



HAL
open science

How Did Jeremiah Become a Convert to Deuteronomistic Ideology ?

Thomas Römer

► **To cite this version:**

Thomas Römer. How Did Jeremiah Become a Convert to Deuteronomistic Ideology?. McKenzie, S. L. and Schaering, L. S. Those Elusive Deuteronomists, 268, Sheffield Academic Press, pp.189-199, 1999. <hal-03819719>

HAL Id: hal-03819719

<https://hal.science/hal-03819719v1>

Submitted on 12 Nov 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire HAL, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



HAL Authorization

HOW DID JEREMIAH BECOME A CONVERT TO
DEUTERONOMISTIC IDEOLOGY?

Thomas C. Römer

*The Confusing State of Current Research
on the Book of Jeremiah*

The relationship between the book of Jeremiah and the so-called Deuteronomistic History (DH) had been noticed, at least partially, a long time before the DH as a scholarly theory came into existence. The Talmud (*b. B. Bat.* 14b-15a) indeed describes Jeremiah as the author of the books of Kings. This might be due to the fact that Jeremiah is contemporaneous with the last events related in 2 Kings 25, but we may also ask if the rabbis had some intuitions about stylistic and theological parallels between these books.

In modern research, it was Bernhard Duhm who first claimed that most of the book of Jeremiah should be ascribed to dtr redactors, who might easily be identified by their repetitious style and theological platitudes. According to Duhm, there was no systematic dtr redaction of the book. Rather, it grew like a jungle until the first century BCE.¹ But some 50 years later, when Old Testament scholarship became more interested in *Redaktionsgeschichte*, the commentaries by Rudolph and Hyatt,² which appeared about the same time as Noth's 'Dtr History',³ argued for a coherent dtr redaction of the book of Jeremiah. According to Hyatt, 'the "school" of writers we call the Deuteronomists' edited DH as well as chs. 1-45 of Jeremiah.⁴ This position became dominant and

1. B. Duhm, *Das Buch Jeremia* (KHAT, 11; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1901), p. xx.

2. W. Rudolph, *Jeremia* (HAT, 1.12; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1947); J.P. Hyatt, 'The Book of Jeremiah', *IB*, V, pp. 775-1142.

3. M. Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien* (Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1943).

4. J.P. Hyatt, 'The Deuteronomic Edition of Jeremiah', in L.G. Perdue and

was reinforced by Thiel's work, which established convincingly the links between DH and the dtr redaction of Jeremiah.⁵

Nevertheless, other explanations for the 'Deuteronomistic' character of Jeremiah have been offered. John Bright, Helga Weippert and William L. Holladay claimed that we should not glibly speak of dtr redaction in Jeremiah,⁶ since what seems to be dtr is just the characteristic rhetorical prose of the seventh/sixth centuries. This thesis seems quite difficult to uphold, because it fails to explain why some texts in the book of Jeremiah do appear with this style and others do not. If there was a *Kunstprosa* (a common artistic prose style) in the seventh/sixth century why does it not recur in other books from the same period as, for instance, Isaiah or Zephaniah? Therefore it seems quite reasonable to admit one or more dtr redactions in Jeremiah.

But then there is another question that arises particularly regarding the pluses of the MT. Most of these pluses, which may be dated from the third or second century BCE sound very 'dtr'.⁷ This is not surprising at all, since the dtr style is very easy to imitate. But does this mean that we should return to Duhm who denied any coherent redactional composition of the book? This is indeed the position of Carroll who states that 'so few of the elements constituting the book are datable, and the social background of many of them equally obscure, that the book may represent many and various political movements from the fall of Jerusalem to the Graeco-Roman period'.⁸ The recent commentary of McKane agrees, considering the formation of the book of Jeremiah as a 'rolling corpus'. He refuses to speak of composition since it would

mean attributing to the redactors 'a degree of planning and thoughtfulness which they do not possess'.⁹ Again, this seems to be a return to Duhm's position.

There is still another problem: Those who admit a dtr redaction in Jeremiah are often puzzled by the fact that the prophet Jeremiah is not mentioned in the DH. Some scholars, especially in Germany, claim that the dtr milieu consists of two different 'parties': the Deuteronomists of the DH and the Deuteronomists of Jeremiah. If we believe Albertz and others, the Deuteronomists of the DH were traditionalists and 'hard-liners' compared to their more open-minded colleagues who edited Jeremiah.¹⁰ So, were there 'republicans' and 'democrats' in the dtr school? If this was the case why should we label them both 'dtr'?

This confusion in the current state of research on Jeremiah suggests two questions: (1) How should the dtr redaction of Jeremiah (if there was any) be described? (2) What is the relationship between the dtr redactors of Jeremiah and those of the historical books?

The Profile of the (First) Dtr Redaction of Jeremiah

Recent discussion on deuteronomism has shown that there is no consensus regarding the characteristics that make a text deuteronomistic. In order to avoid a sort of pan-Deuteronomism, which is not very helpful, we should try to combine the evidence of language, style, compositional techniques and ideology, even if the last criterion is very difficult to handle.

As for the book of Jeremiah, these criteria apply best to the so-called 'prose sermons' or discourses. This was observed by Mowinckel,¹¹ and

B.W. Kovacs (eds.), *A Prophet to the Nations: Essays in Jeremiah Studies* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1984), pp. 247-67.

5. W. Thiel, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 1-25* (WMANT, 41; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1973).

6. J. Bright, 'The Date of the Prose Sermons in Jeremiah', in Perdue and Kovacs (eds.), *A Prophet to the Nations*, pp. 193-212; and H. Weippert, *Die Prosareden des Jeremiabuches* (BZAW, 132; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1973); W.L. Holladay, *Jeremiah I: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah Chapters 1-25* (Hermencia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986).

7. Cf. H.-J. Stipp, *Das masoretische und alexandrinische Sondergut des Jeremiabuches: Textgeschichtlicher Rang, Eigenarten, Triebkräfte* (OBO, 136; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994); P. Piovanelli, 'La condamnation de la diaspora égyptienne dans le livre de Jérémie (JrA 50,8-51,30 / JrB 43,8-44,30)', *Trans* 9 (1995), pp. 35-49.

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

9. W. McKane, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jeremiah I-XXV* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1986), p. lxii.

10. R. Albertz, 'Die Intentionen und Träger des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks', in R. Albertz et al. (eds.), *Schöpfung und Befreiung: Für C. Westermann zum 80. Geburtstag* (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1989), pp. 37-53; C. Hardmeier, 'Die Propheten Micha und Jesaja in Spiegel von Jeremia xxvi und 2 Regnum xviii-xx: Zur Prophetie-Rezeption in der nach-josianischen Zeit', in J.A. Emerton (ed.), *Congress Volume: Leuven 1989* (VTSup, 43; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1991), pp. 172-89; H.-J. Stipp, 'Probleme des redaktionsgeschichtlichen Modells der Entstehung des Jeremiabuches', in W. Gross (ed.), *Jeremia und die 'deuteronomistische Bewegung'* (BBB, 98; Weinheim: Beltz Athenäum, 1995), pp. 225-62.

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

so is nothing new. What is more important is that some of these discourses are clearly interrelated. This is especially the case for chs. 7, 25 and 35 (according to the Masoretic order¹²), which mark important divisions in the book: 7–24 and 26–35 with 25.1–13 being a sort of ‘hinge’. Both parts start with the temple speech of Jeremiah (chs. 7 and 26) and end with a word of comfort to a restricted group (ch. 24: the deportees of 597; ch. 35: the Rechabites¹³).

Chapters 7, 25 and 35 are linked to each other in different ways. First of all, the topic of the land as a gift from Yhwh to the fathers is typically dtr in terminological and ideological concerns. In the book of Jeremiah this topic occurs for the first time in Jer. 7.7, 14 and for the last time in Jer. 35.15. In these verses the maintenance of the land given to the fathers depends on the amendment of the addressee’s ethical and theological behavior. The same formulation found in Jer. 35.15 is in Jer. 25.5: ‘turn again now every one from his evil way, and from the evil of your doings’:

כי אסדהישיב תישיבו את־דרכיכם ואת־מעלליכם	Jeremiah 7.5
שׁוּבוּ־נָא אִישׁ מִדְרָכּוֹ הַרְעָה וּמִרַע מַעֲלָלֵיכֶם	Jeremiah 25.5
שׁוּבוּ־נָא אִישׁ מִדְרָכּוֹ הַרְעָה וְהִי־שׁוּבוּ מִעֲלָלֵיכֶם	Jeremiah 35.15

There are many other parallels between chs. 7 and 25,¹⁴ such that Jeremiah 25 is partially a summary of ch. 7, but displays at the same time links with ch. 35 (esp. 25.3–6 and 35.14–15¹⁵). Thus there are clear indications that these three chapters function as a literary vault. This observation weakens the idea that the book of Jeremiah does not represent a compositional project. There are many other links between the

12. For convenience I will refer to the Masoretic order. If the order of the Septuagint is to be preferred this does not affect the remarks on the dtr structure of the book, since the oracles to the nations do not seem to have been edited by the Deuteronomists.

13. According to C. Levin (*Die Verheissung des neuen Bundes in ihrem theologisch-geschichtlichen Zusammenhang ausgelegt* [FRLANT, 137; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985], p. 158) and H. Cazelles (‘La production du livre de Jérémie dans l’histoire ancienne d’Israël’, *Masses Ouvrières* 343 [1978], pp. 9–31 [24–25]), ch. 35 was the final of an exilic edition of the book of Jeremiah.

14. T. Römer, *Israels Väter: Untersuchungen zur Väterthematik im Deuteronomium und in der deuteronomistischen Tradition* (OBO, 99; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990), pp. 458–60.

15. Thiel, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 1–25*, pp. 265–67.

discourses that cannot be enumerated here. Still I would like to pay some attention to the relationship between Jeremiah 11 and 31.31–34*, which present the two poles of the dtr covenant theology in Jeremiah:

31.32	לא כבִּרְתִי אֲשֶׁר כִּרְתִי אֶת־אֲבוֹתֶם	... להוציאם מארץ מצרים
11.10	אֶת־בְּרִיתִי אֲשֶׁר כִּרְתִי אֶת־אֲבוֹתֶם	(11.4) בְּיוֹם הוֹצִיאִי־אוֹתָם מֵאֶרֶץ־מִצְרַיִם
31.32	אֲשֶׁר־הִמָּה הִפְרוּ אֶת־בְּרִיתִי	
11.10	הִפְרוּ... אֶת־בְּרִיתִי	

Jeremiah 31.32 clearly refers to ch. 11: ‘not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; when they broke my covenant...’ (cf. 11.10: ‘they have broken my covenant that I made with their fathers’ and 11.4: ‘...in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt’). The link between these texts also explains the quite unusual designation of the fathers in 11.10 as *ri’šōnīm*, since this prepares for the announcement of the *b^crit ḥ^adāšāh* in 31.31 (the pair *ri’šōn-ḥādāš* is quite common in prophetic oracles of the exilic period).¹⁶

Structuring the book by discourses that relate to each other is exactly the same compositional technique observed by Noth for the DH. Thus, we can conclude that there is a coherent dtr redaction of Jeremiah. Perhaps the first dtr redaction of Jeremiah only encompassed chs. 7–35. Indeed, ch. 7 contains the first and ch. 35 the last of the prose discourses which, according to Nicholson, display the same structure.¹⁷ This may even be confirmed by some statistics. L. Stulman,¹⁸ following Weinfeld,¹⁹ has compiled lists of dtr vocabulary in Jeremiah and the DH that show that about 75 per cent of the dtr terms common to the two works occur between Jeremiah 7 and 35. This first dtr redaction of Jeremiah is well organized and related to the DH, as I shall now try to show.

16. T. Römer, ‘Les “anciens” pères (Jér 11,10) et la “nouvelle” alliance (Jér 31,31)’, *BN* 59 (1991), pp. 23–27.

17. E.W. Nicholson, *Preaching to the Exiles: A Study of the Prose Tradition in the Book of Jeremiah* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1970), p. 34.

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

19. M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomist School* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972).

*The Relationship between the Deuteronomists of Jeremiah
and the Deuteronomists of the DH*

According to Stipp there is 'a deep gap between the authors of the DH and the authors of the dtr texts in Jer.',²⁰ and quite a lot of scholars agree. But are there really different *dtr* ideologies in both corpora? Stipp, Albertz and others claim that the rejection of the temple in Jeremiah 7 is to be understood as opposition to the temple ideology of the DH.²¹ Personally, I cannot find any rejection of the temple in Jeremiah 7. The *dtr* redactors do denounce a magical and populist comprehension of the temple. They want to explain in their setting after 587 why the temple has been destroyed, and in the first part of the speech (vv. 2-7) they put forward the conditions under which it would have been possible to live in the *māqôm*, which alludes to the temple as well as to the land. There is no contradiction at all with the view of the temple in the DH.²² We may go even further and argue that Jeremiah 7 functions as a parallel to the temple speech in the DH, namely the inauguration of the temple by Solomon in 1 Kings 8. Both texts envisage and explain the catastrophe of the exile. The formulation of the 'land given to the fathers' appears in the DH for the first time in 1 Kings 8, and in the book of Jeremiah in ch. 7. 1 Kings 8.36 as well as Jer. 7.3, 5 mention the 'good way' in which the audience should walk. The possibility of deportation, which is the topic of Solomon's last prayer (8.46-53), is confirmed by the announcement of judgment in Jeremiah's discourse (7.15). It seems quite clear that both texts are related to each other, and we may assume, following Lohfink, that the *dtr* redactors of the historical books and those of Jeremiah tried to establish cross-references between the two corpora.²³ Many other links could be observed. Rendtorff has stated that Jer. 25.1-13 'displays clear connections with

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

21. Stipp, 'Probleme des redaktionsgeschichtlichen Modells', p. 232; Albertz, 'Die Intention', pp. 345-47.

22. See also T. Seidl, 'Jeremias Tempelrede: Polemik gegen die joschijanische Reform? Die Paralleltraditionen Jer 7 und Jer 26 auf ihre Effizienz für das Deuteronomismusproblem in Jeremia befragt', in Gross (ed.) *Jeremiah und die 'deuteronomistische Bewegung'*, pp. 141-79 (175).

23. N. Lohfink, 'Gab es eine deuteronomische Bewegung?', in Gross (ed.), *Jeremia und die 'deuteronomistische Bewegung'*, pp. 313-82 (360).

the summary Deuteronomistic interpretation of the history of Israel in II Kings 17.²⁴ The covenant speech in Jeremiah 11 could also have been given by Moses in the book of Deuteronomy. The idea in 11.3-4 that Yhwh commanded his *b'ērît* to the fathers (for the same expression, see Judg. 2.20) at the very time he brought them out of Egypt is also to be found in the DH (Deut. 29.24 and 1 Kgs 8.21). The Mosaic covenant which, as Gary Knoppers has recently emphasized,²⁵ is important to the Deuteronomists, provides another link between DH and the book of Jeremiah. It is indeed easy to show that the author of Jeremiah 11 is quoting from Deuteronomy (compare 11.4-5 to Deut. 7.8 and 8.18). In the DH as well as in the *dtr* redaction of Jeremiah, God's promise is presented as on oath (*nišba'*), and as John Van Seters has convincingly shown, in both corpora 'the oath to the fathers represents the divine promise to the exodus generation'.²⁶ We may also recall the end of the vision of the good and bad figs (Jer. 24.9-10)²⁷ which is clearly related to the curses of Deuteronomy 28 (esp. 28.25, 63). There are no ideological problems between the Deuteronomists of Jeremiah and those of the DH. The problems that exist occur on another level.

How Did Jeremiah Become a Convert to Dtr Ideology?

The problem is the absence of Jeremiah in the DH. How does one explain this *Prophetenschweigen*, which also concerns Amos and Hosea,²⁸ and which is quite astonishing, since the books of these prophets sound very deuteronomistic? One suggestion is that these

24. R. Rendtorff, *The Old Testament: An Introduction* (London: SCM Press, 1985 [1983]), p. 204.

25. G.N. Knoppers, *Two Nations under God: The Deuteronomistic History of Solomon and the Dual Monarchies, II* (HSM, 52; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), p. 160.

26. J. Van Seters, *Prologue to History: The Yahwist as Historian in Genesis* (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1992), p. 235; see also Römer, *Israels Väter, passim*.

27. It is questionable, however, whether this chapter belongs to the first *dtr* edition of Jeremiah. Cf. G. Wanke, *Jeremia* (ZBK, 20; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1995), pp. 222-23.

28. K. Koch, 'Das Prophetenschweigen des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks', in L. Peritt and J. Jeremias (eds.), *Die Botschaft und die Boten: Festschrift für Hans Walther Wolff zum 70. Geburtstag* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1981), pp. 115-28.

prophets announced an irrevocable disaster that did not suit dtr ideology. This solution is hypothetical as far as both the message of the 'historical' Jeremiah and the ideology of the DH are concerned. But there are indeed tensions between the non-dtr texts in Jeremiah and the DH. The purchase of a field by Jeremiah in Jer. 32.1-15, which is normally not considered dtr material,²⁹ makes the following point: 'Houses, fields, and vineyards³⁰ will still be acquired in this land' (15b).³¹ This text clearly expresses hope for an ongoing life in Judah. The restoration will take place in Palestine, not Babylon. It seems then that those left in the land after 597/587 were envisioned.³² This hope is also visible in the non-dtr parts of Jeremiah 37-44. According to 39.14 and 40.2-6 the prophet chooses to remain with the non-exiled population in the land, refusing the offer of Nebuzaradan to accompany him to Babylon. These texts legitimate the idea that God is on the side of the remnant community in the land. According to 40.12 the government of Gedaliah, who is assisted by Jeremiah (40.6), produces welfare for the people: 'they harvested an abundance of wine and summer fruit'. It is not astonishing that this statement is missing in the parallel account in 2 Kgs 25.22-26, which, according to Seitz, seems to 'downplay the potential rule of Gedaliah'.³³

The vision of a non-dtr 'biography' of Jeremiah in chs. 37-44 contradicts indeed the perspective of the exilic edition of the DH which states at its conclusion: 'So Judah was deported away from her land' (2 Kgs 25.21). We may conclude that the DH does not mention Jeremiah because there was a Jeremiah tradition that strongly supported the views of the remaining population in Judah. This view is found in the primitive version of chs. 37-44, which Christopher Seitz has characterized as a 'scribal chronicle'. According to Seitz, this chronicle was written by a member of the post-597 Judean community³⁴ and

29. For instance W. Thiel, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 26-45* (WMANT, 52; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1981), p. 29.

30. 'Houses' and 'vineyards' may have been added secondarily (cf. Holladay, *Jeremiah*, pp. 210-11) but this does not affect the sense of the oracle.

31. According to the very critical Levin (*Die Verheissung*, p. 159), this reflects the message of the historical Jeremiah.

32. Cf. W. McKane, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jeremiah XXVI-LII* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1996), p. 841.

33. C.R. Seitz, *Theology in Conflict: Reactions to the Exile in the Book of Jeremiah* (BZAW, 176; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1989), p. 217.

34. Seitz, *Theology*, p. 285.

presents 'a profile of this community that is not unsympathetic'.³⁵ This perspective is excluded from DH and the Ezekiel traditions.³⁶ When this scribal chronicle came to Babylon (following Seitz this happened during the third deportation in 582) it was reworked from an exilic and dtr perspective. Jeremiah 43.5-7, which states that 'all the remnant of Judah...every person whom Nebuzaradan had left with Gedaliah...came into the land of Egypt, for they did not obey the voice of Yhwh', stresses a picture of wholesale evacuation, which corresponds to the end of DH.

We can imagine the 'deuteronomization' of the Jeremiah tradition in the following way: The exilic redactors of the DH conflicted with a chronicle telling the last days of Jeremiah and of the kingdom of Judah. Since this chronicle revealed a positive attitude of Jeremiah towards the 'autochthonous', the population who had not been deported, the redactors of the DH were not eager to mention Jeremiah at the end of their historiography. Two centuries later the Chronicler would include Jeremiah at the end of his story, because, as Sara Japhet has shown,³⁷ he had, in opposition to the DH, a more autochthonous vision of Israel, playing down the impact of exile and exodus. But let us go back to the Deuteronomists. Even if they did not like Jeremiah they could not ignore him. So they edited a dtr version of Jeremiah, in Jeremiah 7-35*. It would be interesting to explore the hypothesis that such dtr editing of Jeremiah was carried out at the same time as the dtr redaction of Amos and Hosea. If this were true we would then have a kernel of a 'dtr' prophetic canon. Such a hypothesis could eventually explain why the historical books and the prophetic books were bound together.

Turning back to Jeremiah 7-35, we have seen that this first dtr edition is very close to the DH in vocabulary, compositional techniques and theology. In this edition Jeremiah speaks as if he were a member of the dtr party. But when the scribal chronicle, as identified by Seitz, came to Babylon, it was integrated into a second dtr edition of the book of Jeremiah. This second edition usurped the scroll containing chs. 37-44 as well as the collection of oracles in Jeremiah 2-6, in which, as Mark

35. Seitz, *Theology*, p. 287.

36. Seitz, *Theology*, p. 286.

37. S. Japhet, 'L'historiographie post-exilique: Comment et pourquoi?', in A. de Pury, T. Römer and J.-D. Macchi (eds.), *Israël construit son histoire: L'historiographie deutéronomiste à la lumière de recherches récentes* (MB, 34; Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1996), pp. 123-52.

Biddle has shown,³⁸ the dtr redaction is quite different from chs. 7–35. This second edition is framed by chs. 1 and 45,³⁹ as well as by the idea of the disobedience of the fathers (Jer. 2.5 and 44.9). At the end of this new edition, chs. 43–44 present a very harsh criticism of the Egyptian diaspora, which seems very well established. So we should date this second edition not earlier than the end of the exilic period, or, better, at the beginning of the Persian period. There seems to be a certain evolution of the vocabulary in this edition since about 55 per cent of Stulmann's 'dtr' or 'C' diction not attested in the DH is found in chs. 1–6 and 36–45. Moreover, in the revised dtr edition the expression 'the land given to the fathers' has been changed into 'the Torah given to the fathers' (44.10). This may indicate that the return to the land became less important and that the Babylonian redactors of Jeremiah 1–45 transformed the *golah* into diaspora. For them there was no urgency to return to *eretz yisrael* since the Torah had become the new land in which Yhwh fully could be worshiped.

The importance of the written word of Yhwh appears quite clearly in the story of the re-edition of the burnt scroll in Jeremiah 36. This story, which is in many respects linked to 2 Kings 22–23, legitimates the new edition of the book of Jeremiah (v. 32) and offers a new interpretation for the 'chronicle' contained in chs. 37–44. At first, the oracle 'quoted' in 36.29 says that the king of Babylon will empty the land, cutting off from it man and beast, which gives an *interpretatio babylonica* to the following story. But the point of ch. 36 is to appeal to the audience not to behave as did king Jehoiakim, in showing them that the written prophetic word transcends time and place and does not depend on any institution. As Carroll puts it, 'committed to writing, the word has a permanence...and can survive even the absence of its original bearer'.⁴⁰ In other words: the conversion of Jeremiah into a dtr preacher was suc-

38. M.E. Biddle, *A Redaction History of Jeremiah 2.1–4.2* (ATANT, 77; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1990).

39. Jer. 1 is a mixture of dtr and postexilic prophetic terminology (see S. Herrmann, *Jeremia* [BKAT, 12.1; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1986], pp. 52–55). Jer. 45 is linked to Jer. 1 (cf. 1.10 and 45.4, see R.P. Carroll, *Jeremiah* [OTL; London: SCM Press, 1986]), p. 746). We cannot discuss here the addition of Jer. 52. As W. Brueggemann has shown, Baruch is a cipher for the Babylonian community of Jews and functions as a counterpoint to the Egyptian Jews who are condemned in chs. 43–44 (*To Build, to Plant: A Commentary on Jeremiah 26–52* [ITC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991], pp. 204–208).

40. Carroll, *Jeremiah*, p. 668.

cessful, because those redactors bound sermons, oracles and stories together into a book. This book as it stands is marked by dtr ideology, but since it also integrates other conceptions of 'Israel' and God, it offers the possibility for different trends of Judaism to find room inside this new homeland, which is the book.