

University of Windsor

Scholarship at UWindor

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Theses, Dissertations, and Major Papers

1-1-1977

Re-applying the concept of "original" in modern biblical criticism.

Stephen Miletic
University of Windsor

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd>

Recommended Citation

Miletic, Stephen, "Re-applying the concept of "original" in modern biblical criticism." (1977). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 6649.

<https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd/6649>

This online database contains the full-text of PhD dissertations and Masters' theses of University of Windsor students from 1954 forward. These documents are made available for personal study and research purposes only, in accordance with the Canadian Copyright Act and the Creative Commons license—CC BY-NC-ND (Attribution, Non-Commercial, No Derivative Works). Under this license, works must always be attributed to the copyright holder (original author), cannot be used for any commercial purposes, and may not be altered. Any other use would require the permission of the copyright holder. Students may inquire about withdrawing their dissertation and/or thesis from this database. For additional inquiries, please contact the repository administrator via email (scholarship@uwindsor.ca) or by telephone at 519-253-3000ext. 3208.

RE-APPLYING THE CONCEPT
OF "ORIGINAL"
IN
MODERN BIBLICAL CRITICISM

by

Stephen Miletic

A Thesis

Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
through the Department of Religious Studies
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of Master of Arts at
The University of Windsor

Windsor, Ontario, Canada

1977

UMI Number: EC53139

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI®

UMI Microform EC53139

Copyright 2009 by ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest LLC
789 E. Eisenhower Parkway
PO Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

HAX 9319

© Stephen Francis Miletic 1977
All Rights Reserved

607415

Approved by:

Edward Crowley
J. J. [unclear]
Carl [unclear]

ABSTRACT

The categories of "original", "authentic" and "genuine" are consistently applied throughout literary, form and traditio-historical criticisms. With significant gains and new historical knowledge attained by scholars applying these critical methods adjustments both in method and in conceptualizing were effected by these scholars. This thesis examines Jeremianic literary, form and traditio-historical criticisms with special interest in those above mentioned categories. Attention is given to the questions they ask and in regard to their use of our categories.

In the first chapter we note how the above categories are applied to the prose and poetry within the book of Jeremiah. We discover that the poetry is almost universally considered original Jeremianic while the prose is not. This distinction is maintained within Jeremianic form criticism which is examined in chapter two.

Within this second chapter, an outline of form criticism in prophetic literature is given. Specific Jeremianic form critics are then examined. It is noted that the latter rely on the literary-critical divisions of poetry and prose within the book of Jeremiah. Since these form critics view most of the prose passages as exilic or even post-exilic they tend to conclude that

these materials are unoriginal Jeremianic materials. In this they perpetuate the categories of original and unoriginal.

The third chapter sketches out problems concerning oral and written traditions and their oral and written transmission. One conclusion reached is that questions concerning oral or written traditions and transmission processes can only be answered for each individual unit under consideration. It is significant that Jeremianic tradition-historical scholars have established a relationship of both style and content between those tradition complexes examined in this chapter. This development provides further grounds for illustrating the inadequacies of the present application of the terms original, etc.

The last chapter demonstrates the problems with the application of these categories. The solution suggested is as follows: (1) the term original should refer to those materials which were unique creations of the prophet Jeremiah, which are not found outside his "book"; (2) the term authentic should apply to those materials which are original to the prophet (as we have defined it) along with those materials which the prophet himself used. Consequently, if a text was used by Jeremiah, be it original or not, and it survived the long transmission process with major linguistic and formulaic changes but maintains the essential concepts and ideas established

by the prophet, then that text must be considered authentically Jeremianic.

A short concluding section underlines the importance of more precise terminology as a result of new developments in biblical criticism. New linguistic theories developed by literary critics and the relationship between prose and poetry suggested by traditional historical critics points to a need to restrict the application of the term "original" and the word "authentic".

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study could not have been completed without the generous assistance, encouragement and support of many people. I am greatly indebted to Miss Gwen Rouble who typed this difficult text (from an even more difficult rough draft) with much love and care. To her I can only offer my sincere thanks with heartfelt appreciation, no matter how inadequate that may be.

I wish to thank Dr. Carl Querbach for his meticulously careful reading of this study in its near completed stages. His comments, suggestions along with our discussions concerning this thesis have made me aware of the true task of the aspiring scholar. To him I offer thanks for tolerating the burden of being "outside reader" for my thesis committee.

Dr. Norm King graciously consented to being the "Departmental Reader" for this study. Without his encouragement and support throughout my attendance at the Department of Religious Studies, I may not have completed what I originally started in September, 1975. To him my debt may never be repaid.

To the director of this thesis I owe much. My first contact with Religious Studies was in his "Introduction to Hebrew Literature" class. It was here that I drew my inspiration (unknown to him) for pursuing Religious

Studies as an undergraduate. His flexibility, patience and vast knowledge of my field all contributed to many intense learning experiences. He far surpassed my expectations of thesis director. To Dr. Edward Crowley my thanks are offered. It is from him that I take much wherever I go.

Finally, I wish to thank my wife, Joyce. There have been many times in the past year when she was neglected and left unsupported. She willingly permitted this thesis to become the focal point of our marriage and household. For this and for her loving support I am grateful.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE PAGE.....	i
APPROVAL SHEET.....	ii
ABSTRACT.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	viii
ABBREVIATIONS.....	ix
INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER 1	
20th CENTURY LITERARY CRITICISM.....	2
20th CENTURY LITERARY CRITICS.....	3
H. G. MAY.....	6
J. P. HYATT.....	11
W. L. HOLLADAY.....	12
J. BRIGHT.....	15
CONCLUSION.....	20
NOTES.....	22
CHAPTER 2	
20th CENTURY FORM CRITICISM.....	27
20th CENTURY FORM CRITICISM AND PROPHETIC FORMS.....	29
FORM CRITICISM AND THE BOOK OF JEREMIAH.....	36
GEORG FOHRER.....	37
HENNING GRAF von REVENTLOW.....	42
ARTHUR WEISER.....	49
CONCLUSION.....	53
NOTES.....	55
CHAPTER 3	
THE TRADITIO-HISTORICAL METHOD.....	60
20th CENTURY TRADITIO-HISTORICAL METHOD.....	61
THE TRADITION-COMPLEXES IN THE BOOK OF JEREMIAH.....	74
CONCLUSION.....	80
NOTES.....	82
CHAPTER 4	
INTRODUCTION.....	88
ORIGINAL AND UNORIGINAL.....	91
CONCLUSION.....	109
NOTES.....	110
CONCLUSIONS.....	112
APPENDIX A.....	114
APPENDIX B.....	116
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	118
VITA AUCTORIS.....	123

ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Anchor Bible
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
BWANT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft von Alten und Neuen Testament
Bib	Biblica
BA	Biblical Archeologist
BJRL	Bulletin of the John Rylands Library
CBQ	Catholic Biblical Quarterly
Enc Bib	Encyclopaedia Biblica
FRANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
HTR	Harvard Theological Review
Interpr	Interpretation
Int Dic Bib	Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible
IEJ	Israel Exploration Journal
JB	Jerusalem Bible
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature
JNES	Journal of Near Eastern Studies
JQR	Jewish Quarterly Review
JTS	Journal of Theological Studies
RB	Revue biblique
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
ThZ	Theologische Zeitschrift
UUA	Uppsala universitets årskrift
VT	Vetus Testamentum
VT Sup	Vetus Testamentum Supplements
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament

INTRODUCTION

This study is an attempt to evaluate the concepts behind the words original, authentic, genuine and unoriginal, inauthentic and non-genuine. The first three chapters deal with the contributions and limitations of literary, form and traditio-historical criticisms. The purpose of these three short survey chapters is to establish the general presuppositions within each methodology as it is understood both in general survey materials and specific technical books and articles.

Although the conclusions reached at the end of each chapter deal only with the materials within each respective chapter, they are taken into consideration again in chapter four. In that chapter, the problem concerning the vague use of the concepts behind the above mentioned words is examined in concrete examples. With the problem clearly understood a solution is suggested.

A short section concludes this study. It brings together the main points of each chapter with some suggestions as to the ultimate worth of this study both in the biblical field of study and in the area of the study of religion.

CHAPTER 1

TWENTIETH-CENTURY LITERARY CRITICISM

The first part of this chapter will briefly sketch out the development of Jeremianic literary critical work in order to establish the central question of scholarship in this area. We shall pay particular attention to the goals of the critics in question. Also, we shall concentrate on the presuppositions which direct, shape and determine the conclusions of the scholars examined. We will be particularly interested in the manner in which the scholars pose such questions as: what are the origins of the various Jeremianic materials? We will note the correlation of authentic and inauthentic¹ materials to the categories of prose and poetry.

The second part of this chapter will deal with a more detailed study of four contemporary literary critics. Our goal will be to examine the methods of those critics with an awareness of their presuppositions. The presuppositions are at times explicit and at other implicit; we shall note both. We shall also keep in mind the demands put on literary criticism by the traditio-historical method in order to point out where literary criticism and traditio-historical criticism meet and benefit each other in relationship to the questions concerning the growth of the Jeremianic

traditions (i.e., the provenance of the Jeremianic prose.)²

TWENTIETH-CENTURY LITERARY CRITICS

An outstanding literary critic of his day, Bernard Duhm³ discovered the division between poetry and prose in the book of Jeremiah. He considered 280 verses to be original, 220 from Baruch, and 800 verses to be products of editors and glossators. The secondary literature⁴, he concluded, was from the Deuteronomistic editor. Since his epoch-making commentary on Jeremiah, scholars have widely disagreed about the interpretation of the prose and poetry in the book of Jeremiah.

Building on the work of Duhm, Sigmund Mowinckel⁵ advanced the work of literary critics by proposing that there exist in the book of Jeremiah three basic literary sources. They are as follows: (A) authentic oracles from the prophet, mostly in poetry; (B) biographical narratives from Baruch; (C) autobiographical prose section, the least authentic and originating from the Deuteronomists. A fourth category was later added which was labelled (D). It contained optimistic material for those in exile (cf. Jer. 30-31).⁶

Up till now, literary criticism has done the service of clarifying and categorizing the materials in Jeremiah. P. Volz⁷, W. Rudolph⁸, and J. P. Hyatt⁹ follow in the steps of Mowinckel with few modifications.

Since the difference in style are so apparent in

the book of Jeremiah, literary critics have naturally suggested that the prose and poetry sections have separate points of origins. Consequently, Duhm, Mowinckel and the scholars mentioned above suggested that the prose material resulted from Deuteronomistic editing of the original words of the prophet. Other critics such as A. S. Peake¹⁰, E. J. Young¹¹ and Oesterly and Robinson¹², have suggested other possibilities for the provenance of Mowinckel's "C" source (i.e. the prose contained within the first 20 chapters of the book of Jeremiah).

Although most literary critics have their own interpretations of the Jeremianic materials, they all follow the contributions made by Duhm and Mowinckel in one form or another. The major point of variation between these literary scholars has been in their attempts at locating the origins of the prose materials in the book of Jeremiah. Furthermore, the question of the *Sitz im Leben* of the prose materials has complicated the question of the provenance of Mowinckel's "C" source, as form critics have noticed.

In regard to the origin of the "C" source, Duhm and later Gautier¹³ described it as coming from the additions of the pious *Ergänzer* (an editor who complements and supplements a basic nucleus of material). The *Sitz im Leben* was seen as post-exilic Judaism, centering around the emerging synagogues. Mowinckel did not attempt to evaluate the *Sitz im Leben*. C. W. Rudolph suggested that the style found

in the prose came from the exilic Deuteronomistic editor(s), while H. F. May¹⁴ saw it as the work of an anonymous Biographer, who lived long after the prophet Jeremiah. J. Bright¹⁵ acknowledges the obviousness of the differences between the prose and poetry, but is cautious when making a distinction between the two types of materials.

Scholars such as A. Weiser¹⁶, Henning Graf von Reventlow¹⁷ and E. J. Young¹⁸ interpreted the prose as originating with the prophet. However, though the question is still open, Duhm, Mowinckel and Hyatt consider the Deuteronomistic additions within the book of Jeremiah as being to some extent a betrayal of the prophet's own insights. Thus they (i.e., the Deuteronomistic editors) portray Jeremiah as being a supporter of the reform of Josiah, whereas Duhm, Mowinckel and Hyatt considered such a portrayal of Jeremiah the prophet as inconsistent with the other theological portrayals found in other authentic materials. Similarly, May's "Biographer" used the prophet as his own mouthpiece, in order to express his own ideas. A. Bentzen¹⁹ and S. Granild²⁰ reasoned that, since the two traditions were of different origins, there was necessarily an implied distortion of the theological picture of Jeremiah within the prose material.

Thus far we have noted that the majority of critical comments on the book of Jeremiah deal with two basic thoughts. First, how much of the prose, if any, is actually from the prophet Jeremiah himself, and can its authenticity

be verified through literary analysis? Secondly, the categories of authentic and inauthentic seem to be directly related to the corresponding divisions of poetry and prose.

We shall now examine two works of two scholars who interpret the Jeremianic prose materials as being from a source other than the prophet. Hyatt and May represent the literary critics who find evidence that the prose is not from the prophet, while Holladay and Bright exemplify those literary critics who regard the Jeremianic materials as authentic.²¹

As a basic groundwork to our examination, we will attempt to isolate the presuppositions of the four scholars in regard to their understanding of the transmission process of the "C" materials. We want to note particularly how each scholar interprets such a process.²²

H. G. MAY

H. G. May focuses on the so called "Biographer" of Jeremiah.²³ His conclusion is that much of the book as we now have it comes from the Biographer (p. 141). At the end of his article, May gives characteristic examples of the diction of Jeremiah's Biographer. The following are perhaps the best representatives of his numerous examples: "Yahweh has sent all his servants the prophets to you early and late", Jer. 7:25; 25:4; 26:5; 29:19; 35:15; 44:4. "Early and late", Jer. 7:13,25; 11:7; 25:3-4; 26:5; 29:19; 32:33; 53:14-15; 44:4. "Land which Yahweh gave to you and your

fathers", Jer. 3:18; 7:14; 11:5; 16:15; 23:29; 24:10; 30:3; 32:22; 35:15.²⁴

He bases his argument on a literary analysis found within the book of Jeremiah, rather than exclusively on ideological evidence of the Biographer's hand (p. 142).²⁵ He does not take issue with the traditional literary analysis, but follows Mowinckel's divisions of the materials.²⁶ Thus we note that although he is not consciously dealing with the questions concerning sources "A", "B", "C", he himself notes that the Biographer's style has a wide distribution in the book of Jeremiah, and can be found within the sources just mentioned.²⁷

May has four basic points to make about the Biographer: first, the Biographer has distinctive diction; secondly, this diction can be associated with a specific ideology; thirdly, parallels for both diction and ideology can be clearly traced in writings after the life of the prophet; finally, if the above can be proven, then it becomes possible to isolate the Biographer's materials (p. 142).

As typical of the Biographer's style, he lists Jeremiah 7:21-27; 25:3 ff.; 26:3 ff.; 29:16-21; 35:15 and 44:2ff. Within these texts there is an expansive, repetitive, at times almost redundant diction, with a "piling up of words and phrases in a fluent, conventionalized theological style" (p. 145).

May draws our attention to the fact that Jeremiah

17:5-8 is obviously late, following the pattern of Psalm 1. Secondly, May finds the influence of II Isaiah in Jer. 17:12-18. In regard to the psalms, he finds that other psalms are incorporated into Jeremiah's book by the Biographer (i.e., Jeremiah 14:1-9 is a psalm sung in a drought), and that there is no relationship to the original Jeremianic text. In general he considers that Jer. 14:1-9; 17:12-18; 12:1-4; 10:23-25; 16:19-20 and 33:11 all belong to the *Gattung* of the psalms.

Furthermore, the Biographer wrote under partial influence of the D₂-redactor²⁸ of the book of Deuteronomy (p. 146); and there can be seen in the Biographer literary and ideological styles coming from II Isaiah. A few examples of II Isaiah's influence will serve to illustrate May's hypothesis. He suggests that the influence can be seen if one compares Isa. 50:10 with Jer. 31:35. The Biographer was particularly influenced by II Isaiah's universalism. Also, he follows II Isaiah's affirmations of the return and restoration of the exilic community; for this point, compare Jer. 16:14-15 and 23:7-8 to Isa. 43:16-21 and 11:15-16. For the influence of D₂-redactor compare Jer. 11:1-15 to Deuteronomy 4.²⁹

Similarly, May sees a striking resemblance between the Biographer's materials and the diction and ideology of the redactor of I Zechariah. Furthermore, he suggests that certain analogies can be made between the Biographer's materials and the redactor of Ezekiel. He

also considers it possible that there are certain definite associations with Obadiah, Ezra and Nehemiah (he doesn't list any examples (p. 152)). He concludes that the Biographer lived at least a century after Jeremiah. In light of this conclusion, he suggests that the Biographer's materials do not contain Jeremiah's message, but rather the Biographer's message to future generations living both during and after the exilic period.

The implications of May's conclusion and suggestion are important in discussing the origins of the "C" materials in the book of Jeremiah, with which most of the Biographer's materials are related. Although May does not discuss the question of the Biographer in terms of the Mowinckel divisions, he suggests both explicitly (p. 145) and implicitly (from his evidence of literary relationships between the Biographer's materials and the other non-Jeremianic materials) that the Biographer lived in the time of the exile, not earlier than the first half of the 5th Century B.C.E., and that these materials cannot be from the prophet Jeremiah. The significance of this idea has far-reaching consequences.

Since May does not deal with Mowinckel's divisions of the materials in Jeremiah, his argument may seem, at first glance, to be irrelevant to our discussion. However, there are assumptions in May's argumentation which are very relevant to our study. While focussing on the Biographer and his contributions in composing the book of

Jeremiah, May follows the pattern of literary critics before him. He says, for instance, that the Biographer's materials are not originally from Jeremiah, and this represents another possible explanation of the prose source in Jeremiah. This analysis sounds very much like the thoughts of Duham, Mowinckel, *et al.* May carefully weighs the importance of his study in terms of other Jeremianic problems. He suggests that his hypothesis concerning the existence of a Biographer is:

...the first spade work for a more important task, namely the recovery of the historical Jeremiah.³⁰

It is my contention that any attempt at finding the *ipsissima verba* of the prophet cannot be based solely on literary critical grounds. Moreover, dividing the materials in the book of Jeremiah into sources on the basis of literary critical considerations *only describes* the type of materials therein, and does not lead to any concrete conclusions concerning the origins and development of the book of Jeremiah.³¹

We will now examine J. P. Hyatt's historical analysis of the book of Jeremiah, and determine whether or not his treatment of the relationship between the book of Jeremiah and the book of Deuteronomy offer any concrete solutions to our problem.

J. P. HYATT

Our second example of a literary critic who attempts to solve the problem of sources is J. P. Hyatt.³² He argues for Deuteronomistic influences on the style of the prophet Jeremiah and for Deuteronomistic insertions within the book of Jeremiah. He discusses the relationship of the book of Deuteronomy to Josiah's reform, and concludes that a prototype of the book of Deuteronomy, *Urdeuteronomium*, was not the basis for the reforms of Josiah, but a timely support for them.

Hyatt's contentions are: (1) Jeremiah began his ministry around 611 B.C.E. and not in 627 as most commentators hold (p. 158); (2) the reform of Josiah was only at best partially successful, and Jeremiah's references to idolatry and the like do not necessarily refer to the reign of Josiah but may refer to the early part of Jehoiakim's adulterous reign (p. 161). If the above is true, then Jeremiah was against the writers of Deuteronomy after Josiah. A consequence of this is that those Deuteronomistic texts in Jeremiah are in fact passages which depict Jeremiah as a supporter of the reforms of Josiah and the Deuteronomists (pp. 164-173).

Hyatt's focus is on the literary evidence which connects the book of Jeremiah to the Deuteronomistic editors.³³ He concerns himself with a completely different subject than does May. At a superficial glance one would say that Hyatt and May have relatively little to do with

each other, both in terms of subject matter and in method. However, a closer examination of Hyatt's methodology will reveal a striking similarity to May's. Both authors assume that the sources dealt with (in Hyatt's case the so called Deuteronomistic insertions, and common terminology of the times³⁴) are not original to the prophet himself. It must be said that there surely exist within the book of Jeremiah some redactional materials, as well as editorial sections.³⁵ But the problem is how *many* there are, *where* they are.

As we shall note in both Holladay's and Bright's works, which we study next, the question of original versus non-original Jeremianic materials is a misunderstanding of the very nature of these materials. The assumptions in this question are that if some texts or units were not from the prophet Jeremiah, then they are perversions of the "original and authentic" *Geist* of the prophet.³⁶ The reinterpretation of Jeremianic materials does not necessarily imply perversion of these materials. For the moment, we turn to Holladay and Bright and seek out their contributions to our problem.

W. L. HOLLADAY

W. L. Holladay analyses and compares those passages (poetry and prose) which contain doublets as well as others of similar content and phrasing.³⁷ His basic contention is that the prose passages are based on poetic

"prototypes", with the prose often being an expansion of the poetry. We agree with Holladay when he says: "...such a study points to a renewal of literary analysis" (p. 353). With this renewal of literary analysis in mind, our main concern will be to see what makes Holladay's applications of this method new. We shall also see what he is presupposing when he applies this method.

Holladay's method is analogous to that of the literary critics already referred to. He focuses on the traditional divisions of Jeremiah which were expounded upon by both Duhm and Mowinckel. There are basically two ways in which he differs from the literary critics mentioned above. First, his examination of the prose materials in relationship to the poetry is without the *a priori* assumption that the "Deuteronomistic" style is necessarily derived from Deuteronomistic circles, Jeremiah himself, Baruch or a Biographer. Having examined verse by verse the relationship of the prose to the poetry, he then continues this pattern of investigation for *all the parallels* outside the book of Jeremiah. Secondly, Holladay does not hold the presuppositions of former literary critical divisions concerning the former literary critical divisions within the book of Jeremiah. He does not, for example, consider the division between Mowinckel's "C" and "B" sources valid.³⁸ This consideration is based on the evidence in the book of Jeremiah and not on any preconceived notions. He writes:

If the interested student will take the trouble to underline the typical phrases in the prose throughout the book of Jeremiah, he will find that they occur just as often in the ³⁹speeches of source B as they do in source C.

Holladay's analysis of the prose material in relation to the supposed "prototype" poetry leads to some interesting conclusions. He finds eight different ways in which the prose can be linguistically and stylistically traced back to the poetry. His analysis also establishes the fact that the prose passages with poetic prototypes cut across the divisions of sources A, B, C, and D.

One criticism of Holladay's study, to which he admits, is that there are many prose phrases which are not counterparts to poetic passages.⁴⁰ Thus a study of the prose-poetry in regard to the development and origins of the book of Jeremiah must include those prose texts whose origins have not yet been examined. Along with the above detail Holladay points out an interesting idea for further study:

...one of the most interesting investigations of all would be to analyze the phrases in the prose passages of Jeremiah which are unique to these prose sections, having neither antecedents (prototypes in prophetic or other materials) nor imitations; for example, "his/thy life for a prey", 21:9; 38:2; 39:18; 45:5, which is otherwise completely unattested.⁴¹

One implication of his study is that the relationship between Jeremiah and the work of the Deuteronomists will need to be faced afresh (in terms of influence, etc.). Furthermore, the fact that Holladay studies the relationship

between prose and poetry and finds some clear evidence as to the provenance of some of the prose material lends itself quite readily to the methods of the traditio-historical mode of investigation.

The concept of poetry-prose prototype has as an underlying presupposition a transmission process which fits in with Holladay's suggestion of an expansion of the original poetic Jeremianic material by either Jeremiah himself, applying what he had said in the past to new historical situations in prose form, or by his disciples or others, who were doing the same.

Let it suffice to say that this "renewal" of literary criticism⁷ has much to offer towards a better understanding of Jeremianic materials. Although the study just reviewed has its limitations, it does open up new vistas which revive critical method which has long been considered to be of minor significance by some contemporary scholars.

J. BRIGHT

It may be a misclassification to suggest that J. Bright belongs to the domain of literary criticism. Although he does use literary criticism to a certain extent, he could be thought of as being a consistent applier of the traditio-historical method. He not only uses the literary-critical method, but form-critical methods are not uncommon

in his analysés. However, in his *JBL* 1951 article on the date of the prose sermons in Jeremiah he is primarily concerned with establishing the characteristic expressions of Jeremiah in the prose sermons, and then attempting to establish an historical date for them.⁴²

In terms of methodology, Bright concurs with May and Holladay on the best approach which must be taken when analyzing the prose materials in the book of Jeremiah:

Our point of departure must be the prose sermons themselves. Our task must be to examine this material as a whole, to study its characteristic clichés in their wider relationships, to analyze it for historical allusions and other internal evidence that might throw light on its date. Only then can we hope for constructive results.⁴³

Bright, however, parts ways with May and his method of analysis in that his investigations proceed from the demonstrable premise that in style and in form, the prose sermons are one.⁴⁴

Bright disagrees with May's list of texts which connect Jeremiah to the Psalms and II Isaiah by way of the Biographer. He sees that in these texts (i.e., Jer. 10:1-16; 30:9-11; 31:7-9) the influence of the above mentioned sources outside of the book of Jeremiah is indeed present. But more important for our study is the fact that Bright interprets such texts as being expansions of original Jeremianic texts, in the style, for example, of II Isaiah.⁴⁵ Thus we begin to see that expansion is being suggested as the source of the materials. Such an interpretation does not deal with the problem of original versus unoriginal

texts. It merely describes the literary evidence and cannot conclude that the categories mentioned above are valid or invalid. In terms of an historical literary perspective, Bright concludes that the prose of Jeremiah exhibits no stylistic or other dependency on literature from the restoration period.⁴⁶ In fact, Bright considers the style of the prose as belonging to a period not much after the completion of the book of Deuteronomy (i.e., mid. 6th Century B.C.E.).

Bright picks up on Holladay's challenge in regard to the relationship between Deuteronomy and Jeremiah. He does see influence from and dependancy on Deuteronomy in the book of Jeremiah. However, he questions whether there is any influence of D₂ (i.e., the Deuteronomistic circles) on the style of Jeremiah. Through his statistical analysis (p. 26 ff) Bright finds that there is an inescapable kinship of the prose material to original Jeremianic passages (i.e., the poetic ones). He is in complete agreement with Holladay on this point. He also notes that although there are texts in the book of Jeremiah that *appear*, at first glance, to be directly influenced by the book of Deuteronomy, both Deuteronomy and Jeremiah have their own distinctive styles. Furthermore, Jeremiah's style is, in Bright's opinion, to be found nowhere else.⁴⁷

The obvious point to be made is that Bright, as is the case with Holladay, does not interpret the book of Jeremiah as a static entity when analyzing the prose ma-

terials. That is, the prose materials are presupposed by both authors to exist not simply by means of a literary process of "rewriting", but that their provenance is due to a much more complex expansion process. Perhaps it would be premature at this point to suggest a detailed description of what that expansion process may in fact entail. Let it suffice to note that Bright rejects the "rewriting" hypothesis for a more complex and scientific alternative. In terms of theological distortions referred to above, Bright does not believe the prose materials necessarily pervert the portrait of Jeremiah the prophet as it is presented in the poetry. He writes: "...whatever *expansion* of Jeremiah's thought it [the prose] presents, it presents a picture of him not *essentially* different from that of the poetry" (p. 29). Bright may be moving in the right direction both in his perception of the portrayal of the prophet Jeremiah, and in his concept of how the prose came into being.

One of the criticisms of Bright by tradition-historical critics is that he envisions the transmission process as mainly a literary activity. Other suggestions have been offered which suggest that the transmission process was a re-vitalization of what seems to have been for the Israelite community the "word of God". This view contains many different presuppositions which we shall explore below.⁴⁸

At this point, we may simply note that both

Holladay and Bright renew the literary critical method not so much in the mechanical application of it, but more so in the presuppositions which govern its execution.

Although both authors are still arguing within the concepts of authentic versus inauthentic materials⁴⁹, Bright moves away from this form of conceptualizing the materials (i.e., prose) in that he speaks about the portrayal of Jeremiah in the prose *as being essentially accurate*. Here Bright assumes some type of transmission process which does not allow for the categories of authentic and unauthentic.

To suggest that the prose, a later "expansion" of the poetry, actually retains the *true* concept of Jeremiah is the same as suggesting that the prose is based on "original" materials, and has not been perverted or has not deviated in any way from the representations in the poetry. Furthermore, the methodologies of neither Holladay nor Bright presuppose any absolute or exhaustive treatment of the problem. Thus their working hypotheses have within them aspects which allow for improvement and change, a commendable objective in the science of studying the Hebrew and Christian bibles.

CONCLUSION

This chapter has examined the manner in which literary criticism of the 20th Century has attempted to answer the question of the provenance of the Jeremianic prose materials, (more specifically Mowinckel's "C" source). We have noted a variety of different approaches and possible solutions to the question. We have also noted that each literary critic has approached the problem with a different presupposition concerning the *nature* of the prose materials in question. For example, some consider that the prose materials originate from Jeremiah himself, some from Deuteronomistic editors and others from Baruch, a Biographer or the *Ergänzer*.

What is certain is that none of these theorists agree with each other completely. It is also apparent that the literary critical method in and of itself does not seem to be able to answer adequately the question of the provenance of the prose materials in the book of Jeremiah. Because of the divergency of opinions one must call into question the value of the so called "sources" as understood by the literary critical scholars. Perhaps, it is the presupposition that the "C" material is a "source" that prevents the literary critic from solving the question of provenance. When scholars such as Holladay and Bright suggest that the prose may be a derivation from the poetry in one form or another, perhaps we have then the kernel

idea with which we can approach and appreciate the relationship of those two styles of Hebraic expression.

NOTES

¹Generally within biblical scholarship, the terms "original", "authentic", and "genuine" are understood in the following manner. If an oracle, prophecy, or any other type of saying was used by the prophet in his ministry or in other circumstances in his life, then that unit of material is "original", "authentic" or "genuine". However, if those same units of material were not in any way used by the prophet Jeremiah, then they are the opposite of the above categories or concepts which are represented by those words in brackets. We shall leave the problems of such conceptualizing for the last chapter of this study.

²Our interest in prose is central to this chapter. We will want to know from where the prose comes, how it evolved to its present form, and what its relationship to the poetic section is.

³B. Duhm, *Das Buch Jeremia* (HKAT; Tübingen: J.B.C. Mohr, 1901). Almost all the articles listed in this paper dealing with the problem of the prose-poetry complex mention Duhm's great work. Its influence at one time was extremely important.

⁴"Secondary" literature is synonymous with the concepts behind the words "unoriginal", "inauthentic" and "non-genuine". Essentially, it refers to those materials which are included within the book of Jeremiah but were not in any way used by the prophet during his lifetime. Thus Baruch's insertions, the so called Deuteronomistic editions and additions and the *Ergänzer's* materials would fit this category.

⁵S. Mowinckel, *Zur Komposition Des Buches Jeremia* (Kristiania: Dywad, 1914); Mowinckel, *Prophecy and Tradition* (Oslo: Bywad, 1946).

⁶We will be particularly interested in Mowinckel's "C" source: 7:1-8:3; 11:1-5,9-14; 18:1-12; 21:1-10; 25:1-11a; 32:1-2,6-16, 24-44; 34:1-7; 34:8-22; 35:1-19; 44:1-14. These texts are perhaps the most controversial in the book of Jeremiah. They have been identified by H. G. May ("Towards an objective approach to the book of Jeremiah: The Biographer," *JBL* 61 (1942) 139-159, as being from the Biographer; Duhm designated them as being the work of Baruch, etc. The importance of accurately and specifically identifying what these texts in fact are is essential. They have been identified as being prose and poetic in structure and syntax; beyond this, there is not the agreement necessary for a secure understanding of these materials.

⁷P. Volz, *Der Prophet Jeremia* (Leipzig: Tauchnitz, 1928).

⁸W. Rudolph, *Jeremia* (HAT 12; Tübingen: J.B.C. Mohr, 1947).

⁹J. P. Hyatt, "Jeremiah and Deuteronomy," *JNES* 1 (1942) 156-173 and more recently his "Jeremiah: Introduction and Exegesis," *Int. Bib.*, vol. 5 (Nashville: Abingdon, 1957) 777-1142.

¹⁰A. S. Peake, *Jeremiah*, vls. 1 & 2 (Edinburgh T. C. & E. C. Jack, n.d.), p. 51.

¹¹E. J. Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament* (London: Tyndale Pres, 1960). Hereafter will be cited as Young, *Introduction...*.

¹²Oesterly and Robinson, *Introduction to the books of the Old Testament* (London: SPCK, 1936).

¹³N. Gautier, *Introduction à l'Ancien Testament* 2 ed.; (Lausanne: Payot & Cie., 1910).

¹⁴H. G. May, see note 6. Hereafter cited as "Towards an objective...".

¹⁵J. Bright, "The Date of the Prose Sermons of Jeremiah," *JBL* 70 (1951) 15-35; Bright, *Jeremiah* (AB 21; New York: Doubleday, 1965) LX ff.

¹⁶A. Weiser, *Das Buch Des Propheten Jeremia* (ATD 20-21; 4 ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969), XXXVII.

¹⁷Henning Graf von Reventlow, "Gattung and Überlieferung in der 'Tempelrede Jeremiah' Jer. 7 und 26," *ZAW* (1960) 315-353.

¹⁸Young, see his *Introduction...*.

¹⁹A. Bentzen, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, vol. 2, (Copenhagen: Gad, 1958), p. 119.

²⁰S. Granild, "Jeremia und das Deuteronomium," *StTh* 16 (1962) 135-154.

²¹The criteria for choosing the four scholars are: (1) they all depend upon literary criticism in their analysis of the Jeremianic prose; (2) they can be paired off and put into different camps which represent two major view points in Jeremianic scholarship; (3) they are the most recent representatives of each group.

²²In May's case, we want to see how he views the Biographer's materials being inserted into the book of Jeremiah; in Hyatt's case, we would like to know how he thinks the supposed insertions arrived at their present positions. We shall have similar goals for both Holladay and Bright.

²³H. G. May, "Towards an objective..." see note 14.

²⁴H. G. May, "Towards an objective..."; further examples are found on pages 154-155.

²⁵"In making our criterion literary rather than ideological we hope to escape reasoning in a circle."

²⁶H. G. May, "Towards an objective...", see p. 139 first paragraph.

²⁷*Ibid.*

²⁸"D₂-redactor" refers to a second level of literary activity within the book of Deuteronomy. This activity deals with the inserting, rearranging and editing of fixed units of literature.

²⁹*Ibid.*, p. 154.

³⁰*Ibid.*, p. 153.

³¹See J. P. Hyatt's "Jeremiah and Deuteronomy," *JNES* 1 (1942) article, p. 163, Section III on this point. Also, we acknowledge that much can be gained in terms of historical knowledge through literary criticism, along with pinpointing specific units. We are not attempting to refute literary criticism, but are attempting to establish its proper function within the scientific study of the bible.

³²J. P. Hyatt, see his *JNES* 1 (1942) 156-173.

³³J. P. Hyatt, "Jeremiah and...", pp. 166-172: (1) texts dealing with dates in Jeremiah which were intended to make Jeremiah begin his public ministry before the Deuteronomistic reforms are: Jer. 1:2; 3:6; 25:3; 36:2; (2) texts emphasizing pre-Deuteronomic sins during Jeremiah's early ministry are: Jer. 19:2-9, 11b-14a; for a "D" flavour in Jeremiah compare: Jer. 19:7 to Deut. 27:26; Jer. 19:8 to Deut. 29:22; Jer. 19:9 to Deut. 28:53. For a full listing see pp. 166-172; (3) texts which demonstrate Jeremiah as an active supporter of the Josianic reforms: Jer. 11:3 (Deut. 27:26; Jer. 11:4 (Deut. 4:20); (4) texts which show the exile as being the consequence of Israel's disobedience to Yahweh and worshipping foreign gods: Jer. 5:19; 19:11-13; 16:10-13; 22:8-9; (5) texts predicting the restoration of the exilic community and promising them future prosperity: Jer. 30-33 (Deut. 30:3,5); (6) legalistic passages inserted to prove that Jeremiah knew the laws of Deuteronomy: Jer. 3:8; 34:13b-14a.

³⁴It is of interest to note Hyatt's fourth example of this type of literature on p. 165. He considers it to be non-original or unoriginal by virtue of it being part of the so-called Deuteronomistic editing. However, it is analysed by Holladay as being original, as we shall note below.

³⁵For example, see E. Tov, "L'incidence de la Critique Textuelle sur la critique littéraire dans le livre de Jérémie," *RB* 79 (1972) 189-199, who points out some examples on pp. 92-97.

³⁶This assumption may include those who think that a Deuteronomistic circle was responsible for the transmission of Jeremianic materials and those who think that it was his disciples who did the same.

³⁷W. L. Holladay, "Prototype and Copies: A new approach to the poetry-prose problem in the book of Jeremiah," *JBL* 79 (1960) 351-357. Hereafter will be cited as Holladay, "Prototype and Copies...", On pp. 354-366, Holladay lists examples of which just a few are listed in the following:

THEME	PROSE TEXTS	POETIC PROTOTYPES
"Deliver from the (of) the oppressor him who has been robbed."	22:3	21:12
"Gate of Jerusalem"	1:14-15; 17:19-27	22:19
"Trust in a lie" "Trust in lying"	7:4-8; 28:15 29:31	13:25
"Cities of Judah and streets of Jerusalem"	7:17,34; 11:6,13; 33:10; 44:6,17, 21.	5:1; 4:16; 9:10.

³⁸W. L. Holladay, "Prototypes and...", pp. 353-354. "Let me note the fact that no distinction is made in the following analysis [of prose-poetry prototypes] between Mowinckel's Source B and C. I have called both sources "prose" without any differentiation.

³⁹W. L. Holladay, "Prototypes and Copies...", p. 354.

⁴⁰W. L. Holladay, "Prototypes and Copies...", p. 366. "Two examples at random: "on the day of bringing the up/out from the land of Egypt," (Jer. 7:22; 11:4; 34:13), ultimately from the Ten Commandments, etc., but cf. Jer. 2:6: "The land/place/etc. which I/the Lord have given you/them/your fathers" Jer. 7:7,14 and at least six other times in the prose(, cf. Deut. 26:9 and often, but cf. also Jer. 2:7."

⁴¹W. L. Holladay, "Prototypes and Copies...", p. 367.

⁴²J. Bright, "The Date of the Prose Sermons of Jeremiah," *JBL* 70 (1951) 15-35. Hereafter will be cited as Bright, "The Date of...", The dating of the texts rests largely on the literary-critical and form critical methods. Bright uses his vast historical knowledge of this period as a means of supporting his literary analysis, but, essentially, his discussion deals with literary criticism.

⁴³Bright, "The Date of...", p. 17.

⁴⁴Bright, "The Date of...", p. 16 and Appendix A on pp. 30-35.

⁴⁵Bright, "The Date of...", p. 20 note 18.

⁴⁶Bright, "The Date of...", p. 22.

⁴⁷ Bright "The Date of...", p. 26 and see Appendix A for his numerous examples.

⁴⁸ For example see Nicholson's *Preaching to the Exiles* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1970); P. R. Ackroyd, "The Vitality of the Word of God in the Old Testament," *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute*, vol. 1:1962, pp. 7-23; G. W. Ahlström, "Oral and Written Transmission: Some Considerations," *HTR* 59 (1966) 69-81).

⁴⁹ At this point we shall not discuss the aspect of authentic versus inauthentic. These words will be fully discussed in the last chapter of this study.

CHAPTER 2

20TH CENTURY FORM CRITICISM

In this chapter, our aim is to examine the contributions and possible limitations of the form critical method in regard to the prose materials in the book of Jeremiah. In order to accomplish our task, it is first necessary to review briefly the contributions and limitations of 20th century form criticism in relation to prophetic literature in the Hebrew bible. After this survey, we shall outline the form critical work dealing specifically with the book of Jeremiah. We shall attempt to closely examine the presuppositions of Jeremianic form critics, and draw some conclusions about the lasting contributions of form criticism in Jeremianic and prophetic literature.

Our history of the study of prophetic *Gattungen* (i.e., forms) will focus primarily on those which each scholar attempts to establish. Some attention will be given to their presuppositions, but our main interest will be to notice the various classifications given to the same form of prophetic speech. We shall also note that the pattern of study established by form critics of the 20th Century begins with psychological theories concerning the private experiences of the prophets progressing to the study and delineation of various *Gattungen*, and culminates in the search for the *Sitz im Leben* or social matrix of the various *Gattungen*.

For the most part this study of the prophetic forms of speech is extracted from three sources: Clause Westermann's *Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech*; Jack Lundbom's *Jeremiah: A Study in Ancient Hebrew Rhetoric*, and from John March's "Prophecy" in John Hayes' (ed.) *Old Testament Form Criticism*. I have found that the analysis of these three authors, while good, does not deal directly with our topic. I have, therefore, examined the references made in the three sources and coordinated my findings with those of Westermann, Lundbom and March.

The second part of this chapter deals with three representative form critics who have dealt specifically with the book of Jeremiah. This section contains a more detailed study of the presuppositions which to a certain extent control and determine the conclusions of each scholar. For the first two critics, we shall examine the treatment of Jer. 7:1-15 and to a lesser extent Jer. 26. These texts are of prime importance to our analysis. They will allow us to limit our comments, control our focus and dispose of unnecessary side issues. More specifically, because Jeremiah 7:1-15 is in fact prose material, we shall be able to ask the following question in regard to the basic limitations of form criticism: Is form criticism equipped to answer questions concerning the provenance of the Jeremianic prose materials? The problems of the history of the *Gattung*, along with the problems of its *Sitz im Leben*, will hopefully reveal the answers to this question. With the

above in mind, we will examine the history of the study of the prophetic speech forms of the 20th Century.

FORM CRITICISM AND PROPHETIC GATTUNGEN

The form critical work of W. W. Baudassin¹, C. Steurnagel² and G. Hölscher³, which contain analyses of prophetic forms of speech, will be examined first. Although they use their form critical tools in variance with one another, they all agree that the primary prophetic unit has its origins in the short independent sayings of the prophets. Baudassin begins with the preliterate prophets, who, he assumes, had "private experiences" which produced these short sayings. Steurnagel follows this theory and confirms Baudassin's other theory (i.e., the rhetoric theory) that these short sayings were then expanded by the prophet when he developed a rhetorical style of his own.⁴ Their theories as to how the prophetic short independent sayings developed to the present forms of prophetic oracles all vary, and accordingly so their analyses and interpretations of those present forms.

It was not until Hermann Gunkel's epoch-making form critical studies on Genesis and the Psalms that we find deeper probing into the prophetic speech forms and a clearer understanding of the concept of *Gattung* and its function.⁵ Gunkel establishes two levels of prophetic speech which he divides into categories. They are short enigmatic words

along with compound words such as names given to children and short sayings of two or three lines long.⁶ Both he and Hölscher disagree with the older concept that the prophets were speech *writers*. They balance this "rhetoric theory" by demonstrating through literary evidence that the short enigmatic statements are earlier than the longer prophetic speeches. As for the prophetic *Gattungen*, Gunkel considered the "announcement of judgement against Israel" speech to be the earliest.⁷

Gunkel's long-range contributions to form criticism in prophetic literature can be clearly traced in Hugo Gressmann's work.⁸ Gressmann carried on Gunkel's work on the "threat and reason" *Gattung*. He went beyond the distinction of "threat and reason" made by Gunkel by suggesting that there should be a distinction between oracles of salvation and of judgement.⁹ Having compared Egyptian oracles with pre-exilic prophetic salvation-judgement oracles, Gressmann found that Hosea contains the salvation-judgement oracle as a whole unit. Thus he challenged the literary critical hypothesis that the pre-exilic prophets were familiar solely with judgement oracles.¹⁰

Attention given to the "reason-reproach" element within the prophetic speeches is not focused until Hans Walter Wolff, whom we will examine later. Emil Balla¹¹ continued Gunkel's form critical work in yet another direction with his studies of introductory and concluding formulae. Balla's work on introductory formulae together with

his view that the prophets were *seers* and then *messengers* is a significant contribution to form criticism.

Ludwig Köhler¹², Johannes Lindblom¹³ and Johannes Hemple¹⁴ take up this same approach and make significant clarifications regarding introductory and messenger formulae. While Balla divides the prophetic speeches into three categories (the proclamation, the imperative, the conclusion), Köhler, in his study of prophetic narratives, limits himself to the introductory and concluding formulae, and finds a major form which he designates "messenger speech". Lindblom compares the medieval mystical literature with the prophets (especially Amos) and finds that the major *Gattung* in Amos is "the revelation". More important, however, is his appendix, which shows a detailed study of both introductory and concluding formulae such as thus says YHWH, and, establishes that such formulae appear only in Israelite prophetic literature.

Hemple is the scholar who combines the study of introductory and concluding formulae with the "threat and reproach" elements. Focusing on the divine "I" of the prophetic speeches, he suggests that the threat was contained in the divine "I" part of the speech and that the reproach or "reason", as he calls it, represents the prophet's own reflections about the threat.¹⁵

Hans Walter Wolff¹⁶ continues research on the "threat-reason" formulae in his encyclopaedic study of all the prophetic speech forms. Wolff is similar to Lindblom

in that the significance of his contributions lies not in his over-generalized study of prophetic speech forms, but in his detailed analysis of the manner in which the reason is connected with the threat. He finds that in almost all the prophetic speeches, both early and late, the reason or reproach is not an independent unit but a part of a unified whole within the announcement speeches concerning the future. He discovers that the reason is connected to the threat by the phrase למה, למה לך ¹⁷ or something similar. Wolff establishes the "speech concerning the future" (i.e., the judgement speech concerning the future) as being the major speech form in the prophetic literature. The fact that Wolff establishes the announcement of judgement concerning the future, with the "reason" element attached, as, the earliest form of prophetic speech, is in itself a significant breakthrough in form-critical methodology. The pattern of research reflected here is one of narrowing down the interest and focus of study, which in later studies will prove to be a significant approach to establishing the proper *Gattungen*. Secondly, this type of accurate research places the prophet out of the category of mystic (so Lindblom) or ecstatic (so everyone prior to Lindblom) into the category of giver of oracles!

Hans Wildberger¹⁸ continues the line of research established by Balla in his study of introductory and concluding formulae in the book of Jeremiah. His basic contri-

bution lies in the distinction which he makes between four groups of materials in Jeremiah.¹⁹ His work could be interpreted as a clarification and development of Sigmund Mowinkel's theory concerning the literary sources in the book of Jeremiah. At this time, we might note what direction form criticism is beginning to take: it picks out particular phrases such as the introductory and concluding elements or the threat-reproach elements in the prophetic speeches and gives special attention to their function in those speeches. It is in this type of research that most of the lasting and more significant results of the form critical method in the 20th Century will be found.

Claus Westermann²⁰ compares the basic forms of Israelite prophetic speech with those found in the Mari Letters. He suggests that in regard to the announcement of Judgement together with the reason or reproach, the prophetic speech forms are best understood in terms of messenger speeches.

These messenger formulae are also the basic clues for interpreting the prophetic speeches. But Friederich Ellermeier²¹ challenges Westermann's narrow basis of comparison, namely, the Mari Texts. Ellermeier points out that the messenger formula and messenger speech are not the two most dominant forms of prophetic speech from Mari.²² Robert North²³ in his study on the messenger function stresses its complexity as a form. His analysis indicates

that the messenger form of ancient Israel has been combined with priestly and legal functions which are reflected in the speech's *genres* (i.e., forms). Thus one must be cautious with Westermann's use of Mari Texts as sole clues for properly interpreting the prophetic messenger formula.

Thus far in our study we have noted that form critics have struggled with two basic problems: the establishing of (a) a particular *Gattung*; and, (b) an interpretation of its content in terms of that form. Robert North's work on the Mari Texts and on the Israelite prophetic texts inspired later form critics to search for *the various possible* life settings behind those complicated forms of speech. From such an inspiration critics have discovered a variety of *Sitzeim Leben* for the messenger texts.

We shall examine the research done on such themes as the "call to battle" and "call to flight", and the **17** or "controversy" patterns within prophetic speech. Robert Bach studied the "call to battle" and the "call to flight" (which occur more frequently in the book of Jeremiah than elsewhere in the Hebrew bible) and found their roots in the "holy war" texts from pre-monarchical charismatic leaders in the period of the Judges.²⁴ His theory concerning the transmission of these themes or motifs is that they were taken over from pre-monarchical charismatic leaders by early monarchical prophets.

Henning Graf von Reventlow²⁵ takes another direction in terms of the *Sitz im Leben* of prophetic speech. In dealing with the prophet and his natural setting, he associates the prophetic office with the covenant renewal. He is similar to North in that his analysis leads one to believe that the prophetic *Gattungen* have some legal and priestly influences contained within their cultic expressions. He suggests that Israel's primary faith was expressed in the covenant-renewal festival where the law, covenant and curses (and blessings) were all proclaimed alongside one another.

Eberhard von Waldow²⁶ studies the historical background of the prophetic speech of Judgement. His main interest and objective is to establish the legal influences upon prophetic speech *Gattungen*. He suggests that the "legal secular" tradition greatly influenced prophetic speech forms. He concludes that since the cult and covenant traditions were interrelated, the prophets used defined legal forms to express their understanding of the reality of God, who was represented both as an accuser and Judge. Joachim Begrich²⁷ develops on the study of legal influence in prophetic text concerning II Isaiah. He relates several *Gattungen* in II Isaiah. Ernest Würthwein²⁸ continues examining von Waldow's "God as Judge" motif in his argument that the *Sitz im Leben* of the prophetic judicial speech was in fact cultic, with legal influences besides.

Concerning the "complaint", "controversy" or lawsuit forms *ל* within prophetic literature, Bernard Gemser²⁹, Herbert Huffmon³⁰ and Julien Harvey³¹ all make further needed clarifications. Gemser, finds the *ל* or controversy patterns to be characteristic of Hebrew thought in general, but locates it in other surrounding cultures of ancient Israel. Huffmon makes a significant breakthrough in this line of research by distinguishing between the "heavenly *ל*" which deals with a heavenly council or tribune making references to earthly tribunal structures and, the "indictment *ל* against Israel". The latter refers to a breach of covenant, and calls the natural elements as covenantal witnesses, and contains an historical prologue. He finds a great influence exerted on this *Gattung* by ancient Near Eastern international treaties. Finally, Harvey's contribution follows Huffmon in that he also studies the relationship between Ancient Near Eastern International Treaties and prophetic forms of speech. His analysis leads to the conclusion that there must be a distinction between the "*ל* of warning" and "*ל* of condemnation".³²

FORM CRITICISM AND THE BOOK OF JEREMIAH

Our prime objective in this section is to examine the three form critics who deal with the prose material in the book of Jeremiah, (i.e., Jer. 7:1-15). In examining their work, we would like to keep in mind questions concerning the provenance of the prose. Do, for example, the

scholars suggest any possible explanations for the provenance of the prose materials with which they deal? Do the conclusions reached from the *Sitz im Leben* of the text, or the analysis of the transmission of the text's *Gattung* provide any clues as to the provenance of Jeremianic prose?

Before we examine the three scholars, a few explanatory remarks as to why these three scholars have been chosen for this section of this chapter are in order. Georg Fohrer³³ and Henning Graf von Reventlow³⁴ deal with Jeremianic prose material, more specifically chapter 7:1-15. Arthur Weiser³⁵ does not exercise any form critical analysis on any particular text, but his short treatment of the book of Jeremiah in his *Introduction to the Old Testament* does reflect the attitudes, presuppositions and questions asked by form critics. Thus this work, as J. March puts it, is part of a different kind of contribution to form critical research.

A different sort of contribution to form critical research has been made by several writers of "critical introductions" and "theologies of the Old Testament."³⁶

GEORG FOHRER

Fohrer analyses the Temple Sermon of Jeremiah 7:1-15.³⁷ He is interested in the original structure of the prose materials which make up this text. In his treatment of this text, he finds it to be an elongation of what was originally poetry (pp. 406-407). This *metric form*

which he reconstructs from the prose verses is entitled *Kurzvers*, ("shortverse") and supplies a category which affords him the opportunity to establish what in his mind is the "original form of the speech".

Having established what he considers to be the history of the text, Fohrer then suggests his own interpretation (through his own translation) for Jeremiah 7:1-15 (pp. 401-404). He discusses in summary fashion the long history of scholarly research from Mowinckel and his classic three-source theory (i.e., A, B and C sources) to his time. Fohrer is not satisfied with the past scholarly attempts at dividing the sources in the Book of Jeremiah. He bases his opinion on the idea that, due to their complex nature, the prose materials have been consistently misinterpreted. Thus we read the following in Fohrer's article:

Die Versuche Giesebrecht, Qinaverse (3+2) herzustellen, und von Nowack, Langverse mit einer wechselnden Zahl von Hebungen (4+4, 3+3, 3+2, 2+2+2) zu erreichen, scheitern ebenfalls daran, dass für kein Parallelismus vorliegt und viele sachlich falsche Streichungen vorgenommen werden müssen.³⁸

In the following, he suggests that in general, there are various *Kurzvers* with underlying parallelism which make up the form of the prose in Jer. 7:1-15:

Trotzdem ist 7:1-15 in Versform verfasst; nur liegen nicht die allgemein bekannten Langverse (mit Parallelismus der Versglieder), sondern Kurzvers zugrunde. Sie bestehen nur aus einem Versglied, das 2 oder 3 Hebungen aufweist, und lassen sich zu Strophen zusammenfassen.³⁹

Fohrer reconstructs the original *Gattung* of Jer. 7:1-15 on

the basis of his *Kurzvers* hypothesis. Thus the text as it now stands is but an expanded form of the following:

- 1-3 Strophe (7:2-4): Einleitung und erste Mahnwort
- 4-6 Strophe (7:5-7): Zweites Mahnwort
- 7-9 Strophe (7:9-11): Scheltwort⁴⁰
- 10-12 Strophe (7:12-14) Drohwort

Using the *Kurzvers* concept as his model, Fohrer then suggests that hidden within the prose materials (i.e., A, B and C) is the *Kurzvers* model in one form or another, (pp. 408-409).

In examining Fohrer's work in relation to the *Sitz im Leben* of the *Kurzvers*, we find that he does not deal in specific terms, nor does he give concrete examples which illustrate how he arrives at the general *Sitz im Leben* of the text. This may be due to the fact that his article is essentially devoted to *establishing* the possibility of a *Kurzvers* "reality" behind the prose texts.

Fohrer does not share the opinion of some scholars that there is a great influence on the Jeremianic prose materials by the Deuteronomists as is clearly understood from the following:

Jedoch is der tatsächliche Einfluss der deuteronomischen Theologie auf Jeremia nicht sehr gross. Nicht nur die Worte der angeblichen 3. Quelle sind typische Schelt— und Droh— worte, sie finden sich bereits in der ersten vordeuteronomischen Periode der Wirksamkeit des Propheten⁴¹ (5:1-3&6; 5:30-31; 6:10-11; 6:13-15; 6:20-21).

Fohrer goes on to point out that where Deuteronomistic texts are discovered, one finds a different metrical form than is found in the Jeremianic prose materials.⁴² Based on the

metrical form established in the *Kurzvers* model above, he suggests that the distinction between Deuteronomistic texts and authentic Jeremianic texts can be made with less difficulty than has previously been possible.

Since, as we have noticed, Jeremianic materials can be distinguished from Deuteronomistic texts on the basis of metrical form, the value of the *Kurzvers* hypothesis to Fohrer's analysis is obvious. In particular, the *Kurzvers* affords Fohrer the opportunity not only of reconstructing the prose text of Jer. 7:1-15, but of finding its original form. Through this process of working towards an older more original form of 7:1-15, Fohrer considers that verses 2-4; 5-7; 9-11; 12-14 of chapter 7 are authentic since that they are nearer to what Jeremiah may have spoken. In his analysis, he designates verses 7:1, 8, 10 as connecting links within the passage.⁴³ Thus in Fohrer's analysis, the connecting links which reveal a different metrical form betray the hand of the Deuteronomistic editor or redactor. What could prove to be a valid pursuit in view of the above analysis does not take place. Fohrer should at this point in his article pursue two *Sitze im Leben* for both levels of 7:1-15 (i.e. for the original *Gattung* and for the edited one). But Fohrer is not concerned to test the *Kurzvers* hypotheses by seeking out the *Sitz im Leben* at both levels, but merely to establish the probability of such an hypothesis by analyzing other texts in Jeremiah and establishing

the feasibility of the *Kurzvers* hypothesis.

Several significant observations may be made on Fohrer's analysis of the origins of Jeremianic prose material. We might point out the direction of Jeremianic form criticism at this point in its development by outlining the deficiencies of Fohrer's approach. First there are lacking concrete or specific suggestions as to the provenance of the prose materials. Secondly, we must agree with E. W. Nicholson that the basis for the *Kurzvers* hypothesis rests on weak foundations. Nicholson criticises Fohrer's presuppositions concerning the construction or reconstruction of the *Kurzvers*, the central focal point of Fohrer's article. He states that Fohrer:

...attempts to reconstruct the Temple sermon in 7:1-15 as an original composition in *Kurzvers*. But his arguments necessitate excising, in most instances arbitrarily, many phrases from the sermon in its present form.⁴⁴

We are not primarily interested in whether Fohrer's *Kurzvers* hypothesis is well founded or not. Fohrer's article does demonstrate, however, the type of questions (which in turn reflect certain presuppositions) asked by Jeremianic form critics. The direction taken in Fohrer's article is not to be strongly criticized on the basis of the *Kurzvers* hypothesis. The mode of thinking reflected by Fohrer, however, does suggest that form criticism has more creative possibilities than has been formerly granted it. The weakness of Fohrer's hypothesis follows a familiar pattern: the

scholar hits upon an intuitive idea, then having sketched out his hypothesis, he finds or interprets historical evidence which supports such a theory. This process is not foreign to other questions concerning the book of Jeremiah. One need for example only study the arguments concerning the start of Jeremiah's ministry as evidenced by Hyatt and Bright to see a concrete example of this pattern of theorizing.

In any case, we shall examine a later article by Henning Graf von Reventlow and note the advances of Jeremianic form criticism up to the year 1969. Reventlow does exemplify some of Fohrer's creativity, but in general one finds a more careful analysis of both the vocabulary and form of the text in question (i.e. 7:1-15). Let us, then, examine Reventlow's thesis, paying particular attention to the presuppositions in it.

HENNING GRAF VON REVENTLOW

Reventlow begins his discussion of the form and transmission of Jer. 7 & 26 with a general survey of "*Das Problem der Proseüberlieferung in Jeremiabuch*", (p. 315). In this section, he deals with the contributions of Bernhard Duhm (p.315), S. Mowinckel (p. 316), Rietzchel (pp. 316-317), and with the problem of the *Urrole* (Jer. 36). He simply reports the progress of the various scholars and exposes

the reader to the questions with which scholars are struggling. His analysis leads him to conclude that the weakness of most arguments lies in the fact that they do not study the history of the forms contained within Jer. 7:1-15. Reventlow does not consider the *literary critical* method to be ideal for seeking out the actual *Sitz im Leben* of the texts in question.

His proposal is that one should study the history of the form in question, as the following suggests.

Es ist die Aufgabe der Formgeschichte, nicht nur die voll entwickelte Form festzustellen, sie muss ebensogut die Geschichte der Form untersuchen. Ist man einig über die prononcierte Eigenart des Stiles und der Theologie des Deuteronomiums, dann ist die Frage nach der Geschichte dieses Stiles und dieser Theologie unvermeidlich.⁴⁵

Reventlow accepts Bright's divisions concerning the style of the book of Deuteronomy, the Deuteronomistic editor-historian and the prose materials in the book of Jeremiah. Thus he allows for the traditional divisions in the book of Jeremiah, a step he must take before he can establish a history of any *Gattung*. Reventlow, however, disagrees with Bright regarding styles of Jeremianic prose materials and their relationship to Deuteronomistic corpus:

Andererseits ist seine positive Auskunft, es handele sich "but examples of the rhetorical prose of the late 7th and early 6th centuries in Juda" unbefriedigend allgemein.⁴⁶

What can be gathered thus far concerning Reventlow's goal and method is the following: the past approaches of literary critics are not able to establish the actual life

setting of the text; this is due to the very complex nature of the text setting (i.e., also the many layers of the text complicate this factor); the life setting will be found only if one establishes the history of the given *Gattung* and its *Sitz im Leben* from its point of inception to its present form.

In the last paragraph before Reventlow actually begins his analysis of Jer. 7:1-15 and 26:1-19, he sums up his contributions concerning the proper perspective one should take when attempting to find a solution to the problem of Jeremianic prose materials and their origins.

Wenn eine allgemeine Diskussion in eine Sackgasse geraten ist, empfiehlt es sich stets, den Sachverhalt erneut anhand eines konkreten Testes zu prüfen. Für die vorliegende Problematik biete sich dazu die sog. Tempelrede Jeremias, Jer. 7:1-15 an, da ihr in Jer. 26:1-19 ein den gleichen Anlass wiedergebendes Erzählungsstück entspricht. Eine vergleichende Untersuchung dieser beiden Abschnitte wird ihren formgeschichtlichen Hintergrund näher klären können und damit von den Gattungsfragen her weitere Aufschlüsse auch für den Charakter der zu den Quellen C und B gerechneten Stoffe überhaupt geben.⁴⁷

Reventlow wishes to discuss the problem of when and where Jeremiah could have delivered his prophetic "Temple speech". But the clue to answering his question remains hidden in the relationship between Jer. 7:1-15 and Jer. 26:1-19. He suggests that the content in the introduction of Ch. 26, when compared with Ch. 7, demonstrates more of a divergency than a unity.⁴⁸ To make this point clear, Reventlow lists the discrepancies between the two

introductory formulae (see p. 325 for the list). The most important difference is that Jer. 26 has, in its introductory formula, a specific date which is not found in Chapter 7. This difference is interpreted by Reventlow as the clue for pinpointing the historical occasion for the "Temple speech".

The historical information in Jer. 26 along with its style (a shortened version of chapter 7) suggests that it is a later text. Its function is to give an historical setting for the Temple speech of chapter 7 and interpret the events that surrounded the speech. The date given in Jer. 26:1 (i.e., the beginning of the reign of Jehoahaz II son of Josiah, king of Judah) is interpreted by Reventlow as the early part of 608 B.C.E. This is based on historical analysis of the successive reigns of Jehoahaz II (ending in the summer of 609 B.C.E.) and Hehoiakim (beginning in early 608 B.C.E.).

This type of historical analysis is extremely important for establishing a *Sitz im Leben* of a given text. If Reventlow's historical analysis is accurate then the "temple speech" of Jer. 7 and 26 may very well have had its origins in some sort of Festival of the New Year, coinciding with the coronation of a New King. Thus some sort of cultic setting is responsible for the tone and style of the texts concerned.

At this point we are at the heart of Reventlow's

argumentation.⁴⁹ Concerning the cultic life setting, Reventlow suggests that Jeremiah was at home with the cult tradition in Jerusalem (pp. 329-30), and that the cult-tradition terminology used by Jeremiah is derived from the Zion theological tradition.

Auffällig ist, dass die Vorstellung vom Wohnen Jahwes im Tempel der gleichen Zions-Tradition entstammt, zu der auch die kultische Prädikation in v. 4 gehört, auf die sich das Volk verlasst. Das erkennt man an dem häufigen Vorkommen des Gedankens in den Zions-Psalmen (ps. 43:3; 46:5; 89:2; 132:5; 135:21), aber auch bei dem in der gleichen Tradition stehenden Jesaja (Jer. 8:18).⁵⁰

Reventlow continues with a comparative analysis of the form and vocabulary of Jer. 7:1-15 with that of Mi. 6:6-8. He focuses on the cultic demands of YHWH and notes that YHWH's commands are: righteous and just living; to love tenderly; and, to walk humbly with God. Klaus Koch⁵¹ has correctly (in Reventlow's opinion) labelled the vocabulary and *Sitz im Leben* of this text (Mi. 6:6-8) as "Temple liturgical-Decalogue entrance speech" (i.e. *Tempel-einlassliturgien und Dekaloge*). Reventlow places Jer. 1:6 ff.; 7:33 ff.; and Amos 5:14 ff., within the "Temple entrance speech form".⁵²

The nature of Reventlow's analysis contributes much for our purposes. It implies that *the content* of a particular text will mold, shape, structure and control the type of *form* in which it is contained. To put it another way, the form of a text will always reflect the *Sitz im Leben* of the content which is characterized by the

form. Therefore, if a text has a "legal" form, or "lament" form, then the content of the text and its origins must categorically come from a "legal" or "lamentation" setting (i.e. *Sitz im Leben*).

This hypothesis can hardly hold true, as we shall note in the following. For example, Klaus Koch notes that not every similarly constructed form can be placed in a single *Sitz im Leben*:

...nicht in jedem Fall darf von einer bemutzen Gattung auf das gleichzeitige Bestehen des dazugehörigen Sitzes im Leben geschlossen werden. Nur der Schiess ist erlaubt,⁵³ dass dieser einmal bestanden haben muss.

Georg Fohrer comments similarly on the question of the relationship between the form of a text and its *Sitz im Leben*.

In Isa. 5:1-17, Isaiah utilizes the type of the love song and in 28:23-29, the type of the wisdom instruction. But as a prophet he certainly did not have the office of a minnesinger or troubadour or that of a teacher of wisdom.⁵⁴

John M. Berridge discusses the problem of form and content in relation to the transmission process of the form in the book of Jeremiah.

When the form-critical method is employed, it must be remembered that the relationship between form and content is always one of tension... Various questions must be posed regarding Jeremiah's use of older *Gattungen*. Does the prophet use such *Gattungen* for a new purpose? Whilst being guided by these *Gattungen*, does he nevertheless fill these with new and individual content in order that he might give expression to a personal experience which has been his? Does he exercise freedom with the structure of the *Gattungen*, that is, with the elements of which the prototypes of these *Gattungen* are composed? Does he use older terminology in a new and individual manner?⁵⁵

The above critique of Reventlow's method may seem overpowering. It does, however, illustrate our point. A *Gattung* in prophetic literature, more specifically in Jeremianic literature, may not necessarily reflect an obvious *Sitz im Leben*, based solely on the *Gattung*. Rather to establish a *Sitz im Leben* for the *Gattungen* in the Book of Jeremiah, one must study the complexities of the texts. Such questions as are asked by Berridge deal more directly with this complexity. Both Fohrer and Reventlow do give some attention to the transmission process of the texts in question. But perhaps the greatest deficiency in their arguments ease is the failure to take into account the context of the whole of the prophetic materials when analyzing the Jeremianic prose materials. One short example will suffice to demonstrate the point.

According to Reventlow, the context of the "Temple speech" is to be understood in terms of the "Temple entrance Torah" which has in its *Gattung* elements of liturgy and the law of the Torah (i.e. the decalogue). But an examination of other examples of "Temple entrance Torah" forms (i.e., Pss. 15; 24:3-6; Mic. 6:6-8; Amos 5:14 and Isa. 1:6ff.) indicates that *poetry and not prose* is the literary vehicle in which the forms are expressed. Reventlow does not deal with this fact when he cites these texts in his analysis (pp. 330-31), even though his article deals with Jer. 7:1-15 which is part of the prose materials (Mowinckel's source C).

Where does this prose come from? Has Reventlow's article sufficiently established the *Sitz im Leben* of Jer. 7:1-15 in order to answer the above question? I think not. Although he mentions that the general *Sitz im Leben* is cultic, and that the prophet Jeremiah may have had an official cultic-prophetic office, we are still left with the question of the provenance of the Jeremianic prose materials.

ARTHUR WEISER

Arthur Weiser represents yet a third form critical approach to the book of Jeremiah in his *Introduction to the Old Testament*. The nature of this work does not allow for a detailed application of the form critical method.⁵⁶ However, it is of a type that reflects clearly the presuppositions of the author in question. Thus the treatment given by Weiser of the book of Jeremiah can be considered as a window which reflects the general questions asked by Jeremianic form critics up to 1961.

Weiser's analysis is based on the long-established premise that the book of Jeremiah has grown out of stages of transmission. At certain levels of transmission, specific forms of tradition "...stand out as distinct from each other, and these afford a general survey of the development of the book of Jeremiah."⁵⁷

Weiser is concerned with essentially three stages in the transmission process. The first deals with what he

calls "Jeremiah's notes". He considers, for example, the oracles of the original roll dictated to Baruch and its second expanded form, along with Jeremiah's confessions, prophecies of restoration, prayers for vengeance as being at the first stage. The second stage in the process of transmission deals with the composing and arranging of sayings which Baruch used to elaborate his own accounts of events (cf. Jer. 37-45). The third stage is, as Weiser suggests, a process by which foreign matter and revisions are inserted. Those oracles of Jeremiah which may be interpreted as instructive and edifying, are set in the Deuteronomistic style with cultic vocabulary, fit this section (i.e., 7:1 ff.; 11:1 ff.; 16:1 ff.; 18:1 ff.; 12:1 ff.; 22:1 ff.; 25:1 ff.; 34:1 ff.; ch. 35).

The suggestions of Mowinckel and Rudolph which assigns these texts to a special Deuteronomistic source developed during the exile, is not accepted by Weiser. Basing his opinion on Miller⁵⁸, Weiser finds that the content of those Deuteronomistic sources actually runs counter to fundamental trends established by Deuteronomy. He considers the similarities between the above-mentioned texts and Deuteronomy as simply a matter of the phraseology in public worship, employed already before the "Deuteronomistic" view of history, and used by Jeremiah himself or by Baruch. He cites Jer. 21:1 ff.; 22:1 ff.; 25:1 ff. as support for his anti-Deuteronomistic viewpoint. Weiser understands the

similarities between the third layer of the transmission process and the Deuteronomistic historical materials as being due to the common phraseology of the times. In this, he is in agreement with John Bright.⁵⁹

Weiser does suggest a *Sitz im Leben* for the texts quoted in the above paragraph. Most of these (especially 21:1 ff.; 25:1 ff.; 34:8 ff.; and, ch. 35) are designated as "C" materials in terms of Mowinckel's categories. He describes their *Sitze im Leben* as follows:

...since such instructions and exhortations were suitable for repeated use in worship, it is not possible in every case to keep apart the original wording of Jeremiah's sermons and later liturgical elaborations.⁶⁰

Weiser's assumption is that the prose material in the above texts is liturgical. Earlier in his analysis of the origins and growth of the book of Jeremiah, he suggests that the approximate date and place of the Jeremianic prose materials is a liturgical setting.

...usually these are considered to include those oracles of Jeremiah which have been given a more instructive and edifying form and set in a framework which recalls the Deuteronomistic style and was the *regular usage* for the *cultic recital* of the prophetic writings (in the synagogue)...⁶¹

Finally, then, the *Sitzen im Leben* of those texts under consideration are exilic and cultic in form and content.

Weiser sees the transmission process as a vehicle by which the *Geist* of the prophet Jeremiah's materials was transmitted accurately. The first stage involves the notes of Jeremiah; the second, Baruch's expansions based on

materials together with revisions from stage one; the third, interpretations of foreign materials together with more revisions. Weiser's suggestions at this point in his hypothesis break away from the traditional form critical question (and presuppositions). Even though he does not offer any form critical analysis of the individual prose materials, his treatment of the transmission process reflects a traditio-historical bias, without abandonment of the form critical contributions.

In summary, Weiser places the third stage of transmission within a cultic and exilic setting: he considers the relationship between the prose and Deuteronomy as due not to dependency but to the fact that both the book of Deuteronomy and this part of the book of Jeremiah were produced in a similar setting; therefore the terminology in both books must be based on some common ground with certain later texts. In regard to his method, we have noted that Weiser leans toward a traditio-historical bias as a presupposition controlling his application of form criticism.

CONCLUSION.

Form critics are interested in primarily two aspects of any given text; its *Gattung* and *Sitz im Leben*. This procedure is difficult and success is sometimes not attained. Reventlow concludes that chapter 7 has its *Sitz im Leben* in some form of exilic cultic environment. He concludes that this text is a representation of the community's prayer to Yahweh projected upon the figure Jeremiah. An obvious assumption in this conclusion is that Jeremiah did not create this text. It is therefore unoriginal, according to Reventlow's analysis.

The main point to understand is that both Fohrer and Reventlow simply assume the literary-critical divisions of the prose and poetry. The conclusions reached from their analysis do not necessitate any revision of the categories behind original, unoriginal, etc. They omit any consideration of the relationship between prose and poetry; also, they do not trace back the *Gattung* in question with special regard to the process of transmission which affects their knowledge of the *Gattung* in question.

In that these scholars fail to consider the relationship between the prose and poetry along with not establishing a thorough history of the *Gattung* in question, they can only conclude certain minor facts about the texts in question.

Their search for the *Sitz im Leben* establishes

that Jeremiah 7 is in fact cultic and exilic. The date attributed to this text excludes any consideration of the possibility that our text may have had some connections with prose materials. In fact, it may not have had any connection. In light, however, of Holladay's thesis, that there may be some relationship between poetic and prose passages (especially between poetry and Mowinckel's "C" source of which 7:1-15 is included), there is a serious problem. If there is a relationship between the poetry and prose in the book of Jeremiah and the form critics do not consider it, their conclusions are in need of revision. The amount of revision needed would depend greatly upon the conclusions reached from studying that relationship between the poetry and prose within the book of Jeremiah.

NOTES

- ¹W. W. Baudassin, *Einleitung in die Bücher des Alten Testament* (1901).
- ²C. Steuernagal, "Die Propheten", *Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Tübingen, 1912), Abschnitt II.
- ³G. Hölscher, *Die Propheten* (Leipzig: 1914).
- ⁴C. F. Clause Westermann, *Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech* (Philadelphia: Westminster 1967 [1960], see his first chapter on the scholars. Hereafter referred to as Westermann, *Basic Forms...*, .
- ⁵In the case of this chapter, we are concerned with Gunkel's "The Israelite Prophecy from the Time of Amos", in *Twentieth Century Theology in the making*, ed. by J. Pelikan, tr. by R. A. Wilson (New York: Harper and Row, 1969), pp. 48-75.
- ⁶As Westermann remarks in *Basic Forms...*, p. 24.
- ⁷See Westermann, *Basic Forms...*, the section on Gunkel.
- ⁸Hugo Gressmann, *Der Messias* (FRLANT 34, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1929), BK II. Hereafter referred to as Gressmann, *Der Messias*.
- ⁹See Westermann, *Basic Forms...*, on Gressmann, pp. 31-34.
- ¹⁰Gressmann, *Der Messias*. In regard to the transmission process and the handing down of these oracles, Gressmann breaks through to some important points. He considers oral delivery as a secondary recording of short independent sayings which were subsequently expanded within the process of being recorded (i.e., written). With this type of analysis, there is an assumption concerning some sort of transmission process of tradition, although, this assumption is not clearly expressed but implied.
- ¹¹Emile Balla, *Die Droh- und Scheltworte des Amos* (Leipzig: Alexander Edelmann, 1926).
- ¹²Ludwig Kohler, "Die Botenspruch" in his *Kleine Lichten* (Zürich: Zwingli-Verlage, 1945), pp. 13-17; and his *Deuterojesaja (Jesaja 40-55) Stilkritische untersucht* (BZAW 37, Gießen: A. Töpelmann, 1923) pp. 102-105.
- ¹³Johannes Lindblom, *Die Literarische Gattung der prophetischen Literatur* (UUA Theologi I, Uppsala: A—B. Lundequistaka Bokhandeln, 1924); a detailed study of introductory formulae is found on pp. 97-115.

¹⁴Johannes Hempel, *Die althebräische Literatur und ihr hellenistisch-jüdisches Nachleben* (Wildpark-Postdam: Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft, 1934).

¹⁵Cf., J. March, "Prophecy," in *Old Testament Form Criticism*, ed. by J. Hayes (San Antonio: Trinity University Press, 1974), p. 150; Westermann, *Basic Forms...*, pp. 52-56. Hempel's analysis concludes that the speeches were originally short independent units which were then developed by the prophet through primary and secondary reflections which formed larger speech forms. Hereafter referred to as Hayes, *Old Testament Form...*, .

¹⁶Hans Walter Wolff, "Die Begründungen der prophetischen Heils- und Unheilssprüche," *ZAW* LII (1934) 1-22.

¹⁷כִּן (Lākēn: "upon this condition, therefore"); for example see Amos 4:12; Is. 5:13,14,24; Jer. 6:15; 8:10; Hos. 2:18. כִּן כֵּן ('al kēn: "therefore, that being so"); for example see Jer. 5:6; 27; 9:14; 10:21; 21:11; 31:3, 20.

¹⁸Hans Wildberger, *Jahwehwort und prophetische Rede bei Jeremias* (Zurich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1942).

¹⁹Some examples are as follows: (1) autobiographical materials; (2) biographical narratives; (3) private words and (4) introduction to divine addresses by the prophet to the people.

²⁰Westermann, *Basic Forms...* .

²¹Friederich Ellermeier, *Prophetie in Mari und Israel* (TOA 1, Herzberg: Erwin Jungfer, 1968).

²²Cf. Hayes, *Old Testament Form...*, March's article, p. 153.

²³Robert North, "Angel-Prophet or Satan-Prophet," *ZAW* LXXXII (1970) 31-67.

²⁴Robert Bach, *Die Aufforderung zur Flucht und zum Kampf in Alttestamentliche Prophetensprüche* (WMANT 9 Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlage, 1962); see chapter 3, especially pp. 92-95.

²⁵Henning Graf von Reventlow, "Gattung und Überlieferung in der Tempelrede Jeremias," Jer. 7 und 26," *ZAW* LXXI (1969) 315-352; Reventlow, *Liturgie und prophetisches Ich bei Jeremia* (Gutersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1963). Hereafter referred to as Reventlow, "Gattung und Überlieferung...".

²⁶Eberhard von Waldow, *Der traditionsgeschichtliche Hintergrund der prophetischen Gerichtsreden* (BZAW 85, Berlin; A. Töpelmann, 1963)

²⁷Joachim Begrich, "Das priesterliche Heilsorakel," *ZAW* LII (1934) 81-92; Begrich, *Studien zum Deuterodesaja* (BWANT iv/25, Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1938).

²⁸Ernst Würthwein, "Der Ursprung der propheten Gerichtsrede," *ZTK* XLIX (1952) 120-137.

²⁹Berend Gemser, "The Rib or Controversy-Pattern in Hebrew Mentality," *VTS* III (1955) 120-137.

³⁰Herbert Huffmon, "The Covenant Lawsuit in the Prophets," *JBL* LXXVIII (1959) 285-295.

³¹Julien Harvey, "Le 'Rib-Pattern' réquisitoire prophétique sur la rupture de l'alliance," *Bib* XLIII (1962) 172-196.

³²It is of some significance to note that the scholars thus far mentioned do not deal with the fact that the 17 form is drastically affected after the Neo-Assyrian ascent to power in 850 B.C.E. One would expect to find some remarks concerning this change. For a detailed account of the shift in the role of the official royal messenger to the official royal herald, and the subsequent effects such a shift had on the form, see: J. S. Holladay, Jr., "Assyrian Statecraft and the Prophets of Israel," *HTR* 63 (1970) pp. 29-51.

³³Georg Fohrer, "Jeremias Tempelwort, 7:1-15," *ThZ* 5 (1949) 401-417. Hereafter referred to as Fohrer, *ThZ* 5.

³⁴Henning Graf von Reventlow, "Gattung und Überlieferung...", *ZAW* LXXI, pp. 315-352.

³⁵Arthur Weiser, *The Old Testament: Its Formation and Development* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1961).

³⁶J. March, "Prophecy", p. 156

³⁷G. Fohrer, *ThZ* 5, see note 33.

³⁸Fohrer, *ThZ* 5 pp. 406-407.

³⁹*Ibid.*

⁴⁰*Ibid.*

⁴¹Fohrer, *ThZ* 5, p. 411.

⁴²Fohrer, *ThZ* 5, p. 411. Fohrer expresses this point in the following manner: Es ergibt sich daraus, dass die übrigbleibenden Deuteromismen in der Zeit Jeremias durchaus erklärlich sind und keinesfalls zur Annahme einer besondern Quelle für einige Worte zwingen die zunächst durch ihren anscheinend prosaischen Stil aufgefallen waren der in Wirklichkeit eine besondere metrische Form darstellt.

⁴³Fohrer, *ThZ* 5, p. 407. We note here his argument for "carving" down the shell of Jer. 7:1-15: "In 7:1-15 schälen... sich 12 Strophen heraus, die jeweils aus der beliebten Zahl von 5 Kurzversen bestehen. Ausserhalb des Metrums steht wie Jewöhnlich die später hinzugefügte Ueberschrift die Aufforderung "und sprich" (in 7:2b). Im allegemeinen bildet jede Strophe einen in sich geschlossen Zusammenhang, wie es auch bie den Langversstrophen der Fall ist. Jedoch weist dieses Jeremiaworte eine Eigentümlichkeit auf, die such in anderen aus Kurzversen bestehenden. Stücken selten findet: Dreimal greifen mehrer Strophen ineinander über und bilden erst gemeinsam einen geschlossenen Zusammenhang (4-6; 7-8; 9-12 Strophen)."

⁴⁴E. W. Nicholson, *Preaching to the Exiles*, p. 69, but see note 1.

⁴⁵Reventlow, *ZAW* LXXI, p. 320, but see note 31.

⁴⁶Reventlow, *ZAW* LXXI, p. 320.

⁴⁷Reventlow, *ZAW* LXXI, p. 324.

⁴⁸Reventlow, *ZAW* LXXI, pp. 325-326. The following constitutes Reventlow's historical analysis: "Schon hier wird der Unterschied zu der Erzählungsquelle deutlich: In 26:1 steht eben diese in Kap. 7 vermisste Zeitangabe voran. Der moderne Ausleger, den gerade die Datierung besonders interessiert, erhält hier eine ihn befriedigende Auskunft: Die "Tempelrede" Jeremia fällt in den "Anfang der Regierung Jojakims," das ist die Zeit zwischen der Absetzung der Königs Joajes (Sommer 609) und dem Beginn des ersten eigentlich als solchen gezählten Regierungsjahres im Frühjahr 608. Dass so ein mehre Monate umfassender Zeitraum zur Verfügung steht ist auch für die Bestimmung des anlasses der Tempelrede bedeutsam: Gegen Volz der annahme, dass die "Tempelrede" auf der Krönungsfeier des neuen Königs gesprochen sei, ist Rudolph recht zu geben, dass der Anlass auch eines der gewöhnlichen Jahresfeste gewesen sein kann.

⁴⁹Reventlow, *ZAW* LXXI, pp. 329-33?. Reventlow continues his discussion in his primary focus: to establish the cultic *Sitz im Leben* from the evidence found in the Temple speech itself.

⁵⁰Reventlow, *ZAW* LXXI, pp. 329-330. Reventlow once more continues his discussion in the following quotation which suggests that on the basis of his historical analysis, a cultic life setting is the only possible solution to the problem of the *Sitz im Leben*: "diese erkenntnis verbietet es, den Kern der Auseinandersetzung in einer Alternative Kultisch—antikultisch oder akultisch zu sehen; beide Parteien fechten auf dem gleichen Boden, sie bleiben im Kultischen Bereich." (p. 330).

⁵¹Klaus Koch, *Studien zur Theologie der alttestamentlichen Überlieferungen* (Festschr. G. von Rad, 1961) pp. 54-60; concerning Mi. 6:6-8 see p. 53ff.; concerning *Tempelreinlassliturgien und Dekaloge*

see Reventlow ZAW LXXI, p. 331.

⁵²Reventlow, ZAW LXXI, p. 331.

⁵³Klaus Koch, *Was ist Formgeschichte?* 2 ed. (Neukirch: Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1967), p. 45.

⁵⁴G. Fohrer, "Remarks on Modern Interpretations of the Prophets," *JBL* 80 (1961), p. 311 for the question in the text. A second statement made by Fohrer deals with the relationship between *content* and *form* in the prophetic speech. Specifically dealing with cultic speeches Fohrer makes the following remarks: "A genre derived from the cult or from the law does not necessarily possess, *in the case of the prophet*, a cultic or legal content and significance. Such an assumption is artificial. A distinction must rather be made between the original meaning of a genre and the way it is utilized, that is, between the form and its function in the prophetic proclamation."

⁵⁵John M. Berridge, *Prophet, People and the Word of Yahweh: An Examination of Form and Content in the Proclamations of the Prophet Jeremiah* (Zurich: EVZ-Verlag, 1970), pp. 18-19.

⁵⁶For other "critical" introduction to the Old Testament which follow a similar pattern exemplified by Weiser, see: Aage Bentzen, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, 2 vls., (Copenhagen: G.E.C. Gad, 1948, 1952²); Otto Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament: An Introduction*, trs. P. R. Ackroyd (New York: Harper and Row, 1965); Bernard W. Anderson, *Understanding the Old Testament* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1973³). Weiser's Old Testament introduction is also published as a "critical" introduction to the Old Testament, but the English title is somewhat misleading *The Old Testament: Its Formation and Development* (New York: Association Press, 1961).

⁵⁷Arthur Weiser, *The Old Testament...*, p. 217.

⁵⁸J. Miller, *Das Verhältniss Jeremias und Hezekiel sprachlich und theologisch untersucht mit besondere Berücksichtigung der Prosereden Jeremias* (Van Gorcum's Theol. Bibliothek, 1955).

⁵⁹J. Bright, "The Date of the Prose Sermons of Jeremiah," *JBL* 70 (1951), p. 27: this is quoted by Reventlow in my text on page 41 in this chapter.

⁶⁰Arthur Weiser, *The Old Testament...*, p. 218. This quotation does not deal specifically with the question of *Sitz im Leben*. As was mentioned in the first paragraph concerning Weiser, he does not apply any form critical methods to any texts, but his comments are direct products of form critical *untersuchen* which were previously attempted by Weiser, as the quotation demonstrates.

⁶¹Arthur Weiser, *The Old Testament...*, p. 217.

CHAPTER 3 THE TRADITIO-HISTORICAL METHOD

This chapter deals with the traditio-historical method of biblical criticism. We try to establish the development of the method from Gunkel's time to present-day contributors. The first section contains a brief review of research on the topic of the presence of oral materials in the formation of the Old Testament. It is also necessary to outline the research concerning such phenomena as oral composition, oral and written literatures and transmission processes.

In order to limit this first section, we shall concentrate on the foundation studies which discuss the above, and which have brought significant contributions in the areas of oral compositions, etc. Moreover this outline will enable us to understand the criteria used by Jeremi-
anic scholars in their attempts at establishing the tradi-
tio-historical complexes within the book of Jeremiah.

The second section discusses the tradition-com-
plexes which contemporary scholarship has established with-
in the book of Jeremiah. Our aim here is to establish the
complexes as they are best attested by contemporary tradi-
tio-historical critics of the book of Jeremiah. With the
complexes established we will then be able to study the
relationship between the prose of one complex and the prose
of other complexes.

20TH CENTURY TRADITIO-HISTORICAL CRITICISM

Even though Hermann Gunkel was not the first to note the necessity of studying the pre-literary stages of the Old Testament¹ he was the first individual to meet successfully the challenges of his contemporary colleagues, and the first to penetrate the numinous, mysterious and complex problems of oral literature.² Gunkel was well aware that the traditions behind the book of Genesis had been formed through some sort of oral composition prior to their being recorded in writing and fused into larger blocks of materials. In his commentary on Genesis, Gunkel challenged the literary-critical premise that the sources which are behind the book of Genesis were actually "literary sources". Such a thesis (as expressed by most literary critics of Gunkel's day) conjured up the image of the author of Genesis composing the book at "his desk, with scissors, paper and glue." The following quotation demonstrates Gunkel's conception of oral compositions; he suggests that:

...certain sagas, existing originally as individual and independent units but dealing with the same character(s), similar themes, or related historical occurrences, often became gathered into small cycles ("SagenKränge") while still at the oral level. These they continued to be narrated as a longer story...³

With this all-important emphasis on what may be termed oral composition⁴ there came many subsequent studies

which were equal to Gunkel's discovery. With the scope of this first section in mind, and due to the lack of space, it is unrealistic for us to summarize, no matter how briefly, the contributions of each scholar who has brought the study of oral compositions to a clearer focus. It is much more feasible to follow Douglas A. Knight's summary, which digests the scholarly opinions concerning the oral questions from Gunkel's time to the year 1940.

Between Gunkel's earliest work and the year 1940 there is a definite interest in the formative and early transmittal stages of the Old Testament.⁵ The questions concerning oral traditions become the center of attention as a consequence of the research being done. It is extremely important to note that scholars are more and more aware of the role which oral compositions played in, for instance, the creation cycles, ethnological and cultic information being gathered together and consequently unlocking doors which were closed to the students of the Old Testament.

Parallel to the developing awareness of the role of oral materials in the formation of the Old Testament literature is the question concerning the "faithfulness and reliability" of oral transmission of those traditions. The general opinion was that certain transmittal aids within the oral materials could be detected by means of textual, literary and form critical studies. These transmittal aids

were literary patterns such as mnemonic devices, poetic structures, various institutional "catch-words", etc. These aids were thought of as being supports which controlled an accurate oral transmission of the various traditions.⁷

At this point in Old Testament research there is no question as to the existence of oral composition and oral tradition. What is a concern, however, is this question: How much oral material (rather than written documents or sources) do we have in any preliterate⁸ stage of any given Old Testament text?

In their attempts at solving this question Old Testament researchers were interested in examining the preliterate development, transformation and transmission of various traditions. At this point, Nyberg proposes his trend-setting thesis. He focuses on the problem in his programmatic statement concerning the relationship between oral and written traditions in the transmission process of the various traditions in the Old Testament:

Transmission in the Orient is seldom purely written; it is predominantly oral... The written Old Testament is a creation of the Jewish community after the exile; what preceded it was surely only in smaller part fixed in writing.⁹

From this point onwards, opinions about the relationship between oral and written traditions prior to their final composition and redaction move in two basic directions. Scholars concluded that there were either many oral

traditions being transmitted or there were mostly written documents which were transmitted by other than oral means.

There needed to be a balance between these two extremes. But the compromise between these two extremities was to be found only after much painstaking and tedious work was done on the various Old Testament documents. It was only when this was done, book by book, tradition-complex by tradition-complex and tradition by tradition, that any concrete and provable solutions were to be offered by the traditio-historical critics.

We will now examine three major figures who could be considered to be precursors to most modern-day traditio-historical investigators. Those scholars provided concrete solutions to the above mentioned extremities and problems concerning oral composition, oral transmission and oral literature in general. They also attempted to answer the question of the reliability and faithfulness of those texts which were transmitted orally.

Albrecht Alt¹⁰, Gerhard von Rad¹¹ and Martin Noth¹² are the major researchers who follow the traditio-historical method. All three set the scene for ensuing periods of research both within that methodological pursuit and within biblical studies in general. Their contributions shed important light not only on the discussion of the nature and function of oral literature in the Old Testament, but also on defining what to this point in the history of the re-

search was an ever-increasing maze of confusion.¹³

Of the numerous contributions made by Alt we shall concern ourselves with two general ones. In terms of traditio-historical methodology, he emphasized the importance of the cult in the process of tradition growth and composition for the patriarchal period (i.e., the legends in particular).¹⁴ He established the *Sitz im Leben* of the "God of the Fathers" concept. His perceptions of oral traditions which are behind our concept are very much akin to a fluid and flexible transmission process. The flexibility allows for the patriarchal traditions to be fused together at some later point in the transmission process. Moreover, we learn from Alt that it is possible for a tradition to be fused with others only if it has not attained a high degree of fixity.¹⁵ In summary, we might conclude that oral traditions containing patriarchal materials were no doubt unfixed for a long period in the transmission process. The key to this summary is that the traditions were not written documents but were in fact oral.

Gerhard von Rad continues the discussion of the nature of oral traditions in his work on the traditions in the Pentateuch known as J, E, P. Concerning the fusion of these traditions in the book of Genesis, von Rad did not rely on the classical literary-critical theory as to how this came about. Rather, he suggested that the combining or fusion of materials took place at the oral stages of its

growth. He concludes:

On the contrary, what we see is a large quantity of detached materials which have been fused into a single whole according to the pattern of one ancient tradition. The various materials all lie as it were in the same stratum. One plan alone governs the whole, and a gigantic structure such as this, the whole conforming to one single plan, does not grow up naturally of its own accord.¹⁶

Von Rad was speaking here of the manner in which the tradition-complexes were fused together. In speaking about various materials fusing or being woven into one fabric he assumed that there was a certain degree of flexibility within the materials being used. Thus he referred to the stage of transmission which was prior to their reception by the Yahwists. The point for us to understand is that, according to von Rad, these traditions were at first transmitted orally, then collected and put into writing by the Yahwist. Such a suggestion touches upon the concept of oral composition, but in a very primitive fashion.¹⁷ Also, the place of oral tradition is important enough for further study, as we shall note with Martin Noth's work.

Martin Noth continued the discussion initiated by Alt and developed by von Rad. He pursued answers to these questions: How many of the materials in the Pentateuch are products of an oral transmission? How long were they transmitted in that way, if at all? When were they written down, for what purpose and what significant changes occurred

at this time?

Of the much debated questions just mentioned we focus on only one. After a step-by-step analysis of the manner in which the Pentateuch was formed, Noth concluded that the formation of its traditions was done primarily by oral means, and that it was done within the earliest stages of transmission. Literary fixation effected many changes in word usage, in literary style, and in length, while the substance and the mood of the traditions were altered only in the slightest.¹⁸

The above three scholars asserted that the prime means of transmitting the earlier traditions was oral. They all agree that the reinterpreting of these traditions, which were oral in essence, was by a non-literary means. Implicit here is the concept of some sort of hermeneutic and the assumptions of an oral prehistory behind the written texts. These two points are significant. These scholars represent the first of many other detailed attempts at tracing a tradition-complex back to its smaller groupings (the first, that is, after the pioneering work of Gunkel).

Their contributions pave the way for subsequent defining and redefining not only of the traditio-historical method and scope of study, but also of the role, nature and function of oral materials and oral transmission within the Pentateuch, and the whole of the Old Testament.¹⁹

Scandinavian scholars as well as Germans were

mostly responsible for developing the traditio-historical method. Alt, von Rad and Noth influenced both groups of scholars. In terms of the awareness of oral compositions, the Scandinavians were nonetheless more active than the Germans. Of particular importance concerning the establishment of oral traditions and their significance in prophetic literature are Harris Birkeland²⁰, Sigmund Mowinckel²¹, R. A. Carlson²² and Eduard Nielson²³.

Birkeland, Carlson and Nielson, along with Ivan Engnell, are the traditio-historical critics who reject the gains of literary criticism. They reject the documentary hypothesis which was developed by critics as early as Richard Simon. They base their criticism of this hypothesis on the assumption that the oral transmission process was reliable and that therefore there was no need to postulate "written documents" when solving the problems within prophetic literature. Essentially, these scholars maintained a fixed period of transmission at the oral level. They also maintained, as did Gunkel, that the reliability of this fixed period of oral transmission was not to be questioned.

The foundation of this theory is the reliability of an oral transmission. If it could not be proven true according to the evidence of the texts, the theory would be invalidated. This position is an extreme one, which would not allow for any possible existence of "literary works"²⁴

within the period of transmission. There are some problems with this theory.

A central problem deals with the question of the reliability of the oral transmission process. If, as the Scandinavians hold, one can maintain that the oral transmission process was completely reliable, then should not the gains of literary criticism also hold true? The literary critics, when dealing with the transmission process, assume that the written texts are indeed stable, fixed and completely reliable. The suggestion by the Scandinavian scholars that the oral process of transmission of oral, but fixed and highly reliable texts is very similar to the "written documents" held by literary critics. What is being postulated as having existed behind the present texts of the prophetic writings by both sides of the argument is almost the same phenomenon. It seems that the difference is in the way each side of the argument identifies this phenomenon. Moreover, if what the Scandinavians suggest is true, would not the method of literary criticism be equally applicable to oral as well as written texts?

Ivan Engnell continues research concerning the nature and function of oral transmission within prophetic literature. Basically, he has two main ideas which are challenged by other traditio-historical critics, and which flower into two ongoing debates.

In the first debate Engnell maintains that the

process of transmission was at the oral and not at the written level. He suggests that at the end of the long process of transmission the tradition-complexes were committed to writing. Sigmund Mowinckel is the Scandinavian critic who first challenges this hypothesis. The second debate concerns the widely held assumption that ancient Near Eastern cultures categorically relied upon oral means for transmitting their secular and religious traditions. On this point, Engnell encounters the challenges of Geo Widengren.

In rejecting the gains of literary criticism, particularly in regard to the "written document hypothesis", Engnell postulated a traditio-historical means of analyzing the traditions of Israel. Engnell's suggestion is special because he excludes literary and form critical methodologies from his concept of traditio-historical criticism.²⁵

Engnell's main reason for discounting literary criticism is that it allows for written documents to have existed prior to final stages of transmission. A subsequent suggestion made by Engnell is that one, therefore, should not search for the *apsissima verba* of the prophet in question.²⁶

Mowinckel points out the inconsistencies of asserting that the oral transmission process was completely reliable. He follows the reasoning given in our text above (pp. 60-61). Concerning the idea that traditio-historical methodology should exclude literary criticism and form

criticism, Mowinckel, basing his answer on the criticisms leveled against the "reliability" hypothesis, suggests that the traditio-historical method should include the basic gains and insights from both literary and form criticism.

In regard to the search for the *ipsissima verba* of the prophets, Mowinckel writes the following:

Behind the tradition there loom, after all, the powerful figures of the prophets, who have created that very tradition, and in a number of cases their own words speak to us so clearly that we cannot take amiss. We are not going to allow anybody to deprive us of the right to attempt to let them speak as clearly as possible... Where there appears to be a possibility to ascertain their own words, get hold of the original sayings, approximately such as they once sounded in the gates of the temple, there we will try to find them by all the means in our power both those of form history, tradition history and literary criticism.²⁷

In the second debate Engnell holds that oral tradition was transmitted by oral means throughout the ancient Near East.²⁸ Widengren's contribution to this debate proves to be a long overdue corrective within this line of thinking. Engnell's basis for suggesting the above comes from the logic of analogy. Engnell maintains that, on the basis of comparative Indo-European studies, the Israelite culture has similar characteristics to those Indo-European cultures examined, with oral transmission being one of those characteristics.

Argumentation by analogy is often very helpful, and can be very informative.²⁹ Widengren, however, suggests that the conclusions reached from his comparative study³⁰

of Near Eastern cultures do not allow for those conclusions reached by Engnell. Widengren does a comparative study of the function of oral transmission in Mesopotamian, Arabian and Old Testament settings. He finds evidence to support the claim that there was no doubt oral transmission in these cultures. But he qualifies his claim by suggesting that the use of oral transmission for the preserving and passing down oral traditions was primarily restricted to nomadic and semi-nomadic groups.

If we examine the Old Testament evidence, we note that outside of a few prophets and those texts which are long and extremely complicated there seems to be little evidence that most of the Old Testament was transmitted by written means, according to Engnell. Hence the need for analogous and comparative studies. Furthermore, Widengren's study is one of analogy concerning the transmission process, and is one which concludes³¹ that there is a high probability that the oral traditions were written down quite early in their transmittal processes.³² The point to make is that, when doing comparative studies of the type just mentioned, one should follow the evidence provided by internal facts (i.e., within the literature being examined) rather than basing one's conclusions on external and analogous argumentation.

The questions as to how much oral transmission occurred, when, and to what texts is still unsolved for

most of the Old Testament. My suggestion is that there is no doubt a combination of both oral and written transmission within the various types of literature of the Old Testament. Furthermore, I suggest that specific answers to the above questions can be given only for each text examined. Any theory which attempts to categorize all of the Old Testament literature (such as the one suggested by Engnell) must be approached with great caution.

From Gunkel to Engnell, there came an awareness that the form and content of prophetic texts have undergone a complex process of transmission. What is central to these discoveries is that a high degree of change can take place within the process of transmission, be it oral or written. In other cases, however, there may be a great deal of fixed material which remains constant throughout the transmission of that material. These new discoveries should allow for new questions to be asked along with new problems to arise. We shall note how this does not occur, and how this is a serious drawback in modern biblical criticism. For now, we must examine how the discoveries of a transmission process of tradition-complexes have been applied to the book of Jeremiah. Our purpose is to demonstrate the applicability of those theories we have just examined.

THE TRADITIO-HISTORICAL COMPLEXES IN THE BOOK OF JEREMIAH

Having established the importance of oral traditions behind the prophetic books, scholars became aware that these traditions were collected into larger units which formed the so-called tradition-complexes. These complexes were later collected and this collection was labelled "books" in the west.³³ There were many attempts at dividing the book of Jeremiah into tradition-complexes. Most commentators began with the famous chapter 36, out of which they attempted to reconstruct the *Urrolle*, thinking that chapter 36 represented the original book of Jeremiah in summary form.

Ivan Engnell³⁴ sought to establish ideological thrusts which were contained within chapter 36. This method broke away from the pattern of reconstructing the events which are described within our famous chapter. His conclusions can be condensed into two basic points. First, there existed a growing opposition between the King and prophet. Secondly, the "dictating" of the scroll by Jeremiah on two separate occasions demonstrated the importance of the process of oral transmission. Engnell's basis for this point is found in the idea that the scroll was dictated after twenty years of preaching.³⁵

Engnell divided the book of Jeremiah into tradition-complexes (chapters 1-24; 26-36; 37-45; 25, 46-51).

He suggested that these traditions were conflated into complexes by means of oral transmission. The basis for Engnell's divisions rests mainly on the common subject matter, common intention and milieu of those complexes.³⁶

The question of oral versus written transmission processes need not concern us at this point. What is significant, however, is Engnell's tradition-complexes: they contain both poetry and prose and therefore cut across the literary critical divisions mentioned in chapter one. He considers this fusion of complexes to have taken place at the end of or immediately after the exile.³⁷

C. Rietzchel represents the Germanic tradition-historical approach to the book of Jeremiah.³⁸ He accepted the contributions of literary criticism in terms of the distinction between poetry and prose.³⁹ He differs with Engnell in that he considers the poetry to be the first to be written, while the prose underwent a longer process of transmission. On this point, he suggests, the transmission process consisted of the collecting of the poetry and prose together into smaller units before they were fused into the present form of the book of Jeremiah.⁴⁰

Rietzchel agrees that the *Sitz im Leben* of the complexes was the exilic, post-exilic milieu.⁴¹ The material which corresponds to this *Sitz im Leben* would be the sermons of Jeremiah. Rietzchel touches upon Holladay's theory with his interpretation of the prose materials.

These materials he considers to be from homiletical and didactical commentaries on poetic materials. They are in an expanded form and are heavily influenced by the book of Deuteronomy.

T. R. Hobbs follows the direction established by Engnell and Rietzchel. He argues for a common source which lies behind the traditio-complexes established by Engnell.⁴² Hobbs maintains that chapters 1-24; 26-26 and 37-45 all have a degree of homogeneity⁴³, both within each individual unit and in relation to other units.

Exploring further Hobbs' thesis we note that he suggests chapters 1-24 contain a collection of oracles, sayings and sermons along with a few didactic narratives. The bulk of this material concerns itself with a polemic of some sort against Jerusalem. As the accusations become more specific the reaction of the various groups within the city against the prophet and his words becomes clearer and clearer.

We find a dramatic narrative unfolding the "word of Yahweh" through the prophet within the context of the people's history in chapters 37-45. Hobbs considers this unit's main intention to be the retelling of the fulfillment of the prophet's words which were proclaimed before the exile.⁴⁴

Even though scholars such as J. P. Hyatt, J. Bright and others claim that there are no logical means by which

one may detect any arrangement of the book of Jeremiah, Hobbs is of the opinion that he is able to offer some concrete proof which established the units' logic. He also suggests that his proof demonstrates that there is a homogeneous connection between the three complexes which he focuses upon.⁴⁵

The first proof which establishes the existence of complexes (within themselves) is that each has a distinct heading which marks it off from the others. Thus in chapter 2 the opening verse describes Jeremiah's role as the prophet who will: proclaim Yahweh's message so that all Jerusalem shall hear. General complaints from Yahweh to the people of Jerusalem are developed until, in chapters 19-24, we see more specific complaints to specified groups. The opening statement of 2:1 introduces what finally comes to a climax in chapters 19-24. The subunit of chapters 19-24 also introduces and prepares the reader for more detailed accusations to more specified individuals.

In chapters 26-36 there seems to be a movement toward expressing a theological point: the apostacy of the rulers (i.e., elders, king and false prophets) of Jerusalem. Thus, although 26:1-6 describes the first concrete complaint of Yahweh to specific individuals, it also reminds us of the contents of chapter 7, the temple sermon. Once more we note that the heading of a complex separates it from the previous one and introduces the direction of speci-

fic prophecies to particular individuals and groups.

The break between chapters 19-25 and 26-36 may not seem all that apparent. My suggestion is that chapters 19-25 function not only as a bridge or transitional section but also as a climactic section, building the reader's interests and creating a certain amount of tension which is not resolved but rather heightened in chapters 26-36 (excluding chapters 30-33).

Hobbs suggests that in chapters 26-36 there is some knowledge of chapters 1-24. We shall examine one example which he proposes as evidence for this claim.⁴⁶ In chapter 36 the focus is upon the scroll of Jeremiah, and the royal reaction to its contents. In 36:26b, we have a description of the content of the scroll, all contained within one half of a verse:

...the king of Babylon will destroy this land
and cut off from it man and beast.

This text represents a summary of the prophet's ministry which is described in chapters 1-24.

Jeremiah 37:1-2 is the heading for the complex of chapters 37-45. Zedekiah is put on the throne by the Babylonians and "neither he nor his courtiers nor the people of the land listened to the words the Lord spoke through the prophet Jeremiah" (37:1-2). What this passage does is introduce a new development in the history of Judah and at the same time it supports a continuum: the people of Israel, from the royal courts to the very peasant, all

of whom refused to listen to the "words of the Lord" through Jeremiah. The idea presented here might be thought of as a short summary of the previous two tradition-complexes. As we move into this complex, texts such as 27:7ff. and 38:2 are to be considered summaries of earlier texts in the book which depict the preaching of Jeremiah. As we move on within this complex, two levels of activity are developed. First, the prophet's giving of his own words is expanded and extended, and the complaints are now made specific, and are directed to particular individuals.

In terms of the homogeneity which exists between the three complexes in question, Hobbs offers some interesting ideas. He maintains that the prose in the book of Jeremiah is common to all the complexes⁴⁶, but it is more predominant in chapters 26-36 and 37-45. A second point dealing with the prose: it has the characteristic sameness wherever it occurs.⁴⁷ Concerning the differences between the narrative prose and the sermonic prose, Hobbs suggests that these differences depend more upon the purpose of each complex than upon anything else.⁴⁸

From our understanding of the transmission process as defined in the first section of this chapter, we might draw the conclusion that these tradition-complexes were independent of each other until they were put along side each other in the final editing and redaction of the

book of Jeremiah.⁴⁹ We may also conclude that there is a good evidence to support the concept of tradition-complexes in Jeremiah. That the prose materials are characteristically the same wherever they occur in the book of Jeremiah is another question. We suggest that there does seem to be sufficient support to maintain this point.⁵⁰

CONCLUSION

In the first section of this chapter we noted that questions concerning oral composition, oral traditions, tradition-complexes and oral transmission all form an important part for understanding Pentateuchal and more specifically prophetic literature. We have also noted that there can be no general answer to these questions in terms of the whole of Old Testament literature. Rather, answers concerning these questions, are to be discovered in each tradition-complex being studied. It is within the particular complexes that the answers concerning: how much oral literature was present; where and when it was transferred to written forms; and, what effect such a process had on the ideas being transmitted are to be found.

The second section of this chapter established certain units or tradition-complexes within the book of Jeremiah. We have followed the argumentation of several scholars who establish that there is good reason to believe that there exist within the book of Jeremiah certain tra-

dition-complexes. These units are based on structural criterion and not only on content. Lundbom's *Jeremiah: A Study in Ancient Hebrew Rhetoric* demonstrates that there is some logic to the structure of the book of Jeremiah. Thus one must re-examine the statements of those who claim that there are no logical signs of order or structural planning of the book of Jeremiah.

The knowledge gained from understanding the function of the transmission process (i.e., the effect and the changes of both form and content while under the process of transmission) must call to us to re-examine the concepts which were used without this knowledge and its important gains. This re-examination will be done in the next chapter.

NOTES

¹Douglas A. Knight, *Rediscovering the Traditions of Israel* (SBL Diss. Series 19: Missoula: University of Montana, Scholars Press, 1975 [1973], p. 55, hereafter referred to as Knight, *Rediscovering...*). It was not until Johann Christoph Nachtigal (1753-1819) that there was any attempt at giving a detailed account of the pre-Mosaic oral traditions behind the book of Genesis, as Knight in *Rediscovering...*, points out on p. 63. I quote Knight who sums up the development of the work done on the precompositional stages (i.e., oral stages) in the 19th Century: "But the issue is that these 19th Century scholars concentrated almost exclusively on the developments at the literary levels and this as a rule neglected the precompositional stage of tradition growth and agglomeration as well as the factors operative during the pre-history of the documents" (p. 65).

²Hermann Gunkel, *Die Urgeschichte und die Patriarchen* (SATT/1, 2d ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1921), p. 6 where Gunkel's classic statement sets the tone and intention of his work, "All ancient literature arose originally not in written but in oral form." On this point see Knight, *Rediscovering...*, p. 82.

³Hermann Gunkel, *Genesis, Übersetzt und erklärt* (HKI/1 3d ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910), pp. XXXI-XXXIII in his "Einleitung". For the English translation of his "Einleitung" see *The Legends of Genesis: The Biblical Saga and History*, trans. W. H. Carruth (New York: Schocken, 1964 [1901]). But Knight, *Rediscovering...*, has some interesting remarks to make on p. 82.

⁴Concerning the definition of "oral composition" we follow Knight's, which, is found in his *Rediscovering...*, p. 23 and reads as follows. "The development of oral as well as written tradition units but not including the literary stages [that is to say, the scissors, paper and glue stages] of composition and redaction..." are the essence of oral composition. Gunkel's definition (given on the second page of this chapter) does not exclude Knight's. It must be noted that Knight's definition is a summary and ideal one, being abstracted from various studies of oral composition; thus it is much broader than Gunkel's in both range and scope and can fit Gunkel's or Martin Noth's or even Ivan Engnell's. Since Knight's definition suits the purposes of this chapter, and, since it is a very responsible one, we shall follow it throughout the rest of this chapter and the thesis.

⁵Knight, *Rediscovering...*, p. 89.

⁶An oral composition may be a small story, a prophetic oracle, a strophe or wisdom material concerning life etc. An oral tradition normally consists of several small compositions. A tradition-complex would consist then of several traditions combined, fused, and, agglomerated into one unit, one whole. At what point these compositions, traditions and complexes become written is still an open

question. Since there is a great diversity of materials within the Old Testament, one cannot afford even a general answer to the oral/written question. It is therefore imperative that the oral/written question be answered for each complex, tradition and compositional unit in question.

⁷Knight, *Rediscovering...*, p. 91.

⁸Preliterary stages or oral literature simply refer to those stages of transmission of compositions (oral and written), traditions (oral and written) which existed in the formative, creative and relatively unsettled periods of transmission. This concept of a preliterary stage includes everything that has gone into the transmission process prior to the literary and redactional stages. This concept derives from Knight's *Rediscovering...*, pp. 22-24, where he outlines both the scope and method of the traditio-historical process of analysis.

⁹Henrik Samuel Nyberg, "Das text Kritische Problem des Alten Testament, am Hoseabuche demonstriert," *ZAW* 52 (1934) pp. 241-254. The above quotation is taken from *Studien zum Hoseabuche: Zugleich ein Betrag zur Klärung des Problems der Alttestamentlichen Textkritik* (Uppsala: Universitats Arsskrift, 1935), p. 8. The English translation used in our text can be found in both Knight, *Rediscovering...*, p. 91 and Otto Eissfeldt's "The Prophetic Literature," in *The Old Testament and Modern Study*, ed. H. H. Rowley (Oxford: University Press, 1967³ [1961]), pp. 115-161, for the quotation see p. 126.

¹⁰Albrecht Alt (1883-1955) "Der Gott der Väter," (BWANT III/12; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1929). See also *Kleinen Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, I (München: C. H. Beckische Verlag, 1929), pp. 1-78. The English translation is "The God of the Fathers," in *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion*, trans. R. A. Wilson (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1966) pp. 1-77.

¹¹Gerhard von Rad (1901-1971), "Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuch," in *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament* (München: Chr. Kasper Verlag, 1965³), pp. 9-86. For the English translation see *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*, trans. E. W. Trueman Dicken (Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1966), pp. 1-78.

¹²Martin Noth (1902-1968) *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1966³ [1948]). For the English translation see B. W. Anderson's *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, trans. with an introduction by B. W. Anderson (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1972).

¹³Although the contributions of these three scholars to the field of Old Testament research is basically orientated towards the first division of the Old Testament, (i.e., the Pentateuch or as von Rad puts it: the Hexateuch), their discussion of the nature of oral

literature corresponds (at some points) and augments the discussion of oral materials in the prophetic literature, and thus their findings are of some value to our discussion.

¹⁴In Alt's *Kleinen Schriften...*, we learn that the *Sitz im Leben* of "Der Gott der Väter," is the cult, the worship of ancestral Gods. In the English translation of Alt's above mentioned article, we read: "... the Israelite tradition in fact contains a distinctive religious element of which the peculiar characteristics have not yet been recognized and which, if I judge right, goes back to the original religious forms used by the individual tribes and groups. This is the tradition of the God of Abraham, and Fear of Isaac, and the Mighty One of Jacob, or in short, the God of the Fathers." See Alt's English translation, p. 10, note 10 in *Essays in Old Testament History and Religion*, which is cited in Knight's *Rediscovering...*, p. 96.

¹⁵I am thinking particularly of Knight, *Rediscovering...*, p. 388, where he makes a distinction between, "...on the one hand the oral stage of formation and composition and, on the other, the oral period of transmitting traditions already basically fixed." Alt seems to make this distinction in the quotation given in the text but it is implicit and not articulated explicitly.

¹⁶Gerhard von Rad, see *The Problems of the Hexateuch and others Essays* p. 52; on this point see Knight's *Rediscovering...*, pp. 105-106.

¹⁷According to Knight, (*Rediscovering...*, pp. 23, 30, 36, 80-82, 90, 105 ff., 253, 250, 259, 324, 335, 354, 388, 392, and especially 388, see my note 15) it is prior to the oral transmission of fixed traditions and tradition-complexes.

¹⁸Martin Noth, see his *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch*, p. 251 and Knight, *Rediscovering...*, p. 155.

¹⁹See Knight, *Rediscovering...*, pp. 172-176 for a digest of the contributions of both von Rad and Noth.

²⁰Harris Birkeland, *Zum hebräischen Traditionswesen: Die Komposition der prophetischen Bücher des Alten Testaments* (ANVO, II, Hist.—Filos, Kl., 1939, no. 1: Oslo: Jacob Dybwad, 1938).

²¹Sigmund Mowinckel, *Prophecy and Tradition: The Prophetic Books in Light of the Study of the Growth and History of the Tradition* (ANVAO, II. Hist.—Filos. Kl., 1946, no. 3; Oslo: Dybwad, 1946); also his "Oral Tradition" in *IDB IV* (1962), pp. 683-685, as well as his *Profeten Jesaja* (Oslo: H. Aschehoug, 1925).

²²R. A. Carlson, *David, the Chosen King: A Traditio-Historical Approach to the Second Book of Samuel*, trans. by Eric J. Sharpe and Stanley Rudman (London: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1964).

²³Eduard Nielsen, *Oral Tradition: A Modern Problem in Old Testament Introduction* London: SCM Press Ltd., 1961 [1954].

²⁴Literary works, according to most literary critics, are ones which have as their basis or origin written documents. The whole debate centers around whether or not the original materials (i.e., sayings, traditions and complexes) were actually written accounts or not. The question of transmission becomes secondary but our understanding of transmission is affected, depending on whether or not the original materials were "literary documents" or "oral documents". If the materials were transmitted orally, then as far as the Scandinavians are concerned they were transmitted "faithfully". For example, Knight (*Rediscovering...*, p. 354) in his analysis of Nielsen writes the following concerning the latter's thesis that oral transmission was in fact extremely reliable: "...fellow traditionists as well as all the listeners served to uphold the tradition and to prohibit the individual traditionist from carrying through a corrupt recension." (Nielsen suggests this himself in his *Oral Tradition...*, p. 37). If, however, the documents were orally transmitted but were not in a relatively fixed position, then such factors as geographical transferring of materials (i.e., the change in *Sitz im Leben*) and the combining of traditions into tradition-complexes would all have an irreversible effect on the transformation of the tradition-complex in question. In terms of literary sources, again our understanding is greatly changed if the above possibility exists. It is important to note that both oral and written sources are behind the prophetic materials, or at least a majority of this material. Jeremiah 36, for example, suggests written and oral means of transmitting the preaching of Jeremiah: first by memory (remembering that it was dictated from the recall of the prophet), then it was *written*.

²⁵Ivan Engnell, *Gamla Testamente. En traditionshistorisk Inledning, I.* (Stockholm: Svenska Kyrkans Diakonstyrelses Bokförlag, 1945), pp. 191-194. On this see Knight, *Rediscovering...*, p. 269. More specifically, Engnell objected to literary criticism on the basis that the existence of doublets in the texts proves the process of oral transmission and is not proof for separate documentary sources. Also, Engnell claims stylistic differences, and literary constants (i.e., that there are certain words or idioms which are peculiar to the different sources) are not consistent within the text themselves. (see Knight, *Rediscovering...*, pp. 269-70).

²⁶See Knight, *Rediscovering...*, p. 227. On this point see Mowinckel, *Prophecy and Tradition...*, p. 18, 36, 88, 112.

²⁷Mowinckel, *Prophecy and Tradition...*, p. 88.

²⁸Widengren, *Literary and Psychological Aspects of the Hebrew Prophets* (UUA 1948:10; Uppsala: Lundequist, 1948), pp. 77 ff. But see Knight, *Rediscovering...*, pp. 315 ff., and 388-89. Hereafter referred to as Widengren, *Literary and Psychological Aspects...*.

²⁹For example, see R. C. Culley, "An Approach to the Problem of Oral Tradition," *VT* 13 (1963), pp. 113-125; and Van Der Ploeg, *RB* 54 (1947), pp. 8 ff.

³⁰Widengren, *Literary and Psychological Aspects...*, for Mesopotamian evidence see pp. 58 and 90, for Arabic evidence see pp. 11-20 and 29, for Old Testament evidence see pp. 60-80.

³¹Widengren, *Literary and Psychological Aspects...*, p. 77.

³²See Knight, *Rediscovering...*, p. 315 on this point.

³³I am thinking particularly of T. H. Robinson's characteristic study on the treatment of the origins, growth and transmission of the prophetic books entitled *Prophecy and the Prophets in Ancient Israel* [1923] 1944. Robinson's study, which divides the origins, growth and transmission of the prophetic books into three stages, became the model for such studies between 1920 and 1935. On this point see Otto Eissfeldt's chapter "The Prophetic Literature" in *The Old Testament and Modern Study*, ed. H. H. Rowley, pp. 126-128.

³⁴Ivan Engnell, *Svenskt Bibliskt Uppslagsverk*, vl. 2, pp. 1089-1106. See T. R. Hobbs, "Some Remarks on the Composition and Structure of the book of Jeremiah," *CBQ* 34 (1972) pp. 257-275. On this point see especially p. 263 ff., (i.e., Engnell). Hereafter we will refer to Hobbs as follows: Hobbs, "Some Remarks...".

³⁵On this see Hobbs, "Some Remarks...", pp. 262-263.

³⁶*Ibid.*, p. 263.

³⁷*Ibid.*

³⁸Claus Rietzchel, *Das Problem der Urrole: Ein Betrag zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Buches Jeremia* (Gutersloh: Gerhard Mohn, 1966).

³⁹See Hobbs, "Some Remarks ...", p. 264.

⁴⁰C. Rietzchel, *Das Problem der Urrole: Ein Betrag zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Buches Jeremia*, pp. 19 ff. Here he offers a good summary of the previous attempts at understanding the origins, growth and transmission of the book of Jeremiah.

⁴¹On this point Rietzchel follows the study made by E. Janssen, *Juda in der Exilzeit: Ein Betrag zur Frage der Entstehung der Judentums* (FRLANT 51; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956).

⁴²Hobbs, "Some Remarks...", eliminates from his discussion chapters 25, 46-51 and 52 for the following reasons. Chapters 25, 46-51 are the least important for his study since they are composed almost entirely of poetry and the material contained within these sections

have a common ideology, namely, the defeat of Israel's enemies. In terms of it being marked off as a tradition-complex, it is clear that this unit constitutes prophecies against the foreign nations and since this material is not found anywhere else in the book of Jeremiah it must have a history of its own, thus making it a shorter tradition-complex.

⁴⁴Hobbs, "Some Remarks...", p. 268.

⁴⁵Hobbs, "Some Remarks...", pp. 268-269.

⁴⁶Hobbs, "Some Remarks...", p. 269.

⁴⁷Hobbs, "Some Remarks...", p. 270. But see N. Schmidt, "Jeremiah (Book)" *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, vl. 2, 2372-2395; May, *JBL* 61 (1942), pp. 130-155 and his *JBR* 10 (1942) 195-201 and Holladay, *JBL* (1960) pp. 351-367 who all support Hobb's claim concerning the characteristic sameness of the prose wherever it occurs.

⁴⁸Hobbs, "Some Remarks...", p. 270.

⁴⁹I am not suggesting that these complexes may have not been united prior to their final (present) positions within the book of Jeremiah. It is quite conceivable, for example, that the two complexes which have predominantly prose materials may have, on the basis of style, catch-words and a number of other considerations been placed together to form a shorter tradition-complex before they were placed into their present form in the book of Jeremiah (i.e., chapters 26-36 with 37-45).

⁵⁰I do not wish to accept these last two points uncritically, but the evidence offered by those scholars mentioned in note 47 convince me (on stylistic, formulaic and catch-word principles) that the characteristic sameness of the prose wherever it occurs must be taken seriously.

CHAPTER 4

INTRODUCTION

We draw upon the research presented in the first three chapters of this thesis along with other material not yet mentioned. It is my contention that there are inbuilt limitations within literary, form and traditio-historical criticisms, especially in regard to the categories of original, authentic and their opposites as presently applied in biblical criticism.¹ Moreover these limitations are not only methodological but conceptual as well. We deal primarily with the conceptual problems which to a certain extent limit and control questions asked by most critics working with any of the above methods. We analyse the presuppositions of Jeremianic critics in order to establish the conceptual difficulties with our categories.

More concretely, this chapter will first give an outline of the concepts of original and unoriginal within literary criticism. We shall note how these words are used synonymously with authentic, inauthentic, genuine and non-genuine. We will then note how these concepts are transferred to form criticism. The traditio-historical method inherits most of the literary and form critical presuppositions and this is noted in the work of E. W. Nicholson.²

The conclusions suggest that "original" should be

distinguished from "authentic". The concept of original is a subcategory of authentic. There is an emphasis on the value of using words in a more precise manner. My assumption is that when new discoveries are made within biblical criticism, the implications of this must be examined and adjustments, where needed, must be made. We shall find this reasoning applicable to the concepts mentioned above.

In regard to conceptualizing various phenomena which are contained within the Old Testament, criteria such as form, content and stylistic considerations have been associated with certain materials causing a strong connection between the materials and the labels to exist. A second point to note regarding the conceptualizing of materials concerns the questions asked by critics dealing with any of the above methods. At the early stages of biblical criticism certain questions were asked concerning specific biblical phenomena. When new discoveries were made, either of the historical or methodological nature, questions asked by scholars were adjusted in order to take into account these new discoveries. Thus as newer and newer discoveries were made, newer and newer questions were being asked.

There were, however, some concepts and questions which remained constant throughout the history of biblical criticism. These concepts and questions remained constant because the basis upon which they were built remained

static, unchanged, undeveloped and dormant.

A case in point would be the concepts of Hebrew poetry and Hebrew prose. A brief glance at Appendix "A" demonstrates my point. Almost all the literary, form and traditio-historical critics mentioned there assume a basic division of the book of Jeremiah into two categories: poetry and prose. They also associate that which is original to the prophet Jeremiah (i.e., that which he himself used within his lifetime) with poetry, and, that which is unoriginal to the prophet with prose. This basic mode of conceptualizing the materials within the book of Jeremiah comes from the literary critics and is transferred to the form critics who in turn pass it on to the traditio-historical critics.

Although there is some question as to the boundaries of poetry and prose in the book of Jeremiah³, our concern is with the manner in which critics have placed these two styles of Hebrew into the categories of original and unoriginal. I hope to demonstrate that the concepts of original and unoriginal need to be redefined or rather used more precisely in view of the gains of (as Holladay puts it) "renewed literary criticism", form and traditio-historical criticisms. I do not wish to discount any of these critical methodologies because they continue to supply the student of the Old Testament with new insights and gains which allow him/her to more fully

understand the texts being studied. Important to my analysis will be the concept of transmission, which will effect the critic's interpretation of the materials in question (especially in regard to the concepts of original and unoriginal).

ORIGINAL AND UNORIGINAL

Of the fourteen scholars listed in Appendix "A" all assume that there existed a nucleus of material which was subsequently expanded. The means of expansion is generally understood as a literary process, one which closely parallels the process of copying and re-copying the nucleus of material. The reason for their thinking that the process of expanding those early Jeremianic materials was mainly literary is due to the nature of their methodology, and more importantly, because they had a certain concept of what material was original and what was not.

Since Julius Wellhausen, for example, there has been a debate concerning the validity of the source-critical method, with particular attention to the view that the four main sources in the Pentateuch were literary and not oral. The assumption that these sources were literary as opposed to oral documents produced a search for literary developments responsible for influencing this process. With the advances of literary criticism, there came a

great deal of refinement and sophistication. These advances afforded knowledge of existing transmission processes which were considered as literary (i.e., re-copying materials). Consequently those texts which reflected the same ideology as, for example, the J tradition but did not reflect the same literary and stylistic patterns were considered unoriginal J material or, if you will, J₂ materials.

It is from this type of thinking that we find the categories of original and unoriginal being used by scholars who interpret the materials in the book of Jeremiah. We might note the very important fact that these categories were borrowed from the German literary critical methods without the gains and knowledge of form and traditio-historical criticism.

Returning briefly to Appendix "A" we note a concrete consequence of the thinking outlined above. As mentioned in the introduction, the fourteen critics listed divide the poetry and prose in the book of Jeremiah into the categories of original and unoriginal respectively, T. R. Hobbs, when referring to those scholars in his article, suggests the following concerning the categories just mentioned:

The majority of studies [i.e., literary critical] thus far examined have presupposed the difference in style and intent of the poetry and prose of the book of Jeremiah. Thus, either one is seen as "authentic" or "inauthentic"; more often than not this division corresponds to "poetry" and "prose"

respectively, the latter frequently being denied any value in an assessment of the prophet's message.

It isn't until W. L. Holladay's suggestion that there may be some relationship between the poetry and prose in the book of Jeremiah that we begin to understand that there is a need for a more precise use of the concept of original, etc. If, as Holladay holds, certain prose texts are related to poetic texts on stylistic and other considerations, then those texts may have a *direct connection* to the prophet's own words (i.e., his *ipsissima verba*). If this poetic prototype theory is valid, then one can no more designate those prose passages which fit this theory as being "unoriginal", for, these prose texts may be the *ipsissima verba* of the prophet Jeremiah in a varied form.

The form critics have not been exempt from the presuppositions which were perpetuated within literary critical circles (i.e., especially regarding the categories of original etc.). Although form criticism is not primarily interested in the question of authorship, it must deal with it when attempting to deduce certain factual data concerning the *Sitz im Leben* of a given text. As most students of biblical methodologies will agree, form criticism builds, in a variety of ways, upon the concepts of literary criticism, and attempts to solve those problems which are not being solved within literary criticism. Furthermore, the questions of authorship and

of the development and transmission of tradition are of fundamental importance to both methodologies.

The problem concerning the imprecise use of our concepts is not clearly seen until we understand the contributions of the traditio-historical critics, which will be done below. The foundation of the problem within form criticism is directly related to the tension between form and content of various *Gattungen* within prophetic literature. As we will note, this tension, which had always been a weakness in form criticism, clearly exemplifies the misapplication of original and unoriginal.

Before we can establish the tension between form and content we must establish the primary goals of form criticism. Form criticism seeks to establish the original *Sitz im Leben* of any given form. Thus it must first establish what in fact that form of any given text is. A quick reading through *Old Testament Form Criticism*, edited by J. H. Hayes, demonstrates the obvious success of form criticism as a method which is able to isolate the various *Gattungen* and their variants within the Old Testament.⁵ With the establishment of various *Gattungen* there came knowledge not only of their function, structure and setting, but also of their intention. The general presupposition was that the content reflected the setting from which it came. Thus if a text reflected legal concerns by means of defined legal vocabulary and style, then it

was assumed, and for good reason, that the text came from a court or legal setting. The next step was to describe the social matrix or *Sitz im Leben* of that text.

The tension between form and content was made clear when the following was discovered. There were texts which had forms relating to specific cultural and sociological settings whose contents did not necessarily reflect the actual institutions which were normally associated with those sociological settings. Thus there were texts which reflected legal vocabularies and styles not related to the institutions which were of legal concerns. How was this to be explained? After numerous attempts at explaining this phenomenon, there came the realization that sometimes inexplicable tension existed.

Perhaps a concrete example taken from the book of Jeremiah would better demonstrate the problem. The texts which concern us are variants of the "*vision Gattung*" (i.e., Jer. 1:11 ff., 1:13 ff., and Jer. 24:1 ff.). The *vision Gattung* occurs no earlier than the time of Amos. It occurs only in Amos 7:1-3, 7:4-6; 8:1-3 prior to its use by Jeremiah.⁶ These texts are cultic in vocabulary and style, not to mention their form or structure. Logically, one should expect that the prophet Jeremiah was involved with some sort of cultic function. J. M. Berridge, however, has a note of caution to make concerning such logical thinking. In his book dealing with these

same texts he writes the following:

With respect to Jeremiah's use of this particular *Gattung* [i.e., the vision *Gattung*], it must be emphasized that even if the *Sitz im Leben* of this *Gattung* is to be considered as being the cult, this does not necessarily mean that Jeremiah must be regarded as having been a cultic functionary.

What is critical to our analysis is the fact that the form of a text may not necessarily dictate its content. Thus, if the vision *Gattung* is a form which derives from a cultic life setting, the content may not necessarily always be from the cult, or even related to it. There is an obvious tension between form and content in this case.

In terms of describing these vision texts, the form-critics have fallen back on the concepts provided by literary criticism. Because the vision texts can be traced back, at least in form, to the book of Amos, one concludes that this form *did not originate* with the prophet Jeremiah. Yet, in that no scholar doubts that Jeremiah actually used this text, *it is also original*. We seem to have one word which can be used in two different ways, not uncommon to any language. The problem seems obvious: it concerns the distinction between two senses of "original": (1) the sense that an individual invents something unique; and, (2) the sense that something was used by an individual, and thus it is original to that person. We shall pursue this below.

I wish to develop the problem of the tension between form and content in regard to the double use of original. Jeremiah did not come from a vacuum, he did not create the forms of expression nor their content *ex nihilo*. There are some texts, especially the oracles of salvation and doom, whose forms he inherited from previous prophets. The forms which he inherited afforded him ready made vehicles to express his own ideas, ideas which spoke to specific historical circumstances within his community.

If both form and content are used by the prophet, and if this is agreed upon by almost all exegetes, then the conclusion drawn is that these materials (both form and content) are original to the prophet. This use of original is the common sense use, and is the one which is used by most critical scholars of the Old Testament. When doing a study of a form, such as the Salvation oracle, we note a problem with this use of the word original. In studying the salvation oracle one can trace it back before the time of Jeremiah. If, for example, one finds that the earliest use of it in the Old Testament is in a period prior to Jeremiah's, then historically speaking, that form probably *originates* from that period. If that form is in turn used by Jeremiah, most critics would suggest that it *originates* from the prophet. How can something have originated from two places and two histori-

cal periods at the same time? One could describe the content in a similar manner (i.e., as is done in the above). Perhaps the problem can be better developed with the contributions and gains of the traditio-historical approach.

As noted in chapter three the traditio-historical method attempts to answer the questions which concern oral and written composition, oral and written transmission and the final composition and redaction of tradition complexes of the various groups of texts within the Old Testament.

With the traditio-historical method there also developed the conceptual tools which accompanied this growth. The concepts of original, etc., and their opposites were not so much explicit as they were implicit. They can be traced back to the earliest literary-critical studies. But perhaps they do not affect the means of analyzing the materials in question until Hermann Gunkel's breakthroughs in the form critical method.

In Gunkel's *Schöpfung und Chaos* we note the beginnings of what later will be a major undertaking within the traditio-historical method and the vehicle which perpetuates the literary-critical presuppositions concerning the concepts of original, etc. D. A. Knight writes the following concerning Gunkel's study of ideas which are later broken down into technical categories of their own.

In *Schöpfung und Chaos* he follows a religio-historical *idea back to its origin*, and this is paralleled in his commentary on Genesis by the tracing of a formally defined unit of tradition back to its earliest beginnings.

The point which interests us is that Gunkel traced back *ideas to their origins*. In that he was able to trace back ideas which existed before their incorporation into the Israelite traditions, the concepts of original etc., must be present at some point within his methodology.

We examine the creation motif in Genesis as one example. It is not original (historically) to the Israelite sacred writings and is therefore unoriginal in the above sense of the word. One might state that the form and content of these motifs are not creations *ex nihilo* of the Israelite tradition, the same can be said concerning the materials in the book of Jeremiah.

Gunkel's tracing back of ideas to their origins developed into a major discipline not only within the traditio-historical method but also within the History of Religions schools initiated by such scholars as Eliade, etc. This whole process of study brings to the fore the problem between form and content. It takes note of the changes in both form and content and attempts to suggest what historical forces contributed to those changes. It also introduces another element, namely, the necessity for understanding the transmission process which transformed, developed and brought those forms and their contents to

their final shapes.

What is clear from the above is that one can no longer consider a text to be *purely original or unoriginal*. This distinction is not made in any of the three methods studies in this thesis. It is not made for the form, nor is it made for the content (i.e., motifs, themes etc.). We shall note below how an idea may be historically original to the prophet Jeremiah while the form in which it is contained is not.

We shall examine one traditio-historical critic in order to demonstrate more clearly the problem between original form and original content, namely, E. W. Nicholson.⁹ His book deals with both the composition and final redaction of the book of Jeremiah. Basically he argues that the book of Jeremiah as we now have it was composed in two stages. In the first stage we have the collected oracles and sayings of the prophet Jeremiah while the second stage deals with sermonic and didactic materials. Although these sermonic materials are essentially Deuteronomistic compositions, he considers them to be derivations of the first stage of composition (i.e. chapters 1-24). Concerning the above points Nicholson writes as follows:

Broadly speaking two main stages in the evolution of the material in the book may be discerned: (1) the oracles and sayings of Jeremiah himself spoken during his prophetic ministry from his call in 626 B.C. to his exile to Egypt after the murder of Dedaliah, and (2) the subsequent transmission of these sayings and oracles in the exi-

lic period during which they were utilized and in many instances expanded or developed to meet the changing circumstances in the life of the exilic community; the composition of narratives and stories intended to present the theological significance of incidents and events in the life and times of Jeremiah; and the addition of other material. The book of Jeremiah had thus probably assumed substantially its present form by the end of the exilic period.¹⁰

Nicholson's version of the traditio-historical method includes literary and form criticisms unlike Engnell and Neilson, who exclude these two methods. We note this point in order to understand that Nicholson's method is broader than other traditio-historians thus far examined.

In that Nicholson does not exclude literary and form criticisms from his methodology, he consequently inherits the conceptual categories of original, unoriginal, etc. In the following quotation, we will note the synonymous use of the word original with the word genuine. We are not interested in the synonomous use of the words in question, but more so in that to which they refer. Does he make a distinction between original in the historical and non-historical sense? Does he distinguish between the form and content?

On the contrary, it seems clear that underlying many of them [i.e., the Deuteronomistic sermons otherwise referred to in this thesis as Mowinckel's "C" source] are sayings and oracles which *the prophet himself uttered*. In other words, the circle responsible for these sermons were working on the basis of genuine Jeremianic material and

it is therefore only to be expected that the sermons contain elements of that original language in which it was couched.¹¹

The context of the quotation just given deals with establishing how the Deuteronomistic authors transmitted what Nicholson considers as original Jeremianic materials. In what manner are these materials original? It seems clear from the above quotation that Nicholson defines original as that which refers to those materials which come from Jeremiah the historical person. But Nicholson applies the word to two different elements. He differentiates between the language which Jeremiah himself used to express his message (i.e., oracular and prophetic forms of speech of his day) and the "materials" contained within that language.

The referent of this "material" is not at all clear from the context or the text of the quotation. My suggestion is that it may refer to a number of related possibilities. If, for example, in referring to the word "material" Nicholson is not only referring to stylistic and linguistic elements, then one is left to consider at least the theological and ideological themes, motifs etc. As the quotation assumes, there is a close relationship between between the language which is used to express an idea, and, the idea itself. This is how Nicholson supports the thesis that even though the sermonic and didactic texts are essentially Deuteronomistic compositions, they

also contain some elements of original (historically) Jeremianic materials.

There is, however, a problem with Nicholson's use of "original". First of all, the Deuteronomistic texts which Nicholson claims are based upon the *ipsissima verba* of the prophet Jeremiah are considered secondary, unoriginal etc., in regard to the poetry by almost all critics of the book of Jeremiah. This analysis is based upon literary and form critical considerations, and consequently we have some texts which are both original and unoriginal in the same instance.

How do we define these texts in terms of the categories of original, etc.? In that these texts are Deuteronomistic in intention but contain characteristics which may be traced back to the prophet they are not entirely unoriginal. In that these materials are not direct compositions of the prophet, but rather expansions greatly varied from the actual words of the prophet, they are not entirely original.

Before I can suggest how we can re-apply the concept underlying the words original, etc., it might be of some advantage to describe the various possibilities of borrowed, fused or combined forms and content with unique texts which exist within the book of Jeremiah. From such an analysis, we should be able to understand clearly how new applications of the words original, etc.

are possible.

In terms of various *Gattungen* which exist in the book of Jeremiah three categories are immediately apparent. The most obvious, and the first one in our Appendix "B", is the borrowed form with relatively little change, as applied by Jeremiah himself. This form has a history which can be traced back before Jeremiah's time.¹²

In regard to the second category we note the following. It contains forms which are traditional (as defined in note 12) but which are major variations of those traditional forms. Consequently such forms may appear to be similar to their predecessors but either have elements missing, added or rearranged.¹³

The third category contains those forms which are so varied from their predecessors that they can no longer be equated with them. One example of this type would be when two very different *Gattungen* are completely fused so as not to resemble either of their predecessors.¹⁴

With respect to the content, themes, motifs, etc., a similar process of analysis is in order. First we have those traditional ideas which are being perpetuated by the prophet Jeremiah without any significant change. Jeremiah continued those prophecies which condemned the foreign nations; he therefore perpetuated those speech forms established by first Isaiah.¹⁵

There are texts which suggest that Jeremiah re-

vised certain standard and traditional ideas; these make up our second category. In this division certain ideas might have been added to by the prophet in order to establish a continuum between those standard ideas and those new insights which were being developed by the prophet in light of his experience. Thus we find conditions being added to what were traditionally considered (by the Israelites of Jeremiah's time) as unconditional promises of salvation.¹⁶

The third category contains those ideas which are newly introduced by the prophet. We must understand that there can be nothing completely new. What is meant by "new" is: as Jeremiah penetrates his traditional ideas, basing and comparing them with his historical experience, certain concepts become obvious in his mind. He then expresses these concepts in the language which best expresses the uniqueness of his ideas. Thus they may appear similar to other statements of the past, but are actually unique.¹⁷

With these six categories we have, at least in theory, all the possible combinations of elements of variation ranging from unchanged to transformed ideas and forms of speech. If a text has an unchanged form but a unique idea can we call it completely original? May we call it unoriginal? If we attach the label "original" to it, in what sense is it original to the prophet:

historically, creatively? At this point it seems that new possibilities for applying the concepts behind original, authentic, genuine and unoriginal, inauthentic and non-genuine are in order.

I suggest that the above terminology, when used to describe such a mixture of texts as exemplified in Appendix "B", must be more specific.

When referring to the form of a text which falls into the third category of Appendix "B", and, if the intention of that form communicates a new concept (be it theological, ideological, philosophical, historical or political), and, that form can be traced back to the prophet Jeremiah alone, then that form should be considered original to Jeremiah (in the historical sense of the word). That is to say it originates historically from, and only from, the prophet.

If on the other hand, the form is completely borrowed and does not introduce any new intention or meaning through its structure, then it could be considered as unoriginal to the prophet. In that Jeremiah actually used that form, it may be considered authentic. That is to say, regardless of its origins, it contributed to the worldview of the historical figure Jeremiah and thus is an authentic form.

As can be gathered from the above paragraph, I wish to restrict the use of authentic to those passages

which are from the historical figure Jeremiah, whether or not they are his own unique creations. If, for example, a passage which was used by Jeremiah is developed by subsequent interpreters of Jeremianic materials (be they original in my sense of the word or not) to the point where it does not resemble the form or content (when used by the prophet himself), but maintains the prophet's message as he intended it, it is authentic.

To express what I mean in another manner, the following would hold true as well. The use of authentic should be restricted to those materials which, based upon the *ipsissima verba* of the prophet, have survived the long and complex process of transmission. These texts, in some fashion, had meaning for subsequent generations to such an extent that they were reworked into a completely new framework. Consequently, such texts as the Deuteronomistic ones (i.e., Mowinckel's "C" source) were chosen to last through the process of transmission. Although they are to a large extent compositions of the Deuteronomistic circles, they represent a nucleus of ideas which reflect (essentially) the life and times of the prophet.

Inauthentic passages would be those which were not in any way used by the prophet in his time. In Jeremiah 52, an historical appendix, we would find materials which Jeremiah had no personal contact with. Other phenomena such as Deuteronomistic editing, additions,

textual glosses would also be within this category.

This striving for a more precise use of the concepts behind the words in question takes into account the gains of traditio-historical criticism. In fact it is only through the contributions of this method that the above suggestions become valid. In essence I am saying that when new information, knowledge etc., is given to the researcher, this new data must affect his conceptual means of categorizing his subject matter. If the new gains are to be of any significant consequence these new gains must affect the questions being asked of the subject in question; it must aid the researcher in pushing on to new areas of thought. Only when this process of development occurs can the new insights, gains and knowledge be fully appreciated.

The precise and clear use of technical terminology is necessary for any scientific discipline which hopes to survive. I wish to restrict the use of "original" and "authentic" in such a manner as to accommodate the knowledge of Jeremianic texts gained through the traditio-historical method. In doing so, I trust that the science of biblical criticism has gained from it.

CONCLUSION

We have attempted to demonstrate from the literary, form and traditio-historical methods that the concepts behind the words "original" and "authentic" are inadequately applied by modern biblical critics. With the problem set forth we have noted one of the possible solutions.

Because of the complexities contained within a given text, the transmission effects on it, etc., we have restricted the use of "original" and "authentic" to specific phenomena. The term "original" should refer to those forms and that content which Jeremiah himself originated. That is, it should be restricted to those materials which are not found earlier than Jeremiah, and which are not found in cultures with which he had contact.

The term "authentic" should refer to those materials which (a) were used by Jeremiah and which aided in composing his philosophical, theological and historical mentality, and which are found in the book of Jeremiah: and (b) those texts actually used by Jeremiah which survived the long process of transmission, which were reinterpreted and reused by subsequent traditionists such as the Deuteronomistic editors, and which maintain his message.

NOTES

¹In general within biblical criticism these terms are used synonymously. That is to say, original, authentic and genuine are used when referring to these materials which were actually used by the prophet. They do not express the concept of uniqueness of anything similar. This if the prophet used a form of speech common to his tradition, and if it has a long history of existence prior to his use of it, it is still considered original to that prophet. Original in this sense of the word is equated with the *ipsissima verba* of the prophet. The usage described above is a common sense one. Later we shall note some difficulties which arise when using this word in above described manner. For sake of convenience we shall use the term original to represent the other two words unless otherwise specified.

²E. W. Nicholson, *Preaching to the Exiles* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1970). (Hereafter cited as Nicholson, *Preaching...*).

³See W. L. Holladay, "The Recovery of Poetic Passages of Jeremiah," *JBL* 85 (1966) 401-435. When asking questions concerning the boundaries of poetry and prose in the book of Jeremiah, Holladay writes the following (p. 401): "Are our categories of 'poetry' and 'prose' really arbitrary ones, so that what we have is a continuous spectrum between the most poetic and most prosaic materials, some kind of 'rhythmic prose' standing between them? Or on the contrary, are our categories valid but not yet fully understood? My own conviction is that in the book of Jeremiah poetry is really poetry, and the category a valid one, but that our eyes need to be sharpened in new ways to its nature and structure."

⁴T. R. Hobbs, "Some Remarks on the Composition and Structure of the Book of Jeremiah," *CBQ* 34 (1972) pp. 257-275, see pp. 261-262.

⁵J. H. Hayes, ed., *Old Testament Form Criticism* (San Antonio: Trinity University, 1974), see pp. 141-175 for the chapter on form criticism and prophetic literature.

⁶On this point see John MacLennan Berridge, *Prophet, People and the Word of Jahweh: An Examination of form and content in the Proclamation of the Prophet Jeremiah* (Zurich: EVZ-Verlag, 1970), pp. 63-72. (Hereafter cited as Berridge, *Prophet...*).

⁷Berridge, *Prophet...*, p. 64.

⁸Douglas A. Knight, *Rediscovering the Traditions of Israel* (SBL Diss. Series 9; Missoula: University of Montana, Scholars Press, 1975), p. 79.

⁹Nicholson, *Preaching...*, p. 136.

¹⁰Nicholson, *Preaching...*, p. 136.

¹¹Nicholson, *Preaching...*, p. 30.

¹²This form is part of Jeremiah tradition and exists prior to his time. That is, it appears and reappears with each new generation and continues to hold some importance for each generation.

¹³See Appendix "B" Form #2.

¹⁴See Appendix "B" Form #3.

¹⁵See Appendix "B" Content #1.

¹⁶See Appendix "B" Content #2.

¹⁷See Appendix "B" Content #3.

CONCLUSIONS

In chapter one, we noted that the general working hypothesis within literary-critical circles concerning the divisions of prose and poetry was that the latter was "original" or "authentic" while the former was not. The resulting mentality which conditioned the thinking of modern literary critics was transferred to form criticism. It found its expression within other questions not related to authorship and literary divisions.

Form criticism gave birth to the concepts of *Sitz im Leben* and to the search origins of texts which reflected certain characteristic traits. Thus if a text reflected legal, cultic or wisdom characteristics, the task of the form critic was to establish the particular institutional setting from which these texts came. But the tension between form and content was made clear when certain texts (e.g., prophetic ones) which appeared to be cultic did not directly relate to the cult. In dating these texts, especially in regard to Mowinckel's "C" source, form critics concluded that these texts were exilic or even post-exilic. Because of this, those exilic Jeremianic texts were not considered as original or authentic by form critics. Consequently they relied upon the classical applications of our categories as established by the literary-critical circles.

The traditio-historical critic, though well

aware of the complex transmission process and history of both form and content within given texts, did not escape from using imprecisely the terms mentioned above. It was concluded that there was a need to re-apply and distinguish between the above categories.

We distinguish between the terms original and authentic. This has not been done in biblical scholarship to this point. The necessity for such a distinction arises primarily from the research offered to us by the traditio-historical critics who make use of literary and form criticisms.

An implication of this re-applying and distinguishing between our categories suggests the need for re-examining our concepts and presuppositions when new significant discoveries are made. I am not in disagreement with the methods or results of contemporary biblical criticism. My suggestion is that the concepts behind the words original, authentic, genuine and their opposites must be adjusted in order to fit the knowledge of given texts ascertained in recent critical work.

It is hoped that with a more precise tool, the critic can more aptly deliver the service that today is so necessary.

APPENDIX "A"
THE QUESTION OF THE ORIGINS OF
JEREMIANIC MATERIALS

SCHOLAR	JER. HIMSELF	DEUTERONOMISTIC EDITORS	OTHERS
Duhm	Poetry	Prose	Baruch and Erganzer use of "C"
Gautier	Poetry	Prose	Erganzer: "C"
Hyatt	Poetry	Most of Prose	
Rudolph	Poetry	Most of Prose	
May	Poetry		Biographer: "C"
Bright	"C" mater. Poetry most of Pr.	Some prose included in "C".	Some of prose: Baruch
Holladay	Same as above		
Weiser	Same as above		
Reventlow	Same as above		
E. J. Young	Same as above		
Bentzen			Diverse sources for poetry & prose
Granild			Ibid.
Volz	Poetry	"C"	Baruch: Prose
Mowinckel	Poetry	"C"	Baruch: Prose

- COLUMN #1: Jeremianic scholars.
- COLUMN #2: What Jeremiah is considered to have written.
- COLUMNS #3 & 4: Other authors, editors, redactors considered by the Jeremianic literary critics to be "co-authors" or "post-authors" of the book of Jeremiah.

APPENDIX "B"

FORM

#1 BORROWED FORMS: RELATIVELY UNCHANGED BY JEREMIAH.

- Jer. 24:1 ff. Represents a vision *Gattung* in its purest form except for introductory formula in vs. 1 and 4.
- Jer. 15:15-18 Is a pure lamentation form of the individual. Except for vs. 16 all other elements within this text can be accounted for.

#2 BORROWED FORMS: WITH MAJOR VARIATIONS.

- Jer. 15:17 Is a transformed "affirmation of innocence element into a "lamentation".
- Jer. 30:10,11 Contains a unique combination of both a word of salvation and of judgment.
- Jer. 15:19-21 has a "condition" within the oracle (of salvation) which normally does not contain this.
- Jer. 42:10-16 Contains an oracle of salvation in vs. 10-12 while having the "condition" in vs. 13-16.

#3 COMPLETELY NEW *GATTUNG*.

- Jer. 1:1 ff., & 1:13 ff. Are vision *Gattungen* adopted for two non-visionary experiences. The visions are not intended to represent literal visions but more the metaphoric types.
- Jer. 1:4-9 Combines the call narrative *Gattung* with a salvation oracle, not done prior to Jeremiah.
- Jer. 15:16 & 16:9 Use two "frequently collocated" words ששון and שמחה in a new and unique meaning.
- Jer. 21:5; 27:15; 32:17 Represent unique usages of Deuteronomic expressions "great/powerful/strong hand and outstretched arm."
- Jer. 20:7-9 Is a lamentation but uses legal terminology found in Deut. 22.

CONTENT

#1 TRADITION CONCEPTS BEING PERPETUATED BY JEREMIAH.

Jer. 1:11 ff.; 1:13 ff.; 6:16-21; 28:8; 7:25 Represent the tradition of the prophet. These reflect the idea that Jeremiah saw himself within a close chain of prophetic tradition.

Jer. 7:22 Represents the wilderness tradition.

Jer. 47:1-2 These oracles against the foreign nations are found in other prophetic texts before Jeremiah.

#2 REVISED TRADITIONAL CONCEPTS.

Jer. 15:19-21 & 42:10-16 add a condition to what was an unconditional promise of salvation.

Jer. 24:9; 25:18; 25:9; 42:18; 44:8 Reflect a new usage of the phrase found in Deut. 28:27.

Jer. 7:32; 9:24; 16:14; 19:6; 23:5; 30:3; 31:27; 48:12; 49:2; 51:47 and 52 Reflect new usages of the phrase in Amos 4:2; 8:11 and 9:13.

#3 NEW CONCEPTS.

Jer. 31:31 Reflects the "New Covenant" concept.

Jer. 7:10; 11:14,30; 32:34; 34:15 Contain the phrase "the house upon which my name is called", which is not found outside of the book of Jeremiah.

Jer. 7:34; 16:9; 25:10; 33:11 All reflect the phrase "the voice of mirth and the voice of gladness; the voice of the bride." Not found outside the book of Jeremiah.

Jer. 28:8 Reflects the idea that Jeremiah did not belong to any prophetic guild. This does not occur outside of the book of Jeremiah.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ackroyd, P. R., "The vitality of the word of God in the Old Testament," *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute* v. 1; 1962, pp. 7-23.
- Ahlstöm, G. W., "Oral and Written Transmission: Some considerations," *HTR* 59 (1966) 69-81.
- Alt, A., "Der Gott der Väter," (BWANT III/12; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1929).
- _____, "Der Gott der Väter," *Kleinen Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel, I*, (München: C. H. Bchische, 1929).
- _____, "The God of the Fathers," *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion*, trans. by R. A. Wilson (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1966).
- Anderson, B. W., *Understanding the Old Testament* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1975³).
- Aull, J., "Obey my voice: A Form-critical study of selected prose speeches from the Book of Jeremiah". Ph.D. dissertation, Duke University, 1971.
- Bach, R., *Die Aufforderung zur Flucht und zum Kampf in Alttestamentliche Prophetensprucht* (WMANT 9 Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1962).
- Balla, E., *Die Droh- und Scheltworte des Amos* (Leipzig: Alexander Edelmann, 1926).
- Bardtke, H., "Henning Bernard Witter," *ZAW* 66 (1954), pp. 153-181.
- Baudassin, W. W., *Einleitung in die Bücher des Alten Testament*, 1901.
- Begrich, J., *Der traditionsgeschichtliche Hintergrund der prophetischen Gerichtsreden* (BZAW 85; Berlin; A. Töpelmann, 1963).
- Bentzen, A., *Introduction to the Old Testament*, vls. 1 & 2 (Copenhagen: Gad, 1958).
- Berridge, J. M., *Prophet, People and the Word of Yahweh: An Examination of Form and Content in the Proclamations of the Prophet Jeremiah* (Zurich: EVZ-Verlag, 1970).
- Birkeland, H., *Zum herbräischen Traditionswesen: Die Komposition der prophetischen Bücher des Alten Testaments* (ANVO, II, Hist.—Filos, Kl., 1939, no. 1; Oslo: Jacob Dybwad, 1938).
- Bright, J., "The date of the prose sermons of Jeremiah," *JBL* 70 (1951) 15-35.
- _____, *Jeremiah* (AB 21; New York: Doubleday, 1965).
- Carlson, R. A., *David, the Chosen King: A Traditio-Historical Approach to the Second Book of Samuel*, trans. Eric J. Sharpe and Stanley Rudman (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1964).

- Culley, R. C., "An Approach to the Problem of Oral Tradition," *VT* 13 (1963), pp. 113-125.
- Duhm, B., *Das Buch Jeremia* (HKAT 11; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1901).
- Engnell, I., *Gamla Testamentet. En traditionshistorisk inledning.* (Stockholm: Svenska Hyrkans Diakonistyrelses Bokförlag, 1945).
- _____, "Methodological Aspects of Old Testament Study," in _____ (Congress Volume, Oxford, 1959) *VTS* 7 (1960), pp. 13-30.
- _____, *Svenskt Bibliskt Uppslagsverk*, vol. 2, 1089-1106.
- Eissfeldt, O., *The Old Testament: An Introduction*, trs. by P. R. Ackroyd (New York: Harper and Row, 1965).
- _____, "The Prophetic Literature," in *The Old Testament and Modern Study*, ed. by H. H. Rowley, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967 [1961]), pp. 115-161.
- Fohrer, G., "Jeremias Tempelwort, 7:1-15," *ThZ* 5 (1949) 401-417.
- _____, "Remarks on Modern Interpretations of the Prophets," *JBL* 80 (1961).
- Gautier, P., *Introduction à l'Ancien Testament* (2nd ed.; Lausanne: Payot & Cie., 1910).
- Gemser, B., "The Rib or Controversy-Pattern in Hebrew Mentality," *VTS* III (1955) 1-16.
- Granild, S., "Jeremia und das Deuteronomium," *StTh* 16 (1962) 135-154.
- Gressmann, H., *Der Messias* (FRLANT 34; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1929) BK II.
- Gunkel, H., *Genesis, übersetzt und erklärt* (HKI/1 3rd ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1921).
- _____, *Die Urgeschichte und die Patriarchen* (SAT I/2nd ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1921).
- _____, *The Legends of Genesis: The Biblical Saga and History*, Trans. by W. H. Carruth (New York: Schocken, 1964 [1901]).
- _____, "The Israelite Prophecy from the Time of Amos," in *Twentieth Century Theology in the making*, ed. by J. Pelikan, trs. by R. A. Wilson (New York: Harper and Row, 1969), pp. 48-75.
- Harvey, J., "Le 'Rib-Pattern' réquisitoire prophétique sur la rupture de l'alliance," *Bib* XLIII (1962) 172-196.
- Hayes, J., ed., *Old Testament Form Criticism* (San Antonio: Trinity University Press, 1974).
- Hempel, J., *Die althebräische Literature und ihr Hellenistisch jüdisches Nachleben* (Wildpart-Postdam: Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft, 1934).

- Hobbs, R. R., "Some Remarks on the Composition and Structure of the Book of Jeremiah," *CBQ* 34 (1972), pp. 257-275.
- Holladay, J.R., "Assyrian State craft and the Prophets of Israel," *HTR* 63 (1970) pp. 29-51.
- Holladay, W. L., "Prototype and Copies: A new approach to the poetry-prose problem in the book of Jeremiah," *JBL* 79 (1960) 351-367.
- _____, "The Recovery of Poetic Passages of Jeremiah," *JBL* 85 (1966) 401-435.
- Hölscher, G., *Die Propheten* (Leipzig: n.p., 1914).
- Huffman, H., "The Covenant Lawsuit in the Prophets," *JBL* LXXVIII (1959) 285-295.
- Hyatt, J. P., "Jeremiah and Deuteronomy," *JNES* 1 (1942) 156-173.
- _____, "Jeremiah: Introduction and Exegesis," *Int. Bib.* vl. 5 (Nashville: Abingdon, 1956) 777-1142.
- Janssen, E., *Juda in der Exilzeit: Ein Beitrag zur Frage der Entstehung des Judentums* (FRLANT 51; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956).
- Knight, D. A., *Rediscovering the Traditions of Israel* (SBL Diss. Series 9; Missoula: University of Montana, Scholars Press, 1975 [1973]).
- Koch, K., *Studien zur Theologie der alttestamentlichen Überlieferungen* (Festschr. G. von Rad, 1961).
- _____, *Was ist Formgeschichte?* 2nd ed. (Neukirch: Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1967).
- Köhler, L., "Der Botenspruch," in his *Kleine Lichten* (Zurich: Zwingli-Verlage, 1945).
- _____, *Deuterocesaja (Jesaja 40-55) Stilkritisch untersucht* (BZAW 37; Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1923).
- Lindblom, J., *Die Literarische Gattung der prophetischen Literatur* (UUA Theologi I; Uppsala: A-B. Lundequistaka Bokhandeln, 1924).
- Lods, A., "Un précurseur allemand de Jean Astruc: Henning Bernhard Witter," *ZAW* 66 (1954), pp. 153-181.
- Lundbom, J., *Jeremiah: A Study in Ancient Hebrew Rhetoric* (SBL Diss. Series 18; Missoula: University of Montana. Scholars Press. 1975 [1973]).
- May, H. G., "Towards an objective approach to the book of Jeremiah; the Biographer," *JBL* 61 (1942) 139-159.
- Miller, J., *Das Verhältniss Jeremias und Hezekiel sprachlich und theologische untersucht mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Prosereden Jeremias* (Van Gorcum's Theol. Bibliothek, 1955).

- Mowinckel, S., *Prophecy and Tradition: The Prophetic Books in the Light of the Study of the Growth and History of the Tradition* (ANVAO, II. Hist.—Filos. Kl., 1946, no. 3.; Oslo: Dybwad, 1946).
- _____, "Oral Tradition," *IDB*, IV (1962), pp. 683-685.
- _____, *Profeten Jesaja* (Oslo: H. Aschehoug, 1925).
- _____, *Zur Komposition des Buches Jeremia* (Kristiania: Dywad, 1914).
- Nicholson, E. W., *Preaching to the Exiles* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1970).
- Nielsen, E., *Oral Tradition: A Modern Problem in Old Testament Introduction* (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1961 [1954]).
- North, R., "Angel-Prophet or Satan-Prophet," *ZAW* LXXXII (1970) 31-67.
- Noth, M., *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1966 [1948]).
- Nyber, A. S., "Das testkritische Problem des Alten Testament, am Hoseabuche demonstriert," *ZAW* 52 (1934) pp. 241-254.
- Oesterly and Robinson, *Introduction to the books of the Old Testament* (London: SPCK, 1936).
- Peake, A. S., *Jeremiah*, vls. 1 & 2 (Edinburgh: T. C. & E. C. Jack, n.d.).
- Ploeg, Van der, "Le rôle de la tradition orale dans la transmission du texte de l'Ancien Testament," *RB* 54 (1947), pp. 5-41.
- Rad, G. von, "Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuch," (*BWANT* IV/26. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1938).
- _____, *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament* (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1965).
- _____, *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*, trans. by E. W. Trueman Dicken (Edinburgh and London: Oliver & Boyd, 1966).
- Reventlow, H. Graf von, "Gattung und Überlieferung in der Tempelrede Jeremias, Jer. 7 und 26," *ZAW* (1960) 315-352.
- _____, *Liturgie und prophetisches 'Ich' bei Jeremia* (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1963).
- Rietzschel, C., *Das Problem der Urrolle: Ein Beitrag zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Buches Jeremia* (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1966).
- Rowley, H. H., *The Old Testament in Modern Study* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1967, [1951]).
- Rudolph, W., *Jeremia* (HAT 12; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1947).
- Schmidt, N., "Jeremiah (Book)," *Encyclopaedia Biblica* vol. 2, pp. 2372-2395.
- Steuernagel, C., "Die Propheten," *Lehrbuch Der Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Tübingen, 1912), Abschnitt II.

- Tov, E., "L'incidence de la Critique Textuelle sur la critique littéraire dans le livre de Jérémie, *RB* 79 (1972) 189-199.
- Volz, P., *Der Prophet Jeremia* (Leipzig: Tauchnitz, 1928).
- Waldow, E. von, *Der traditionsgeschichtliche Hintergrund der prophetischen Gerichtsreden* (BZAW 85; Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1963).
- Weiser, A., *Das Buch Des Propheten Jeremia* (ATD 20-21, 4th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960).
- _____, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1948, 1957⁴). For the English translation see his *The Old Testament: Its Formation and Development*, tr. by D. M. Barton (New York: Association Press, 1961).
- Westermann, C., *Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech* (Philadelphia: Westminster 1967 [1960]).
- Widengren, W., *Literary and Psychological Aspects of the Hebrew Prophets* (UUA 1948, 10; Uppsala: Lundequist, 1948).
- Wildberger, F., *Jahwewort und prophetische Rede bei Jeremias* (Zurich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1942).
- Wolff, H. W., "Die Begründungen der prophetischen Heils— und Unheilssprüche," *ZAW* LII (1934) 1-22.
- Würthwein, E., "Der Ursprung der propheten Gerichtsrede," *ZTK* XLIX (1952) 1-16.
- Young, E. J., *An introduction to the Old Testament* (London: Tyndale Press, 1960).

VITA AUCTORIS

EDUCATION:

- 1971 Graduated from F. J. Brennan High School, Windsor, Ontario, Canada.
- 1971 Attended the Conservatory of Music, Vienna, Austria, (clarinet performance).
- 1972- Attended the Academy of Music and Performing Arts in Vienna,
1973 Austria.
- 1973- Attended the University of Windsor, Department of Music,
1974 Windsor, Ontario, Canada
- 1975 Graduated from the University of Windsor, Gen. B.A.
- 1975- Graduated from the University of Windsor, Hon. B.A., in
1976 Religious Studies.
- 1977 Attending the University of Windsor, Faculty of Education.

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

- 1972 "Big Band of Vienna", Vienna, Austria (sax. and clar.).
- 1973 "Hochschule Orchester", Vienna Austria (B flat and base clarinet).
- 1973 Flutist in "Wiener Hochschule Kammermusik Ensemble" for the film "The Great Walse" produced by Andrew Stone for Metro Golden Mayer, filmed in Vienna.
- 1973 "Opportunities for Youth Big Band", Windsor, Ontario, Canada (sax. and clar.).
- 1973 Recording for Canadian Broadcasting Company, Windsor, Ontario, Canada.
- 1973 Substitute Teaching at St. Anne's School, Tecumseh, Ontario, Canada
- 1973- Mount Clemens Symphony Orchestra, Mount Clemens, Michigan,
1974 U.S.A. (solo clar.)
- 1976- University of Windsor, Department of Religious Studies, Windsor,
1977 Ontario, Canada (T.A. and R.A.).
- 1977 Industrial Research Institute, Windsor, Ontario, Canada, (Research Subject).