *ABD*, V, pp. 608-609, for a discussion of the mourning rituals associated with the tomb tradition near Bethel. The reference, though, seems to be a direct quotation of Gen. 37.35. It may be the case that the tradition of Rachel's mourning is being hermeneutically merged with Jacob's mourning from the Genesis passage for the purposes of rhetorical presentation.

and its syntactical connection to the term צִיּוּנִים in the same verse suggests
that the return to Zion constitutes the return of these priests to their traditional
posts at Shiloh, which in turn would allow for northern Israel to re-emerge
and bring an end to Rachel's lament.[49] Indeed, the reference to Gen. 37.35
suggests that the north, like Joseph, will reclaim its place among its brethren.
Jeremiah indicates that the Shilonites of Anathoth must recognize that the
return to Zion is as much a part of Yahweh's plan as Joseph's re-emergence
among his brethren in the old E narrative.[50]

The Shilonites are thus incorporated into a larger scheme that goes beyond
social particulars; even the clear reference to traditional kinship and territory
in 31.14 follows upon a textual unit qualified by Zion-based language (בְּמְרוֹם
צִיּוֹן in 31.12) that ends with a reference to a restored priesthood (וְרִוֵּיתִי נֶפֶשׁ
הַכֹּהֲנִים in 31.14). The Ephraimite traditions in 31.14 are subsumed within a
broader, comprehensive theological context, but the statement concerning the
restored priesthood stands out as particularly important. The Josianic plan for
the north required Shilonite participation, but the Shilonites in turn needed
the Josianic plan in order to be restored to their homeland and former
authority.

The Reliance on Jerusalem's Priestly Tradition

Pursuant to this point is perhaps the most dramatic device employed by
Jeremiah to convince the Shilonites of Anathoth to accept Josianic policy—
the use of the Priestly (P) language (esp. Gen. 1.1-2, 14-16)[51] in Jer. 31.35-37:

49. So also Sweeney, *King Josiah*, p. 232. Holladay (*Jeremiah 1*, pp. 193-94) also
observes the connection to Zion here, but further suggests a connection to 2 Kgs 23.17.

50. For the re-emergence of Joseph as a metaphor for the Adonis myth, see J.B.
Peckham, *History and Prophecy* (New York: Doubleday, 1993), pp. 276-77. It is possible
that Jeremiah is playing here upon the Adonis myth of the Joseph story and applying it
broadly to the northern population. However, the restoration from death is no longer a
matter of a mythic cycle but of Josiah's authority, as it is through reunification with Zion
that the north will be reborn.

51. For P's chronological priority to the Deuteronomic literature, see M. DeRoche,
'The Reversal of Creation in Hosea', *VT* 31 (1981), pp. 401-407; M. Haran, 'Behind the
Scenes of History: Determining the Date of the Priestly Source', *JBL* 100 (1981), pp. 321-
33 (328-29, 331-33); Peckham, *History and Prophecy*, pp. 255-65; J. Milgrom, 'The
Antiquity of the Priestly Source: A Reply to Joseph Blenkinsopp', *ZAW* 111 (1999),
pp. 10-22. The P material is in some cases found within the Deuteronomistic texts (see
Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, pp. 179-89). This is not to exclude
the possibility of ongoing development of P texts/traditions during later stages, but only to
affirm that a core P tradition did exist at an earlier period. That P would also serve as a
source for Jeremiah's early writings is therefore consistent with the emergent features of
Josianic literary discourse, suggested also by Halpern and Vanderhooft in relation to the
background to Huldah's oracle in 2 Kgs 22.15-20 ('The Editions of Kings', pp. 226-27).

> Thus says Yahweh, who gives the sun for a light by day, and the ordinances of the moon and of the stars for a light by night, who stirs up the sea, that the waves thereof roar, Yahweh of hosts is his name: 'If these ordinances depart from before me', says Yahweh, 'then the seed of Israel also shall cease from being a nation before me forever'. Thus says Yahweh: 'If heaven above can be measured, and the foundations of the earth searched out beneath, then will I also cast off all the seed of Israel for all that they have done', says Yahweh.

Jeremiah's invocation of the P creation account presupposes a cosmic order with Jerusalem at the center. This may seem inconsistent for an appeal to a priestly group long opposed to Jerusalem, but in the context of the Josianic period, such a reference to P is perfectly suited.[52] The Deuteronomic legislation would subsume all priesthoods under the banner of Levitical heritage, and Jeremiah's oracle thus prefigures what would be codified through law, suggesting that the P material was not anathema to Shilonite needs or concerns. Moreover, just as Yahweh's plan for Jeremiah was established before his own birth,[53] the Josianic policy Jeremiah advocates is the realization not only of the Davidic covenant but also of creation itself. Josiah's ambitions in the northern territories were part of Yahweh's plan conceived at the moment of creation.

Finally, the fate of the created order is tied specifically to the successful extension of Josianic hegemony over the north. Verses 36-37 claim that the future of Israel as a nation will be secure so long as the content of v. 35—the cosmology of P—is not abrogated. The Shiloh tradents are here being asked to accept the ideology of the Jerusalem priesthood as their own. The term ימשו in v. 36 may thus play a double role: it not only means 'abrogation' but may also be a pun or anagram on the term 'Mushite' (מושי),[54] directly addressing the Shilonites of Anathoth. They, as part of the Mushite priestly line, must rise to the occasion for the sake of history and the covenant and bring the northern populations into the Josianic fold.

The structure of these chapters is deliberate, especially if we count the early layer of the call narrative as their one-time introduction. This introductory material strongly addresses the relationship between Shilonite and Jerusalemite tradition (via the actual mission of Jeremiah). Next follows a poetic discourse regarding the north more generally, punctuated by references again to the Jerusalem and Shiloh traditions (Jer. 30.18, 21[55]). This is followed again by general poetic discourse regarding the north, followed by yet another

---

52. See L. Shedletsky, 'Josiah's Reform and the Dynamics of Defilement: A Phenomenological Approach to 2 Kings 23' (PhD dissertation; New York University, 2004), pp. 159-200. Shedletsky identifies a Priestly *Grundlage* later augmented by Deuteronomistic editing.

53. See above, p. 74.

54. Following Cross, *Canaanite Myth*, p. 197.

55. See the discussion of these verses above.

reference to Shilonite tradition in relation to Jerusalem (31.14). A last poetic discourse of redemption follows, and the oracles conclude with a final reference to the Shilonite role in Jerusalem's politics (31.35-37). The Shiloh/ Jerusalem passages are relatively equidistant and frame the general poetic discourses; this structural strategy demonstrates that the role of the Shilonites should support the broader goals of the Josianic discourse. Hermeneutically speaking, partisan politics are woven into the literary fabric of the oracles.[56]

That the Shilonite priests of Anathoth rejected Josiah's ambitions and Jeremiah's oracles is not surprising. Had they heeded Jeremiah's words, the Josianic DH would certainly have made mention of their allegiance and involvement in Josiah's reforms. The sponsorship of the Shilonites would have further legitimized Josiah's standing as the scion not only of the Davidic house but also of Mosaic tradition, reclaiming for both groups what Assyria had taken away. Yet Assyria was far from finished. The early oracles of Jeremiah 30–31 presuppose a period of uncertainty for Assyria and opportunity for Josiah, but the coalition of Egyptian and Assyrian forces near the Euphrates by 616 suggests that the period of opportunity for Josiah was in danger of coming to an end.[57]

Josiah was therefore in some potentially hot water. He had just rebelled against Assyria within his own borders, and he had annexed an Assyrian province and demolished the religious and political structure therein as well. This hostile act went beyond the withholding of tribute that led to the devastation of Hezekiah's regime almost a century earlier.[58] The resuscitation of Assyrian power in the northern territories—supported by Egyptian forces —would have left tiny Judah in a compromised position. Thus while Josiah may have returned to Jerusalem to carry out his covenantal Passover festival without the support of the Shilonites of Anathoth (and therefore without having solidified his own authority in the north) he would not have been able simply to let go of the matter. Josiah desperately needed to reclaim the north while he still could, for the re-establishment of Assyrian (and Egyptian) hegemony would have invariably led Judah to the same fate as Israel in 721.

56.   L. Stulman ('The Prose Sermons as Hermeneutical Guide to Jeremiah 1–25: The Deconstruction of Judah's Symbolic World', in Diamond, O'Connor, and Stulman [eds.], *Troubling Jeremiah*, pp. 34-63) identifies an identical pattern with the prose and the poetry of Jer. 1–25 at a later stage in the book's growth but ascribes this to a later writer/ editor. This continuity of form, however, suggests some degree of common authorship (see the concluding observations in the present study).

57.   For a concise discussion of the historical developments during this period, see Finkelstein and Silberman, *The Bible Unearthed*, pp. 289-92; Provan, Phillips Long, and Longman III, *Biblical Israel*, p. 276; Oded, 'Judah and the Exile', pp. 435-76; Tadmor, 'The Period of the First Temple, the Babylonian Exile, and the Restoration', pp. 151-52.

58.   See Halpern, 'Jerusalem and the Lineages', pp. 19-27, 31-41.

5

THE NORTHERN CHASTISEMENT

Jeremiah was once again deployed to solidify Josiah's position in the north, and Jeremiah 2–4 possess early textual layers that evidence the shift in tone and need.[1] Whereas the earlier oracles in chs. 30–31 had presented an ecumenical message to the Shilonites concerning the mixed northern population, Jeremiah 2–4 involve chastisement of that population and the Shilonites as one corporate unit.[2] The threats in these oracles, however, once again demonstrate a desire to project Jerusalemite perspective onto the north. It was Josiah, not the northern populations, who had officially denounced Assyrian (now Assyrian–Egyptian) authority, and it was Josiah and his own kingdom that would have to face the consequences for such action. The tone of Jeremiah's words reveals the insecurity that must have motivated Josiah to use him once again.

The Threat Oracles: Jeremiah 2–4

The threat oracles likely date from a time after 616, the year that Assyria and Egypt formed their military coalition.[3] This would account not only for the repeated references to Assyria–Egypt and the sense of impending political doom running through these chapters, but also to more overt references to the Deuteronomic Torah that would have by then been a subject of public discourse.[4] These references surface throughout Jeremiah 2–4, but are

---

1. For a redaction-critical study of these chapters isolating the early layers of text, see Sweeney, *King Josiah*, pp. 215-25. Subsequent uses of 'Jer. 2–4' will refer primarily to the Josianic compositional stratum within these chapters.

2. See below re. Jer. 2.23.

3. Malamat, *Biblical Israel*, pp. 290-91; Provan, Phillips Long, and Longman III, *History of Biblical Israel*, p. 276.

4. See especially Holladay's discussion concerning the unparalleled frequency of references to Deut. 32 in these chapters ('Elusive Deuteronomists', pp. 63-64, 73-74), which was likely part of the pre-exilic Deuteronomic corpus (so also Halpern and Vanderhooft, 'The Editions of Kings', p. 237).

couched in language that is an extension of the earlier oracles directed to the Shilonites and the north. The chastisement carries forward the imagery consistent with earlier Ephraimite tradition via a reference to the wilderness and Israel's youth in Jer. 2.2-3,[5] and the interweaving with Jerusalemite ideology is initiated simultaneously:

> Thus says Yahweh: I remember for you the affection (חסד) of your youth, the love of your espousals; how you went after Me in the wilderness, in a land that was not sown. Israel is Yahweh's hallowed portion, His first-fruits of the increase; all that devour him shall be held guilty, evil shall come upon them, says Yahweh.

Immediately, we encounter the Davidic term חסד (2 Sam. 7.15), continuing in v. 3 with the sanctity of such a community by comparing it to Yahweh's first-fruits, a reference to Deuteronomic law (Deut. 26.2, 10). The passage here does not claim a likeness to the first-fruits but that Israel *is* Yahweh's first-fruits, which is of considerable significance.[6] Yahweh will invariably punish those who desecrate the sacral status of Israel. Who, precisely, is desecrating Israel? Under the current circumstances, the desecration seems to be internal, as the Shilonites (and the north more generally) have apparently thumbed their noses at the Josianic program that Jeremiah supports. If the protasis is that Yahweh will punish those who desecrate Israel, the apodosis is that those who are punished cannot be counted as part of the nation.

　Whereas the focus of Jeremiah 30–31 was on the past suffering of an Israel ready for repentance, Jer. 2.2-3 begins by setting Israel's *fidelity* in the distant past, suggesting that the Israel of the moment is far removed from their original idyllic state. It moreover equates Davidic rule and Deuteronomic law as part of that ancient paradigm via the חסד reference. This Camelot of days gone by is immediately set aside for a look into the more unpleasant reality of Israel's history once settled in the land. Jeremiah focuses on the reasons for why Ephraim fell: the ancestors had no recognition of Yahweh's benevolence. Verse 6 specifies that the Exodus and period of purity in the wilderness were forgotten by the nation, leading to the charge facing Jeremiah's audience in v. 7:

5.　Hosea's influence on Jeremiah is felt here; see Hos. 2.17. Holladay (*Jeremiah 1*, pp. 82-84) discusses the litigious dimensions of this verse. It is, as Holladay notes, not simply a recollection of better days but an invocation of a standard of behavior that Jeremiah now argues has been compromised. Holladay's late dating of Jeremiah's early oracles precludes the possibility that this transgression involves the north rejecting Josianic authority, ergo his understanding of the Assyrian references as metaphorical rather than actual (p. 63).

6.　See Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, pp. 300-304, though Fishbane views the source material as originating in P.

> And I brought you into a land of fruitful fields, to eat the fruit thereof and the good thereof; but when you entered, you defiled (ותטמאו) my land (ארצי), and made my heritage (נחלתי) an abomination (תועבה).

If this oracle was directed to the north, it is significant that Yahweh, not an Assyrian monarch, is identified as the force that gave them the land they currently occupy. Jeremiah engages in the same polemical strategy of 'exegetical silence' that we encounter in Deuteronomy,[7] pushing aside the record of Assyria's post-721 repopulation policies in the north and instead crediting their habitation to divine providence. The use of the term תועבה here is careful and qualitative. It very often refers to foreign religious practice among the Israelite communities in Deuteronomic texts (Deut. 7.25; 17.1; 22.5; 23.18; 27.15; 29.17; 32.16). As such, the passage sets up a polarity: the land in which the audience lives is given to them by Yahweh, but their allegiance to foreign power (Assyria–Egypt) has defiled this community and its land. The language of v. 7 deliberately invokes that of Deut. 24.4:

> Her former husband, who sent her away, may not take her again to be his wife, for she has been defiled (הטמאה); for that is abomination (תועבה) before Yahweh; and you shall not cause the land (הארץ) to sin, which Yahweh your God gives your for an inheritance (נחלה).

The Deuteronomic reference in Jer. 2.7 is unmistakable: the circumstance of defilement and its effect on the land given by Yahweh powerfully permeate the Jeremianic passage, but the prophet goes on in Jer. 2.8 to specify exactly what problems lie at the heart of the defilement:

> The priests did not say: 'Where is Yahweh?' And they that handle the law (תורה) did not know me, and the shepherds (רעים) transgressed against me; the prophets also prophesied by Baal, and walked after things that do not profit.

Various institutions appears to be criticized here: priests, 'handlers' of the Torah (likely a reference here to the Deuteronomic Torah itself) who do not 'know' Yahweh,[8] governors, and prophets. It is possible that this criticism is being lodged against different typologies, but it is likely that they all refer to the Shilonites.[9] As observed earlier, the Shilonite Zophim possessed the

---

7. Levinson, *Deuteronomy*, p. 126.

8. 'Knowledge' often connotes marital intimacy in biblical tradition (e.g. Gen. 4.1); it is not simply a reference to sexuality (in Gen. 16.4, Abraham 'goes to' Hagar and she conceives a child, but he does not 'know her'). In the context of Jer. 2–4 with its focus on harlotry, the term clearly refers to Israel as betrothed to Yahweh through covenant but having absconded with competing forces on the same intimate level.

9. Holladay (*Jeremiah 1*, pp. 88-89) sees the 'priests' and 'handlers of the law' as the same, though the other terms in this verse reflect the variegated nature of Shilonite figurehood and tradition.

characteristics that surface in Jer. 2.8: priesthood and prophecy were closely intertwined in Shilonite tradition, and their Mushite heritage certainly qualified them as handlers of the Torah in its different manifestations.[10] That they are presented as social/communal leaders (another Zuphite trait) resonates at a Deuteronomic frequency is implied by their designation as 'shepherds' (רעים), that is, administrators, a position mandated for Levites by the Deuteronomic Torah.[11] This indeed was the reason for Jeremiah's initial message to the Shilonites in Jeremiah 30–31; the critique here refers to their complete disregard for that message and the Josianic policy it heralded.

Collectively, then, vv. 2-8 invoke Shilonite tradition against the Shilonites themselves: they have neglected the understanding of the Exodus and the wilderness tradition by ignoring their role in Josiah's Deuteronomic agenda and by denying the centrality of Jerusalem. This would have also characterized the broader northern populations; without the Shilonites' cooperation, they could not have effectively adopted Deuteronomic policy. As a result, the Deuteronomic concept of defilement has been applied broadly to the north. What is remarkable here is that the rejection of Deuteronomy itself constitutes a form of Baalism ('the prophets also prophesied by Baal').[12] This form of Baalism includes choosing the wrong political allies expressed dramatically in v. 13:

> For my people have committed two evils: they have forsaken me, the fountain of living waters, and hewed them out cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water.

Though this charge seems to be a matter of theology—the broken cisterns are often understood as false deities[13]—the broader features of the chapter infuse this verse with a political implication. As per the implications of Jer. 2.8, Baalism is now a matter of the wrong political choice, and language that might identify a strictly theological or cultic concern may thus be applied to

---

10.   So also Halpern, 'The Uneasy Compromise', pp. 76-77, with respect to the early instructional authority of the Shilonite priesthood. See also G. Widengren, 'What Do We Know about Moses?', in Durham and Porter (eds.), *Proclamation and Presence*, pp. 21-47 (40).

11.   See above, pp. 41-42; Leuchter, 'Jeremiah's 70-Year Prophecy', p. 512.

12.   For a full treatment of the transformation of the Baal terminology and ideology in seventh-century Israel, see B. Halpern, 'The Baal (and the Ashera?) in Seventh Century Judah', in R. Bartelmus, T. Kruger, and H. Utzschneider (eds.), *Konsequente Traditionsgeschichte: Festschrift für Klaus Baltzer zum 85. Geburstage* (OBO, 126; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1993), pp. 115-54; *idem*, 'Jerusalem and the Lineages', pp. 83-84.

13.   Holladay (*Jeremiah 1*, p. 93) suggests that the 'broken cisterns' is a metaphor for human-fashioned baals, but the political reality facing Judah and under which these oracles were delivered suggests a political dimension to the metaphor. McKane (*Jeremiah*, I, p. 35) points out that the medieval exegete Kimḥi already supposed a political flavor to the cisterns reference.

the realm of politics, diplomacy, and warfare. This is made explicit in vv. 16-18, which identify Egypt and Assyria as the broken cisterns that stand against Yahweh, and explicated in vv. 19-22, which claim that allegiance to the Assyria–Egypt political machine is an affront to proper worship of Yahweh.[14] Deuteronomy is thus once more invoked, albeit in a less direct manner: the Exodus from Egypt and the Assyrian crisis together form the basis for Deuteronomic covenantal discourse,[15] and it is now Assyria and Egypt that stand against Jeremiah and Josiah.

Jeremiah 2.23 then provides us with something unexpected: the prophet quotes his audience, who deny his charge of Baalism:

> How can you say: 'I am not defiled (נטמאתי), I have not gone after the baals'?

The use of the טמא catchword here identifies this statement as part of the same thematic unit as Jer. 2.7, but the statement may accurately reflect the argument of the Shilonites, the members of Jeremiah's audience that could actually make such a pious claim. The quote simultaneously rebukes the Deuteronomic concept of 'political' Baalism advanced by Jeremiah while recognizing the legitimacy of a Baalistic charge against the broader popula-tions of the north, whose deities would have certainly been viewed by Yah-wistic clergy such as the Shilonites as 'baals'. Furthermore, the use of the term נטמאתי reflects the concerns of a priesthood and the desire to retain a sense of cultic purity. That this term is used in an argument against Jeremiah points to some common theological and cultic ground between the prophet and the respondent he is citing; the respondent agrees that Baalism leads to defilement, though he does not consider himself guilty of such a transgres-sion against Yahweh.

Regardless, Jeremiah's condemnation in vv. 23b-26 deftly sweeps aside the Shilonite protest:[16]

14. This image also recalls עלו in Jer. 30.8 and the 'untrained calf' of 31.17. The context, though, has reversed itself, as the audience is no longer the chastened calf but has relapsed back into the obstinate harlot. Jeremiah engages in the same type of reversal here as he did with the תמרורים of Jer. 31.20 and its source in Hos. 12.15, evidencing a continuity of method despite the radically different message. Holladay (*Jeremiah 1*, p. 97) points out that the על terminology is largely political, and reads the reference as a commentary on the covenant relationship with Yahweh. However, if the text was generated to address the growing threat of Assyria–Egypt, then the political nature of the reference is reinforced, as the issue becomes one of dominance under Judah (and thus Yahweh) or dominance under Assyria–Egypt.

15. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, pp. 91-129; Hoffman, 'The Exodus in Amos and Hosea'.

16. Jer. 2.26b-28 constitutes a subsequent accretion to these oracles, and dates from a post-Josianic period. Verse 26a is fully functional on a syntactical level independent of 26b. Though the mention of priests and prophets in 26b corresponds in part to the

> See your way in the valley, know what you have done; you are a swift young camel traversing her ways; a wild ass used to the wilderness, that snuffs up the wind in her desire; her lust, who can hinder it? All they that seek her will not weary themselves; in her month they shall find her. Withhold your foot from being unshod, and your throat from thirst; but you said: 'There is no hope; no, for I have loved strangers, and after them will I go'. As the thief is ashamed when he is found, so is the house of Israel ashamed.

Jeremiah here picks up on the image of Baalism on the high places voiced in v. 20 (על כל גבעה גבהה) by stating that even abstinence from this practice does not exonerate his audience if they still refuse Josianic hegemony. The reference to 'the valley' in v. 23b is thus likely not a judgment against the Tophet in the Valley of Hinnom[17] but a matter of literary juxtaposition: the protestor(s) may not have sinned in the high places (the traditional loci of what the Deuteronomists considered Baalism), but even in the lowland valleys, they are guilty if they reject the Deuteronomic Torah and side with Assyria–Egypt. The audience's 'love' of 'strangers'—both politically charged terms—is the real matter of contention.[18] The declaration of innocence in v. 23a is repeated in v. 35 (with an intervening insight into the ferocity of the tension between Jeremiah and his audience in v. 30, nullifying the effect of the claims to innocence), but this is followed by an overt condemnation of Assyria–Egypt running through v. 37:

> You said: 'I am innocent; surely His anger is turned away from me'; behold, I will enter into judgment with you, because you say: 'I have not sinned'. How greatly do you cheapen yourself to change thy way? You shall be ashamed of Egypt also, as you were ashamed of Assyria. From him also shall you go forth, with your hands upon your head; for Yahweh has rejected them in whom you did trust, and you shall not prosper in them.

The final statement in v. 37 situates the entire critique (introduced as a ריב in v. 9)[19] in historical context: the rejection of Josiah and Deuteronomy is the

---

language of Jer. 2.8, the presence of the terms 'kings' and 'officials' suggests a Jerusalemite environment, and likely does not refer to a defunct northern monarchic infrastructure no longer suitable for condemnation. That this passage derives from a post-Josianic redaction is implied in the overt reference to Judah and Jerusalem in v. 28.

17.   *Pace* McKane, *Jeremiah*, I, p. 43; Barrick, *The King and the Cemeteries*, p. 99 (with citation of scholarship on this passage).

18.   The term זרים would be an odd choice for a reference to the worship of foreign gods, which are typically referred to as אלהי נכר or אלהים אחרים (Deut. 11.16; Judg. 2.12; 1 Sam. 7.3) or simply as הבעלים (e.g. Judg. 2.11). That the phrase is more likely a reference to foreign political entities is suggested by the term אהבתי; אהב is employed in DH to refer to foreign alliances (1 Kgs 5.1; 11.1-2).

19.   The identification of Jeremiah's critique as a ריב is a rhetorical device further geared to identify Jeremiah with an authoritative and recognized prophetic tradition. See Thiessen, 'The Song of Moses', pp. 405-406, 410-13.

rejection of the cistern of living waters, the 'first sin' of v. 13. The second sin, the choosing of the broken cisterns, represents political harlotry, which here constitutes no less an infraction. Gone are the days of Assyria serving as the rod of Yahweh's anger (Isa. 10.5); siding with them and Egypt reflects a perversion of the sacred program of history Yahweh intended for his people under Josiah.[20] Though the oracles are addressed to the Shilonites and the northern population, we may find within these verses the beginnings of the international theology that would become a major force in Jeremiah's later oracles. Indeed, the later triumph of Babylon over Egypt at Carchemish (in 605) vindicated Jeremiah's oracles in these verses.

Having established the foundations for the רִיב, the oracle continues in Jer. 3.1 with statement that invokes both Hosea and the Deuteronomic legislation:

> It is said (לֵאמֹר): If a man put away his wife, and she go from him, and become another man's, may he return unto her again? Will not that land be greatly polluted? But you have played the harlot with many lovers; would you return to me (וְשׁוֹב אֵלַי), says Yahweh.

Jeremiah returns to the divorce rule from Deut. 24.1-4, establishing continuity between the current oracle and that which preceded it (Jer. 2.7), but he also re-engages the Hosea tradition.[21] Though Jeremiah has taken up Hosea as he did in the appeal of Jeremiah 30–31, the tables have turned, as the Hosean notion of Yahweh taking back adulteress Israel with open arms is no longer an option. The about-face done by Jeremiah in this verse (and throughout Jer. 2–4) evidences the failure of his first mission, the purpose of which was to herald the institution of Deuteronomic policy. The conditions under which Jer. 3.1 was formulated were, however, contradictory in nature. The rejection of Jeremiah 30–31 required condemnation of the Shilonites and the north, but the political threat posed by Assyria–Egypt still required

---

20.   The berating of Assyria–Egypt recalls the taunts of the Rabshakeh levied against the population of Jerusalem, who refused Assyria and thereby survived. The suggestion is thus that Jeremiah's audience should not put their trust in Assyria (and Egypt), for divine favor is clearly with Jerusalem and Josiah. Rudman notes the parallel between the Rabshakeh's message and that of Jeremiah in Jer. 29 ('Is the Rabshakeh Also among the Prophets?', pp. 105-106). Jeremiah's current oracle bears much in common with the features observed by Rudman in terms of a monarchic authority as the operative arm of Yahweh (Babylon in Jer. 29; Josiah in Jer. 2–4).

21.   See Holladay, 'Elusive Deuteronomists', p. 65; compare also Jer. 3.1 with Hos. 3.1-5. Both Lundbom (*Jeremiah: A Study in Ancient Hebrew Rhetoric*, p. 38) and Holladay (*Jeremiah 1*, pp. 112-13) understand this verse to be a repudiation of the nation's Baalism; Holladay argues that it is also a repudiation of the Hosean text that Jeremiah's audience may have turned to. A number of scholars have suggested that Hosea is therefore the precursor to Deut. 24.1-4. On this, see Peckham, *History and Prophecy*, p. 386, where he also cites a list of scholars coming to the same conclusions.

that the north fall under Josiah's control, if for no other reason that to buffer Judah against a potential military attack. As such, the original Hebrew of 'would you return to me?' (ושוב אלי) is both a criticism *and* a command.[22] Jeremiah suggests that despite their sins, political or otherwise, the north is yet fair game both for Yahweh and Josiah and must indeed return.

Jeremiah once more launches into the details of Israel's harlotry from Yahweh, set again in decidedly political terms. Verse 2 refers to the 'bare heights', the high places eliminated during Josiah's incursion into the north, as well as 'the waysides', likely the official road systems maintained by the Assyrian administration and upon which the Egyptian forces would have traveled to reach their base at the Euphrates.[23] Verses 4-5a again present the opposing viewpoint—an ostensibly faithful call to Yahweh:

> Did you not just now cry to me, 'My father, you are the friend of my youth.
> Will he bear grudge forever? Will he keep it to the end?'

In light of the various protests quoted in the previous chapter, this too may reflect a Shilonite perspective,[24] though it is likely Jeremiah's own wording. The language recalls not only the youth imagery of Jer. 2.2 but also the parent–child dynamic of 31.9. The appeal to the youth tradition is invalid, though, since far more is now involved in maintaining the covenantal relationship with Yahweh, and v. 5b points out the futility of the call.

The ensuing call to return (3.12–4.2[25]) follows the rhetorical logic of 3.1-5; just as that passage recalls 2.7, 3.12 repeats the terminology and themes of 2.2, again establishing the singular message shared by the two chapters:

> Jer. 3.12—I will not frown upon you; for I am merciful (כי חסיד אני).

> Jer. 2.2—I remember for you the affection of your youth (חסד נעוריך).

The Davidic חסד terminology is here the essential bond between Israel and Yahweh; it characterizes the nation's infancy and the nature of Yahweh's

---

22.   See Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, pp. 310-11.

23.   For a study on the control of travel in the north, particularly with respect to the important highways linking Jerusalem to the pivotal cities in the northern territories, see D.A. Dorsey, *The Roads and Highways of Ancient Israel* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991), pp. 132-46; Shiloh figures prominently in this road plot and is actually the midpoint between Jerusalem and Samaria/Shechem. The significance of this road plot must certainly be at the base of the tradition in Jer. 41.5, which mentions all three northern locales bound to this single highway. The road system in contention in Jer. 3.2 would have allowed easy access for Assyrian–Egyptian forces to reach Jerusalem.

24.   All the citations of his audience revolve around a fairly orthodox self-concept (Jer. 2.23, 35; 3.4-5), identifying at least part of his audience as the Shilonites, who alone could make such claims and have them qualified (not plainly rejected) by Jeremiah's rhetoric.

25.   Jer. 3.6-11 is widely recognized to be a subsequent redactional accretion.

mercy and love. In both cases, the message is clear: Josianic hegemony is the only choice for an ongoing covenantal relationship between Jeremiah's audience and their deity. Jeremiah 3.13 specifies, though, that divine mercy is contingent upon changing their political perspectives and recognizing Josianic authority.[26] This will lead to the imagery in v. 15:

> And I will give you shepherds (רעים) according to my heart (כלבי) who shall feed you with knowledge and understanding.

The לב terminology here rings of Deuteronomic themes (e.g. Deut. 6.5), though in Deuteronomy it is the Israelite whose heart must be turned to Yahweh. It is appropriate in this context for the deity to be presented as a participant, though, as the issue at hand is the restoration of a covenantal dialogue with Yahweh. The term רעים surfaces again here (as in Jer. 2.8), pointing to the ongoing need for regional cooperation and administration of the Deuteronomic legislation. This is followed, significantly, by a reference to P in v. 16 with the phrase תרבו ופריתם, recalling Gen. 1.28 (פרו ורבו). This is not merely an allusion but a direct citation of the P commandment in Genesis employing Seidel's Law of intertextual referencing;[27] once again, as in Jeremiah 30–31, the acceptance of Josianic hegemony is a matter of cosmic significance. Here, following upon the other references to Deuteronomy running through these chapters, blessings of fertility and prosperity are rooted in the acceptance of Deuteronomic law.

It is worth noting that Seidel's Law is used with respect to the citations of P, but it is not employed with the Deuteronomic references and citations running through Jeremiah 2–4. While this demonstrates the viability of P to Jeremiah's thought (as is the case in Jer. 31.35-37),[28] it also suggests that the prophet recognized P as a literary/theological tradition that was now distinct

---

26. Holladay (*Jeremiah 1*, p. 67) sees this verse as part of a secondary composition due to a break in word-strings, but if (as he suggests) vv. 12 and 14 possess terminological commonalities, then v. 13 becomes rhetorically central to the passage, framed by concurrent terms on either side. From a strictly thematic point of view, the pairing of זרים, דרכיכם, and the עץ רענן are in keeping with the larger polemic. McKane (*Jeremiah*, I, pp. 72-73) views v. 14 as a late (postexilic) addition, but Lundbom has shown that this verse is structurally integral to the larger literary context (*Jeremiah 1–20*, pp. 312-13).

27. See Levinson, *Deuteronomy*, pp. 18-20, for a discussion of Seidel's Law.

28. Jer. 31.35-37, however, does not deploy Seidel's Law when invoking P. This may be a matter of chronology. As observed earlier, Jer. 30–31 are likely the prophet's earliest oracles, and thus would date to roughly 627 (cf. Jer. 1.2), predating the emergence of Deuteronomy by about 5 years. The dominant Jerusalem tradition of the time would not have been Deuteronomic but Priestly (so Shedletsky, *Josiah's Reform and the Dynamics of Defilement*, pp. 159-200; see also Halpern and Vanderhooft, 'The Editions of Kings', pp. 226-27, on Huldah's use of P terminology). Jer. 30–31 incorporates the P material into the closing strophe in the same way that Jer. 2–3 incorporates Deuteronomy. Once Deuteronomy emerges, however, P is subordinated to it, and Jeremiah's oracles carry forward its (Deuteronomy's) mandates.

from his current compositional enterprise. By contrast, the Deuteronomic material is incorporated in a linear, direct manner, that is, not cited through lexical inversion. Jeremiah may therefore have viewed his oracles as part of the Deuteronomistic tradition and may this have been able to weave these lexemes and themes into his work without the need for the citation pattern witnessed in Jer. 3.16 with respect to the P Genesis material.

Jeremiah's position here speaks to the need for Shilonites in the north, but not to the need for outdated Shilonite ideology. This is perhaps most dramatically voiced in the second part of v. 16, which marginalizes the importance of the Ark, the icon most closely associated with the Shiloh sanctuary before the days of Solomon.[29] The role of Jer. 3.16 as an early Josianic-era oracle speaks to Jerusalem as the exclusive locus of Yahweh's favor, since the heyday of the Ark at Shiloh is no longer to be on the minds of the audience. This is made even more explicit in v. 17, as Jerusalem, not the Ark, is the divine throne, which creates an immediate association with the royal court therein and the Deuteronomic law produced by that court that now replaced the Ark as the icon of Yahweh. The verse also employs the phrase שָׁם ה', invoking the Deuteronomistic concept of covenantal fulfillment,[30] and closes with the phrase 'and they will no longer follow the wicked stubbornness of their hearts' (שררות לבם הרע). The idea of competing ideologies being steeped in 'wicked stubbornness' further suggests the audience's reluctance to align with Josiah's politics, for whatever reasons.

Pursuant to this embracing of new norms, Jeremiah's oracle continues in 3.19-20 with Yahweh's plan for a new type of covenant for the north. No longer are they to be considered Yahweh's bride. Rather, they are to be counted among Yahweh's children. This idea was already established in Jeremiah's first mission to Anathoth (31.8, 19), though it was the grounds for the re-establishment of Israel's virginal betrothal to its God. Moreover, the dramatic reference to Rachel crying in Ramah for her lost children in 31.14 is reversed in 3.21, for it is the sons who now cry because of their sin.[31] Here we encounter the same terminology that initiated the discourse in this chapter:

> Jer. 3.21—Upon the high hills (שְׁפָיִים) is heard the suppliant weeping of the children of Israel; for that they have perverted their way (דרכם)…
>
> Jer. 3.2—Lift up your eyes unto the high hills (שְׁפִים), and see: where have you not been lain with? By the ways (דרכים) have you sat for them…

---

29.   For a treatment of the historical ramifications of Jer. 3.16 and the implications concerning the presence of the Ark in Israelite history, see J.A. Soggin, 'The Ark of the Covenant, Jeremiah 3,16', in Bogaert (ed.), *Le Livre de Jérémie*, pp. 215-21.

30.   So W. Garr, 'The Grammar and Interpretation of Exodus 6.3', *JBL* 111 (1992), pp. 385-408 (407-408).

31.   *Pace* Holladay (*Jeremiah 1*, p. 123) who sees Yahweh as the one who weeps.

Jeremiah 3.21 creates an *inclusio* with 3.2, identifying the extent of the critique concerning political infidelity, but focusing attention on the Shilonites via the subtle reference to Rachel's weeping from Ramah in 31.14. As Jeremiah concludes his oracles, he once again 'quotes' from those whom he addresses:

> Here we are, we have come to you; for you are Yahweh our God. (Jer. 3.22b)

The quote is not actual but projected into the text as an ideal response to the invective against them: as Yahweh beckons his sons to return (v. 22a), they accept his grace (v. 22b), and denounce their cultic/political illusions in favor of Jeremiah's—and Josiah's—concept of Yahweh (v. 23). Nevertheless, to do so must involve recognition of their guilt, as prescribed earlier in v. 13, and a willingness to engage in obeisance (vv. 24-25). This obeisance, given the circumstances surrounding Jeremiah's second mission, involves accepting what they did not accept the first time: Deuteronomic law and Josianic rule. Unlike the joyous restoration of Jeremiah 30–31, the audience in question is not worthy of adulation and celebration as they return to Zion, but of derision for their stubbornness and earlier denial. This denial is given an opportunity to reach its end under Josiah, however, as implied by 3.25: their sin lasts 'until this day', a formula strongly associated with Josianic-era compositions that present the reign of that king as a chance to amalgamate Israel as one nation under the banner of Deuteronomic law.[32] Once again, Deuteronomistic material is directly woven into Jeremiah's discourse.

As the oracle comes to an end in 4.1-2, it is clear that this act of contrition will redeem them, and it is here where we find the final indication that the Shilonites of Anathoth are being addressed. By returning to Yahweh wholeheartedly (v. 1) and pledging their allegiance to him (חי ה׳ in v. 2), the nations—a reference to the mixed population of the northern territories under contention—will bless themselves by Israel's God and praise him. This will happen, though, only if the pledge of allegiance is one that accepts the combination of Shilonite and traditional Jerusalem ideology (note the במשפט ובצדקה in v. 2). As such, the path to northern revival and the redemption of the Shilonites is the same as that which would hopefully provide Josiah with a way out of his own political dilemma, one which had certainly shifted from an issue of imperial ambition to that of Judah's national survival.

The Call for Vengeance: Jeremiah 11.18-23

Jeremiah's words were apparently rejected once more by the men of Anathoth. There is no record in the DH of any successful rehabilitation of the Shilonites or of any activity in the north beyond the demolition of the north-

---

32. Geoghegan, '"Until this Day"', p. 224.

ern priesthoods and shrines in 2 Kgs 23.15-20. Indeed, subsequent biblical texts came to view northern populations as unrelated to the Israel that experienced the Babylonian exile (a community that was intensely interested in Jeremiah's prophecies).[33] The Jeremianic tradition, however, does contain an indication of the response to his threat oracles in Jeremiah 2–4. This is found in 11.18-23, part of what would become the complaints/confessions of Jeremiah as the corpus expanded in subsequent years. Jeremiah 11.18-23 is generally bound to 12.1-6,[34] but the association is a secondary reflex related to the growth of the corpus and the complaint/confession tradition that runs through chs. 11–20.[35] It is in 11.18-23 that we have an overt condemnation of the Shilonites of Anathoth, and the entire text therefore warrants examination:

> And Yahweh gave me knowledge of it, and I knew it; then you showed me their doings. But I was like a docile lamb that is led to the slaughter; and I knew not that they had devised devices against me: 'Let us destroy the tree with the fruit thereof, and let us cut him off from the land of the living, that his name may be no more remembered'. But, Yahweh of hosts, who judges righteously, who tries the innards and the heart, let me see your vengeance on them; for to You have I revealed my cause (כי אליך גליתי את־ריבי). Therefore thus says Yahweh concerning *the men of Anathoth*, that seek your life, saying, 'You shall not prophesy in the name of Yahweh, that you die not by our hand'; therefore thus says Yahweh of hosts, 'Behold, I will punish them; the young men shall die by the sword, their sons and their daughters shall die by famine; and there shall be no remnant of them; for I will bring evil upon *the men of Anathoth*, in the year of their visitation'. (Jer. 11.18-23)

There is general agreement among scholars that the 'men of Anathoth' notices in vv. 21 and 23 are later additions to a base text, and the usual conclusion is that a later redactor of the material is responsible for this addition.[36] Who

---

33.   On the exile as a defining characteristic of 'proper' Israelite identity, see P.R. Bedford, 'Diaspora: Homeland Relations in Ezra–Nehemiah', *VT* 52 (2002), pp. 147-65 (160-65). For the interest in Jeremianic prophecy among this community, see Sommer, *A Prophet Reads Scripture*, pp. 32-72; G. Boccaccini, *Roots of Rabbinic Judaism: An Intellectual History, from Ezekiel to Daniel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), p. 52.

34.   Lundbom, *Jeremiah 1–20*, p. 67.

35.   See M.S. Smith, *The Laments of Jeremiah and their Context: A Literary and Redactional Study of Jeremiah 11–20* (SBLMS, 42; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), pp. 2-11; Holladay, *Jeremiah 1*, pp. 265-67; F.D. Hubmann, *Untersuchungen zu den Konfessionen, Jer 11,18–12,6 und Jer 15,10-21* (Forschung zur Bibel, 30; Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1978), pp. 57-108. For a similar argument concerning the growth of another lament/complaint/confession (Jer. 15.10-21) from an originally independent core, see E. Gerstenberger, 'Jeremiah's Complaints: Observations on Jer. 15.10-21', *JBL* 82 (1963), pp. 393-408. For an overview of scholarship concerning the laments of Jeremiah, see L.G. Perdue, 'Jeremiah in Modern Research', in Perdue and Kovacs (eds.), *A Prophet to the Nations*, pp. 1-32 (25-27).

36.   This position is based largely on matters of poetic meter and the length of the respective verses. For a discussion, see K.M. O'Connor, *The Confessions of Jeremiah:*

was this redactor and when was he active? The impulse among most schol-
ars is to attribute this addition to an anonymous editor,[37] but the problem is
that such an editor, working with the extant Jeremianic material, would have
had little basis for identifying the men of Anathoth as Jeremiah's adversaries.
To be sure, there are brief references to Anathoth found in the book (Jer. 1.1;
32.6-15), yet there is no indication whatsoever of any tension between
Jeremiah and his kin in these references. If anything, these few references
establish positive ties between the prophet and his brethren in his hometown.
It also seems a rather remote likelihood that an exilic or postexilic editor
dealing with major world forces such as Egypt, Babylon, or Persia would
have so carefully lodged a complaint against the small Benjaminite town of
Anathoth. Finally, we find little anti-Anathoth material in other traditions in
the DH or even other prophetic texts such as Hosea or Amos that may have
informed the discourse in the Jeremianic corpus.

   In essence, there is no political or text-traditional basis upon which an
exilic or postexilic editor may have crafted a 'men of Anathoth' polemic, yet
the polemic exists within the text of Jer. 11.18-23. A later editor far removed
from the initial purpose of Jeremiah 30–31 and 2–4 would not have drawn
attention to the Shilonite–Anathoth connection; indeed, these chapters would
be submerged within more comprehensive expanses of text during the
prophet's own lifetime and come to serve very different purposes.[38] It is thus
likely that the prophet himself is responsible for the 'men of Anathoth'
additions, basing them on events not overtly discussed in the Jeremianic
literature but reflecting the reaction to both the appeal in chs. 30–31 and the
to the chastisement of chs. 2–4. If the prophet himself added the 'men of
Anathoth' notices later, they were included to amplify the original purpose
of the earlier text which would have been obvious at the time of its composi-
tion.[39] Indeed, 11.18-23 shares several lexical and thematic features with
chs. 2–4. Jeremiah 11.18 ascribes covenantal knowledge to Jeremiah in
contrast to the lack of this knowledge among the Shilonites in 2.8, and 11.19
contains the device of Jeremiah quoting his adversaries. What is being
quoted reveals the rejection of the prophet's rhetoric in chs. 2–4. The
prophet cites his opponents:

> Let us destroy the *tree* with the *fruit* thereof, and let us cut him off from *the
> land* of the living, that *his name* may be no more remembered (ושמו לא יזכר
> עוד). (Jer. 11.19)

Their Interpretation and Role in Chapters 1–25 (SBLDS, 94; Atlanta: Scholars Press,
1988), pp. 18-19; Smith, *Laments*, pp. 3-6.

   37.   O'Connor, *Confessions*, p. 22.

   38.   For the later use of Jer. 30–31, see Leuchter, 'Jeremiah's 70-Year Prophecy',
pp. 519-20. For the reapplication of Jer. 2–4, see below, Chapter 8.

   39.   See below, pp. 162-63.

Jeremiah's adversaries here seem to be mocking the prophet's words in 2.20 (עץ רענן) and the general idiom of the prophet's imagery involving blossoming fruit in 2.3 (תבואתה) and 2.7 (פריה וטובה), as well as the prophet's contention in the same verse that they had defiled the land (תממאו ארצי). The call to obliterate 'his name' (ושמו לא יזכר עוד) constitutes a rejection of 3.17, which invokes the Deuteronomistic name theology (שם ה'). As such, the ריב once conveyed to the Shilonites in 2.9 (עד אריב אתכם) is now presented to Yahweh in 11.20 (כי אליך גליתי את ריבי). The complaint in 11.18-23 thus involves elements from the earlier threat oracles, and after revealing the degree to which the men of Anathoth have reviled him, Jeremiah calls for vengeance against his own kinsmen (vv. 20-23).

This call for vengeance is a cataclysmic revelation concerning the degree to which the prophet accepted Deuteronomistic ideology. As observed earlier, Deuteronomy subordinated Israelite ethnicity to adherence to the law and its concept of covenant. This also dissolved the inviolability of kinship ties, evident in Deut. 13.7-10. The passage is especially pertinent with respect to Jeremiah's call for vengeance:

> If your brother, the son of your mother, or your son, or your daughter, or the wife of your bosom, or your friend, that is as your own soul, entices you secretly, saying, 'Let us go and serve other gods', which you have not known, you, nor your fathers, of the gods of the peoples that are round about you, near to you or far from you, from the one end of the earth even unto the other end of the earth, you shall not consent or listen to him; neither shall your eye pity him, neither shall you spare, neither shall you conceal him; but you shall surely kill him; your hand shall be first upon him to put him to death, and afterwards the hand of all the people. (Deut. 13.7-10)

Deuteronomy 13.7-10 commands that the faithful Israelite place allegiance to the law above allegiance to kinship, and Jer. 11.18-23 appears to be inspired by this very piece of legislation. The Deuteronomic passage specifies that a kinsman's dedication to gods other than Yahweh is punishable by death, and that the Israelite must himself be involved in bringing about this punishment. The prophet had made clear in Jeremiah 2–4 that rejecting his message concerning Josianic hegemony constituted a form of Baalism; in 11.18-23, he makes himself an integral facilitator of Yahweh's tentative wrath. The call for vengeance is not only born from the bitterness that Jeremiah must have felt after being rejected by his own brethren, but the prophet's deep conviction that Deuteronomic law—now the source of the prophet's sense of self-identity—must be upheld.[40]

---

40.   The prophet's decisive break with his kinsmen at this point illustrates Halpern's observation that 'Deuteronomy reflects a pass at which the state has supplanted the kinship system as the administrator of justice…[it contributes] to an impression of a devaluation of kinship segmentation: the lawgiver speaks directly to the individual, his

Josiah's Secret War

Jeremiah's invocation of the stipulations of Deuteronomy 13 reflects the degree to which the Deuteronomic dream had degenerated into a nightmare. With the wrath of Assyria–Egypt facing him, circumstances facing Josiah were dire. There is little to indicate that Josiah would have been able to muster the support of the other small West Semitic nations, who had long lived under foreign domination and had little to gain by forming a coalition. The model of the Syro-Ephraimite alliance a little more than a century earlier had proved to be ineffective in a similar regard (2 Kgs 16.5-9), and the resulting devastation to local autonomy would not be easily forgotten. Josiah was effectively isolated, with no foreign buffer or recourse to the imminent retaliation for his destruction of the northern socio-religious infrastructure.

The DH provides no discussion concerning this situation whatsoever. The king's death at Megiddo could not be ignored and is reported in 2 Kgs 23.29, but the circumstances leading up to his death could be muted in the interests of presenting Josiah as perfectly obedient to the mandates of the law and, therefore, entitled to a peaceful death in line with Huldah's oracle.[41] Many scholars have speculated as to the reasons why Josiah met his end in battle at Megiddo, with varying degrees of detail provided to reconstruct the political background for his presence there.[42] The circumstances leading up to Jer. 11.18-23 discussed above point to the likelihood of a military campaign waged by Josiah to secure the north. Jeremiah 11.22 itself suggests military action, and the brief narrative of Josiah's northern annexation in 2 Kgs 23.15-20 establishes a precedent.

The vengeance called for by Jeremiah in Jer. 11.18-23 offers an explanation for the secondary redactional incursions in 2 Kgs 23.15-20.[43] It is

voice unmediated by lineage usage. Scripture has supplanted tradition' ('Jerusalem and the Lineages', p. 75).

41. Deut. 30.16, 19-20; 2 Kgs 22.18-20. For the 'conspiracy of silence', see S.B. Frost, 'The Death of Josiah: A Conspiracy of Silence', *JBL* 87 (1968), pp. 369-82.

42. See, e.g., J. Bright, *A History of Israel* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 4th edn, 2000), p. 324; Finkelstein and Silberman, *The Bible Unearthed*, pp. 289-91; King, *Jeremiah*, p. 20; F.M. Cross and D.N. Freedman, 'Josiah's Revolt against Assyria', *JNES* 12 (1953), pp. 56-58; A. Malamat, 'Josiah's Bid for Armageddon', *JANES* 5 (1973), pp. 267-73. But if the sequence of early Jeremianic texts proposed here possesses merit, then Josiah's position at Megiddo was likely a tactical decision to safeguard his intended dominion over the north, given the location of the site along the ancient travel route that Necho's forces would have followed from their position on the upper Euphrates (so Dorsey, *Roads and Highways*, pp. 132-46). For biblical references to the centrality of Megiddo from a strategic perspective, see Judg. 5.19-20; 1 Kgs 4.12; 9.15. See also C. Herzog and M. Gichon, *Battles of the Bible* (London: Greenhill Books, 1997), p. 258.

43. See above, pp. 63-65.

obvious that Josiah's northern agenda had failed, and that any reform activity
therein was of very limited success. The redactor of 2 Kgs 23.15-20 appar-
ently felt unable completely to invent a report of a thorough reform in the
north, and instead opted to project a part of the southern reform account
(2 Kgs 23.16-18) onto the north through the editorial addition of 2 Kgs
23.15 and 19-20.[44] These brief accretions recount the king's actual activity
and transform vv. 16-18 into a narrative of what Josiah might have done in
the north had his (and Jeremiah's) efforts been successful. This method of
transformation is typical of the Deuteronomistic redaction/composition: the
Deuteronomistic writers felt compelled to work with available sources rather
than toss them aside and engage in wholesale literary invention.[45] Their
redactions provide new meaning through hermeneutical association (the
southern reforms earlier depicted in vv. 16-18 are now associated with the
north via the frame in vv. 15/19-20).[46] Yet this is all the redactor was willing
to do and, indeed, was as much as he was able to do under the circumstances.
The king had ventured into the north, but the Deuteronomistic writers were
silent regarding his failure. It is here where we must see a connection to
Jeremiah, on whom the DH is also silent. The reason for the lack of any
mention of Jeremiah may be ascribed to his involvement in an episode that
was deliberately left out of the story.

Josiah's Death

The silence of the DH regarding these difficult circumstances leaves us with
little to reconstruct the events that led to Josiah's death at Megiddo in 609
beyond the implications of Jeremiah's writings. Indeed, the language of the
DH attempts to gloss over the calamity by presenting Josiah as a political
vassal of Egypt, answering the call of his suzerain Necho at Megiddo.[47] This
may derive from an editor writing during Jehoiakim's reign, when Egypt
was indeed Judah's suzerain, but it does not reflect a reality that would have
obtained during Josiah's reign. Jeremiah's rhetoric in Jeremiah 2–4 makes
clear that Josiah's Judah was outside the political sphere of Egyptian control
and viewed that kingdom as an enemy, not as an overlord. Furthermore, the

    44.   Barrick, *The King and the Cemeteries*, pp. 46-50.
    45.   See Leuchter, 'Jeroboam the Ephratite', for similar redactional transformation in
1 Kgs 11.29-39.
    46.   On the hermeneutical implications of literary sequences, see Levinson, *Deuteron-
omy*, pp. 107-27.
    47.   See Z. Talshir, 'The Three Deaths of Josiah and the Strata of Biblical Histori-
ography (2 Kings xxiii 29-30; 2 Chronicles xxxv 20-[2]5; 1 Esdras i 23-31)', *VT* 46
(1996), pp. 213-36 (215-18). Talshir posits that the language of the Kings account in
2 Kgs 23.29 presents Josiah's trek to Megiddo as standard political behavior of a vassal
to the recognized suzerain (pp. 217-18) and does not imply a military conflict.

Deuteronomic legislation regarding kingship prohibits any suzerain other than Yahweh, especially in Deut. 17.15.[48] It is difficult to imagine that after such stringent application of the Deuteronomic law in Judah (and a fierce attempt to do so in the north), Josiah would have capitulated to any foreign overlord, let alone an Egyptian.[49] Thus 2 Kgs 23.29 not only mutes the events at Megiddo, it deliberately attempts to lead the reader to a conclusion that suggests continuity between Josiah's court and that of Jehoiakim,[50] with the latter carrying on in the footsteps of the former, and with greater success.[51]

Two non-Deuteronomistic traditions may fill in the gaps left by Kings concerning Josiah's death:

> Josiah, however, did not turn back to his chariot, but tried to fight with him [Necho], and did not heed the words of the prophet Jeremiah from the mouth of Yahweh. (1 Esd. 1.28)

> Nevertheless Josiah would not turn his face from him, but disguised himself, that he might fight with him, and did not heed the words of Necho, from the mouth of God, and came to fight in the valley of Megiddo. (2 Chron. 35.22)

These two traditions derive from an original *Vorlage*;[52] there are slight variations, but the significant difference is that 2 Chronicles places the words of

48. Lowery, *The Reforming Kings*, pp. 154-56.

49. This is reinforced by the manifold references in Deuteronomy to the liberation from Egypt as the defining characteristic of Israel; it is most overtly addressed in Deut. 17.16.

50. As Halpern notes, the account of 2 Kgs 23.29 reflects an attempt to forge an ally-type relationship between Josiah and Necho ('Why Manasseh', pp. 501-503), in the hopes of rectifying Huldah's oracle that promised that the king would die בשלום (2 Kgs 22.20). For the editor, this meant portraying Necho as an ally of Judah rather than as an ally of Assyria (Necho goes 'up against' Assyria in the Kings account). Halpern rightly views this editorial accretion as deriving from shortly after Josiah's death (p. 510), and Talshir's observations concerning the suzerain–vassal language of the passage supports Jehoiakim's reign as the likely point of origin.

51. This differs, obviously, from the exilic edition of Kings, where Jehoiakim is judged poorly, and represents an intermediate stage of editing (Halpern, 'Why Manasseh', p. 510).

52. For an overview, see H.G.M. Williamson, 'The Death of Josiah and the Continuing Development of the Deuteronomistic History', *VT* 32 (1982), pp. 242-48. Talshir ('The Three Deaths of Josiah', p. 214) views the 2 Chronicles/1 Esdras accounts as deriving not from an independent source used by the Chronicler but from the Kings account, augmented by Jer. 46. The Chronicler, consequently, creates a 'fictitious war' (p. 219) in her view. The foregoing analysis, however, suggests that the implied vassal-age of Josiah in 2 Kgs 23.29 is not historically likely. The 2 Chronicles/1 Esdras tradition is thus probably closer to the events at Megiddo and meshes well with the political circumstances that would have required military action, though these texts also funnel history into a rhetorical direction that addresses the problem of Huldah's oracle (so also Talshir, 'The Three Deaths of Josiah', p. 220).

warning in Necho's mouth (in reference to the previous verse), and 1 Esdras ascribes these words to Jeremiah. It is difficult to determine which version is closer to the *Vorlage*. Arguments have been made that the *Vorlage* was developed among the Jeremianic tradents in order to increase the prophet's centrality to Josiah's reign, and that the 1 Esdras text is a later adjustment to that of 2 Chronicles 35, giving Jeremiah the role earlier credited to Necho.[53] Conversely, an original tradition could have already placed Jeremiah in this position, with a subsequent editor altering the text to conform to the current form of 2 Kgs 23.29 and its presentation of Necho as a political ally.[54] If this was the case, then the 1 Esdras text is closer to the *Vorlage*, and Jer. 12.5-6 may constitute the divinely inspired warning that 1 Esdras ascribes to Jeremiah:

> If you have run with the footmen, and they have wearied you, then how can you contend with horses? And though in a land of peace you are secure, how will you do in the thickets of the Jordan? For even your brethren, and the house of your father, even they have dealt treacherously with you, even they have cried aloud after you; do not believe them, though they speak fair words to you. (Jer. 12.5-6)

53.   Williamson ('The Death of Josiah', pp. 243-45) argues that the 'Jeremiah' of the 1 Esdras text is the substitution for 'Necho' in the *Vorlage*; such is also the position of Talshir ('The Three Deaths of Josiah', p. 232) and S. Delamarter, ('The Death of Josiah in Scripture and Tradition: Wrestling with the Problem of Evil?', *VT* 54 [2004], pp. 29-60 [39-42]).

54.   The discrepancy between the 2 Chron. 35 and 1 Esdras versions may be a matter of the influence of 2 Kgs 23.29. The Chronicler appears to have adjusted his *Vorlage* according to the DH tradition in 2 Kgs 23.29, which legitimizes Necho as a conduit of a divine message via his status as an 'ally' of Judah. It is highly likely that the Chronicler worked from a version of Kings very similar to the current form (Talshir, 'The Three Deaths of Josiah', pp. 226-27) replete with Necho 'going up [against]' the king of Assyria. The involvement of Jeremiah in the 1 Esdras version matches the prophet's appearance a few verses later in both the 1 Esdras and 2 Chronicles accounts (see below, pp. 111-12), and corresponds to the tradition in Sir. 49.6-7 associating Jeremiah with the events surrounding Josiah's activity (so noted by Delamarter, 'The Death of Josiah in Scripture and Tradition', p. 43). 1 Esdras may therefore preserve the original sense of the *Vorlage* with respect to Josiah's engagement of Necho and Jeremiah's role before the Chronicler adjusted it in his own work. This does not mean, however, that the author of 1 Esdras has not developed the base tradition in other ways, and even at a time subsequent to the composition of 2 Chron. 35 (see Talshir, 'The Three Deaths of Josiah', pp. 233-34). The position argued here pertains only to the tradition of a battle at Megiddo and Jeremiah's involvement, not to larger matters of composition or shaping of the 1 Esdras material. If Williamson is correct in his view that the *Vorlage* was cultivated among Jeremianic tradents ('The Death of Josiah', p. 248), then this battle tradition may derive from a period concurrent with the editorial accretion in 2 Kgs 23.29 as a counterposition, that is, it may also stem from the reign of Jehoiakim, when many other Jeremianic texts were composed against that king and the policies emanating from his court.

The editorial proximity of these verses to Jer. 11.18-23 (they are currently part of the same confession/complaint spanning 11.18–12.6) suggests that they may have originated in a similar period of composition, that is, in relation to Josiah's campaign in the north.[55] In their current context, they represent part of the dialogue between Yahweh and Jeremiah regarding his prophetic mission,[56] but if they derive from the same period as Jer. 11.18-23, then it is unlikely that they were conceived as a divine message originally directed to the prophet. Verse 5 involves militaristic competition,[57] and there is no indication that Jeremiah himself engaged in any acts of warfare. Furthermore, the reference to treachery in v. 6 seems redundant if it is part of Yahweh's answer to Jeremiah: Jeremiah has already revealed his awareness of the problem in 11.18-23, and it is clear that his enemies do not mask their hostility as opposed to the duplicity of those mentioned in v. 6.[58] By contrast, the militaristic context of v. 5a would fit with the apparent difficulties Josiah encountered in his campaign, as it reveals that Josiah's army had suffered setbacks. The second part of the verse identifies the topographical area in question as the northern territories bordering the Jordan river.

If Josiah had tried to take the north through force and had not encountered success, then these verses might present Jeremiah advising Josiah not to continue with any additional campaigns. In this case, the reference to a 'safe land' (ארץ שלום[59]) in apposition to the 'thickets of the Jordan' might therefore function as a plea to desist from military action in the north and return to Judah.[60] The reference to horses would not relate to a foreign threat but

---

55. See below, pp. 176-77, for a proposed compositional history of the broader passage (11.18–12.6).

56. See Smith, *Laments*, pp. 9-11; McKane, *Jeremiah*, I, pp. 263-68; Holladay, *Jeremiah 1*, pp. 379-82; Lundbom, *Jeremiah 1–20*, pp. 83-84.

57. The reference to 'horses' in v. 5 follows Hosea's use of the same term in a like military context (Hos. 1.7, though this verse is likely part of an Hezekian or Josianic redaction; see Sweeney, *King Josiah*, pp. 261, 269-72).

58. The phrase דברו אליך טובות in 12.6 cannot be a reference to the men of Anathoth of Jer. 11.18-23, since there is no indication that Jeremiah's adversaries spoke kindly to him or engaged in duplicity: their wrath is overt and the threat is made clear ('do not prophesy in the name of Yahweh and you will not die by our hands'). Jer. 12.6 must be seen as part of a separate address that had a different function before its later (redactional) association with Jer. 11.18-23.

59. The term שלום, though, may refer more to ritual/covenantal issues than a simple matter of safety or security; see J.P. Sisson, 'Jeremiah and the Jerusalem Conception of Peace', *JBL* 105 (1986), pp. 429-42. Sisson discusses the cultic context of the שלום formula (p. 432), which must have dominated during the Temple-centric Josianic period.

60. The phrase 'in a safe land you are secure' must also receive some consideration in this regard. Holladay (*Jeremiah 1*, pp. 379-80) argues that the standard meaning of the root בטח ('secure') should be followed, while Smith (*Laments*, p. 10) reads the term as 'fall' (from the Arabic cognate *baṭaḥa*; see also A. Ehrman, 'A Note on בטח in Jer 12.5',

to Josiah's own armed brigades as useless (what good will armed cavalry do in winning unworthy hearts and minds?). This would reveal a shift in Jeremiah's attitude toward Josiah's imperialistic impulses. The Deuteronomic Torah might be infallible, but if the prophet is advising Josiah against taking action, then the Davidic king is not.

If the above reading of v. 5 is adopted, then v. 6 reveals rather severe circumstances in addition to the military difficulties Josiah faced in the north. The term 'brethren' cannot refer to the northern population or the Shilonites, who were already excluded from any legitimate kinship ties in Jeremiah's eyes (Jer. 11.21-23). Rather, if Josiah is the addressee, then the term likely relates to Davidic circles, supported by the phrase 'your father's house' (בית אביך). Jeremiah goes on to use ideas and language reminiscent of his own experience in Jer. 11.18-23, only the duplicity of Josiah's peers points to something awaiting him in Jerusalem: conspiracy and treason within the royal court. The speed with which Necho replaced Jehoahaz with Jehoiakim after Josiah's death attests to the pro-Egyptian faction already existing in the royal court, and 12.6 may address the plans being hatched by this group.[61]

Whether or not this group was directly involved in Josiah's death at Megiddo cannot be determined, but Jeremiah considered them enough of a threat to urge Josiah to return home. The presence of Necho at Megiddo, however, could not be ignored, as it likely represented the Pharaoh's plan to quash Josiah's campaign.[62] Josiah had no choice but to defend his interests, which at the time of his death may have still involved the conquest of the north or may have simply been to maintain the safety of Jerusalem and Judah from Egyptian domination.[63]

The Aftermath of Josiah's Death

The 1 Esdras/2 Chronicles materials go on to discuss Jeremiah's reaction to Josiah's death and the prophet's position in the public reaction at large:

JSS 5 [1960], pp. 153-55 and, more generally, L. Kopf, 'Arabische Etymologien und Parallelen zum Bibelwörterbuch', *VT* 8 [1958], pp. 101-25). If we adopt Smith's reading, then Jeremiah is likely suggesting that the Deuteronomic reform efforts in Judah had been compromised, that is, Josiah's efforts have fallen flat. However, Holladay's reading should stand since later Jeremianic texts suggest that the Deuteronomic superstructure was preserved (see Jer. 7.1-15; 8–11; 34.8-11), though not to the prophet's liking. Moreover, the focus is on the broad juxtaposition between a land too far-gone for redemption (the north) and a region where Josiah's presence was needed to make certain that the sacred order could be maintained.

61.   Wilcoxen, 'The Political Background of Jeremiah's Temple Sermon', pp. 158-62.

62.   See Malamat, *Biblical Israel*, p. 283.

63.   For a brief discussion of the military circumstances facing Josiah, see Herzog and Gichon, *Battles of the Bible*, pp. 255-57.

> And Jeremiah lamented for Josiah; and all the singing men and singing women spoke of Josiah in their lamentations, unto this day; and they made them an ordinance in Israel; and, behold, they are written in the lamentations. (2 Chron. 35.25)

> In all Judah they mourned for Josiah. The prophet Jeremiah lamented for Josiah, and the principal men, with the women, have made lamentation for him to this day; it was ordained that this should always be done throughout the whole nation of Israel. These things are written in the book of the histories of the kings of Judea… (1 Esd. 1.32-33)

Again, the 1 Esdras and 2 Chronicles texts possess differences, but both agree on Jeremiah's role in lamenting the death of Josiah. Two passages in the Jeremianic corpus may be identified with this tradition, namely, Jer. 4.19-26 and 20.14-18.[64] It is possible that other texts may be associated with this tradition (many of the complaints/confessions would seem appropriate) but the aforementioned passages stand out in a number of ways. Alongside Jeremiah's personal pain and grief, Jer. 4.19-26 possesses specifics that fit well with a reaction to military failure, such references to warfare and destruction in vv. 19-20:

> My innards, my innards! I writhe in pain! The chambers of my heart! My heart moans within me! I cannot hold my peace because you have heard, O my soul, the sound of the horn, the alarm of war. Destruction follows upon destruction, for the whole land is spoiled; suddenly are my tents (אהלי) spoiled, my curtains in a moment.

This cry fits the historical context of warfare, and the reference to 'my tents' (אהלי) points to the Ephraimite territories as in the prophet's earlier message to the north (Jer. 30.18). This brief reference leads directly into the next set of verses original to the early layer of composition, vv. 23-26, which deal directly with the ramifications of the king's death:

> I beheld the earth, and, lo, it was waste and void; and the heavens, and they had no light. I beheld the mountains, and, lo, they trembled, and all the hills moved to and fro. I beheld, and, lo, there was no one, and all the birds of the heavens were fled. I beheld, and, lo, the fruitful field (הכרמל) was a desert, and all the cities thereof were broken down at the presence of Yahweh, and before his fierce anger.

The text of 4.23-26 has long been recognized as reference to the P creation account, and a variety of interpretations concerning its approximate date of

---

64. Jer. 4.22 is part of a subsequent redaction of his earlier material and can be dated to roughly 605; the חכם terminology does not enter into Jeremianic discourse until the period after the Temple Sermon (Jer. 7.1-15) is delivered. This verse anticipates the content of a particular compositional stratum in Jer. 8–10, where the חכם terminology appears again with regularity. See Chapter 7 below for a discussion.

composition and purpose have been advanced.[65] Given the dating and con-
text for the texts discussed above, these verses are best seen as a conclusion
of the initial phase of the prophet's activity at the event of Josiah's death.
For Jeremiah, Josiah's destiny was to establish a cosmic order that emanated
from Jerusalem, hence the prophet's earlier reliance on P. The king's death
in 609, however, put an end to that order. Jeremiah 4.23-26 does not signify
a polemical rejection of P but an undoing of its applicability.[66]

   The reversal of the P creation account's language symbolizes the reversal
of the Jerusalem-based created order it was written to support. The belief in
territorial sanctity is made illegitimate by Jeremiah's words, particularly in
v. 26, the one verse that does not refer directly to Genesis 1 but which
provides an allegorical and appropriate conclusion to the unit: from the north
(הכרמל referring to Mt Carmel) to the south (המדבר, i.e., the Negev in the
Judean wilderness) and all the cities in between, the exalted position that
would have been established under the Deuteronomic law has given way
to desolation. This, concludes the verse, is the result of Yahweh's anger.[67]
Jeremiah again relies on the precedent set by Hosea in his own reversal of
the P creation account (Hos. 12.4-5) and the ideas that inspired Hosea to
threaten a reversal of creation are realized in the calamity of 609. The death
of Josiah returned the nation to the dire circumstances that existed before
Josiah's reform, when the apostasy against which Hosea railed in the north
was in full force in pre-Deuteronomic Judah as well.

   Jeremiah 20.14-18 take this sense of desolation and defeat even further,
questioning the very nature of Jeremiah's Josianic career with a reference to
the failure of the Deuteronomic reform itself (italicized):[68]

---

65.   See Friedman, *Who Wrote the Bible?*, p. 167; M. Fishbane, 'Jeremiah iv 23-26
and Job iii 3-13: A Recovered Use of the Creation Pattern', *VT* 21 (1971), pp. 151-67
(151-53); Holladay, *Jeremiah 1*, pp. 163-64; McKane, *Jeremiah*, I, pp. 107-108; A.
Borges de Sousa, 'Jer 4,23-26 als P-orientierter Abschnitt', *ZAW* 105 (1993), pp. 419-28
(who argues that the passage relates to the destruction of Jerusalem in 587); Lundbom,
Jeremiah 1–20, pp. 356-59. Carroll (*From Chaos to Covenant*, pp. 65-66) points out that
this text is thematically resonant with 'certain points in the so-called confessions' (p. 66)
found in Jer. 11–20, which suggests an ideological continuity with Jer. 11.18-23 and
12.5-6.
   66.   *Contra* Friedman, *Who Wrote the Bible?*, pp. 167-68.
   67.   Fishbane, 'Jeremiah iv', p. 153; Fishbane notes that 'anger' and 'Sabbath' are
interchangeable in this context given their correspondence with the Akkadian cognates,
and constitute a deliberate play on words.
   68.   Lundbom correctly notes that this passage is independent from the preceding
complaint/confession in Jer. 20.7-13 ('The Double Curse', p. 591). The uniqueness of
this passage suggests its pivotal position in Jeremiah's prophetic career, with the end of
the Josianic period (initiated in 1.5) leading to the precipice of his post-Josianic mission
to Judah.

> Cursed be the day wherein I was born; the day wherein my mother bore me, let it not be blessed. Cursed be the man who brought tidings to my father, saying, 'A man-child is born unto you', making him very glad. *And let that man be as the cities which Yahweh overthrew, and repented not; and let him hear a cry in the morning, and an alarm at noontide*; because he slew me not from the womb; and so my mother would have been my grave, and her womb always great. Why did I come forth out of the womb to see labor and sorrow, that my days should be consumed in shame? (Jer. 20.14-18)

Jeremiah 20.14-18 serves as an inverse-parallel to the early layers of the call narrative in Jeremiah 1.[69] In the call narrative, Jeremiah's message is legitimized by the fact that Yahweh ordained him a prophet before he was born or even formed in the womb, and it is this very issue which lies at the heart of the conclusion in 20.14-18. The repudiation of his birth (vv. 14-15) and conception in the womb (vv. 17-18) frame an oblique reference in v. 16 to Yahweh's rejection of the cities of the north that Josiah had hoped to bring into the Deuteronomic fold, and possibly to the corruption of Jerusalem itself at the hands of the pro-Egyptian faction therein.[70]

We thus encounter a good deal of material that places Jeremiah's early activity not only within the period of Josiah's reign and reform, but as central to it.[71] The prophet has employed the scribal methods of the Deuteronomists, and several passages in his earliest oracles suggest the composition of Deuteronomy and the DH as works-in-progress. The prophet also very firmly adopts the ideology of Deuteronomy as his own, viewing it as the basis for his own self-concept. Deuteronomic consciousness was not secondarily appended to the prophet's work but woven into its soul from the beginning.[72] It is also clear that during the early period of the prophet's

69. Holladay (*Jeremiah 1*, p. 563) points out that these verses constitute a separate composition from Jer. 20.7-13, but claims that vv. 14-18 were composed to 'round off the confessions' of Jer. 11–20; this no doubt explains the current position of the text. However, Lundbom ('The Double Curse') has demonstrated that the passage is not a lament/confession, and there is no reason to assume that it was composed as a postscript to that collection. Both Holladay and Lundbom have recognized that these verses create an *inclusio* with Jer. 1.5, though they differ in opinion concerning which is the 'answer' to which (noted above).

70. Since Josiah is apparently the one responsible for announcing Jeremiah's 'birth' as a prophet via the initiation of his northern agenda (the call narrative, as argued above, began as a defense of Jeremiah's prophetic role under Josianic auspices) and since Josiah has just been killed, the reference may very well relate to him—Holladay has suggested as much (*Jeremiah 1*, p. 561) though only in terms of the 'man' being a representative of Jerusalem. McKane points to the זעקה and תרועה terminology as a reference to military disaster (*Jeremiah*, I, pp. 487-88), a context befitting of the death of Josiah at Megiddo and the dominance of Egypt over Jerusalem.

71. *Pace* Wilson, *Prophecy and Society*, pp. 242-43.

72. *Pace* Römer, 'Convert', pp. 196-99.

career, the P tradition was deployed in the service of the Deuteronomistic movement and eventually Deuteronomy itself; while the rift between these traditions would become more pronounced in later periods, Jeremiah draws from both in forming his oracles.[73] As such, the prophetic word represents the dynamic development of the Deuteronomistic tradition, just as Deuteronomy itself constituted the dynamic development of earlier traditions (Shilonite or otherwise). Divine laws were not static literary collections but the basis for an ongoing dialogue between Israel and their deity mediated through prophetic functionaries;[74] so much is spelled out in Deut. 17.8-13/18.15-22. The Shilonites of Anathoth had infuriated Yahweh because they denied the dynamism of the divine דבר, now manifested in the Deuteronomistic tradition and Jeremiah's oracles. The death of Josiah, however, demanded that the Jerusalem-centricity behind the promulgation of Deuteronomistic ideology had to be seriously reconsidered.

---

73. For the subsequent Zadokite view of Deuteronomic law, see S.W. Hahn and J.S. Bergsma, 'What Laws Were "Not Good"? A Canonical Approach to the Theological Problem of Ezekiel 20.25-26', *JBL* 123 (2004), pp. 201-18 (206-17).

74. So also Halpern, 'Why Manasseh', p. 505.

6

THE TEMPLE SERMON*

The issue of Jeremiah's ongoing mission in Judah speaks to the uncertainties that would have arisen after Josiah's death. The collection of literature that emerges from Jeremiah's response to these circumstances constitutes a polemic against the institutions of Judah that compromised the spirit of the Deuteronomistic ideology, which Jeremiah did not abandon but had to re-evaluate with the paradigm shift now facing the nation. It is in the polemical literature that comes out of this period of Jeremiah's activity that the dissonant voices and conflicting ideologies of late seventh-century Judah emerge more clearly. The likely historical background for the initiation of this material is the deposition of Jehoahaz and ascension of Jehoiakim under the auspices of Necho in 609 (2 Kgs 23.34). For Jeremiah, this confirmed his earlier observations: it signaled the end of Judean autonomy and revealed the broader implications of Yahweh's actions on the world stage.

The passage commonly known as the prophet's 'Temple Sermon' (Jer. 7.1-15)[1] represents the pivotal moment in Jeremiah's career where he

---

* The present chapter is based on my article 'The Temple Sermon and the Term מקום in the Jeremianic Corpus' (*JSOT* 30 [2005], pp. 93-109). This chapter focuses on different issues from those discussed in the *JSOT* article, but relies on much common material.

1. Most scholars view these verses as the original 'Sermon' or the basic literary unit reflecting it, though views vary enormously on authorship. Weinfeld (*Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, pp. 27-28, 325, 352), Nicholson (*Preaching*, pp. 34, 68-69), Thiel (*Jeremia 1–25*, pp. 105-15), and E.K. 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) argue for the Deuteronomistic provenance of the passage. On the other hand, Holladay (*Jeremiah 1*, pp. 236-49) attributes the unit to Jeremiah, and others such as Weippert (*Prosareden*, pp. 26-48) and Lundbom (*Jeremiah 1–20*, p. 455) are inclined to attribute authorship to Jeremiah as well. See also S.M. Kang, 'The Authentic Sermon of Jeremiah in Jeremiah 7.1-20', in M.V. Fox *et al.* (eds.), *Texts, Temples and Traditions*: *A Tribute to Menachem Haran* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns 1996), pp. 147-62, who follows Haran's observation that vv. 16-20 are part of the literary

expands his role from that of a poetic advocate of the Deuteronomistic ideology to that of the Deuteronomic Mosaic prophet and generator of new policy.[2] The passage is primarily concerned with the problem of outdated and theologically bankrupt covenantal concepts; it is the Deuteronomic covenant—properly applied—that can sustain the people, not Jerusalem's king, priesthood, or sacred sanctuary.[3] Following in the footsteps of the Deuteronomic reform, all of these are presented as idolatrous if they are not motivated by Deuteronomic Torah, and faith in them without submission to the law demands divine chastisement.

The passage begins with a contextual introduction in v. 1 which identifies it as a new literary unit but also as a continuation of Jeremiah's earlier prophetic messages via its identification as a self-contained דבר. Though prose in form, the passage is thereby classified as consistent with the other דברים pronounced by Jeremiah in his Josianic-era oracles.[4] Verse 2, however, specifies that it is not the Shilonites or the northerners to whom this message is directed but the congregants in the Temple. These two verses, in tandem, connect Jeremiah's earlier missions to his current one, legitimizing the content and message of his Josianic oracles for use in addressing a Judean audience.

unit and inherent to Jeremiah's proclamation (M. Haran, 'From Early to Classical Prophecy: Continuity and Change', *VT* 27 [1977], pp. 385-97 [391]; see, however, Weippert, *Prosareden*, p. 227, who points to stylistic differences separating these verses as a different unit). Kang, though, discerns Deuteronomistic reworking of the original sermon (pp. 150-59), representing a medium point of sorts between Holladay/Weippert and Thiel. See also Isbell and Jackson, 'Rhetorical Criticism', pp. 21-22, for vv. 16-20 as an independent rhetorical unit. I take vv. 16-20 to be authentic to Jeremiah but deriving from a later period; see the concluding chapter below.

2. McKane (*Jeremiah*, I, pp. 159-60) points out that the Sermon follows the form of the 'entry Torot' (following H.G. Reventlow, 'Gattung und Überlieferung in der "Tempelrede Jeremias"', *ZAW* 81 [1969], pp. 315-52 [333]) that a worshipper would hear upon entering the Temple, but demonstrates that the passage is concerned with the conditions that will sustain life in the land. The Sermon is not, therefore, a mere cultic ornament but relates to the Deuteronomic Torah as a covenantal clause (Deut. 7.12; 8.1; 16.20; 19.8).

3. Holladay (*Jeremiah 1*, p. 240) and Lundbom (*Jeremiah 1–20*, p. 455) both point out terminological 'overlap' with Deuteronomic phraseology but conclude that it is minimal. However, it is exactly this overlap that commands our attention, for it creates continuity with Jeremiah's utterance here and the larger Mosaic exhortation of the Deuteronomic Torah.

4. Thiel (*Jeremia 1–25*, pp. 290-300) states that the introductory formulae are evidence of the Deuteronomistic redaction in the book. While they point to a systematic literary cohesion (rather than a loose collection of oral traditions), there is no reason that Jeremiah himself is not to some degree responsible for this, especially if he sought to create continuity between the phases in his career.

The Conditional Promise: Jeremiah 7.3-7

The message proper begins in v. 3, where Jeremiah employs the messenger formula in addressing his audience.[5] This verse and those that follow may therefore have been geared for oral proclamation as opposed to the strictly literary nature of his oracles to the Shilonites/northerners in Jeremiah 30–31 and 2–4.[6] Verses 3-7 are marked as a self-contained unit by recurring terminology at the beginning and end of the text:

> Thus says Yahweh of hosts, the God of Israel, 'Amend your ways and your doings, and I will cause you to dwell (ואשכנה אתכם) in this place (במקום הזה). Trust not in lying words, saying, "The temple of Yahweh (היכל ה'), the temple of Yahweh, the temple of Yahweh, are these". No, but if you thoroughly amend your ways and your doings (דרכיכם ומעלליכם); if you thoroughly execute justice between a man and his neighbor; if you oppress not the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow, and shed not innocent blood in this place, neither walk after other gods to your hurt; then will I cause you to dwell (ושכנתי אתכם) in this place (במקום הזה), in the land that I gave to your fathers, forever.'

The reliance upon Deuteronomic language is immediate, as the prophet invokes the שכן terminology, quoting Yahweh as saying that if the nation improves its behavior, he will cause the people to dwell 'in this place' (במקום הזה), that is, the Temple. While this verse does recall the multitude of passages in the Deuteronomic Torah that employ similar language,[7] there is a notable shift. It is no longer Yahweh's own name that he will cause to dwell in the Temple; the name terminology is absent from these verses, which points to an alteration of the original initiatives behind Josiah's reform. The focus is on the people themselves rather than the architectural structure surrounding them. The verse employs the pronoun אתכם ('you'), referring to those to whom the Sermon is addressed.[8] This, however, is

---

5. Westermann, *Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech* (trans. H.C. White; Philadelphia: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1967), pp. 100-15.

6. The rhetorical structure of the passage, though, suggests that it was composed before being proclaimed orally. See Lundbom, *Jeremiah 1–20*, pp. 455-59.

7. The מקום terminology is particularly important with regard to Deut. 17.8-13, which is the programmatic basis of Jeremiah's current address as an addendum to Deuteronomic tradition. See W.S. Morrow, *Scribing the Center: Organization and Redaction in Deuteronomy 14.1–17.13* (SBLMS, 49; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), pp. 221-22, for the effect of the deployment of מקום in the rhetorical legitimization of the Deuteronomic text.

8. Holladay (*Jeremiah 1*, p. 241) and Reventlow ('Gattung und Überlieferung', p. 329) suggest emending the text to read 'so that I may dwell with you', but Lundbom (*Jeremiah 1–20*, p. 461) points out the problems with this approach. The original form of the MT is therefore the preferred reading and thus indicates the shift in understanding from the original Deuteronomic usage of the שכן term to that used by Jeremiah.

conditional upon the people's betterment of their 'ways and doings' (דרכיכם
ומעלליכם), their adherence to the covenantal spirit behind the law that
invokes not only elements of Jeremiah's earlier oracles (Jer. 2.33, 36; 3.13,
21) but Hosea's message to the north (פקדתי עליו דרכיו ומעלליו אשיב לו) in
Hos. 4.9; see also Hos. 12.3). The implication, from the outset, is that Judah
is subject to the same standards as Israel in days past, but also that Jeremiah's
adjustment of the Deuteronomistic ideology is in keeping with established
prophetic tradition.

  Jeremiah 7.3-7 follows the rhetorical format of Deuteronomy. Verse 3
establishes the apodictic dynamic that fuels the rest of the passage, which is
taken up and expanded casuistically in the next several verses. Verse 4
warns the listener against empty words that focus entirely on the divine sanc-
tuary; the threefold repetition of the phrase היכל ה' emphasizes the futility
of faith in expired systems that leave no room for additional concerns.[9] This
verse possesses a certain self-reflexive property: Jeremiah is delivering a
new דבר, one that contains an important divine message. A futile, obsessive
reliance on a Temple-based mantra excludes the possibility of his words or
any other prophetic transmission from entering into religious consciousness.
Sublimation in limited icons such as the היכל ה' is an impediment to the
fulfillment of true covenantal obligation.[10] The element of שקר, emptiness or
falsehood, comes not from the היכל ה' itself, but from the denial of essential
external forces and ideas that factor into the discourse.[11]

  In contradistinction to the futile words and ideas voiced in Jer. 7.4, v. 5
presents the counterpoint that would indeed allow for the 'betterment of
ways' that will sustain the covenant: the people must engage in the legal
provisions of social justice and communal responsibility (משפט בין איש ובין
רעהו). The term משפט, in this context, must refer to the juridical process of
Deut. 17.8-13, which deals exclusively with civil matters but casts them
under the jurisdiction of divine law.[12] This is reinforced by overt references

---

  9.   McKane (*Jeremiah*, I, p. 160) states that the היכל mantra is a formula, but in the
context of the Sermon, it is precisely the concept of a formula that is being criticized.

  10.   The term היכל appears in several other passages, but given the current Jerusalem-
ite context, Jeremiah may be limiting over-valuing of the sacred crypt that occupies an
important role in the account of Josiah's reform (2 Kgs 23.4). Holladay (*Jeremiah 1*,
p. 242) notes the connection to the היכל terminology relating to Shiloh (1 Sam. 1.9; 3.3),
and the reference may thus be a subtle preface to the more overt likening of the Jerusalem
Temple to Shiloh in vv. 12 and 14.

  11.   So also T. Overholt, *The Threat of Falsehood: A Study in the Theology of the
Book of Jeremiah* (SBT, Second Series, 16; London: SCM Press, 1970), p. 8.

  12.   Hence Levinson's observation that eliminating cultic dimensions from regional
life nevertheless retains the sanctity of regional life (Levinson, *Deuteronomy*, pp. 49-52).
Overholt (*The Threat of Falsehood*, p. 8) recognizes the legalistic dimensions of the term
משפט but associates it strictly with the Covenant Code (Exod. 21.1) rather than with the
process of Deuteronomic jurisprudence in Deut. 17.8-13.

to Deuteronomic laws of social justice in v. 6: oppression of the underprivileged and homicide, coupled with a reference to worshipping foreign gods. Cultic concerns are thus expressly incorporated into matters of social order. This verse also possesses a transformative dimension, for cultic law and social law occupy separate categories in the Deuteronomic Torah.[13] Here, Jeremiah redefines their meaning in a post-Josianic environment as part of one constitutive law code in need of further expansion.

Verse 7 then completes the initial part of Jeremiah's message, repeating the assurance that if these social conditions are met, all will be well, but the wording of the assurance from v. 3 is altered in the present verse:

> Then will I cause you to dwell in this place (ושכנתי אתכם במקום הזה), in the land that I gave to your fathers, forever (עד עולם). (Jer. 7.7)

A notable change occurs with the מקום terminology, which here relates not to the Temple but to the entire land. This does not constitute a rejection of the Deuteronomistic sense of the term but an adjustment of it that is consistent with the critique of the היכל mantra and the ensuing discourse of the Temple Sermon.[14] The implication is that the Torah laws cited in the preceding verse apply everywhere, and the carrying out of those laws is the determinative factor regarding covenantal sustenance. Furthermore, it reflects the same methods of lemmatic transformation employed by the Josianic scribes behind Deuteronomy, though here it is a Deuteronomistic lemma that is the basis for innovation.[15] Finally, the addition of the phrase 'forever' (עד עולם) is new to the covenantal dynamic and not articulated in the Deuteronomic Torah.[16] The dramatic nature of this statement speaks to both the newness and gravity of Jeremiah's message in these verses. The security will be certain if the people adhere to Jeremiah's words.

It is important to note that Jeremiah does not consider the Temple to be anathema to his concern with law independent of its earlier Josianic context. The Temple itself is not an object of derision in the prophet's view,[17] but its

13. See Levinson, *Deuteronomy*, pp. 117-18; Sweeney, *King Josiah*, pp. 160-63.

14. *Pace* Sharp, *Jeremiah*, pp. 49-50, who views Jer. 7.7 as a later interpolation arguing in favor of life in the land vs. life in exile.

15. Levinson, *Deuteronomy*, pp. 144-57 and *passim*.

16. So also Lundbom, *Jeremiah 1–20*, p. 464.

17. *Contra* Holt, 'Jeremiah's Temple Sermon', pp. 78-81, who sees the Sermon as a Deuteronomistic construction based on Jeremiah's rejection of the Temple. Holt's reading, though, is predicated upon the Sermon being a retrospective view of the events that led up to the Temple's destruction, which facilitates this understanding of the text. From the retrospective point of view, having Jeremiah inveigh against the Temple legitimizes his position as a prophet to an audience that had seen it destroyed. Much of this is based upon Holt's presumption that 'it would, of course, be impossible' (p. 77) to determine an original Jeremianic utterance in Jer. 7.1-15, a view easily adopted if the passage is categorically attributed to a later Deuteronomistic redaction. The relationship between

validity is completely contingent upon the supremacy of the law and the nation's adherence to it. The law and its prophetic commentary are the foundation of Israel's relationship with Yahweh—not the Temple, the king who sits upon David's throne, or the Egyptian overlord who placed him there. Those both within the Temple precincts and outside in the surrounding cities and towns must accept this new revelation and covenantal condition, or risk engaging in the futile and vapid practices and thought patterns of those who sublimate in illusory concepts.[18]

The Indictment: Jeremiah 7.8-11

Having presented the security that could be, the passage continues with an indictment of the nation that makes clear the pressing need for Jeremiah's delivery of the Sermon. Verses 8-10 identify precisely what it is that the people have done and are doing that demands a betterment of ways:

> Behold, you trust in lying words (דברי שקר) that cannot profit. Will you steal, murder, commit adultery, swear falsely, and offer to Baal, and walk after other gods whom you have not known, and come and stand before me in this house, whereupon my name is called, and say, 'We are delivered', that you may do all these abominations?

The people have accepted the empty words (דברי שקר) alluded to in v. 4,[19] which are spelled out in vv. 9-10: they have elevated the Temple above the principles of Deuteronomic law. Jeremiah's selection of these few laws from the Decalogue has prompted speculation that in the prophet's time and earlier the Decalogue existed in a truncated or alternative form,[20] but there

Jeremiah's prose and Deuteronomistic prose is much more complex; the function of the Sermon and its reliance upon the process at the heart of Deut. 17.8-13 follows Levinson's argument that Deuteronomic literature is geared to transform traditions (*Deuteronomy*, *passim*), an element that Holt does not consider in evaluating the passage as a redactional justification rather than a functional/programmatic revelation.

18.   McKane (*Jeremiah*, I, p. 160) and Lundbom (*Jeremiah 1–20*, p. 464) both point to the land as a pivotal element in the Sermon. McKane's contention that the מקום terminology cannot relate to the Temple is erroneous, however, if the Temple plays a symbolic role in relation to the land in general. It is indeed the illusion of the Temple as the single saving element of a fallacious covenant (vv. 10-11) that Jeremiah inveighs against and that is at the heart of the Sermon. See Morrow, *Scribing*, pp. 221-22, for the attachment to this term with the Temple.

19.   The allusion points to the literary unity of the Sermon; moreover, it functions as a casuistic qualification of the apodictic nature of the phrase in v. 4. Kang's proposed reconstruction of the original Sermon (Kang, 'The Authentic Sermon', pp. 160-61) highlights its polemical but not its rhetorical or transformative dimensions.

20.   See E. Nielsen, *The Ten Commandments in New Perspective* (SBT, 7; Naperville, IL: Allenson, 1968), pp. 110-12; B.S. Childs, *The Book of Exodus: A Critical, Theological Commentary* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1974), pp. 393-401; D.N. Freedman,

is no reason to deny that Jeremiah is here invoking the Decalogue laws of Deuteronomy that most clearly articulate his position. The dominance of a Temple liturgy that marginalizes Deuteronomistic discourse has permeated public consciousness, prohibiting the nation from recognizing the new world order ushered in by Josiah's death. Deuteronomy is no longer the vehicle that ratifies the Davidic/Temple covenant but, as in vv. 3-7, stands above it and establishes a new paradigm for existence, one devoid of the nationalistic concerns of a bygone era. Those who do not interrupt their incessant concern with the Temple are indeed buying into a delusion.

This message is driven home by the harsh tone of v. 11:

> 'Has this house, whereupon my name is called (אֲשֶׁר נִקְרָא שְׁמִי עָלָיו), become a den of vagabonds (מְעָרַת פָּרִצִים) in your eyes? Behold, I, even I, have seen it', says Yahweh.

This verse appears to invoke the Deuteronomistic name theology, but a close reading reveals otherwise. The standard Deuteronomistic formula involving the divine name places Yahweh in the active position, whereby the deity causes his name to dwell therein (לְשַׁכֵּן שְׁמוֹ שָׁם; see, e.g., Deut. 12.5, 11, 21; see also 2 Kgs 21.4, 7 for a variant). Here, the passive verbal form (נִקְרָא) distances Yahweh from the act of linking the divine name to the Temple, implying instead that in the wake of Josiah's death, this is no longer a divine initiative but a human-born conceit. The name terminology for the Temple in Jer. 7.11 is found in only one other place in the Deuteronomistic historiography, and that is 1 Kgs 8.43, part of Solomon's Temple dedication speech:

> …that your name *is called upon* this house (כִּי שִׁמְךָ נִקְרָא עַל הַבַּיִת הַזֶּה).

1 Kings 8.43 draws directly from 2 Sam. 6.2, the narrative relating the Ark's transference to Jerusalem.[21] There, the divine name is called upon the Ark in very similar terms:

> And David arose, and went with all the people that were with him, from Baalei Judah, to bring up from thence the Ark of God, *whereupon is called* the name, even the name of Yahweh of hosts that sits upon the cherubim (אֲשֶׁר נִקְרָא...עָלָיו).

1 Kings 8.43 uses the same lexical idiom to declare that the name once called upon the Ark is now called upon the Temple. This no doubt made a

The Unity of the Hebrew Bible (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1991), p. 27. Freedman points out that the order preserved in Jeremiah conforms with the order of abrogation in the sequence of biblical books of Joshua, Judges, and Samuel, though he also cites the variation of the sequence in Hos. 4.2.

21. For the early dating of this narrative, see Halpern, *David's Secret Demons*, pp. 57-92.

profound impression upon the Deuteronomists, who developed the ideology in a different direction, qualifying its use in the context of the Temple according to Deuteronomic law.[22] 1 Kings 8 has been subjected to significant Deuteronomistic editing and is of course a central text in the DH, and other references to the divine name therein resonate at Deuteronomistic frequencies. This particular idiomatic expression, however, stands out as pre-Deuteronomistic, invoking not Yahweh's will but Solomon's special place as Yahweh's earthly agent.[23] Solomon's bravado in this episode is tempered by the Deuteronomistic critique against that king.[24] By employing the very language of 1 Kgs 8.43, Jeremiah carries forward that Solomonic critique by applying it directly to those now most closely associated with the Temple, namely, the 'vagabonds' of his day. The term פרצים used to describe this group should give us cause for reflection on the meta-message behind Jeremiah's words. It may constitute a pun on the term פרץ, the traditional clan associated with the Davidic line (Gen. 38.29-30; 46.12; Num. 26.20; Ruth 4.18-21). For Jeremiah to employ the term פרצים in this regard suggests that the Davidic covenant is in a state of dereliction. Those who cling

---

22.   Schniedewind, *Society and the Promise to David*, p. 97.

23.   Solomon's role as intercessor in 1 Kgs 8 must also derive from the pre-Deuteronomistic stratum; Deut. 17.14-20 prohibits the king from assuming an intercessory role; this is reserved for prophets alone. The Josianic authors address this problem in their source text by assigning to Solomon a prophetic experience following Deuteronomic rubrics: 1 Kgs 6.11-13 relates that the דבר ה׳ came to Solomon, clarifying that the Temple would be legitimate only if he upheld divine law (*pace* Friedman, *The Exile and Biblical Narrative*, p. 33, who views 1 Kgs 6.11-13 as exilic). This charge would be fulfilled only by Josiah (2 Kgs 23.25). For a discussion of the Deuteronomistic editing of 1 Kgs 8, see M. Brettler, 'Interpretation and Prayer: Notes on the Composition of 1 Kings 8.15-53', in M. Brettler and M. Fishbane (eds.), *Minhah le-Nahum: Biblical and Other Studies Presented to Nahum M. Sarna in Honour of his 70th Birthday* (JSOTSup, 154; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), pp. 17-35; J.D. Levenson, 'From Temple to Synagogue: 1 Kings 8', in Halpern and Levenson (eds.), *Traditions in Transformation*, pp. 143-66. G.N. Knoppers draws attention to the literary unity of the speech and argues for a pre-exilic provenance ('Prayer and Propaganda: Solomon's Dedication of the Temple and the Deuteronomist's Program', *CBQ* 57 [1995], pp. 229-54). The chapter has indeed been skillfully shaped (Knoppers) but very likely reflects exilic concerns (Levenson, Brettler). V.A. Hurowitz notes many parallels between Solomon's speech and Mesopotamian temple texts of the neo-Assyrian period (*I Have Built You an Exalted House: Temple Building in the Bible in Light of Mesopotamian and Northwest Semitic Writings* [JSOTSup, 115; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), pp. 271-77, but it must be recalled that the Mesopotamian ritual texts from this period deliberately invoke much earlier modes of ritual (T. Jacobsen, 'The Graven Image', in Miller, Hanson, and McBride [eds.], *Ancient Israelite Religion*, pp. 23-24; see also Halpern, 'Jerusalem and the Lineages', pp. 86-89). As such, it is very possible that many elements within Solomon's speech have earlier analogues in ancient Near Eastern culture and likewise possess an early, pre-Deuteronomistic date.

24.   Sweeney, 'The Critique of Solomon'.

to what the Temple might have meant in Josiah's day are vagabonds because they are caught up in Davidic pretensions,[25] turning it into little more than a monument to royal megalomania.[26]

<p style="text-align:center">*The Invocation of Shiloh and the*
'Whole Seed of Ephraim': Jeremiah 7.12-15</p>

To drive home the message that faith in obsolete systems equals the abrogation of covenantal responsibility, the closing verses of the passage ground Jeremiah's words in a somber and powerful historical example in vv. 12-15 that would have resonated deeply among his audience:

> 'Go now unto my place which was in Shiloh, *where I first caused my name to dwell*, and see what I did to it for the wickedness of my people Israel. And now, because you have done all these works', says Yahweh, 'and I spoke unto you, speaking early and often, but you heard not, and I called you, but you answered not; therefore will I do unto the house, whereupon my name is called, wherein you trust, and unto the place which I gave to you and to your fathers, as I have done to Shiloh. And I will cast you out of my sight, as I have cast out all your brethren, even the whole seed of Ephraim.'

One striking feature of this passage is that Jeremiah casts the name theology back before the age of Josiah's reforms and the Deuteronomistic works, ascribing its initial residence to the Shiloh sanctuary.[27] Many interpreters have read this verse as an allusion to the fall of Shiloh in the eleventh century and a reference to the corruption of the Elides who operated without any religious sincerity.[28] While this notion certainly must accompany any reference to Shiloh, the closing line of the verse is primarily concerned not with the Elides but with 'the wickedness of [Yahweh's people] Israel'. In Jeremiah's estimation, Shiloh's fall is not attributed to the misconduct of a single priestly house but to a national sin. Yet if Jeremiah is referring to the ancient Shiloh sanctuary in the days of Samuel, the verse raises the question: *What* national sin? The narrative in 1 Samuel 1–6 makes the loss of the Ark a matter of Eli's ineffectuality and the corruption of his sons, not the fault of

---

25.   Holladay (*Jeremiah 1*, p. 246) discusses the possible allusion to David's days as an outlaw, though he does not propose a related word-play with the פֶּ֫רִיץ terminology.

26.   See Wilcoxen, 'The Political Background of Jeremiah's Temple Sermon', pp. 162-63.

27.   See the discussion by Schley, *Shiloh*, pp. 173-76.

28.   See J. Day, 'The Destruction of the Shiloh Sanctuary and Jeremiah vii 12, 14', in J.A. Emerton (ed.), *Studies in the Historical Books of the Old Testament* (VTSup, 30; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1979), pp. 87-94; Sweeney, *King Josiah*, p. 212; Lundbom, *Jeremiah 1–20*, pp. 168-69, 471-72; McKane, *Jeremiah*, I, p. 163; Holladay, *Jeremiah 1*, pp. 247-48; Overholt, *The Threat of Falsehood*, pp. 19-21; Mendenhall, 'Deuteronomy 32', p. 176.

the broader population; the people, if anything, are portrayed as pious.[29] Moreover, Samuel becomes the bearer of the Shiloh tradition even after the Elide line is deposed, maintaining a sense of religious consistency during his tenure as the nation's leader.[30] The only national sin that could be connected with this period in history would be that of the people asking for a king in 1 Samuel 8, but it is debatable as to whether this constitutes an actual sin since the request in the narrative is indeed granted by Yahweh (1 Sam. 9–12). The coronation and activity of Saul is associated with a number of ancient sites in what would have been considered 'northern Israel' to a seventh-century Judean audience—Gilgal, Mizpah, Gibeah, etc.—but there is no mention of Shiloh. The closest the text comes to such a mention is that Saul's encounter with Samuel takes place in Ramah/the land of Zuph, but this encounter is directed by Yahweh and would hardly qualify as a sinful moment. Ephraim hardly came to an end because of the fall of Shiloh; indeed, the north became David's prize for outlasting Saul (and the Shiloh tradition itself was effectively transplanted by David into Jerusalem). More-over, the fall of Ephraim in the eighth century came not from activity at Shiloh but from Jeroboam's veneration and use of the Dan and Bethel shrines (according to the book of Kings, especially 2 Kgs 17.7-23).

The reference to Shiloh in Jer. 7.12 therefore cannot simply be a reminder of the events of ages past as preserved in the DH, since national sin played no discernible role in this context; it must pertain primarily to a different issue.[31] In the context of Jeremiah's current speech and its concern with clinging to outmoded theologies, the true purpose behind the reference emerges: Jeremiah is referring to the Shilonites of Anathoth and the broader northern

29. *Pace* Mendenhall, 'Deuteronomy 32'. The portrayal of both Hannah and Elkanah in 1 Sam. 1 point to their commitment to and faith in Yahweh; 1 Sam. 2.16 shows the common man as following the norms of sacrificial rites over against priestly corruption, and v. 22 suggests that women functioning innocently in cultic capacities were abused.

30. It may be the case that 1 Sam. 2.27-36, in its original, pre-redacted form, pointed to Samuel as the 'faithful priest' (v. 35) who would replace the Elide line (see Leuchter, 'Something Old, Something Older: Reconsidering 1 Sam. 2.27-36', *JHS* 4 [2003], Article 6, 2.5, <http://www.jhsonline.org>). Samuel's ongoing ministry (1 Sam. 7.15-17) locates his home in Ramah, the region where the Shiloh shrine was located, and it is there that he continues his priestly functions (1 Sam. 9.11-14, 22-25).

31. Holladay observes that the people would not have 'enjoyed' being reminded of Shiloh's destruction (*Jeremiah 1*, p. 249), but this alone would be too casual a reference when compared with the focused polemic of the Sermon. Schley (*Shiloh*, pp. 177-78) points to a reference to the fall of the north in the eighth century, though his reading is based on a tenuous paralleling of Shiloh and 'the captivity of the land' in Judg. 18.30-31. Wilcoxen's observation—that the reference recalls the back-story to the Zion tradition, turning it against itself—certainly underlies Jeremiah's choice of expression ('The Politi-cal Background to Jeremiah's Temple Sermon', pp. 163-64), but as will be demonstrated below, this is only one note in the critical symphony of the Shiloh reference.

population he addressed during the Josianic period.[32] By the time of Josiah's death, and certainly by the time of Jeremiah's Temple Sermon, the Shilonites and mixed northern populations were cut off from the Israelite community. Jeremiah's call to look to Shiloh would thus possess greater immediacy in the memory of his audience. It refers to the final loss of the north as a result of the resistance of the Shilonites and the northern population (the 'whole seed of Ephraim') to accept the divinely mandated paradigm shift. It is a cautionary lesson wholly applicable to those who cling to the hallowed heritage of the Jerusalem Temple.

Verse 13 picks up on this Shilonite lesson and merges it with the Judean experience. The verse opens with a statement that the people have 'done all these things', possibly referring back to the transgressions of v. 9,[33] but more likely referring to their clinging to empty traditions or false faith. The ambiguity is curious and perhaps deliberate. Jeremiah has just referred to the Shilonites, who had rejected Jeremiah's words. As in the early text of Jeremiah 2–4, this constituted a sin just as egregious as worshipping foreign gods (Jer. 2.23, 35). The ambiguity in v. 13 may thus be an attempt to extend the same associative logic to Judah's current situation: their rejection of Jeremiah's words in vv. 3-7 and their unwavering belief in the Temple and the Davidic covenant would constitute a covenantal breach as grave as the transgression of the Decalogue laws in v. 9.[34]

The verse continues to place additional emphasis on Judah's abrogation of covenantal responsibility by drawing attention to the people ignoring the essence of Deuteronomistic consciousness. Yahweh has spoken to the people (ואדבר אליכם) but they have not heard (ולא שמעתם).[35] While they may technically adhere to the plain meaning of the Deuteronomic Torah, their potential rejection of Jeremiah's current words would constitute a rejection of the spirit behind that Torah, one that allows it to become an expansive, dynamic document (in keeping with the generation of additional משפטים in Deut. 17.8-13). This current predicament facing Judah is not a historical

32.   In this sense, the observations of Schley and R.A. Pearce ('Shiloh and Jer. vii 12, 14 & 15', *VT* 23 [1973], pp. 105-108 [107]) that Jeremiah's mention of Shiloh must refer to a recent episode is certainly correct, though Day rightly points to the difficulties in arguing that the Shiloh sanctuary persisted as a functioning shrine into the eighth century ('Destruction of the Shiloh Sanctuary').

33.   So Lundbom, *Jeremiah 1–20*, p. 472.

34.   We may detect here, as in Jer. 2.23, 35, a methodological continuity with Deuteronomic hermeneutics (as by Levinson, *Deuteronomy*, pp. 149-50), though the purpose is no longer to legitimize but to condemn.

35.   The phrase further qualifies Jeremiah's current speech as consonant with the Deuteronomic law. The terminology draws directly upon Deuteronomic understandings, where Yahweh speaks (דבר) and the people listen (שמע); see Deut. 5.19-25 (notice that the roles shift in v. 25).

anomaly, but is again prefaced by the example of Shiloh; v. 13 continues
with the phrase 'and I called to you (ואקרא אתכם) but you did not answer
(ולא עניתם)'. The language here relates closely to that of 1 Sam. 7.9 and
Exod. 19.19, both of which depict archetypal intercessory acts.[36] These nar-
ratives represent moments of the covenant in action, with Yahweh fulfilling
his role by answering the call of the intercessor. In Jer. 7.13, the role is
reversed: it is Yahweh who calls the people, but they do not live up to *their*
covenantal role. The implication is that the Shilonites fell from grace by not
accepting the ever-unfolding word of Yahweh, and that the Judean audience
of 7.13 will fall from grace as well should they follow suit.

The allusion to the Moses/Samuel narratives implies that Yahweh calls to
the people through Jeremiah the same way that Yahweh answered the people
through these earlier intercessors. He is, through his words of the Temple
Sermon, a Mosaic prophet, and like the moments in the nation's history to
which he refers, Jeremiah's words usher in another new era.[37] The rejection
of this message would result in Yahweh visiting the same justice upon Judah
as had been visited upon the north. Verse 14 makes this abundantly clear, as
Yahweh is quoted once more as saying that he will destroy 'this house', the
Temple, 'which is called by [his] Name'. The tone here again diminishes the
value of the Deuteronomistic name theology by highlighting its Solomonic
form,[38] and is effective in qualifying the extent to which Yahweh honors out-
dated ideas: he does not. The insistent calling upon the divine name offers
no safeguard from the force of the law. It is therefore not the Temple that is
fundamentally at issue but, as already suggested by vv. 3-7, the people
themselves and the continuity of their daily lives.

Jeremiah's Authorship of the Temple Sermon

A number of factors support the likelihood that Jeremiah himself composed
the Temple Sermon. The mention of Shiloh as a reference to Jeremiah's mis-
sion to the north and to Anathoth, as we have seen, does not match what a
Deuteronomistic redactor would have known from the Josianic DH, which
makes no mention whatsoever of Josiah's northern agenda beyond his

---

36. See Leuchter, 'Psalm xcix', pp. 32-37.

37. Holladay's contention (Holladay, *Jeremiah 1*, p. 238) that this verse and vv. 14-15
are secondary to the original Sermon does not account for the inter-textual and inter-
traditional hermeneutic that binds v. 13 to the preceding Shiloh reference in v. 12.

38. See v. 10. That Yahweh can cause his name to dwell where he wishes suggests
that he can withdraw it as well, and the voicing in vv. 10 and 14 points to Yahweh's with-
drawal of the name but the people's fallacious insistence that it still resides in the
Temple. Jeremiah is thus not criticizing the divine name but the misguided notions of
his audience.

destruction of the northern cult in 2 Kgs 23.15-20. Indeed, any details concerning the north as a whole—the population, the government, the religious institutions—are excluded beyond 2 Kings 17, save for the brief note in 2 Kgs 23.15-20.[39] A post-721 reference to northern Israel in Jer. 7.12-14 is incongruous with Deuteronomistic consciousness, which clearly sought to suppress the record of activity in the north, and cannot be based upon Deuteronomistic historical sources that have nothing to say on the matter. Some scholars have suggested that the reference is drawn from Psalm 78,[40] but this too is unlikely. Psalm 78 glorifies Jerusalem in *contradistinction* to Shiloh, and Jeremiah is concerned with equating the two. The reference is entirely internal to the Jeremianic tradition.

It is possible that a later Deuteronomistic redactor drew upon Jeremiah's early poetry initially directed to the Shilonites and the north, but the likelihood of this is slim. An exilic redactor would not have had these early poetic oracles in their original state; Jeremiah himself would have already worked them into a broader corpus directed at Judah, not Israel.[41] The verses addressed to the Shilonites and the north would have been submerged in Jeremiah's additional poetic writings, and a Deuteronomistic editor in the sixth century would not have picked them apart in order to reconstruct references to a seventh-century Shiloh, especially with no external historical narratives bearing witness to it.[42] Indeed, the motivation for doing so would have been rather slight. Jeremiah 7.12-15 impels the reader/listener to take note of the transgressions of the north (notably Josiah's ambitions) so that the same fate will not befall Judah, yet to the exilic mind the example of the north would have meant very little; the fall of Jerusalem would have resonated far more loudly.[43] Indeed, the last few chapters of the exilic DH focus on this, and draw attention to the sins of the Judean king Manasseh, not to those of the northern population.

It is also possible that Baruch b. Neriah may have been responsible for Jer. 7.1-15, as he is presented as the bearer of the Jeremianic message.[44] Within the Jeremianic tradition, however, Baruch does not play a major role until several years after the delivery of the Temple Sermon. His first appearance, chronologically speaking, takes place in 605, as the bearer of Jeremiah's

---

39. The narrative, however, says nothing about the infrastructure demolished by Josiah, and quickly turns the reader's attention back to Jerusalem.

40. Overholt, *The Threat of Falsehood*, pp. 19-20; Holladay, 'Jeremiah's Psalter', pp. 257-58.

41. See below, Chapter 8.

42. *Pace* Thiel, *Jeremia 1–25*, pp. 105-19.

43. This mindset governs the exilic addition in 2 Kgs 17.19, which seeks to steer the concern with Israel's fate in a Judean direction.

44. Jer. 45.1-5. See Lundbom, 'Baruch, Seraiah', pp. 99-101.

first scroll containing 'all the words' the prophet had spoken concerning Israel and Judah (36.2). It is unlikely that Baruch, in continuing the message of his master, would have reverted to an earlier form of text that Jeremiah himself had already sought to submerge in the larger corpus (if Baruch was even aware of this earlier literary stratum and its original purpose). Furthermore, by the time the 'many more words' would have been added to this scroll (36.32), the focus of the prophet had shifted to the problems involving the rise of Babylon. The Shiloh theme of 7.1-15 would have been passé for Baruch, since the focus of Jeremiah's attention had shifted and the original Ephraimite emphasis of the early poetry had since been subsumed within the Judah-oriented work.

It is therefore far more likely that the passage originated with the prophet himself in 609.[45] Jeremiah took up matters concerning recent events in which he was directly involved earlier that same year, as well as Deuteronomistic themes that he felt required adaptation. The Shiloh references, the adaptation of the שׁכן terminology and the marginalization of the Deuteronomic name theology from the Temple would be in concert with Jeremiah's line of thinking at the time, in recognition of Josiah's failure. In this last regard, Jer. 7.1-15 parallels an earlier prophecy associated with the Deuteronomic reform, and one that Jeremiah would have known: the oracle of Huldah in 2 Kgs 22.15-20.[46] Given Jeremiah's reliance upon older prophetic literature in the formation of his earlier oracles in Jeremiah 30–31 and 2–4, it is entirely likely that Jeremiah fashioned his speech here after Huldah's in order to associate his proclamation with the norms of Deuteronomistic discourse concerning the proclamation of Mosaic prophets.[47] Both are examples

---

45. This date is traditionally assigned in concert with the 'parallel' account in Jer. 26 (though Jer. 26 is more than just a narrative summary of the Temple Sermon). Holladay (*Jeremiah 1*, p. 240) assigns a similar date on the basis of the cycle of septennial Deuteronomic readings (pp. 2-3). Carroll (*Jeremiah*, pp. 43-44) criticizes this theory, but ch. 34 preserves a tradition that the Deuteronomic law was still followed at least as a technicality, and Jeremiah's ongoing polemic in chs. 8–10 seems geared to debase a perfunctory adherence to the Torah (see below, Chapter 7). Holladay's suggestion may therefore have merit in determining the setting for the Sermon. In fact, the desperation intimated in the report of the היכל mantra would suggest that, faced with Josiah's death, the people may very well have adhered to the stringent aspects of Deuteronomic prescriptions such as a septennial reading in the attempt to re-establish a sense of social and theological order.

46. There is much disagreement over the provenance and unity of Huldah's oracle. Sweeney (*King Josiah*, p. 29) suggests a possible exilic addition to the oracle, while Halpern and Vanderhooft ('The Editions of Kings', pp. 222-29) argue for its unity as a complete and conditional oracle. Holladay (*Jeremiah 2*, p. 64) points to Huldah's oracle as a basis for Jeremiah's own Sermon, which supports the position of Halpern and Vanderhooft. The conditional dimensions, moreover, are in full force in Jeremiah's Sermon, drawing upon the conditionality of Huldah's own oracle.

47. So also Holladay, *Jeremiah 2*, p. 64.

of divine proclamations on a par with those found within the Deuteronomic Torah itself, and are thus examples of the juridical process (Deut. 17.8-13) situated at its center.

The Political Concerns of the Temple Sermon

The Temple Sermon serves as the Archimedean point in Jeremiah's career. Though the prophet had engaged prose forms during the Josianic period (both in the early call narrative and in the citation of his adversaries, all of which are largely prosaic), Jer. 7.1-15 constitutes his first parenetic declaration. It is a remarkably economical work, simultaneously bold in its assertions and subtle in its allusions, wasting nary a word in revealing the problems of Jerusalemite culture following Josiah's death. It parallels the scribal methods of Deuteronomy in its use of rhetorical structure, similar keywords, and lemmatic transformation,[48] but obviously moves beyond the strictures of the extant Deuteronomic Torah to apply that work's ideology to circumstances it had not foreseen. Nevertheless, the Sermon is extremely Deuteronomic in spirit. Deuteronomy had been composed in the wake of Assurbanipal's death; likewise, the Temple Sermon was composed and delivered because of another major political event following Josiah's death. The similarities to Huldah's oracle also point to the purpose of the Temple Sermon. Huldah had proclaimed her message as an instruction in light of apparent transgressions of the Deuteronomic Torah, and Jeremiah does the same in the Temple Sermon. Jeremiah must have viewed the deposition of Jehoahaz and the enthronement of Jehoiakim by Necho in 609 as a transgression of Deut. 17.15, which as we have seen was conceived to safeguard against foreign imperialism.[49] The delivery of the Sermon attempted to place Deuteronomic law above the veneration of a royal court that was now under the direct influence of Egypt. In other words, the spirit and ideology of Deuteronomy could no longer be so closely linked to the royal court and the Temple as a symbol of the covenant with David. But in critiquing these royal institutions, Jeremiah opened himself to forces in Jerusalem who possessed differences of opinion concerning what texts, traditions, and sacral figures could rightly guide Judah following the death of Josiah. The elite of Jerusalem would opt for more conservative approaches to religious and political life, and provide the prophet with a powerful counter-argument following the delivery of the Temple Sermon.

48. On this, see Levinson, *Deuteronomy*, pp. 3-17, 34-38, 75-81.

49. Wilcoxen ('The Political Background of Jeremiah's Temple Sermon', pp. 162-64) correctly notes that the Sermon addresses the move away from Josianic/Deuteronomic norms under Jehoiakim, but he does not establish the connection to the Deuteronomic Law of the King that has been specifically transgressed.

7

THE CONFRONTATION WITH THE
JERUSALEM ESTABLISHMENT

*Ideological and Political Opposition
to Jeremiah's Temple Sermon*

The chief opponents to the Temple Sermon were the members of the cultic and political establishment in Jerusalem with close ties to the crown. As Jer. 18.18 attests, the wise men and cultic functionaries (priests and prophets) in Jerusalem formed a unified front against Jeremiah, and the rise of Egypt as the new suzerain of Judah would have provided them with an opportunity to reclaim a semblance of the old political/sacral order in Jerusalem from the pre-Assyrian period.[1] Jeremiah 8–10, often recognized by scholars as a collection of related oracles,[2] contains information regarding the position of these opponents and how the prophet engaged them in an extended polemical debate.[3] Such a polemical exchange must have taken place after the delivery of the Sermon (609) and probably lasted until 605, the date of the battle of Carchemish which saw a major shift in international politics and which commanded the prophet's attention.[4] The oracles relating to the debates of 609–605 are situated in relative proximity to the Temple Sermon in the current form of the book of Jeremiah; they are separated only by 7.16–8.3, which contains supplemental material appended to the Temple Sermon at a later date. The Jeremianic texts with which we are concerned are 8.4-12;[5]

---

1. See above, pp. 54-58.
2. Stulman, 'The Prose Sermons', pp. 43, 49-53; W.L. Holladay, 'The Identification of the Two Scrolls of Jeremiah', *VT* 30 (1980), pp. 452-67 (456).
3. As with other collections discussed in this study, 'Jer. 8–10' will generally refer to specific texts within those chapters relevant to the current discussion, unless otherwise noted.
4. See the concluding comments in this chapter.
5. See Lundbom, *Jeremiah 1–20*, pp. 503-18, who considers these verses to come from the same period (p. 518), though McKane (*Jeremiah*, I, pp. 182-88) breaks this section up into smaller subunits. T. Overholt ('Jeremiah', in J.L. Mays [ed.], *The Harper-Collins Bible Commentary* [New York: HarperCollins, 2000], pp. 538-76 [554]) includes

9.1-13;[6] and 10.1-16.[7] Though these units have been redacted into a larger literary context, they are delimited by rhetorical features suggesting their distinction from the surrounding material and possess lexical and thematic commonalities that are not found elsewhere in Jeremiah 8–10 as these chapters currently stand. These include consistent references to the wisdom and cultic traditions of the Solomonic court, a recurrence of the term 'falsehood' (שֶׁקֶר; pointing as well to the connection to the Temple Sermon in 7.4), and a preoccupation with Baalism and idolatry in variant forms (also a theme in the Temple Sermon). Though these themes emerge elsewhere in the Jeremianic

v. 13, a view shared by Holladay (*Jeremiah 1*, pp. 275-76) on the grounds of a particular historical setting (p. 277), but McKane points out that the verse is not to be included as part of the preceding unit (McKane, *Jeremiah*, I, p. 187). The unit is demarcated by the נפל terminology that appears in v. 4 and recurs in v. 12.

6.   Lundbom (*Jeremiah 1–20*, p. 87) associates Jer. 9.1 with the text of 8.22-23 and regards it as part of a larger unit running through 9.10. While Lundbom's observation is correct, it pertains to the text as a composite whole, and the structural features he points to may be the result of a working of the later text (8.13-23) into the earlier collection. When isolated from 8.13-23, the poetry of 9.1-11 evidences a very strong continuity with 8.4-12. It uses the same catchwords (חכם/שלום/שקר) and is tied both syntactically and thematically to 9.12-13, a prose unit that creates an *inclusio* via the word תורתי with the material in 8.4-12 (תורת ה׳, v. 8) and points to the next textual unit in 10.1-16 in terms of idolatry. The prose form should not necessarily identify 9.12-13 as a secondary accretion; see the conclusion to this study for a discussion.

7.   Though many scholars have taken this passage to be an exilic addition to the Jeremianic corpus (see, e.g., Carroll, *Jeremiah*, pp. 252-59; Stulman, 'The Prose Sermons', p. 52), B.D. Sommer has demonstrated that Deutero-Isaiah is dependent upon this text, suggesting that it obtained at a significantly earlier period (*A Prophet Reads Scripture: Allusion in Isaiah 40–66* [Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998], pp. 166, 237 n. 112, 258 n. 94). See also M. Margaliot, 'Jeremiah x 1-16: A Re-examination', *VT* 30 (1980), pp. 295-308, for an analysis of the passage as original to Jeremiah; as well, see Holladay, 'Jeremiah's Psalter', p. 247. Strong stylistic continuity between Jer. 10.1-16 and other Jeremianic passages is discussed by J. Krašovec, *Antithetic Structure in Biblical Hebrew Poetry* (VTSup, 35; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1984), pp. 76-85. See also Lundbom, *Jeremiah 1–20*, p. 582, for brief comments on the compositional chronology of similar passages that may be dated to the pre-exilic period. Lundbom points to the wide margins of possible dates for this passage and its concern with wisdom, ranging from the beginning of Josiah's reform until the fourth year of Jehoiakim (*Jeremiah 1–20*, p. 592). Yet the beginning of the reform would have involved the subordination of the wisdom tradition to that of the Deuteronomic program (hence the limited wisdom language in the DH and the relegation of wisdom language of a sub-stratum in Deuteronomy; see Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, pp. 244-81). The best date for this passage is between 609 and 605; see U. Cassuto, *Biblical and Oriental Studies* (trans. I. Abrahams; 2 vols.; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1973), I, p. 148. A date later than this must be rejected due to the absence of historical references that dominate the post-605 texts (Margaliot, 'Jeremiah x 1-16', p. 307) as well as the prophet's own emphasis on issues beyond the debate with the wisdom circles.

corpus, chs. 8–10 reflect a higher frequency and concentration of these three elements, and they appear in tandem with each other only here. Moreover, the formal structure of the book of Jeremiah isolates this material by placing them between two parenetic passages of roughly equal length (7.1-15 and 11.1-17),[8] identifying them as compositionally and rhetorically related. In their current form, these relationships result from editorial arrangement and augmentation,[9] but derive from the common purpose for which the prophet initially composed the base units.

The Resurgence of Solomonic Norms: Jeremiah 8.4-12

The contents of 8.4-12 presuppose the prophet's engagement of a group that rejected the Temple Sermon.[10] These verses allude to the same basic ideas as the Sermon, though it is clear that the prophet's adversaries have rejected the Sermon's message and purpose:

> Moreover you shall say to them: 'Thus says Yahweh: "Do men fall, and not rise up again? Does one turn away, and not return (שׁוב)? Why then is this people of Jerusalem rebellious by a perpetual rebellion? They hold fast to deceit, they refuse to return (לשׁוב). I attended and listened, but they spoke not aright;[11] no man repents of his wickedness, saying: 'What have I done?' Every one turns away in his course (במרצותם), as a horse that rushes headlong into battle (כסוס שׁוטף במלחמה). The stork in the heaven knows her appointed times; and the turtle and the swallow and the crane observe the time of their coming; but My people know not the ordinance (משׁפט) of Yahweh."' (Jer. 8.4-7)

The שׁוב terminology immediately recalls the language of Jeremiah 2–4 (especially 3.1, 14, 19, 22; 4.1), and the imagery of a horse heading into

---

8.   Stulman ('The Prose Sermons') identifies the framing and structural function of these (and other) parenetic passages in Jer. 1–25.

9.   Jer. 8.13-23, for example, constitutes a later layer of poetry, as mentioned above. Its concern is more explanatory than prescriptive, and it functions as retrospective lament rather than as a threat of judgment. It draws upon the ideas expressed in the earlier verses and in fact evidences their fulfillment, representing a development in the prophet's compositional intentions, presupposing the conquest of Judah by Babylon. This is especially the case with the military invasion depicted in vivid terms in v. 16 (replete with the invading forces coming through Dan in the north), decidedly different in tone from the intra-Jerusalemite concerns of 8.4-12.

10.   Holladay's proposed dating of this material (to the year 601) would place it too far away from the Temple Sermon to be dealing with related issues (*Jeremiah 1*, p. 277), especially with the rise of Babylon in 605 refocusing public attention. However, a number of internal elements suggest that the text relates to issues that antedate even 605 and sustain the debate initiated by Jeremiah's Temple Sermon (see below; see also Jer. 26 for a tradition concerning the intensity of that debate). Holladay's dating thus seems unlikely.

11.   See above, Chapter 6 on Jer. 7.13, which appears to be reused in this context.

battle recalls 12.5-6.[12] Jeremiah's message is that those who reject the Temple Sermon (perhaps referred to as the מֹשְׁפָּט in v. 7) are as obstinate as the northerners who rejected his word and, consequently, will secure for themselves the same fate as that which befell Josiah in 609.

This leads us to 8.8, which dramatically addresses the fundamental issue underlying the reason for the diatribe in vv. 4-7:

> How do you say, 'We are wise (חכמים אנחנו), and the Law of Yahweh (תורת ה') is with us?' But in falsehood (שׁקר) has wrought the lying pen of the scribes (עט שׁקר ספרים). (Jer. 8.8)

This verse represents one of the greatest enigmas in the book of Jeremiah. Subsequent texts in the book of Jeremiah closely identify Jeremiah with Baruch and Seriah the sons of Neriah and with various members of the Shaphanide scribal circle.[13] We have seen that Jeremiah appears to have benefited from scribal training. He formed his early oracles according to scribal conventions (especially the Temple Sermon) and his work defers to the Deuteronomistic literature produced by the Josianic scribes themselves. Yet 8.8 appears to pit Jeremiah against these scribes, denigrating their understanding of Torah.[14] Some have supposed that this verse reflects Jeremiah's criticism of a different scribal group and constitutes his rejection of the P tradition,[15] but many scholars view this verse as evidence that Jeremiah is in fact rejecting the scribal enterprise reflected in the composition of Deuteronomy and the DH under Josiah.[16]

---

12. Holladay (*Jeremiah 1*, p. 279) discusses the difficulties with the phrase כלה שב במרוצתם ('every one turns away his course'—במרוצתם occurs in the *ketib* of the MT, corrected in the *qere* as במרוצתם). The term במרוצתם recalls the רצתה of Jer. 12.5, part of his word of warning to Josiah. The Temple Sermon is thus his warning to the people, who face similar threats.

13. Jer. 32.6-15; 36.4-32; 40.6; 51.59-64; the 'pen of iron' in Jer. 17.1 suggests the force and legitimacy of the scribal medium. See Lundbom, 'Baruch, Seraiah'; *idem*, *Jeremiah 1–20*, p. 92; Dearman, 'My Servants the Scribes', pp. 417-20.

14. The verse also invariably recalls Isaiah's attempt to dissociate the term *torah* from wisdom circles in his day; see Jensen, *The Use of tôrâ*, p. 120.

15. See, e.g., Friedman, *Who Wrote the Bible?*, pp. 167-68.

16. For an overview, see Perdue, 'Jeremiah in Modern Research', pp. 4-6; Weinfeld (*Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, pp. 158-63); Fishbane (*Biblical Interpretation*, pp. 33-36). Halpern ('Why Manasseh', p. 505) and Schniedewind (*How the Bible Became a Book*, pp. 115-17) adopt the more general reading that Jeremiah stands against the scribal craft with respect to law. Barrick views the protest as arising from Jeremiah having been excluded from the inner circle of the Deuteronomists under Josiah (*The King and the Cemeteries*, p. 129). McKane (*Jeremiah*, I, p. 186) warns against assuming that Jeremiah is rejecting Deuteronomy, and argues that the verse should be understood only in a broad sense. Lundbom (*Jeremiah 1–20*, p. 514) suggests that Jeremiah is behind the scribal castigation in Jer. 8.8 and that this may have been directed at priests, who functioned as scribes as well.

These positions are based on a reading of the verse that attributes too much of the actual text to Jeremiah, and not enough to his adversaries being quoted.[17] The standard reading is below, with Jeremiah's perspective underlined and the quotation of his adversaries in italics:

> How do you say, *'We are wise, and the Law of Yahweh is with us?'* But in falsehood has wrought the lying pen of the scribes.

The verse employs the now-standard device of the prophet citing the position of his adversaries, but the reading and meaning of the verse is quite different if the quotation is extended to the end of the sentence:

> How do you say, *'We are wise, and the Law of Yahweh is with us, but in falsehood has wrought the lying pen of the scribes'*?

With this reading, we see that it is not Jeremiah who is standing against the scribes, but *his adversaries*.[18] *Jeremiah is quoting a group of people who view him and his scribal peers as illegitimate.* The adversaries being quoted apparently view themselves as the proper custodians of the 'Torah'; by 609, this might have constituted the written Deuteronomic legislation itself, but it may also have been a more generic term regarding oral or written cultic instruction and wisdom teachings.[19] The latter may well be the dominant tradition to which the adversaries subscribe by virtue of the חכם terminology in this verse and elsewhere in Jeremiah 8–10, but this does not preclude the possibility that they viewed the Deuteronomic law as a fixed entity that was subordinate to the larger Jerusalem sacral infrastructure. Indeed, the Temple Sermon addresses a movement in Jerusalem that found expression in the

---

17.   Though the present study has advanced the suggestion that a rift developed between traditional wisdom circles and the scribes of Jerusalem in Josiah's day, Fishbane's basic conclusion ('His [Jeremiah's] remarks are pitched against the sage-scribes… who claimed that "the Torah of Yahweh is with us"' [*Biblical Interpretation*, p. 36]) remains salient insofar as Jeremiah stands against the wisdom circles.

18.   For a similar reading, see Peckham, *History and Prophecy*, p. 391 n. 378, though Peckham attributes the quote to the broader Judean population in relation to different literary collections.

19.   For a discussion of the variety of 'torahs' that Jeremiah's adversaries may have had in mind, see Schniedewind, *How the Bible Became a Book*, pp. 119-21 (though Schniedewind is among the scholars who read Jer. 8.8 as the prophet's castigation of a written Torah). The wisdom tradition was already regarded by the Deuteronomic scribes as a foundational tradition worked into the book's synthesis; see Heaton, *The School Tradition*, pp. 106-14; Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, pp. 244-81. Weinfeld's observations demonstrate, however, that the wisdom tradition is subordinated to the political/theological purpose of the Deuteronomic Torah akin to the subordination of P material within Deuteronomic literature (pp. 179-243); see also Sweeney, *King Josiah*, pp. 137-69.

city's old ideological institutions;[20] the emulation of the Temple cult would likely have been paralleled by an emulation of the Jerusalem wisdom tradition, both born during the reign of Solomon. This would have certainly included a restoration of sorts to the pre-Josianic norm of wise men carrying out scribal duties of their own, reclaiming for themselves the traditions of the royal court and the literature that served it,[21] over against the ideology of Deuteronomy, where royalty was subordinate to the law (Deut. 17.18-20) and to the figure of the prophet who legitimized it (Deut. 18.15-18).[22]

If the prophet's adversaries associated him with the Deuteronomistic scribal circles, they would likely have castigated him for attempting to sustain the models of authority advocated by Deuteronomy that officially limited the royalistic tradition of hallowed antiquity. In the absence of Josiah, the cultic/wisdom Jerusalem establishment may have attempted to marginalize the influence of the Deuteronomists by promulgating the idea that they (the Deuteronomists) were responsible for the nation's current travails.[23] The sages, priests, and cultic prophets of Jerusalem appear to have grouped Jeremiah along with the Deuteronomists in direct response to the Temple Sermon. Therein, the prophet had charged that the Jerusalem-centric ideology was 'falsehood' (שֶׁקֶר). The quotation of the adversaries in 8.8 suggests that the same charge has now been levied against Jeremiah and his scribal peers—it is Jeremiah and his peers, the adversaries charge, who have turned the Torah into falsehood.[24]

The ongoing discussion in vv. 9-10 sets the critique of 8.8 in a broader social context:

20.   Wilcoxen, 'The Political Background of Jeremiah's Temple Sermon', pp. 162-64.

21.   Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, pp. 24-33.

22.   Sharp (*Jeremiah*, pp. 145-47) notes an important intertextual connection between 2 Kgs 17.13 and Jer. 2.5. The verse in 2 Kings is a later redactional interpolation into the chapter that overtly quotes Jeremiah, portraying him as an archetypal prophetic servant. Though Sharp ascribes this passage to a later period of composition, it perfectly fits the model proposed herein concerning Jeremiah's connection to the Deuteronomistic enterprise, and evidences a scribe's desire to apply Jeremiah's prophecy to 2 Kgs 17 in addressing Judah, that is, the prophet Jeremiah now confronting the people of Judah is precisely the voice that the north rejected, leading to their destruction. This is a direct parallel to Jeremiah's own application of terms from Jer. 2–4 to his current Jerusalemite audience, and it further ties Jeremiah to the Deuteronomistic scribes who receive the brunt of the wise men's castigation alongside the prophet.

23.   Such appears to be the position voiced by Ezekiel in the early years of the sixth century (Ezek. 1.1), which suggests an extant polemical tradition already firmly entrenched among the prophets/priests closely associated with the Temple.

24.   See K. Bodner, 'The Locution of 1 Kgs 22.28: A New Proposal', *JBL* 122 (2003), pp. 533-43 (537-39), for a similar example of a prophet's words being turned against him by his adversary.

The wise men are ashamed, they are dismayed and taken; they have rejected the word of Yahweh; what wisdom is in them? Therefore will I give their wives to others, and their fields to them that shall possess them; for from the least to the greatest every one is greedy for gain, from the prophet to the priest every one deals falsely (עשה שקר). (Jer. 8.9-10)

In this passage, Jeremiah lashes out at the wise men, the priests and the cultic prophets; notably absent from this list is a mention of scribes, which reinforces the likelihood that it is not the prophet who has just discredited them in Jer. 8.8. Of special note is the chiastic design of v. 9:

The wise men (חכמים) are ashamed, they are dismayed and taken	A
They have rejected the word of Yahweh (דבר ה')	B
What wisdom (חכמת) is in them?	A′

Verse 9 establishes the polarity between Jeremiah as a Mosaic prophet and the wise men; the דבר communicated by the prophet is literally central to the verse and obviates their claims. Verse 10 further defends the prophet's position by returning the adversaries' insult in v. 8, literally turning their words against them:

Jer. 8.8—הנה לשקר עשה (the castigation by the wise men of Jeremiah and his peers)

Jer. 8.10—כלה עשה שקר (Jeremiah's castigation of the wise men and their allies)

Jeremiah 8.10 cites what is being quoted in Jer. 8.8, but in the manner of an external tradition, reversing the lexemes (another example of Seidel's Law). Not only does this support our reading of 8.8 as something not voiced by the prophet, but it strongly suggests that the quotation was something actually spoken by the wise men of Jerusalem and was well known in the prophet's day.[25] Jeremiah's Temple Sermon must have been quite familiar to the Jerusalem establishment; they cite its lexemes just as Jeremiah cites theirs. The rancor between Jeremiah/the Deuteronomists and the royalist/cultic establishment in Jerusalem must have been both public and very heated.

25.   Compare to Jer. 2.23, where the prophet cites the perspective of his Shilonite adversaries but uses his own language to do so (see above, Chapter 5). For Jeremiah's engagement of the wisdom tradition, see T.R. Hobbs, 'Some Proverbial Reflections in the Book of Jeremiah', *ZAW* 91 (1979), pp. 62-72; see also M. Gilbert, 'Jérémie en conflit avec les sages?', in Bogaert (ed.), *Le Livre de Jérémie*, pp. 105-18. Gilbert discusses the relationship between the Wisdom tradition and Jeremianic discourse, and makes special mention of Jer. 8.8-9 as one example. However, Gilbert interprets 'the scribes' as a group associated with the sages rather than with Jeremiah.

The Ongoing Critique of Solomon

Jeremiah's response to his adversaries in vv. 9-10 (expressed in violent detail in v. 12) carries forward the prophet's impulse in the Temple Sermon to develop the Deuteronomistic polemic against Solomon.[26] It is of course Solomon who created the Temple and its cult (1 Kgs 5.19–8.66) and who engineered the fundamental elements of the Davidic covenant,[27] both of which are taken down several pegs by Jeremiah's Temple Sermon. But the rhetoric of Jeremiah 8–10 is especially concerned with the חכם terminology, which had ousted the Shiloh–Mosaic tradition as the sole vehicle for sacred jurisprudence in Solomon's day. As discussed earlier, 1 Kgs 3.7 involves Solomon identifying himself as a נער who does not know how to 'go out and come in' (צאת ובוא); these terms relate to Samuel and Moses, respectively, in other Deuteronomic texts (Deut. 31.2; 1 Sam. 2.26; 3.1). 1 Kings 3.9 contains the pivotal request: that he (Solomon) be granted the juridical abilities that had previously applied to these venerable figures. The narrative continues in 1 Kgs 3.12 with Yahweh granting the request, giving him a 'wise heart' (לב חכם) and bestowing upon Solomon the incomparability formula that is otherwise reserved only for Hezekiah (2 Kgs 18.5) and Josiah (2 Kgs 23.25) in the DH, both of whom submit to prophetic authority.[28] The remainder of 1 Kings 3 describes Solomon putting his wisdom to use in adjudication, and concludes that the juridical process that once resided among Mosaic circles (such as the Zophim) now belongs to Solomon due to his divine wisdom (חכמת אלהים). Solomon completely usurps the sacral heritage of jurisprudence.[29]

After a brief interlude detailing Solomon's royal retinue, 1 Kgs 5.9-14 provides the definitive statement on Solomon's wisdom, which is unparalleled anywhere on earth. Nowhere in this collection of verses is there mention of Mosaic law or the significance of the prophetic office. The Josianic

26.   See Sweeney, *King Josiah*, pp. 93-109.

27.   See Halpern, *David's Secret Demons*, pp. 391-424.

28.   Since the Hezekiah and Josiah narratives are obviously subsequent compositions, the ascription of this term to both kings likely reflects a Deuteronomistic attempt to equate the prophetic message with the royal cult established by Solomon. It is thus not surprising to find the Deuteronomistic note in 1 Kgs 6.11-13 that ratifies the Temple's construction through the phenomenology of prophecy (see above, p. 118 n. 23).

29.   See Halpern, 'Compromise'. The shift from Shiloh/Levitical juridical leadership begun by Saul (p. 87) and moderated by David (p. 91) was ultimately obviated by Solomon in favor of a replacement for the Shilonite system. Halpern points out Solomon's control of this replacement faction but also points to his retention of the Ark as an ameliorative measure (pp. 93-94). The Ark, though, is given into the charge of Zadokites/Aaronides from Hebron rather than Mushites from Shiloh (so Cross, *Canaanite Myth*, pp. 214-15), who had been expelled from the cult (1 Kgs 2.26).

DH does not question the effectiveness of Solomon's initiatives on the administrative/political level,[30] but the overall theological picture presents the king's 'divine wisdom' as the root cause of his introduction of foreign worship into Jerusalem (1 Kgs 11.1-11), the principal feature eliminated by Josiah through his championing of Mosaic tradition.[31]

Jeremiah could hardly have ignored what appeared to be a repetition of history as preserved in the DH. The wise men and their cultic confederates were reviving Solomonic norms by placing too much attention on the sacral heritage of Jerusalem and subordinating the Mosaic (Deuteronomic) tradition championed by Jeremiah. The prophet thus draws upon his earlier oracles to the north, extending to his Jerusalemite audience the same threats:

> 'They shall be put to shame because they have committed abomination (תועבה); they are not at all ashamed, neither know they how to blush; there-fore shall they fall among them that fall, in the time of their visitation they shall stumble', says Yahweh. (Jer. 8.12)

This verse powerfully recalls the charge of abomination (תועבה) derived from Deut. 24.4 and levied against the north in Jer. 2.7. The result of this invocation is that Jeremiah's Jerusalemite adversaries, having adopted Solomon's sins, are placed on par with the sinful northerners who had rejected Josiah and Deuteronomistic ideology, despite whatever illusions they have maintained concerning the externalities of the Deuteronomic covenant (e.g. the sanctity of the Temple and the royal wisdom tradition).

The prophet's condemnation is broad but not monolithic. He criticizes the sages with appropriate language, but does the same to the cultic func-tionaries associated with the sages in minimizing the force of the Torah. For Jeremiah, the priests have not put it into action,[32] and the prophets have done nothing to support it with legitimate proclamations of their own.[33] Jeremiah 8.11 supports the supposition that the prophets and priests have subordinated their roles to the doctrines of the royal circles: they are proclaiming 'peace' (שלום) though no such proclamation is warranted. It is instructive to

---

30.   The DH preserves the propagandistic elements that support Solomon, a necessary step in legitimizing Josiah's own claims to hegemony as part of the Jerusalem establish-ment, which balances the polemic against Solomon's religious and political policies. The end result is a critique of the man, though not the royal and Temple institutions he established. See Knoppers, *Two Nations under God*, I, pp. 77-90.

31.   Sweeney, *King Josiah*, pp. 97-109.

32.   Deut. 17.8-13; see also Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, p. 84.

33.   The reference to 'prophets' in this verse need not relate to Mosaic-type prophets; see 2 Kgs 23.2, where prophets other than Huldah are part of Josiah's entourage. See D.L. Petersen, *Late Israelite Prophecy: Studies in Deutero-Prophetic Literature and in Chronicles* (SBLMS, 23; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977), pp. 83-87, especially p. 85.

compare this use of the term שלום with its use in Jeremiah's Josianic-era oracles, particularly in 12.5. In this earlier context, the prophet alludes to Judah as a land of שלום while the northern territories are untamed and not worth Josiah's efforts. שלום possesses a military connotation in 12.5, but because of this very context it cannot mean 'peace', for the fate of Judah and its king was clearly at great risk either at the hands of Necho or at the hands of the pro-Egyptian faction in Jerusalem.

The use of שלום in 12.5 may refer instead to another dimension of its etymological root, namely, that of 'fullness' or 'fulfillment' (שלם).[34] In this context, the ארץ שלום of 12.5 would refer to a land fulfilled in a covenantal sense, that is, a land and population characterized by Deuteronomic law. This would dovetail with Jeremiah's message to Josiah that the northern regions were not worth fighting for, from a sacral point of view.[35] The Deuteronomic reform had not been successfully applied therein, and these regions were therefore unworthy of inclusion in his realm. Judah and Jerusalem, on the other hand, had experienced the reform and had participated in the covenant ceremony, therefore qualifying as a fulfilled region and community. Seen in this light, the term שלום in 8.11 ought to be understood not as a delusion concerning plain political or military safety but as a delusion concerning a covenantal state. Those who repeatedly proclaim שלום are similar to those who repeat the היכל ה' mantra in 7.4; the same elements of שקר accompany both acts, as suggested in 8.10.[36] The consequences of such posturing are expressed in v. 12, which is directed at the group or groups engaged in this brand of heresy.

The Corrupted Community: Jeremiah 9.1-13

The next literary unit, 9.1-13, continues the discourse with the wisdom faction, intensifying the connection with the obstinate northern circles:

34.   See Sisson, 'Jeremiah and the Jerusalem Conception of Peace', p. 432, in reference to the cultic context of the term שלום; it is no coincidence that Jeremiah's condemnation of fallacious שלום proclamations in 8.11 is levied at the priests/prophets of 8.10. If the Temple Sermon called for cultic change, then the rejection of the Sermon would likely have included steadfast reliance upon cultic staples such as oracles of שלום.

35.   There is no indication that the covenant ceremony in Jerusalem (2 Kgs 23.21) involved the population of the north, and thus Jeremiah would have viewed them as beyond the boundaries of the community.

36.   Jeremiah may be pointing to another ritual 'formula' as empty as that of the היכל ה' mantra of Jer. 7.4. The שלום formula's 3/4 rhythmic meter is disrupted by the intrusion of ואין before the third שלום (yielding instead a 4/4 meter), perhaps pointing to the more severe tone of Jeremiah's current discourse, where the formulae are not allowed to retain integrity even as literary references.

> Oh that I were in the wilderness (מדבר), in a lodging-place of wayfaring men, that I might leave my people, and go from them! For they are all adulterers, an assembly of treacherous men. (Jer. 9.1)

The imagery of the wilderness and adultery establishes a typological connection with the audience of Jeremiah's earlier work (2.2, 5, 32; 3.1) and his current adversaries.[37] Moreover, the motif of treachery recalls 11.18-23 and the prophet's rejection at the hand of his Shilonite brethren. The prophet goes on to intensify the parallel qualified as part of the שקר discourse, invoking the lexemes of 2.8:

> Jer. 9.2—'And they bend their tongue, their bow of falsehood (שקר); and they are grown mighty in the land, but not for truth; for they proceed from evil to evil, and me they know not (ואתי לא ידעו)', says Yahweh.

> Jer. 2.8—And they that handle the law did not know me (לא ידעוני).

This again carries forward the theme of the Temple Sermon, which charged that the fate of 'Shiloh' would be visited upon Judah unless the prophet's words were heeded. Here, the threat of 7.12-15 has begun to take effect, as the prophet hermeneutically transforms the wise men of the Jerusalem establishment into Judean versions of the Shilonites of Anathoth. The basic transgression is the same: both reject progressive Deuteronomistic ideology.[38]

Verses 3-5 continues the association with the past and, significantly, with his earlier oracles, expressing how the influential Jerusalem establishment has affected the broader Judean population:

> 'Take heed every one of his neighbor, and trust not in any brother; for every brother (כל אח) acts deceptively (עקוב יעקב), and every neighbor slanders (רכיל). And they deceive each one his neighbor, and do not speak the truth; they have taught their tongue to speak lies (שקר), they weary themselves to commit iniquity. Your habitation is in the midst of deceit (מרמה); through deceit they refuse to know me (מאנו דעת אותי)', says Yahweh.

The שקר terminology appears here as an oral teaching (the 'teaching' of the 'tongue'); this sheds light on the castigation levied against Jeremiah and his peers (8.8) for championing the scribal process of exegesis so bound to the

---

37.   Lundbom (*Jeremiah 1–20*, pp. 534-38) and Holladay (*Jeremiah 1*, p. 298) take this verse to be part of the material closing the current form of Jer. 8. McKane (*Jeremiah*, I, p. 198) points out that 9.1 shares the same language as 8.23, but it introduces ideas that are not shared with that verse or the ones immediately surrounding it. These ideas, though, relate quite well to 8.4-12, and thus 9.1 forms a fitting bridge from 8.12 to 9.2-13. The similar language in 8.23 is thus deliberately employed via a later redaction to create rhetorical continuity between the various compositional layers, and is consciously drawn from the extant text of 9.1.

38.   See Overholt, *The Threat of Falsehood*, p. 101; the destructive force mentioned by Overholt is expressed herein as resistance to Deuteronomic development.

Deuteronomistic literature.[39] But as with 8.4-12, the prophet attempts to associate his current enemies with the events of his Josianic-era activity. Jeremiah draws again upon the deceit-among-brethren motif developed in 12.6, applying it broadly to the entire populace who are now being duped into a catastrophic circumstance.[40] That the individual fate of Josiah now applies to Judah is facilitated by identifying 'every brother' (כל אח), and is cemented by the phrase 'acts deceitfully' (עקוב יעקב), a wordplay on the name Jacob once at home in earlier prophecies addressed to the north (2.4).[41] This is further reinforced by the phrase 'slander', rendered as רכיל in the Hebrew text.[42] Given the association Jeremiah makes between the fate of the north and the tentative fate of Judah, the phrase רכיל may be a pun on רחל, 'Rachel'. This would invoke 31.14-15, the reference to Rachel crying for her children, the northern tribes. Just as Rachel mourns for her lost children due to their apostasy, Jeremiah's adversaries are setting themselves up to become the object of mourning due to their own delusions and deceptions.[43] Verses 4-5 complete the invective, highlighting the essential point of Jeremiah's redress: the people cheat each other,[44] and suffer the same condition as the wise men of 9.2 by not 'knowing' Yahweh. The damage is widespread, for deceit (מרמה) is all around. If Jeremiah is attempting to create ties to his earlier northern mission under Josiah, then the term מרמה may be a pun alluding to Rachel's weeping from Ramah in 31.14, and it is therefore no

---

39. Deuteronomy, of course, repeatedly advocates the sacred process of writing (Schniedewind, *Society and the Promise to David*, pp. 76-77) and the Deuteronomistic writers themselves engage in expressly literary methods to build their theology throughout the late seventh–mid-sixth centuries (M.Z. Brettler, 'A "Literary Sermon" in Deuteronomy 4', in Olyan and Culley [eds.], *A Wise And Discerning Mind*, pp. 33-50; Leuchter, 'Jeroboam the Ephratite'). Here, Schniedewind's observations are certainly correct in terms of ancient tensions between oral and written modes of communication (*How the Bible Became a Book*, pp. 119-21, 127, 134-38), though it is not Jeremiah who stands against the written medium but the wise men whom he castigates.

40. Holladay (*Jeremiah 1*, p. 300) points to the possible reliance here upon Isaiah (Isa. 19.2) in relation to Egypt; this observation is significant given the dominance of Egypt over Judah at the time Jer. 9.3 would have been composed.

41. Holladay (*Jeremiah 1*, p. 300) suggests an allusion here to Gen. 25.26 and 27.36, but Jeremiah may also be drawing here from Hos. 12.3-4.

42. The pointing in the MT excludes the *dagesh*, resulting in a homonymous pronunciation with the Hebrew letter *ḥeth*.

43. The Jacob/Rachel dynamic is particularly pertinent if Jeremiah is indeed drawing from Hos. 12, since the same chapter in Hosea alludes to the relationship between Jacob and Rachel (Hos. 12.13).

44. Holladay (*Jeremiah 1*, p. 301) points out that the term יהתלו in v. 4 may refer to Gen. 31.7, where Jacob claims that Laban has mistreated him (אביכן התל). The initial context of this cheating, of course, is with the substitution of Leah for Rachel; this supports our reading of רכיל as an aural pun on the name of Rachel.

accident that the lack of knowledge in 9.5 employs the term מאנו, recalling the near-identical מאנה in 31.14.[45]

Having once again established the gravity of the circumstances, the passage continues with the charge and justification of divine wrath in vv. 6-8:

> Therefore thus says Yahweh of hosts, 'Behold, I will smelt them (הנני צורפם), and try them; for how else should I do, because of the daughter of my people? Their tongue is a sharpened arrow, it speaks deceit; one speaks peaceably to his neighbor with his mouth, but in his heart he lays wait for him. Shall I not punish them for these things?', says Yahweh; 'shall not my soul be avenged on such a nation as this?'

The phrase 'behold, I will smelt them' (הנני צורפם) in v. 6 and the repetition of catchwords from vv. 1-5 in v. 7 both anticipates the language of 10.1-16 (specifically vv. 9, 14)[46] and build to the declaration of 9.9-10: that Yahweh will indeed bring about the mourning and lamentations that his people refuse to accept as a possible consequence for their actions.[47] Jerusalem and the surrounding towns of Judah will be laid waste. The fate of the people in v. 3 comes to a terrible fruition in the decree of judgment, but it is an entirely justified response on the part of Yahweh to a people who refuse to accept his law inclusive of Jeremiah's prophetic decrees. While we might view this declaration of judgment as the climax of the unit, it is only penultimate. Verses 11-13 provide the apex and ultimate purpose of the prophet's message:[48]

---

45.   It should be noted that the term מרמה draws from the Jacob tradition (Gen. 27.35) and is inspired by Hosea's similar discourse (Hos. 12.8). See Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, pp. 377-79. This term indeed creates additional associations with the Rachel references in the Josianic-era oracles, functioning as a *double entendre* with reference to Ramah (רמה). It is in Ramah, Jeremiah had earlier written, where Rachel cries for her lost children (Jer. 31.14). Given the unsuccessful outcome of his mission to those children, it is fitting that Jer. 9.5 suggests that the lack of covenantal knowledge (see Jer. 2.8, which also brings up this term and issue) should be associated with what happened with Rachel's lament in Ramah, that is, the rejection of his prophetic word in the north. The allusion, subtle though it may be to modern readers, would likely have been quite effective if it was written shortly after Jeremiah delivered the Temple Sermon, where the audience was invited to turn their attention to Shiloh (and it is, along with Hosea, a clear example of Fishbane's 'Aggadic Exegesis' [*Biblical Interpretation*, pp. 378-79]). The Shilonites, who once inhabited Ramah, deceived themselves and were cut off from the covenant, and the people of Judah face the same fate.

46.   See below, p. 142.

47.   McKane (*Jeremiah*, I, p. 204) rightly points to the theme of natural obviation in this verse. This carries forward the idea from Jer. 8.7 concerning natural law and the people's rejection of it.

48.   Thiel's proposal (*Jeremia 1–25*, pp. 136-38) that all of vv. 11-15 is exilic thus makes the issue strictly one of Torah vs. Baalism, the latter of which had overtaken the Judean people (so also McKane, *Jeremiah*, I, p. 207). But this does not allow for the

> Who is the wise man (חכם), that he may understand this? And who is he to whom the mouth of Yahweh has spoken (דבר), that he may declare it? Why is the land (ארץ) perished and laid waste like a wilderness (מדבר), so that none pass through? And Yahweh says, 'Because they have forsaken my law (תורתי) which I set before them, and have not hearkened to my voice or walked therein, but have walked after the stubbornness of their own heart (שררות לבם), and after the baalim (הבעלים), which their fathers taught them'.

The formal features of the questions in v. 11 have led some scholars to suggest that this passage dates from a period near or subsequent to the Babylonian conquest of Jerusalem, insofar as the verse alludes to some major devastation and the wisdom-style questions reflect a late time when the standard forms of prophetic announcement were no longer in use.[49] However, a number of elements allow for an earlier dating. If we see this current discourse as relating to the calamitous events surrounding the failure of Josiah's reform, the vision of destruction constitutes a threat that Judah will face a similar fate. The wisdom form, moreover, ridicules the wisdom tradition akin to the structure of 8.9, and the same terminology is deployed (חכם, דבר). Jeremiah uses the discourse form of his adversaries for a rhetorical effect, not because traditional prophetic invective forms had died out.[50]

Additional features allow us to date 9.11-13 as part of his 609–605 debates. As with 8.4-12 and 9.1-5, we see lexical references in vv. 11-13 that relate to the prophet's mission to the north, namely, an emphasis on the land (ארץ; see 2.7; 11.19) and the wilderness imagery (מדבר; see 2.2). We also find reference to the (Deuteronomic) law (תורתי) in v. 12, recalling both 2.8 and 8.8, as well as the charge of Baalism and stubbornness (הבעלים, לבם שררות) in v. 13.[51] This terminological strategy continues the metaphorical association of the Jerusalem establishment and the north, who were also charged with stubbornness and Baalism (2.8, 23; 3.17). Yet here we find a significant difference. The metaphorical Baalism and stubbornness of heart

possibility of improper Torah observance being a *form* of Baalism, which must be the issue at heart in vv. 12-13 in relation to the preceding material in 8.4-12 and 9.1-11; see below. Verses 14-15 are later additions (noted above with reference to Lundbom). See also Holladay, *Jeremiah 1*, p. 308.

49.   Lundbom (*Jeremiah 1–20*, p. 554) argues strenuously for dating the passage between 597 and 586 on account of the references to destruction. Holladay (*Jeremiah 1*, pp. 306-307) posits a late exilic or postexilic date on the basis of the wisdom form inherent to the question.

50.   *Pace* Holladay, *Jeremiah 1*, pp. 306-307.

51.   The fact that vv. 12-13 are prose in form does not require that they derive from a secondary compositional stratum. The keywords here are part of the same stream of discourse as those found in the poetic sections of the passages discussed above. The relationship between the poetry and the prose in this section and elsewhere will be addressed in the conclusion to the present study.

in the early layers of Jeremiah 2–4 referred to illegitimate trust in Assyria–Egypt; in the context of 9.13, the same charges pertain to adherence to illegitimate cultic and theological fetishes and ideologies within Judah. For Jeremiah, the form of the sin may have changed, but both forms constituted faith in illegitimate ideas and institutions.

We thus encounter advancement as well as continuity in Jeremiah's thought. The earlier material dealt with the theological dimensions of inter-national politics (an idea Jeremiah would revisit after the rise of Babylon) while the current debate deals with competing theologies within the bounda-ries of the Judean community. But in both cases, Baalism goes beyond the technical veneration of a Canaanite deity of the same name. It becomes a symbolic term for illegitimate devotion, the hypostatization not only of deities (which was already addressed by the Deuteronomic legislation) but also of ideas, individuals, covenants—and even laws and law-codes them-selves.[52] While the wisdom/cultic establishment of Jerusalem may have wished to subordinate the Deuteronomic Torah to their own preferred sacral traditions, it is unlikely that they would have rejected it outright. The Josianic reform may have failed, but it left a permanent impression upon the religion of Judah. Both the DH and the Jeremianic corpus attest to the per-sistence of Deuteronomic behavior following Josiah's death, though this behavior is presented as devoid of spirit, conviction, or integrity.[53] Rather, the Jerusalem establishment appears to have opted for a policy of literary containment, preserving the written form of the Deuteronomic law but prohibiting its dynamic application or expansion. The Deuteronomic law became, like the Temple, a 'baal', a mere icon that was ritualized and fetishized in the service of what the Jerusalem establishment considered to be the enduring security of the Zion tradition.[54]

The Making of Idols: Jeremiah 10.1-16

It is against this perspective that 10.1-16 responds. The issue at the core of 10.1-16 is not simply idolatrous rituals but the method of *producing* idols;

---

52.   See Halpern, 'Brisker Pipes than Poetry', pp. 95-101.

53.   The presentation of Josiah as a vassal of Necho in 2 Kgs 23.29 (Talshir, 'The Three Deaths of Josiah', pp. 217-18) artificially presents some continuity between Josiah and Jehoiakim, suggesting that some practices may have been retained on a perfunctory or superficial level. Friedman notes that the post-Josianic kings are judged poorly but are not criticized for the Deuteronomistic shortcomings of their pre-Josianic predecessors ('From Egypt to Egypt', p. 174).

54.   The predilection for hypostatization apparently continued well beyond the reign of Jehoiakim; Jer. 34.8-22 reveals that Zedekiah engaged the Deuteronomic laws but reduced them to the status of an empty ritual; see Leuchter, 'Jeremiah's 70-Year Prophecy', p. 506.

Jeremiah does not at all excuse idolaters, but the emphasis is on the component parts of the idols in question and the modes of construction. To this end, the passage shows a strong familiarity with the rituals and methods of idol construction in the surrounding nations throughout the ancient Near East,[55] where the craft of fashioning an idol actually possesses some analogous qualities to the mode of Mosaic prophecy as witnessed in Deuteronomy. Just as the Mosaic prophet speaks Yahweh's words and not his own, the constructor of idols makes clear in a liturgical declaration that the graven image he constructs is not his own but the result of divine initiative. He, like the Israelite prophet, is merely the human vehicle of divine will.[56] As Jeremiah points out, though, the end result of the constructor's activity is a dead icon that must be carried by manual workers in order to move. By contrast, the end result of the Mosaic prophet's activity is the articulated word of Yahweh, the 'living God' (10.10; see below).

The likening of Jerusalem's wise men to followers of Baal in 9.11-13 is amplified by their implicit association with the wise men of foreign nations in 10.7:

> Who would not fear you, O king of the nations? For it befits you; forasmuch as among all the wise men of the nations (חכמי הגוים), and in all their royalty (מלכותם), there is none like you.

The rhetoric of this verse further develops the critique of Solomon running through the previously composed material. Solomon had imported the wisdom tradition into Jerusalem and sullied his reign with foreign idolatry; correcting this mistake was of paramount importance to Josiah during the Deuteronomic reform.[57] Jeremiah's invective condemns his current adversaries for relapsing into Solomonic practice. The use of the term מלכותם invokes the royal tradition that the prophet had already condemned in the Temple Sermon.[58] The verse suggests that the delusions of the Jerusalem cultic and wisdom circles concerning the fetishizing of the Torah make them no different than a foreign nation.

The ensuing verses contrast Yahweh to the result of these fetishistic processes overtly tied to wisdom tradition in v. 9 (מעשׂה חכמים הוא). Just as the

---

55. See Jacobsen, 'The Graven Image', pp. 23-24.

56. Jacobsen, 'The Graven Image', pp. 23-24.

57. Lowery, *The Reforming Kings*, pp. 207-208; Sweeney, 'The Critique of Solomon'. See Barrick, *The King and the Cemeteries*, pp. 196-215, for a detailed compositional analysis of the account of Josiah's measures against Solomon's relics.

58. We should note, however, the Aramaicized form of the word מלכותם, which fits the context of reference to foreign wisdom and anticipated the Aramaic in v. 11. For a brief discussion, see M. Ehrensvärd, 'Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts', in I. Young (ed.), *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology* (JSOTSup, 369; London/ New York: Continuum, 2003), pp. 164-88 (183).

molten images are bereft of life, a static, frozen Torah text as conceived by the Jerusalem establishment is anathema to the 'living God' (אלהים חיים in v. 10), which recalls the deity's earlier characterization as the 'source of living waters' (2.13). The association between the wise men of Jerusalem and those of foreign nations is amplified by v. 11, which conveys its message in Aramaic:

<div dir="rtl">
כדנה תאמרון להום אלהיא די שמיא וארקא לא עבדו
יאבדו מארעה ומן תחות שמיא אלה
</div>

> Thus shall ye say unto them, 'The gods that have not made the heavens and
> the earth, these shall perish from the earth, and from under the heavens.'

The use of Aramaic in this one verse has led to the suggestion that 10.1-16 was composed during the exile or later; other scholars have argued that the verse was composed before the Babylonian conquest but directed to Israelites living in exile or that it was indeed directed to foreign nations.[59] Much of this is founded upon the understanding that the entirety of 10.1-16 is late, but the lexical features of the surrounding text argue against this. As observed above, 10.1-16 is saturated with the חכם terminology found throughout 8.4-12 and 9.1-13, and 10.9 and 10.14 possess the צורף terminology anticipated in 9.6 (הנני צורפם). Jeremiah 10.14 also returns us to the שקר theme running throughout the aforementioned units as well as the Temple Sermon. We are therefore justified in viewing 10.1-16 as part of the same period of composition,[60] and the Aramaic of v. 11 falls into the same stream of discourse by suggesting the generic Near Eastern nature of the Jerusalem elite. Aramaic had earlier been identified as a common vehicle for communication beyond Israel in the episode of the Rabshakeh:

> Then said Eliakim the son of Hilkiah, and Shebnah, and Joah, unto the
> Rabshakeh, 'Speak, I pray you, to your servants *in the Aramean language*; for
> we understand it; and speak not with us in the Judeans' language, in the ears
> of the people that are on the wall'. (2 Kgs 18.26)

The Deuteronomistic author here highlights the notion that the Aramaic language was essentially alien to Judah, functioning only as a means of

---

59.   McKane views the verse as a later gloss and accepts a dating of the passage to the fifth century (*Jeremiah*, I, pp. 218, 225). Margaliot ('Jeremiah x 1-16', p. 307) suggests that the verse was meant for the exiled northerners living among Aramaic-speaking peoples. However, if the passage is post-609, then the north would no longer be an active audience for Jeremiah. Aramaic was used specifically in instances of foreign relations and was well known to the elite of Jerusalem in the late eighth century (2 Kgs 18.26). There is no need to ascribe the verse's message to a distant audience beyond Jerusalem or to an exilic period when Aramaic would have been more commonly spoken.

60.   See n. 7, above.

diplomatic correspondence with foreigners.[61] Jeremiah elucidates this notion in Jer. 10.11, suggesting that they are distant indeed from the sacral discourse of Yahweh. We should note that the content of v. 11 addresses 'heaven and earth' and then reverses the order of these lexemes in depicting the fate of the Jerusalem institutions venerated by the prophet's adversaries:

> The gods that have not made *the heavens* and *the earth*, these shall perish from *the earth*, and from under *the heavens*. (Jer. 10.11)

This further recalls the reversed P creation pattern in 4.23-26 and may constitute another example of the prophet drawing from his Josianic-era oracles in order to address his current audience.

Jeremiah 10.12-16 clarify what Jeremiah felt the 'wise men' of Jerusalem did not understand.[62] It is Yahweh who possesses wisdom (מכין תבל בחכמתו in v. 12); he causes the elemental forces such as wind (רוח in v. 13), a *double entendre* that anticipates the recurrence of the term in v. 14 in the context of 'life' or 'spirit' (certainly a comment on lifeless idols). Verses 15-16 complete the unit: the folly of the foreign nations are 'worthless' (הבל in v. 15),[63] but Yahweh is the prime mover, the grand creator, who is both the unique portion of Jacob (חלק יעקב) and the owner of Israel (ישראל שבט נחלתו). This statement possesses polemical implications, as the matter of Yahweh's 'inheritance' was conveyed to the north in 2.7 (נחלתי שֹמתם לתועבה). The polarity established in 10.1-16 pits foreign practices against the will of Yahweh, and points to the wise men and cultic leaders of Jerusalem as the ones responsible for 'every brother' dealing falsely throughout the population (9.3). The finale of 10.1-16 declares in no uncertain terms that Jeremiah's adversaries are Yahweh's adversaries as well.

We have seen that the texts under consideration in Jeremiah 8–10 exhibit strong similarities with those addressed to the Shilonites and the north. Both collections contain similar stylistic devices, most notably the citation of his adversaries and the likening of variant forms of Yahwism to Baalism. This again reveals the depth of Jeremiah's Deuteronomistic thought, as the Deuteronomists had earlier characterized older and variant forms of Yahwism as foreign and abominable (Deut. 12.2-3; 18.9-14). Jeremiah is not restricted, however, to the confines of extant Deuteronomistic thought: his polemical

---

61. So also F. Polak, 'Style is More than the Person: Sociolinguistics, Literary Culture, and the Distinction between Written and Oral Narrative', in Young (ed.), *Biblical Hebrew*, pp. 38-103 (54-55).

62. Lundbom (*Jeremiah 1–20*, pp. 593-600) identifies vv. 12-16 as a separate unit from vv. 1-10 (though not a separate composition), with both units converging around v. 11 (p. 593).

63. The הבל terminology here resuscitates the language of Jer. 2.5, strengthening the comparison between the prophet's Judean adversaries and his earlier northern audience.

tone, use of metaphor, and hermeneutical suggestions reveal that the prophet was interested in extending the trajectory of that thought. The Deuteronomic Torah and its concept of covenant would be preserved not through subordinating it to Solomonic ideologies but through Jeremiah's prophetic innovation, legitimized by its own mandates (Deut. 17.8-13/18.15-22).

In terms of compositional sequence, it is difficult to posit any detailed reconstruction. The Temple Sermon appears to have been the foundational declaration that spawned the confrontation itself. The adversarial response quoted in Jer. 8.8 suggests that 8.4-12 was the first text composed subsequent to the Temple Sermon, but there is little internal information within 9.1-13 and 10.1-16 as to which of these passages were composed next, or how much time elapsed between their composition. The presence of the צורף terminology in 9.6 and 10.9, 14 indicate that these texts are more closely related to each other than they are to 8.4-12, which lacks this lexeme. But the repetition of other catchwords common to all three units points to a relative temporal proximity to their respective compositions.

The Textual Origination of the Oracles

One thing that seems certain, though, is that the manner of Jeremiah's allusion to his Josianic-era oracles indicates his audience's knowledge of these oracles and attests to their origination on a literary level. Had these oracles been conceived first as oral proclamations only to be remembered much later, Jeremiah would not have been as able to refer to them in such a detailed and subtle manner in Jeremiah 8–10 and expect his Jerusalemite audience to comprehend his message. The Josianic-era oracles may have been copied and collected in such a way that the *literati* of Jerusalem would have had familiarity with them and been able to refer to them.[64] Jeremiah's later redaction of Jeremiah 30–31 suggests that the early version of these oracles rested in an archival state for some time, and this archive may have housed his other Josianic-era material as well.[65] The same may be said about

64. Public access to written prophecy was a hallmark of the eighth through seventh centuries; see Schaper, 'Exilic and Post-Exilic Prophecy', pp. 330-31, 334-35.

65. Peckham (*History and Prophecy*, pp. 302-17) proposes a detailed reconstruction of a Jeremianic archive and persuasively demonstrates the influence of an archival model on the function and shape of the current book of Jeremiah. It is difficult to recover the shape and categories of an actual archive from the extant form of the book as Peckham proposes, but his observations demonstrate an archival form and function to its interrelated passages. For the once-archival state of Jer. 30–31 and their later reuse, see Leuchter, 'Jeremiah's 70-Year Prophecy', pp. 519-20. Pursuant to Williamson's observations ('The Death of Josiah', pp. 246-48), the *Vorlage* to 1 Esd. 1/2 Chron. 35 may also have been associated with this archive, attesting to its persistence during and beyond the prophet's lifetime.

the material under consideration in Jeremiah 8–10. The careful referencing between these oracles (i.e. 9.6 and 10.9, 14) and other traditions points to a textual point of origin. This is not to say that the oracles were not read out loud publicly, but the subtlety and function of these oracles match Deuteronomy's own lemmatic adjustments and literary citations.[66] It is no wonder that the prophet's adversaries chastised him among the scribes in 8.8; Jeremiah's methods and those of the Josianic scribes behind Deuteronomy and the DH are extremely compatible.

The End of the Confrontation

The paucity of wisdom references in later compositions suggests the polemic against the sages came to an end.[67] These subsequent compositions focus more attention on the prophets/priests (Jer. 14.13-17; 20.1-6; 23.9-40; 27–29). Kingship also comes under fire,[68] as do the Canaanite rituals periodically associated with it (19.3-13). It is possible that the end of the polemic against the wise men is due to the deportation of 597 that resulted from Jehoiakim's resistance to Nebuchadnezzar, as they would have likely been among the Jerusalem elite taken captive to Babylon. However, the texts that appeal to this community deal more with false prophecy than with wisdom.[69] As discussed at the beginning of this chapter, the likely event that accounts for this shift is the defeat of Egypt by Babylon at Carchemish in 605.[70] An event of such titanic proportions as Nebuchadnezzar's defeat of Judah's Egyptian suzerain likely forced the prophet to redirect his efforts to more pressing matters such as how this shifting political tide reflected Yahweh's intentions.[71] The polemic against the Jerusalem establishment had to factor into a larger and more comprehensive work; the דבר ה' again unfurled as a particular historical reality, and Jeremiah had to go back to the scriptural drawing board in order to translate it into literary terms. The end result would be the first comprehensive and systematic collection of his oracles: the *Urrolle*.

66. See Levinson, *Deuteronomy*, pp. 4-6.
67. Wisdom is taken up at a later time in Jer. 9.16-23, but from a very different perspective that addresses the wise *women* (not men) and their consideration of the Babylonian crisis. See G. Baumann, 'Jeremia, die Weisen und die Weisheit', *ZAW* 114 (2002), pp. 59-79.
68. Jer. 22.1-30. See also 17.19-27; 21.1-8, 11-14, though these likely derive from a later writer.
69. See Leuchter, 'Jeremiah's 70-Year Prophecy', pp. 517-18.
70. For a discussion of the battle and its ramifications, see King, *Jeremiah*, p. 22; Bright, *A History of Israel*, pp. 326-27; Oded, 'Judah and the Exile', p. 470.
71. So also Margaliot, 'Jeremiah x 1-16', p. 307.

8

JEREMIAH'S SCROLL (THE *URROLLE*)

The Account of the Urrolle*'s Composition:*
History and Hermeneutics

The matter of the historicity of Jeremiah 36—the narrative of how the *Urrolle* was composed and first made public—is one of the most intensely debated topics in modern research into the book of Jeremiah.[1] The chapter is very clearly influenced by 2 Kings 22: a scroll from a Mosaic prophet emerges, it is brought to the king by scribal agents, and the king responds dramatically to its contents.[2] Of course, Jeremiah 36 presents much of this in an antithetical manner: whereas Josiah tore his garments in pious fear, Jehoiakim cuts each column of the scroll with impudence and burns its contents. The account of the composition of a second scroll (Jer. 36.27-32) may address the composition of the supplemental sections of the book of Jeremiah (i.e. chs. 26–45) and legitimize secondary scribal accretions via their qualification as 'many similar words' (36.32). Moreover, the chapter may hermeneutically legitimize the variety of Jeremianic collections that existed in antiquity by suggesting that copies of earlier oracular collections and the new scroll with its secondary accretions were equally authentic in nature.[3]

Nevertheless, the chapter contains much relevant historical information. The dates proposed for Baruch's reading of the scroll (see below) match the dates of known military tensions in the region, the description of the Temple

---

1. For a criticism of the historical veracity of the account, see Isbell, '2 Kings 22.3–23.24 and Jeremiah 36'; Carroll, *From Chaos to Covenant*, pp. 15-16. In addition, see M. Kessler, 'Form-Critical Suggestions on Jer 36', *CBQ* 28 (1966), pp. 389-401; *idem*, 'The Significance of Jer 36', *ZAW* 81 (1969), pp. 381-83.

2. Dearman, 'My Servants the Scribes', pp. 408-11; see also Isbell, 'A Stylistic Comparison'; G. Wanke, *Untersuchungen zur sogenannten Baruchschrift* (BZAW, 122; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1971), pp. 69-70; C. Rietzschel, *Das Problem der Urrolle: Ein Beitrag zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Jeremiabuches* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher [Gerd Mohn], 1966), pp. 97-99.

3. Sharp, 'Take Another Scroll and Write', pp. 508-509.

precincts are vivid and reflect a detailed knowledge of the structure itself,[4] and as observed earlier, the names of the scribes mentioned in Jeremiah 36 have been confirmed in large part in archaeological excavations in Jerusalem.[5] Finally, the oracle in Jer. 36.30 against Jehoiakim went unfulfilled; though it is consistent with the prophet's caustic critique of that king in Jer. 22.13-23, the DH reports that Jehoiakim died in Jerusalem and was buried in the royal tomb (2 Kgs 24.6).[6] If the reporting of the oracle in Jer. 36.30 was an *ex eventu* literary contrivance, we would expect the oracle to reflect history more accurately. The fact that it is technically inaccurate makes its historical veracity more likely. Thus while Jeremiah 36 is concerned with ideological agendas and symbolic or hermeneutical constructs,[7] it is apparently based on actual events and personages. The report of the *Urrolle*'s composition, central as it is to the chapter, is in all likelihood historical as well.

The events of 605 must have been cataclysmic, as the defeat of Egypt at Carchemish initiated a sequence of Babylonian campaigns conducted over the next few years throughout the eastern Mediterranean.[8] The gravity of the situation appears to have been recognized by the inhabitants of Judah, who are reported in Jeremiah 36 to have observed in a solemn fast in 604 at the time that Baruch b. Neriah entered the Temple to read from Jeremiah's *Urrolle*. The LXX version of the episode, by contrast, points to the year 601 for Baruch's reading of the scroll.[9] Both years would have been ripe for such a reading, as the Babylonians were campaigning in nearby Philistia in 604 and against the Judean suzerain Egypt in 601. In both cases, the wisdom of maintaining allegiance to Egypt would be up for review with the intimidating immanence of Babylon. Of the two options, 604 would seem the more likely choice: the LXX agrees with the MT of Jer. 36.1-2 that Jeremiah began collating and arranging his work in 605 (likely in response to the outcome at Carchemish), and the sense of immediacy and desperation in Jeremiah 36

---

4.   The description of the scribe's chamber within the Temple in Jer. 36.10 would be consistent with the closeness of these scribes with the Temple priests; see Barrick, 'Josiah's Eighth Year', pp. 575-78. It would further account for the 'finding' of Deuteronomy in the Temple in 2 Kgs 22.8, a symbolic statement on the sacral role of the scribes behind the composition of that document.

5.   Dearman, 'My Servants the Scribes', pp. 417-20; Lundbom, *Jeremiah 21–36*, p. 298; Avigad, 'Hebrew Seals', pp. 11-12.

6.   Lundbom's suggestion that the DH conceals a more violent death suffered by Jehoiakim is unlikely (*Jeremiah 1–20*, p. 104). The DH does not pull punches in evaluating that king as wicked (2 Kgs 23.37) and no practical purpose would be served by obscuring the account of a violent death.

7.   Sharp, 'Take Another Scroll and Write', pp. 508-509.

8.   See Lundbom, *Jeremiah 1–20*, p. 104, for a discussion of these events.

9.   'The eighth year of Jehoiakim' in LXX Jer. 43.9.

suggests that the prophet and his peer Baruch would not have taken four years to complete their task.

The task, however, was daunting. The oracles spanning 627–605 included the early call narrative and propagandistic oracles (Jer. 1.1-7; 30–31), threat oracles (chs. 2–4), a call to vengeance and declaration of war (11.18-23), personal communication to Josiah (12.5-6), lamentations following Josiah's death (4.19-23), a meditation on the prophet's career following the failure of the reform (20.14-18), the Temple Sermon (7.1-15), debates with the sages and cultic elite of Jerusalem (8.4-12; 9.1-13; 10.1-16), and in all likelihood other brief texts deriving from the pre-605 period.[10] These texts reflected vastly different concerns and were addressed to diverse audiences, but two elements could facilitate their redaction into a single scroll. The first, as discussed earlier, is the very likely existence of an archive that would have preserved different copies of these disparate texts in earlier forms known to Jeremiah's audience; updates and redactions would thus be obvious, deliberately calling attention to themselves as new theological/rhetorical overtures.[11] The second is the methodological precedent already evident on the compositional level in the prophet's extant oracles. Jeremiah's earliest oracles to the north had attempted to harmonize his own words with earlier tradition; his oracles from the years 609–605 do the same with respect to his Josianic-era work. These texts were thus open to dramatic redefinition. The composition of the *Urrolle* involved more than just editing and redactional expansion. Older passages would receive updates to bind them structurally and hermeneutically to new texts originating with the *Urrolle*'s composition. This would account for many of the doublets in the first part of the book (e.g. 6.13-15 and the older 8.10b-12),[12] as new texts would establish overt

---

10. Lundbom notes that Jer. 15.16-17 appears to address the 'discovery' of Deuteronomy in 622 (*Jeremiah 1–20*, pp. 743-44); the words of distress voiced by the prophet may relate to his difficult work in Anathoth and the resistance of its citizenry to Jeremiah's mission. Jer. 18.18-23 appears to date from the period of 609–605, as it preserves the tensions between Jeremiah and the wise men and cultic functionaries evident during this period (see above, Chapter 7).

11. See Peckham, 'Writing and Editing', pp. 382-83, for the self-consciousness of the editorial process and the deliberate challenge to the reader to recognize the new meaning conveyed through the combination of redactional strata.

12. See G. Parke-Taylor, *The Formation of the Book of Jeremiah: Doublets and Recurring Phrases* (SBLMS, 51; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000), pp. 93-98. Parke-Taylor notes that Jer. 8.10b-12 is missing in the LXX, and Lundbom suggests that 8.10b-12 has been adapted into its present context within an *inclusio* in vv. 10a and 12a (*Jeremiah 1–20*, p. 517). The use of the *inclusio*, however, is inherent to Jer. 8–10, which deploys similar devices on a larger macrostructural level (e.g. the תורה *inclusio* in 8.8 and 9.12), whereas the counterpart passage in 6.13-15 is an isolated note in its larger context. This points to the origin of the doublet within 8.10-12 and supports our position

symbolic connections with the old. The result is a literary work that was not to be read in a linear way, but studied and consulted as a complex system of thought and theology.

The Expansion of the Call Narrative

As many scholars have noted, the call narrative possesses several redactional levels. The composition of the *Urrolle* would seem a natural starting point for updating the initial material spanning Jer. 1.1-7 with a statement on the prophet's post-Carchemish role:

> Then Yahweh put forth his hand, and touched my mouth; and Yahweh said to me, 'Behold, I have put my words in your mouth; see, I have this day set you over the nations and over the kingdoms, to root out and to pull down, and to destroy and to overthrow; to build, and to plant'. Moreover the word of Yahweh came to me, saying, 'Jeremiah, what do you see?' And I said, 'I see a rod of an almond-tree'. Then Yahweh said to me, 'You have seen well; for I watch over my word to perform it'. (Jer. 1.9-12)

The new verses very plainly summarize the prophet's new purpose—to tear down old invalid institutions and establish new ones (v. 10) by virtue of his Mosaic authority (v. 9; see Deut. 18.18) which Yahweh will certainly validate (vv. 11-12). The path for Jeremiah's self-identification as carrying forward Mosaic (or Mushite) tradition had already been cleared in the earlier layers of the call narrative via the references to Moses and Samuel (Jer. 1.6), but Jer. 1.9 is unique in the prophetic corpus or the DH. The claim to Deuteronomic Mosaic succession is implied elsewhere concerning various prophetic figures (1 Kgs 19; Hos. 9.7-8/12.13; 2 Kgs 22.14-20), however, nowhere else is it *overtly* declared. The overt reference to Deut. 18.18 is meant to strike fear and awe into the heart of the audience or reader. It makes absolutely clear, in no uncertain terms, that what is to follow must be understood as equally binding as the Deuteronomic law ascribed to Moses.

It is unlikely that this self-perception would have characterized the prophet's earliest activity under Josiah. Though Jeremiah was certainly an advocate of Deuteronomy early in his Josianic-era career, he does not engage in parenetic exhortation in the oracles from that time. Deuteronomy 17.9 specifies that while the Levitical priests constitute a class, the 'judge who will be [there] in those days' is a single individual holding a single office.[13]

---

that 6.13-15 is a proleptic reference. The absence of 8.10-12 in the LXX may result from a subsequent copy of the larger *Urrolle* or even a later edition of the Jeremianic corpus, where the copyist accidentally or deliberately left out the passage.

13. So also Wilson, *Prophecy and Society*, p. 165, though the holding of this 'office' in the pre-Josianic period may simply be a matter of rhetorical construction within the literature.

2 Kings 22.14-20 makes clear that this office was held by Huldah, and her selection provides a neat parallel to the legends of Deborah, the earliest Israelite reported in the DH to be a 'prophet' (אשה נביאה) during the post-wilderness period. The literary presentations of both are very similar:

> 2 Kgs 22.14—[Josiah's agents went to] Huldah *the prophetess* (הנביאה)*, the wife of* (אשת) Shallum the son of Tikvah, the son of Harhas, keeper of the wardrobe—*and she dwelt* (והיא ישבת) in Jerusalem in the second quarter, *and they spoke with her.*

> Judg. 4.4-5—Now Deborah, *a prophetess* (אשה נביאה)*, the wife of* (אשת) Lappidoth, she judged Israel at that time. *And she dwelt* (והיא יושבת) under the palm of Deborah between Ramah and Bethel in the hill-country of Ephraim; *and the children of Israel came up to her* for judgment.

The presentation of Huldah creates a closing 'frame' to Mosaic prophecy in the Josianic DH. It would only be years later, after the disappearance of Huldah and the death of Josiah, that Jeremiah could lay claim to this office. The reference to Deut. 18.18 in Jer. 1.9 presents this eventual claim as part of Yahweh's cosmic mandate for the prophet, bound to his call from before birth (v. 5).

Jeremiah's mission, dating back to his purpose behind the mission to the Shilonites, is primarily one of transformation—'to destroy' and 'root out' that which is archaic and futile; and 'to build and to plant' that which is vital to covenantal sustenance. As observed earlier, it is in Jer. 1.10 that his role as prophet 'to the nations' (v. 5) is expanded to include 'kingdoms'. This carries major implications for the audience of 605 and beyond, especially in relation to the outcome of the battle of Carchemish.[14] If Israel is no longer the center of the world but a smaller part of it, then 'the nations' themselves are no longer the mixed populations of the northern kingdom but the larger empires that Yahweh would use to affect Judah's fate. It is no longer the lowly nations who are to be subject to Israelite hegemony, but Israel that is to be subject to Yahweh's international agenda.[15] That *this* is now what Yahweh ordained before Jeremiah's birth—in other words, in sacred time—

---

14.   The oracle against Egypt in Jer. 46 was therefore probably once a part of the *Urrolle*, since it is dated to 605, mentions Carchemish (v. 2), and falls under the category of the prophet as a messenger to 'nations and kingdoms'. Its current position in the OAN derives from subsequent editing as Jeremiah's book developed.

15.   This ideology is prefaced by Isaiah's earlier reading of Assyrian dominance as Yahweh's will (Isa. 10.5) before the Hezekian emphasis on Jerusalemite centrality (so also Halpern, 'Brisker Pipes than Poetry', pp. 95-97). This reaffirmation follows the defensive response pattern to historical calamity; see Ben Zvi, 'History and Prophetic Texts', pp. 106-20. Jeremiah's purpose, following that of Isaiah, runs against the grain of traditional self-aggrandizing responses to historical pressure, a response that seems to dominate the post-609 culture against which he contends in chs. 8–10.

bestows upon the prophet's redaction the authority claimed by his earlier texts. As many other texts in the Jeremianic corpus reveal, the charge of Jer. 1.10 indeed becomes foundational to subsequent understandings of the prophet's career (e.g. 31.27; 42.10; 45.4).

Continuing with this literary strategy, vv. 11-12 fuse the motif of planting/uprooting with the שֹקֵד motif of Jeremiah 8–10 (and, perhaps, the Temple Sermon as well) by implicitly referring to the things Jeremiah 'sees' as an almond tree, a שֹקֵד, with the ד standing in for the similar-looking ר of שֶקֶר (v. 11). The visual pun calls attention to itself—Yahweh is 'watching' over his word, thus suggesting that the reader pay attention to the close visual similarities between שֹקֵד and שֶקֶר. The reference is meta-literary, as it implies that paying close attention to Jeremiah's words of truth will safeguard against falling prey to the words of 'falsehood' that no doubt circulated at the time of the *Urrolle*'s composition. The play on words continues in v. 12 with Yahweh stating that he will watch over (שׁוקֵד) his דבר and apply it. This in turn affirms Jeremiah's authority, for Jer. 1.1, 4, and 9 associate the prophet and the record of his activity with the דבר terminology. Jeremiah's prophecies, says the deity, represent the דבר to be applied at the end of v. 12.

Finally, vv. 13-16 point to the redaction of an earlier collection via the overt mention of a second, separate revelation (ויהי דבר ה׳ אלי שֵׁנִית in v. 13). The inclusion of this second vision reinforces the applicability of the ideas that emerged from Jeremiah's earlier activity via a northern foe that will punish Judah for ignoring Jeremiah's words from the years 609–605, and it has been suggested that the second vision indeed fulfills the first.[16] The imminent northern threat, part of the second דבר, anticipates the impeding danger facing Judah in metaphorical terms.[17] (Verses 17-19 may be of later provenance, reflecting upon subsequent difficulties faced by the prophet as his career continued, though they may also simply address the tumultuous nature of his career to date.[18])

The new purpose of the call narrative infused it with a darker, more threatening tone informed by the prophet's experiences to date. One verse in particular (1.8) appears to address these experiences overtly:

---

16. See Lundbom, 'Rhetorical Structures'.

17. See below for a discussion on the identity of the foe. The notion of threat from the north is already present in the pre-605 oracles on a typological-metaphorical level (Jer. 8.12).

18. Holladay (*Jeremiah 1*, p. 43) identifies vv. 17-19 as later additions to the call narrative geared to account for ongoing difficulty that the prophet encountered during his career. Lundbom (*Jeremiah 1–20*, pp. 240-41) sees these verses as part of the same stratum of composition as vv. 13-16, in large part due to the ascription of certain texts to a state of extant composition by the time the call narrative was formed.

'Be not afraid of them; for I am with you to deliver you, says Yahweh.'

The incorporation of the oracles against the Jerusalem establishment in Jeremiah 8–10 might account for this promise of salvation from adversity, but there is nothing in those oracles to suggest that Jeremiah's life was put at risk.[19] Rather, this verse appears to anticipate the difficulty Jeremiah faced at the hands of the Shilonites of Anathoth, who threatened his life (11.21). There is no indication that the oracles of the Josianic period were worked into a single collection early on, and we should not assume that 1.8 was added at that time. Such an addition, however, *does* fit the background to the *Urrolle's* composition, at which point the call narrative was dislodged from chs. 30–31 and put at the head of the *Urrolle*. It is therefore likely that 1.8 was inserted to anticipate the threat we encounter in 11.21, but also to anticipate the threat oracles constituting what is now Jeremiah 2–6.[20]

The Expansion of the Threat Oracles

The expansion of the early northern threat oracles consisted of minor additions to original text units (especially the statement concerning Judah's rampant apostasy in 2.28),[21] the insertion of a significant prose oracle (3.6-11) and the supplementation with a fairly long expanse of new poetic oracles (4.3–6.30) that anticipate the Temple Sermon and the related oracles in Jeremiah 8–10. We should turn our attention first to the prose oracle:

> And Yahweh said unto me in the days of Josiah the king, 'Did you see that which backsliding Israel (משבה ישראל) did? She went up upon every high mountain and under every leafy tree, and there played the harlot. And I said, "After she has done all these things, she will return unto me; but she returned not". And her treacherous sister Judah (בגודה אחותה יהודה) saw it. And I saw, when, forasmuch as backsliding Israel had committed adultery (נאפה), I had put her away and given her a bill of divorcement (ספר כריתתיה), that yet treacherous Judah her sister feared not; but she also went and played the harlot; and it came to pass through the lightness of her harlotry, that the land was polluted, and she committed adultery with stones and with stocks; and yet for all this her treacherous sister Judah has not returned to me with her whole heart, but in falsehood (בשקר)', says Yahweh; and Yahweh said to me, 'Backsliding Israel has proved herself more righteous than treacherous Judah'. (Jer. 3.6-11)

---

19.   It is possible that the 'trial' in Jer. 26 reflects such a perilous moment for the prophet, but this chapter has been constructed for primarily ideological purposes. See K.M. O'Connor, ' "Do Not Trim a Word": The Contribution of Chapter 26 to the Book of Jeremiah', *CBQ* 51 (1989), pp. 617-30.

20.   The call for vengeance in Jer. 11.18-23, which resulted from Jeremiah's oracles in chs. 2–4, will be discussed below.

21.   See Sweeney, *King Josiah*, pp. 217-21, for an overview.

Some scholars have viewed this passage as a post-Jeremianic addition of exilic or even Persian-period origin.[22] While these commentators point to its formal differences with the surrounding poetry and the author's 'mining' of that poetry (especially as regards the terms משבה and בגדה; see Jer. 3.1, 14, 20),[23] many of these terms also appear in the oracles Jeremiah directed to the Jerusalem establishment between 609 and 605, which (as we have seen) drew from the Josianic-era oracles:

Jer. 8.4:	אם ישוב ולא ישוב
Jer. 8.5:	ירושלים משבה נצחת
Jer. 9.1:	כלם מנאפים עצרת בגדים

Not only does 3.6-11 draw from these post-Temple Sermon oracles, but its ascription of שקר to Judah in v. 10 ties into the שקר theme so strongly developed in these oracles, identifying them as a source. This does not point to a secondary author's mining of the immediately surrounding poetic material, but a broader vision and contextual awareness of the composition history of Jeremiah 8–10. The passage may therefore be ascribed to Jeremiah himself.[24] The 'bill of divorcement' (ספר כריתתיה) may constitute an allusion to the Josianic-era threat oracles (chs. 2–4) surrounding 3.6-11. This possibility is supported by the earlier reference in 2.7 and 3.1 to the very same Deuteronomic law of divorce referred to in 3.8 (see ספר כריתת in Deut. 24.1). It is also possible that the bill of divorcement in question constitutes an oblique reference to the Temple Sermon, where Yahweh has declared that the 'whole seed of Ephraim' has finally been cast away (7.15). In either case, the tone of 3.6-11 matches that of the Temple Sermon: Judah has not yet been divorced, but the marriage is very much in danger.

The placement of 3.6-11 into its current position serves several purposes: it reinforces the hermeneutical association of the audiences of Jeremiah 2–4 and 8–10, and declares that this association does not address a mere political squabble in Jerusalem, but, rather, relates strongly to the place of international forces that led to the failure of Josiah's reform. The dating of this revelation to the Josianic era is reminiscent of 1.5, where the prophet's Josianic-era career is mandated well before the prophet's lifetime. The revelation in 3.6-11 thus takes place in sacred, mythic time alongside the prophet's pre-natal call. Its insertion into its present context extends this

---

22. Thiel, *Jeremia 1–25*, pp. 85-91 (though he admits that there is little Deuteronomistic language in this passage); McKane, *Jeremiah*, I, pp. 68-69; Holladay, *Jeremiah 1*, p. 81.

23. Thiel, *Jeremia 1–25*, p. 88; Lundbom, *Jeremiah 1–20*, p. 306.

24. So also Sweeney, *King Josiah*, pp. 221-25, especially p. 224; Kaufman, 'Rhetoric, Redaction and Message', p. 67.

same sacred dimension to the oracles of the *Urrolle*, and addresses the impending presence of Babylon.[25] Finally, the parenetic form also conforms to Jeremiah's adoption of the Mosaic office as his own, facilitating the continuity between the *Urrolle* and the Deuteronomistic style of prophetic declaration.

   The poetic units that follow in Jer. 4.3–6.30 provide a commentary on the state of Judean religion. The call for Israel to repent is extended to Judah as well (4.3-4), made urgent by the reference once again to the foe from the north (4.6) that will descend upon Judah should Jeremiah's audience rebuke him. The foe is unnamed, but is probably not meant to be a mythic entity.[26] That the foe is from the 'north' suggests that the archetype is drawn from the texts already worked into this redaction that dealt with 'northern enemies', that is, Assyria and Egypt (who had massed forces at Carchemish in 616, far north of Israel).[27] Yet by the time of the composition of the *Urrolle* Assyria was no more and Egypt was not a threat but an overlord. There is every reason to accept the view that the foe is a reference to Babylon, the inheritor of the power once wielded by Assyria–Egypt. But unlike previous face-offs against Mesopotamian foes (such as Sennacherib in 701),[28] the terms and security of the covenant will not survive the fury of Babylon. Here, Jeremiah redeploys the text of Jer. 4.20-21 that addressed the failure of the Josianic program, but goes on in v. 22 to identify the current problem that would see history repeat itself:

   25.   Margaliot, 'Jeremiah x 1-16', p. 307.

   26.   *Contra* A.C. Welch, *Jeremiah: His Time and his Work* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), pp. 110-26; C.F. Whitley, 'Carchemish and Jeremiah', *ZAW* 80 (1968), pp. 38-49 (42-44); B.S. Childs, 'The Enemy from the North and the Chaos Tradition', in Perdue and Kovacs (eds.), *A Prophet to the Nations*, pp. 151-61, though Childs argues that the foe in Jeremiah is a mediating factor between an actual enemy and a mythic one. Most scholars have abandoned the Scythian hypothesis suggested by A. Malamat ('The Historical Setting of Two Biblical Prophecies on the Nations', *IEJ* 1 [1950–51], pp. 155-59), citing a lack of archaeological evidence to support a Scythian presence. See M. Avi-Yonah, 'Scythopolis', *IEJ* 12 (1962), pp. 123-34.

   27.   Jeremiah's employment of the 'foe' theme draws upon Isaiah's references to the Assyrian onslaught, especially Isa. 5.1-10, 25-30 and 10.1-11. Assyria had dominated prophetic consciousness since the time of Isaiah and informs much of the rhetoric in Deuteronomy and the DH. See Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, pp. 88-138; Sweeney, *King Josiah*, pp. 166-67; E. Otto, 'Rechtsreformen in Deuteronomium xii–xxvi und im mittelassyrichen Kodex der Tafel A (KAV 1)', in J.A. Emerton (ed.), *Congress Volume: Paris, 1992* (VTSup, 61; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995), pp. 239-73; P. Machinist, 'The Rab Šāqēh at the Wall of Jerusalem: Israelite Identity in the Face of the Assyrian "Other"', *Hebrew Studies* 41 (2000), pp. 151-68 (163-66).

   28.   See Halpern, 'Jerusalem and the Lineages', pp. 28-41, for a discussion of Sennacherib's campaign into Judah in 701 and the archaeological evidence supporting the Assyrian king's claims of having demolished the Judean hinterland.

> For my nation is foolish, they know me not; they are sottish children, and they have no understanding; they are wise to do evil (חכמים המה לרעה) but to do good they have no knowledge (לא ידעו). (Jer. 4.22)

The lack of covenantal knowledge (לא ידעו) is rooted in the delusions of 'wisdom' (חכמים המה), which further anticipates the post-Temple Sermon oracles in Jeremiah 8–10. At this point, Jeremiah masterfully re-incorporates his 'sealing' of the P ideology from his Josianic-era career into the current *Urrolle* unit (Jer. 4.23-26). The introduction of a syntactically dependent clause in v. 27 (כִּי כה אמר ה') calls attention to the submerging of the older unit into its new and more comprehensive context.

Jeremiah 5 continues with further anticipations of what is to come: v. 1 wonders if there are people in Jerusalem who stand in good faith, but this search yields no good result: v. 2 reveals that those who swear by Yahweh do so in falsehood (שקר). This establishes typological connections with older traditions concerning the threats to a city's existence, namely, Abraham's desire to find righteous men in Sodom (Gen. 18.22-33)[29]—the reference could hardly be less subtle in conveying the gravity of the circumstances. A potential identification of factions responsible for these circumstances is then presented:

> And I said, 'Surely these are simple folk (דלים); they are foolish, for they know not the way of Yahweh, nor the ordinance (משפט) of their God; I shall go to the great ones (הגדלים) and shall speak to them, for they (המה) surely know the way of Yahweh, the ruling of their God, but (אך) they together (המה יחדו) have broken the yoke and burst the harnesses'. (Jer. 5.4-5)

The passage identifies both the 'great ones' (הגדלים) and the 'simple folk' (דלים) as culpable;[30] this implies that the 'great ones' have led the simpletons down the path of iniquity. That these 'great ones' do not know the divine משפט prefaces the dynamic that will later surface in 8.9, where the wise men do not know the divine דבר. Furthermore, the association of 'great ones' and 'simple folk' looks forward to 8.10, where the Jerusalem establishment has misguided the population ('from the least to the greatest [ועד גדול]').

A comparison between the גדל terminology here and in Jer. 45.5 is suggestive of the identity of those being criticized. Baruch is instructed not to seek 'great things' (גדלות) for himself. The superscription in 45.1 is dated to the same year as the composition of the *Urrolle*, namely, 605. The confluence of the date and the גדל terminology against which Baruch is counseled

---

29.   The parallels between vv. 1-8 and the story of Abraham's attempted intervention on behalf of Sodom have been noted by Lundbom (*Jeremiah 1–20*, p. 376), Holladay (*Jeremiah 1*, p. 176), McKane (*Jeremiah*, I, p. 115), and Carroll (*Jeremiah*, p. 176). Sweeney has demonstrated that the tradition was already well known during the Josianic period and employed in the composition of Judg. 19–21 (*King Josiah*, p. 119).

30.   This is indeed how Lundbom translates the verse (*Jeremiah 1–20*, pp. 372-79).

supports the proposed rift between scribes such as Baruch and the other members of the Jerusalem elite who could be considered 'great ones' in 5.5. That the 'great ones' of 5.5 is an allusion to Jeremiah's wisdom/cultic adversaries is confirmed by v. 9, which closes the unit,[31] and which closely follows 9.8, part of the polemic against those adversaries:[32]

> Jer. 5.9—'Shall I not punish for these things?', says Yahweh; 'and shall not my soul be avenged on such a nation as this?'

> Jer. 9.8—'Shall I not punish them for these things?', says Yahweh; 'shall not my soul be avenged on such a nation as this?'

A complex relationship obtains between 9.8, 5.9, and 5.29, as this last verse repeats the lexemes of 5.9, creating an *inclusio*. Within this *inclusio*, Jeremiah once again quotes his adversaries:

> They have belied Yahweh, and said, 'It is not he, neither shall evil come upon us; neither shall we see sword nor famine; and the prophets shall become wind, and the word is not in them; thus be it done unto them'. (Jer. 5.12-13)

Jeremiah's adversaries not only reject his message, but also apparently claim that prophecy itself (presumably, that of the Deuteronomic variety) is an empty practice. To this, Jeremiah responds with vehemence: his prophetic word will be a consuming fire (v. 14). The unnamed foe is again invoked and depicted in very real, non-mythologized terms (vv. 15-17), drawing heavily upon the imagery from Deuteronomy 28.[33] Verses 19-28 establish that this is a warning rather than a decree of finalized judgment: the calamity will befall the nation because they have fallen into the trap set by those who

---

31.   For Jer. 5.9 as the end of the unit, see Lundbom, *Jeremiah 1–20*, pp. 371-83.

32.   Lundbom (*Jeremiah 1–20*, p. 410) also calls attention to the shared language with 5.9 and 9.8. Parke-Taylor (*Formation*, pp. 187-88) points out the wisdom form of the question. See also W. Brueggemann, 'Jeremiah's Use of Rhetorical Questions', *JBL* 92 (1973), pp. 358-74 (364); Brueggemann suggests that the phrase was independent and drawn upon as needed by Jeremiah, but if the question possesses wisdom dynamics, then its use is deliberate and anticipates the polemic against the wise men. Pohlmann's suggestion that Jer. 7–8 disturbs the unity of the materials that employ the question must be rejected (see K.F. Pohlmann, *Studien zum Jeremiabuch: Ein Beitrag zur Frage nach der Entstehung des Jeremiabuches* [FRLANT, 118; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978], p. 161), since Jer. 7–8 is intrinsically linked to the debates against the wise.

33.   So also Lundbom (*Jeremiah 1–20*, p. 396). McKane (*Jeremiah*, I, p. 123) suggests that the corresponding LXX material is shorter due to the influence of Deut. 28.49, which possesses truncated phraseology. Thiel (*Jeremia 1–25*, p. 97) also notes the similarities to Deut. 28.49-52 but the differences in vocabulary lead him to suggest that the Jeremianic passage predates the Deuteronomic. This has been demonstrated as unlikely by Halpern ('Why Manasseh', pp. 497-501), since Huldah's oracle already invokes Deut. 28, and Jeremiah's Temple Sermon—composed prior to Jer. 5—is informed by Huldah's oracle.

have rejected Jeremiah's words. The wide variety of intimidating oracles contained in the *inclusio* of 5.9-29 becomes a specific collection to which the reader may refer back to upon reaching the coda of 9.8.[34] Listening to those who deny Jeremiah (i.e. the wise men addressed in Jer. 9.1-13) will result in the curses of Deuteronomy 28 coming true, because Jeremiah's word is part of the same Deuteronomistic tradition denied by the wise men.

Jeremiah 6 opens with a reference once again to an impending calamity from the north, but contains a rather curious allusion to Benjamin:

> Put yourselves under cover, children of Benjamin, away from the midst of Jerusalem. (Jer. 6.1)

Considering the calamitous events that befell Jeremiah at the Benjaminite town of Anathoth, it may seem odd that the prophet should here appear to warn Benjaminites to protect themselves. But vv. 3-5 suggest a broader association with the earlier oracles to the north:

> The comely and delicate one, the daughter of Zion, will I cut off. Shepherds (רעים) with their flocks come unto her; they pitch their tents against her round about; they feed bare every one what is nigh at hand. 'Prepare war against her; arise, and let us go up at noon! Woe unto us, for the day declines, for the shadows of the evening are stretched out! Arise, and let us go up by night, and let us destroy her palaces.'

In these verses, Jeremiah revisits the language of his threat oracles to the north, which had left some room for the Shilonites yet to take up the role of regional administrators to shepherd the north toward Josianic hegemony and Deuteronomic policy (רעים in 3.15). In 6.3, the 'shepherds' are still Yahweh's agents, but the tables have turned, as they are now poised to attack Jerusalem day and night. The children of Benjamin (an allusion to the men of Anathoth) are excluded from this punishment not because they have won divine favor but because they are no longer part of the covenantal community that faces punishment. This recalls the parameters of divine chastisement articulated over a century earlier by the prophet Amos:[35]

> You only have I known of all the families of the earth; therefore I will visit upon you all your iniquities. (Amos 3.2)

As with Amos's threat, Jeremiah implies that an impending calamity derives from Yahweh and possesses a covenantal dimension. Jeremiah 6.8, however,

---

34. *Pace* Brueggemann ('Rhetorical Questions', p. 364). As Wilson notes, this device is also found in Deut. 29.21-27 and 1 Kgs 9.8-9 (*Prophecy and Society*, p. 236), though Friedman identifies these verses as exilic ('From Egypt to Egypt', pp. 182-83). The commonalities demonstrate congruence between schools of thought rather than Brueggemann's proposed free adaptation model.

35. See Lalleman-de Winkel, *Jeremiah in Prophetic Tradition*, pp. 183-85.

notes that however bleak Jeremiah's picture might be, the opportunity for repentance is still available. Like the original threat oracles to the north, the population of Judah can be saved if they admit their wrongdoing and return to Yahweh's good graces. If they refuse, he will remove his 'soul' from their midst and render the land desolate (ארץ לוא נושבה). That Judah is the only proper recipient of this threat is made explicit in vv. 9-10: Yahweh tells Jeremiah to 'turn his hand' once again to Judah, identified as the last 'remnant of Israel'.

This brings us to the curious statement in v. 11 concerning Jeremiah's 'holding in' of Yahweh's wrath.[36] Since vv. 10-11 are from the same speaker (Jeremiah), the 'wrath of Yahweh' parallels the דבר ה' mentioned in the previous verse.[37] The implication is that the current *Urrolle* is a single exhortation with the force and power of a persistent divine message that has been held back in its full form. The statement also aligns the disparate oracles as a single דבר addressing a new and immediate concern, despite the diachronic nature of these oracles. The comment about 'holding back' the divine word may also relate to the response to Jeremiah's Temple Sermon, delivered long after he had begun his prophetic career. As we have seen, it is with the Temple Sermon that Jeremiah makes his first public appearance as a Mosaic prophet, delivering a parenetic proclamation in keeping with the Mosaic prophets of Deuteronomistic tradition. Jeremiah likely faced the charges of being a 'Johnny-come-lately' Mosaic prophet by those who sought to rebuke him, and their charges may have compromised his credibility.[38]

As such, the conclusion to Jeremiah 6 is a meditation on the history of the relationship between the Mosaic prophets and the nation. That this follows the sub-unit associating Jeremiah with Mosaic methods is no surprise, as it anchors his 'new' message in ancient tradition (the 'old paths' in v. 16). Verses 17-21 indeed invoke old traditions but demonstrate their current applicability and what can be expected if they continue to be abrogated:

> 'And I set watchmen (צופים) over you: attend to the sound of the horn (קול שפור), but they said, "We will not attend". Therefore hear, O nations (שמעו הגוים), and know, O congregation, what is against them. Hear, O earth (שמעי הארץ): behold, I will bring evil upon this people, even the fruit of their

---

36.   So Lundbom, *Jeremiah 1–20*, pp. 422-23, concerning the dialogic qualities of Jer. 6.9-12. Parke-Taylor (*Formation*, p. 96) also points this out, though he sets the upper limit of the unit at v. 9.

37.   McKane (*Jeremiah*, I, p. 146) suggests that it is the city of Jerusalem that will pour out Yahweh's anger, but this seems pedestrian in the context of a dialogue where Jeremiah is one of the speakers (and the speaker of this verse as well, since the other speaker, Yahweh, would more rightly refer to it as 'my anger'; see Isa. 10.5).

38.   The counter-lodging of the שקר threat against Jeremiah and his scribal peers in Jer. 8.8 (based on the prophet's own accusation in 7.4) was likely part of this challenge to his legitimacy.

thoughts (מחשבותם), because they have not attended to my words (דברי), and as for my teaching (תורתי), they have rejected it. To what purpose is to me the frankincense that comes from Sheba, and the sweet cane, from a far country? Your burnt offerings are not acceptable, nor your sacrifices pleasing unto me.' Therefore thus says Yahweh, 'Behold, I will lay before this people stumbling blocks (מכשלים), and the fathers and the sons together shall stumble against them (יכשלו בם), the neighbor and his friend, and they shall perish'.

This passage contains a rapid succession of allusions. Jeremiah identifies himself with the Zophim who preserved the divine dialogue begun at Sinai (קול שׁופר);[39] the call to the nations and the earth as witnesses invokes Deut. 32.1, 43; the empty ritual and sacrifices involving items from as far as Sheba recalls once more the polemic against Solomon;[40] the 'fruit of their thoughts' (מחשבותם) points to the call for vengeance against the Shilonites in Jer. 11.19 (כי עלי חשׁבו מחשׁבות); and finally, the stumbling of the nation looks forward to the prophet's oracle against his establishment adversaries in Jerusalem (בעת פקדתם יכשׁלו in Jer. 8.12).[41]

The entirety of the prophetic tradition, the Sinai covenant, Deuteronomic law, and Jeremiah's earlier oracles are fused into a single exhortation. Jeremiah's message is part of a trajectory of faith that has time and again been rejected by the people, and, as the closing verses of Jeremiah 6 demonstrate, Yahweh's patience has run out. The calamity that will result from the rejection of the ensuing texts of the *Urrolle* will not discriminate between generations or individuals (v. 21): the foe from the north will wipe out everyone, and the people will suffer collective rejection by Yahweh (vv. 22-30). The end of Jeremiah 6 is a compelling lead-in to the Temple Sermon and the debate oracles against the wisdom and cultic elite of Jerusalem (Jer. 7–10),[42] warning against the denial of their contents.

The Parameters of the Covenant (Jeremiah 11.1-17)

To follow and amplify the dramatic message of Jeremiah 7–10, Jeremiah composed 11.1-17 as a final meditation on the covenantal demands placed upon his audience. Like 3.6-11 and the Temple Sermon, the parenetic form of this address reminds the reader of the Mosaic authority of the prophet behind its composition, and its verses contain overt references to Deuteronomy.

39. On the Zophim, see above, Chapter 1. For the role of the קול שׁופר at Sinai, see Leuchter, 'Psalm xcix', p. 33.

40. 1 Kgs 10.10, 15, 25; 11.8. See Sweeney, 'The Critique of Solomon'.

41. Note the similar wording of Hos. 14.10 (ופשׁעים יכשׁלו בם), which also addresses the wisdom tradition.

42. This would not include the supplemental material in Jer. 7.16–8.3 (though some of this may derive from the prophet himself at a later time); 8.13-23; 9.14-25 or 10.17-25, all of which presuppose subsequent periods of composition.

Considering the debates between Jeremiah and the prophet's adversaries (who emulated older and outdated covenantal concepts), the allusions are not surprising. The people are commanded to 'hear the words of this covenant' (שמעו את דברי הברית הזאת), closely resembling Deut. 5.3 (הברית הזאת) and the DH's characterization of Deuteronomy as the 'words of the book of the covenant' (דברי ספר הברית) in 2 Kings 23. The opening unit contains a divine word to the prophet, which in turn charges him with invoking the Deuteronomic covenant:

> The word that came to Jeremiah from Yahweh, saying, 'Hear the words of this covenant, and speak to the men of Judah, and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem; and say to them, "Thus says Yahweh, the God of Israel, 'Cursed be the man (ארור האיש) that does not hear the words of this covenant, which I commanded your fathers in the day that I brought them forth out of the land of Egypt, out of the iron furnace, saying, "Hearken to my voice, and do them, according to all which I command you; so shall ye be my people, and I will be your God; that I may establish the oath which I swore unto your fathers, to give them a land flowing with milk and honey, as at this day".'"' Then answered I, and said, 'Amen, Yahweh (אמן ה׳)'. (Jer. 11.3-5)

As most commentators recognize, the threat of a curse (ארור האיש) in v. 3 and Jeremiah's response in v. 5 (אמן ה׳), recalls the covenant ceremony in Deuteronomy 27. Based on the response dynamic of this Deuteronomic text, some scholars suggest emendations to the current passage, reducing it to a recitation of the curse condition followed by the response;[43] but this misses the purpose of the passage. Yahweh has charged Jeremiah not with a curse stipulation but with communicating that curse stipulation to a larger audience; the actual communication takes place in vv. 6-8, which is similar in diction and content to vv. 1-5.[44] As such, the response אמן ה׳ in v. 5 reflects Jeremiah answering Yahweh that he will indeed carry out Yahweh's orders and communicate the message.[45] The message to Judah in vv. 6-8 condenses the basic historical and covenantal themes of Deuteronomy. The people are commanded to 'hear' (Deut. 5.1; 6.4; 9.1) and 'do' (Deut. 5.1; 8.1; 11.22) what was abrogated by their 'fathers' (Deut. 5.3) who were commanded to hear the divine 'voice' (Deut. 9.23). That all of this is commanded even 'until this day' (Jer. 11.7) invokes the repeated appearance of this phrase throughout the DH, conforming Israel's history to the Deuteronomic covenant of the Josianic period.[46] Thus the covenantal demands established during Josiah's reign are still in effect even after that king's death, preserved and adjusted by Jeremiah's oracles.

---

43. See, e.g., McKane, *Jeremiah*, I, p. 237.
44. McKane, *Jeremiah*, I, p. 236.
45. Such is also the conclusion of Lundbom on the basis of the rhetorical shape of vv. 1-5 (*Jeremiah 1–20*, pp. 614-17).
46. Geoghegan, '"Until this Day"', pp. 225-27.

The lines between Jeremiah's oracles and the Deuteronomic corpus are deliberately blurred. The terms דברי and דברים in Jer. 11.2 and 11.6, respectively, relate both to Deuteronomy (הדברים in Deut. 5.18; 6.6; etc.) as well as the preceding Jeremianic oracles (דברי ירמיהו in Jer. 1.1). As the unit closes in v. 8, it is clear that the people have not done as commanded: the 'stubbornness of their wicked heart' (שרירות לבם הרע; see Jer. 3.17; 9.13) has prohibited them from living up to Yahweh's demands. The use of a phrase from the prophet's earlier oracles equates the abrogation of Jeremiah's words with the rejection of Deuteronomy and, ultimately, the relationship between Yahweh and the nation.

Verses 9-13 take leave of the past and address the present, interweaving Deuteronomic phrases and Jeremianic lexemes. Judah and Jerusalem are charged with conspiracy; here, the invitation in 1.12 carefully to watch Jeremiah's words benefits the reader, as the charge of conspiracy (קשר) may constitute a wordplay/anagram on the theme of שקר that runs through the preceding oracles, identifying Jeremiah's adversaries as enemies of the state (and, by extension, Yahweh).[47] Once again, these adversaries (who apparently had a strong influence on public opinion as per 5.4-5) are likened to the apostates of the north:

> …they are gone after other gods to serve them; the *house of Israel and the house of Judah* have broken my covenant which I made with their fathers. (Jer. 11.10)

The parenetic prose here mirrors that of Jer. 3.6-11 by having Israel and Judah share in the same sin: improper worship of other gods. While this would apply to the persistence of family-based worship of fertility deities (see 7.17-18; 44.15-19), the primary charge is against the stubbornness mentioned in 11.8 and the variant Yahwisms standing against Deuteronomistic tradition. The stubbornness of the northerners to accept Josianic hegemony led to the charge of political Baalism that permeates chs. 2–4; a similar charge of institutional Baalism (i.e. the hypostatization of the Temple and its cult, the Torah and its laws, wisdom, or the Zion tradition more generally) was lodged against Jeremiah's Jerusalem adversaries in Jeremiah 8–10. Here, Jeremiah lays the sin in plain view: the pursuit of variant traditions is the pursuit of foreign gods, reinforced by the polemical statement repeated from 2.28 that Judah has indeed devoted itself to many gods (11.13).[48]

---

47. See McKane, *Jeremiah*, I, p. 239, for the political dimensions of קשר. The association of political conspiracy with theology is already presumed in the oracles of Jer. 2–4.

48. So also Halpern, 'Brisker Pipes than Poetry', pp. 98-101. Many of the instances cited by Parke-Taylor of similar terminology (*Formation*, *passim*) are obtained from later expansions of earlier material (Jer. 7.17, 34, for example, are subsequent to the initial layer of the Temple Sermon [see Holladay, *Jeremiah 1*, p. 251, though the dating suggested by Holladay is debatable]).

By definition, then, only Deuteronomy and its licensed adjustment via Jeremiah constituted proper national faith, as only this tradition facilitated Israel's dialogue with its one true God. By implication, the prophet's counsel to recognize the imminent suzerainty of Babylon constitutes a divine decree, the refusal of which constitutes apostasy.[49] The final verses of the unit make clear the current stakes: Yahweh commands Jeremiah not to intercede any more on behalf of the people (v. 14), reversing the pattern established by both Moses and Samuel (Deut. 9.26; 1 Sam. 12.26). The subsequent characterization of Judah as Yahweh's beloved and as a fertile tree recall the prophet's early invective against the north in Jeremiah 2–4, but v. 17 states that even though this tree had been planted by Yahweh, the Baalism with which it is charged will see it destroyed.

Despite the ferocity of these last few verses, they reflect a threat rather than a proclamation of a finalized judgment, similar to the force of Huldah's oracle and the closing threats of the Temple Sermon.[50] Jeremiah is directed not to pray any *further*, but this means that the *Urrolle* represents the prophet's final appeal. Jeremiah 11.14 also serves an emphatic and rhetorical purpose, namely, it argues in no uncertain terms that Jeremiah is indeed a Mosaic prophet of Deuteronomic proportions, for only such a prophet could be prohibited from interceding. Jeremiah 11.1-17 thus combines the Deuteronomistic form of prophetic address and the intercessory traditions ascribed to Moses and Samuel, both of whom are presented in the DH as supporting (or in the case of Moses, authoring) the covenant stipulations of Deuteronomy that Jeremiah has invoked in this passage.

The Return of the Shilonites: Jeremiah 11.18-23

Jeremiah ends his meditation on the broken covenant by appending his decree of judgment against the Shilonites (11.18-23) to the end of his work. It is likely that at this time the secondary additions that identify the Shilonites by name ('the men of Anathoth' in vv. 21 and 23) were added to the original text for purposes of clarification.[51] The condemnation of the Shilonites

---

49.   The repeated threats of the 'foe from the north' imply the inescapability of this foe's dominance. Jeremiah clearly felt that capitulation to Babylonian political hegemony reflected divine will, and resistance was a sin. This idea would permeate subsequent composition following the exile of 597; see Leuchter, 'Jeremiah's 70-Year Prophecy', pp. 516-19; Berlin, 'A Deuteronomic Allusion?', pp. 8-11.

50.   For a discussion of the threat/proclamation pattern in Huldah's oracle, see Halpern, 'Why Manasseh', pp. 493-505.

51.   Parke-Taylor (*Formation*, p. 32) sees these additions as dependent upon the doublet in Jer. 23.12 due to the unity of the poetry in the latter and the intrusive nature of the prose in 11.23 (so also Hubmann, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 169-72; Holladay, *Jeremiah 1*, pp. 364, 369-71). However, there are no grounds for seeing the 'Anathoth' reference as

would be extended to anyone who denies the force of Jeremiah's words. So much is intimated in Jer. 11.3-5 with the reference to Deuteronomy 27, which ends with a curse placed on anyone 'who does not confirm the words of this Torah' (Deut. 27.26). The reference to the Shilonites would serve as a powerful ending to a message that urged its audience to reconsider its political options by evaluating the past.

The Structure and Function of Jeremiah 11

Beyond the historical implications of invoking the Shilonite calamity of the Josianic-era, several linguistic and structural elements converge to suggest that Jeremiah 11 provides a rhetorical 'answer' to elements at the beginning of the book of Jeremiah:

1. The call narrative in 1.1-16 [17-19[52]] is a prose passage roughly equivalent in length to 11.1-17.
2. Jeremiah 11.2 and 1.1 both deploy the term דברי.
3. The שרירות לבם הרע in 11.8 forms an *inclusio* with 3.17, and 11.13 does the same with 2.28; this constitutes a 'working back' through the earlier material to the beginning of the book.
4. Jeremiah 11.14 ends the pattern of intercession associated with Moses and Samuel, two figures invoked in 1.6.[53]
5. Jeremiah 11.17 states that Yahweh has 'planted' Judah but will now pronounce 'evil' upon it; 1.10 states that the prophet will be used by Yahweh to uproot what has been planted, and 1.14 states that 'evil' will break forth upon the prophet's audience.

dependent on 23.12. The original compositional context of 11.18-23, as observed above (Chapter 5), related strongly to the Shilonites of Anathoth. Moreover, the doublet that Parke-Taylor discusses does not include the Anathoth reference in 11.21, only that of 11.23, and he is unable to posit a background for the specificity of the reference in either case in large part because he does not consider Jeremiah active during the days of Josiah's reform (*Formation*, p. 20). If 11.18-23 was initially composed with an eye to Anathoth, then Jeremiah's redaction of the material for didactic purposes would provide the best explanation not only for the secondary nature of the references to Anathoth but also for their specificity. Parke-Taylor is right to sense the secondary nature of the Anathoth references as opposed to the origin and cohesion of 23.12 to its surroundings, but this speaks only to the unity of the poetic material in 23.9-12, not to its antedating 11.18-23. Jer. 23.12, then, should be seen as dependent upon 11.23, and creates herme-neutical associations between the prophets of 23.11 and the men of Anathoth from the earlier reference.

52.　Verses 17-19 may or may not derive from the same period of redaction as the majority of the call narrative as it became the introduction to the *Urrolle*. The contents of these verses lend themselves just as well to later redactional episodes that expanded the scope of the corpus.

53.　See above, pp. 76-78.

6. Jeremiah 11.23 ends with a reference to Anathoth; 1.1 begins the book by identifying the prophet as coming from Anathoth. The resulting *inclusio* would have been difficult to ignore.

We may therefore view Jeremiah 1–11, in an early but relatively recognizable shape, as the basic form of the *Urrolle* composed by the prophet between 605 and 604.[54] The purpose and diction of Jeremiah 11 is suggested by the explanation for the scroll's composition in ch. 36:

> It may be that the house of Judah will hear all the evil (כל הרעה) which I purpose to do to them; that they may return every man from his evil way (דרכו הרע), and I may forgive their iniquity and their sin. (Jer. 36.3)

This later composition appears to relate closely to the closing sentiments of Jeremiah 1–11, as the term רע appears seven times in 11.6-17, the message Jeremiah is directed to communicate to the nation. Yet this is not the only connection between Jeremiah 11 and Jeremiah 36. The latter chapter emphasizes the role of the scribes,[55] and begins with a passage (36.1-8) structured upon the conventions of a scribal colophon:[56]

> And it came to pass *in the fourth year of Jehoiakim the son of Josiah*, king of Judah, that this word came *to Jeremiah from Yahweh*, saying, 'Take *a scroll of a book*, and write therein *all the words* that I have spoken to you against Israel, and against Judah, and against all the nations, from the day I spoke to you, *from the days of Josiah, even unto this day*. It may be that the house of Judah *will hear all the evil which I purpose to do to them*; *that they may return every man from his evil way, and I may forgive their iniquity and their sin*.'

54.   Holladay (*Jeremiah 2*, pp. 16-20) suggests that the *Urrolle* initially comprised principal portions of Jer. 2.1–7.12 (with 25.1-7 functioning as an introduction [p. 19]); the second scroll in its early form expanded the introduction to include 25.1-13 and placed it at the end of the scroll, added material throughout 2.1–7.12, and continued with blocks of text primarily found now in 7.13–10.25 (p. 20). This proposition sees the principal unity of the material in chs. 7–10 but does not include 10.1-16 (though Holladay has now changed his position on the dating of 10.1-16; see his 'Jeremiah's Psalter', p. 247) or recognize the functional dynamic of the prose–poetry patterns in the polemic against the Jerusalem establishment. For this reason, he also excludes 11.1-17 as a final comment on covenantal obligation, as well as 11.18-23 as a structural and historical finale. Early versions of additional texts (e.g. ch. 46) may have also been housed within the skeletal form of chs. 1–11, later moved to other parts of the developing book (see the Conclusion below for a discussion).

55.   Dearman, 'My Servants the Scribes'. See also Holladay, *Jeremiah 2*, pp. 257-60; Lundbom, *Jeremiah 21–36*, pp. 582-608.

56.   See Lundbom ('Baruch, Seraiah', pp. 103-06), who describes such passage such as 'expanded colophons' due to the additional narrative or oracular features found therein. On the function of colophons in ancient literature, see immediately below.

> Then Jeremiah called *Baruch the son of Neriah*; and Baruch wrote *from the mouth of Jeremiah all the words of Yahweh*, which he (Yahweh) had spoken unto him, upon *a scroll of a book*. And Jeremiah commanded Baruch, saying, 'I am detained, I cannot go into *the house of Yahweh*; therefore go, and read in the scroll, which you have written from my mouth, the words of Yahweh in the ears of the people in Yahweh's house *upon a fast-day*; and also you shall read them in the ears of all Judah that come out of their cities. *It may be that they will present their supplication before Yahweh, and will return every one from his evil way; for great is the anger and the fury that Yahweh has pronounced against this people*.' And Baruch the son of Neriah did according to all that Jeremiah the prophet commanded him, reading in the book the words of Yahweh *in Yahweh's house*.

In this passage we encounter formal elements (italicized) that are common to scribal colophons in the ancient Near East: the name of the authority or authorities licensing the composition, a date of composition, a delineation of the composition's length, the name of the scribe responsible for committing it to writing, the purpose of the composition, curses and/or blessings, and the place of the text's storage or preservation.[57] All of these are present in 36.1-8. The passage forges a continuum between prophet and scribe, as both the scribe Baruch and the prophet Jeremiah are commanded to write down the oracles (36.2, 4). Nevertheless, the reading of 36.4 that most scholars adopt —that Baruch wrote at Jeremiah's dictation (so also the refrain in 36.32)— misses a nuance of the text that resonates at a particularly Deuteronomic frequency:

> Jer. 36.4—Baruch wrote from the mouth of Jeremiah (מפי ירמיהו) all the words of Yahweh (דברי ה') that he spoke to him (אשר דבר אליו)...

> Deut. 18.18—I will put my words (דברי) in his mouth (בפיו), and he shall speak unto them (ודבר אליהם) [i.e. Israel]...

Both named and anonymous prophets are written into narratives, and the subtleties of their words are careful literary contrivances.[58] The 'speeches' of this era were scribal constructs, words that were truly placed in the mouth of the historical figures in the scribes' source traditions. These prophets 'spoke' to Israel through the literature produced in Josiah's day, while their words

---

57. See the discussion by Lundbom, 'Baruch, Seraiah', pp. 89-95; Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, pp. 27-32; H.M.I. Gevaryahu, 'Biblical Colophons: A Source for the "Biography" of Authors, Texts and Books', in G.W. Anderson and P.A.H. de Boer (eds.), *Congress Volume: Edinburgh, 1974* (VTSup, 28; Leiden: Brill, 1975), pp. 42-59 (55-56); E. Leichty, 'The Colophon', in R.D. Biggs and J.A. Brinkman (eds.), *Studies Presented to A. Leo Oppenheim, June 7, 1964* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964), pp. 147-54.

58. Judg. 6.7-10; 1 Sam. 2.27-36 (see Leuchter, 'Something Old, Something Older', §§2.1–3.1); 1 Sam. 12; 1 Kgs 11.29-39 (see Leuchter, 'Jeroboam the Ephratite', for a detailed discussion of the exegetical additions to the earlier text, etc.).

could be read out loud, but the authority of the text containing them served as their ultimate anchor. The Deuteronomic Torah itself is first and foremost a literary work of the same period: its methods of persuasion and exegesis are literary reflexes, despite the fact that it is presented as Moses' final 'speech'.[59] We may thus understand the wording of Jer. 36.4 as an allusion to the literary nature of the episode, strongly evidencing continuity between the Josianic-era textual method and that of the *Urrolle*.[60] If Jeremiah wrote a scroll, then that scroll constituted the prophet's 'speech' (which could be read out loud), the literary manifestation of the divine word placed in the prophet's mouth. Just as the Josianic scribes developed Deuteronomy and the DH from written sources, Baruch likely wrote his scroll on the basis of a literary document penned by Jeremiah himself (see also Jer. 30.2; 51.60).

If both men wrote a scroll, then scribal convention suggests that Jeremiah composed his own colophon to the collection that Baruch copied and read in the Temple in 604.[61] Jeremiah 11.1-23 appears to constitute such a colophon.[62] It contains information that looks back upon the preceding chapters (and Deuteronomy), and this information is conveyed in a colophonic manner:

1. *The name of the authority or authorities licensing the composition*: Yahweh is identified as the source of authority in 11.1.
2. *A delineation of the composition's length*: the lexemes of 11.3-5 point to the Deuteronomic Torah of the Josianic period (ארור האיש, דברי הברית הזאת, אמן), and the rhetorical connections with the call narrative identify the expanse of material spanning the collection of Jeremiah 1–10 that had accrued by 605. Thus discernible collections with finite lengths are identified.
3. *A date of composition*: 'until this day' in 11.7 points to the day of Jeremiah, in relation to the reign of Josiah.
4. *The scribe's name responsible for committing it to writing*: 11.1 identifies Jeremiah as the recipient of the divine word.

59.   See Levinson, *Deuteronomy*, p. 145, for commentary.

60.   Herein we encounter once more the phrase 'until this day' typical of Josianic-era compositions (see Geoghegan, ' "Until this Day" ', pp. 225-27). We should note, though, that Jer. 36.2 views the moment of the *Urrolle*'s composition not as part of that Josianic 'day' but as a response to it (מימי יאשיהו ועד היום הזה).

61.   Lundbom observes that it was standard practice for scribes to create copies of the documents they worked on ('Baruch, Seraiah', pp. 98, 103). Sharp notes that the time taken to construct the *Urrolle* in Jer. 36 allows for different versions of this collection to have been composed and circulate ('Take Another Scroll and Write', p. 508).

62.   Though Lundbom's designation 'expanded colophon' is perhaps more appropriate given the hortatory dimensions of this passage not found in standard ancient colophons (Lundbom, 'Baruch, Seraiah', p. 99).

5. *The purpose of the composition*: 11.3-5 addresses the matter of the covenant, 11.6 specifies that the nation should 'hear the words of (דברי) this covenant, to do them (ועשׂיתם אתם)'. Very similar terminology is found in Deut. 17.8-13 which legitimizes the expansion of the Deuteronomic corpus through new proclamation.

6. *Curses and/or blessings*: 11.3 pronounces a curse upon anyone who ignores the words of the covenant. The episode involving the Shilonites cited in vv. 18-23 demonstrate that the curse was already put into effect and could be imposed yet again. A blessing is alluded to in v. 5 with the mention of the promised land flowing with milk and honey.

7. *The place of the text's preservation*: 11.2, 6, 9, 12-13 identify the city of Jerusalem and the towns of Judah as the audience of the foregoing proclamations; 11.15 identifies Yahweh's 'house', which suggests the Jerusalem Temple. This is indeed the location where the scroll is read by Baruch in Jeremiah 36.

Every major colophonic element thus appears in the composite form of Jeremiah 11, functioning in either a direct manner, symbolically, or both. These features weigh against the argument that the chapter is simply a Deuteronomistic addition to the book deriving from a subsequent redactor; it carries a personalized stamp rather than the hallmarks of a secondary generic address.[63] Even if one were to argue that an exilic editor/redactor would have been well acquainted with the scribal conventions of colophons, this exilic scribe would have placed a symbolic colophon at the end of the corpus rather than in the middle of a stream of discourse that continues for many more chapters. The functional unity of the chapter as a colophon also weighs against viewing it as a fragmentary assortment of material.[64]

63. *Pace* Thiel, *Jeremia 1–25*, pp. 153-56; Nicholson, *Preaching to the Exiles*, p. 67; Stulman, 'The Prose Sermons', pp. 53-54 (though Stulman's observations about Jer. 11.1-17 in a broader literary context of chs. 1–25 are salient and speak to the later shaping of that corpus). The colophonic function of identifying Jerusalem and Judah also qualifies Parke-Taylor's view that the phrase is a subsequent scribal addition unconnected to the author of 2.28 (*Formation*, p. 186). This would appear to support Weippert's assertions that Jeremiah is responsible (at least in part) for the parenetic prose of the book in terms of stylistic peculiarities, but these only attest to the prophet's personal take on or adjustment of Deuteronomic/Deuteronomistic tradition, not his disconnection from it (though Weippert does note the shared concerns of both traditions; see her *Prosareden*, pp. 215-22).

64. *Pace* McKane, *Jeremiah*, I, pp. 241-42, 246, 247-53; Thiel, *Jeremia 1–25*, p. 156. Lundbom demonstrates (against the aforementioned scholars) that vv. 15-17 are bound to v. 14, which they take to be part of a larger unit beginning with 11.1 (*Jeremiah 1–20*, pp. 628-29).

   If ch. 11 indeed functioned as a colophon written by Jeremiah, it explains why it possesses so many rhetorical features meant to create an envelope identifying Jeremiah 1–11 as a unit.[65] It also explains the overlap between the message of the *Urrolle* and the language and themes of Deuteronomy: the entire *Urrolle* is an appeal to an evolving Deuteronomic ideology,[66] signed and sealed by a prophet whose office was conceived by the advent of Deuteronomy itself. If Deuteronomy represented an official interpretation of the Sinai theophany as it was to be applied in Josiah's day, the *Urrolle* represented an official interpretation of Deuteronomy as it was to be applied after the king's death.

---

   65.   The rhetorical connections to the call narrative in Jer. 1 and themes/lexemes from chs. 2–4 and 8–10 challenge the view that the call narrative resulted from a secondary redactional accretion (Römer, 'Convert', pp. 197-98).
   66.   Hence the allusion in 11.6 to the process in Deut. 17.8-13.

9

CONCLUSION

Jeremiah: A Self-Proclaimed Deuteronomist

The foregoing examination suggests that we can no longer speak of the prophet Jeremiah as a thinker whose work was brought into the Deuteronomistic fold only by later redactors. Deuteronomistic thought permeates both the poetry and the prose, and formal differences should not necessarily be understood as evidence of different authorship.[1] The prophet considered his own mission to be Deuteronomistic in the true sense of the word, developing Deuteronomy's ideas as mandated in Deuteronomy 17–18 and following its patterns of discourse. This is why Jeremiah's adversaries attack the (Deuteronomistic) scribes even as they attack the prophet (Jer. 8.8): Jeremiah's scribal status did not end when his prophetic activity began. Rather, the prophet identifies himself as a scribe and legitimizes his oracles through that identification;[2] the prophet's *Urrolle* is as much a work of scribal exegesis as it is a work of prophetic proclamation. The identification of the basic shape of the *Urrolle* as an early form of Jeremiah 1–11 carries major implications not only for identifying the parameters of the prophet's thought in the first part of his career (627–605) and for our understanding of the political factions active in Jerusalem in the late seventh through early sixth centuries, but also for determining the methods and tools deployed by the prophet and subsequent writers in developing the book and disseminating its contents.

Prophetic Texts and Jerusalem's Scribes

Jeremiah's reliance on scribal conventions in these chapters establishes the formal and semiotic precedent for the later shaping and expansion of the book, first with the prophet himself and later with the scribes who inherited

---

1. This is not to suggest that the parenetic prose must *all* derive from Jeremiah himself; see below.

2. Friedman's observations concerning the connection between the Jeremianic and Deuteronomistic compositional circles are thus reinforced beyond the level of thematic, lexical, or even stylistic commonality ('The Deuteronomistic School', pp. 79-80).

his work. It is difficult to identify the scribes responsible for this with any certainty, but the book does point to Baruch and Seraiah b. Neriah as key figures in the preservation and development of the text, as well as the Shaphanide circles in Jerusalem who were eventually deported to Babylon in 597.[3] That scribes were charged with the reading of these collections is suggested not only by Seraiah's possession and eventual submersion of a later corpus in the Euphrates river (Jer. 51.59-64) and Baruch's reading of the *Urrolle* in 36.10 (notably, in the office of the scribe Gemariah b. Shaphan), but also by the summarizing and reading of that same collection by Baruch's scribal peers later in the chapter (36.20-21). It is also the case that Shaphan the scribe was responsible for reading the Deuteronomic Torah to Josiah in 2 Kgs 22.10, and, as we have already seen, the 'men of Hezekiah' bore the responsibility for redacting, editing, and collecting assorted literature (Prov. 25.1).[4] As observed earlier, an archive of Jeremianic materials was very likely preserved by the prophet and his colleagues, which would have made copies of Jeremiah's oracles available for public reading and consultation.[5] The redaction of earlier prophetic collections during Hezekiah's reign and again during Josiah's reign points to similar archives,[6] likely located in the Temple, so it is not surprising that Baruch's reading of the scroll would have also taken place in the (Temple-based) precincts of Gemaraiah's office and, later, in the office of the other scribes (36.12-15). We should therefore consider the role of this archive in the development and preservation of the *Urrolle*.

---

3.   Lundbom ('Baruch, Seraiah', pp. 108-109) and R.C. Steiner ('The Two Sons of Neriah and the Two Editions of Jeremiah in Light of the Two *atbash* Code-Words for Babylon', *VT* 46 [1996], pp. 74-84 [83-84]) identify Baruch as the editor of a proto-LXX Jeremianic collection and Seraiah as the editor of the proto-MT collection. I am inclined to agree that these figures had a direct hand in the preservation and growth of the early Jeremianic corpus, but it is also possible that later writers used the names of these figures symbolically as the collections developed and took on discernible forms. For the deportation of a significant Shaphanide group in 597, see Leuchter, 'Jeremiah's 70-Year Prophecy', p. 515.

4.   Halpern, 'Jerusalem and the Lineages', pp. 79-82; Schniedewind, *How the Bible Became a Book*, pp. 75-77; Dearman, 'My Servants the Scribes', p. 419.

5.   Peckham notes the diversity of locales where ancient archives were kept (*History and Prophecy*, pp. 302-303). Given the prophet's persistent interest in the Temple (Jer. 7.1-15; ch. 35; 36.1-8) and his connection to the Shaphanides and related groups, it is likely that one archive of Jeremiah's work was maintained therein. Indeed, the scroll Jehudi fetches from the office of the scribes in Jer. 36.21 would probably have been stored in a specific and pre-determined location that already held copies of Jeremiah's oracles.

6.   Sweeney, *King Josiah*, pp. 311-13.

The Jeremianic Archive

The close association between the prophet and the above-mentioned Temple scribes would have allowed for subsequent access to the archival repository of oracles,[7] which would have facilitated the prophet's reconstruction of his original scroll and its subsequent expansion (Jer. 36.32). This, however, does not rule out the possibility that Jeremiah or Baruch may have preserved their own copies of archived material. In either case, important Jeremianic oracles were clearly not included in the *Urrolle*, and must have rested in an archival state. The *Urrolle* is described in 36.2 as words spoken against Israel, Judah, and the nations. Though this accurately describes the purpose of Jeremiah 2–4 and later 7–10, it would not pertain to the oracles of restoration and promise in Jeremiah 30–31.[8] Beyond matters of theme, the sequential distance between the contents of chs. 1–11 and the current location of chs. 30–31 speaks to their exclusion from the *Urrolle*. Rather than falling within chs. 1–25, which appears to have attained a discernible form already before the fall of Jerusalem,[9] they occur within chs. 26–45, a later supplement constructed during the exile to expand the parameters of the Jeremianic corpus.[10] The archive persisted as a tool for later redaction and composition, but the fact that archived material could be re-incorporated into an 'active' and developing corpus reveals that the archive was no mere file folder, but a sacred vehicle for prophecy in its own right.[11]

The archive, though, may have also contained material in addition to Jeremiah's oracular compositions or complaints/confessions. As we have seen, the *Vorlage* of 2 Chron. 35.19-25/1 Esd. 1.25-32 stems from alternative historical sources that were generated within the Jeremianic tradition circles.[12] These Jeremianic tradents worked well into the postexilic period

---

7.   See above, pp. 144-45; Schaper, 'Exilic and Post-Exilic Prophecy', pp. 330-31, 334-39.

8.   All text collections cited here pertain only to those passages deriving from the period before 605–604.

9.   Schniedwind, *How the Bible Became a Book*, pp. 154-55.

10.   Virtually all commentators recognize that Jer. 26–45 is primarily exilic in provenance, though scholars are divided over the origin of individual passages and traditions. The extensive discussion on this matter cannot be addressed herein; I hope to make the composition of this material the subject of a subsequent monograph. For a brief discussion of scholarly disagreement on the issue of authorship concerning this material, see C.J. Sharp, 'Review of Jack R. Lundbom, *Jeremiah 21–36*', *Review of Biblical Literature* (<http://www.bookreviews.org>) 2005.

11.   The various oracles contained therein would thus fall under the rubric of 'sanctity' despite their exclusion from the *Urrolle* or other subsequent collections; see Sharp, 'Take Another Scroll and Write', pp. 508-509.

12.   So Williamson, 'The Death of Josiah', pp. 246-47.

and drew from the archive, and it is likely that the alternative tradition was maintained and developed therein before its usage in 2 Chronicles 35/ 1 Esdras 1. Other historical traditions pertaining to the prophet's life may have been deposited in the archive before being worked into the Jeremianic corpus as it continued to develop.[13]

The possibility of Jeremiah's oracles preserved among the Temple collections by the scribes of ch. 36 suggests a tension: chs. 26–36 portray the prophet as an 'outsider' to the political establishment of late seventh-century Judah, but his scribal training, ability to proclaim divine judgments within the Temple precincts, and his connection to Josiah in his early career would have made him a familiar of that establishment. Unlike Micah the Moreshite who was forcibly herded into Jerusalem two generations earlier, Jeremiah had friends in high places with strong connections to the royal court. Though the prophet was a critic of Jerusalemite politics, he was clearly familiar with its machinations, and recognized the power of political office in swaying public opinion (e.g. 5.4-5). It is thus likely that the *Urrolle*, while addressed to the nation in a general way, was constructed for presentation to Jehoiakim.

The Appeal to Jehoiakim

Jeremiah's critique of Davidic pretensions in the Temple Sermon did not invalidate the role of the Davidic king in a wholesale manner. The critique was against elevating the king beyond the Deuteronomic paradigm of kingship (especially with respect to foreign influence), but his reliance upon Deuteronomistic sources would have led him to see the king as the representative of the people.[14] Since Jehoiakim had been placed on the throne by Egypt, he might have recognized the tenuous position of his authority with Babylon having bested his Egyptian overlord at Carchemish. The oracles dealing with the prophet's own prophetic adversaries bear witness to the fact that Jehoiakim was receptive to prophetic counsel; it is not simply their recitation of fallacious rhetoric that bothers the prophet but their influence over Judah's king. The office of the prophet, Mosaic or otherwise, had not been totally marginalized in the royal court, and there may yet have been room for Jeremiah to voice his concerns with the hope of making an impression.

---

13.   This may account for the oracles in the disparate episodes from the supplemental unit of Jer. 26–45 such as 32.6-15; 34.8-22; 35; and 45.1-5. So also the characterization of Jeremiah in Sir. 49.6-7 (Delamarter, 'The Death of Josiah in Scripture and Tradition', p. 43).

14.   We should recall that in 2 Kgs 22–23 Josiah himself stands in for the generic Israelite petitioner of Deut. 17.8-13.

In addition, the merit and memory of Josiah would also have played a role in Jeremiah's decision to approach Jehoiakim. It was, after all, Josiah who centralized and consolidated power, and the Josianic texts that accomplished this feat were still venerated by the elite of Jerusalem and Judah, despite Jeremiah's critique of *how* they were venerated. Both Jeremiah and the political elite of Jerusalem wished to sustain the religious legacy that came to fruition during Josiah's reign, one from the royalistic/wisdom perspective, the other from the prophetic/Deuteronomistic. As such, Josiah must have loomed large in the minds of those in Judah who outlived him, and Jeremiah's appeal to Jehoiakim was therefore a calculated risk: either the king would accept a text bearing Mosaic authority for a new era as his father had done, or he would yield to those who wished to focus on outdated Davidic ideals.

That Jer. 11.1-5 recalls Deuteronomy 27 bears significantly in this regard. The covenant ceremony in conducted by the Levites (Deut. 27.14); though Jeremiah had already distanced himself from the Shilonites, he would have still understood himself as possessing Levitical heritage, and it is for this reason that this particular Deuteronomic text is invoked in the closing strophe of the *Urrolle*. By identifying himself as a Levite, Jeremiah also invokes a major feature of the relationship between the Israelite king and the Deuteronomic Torah as articulated in Deut. 17.18-19:

> And it shall be, when he sits upon the throne of his kingdom, that he shall write himself a copy of this law in a book, out of that which is before the Levitical priests (הכהנים הלוים). And it shall be with him, and he shall read therein all the days of his life; that he may learn to fear Yahweh his God, to keep all the words of this law and these statutes, to do them (לעשׂתם).

The Torah, according to this text, is to be read by the king under the guidance of Levites in Jerusalem. The call for the king to 'do' the laws of the Torah is echoed in Jer. 11.6, 8, which stress that the covenant had not been adhered to (ולא עשׂו in v. 8). The presence of this lexeme alongside Jeremiah's identification with the Levites of Deut. 27.14 suggests strongly that the *Urrolle* was indeed geared to appeal to Jehoiakim as a form of Torah. The king might be persuaded to adopt a tenable political/religious policy that would preserve the Deuteronomic covenant brokered by his father Josiah (2 Kgs 23.3) in the face of Babylon's rising dominance by appealing to the standards of monarchic piety mandated in Deuteronomy. The likelihood that 2 Kgs 23.29 derives from Jehoiakim's court and attempts to present that king as a fit successor to Josiah probably affected the prophet's construction of the *Urrolle* and its presentation to the king.[15] If Jehoiakim was truly a successor to his father and sought to present continuity in governance from his father's reign

---

15. For the dating of 2 Kgs 23.29 to Jehoiakim's reign, see above, Chapter 5.

to his own, then Jeremiah would reasonably hope that this king would follow in his father's footsteps and heed the words of the scroll brought before him. By extension, the rejection of the *Urrolle* would constitute a rejection of Deuteronomy and its expectations of Israelite kings.[16]

It is clear, though, that Jeremiah's gamble did not yield the results for which he had hoped. There is nothing within Jeremiah 1–11 that resembles the ferocity levied upon Jehoiakim in the texts found subsequent to ch. 11, which suggests that the *Urrolle* was indeed rejected by the king as in ch. 36 (v. 23), however stylized that narrative might be.[17] The socio-political reper- cussions of this, coupled with the personal affront to Jeremiah, are the force behind the anti-Jehoiakim polemic of later texts. Indeed the prophet's anti- Solomonic polemic that was once applied to the wisdom circles is now directed at the king. Jeremiah writes that Jehoiakim rejects the Mosaic law that was accepted by his father (22.15b-17), and engages in self-centered materialism that apparently drew upon a system of forced labor and that even involves the same commodities that Solomon treasured (22.13-15a; compare to 1 Kgs 5.13, 20, 22-24); and he ties him politically to Solomon's own Phoenician allies (Jer. 22.20-23, especially the כל מאהביך in v. 20; compare to 1 Kgs 5.15).[18] By siding with Egypt (also a Solomonic trait; see 1 Kgs 3.1) and refusing to recognize the dominance of Babylon, Jehoiakim sealed the fate of the nation and secured Yahweh's wrath. The king thus replaces the sages as Jeremiah's target, and the itinerant prophetic and priestly circles already tied to the Jerusalem ideology of the royal court (and alluded to in the scroll) become subject to judgment.

We may see an additional dimension appended to the anti-Jehoiakim polemic, and that is the attribution of the sins of the Judean king Manasseh to Jehoiakim. It is Manasseh who occupies a particularly negative role in the Josianic DH and whose reported actions are projected onto the northern kingdom in 2 Kgs 17.7-23 as the cause of its fall.[19] In the Josianic DH, both Solomon and Manasseh are presented as anti-types to Josiah,[20] both engage in foreign worship, both make alliances with or submit to what would be Josiah's enemies (Assyria and Egypt), and both reportedly marginalize or reject Mosaic law and authority.[21] By contrasting Jehoiakim to Josiah in a

---

16. It is perhaps for this reason that the paradigm of prophetic intercession is merged with the call to adhere to the Deuteronomic law and covenant in Jer. 11.14.

17. Isbell, 'A Stylistic Comparison', pp. 33-45.

18. This terminology also recalls the prophet's castigation of the north and its politi- cal allegiances in Jer. 2–4.

19. So M.Z. Brettler, *The Creation of History in Ancient Israel* (London: Routledge, 1995), p. 134.

20. See Sweeney, *King Josiah*, pp. 64-76.

21. This logic of typological qualification via semantic opposition is evident in the DH as well: see Halpern, 'Why Manasseh', pp. 501-502.

Solomonic light (Jer. 22.13-16), Jeremiah could legitimately cast him in a Manassic light as well (v. 17; compare with 2 Kgs 21.16) and wish upon him the fate that Manasseh himself deserved but never suffered (Jer. 22.18-19). Moreover, the Deuteronomistic polemic against Manasseh depicts him as having caused *the nation* to engage in apostasy of the most violent order (2 Kgs 21.6-9, 16). This gave Jeremiah additional license to apply Jehoiakim's sin to the Judean people at large, and the ascription of Canaanite ritual practices to the people of Judah uniformly occurs in passages that originate during the post-*Urrolle* development in the Jeremianic corpus and its sustained anti-monarchic ethic well beyond the days of Jehoiakim.[22]

The Expansion of the Urrolle

At this point, some observations may be made about the growth of the Jeremianic corpus beyond the composition of the *Urrolle*. A consistent strategy emerges from early on in Jeremiah's rhetoric: those who are first addressed by the prophet but who reject his message become examples for future addressees. The Shilonites/northerners became prototypes for the audience of the Temple Sermon, and the wise men (and their related factions) become prototypes for Jehoiakim and the royal retinue. With the rejection of the *Urrolle*, this latter group became the subject of discourse, and the focus of Jeremiah's writings from this point onward seem to be directed to the public rather than to a limited audience.[23] A number of texts in the *Urrolle* would thus become subject to expansion at Jeremiah's hand with a public audience in mind, but it is important to note that they presuppose judgment and the inevitability of Babylonian dominance. The subsequent compositional layers in the corpus often stem from Jeremiah's own hand as he witnessed his earlier words taking effect, and the compositional additions likely persisted throughout the remainder of the prophet's career.[24]

---

22. Zedekiah receives no divine favor either (e.g. Jer. 21) though he is not cast in such derisive terms as Jehoiakim. From the time of Josiah's death onward, Davidic kingship was no longer the apex of covenantal existence in Jeremiah's eyes, but Jehoiakim completely deflates the institution and irrevocably corrupts it as a means for communal sustenance, thereby implicating Zedekiah as well.

23. Such is already intimated by Jer. 36.1-3, though the narrative focuses not on the public reaction but on that of the scribes; the role of the public is the central issue, however, in Jer. 26.

24. So Holladay, *Jeremiah 2*, p. 17: '…it is not stated how long it was after the burning of the first scroll that Jrm [*sic*] dictated his second scroll—it could have been an extended period of time—and in any case the second scroll is "open-ended", so that one cannot expect any signs of a cut-off, since one might assume Baruch could continue to add fresh material as time went on'.

A number of texts and their current arrangements can be attributed to this later period of composition and redaction. Following upon the original Temple Sermon is Jer. 7.16-20, which announces that judgment has arrived and that Jeremiah will no longer be able to intercede for the people, who are guilty through their own sins (vv. 16 and 18).[25] The long collection of material in 7.21–8.3 constitutes subsequent additions, though it is difficult to determine who is responsible for them.[26] Later expansions are be found throughout the book, including the poetry of 8.13-23[27] and 9.14-25,[28] which subsume the *Urrolle* material within the prophet's later message of rendered judgment. It is clear that the scope of the *Urrolle* underwent major changes in subsequent periods, including its expansion into a collection resembling Jeremiah 1–20, which may have constituted the earliest 'official' expansion of the *Urrolle*.[29] This collection clearly dates from a subsequent period, as the various complaints/confessions running through Jeremiah 11–20 are self-reflexive contemplations on Jeremiah's prophetic career in the face of unavoidable political travails secured by Jehoiakim's rejection of the *Urrolle*. Structurally, they carry forward thematic elements from Jeremiah 1–11 and dissolve the closing frame to that corpus by creating *inclusio*s with passages within the 'Anathoth' frame of 1.1/11.23. Such is the case with 20.12, which repeats the lexemes of 11.20, subsuming the following material in 11.21-23 within a larger literary framework.[30]

The joining of additional material is facilitated by the thematic binding of 11.18-23 with 12.1-6 as a single complaint/confession, yielding a larger

---

25. We should note the similarities here with Jer. 11.14, which may serve as the source for 7.16.

26. See C.D. Isbell and M. Jackson, 'Rhetorical Criticism and Jeremiah vii 1–viii 3', *VT* 30 (1980), pp. 20-26. See also D. Rom-Shiloni, 'The Prophecy for "Everlasting Covenant" (Jeremiah xxxii 36-41): An Exilic Addition or a Deuteronomistic Redaction?', *VT* 52 (2002), pp. 201-23. It is worth noting the manner in which one particular subsequent addition transforms an early Josianic-era oracle: Jer. 7.31 makes mention of the valley of Ben-Hinnom, coloring the manner in which 'the valley' in 2.23 is to be understood.

27. Overholt's suggestion ('Jeremiah', p. 554) that the chapter now contains reference to Babylonian destruction more closely applies to the tone of these verses as later additions in light of a post-Carchemish environment.

28. The phrase הנה ימים באים in vv. 24-25 is typical of the prophet's post-597 redactions, as they characterize redactional additions to Jer. 30–31 dating from the same period; see Leuchter, 'Jeremiah's 70-Year Prophecy', pp. 519-20. The nations alluded to in these verses correspond to the territories that would have fallen under Babylonian dominance, and the passage may have originated in some form during the conquest of Judah by Babylon along with the other verses in 9.14-25.

29. The first 'edition' of the book of Jeremiah would have been the re-written scroll and its expanded material as in 36.32 (so also Lundbom, *Jeremiah 1–20*, p. 103).

30. McKane, *Jeremiah*, I, p. 468; Parke-Taylor, *Formation*, p. 16.

macrostructural message in chs. 11–12.[31] A number of the other complaints/ confessions in chs. 11–20 also suggest that they once had a place within the *Urrolle* given their linguistic commonalities with the call narrative or the debate oracles of chs. 8–10 (see, e.g., 15.16; 18.18). The prophet's re-use of these passages evidence his attempt to sustain a sense of theological and structural continuity between the original scroll and its expanded edition.[32] Finally, the placement of 20.14-18 at the end of the corpus forms the 'womb' *inclusio* with 1.5.[33] Whereas the initial purpose of these verses was to mourn for the failure of his mission and Josiah's Deuteronomic reform, the mourning now pertains to the burden of his ongoing mission and indeed the purpose of the evolving active corpus to announce judgment upon the nation.[34]

Jeremiah 20 is itself a summary of elements found within chs. 1–11. While 20.1-6 represents a later narrative addition,[35] vv. 7-12 makes reference to the 'holding back' of the divine word (20.9) which recalls similar references in 6.10-11,[36] and as observed above, 20.12 replicates 11.20 (כי אליך גליתי את ריבי). As well, the motif of 'stumbling' from 6.15 finds its way into this text (יכשלו in v. 11), with the clever play on words later in the verse (השכילו), which must certainly have applied to the wisdom circles (via the related root שכל or 'intelligence'). Finally, 20.14-18 contains a recurrence of the ארור האיש language that so prominently characterized 11.3 in relation to

---

31. O'Connor notes the deliberate structure of Jer. 11.18–12.3 (*Confessions*, pp. 17-18; with the proviso that vv. 21-23 constitute an exegetical clarification) but points out that 12.4-6 do not cohere as well (p. 19). This goes to support the sequence of composition proposed in the present study, namely, that 12.5-6 were generated independently of 11.18-23. The subsequent composition of 12.1-3 forms chiastic parallels with conscious awareness of Jer. 11.18-20 (and vv. 21-23), and the composition of 12.4 (the language of which presupposes devastation of a later period in Judah) facilitates the inclusion of vv. 5-6. For the macrostructure of chs. 11–12, see Smith, *Laments*, pp. 44-50.

32. Parke-Taylor's observations concerning the respective doublets in these passages support the proposed redactional background to their current positions (*Formation*, pp. 35-42). Redactional relocation is almost certainly behind the current location of Jer. 18.18, which bears much in common with the debates of chs. 8–10 and which is anticipated by 6.19.

33. Lundbom, 'The Double Curse'; *idem*, *Jeremiah 1–20*, pp. 93-94.

34. See Wanke, *Baruchschrift*, pp. 155-56. Though Wanke correctly recognizes this theme in chs. 37–44, the current setting for 20.14-18 applies it to the materials that originate with the prophet himself rather than through a later author's narratives. It is perhaps for this reason that Wanke's 'second cycle' of material in 19.1–20.6 (p. 156) is brought into this literary matrix.

35. In the case of Jer. 20 the older poetic text in vv. 7-12 is used to qualify the prose passage in vv. 1-6, identifying Pashhur as the ignorant, theologically corrupt bully who will ultimately get his come-uppance from Yahweh. It is the existence of people like Pashhur, renamed 'Magor-missabib' (v. 3), that realizes the threat of 'all-encompassing terror' introduced in the earlier compositional stratum (v. 10).

36. So also Lundbom, *Jeremiah 1–20*, pp. 856-57.

Deuteronomy 27. Though the prophet's bewailing of his own conception in these verses was written much earlier, its language perfectly suited the need to expand the book and give it thematic and rhetorical continuity. In this way, the meditation in 20.14-18 took on a new meaning: Jeremiah's frustration concerning his own prophetic career is inseparable from his conviction that the covenant curses in Deuteronomy 27 were certain to come to fruition following the rejection of his *Urrolle*. This again points to the degree to which Deuteronomistic ideology informed Jeremiah's poetry as much as it shaped the nature of the parenetic prose.

The Structural Relationship between the Poetry and Parenetic Prose

The macrostructure of Jeremiah 1–25 demonstrates a strategic placement of the poetry and parenetic prose in relation to each other. This feature is certainly a product of the post-Jehoiakim period of the prophet's career, and addresses the demolition of Judah's social order in the wake of the fragmentation of the community at the beginning of the sixth century (see immediately below for a discussion).[37] Whether or not this reflects the handiwork of the prophet himself or a related tradent, it demonstrates rhetorical continuity with earlier compositional layers that may indeed be attributed to Jeremiah. The references to the Shilonites in chs. 30–31 provide a framework for the general discourse in those chapters, regularly punctuating the broader message with terms directed specifically to Shilonites; this creates the impression that the fate of the north is closely bound up with the fate of the Shilonites. The same basic strategy is found with the prose insertions found throughout the *Urrolle*, interjecting specific declarations as structural girders for the surrounding material. The largely poetic oracles of chs. 8–10 are regularly punctuated with brief prosaic passages (8.8; 9.12-13; 10.11) that are well integrated into their literary contexts and are not secondary accretions from a different writer working at a much later period. Rather, they ground the poetic discourses in a larger social and ideological matrix and clarify the prophet's meta-message concerning how one should view Torah, Baalism, and even one's own (misguided) sense of ethnicity.

The prose additions in Jer. 11.21-23 serve a similar purpose; they are secondary and exegetical, but (as demonstrated earlier) thematically integrated into their current context and consistent with the purpose of the poetic passages to which they were appended. This is taken a step further in the structuring of the *Urrolle*, as longer prose passages are placed at regular intervals hermeneutically to guide the reader to a proper understanding of the poetic materials. It is notable that most of these prose passages (the call narrative in Jer. 1; 3.6-11; the Temple Sermon in 7.1-15; and finally the

---

37.   Stulman, 'The Prose Sermons'.

covenantal meditation in 11.1-17) relate to the Josianic period and Deuter-
onomic reform. These passages attempt to demonstrate that the principles of
the reform are inherent to the prophet's personal experiences. This facilitates
the presentation of the *Urrolle* as a second Deuteronomy, and legitimizes the
further development of the Jeremianic corpus along the same structural and
thematic lines.[38] The reliance upon both forms of discourse further suggests
a composite dimension to the variety of sacred texts in late seventh-century
Judah, where the collective weight of these literary traditions could comple-
ment and augment each other in the formation of new messages and insights.

The Growth of the Broader Jeremianic Corpus

The extension of Jeremianic texts beyond ch. 20 through ch. 25 dates from
the later periods of the prophet's career.[39] While the oracles of 22.11-23
were once likely located within the confines of chs. 1–20, they were relo-
cated when later material was added to account for the reigns of later kings.[40]
We cannot know for certain who was responsible for this, but it is certainly
possible that Jeremiah himself was behind this move. The extension of the
active corpus during this period was probably initiated by the exile of 597
that saw Jehoiachin and the elite of Jerusalem deported, and thus allowed the
prophet to address the reality of two communities—the exiles of 597 taken
to Babylon and those who remained in Judah under Zedekiah. This period
would see the composition of ch. 24 and 25.1-13 as the introduction to the
OAN,[41] since Jeremiah's audience was now among the foreign nations in a

---

38. This methodological and thematic feature serves as the basis for subsequent
Jeremianic influence upon the Deuteronomistic material as argued by Friedman, 'The
Deuteronomistic School', pp. 78-80; Sharp, *Jeremiah*, pp. 145-47; Holladay, 'Elusive
Deuteronomists', pp. 75-76; M.Z. Brettler, 'Predestination in Deuteronomy 30.1-10', in
Schearing and McKenzie (eds.), *Those Elusive Deuteronomists*, pp. 171-88.

39. It is notable that Jer. 25.1-3 hermeneutically presents the entirety of chs. 1–25 as
the *Urrolle* itself via the superscription, which adopts the דבר formula present in 11.1
(see also 7.1), and which dates the oracle of Jer. 25 to 'the fourth year of Jehoiakim', that
is, 605. See Peckham, *History and Prophecy*, p. 377 n. 276. It is also worth noting that
the chapter draws from 11.7 by deploying the phrase עד היום הזה.

40. Jer. 22.1-10 is a later addition that introduces the chapter as a collection of poems
against the remaining Davidic kings, working around the core of original poetry that only
addressed Jehoiakim.

41. I take the OAN to have originally been appended to Jer. 25.1-13 (see Lundbom,
'Baruch, Seraiah', p. 103) and later relocated to its current position in the MT version of
the book of Jeremiah. As regards Jer. 24, Parke-Taylor points to the chapter as the lower
limit of an initial Jeremianic corpus, forming a vision *inclusio* with 1.11-16 (*Formation*,
pp. 296-97). The fundamental layers of chs. 1–24, he states, obtain by 597–587, which I
agree is a reasonable view. The need for a second vision distinguishing between Judean
and Babylonian communities is essential if the first vision established the parameters for

very tangible sense. Jeremiah 25.1-13, an early form of the OAN, and the final note now situated in 51.59-64 (concluding with the statement עד הנה דברי ירמיהו) must at some point have constituted what the prophet considered to be the official ending to his active corpus, with 51.64 forming an *inclusio* with 1.1 via the phrase דברי ירמיהו. This was the likely shape of the book at the point of the exile of 597.[42] This was preserved in very similar versions by the community taken to Babylon at that time and the remnant community in Judah that eventually fled to Egypt c. 582, as evidenced by the structural commonalities of the LXX and MT of 1.1–25.13.[43] The composition and inclusion of additional texts that stem from Jeremiah's hand, however, suggest that the corpus was still open to additional development.[44] Thus the later compositions extend the prophet's message and authority into periods far beyond the reign of Jehoiakim, though that king's negative influence informs all of the subsequent oracles and declarations. The Davidic covenant was no longer tenable, the social infrastructure of Judah in the land was no longer sacred, and the future of the people was contingent upon the growth and message of the prophet's corpus itself.

    This very idea serves as the basis not only for Jeremiah's personal additions to his corpus but also for the supplemental unit of Jeremiah 26–45. The sacral institutions bound to the covenantal norms of the pre-exilic period are presented as devoid of merit. Prophetic intercession for the purposes of salvation is repeatedly portrayed as futile (chs. 28 and 37) and kings are presented as alternately brutish or hypocritical (34.8-22; 37–38).[45] Further, the

---

judgment against a corporate Judah at an earlier period, and only part of that community suffered punishment (the deportees of 597). This would suggest that chs. 1–20 obtained its basic form at an earlier period (between 604 and 597) but before the second vision (between 597 and 594, following Holladay's dating), during which time materials dealing solely with Jehoiakim initially located within these chapters would have been expanded beyond them. C.R. Seitz has made a similar observation; see his *Theology in Conflict* (BZAW, 176; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1989), p. 207. Jer. 25.1-13 would also derive from this later 597–587 period; the OAN was developed as time went on once it was appended to the end of the 25.1-13. See Friedman, 'The Deuteronomistic School', pp. 77-78, for evidence of late composition in the OAN. This should not, however, preclude us from seeing the OAN's initial strata as deriving from Jeremiah, especially since they are in concert with his predilection for internationalizing the applicability of his words through the end of the seventh century and certainly in relation to the deportation of 597.

    42.   Leuchter, 'Jeremiah's 70-Year Prophecy', p. 519.

    43.   For an overview, see Schniedewind, *How the Bible Became a Book*, pp. 154-55.

    44.   Chief among these would be Jer. 27–29 and 30–31; see the Introduction and Chapter 4 of this study for discussion.

    45.   See A.R.P. Diamond, 'Portraying Prophecy: Of Doublets, Variants and Analogies in the Narrative Representation of Jeremiah's Oracles—Reconstructing the Hermeneutics of Prophecy', *JSOT* 57 (1993), pp. 99-119 (104-106), for Zedekiah's tactics of intimidation.

national unity advanced by the Deuteronomistic literature is dissolved—the deportees of 597 are presented as the sole bearers of covenantal legitimacy (chs. 24; 27–31) and the remaining population is eventually qualified as a foreign nation (ch. 44).[46] The exclusivity of the Jerusalem Temple is likewise dissolved: Babylon becomes the surrogate locale of covenantal fulfillment and resonance with the divine will (chs. 27–29), political administration reverts back to Mizpah after centuries of Jerusalemite centricity (40.6-12), and the Temple Mount itself becomes a life-threatening snare to the misguided faithful (41.5-7).

At the heart of the developing Jeremianic corpus is the basic notion that the unique nature of the Jerusalemite culture, in terms of its royalistic and cultic foci, is defunct. Emerging from the ashes of the destroyed city of Jerusalem, however, is the idea of Scripture as the new locus of covenantal symbols and institutions, with revelation and covenant enshrined within the verses on the page (31.31-34), ready for individual internalization and application. It is the engagement of text that solidifies the principles of the covenantal dialogue within the nation.[47] The prophetic tradition evolves from an emphasis on figures to an emphasis on their written words, preserved, interpreted, and developed by the scribes who serve as their guardians and the bearers of the prophetic legacy.[48] All this is anticipated in Jeremiah's *Urrolle*, with respect to both form and content, as the prophet relies on the active

46. This suggests the cogency of the location of Jer. 26–45 in the MT, as these chapters emphasize the illegitimacy of the community that remained under Zedekiah and which eventually retreated under Johanan to Egypt (chs. 43–44), and appear immediately before the OAN. Seitz points to the redactional relationship of ch. 45 to the preceding material in relation to the OAN ('The Prophet Moses', pp. 22-27).

47. We should note the specific terminology of Jer. 31.31-34, which suggests that the divine word will be in the mouths of *all* the people who cleave to the Torah. This is a significant reworking of Deut. 18.18, where the divine word will be in the mouth of a Mosaic prophet who will intercede on behalf of the people.

48. Such is indeed overtly expressed in Jer. 26.5, which emphasizes the *words* of Yahweh's prophetic servants rather than the servants themselves, thus departing from the phrase 'the hand of my servants the prophets' (2 Kgs 17.13, 23). For the scribe as the inheritor of prophetic authority, see Seitz, 'The Prophet Moses', pp. 18-26; Dearman, 'My Servants the Scribes', pp. 417-21. For examples of the shift in prophetic focus from oral to written vehicles, see Petersen, *Late Israelite Prophecy*, pp. 45, 97-102; B. Halpern, 'The New Names of Isaiah 62.4: Jeremiah's Reception in the Restoration Politics of "Third Isaiah"', *JBL* 117 (1998), pp. 623-43; Sommer, *A Prophet Reads Scripture*, pp. 32-72 (Sommer's work supports Halpern's observations, despite Williamson's refutation of Halpern's position [H.G.M. Williamson, 'Isaiah 62.4 and the Problem of Inner-Biblical Allusions', *JBL* 119 (2000), pp. 734-39]); M.H. Floyd, 'The משׂא (*maśśa*) as a Type of Prophetic Book', *JBL* 121 (2002), pp. 401-22. Further, the authority of Ezra, a Zadokite priest, appears to be based as much on his training as a scribe as on his priestly lineage (Ezra 7.6, 10-11).

force of previously composed oracles to forge new meaning for a new and more comprehensive theology. The book that eventually came to bear Jeremiah's name contributed significantly to the fundamental ideology of the exilic literary canon and early postexilic Judaism,[49] where Torah would rival and eventually supplant Temple as the defining characteristic of communal and individual identity.[50]

49.   See Holladay, 'Elusive Deuteronomists', pp. 75-76; Brettler, 'Predestination in Deuteronomy 30.1-10'. See also S. Delamarter, 'The Vilification of Jehoiakim (a.k.a. Eliakim and Joiakim) in Early Judaism', in C.A. Evans and J.A. Sanders (eds.), *The Function of Scripture in Early Jewish and Christian Tradition* (JSNTSup, 154; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), pp. 190-204.

50.   See Peckham, *History and Prophecy*, pp. 741-56, 773-77, for this tension in Haggai and Zechariah. See also H. Tadmor, 'The Appointed Time Has Not Yet Come: The Historical Background of Haggai 1.2', in R. Chazan, W.W. Hallo, and L.H. Schiffman (eds.), *Ki Baruch Hu*: *Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Judaic Studies in Honor of Baruch A. Levine* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1999), pp. 401-408. T.C. Eskenazi notes the eventual paralleling of Temple and Torah as equally vital in the architecture of Ezra–Nehemiah ('The Structure of Ezra–Nehemiah and the Integrity of the Book', *JBL* 107 [1988], pp. 641-56 [649-50]). Though the Zadokite party would subsequently shape literary tradition to present the Temple as the theological epicenter of the Jewish world, dissident groups relied upon literary reflexes to divorce the notion of written revelation from exclusive Zadokite auspices; see Boccaccini, *Roots of Rabbinic Judaism*, pp. 89-103.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ahlström, G.W., *The History of Ancient Palestine from the Palaeolithic Period to Alexander's Conquest* (ed. D.V. Edelman; JSOTSup, 146; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993).

Avi-Yonah, M., 'Scythopolis', *IEJ* 12 (1962), pp. 123-34.

Avigad, N., 'Hebrew Seals and Sealings and their Significance for Biblical Research', in Emerton (ed.), *Congress Volume: Jerusalem, 1986*, pp. 7-16.

Barrick, W.B., 'Dynastic Politics, Priestly Succession, and Josiah's Eighth Year', *ZAW* 112 (2000), pp. 564-82.

—*The King and the Cemeteries: Toward a New Understanding of Josiah's Reform* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2002).

Baumann, G., 'Jeremia, die Weisen und die Weisheit', *ZAW* 114 (2002), pp. 59-79.

Beck, A., *et al.* (eds.), *Fortunate the Eyes That See: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebration of his Seventieth Birthday* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995).

Bedford, P.R., 'Diaspora: Homeland Relations in Ezra–Nehemiah', *VT* 52 (2002), pp. 147-65.

Ben Zvi, E., 'History and Prophetic Texts', in M.P. Graham, William P. Brown, and Jeffrey K. Kuan (eds.), *History and Interpretation: Essays in Honour of John H. Hayes* (JSOTSup, 173; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), pp. 106-20.

—'Who Wrote the Speech of the Rabshakeh and When?', *JBL* 109 (1990), pp. 79-92.

Bergey, R., 'The Song of Moses (Deuteronomy 32.1-43) and Isaianic Prophecies: A Case of Early Intertextuality?', *JSOT* 28 (2003), pp. 33-54.

Berlin, A., 'Jer. 29.5-7: A Deuteronomic Allusion?', *HAR* 8 (1984), pp. 3-11.

Boccaccini, G., *Roots of Rabbinic Judaism: An Intellectual History, from Ezekiel to Daniel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002).

Bodner, K., 'The Locution of 1 Kgs 22.28: A New Proposal', *JBL* 122 (2003), pp. 533-43.

Bogaert, P.-M. (ed.), *Le Livre de Jérémie: Le prophète et son milieu. Les oracles et leur transmission* (Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium, 54; Leuven: Peeters Press, 1997 [original, 1981]).

Börcher-Klähn, J., *Altvorderasiatische Bildstelen und vergleichbare Felsreliefs* (Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1982).

Borges de Sousa, A., 'Jer 4,23-26 als P-orientierter Abschnitt', *ZAW* 105 (1993), pp. 419-28.

Brettler, M.Z., *The Creation of History in Ancient Israel* (London: Routledge, 1995).

—'Interpretation and Prayer: Notes on the Composition of 1 Kings 8.15-53', in M. Brettler and M. Fishbane (eds.), *Minhah le-Nahum: Biblical and Other Studies Presented to Nahum M. Sarna in Honour of his 70th Birthday* (JSOTSup, 154; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), pp. 17-35.

—'A "Literary Sermon" in Deuteronomy 4', in Olyan and Culley (eds.), *A Wise And Discerning Mind*, pp. 33-50.

—'Predestination in Deuteronomy 30.1-10', in Schearing and McKenzie (eds.), *Those Elusive Deuteronomists*, pp. 171-88.

Brueggemann, W., 'Jeremiah's Use of Rhetorical Questions', *JBL* 92 (1973), pp. 358-74.

Bright, J., 'The Date of the Prose Sermons of Jeremiah', *JBL* 70 (1951), pp. 15-35.

—*A History of Israel* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 4th edn, 2000).

—*Jeremiah* (AB, 21; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1965).

Carr, D.M., *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature* (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

Carroll, R.P., 'The Book of J: Intertextuality and Ideological Criticism', in Diamond, O'Connor, and Stulman (eds.), *Troubling Jeremiah*, pp. 220-43.

—*From Chaos to Covenant* (New York: Crossroad, 1981).

—'Halfway Through a Dark Wood: Reflections on Jeremiah 25', in Diamond, O'Connor, and Stulman (eds.), *Troubling Jeremiah*, pp. 73-86.

—*Jeremiah: A Commentary* (OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1986).

—'Something Rich and Strange: Imagining a Future for Jeremiah Studies', in Diamond, O'Connor, and Stulman (eds.), *Troubling Jeremiah*, pp. 423-43.

Cassuto, U., *Biblical and Oriental Studies I* (trans. I. Abrahams; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1973).

Chazan, R., W.W. Hallo, and L.H. Schiffman (eds.), *Ki Baruch Hu*: *Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Judaic Studies in Honor of Baruch A. Levine* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1999).

Childs, B.S., *The Book of Exodus: A Critical, Theological Commentary* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1974).

—'The *Enemy* from the North and the Chaos Tradition', in Perdue and Kovacs (eds.), *A Prophet to the Nations*, pp. 151-61.

Christensen, D.L. (ed.), *A Song of Power and the Power of Song*: *Essays on the Book of Deuteronomy* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1993).

Cogan, M. (with H. Tadmor), *II Kings* (AB, 11; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1988).

—'Judah under Assyrian Hegemony: A Reexamination of *Imperialism and Religion*', *JBL* 112 (1993), pp. 403-14.

Cohn, R.L., 'Literary Technique in the Jeroboam Narrative', *ZAW* 97 (1985), pp. 23-35.

Coogan, M.D. (ed.), *The Oxford History of the Biblical World* (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998).

Cook, S.L., 'The Lineage Roots of Hosea's Yahwism', *Semeia* 87 (1999), pp. 145-62.

Cross, F.M., *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973).

—'Josiah's Revolt Against Assyria', *JNES* 12 (1953), pp. 56-58.

Culley, R.C., 'The Confessions of Jeremiah and Traditional Discourse', in Olyan and Culley (eds.), *A Wise and Discerning Mind*, pp. 69-81.

Day, J., 'The Destruction of the Shiloh Sanctuary and Jeremiah vii 12, 14', in J.A. Emerton (ed.), *Studies in the Historical Books of the Old Testament* (VTSup, 30; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1979), pp. 87-94.

Day, J., R.P. Gordon, and H.G.M. Williamson (eds.), *Wisdom in Ancient Israel: Essays in Honour of J.A. Emerton* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

Dearman, J.A., 'My Servants the Scribes: Composition and Context in Jeremiah 36', *JBL* 109 (1990), pp. 403-21.

Delamarter, S., 'The Death of Josiah in Scripture and Tradition: Wrestling with the Problem of Evil?', *VT* 54 (2004), pp. 29-60.

—'The Vilification of Jehoiakim (a.k.a. Eliakim and Joiakim) in Early Judaism', in C.A. Evans and J.A. Sanders (eds.), *The Function of Scripture in Early Jewish and Christian Tradition* (JSNTSup, 154; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), pp. 190-204.

DeRoche, M., 'The Reversal of Creation in Hosea', *VT* 31 (1981), pp. 401-407.

Diamond, A.R.P., 'Introduction', in Diamond, O'Connor, and Stulman (eds.), *Troubling Jeremiah*, pp. 15-32.

—'Portraying Prophecy: Of Doublets, Variants and Analogies in the Narrative Representation of Jeremiah's Oracles—Reconstructing the Hermeneutics of Prophecy', *JSOT* 57 (1993), pp. 99-119.

Diamond, A.R.P., K.M. O'Connor, and L. Stulman (eds.), *Troubling Jeremiah* (JSOTSup, 260; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999).

Dion, P.E., 'Deuteronomy 13: The Suppression of Alien Religious Propaganda in Israel during the Late Monarchical Era', in B. Halpern and D. Hobson (eds.), *Law and Ideology in Monarchic Israel* (JSOTSup, 124; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), pp. 147-206.

Donner, H., 'The Separate States of Israel and Judah', in Hayes and Miller (eds.), *Israelite and Judaean History*, pp. 381-434.

Dorsey, D.A., *The Roads and Highways of Ancient Israel* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991).

Duke, R.K., 'The Portion of the Levite: Another Reading of Deuteronomy 18.6-8', *JBL* 106 (1987), pp. 193-201.

Durham, J., and J.R. Porter (eds.), *Proclamation and Presence: Old Testament Essays in Honour of Gwynne Henton Davies* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1983).

Ehrensvärd, M., 'Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts', in Young (ed.), *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology*, pp. 164-88.

Ehrman, A., 'A Note on בטח in Jer. 12.5', *JSS* 5 (1960), pp. 153-55.

Emerton, J.A. (ed.), *Congress Volume: Jerusalem, 1986* (VTSup, 40; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1988).

Eskenazi, T.C., 'The Structure of Ezra–Nehemiah and the Integrity of the Book', *JBL* 107 (1988), pp. 641-56.

Finkelstein, I., *Shiloh: The Archaeology of a Biblical Site* (Tel Aviv University Monograph Series, 10; Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, 1993).

Finkelstein, I., and N.A. Silberman, *The Bible Unearthed* (New York: The Free Press, 2001).

Fishbane, M., *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985).

—'Jeremiah iv 23-26 and Job iii 3-13: A Recovered Use of the Creation Pattern', *VT* 21 (1971), pp. 151-67.

—'Rabbinic Mythmaking and Tradition: The Great Dragon Drama in *b. Baba Batra* 74b-75a', in M. Cogan, Barry L. Eichler, and Jeffrey H. Tigay (eds.), *Tehilla le-Moshe: Biblical and Judaic Studies in Honor of Moshe Greenberg* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1997), pp. 273-83.

Floyd, M.H., 'The משׂא (*maśśa*) as a Type of Prophetic Book', *JBL* 121 (2002), pp. 401-22.

Fox, M.V., *et al*. (eds.), *Texts, Temples and Traditions*: *A Tribute to Menachem Haran* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns 1996).

Frame, G., 'The "First Families" of Borsippa during the Early Neo-Babylonian Period', *JCS* 36 (1984), pp. 67-80.

Freedman, D.N., *The Unity of the Hebrew Bible* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1991).

Friedman, R.E., 'The Deuteronomistic School', in Beck *et al.* (eds.), *Fortunate the Eyes That See*, pp. 70-80.

—*The Exile and Biblical Narrative* (HSM, 22; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981).

—'From Egypt to Egypt: Dtr1 and Dtr2', in Halpern and Levenson (eds.), *Traditions in Transformation: Turning Points in Biblical Faith*, pp. 167-92.

—*Who Wrote the Bible?* (New York: HarperCollins, 1997).

Frost, S.B., 'The Death of Josiah: A Conspiracy of Silence', *JBL* 87 (1968), pp. 369-82.

Garr, W.R., 'The Grammar and Interpretation of Exodus 6.3', *JBL* 111 (1992), pp. 385-408.

Geoghegan, J.C., ' "Until this Day" and the Pre-Exilic Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History', *JBL* 122 (2003), pp. 201-27.

Gerstenberger, E., 'Jeremiah's Complaints: Observations on Jer. 15.10-21', *JBL* 82 (1963), pp. 393-408.

Gevaryahu, H.M.I., 'Biblical Colophons: A Source for the "Biography" of Authors, Texts and Books', in G.W. Anderson and P.A.H. de Boer (eds.), *Congress Volume: Edinburgh, 1974* (VTSup, 28; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1975), pp. 42-59.

Gilbert, M., 'Jérémie en conflit avec les sages?', in Bogaert (ed.), *Le Livre de Jérémie*, pp. 105-18.

Ginsberg, H.L., *The Israelian Heritage of Judaism* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1982).

Gnuse, R.K., 'Redefining the Elohist', *JBL* 119 (2000), pp. 201-20.

Grabbe, L.L., *Priests, Prophets, Diviners, Sages: A Socio-Historical Study of Religious Specialists in Ancient Israel* (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press, 1995).

Greenfield, J.C., 'The Wisdom of Ahiqar', in Day, Gordon, and Williamson (eds.), *Wisdom in Ancient Israel*, pp. 43-52.

Gunneweg, A.H.J., 'Ordinationsformular oder Berufsbericht in Jeremiah I', in G. Müller and W. Zeller (eds.), *Glaube, Geist, Geschichte: Festschrift für Ernst Benz zum 60. Geburstage am 17. November 1967* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1967), pp. 91-98.

Hahn, S.W., and J.S. Bergsma, 'What Laws Were "Not Good"? A Canonical Approach to the Theological Problem of Ezekiel 20.25-26', *JBL* 123 (2004), pp. 201-18.

Halpern, B., 'The Baal (and the Ashera?) in Seventh Century Judah', in R. Bartelmus, T. Kruger, and H. Utzschneider (eds.), *Konsequente Traditionsgeschichte: Festschrift für Klaus Baltzer zum 85. Geburstage* (OBO, 126; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1993), , pp. 115-54.

—'Brisker Pipes than Poetry: The Development of Israelite Monotheism', in Neusner, Frerichs, and Levine (eds.), *Judaic Perspectives on Ancient Israel*, pp. 77-115.

—*David's Secret Demons: Messiah, Murderer, Traitor, King* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001).

—'Jerusalem and the Lineages in the 7th Century BCE: Kinship and the Rise of Individual Moral Liability', in Halpern and Hobson (eds.), *Law and Ideology in Monarchic Israel*, pp. 11-107.

—'Levitic Participation in the Reform Cult of Jeroboam I', *JBL* 95 (1976), pp. 31-42.

—'The New Names in Isaiah 62.4: Jeremiah's Reception in the Restoration and the Politics of "Third Isaiah" ', *JBL* 117 (1998), pp. 623-43.

—'The Uneasy Compromise: Israel between League and Monarchy', in Halpern and Levenson (eds.), *Traditions in Transformation: Turning Points in Biblical Faith*, pp. 59-96.

Halpern, B., and D. Vanderhooft, 'The Editions of Kings in the 7th–6th Centuries', *HUCA* 62 (1991), pp. 179-244.

Halpern, B., and D. Hobson (eds.), *Law and Ideology in Monarchic Israel* (JSOTSup, 124; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991).

Halpern, B., and J.D. Levenson (eds.), *Traditions in Transformation: Turning Points in Biblical Faith* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1981).

Hanson, P.D., 'Israelite Religion in the Early Post-Exilic Period', in Miller, Hanson, and McBride (eds.), *Ancient Israelite Religion*, pp. 485-506.

Haran, M., 'Behind the Scenes of History: Determining the Date of the Priestly Source', *JBL* 100 (1981), pp. 321-33.

—'From Early to Classical Prophecy: Continuity and Change', *VT* 27 (1977), pp. 385-97.

—'Shiloh and Jerusalem: The Origin of the Priestly Tradition in the Pentateuch', *JBL* 81 (1962), pp. 14-24.

Hayes, J.H., and J.M. Miller (eds.), *Israelite and Judaean History* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1977).

Heaton, E.W., *The School Tradition of the Old Testament* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994).

Heltzer, M., 'Some Questions concerning the Economic Policy of Josiah', *IEJ* 50 (2000), pp. 105-108.

Herrmann, S., 'Die Bewältigung der Krise Israels', in H. Donner, R. Hanhart, and R. Smend (eds.), *Beiträge zur alttestamentlichen Theologie: Festschrift für Walther Zimmerlo zum 70. Geburstag* (Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977), pp. 164-78.

Herzog C., and M. Gichon, *Battles of the Bible* (London: Greenhill Books, 1997).

Hobbs, T.R., 'Some Proverbial Reflections in the Book of Jeremiah', *ZAW* 91 (1979), pp. 62-72.

Hoffman, Y., 'History and Ideology: The Case of Jeremiah 44', *JANES* 28 (2000), pp. 43-51.

—'A North Israelite Typological Myth and a Judaean Historical Tradition: The Exodus in Hosea and Amos', *VT* 39 (1989), pp. 169-82.

Holladay, J.S., 'Assyrian Statecraft and the Prophets of Israel', *HTR* 63 (1970), pp. 29-51.

Holladay, W.L., 'The Background of Jeremiah's Self-Understanding: Moses, Samuel, and Psalm 22', in Perdue and Kovacs (eds.), *A Prophet to the Nations*, pp. 313-24.

—'Elusive Deuteronomists, Jeremiah, and Proto-Deuteronomy', *CBQ* 66 (2004), pp. 55-77.

—'The Identification of the Two Scrolls of Jeremiah', *VT* 30 (1980), pp. 452-67.

—*Jeremiah 1: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah Chapters 1–25* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1986).

—*Jeremiah 2: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah Chapters 26–52* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989).

—'Jeremiah and Moses: Further Observations', *JBL* 85 (1966), pp. 18-27.

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

Hubmann, F.D., *Untersuchungen zu den Konfessionen: Jer 11,18–12,6 und Jer 15,10-21* (Forschung zur Bibel, 30; Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1978).

Hurowitz, V.A., *I Have Built You an Exalted House: Temple Building in the Bible in Light of Mesopotamian and Northwest Semitic Writings* (JSOTSup, 115; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992).

Hyatt, J.P., 'The Deuteronomic Edition of Jeremiah', in Perdue and Kovacs (eds.), *A Prophet to the Nations*, pp. 247-67.

Isbell, C.D., '2 Kings 22.3–23.24 and Jeremiah 36: A Stylistic Comparison', *JSOT* 8 (1978), pp. 33-45.

Isbell, C.D., and M. Jackson, 'Rhetorical Criticism and Jeremiah vii 1–viii 3', *VT* 30 (1980), pp. 20-26.

Ishida, T. (ed.), *Studies in the Period of David and Solomon and Other Essays* (Tokyo: Yamakawa-Shuppansha, 1982).

Jacobsen, T., 'The Graven Image', in Miller, Hanson, and McBride (eds.), *Ancient Israelite Religion*, pp. 15-32.

Jacobson, H., 'Jeremiah xxx 17: ציון היא', *VT* 54 (2004), pp. 398-99.

Jenks, A., *The Elohistic Source and North Israelite Traditions* (SBLMS, 22; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977).

Jensen, J., *The Use of tôrâ by Isaiah: His Debate with the Wisdom Tradition* (CBQMS, 3; Washington: Catholic Biblical Association, 1973).

Kang, S.M., 'The Authentic Sermon of Jeremiah in Jeremiah 7.1-20', in Fox *et al.* (eds.), *Texts, Temples and Traditions*, pp. 147-62.

Kaufman, S.A., 'Rhetoric, Redaction and Message in Jeremiah', in Neusner, Frerichs, and Levine (eds.), *Judaic Perspectives on Ancient Israel*, pp. 63-74.

Kessler, M., 'Form-Critical Suggestions on Jer. 36', *CBQ* 28 (1966), pp. 389-401.

—'The Function of Chapters 25 and 50–51 in the Book of Jeremiah', in Diamond, O'Connor, and Stulman (eds.), *Troubling Jeremiah*, pp. 64-72.

—'The Significance of Jer 36', *ZAW* 81 (1969), pp. 381-83.

King, P.J., *Jeremiah: An Archaeological Companion* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993).

Kopf, L., 'Arabische Etymologien und Parallelen zum Bibelwörterbuch', *VT* 8 (1958), pp. 101-25.

Knoppers, G., 'Aaron's Calf and Jeroboam's Calves', in Beck *et al.* (eds.), *Fortunate the Eyes That See*, pp. 92-104.

—'Prayer and Propaganda: Solomon's Dedication of the Temple and the Deuteronomist's Program', *CBQ* 57 (1995), pp. 229-54.

—'Rethinking the Relationship between Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History: The Case of Kings', *CBQ* 63 (2001), pp. 393-415.

—*Two Nations under God*: The Deuteronomistic History of Solomon and the Dual Monarchies, I and II (HSM, 52/53; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993–94).

Krašovec, J., *Antithetic Structure in Biblical Hebrew Poetry* (VTSup, 35; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1984).

Lalleman-de Winkel, H., *Jeremiah in Prophetic Tradition: An Examination of the Book of Jeremiah in the Light of Israel's Prophetic Traditions* (Leuven: Peeters, 2000).

Leichty, E., 'The Colophon', in R.D. Biggs and J.A. Brinkman (eds.), *Studies Presented to A. Leo Oppenheim, June 7, 1964* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964), pp. 147-54.

Lemaire, A., 'Jérémie xxv 10b et la stèle araméenne de Bukan', *VT* 47 (1997), pp. 543-45.

—'Wisdom in Solomonic Historiography', in Day, Gordon, and Williamson (eds.), *Wisdom in Ancient Israel*, pp. 106-18.

Leuchter, M., 'Jeremiah's 70-Year Prophecy and the ששך/לב קמי *atbash* Codes', *Bib* 85 (2004), pp. 503-22.

—'Jeroboam the Ephratite', *JBL* (forthcoming).

—'The Literary Strata and Narrative Sources of Psalm xcix', *VT* 55 (2005), pp. 20-38.

—'Something Old, Something Older: Reconsidering 1 Sam. 2.27-36', *JHS* 4 (2003), Article 6, <http://www.jhsonline.org>.

—'The Temple Sermon and the Term מקום in the Jeremianic Corpus', *JSOT* 30 (2005), pp. 93-109.

Levenson, J.D., 'From Temple to Synagogue: 1 Kings 8', in Halpern and Levenson (eds.), *Traditions in Transformation: Turning Points in Biblical Faith*, pp. 143-66.

Levin, Y., 'From Lists to History: Chronological Aspects of the Chronicler's Genealogies', *JBL* 123 (2004), pp. 601-36.

Levine, B.A., *Numbers 21–36* (AB, 4A; New York: Doubleday, 2000).

Levinson, B.M., *Deuteronomy and the Hermeneutics of Legal Innovation* (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997).

—'The Hermeneutics of Tradition in Deuteronomy: A Response to J.G. McConville', *JBL* 119 (2000), pp. 269-86.

—'The Reconceptualization of Kingship in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History's Transformation of Torah', *VT* 51 (2001), pp. 511-34.

Lewin, E., 'Arguing for Authority: A Rhetorical Study of Jeremiah 1.4-19 and 20.7-18', *JSOT* 32 (1985), pp. 105-19.

Linville, J.R., 'On the Nature of Rethinking Prophetic Literature: Stirring a Neglected Stew (A Response to David L. Petersen)', *JHS* 2 (1998–99), Article 3, <http://www.jhsonline.org>.

Lipiński, E., 'Royal and State Scribes in Ancient Jerusalem', in Emerton (ed.), *Congress Volume: Jerusalem, 1986*, pp. 157-64.

Lohfink, N., 'The Cult Reform of Josiah of Judah: 2 Kings 22–23 as a Source for the History of Israelite Religion', in Miller, Hanson, and McBride (eds.), *Ancient Israelite Religion*, pp. 459-75.

—'Der junge Jeremia als Propagandist und Poet. Zum Grundstock von Jer 30–31', in Bogaert (ed.), *Le Livre de Jérémie*, pp. 351-68.

—'Die Sicherung der Wirksamkeit des Gotteswortes durch das Prinzip der Schriftlichkeit der Tora und durch das Prinzip der Gewaltenteilung nach den Ämtergesetzen des Buches Deuteronomium (Dt. 16,18–18,22)', in *idem*, *Studien zum Deuteronomium und zur deuteronomistischen Literatur I* (SBAB, 8; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1990), pp. 305-23.

Long, B.O., *2 Kings* (FOTL, 10; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991).

Lowery, R.H., *The Reforming Kings: Cult and Society in First Temple Judah* (JSOTSup, 120; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991).

Luker, L., 'Rachel's Tomb', in *ABD*, V, pp. 608-609.

Lundbom, J.R., 'Baruch, Seraiah, and Expanded Colophons in the Book of Jeremiah', *JSOT* 36 (1986), pp. 89-114.

—'The Double Curse in Jeremiah 20.14-18', *JBL* 104 (1986), pp. 589-600.

—'The *Inclusio* and Other Framing Devices in Deuteronomy i–xxviii', *VT* 46 (1996), pp. 296-315.

—*Jeremiah 1–20* (AB, 21A; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1999).

—*Jeremiah 21–36* (AB, 21B; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 2004).

—*Jeremiah 37–52* (AB, 21C; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 2004).

—*Jeremiah: A Study in Ancient Hebrew Rhetoric* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1997 [repr. of 1975 edn]).

—'Rhetorical Structures in Jeremiah 1', *ZAW* 103 (1991), pp. 193-210.

Machinist, P., 'The Rab Šāqēh at the Wall of Jerusalem: Israelite Identity in the Face of the Assyrian "Other"', *Hebrew Studies* 41 (2000), pp. 151-68.

Macintosh, A.A., 'Hosea and the Wisdom Tradition: Dependence and Independence', in Day, Gordon, and Williamson (eds.), *Wisdom in Ancient Israel*, pp. 124-32.

Malamat, A., *History of Biblical Israel: Major Problems and Minor Issues* (Culture and History of the Ancient Near East, 7; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2001).

—'The Historical Setting of Two Biblical Prophecies on the Nations', *IEJ* 1 (1950–51), pp. 155-59.

—'Josiah's Bid for Armageddon', *JANES* 5 (1973), pp. 267-73.

Margaliot, M., 'Jeremiah x 1-16: A Re-Examination', *VT* 30 (1980), pp. 295-308.

McBride, S.D., 'Polity of the Covenant People: The Book of Deuteronomy', in Christensen (ed.), *A Song of Power and the Power of Song*, pp. 62-77.

McCarter, P.K., *I Samuel* (AB, 8; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1980).

McKane, W., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jeremiah* (ICC; 2 vols.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1986–96).

Mendenhall, G.E., 'Samuel's "Broken Rîb": Deuteronomy 32', in Christensen (ed.), *A Song of Power and the Power of Song*, pp. 169-80.

Mettinger, T.N.D., *Solomonic State Officials: A Study of the Civil Government Officials of the Israelite Monarchy* (Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1971).

—'Yahweh Sabaoth—The Heavenly King on the Cherubim Throne', in Ishida (ed.), *Studies in the Period of David and Solomon*, pp. 109-38.

Meyers, C. 'Kinship and Kingship: The early monarchy', in Coogan (ed.), *Oxford History of the Biblical World*, pp. 165-205.

Milgrom, J., 'The Antiquity of the Priestly Source: A Reply to Joseph Blenkinsopp', *ZAW* 111 (1999), pp. 10-22.

Miller, J.M., and J.H. Hayes, *A History of Ancient Israel and Judah* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1986).

Miller, P.D., P.D. Hanson, and S.D. McBride (eds.), *Ancient Israelite Religion: Essays in Honor of Frank Moore Cross* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987).

Morrow, W.S., *Scribing the Center: Organization and Redaction in Deuteronomy 14.1– 17.13* (SBLMS, 49; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995).

Mowinckel, S., *Zur Komposition des Buches Jeremia* (Kristiania: J. Dybwad, 1914).

Muilenberg, J., 'Baruch the Scribe', in Durham and Porter (eds.), *Proclamation and Presence*, pp. 215-38.

Na'aman, N., 'The Debated Historicity of Hezekiah's Reform in the Light of Historical and Archaeological Research', *ZAW* 107 (1995), pp. 179-95.

—'The Pre-Deuteronomistic Story of King Saul and its Historical Significance', *CBQ* 54 (1992), pp. 638-58.

Nelson, R.D., 'The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History: The Case is Still Compelling', *JSOT* 29 (2005), pp. 319-37.

Neusner, J., E. Frerichs, and B. Levine (eds.), *Judaic Perspectives on Ancient Israel* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987).

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

Nielsen, E., *The Ten Commandments in New Perspective* (SBT, 7; Naperville, IL: Allenson, 1968).

Nurmela, R., *The Levites: Their Emergence as a Second-Class Priesthood* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998).

O'Connor, K.M., *The Confessions of Jeremiah: Their Interpretation and Role in Chapters 1–25* (SBLDS, 94; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988).

—'"Do Not Trim a Word": The Contribution of Chapter 26 to the Book of Jeremiah', *CBQ* 51 (1989), pp. 617-30.

Oded, B., 'Judah and the Exile', in Hayes and Miller (eds.), *Israelite and Judaean History*, pp. 435-88.

Olyan, S., and R.C. Culley (eds.), *A Wise and Discerning Mind: Essays in Honor of Burke O. Long* (BJS, 325; Providence, RI: Brown University, 2000).

Otto, E., 'Rechtsreformen in Deuteronomium xii–xxvi und im mittelassyrichen Kodex der Tafel A (KAV 1)', in J.A. Emerton (ed.), *Congress Volume: Paris, 1992* (VTSup, 61; Leiden: Brill, 1995), pp. 239-73.

Overholt, T., 'Jeremiah', in J.L. Mays (ed.), *The HarperCollins Bible Commentary* (New York: HarperCollins, 2000), pp. 538-76.

—*The Threat of Falsehood: A Study in the Theology of the Book of Jeremiah* (SBT, Second Series, 16; London: SCM Press, 1970).

Parke-Taylor, G., *The Formation of the Book of Jeremiah: Doublets and Recurring Phrases* (SBLMS, 51; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000).

Paul, S.M., 'Deutero-Isaiah and Cuneiform Royal Inscriptions', in W.W. Hallo (ed.), *Essays in Memory of E.A. Speiser* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968), pp. 180-86.

Pearce, R.A., 'Shiloh and Jer. vii 12, 14 & 15', *VT* 23 (1973), pp. 105-108.

Peckham, J.B., *History and Prophecy* (New York: Doubleday, 1993).

—'Writing and Editing', in Beck *et al.* (eds.), *Fortunate the Eyes That See*, pp. 364-83.

Pečírková, J., 'The Administrative Methods of Assyrian Imperialism', *Archív Orientální* 55 (1987), pp. 162-75.

Perdue, L.G., 'Jeremiah in Modern Research', in Perdue and Kovacs (eds.), *A Prophet to the Nations*, pp. 1-32.

Perdue, L.G., and B.W. Kovacs (eds.), *A Prophet to the Nations: Essays in Jeremiah Studies* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1984).

Petersen, D.L., *Late Israelite Prophecy: Studies in Deutero-Prophetic Literature and in Chronicles* (SBLMS, 23; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977).

Pohlmann, K.F., *Studien zum Jeremiabuch: Ein Beitrag zur Frage nach der Entstehung des Jeremiabuches* (FRLANT, 118; Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978).

Polak, F., 'The Oral and the Written: Syntax, Stylistics and the Development of Biblical Prose Narrative', *JANES* 26 (1998), pp. 59-105.

—'Style is More Than the Person: Sociolinguistics, Literary Culture, and the Distinction between Written and Oral Narrative', in Young (ed.), *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology*, pp. 38-103.

Provan, I., V. Phillips Long, and T. Longman, III, *A History of Biblical Israel* (Louisville, KY/London: Westminster/John Knox Press, 2003).

Rendsburg, G.A., *Linguistic Evidence for the Northern Origins of Selected Psalms* (SBLMS, 43; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990).

—'Some False Leads in the Identification of Late Biblical Hebrew Texts: The Case of Genesis 24 and 1 Samuel 2.27-36', *JBL* 121 (2002), pp. 23-46.

Reventlow, H.G., 'Gattung und Überlieferung in der "Tempelrede Jeremias"', *ZAW* 81 (1969), pp. 315-52.

—*Liturgie und prophetisches Ich bei Jeremia* (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1963).

Rietzschel, C., *Das Problem der Urrolle: Ein Beitrag zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Jeremiabuches* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher [Gerd Mohn], 1966).

Roberts, J.J.M., 'The Davidic Origin of the Zion Tradition', *JBL* 92 (1973), pp. 329-44.

—'The Enthronement of Yhwh and David: The Abiding Theological Significance of the Kingship Language of the Psalms', *CBQ* 64 (2002), pp. 675-86.

—'Zion in the Theology of the Davidic–Solomonic Empire', in Ishida (ed.), *Studies in the Period of David and Solomon*, pp. 93-108.

Robertson, D.A., *Linguistic Evidence In Dating Early Hebrew Poetry* (SBLDS, 3; Missoula, MT: Society of Biblical Literature, 1972).

Rofé, A., 'The Strata of the Law about the Centralization of Worship in Deuteronomy and the History of the Deuteronomic Movement', in *Congress Volume: Uppsala, 1971* (VTSup, 22; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1972), pp. 221-26.

Römer, T.C., 'How Did Jeremiah Become a Convert to Deuteronomistic Ideology?', in Schearing and McKenzie (eds.), *Those Elusive Deuteronomists*, pp. 189-99.

Rom-Shiloni, D., 'The Prophecy for "Everlasting Covenant" (Jeremiah xxxii 36-41): An Exilic Addition or a Deuteronomistic Redaction?', *VT* 52 (2002), pp. 201-23.

Rudman, D., 'Is the Rabshakeh Also among the Prophets? A Rhetorical Study of 2 Kings xviii 17-35', *VT* 50 (2000), pp. 100-110.

Sanders P., *The Provenance of Deuteronomy 32* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996).

Schaper, J., 'Exilic and Post-Exilic Prophecy and the Orality/Literary Problem', *VT* 55 (2005), pp. 324-42.

Schearing, L.S., and S.L. McKenzie (eds.), *Those Elusive Deuteronomists: The Phenomenon of Pan-Deuteronomism* (JSOTSup, 268; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999).

Schley, D.G., *Shiloh: A Biblical City in Tradition and History* (JSOTSup, 63; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989).

Schniedewind, W.M., *How the Bible Became a Book*: *The Textualization of Ancient Israel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

—*Society and the Promise to David* (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999).

—*The Word of God in Transition: From Prophet to Exegete in the Second Temple Period* (JSOTSup, 197; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995).

Seitz, C.R., 'The Prophet Moses and the Canonical Shape of Jeremiah', *ZAW* 101 (1989), pp. 3-27.

—*Theology in Conflict* (BZAW, 176; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1989).

Sharp, C.J., *Prophecy and Ideology in Jeremiah* (New York/London: T. & T. Clark International, 2003).

—'Review of Jack R. Lundbom, *Jeremiah 21–36*', *Review of Biblical Literature* (2005), <http://www.bookreviews.org>.

—'Take Another Scroll and Write: A Study of the LXX and the MT of Jeremiah's Oracles against Egypt and Babylon', *VT* 47 (1997), pp. 487-516.

Shedletsky, L., 'Josiah's Reform and the Dynamics of Defilement: A Phenomenological Approach to 2 Kings 23' (PhD Dissertation, New York University, 2004).

Shroter, U., 'Jeremias Botschaft für das Nordreich, zu N. Lohfinks Überlegungen zum Grundbestand von Jeremia xxx–xxxi', *VT* 35 (1985), pp. 312-29.

Sisson, J.P., 'Jeremiah and the Jerusalem Conception of Peace', *JBL* 105 (1986), pp. 429-42.

Smith, M.S., *The Laments of Jeremiah and their Context: A Literary and Redactional Study of Jeremiah 11–20* (SBLMS, 42; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990).

—*The Pilgrimage Pattern in Exodus* (JSOTSup, 239; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997).

Soggin, J.A., 'The Ark of the Covenant, Jeremiah 3,16', in Bogaert (ed.), *Le Livre de Jérémie*, pp. 215-21.

Sommer, B.D., 'New Light on the Composition of Jeremiah', *CBQ* 61 (1999), pp. 646-66.

—*A Prophet Reads Scripture: Allusion in Isaiah 40–66* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998).

Stager, L.E., 'Forging an Identity: The Emergence of Ancient Israel', in Coogan (ed.), *Oxford History of the Biblical World*, pp. 123-75.

Steiner, R.C., 'The Two Sons of Neriah and the Two Editions of Jeremiah in Light of the Two *atbash* Code-Words for Babylon', *VT* 46 (1996), pp. 74-84.

Stulman, L., 'The Prose Sermons as Hermeneutical Guide to Jeremiah 1–25: The Deconstruction of Judah's Symbolic World', in Diamond, O'Connor, and Stulman (eds.), *Troubling Jeremiah*, pp. 34-63.

Sweeney, M., 'The Critique of Solomon in the Josianic Edition of the Deuteronomistic History', *JBL* 114 (1995), pp. 607-22.

—*King Josiah of Judah*: *The Lost Messiah of Israel* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001).

—'Review of Martti Nissinen, C.L. Seow and Robert K. Ritner, *Prophets and Prophecy in the Ancient Near East*', *Review of Biblical Literature* (2005), <http://www.bookreviews.org>.

Tadmor, H., 'The Appointed Time Has Not Yet Come: The Historical Background of Haggai 1.2', in Chazan, Hallo, and Schiffman (eds.), *Ki Baruch Hu*, pp. 401-408.

—'The Period of the First Temple, the Babylonian Exile, and the Restoration', in H.H. Ben-Sasson (ed.), *A History of the Jewish People* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1976), pp. 91-182.

Talshir, Z., 'The Three Deaths of Josiah and the Strata of Biblical Historiography (2 Kings xxiii 29-30; 2 Chronicles xxxv 20-[2]5; 1 Esdras i 23-31)', *VT* 46 (1996), pp. 213-36.

Thiel, W., *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).

Thiessen, M., 'The Form and Function of the Song of Moses (Deuteronomy 32.1-43)', *JBL* 123 (2004), pp. 401-24.

Tigay, J., *Deuteronomy: The JPS Torah Commentary* (New York: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1989).

Van Seters, J., 'The Deuteronomistic History: Can it Avoid Death by Redaction?', in T. Römer (ed.), *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2000), pp. 213-22.

Wanke, G., *Untersuchungen zur sogenannten Baruchschrift* (BZAW, 122; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1971).

Weinfeld, M., 'Deuteronomy', in *ABD*, II, pp. 168-83.

—*Deuteronomy 1–11* (AB, 5; Garden City: Doubleday, 1991).

—*Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972).

—'The Emergence of the Deuteronomic Movement: The Historical Antecedents', in N. Lohfink (ed.), *Das Deuteronomium: Entstehung, Gestalt und Botschaft* (Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium, 68; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1985), pp. 76-98.

—'Judge and Officer in Ancient Israel and in the Ancient Near East', *IOS* 7 (1977), pp. 65-88.

Weingreen, J., *From Bible to Mishna: The Continuity of Tradition* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1976).

Weippert, H., *Die Prosareden des Jeremiabuches* (BZAW, 132; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1973).

Welch, A.C., *Jeremiah: His Time and his Work* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955).

Westermann, C., *Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech* (trans. H.C. White; Philadelphia: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1967).

White, M., *The Elijah Legends and Jehu's Coup* (BJS, 311; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997).

Whitley, C.F., 'Carchemish and Jeremiah', *ZAW* 80 (1968), pp. 38-49.

Whitt, W.D., 'The Jacob Traditions in Hosea and their Relation to Genesis', *ZAW* 103 (1991), pp. 18-43.

Widengren, G., 'What Do We Know about Moses?', in Durham and Porter (eds.), *Proclamation and Presence*, pp. 21-47.

Wilcoxen, J.A., 'The Political Background of Jeremiah's Temple Sermon', in A.L. Merrill and T.W. Overholt (eds.), *Scripture in History and Theology: Essays in Honor of J. Coert Rylaarsdam* (Pittsburgh: The Pickwick Press, 1977), pp. 151-65.

Williamson, H.G.M., 'The Death of Josiah and the Continuing Development of the Deuteronomic History', *VT* 32 (1982), pp. 242-48.

—'Isaiah 62.4 and the Problem of Inner-Biblical Allusions', *JBL* 119 (2000), pp. 734-39.

—'Isaiah and the Wise', in Day, Gordon, and Williamson (eds.), *Wisdom in Ancient Israel*, pp. 133-41.

Wilson, R., *Prophecy and Society in Ancient Israel* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980).

Wolfe, C., 'Yoke', in *IDB*, IV, pp. 924-25.

Wright, G.E., 'Deuteronomy', in *IB*, II, p. 425.

—*Shechem: The Biography of a Biblical City* (New York: McGraw–Hill, 1965).

Young, I. (ed.), *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology* (JSOTSup, 369; London/New York: Continuum, 2003).

Zimmerli, W., *Ezekiel 1* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979).

INDEX OF REFERENCES

INDEX OF AUTHORS

Oded, B. 59, 65, 86, 145
Olivier, J.P.J. 54
Otto, E. 154
Overholt, T. 114, 119, 123, 126, 136, 176

Parke-Taylor, G. 83, 148, 156, 158, 161-63, 167, 176, 177, 179
Paul, S.M. 14
Pearce, R.A. 121
Pečírková, J. 73, 79
Peckham, J.B. 61, 84, 93, 130, 144, 148, 170, 179, 182
Perdue, L.G. 11, 72, 98, 129
Petersen, D.L. 134, 181
Pohlmann, K.F. 156
Polak, F. 9, 143
Provan, I. 56, 86, 87

Rendsburg, G.A. 21, 52, 53
Reventlow, H.G. 73, 112, 113
Rietzschel, C. 146
Roberts, J.J.M. 57
Robertson, D.A. 20, 52
Rofé, A. 58, 68
Rom-Shiloni, D. 176
Römer, T.C. 10, 109, 168
Rudman, D. 71, 93

Sanders, P. 52
Schaper, J. 79, 144, 171
Schley, D.G. 18, 19, 23, 32, 67, 119, 120
Schniedewind, W.M. 22, 39, 49, 51, 52, 55, 56, 60, 118, 129, 130, 137, 170, 171, 180
Seitz, C.R. 27, 46, 180, 181
Sharp, C.J. 10-12, 16, 115, 131, 146, 147, 171, 179
Shedletsky, L. 85, 95
Shroter, U. 16, 78
Silberman, N.A. 59, 65, 86, 101
Sisson, J.P. 105, 135
Smith, M.S. 42, 98, 99, 105, 177

Soggin, J.A. 96
Sommer, B.D. 8, 14, 98, 127, 181
Stager, L.E. 20, 21
Steiner, R.C. 170
Stulman, L. 86, 126-28, 167, 178
Sweeney, M. 12, 13, 15, 16, 19, 25, 32, 34, 36, 38-40, 46, 51, 59, 61, 62, 64, 67, 70, 73, 75, 78, 81, 84, 87, 105, 115, 118, 119, 124, 130, 133, 134, 141, 152-54, 159, 170, 174

Tadmor, H. 51, 54, 71, 86, 182
Talshir, Z. 102-104, 140
Thiel, W. 10, 11, 75, 111, 112, 123, 138, 153, 156, 167
Thiessen, M. 52, 92
Tigay, J. 45

Van Seters, J. 62
Vanderhooft, D. 48, 51, 55, 84, 87, 95, 124

Wanke, G. 146, 177
Weinfeld, M. 13, 15, 32, 34, 36, 39, 42, 44, 48, 56-58, 68, 78, 80, 84, 91, 111, 127, 129, 130, 154
Weingreen, J. 24
Weippert, H. 8, 9, 111, 112, 167
Welch, A.C. 154
Westermann, C. 113
White, M. 31, 47, 53, 113
Whitley, C.F. 154
Whitt, W.D. 47, 53
Widengren, G. 90
Wilcoxen, J.A. 57, 106, 119, 125, 131
Williamson, H.G.M. 55, 103, 104, 144, 171, 181
Wilson, R. 18, 25, 27, 31, 43, 46, 70, 73, 77, 109, 149, 157
Wolfe, C. 79
Wright, G.E. 32, 67, 68

Zimmerli, W. 77