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Abstract

Jeremiah scholars agree that what we find in the book of Jeremiah is a literary tradition of Jeremiah that grew over time through the traditioning process of scribal reading, interpreting, composing, redacting and transmitting Jeremiah materials. Hence, they also acknowledge that the textually-presented Jeremiah is not a faithful portrayal of the historical prophet but a literary-theological character developed in keeping with the growth of the tradition. However, there has been little discussion of how Jeremiah’s historical and theological significance was constructed and promoted through the ongoing development and expansion of the Jeremiah tradition across and beyond the Second Temple period. Hence, Jeremiah was often reduced to stereotypical images associated with destruction, suffering and exile.

In this dissertation, I consider the Jeremiah tradition, that is, literary traditions tied to the prophet Jeremiah that participated in the continued development of the Jeremiah figure. And I argue that Jeremiah developed as the major prophet of exile and restoration with a strong pro-Jerusalem and pro-Temple Tendenz. Literary evidence shows that Jeremiah and his legacy played an important role in the ongoing Jewish reflections on, and interpretations of, the changing fate of God’s people, city and Temple, and that Jeremiah’s significance for the unfolding fate of Jerusalem and the Temple continued to be acknowledged and affirmed in the
ongoing Jewish conceptualizations of exile and restoration. Although Jeremiah’s historical association with the destruction and exile was an essential part of the people’s memory and perception of this ancient figure, Jewish authors turned to Jeremiah, not merely to account for their experiences and ideas of ‘exile,’ but also to articulate those of ‘restoration’ centred on the city and Temple of Jerusalem. The expanding traditions of Jeremiah thus testify to Jeremiah’s enduring significance and relevance for the unfolding history of the people paradigmatically understood as the history of exile and restoration.

By examining the ways in which the memory and perception of Jeremiah were shaped, reshaped and reinforced over time, we may be able to see that an afterlife of a ‘biblical’ figure is crucial to an understanding of how the tradition associated with that figure became a living tradition and why.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

In *Legends of the Jews*, we can catch a glimpse of how the prophet Jeremiah was remembered by the sages of Rabbinic Judaism. Jeremiah is more than a prophet of doom and judgment who anticipated the disaster of the conquest and exile. He is the weeping prophet who struggled over his prophetic mission to prophesy against his own people and lamented the destruction of Jerusalem. Jeremiah also accompanied the deportees to Babylon as far as the River Euphrates, and then he returned to Jerusalem and comforted Mother Zion with the words of her future restoration:

> When Jeremiah saw a band of young men tied by neck chains one to the other, he put his head into a neck chain with them, but Nebuzaradan came along and released him. Then later, when he saw a band of old men bound together by chains, he put the chains on his own neck, but once more Nebuzaradan came by and released him. Even as Jeremiah wept with them and they wept with him, he spoke up and said, “My brethren and my people, all that has befallen you is the consequence of your not hearkening to the words of the prophecy that God uttered through me.”

> When Jeremiah reached the Euphrates River, Nebuzaradan spoke to him, saying to him, “If it seems good unto thee to come with me into Babylon, come” (Jer 40:4). So Jeremiah thought in his heart: If I go with the exiles to Babylon, there will be no comforter for the captivity left in Jerusalem. . . . When the exiles lifted their eyes and saw that Jeremiah was taking leave of them, all of them broke out weeping and wailing as they implored, “Our father Jeremiah, you are in truth abandoning us!” There they sat down and wept, for thus it is written: “By the rivers of Babylon, there we sat down, yea, we wept” (Ps. 137:1). Jeremiah answered and said, “I call heaven and earth to witness that if you had wept even once while you dwelled in Zion, you would not have been driven out.”

> As Jeremiah went, he wept and said, “Alas for you, most precious of cities.” . . . Jeremiah said: [After I left the exiles and] was going back up to Jerusalem, I lifted my eyes and saw at the top of a mountain a seated woman, clothed in black, her hair disheveled, crying and pleading for someone to comfort her, . . . I replied, “You are not more deserving of comfort than Mother Zion, who has been made into a pasture for the beasts of the field.” She replied, “I am your Mother Zion, the mother of seven.” Jeremiah said, “Your chastisement is like Job’s chastisement. Job’s sons and daughters were taken from him and your sons and daughters have been taken from you. Job’s gold and silver were taken from him, and your gold and your silver have been taken from you. . . . but even as the Holy One turned back and comforted Job, so will
He turn back and comfort you.”

In the passages above, Jeremiah’s genuine love and concern for the city and the people are clearly shown in his co-suffering with the deportees to Babylon and his lament over and consolation of Zion. In the “book” of Jeremiah, however, Jeremiah does not accompany the deportees nor does he voluntarily suffer with them on their way to Babylon. There is no account in the book that Jeremiah consoled mother Zion with the promise of restoration (cf. Jer 31:15–17). We all know that these so-called ‘non-biblical’ elements that are found in rabbinic tradition are not the product of the sheer imagination of the sages. Rather, these are drawn from the Jeremiah tradition that continued to develop and expand through and beyond the Second Temple period.3

By the Jeremiah tradition, I mean a literary tradition associated with the prophetic personage of Jeremiah. Here, Hindy Najman’s idea of ‘a tradition’ tied to a founder is worth considering. In Seconding Sinai, Najman discusses the development of ‘a Mosaic discourse’ tied to the founder Moses whose personality as a lawgiver played a significant role in the growth of the halakhic tradition in Second Temple times.4 Unlike ‘a discourse’ tied to a founder, in which the founder already has a distinctive personality, ‘a tradition’ tied to a founder incorporates the texts of

---


2Following Ehud Ben Zvi’s definition of ‘a prophetic book,’ I understand this word as “a self-contained written text” which is associated with a prophetic personage and which is marked by its textual fluidity. See Ben Zvi, “The Prophetic Book: A Key Form of Prophetic Literature,” in The Changing Face of Form Criticism for the Twenty-First Century, ed. Marvin A. Sweeney and Ehud Ben Zvi (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 2003), 276–97 (282).

3Cf. Jeremiah’s accompanying the deportees to Babylon as far as the ‘River’ is found in the Apocryphon of Jeremiah C (4Q385a 18 I); Jeremiah’s co-suffering with the exiles is depicted in 4 Baruch (Paraleipomena Jeremiou); Jeremiah’s consolation of Mother Zion seems to be an amalgam of different traditions, such as the book of Consolation (Jer 30–33), Lamentations, and 4 Ezra.

disparate characteristics and genres associated with the founder, and the founder begins to develop a distinctive personality as the tradition grows. In the case of Jeremiah, his personality as a lamenter was important enough for some Jewish intellectuals to attribute Lamentations to him. Yet it is worth stressing that Jeremiah, as a founder of ‘a tradition,’ was associated with diverse textual forms, and that his distinctive personality developed in keeping with the growth of the tradition over an extended period of time.

1.1 Why Jeremiah?

In view of the expansion of the Jeremiah tradition during the Second Temple period, we must ask one important question: Why Jeremiah? In other words, what was there about Jeremiah that was considered so important by the Jewish intellectuals that they continued to develop the Jeremiah tradition and construct the Jeremiah figure?

The most fundamental, pervasive memory of Jeremiah was, of course, Jeremiah’s historical association with the Babylonian destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple. This historical memory played a significant role in extending the Jeremiah tradition beyond the Babylonian crisis in the 6th century B.C.E. and recontextualizing it in the Seleucid and Roman crises centuries later. However, it was not merely Jeremiah’s association with the destruction of Jerusalem by the Babylonians and the ensuing exile but also his association with the repatriation to Jerusalem and the reconstruction of the Temple in the early Persian period that became an essential part of the people’s memory and perception of this ancient prophet. In this regard, the Chronicler’s presentation of Jeremiah is noteworthy. In 2 Chronicles, the restoration of the Jerusalem Temple

---

after the repatriation is interpreted as the fulfilment of Jeremiah’s prophecy of ‘seventy years.’

The Chronicler thus paved the way for the development of Jeremiah’s historical and theological significance as the prophet of exile and restoration through the changing fate of the people, the city and the Temple across and beyond the Second Temple period. What we can infer from 2 Chronicles is that Jeremiah’s pro-Jerusalem and pro-Temple significance with respect to the fate of the city and the Temple became an important aspect of the Jeremiah figure as a founder of a tradition.

That said, we need to qualify Jeremiah’s pro-Jerusalem and pro-Temple significance given the fact that Isaiah and Ezekiel also may be called pro-Jerusalem and pro-Temple prophets in some respects. In First Isaiah, the Zion theme in association with the Davidic ideology points to Yahweh’s protection of Jerusalem and the inviolability of the chosen city. Isaiah’s Zion theology thus contradicts Jeremiah’s prophetic message that the security of Jerusalem is not divinely guaranteed. Nevertheless, in the book of Jeremiah, Jeremiah’s pro-Jerusalem significance is revealed in his genuine concern for the safety of the city and his lament over its impending destruction. Deutero-Isaiah’s Zion ideology is compatible with Jeremiah’s oracles of return and restoration at the completion of Babylon’s seventy years. This compatibility, however, may stem

---

from an anonymous author’s dependence on and continuation of the Jeremiah tradition. This means that Deutero-Isaiah’s pro-Jerusalem Tendenz may be understood as an extension of Jeremiah’s significance for return and restoration that came to be attributed to Isaiah only secondarily. The Zion tradition in Trito-Isaiah focuses on the eschatological restoration of Jerusalem and its Temple as the holy city inhabited by the righteous remnants and as the centre of a purified worship of Yahweh. This eschatological vision presupposes intra-communal conflicts and, therefore, differs from Jeremiah’s promise of restoration which presupposes gentile assaults and oppressive imperial powers threatening the city and the Temple. Although the Zion theme is a central unifying motif that holds the book of Isaiah together, it is largely distinct from Jeremiah’s pro-Jerusalem and pro-Temple significance developed against the backdrop of the Babylonian crisis, and Deutero-Isaiah’s pro-Jerusalem significance may be viewed as an extension of Jeremiah’s personality as a prophet of return/restoration.

Ezekiel’s pro-Jerusalem and pro-Temple significance is revealed in his vision of a new sanctuary and city in Ezekiel 40–48. A new temple is structured with a view to protecting the holiness of

---


God, and the city, which is no longer viewed as the city of David, is renamed, “Yahweh is There.” This vision is an ideal and utopian description of a theocentric community of Israel with Yahweh as its King. It is unlikely, however, that the vision was expected to be implemented after the repatriation to Jerusalem. As Kalinda Rose Stevenson has cogently argued, Ezekiel’s vision developed as a rhetorical response to the theological crises of the community in exile and as an attempt to provide the hope of a future when the God of holiness would dwell in the midst of a morally-perfected people of Israel.\(^9\) Unlike Ezekiel’s utopian vision, Jeremiah’s prophetic vision of a future return and restoration is not a rhetorical expression for a completely transformed city and sanctuary in radical discontinuity from the past. Rather, Jeremiah’s vision awaits its fulfilment in the future history of the people, in the restoration of Jerusalem and the Temple in continuity with the past before the major disruption of exile took place.\(^10\)

Why Jeremiah? Jeremiah’s historical and theological significance for the unfolding fate of Jerusalem and the Temple from destruction to restoration was a central, if not the central, theme that allowed him to become a founding figure of a living tradition over centuries after the disappearance of the historical prophet, especially when the security and well-being of the city and Temple of Jerusalem remained vulnerable to the threat of violence and when the hope of a future restoration centred on God’s holy city and sanctuary persisted through the period of foreign

---


\(^10\)In this regard, the motif of the preservation and restoration of the vessels in the Jeremiah tradition is noteworthy (cf. Jer\(^\text{MT}\) 27:21–22). The emphasis on the continuity with the past is missing in Ezekiel’s vision of restoration.
domination that spanned centuries after the Babylonian crisis.

1.2 The Development of the Jeremiah Figure

1.2.1 The Growth of the “book” of Jeremiah

We cannot understand the development of the Jeremiah figure apart from the book of Jeremiah itself. The book of Jeremiah is a collection of disparate materials such as the judgment oracles, the oracles against the nations, the king collection, the book of consolation, the laments and complaints, the (auto-)biographical narratives, the sermonic prose, Jeremiah’s letters and so on. This clearly indicates that the Jeremiah tradition expanded through the ongoing scribal process of composition, redaction and transmission. This also means that the prophet Jeremiah whom we meet in the book of Jeremiah is a person who developed through such a process. As Walter Brueggemann has correctly noted, “Every historical presentation of a person is a mediation and a construction.”

Given the secondary materials in the book, some scholars were interested in retrieving the earliest Jeremiah tradition. They, assuming that Jeremiah 2–6 and 30–31 contain the original words of the prophet, proposed that Jeremiah began his ministry by preaching to the people in the north in support of Josiah’s national and religious reform and then came to proclaim the word of God to Judah and Jerusalem against the backdrop of the rise of Babylon. According to their

---


reconstruction, Jeremiah was originally a supporter of Josiah’s reform and a preacher of ‘return.’

Others paid more attention to the secondary expansion of the Jeremiah tradition and argued that it is almost impossible to isolate the earliest and authentic Jeremiah material and to reconstruct the historical Jeremiah from the book itself. Robert P. Carroll took an extensive deuteronomistic redaction of the book seriously and believed that Jeremiah’s preaching of repentance and Torah obedience is a tradition that developed redactionally with a view to explaining the destruction and exile theologically. Christl Maier also suggested that the portrayal of Jeremiah as a Mosaic teacher of Torah was a post-exilic development. Instead of postulating a systematic deuteronomistic redaction, William McKane proposed that the text of Jeremiah grew over a long period of time at the hands of many scribal authors through the ongoing process of interpretation and relecture of the core-kernel material (“a rolling corpus”). McKane’s *Fortschreibungen* model is different from Carroll’s idea of a systematic redaction, but the fact that McKane was hesitant to ascribe the so-called core-kernel material to the historical Jeremiah indicates that he was also aware of the difficulty of ascertaining the earliest and authentic Jeremiah material.

---

13Lohfink (‘Der Junge Jeremia,” 358–9) suggests that ‘return’ (šûb) in Jeremiah’s early preaching to the north (Jer 30–31) connotes the return of the exiles to the land. According to Lohfink, its meaning changes as Jeremiah’s preaching is extended to Judah/Jerusalem. Hence, Jeremiah appears in Jer 2–6 as a preacher of ‘repentance.’ The meaning of ‘return’ changes further in Jer 30–31(33). There, ‘return’ also comes to refer to the reversal of Yahweh’s judgment and, therefore, Jeremiah emerges as a prophet who announces the ‘restoration’ of Judah/Jerusalem after the Babylonian exile. Cf. John M. Bracke, “šûb šbût: A Reappraisal,” ZAW 97 (1985): 233–44.


It has also been argued that there exist the Judah-oriented and the Golah-oriented composition and redaction in the book of Jeremiah. Christopher R. Seitz has argued that the Judah-oriented tracts of Jeremiah emphasized the possibility of ongoing life in the land through submission to Babylon, whereas the ensuing Golah-oriented exilic redaction maintained that Judah and the nations are under Yahweh’s wrath and that the hope of a future restoration rests only with the exiles. According to Carolyn J. Sharp, however, it was Golah-based traditionists who supported the pro-Babylonian ideology through the advice of submission, whereas Judah-based traditionists, in resistance to the pro-Golah stance, developed a full-doom view anticipating the imminent destruction of Judah and the nations (including Babylon) alike. Despite their different explanations as to the theo-political perspectives of the Judah-oriented and the Golah-oriented tracts of Jeremiah, both Seitz and Sharp may corroborate our view of Jeremiah as a literary-theological figure reconstituted by the tradition. In a way, Carroll’s conviction seems more or less correct. The book of Jeremiah is a theologically and ideologically mediated and interpreted text that betrays various theological, ideological and socio-political perspectives.

This, however, does not mean that the growth of the tradition resulted from an ad hoc creation without any regard for historical truth. In this regard, a recent study on prophetic phenomenon is worth considering. Instead of taking the ‘biblical’ portrayal of Jeremiah at face value, some...

---

17 Christopher R. Seitz, Theology in Conflict: Reactions to the Exile in the Book of Jeremiah (BZAW 176; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1989). Seitz posits that the voice of the Judah-based tracts of Jeremiah was recorded in the ‘Scribal Chronicle’ (Jer 27–29*; 37–42*) in the post 597 B.C.E. This Chronicle, according to Seitz, made its way to Babylon after the destruction in 586 B.C.E. where it was redacted under the influence of the Ezekiel tradition. Yet there is no hard evidence to prove the existence of such a written document.

18 Carolyn J. Sharp, Prophecy and Ideology in Jeremiah: Struggles for Authority in the Deutero-Jeremianic Prose (London: T & T Clark, 2003). Sharp considers the Judean politics and social conflicts in the post-597 period as the main context in which the Jeremiah tradition took its shape. Her work is commendable in that the theo-political function of prophecy in ancient Israel is rightly taken into consideration, although it is unlikely that a full-doom view was the theopolitical stance of the Judah-based traditionists during the last days of Jerusalem.
scholars employed a socio-cultural comparative model and examined the prophetic activity of Jeremiah described in the book in the larger context of the phenomenon of ancient Near Eastern prophecy. They supposed that the historical Jeremiah behaved like other prophets or diviners of the time and performed a typical socio-political function as expected by his contemporaries. They also assumed that the scribes who recorded the word and life of Jeremiah are most likely to have tried to represent the empirical world of the 6th century B.C.E.19

On the basis of the observation that ancient prophets functioned within the existing socio-political and religious institutions in order to maintain the well-being of the state, Matthijs J. de Jong has argued that Jeremiah’s warning against Judah’s rebellion against Babylon and his lament over the destruction of Judah/Jerusalem reflect Jeremiah’s original prophetic activity that is in agreement with the profile of a “pro-society” prophet.20 De Jong’s argument is of interest to us since it suggests that Jeremiah’s pro-Jerusalem and pro-Temple Tendenz is, in all likelihood, integral to the historical Jeremiah who was genuinely concerned about the fate of the city and the Temple. It is plausible and possible that such a Tendenz of Jeremiah continued to be remembered and cultivated and came to be perceived as an important aspect of Jeremiah’s personality.

As regards the phenomenon of ancient Near Eastern prophecy, it is also important to note that


prophecy as divine revelation (or divination) was an oral performance. Yet it was sometimes written to communicate the message to a recipient over physical distance (cf. Jeremiah’s exilic letters).\textsuperscript{21} It was also committed to writing by the (temple) scribes for the purpose of preservation and future reference.\textsuperscript{22} It is most likely that Jeremiah’s oracles were collected and written down for the same purpose and became subject to the scribal activities of reading, interpreting, studying, copying, redacting and composing. It was at the hands of those scribes that Jeremiah’s oracles grew into a prophetic “book” bearing his name. Crucial here is that the scribes viewed their activities as ongoing revelation: they tried to discern and communicate the divine will and message for their communities and claimed to continue the intermediary role of the prophet Jeremiah. In this respect, scribal activity was prophetic activity and their literary products were essentially prophecies.\textsuperscript{23}

These scribes claimed not authorship but authority by attributing their work to “the words of Jeremiah,” or more specifically to “the words of Yahweh” revealed to and through the prophet


\textsuperscript{22} Ibid., 192–4.

Jeremiah.\textsuperscript{24} This is clearly indicated not only in the editorial superscription in Jer 1:1–3 but also in the account of Jeremiah’s scrolls in Jeremiah 36.\textsuperscript{25} According to the passage in Jeremiah 36, the original scroll was written by Baruch the scribe at Jeremiah’s dictation. When Jehoiakim destroyed it, Jeremiah and Baruch reproduced and even expanded it. Although it is Baruch the scribe who produced a written text of Jeremiah, he is not regarded as its author. Rather, his scribal activities are presented as an integral part of the prophetic phenomenon of communicating and preserving the words of Jeremiah.\textsuperscript{26} There is no indication that Baruch’s scribal activities rendered Jeremiah’s scrolls less authoritative. Even an amplified version of the scroll is deemed authoritative regardless of its textual form. What we can infer from Jeremiah 36 is that Jeremiah the prophet, as an authoritative medium of divine revelation, served as the indispensable source of authority. Here, we may even have a glimpse at the practice of pseudepigraphy. Hindy Najman understands pseudepigraphic attribution as an authority conferring strategy and argues that the concept of an author is associated with a founder to whom a text is ascribed.\textsuperscript{27} Given the sheer length of the book of Jeremiah, we may safely assume that the Jeremiah tradition continued to develop and expand at the hands of those who acknowledged Jeremiah’s authority as the major source of revelation for their communities over a long period of time.

The scribal production of a prophetic “book” bearing the name of Jeremiah has great implications


\textsuperscript{25}We read in Jeremiah 36 that the scroll contained the revealed words of Yahweh (vv. 4, 6, 8) and the words of Jeremiah (v. 10).

\textsuperscript{26}Jeremiah 36 is an important text that explains the scribal activity in the production of prophetic books in light of the correlation between the oral and the written in the overall socio-cultural process of prophecy. See Joachim Schaper, “On Writing and Reciting in Jeremiah 36,” in \textit{Prophecy in the Book of Jeremiah}, 137–147.

\textsuperscript{27}Najman, \textit{Seconding Sinai}.
for our understanding of Jeremiah the prophet. The textually-presented Jeremiah is not always a faithful representation of the historical prophet. The historical Jeremiah was filtered through the recollection and textualization of the *ipsissima vox* of Jeremiah. Accordingly, the memory and perception of Jeremiah continued to be shaped and reshaped by the scribal authors who preserved and, at the same time, interpreted, modified, created and expanded the received tradition of Jeremiah. This tells us that we are to view the textually-presented Jeremiah as a literary-theological figure who grew over time in keeping with the growth of the tradition. This also tells us that the expanding tradition of Jeremiah attests to his enduring significance and relevance that continued to be acknowledged and affirmed by the authors/readers of the “book.”

1.2.2 Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} and Jer\textsuperscript{MT}

What may complicate our understanding of the Jeremiah figure is that there exist two textual traditions, Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} and Jer\textsuperscript{MT}. Two different traditioning processes for Jeremiah suggest that different Jeremiahs are likely to have been remembered and constructed over time.

A two-edition theory has been dominant in scholarship. According to this theory, Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} represents the earlier, shorter edition and Jer\textsuperscript{MT} the subsequent, expanded edition.\textsuperscript{29} Therefore, textual differences between Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} and Jer\textsuperscript{MT} have been explained mainly in terms of editorial revisions

---


and expansions in the masoretic tradition. This theory, however, has some weaknesses. The idea of ‘edition’ ignores textual fluidity and misleads us to take the Hebrew traditions underlying Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} and Jer\textsuperscript{MT} as textually fixed entities. The Hebrew manuscripts of Jeremiah from Qumran that reflect both proto-LXX and proto-MT traditions clearly show, not only that the “book” of Jeremiah was in a state of textual fluidity until around the 2\textsuperscript{nd}–1\textsuperscript{st} centuries B.C.E., but also that two different Hebrew traditions of Jeremiah were circulating simultaneously. These Qumran manuscripts raise an important question as to why the so-called earlier, shorter Hebrew tradition was preserved and transmitted if Jewish scribes were concerned with modifying, reinterpreting and adapting this earlier, shorter version for new circumstances.

Instead of assuming the early-late distinction between Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} and Jer\textsuperscript{MT}, some scholars began to postulate two distinct Hebrew Vorlagen, or two independent literary and interpretative traditions that developed almost simultaneously from their respective origins. A two-Vorlagen theory can better explain why both textual traditions of Jeremiah were preserved at Qumran. Yet the burden of this theory is to account for the sheer length of Jer\textsuperscript{MT} since it implies that the masoretic tradition

\footnote{Hermann-Josef Stipp, \textit{Das masoretische und alexandrinische Sondergut des Jeremiabuches: textgeschichtlicher Rang, Eigenarten, Triebkräfte} (OBO 136; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1994). For Stipp, Jer\textsuperscript{MT} Ergänzer was not merely a redactor but also a writer whose purpose was to modify, enrich, adapt, and accommodate the Hebrew Vorlage.}

\footnote{Orality and memory, which are important aspects of scribal culture, are very likely to have contributed to the fluidity of the textual traditions of Jeremiah. See Ben Zvi’s discussion of ‘prophetic readings’ in “The Prophetic Book: A Key Form of Prophetic Literature,” 286–88. On the significance of memorization and recitation for scribal-textual systems, see David M. Carr, \textit{Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature} (Oxford: University Press, 2005).}

\footnote{The fragments 4QJer\textsuperscript{a,c} are close to the proto-MT tradition, and the fragments 4QJer\textsuperscript{b,d} reflect the proto-LXX tradition. See Emanuel Tov, “The Jeremiah Scrolls From Qumran,” \textit{RevQ} 14 (1989):189–206; idem, “Three Fragments of Jeremiah From Qumran Cave 4,” \textit{RevQ} 15 (1992): 531–41.}

\footnote{For such a view, see Carolyn J. Sharp, “‘Take Another Scroll and Write’: A Study of the LXX and the MT of Jeremiah’s Oracles Against Egypt and Babylon,” \textit{VT} 67 (1997): 487–516. Sharp suggests that two textual traditions with two independent parent texts developed very early at the level of composition.}
developed through a more extensive scribal process of interpretation, composition and redaction extending over a relatively long period of time. 34 Here, we may briefly consider the basic assumptions of NETS (A New English Translation of the Septuagint), that the LXX is an interlinear text which is completely dependent on the Hebrew original, and that it was not meant to be read as a free-standing scripture but rather as a mere translation, and that it was intended to bring the Greek-speaking reader to the Hebrew Scripture. 35 These assumptions of NETS are not without criticism. 36 Yet one may wonder whether or not the Greek translation of a short form of the Hebrew text of Jeremiah influenced the Jewish perception of the scriptural authority of this short textual tradition of Jeremiah. One may speculate that a more extensive scribal process behind the development of the masoretic tradition of Jeremiah had to do with its scriptural authority. That is, it is plausible that scribes continued to read, interpret, study and redact the masoretic tradition of Jeremiah in acknowledgment of its scriptural authority as the major source of ongoing divine revelation.

At any rate, two textual traditions of Jeremiah indicate that different memories of Jeremiah and different perceptions of his historical and theological significance are likely to have coexisted during the Second Temple period. In this respect, it seems legitimate to exercise a synchronic

34 Stipp (Sondergut des Jeremiabuches, 143) thinks that most of the MT variations may be dated to the 4th–3rd centuries B.C.E. Adrian Schenker’s view is that the masoretic tradition of Jeremiah continued to expand until around the time of the Maccabees in the 2nd century B.C.E. See Schenker, “Le rédaction longue de livre de Jérémie: Doit-elle être datée au temps des premiers Hasmonéens?,” Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses 70 (1994): 281–293.

35 See the introduction to A New English Translation of the Septuagint, ed. Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

comparison between $\text{Jer}^{\text{LXX}}$ and $\text{Jer}^{\text{MT}}$ as two parallel scriptural traditions with their own hermeneutical and theological perspectives.\footnote{For such an approach, see Marvin A. Sweeney, “The Masoretic and Septuagint Versions of the Book of Jeremiah in Synchronic and Diachronic Perspective,” in \textit{Form and Intertextuality in Prophetic and Apocalyptic Literature} (FAT 45; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 65–77.} True, the comparison has only heuristic value since we do not have direct access to the proto-LXX and proto-MT texts of Jeremiah which were circulating during the Second Temple period. Nor can we reconstruct the textual history of the Hebrew \textit{Vorlagen} underlying $\text{Jer}^{\text{LXX}}$ and $\text{Jer}^{\text{MT}}$ from their respective origins. $\text{Jer}^{\text{LXX}}$ and $\text{Jer}^{\text{MT}}$ are at best the windows into the fluid traditions of Jeremiah. Nevertheless, the comparison may reveal to us a direct correlation between the production of the text of Jeremiah and the development of the historical and theological significance of the figure of Jeremiah. This correlation becomes even clearer when we consider the ongoing development of the Jeremiah figure in the apocrypha and pseudepigrapha.

1.2.3 Jeremiah in Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha

Christian Wolff has written a notable monograph on the Jeremiah tradition in early Jewish and Christian literature.\footnote{Christian Wolff, \textit{Jeremia im Frühjudentum und Urchristentum} (Texts und Untersuchungen 118; Berlin: Akademie, 1976).} In this classical study, Wolff focussed on two aspects of the Jeremiah tradition: the Gestalt of Jeremiah the person and the reception of the book of Jeremiah. As regards the former, Wolff identified Jeremiah’s association with the Temple and its vessels, Jeremiah’s Mosaic analogy, Jeremiah’s liturgical role as a pray-er, and Jeremiah’s death as special themes within the tradition.\footnote{Ibid., 1–98.} As regards the latter, he correctly noted that the book of Jeremiah was not as popular as the book of Isaiah or the book of Psalms. He, nevertheless, provided a very helpful
discussion of the interpretive history of Jeremiah’s ‘seventy years’ prophecy and, especially, the reception of Jeremiah’s ‘new covenant’ in Christian circles.\textsuperscript{40} Considering the parallels between the two national catastrophes in 586 B.C.E. and 70 C.E., Wolff also proposed that Jeremiah the prophet of \textit{Unheil} in early Judaism received a renewed significance after 70 C.E. in terms of his preaching of repentance and comforting promises for the future. For Wolff, the catastrophe in 70 C.E. was a decisive time for ‘the rediscovery of the book of Jeremiah’ in Judaism and Christianity.\textsuperscript{41} Wolff’s monograph is commendable in that it offers a comprehensive treatment of the Jeremiah tradition extending to the time of the apostolic church fathers in the 3rd–4th centuries C.E.

Yet it seems necessary to refine Wolff’s study in some respects. Here, I will mention only two. First, the major problem lies in his generalization of Jeremiah as the prophet of \textit{Unheil} and \textit{Unglück} in early Judaism. This is a serious reduction in ‘the Gestalt of Jeremiah.’ Wolff himself has noted a temple-related motif that is prominent in the Jeremiah tradition. This recurring motif alone shows that the prophet Jeremiah’s significance for the restoration of the Temple and its cult continued to be acknowledged and affirmed over time. Although Wolff argued that Jeremiah was rediscovered after 70 C.E. in terms of his role of preaching repentance and Torah obedience, Jeremiah’s Mosaic teaching and preaching were an important theme which was already developing in the post-exilic Yehud to provide direction to the Jerusalem community towards the complete fulfilment of the promised restoration, as First Zechariah’s utilization of prophetic teaching of Jeremiah clearly demonstrates (Zech 1:3–6; 7:8–14). Although I agree with Wolff’s basic

\textsuperscript{40}Ibid., 99–188.

\textsuperscript{41}Ibid., 189–192.
assumption that the prophet Jeremiah did not remain static as a ‘flat’ character but continued to
develop over time, it is questionable whether Jeremiah was perceived mainly as the prophet of
Unheil and Unglück in early Judaism until the Roman destruction of the Second Temple in 70 C.E.

Second, Wolff’s division between the book and the person, between the text and the figure, is
methodologically problematic. The figure always lives in the world of the text. A new text may
add new meanings to the figure, reshaping and transforming the people’s memory and perception
of that figure. As indicated earlier, a figure grows and transforms as a tradition expands.
Therefore, we need to acknowledge that the book and the person, or the text and the figure, exist
in a reciprocal relationship. Moreover, ‘the rediscovery of the book of Jeremiah’ which is noted
by Wolff is comparable to ‘the rediscovery of the book of Lamentations’ in Jewish liturgy in the
post-70 period. Given the interpretive tradition that acknowledged the Jeremianic authorship of
Lamentations as well as the reciprocal relationship between the text and the figure, one may wish
to complement Wolff’s work by considering the Jewish-rabbinic rediscovery of the book of
Jeremiah and its implications for the Gestalt of Jeremiah in the post-70 period.42

John Barton’s approach to the Jeremiah tradition is very different from Wolff’s. In his short
article on the Jeremiah tradition in the apocrypha and pseudepigrapha, Barton focussed exclusively
on the figure of Jeremiah.43 He identified four types of the Jeremiah figure in early Jewish
writings:

(1) Jeremiah as a historical figure, with the details of his involvement in the events of
his time enhanced but not transformed; (2) Jeremiah as a seer, predicting the future,

[42]For a good source book on this topic, see Jacob Neusner, Jeremiah in Talmud and Midrash (Lanham,

often the distant future – a development common in all presentations of ancient prophets in the Second Temple period; (3) Jeremiah as a wonder-worker and mystagogue; and (4) Jeremiah as a figure of the end-time.  

Although his typological descriptions of Jeremiah seem to have been influenced by his pre-understanding of the four modes of reading and interpreting the Prophets during the Second Temple period, Barton’s discussion certainly shows that the Jeremiah figure was diversified in keeping with the growth of the tradition in the apocrypha and pseudepigrapha. Barton has argued in his article that, “[Jeremiah] became the focus for all sorts of legendary accretions which had little or no direct connection with the biblical text.” In this respect, Barton’s work has offered a good corrective to Wolff’s stereotypical characterization of Jeremiah as the prophet of Unheil.

Barton, however, largely overlooked the historical factors that influenced the production of the apocryphal and pseudepigraphic traditions of Jeremiah. For example, it is against the backdrop of the Antiochene crisis and the Maccabean restoration of the city and the Temple in the 2nd century B.C.E. that we find multiple attestations of Jeremiah (cf. Daniel 9; Eupolemus; 2 Maccabees). After the Roman assaults on the Temple and the city in the 1st and 2nd centuries C.E., Jeremiah reappears in 2 Baruch and 4 Baruch. Barton overlooked the fact that the memory of Jeremiah was activated whenever the city and the Temple faced gentile threats and assaults. This

---

44Ibid., 308.


47It is worth stressing that Barton’s third type of Jeremiah – ‘a wonder-worker and mystagogue’ – shows a strong Egyptian influence. Jeremiah is portrayed as a wonder-worker in The Lives of the Prophets which is strangely excluded from Barton’s discussion. Jeremiah appears as a mystagogue only in Philo’s De Cherubim under the influence of Hellenistic Judaism in Egypt. The development of the Jeremiah tradition in Egypt deserves separate research and will not be discussed in the present study. Nevertheless, the configuration of Jeremiah as ‘a wonder-worker and mystagogue’ alerts us to the importance of the historical and contextual factors in the development of the
is why we are reluctant to account for Jeremiah in the apocrypha and pseudepigrapha simply as a ‘legendary’ development. The memory and perception of Jeremiah that are closely associated with the fate of the city and Temple of Jerusalem played a crucial role in the ongoing development of the Jeremiah figure and the ongoing expansion of the Jeremiah tradition. Innovative elements are certainly there, but as James L. Kugel has said, these must not be confused with “popular ‘legends’ that simply sprang up in the minds of the commonfolk just as the ‘legends’ of ancient Greece or the folklore of other civilizations.”

In this respect, Barton has rightly qualified his view of a ‘legendary’ growth of the Jeremiah tradition: “Those who wrote pseudonymously . . . do not seem to have been entirely random in their choice of biblical figures to whom to attach revelations or histories; though it can hardly be said that they were exactly ‘faithful’ to the biblical record either.”

This brings us back to Hindy Najman’s idea of ‘a tradition’ tied to a founder. According to Najman, new texts and traditions that were attributed to a founding figure were understood as the extension of the received tradition of the founder, and the authors viewed themselves, not as innovators, but as emulators of an exemplary figure as they continued to seek the ongoing divine revelation for their own times. We learn from Najman’s discussion that we cannot

---


consider Jeremiah in the apocrypha and pseudepigrapha as the product of *ad hoc* creations and innovations. The authors were already aware of certain motifs and ideas associated more closely with Jeremiah than with others, and they tried to authorize their theological reflections on, and interpretations of, the past, present and future of the communities by means of Jeremiah’s legacy. In doing so, they continued to shape and reshape the memory and perception of Jeremiah and revitalized the Jeremiah tradition for their own times in history. As we shall see in the following chapters of the present study, Jeremiah’s ongoing relevance and significance in the unfolding history of the people were found in his enduring significance for the fate of Jerusalem and the Temple. Hence, it is not difficult to assume that Jeremiah and his legacy were crucial to the ongoing Jewish conceptualizations of exile and restoration through the changing fate of God’s people, city and Temple across and beyond the Second Temple period.

1.3 Plans for the Study

The present study takes a diachronic approach to the Jeremiah tradition, considering the correlation between the growth of the tradition and the development of the Jeremiah figure. It is also a synchronic study to the degree that each chapter (except for Chapter Two) deals with the literary sources that roughly belong to the same time period. The three time periods that are covered in the study are the Babylonian-Persian, Greek and Roman periods. The present study does not intend to be an exhaustive study. I will examine only a portion of the Jeremiah tradition and read only a portion of each writing selected for examination.

In Chapter Two, I will first consider the development of the Jeremiah figure in the “book” of

Jeremiah by comparing two textual traditions, Jer^LXX and Jer^MT. In Chapter Three, I will turn to Lamentations^51 and 2 Chronicles and examine how the historical and theological significance of Jeremiah for the fate of Jerusalem and the Temple was perceived and constructed against the backdrop of the Jerusalem crisis during the Babylonian period and through the reconstruction period under Persian rule. In Chapter Four, I will investigate the ongoing development of the Jeremiah figure and his significance against the backdrop of the Antiochene crisis and the Maccabean restoration by reading Daniel 9^52 and 2 Maccabees 2 and 15. In Chapter Five, I will consider how Jeremiah is reconfigured in 2 Baruch and 4 Baruch after the destruction of the Temple and the city by the Romans in the 1st–2nd centuries C.E. In Chapter Six, I will summarize the main argument of the study and offer its implications for further research.

^51 Jeremiah as a literary-theological figure often appears as a living character: his name is mentioned and his words and deeds are described in the text (e.g., the book of Jeremiah, 2 Maccabees 2 and 15, Apocryphon of Jeremiah C, 2 Baruch, 4 Baruch). In some cases, Jeremiah does not appear as a real character, but his memory is evoked and his persona is constructed. For example, the name ‘Jeremiah’ is not mentioned in Lamentations, but there is an unnamed lamenting figure who laments in the language of Jeremiah. The intertextual link between the book of Jeremiah and Lamentations indicates that the early memory of Jeremiah’s lament played an important role in the development of the lament tradition in the exilic Judahite context. Conversely, it is also very likely that the developing lament tradition during the Babylonian period played an important role in constructing and reinforcing the memory and perception of Jeremiah as an archetypal lamentor. In this respect, it seems legitimate to understand Lamentations as a tradition associated with Jeremiah.

^52 What is remembered and interpreted in Daniel 9 is not Jeremiah the person but his prophecy. Daniel 9, however, sheds important light on the ways in which Jeremiah’s legacy found its ongoing relevance for new circumstances and also on Jeremiah’s enduring significance as perceived and constructed by Jewish authors in the 2nd century B.C.E. In this respect, it is worth considering how Daniel 9 may have contributed to the memory and perception of Jeremiah against the backdrop of the Antiochene crisis.
Chapter 2

Jeremiah as a Literary-Theological Figure in the Book of Jeremiah

Two textual traditions of Jeremiah evince two different traditioning processes and, by implication, two different presentations of Jeremiah. In the present chapter, I will compare two textual traditions of Jeremiah in order to examine how the prophet Jeremiah is constructed and portrayed similarly or differently in Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} and Jer\textsuperscript{MT} and to identify certain theological ideas or motifs that are considered to be important to the development of the historical and theological significance of Jeremiah in each textual tradition. True, the overlapping text that is common to both Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} and Jer\textsuperscript{MT} indicates that we should not regard Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} and Jer\textsuperscript{MT} as two discrete traditions of Jeremiah. In addition, not all textual variances between Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} and Jer\textsuperscript{MT} reflect different hermeneutical and theological perspectives. As David M. Carr has noted, many variances can be explained as the MT revisions that are “small-scale coordinations and harmonizations of different parts of Jeremiah (particularly prose portions) with each other and other texts in the Hebrew Bible.”\textsuperscript{53} Nevertheless, the eight cases of textual comparison that will be considered below clearly show that the construction and portrayal of the Jeremiah figure are not identical in Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} and Jer\textsuperscript{MT} especially when it comes to the interpretation of exile and restoration.

Based on the eight cases of textual comparison, I will discuss the development of the historical and theological significance of Jeremiah. But before I do that, I will briefly consider the presentation of the Jeremiah figure in the common textual tradition in order to have a more complete view of Jeremiah. The prophet Jeremiah emerging from the common tradition is a “pro-

society” figure,\textsuperscript{54} and we will be able to see that the Jeremiah figure who continues to develop in keeping with the growth of the tradition, especially in Jer\textsuperscript{MT}, is in essence an extension of this “pro-society” figure, who is deeply concerned about the fate of God’s people, city and Temple.

2.1 The Comparison Between Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} and Jer\textsuperscript{MT}\textsuperscript{55}

Case 1. The Divine Promise to Jeremiah

Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} 1:18–19
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{18}Behold, I have made you in this very day like a strong city and like a strong bronze wall, to all the kings of Judah and its rulers and the people of the land.
\item \textsuperscript{19}And they will fight you, and they shall not prevail against you, for I am with you to deliver you.
\end{itemize}

Jer\textsuperscript{MT} 1:18–19
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{18}I for my part have made you today a fortified city, an iron pillar, and a bronze wall, against the whole land – against the kings of Judah, its princes, its priests, and the people of the land.
\item \textsuperscript{19}They will fight against you; but they shall not prevail against you, for I am with you, says the Lord, to deliver you.
\end{itemize}

Jer 1:18–19 is the divine promise given to Jeremiah at the beginning of his prophetic ministry. According to this passage, Jeremiah shall face the people’s rejection and persecution, but God will protect him from them. In Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} Jeremiah is likened to a divinely-protected strong city and its wall. Hence, the divine deliverance of Jeremiah is contrasted with the divine punishment of the city of Jerusalem on account of the people’s refusal to heed Jeremiah. In Jer\textsuperscript{MT} Jeremiah is likened not only to a strong city and its wall but also to an iron pillar that represents the Temple vessels or the Temple itself. The fact that the priests of Judah are counted among Jeremiah’s persecutors

\textsuperscript{54}Borrowing Matthijs J. de Jong’s term from his article, “Why Jeremiah is Not Among the Prophets: An Analysis of the Terms יַעֲבֹדָה and נָבִיא in the Book of Jeremiah,” JSOT 35.4 (2011): 483–510. Yet my understanding of this term is slightly different from de Jong’s. According to him, the prophet Jeremiah, as a “pro society” figure, strived for the well-being of Judah. I suggest that Jeremiah’s “pro society” significance lies not only in his ministry prior to the destruction but also in his prophetic role of ensuring the survival of the people through the time of exile and eventually their future restoration.

\textsuperscript{55}Unless otherwise noted, all English translations are from NETS for Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} and from NRSV for Jer\textsuperscript{MT}. All references to Greek and Hebrew texts are from the Alfred Rahlfs edition of the Septuagint and BHS respectively.
further suggests that Jeremiah’s personal fate is now contrasted with the fate of the city and the Temple.

Noteworthy here is that we do not find any clear reference to the destruction of the Temple in the account of the Babylonian destruction of Jerusalem from the prose section of the book of Jeremiah. It is said in Jer 39:1–10 that the city and its walls were destroyed. We read in Jer 41:5 that eighty men came to offer sacrifices at the house of the Lord after the destruction of the city. These passages that do not mention the destruction of the Temple cohere with Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} 1:18–19. Yet the destruction of the Temple is mentioned in Jer 52:17–23, where we read that the two bronze pillars were broken into pieces and taken to Babylon. Hence, the divine promise given to Jeremiah in Jer\textsuperscript{MT} 1:18–19 seems to be in harmony with the historical appendix in Jeremiah 52. This implicit inclusio found in Jer\textsuperscript{MT} indicates that the fate of the Temple was considered very important by those who continued to read and interpret the Jeremiah tradition and developed the masoretic tradition of Jeremiah.

Case 2. The Temple Sermon

Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} 7:1–15

Hear a word of the Lord, all Judea.

This is what the Lord, the God of Israel, says: Amend your ways and your doings, and I will cause you to dwell\textsuperscript{a} in this place. Do not trust in yourselves with deceptive words, because they will not benefit you at all, when you say, “A shrine\textsuperscript{c} of the Lord, a shrine of the Lord it is.” Because if in amending, you

Jer\textsuperscript{MT} 7:1–15

The word that came to Jeremiah from the Lord: Stand in the gate of the Lord’s house, and proclaim there this word, and say, Hear the word of the Lord, all you people of Judah, you that enter these gates to worship the Lord.

Thus says the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel: Amend your ways and your doings, and let me dwell with you\textsuperscript{b} in this place. Do not trust in these deceptive words: “This is the temple\textsuperscript{e} of the Lord, the temple of the Lord.”

If you truly amend your ways and your
amend your ways and your doings, . . . \[7a \] I will also cause you to dwell in this place, in the land that I gave of old to your fathers and forever.

\[7b \] b will also cause you to dwell in this place, in the land that I gave of old to your ancestors forever and ever.

. . .

\[11 \]

Surely my house, there where my name has been called on it, has not become den of robbers before you? . . .

\[12 \]

Go to my place which was in Selo, there where I made my name encamp formerly, and see what I did to it because of the wickedness of my people Israel. 13 And now, because you have done all these things and I spoke to you and you did not hear me and I called you and you did not answer, I will also do to the house, where my name is called on it, in which you trust in it, and to the place that I gave to you and to your fathers, just what I did to Selo. 15 And I will cast out you from before me, just as I cast out your kinsfolk, all the offspring of Ephraim.

\[11 \]

Has this house, which is called by my name, become a den of robbers in your sight?

. . .

\[12 \]

Go now to my place that was in Shiloh, where I made my name dwell at first, and see what I did to it for the wickedness of my people Israel. 13 And now, because you have done all these things, says the Lord, and when I spoke to you persistently, you did not listen, and when I called you, you did not answer, therefore I will do to the house that is called by my name, in which you trust, and to the place that I gave to you and to your ancestors, just what I did to Shiloh. 15 And I will cast you out of my sight, just as I cast out all your kinsfolk, all the offspring of Ephraim.

a-a. in LXX, the same verbal form κατοικεῖν (“I will cause to dwell”) is used in both v. 3 and v. 7.

b-b. in MT, אֲשֵׁם (v. 3) and אִשְׁמַעְיָה (v. 7).

c. in LXX, “a shrine” in v. 4 is ναός, the dwelling place of a god; in MT, “the temple” is מַשְׁלֹחֵן, the royal palace of a king.

According to the passage in Jer\(^{\text{LXX}}\) 7:1–15, Jeremiah is not present at the Temple and his preaching is directed to all the people of Judah. He calls them to remove their wickedness and walk in the way of the Lord because their dwelling in “this place” (i.e., the land) is conditional upon their covenant loyalty to Yahweh. Jeremiah accentuates this point by saying that the Lord’s “house” standing in the midst of the people guarantees neither Yahweh’s unconditional salvation of His people nor their ongoing possession of “the place,” that is, the land given to their forefathers.

We see in Jer\(^{\text{MT}}\) that Jeremiah stands in the gate of the Temple and speaks to the Judeans who come to worship the Lord (vv. 1–2). Although “this place” in v. 7 and “the place” in v. 14 refer
to the land as in Jer\textsuperscript{LXX}, Jeremiah’s physical presence in the Temple allows us to construe “this place” in v. 3 as the house of the Lord. Moreover, we can hear in the people’s mantra, “the Temple of the Lord (הַכֵלֵל יְהוָה),” a clear allusion to the Zion tradition that the Jerusalem Temple is the royal palace of the divine King, Yahweh, who dwells there to protect and deliver the people and the city (cf. Pss 46; 48). Hence, it is truly significant that the Hebrew verbs אָשֶׁר הָיָה (v. 3) and אָשֶׁר הָיָה (v. 7) are used in association with “this place.” These verbs indicate that at stake is Yahweh’s ongoing dwelling in His royal residence in Jerusalem as well as in the land of Judah. The people’s disobedience and disloyalty can cause Yahweh to remove His presence from the Temple and the land (cf. Jer 12:7). This parallels the Ezekielian ideas, that God cannot dwell among a morally and ethically depraved people and that the departure of the glory of the Lord from the house will lead to the destruction of the Temple as well as the exile of the people from the land. In this respect, the Temple Sermon in Jer\textsuperscript{MT} seems to qualify Zion theology by emphasizing the covenant requirements on the part of the people.\textsuperscript{56}

In both Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} and Jer\textsuperscript{MT} Jeremiah’s preaching of Torah obedience draws attention to the people’s appropriate responses to their God. In Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} their Torah obedience would ensure their ongoing occupation of the land as well as the safety of the Temple, whereas in Jer\textsuperscript{MT} their obedience would

\textsuperscript{56}Cf. Tryggeve N. D. Mettinger, \textit{The Dethronement of Sabaoth: Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies} (CWK Gleerup, 1982), 62–66. According to Mettinger, the prophet Jeremiah himself did not question the presence of God in the Temple but only imposed a condition on it. Mettinger’s explanation, however, is not applicable to the Temple Sermon in Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} where the central issue is the people’s dwelling in the Land. Mettinger also argues that the “name” formula which is redactional in the Temple Sermon came to serve to qualify the divine presence in the Temple. But see J. G. McConville, “Restoration in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic Literature,” in \textit{Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives}, ed. James M. Scott (JSJSup 72; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 11–40, especially 33–34. According to McConville, the “name” formula refutes the absolute claims of the one particular place in a succession of places in Israelite history. McConville’s view is more in agreement with the common textual tradition of the Temple Sermon since Jeremiah says in both Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} and Jer\textsuperscript{MT} that the Jerusalem Temple is, in God’s view, qualitatively no different from the place of the Lord which was once in Shiloh. In Jer\textsuperscript{MT}, however, the expression “הַכֵלֵל יְהוָה” (v. 4) affirms the uniqueness of the Jerusalem Temple in accordance with the Zion tradition and, at the same time, serves to qualify that tradition in view of the destruction.
ensure Yahweh’s ongoing dwelling in the Temple and in the land as well. Thus we see in Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} that the people’s occupation or loss of the land is a central idea associated with Jeremiah’s instruction in Torah obedience. In Jer\textsuperscript{MT}, however, it is the fate of the Jerusalem Temple that comes to the fore in relation to Zion theology.

Case 3. ‘Seventy Years’

Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} 25:9–12
\textsuperscript{9}behold, I am sending for and I will take a paternal family from the north, and I will bring them against this land and against its inhabitants and against all nations around it . . . .
\textsuperscript{11}and the whole land shall become an annihilation, and they shall be slaves amongst the nations \textit{seventy years}. \textsuperscript{12}and when seventy years are completed, I will punish that nation, and I will make them an everlasting waste.

Jer\textsuperscript{MT} 25:9–12
\textsuperscript{9}I am going to send for all the tribes of the north, says the Lord, even for King Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon, my servant, and I will bring them against this land and its inhabitants, and against all these nations around . . .
\textsuperscript{11}This whole land shall become a ruin and a waste, and these nations shall serve the king of Babylon seventy years.
\textsuperscript{12}Then after seventy years are completed, I will punish the king of Babylon and that nation, the land of the Chaldeans, for their iniquity, says the Lord, making the land an everlasting waste.

There is no historicizing tendency in Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} 25:9–12. “[A] paternal family from the north” is left unidentified (v. 9). The identity of those who shall become slaves amongst the nations for seventy years is also uncertain. Most probably, they refer to both the people of Judah and Jerusalem and the surrounding nations whose fates are affected by a certain nation from the north. What is clearly stated in this passage is that their slavery amongst the nations will last for seventy years until the divine punishment of “that nation” from the north (vv. 11–12). Here, we can see that the period of seventy years is constructed as the time of exile (dislocation from the land) and servitude.
In JerMT a fearful nation from the north is identified as Babylon. King Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon is called God’s “servant” who carries out God’s purpose in history (v. 9) and, therefore, all the nations must serve him seventy years (v. 11). The period of seventy years is thus interpreted as the time of the nations’ political subjection to the king of Babylon. It is also theologically constructed as the time of Yahweh’s punishment of the nations through His servant. It is worth stressing that even the completion of seventy years is theologized as the divine punishment of the kingdom of the Chaldeans and its king “for their iniquity” (v. 12). In JerMT, therefore, Jeremiah’s prophecy of ‘seventy years’ serves to defend Yahweh’s just rule over the nations. The idea of divine retribution, as part of the theology of history, refutes the idea of Yahweh’s whimsical, arbitrary governance in history and affirms the historical necessity and certainty of the downfall of Babylon. Hence, we can find in JerMT that the period of seventy years is not merely perceived as the time of exile and servitude amongst the nations. It is rather conceived of as the time of the nations’ political subjection to the king of Babylon (i.e., the hegemony of Babylon) which will surely come to an end with the divine punishment of Babylon and its king.

Case 4. ‘Serve Babylon and Live’

Jer34:6–22
6I have given the earth to King Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon to be subject to him, and the wild animals of the field to work for him.

Jer27:6–22
6Now I have given all these lands into the hand of King Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon, my servant, and I have given him even the wild animals of the field to serve him.
7All the nations shall serve him and his son and his grandson, until the time of his own land comes; then many nations and great kings shall make him their slave.
8But if any nation or kingdom will not serve this king, Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon, and

57King Nebuchadnezzar is called “my servant” only in JerMT 25:9; 27:6; 43:10.
king of Babylon, I will visit them with dagger and with famine, said the Lord, until they fail in his hand.

9 and you, do not keep heeding your pseudo-prophets and your diviners . . . , when they say, ‘You shall not work for the king of Babylon.”

10 For they are prophesying lies to you so as to distance you far from your land.

11 And the nation that brings its neck under the yoke of the king of Babylon and works for him, I will also leave him on his own land, and it will work for him and will live in it.

12 I spoke to King Zedekiah of Judah according to all these words, saying: Bring your neck, and work for the king of Babylon,

14 because they are prophesying wrong things to you,

15 because I did not send them, quoth the Lord, and they are prophesying wrongly in my name so as to destroy you, and you will perish, you and your prophets who are prophesying lies to you.

16 I spoke to you and all this people and the priests, saying, Thus did the Lord say: Do not listen to the words of the prophets who are prophesying to you, saying “Behold, the vessels of the Lord’s house are returning from Babylon,” because they are prophesying wrong things to you;

17 I did not send them.

18 If they are prophets and if there is a word of putting its neck under the yoke of the king of Babylon, then I will punish that nation with the sword, with famine, and with pestilence, says the Lord, until I have completed its destruction by his hand.

9 You, therefore, must not listen to your prophets, your diviners . . . , who are saying to you, “you shall not serve the king of Babylon.”

10 For they are prophesying a lie to you, with the result that you will be removed far from your land; I will drive you out, and you will perish.

11 But any nation that will bring its neck under the yoke of the king of Babylon and serve him, I will leave on its own land, says the Lord, to till it and live there.

12 I spoke to King Zedekiah of Judah in the same way: Bring your necks under the yoke of the king of Babylon, and serve him and his people and live.

13 Why should you and your people die by the sword, by famine, and by pestilence, as the Lord has spoken concerning any nation that will not serve the king of Babylon.

14 Do not listen to the words of the prophets who are telling you not to serve the king of Babylon, for they are prophesying a lie to you. 15 I have not sent them, says the Lord, but they are prophesying falsely in my name, with the result that I will drive you out and you will perish, you and the prophets who are prophesying to you.

16 Then I spoke to the priests and to all this people, saying, Thus says the Lord: Do not listen to the words of your prophets who are prophesying to you, saying “The vessels of the Lord’s house will soon be brought back from Babylon,” for they are prophesying a lie to you.

17 Do not listen to them. Serve the king of Babylon and live. 18 Why should this city become a desolation?

19 If indeed they are prophets, and if the word
the Lord in them, let them counter me.

19 because thus did the Lord say: Even some of the remaining vessels,
20 which the king of Babylon did not take when he exiled Jeconiah from Jerusalem,

19 For thus says the Lord of hosts concerning the pillars, the sea, the stands, and the rest of the vessels that are left in this city,
20 which King Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon did not take away when he took into exile from Jerusalem to Babylon King Jeconiah son of Jehoiakim of Judah, and all the nobles of Judah and Jerusalem—

22 shall enter into Babylon,
says the Lord.

They shall be carried to Babylon, and there they shall stay, until the day when I give attention to them, says the Lord. Then I will bring them up and restore them to this place.

a. in v. 11, “to work” (LXX) and “to till” (MT) most probably reflect the same Hebrew Vorlage, יְהִי.
b. in v. 11, “live” literally means “to dwell” in both LXX and MT (ἐποικίζομαι; בָּשָׂר).
c. in MT, “live” in v. 12 and v. 17 is יָדַע.

Jeremiah’s message in JerLXX is simple: Judah and the nations must serve the king of Babylon. If they do, they can continue to live (i.e., dwell) in their own lands. There are Jeremiah’s opponents, “pseudo-prophets,” who contradict him by saying that there is no need to serve the king of Babylon (vv. 9–10). They even (falsely) prophesy that the sacred vessels taken to Babylon in 597 B.C.E. shall soon return to Jerusalem (v. 16). In response, Jeremiah utters another oracle that some of the remaining vessels in the house of the Lord will be taken to Babylon (vv. 19–22). Jeremiah says in v. 18 that the prophets who have the word of God may counter him, and it is “the pseudo-prophet Hananiah” who stands up against Jeremiah in the following chapter (JerLXX 35). In JerLXX Jeremiah is presented as the true prophet of the Lord who, through his advice of submission to Babylon, reveals the way to prevent another deportation to Babylon. It is the pseudo-prophets like Hananiah who mislead the nations to rebel against Babylon and lose the opportunity for continued
life (i.e., dwelling) in their own lands.

In Jer\textsuperscript{MT} submission to Babylon is again theologized as subjection to Yahweh’s servant until the appointed time of his punishment (vv. 6–7; cf. 25:9–12). Hence, it is emphasized in 27:8 and 10 that Yahweh Himself will punish any nation or kingdom that does not serve the king of Babylon. Moreover, submission to Babylon becomes a matter of life and death in Jer\textsuperscript{MT}. If the people of Judah and Jerusalem heed Jeremiah and serve the king of Babylon, they can avoid death by the sword, famine and pestilence (v. 13) and “live” (נָּפֵל, vv. 12, 17). In this regard, it is also noteworthy that Jeremiah’s concern for life has implications for the fate of Jerusalem: he indicates in v. 17 that the survival of “this city” hinges on submission to Babylon. Jeremiah’s concern for the well-being and safety of the city of Jerusalem is further revealed in v. 18, where Jeremiah says that the prophets who have the word of God must intercede with the Lord so that the remaining vessels in the Temple, in the royal palace, and in Jerusalem may not be taken to Babylon. The implication is that the prophets who lure the people to rebel against Babylon, in opposition to Jeremiah’s advice, are responsible for the desolation of the city and the destruction of the political and religious institutions established in it.

The growing concern with the fate of Jerusalem and the Temple is clearly indicated in Jeremiah’s oracles concerning the captivity and the return of the vessels in Jer\textsuperscript{MT} 27:19–22. Jeremiah says that “the pillars, the sea, the stands” and the rest of the vessels that are left in the city shall be taken to Babylon and that these vessels shall return to “this place” at a divinely-appointed time in the future. Note the exodus imagery of God’s ‘bringing up’ the vessels from Babylon and ‘causing them to return’ to Jerusalem (v. 22). In Jer 16:15, two Hebrew verbs נָּפֵל and בָּשָׂר are used to construct the return of the exiles to the land as a second exodus. The same verbs appearing
together in 27:22 indicate that the return of “the pillars, the sea, the stands” and the rest of the vessels taken from the city of Jerusalem is now essential to the idea of the divine fulfilment of restoration and salvation. Crucial here is that the captivity and the return of the vessels are most likely to refer to the destruction and the restoration of Jerusalem and the Temple. This means that in Jer the fate of Jerusalem and the Temple is central to the conceptualization of exile and restoration. In Jer, therefore, Jeremiah is not merely the prophet of the Lord who tries to secure the people’s ongoing dwelling in the land with his advice of surrender. He is also a pro-Jerusalem and pro-Temple prophet who is deeply concerned about the well-being of the city and the Temple and reveals the divine promise of restoration centred on the city and Temple of Jerusalem.

Case 5. Jeremiah’s Exilic Letter

Jer XX 36:4–14
4Thus did the Lord God of Israel say to the exile which I exiled from Jerusalem:
5Build houses, and settle down, and plant orchards, and eat their fruit, and take wives and produce sons and daughters, and take wives for your sons, and give your daughters to husbands, and multiply, and do not decrease, and seek for peace of the land into which I have exiled you there, and pray to the Lord on their behalf, because in their peace there will be peace for you.

Jer MT 29:4–14
4Thus says the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel, to all the exiles whom I have sent into exile from Jerusalem to Babylon.
5Build houses and live in them; plant gardens and eat what they produce; take wives and have sons and daughters; take wives for your sons, and give your daughters in marriage, that they may bear sons and daughters; multiply there, and do not decrease. But seek the welfare of the city where I have sent you into exile, and pray to the Lord on its behalf, for in its welfare you will find your welfare.

10For thus did the Lord say: when Babylon’s seventy years are about to be completed, I

58 The totality of the restoration of Jerusalem is affirmed in that all the vessels taken from the house of the Lord, from the house of the king of Judah, and from Jerusalem shall return to “this place.” This clearly refers to the reestablishment and reinstatement of Jerusalem as the religious and political centre. See Yahanan Goldman, Prophétie et royauté au retour de l’exil. Les origines littéraires de la forme massorétique du livre de Jérémie (OBO 118; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992), 179–188.
I visit you, and I will establish my words upon you to bring your people back to this place.

11 And I will plan a plan of peace for you, and not to give you these evils.

12 And pray to me, and I will listen to you. 13 And seek me out, and you will find me, because you will seek me with your whole heart, 14 and I will appear to you.

I visit you, and I will fulfill to you my promise and bring you back to this place.

11 For surely I know the plans I have for you, says the Lord, plans for your peace and not for harm, to give you a future with hope.

12 Then when you call upon me and come and pray to me, I will hear you. 13 When you search for me, you will find me; if you seek me with all your heart, 14 I will let you find me, says the Lord, and I will restore your fortunes and gather you from all the nations and all the places where I have driven you, says the Lord, and I will bring you back to the place from which I sent you into exile.

In his letter to the first deportees to Babylon in Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} 36, Jeremiah countermands the lying prophets’ oracle of an imminent return and restoration. He says that the exiles shall return after Babylon’s seventy years are completed. Therefore, he commands them to build, plant, multiply and increase in “the land” of Babylon and seek the well-being of its inhabitants for the sake of their own well-being until the time of divine visitation and restoration (v. 7). It is interesting to note Jeremiah’s advice to the exiles who must live in “the land” of Babylon for a long time: they must multiply/increase. In the patriarchal narratives, the divine word of ‘increase,’ usually combined with the divine promise of the land, is a form of blessing (Gen 17:4–8; 35:11–12). This particular blessing was fulfilled in “the land” of Egypt (cf. Gen 47:27; Exod 1:7), and it is now to be fulfilled in “the land” of Babylon. In this respect, Jeremiah’s instruction seems to anticipate a second exodus for God’s people and their repossession of the promised land.\textsuperscript{59} It is not by chance that Jeremiah’s letter continues to say that God will return them from “the land” of exile

\textsuperscript{59}Leslie C. Allen, \textit{Jeremiah: A Commentary} (OTL; Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 2008), 324. Allen thinks that Jeremiah’s advice was intended to instruct the exiles to regard Babylon as their new home. Possible, but it is also very likely that Babylon is viewed here as the land of slavery comparable to Egypt. This suggests that Jeremiah’s instruction was intended to ensure the well-being of the exiled community in the land of servitude in view of a new exodus from Babylon which is promised by God.
to “this place” when Babylon’s seventy years are completed (Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} \textsuperscript{36:10}). It is most likely that “this place” here refers to “the land” given to the forefathers as in Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} \textsuperscript{7:1–15}.

We read in Jer\textsuperscript{MT} \textsuperscript{29:7} that the place of exile is “the city” of Babylon. This suggests that “this place” to which all the exiles shall return must be construed as “the city” of Jerusalem as in Jer\textsuperscript{MT} \textsuperscript{27:22}. The centrality of Jerusalem in the conceptualization of restoration is further demonstrated in Jer\textsuperscript{MT} \textsuperscript{29:12–14} where Yahweh’s plan for the people is revealed. A series of verbs in vv. 12–13 — דֶּרֶשׁ, בֵּךְשׁ, הָאַפְּלָל, נָהַל, קְרוּ — describe the people’s pious activities and these activities signify their ‘return’ to the Lord.\textsuperscript{60} According to Yahweh’s comprehensive plan for His people in v. 14, their ‘return’ to the Lord will ensure their physical return to “the place” (i.e., Jerusalem). Although the present letter is directed to the exiles in Babylon, Yahweh promises their return from “all the nations” and “all the places” of their exile and, by implication, the end of the dispersion of His people. In this regard, we may even argue that God’s great ingathering of the dispersed announced in v. 14 confirms the theological and ideological significance of Jerusalem as the ingathering centre.\textsuperscript{61}

As we can see, Jeremiah’s exilic letter betrays different theological and hermeneutical perspectives on exile and restoration in Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} and in Jer\textsuperscript{MT}. In the former, the place of exile is “the land” of

\textsuperscript{60}Compare LXX. The verbs that we find in Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} \textsuperscript{36:12–13} are προσεύχομαι (to pray) and ἐκζητεῖον,ζητέω (to seek/enquire). In Jer\textsuperscript{MT} \textsuperscript{29:12}, the verb דֶּרֶשׁ is very likely to connote a journey to a sacred place where the people would gather to pray and seek the Lord. There is no compelling reason to take דֶּרֶשׁ as an auxiliary verb (contra Jack R. Lundbom, \textit{Jeremiah 26–36: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary} [AB \textsuperscript{21B}; New York: Doubleday, 2004], 354). Allen (\textit{Jeremiah}, 325) interprets דֶּרֶשׁ in reference to communal lamentation. Allen’s idea presupposes the existence of a gathering place for worship. We may even postulate that the religious activities that are described in 29:12–13 point to the development of penitential prayers and/or penitence-related liturgy in Second Temple Judaism.

\textsuperscript{61}The centrality of Jerusalem is not apparent in Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} \textsuperscript{36:12–14}. Its intertextual connection to Deut 4:29 indicates that Yahweh’s words in Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} \textsuperscript{36:12–14} simply set forth the precondition for homecoming — the ‘return’ of the exiles to their God.
Babylon and, therefore, the idea of restoration is focussed on the return of the exiles to their own land. In the latter, the place of exile is “the city” of Babylon. Accordingly, the idea of restoration is focussed on the city of Jerusalem where Yahweh’s plan for the future of His people will come to fruition.  

Case 6. The Book of Consolation I

Jer^LXX^ 37:3
I will “bring back the exile of my people,” Israel and Judah, said the Lord, and I will bring them back to the land that I gave to their fathers, and they shall have dominion over it.

Jer^LXX^ 38:12
And they shall come and be glad on the mountain of Zion, and they shall come to the good things of the Lord, to a land of grain and wine and fruit and cattle and sheep, and their soul shall become like a fruitful tree, and they shall hunger no more.

Jer^LXX^ 40:10–11
Thus did the Lord say: There shall yet be heard in this place of which you say, “it is a wilderness apart from human beings and animals,” in the cities of Judah and outside of Jerusalem, that are desolate, to the point that there are no human being or animal, a voice of gladness and a voice of joy, a voice of bridegroom and a voice of bride, a voice of people saying, “Acknowledge the Lord Almighty, because the Lord is kind, because his mercy is forever.” And they will bring gifts into the house of the Lord, because I will return the exile of that land as before, said the Lord.

Jer^MT^ 30:3
I will “restore the fortunes of my people,” Israel and Judah, says the Lord, and I will bring them back to the land that I gave to their ancestors and they shall take possession of it.

Jer^MT^ 31:12
They shall come and sing aloud on the height of Zion, and they shall be radiant over the goodness of the Lord, over the grain, the wine, and the oil, and over the young of the flock and the herd; their life shall become like a watered garden, and they shall never languish again.

Jer^MT^ 33:10–11
Thus says the Lord: In this place of which you say, “it is a waste without human beings or animals,” in the towns of Judah and the streets of Jerusalem that are desolate without inhabitants, human or animal, there shall once more be heard the voice of mirth and the voice of joy, the voices of those who sing, as they bring thank offerings to the house of the Lord: “Give thanks for the Lord of hosts, for the Lord is good, for his steadfast love endure forever!” For I will restore the fortunes of the land as at first, says the Lord.

^62^For a similar case, compare Jer^MT^ 34:22 and Jer^LXX^ 41:22.
In both Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} and Jer\textsuperscript{MT}, the Book of Consolation immediately follows the account of Shemaiah in Babylon who receives Yahweh’s verdict that none of his descendants shall see “the good things” (τὰ ἄγαθά/ות) that God will do for His people in the future. Hence, the Book of Consolation, in its present literary context, elucidates “the good things” that lie in store for God’s people, that is, God’s plan for a future restoration. \textsuperscript{63} Yet the Book of Consolation, just like Jeremiah’s exilic letter, betrays different theological and hermeneutical perspectives on restoration in Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} and Jer\textsuperscript{MT}. According to Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} 37:3, Yahweh will bring back the exiled community to the land. The restoration of Zion is affirmed in 38:12, but the focus shifts from Zion to a fruitful land, indicating that “the good things of the Lord” will be manifested in the people’s repossession of the land. Similarly, the restoration of Temple rituals is hinted at in 40:10–11 but, again, the focus is on the land. When the exiles reinhabit the land, they will bring gifts to the Lord who has fulfilled the promise to return them to their own land.

In Jer\textsuperscript{MT} 30:3, the return of the exiles to the land is also regarded as an important aspect of restoration. Yet it is only one of many ways in which שבע שבעת is to be actualized in the history of the people. According to the passage in 31:12, they shall come to Zion and be joyful over “the goodness of the Lord” (שלום יהוה), that is, an abundant harvest in the land. The importance of a good land is not in question, but Zion is the place where a redeemed people of God will gather for celebration and thanksgiving. The repopulation of Judah and Jerusalem and the resumption of Temple rituals are also mentioned in 33:10–11, but these are not directly associated with the

divine promise to return the exiles to the land. Rather, these demonstrate the restoration of “the fortunes of the land” (שׁוּם שׁבֵׂתְיָהוֵד). That is, the restoration of “the fortunes of the land” shall culminate in the restoration of Jerusalem and the people’s joyful worship in the house of the Lord.

Case 7. The Book of Consolation II

JerLXX 40:5–9

I turned away my face from them for all their acts of wickedness. Behold, I am bringing it soundness and healing, and I will make clear to them and heal it and make for them peace and trust. I will return the exile of Judah and the exile of Israel and build them as they were before. And it shall be for gladness and for praise and for greatness for all the people of the earth, whoever shall hear of all the good that I shall perform, and they shall fear and be embittered concerning all the good and concerning all the peace which I shall make for them.

JerMT 33:5–9

I have hidden my face from this city because of all their wickedness. I am going to bring it recovery and healing; I will heal them and reveal to them abundance of prosperity and security. I will restore the fortunes of Judah and the fortunes of Israel, and rebuild them as they were at first. And this city shall be to me a name of joy, a praise and a glory before all the nations of the earth who shall hear of all the good I do for them; they shall fear and tremble because of all the good and all the prosperity I provide for it.

In both passages above, the 3 fs. pronoun “it” and the 3 pl. pronoun “them” occur alternately. This implies that the fate of the city and the fate of the people are intertwined. Yet the major concern of the oracles in JerLXX 40:5–9 is the fate of the people. God turned His face from “them” due to “their” wickedness (v. 5), but God will return the exiles and rebuild “them” (v. 7), and all the people of the earth shall fear when they see all the good and peace that God will make for “them” (v. 9). Of course, their restoration has implications for the fate of Jerusalem: “it” shall be healed.

In this regard, Jeremiah’s purchase of the field at Anathoth is also worth considering. According to the passage in JerLXX 39:44, Jeremiah’s purchase of the field anticipates the return of the exiles to the land. Yahweh promises to bring their settlements/colonies back (ἀποστρέψω τὰς ἀποικίας αὐτῶν). In JerMT 32:44, Jeremiah’s purchase of the fieldled this anticipates Yahweh’s restoration of the fortunes of the people in the future (שׁוּם שׁבֵׂתְיָהוֵד). Hence, the promise that fields shall be bought again signals a turn in the fate of the people: Yahweh’s שׁוּם שׁבֵׂתְיָהוֵד will turn into שׁוּם שׁבֵׂתְיָהוֵד.
(v. 6) and “it” shall become a joy and a praise among the peoples of the earth (v. 9).

In Jer\textsuperscript{MT} 33:5–9, the fate of the city comes to the fore. God turned His face from “this city” because of the evil of its inhabitants (v. 5), but God will bring healing to “it” (v. 6). It shall become a name of joy, a praise and a glory to God, and all the nations shall fear because of all the šalāh and נחמה that God will provide to “it” (v. 9). Such a reversal in the fate of Jerusalem is undeniable evidence for the divine restoration of “the fortunes” of Judah and Israel (v. 7). The centrality of Jerusalem in the divine fulfilment of restoration continues to be affirmed in Jer\textsuperscript{MT} 33:14–16 (MT Sondergut). As shown below, this passage is a relecture of Jer 23:5–6:

\begin{align*}
\text{Jer 23:5–6} &\quad \text{Jer\textsuperscript{MT} 33:14–16} \\
\text{The days are surely coming, says the Lord,} &\quad \text{The days are surely coming, says the Lord,} \\
\text{when I will raise up for David a righteous} &\quad \text{when I will fulfill the promise I made to the} \\
\text{Branch, and he shall reign as king and deal} &\quad \text{house of Israel and the house of Judah.} \\
\text{wisely, and shall execute justice and} &\quad \text{In those days and at that time I will cause a} \\
\text{righteousness in the land.} &\quad \text{righteous Branch to spring up for David; and} \\
\text{In his days Judah will be saved and Israel} &\quad \text{he shall execute justice and righteousness in} \\
\text{will live in safety. And this is the name by which he will be} &\quad \text{the land. In those days} \text{Judah will be saved} \\
\text{called: “The Lord is our righteousness.”} &\quad \text{and Jerusalem will live in safety. And this is} \\
\text{the name by which it will be called: “The Lord} &\quad \text{the name by which it will be called: “The Lord} \\
\text{is our righteousness.”} &\quad \text{is our righteousness.”} \\
\end{align*}

According to the passage in Jer 23:5–6, Yahweh will raise up a righteous Davidic king who will establish his royal rule with justice and righteousness in the land. Judah and Israel will be saved and live securely in the land “[i]n his days,” and he will be called, “The Lord is our righteousness.”

As we can see, the entire passage remains focussed on this Davidic figure. The passage in Jer\textsuperscript{MT} 33:14–16, however, does not concern itself much with a Davidic king. “In those days and at that time,” God will raise up a righteous Branch who will bring justice and righteousness to the land
The mention of his kingship is omitted in 33:15. We also read in v. 16a that, “[i]n those days,” Judah will be saved and Jerusalem will dwell in security. It is this future Jerusalem that will be called, “The Lord is our righteousness” (v. 16b). It is most likely that the renaming of Jerusalem signals the fulfilment of the earlier oracle in v. 9, that it shall be a name of joy, a praise and a glory to the Lord. Here, again, we can find the growing concern with the fate of Jerusalem in the conceptualization of a future restoration.

Case 8. Oracles Against Babylon

Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} 27

14 Take up your positions against Babylon round about, all you that bend a bow; shoot at her; do not be sparing with your arrows.

28 A sound of people fleeing and escaping from the land of Babylon to declare in Zion the vengeance of the Lord our God.

Jer\textsuperscript{MT} 50

14 Take up your positions around Babylon, all you that bend the bow; shoot at her, spare no arrows, for she had sinned against the Lord.

28 Listen, fugitives and returnees from the land of Babylon, are coming to declare in Zion the vengeance of the Lord our God, vengeance for his Temple.

Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} 28

11 The Lord has stirred up the spirit of the king of Medes, because his wrath is against Babylon to destroy it utterly, because it is vengeance from the Lord, vengeance for his people.

34\textsuperscript{a} King Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon has devoured me, . . .
35\textsuperscript{b} My hardships and my miseries drove me into Babylon,” resident Zion shall say.
36 And my blood be on the residing Chaldeans,” Jerusalem shall say.
36\textsuperscript{c} Therefore this is what the Lord says: Behold, I am judging your adversary and

Jer\textsuperscript{MT} 51

11 The Lord has stirred up the spirit of the kings of Media, for his purpose concerning Babylon is to destroy it, for that is the vengeance of the Lord, vengeance for his Temple.

34\textsuperscript{a} King Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon has devoured me, . . .
35\textsuperscript{d} May my torn flesh be avenged on Babylon,” the inhabitants of Zion shall say.
36 May my blood be avenged on the inhabitants of Chaldea,” Jerusalem shall say.
36\textsuperscript{e} Therefore thus says the Lord: I am going to defend your cause and take

\textsuperscript{65} The mention of his kingship is omitted in 33:15. This omission may have to do partly with a short-lived hope in Davidic Zerubbabel and partly with the hierocratic-theocratic ideology of Second Temple Judaism as shown in Zechariah’s vision of the coronation of the high priest Joshua (cf. Zech 6:9–14).
will take vengeance for you. And I will make desolate her sea and make her fountain dry,
and Babylon shall become an annihilation and shall not be inhabited.

37 and Babylon shall become a heap of ruins, a den of Jackals; an object of horror and of hissing, without inhabitant.

In both Jer<sup>LXX</sup> and Jer<sup>MT</sup>, the destruction of Babylon is theodicized as Yahweh’s vengeance on Babylon for its harsh treatment of the subject peoples and nations, especially the people of Judah and Jerusalem. This is clearly indicated in Jerusalem’s lawsuit against Babylon in Jer 51[28]:34–37. Yahweh’s vengeance on Babylon is expected to bring about the people’s release from Babylonian servitude and their long-awaited homecoming. In this respect, the oracles against Babylon are intrinsically associated with Jeremiah’s prophecy of ‘seventy years’ (25:12; 29:10).

Yet Jerusalem’s lawsuit against Babylon in Jer<sup>MT</sup> draws attention to a great reversal of fate for Jerusalem and Babylon. Note that the oracle against Jerusalem in 9:10 [ET 9:11] is reused in 51:37: the expression, “the heap of ruins, a den of jackals,” is found only in these two verses throughout Jer<sup>MT</sup>. On the one hand, the idea of reversal suggests that Yahweh’s vengeance on Babylon would signal the restoration of Jerusalem. On the other hand, the idea of reversal defends theodicy. Just as Jerusalem was punished for its sin, Babylon is also to be punished for its own sin against the Lord (50:14; cf. 25:12). We can discern in 50:28 and 51:11 that Babylon sinned against the Lord by destroying the Jerusalem Temple. It is said in these two verses that Yahweh takes vengeance on Babylon for His royal palace (ךֵּתָמָה תְּדוּלָה). This indicates that the divine punishment of Babylon, that is, the fulfilment of Jeremiah’s prophecy of ‘seventy years’ would...
have great implications for the fate of the Jerusalem Temple. In Jer^{MT}, therefore, it is not merely
the fate of the exiles but also the fate of the city and the Temple that is central to the idea of exile
and restoration in association with Babylon’s seventy years.

2.1.1 Summary
In the foregoing discussion, we have observed that the historical and theological significance of
Jeremiah was interpreted and constructed according to the scribal authors’ ideas, concerns and
interests. In each textual tradition, the authors developed Jeremiah’s distinctive identity as the
prophet of destruction/exile and return/restoration. However, his significance as such was
perceived and presented differently because the ideas of exile and restoration developed in Jer^{LXX}
and Jer^{MT} were not entirely the same, although they were not mutually exclusive either. As
considered above, the motifs of land, city, temple and ‘seventy years’ played an important role in
constructing the Jeremiah figure as a prophet of exile and restoration. Yet the land motif was
more central than others in Jer^{LXX}, and the motifs of city and temple were underscored in Jer^{MT}.
The diverging ideas of exile and restoration that are found in Jer^{LXX} and Jer^{MT} are clearly indicative
of different traditioning processes: scribal authors with different concerns and ideas were involved
in the growth of the tradition. These also tell us that the ongoing development of the Jeremiah
figure was inseparably linked to the ongoing Jewish conceptualizations of exile and restoration.

2.2 Jeremiah as a “Pro-Society” Prophet
The presentation of Jeremiah in the common textual tradition is not far removed from what we
have discussed above concerning the development of the Jeremiah figure in two textual traditions.
The motifs of land, city, temple and ‘seventy years’ also played a significant role in portraying the
Jeremiah figure in the common text. Of note is that the prophet Jeremiah emerging from the common text is a “pro-society” figure. He has deep concern for the well-being of the people and their ongoing life in the land. He strives for the protection and preservation of Jerusalem and its Temple. Although he announces the seventy years of the Babylonian exile, he also assures the people of their future restoration at the completion of Babylon’s seventy years. What is more important is that Jeremiah’s “pro-society” image that is presented in the common text was to become part of the people’s memory of Jeremiah and was to become subject to the scribal activities of reading, interpreting, composing and redacting the Jeremiah tradition. In this respect, we may say that the ongoing development of the Jeremiah figure in two textual traditions was essentially a continuation and extension of Jeremiah’s personality as a “pro-society” prophet who was sent to prevent the exile of the people and the destruction of the city and Temple of Jerusalem. That said, let us consider Jeremiah’s “pro-society” significance as portrayed in the common text more closely, paying attention to the motifs of land, city, temple and ‘seventy years.’

Jeremiah’s prophetic ministry is marked by his concern with the people’s ongoing dwelling in the land. As a covenant mediator, Jeremiah asserts that their ongoing possession of the land is conditional upon their covenant obedience (Jer 11:5). His advice of submission to Babylon is also supposed to ensure continued life in the land (Jer 27). The major concern of Jeremiah’s post-destruction ministry is the fate of the remnants of Judah. When he is released by Nebuzaradan, Jeremiah stays with the remnants (Jer 40:1–6) and exhorts them to remain in the land and never

---

66De Jong (“Why Jeremiah is Not Among the Prophets”) regards Jeremiah’s “pro-society” function as a faithful presentation of the historical prophet and argues that Jeremiah’s “contra society” function is a secondary development within the tradition.
go down to Egypt (Jer 42). Thus we see in the common tradition that Jeremiah is portrayed as ministering to the people of Judah and Jerusalem for the sake of their continued life in the land before and even after the destruction.

Jeremiah’s pro-Jerusalem Tendenz developed in the common text is particularly noteworthy. In Jer 5:1–9, the destruction of Jerusalem is theologized as God’s just punishment of a disobedient people rather than as God’s failure to defend and protect His own city. God seeks one righteous person in order to pardon Jerusalem (v. 1), but those who have searched Jerusalem bring negative reports about the city and its inhabitants (vv. 2–3). Then, Jeremiah intercedes with God and volunteers to go to Jerusalem, but he is also unable to find even one person who knows the way of the Lord and the law of God (vv. 4–5). This is why God cannot pardon Jerusalem (vv. 7–9). It is worth stressing that God appears in this passage as a good God who wishes to pardon and deliver the city, and that Jeremiah is presented as an intercessor who speaks and acts on behalf of Jerusalem. We can infer from God’s and Jeremiah’s good will to save Jerusalem that a scribal author who composed this passage tried to salvage Zion theology by qualifying it through Torah obedience. In this respect, the Jeremiah who defends Jerusalem before God in Jer 5:1–9 seems to perform a theodic function of justifying the destruction of Jerusalem as the outcome of the

---


68 It is difficult to ignore here that Jer 5:1–9 alludes to Gen 18:16–33. There, Abraham intercedes with God on behalf of Sodom, and God responds to his intercession and says that He will not destroy the city if there are ten righteous people in it. The Jeremiah who intercedes with God on behalf of Jerusalem in Jer 5:1–9 is an Abrahamic intercessor, whose intercession fails due to the evil of the people of Jerusalem. Gen 18 as a subtext of Jer 5, see Robert P. Carroll, “Theodicy and the Community: The Text and Subtext of Jeremiah V 1–6,” in Prophets, Worship and Theodicy: Studies in Propheetism, Biblical Theology and Structural and Rhetorical Analysis and on the Place of Music in Worship (OTS 23; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1984), 19–38, especially 19–28; Gen 18 as a theological midrash developed over the experience of the destruction of Jerusalem, see Joseph Blenkinsopp, “Abraham and the Righteous of Sodom,” JJS 33 (1982): 119–132.
people’s disobedience and unrepentance. Nevertheless, it is important to note that the Jeremiah figure emerging from Jer 5:1–9 is a pro-Jerusalem prophet who tries to ensure the well-being and safety of the city and its inhabitants.

Jeremiah’s pro-Jerusalem Tendenz is also revealed in his laments that accentuate his sympathetic concern for the fate of Jerusalem. It is truly significant that judgment oracles and laments coexist in the Jeremiah tradition (cf. Jer 4 and 8–9). I will not offer a detailed discussion here since Jeremiah’s laments will be discussed in the next chapter. It is sufficient to mention here that Jeremiah’s laments embedded in the early chapters of the book are very likely to have influenced the way in which the prophet Jeremiah was remembered and perceived by those who continued to reflect on the tradition through the experience of the destruction of the city.

Given Jeremiah’s priestly identity (Jer 1:1), it is not surprising that Jeremiah’s close association with the Jerusalem Temple is well noted in the common tradition. Consider, for instance, Jeremiah’s Temple Sermon. By asserting that the safety of the Temple is dependent upon the people’s Torah obedience, Jeremiah militates against the popular belief that their safety is automatically guaranteed by the Temple and its cultus. Jeremiah says that such a deceptive idea must be abandoned and that God’s law must be obeyed. The violation of the covenant on the part of the people will result in the disruption of their covenant relationship with God and eventually the destruction of the symbol of that relationship — the Temple. There is no question that Jeremiah’s words affirm the Torah-centred covenant symbolism of the Temple69 and ultimately

---

69 This is in agreement with the deuteronomic/deuteronomistic reconceptualization of the ark in the Holy of Holies as the sacred receptacle that contains the tablets of the Law rather than as God’s throne and footstool. This reconfiguration of the old Temple ideology marginalizes the idea of God’s immanent and physical presence in the Temple as the source of unconditional blessing. Instead, it emphasizes the covenant symbolism of the Temple as housing the ark of the Covenant and affirms the centrality of the Torah in defining the covenant relationship between God and His people.
serve the author’s/redactor’s concern to theologize its destruction by emphasizing the conditional
and legal aspects of the covenant relationship between God and His people. Crucial here is that
Jeremiah is not portrayed as an anti-Temple figure, although he asserts that the Temple is not the
source of security. His pro-Temple Tendenz is revealed in that he shows the true way (i.e., Torah
obedience) to secure the fate of the Temple.

We also find in the common tradition that Jeremiah often goes to the Temple to announce הַנְָפָר to
a disobedient and unrepentant people. Hence, Jeremiah appears, in the eyes of his contemporaries,
as an “anti-society” figure who does not speak ‘peace’ in accordance with the Zion tradition but
threatens the security of Judah, Jerusalem and the Temple with his words of disaster.70 Yet in the
Jeremiah tradition the people of Judah and Jerusalem and their prophets and kings who reject
Jeremiah’s teaching and warning are identified as the real “anti-society” figures responsible for
the destruction of the city and the Temple. Despite Jeremiah’s “pro-society” role and function,
the decreed disaster befalls a disobedient and unrepentant people. Here we encounter an important
theological worldview behind the development of the Jeremiah tradition — theodicy.

Defined as “the effort to defend God’s justice and power in the face of suffering,”71 theodicy is one
of the most important theological perspectives operating in the Jeremiah tradition. It is by no
means an exaggeration to call the book of Jeremiah a book of theodicy. The experience of the

70In Jer 19:14–15, Jeremiah, standing in the court of the Temple, announces that God will bring הַנְָפָר upon
the city of Jerusalem and all the towns of Judah because they have refused to listen to the words of the Lord. We see
in the immediately following passage in Jeremiah 20 that the priest Pashhur imprisons Jeremiah for saying those
ominous words. In Jeremiah 26, Jeremiah is also seen as announcing the words of הַנְָפָר in the house of the Lord (vv.
6, 9) and the priests and the prophets of Jerusalem who hear Jeremiah’s words try to put him to death (v. 11).
Jeremiah 36 reveals the same pattern. Jeremiah’s words of הַנְָפָר announced in the Temple is met with King Jehoiakim’s
strong aversion. These stories present Jeremiah as a rejected, suffering prophet who was viewed as an anti-Jerusalem
and anti-Temple figure by his contemporaries.

national catastrophe in 586 B.C.E. raised a theodic question about the goodness and justice of God and also about His power and sovereignty over history, and various responses to this question found their ways into the Jeremiah tradition. Retribution theodicy is the most prominent type of response. It defends God’s justice and power by explaining the disaster as God’s just punishment for sin.

Jeremiah’s most well-known legacy, the prophecy of ‘seventy years,’ also offers an effective theodic response to the national disaster. Babylon’s seventy years are conceived of as a divinely-decreed time of punishment for Judah and the nations around it. This confirms Yahweh’s power and sovereignty over the world and its history. Jeremiah’s prophecy of ‘seventy years’ also affirms divine justice and goodness by indicating that there is a time limit on Babylonian supremacy and, by implication, on the duration of exile. Although Yahweh has determined to punish His people for their sin, the period of divine wrath will not last forever. Jeremiah thus performs an important theodic function as the prophet of ‘seventy years.’ On the one hand, he justifies the seventy years of exile as a divinely-decreed time of punishment for sin and as a divinely-endorsed time of Babylonian hegemony. On the other hand, he affirms that divine goodness and power will be manifested in the fulfilment of the promised restoration at the completion of Babylon’s seventy years. Not only that, Jeremiah’s use of traditional blessing formulas (e.g., “multiply”) in his exilic letter to the Babylonian exiles (Jer 29) also testifies to his theodic significance as the prophet of ‘seventy years’ in the sense that his instruction serves to ensure the exiled community’s well-being and survival through the seventy years of servitude. Jeremiah’s prophecy of ‘seventy years’ thus affirms that divine goodness and mercy are available even through the seventy-year period of time and that divine justice and power will be fully
manifested when God punishes Babylon and accomplishes יהשם that He has promised through the prophet Jeremiah. In this respect, Jeremiah, the prophet of ‘seventy years,’ is a “pro-society” figure who assures the people of God’s enduring goodness and power in the face of disaster and suffering.

2.2.1 Summary

The Jeremiah figure emerging from the common text is a “pro-society” prophet/priest who concerns himself with the people’s continued life in the land and the safe preservation of the city and the Temple. Jeremiah also maintains, with his prophecy of ‘seventy years,’ theological equilibrium in the face of destruction and exile. He not only justifies the seventy years of exile but also declares that there will be an end to it. He also provides guidance to the exiles in order to ensure their well-being and survival until Babylon’s seventy years are completed. Jeremiah’s “pro-society” personality that develops in the common text extends to his role and function as a prophet of exile and restoration. As considered earlier, JerLXX and JerMT tend to disagree when it comes to the conceptualization of exile and restoration since the motifs of land, city, temple and ‘seventy years’ did not carry the same level of significance in the eyes of the scribal authors/redactors behind the two textual traditions. Yet the Jeremiah who anticipates the return of the exiles and their repossession of the land, who concerns himself over the restoration of Jerusalem and the Temple, and who proclaims the historical necessity and certainty of the downfall of Babylon for its iniquity may be regarded as a continuation of the Jeremiah figure who has already revealed his “pro-society” personality in the common text.
2.3 Jeremiah as a Prophet of Exile and Restoration

Those scribes who continued to read, interpret, compose and redact Jeremiah materials further cultivated and reinforced the memory/perception of Jeremiah as a “pro-society” figure. Particularly noteworthy is the fact that they continued to attribute their ideas of restoration, which were closely associated with the fate of God’s people, city and Temple, to the prophet Jeremiah, thereby confirming Jeremiah’s ongoing significance and relevance for their own times as the major prophet of exile and restoration. As will be shown below, it is in JerMT rather than in JerLXX that we witness such a development of Jeremiah in conjunction with the authors’/redactors’ expanding ideas of exile and restoration.

2.3.1 The Land vs. The City

As noted earlier in our comparison of two textual traditions, the land motif is central to the idea of exile and restoration in JerLXX. This corresponds to the common tradition in which Jeremiah is portrayed as making great efforts to ensure the people’s ongoing dwelling in the land and to assure the exiles of their future return to the land at the completion of Babylon’s seventy years. This correspondence is self-evident since the common tradition is mirrored in JerLXX. It seems that the scribes who developed the Hebrew tradition underlying JerLXX continued to acknowledge the significance of the land motif in the received tradition of Jeremiah. Thus we see in JerLXX that Jeremiah’s preaching of Torah obedience and his advice of submission to Babylon are intended to ensure people’s continued life in the land (see cases 2 and 4 above). Jeremiah’s exilic letter defines the place of exile as the land of Babylon and the place to which the exiles shall return as the land of Judah (see case 5 above). In the Book of Consolation, the return of the exiles to the land is fundamental to the idea of restoration, and the land repossessed by the returnees is even
identified with “the good things of the Lord” (see case 6 above). Yet we cannot assume that the restoration of Jerusalem and the Temple was of no consequence in the development of the Hebrew tradition underlying JerLXX. The restoration of Jerusalem is a central theme in the common texts of Jer 3:15–18 and 31:38–40 and the resumption of the Temple worship is also indicated as part of Jeremiah’s vision of restoration in JerLXX 37:18. Nevertheless, the centrality of the land motif in JerLXX leads us to construe ‘exile’ in its ordinary sense of the term and interpret Jeremiah’s significance for restoration in close relation to the idea of homecoming, that is, the exiles’ return to and repossession of the promised land.

In JerMT the city of Jerusalem is more crucial to the conceptualization of exile and restoration. We see in Jer 27 that Jeremiah’s advice of submission to Babylon has implications for the fate of Jerusalem: if the people serve the king of Babylon, they shall live (ἵππ) and the city will survive, but their rebellion will result in the captivity of all the vessels left in the Temple, in the royal palace and in Jerusalem (vv. 17–21). Moreover, Jeremiah’s oracle concerning the return of all the vessels from Babylon to “this place” (i.e., Jerusalem) clearly shows that the restoration of Jerusalem with its political and religious institutions has become central to the idea of the divine fulfilment of restoration (v. 22). It is very likely that Jeremiah’s oracles concerning the captivity and the return of the vessels in 27:17–22 reveal the post-Babylonian, post-repatriation perspective of the author/redactor, whose concern was no longer the repossession of the land but the reconstruction and reinstatement of the city of Jerusalem. This indicates that the ongoing

---

72 JerLXX 37:18 reads, “. . . καὶ οἰκοδομήθησαι πόλες ἐπὶ τὸ ὄψος αὐτῆς καὶ διὸ ναὸς κατὰ τὸ κρίμα αὐτοῦ καθεδείται.” Compare JerMT 30:18, where we have γυναικα (citadel) instead of ‘the house/temple.’

73 Such an idea of a total destruction of Jerusalem is absent in JerLXX 34 where Jeremiah merely says that some of the remaining vessels in the house of the Lord shall further be taken to Babylon. The concern for the survival of the city is not found in JerLXX 34.
development of the Jeremiah tradition was closely associated with the ongoing expectation of the restoration of fortunes after the repatriation, and that Jeremiah’s historical and theological significance as a prophet of exile and restoration came to be perceived and interpreted in close relation to the unfolding fate of Jerusalem.

The centrality of Jerusalem in the conceptualization of restoration is affirmed in numerous oracles from Jer$^{\text{MT}}$. In Jer$^{\text{MT}}$ 29:10–14, as mentioned earlier, Jerusalem is not merely the place to which the exiles shall return at the completion of Babylon’s seventy years but also the ingathering centre prepared for God’s ingathering of the Diaspora. This passage points to the elaboration of the interpretive tradition of the ‘seventy years’ prophecy in the sense that Jeremiah’s ‘seventy years’ prophecy now anticipates the end of Jewish dispersion. This passage also indicates the development of Jeremiah’s theological significance as the prophet of restoration with a strong pro-Jerusalem Tendenz. Jeremiah is now seen as a pro-Jerusalem prophet who affirms the sanctity and centrality of Jerusalem as “the place” where the divine fulfilment of the promised restoration will be fully manifested in the future history of the people.

Jeremiah’s oracle in the MT Sondergut passage in 33:14–16 is also noteworthy. This passage concerns itself with the restoration of the fortunes of Jerusalem, that is, its eternal security and complete renewal as implied in the renaming of the city (v. 16b). Given the oracles from 33:17–26 (also MT Sondergut) that mention Yahweh’s eternal covenant with “the two families” of David and the Levites as an important aspect of the restoration of fortunes, it is very likely that some scribes hoped for the restoration of the royal and the priestly house and attributed their idea of restoration to Jeremiah. The oracles in vv. 14–16, however, cannot be interpreted in light of Davidic hope because the growing concern with the future of Jerusalem that is expressed in this
passage indicates that the restoration of the Davidic house was no longer the major concern of the author/redactor.\(^{74}\) Rather, the expectation of the eternal security of Jerusalem and its future glory seems to reflect the historical awareness that the present condition of Jerusalem fell short of the promised restoration. It is plausible and possible that these oracles were composed during the Second Temple period when Jerusalem was under foreign domination. If the oracles in vv. 14–16 and vv. 17–26 were by the same hand, it is also likely that these passages were influenced by the Hasmoneans’ royal and priestly rule established in Jerusalem after its liberation from Seleucid rule.\(^{75}\) At any rate, these oracles show that the Jeremiah tradition continued to develop and expand through the ongoing Jewish reflections on restoration during the Second Temple period, and the oracles in vv. 14–16 further show that the condition of Jerusalem played a critical role in those reflections. As we can see, Jeremiah’s historical and theological significance as the prophet of exile and restoration continued to be interpreted and constructed in close relation to the fate of Jerusalem (and the institutions established in it).

2.3.2 The Temple

Jeremiah’s close association with the Jerusalem Temple is not unique to Jer\(^{MT}\). It is nevertheless true that his significance for the fate of the Temple is further reinforced in Jer\(^{MT}\). As discussed earlier, the divine promise of protection given to Jeremiah in Jer\(^{MT}\) 1:18–19 constructs the Jeremiah figure as Yahweh’s servant whose personal fate is contrasted with the impending

\(^{74}\) Carroll, Jeremiah, 639; Goldman, Prophétie et royauté, 225–229. Many commentators date the entire passage in 33:14–26 to the time of Zerubbabel, yet we must note that in vv. 14–16 the focus shifts from the Davidic rule of “a righteous Branch” to the city of Jerusalem (compare Jer 23:5–6).

\(^{75}\) A. Schenker, “Le rédaction longue de livre de Jérémie: Doit-elle être datée au temps des premiers Hasmonéens?,” Ephemerae Theologicae Lovanienses 70 (1994): 281–293, especially 286–289. Schenker dates Jer 33:14–26 to the early Hasmonean period when the Hasmonean dynasty and high priesthood were established superseding the Zadokite Oniads.
destruction of the city and the Temple. It is thus indicated at the very beginning of JerMT that the ongoing interpretation and construction of the Jeremiah figure were closely associated with the authors’/redactors’ concern over the fate of the Jerusalem Temple.

In the oracles concerning the fate of the vessels in JerMT 27:17–22, we also find that “the pillars, the sea, the stands” are specifically mentioned among the vessels to be taken to Babylon (v. 19). This directs us to the passage in Jer 52:12–23 (//2 Kgs 25:8–17), according to which the pillars, the sea and the stands were broken in pieces and taken to Babylon at the time of the Babylonian destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple. Hence, we may safely assume that the return of the pillars, the sea, the stands and the rest of the vessels to Jerusalem connotes the restoration of the Jerusalem Temple, and that a temple restoration has become an essential component of the promised restoration associated with the prophet Jeremiah.

Compared to Ezekiel’s grandiose vision of a temple restoration, Jeremiah’s brief oracle about the return of the Temple vessels to Jerusalem does not sound impressive at all. However, Jeremiah’s oracle has significance of its own. In Ezekiel’s vision, the divine glory filling a new temple renders the ark and other cultic paraphernalia redundant without compromising the idea of God’s immanent presence in the Temple. Unlike Ezekiel’s utopian vision of a new temple, what is anticipated in Jeremiah’s oracle is the restoration of the earlier Temple by means of the preservation and restoration of the sacred vessels from the Solomonic Temple. Jeremiah’s oracle thus underlines the continuity issue in the matter of a temple restoration and reinforces Jeremiah’s pro-Temple Tendenz, not only with respect to the construction of a new temple in Jerusalem, but

---

also with respect to the legitimization of the Second Temple in terms of its continuity with the First.\textsuperscript{77}

Also note the idea of Yahweh’s vengeance for His royal residence (כִּי תֵּכֹסַת הָעֵדֶל), which is found only in Jer\textsuperscript{MT} 50:28 and 51:11. This idea suggests that the most serious crime of Babylon is the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple, and that the downfall of Babylon is Yahweh’s just punishment for its crime. More importantly, the idea of כִּי תֵּכֹסַת הָעֵדֶל affirms God’s ongoing zeal for His royal palace in Jerusalem. In this respect, this idea is very likely to have served as a theological response to the word of Jeremiah from the Temple Sermon, that כִּי תֵּכֹסַת הָעֵדֶל are deceptive words (Jer\textsuperscript{MT} 7:4). These are deceptive words because the divine King in Zion can remove His imminent presence from His כִּי תֵּכֹסַת הָעֵדֶל and even destroy it on account of the people’s sin. In the Temple Sermon, therefore, the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple is interpreted as Yahweh’s voluntary withdrawal from, and abandonment of, His royal residence in Jerusalem. If so, Yahweh’s vengeance on Babylon for His royal residence may connote the re-election of the Jerusalem Temple as the dwelling place of the divine King.\textsuperscript{78} Hence, we can infer from the oracles in Jer\textsuperscript{MT} 50:28 and 51:11 that the Jerusalem Temple came to play a significant role in interpreting and conceptualizing Babylon’s seventy years and, by implication, the promised restoration revealed through Jeremiah’s prophecy of ‘seventy years.’

\textsuperscript{77}Cf. James M. Scott, ed., \textit{Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives} (JSJSup 72; Leiden; Boston; Köln: Brill, 2001), 1–7. Although the idea of restoration may vary, the continuity issue is important to it since the basic concept of restoration is an attempt “to reestablish in whole or in part earlier conditions that prevailed before a major change took place” (p. 2). On the significance of the Temple vessels for the continuity issue, see P. R. Ackroyd, “The Temple Vessels — A Continuity Theme,” in \textit{Studies in the Religion of Ancient Israel} (VTSup 23; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972), 166–181.

\textsuperscript{78}This reflects the theocratic ideology of Second Temple Judaism and, therefore, may be likened to the perspective of the Chronicler who also interpreted Jeremiah’s prophecy of ‘seventy years’ in close association with the restoration of the Jerusalem Temple. It is also possible that the idea of כִּי תֵּכֹסַת הָעֵדֶל developed against the backdrop of the Antiochene crisis and the ensuing Maccabean restoration in the 2nd century B.C.E.
These oracles that attest to Jeremiah’s historical and theological significance for the Temple reflect, in all likelihood, the post-Babylonian and post-repatriation perspective of the authors/redactors who concerned themselves over the fate of the Temple and continued to read and interpret the received traditions of Jeremiah in order to authorize their ideas of restoration centred on a new temple in Jerusalem. In this respect, it is also very likely that the idea of Yahweh’s vengeance on Babylon for His royal palace served to reinforce Jeremiah’s pro-Temple significance vis-à-vis the Second Temple. Jeremiah’s oracles could provide a theological remedy to the Second Temple community by affirming God’s re-election of, and re-commitment to, the Jerusalem Temple as His central sanctuary. Moreover, the affirmation that Yahweh acts on behalf of the Jerusalem Temple and even takes vengeance for it must have undergirded the sanctity and legitimacy of the Second Temple and have functioned as a kind of Temple propaganda not only to those who were disappointed with the reality of the Second Temple but also to the foreigners who would approach it without caution and reverence. Hence, it is not difficult to imagine that these Temple-oriented oracles affirmed and reinforced Jeremiah’s ongoing theological significance and relevance for the Second Temple community.

2.3.3 Seventy Years

There is no question that the prophecy of ‘seventy years’ played a central role in the development of Jeremiah as a prophet of exile and restoration. Yet the promised restoration that is conceptually associated with the ‘seventy years’ prophecy was interpreted differently in Jer^LXX and Jer^MT. The idea of restoration centred on the city and Temple of Jerusalem continued to develop in Jer^MT and, accordingly, the idea of exile was no longer tied to the historical experience of the Babylonian captivity in the 6th century B.C.E. This indicates that the seventy-year period of exile was also
construed differently in Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} and Jer\textsuperscript{MT}.

Let us begin with Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} 25. We read in this passage that God will bring the tribe of the north against Judah and the nations around it, and that the whole land shall be desolate for seventy years. When seventy years are completed, God will judge that tribe from the north and put it into a perpetual desolation. The implication is that the seventy years of the desolation of Judah will end with the divine punishment of the enemy from the north. This passage is directly followed by the Oracles Against the Nations (henceforth, OAN) in Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} 25:14–31:44. This allows us to contextualize the Babylonian destruction of Judah and the surrounding nations in the historical process of Yahweh’s judgment of the nations which shall continue for seventy years. Moreover, the fact that Babylon is found among the nations to be punished by God suggests that the OAN implicitly refers to the completion of Babylon’s seventy years. Yet the OAN is followed by another intriguing passage about Yahweh’s universal judgment in Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} 32. According to this passage, all the kingdoms on the face of the earth must drink from the cup of wrath just as Jerusalem did. Noteworthy is that “the kings of the Persians” are mentioned in 32:11. This seems to indicate that, from the viewpoint of a scribal author/redactor, the downfall of Babylon lies in the past. This passage thus reveals the post-Babylonian perspective that Yahweh’s universal judgment continues beyond Babylon’s seventy years.

Yahweh’s universal judgment is also announced in Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} 51:31–35 [MT 45:1–5]: the disaster is coming upon all flesh. Yet there is hope in that God promises life to Baruch.\textsuperscript{79} What follows is the historical appendix in Jeremiah 52. This historical narrative shows that Yahweh’s universal judgment continues beyond Babylon’s seventy years.

judgment has indeed begun with the destruction of Judah and Jerusalem as declared in Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} 32. Yet there is an intimation of hope in 52:31–34 in that the turn in the fate of King Jehoiachin may connote a turning point in the seventy-year period of exile.\textsuperscript{80} When these concluding chapters are read together, the historical narrative that takes note of the fate of King Jehoiachin seems to demonstrate how the divine promise of life given to the righteous has been, or is to be, manifested during the time of God’s universal judgment.

Note that there is no clear indication in Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} that Jeremiah’s prophecy of ‘seventy years’ failed. Judah and Jerusalem were destroyed by the nation from the north, Babylon, and the Babylonian captivity began. The mention of Persia in 32:11, if it is indicative of the author’s/redactor’s post-Babylonian perspective, shows that the divine punishment of Babylon also took place as declared by the prophet Jeremiah. Nevertheless, Yahweh’s universal judgment that began with Judah and Jerusalem seems to continue in history. It is plausible that the ongoing dispersion of the Jewish people during the Second Temple period influenced and reinforced the idea of the ongoing period of divine wrath. Yet in Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} there is no indication that Jeremiah’s prophecy of ‘seventy years’ was reinterpreted to deal with the problem of an incomplete return/restoration (cf. Jer\textsuperscript{MT} 29:10–14). This means that in Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} the ‘seventy years’ prophecy is not central to the theological and hermeneutical framework through which to interpret the unfolding history of the people beyond Babylon’s seventy years. More central is the overarching theological perspective that Yahweh’s universal judgment is not yet over. In this regard, it is noteworthy that Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} climaxes with Jeremiah’s oracles concerning the disaster coming upon all flesh and the divine promise of life

\textsuperscript{80}As Christopher R. Seitz has noted, “the thirty-seventh year” may signal that “the exiled community has served over half of its requisite seventy-year term.” See Seitz, “The Prophet Moses and the Canonical Shape of Jeremiah,” 27.
given to Baruch.\textsuperscript{81} Jeremiah’s final message thus becomes a theodic assurance of the salvation of righteous individuals through the time of Yahweh’s universal punishment.

Compare Jer\textsuperscript{MT} 25. The nation from the north is identified as Babylon, and its king is designated as God’s servant. As indicated earlier, this designation theodicizes the Babylonian destruction of Judah and Jerusalem as the manifestation of God’s sovereign power over the world and its history.\textsuperscript{82} The completion of Babylon’s seventy years is also theodicized in the sense that God punishes the king of Babylon and his kingdom “for their iniquity” (v. 12). In Jer\textsuperscript{MT} 25, therefore, Jeremiah’s prophecy of ‘seventy years’ subordinates even the fate of Babylon to the theological principle of a retributive theodicy operating effectively in a divinely-governed world. The implication is that divine justice and power, once manifested in the punishment of Judah and Jerusalem, will be manifested again ultimately in the punishment of Babylon and its king.

In this regard, the position of the OAN is noteworthy. In Jer\textsuperscript{MT} the OAN does not immediately follow Jeremiah’s prophecy of ‘seventy years’ in ch. 25. The entire OAN is placed at the end of Jer\textsuperscript{MT} and the oracles against Babylon are placed at the end of the OAN. Hence, Jer\textsuperscript{MT} climaxes with Jeremiah’s oracles concerning Yahweh’s vengeance on Babylon for His people, city and Temple (chs. 50–51). A short account of Jeremiah’s scroll sent to Seraiah in Babylon immediately follows the oracles against Babylon and confirms the message of Babylon’s perpetual desolation.

\textsuperscript{81}There is also Ebed-melech the Ethiopian who receives a similar promise of life when the city is captured (Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} 46:15–18 [MT 39:15–18]).

\textsuperscript{82}Babylon is viewed as one of the nations like Assyria, God’s instrument in punishing Israel (Isa 10:5–6). Similarly, King Nebuchadnezzar is viewed as one of the foreign rulers like Cyrus of Persia, whom God summoned to serve His purpose in history (Isa 44:28–45:7; 2 Chr 36:22–23).
Moreover, the colophon at the end of 51:64 forms a nice inclusio with the superscription at the very beginning of Jer\textsuperscript{MT} 1:1: “The words of Jeremiah” (1:1) — “Thus far are the words of Jeremiah” (51:64). This inclusio, which is missing in Jer\textsuperscript{LXX}, frames the entire book of Jer\textsuperscript{MT} as the collection of Jeremiah’s prophetic words that culminate, neither in God’s punishment of Judah and Jerusalem nor in God’s universal judgment, but in God’s punishment of Babylon for its iniquity. This clearly indicates that Jer\textsuperscript{MT} displays a thematic movement \textit{from} destruction/exile \textit{to} return/restoration which correlates with the rise and fall of Babylon.\footnote{B. Gosse, “La malédiction contre Babylone de Jérémie 51,59–64 et les rédactions du livre de Jérémie,” \textit{ZAW} 98 (1986): 383–399. Gosse compares Jer 36 and 51:59–64. The former speaks of Jeremiah’s scroll to Baruch and the latter speaks of Jeremiah’s scroll to Seraiah, brother of Baruch. Both scrolls are read and then destroyed. Yet the destruction of the scroll signals the destruction of Judah in ch. 36 and that of Babylon in 51:59–64. Gosse thus suggests that the structure of Jer\textsuperscript{MT} shows the shift of focus from the malediction against Jerusalem to the malediction against Babylon; idem, “The Masoretic Redaction of Jeremiah: An Explanation,” \textit{JSOT} 77 (1998): 75–80.}

Yet, as John Hill has cogently argued, the figure of Babylon in Jer\textsuperscript{MT} is more than the historical kingdom of the Chaldeans.\footnote{Cf. In his discussion of the macrostructure of Jer\textsuperscript{MT}, Allen (\textit{Jeremiah}, 12–14) has argued for the amplification of the future hope in Jer\textsuperscript{MT}. Also see Louis Stulman, \textit{Order Amid Chaos: Jeremiah as Symbolic Tapestry} (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998).} In Jer\textsuperscript{MT} 25, Babylon first appears as the historical kingdom that destroys Judah (vv. 1–11), but it becomes Sheshach in the context of Yahweh’s universal judgment (vv. 15–26). Although Sheshach is a code name for Babylon, it cannot be unequivocally identified as the kingdom of the Chaldeans since Sheshach is the last world kingdom to be punished by God. That is, the divine punishment of the king of Sheshach would signal the termination of the entire historical process of Yahweh’s universal judgment. By virtue of its identification with Sheshach, Babylon becomes a metaphor for the last evil nation to be punished

in the latter days. According to Hill, the figure of Babylon in Jer\textsuperscript{MT} “cannot be identified with any particular nation or region, or with any particular period of history. . . Babylon stands apart from the other nations of the world as a figure of mystery.”\textsuperscript{86}

Such a development of the figure of Babylon has direct implications for the interpretation of ‘seventy years’ in Jer\textsuperscript{MT}. The seventy-year period of exile becomes a metaphorical and ideological time that lasts until the divine punishment of the king(dom) of Sheshach at an indefinite point of time in the future.\textsuperscript{87} In this regard, it is truly significant that Sheshach is mentioned again in the oracles against Babylon in Jer\textsuperscript{MT} 51:41. This allows us to interpret all the oracles against Babylon as the oracles against Sheshach, the last evil gentile kingdom to be punished by God for assaulting God’s people, city and Temple. These oracles, as the concluding words of the prophet Jeremiah, attest to the ongoing expectation of the termination of the ‘seventy’ symbolic time of exile which will be marked by Yahweh’s vengeance on Babylon/Sheshach, and such an expectation attests to the growing Jewish perception that the ‘Babylonian’ exile is an ongoing reality.\textsuperscript{88} Most probably, the historical awareness that a ‘Babylon’ to be avenged for God’s people, city and Temple continued to appear in history contributed to the development of Babylon as a symbolic figure of Sheshach in Jer\textsuperscript{MT}.

What is corollary to the idea of continuing exile is that Jeremiah’s prophecy of ‘seventy years’ is

\textsuperscript{86}Hill, Friend or Foe?, 126.


yet to be fulfilled. The fact that Jer\textsuperscript{MT} climaxes with Jeremiah’s oracles against Babylon/Sheshach strongly suggests that, for those who developed the masoretic tradition of Jeremiah, Jeremiah’s prophecy of ‘seventy years’ functioned as the central theological and hermeneutical framework through which to interpret the unfolding history of the people during the Second Temple period. It is also very likely that the historical narrative in Jeremiah 52, immediately following the oracles against Babylon/Sheshach, reinforced the idea of ongoing exile by placing the readers/audience of the book in the middle of the ‘Babylonian’ exile (cf. 51:31, “the thirty-seventh years”). The historical appendix thus created a symbolic world of ‘exile’ in which the fulfilment of Jeremiah’s prophecy of ‘seventy years’ for the destruction of Babylon/Sheshach and the restoration of God’s people, city and Temple continued to be anticipated. In Jer\textsuperscript{MT}, therefore, we can discern that the idea of continuing exile provided an important historical and theological lens through which the prophet Jeremiah and his words were viewed and (re-)interpreted. The scribal authors/redactors, trying to understand their present and future in light of Jeremiah’s legacy, continued to anticipate the fulfilment of the promised restoration through the changing fate of God’s people, city and Temple during the Second Temple period. It is not difficult to imagine that Jeremiah’s enduring significance for exile and restoration was reinforced in keeping with the growing perception of a continuing state of exile and the ongoing expectation of the fulfilment of restoration promised through the prophet Jeremiah.

2.3.4 Summary

In Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} the land motif is central to the construction of Jeremiah as the prophet of exile and restoration. Since exile is understood in its literal sense, Jeremiah’s prophecy of ‘seventy years’ is also interpreted mainly as a reference to the captivity and the return of the Babylonian exiles.
The fact that Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} climaxes with Jeremiah’s words about the salvation of the righteous (such as Baruch and Ebed-melech) allows us to conjecture that the idea of exile and restoration associated with the prophecy of ‘seventy years’ was not fundamental to the overall structure and message of Jer\textsuperscript{LXX}. In Jer\textsuperscript{MT} we discern that the idea of exile and restoration associated with the prophet Jeremiah continued to develop and expand over time. The growing concern with the fate of Jerusalem and the Temple and also with the fate of ‘Babylon’ indicates that the Jeremiah figure, with his prophecy of ‘seventy years,’ came to reveal his timeless significance for exile and restoration in keeping with the developing idea of continuing exile under foreign domination. We can thus see in Jer\textsuperscript{MT} that the ongoing reflections on, and interpretations of, the fate of God’s people, city and Temple within the conceptual framework of destruction/exile and return/restoration were crucial to the ongoing development of Jeremiah’s historical and theological significance as the prophet of exile and restoration.

2.4 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have shown, comparing Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} and Jer\textsuperscript{MT}, that the textually-presented Jeremiah is a literary-theological figure who was interpreted and constructed according to the concerns and interests of scribal authors/redactors. In both Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} and Jer\textsuperscript{MT}, the motifs of land, city, temple and ‘seventy years’ played a significant role in constructing the Jeremiah figure as a “pro-society” prophet. His ministry was geared towards the well-being of Judah, Jerusalem and its inhabitants. The well-being of the remnant community in the land, the well-being of the exiled community in Babylon during the seventy years of servitude and its future return/restoration were also Jeremiah’s major concerns. However, Jeremiah’s historical and theological significance as the prophet of exile and restoration was interpreted and constructed differently in Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} and Jer\textsuperscript{MT} in accordance
with the idea of exile and restoration developed in each tradition. In Jer LXX exile is understood in its ordinary sense of the term. Hence, the primary meaning of restoration associated with Jeremiah is the return of the exiles to the land. In Jer MT the idea of exile and restoration is anchored not only in the land but also in the city and Temple of Jerusalem since the scribal authors/redactors who continued to read and interpret Jeremiah materials concerned themselves over the fate of the city and the Temple beyond Babylon’s seventy years. They attributed their ideas of exile and restoration to Jeremiah and developed him as the prophet of exile and restoration who has enduring significance for the unfolding fate of Jerusalem and the Temple through the Second Temple period.

It is most likely that the growing Jewish perception of an ongoing ‘exilic’ condition during the Second Temple period also influenced the interpretation of the Jeremiah tradition and contributed to the development of Jeremiah’s ongoing relevance and significance as the prophet of exile and restoration. Thus we see in Jer MT that the author/redactor reinterpreted the figure of Babylon as a metaphor for Sheshach and reconceptualized the period of ‘seventy years’ as a metaphorical time of exile that would last until the divine punishment of the king(dom) of Babylon/Sheshach and the divine fulfilment of the restoration of God’s people, city and Temple. This clearly indicates that Jeremiah’s significance for exile and restoration came to transcend the original historical context of the 6th century B.C.E., and that Jeremiah came to be recontextualized and reconstructed through the ongoing Jewish conceptualizations of exile and restoration across and beyond the Second Temple period. The development of Jeremiah that we observe in Jer MT was not achieved all at once. It was the product of the scribal activity extending over a long period of time and involving multiple scribes.
Chapter 3
The Babylonian Crisis and the Reconstruction under Persian Rule

In the previous chapter, we have considered the development of the Jeremiah figure in two textual traditions, JerLXX and JerMT. We have identified some of the central motifs that are closely associated with the prophet Jeremiah and observed that Jeremiah’s “pro-society” function, especially his pro-Jerusalem and pro-Temple Tendenz, continued to develop as an important feature of the Jeremiah figure. Despite his historical association with the Babylonian destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple, it was his pro-Jerusalem and pro-Temple Tendenz that was remembered and promoted as the tradition grew (especially in JerMT). In the present chapter, I will turn to Lamentations and 2 Chronicles and consider what these texts inform us about the development of Jeremiah’s historical and theological significance during the Babylonian and Persian periods.

The name ‘Jeremiah’ does not appear in LamentationsMT, but the authorship of Jeremiah is noted in LamLXX 1:1: “And it happened, after Israel was taken captive and Jerusalem was laid waste, Jeremiah sat weeping and gave this lament over Jerusalem . . .” LamentationsLXX is a witness to the interpretive traditions that ascribed the lament over the destruction and suffering of Jerusalem to the prophet Jeremiah. Although the authorship of Jeremiah is not indicated in LamentationsMT, the fact that an anonymous narrator is constructed as a Jeremianic lamenter is truly significant as we try to understand how the prophet Jeremiah was remembered and perceived.

---
89The authorship of Jeremiah is noted in later translations of Lamentations, all of which postdate 70 C.E. (The LXX, Peshitta, Vulgate and Targum of Lamentations). The Jeremianic authorship of Lamentations may shed light on the interpretative traditions that gradually theologized the destructions of Jerusalem and the First and the Second Temple as God’s just punishment for covenant disobedience.
in the post-destruction Judahite context during the Babylonian period. In order to facilitate the discussion, I will first examine the lament tradition in Jeremiah 4–10 before I turn to a Jeremianic narrator’s discourse in Lamentations.90

The configuration of Jeremiah in the Chronicler’s historiography is also important since we find here a clear example of the post-reconstruction interpretation and reception of the Jeremiah tradition by a group of Jerusalem scribes during the Persian period. In 2 Chronicles, the prophet Jeremiah is presented as a royal lamenter and advisor, and he is implicitly understood as the last of Yahweh’s servants and prophets persistently sent to the people. Jeremiah’s prophecy of ‘seventy years’ is interpreted in order to show that ṭבֵּרכְּרָה הַיָּדֹעַ revealed through the prophet Jeremiah has been completely fulfilled in history. By examining how Jeremiah’s legacy was interpreted from the viewpoint of the reconstituted Jerusalem community, we will be able to discern how Jeremiah’s historical and theological significance was perceived and constructed during the Persian period.

I will argue in this chapter that Lamentations and 2 Chronicles played a crucial role in developing and reinforcing Jeremiah’s pro-Jerusalem and pro-Temple significance in relation to the unfolding fate of Jerusalem and the Temple from destruction to restoration through the Babylonian and Persian periods.

90Konrad Schmid, considering the judgment oracles in Jeremiah 4–10 as secondary accretions, has argued that the very beginning of the literary tradition of Jeremiah may be found in laments, the only literary tradition which may be traced to the historical Jeremiah. Schmid understands Jeremiah’s laments as a theological response to the collapse of the Zion theology. See Schmid, The Old Testament: A Literary History, trans. Linda M. Maloney (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012), 126–130. Jeremiah’s laments in Jer 4–10 must be distinguished from his confessions/complaints in Jer 11–20 that are more closely linked to the rejection and persecution of the prophet Jeremiah. On the theological and hermeneutical aspects of Jeremiah’s confessions/complaints, see Kathleen M. O’Connor, The Confessions of Jeremiah: Their Interpretation and Role in Chapters 1–25 (SBLDS 94; Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1988); A. R. Diamond, The Confessions of Jeremiah in Context: Scenes of Prophetic Drama (JSOTSup 45; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987).
3.1 The Laments in Jeremiah 4–10

3.1.1 The Figures of Jeremiah and Jerusalem

One of the striking features of the poetic material in the book of Jeremiah is the presence of multiple speaking voices. Terence E. Fretheim has correctly noted that these multiple voices give the text a dialogical character and that they convey multiple theological viewpoints about the disaster. In Jer 4:5ff., Yahweh’s plan to bring evil (אָשֵׁר/κακά) from the north is declared to the people of Judah and Jerusalem. The voice of the people in 4:8 expresses their confusion and fear before the impending destruction. We hear Jeremiah’s voice in 4:10. Jeremiah complains that Yahweh has deceived the people and Jerusalem with the words of peace when the sword is at their throat:

Then I said, “Ah, Lord God, how utterly you have deceived this people and Jerusalem, saying, ‘It shall be well with you,’ even while the sword is at the throat!”

Jeremiah’s complaint implies that Yahweh’s prophets failed to warn the people and Jerusalem in advance so that they might turn from their evil ways and avoid a great destruction (cf. Jer 14:13–14; Lam 2:14). What is noteworthy about Jeremiah’s complaint is that it reveals Jeremiah’s concern for the people and the city. Hence, it is not surprising to see that Jeremiah himself begins to exhort Jerusalem to repent of its evil (אָשֵׁר/κακία) in 4:14 and 18. Jeremiah’s exhortation and warning show that he is a true prophet of the Lord who has been sent to save Jerusalem and its inhabitants:

Wash the wickedness of your heart, O Jerusalem, so that you may be saved. How long will you lodge in your midst your evil scheme?

---

18 Your ways and your doings have brought this upon you. This is your doom; how bitter it is! For it has reached your heart.

Jeremiah’s exhortation in v. 14 is for the sake of the salvation of Jerusalem from the approaching evil (רעה/רעה). Although his lament – “How long?” – points to Jerusalem’s persistence in evil, the lament form of his reaction to Jerusalem’s unrepentance shows that he has deep concern for its safety and well-being. He warns Jerusalem in v. 18: Jerusalem’s ‘evil heart’ that is mentioned in v. 14 brings ‘evil’ to the very ‘heart’ of the city. Here, the prophet Jeremiah, unlike the prophets of peace, affirms the principle of a retributive theodicy and tries to persuade Jerusalem to turn from its evil ways and doings.

The immediately following lament in Jer 4:19–21 must be read in conjunction with 10:19–24 in order to identify its speaking voice:

Jer² 4:19–21
19 My belly, I feel pain in my belly and in the faculties of my heart. My soul quivers with excitement! My heart is beating wildly; I cannot keep silent, because my soul heard a trumpet sound, a cry of war. 20 And distress calls upon disaster, because the whole land has become distressed. Suddenly the tent has become distressed, my skins torn up. 21 How long will I see people fleeing, while I hear the sound of trumpets?

Jerᵢ 4:19–21
19a My anguish, my anguish! I writhe in pain! Oh the walls of my heart! My heart is beating wildly; I cannot keep silent, for I hear the sound of the trumpet sound, the alarm of war. 20 Disaster overtakes disaster, the whole land is laid waste. Suddenly my tents are destroyed, my curtains in a moment. 21 How long must I see the standard, and hear the sound of trumpet?

Jerₓ 10:19–24
19 Woe because of your fracture! Your plague is painful. So I said, “Truly this is my wound, and it seized me.”

Jerᵢ 10:19–24
19a Woe is me because of my hurt! My wound is severe. But I said, “Truly this is my punishment, and I must bear it.”
My tent endured hardship, and all my skins\(^c\) were torn; my sons and my sheep are no more; there is no longer a place for my tent, a place for my curtains.\(^c\)

Correct us, O Lord, but in just measure and not in anger so that you may not make us few.

My tent is destroyed, and all my cords\(^d\) are broken; my children have gone from me, and they are no more; there is no one to spread my tent again, and to set up my curtains.\(^d\)

Correct me, O Lord, but in just measure; not in your anger, or you will bring me to nothing.

In both Jer\(^{LXX}\) and Jer\(^{MT}\), it is Lady Jerusalem who laments in 4:19–21. Compare 4:19–21 and 10:20.\(^92\) In both passages, the lament over “my skins”/“my curtains”/“my tents” indicates that Lady Jerusalem is the one who laments over the destruction of the Temple.\(^93\) Lady Jerusalem’s laments are important to an understanding of how the Jerusalem figure is constructed and presented in the text. As noted above, Jeremiah has exhorted Jerusalem to repentance in 4:14 and 18, and Lady Jerusalem begins to lament in vv. 19–21. Jerusalem’s lament of “how long” in v. 21 expresses her strong expectation of God’s deliverance and/or her disappointment in God’s failure to provide

---


timely deliverance. The lament form of Jerusalem’s reaction to Jeremiah’s exhortation is indicative of Jerusalem’s unrepentance, and the content of her lament shows her blind trust in her inviolability in accordance with the popular Zion ideology. As Jerusalem refuses to respond to Jeremiah’s exhortation, God also refuses to respond to her lament. Although God begins to speak in v. 22, He speaks only about Jerusalem’s lack of knowledge, thereby justifying her punishment and destruction. Such a broken dialogue among the speakers is an important rhetorical device that reveals the diverging viewpoints about the destruction of Jerusalem and theodicyizes the destruction by emphasizing Jerusalem’s failure to respond to Jeremiah’s call to repentance.

However, a change in Jerusalem’s attitude is clearly indicated in Jer\textsuperscript{MT} 10:19–24. Jerusalem’s lament in vv. 19–20 is more than an implicit protest that her suffering and destruction are unjustified.\footnote{Compare Jer\textsuperscript{LXX}. If the speaker in v. 19 is Lady Jerusalem, her words in v. 19 are an implicit complaint about Yahweh’s severe punishment. Such is not the case in Jer\textsuperscript{MT} 10:19.} Although she laments the loss of the Temple and her children in v. 20, Lady Jerusalem is now willing to accept God’s pedagogical and corrective chastisement (v. 19). Hence, she says in v. 24, “Discipline me, O Lord” (המרני יהוה). This is Jerusalem’s belated yet positive response to Yahweh’s exhortation which was given to her in 6:8: “Be disciplined, O Jerusalem” (הרשיר ירושלם). In this respect, Jerusalem’s response to Yahweh in 10:24 may be understood as a form of repentance.\footnote{Walter Brueggemann, \textit{A Commentary on Jeremiah: Exile & Homecoming} (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1998), 108. Brueggemann interprets the prayer in v. 24 as an act of repentance.} Moreover, Jerusalem says that God must discipline in just measure so that she may not become naught. The implication is that Yahweh’s discipline must ensure not only her survival but also her future restoration.\footnote{Cf. G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren, eds., \textit{Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament}, vol. VI, trans. David E. Green (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1990), 127–134. The use of צות in the sense of ‘punish’ without pedagogical or remedial overtones is found in only a few passages in the Hebrew Bible. In most}
theological figure in the lament tradition in Jer$^{MT}$ 4–10: her unrepentance and repentance are closely associated with her destruction and restoration respectively.

A supplicant in Jer$^{LXX}$ 10:24 is, in all likelihood, the prophet Jeremiah who prays to God on behalf of the suffering Jerusalem and her children, identifying himself with them: “Discipline us, O Lord” ($\pi\alpha\delta\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\sigma\omicron\nu \varepsilon\mu\omicron \varsigma \kappa\omicron\rho\iota\varepsilon$). Here, Jeremiah takes the principle of an educative theodicy into consideration and pleads with God that He should discipline them in justice, not in wrath. He continues to say in v. 25 that divine wrath must fall upon the nations that devoured Jacob-Israel. Yahweh’s response to Jeremiah’s plea is found in Jer$^{LXX}$26[46]:27–28. There, Yahweh announces that He will not make an end of Jacob-Israel and that He will discipline him in just measure.$^{98}$

Jeremiah’s sympathy and empathy with the people is also well developed in his laments. Consider Jer 8:21–23:

8$^{21}$ For the hurt of “my poor people” I am hurt, I mourn, and dismay has taken hold of me. מיריתו רashi כותֹ יאנה קוךירית

23 $^{b}$ that my head were a spring of water, $^{b}$ and my eyes a fountain of tears, so that I might weep day and night for the slain of “my poor people”! מיריתו ראש מימ ניצין מוקר תמאה וא ล้านוכנסוים יים ולילה עשתו הליל בחרעים

a-a. lit. “Daughter My People”
b-b. lit. “Who will give my head water”

Jeremiah’s genuine concern and love for the people are clearly reflected in the expression, “my

cases, the Hebrew word רפח is pregnant with the hope of regeneration and restoration.


$^{98}$Jer$^{LXX}$ 10:24–25 and 26:27–28 are the only two places where the idea of Yahweh’s just chastisement of the people is found. In Jer$^{MT}$ Yahweh’s promise of just discipline is found in the Book of Consolation 30:10–11 in addition to 46:27–28.
poor people” (lit. Daughter My People, הבנות ממי)

Jeremiah identifies their rushing as his own (8:21) and expresses his wish to weep constantly for the slain among the beloved people (8:23 [ET 9:1]). Jeremiah the weeping prophet is thus portrayed as a sympathetic and empathetic lamenter over the destruction of “Daughter My People.”

Jeremiah also summons the dirge-singers, professional female lamenters and all the women of Judah and Jerusalem to come and lament the fate of Jerusalem in Jer 9:16–21:[ET 17–22]:

Jeremiah emerges in this passage as an archetypal lamenter for Jerusalem who creates a communal

---


100Jer52:8:21: ἐπὶ συντρίμμιαι θυματρὸς λαοῦ μου ἐσκοτῶθην (“Due to the brokenness of Daughter My People, I am in darkness”). NETS translates, “Because of a fracture of the daughter of my people, I was made dizzy.” Although the 'hurt(שֶׁרר)-hurt(שֶׁרר)' correspondence in JerMT is missing in JerLXX, we can still see that Jeremiah’s sympathy and empathy with the beloved people are well expressed in his lament in JerLXX.
voice of lamentation and personally engages in it. He is portrayed as teaching the women how to lament and what to lament (vv. 19–20[20–21]). Yet we see in v. 18[19] that Jeremiah is also the one who hears the sound of wailing from Zion. The present passage thus reveals Jeremiah’s physical and emotional proximity to Jerusalem’s destruction and suffering as an archetypal lamenter for Jerusalem.

3.1.2 Summary

In Jeremiah 4–10, Jeremiah’s genuine concern for the people and the city is expressed in his exhortations and laments. Lady Jerusalem’s laments, recapitulating the popular Zion ideology, indirectly point to her failure to respond to Jeremiah’s exhortation to repentance. Yet the development of the figure of Jerusalem in JerMT 4–10 as a ‘round’ character, whose attitude changes from unrepentance to repentance, attests to the growing concern with the fate of Jerusalem in the developing tradition of Jeremiah and, by implication, the growing perception of Jeremiah’s close association with the unfolding fate of Jerusalem from destruction to restoration. As will be shown below, the memory of Jeremiah as a sympathetic and empathetic lamenter and the perception of his deep concern for the fate of the city and the people are most likely to have influenced the development of the lament tradition in the post-destruction Jerusalem community as it was trying to come to terms with the disaster and to find consolation and hope in the midst of its suffering.

3.2. The Book of Lamentations

The book of Lamentations is a collection of five poems composed in response to the Babylonian destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple. It is generally accepted today that Lamentations
expresses the excessive suffering and extreme pain of survivors by utilizing literary-cultural conventions such as city-laments from the ANE.\(^{101}\) The vivid and detailed description of pain and suffering, the lack of specific references to sin and guilt, and the absence of the voice of God have brought scholarly attention to ‘antitheodicy’\(^{102}\) or the lack of a clear theodic dimension in Lamentations.\(^{103}\) In the same vein, Elizabeth Boase and Carleen R. Mandolfo have recently discussed the subversion of the traditional theological ideas and motifs in Lamentations. Boase has suggested that Lamentations underlines the excessive suffering of Jerusalem by challenging the prophetic motifs, such as the correspondence between sin and punishment.\(^{104}\) Similarly, Mandolfo has argued that Daughter Zion finds her own voice in Lamentations against the prophetic construction of Zion which is dominated by the male-oriented divine/prophetic hegemony.\(^{105}\)

However, an anti-prophetic and subversive aspect of Lamentations must not be overemphasized. We find in the first chapter of Lamentations a clear theodic perspective on the catastrophe as God’s punishment for sin: Lady Jerusalem acknowledges her own transgression and rebellion in

---


\(^{104}\) Elizabeth Boase, *The Fulfilment of Doom?*: *The Dialogic Interaction Between the Book of Lamentations and the pre-exilic/early exilic Prophetic Literature* (JSOTSup 437; New York: T&T Clark, 2006).

\(^{105}\) Carleen R. Mandolfo, *Daughter Zion Talks Back to the Prophets: A Dialogic Theology of the Book of Lamentations* (Atlanta: SBL, 2007). Mandolfo even criticizes the view that Second Isaiah is a prophetic response to Lamentations. According to Mandolfo, the divine response in Second Isaiah does not resolve any issue raised in Lamentations since Second Isaiah speaks of the future of the *Golah* community without dealing with the excessive suffering which Jerusalem has been enduring under the divine hegemony.
We also hear in the third chapter of Lamentations a call to repentance as well as traditional theodic affirmations about God (3:22–23, 40–42). Moreover, the prophetic construction of Zion is not always dominated by the male-oriented divine/prophetic hegemony. Jeremiah is a case in point. As mentioned above, Jeremiah’s complaint to Yahweh points out that the prophets of peace are responsible for the destruction of the people and the city (Jer 4:10). Jeremiah’s sympathetic and empathetic lament for the beloved people is imbued with mixed feelings about the great pain and suffering that God inflicts upon them (8:21–23). Lady Jerusalem, while lamenting the destruction and captivity of her children, demands Yahweh’s just discipline (Jer\(^\text{MT}\) 10:24). In this respect, the prophetic construction of Zion cannot be simplified into a single, homogeneous idea of prophetic condemnation.\(^{107}\)

That said, it is truly significant that we find in Lamentations not only a lamenting Jerusalem but also a Jeremianic narrator. In her study on Lamentations, Nancy C. Lee has identified this unnamed narrator as the prophet Jeremiah on the basis of the shared language, imagery, rhetoric and content, and she has argued that the presence of the voice of Jeremiah in Lamentations renders the book an “extension” of the book of Jeremiah.\(^{108}\) Although intertextuality does not necessarily

\(^{106}\)Precisely for this reason, William S. Morrow argues that Lamentations accommodates the prophetic perspective on the destruction with the protest. Morrow, therefore, thinks that the prophetic tradition and the protest exist side by side, without cancelling each other’s voices. See Morrow, *Protest Against God: The Eclipse of a Biblical Tradition* (HBM 4; Sheffield: Phoenix Press, 2007), 106–119.

\(^{107}\)Continuity or compatibility between the lament and the prophetic tradition is clearly demonstrated in the Jeremiah tradition. Although Jeremiah’s laments and complaints in Jer 11–20 are not discussed in the present study, the contextual reading of them often reveals their theodic function of justifying Yahweh’s punishment of the city and the people who rejected Yahweh’s prophet. Nevertheless, as L. Stulman has argued, Jeremiah’s suffering and mistreatment cannot defend theodicy since he suffers innocently in his obedience to God. Stulman thus affirms that the book of Jeremiah contains both theodic and antitheodic strands. See L. Stulman, *Jeremiah* (AOTC; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2005), 32–34.

\(^{108}\)Nancy C. Lee, *The Singers of Lamentations: Cities under Siege, from Ur to Jerusalem to Sarajevo* (BIS 60; Leiden: Brill, 2002). 130.
prove the Jeremianic authorship of Lamentations, the fact that the narrator is constructed and portrayed as a Jeremianic figure suggests that the Jeremiah tradition had a great impact on the development of the lament tradition in the post-destruction Judahite context. Hence, we may endorse Lee’s argument to the degree that the book of Lamentations evinces the ongoing interpretation and appropriation of the Jeremiah tradition and the ongoing development of the Jeremiah figure. This is why the Jeremianic narrator in Lamentations is important to the present study. We can infer from this figure how the historical and theological significance of Jeremiah was perceived and constructed in the post-destruction Judah during the Babylonian period.

3.2.1. The Jeremianic Lamenter for the Suffering of Jerusalem

Let us begin with Lamentations 2. The Jeremianic narrator laments the destruction of God’s people, city and Temple and brings special attention to divine anger in vv. 1–10. He constantly notes that God destroyed them in anger (אָז; vv. 1, 3, 6), in wrath (שָׁרָה; v. 2), in fury (זָרַע; v. 4), in indignation (זָעָה; v. 6), without pity (לֹא אָלַה הָאָדָם; v. 2), like an enemy (נָאָוָה; vv. 4, 5) and like a foe (כָּרָא; v. 4). His lament almost functions as an implicit charge against God. Given Jeremiah’s (JerLXX) or Jerusalem’s (JerMT) petition for a just discipline in Jer 10:24, the narrator’s lament in Lam 2:1–10 seems to indicate that the present suffering of Jerusalem and its inhabitants cannot be viewed as God’s corrective chastisement in just measure. The narrator thus begins to lament the extreme suffering of the people in vv. 11–12, in which he assumes a distinctively Jeremianic persona:

11 My eyes are spent with tears;  
my stomach churns;  
my bile is poured out on the ground  
because of the destruction of my poor people,  
because infants and babes faint
in the squares of the city.

12 They cry to their mothers,
“where is bread and wine?”
as they faint like the slain
in the squares of the city,
as their life is poured out
on their mothers’ bosoms.

It is difficult to ignore the intertextual connection between this lament and Jer 8:21–23. The
“eyes” that are spent with “tears” for the children who faint like “the slain” are reminiscent of
Jeremiah’s words in Jer 8:23 [9:1], that he would weep day and night for “the slain” of the beloved
people if his “eyes” were a fountain of “tears.” The expression in Lam 2:11, “the destruction of
my poor people” (שבך הבתים), is undeniable evidence for the Jeremianic persona of the narrator
since this expression is unique to Jeremiah’s laments. The present lament is also very similar to
Jer 14:17–18:

17 Let my eyes run down with tears
for the virgin daughter my people is struck
down with a crushing blow
with a very grievous wound.
18 If I go out into the field,
look, those slain by the sword!
And if I enter the city,
look, those sick with famine!

In addition to the shared language (“eyes”/“tears”/“the slain”/“blow” [שבך]/“daughter my people”
[בתים]), we find in both texts that the lamenters laments a great famine in the city. When
Jeremiah’s laments in Jer 8:21–23 [9:1] and 14:17–18 are taken into consideration, it becomes
more evident that the narrator in Lam 2:11–12 is constructed as a Jeremianic lamentor. This
indicates that the memory and perception of the prophet Jeremiah as a sympathetic and empathetic
lamentor for the people and the city were vital to the development of the post-destruction lament
tradition. Conversely, it is also very likely that the developing lament tradition in the post-
destruction Jerusalem community reinforced the memory and perception of Jeremiah as an archetypal lamenter for Jerusalem and affirmed Jeremiah’s ongoing relevance and significance for Jerusalem during the Babylonian period.

It is noteworthy that the Jeremianic lamenter even identifies himself with Lady Jerusalem. In Lam 2:11, he repeats Jerusalem’s lament from 1:20. His lament over the suffering of innocent children in the city is also reflective of the experience of Mother Zion bereaved of her children which is mentioned in 1:16. The Jeremianic lamenter thus emerges as a co-lamenter with Jerusalem and reveals his pro-Jerusalem significance in terms of his complete solidarity with her.

We have already observed in the book of Jeremiah that Jeremiah’s pro-Jerusalem significance is revealed in his genuine concern for the protection and salvation of the city (cf. Jer 4:10; 5:4–5). His laments in Jer 8:21–23 [9:1] and 14:17–18 also demonstrate his sympathetic love for the people whose fate is sealed for destruction. Hence, the Jeremianic lamenter’s solidarity with the suffering Jerusalem may be viewed as a continuation of Jeremiah’s personality. It is very likely that the construction of such a Jeremianic lamenter reinforced Jeremiah’s significance as a pro-Jerusalem figure who has genuine concern for the fate of Jerusalem even after its destruction and through its suffering.

3.2.2 The Jeremianic Narrator for the Consolation of Jerusalem

The Jeremianic lamenter’s complete solidarity with the suffering Jerusalem is further revealed in Lam 2:13–19 where he directly speaks to her for the first time in Lamentations. Consider his

---

109 In Lam 1:20, “תמים תומactivo עמי” and in 2:11, “ינור ינור עמי.”

110 Lee, Singers of Lamentations, 149.
words in v. 13:

13 What can I say for you, to what compare you, O Daughter Jerusalem? To what can I liken you that I may comfort you, O Daughter Zion? 
   For your ruin is vast as the sea; Who can heal you?

a. emendation of אֲשָׁר may yield “what can I compare” (אֲשָׁר).
b-b. in LXX, וְיִשָּׁר is read וַיִּשָּׁר. Hence, “for the cup of your ruin was made great”

We can grasp a full significance of v. 13 when we read this verse in relation to Lamentations 1. There, Lady Jerusalem cries out to Yahweh to “look” and “see” her grievous destruction and suffering (vv. 9, 11, 20). Yet there is no response from God. This leads her to say repeatedly that there is no “comforter” (חַדַּר) for her (vv. 2, 9, 16, 17, 21). While God remains silent in Lamentations, the Jeremianic lamenter turns to Jerusalem and speaks to her in 2:13. He responds to her plea to “look” and “see” by indicating that he has acknowledged her great destruction that is beyond consolation and healing. In this way, he brings himself closer to ‘the city that sits alone without a comforter’ (cf. 1:1). Lee is indeed correct in arguing that this narrator performs the function of a comforter, especially when divine response to Jerusalem is absent in Lamentations.111

The Jeremianic narrator continues to speak to Jerusalem in 2:14–19. He attributes the destruction of Jerusalem to the prophets who saw lying visions and did not expose her iniquity (v. 14).112 He quotes the enemy’s taunt against Jerusalem (vv. 15–16) and says that Yahweh fulfilled what He had purposed “without pity” (v. 17). Yahweh as the subject of the verb לְעַבֵּד (“to purpose”) usually

---

111 Berlin (Lamentations, 73) sees in v. 13 the narrator’s inability to console Jerusalem. Yet Renkema (Lamentations, 278–9) suggests that the narrator speaks about the unavailability of consolation and healing from Yahweh. Lee (Singers of Lamentations, 161) builds upon Renkema’s suggestion and cogently argues that the presence of the Jeremianic narrator as a sympathetic and empathetic dialogic partner to Jerusalem offers comfort to her, especially when she receives no response from Yahweh throughout the book of Lamentations.

appears in the context of Yahweh’s just punishment for sin. However, the expression, “without pity” (לא חוסל) in v. 17, seriously undermines its theodic force since the destruction of Jerusalem is seen as the outcome of God’s merciless and wrathful punishment. Although the narrator’s words are directed to Jerusalem for her consolation, his words also function as an indirect charge against God and provide the theological grounds for demanding the vindication of Jerusalem. Hence, the Jeremianic narrator calls Lady Jerusalem to cry out to the Lord concerning her extreme suffering (vv. 18–19).

Jerusalem thus calls upon God to “see” and “look” what He has wrought on the day of His anger (vv. 20–22). The words of Jerusalem are in essence the recapitulation of the first chapter of Lamentations where she relates Yahweh’s punishment of her and her children, but we also find in 2:21 that Lady Jerusalem borrowed the Jeremianic narrator’s expression, “without pity” (cf. 2:2, 17):

\[2^{21} \text{You killed in the day of Your anger;} \]
\[\text{You slaughtered without pity.}\]

This is Lady Jerusalem’s implicit charge against Yahweh, that the disaster which has fallen upon her and her children cannot be viewed as Yahweh’s corrective chastisement and just discipline. Yahweh brought them to naught by slaughtering them “without pity” and failed to uphold divine justice in disciplining them (cf. Jer 10:24). Crucial here is that it is the Jeremianic narrator who gives the suffering Jerusalem a voice and a language of protest. He summons Lady Jerusalem to continue to cry to Yahweh so that He may reveal Himself as a just and merciful Judge by putting an end to the ongoing victimization of her and her children and by ensuring their present survival and future restoration.

\[^{113}\text{Cf. Jer 4:28; 51:12; Zech 1:6; 8:14.}\]
From the Jeremianic narrator’s special role of comforting Jerusalem, we can infer that the post-destruction Jerusalem community came to perceive Jeremiah, not merely as an archetypal lamenter who created a communal voice of lamentation for Jerusalem (cf. Jer 9:16–21), but also as a sympathetic companion who created a communal voice of protest for Jerusalem. In this respect, it is very likely that Jeremiah’s sympathetic and empathetic concern for the devastated Jerusalem became an essential part of the memory and perception of Jeremiah during the post-destruction period.

3.2.3 The Jeremianic Prophet for the Restoration of Jerusalem

As regards the restoration of Jerusalem, it is important to note that the Jeremianic narrator utters a Jeremianic oracle against Edom in Lam 4:21–22:

21 Rejoice and be glad, O daughter Edom, you that live in the land of Uz;
but to you also the cup shall pass; you shall become drunk and strip yourself bare.

22 The punishment of your iniquity, O daughter Zion, is accomplished, He will keep you in exile no longer; but your iniquity, O daughter Edom, he will punish; he will uncover your sins.

Edom’s drinking the cup in v. 21 is a Jeremianic motif taken from Jeremiah’s oracle in Jer 49:12. In the OAN from the book of Jeremiah, Edom is the only nation to which the imagery of ‘drinking the cup’ is applied. Also note that in the Hebrew Scripture the idea of Edom’s drinking the cup

---

114 Edom is also mentioned in Jer 25:21 as one among the many nations that must drink the cup, but in the OAN only Edom is to drink the cup.
appears only in the books of Jeremiah and Lamentations. This clearly indicates that the Jeremianic narrator is constructed as a prophet like Jeremiah in Lam 4:21–22. He, as a Jeremianic prophet, announces a great reversal of fate for Jerusalem and Edom and anticipates the restoration of Jerusalem. From the fact that Jeremiah’s oracle against Edom was used in order to assure the suffering community of Jerusalem of its future restoration, we can infer that the post-destruction Jerusalem community acknowledged and further promoted the prophet Jeremiah’s pro-Jerusalem significance for its unfolding fate from devastation to restoration.

True, in the book of Jeremiah, the archenemy of Jerusalem is Babylon. From the post-destruction Judahite perspective, however, the major problem was not merely the Babylonian destruction of Jerusalem but also its ongoing affliction by Edom. Hence, Lady Jerusalem identifies her “enemies” as those who rejoiced over her destruction by the Babylonians and pleads with God to punish them for their evil deeds (Lam 1:21–22). There is no response from God, but the Jeremianic narrator’s oracle against Edom in 4:21–22 serves as a direct response to Jerusalem’s plea: Edom may rejoice now but the time of its divine punishment shall surely come. The Jeremianic oracle that proclaims a reversal of fate in 4:21–22 strongly suggests that the prophet Jeremiah’s pro-Jerusalem significance for the restoration of Jerusalem was affirmed in the post-destruction Jerusalem community’s ongoing theological reflections on its present and future.

Some commentators say that the subsequent communal lament in Lamentations 5 diminishes the significance of the Jeremianic oracle concerning the future of Jerusalem. Jill Middlemas argues

---

that uncertainty and doubt about the future of Jerusalem in Lamentations 5 undermine the message of hope expressed in 4:22. Similarly, Dobbs-Allsopp suggests that, in view of Lamentations 5, the oracle in 4:22 expresses only “[a] faint hope.” It is possible that such was the perspective of the compilers and editors of Lamentations who placed the communal lament at the end of the book. Note, however, that Yahweh’s eternal sovereignty serves as the theological foundation upon which the Jerusalem community continues to lament until He responds to its pain and suffering:

5 But you, O Lord, reign forever; your throne endures to all generations.  
20 Why have you forgotten us completely? Why have you forsaken us these many days?

Here, the Jerusalem community’s ongoing lament expresses its faith and hope in the Lord. The community expects Yahweh, the King, to reveal His sovereign power by redeeming the people and the city from their continued affliction. Therefore, there is no compelling reason to deny that the Jeremianic oracle against Edom in 4:21–22 is the Jerusalem community’s concrete expression of its hope and assurance that Yahweh can bring salvation and restoration in the future.

3.2.4 Summary

We can infer from the construction of the Jeremianic narrator in Lamentations that the post-destruction Jerusalem community considered the prophet Jeremiah very important as it tried to

---


117Dobbs-Allsopp (*Lamentations*, 138) writes, “[T]he community is pictured as remaining very much in distress and Mount Zion itself is still in ruins . . . Therefore, the faint hope that these stanzas elicit is short lived, lasting only as long as it takes to start to read the sequence’s concluding poem.”

118Middlemas (*Templeless Judah*, 220–6) correctly notes that, unlike the form of the funeral dirge, the form of the lament/complaint that directs the second-person speech to Yahweh delivers a hope for the future.

grapple with the present suffering without losing hope. Jeremiah’s sympathetic and empathetic laments over the destruction of the people and the city and his oracle against Edom were remembered by the community, and this memory clearly influenced the construction of the Jeremianic narrator who stands in solidarity with the suffering Jerusalem. It is very likely that the development of such a Jeremianic narrator in the lament tradition during the post-destruction period served to affirm and further reinforce Jeremiah’s historical and theological significance for the unfolding fate of Jerusalem toward its restoration. In this regard, we may say that the Jeremianic narrator in Lamentations, as a product of the early reception and interpretation of the existing Jeremiah tradition, is an important window into the post-destruction conceptualization and construction of Jeremiah’s pro-Jerusalem significance.

3.3 2 Chronicles

We now turn to the configuration of Jeremiah in 2 Chronicles from the late Persian period. The Chronicler’s Jeremiah is important to an understanding of how the historical and theological significance of Jeremiah continued to be perceived and constructed in Yehud after the reconstruction of Jerusalem and the Temple.

There is no question that prophets and prophecy are important components in the Chronicler’s historiography. Yet it has been argued that the literary prophets are not so prominent in

---


Chronicles. For example, Isaiah is mainly associated with his writing activity and the archival sources bearing his name (2 Chr 26:22; 32:22). He appears as a living character only in 32:20: he and Hezekiah prayed together in the face of Sennacherib’s invasion. The Chronicler, however, marginalized Isaiah’s significance for the divine salvation of Jerusalem which is affirmed in the source text (2 Kgs 18–20//Isa 36–38), by saying that Yahweh saved Hezekiah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem (2 Chr 32:22). Such is not the case with Jeremiah. In the Chronicistic history, Jeremiah is not a writing prophet whose name is merely associated with the archival sources. He is presented as a living character who uttered a lament for Josiah and delivered God’s words to Zedekiah. In the Chronicler’s interpretation of the ‘seventy years’ prophecy, Jeremiah is also viewed as Yahweh’s prophet who spoke that determined the course of the history of the people from destruction/exile to return/restoration.

3.3.1 Jeremiah as a Royal Lamenter and Advisor

The Chronicler’s Jeremiah first appears as a royal lamenter for Josiah in 2 Chr 35:25:

 Jeremiah also uttered a lament for Josiah, and all the singing men and singing women have spoken of Josiah in their laments to this day. They made these a custom in Israel; they are recorded in the Laments.


Note that a royal lament for Josiah is attributed to Jeremiah, just as Lamentations is attributed to him in the Septuagint. This indicates that the interpretive tradition of ‘Jeremiah the lamenter’ continued to be elaborated during the Second Temple period. The lament tradition that developed in the post-destruction Jerusalem community during the Babylonian period is very likely to have played a significant role in preserving and reinforcing the memory of Jeremiah as an archetypal lamenter. Most probably, the Chronicler, usually identified as a group of Jerusalem scribes with priestly backgrounds, was familiar with Jeremiah’s close association with the lament tradition and attributed a royal lament for Josiah to him in acknowledgment of his reputation as an archetypal lamenter. It is also possible that Jeremiah’s direct association with a royal lament (cf. Jer 22:10) led the Chronicler to say that Jeremiah uttered a lament for Josiah. We must not rule out the possibility that Jeremiah’s authorship of the lament for Josiah was already established by the time of the Chronicler. At any rate, it is crucial that this is the first time that the name ‘Jeremiah’ is mentioned in 2 Chronicles and that it is mentioned in conjunction with King Josiah.

The Chronicler’s presentation of Jeremiah as a royal lamenter cannot be separated from the Chronicler’s overall evaluation of Josiah. Josiah was involved in the renovation and purgation of the Jerusalem Temple and the renewal of the proper worship of the Lord, and his rule culminated in the celebration of Passover in Jerusalem in an unprecedented manner (2 Chr 34–35). He was indeed an ideal Davidic king with a strong pro-Jerusalem and pro-Temple Tendenz. Therefore,

---

\(^{124}\)Renkema (Lamentations, 44–45) opines that Lamentations was composed by the temple scribes/singers remaining in Jerusalem after the destruction. According to the passages in Zech 7:3–5 and 8:18–19, the liturgy of mourning was institutionalized for the fast days which were observed in the ruined Temple site in Jerusalem during the period of the Babylonian exile. Hence, it is plausible that the tradition of ‘Jeremiah the lamenter’ continued to develop at the hands of the temple scribes/singers in the post-destruction Jerusalem community and was later extended to the Second Temple community reconstituted in Jerusalem.

\(^{125}\)Jer 22:10: “Do not weep for him who is dead, nor bemoan him; weep rather for him who goes away . . .” Here, Jeremiah laments for Jehoahaz, son of Josiah, who was taken to Egypt.
his untimely death at Megiddo in 609 B.C.E. must have been perceived as a theological problem that undermined the principle of a retributive theodicy. The Chronicler’s theologization of Josiah’s death is found in 34:28: God did not let him see the disaster approaching Jerusalem. Nevertheless, the Chronicler’s account that Jeremiah’s lament for Josiah became a living tradition “to this day” (2 Chr 35:25) allows us to conjecture that, from the perspective of the Chronicler, the ramifications of Josiah’s untimely death were such that his death deserved the ongoing national lament.

In this regard, the Chronicler’s description of the post-Josianic Judah in 2 Chr 36:1–10 is truly significant. The king of Egypt deposed Jehoahaz and carried him to Egypt; King Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon took Jehoiakim and some of the Temple vessels to Babylon; Jehoiachin was also taken to Babylon, along with some precious vessels from the Temple; all the vessels left in the house of the Lord, large and small, were taken to Babylon when the city of Jerusalem fell. The Chronicler thus indicates that the post-Josianic Judah was marked by the ongoing captivity of kings and vessels. This means that an exilic condition for Jerusalem and the Temple began right after the death of Josiah. In this respect, Jeremiah’s lament for Josiah is almost equivalent to his proleptic lament over the declining fate of Jerusalem and the Temple, and it ultimately foreshadows the Babylonian destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple in 586 B.C.E.

Jeremiah reappears in 2 Chr 36:12 as a royal advisor to King Zedekiah:

\[\text{He [Zedekiah] did what was evil in the} \]

\[\text{יִרְשֶׁה} \text{הָרֹעֶה בֵּיתוֹ יְהוָה אֲלֵהָיו} \text{לֹא} \text{בֵּית יְהוָה יֶרְמוּהוּ.} \]

126 Also note the Chronicler’s analogy between Josiah and Ahab in 2 Chr 35:22–24.

sight of the Lord his God. He did not humble himself before the prophet Jeremiah who spoke from the mouth of the Lord.  

He also rebelled against King Nebuchadnezzar, who had made him swear by God; he stiffened his neck and hardened his heart against turning to the Lord, the God of Israel.

The Chronicler says that Zedekiah did not humble himself before the prophet Jeremiah who revealed the word of Yahweh. In Kings and Chronicles, the expression, ‘humbling oneself before God,’ refers to a righteous act of kings, usually their repentance (שבט), which would turn divine wrath away and bring about a change in the fate of the kings and their kingdoms. Therefore, the Chronicler’s portrayal of Zedekiah implies that his failure to humble himself before Jeremiah who spoke the word of God had negative consequences for the kingdom and the king himself. It is not by chance that the Chronicler mentions Zedekiah’s political rebellion against King Nebuchadnezzar in v. 13. This clearly alludes to Jer 27:1–22 and 38:17–18 where Jeremiah proclaims that submission to Babylon is the command of Yahweh and the only way to save the city and the king himself. In this regard, Zedekiah’s political rebellion was an act of disobedience that called for divine punishment. The Chronicler makes this point more explicit by saying that King Nebuchadnezzar made Zedekiah “swear by God” (2 Chr 36:13; cf. Ezek 17:1–21). The fact that Zedekiah broke an oath that he swore by God and rebelled against Nebuchadnezzar is indicative of his covenant unfaithfulness and disobedience. Hence, the Chronicler states that King Zedekiah, who did not humble himself before Jeremiah and rebelled against Babylon, refused to

128 King Ahab humbles himself before God and God decides not to bring the disaster in his days (1 Kgs 21:29); Rehoboam humbles himself and God turns from wrath and delivers the kingdom of Judah from Egypt (2 Chr 12:6–12); Manasseh humbles himself before God and rules peacefully for fifty-five years despite all his sin (2 Chr 33:12); Hezekiah humbles himself before God and recovers from his sickness (2 Chr 32:26); Josiah humbles himself before God and God does not let him see the disaster coming to Jerusalem and Judah (2 Kgs 22:19–20; 2 Chr 34:27–28).
return (שָׁכְנֹת) to the Lord, the God of Israel.

What is of special interest to us is that the Jeremiah of Chronicles is associated with two kings of Judah — Josiah and Zedekiah. This may have to do with the chronological notation in Jer 1:2–3, that Jeremiah began his prophetic ministry in the days of Josiah and continued to serve the Lord until the end of the reign of Zedekiah. Yet this may also have to do with the Chronicler’s idea of exile associated with these two kings. The exilic age for Jerusalem, which began soon after Josiah’s death with the captivity of kings and vessels, was finalized in the time of Zedekiah with the Babylonian destruction of the city and Temple of Jerusalem. It seems that the Chronicler placed Jeremiah at the strategic points that signal the beginning of the exilic age in the history of Judah and Jerusalem. This means that the Chronicler acknowledged Jeremiah’s historical connection to the destruction/exile and employed the Jeremiah figure in order to express his own idea of exile focussed on the fate of Jerusalem and the Temple.

3.3.2 Jeremiah as the Last of Yahweh’s Prophets Persistently Sent to the People

The Chronicler’s perception of Jeremiah’s significance in the unfolding history of Judah and Jerusalem is further revealed in 2 Chr 36:15–16. The Chronicler explains the destruction as God’s punishment for the people’s ongoing rejection of the words of the prophets whom God persistently sent to them. Compare this passage with its parallel account in 2 Kgs 24:20:

2 Chr 36:15–16

15Now YHWH the God of their ancestors had sent to them persistently through his messengers because he had compassion on his people and on his dwelling place.

2 Kings 24:20

But they kept mocking the messengers of God, despising his words, and ridiculing his prophets, until the rage of YHWH mounted against his people to the point of no cure.

Indeed, the wrath of YHWH mounted against Jerusalem and against Judah until he cast them away from his presence. Zedekiah also rebelled against the king of Babylon.

It is important to note that ‘Yahweh’s persistent sending of His prophets’ is a distinctively Jeremianic concept with a unique Jeremianic expression which appears only here outside the book of Jeremiah. This indicates that the Chronicler perceived Jeremiah as the last of Yahweh’s prophets persistently sent to the people in order to save God’s people, city and Temple. In this regard, it is worth stressing that the Jeremianic concept of ‘Yahweh’s persistent sending of His prophets’ is interpreted in 2 Chr 36:15 as the concrete manifestation of Yahweh’s compassion on His people and on His dwelling place ( huis). We read in the book of Jeremiah that Yahweh’s servants and prophets were persistently sent to the people in order to make them turn to the Lord in covenant loyalty so that they might continue to live in the land (cf. Jer 25:5–6; 35:15). Jeremiah, as the last of Yahweh’s prophets, also preached repentance and Torah obedience in order to turn divine wrath away from the people and to keep Jerusalem and the

---

130 Cf. Jer 7:25; 25:4; 26:5; 29:19; 35:14–15; 44:4. These Jeremianic passages are often read in conjunction with 2 Kgs 17:13–14. Yet 2 Kgs 17:13–14 is not a typical Dtr passage in terms of its portrayal of the prophets and, therefore, cannot be used to substantiate the argument for the deuteronomization of the prophet Jeremiah. The portrayal of the prophet Jeremiah as the last of Yahweh’s servants persistently sent to the people for their return is a distinctively Jeremianic construction which developed retrospectively in the post-destruction period. On this, see Norbert F. Lohfink, “Was There A Deuteronomistic Movement?,” in Those Elusive Deuteronomists: The Phenomenon of Pan-Deuteronomism, ed. Linda S. Scheiring and Steven L. McKenzie (JSOTSup 268; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 36–66, especially 38.

131 ìåòî, as God’s dwelling place, usually refers to the house/sanctuary of Yahweh (1 Sam 2:29, 32; Ps 26:82). By implication, it may also refer to the heights of Zion or the city of Jerusalem where the house the Lord stands (cf. Jer 25:30). In Chronicles, Jerusalem, as the capital city of the theocratic kingdom, is understood as the religious centre where the divine kingship of Yahweh is established through the building of the Temple and the building of the Davidic dynasty. On the Chronicler’s insistence on Jerusalem’s election and centrality, see Japhet, The Ideology, 395–411; idem, “From the King’s Sanctuary to the Chosen City,” in Jerusalem: Its Sanctity and Centrality to Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, ed. Lee I. Levine (New York: Continuum, 1999), 3–15; Kalimi, An Ancient Israelite Historian, 125–141.
Temple from being destroyed on account of their sin (cf. Jer 7:13–14; 26:3–6). In this respect, the Chronicler’s idea of divine compassion seems to draw on the Jeremianic affirmation of Yahweh’s persistent will to save His people, city and Temple which is clearly revealed in His persistent sending of His servants and prophets. As mentioned above, the prophet Jeremiah was sent to Zedekiah, the last king of Judah, to reveal the word of Yahweh. From the Chronicler’s perspective, Jeremiah was the embodiment of divine compassion. Zedekiah, however, did not humble himself before Jeremiah and rebelled against Nebuchadnezzar. Zedekiah’s rejection of Jeremiah, the last of Yahweh’s prophets persistently sent to the people, resulted in the destruction of God’s people, city and Temple.

The Chronicler says in 2 Chr 36:16–17 that divine wrath mounted against ‘the people’ who continued to reject the words of the prophets and that God had no compassion on them when He destroyed them. Compare the parallel account in 2 Kgs 24:20. It says that divine wrath mounted against ‘Jerusalem and Judah.’ The Chronicler thus implies that God’s compassion on His dwelling place persisted regardless of His wrathful judgment of the people.

Also consider another important change that the Chronicler made in his literary source. We read in 2 Chr 36:18 that the Temple vessels were carried to Babylon, along with other treasures of the king and his officials. This account differs from the deuteronomistic historian’s account that the large Temple vessels were cut to pieces before they were carried to Babylon (cf. 2 Kgs 24:13; 25:13). As Isaac Kalimi and James D. Purvis have correctly noted, what is emphasized in the Chronicler’s account is the idea that all the precious vessels from the house of the Lord and from
Jerusalem came to be preserved intact in Babylon. A similar idea is also found in Jeremiah’s oracle concerning the fate of the vessels in Jer\textsuperscript{MT} 27:19–22. There, Jeremiah says that the remaining vessels in the Temple, in the royal house and in Jerusalem shall be taken to Babylon and stay there until a divinely-appointed time of return/restoration. The Chronicler, most probably, knew Jeremiah’s oracle, although it is possible that the passage in Jer\textsuperscript{MT} 27:19–22 was influenced by the Chronicler’s account of the safe preservation of the vessels in Babylon. Either way, it is certain that the Chronicler’s account corroborates the idea of God’s enduring compassion on His dwelling place through the time of exile.

As Ehud Ben Zvi has noted, the Chronicler’s account of the historical exile is not free from historiographic constraints. The core historical facts engraved in the collective memory of the people, such as the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple and the captivity of the people and the Temple vessels, are all mentioned in the Chronicistic history. The Chronicler, however, constructed them anew by utilizing the Jeremianic concept of ‘Yahweh’s persistent sending of His servants and prophets’ (and possibly the Jeremianic oracles concerning the fate of the vessels) and tried to affirm Yahweh’s enduring compassion on Jerusalem and the Temple. Most probably, the idea of divine compassion on ירושלים was crucial to the Chronicler’s theocratic ideology in the sense that this idea could serve the Chronicler’s concern to affirm the sanctity and legitimacy of
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Jerusalem and the Second Temple of his day as the eternal centre of the theocratic kingdom of Yahweh. What is noteworthy is that the Chronicler’s perception of Jeremiah as the last of Yahweh’s prophets and as the embodiment of Yahweh’s enduring compassion on His dwelling place suggests to us that the Chronicler implicitly acknowledged and affirmed Jeremiah’s pro-Jerusalem and pro-Temple significance despite his historical association with the Babylonian destruction of the city and Temple of Jerusalem.

3.3.3 Jeremiah the Prophet of ‘Seventy Years’

Interpreting Jeremiah’s prophecy of ‘seventy years’ in conjunction with Lev 25:1–7 and 26:34–35, the Chronicler says in 2 Chr 36:21 that, while the disobedient people were in exile, the land observed the ten sabbath years “to fulfill seventy years” (למלאת שבעים שנה). In the Chronistic history, therefore, the seventy-year period of exile is more than the seventy years of servitude in Babylon. It is also a divinely-governed sacred time of the recuperation and purification of the land in preparation for a future return and restoration. The Chronicler thus concludes the Chronistic history with the affirmation that the divine promise of restoration spoken by Jeremiah has been fulfilled in history (2 Chr 36:22–23):

In the first year of King Cyrus of Persia, in fulfilment of the word of the Lord spoken by Jeremiah, the Lord stirred up the spirit of King Cyrus of Persia so that he sent a herald throughout all his kingdom and also declared in a written edict:

22 “Thus says King Cyrus of Persia: The Lord, the God of heaven, has given me all the kingdoms of the earth, and he has charged me to build him a house at Jerusalem, which is in Judah. Whoever is among you of all his people, may the Lord his God be with him! Let him go up.”
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According to the passage above, the rise of King Cyrus of Persia signals the imminent fulfilment of דִּבְרֵי יְهوּדָה spoken by the prophet Jeremiah (v. 22). Here, the Hebrew word for “fulfilment” is חֲלֹם. While מָלֵא in v. 21 denotes the ‘full-fill-ment’ of the seventy-year term through a cycle of ten sabbaths, כָּלָה in v. 22 denotes the ‘completion/end’ of the term signalled by Cyrus’ conquest of Babylon and his promulgation of the edict that allows God’s people to return to Jerusalem to rebuild a house of the Lord. It is evident that דִּבְרֵי יְهوּדָה spoken by Jeremiah refers to the divine promise of restoration revealed through his prophecy of ‘seventy years.’ Yet the Chronicler’s idea of restoration was not merely the return of the exiles at the completion of Babylon’s seventy years (Jer 29:10). From the Chronicler’s theological perspective, the divine fulfilment of Jeremiah’s prophecy of ‘seventy years’ culminated in the restoration of the Jerusalem Temple after the repatriation. Note the Chronicler’s statement that God stirred up the spirit of Cyrus (2 Chr 36:22). According to the passages in Hag 1:14 and Ezra 1:5, those whose spirits were stirred up by God were directly involved in a temple restoration. So was King Cyrus: the God of heaven commanded a temple restoration to Cyrus and Cyrus urged all the people of God to go up to Jerusalem to build a house of the Lord (2 Chr 36: 23). In this regard, Jer MT 51:11 is worth considering:

11 The Lord has stirred up the spirit of the kings of the Medes, because his purpose concerning Babylon is to destroy it, for that is the vengeance of the Lord, “vengeance for his temple.”

a-a. lit. “vengeance for his palace”

Here, God’s stirring up the spirit of the kings of Media has implications for the Jerusalem Temple since Babylon is to be avenged for God’s royal residence — the Jerusalem Temple. As discussed in the previous chapter of this dissertation, Yahweh’s vengeance on Babylon not only signals the
fulfilment of Jeremiah’s prophecy of ‘seventy years’ but also demonstrates Yahweh’s enduring faithfulness to, and great zeal for, His royal residence in Jerusalem. Hence, Jeremiah’s oracle in 51:11 may signify God’s re-election of the Jerusalem Temple and, by implication, its restoration at the completion of Babylon’s seventy years. In the same vein, God’s stirring up the spirit of King Cyrus has great implications for the Jerusalem Temple in the Chronistic history. The edict of Cyrus, as the conclusion to the Chronistic history, clearly indicates that the fulfilment of the divine plan and purpose revealed through the prophet Jeremiah culminated in a temple restoration in Jerusalem after the downfall of Babylon. We can glimpse here the way in which the Chronicler legitimized the Second Temple as a divinely-authorized institution and as the centre of the theocratic kingdom of Yahweh. More importantly, we can observe here how Jeremiah emerged as the major prophet of restoration in accordance with the Chronicler’s conviction that the theocratic kingdom centred in the city and Temple of Jerusalem was fully manifested again in the history of the people. It is truly significant that the Chronicler understood Jeremiah’s historical and theological significance as the prophet of exile and restoration in close relation to the unfolding fate of the city and Temple of Jerusalem. From the Chronicler’s perspective, Jeremiah was the major prophet of restoration whose prophecy of ‘seventy years’ was completely fulfilled in the past history of the people, in the reconstruction of the Jerusalem Temple after the repatriation.

---

135 Just as the establishment of the theocratic kingdom of Israel culminated in the construction of the Solomonic Temple, a temple restoration in Jerusalem signaled a renewed presentation of the theocratic kingdom. See Jonathan E. Dyck, *The Theocratic Ideology of the Chroniclers* (BIS 33; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 223. According to Dyck, the Chronistic history has come full circle and has returned to the Urzeit of Israel centred in Jerusalem and the Temple.
3.3.4 Summary

The Chronicler was aware of Jeremiah’s historical connection to the national catastrophe in 586 B.C.E. and utilized the Jeremiah tradition in his account of destruction/exile and return/restoration. As a royal lamenter for Josiah, Jeremiah signals the onset of the exilic age marked by the captivity of kings and vessels. Hence, Jeremiah’s royal lament implicitly betrays his sympathetic concern over the declining fate of Jerusalem and the Temple and testifies to his reputation as an archetypal lamenter for Jerusalem. As a royal advisor to Zedekiah and as the last of Yahweh’s prophets sent persistently to the people, Jeremiah not only theodicizes the Babylonian destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple but also serves the Chronicler’s concern to affirm Yahweh’s enduring compassion on His temple. The Chronicler’s Jeremiah, expressing his genuine concern for the fate of the city and the Temple and embodying God’s enduring compassion on them, emerges as the prophet of exile with a strong pro-Jerusalem and pro-Temple Tendenz.

The Chronicler tried to mitigate the theological and historical crisis of the disaster in 586 B.C.E. by showing that God’s compassion on His dwelling place persisted even through the post-586 period. Hence, he incorporated the account of the safe preservation of the vessels in Babylon. More importantly, he affirmed that the restoration of the Jerusalem Temple was the fulfilment of שבעה spoken by the prophet Jeremiah. From the Chronicler’s perspective, the Jerusalem community of his day was already living in the time of fulfilment preordained by Yahweh and prophesied by Jeremiah.136 Jeremiah thus emerges in the Chronistic history as the prophet of restoration par excellence with respect to the city and Temple of Jerusalem, the centre of theocracy.

---

3.4 Conclusion

In the present chapter, we have examined the ongoing development of Jeremiah during the Babylonian and Persian periods by considering Lamentations and 2 Chronicles. The Jeremianic persona of the narrator in Lamentations, as an extension of Jeremiah’s personality, indicates that Jeremiah’s sympathetic and empathetic concern for the fate of the people and the city was acknowledged as important by the post-destruction Jerusalem community. From the Jeremianic narrator’s complete solidarity with the suffering Jerusalem and from his genuine concern for the consolation, vindication and salvation of Jerusalem, we can also infer that the construction of such an archetypal lamenter in Lamentations reinforced the memory and perception of Jeremiah as a pro-Jerusalem figure who is intrinsically associated with the unfolding fate of Jerusalem. In this respect, we may argue that the lament tradition as exemplified in Lamentations played a significant role in affirming Jeremiah’s ongoing relevance and significance for Jerusalem through the post-destruction period.

In 2 Chronicles, Jeremiah is presented as the prophet of exile and restoration whose pro-Jerusalem and pro-Temple significance is affirmed through the unfolding fate of Jerusalem and the Temple from destruction to restoration. Particularly noteworthy is the Chronicler’s view that the construction of the Second Temple was the fulfilment of Jeremiah’s ‘seventy years’ prophecy towards the re-manifestation of the theocratic kingdom of Yahweh centred in Jerusalem. This clearly shows that the Chronicler interpreted Jeremiah’s historical and theological significance in close relation to the fate of Jerusalem and the Temple, and that Jeremiah, the prophet of ‘seventy years,’ came to be perceived as the major prophetic authority on the restoration of the city and Temple of Jerusalem. In this regard, it is not surprising to find that the authors of Daniel 9 and
2 Maccabees turned to Jeremiah in their reflections on the changing fate of the city and the Temple in the 2nd century B.C.E. As will be discussed in the next chapter, these authors also acknowledged, against the backdrop of the Jerusalem crisis under Antiochus Epiphanes and the ensuing Maccabean restoration, Jeremiah’s close association with the fate of Jerusalem and the Temple and further promoted his enduring significance for it in their conceptualizations of exile and restoration.
Chapter 4
The Seleucid Crisis and the Maccabean Restoration

In the previous chapter, we have observed that the historical and theological significance of Jeremiah continued to develop in close relation to the unfolding fate of Jerusalem and the Temple during the Babylonian and Persian periods. However, with the rise of the Greek Empire and the advancement of Hellenistic culture and religion, the attempt to strengthen the Jewish identity put a renewed emphasis on the prophet Jeremiah’s role as a preacher of Torah obedience. In the Epistle of Jeremiah (ca. 300–200 B.C.E.), the prophet Jeremiah is portrayed as a letter-writer who sent a letter to the Babylonian exiles in order to instruct them to maintain their covenant loyalty and to warn them against idols and false gods.137 Such a portrayal of Jeremiah was, of course, closely related to an anonymous author’s concern to exhort his community to remain faithful to their traditional way of life without succumbing to the threats of Hellenistic culture. In Wisdom of Ben Sira (ca. 195–175 B.C.E.), Jeremiah is presented as the prophet who foretold the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple because the kings of Judah disobeyed the Law and mistreated Jeremiah (49:4–7). Hence, as a rejected prophet of Yahweh, the Jeremiah figure not only theodiced the liquidation of the national order but also served Ben Sira’s concern to promote Torah obedience as the most important Jewish virtue to uphold in the increasingly Hellenized

---

world.¹³⁸

It was against the backdrop of the Antiochene assault on Jerusalem and the Second Temple that Jeremiah’s pro-Jerusalem and pro-Temple significance was regarded once again as important. During this time, the legitimate high priesthood of the Oniads came to an end; Jerusalem fell under the military attacks of the Seleucids and the Jerusalem Temple was plundered and defiled with the altar to Zeus; the sacrificial rituals were disrupted and important Jewish practices such as circumcision and sabbath were suppressed.¹³⁹ Therefore, it is very likely that the Antiochene crisis was viewed by many as a national crisis comparable to the Babylonian destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple or as the undoing of the restoration and reconstruction that had taken place during the Persian period. Most probably, the Jewish intellectuals of the time began to question the Chronicler’s idea that the reconstituted worshiping community in Jerusalem was already living in the blessed time of fulfilment in the theocratic kingdom with Yahweh as its King. It must have been difficult for them to accept that the promised restoration revealed through the prophet Jeremiah had been completely fulfilled in history, especially when the Temple and its cultus were under the threat of gentile assaults. Hence, they began to reflect on the Jeremiah tradition as they tried to grapple with the present condition of Jerusalem and the Temple under foreign domination and envision another (or the real) fulfilment of restoration in their own times.

Thus we find in Daniel 9 that a scribal sage (מַשְׁלֵי) reread Jeremiah’s prophecy of ‘seventy years’

¹³⁸ In the Greek text, the same verb κακοῦν is used to describe both the ‘affliction’ of Jeremiah and his prophetic role of ‘pulling down’ (Sir 49:7). In this, the principle of a retributive theodicy is affirmed and the significance of the response to Jeremiah’s instruction in Torah obedience is reinforced.

¹³⁹ For an excellent discussion on Seleucid rule in Judea, see Anatea E. Portier-Young, Apocalypse Against Empire: Theologies of Resistance in Early Judaism (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 2011), especially Part Two of this volume.
against the backdrop of the affliction of Jerusalem under Antiochus Epiphanes. We also find in 2 Maccabees 2 and 15 that the Jeremiah figure is constructed anew in order to articulate the historical and theological significance of the Maccabean restoration in Jewish history. These texts clearly demonstrate that the Jeremiah tradition continued to develop and expand in close relation to the changing fate of God’s people, city and Temple during the Hellenistic period.

In this chapter, I will consider Daniel 9 and 2 Maccabees 2 and 15 and argue that Jeremiah’s significance for the fate of Jerusalem and the Temple transcended the original historical context of the Babylonian crisis and the ensuing reconstruction under the aegis of Persia in the 6th century B.C.E. and extended to the Seleucid crisis and the ensuing Maccabean restoration in the 2nd century B.C.E. This will further substantiate the argument that Jeremiah’s timeless significance as the prophet of exile and restoration and, especially, his enduring significance as the major authority on the restoration of the city and the Temple were confirmed during this pivotal time in Jewish history. I will also briefly consider the Jeremiah tradition from Qumran and see how it may enrich our discussion of Jeremiah’s significance during the Seleucid-Hasmonean period.

4.1 Daniel 9

The book of Daniel consists of two different genres: the court narratives (chs. 1–6) and the apocalyptic visions (chs. 7–12). It has been argued that the court narratives originated among the Diaspora with a view to reconstituting its life through the fidelity to Yahweh, and that the apocalyptic visions were produced by the maskilim during the religious crisis and persecution under Antiochus Epiphanes. However, the fact that Dan 2:4b–7:28 is in Aramaic and also the fact that the four-kingdom motif appears in chs. 2 and 7 lead us to question a clear-cut division
between Daniel 1–6 and 7–12.\textsuperscript{140} Most scholars now adopt a developmental view that the book of Daniel came to achieve its unity at the hands of the maskilim who continued to interpret and redact older narratives, produced the visions of Daniel, and put them together into a “book” against the backdrop of the Seleucid crisis during the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century B.C.E.\textsuperscript{141} Crucial here is that the unity of the book of Daniel is a thematic unity. Its overarching theme is the sovereignty of Yahweh over gentile kings and kingdoms, and this indicates that the entire book of Daniel was most probably intended to function as a resistance literature.\textsuperscript{142}

Daniel 9, although embedded in the apocalyptic visions of Daniel, has been regarded as distinct from the surrounding apocalyptic materials in terms of its deuteronomistic features that are reflected in Daniel’s prayer (vv. 3–19) and its pesher-like interpretation of Jeremiah’s prophecy of ‘seventy years’ (vv. 1–2, 20–27). Recently, Anathea E. Portier-Young has cogently argued that the prayer of Daniel functions to inculcate Torah obedience and shape the book’s audience as the people of God bound by the covenant.\textsuperscript{143} She has emphasized a socio-political function of Daniel’s prayer as a form of resistance to Seleucid state terror: the liturgical form of Daniel’s

\textsuperscript{140}Cf. Robert G. Hall (\textit{Revealed Histories: Techniques for Ancient Jewish and Christian Historiography} [JSPSup 6; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991], 82–96) places Daniel 2 and 7–12 together under the umbrella concept of the inspired history, that is, a revelation of the past to authenticate the assurance for the future. Paul L. Redditt (\textit{Daniel} [NCBC; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999], 114) suggests that Daniel 2–7 shows a chiastic structure and that it achieved its present form against the backdrop of the Antiochene crisis.


\textsuperscript{143}Portier-Young, \textit{Apocalypse Against Empire}, 243–254.
prayer of repentance and supplication is a religious expression of nonviolent resistance to Antiochus IV’s assault on the covenant and disruption of the Temple worship. The socio-political function of Daniel’s prayer — nonviolent resistance through Jewish liturgy — brings Daniel 9 close to Daniel’s visions produced by the *maskilim*. These scribal sages resisted the Antiochene suppression of the cultural and religious traditions of the Jewish people, of which they saw themselves as the guardians, and wanted to elicit from the persecuted Jews faithful and pious responses to Yahweh.

A revealed interpretation of Jeremiah’s prophecy of ‘seventy years’ and the periodization of the seventy weeks of exile in Daniel 9 are also in continuity with the apocalyptic visions in that they all maintain a deterministic view of history. The *maskilim* tried to make many people understand their transcendent knowledge and vision of the end that is predetermined by God (cf. Dan 11:33). They expected that those who possessed this knowledge and vision would not succumb to the violence of imperial rule but remain faithful to God who controls the course of history. In the same vein, they reinterpreted Jeremiah’s prophecy of ‘seventy years’ in order to show that the decreed end of Antiochus IV was imminent. As John. J. Collins has noted, the periodization of the seventy weeks was intended to assure the persecuted Jews that the final week tribulation under

For a similar view, see Rodney A. Werline, “Prayer, Politics, and Social Vision in Daniel 9,” in *The Development of Penitential Prayer in Second Temple Judaism*, vol. 2 of *Seeking the Favor of God*, ed. Mark J. Boda, Daniel K. Falk, and Rodney A. Werline (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 17–32. Werline argues that the prayer of Daniel, as a social performance of the *maskilim*, functions as a form of nonviolent resistance to Antiochus IV since it confirms the perpetuity of the sacred time ordained by Yahweh even when the sacred space (Temple) is destroyed. In the same vein, Portier-Young (*Apocalypse Against Empire*, 253) writes, “Whether they pray individually or collectively, the act of praying constitutes them as community (“we have sinned”) joined to one another in liturgical practices that counter the invented and imposed liturgies of Antiochus.”

Antiochus IV would soon come to an end.\textsuperscript{146} A hope for an imminent fulfillment of the decreed end of Antiochus IV must have empowered them to endure and persevere in faith. In this respect, we can understand why a pesher-like interpretation of Jeremiah’s prophecy was included in the apocalyptic visions of Daniel.

4.1.1 ‘Seventy Weeks’ for Jerusalem

According to Dan 9:1–2, it was in the first year of Darius the Mede that Daniel read “the books” (ספרי)\textsuperscript{147} and discerned in the word of God to the prophet Jeremiah the number of years that must be fulfilled for the desolation of Jerusalem:

\begin{enumerate}
\item In the first year of Darius son of Ahasuerus, by birth a Mede, who became King over the realm of the Chaldeans, \textsuperscript{2}In the first year of his reign, I, Daniel, perceived in the books the number of years that, according to the word of the Lord to the prophet Jeremiah, must be fulfilled for the devastation of Jerusalem, namely, seventy years.
\end{enumerate}

The chronological notation of ‘the first year of Darius the Mede’ is important since it connotes the completion of Babylon’s seventy years. The Median origin of Darius clearly alludes to Jeremiah’s oracles that mention the divine punishment of Babylon by the Medes (Jer 51:11, 28). The name ‘Darius’ is also noteworthy since this name is associated with the restoration of the Jerusalem Temple in the early Persian period (Haggai; Zechariah). Although ‘Darius the Mede, son of Ahasuerus’ is a historically unverifiable royal figure, he is comparable to king Cyrus of Persia in


\textsuperscript{147} As regards ספרי, Gerald H. Wilson (“The Prayer of Daniel 9: Reflection on Jeremiah 29.” JSOT 48 [1990], 91–99) proposed that this word refers to Jeremiah’s two letters sent to the Babylonian exiles (Jer 29). Yet we may also construe ספרי as a reference to many scrolls that constitute the “book” of Jeremiah (cf. Jer 25:13; 30:2; 36:2, 28).
2 Chronicles in the sense that they both refer to a high hope of a temple restoration in Jerusalem after the completion of Babylon’s seventy years.\textsuperscript{148} In this regard, it is very likely that ‘the first year of Darius the Mede’ is a code word for the restoration of Jerusalem and the Temple that signals the impending fulfilment of Jeremiah’s prophecy of ‘seventy years.’

We read in v. 2 that the fulfilment of the prophecy is to be marked by the termination of “the devastation of Jerusalem.” This suggests that a pseudonymous author Daniel interpreted the seventy years of ‘exile’ as the seventy years of ‘Jerusalem’s desolation.’\textsuperscript{149} Here, we can discern the author’s perception that the affliction of Jerusalem of his day was the sign of an ongoing condition of exile for God’s people. The immediately following prayer of Daniel also shows that the desolation of the city and its sanctuary was crucial to the author’s idea of continuing exile (vv. 16–19). The author’s idea of exile as an ongoing reality for God’s people, city and Temple is most clearly expressed in his reconstruction of ‘seventy years’ as ‘seventy weeks’ — the time of a protracted exile (vv. 24–27). Our author authorized his view by means of an apocalyptic device of a revelation of history: it was Gabriel who revealed the decree of ‘seventy weeks’ to Daniel:

\begin{quote}
24“seventy weeks are decreed for your people and your holy city: to finish the transgression, to put an end to sin, and to atone for iniquity, to bring in everlasting righteousness, to seal both vision and prophet, and to anoint a most holy place.”
\end{quote}

Here, the seventy-week period of time that is decreed for the people to finish their transgression


\textsuperscript{149}In this regard, it is noteworthy that Jerusalem is in focus only in Daniel 9 (vv. 2, 7, 12, 16, 25). Outside of this chapter, the word “Jerusalem” appears only in the introduction (1:1). Hence, John E. Goldingay (\textit{Daniel} [WBC 30; Dallas, Texas: Word Books, 1989], 236–7) notes that we can observe in Daniel 9 the author’s Palestinian perspective focussed on Jerusalem. Yet Greg Goswell has suggested that the Jerusalem Temple is a leading theme in the book of Daniel. See Goswell, “The Temple Theme in the Book of Daniel,” \textit{JETS} 55 (2012): 509–520.
and sin and to atone for their iniquity is consonant with the Jewish perception of the Second Temple period as the time of ongoing sin and divine wrath. Yet it is important to note that ‘seventy weeks’ are decreed for the holy city as well. It is indicated at the end of v. 24 that the seventy weeks of Jerusalem’s desolation will come to an end with the reconsecration of the holy of holies. This clearly tells us that the fate of God’s people, city and Temple was central to the author’s conceptualization of exile and restoration.

Also note that Gabriel’s ‘seventy weeks’ are periodized in close relation to the changing fate of the city and its sanctuary (vv. 25–27). The first seven-week period begins with the proclamation of the word of promise to rebuild Jerusalem and ends with the appearance of “an anointed prince” who, most probably, refers to the high priest Joshua who rebuilt the Temple. After another 62 weeks, the final week begins with the death of “an anointed one,” the high priest Onias III, followed by the Antiochene assault on Jerusalem and the Temple. For half of the final week, lawful sacrifice will cease from the altar, and the Temple will be defiled with an abominable thing. At the end of the final week, “the desolator” of the city and the Temple will be destroyed. As we can see, the periodization of the seventy weeks of ‘exile’ draws attention to the unfolding fate of the city and the Temple and affirms that the completion of the entire seventy-week period of time will be marked by the end of the desolation of Jerusalem and its Temple under Antiochus IV.

It is important to note that Gabriel’s oracle neither nullifies nor discredits Jeremiah’s prophecy. The centrality of the city and Temple of Jerusalem in the interpretation of the ‘seventy years’ prophecy, which we have observed in Jer^MT and 2 Chronicles, is also attested in Daniel 9. Gabriel’s oracle only transfers the time of its fulfilment from ‘the first year of Darius the Mede’

to the time of the author in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century B.C.E. and serves to authorize the author’s view that the promised restoration revealed through Jeremiah’s prophecy of ‘seventy years’ is about to be fulfilled with the restoration/reconsecration of the city and the Temple in the imminent future.

It is truly significant that the author of Daniel 9 considered Jeremiah’s prophecy of ‘seventy years’ as he tried to grapple with the current Antiochene assault on Jerusalem and the Temple. It is most likely that our author, just like the Chronicler before him, fully acknowledged Jeremiah’s historical and theological significance for the fate of Jerusalem and the Temple as the prophet of ‘seventy years’ and as the prophet of exile and restoration. By reconfiguring the seventy years of ‘exile’ as the seventy weeks of ‘the desolation of Jerusalem,’ our author affirmed Jeremiah’s ongoing relevance and significance for the fate of the city and the Temple in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century B.C.E. In this respect, Jeremiah’s reputation as the prophet of exile and restoration was no longer confined to the original historical context of the 6\textsuperscript{th} century B.C.E. Our author anticipated the imminent restoration/reconsecration of Jerusalem and the Temple and believed that this would be the real fulfilment of the restoration promised through the prophet Jeremiah, especially through his ‘seventy years’ prophecy.

4.1.2 The Decreed End of the Desolator

It is indicated in Dan 9:27 that the decreed end of the desolator of the city and the Temple would signal the completion of the entire seventy-week period of time:

\begin{quote}
He shall make a strong covenant with many for one week, and for half of the week he shall make sacrifice and offering cease; and in their place shall be an abomination that desolates, until the decreed end is poured out upon the desolator.
\end{quote}
a. the meaning of Hebrew uncertain. In LXX, ἐπὶ τὸ ἱερὸν (“in the Temple” or “upon the holy place”).
b. in LXX, “desolation” instead of “desolator.” This must be a translator’s failure to read ἔσομαι as a participle.

It is generally accepted that OG-Dan 7–12 is faithful to the Hebrew Vorlage. Differences between OG-Dan and MT-Dan are usually explained as misinterpretations or errors rather than as the translator’s theological or interpretative Tendenz. See Sharon Pace Jeansonne, The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 7–12 (CBQMS 19; Washington: Catholic Biblical Associations, 1988), 127–130.

The author’s expectation of the end of the desolator brings Daniel 9 closer to the apocalyptic visions of the end in Daniel 7, 8 and 11. According to the interpretation of Daniel’s vision in Daniel 7, the eleventh horn of the fourth beast refers to the last evil gentile king of the fourth kingdom who will disrupt the sacred seasons and the law “for a time, times and half a time” (vv. 23–25), and the end of this king will signal the end of the four-kingdom period and the inauguration of the everlasting kingdom of God (v. 27). In the vision of a ram and a goat in Daniel 8, Daniel sees one particular horn that will suspend the regular burnt offerings and overthrow the Temple for “two thousand three hundred evenings and mornings” until the appointed time of the Temple restoration (vv. 1–14). Gabriel interprets this vision for Daniel and reveals that the vision refers to “the time of the end” (יוֹמֵי הָעֲנָא) when the horn (i.e., the last evil gentile king of Greece) will be destroyed (vv. 15–25). Similarly, in Daniel 9, Gabriel reveals to Daniel that the desolator of the city and the Temple will be destroyed after three and a half years of cessation of lawful sacrifices and offerings (v. 27). We also read in Daniel 11 that, in the first year of Darius the Mede, Daniel received another revelation which is in the main an ex-eventu prophecy concerning the history of the Ptolemies and Seleucids. A revealed history concludes with the prediction that “the time of the end” will be marked by the downfall of the Seleucid king who assaults God’s people and profanes the Temple (vv. 30–32, 40–45). It seems evident that the decreed end of the desolator mentioned in Daniel 9 is compatible with the ideas of the end that are developed in the
apocalyptic visions of Daniel.\footnote{Cf. J. J. Collins, “The Meaning of ‘The End’ in the Book of Daniel,” in Of Scribes and Scrolls: Studies on the Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism, and Christian Origins presented to John Strugnell on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday, ed. Harold W. Attridge, John J. Collins and Thomas H. Tobin, S. J. (Lanham, Maryland: University of Press of America, 1990), 91–98. Collins has suggested that there are three different concepts of the end in the Daniel apocalypse, namely, the eschatological kingdom (ch. 7), the temple restoration (chs. 8–9) and the resurrection (chs. 11–12). However, we need to note that the divine punishment of an evil gentile king who acts as the archenemy of God’s people, city and Temple is an important mediating concept that brings diverse visions of the end together in the second half of the book of Daniel.}

What is more interesting is its compatibility with the idea of the end that is developed in the book of Jeremiah. As shown in the second chapter of this dissertation, there is no definitive idea of the end in Jer\textsuperscript{LXX}. The overarching theological perspective of Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} is that the historical process of Yahweh’s universal judgment has not yet been completed. In the meantime, the people are to find comfort and consolation in Yahweh’s promise of life given to Ebed-melech and Baruch who represent the faithful. In Jer\textsuperscript{MT}, however, the definitive idea of the end develops in correlation to the development of Babylon as a symbolic figure of Sheshach. We read in Jer\textsuperscript{MT} 25:26 that the entire historical process of Yahweh’s universal judgment will come to an end with the divine punishment of the king of Sheshach. The definitive end of that historical process is envisaged in Jer\textsuperscript{MT} 50–51, in the oracles against Babylon/Sheshach, the last evil gentile kingdom of the world that must be punished for its assaults on God’s people, city and Temple. These oracles are essentially Yahweh’s decree of the end of the king(dom) of Babylon/Sheshach. Accordingly, the period of seventy years becomes a metaphorical time of exile that will come to a full end when God takes vengeance on the king(dom) of Babylon/Sheshach at an indefinite point of time in the future. It can, in principle, extend to the eschaton.\footnote{In the oracles against Babylon (both Jer\textsuperscript{LXX} and Jer\textsuperscript{MT}), we read that Babylon shall become “the end/last of the nations” (στις τελευταίας οἰκουμενών, 50[27]:12), and that it shall be an utter desolation and the nations shall no longer gather to it (51[28]:44). The oracles against Babylon conclude with the declaration of the Kingship of the Lord (51[28]:57). In this regard, it is very likely that these oracles were originally meant as an implicit polemic against the supremacy of Babylon. In Jer\textsuperscript{MT}, however, Babylon’s identification with Sheshach gives the oracles an eschatological}
Daniel’s conceptualization of ‘seventy weeks’ shows close affinity with Jeremiah’s ‘seventy years’ prophecy as interpreted in Jer$^{MT}$. In Jer$^{MT}$ the ‘seventy’ symbolic time of exile extends to an unknown point of time in the future when the decreed end of the last evil gentile king(dom) of Babylon/Sheshach will be realized towards the fulfilment of the promised restoration of God’s people, city and Temple. In Daniel 9, the period of seventy weeks is to last until the destruction of the desolator of the city and the Temple and his downfall is to be followed by the fulfilment of the end-time restoration centred on Jerusalem and its Temple. If the author of Daniel 9 knew of Jeremiah’s prophecy of ‘seventy years’ as interpreted in the masoretic tradition of Jeremiah, he must have been able to easily identify Antiochus IV of Greece with the king of Babylon/Sheshach and have expected Jeremiah’s oracles against the king(dom) of Babylon/Sheshach in Jer$^{MT}$ 50–51 to be fulfilled in his own days which he perceived as the end time. Even if the interpretation of Babylon as Sheshach in Jer$^{MT}$ was unknown to the author of Daniel 9, it is very likely that our author came to perceive that Antiochus IV, the desolator of the city and the Temple, was a second Nebuchadnezzar who appeared in the end time and came to reason that the divine punishment of this gentile king and his kingdom was essential to the fulfilment of Jeremiah’s prophecy of ‘seventy years.’ In this respect, it is also plausible that Daniel 9 influenced the development of the figure of Babylon as Sheshach and the reconceptualization of ‘seventy years’ as a metaphorical time of exile in Jer$^{MT}$.

Whether or not the author of Daniel 9 knew of Jeremiah’s prophecy as interpreted in Jer$^{MT}$, the divine punishment of the desolator of the city and the Temple, which our author identified as an
important marker for the completion of the seventy weeks of Jerusalem’s affliction, would authenticate both the visions of Daniel and the ‘seventy years’ prophecy of Jeremiah.\(^{153}\) Crucial here is that the author’s idea of the decreed end of the desolator reveals the growing interest in the fate of the gentile king in the ongoing Jewish reflections on the divine fulfilment of restoration.\(^{154}\) Daniel 9 clearly indicates that the changing fate of God’s people, city and Temple under the oppressive Hellenistic rule was crucial to the ongoing Jewish conceptualization of exile and restoration and, especially, to the ongoing Jewish reflections on Jeremiah’s legacy in the sense that Jeremiah was historically associated with the desolation of Jerusalem and the First Temple by the gentile king of Babylon. Daniel 9 is, in this respect, an important text to consider as we try to understand the development of Jeremiah’s timeless significance for exile and restoration. The growing concern with the fate of the dosolator of the city and the Temple, in keeping with the growing concern with the fate of the king(dom) of Babylon/Sheshach in Jer\(^{\text{MT}}\), shows that the development of Jeremiah’s enduring significance as the prophet of exile and restoration during the Hellenistic period was closely associated with the Antiochene assaults on God’s people, city and Temple that heightened the Jewish perception of an ongoing condition of ‘exile’ under gentile domination.

\(^{153}\)This partly explains why it is said in Dan 9:24 that seventy weeks are decreed “to seal the prophetic vision” (להחנס חותם יבשعي).

\(^{154}\)Compare the Chroniclers’ idea that the completion of ‘seventy years’ is signalled by the appearance of a benevolent gentile king, Cyrus. The Chronicler’s theocratic ideology can coexist rather peacefully with Persian rule since the construction of the Second Temple was carried out under the aegis of Persia. However, in Daniel 9, the theocratic ideology of Second Temple Judaism is incompatible with Seleucid rule. See C. A. Newsom, “God’s Other: The Intractable Problem of the Gentile King in Judean and Early Jewish Literature,” in The “Other” in Second Temple Judaism: Essays in Honor of John J. Collins, ed. Daniel C. Harlow, Karina Martin Hogan, Matthew Goff and Joel S. Kaminsky (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 2011), 31–48. Newsom argues that the “elimination” of the gentile king is the most stable and suitable option for the theology of divine sovereignty.
4.1.3 ‘Continuing Exile’ and the Development of Jeremiah

Jeremiah’s timeless significance for exile and restoration can be inferred from other apocalyptic writings from the Second Temple period. In the *Animal Apocalypse* (*1 Enoch* 85–90), which is contemporary with the apocalyptic visions of Daniel, Jeremiah’s prophecy of ‘seventy years’ and the ‘foe from the north’ tradition are combined to conceptualize the extended period of exile from the 6th century B.C.E. to the time of the author in the 2nd century B.C.E. Exile is conceived of as the period of subjugation to the seventy shepherds (i.e., gentile rulers) who have been sent by God to rule over the people and their land. This period of seventy shepherds is divided into four parts, the last of which is marked by the rise of Judas Maccabeus and the great ingathering in the Jerusalem Temple that signals the beginning of the messianic era (*1 Enoch* 89–90). Hence, we find in the *Animal Apocalypse* another clear example of the wise scribes’ construction of the ‘seventy’ symbolic time of exile, which is periodized in accordance with the four-kingdom schema, and their expectation of the imminent fulfilment of the end-time restoration. This tells us that the significance of Jeremiah’s legacy was well-acknowledged by the Jewish scribes who were speculating about the end-time restoration against the backdrop of the Seleucid assaults on God’s people, city and Temple in the 2nd century B.C.E.155 It is not difficult to assume that their interpretation and appropriation of Jeremiah’s legacy further contributed to the memory and perception of Jeremiah as the major prophet of exile and restoration during the Second Temple period.

---

155 In Jer 6:3 and 23:1, the ‘foe from the north’ is described as “the shepherds” who come to Jerusalem. James C. VanderKam argues that the pastoral symbols, the number seventy, the foreign domination of Jerusalem and the eschatological judgment show the significant influence of Jeremiah’s prophecy on the *Animal Apocalypse*. See VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (CBQMS 16; Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association, 1984), 164–7; idem, “Exile in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature,” in *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions*, ed. James M. Scott (JSJSup 56; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 89–109, especially 94–104.
The *Apocryphon of Jeremiah* C from Qumran is another important piece of writing from the same time period (ca. 2nd century B.C.E.). Here, Jeremiah is portrayed as accompanying the deportees to Babylon as far as the river and exhorting them to obey the commandments of the Lord; Jeremiah then comes to Egypt and preaches Torah obedience to the Judean remnants who migrated to Egypt (4Q385a 18). Jeremiah also sends a letter to the Babylonian exiles and they read it at the shore of the river Sour (4Q389 1). As regards Jeremiah’s exilic letter sent from Egypt to Babylon, Lutz Doering has argued that the content of the letter is Jeremiah’s exhortation to Torah obedience, and that such an exilic letter by Jeremiah served an anonymous author’s concern to consolidate his community which he viewed as still living in exile. Yet Devorah Dimant has suggested that what constitutes Jeremiah’s exilic letter is a revealed history of Israel focussed on the Second Temple period until the eschatological end, and that this review of history is presented as a single divine discourse directed to the prophet Jeremiah. According to this revealed history, the ‘exilic’ period of increasing sin and divine wrath is to last for ten jubilees (490 years),

---

156 Devorah Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4. XXI: Parabiblical Texts, Part 4: Pseudeo-Prophetic Texts* (DJD 30; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 107–110. On the basis of its affinity with other Jewish writings from the 2nd century B.C.E., Dimant suggests that the *Apocryphon* was composed in the same time period.


coterminal with the period of imperial rule over the land of Israel (4Q385a 4; 4Q387 2 ii), and the eschatological end would be marked by the destruction of Greece and Egypt (4Q385a 16–17). For Dimant, Jeremiah’s exilic letter is functionally subordinated to the narrative framework of the Apocryphon in which Jeremiah is portrayed as a Mosaic preacher. The implication is that the people of Israel are motivated to observe the Torah in view of their time and place in history as revealed in Jeremiah’s letter to the Babylonian exiles.\(^{159}\) Hence, Dimant writes:

As the last of the Judaean prophets, he [Jeremiah] foretold and witnessed the decline and disintegration of the Judaean kingdom and he saw the destruction of the First Temple. The prophet thus inaugurated a new era in which worship by practicing Torah commandments replaced the Temple ritual. Both the transmission of commandments and the warning against idolatry are linked to the cessation of the Temple ritual. Jeremiah emerges from the Apocryphon as the national religious leader and teacher, whose moral and intellectual stature invest him with the authority necessary to lead his people at that crucial hour and to lay the foundations for Jewish life in exile. He thus stands in analogy to Moses, an analogy found in other contemporary works.\(^{160}\)

Dimant’s view of Jeremiah is similar to Doering’s. They both note that Jeremiah emerges in the Apocryphon as a Mosaic teacher and leader who provides guidance to the exiles, and suggest that the Jeremiah of the Apocryphon must have served the author’s theological and practical concern to strengthen his community that was, from his 2\(^{\text{nd}}\) century B.C.E. standpoint, in a state of continuing exile under the threats of the Greek Empire and its Hellenistic culture.

Recently, Kipp Davis revisited the Apocryphon and endorsed Dimant’s view of Jeremiah as an ideal teacher and leader during the time of exile.\(^{161}\) According to Davis, however, 4Q390 is not

---


\(^{160}\) Dimant, DJD 30, 105.

part of the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah C*. An anti-Hasmonean *Tendenz* in 4Q390, which is missing in the *Apocryphon*, indicates that 4Q390 is later than the *Apocryphon*. Davis argues that the scribes behind 4Q390, who were concerned about the cultic defilement of the Second Temple in the late 2nd century B.C.E., were a group of priestly dissidents who tried to legitimize themselves as a righteous few who were comparable to the righteous returnees from the Babylonian exile who rebuilt the Jerusalem Temple. For Davis, the righteous returnees from the seventy years of Babylonian exile were crucial to a sectarian group’s self-understanding and self-definition. Although the name ‘Jeremiah’ does not appear in 4Q390, Davis is of the opinion that 4Q390 is a form of Jeremianic discourse. He argues for “the maintenance of 4Q390 within a broad stream of Jeremianic traditions on the basis of its association with the *Apocryphon C* as an historical, ideological pastiche that implicitly participates in Jeremianic discourse.”

In the *Damascus Document*, the name ‘Jeremiah’ appears at the end of the Admonition (CD 8:20–21) and the significance of his name may be understood in relation to “the new covenant in the land of Damascus.” According to Davis, Jeremiah’s authority as a prototypical prophet and as a model for ideal leadership and legitimate instruction during the time of exile contributed to the affirmation of the community’s identity by defining the members of the Qumran Essenes as the “insiders” of the new covenant. Similarly, when we consider allusions to scriptural Jeremiah in the Dead Sea Scrolls, most notably in the *Hodayot*, we can also find that Jeremiah served a

---


164Ibid., 227–233, here 233.

165Ibid., 269–273.
sectarian concern to construct the identity of the community and legitimize itself vis-à-vis its opponents and rivals.  

We can infer from 4Q390 and the Damascus Document that the Babylonian exile was important to the Qumran Essenes’ construction of the history of the community that had great implications for their self-definition and self-legitimization. According to the Damascus Document, the Babylonian exile ended with the rise of the Qumran-Essenes 390 years after the destruction, and Jeremiah’s significance was to be found in terms of his prophecy of a new covenant. In 4Q390, the seventy years of the Babylonian exile ended with the return of the exiles who rebuilt the Temple, and this event was implicitly linked to the origin of the movement. Hence, we cannot assume that the idea of continuing ‘Babylonian’ exile is expressed in these sectarian texts. There is no clear evidence in these Qumranic texts that Jeremiah’s reputation as a prototypical prophet of exile played a critical role in the Qumran community’s theological and practical response to an ongoing condition of exile. As Davis has cogently argued, the ideology of the ‘returnees’/‘remnants’ that pervades 4Q390 and the Damascus Document strongly suggests that the Qumran Jeremianic traditions may be taken as “variations on a common origins myth” that contributed to the self-understanding and the identity of the community. Compare the

---


169 Ibid., 300–301.
Apocryphon of Jeremiah C. Jeremiah’s authority as an exilic teacher and leader is affirmed in the Apocryphon, and this testifies to his ongoing relevance and significance for those who perceived that the ‘Babylonian’ exile was an ongoing reality (for ten jubilees). Yet the Apocryphon is not regarded as a sectarian composition.\textsuperscript{170}

From Daniel 9, the Animal Apocalypse and the Apocryphon of Jeremiah C, we may infer that the development of Jeremiah’s timeless significance for exile and restoration was intertwined with the idea of continuing exile that was reinforced by the oppressive Hellenistic-Seleucid rule. Yet the authors’ perceptions of Jeremiah’s theological significance and function were not alike. The authors of Daniel 9 and the Animal Apocalypse acknowledged Jeremiah’s enduring significance for exile and restoration in their reflections on, and responses to, the afflictions of God’s people under foreign domination that spanned the centuries since the time of the Babylonian crisis. However, they differed in their view of the Second Temple. For the author of Daniel 9, the imminent end of the ‘seventy weeks’ of exile would culminate in the reconsecration of the Second Temple and the resumption of its cultus. For the author of the Animal Apocalypse, the Second Temple and its cultus were illegitimate and, therefore, a new Temple was to be built. In the Apocryphon, Jeremiah’s timeless significance for exile developed in keeping with the author’s idea of continuing exile as a religious-spiritual exile of the Jewish people living in the increasingly Hellenized world. Hence, the author of the Apocryphon constructed Jeremiah as a Mosaic preacher of Torah obedience to the exiles, without giving much regard to Jeremiah’s significance

\textsuperscript{170}Dimant (DJD 30, 112) suggests that the Apocryphon is analogous to other contemporary Jewish works composed in reaction to the Hellenistic-Seleucid assaults on the Jewish people and, for that matter, is not a sectarian composition but rather a type of intermediate category. Following Dimant, Davis also argues that the Apocryphon is not a sectarian composition. The Jeremiah of the Apocryphon, as a teacher of Torah and preacher of Torah obedience to the exiles, is in continuity with the Jeremiah figure as portrayed in other contemporary writings such as the Ep. Jer. and 2 Macc 2:2–3.
for the restoration of the city and the Temple. In the Qumranic Jeremiah traditions as developed in 4Q390, the *Damascus Document* and the *Hodayot*, Jeremiah mainly served the Qumran Essenes’ concern with affirming the community’s identity rather than with responding to the problem of a continuing state of exile under gentile domination.\(^{171}\)

As we can see, various groups had different ideas of exile and restoration and different perceptions of Jeremiah’s significance and function. Although we may say in general that the development of Jeremiah’s timeless significance as the major prophet of exile and restoration was closely associated with the developing idea of continuing exile during the Second Temple period, it is important to note that Jeremiah’s significance for the restoration of the city and Temple of Jerusalem was inseparably linked to the idea of continuing exile that developed, especially, in response to the affliction of God’s people, city and Temple under Antiochus IV in the 2nd century B.C.E.

### 4.1.4 Summary

Although Daniel 9 seems to concern itself with the interpretation of Jeremiah’s ‘seventy years’ prophecy rather than with the figuration of Jeremiah, it is noteworthy that the author of Daniel 9, just like the Chronicler before him, viewed the prophet Jeremiah as the major prophetic authority

\(^{171}\)It is also noteworthy that Jeremiah and his prophecies were not crucial to the Qumran Essenes’ eschatological hope of restoration and their concern for the future of Jerusalem and the Temple. As Lawrence H. Schiffman has shown, the idea of restoration developed in Qumran was influenced by the idea of continuing exile and an eschatological hope of restoration in the last days that we commonly find in Jewish historical apocalypses in Second Temple Judaism, and Jerusalem and the Temple were also important elements in the fulfilment of restoration anticipated by the sectarians. However, it seems that Jeremiah’s pro-Jerusalem and pro-Temple significance as developed in non-sectarian Jewish writings was largely irrelevant to the Qumran-Essenes’ concern to legitimize their dissenting position *vis-à-vis* those who presided over Jerusalem and the Temple. Cf. Lawrence H. Schiffman, “The Concept of Restoration in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives*, ed. James M. Scott (JSJSup 72; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 203–221.
on the restoration of Jerusalem and the Temple. Our author turned to Jeremiah’s prophecy of ‘seventy years’ as he grappled with the current Jerusalem crisis under Antiochus IV. He anticipated the destruction of Antiochus IV and the reconsecration of the Temple in the imminent future and believed that these would signal the definitive end of the extended period of Jerusalem’s affliction under imperial rule and the real fulfilment of the promised restoration revealed through Jeremiah’s prophecy. We can discern in Daniel 9 that Jeremiah’s historical and theological significance as the prophet of exile and restoration came to transcend the original historical context of the 6th century B.C.E., and that Jeremiah’s ongoing relevance and significance came to be perceived in close relation to the changing fate of God’s people, city and Temple in the 2nd century B.C.E.

So it seems certain that the growing Jewish perception of a continuing state of exile influenced the development of Jeremiah’s enduring significance as the major prophet of exile. Yet we find in early Jewish writings that exile was conceptualized in many different ways and that the interpretations of Jeremiah’s theological significance and function varied accordingly. For example, in the Apocryphon of Jeremiah C, Jeremiah’s authority as an ideal exilic teacher and leader was affirmed, but his significance for the restoration of the city and the Temple was not acknowledged as important. In Daniel 9, Jeremiah’s enduring significance for exile and his prophetic authority on restoration centred on Jerusalem and the Temple were affirmed against the backdrop of the Antiochene assaults on God’s people, city and Temple. In this regard, the fact that Jeremiah’s close association with the fate of Jerusalem and the Temple was reaffirmed in 2 Maccabees is truly significant. It indicates that Jeremiah’s reputation as the major prophet of exile and restoration was affirmed and reinforced through the historical experience and the theological
interpretation of the Maccabean restoration of the central Jewish city and sanctuary, to which we now turn.

4.2 2 Maccabees 15

Before we examine the portrayal of Jeremiah in 2 Maccabees 15, a few introductory remarks are in order. Although it is stated in 2 Macc 2:23 that the epitomist abbreviated the five-volume work by Jason of Cyrene, the epitome (chs. 3–15) is not a mere abbreviation in that it was recast according to the epitomist’s own theological ideas and interests. Robert Doran has contended that the epitome is a temple-oriented work that recounts the divine deliverance of the Jerusalem Temple. Jan Willem van Henten has argued that the epitome is the history of the salvation of the Jewish temple-state, which may be understood against a Hellenistic literary tradition about a salvation-feast commemorating the liberation of the city-state as well as the rescue of famous sanctuaries. Daniel R. Schwartz has proposed that 2 Maccabees, despite its keen interest in the Jerusalem Temple, climaxes with the salvation and liberation of Jerusalem. According to him,

---

172 Robert Doran, *Temple Propaganda: the Purpose and Character of 2 Maccabees* (CBQMS 12; Washington, DC: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981). According to Doran, 2 Maccabees is typical of the Hellenistic literature dealing with the epiphanic deliverance of a city by its patron deity. He has argued that a tripartite narrative structure of the epitome is focussed on the divine deliverance of the Temple and that the entire epitome functions as Temple propaganda. In his recent commentary, however, Doran revises his earlier view and takes the divine protection of the Temple as the subgenre of the narrative. He suggests that the narrative as a whole summons the Jewish people to follow ancestral traditions and observe Jewish festivals. See Doran, *2 Maccabees: A Critical Commentary* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012), 12–14.


174 Daniel R. Schwartz, *2 Maccabees* (CEJL; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008), 3–7. Schwartz rejects the view that 2 Maccabees is a temple-oriented work. According to him, the focus on the city of Jerusalem in 3:1–3 and 15:37 forms an inclusio and, therefore, the entire epitome must be interpreted as a city-oriented work. In support of this view, we may also consider Schwartz’ argument that the Temple has been reevaluated as the cultic institution of the central Jewish *polis* in the Hellenistic period, unlike in the Persian period when the Temple was central and Jerusalem was seen merely as its locus. See his article, “Temple or City: What did Hellenistic Jews See in Jerusalem?,” in *The
the fact that the narrative conclusion in 15:37 only mentions the liberation of Jerusalem as the ending proper to the history strongly suggests that the entire epitome was intended to be read as a city-oriented history. Nevertheless, we need to note that, even in the final episode of Judas’ definitive victory over Nicanor that leads to the liberation of Jerusalem, the historical and theological importance of the victory also lies in the protection of a recently-reconsecrated Temple (14:36; 15:18). This means that the fate of Jerusalem and that of the Temple are inseparably intertwined in the epitome. Current scholarship tends to favor a bipartite parallel structure that focuses on the two national holidays, Hanukkah and Nicanor’s Day, associated with the restoration of the Temple and the city respectively.

4.2.1 Jeremiah and Reversal of Fate

Jeremiah appears in the final chapter of the epitome, in the account of Judas’ definitive victory over Nicanor’s army and the ensuing liberation of Jerusalem. In a pre-battle speech to his men, Judas Maccabeus relates his dream in order to bolster their courage (15:12–16). In his dream, Judas saw the high priest Onias III. Onias was praying with outstretched hands for the Jewish

---

Schwartz (2 Maccabees, 7–10) argues that the original subject matter of 2 Maccabees is the political sovereignty of the Jewish rule in the city of Jerusalem, and that the book gradually developed to reflect the temple-cultic interest of the Jerusalemites only secondarily. The epitome can be divided into two parallel parts (3:1–10:9 and 10:10–15:36). In both parts, the voluntary death of the righteous is a turning point in history (chs. 6–7 and 14:37–46) and the historical narrative culminates in the establishment of the national festivals, Hanukkah and Nicanor’s Day respectively. On a fourfold structure, see van Henten, The Maccabean Martyrs, 25–26; David S. Williams, “Recent Research in 2 Maccabees,” CBR 2.1 (2003): 69–83, especially 77–78. A fourfold structure of the epitome (3:1–4:6; 4:7–10:9; 10:10–13:26; 14:1–15:36) is not so different from a bipartite structure in that the founding of Jewish festivals is the subject matter of the second and the fourth unit.
‘military corps’ (σώστημα, v. 12). This, most probably, refers to a priestly blessing of the army for victory. Judas also saw another figure with grey hair and great majesty, whom Onias introduced with the following words:

14ο ‘This is a lover of brethren who prays much for the people and the holy city — Jeremiah, the prophet of God.”

14ο ο φιλαδέλφος ουτός έστιν ο πολλά προσευχόμενος πέρι τού λαού καὶ τῆς ἁγίας πόλεως Ἰερεμίας ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ προφήτης.

Note that “Jeremiah, the prophet of God” is also presented as a pray-er. Unlike the high priest Onias III, however, Jeremiah prays for the people and the holy city. The juxtaposition of these two praying figures in Judas’ dream thus implies that Judas’s military victory over Nicanor would have great implications for the fate of the people and the city of Jerusalem.

The prophet Jeremiah who prays for the people and the city is also described as “a lover of brethren” (ὁ φιλαδέλφος). This designation seems to accentuate Jeremiah’s genuine concern and love for the people and the city that we have observed in his exhortations and laments from the book of Jeremiah and also in the Jeremiah persona developed in Lamentations. It is, however, unlikely that a praying Jeremiah in the epitome merely functions to confirm Jeremiah’s well-established personality as “a lover of brethren” who has deep concern and compassionate love for the people and the city. Given that the divine prohibition of Jeremiah’s intercessory prayer connotes God’s will to punish the people and the city in the book of Jeremiah (cf. Jer 7:16; 11:14; 14:11), it is more likely that a praying Jeremiah in the epitome points to a change in God’s will and, by implication, a change in the fate of the people and the city. True, there is no clear indication in the epitome that Jeremiah’s prayer has elicited divine forgiveness and deliverance. Such an intercessory function is assigned to the Maccabean martyrs. The martyrdom of Eleazer

177Schwartz (2 Maccabees, 501) reads σώστημα as a military unit rather than as the whole body of the Jews. His reading seems more appropriate in the literary context of Judas’ battle against Nicanor (cf. 2 Macc 8:5).
and seven brothers with their mother (2 Maccabees 6–7) is integral to the history of salvation in the sense that their deaths bring the period of divine wrath to an end, introduce the time of divine mercy and ensure Judas’ initial victory over Nicanor (ch. 8).\textsuperscript{178} Similarly, Razis’ voluntary death (14:37–46) precedes Judas’ definitive victory over Nicanor (ch. 15).\textsuperscript{179} Therefore, we cannot postulate that a praying Jeremiah performs the intercessory function comparable to that of the Maccabean martyrs.\textsuperscript{180} However, in view of the divine prohibition against praying for the people which is announced repeatedly in the book of Jeremiah, we may say that a praying Jeremiah in the epitome conveys the idea that the time of divine favor and blessing, that is, the time of a great reversal for the people and the city has finally arrived in Jewish history.

Jeremiah’s significance for the fate of the people and the city continues to be affirmed in Judas’ dream (15:15–16), where Jeremiah appears as a mediator who delivers the divine gift of a golden sword to Judas to smite Nicanor’s army:

\begin{quote}
Jeremiah stretched out his right hand and gave to Judas a golden sword, and as he gave it he addressed him thus: \textsuperscript{16}`Take this holy sword, a gift from God, with which you will strike down your adversaries.’"
\end{quote}

It has been well-noted in scholarship that the divine gift of a sword is an Egyptian motif: the principal god gives a sword to the Pharaoh or Ptolemaic king in order to ensure his victory over

---

\textsuperscript{178} Ulrike Mittmann-Richert, \textit{Supplementa: Einführung zu den Jüdischen Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit: Historische und legendarische Erzählungen} (JSRZ VI, 1,1; Gütersloh; Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2000), 41–42. According to Mittmann-Richert’s chiastic structure of the epitome, martyrdom placed at the centre of the epitome (6:18–10:8) is the turning point in history in the sense that it introduces divine grace and intervention.

\textsuperscript{179} On the effect of Razis’ suicide, see van Henten, \textit{The Maccabean Martyrs}, 144–150. Considering some non-Jewish sources, van Henten argues that Razis’ suicide is a self-sacrifice that transfers divine wrath to the enemy.

\textsuperscript{180} Cf. van Henten (\textit{The Maccabean Martyrs}, 181, n. 252) argues that Onias and Jeremiah in Judas’ dream are vindicated martyrs who offer intercessory prayer, based on the assumption that Jeremiah’s violent death was a well-known tradition as it is attested in “Vita Jeremiahae” (\textit{The Lives of the Prophets}).
the enemy. Yet we also see in the *Animal Apocalypse* (*1 Enoch* 90:19) that God gives “the sword” to the sheep to destroy the beasts. This refers to the Maccabean war that brought the entire period of gentile domination to an end. It seems that our author was fully aware of the importance of the sword motif in theologizing and legitimizing Judas’ military resistance as a divinely-authorized war against the enemies of the people towards the fulfilment of restoration.

To some extent, the high priest Onias III, who is portrayed as praying for Judas’ men for their military victory, seems to be a better candidate than Jeremiah for the role of delivering the sword to Judas. Schwartz accounts for the choice of the prophet Jeremiah for this role in terms of Jeremiah’s popularity among the Egyptian diaspora. Yet this is a simplistic explanation that considers neither Jeremiah’s close association with the unfolding fate of Jerusalem and the Temple nor his enduring significance in the ongoing Jewish conceptualizations of exile and restoration during the Second Temple period. Note that the Jeremiah who delivers the sword and endorses Judas’ armed resistance to Greece in the epitome is contrasted with the Jeremiah who advocates nonviolent submission to Babylon in the book of Jeremiah. Such a contrast has led J. J. Collins to regard the Jeremiah figure in the epitome as ironic. He says, “No biblical figure would be less

---


183 Also consider Daniel L. Smith’s interesting article, “Jeremiah as Prophet of Nonviolent Resistance,” *JSOT* 43 (1989): 95–107. Smith suggests that Jeremiah’s strategy for exileic existence (i.e., build, plant and multiply) that is revealed in his exilic letter in Jer 29:5–7 espouses nonviolent resistance. Nevertheless, we need to note that Jeremiah is never portrayed as advocating violent resistance in the book of Jeremiah.
apt to endorse the Maccabees.” However, it is important to note that Jeremiah’s advice of submission and his deliverance of the sword attest to his pro-Jerusalem Tendenz in that they both were intended to protect and save Jerusalem from the threat of imperial powers. Moreover, the changing portrait of Jeremiah, from a prophet of nonviolent submission to a prophet of violent resistance, may indicate a great reversal in the fate of Jerusalem from subjection to independence and from desolation to restoration. In the book of Jeremiah, Zedekiah’s rejection of Jeremiah’s advice of submission triggered the Babylonian destruction of Jerusalem. In the epitome, Judas’ acceptance of Jeremiah’s golden sword for armed resistance to Greece leads to the restoration of Jerusalem. It is truly significant that Jeremiah’s changing roles have direct implications for the changing fate of Jerusalem.

Consider the author’s concluding remark in 2 Macc 15:37: “from that time the city has been in the possession of the Hebrews. So I will here end my story.” The implication is that the suffering of the people and the city under foreign domination came to an end through Judas’ definitive victory over Nicanor in 161 B.C.E. We can infer from this concluding statement that the important function of the prophet Jeremiah, who is portrayed as a pray-er for the people and the holy city and as a deliverer of the sword to Judas in the final chapter of the epitome, is to affirm that a prolonged ‘exile’ under imperial rule, which began with the Babylonian crisis in the 6th century B.C.E., has come to a full end with the liberation of Jerusalem and the achievement of Jewish independence in the 2nd century B.C.E. Schwartz suggests that the reappearance of Onias III in 15:12, after his initial appearance in 3:1–3, connotes the restoration of Jerusalem’s earlier state of peace enjoyed

---

under his leadership.\textsuperscript{185} We may argue that the appearance of the prophet Jeremiah side by side with Onias III connotes a different level of restoration, that is, the restoration of Jerusalem’s earlier state of independence which was enjoyed prior to the Babylonian crisis.

4.2.2 Jeremiah as the Prophet of the Maccabean Restoration

Historically speaking, the real liberation of Jerusalem came much later in 142 B.C.E. when Simon became the leader of the Jews and the Akra was freed from the gentiles (cf. 1 Macc 13:41–42, 49–53). The Akra and the gentile garrison stationed there were the symbols of the gentile control and occupation of the holy city and ongoing threats to the Temple (cf. 1 Macc 1:29–40). Therefore, the fact that they continued to exist in Jerusalem even after Antiochus IV’s death and Judas’ rededication of the Temple in 164 B.C.E. must have led some Jews to think that the end of the desolator, Antiochus IV, and the reconsecration of the Temple did not bring about the complete end of the ongoing desolation of Jerusalem under imperial rule (cf. Dan 9:24–27). Jerusalem and the Temple were still under the threat of violence. In this regard, it is noteworthy that the Akra is mentioned in the final chapter of the epitome, in the account of Judas’ defeat of Nicanor: Judas summons the gentiles stationed in the Akra, shows them Nicanor’s head and arm and hangs his bust from the Akra (2 Macc 15:31–35). Compare 1 Macc 7:47, in which Nicanor’s head and right hand are cut off and hung up outside Jerusalem. There is no mention of the Akra in connection with Nicanor’s death in 1 Maccabees. Therefore, it is very likely that Judas’ actions described in the final chapter of the epitome were intended to construct the significance of Judas’ defeat of Nicanor in 161 B.C.E. as completely eradicating gentile threats to Jerusalem and the Temple.

\textsuperscript{185}Schwartz, \textit{2 Maccabees}, 501.
It is noteworthy that the political significance of Nicanor’s death corresponds to that of Antiochus IV’s death in the epitome. Of course, the theological significance of their death is also very important. The death of Antiochus IV is viewed as God’s just punishment of the arrogant and evil king of Greece who attacked God’s people, city and Temple (2 Macc 9:4, 16). His death thus affirms God’s sovereign rule over history in accordance with the theological principle of a retributive theodicy. His death also signals, as in Daniel 9, the reconsecration of the Jerusalem Temple: the account of Judas’ Temple rededication (2 Macc 10:1–8) immediately follows that of Antiochus IV’s death. Similarly, Nicanor’s death is interpreted as God’s just punishment in that he, in his arrogance, rose up against God’s holy people, city and Temple (14:12–14, 31–33; 15:1–6). Nicanor’s death also has implications for the Temple in that the reconsecrated sanctuary was not defiled by his army. It is, however, to the political significance of their death that the epitomist draws our attention. In his vow made to the Lord before his death, Antiochus IV not only promises to restore the Temple but also declares Jerusalem to be free and the Jews to be free citizens (9:14–16). He then writes a letter to the “Jewish citizens,” in which he says that his successor will follow his royal policy concerning the Jewish people and the city of Jerusalem (vv. 19–27). The complete fulfilment of Antiochus IV’s vow is narrated in the final chapter of the epitome, in the account of Nicanor’s death that leads to the political independence of the city and the people (cf. 15:37).

---

186 In 2 Maccabees 9, the death of Antiochus IV is seen as God’s just punishment upon the “murderer and blasphemer” (v. 28). On the theological aspect of Antiochus IV’s death, see Daniel Schwartz, “Why did Antiochus have to fall (II Maccabees 9:7)?,” in Heavenly Tablets: Interpretation, Identity and Tradition in Ancient Judaism, ed. Lynn LiDonnici and Andrea Lieber (JSJSup 119; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 257–265; Doron Mendels, “A Note on the Tradition of Antiochus IV’s Death,” IEJ 31 (1981): 53–56. Despite the influence of the Babylonian tradition of Nabonidus’ prayer, 2 Maccabees 9 does not mention king’s recovery from the disease.

187 Van Henten (The Maccabean Martyrs, 251) considers the second half of the epitome as the Jewish struggle to defend the freedom of the people and the city, which has already been recognized by Antiochus IV (9:13–27) and Antiochus V (11:22–33).
The fact that the Jeremiah figure appears at the end of the second half of the epitome in association with Judas’ liberation of Jerusalem, rather than at the end of the first half in association with the death of Antiochus IV and the rededication of the Temple, clearly shows that our author, unlike the author of Daniel 9, did not consider ‘the end of the desolator’ and ‘the reconsecration of the holy of holies’ as significant markers for restoration. He believed that the time of restoration dawned in Jewish history only when Judas, with God’s help, secured the fate of Jerusalem and a recently-reconsecrated Temple from the threat of violence and paved the way for the establishment of an independent Jewish state. From his perspective, the promised restoration associated with the prophet Jeremiah was not far from a political-national restoration of Israel. In this respect, the epitomist’s perception of Jeremiah’s theo-political significance was also distinct from the Chronicler’s. In the epitome, the prophet Jeremiah is associated with Judas whose armed resistance played a significant role in establishing an autonomous Jewish state centred in Jerusalem, whereas in 2 Chronicles the prophet Jeremiah is associated with the rise of Cyrus who allowed the Jewish people to return to Jerusalem to rebuild the Jerusalem Temple under the aegis of Persia and this was, in the Chronicler’s view, a primary first step towards the re-manifestation of the theocratic kingdom of Yahweh centred in Jerusalem.

True, it is significant that the authors of 2 Chronicles, Daniel 9 and the epitome all acknowledged Jeremiah’s historical and theological significance for the fulfilment of restoration centred on the city and Temple of Jerusalem. Yet it is only in the epitome that Jeremiah is not presented as the prophet of ‘seventy years.’ Jeremiah is portrayed as a pray-er for the people and the holy city and an advocate of violent resistance who supported Judas’ armed revolt towards the liberation of Jerusalem. This indicates that the epitomist did not want to conceptualize the Maccabean
achievements as an ineluctable fulfilment of Jeremiah’s prophecy but rather as the restoration supported and endorsed by “Jeremiah, the prophet of God.” Most probably, our author reconfigured Jeremiah as the prophet of the Maccabean restoration in order to commemorate the Jewish struggle and sacrifice for the ancestral laws and customs and also to portray Judas as a divinely-appointed leader for the salvation of the people and the city. Yet there is no question that our author was fully aware of Jeremiah’s historical and theological significance as the prophet of exile and restoration with respect to the changing fate of God’s people, city and Temple. As mentioned above, it was by means of the Jeremiah figure that the author was able to affirm the significance of Judas’ achievements as terminating a prolonged time of ‘exile’ under imperial rule and inaugurating the time of restoration towards the reestablishment of earlier conditions for God’s people, city and Temple, that is, the restoration of their freedom and security which they enjoyed prior to the Babylonian crisis.

4.2.3 Summary

As regards the Jeremiah of the epitome, it is crucial to note that the author’s idea of reversal is substantiated by the changing portrait of Jeremiah. The Jeremiah who is portrayed as praying much for the people and the city in the epitome stands in contrast to the prophet Jeremiah who was forbidden to pray for them before the Babylonian destruction of Jerusalem. The Jeremiah who delivers the divine gift of a sword to Judas and authorizes his violent resistance is also contrasted with the prophet Jeremiah who advocated nonviolent submission to Babylon during the final days of Judah and Jerusalem. The Jeremiah figure as portrayed in the epitome thus indicates a radical reversal for the people and the city and serves to construct the significance of Judas’ definitive victory over Nicanor as terminating the entire period of affliction under imperial rule spanning
from the 6th to the 2nd century B.C.E. Hence, we can clearly see in the epitome that Jeremiah’s enduring significance as the prophet of exile and restoration and, especially, his strong pro-Jerusalem Tendenz were affirmed and further reinforced by the author who interpreted the Maccabean restoration as the very restoration supported by the prophet Jeremiah himself. Jeremiah thus emerges as the prophet of the Maccabean restoration in the epitome. This partly explains why the Jeremiah figure reappears in the second letter prefixed to the epitome.

4.3 2 Maccabees 2:1–8

The first and second letters prefixed to the epitome were sent by the Jerusalem Jews to the Jews of Egypt with a view to encouraging them to celebrate Hanukkah. The second letter (2 Macc 1:10–2:18), unlike the first (1:1–9), contains the accounts of Nehemiah and Jeremiah. It has been well-noted in scholarship that the Nehemiah pericope (1:18–36) serves to legitimize Judas’ Temple rededication by establishing the continuity between the Maccabean Temple and the First and Second Temples by means of the altar fire. We read in the Nehemiah pericope that the altar fire, which the priests hid in Jerusalem at the time of the Babylonian destruction of the city and the Temple, was later recovered by Nehemiah and his priests in the early Persian period. The fire was recovered in the form of a liquid that miraculously caught fire and consumed the sacrifices when the sun shone. It is evident that the altar fire, hidden and recovered, legitimizes the Second Temple by emphasizing its continuity with the First. The author’s statement in 1:31 that the remaining liquid was poured on large stones (λιθοίως) is particularly noteworthy in view of Judas’ Temple rededication. We read in 10:3 that Judas made a fire with stones (λιθοίως) and offered

188 The first letter in 1:1–9 is dated to 124/3 B.C.E., but the second letter has been regarded by most scholars as a fictive letter which was composed sometime between 124/3 and 63 B.C.E. For a different view, see Schwartz, 2 Maccabees, 11–14. Schwartz dates the first letter and the epitome to 143/2 B.C.E.
The Nehemiah pericope is immediately followed by the account of Jeremiah. The Jeremiah pericope in 2:1–8 also serves the purpose of the second prefixed letter by legitimizing the Maccabean Temple and motivating the Egyptian Jews to celebrate Hanukkah. As will be shown below, however, it offers different theological-ideological motivations for celebrating it. On the one hand, it affirms the unity of all Jews (vv. 1–3). On the other hand, it legitimizes Judas’ reconsecration of the Temple by interpreting its historical and theological significance in light of the Jewish hope for an eschatological salvation and restoration (vv. 4–8).

4.3.1 Jeremiah’s Instruction to the Deportees to Babylon

It is indicated at the very beginning of the Jeremiah pericope that what is written in the letter regarding the prophet Jeremiah is an authentic and authoritative tradition that the author has discovered “in the records” (ἐν ταῖς ἀπογραφαίς). This is how the author authorized his innovative construction of Jeremiah in 2:1, that the prophet Jeremiah ordered the deportees to Babylon to take some of the altar fire with them. This reveals the author’s innovative idea that the exiles have in their possession the legitimate altar fire from the First Temple. Hence, it is unlikely that Jeremiah’s instruction concerning the altar fire was meant to criticize the worship outside

---

189 Schwartz, 2 Maccabees, 157.

190 Because of Jeremiah’s instruction in Torah obedience and covenant loyalty that is mentioned in vv. 2–3, it is usually assumed that “the records” refer to the Epistle of Jeremiah, but Dimant (DJD 30, 107–108) suggests that the Apocryphon of Jeremiah C is also a good candidate.
Jerusalem.\(^{191}\) Rather, it was to affirm the synchronic continuity between the cultic centre in Jerusalem and the exiled community. As noted in the Nehemiah pericope, the motif of the altar fire serves to legitimize the Maccabean Temple by establishing the diachronic continuity between the First, Second and Maccabean Temples. The same motif now serves to bring all Jews together as a single religious-cultic community that acknowledges the centrality and sanctity of the Jerusalem Temple to which the same legitimate altar fire was restored previously by Nehemiah and recently by Judas. Therefore, we may say that Jeremiah’s instruction concerning the altar fire has to do with the author’s concern to affirm the unity of all Jews for the sake of the universal commemoration of Judas’ purification of the Jerusalem Temple.

According to the passage in vv. 2–3, the prophet Jeremiah also instructed the deportees to Babylon not to forget the commandments of the Lord, warned them against idolatry, and exhorted them that the law must not depart from their hearts. Here, Jeremiah is portrayed as a Mosaic preacher of Torah obedience and covenant loyalty, who is greatly concerned with preserving the Jewish way of life in exile. Although Jeremiah’s Mosaic instruction is a common topos in the Jeremiah tradition, the focus on the Torah seems to be a digression from the main subject matter of the second letter. In order to understand the implications of Jeremiah’s Torah instruction for the celebration of Hanukkah, we need to take the epitome into consideration.

The history of salvation narrated in the epitome is a deuteronomistic historiography. The self-

---

\(^{191}\)As regards the prefixed letters, Goldstein (Il Maccabees, 25–26) has argued that the celebration of Hanukkah performed a polemical function against the Oniad temple in Leontopolis. Stephanie von Dobbele (Die Bücher 1/2 Makkabäer [NSKAT 11; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk GmnH, 1997], 169 ff.) has also argued that the letters are against the cult in Leontopolis. However, Jeremiah’s instruction about the altar fire in 2:1 does not support their view. J. J. Collins is correct in saying that the letters do not show any anti-Oniad tendency but only ask the Egyptian Jews to observe Hanukkah. See J. J. Collins, Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 2000), 69–83. Also Doran, Temple Propaganda, 11–12.
seeking, hellenizing Jews of Jerusalem brought disasters upon the city and the Temple, but the Maccabean martyrs and Judas’ men who fought and died for the ancestral laws and customs elicited divine intervention and deliverance.\textsuperscript{192} It is worthy of note that such a theological pattern in the Maccabean historiography is also closely related to the rise of Jewish nationalism in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century B.C.E. Jewish nationalism must not be taken merely as a political concept, although a Jewish political autonomy was achieved during this time.\textsuperscript{193} As David Goodblatt has suggested, Jewish nationalism in antiquity was intertwined with the ethnic, cultural, religious and political components of Jewish identity. Thus Goodblatt defines the national identity as “a belief in a common descent and shared culture available for mass political mobilization.”\textsuperscript{194} In this respect, Judas and his men who are portrayed in the epitome as adhering to \textit{Ioudaísmos} and rising in opposition to the hellenizing movement under Antiochus IV clearly attest to the rise of Jewish nationalism in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century B.C.E. Note that the Greek word \textit{Ioudaísmos}, which occurs for the first time in 2 Maccabees (8:1; 14:38), if interpreted as a reference to the Jewish way of life vis-à-vis foreign (Greek) ways, points to the essence of the ethno-cultural-religious identity of the Jews.\textsuperscript{195} Moreover, Judas who fought for the ancestral laws and customs was a man of Torah

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{192}George W. E. Nickelsburg, \textit{Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction} (2\textsuperscript{nd} ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005), 106–108. Although Nickelsburg’s view that the epitome is structured in accordance with a deuteronomic scheme is not well supported, there is no question that a deuteronomistic view of retributive theodicy influenced the rhetoric of the epitome.

\textsuperscript{193}On political nationalism, Doron Mendels, \textit{The Rise and Fall of Jewish Nationalism: Jewish and Christian Ethnicity in Ancient Palestine} (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1992).


\end{footnotes}
obedience in reconsecrating the Jerusalem Temple in the sense that he destroyed all the idolatrous altars and shrines in Jerusalem in accordance with the Mosaic Torah (10:2; cf. Deut 7:5; 12:3).

It seems certain that the history of salvation narrated in the epitome manifests a national consciousness of the Jewish people and testifies to their corporate identity as a unique people of God.

That said, we can understand why Jeremiah’s Mosaic instruction to the exiles is mentioned in the second letter. First, the Maccabean restoration of the city and Temple of Jerusalem was achieved by those who rose in revolt with a view to safeguarding the ancestral laws and customs. Second, the ancestral laws and customs were fundamental to the corporate identity of the Jewish people and their self-definition vis-à-vis other peoples. Hence, the account of Jeremiah’s Torah instruction to the exiles could give support to the author’s appeal to the Egyptian Jews: all who confess their Jewish identity and obey God’s holy law must acknowledge their unity and solidarity with the Jerusalem Jews who fought and died for the cause of Ioudaïsmos and celebrate Hanukkah together with them.

4.3.2 Jeremiah’s Hiding of the Temple Vessels

Jeremiah’s close association with the fate of the Jerusalem Temple is clearly expressed in 2 Macc 2:4–8, where he is portrayed as a preserver of the sacred vessels. The author claims that he found a story of Jeremiah’s hidden vessels “in the document” (v. 4, ἔν τῇ γραφῇ). Most probably, this

Steve Mason, however, defines Ioudaïsmos in 2 Maccabees as “Judaization” which arose in reaction to the hellenizing movement under Antiochus IV, rather than as “Judaism” which he regards as an anachronistic concept in ancient history. Hence, he argues that we do not need another term “Jew” in order to highlight the cultural-religious component of Jewish identity in antiquity. For Mason, “Judaean” is a fully functioning category that constructs Ioudaioi as a unique people, an ethnos, adhering to their ancestral place, law and custom regardless of their actual presence in the land of Judaea. See Steve Mason, “Jews, Judeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History,” JSJ 38 (2007): 457–512.
document refers to *Eupolemus* (ca. 158/7 B.C.E.), which is believed to be the origin of the tradition of Jeremiah’s hiding of the Temple vessels. Five fragments of Eupolemus’ rewritten history of Israel are preserved in Eusebius, and Jeremiah’s preservation of the vessels is mentioned in the fourth fragment, in the account of the fall of Jerusalem.

Most scholars characterize Eupolemus’ historiography as nationalistic, apologetic, and propagandistic because the cultural, religious and political superiority of the Jews is underscored in it. Even the account of the fall of Jerusalem seems to have been influenced by his nationalistic and propagandistic *Tendenz*. According to Eupolemus, the prophet Jeremiah foretold misfortune on account of the people’s idolatry and his own persecution at the hands of King Jonachim, and Nebuchadnezzar invaded Jerusalem only after hearing about Jeremiah’s prophecy. Eupolemus’ idea that Jeremiah’s prophecy influenced Nebuchadnezzar’s decision and action elevates the status of Jeremiah above the gentile king and presents him literally as a prophet over nations and kingdoms (cf. Jer 1:10). We also read that, when Nebuchadnezzar took the Temple treasures to Babylon, Jeremiah withheld the ark and the tablets in it and preserved them in Jerusalem. This account contradicts the Deuteronomistic historians’ idea of an utter destruction of the Jerusalem Temple and its holy vessels. It also differs from 2 Chr 36:18 and Ezra 1:7, according to which the precious vessels were preserved safely, not in Jerusalem, but in Babylon.

---


198 On the persecution of Jeremiah as a direct cause of the destruction of Jerusalem, see also Sirach 49:4–7.
Eupolemus’ account maintains that the core object of the sanctum did not fall into the hands of the enemy.

Ulrike Mittmann-Richert has argued that Jeremiah’s preservation of the ark and the tablets anticipates their eschatological restoration. Possible, but we cannot ascertain from the extant fragments that Eupolemus concerned himself with the eschatological retrieval of the ark and the tablets. Based on Eupolemus’ nationalistic and triumphalistic Tendenz, however, we may suppose that Jeremiah’s preservation of the ark and the tablets was to affirm the superiority of the Jews in at least two respects. First, given that the Jerusalem Temple survived the Antiochene assault and was rededicated by Judas, it is possible that Jeremiah’s safeguarding of the ark in Jerusalem was intended to relativize gentile assaults on the Jerusalem Temple and to demonstrate its superiority and sanctity as the central Jewish sanctuary. Second, given the Antiochene suppression of Jewish laws and religious practices, Jeremiah’s preservation of the ark and the tablets in it may be seen as Eupolemus’ way of confirming the superiority of the Torah and establishing its centrality in the affirmation of Jewish identity. Therefore, we may say that Eupolemus’ Jeremiah played a significant role in upholding the primary Jewish institutions, the Jerusalem Temple and the Torah.

---

199 Mittmann-Richert, Supplementa, 181–183.

200 Cf. Doron Mendels, The Land of Israel as a Political Concept in Hasmonean Literature: Recourse to History in Second Century B.C. Claims to the Holy Land (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1987), 29–46, especially 39–46. According to Mendels, Eupolemus was concerned with affirming the legitimacy of the Jerusalem Temple against other Jewish temples, especially Onias’ temple at Leontopolis, and one of the ways to achieve his goal was to underscore “the structural continuity” between Moses’ tabernacle, the Solomonic Temple and the Second Temple. Mendels has also argued that Jeremiah’s preservation of the ark in Jerusalem is part of the theme of “the structural continuity” which supports the legitimacy and centrality of the Jerusalem Temple. It is, however, unlikely that “the structural continuity” of the Jerusalem Temple was meant to denounce other Jewish sanctuaries. Given Eupolemus’ nationalistic and propagandistic Tendenz, it is more likely that such a continuity was meant to bolster a national pride of all Jews by affirming the sanctity and superiority of the central Jewish sanctuary in Jerusalem that survived the Babylonian (Seleucid) assault.
In the second letter prefixed to the epitome, Jeremiah’s close association with the Torah is noted in 2:2–3. Jeremiah’s Temple association also comes to the fore in the account of his preservation of the sacred vessels in 2:4–8. Yet the author of the second letter reworked Eupolemus’ innovative construction of Jeremiah according to his own concern to legitimize the Maccabean Temple in the eyes of the Egyptian Jews:

4It was also in the document that the prophet, having received an oracle, ordered that the tent and the ark should follow with him, and that he went out to the mountain where Moses had gone up and had seen the inheritance of God. Jeremiah came and found a cave-dwelling, and he brought there the tent and the ark and the altar of incense; then he sealed up the entrance. Some of those who followed him came up intending to mark the way, but could not find it. When Jeremiah learned of it, he rebuked them and declared: “The place shall remain unknown until God gathers his people together again and shows his mercy. Then the Lord will disclose these things, and the glory of the Lord and the cloud will appear, as they were shown in the case of Moses, and as Solomon asked that the place should be specially consecrated.”

Here, Jeremiah is more than a preserver of the Temple vessels. He is portrayed as a second Moses in that he hid the sacred vessels in a cave at Mount Nebo and announced their future revelation at the eschatological time of God’s great ingathering of the people into the holy place. The story of Jeremiah’s hidden vessels that points to a new exodus of God’s people and their return to the holy place must have rendered the second letter very relevant and interesting to the Egyptian Jews.

We find in vv. 4–5 a new list of Jeremiah’s hidden vessels: the tent, the ark and the altar of incense. In their joint article, Isaac Kalimi and James D. Purvis have argued that the account of Jeremiah’s hiding of the Temple vessels in the second prefixed letter not only explains why the ark and the tent were missing in the Second Temple but also responds to the problem, that “at the
time of writing the second temple lacked the full sanctity of the first temple, and of the tabernacle

201Note that God’s great ingathering of the people into the holy place is central to the author’s vision of restoration which is expressed throughout the second prefixed letter (cf. 2 Macc 1:29; 2:7–8, 17–18).
earlier still.\textsuperscript{202} It is, however, questionable whether Jeremiah’s hiding of the tent, the ark and the altar of incense was meant to deal exclusively with the incomplete sanctity of the Second Temple \textit{vis-à-vis} the First. As Kalimi and Purvis themselves have noted, the altar of incense was not missing in the Second Temple. Moreover, according to the account in 2 Macc 10:3, Judas offered incense offerings at the rededication ceremony. Hence, it is plausible and possible that the author of the second letter added this third item — the altar of incense — to the list of the hidden vessels in 2:5 for a special purpose (compare v. 4).

The author’s innovative idea, that the altar of incense which is present in the Maccabean Temple was one of Jeremiah’s hidden vessels to be revealed at the eschatological time of God’s great ingathering, has great implications for the historical and theological significance of Judas’ Temple rededication. The altar of incense hidden by Jeremiah but used by Judas in his reconsecration and rededication ceremony suggests that the eschatological time of restoration anticipated by Jeremiah has already begun with Judas’ Temple restoration. This further implies that God’s great ingathering promised through Jeremiah is imminent, and that the Maccabean Temple is the very Temple to which the rest of the hidden vessels will be restored and in which God’s glory and the cloud will reappear. The concluding words of the second letter corroborate such a view. The author writes: “We have hope in God that he will soon have mercy on us and will gather us from everywhere under heaven into his holy place, for he has rescued us from great evils and has purified the place” (2:18). It is the author’s conviction that God who has delivered the Jerusalem community from the Seleucids and purified the Temple will “soon” gather the dispersed Jews into

the holy place. In this respect, it is most likely that the author of the second letter tried to legitimize Judas’ Temple restoration by affirming its significance as inaugurating the eschatological time of salvation and restoration spoken by Jeremiah.

Theodore A. Bergren has argued that the stories of Nehemiah, Jeremiah, Moses and Solomon in the second letter all support the Maccabean restoration of the Temple. According to him, such support comes from a set of “historical antecedents for Judas’ activities of dedication, placing him at the end of a redoubtable chain of worthies that includes Nehemiah, Solomon, Moses and, to some degree, Jeremiah.”

Here, Bergren has underestimated the significance of the innovative reconstruction of the Jeremiah figure in the second letter. The author of the second letter supported Judas’ Temple restoration, not only by looking for the “historical antecedents for Judas’ activities of dedication,” but also by considering the historical and theological implications of Judas’ activities of dedication for the future history of the people. Hence, he incorporated the account of Jeremiah’s hidden vessels into his letter and contextualized Judas’ Temple restoration in the unfolding history of salvation. He redefined Mount Nebo, the place where Moses saw the inheritance of God, as the place where Jeremiah hid the sacred vessels for their eschatological revelation and return to ‘the place.’ He portrayed Jeremiah as a second Moses who anticipated an eschatological re-enactment of the Urhistory of salvation and who affirmed the centrality of the Jerusalem Temple in the consummation of the salvation history of the people. Our author, by including the altar of incense in the list of Jeremiah’s hidden vessels, identified the Second Temple rededicated by Judas as ‘the place’ where the hidden vessels shall be revealed eschatologically. This not only served to establish the continuity between the Maccabean Temple and the

---

eschatological ingathering centre but also served to legitimize Judas’ Temple restoration as signalling the imminent fulfilment of God’s ingathering of the people. In this respect, it is most likely that our author incorporated the account of Jeremiah’s hidden vessels into the second letter in order to motivate the Egyptian Jews to commemorate Judas’ Temple restoration in acknowledgment of its historical and theological significance in the unfolding history of the salvation of God’s people.

4.3.3 Summary

The author of the second letter knew many traditions about Jeremiah’s activities at the beginning of the Babylonian exile in the 6th century B.C.E. and he constructed them anew as he tried to interpret and legitimize Judas’ Temple restoration in the 2nd century B.C.E. Jeremiah’s instructions to the deportees to Babylon concerning the altar fire and Torah obedience (2:1–3) were intended to affirm the unity of all Jews so that the Egyptian Jews might celebrate Hanukkah together with the Jerusalem Jews. The account of Jeremiah’s hiding of the Temple vessels for their eschatological revelation (vv. 4–8) was intended to legitimize Judas’ Temple restoration as inaugurating the blessed time of fulfilment foreseen by Jeremiah and to motivate the Egyptian Jews to celebrate Hanukkah in view of the imminent consummation of the history of salvation.

From the author’s 2nd (or 1st) century B.C.E. standpoint, his own time in history was the right time to anticipate God’s great ingathering of the people, that is, the eschatological consummation of the history of salvation revealed through the prophet Jeremiah at the beginning of the Babylonian exile. This indicates that our author also believed that the time of exile which began in the 6th century B.C.E. was coming to an end through the Maccabean restoration. Noteworthy here is that
it was Jeremiah’s hidden vessels and their eschatological revelation that provided the author with the historical and theological framework of exile and restoration through which to interpret the significance of Judas’ Temple rededication. This clearly shows that our author fully acknowledged Jeremiah’s timeless significance for the fate of the Jerusalem Temple as the prophet of exile and restoration and utilized the Jeremiah tradition as he tried to understand the significance of the recent development in the history of the Jewish people — the Maccabean restoration overcoming the Antiochene crisis.

4.4 Conclusion

In this chapter, we have considered the ongoing development of Jeremiah and his significance in Daniel 9 and 2 Maccabees against the backdrop of the Antiochene crisis and the Maccabean restoration. Jeremiah played a significant role in the authors’ reflections on, and interpretations of, the Seleucid assaults on Jerusalem and the Temple and the ensuing Maccabean restoration. These authors all believed that the exilic age which had begun with the Babylonian crisis in the 6th century B.C.E. was coming to an end in the 2nd (or 1st) century B.C.E., and that the fulfilment of the restoration anticipated by Jeremiah was to be, or had already been, realized in their own days. In this way, they continued to develop and affirm Jeremiah’s timeless significance for exile and restoration through the changing fate of God’s people, city and Temple.

Yet their ideas of exile and restoration were not exactly the same. In Daniel 9, the Antiochene assault on Jerusalem and the Temple was seen as indisputable evidence for an ongoing exile, and the destruction of Antiochus IV and the restoration of the Jerusalem Temple were presented as two key constituents of the end-time fulfilment of the ‘seventy’ symbolic time of exile. In the epitome,
the Seleucid assaults on Jerusalem as well as the encroachment of the Greek way of life were signs of a continuing state of exile, and Judas’ liberation of the people and the city from Seleucid rule signalled the real fulfilment of restoration. In the second letter prefixed to the epitome, the ongoing dispersion of the Jewish people indicated that exile was an ongoing reality, and Judas’ Temple rededication was viewed as inaugurating the eschatological time of fulfilment when God would soon gather His beloved people into the holy place in Jerusalem.

It is noteworthy that, despite these differences, Jeremiah continued to be constructed and presented as a pro-Jerusalem and pro-Temple figure. For the author of Daniel 9, Jeremiah, the prophet of ‘seventy years,’ was the major authority on restoration centred on Jerusalem and the Temple. The Jeremiah of the epitome was the prophet of the Maccabean restoration who supported Judas’ armed revolt towards the liberation of Jerusalem and the establishment of an autonomous Jewish rule in it. In the second prefixed letter, the Jeremiah who hid the sacred vessels and anticipated an eschatological renewal of the Jerusalem Temple as the ingathering centre served the author’s concern to legitimize the Maccabean restoration of the Temple in the context of the unfolding history of the salvation of God’s people. All these texts demonstrate that Jeremiah’s timeless significance for exile and restoration with respect to the fate of God’s holy city and Temple was firmly established and further reinforced through the authors’ theological interpretations of the Seleucid assault on, and the Maccabean restoration of, Jerusalem and the Temple in the 2nd century B.C.E.
Despite the Maccabean restoration in the 2nd century B.C.E., Pompey’s assault on Jerusalem and the Temple in 63 B.C.E. and the complete loss of Jewish independence in 6 C.E. were enough to dampen the spirit of Jewish triumphalism and, at the same time, enough to rekindle the nationalistic aspiration of the Jewish people towards the victory over another evil gentile empire and the reestablishment of an autonomous Jewish nation. The resurgent political and militant Jewish nationalism is clearly manifested in the First Jewish Revolt which unfortunately ended in failure with the Roman capture of Jerusalem and the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple in 70 C.E. The devastating effect of the Roman destruction of the Jerusalem Temple was far greater than that of the desecrations of the Temple by Antiochus IV and Pompey in that the loss of the Temple and cessation of the Temple worship meant the recapitulation of the Babylonian crisis and the onset of the second “templeless age” in Jewish history, if I may borrow Jill Middlemas’ term. Moreover, Hadrian’s foundation of Aelia Capitolina on Jerusalem in the 130s intensified the spirit of resistance to Rome since the construction of Aelia Capitolina meant the loss of Jerusalem in addition to the Temple. Therefore, it is not difficult to imagine that Jeremiah would emerge once again as an important theological figure in the ongoing Jewish reflections on the present and future of the people in the aftermath of the destruction of the Second Temple in 70 C.E. and the desolation of Jerusalem in the 130s.

---

204 This chapter is an expanded version of the present writer’s article, “The Development of the Jeremiah Figure in 2 Baruch and 4 Baruch: A Response to Jens Herzer,” in Jeremiah’s Scriptures: Production, Reception, Interaction, and Transformation, ed. Hindy Najman and Konrad Schmid (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 398–416.

2 Baruch and 4 Baruch (Paraleiopomena Jeremiou) are two important pieces of Jewish writing where we can find some interesting constructions of the Jeremiah figure from the post-70 period. The authors of 2 Baruch and 4 Baruch reinvented the past history of the Babylonian crisis in order to deal with the present Roman crisis and to envision the future history of the people. They both acknowledged Jeremiah’s enduring significance for the fate of Jerusalem and the Temple but, as will be discussed below, they took different approaches. The author of 2 Baruch made a conscious effort to downplay Jeremiah’s close association with the fate of Jerusalem and the Temple and tried to reconfigure Jeremiah’s theological significance according to his own concerns and interests. The author of 4 Baruch affirmed Jeremiah’s enduring significance for the fate of the city and the Temple in his vision of the eschatological salvation of God’s chosen people of Israel, although Jeremiah’s pro-Jerusalem and pro-Temple significance was relativized through the process of transmission and redaction. In this chapter, I will examine how the Jeremiah figure and his historical and theological significance continued to develop in 2 Baruch and 4 Baruch in keeping with the authors’ respective hopes and visions for the future of the Jewish people.

5.1 2 Baruch

2 Baruch is a religious response to the undermining of the political, social and religious life of Jews under Roman rule after the destruction of the Second Temple. The Temple rituals ceased; the religious authority of the priests was affected by the loss of the Temple; the Temple tax was diverted to Rome as the fiscus Judaicus; pilgrimages to Jerusalem ceased; Jerusalem became a permanent legionary station; a new Jewish religious authority was established at Yavneh but it
survived only under Roman political authority. Hence, it is very likely that the disintegration of the central Jewish institutions of Jerusalem and the Temple led some Jews to abandon the Jewish way of life and accept the contemporary Greco-Roman culture and religion. The danger of apostasy at the time is noted in 2 Bar 41:3: “For behold, I see many of your people who have separated from your covenant, and thrown off from them the yoke of your Law.” Seeking to reconsolidate and reorient the Jewish people who were faced with another ‘exile’ under Roman rule and another “templeless age” in their history, the author of 2 Baruch employed the Baruch figure who is associated with the Babylonian destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple and tried to offer his vision and instruction to the devastated Jews.

5.1.1 The Marginalization of Jeremiah

Baruch is the protagonist in 2 Baruch. The prophet Jeremiah is a peripheral figure whose name is mentioned only six times throughout the book (2 Bar 2:1; 5:5; 9:1; 10:2, 4; 33:1). As regards the author’s choice of Baruch as the protagonist, it has often been assumed that the increasing authority of scribes played a part. Their ability to read, write and interpret the sacred texts and their knowledge of the sacred traditions of the Jewish people enhanced their authority during the Second Temple period when correct understanding of scripture was viewed as the source of power and legitimacy. It is very likely that their authority to teach the law and provide guidance to the post-70 generations of Jews was further reinforced when the authority of the priests of Jerusalem

---


was shaken by the destruction of the Second Temple.\(^{208}\) If the author of 2 Baruch belonged to a group of wise scribes who tried to reconsolidate the Jewish people through their understanding and knowledge, it is understandable that he chose Baruch as the protagonist of his writing.\(^{209}\)

We may also consider the significance of the Baruch figure within the Scriptural tradition of Jeremiah. In Jer\(^{LXX}\) Baruch is not always subservient to the prophet Jeremiah.\(^{210}\) Jeremiah commands Baruch to write the words on the scrolls in Jer\(^{MT}\) 36, whereas in Jer\(^{LXX}\) it is Baruch who takes the initiative in the production of the second scroll. While Jer\(^{MT}\) concludes with Jeremiah’s oracles against Babylon and affirms his prophetic authority to the end, Jer\(^{LXX}\) ends with the divine promise to Baruch and it is directly followed by the apocryphal book of Baruch. Therefore, what is affirmed in the Septuagint is the beginning of Baruch’s ministry in the post-destruction period. Moreover, the divine promise of ‘life’ given to Baruch against the backdrop of God’s impending judgment coming upon all flesh (Jer 45:1–5 [LXX 51:31–35]) must have been considered important by the scribal sage of 2 Baruch who concerned himself with teaching all Jews about the eschatological reward of ‘life’ for Torah obedience\(^{211}\) and also with ensuring their survival through


\(^{209}\)Cf. J. E. Wright, “The Social Setting of the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch,” *JSP* 16 (1997): 81–96. Wright suggests that the author of 2 Baruch saw himself as a charismatic leader and inspired teacher of Torah like Baruch or as a tradent of the visions of Baruch. Yet, as noted by many scholars, 2 Baruch is not a sectarian text that promotes esoteric knowledge as the way to salvation.


the difficult times.\textsuperscript{212}

Although Baruch’s authority and significance are most likely to have been fully acknowledged by the author, Baruch the protagonist is never called “a scribe” in 2 Baruch. Rather, he is portrayed as a prophet like Jeremiah. The word of the Lord comes upon Baruch, and God reveals to him the imminent punishment of the city and the people (2 Bar 1:1–5). Jeremiah hears the word of God only through Baruch (2:1–2). As Matthias Henze has noted, the Baruch figure who receives a divine revelation of history and preaches Torah obedience is analogous to the prophet Jeremiah of the Apocryphon of Jeremiah C from Qumran.\textsuperscript{213} Each, as a second Moses, instructs the people to observe the Torah by revealing the history of Israel moving towards the eschatological end. Henze is indeed correct in saying that “Baruch is a prophet in his own right and successor to Jeremiah.”\textsuperscript{214}

However, an important question arises at this juncture. If the author of 2 Baruch was interested in the jeremianization of Baruch and tried to portray him as a Jeremianic prophet teaching Torah obedience, why was he reluctant to choose the prophet Jeremiah as the protagonist in the first

\textsuperscript{212}Gwendolyn B. Sayler, Have the Promises Failed?: A Literary Analysis of 2 Baruch (Chico, California: Scholars Press, 1984), 38–39. Sayler has identified the survival of the Jewish community as the central issue in Baruch’s public addresses. Also Shannon Burks, “‘Life’ Redefined: Wisdom and Law in Fourth Ezra and Second Baruch,” CBQ 63 (2001): 55–71. Burks argues that ‘life’ in 2 Baruch entails both the eschatological immortality and the possibility of community survival here and now.


place? In other words, why would he choose Baruch and jeremianize him while marginalizing Jeremiah? Given that the author was not hostile towards Jeremiah, Henze says that there is no clear explanation as to “[w]hat prompted the transferral of prophetic authority from Jeremiah to Baruch.”

It seems to me that the author downplayed Jeremiah primarily because of Jeremiah’s enduring significance for the fate of Jerusalem and the Temple. Note that the author aimed to reconsolidate a devastated people through the Torah apart from the Jerusalem institutions. According to Frederick J. Murphy, Baruch’s public address that concludes each literary unit and his Diaspora letter that concludes the entire book reveal the author’s intention to draw the people’s attention away from the fate of Jerusalem to Torah obedience and ultimately to eschatological salvation in the heavenly world. Mark F. Whitters has argued that Baruch’s public address that extends to an ever-growing audience and his final letter to the nine and a half tribes are correlated with Baruch’s geographical movement away from Jerusalem. From the perspective of the author of 2 Baruch who tried to reconstitute the people of Torah apart from the Jerusalem institutions, it must have been necessary to marginalize Jeremiah whose strong pro-Jerusalem and pro-Temple significance had been affirmed and reinforced through the ongoing Jewish conceptualizations of exile and restoration during the Second Temple period, especially during the pivotal time of the Seleucid crisis and the Maccabean restoration in the 2nd century B.C.E.

---


216 Frederick J. Murphy, The Structure and Meaning of Second Baruch (SBLDS 78; Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1985), 11–28.

217 Mark F. Whitters, The Epistle of Second Baruch: A Study in Form and Message (JSPSup 42; London, New York: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003), 35–42, 48–65. Although the Temple/Zion serves as an important place where Baruch’s dialogues with God and his visionary experiences take place, Baruch’s public addresses always take place outside the city of Jerusalem and, in 47:1, Baruch also goes to Hebron.
As discussed in the previous chapters of this dissertation, Jeremiah’s close association with the fate of Jerusalem and the Temple was an important motif in the ongoing development of the Jeremiah tradition. In 2 Chronicles, the reconstruction of the Jerusalem Temple is interpreted as the fulfilment of Jeremiah’s prophecy of ‘seventy years’ (2 Chr 36:22–23). In the book of Daniel, the end of Antiochus IV and the reconsecration of the Temple are viewed as the real fulfilment of Jeremiah’s prophecy (Dan 9:24–27). In 2 Maccabees, the Maccabean restoration of Jerusalem and the Temple is interpreted and legitimized as the very restoration anticipated and/or supported by the prophet Jeremiah (2 Macc 2:1–8; 15:13–16). Therefore, it is not difficult to imagine that in the post-70 period some people reflected upon the earlier restorations of Jerusalem and the Temple and perceived Jeremiah’s enduring significance for the restoration of the city and Temple of Jerusalem. It is very likely that those restorations in the past renewed their hope for another fulfilment of restoration in the imminent future. However, the author of 2 Baruch was interested, not in the restoration of Jerusalem and the Temple, but in the reconsolidation of the people through the Torah. Although the idea of the literal restoration of Jerusalem and the Temple is not completely rejected in 2 Baruch (cf. 32:4; 44:7; 77:6), it is never understood as an ineluctable fulfilment of earlier prophecies of restoration. Torah obedience is the precondition for it.218

Moreover, given the activities of many would-be prophets who appeared prior to the revolt,219 it is also possible that the author felt the need to marginalize the prophet Jeremiah primarily because of his potential influence on those who would continue to fight the Romans with a view to the achievement of Jewish independence and the restoration of the city and the Temple in the post-70


period.\(^{220}\) Hence, the author allowed only a minimal presence of Jeremiah in his work and even constructed the Jeremiah figure anew in order to deal with Jeremiah’s enduring significance for the restoration of Jerusalem and the Temple.

5.1.2 Jeremiah’s Disassociation From Jerusalem and the Temple

5.1.2.1 Jeremiah in Jerusalem

In 2 Bar 2:1–2, God commands Baruch to tell Jeremiah and all those who are like him to leave the city because they are protecting the city from divine punishment:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{2 For I have told these (things) to you so that you may tell Jeremiah, and all those who are like you, that you may leave this city.} & \\
\text{2 For your deeds are like a firm pillar for this city, and your prayers are like a strong city wall.}
\end{align*}\]

This passage reminds us of Jer\(^{\text{MT}}\) 1:18, in which God promises that He will protect Jeremiah by making him a fortified city, an iron pillar and a bronze wall against which no one can prevail. There, the imagery of an impregnable city is used as a reference to the security of Jeremiah protected by God. In 2 Bar 2:1–2, the same imagery refers to the security of Jerusalem protected by the righteous. Crucial here is that Jeremiah’s pro-Jerusalem and pro-Temple significance is implicitly affirmed in terms of his deeds and prayers protecting Jerusalem and the Temple. Yet our author weakened Jeremiah’s intrinsic relationship with the fate of the city and the Temple by placing him among many other righteous ones in Jerusalem. According to passage in 2 Bar 2:1–2, Jeremiah is merely one of those who are like Baruch.

Consider 2 Bar 5:5–7. On the day before the Babylonian capture of Jerusalem, Baruch takes

Jeremiah and all the nobles to the Kidron valley and tells them all the words that God spoke to him, and they weep and fast because of what is about to happen to Jerusalem:

5 And I went and took Jeremiah and Adu, Seraiah and Jabish, and Gedaliah and all the nobles of the people. And I led them to the Valley of Kidron. And I repeated to them everything that was said to me. 6 And they lifted up their voice and they all wept. 7 And we sat there and fasted until evening.

Given that Seraiah and Gedaliah are Jerusalem scribes and Jeremiah’s close associates (cf. Jer 40:6; 51:59–64), we may take Jeremiah and the other named figures in 2 Bar 5:5 as part of the Jerusalem leadership during the final days of Jerusalem. Note that their weeping and fasting on account of the impending Babylonian capture of Jerusalem clearly demonstrate their genuine concern and love for the holy city. Such a portrayal of the Jerusalem leadership may serve as a foil for the failure of the Jerusalem leadership prior to 70 C.E. The high priests and the Herodian aristocracy were interested in maintaining their own power and control sanctioned by Rome. In addition, the rebel coalition which was formed in Jerusalem in 66–70 C.E. also suffered from internal division and failed to give a unified resistance to Rome to protect the city and the Temple.

221 Unlike these self-serving leaders and aristocrats, Baruch, Jeremiah and all the nobles of the people, as the genuine lovers of the city and the Temple, show the qualities of ideal leaders of Jerusalem. In this respect, the author’s presentation of Jeremiah seems to affirm Jeremiah’s pro-Jerusalem and pro-Temple personality. However, as in 2 Bar 2:1–2, Jeremiah is found among the other righteous leaders of Jerusalem who are equally concerned about the fate of the city and the Temple.

---

In *2 Bar* 9:1–2, Jeremiah alone appears in Baruch’s company, lamenting and fasting with him for seven days after the fall of Jerusalem. Consider the author’s description of Jeremiah in v. 1:

91 And I, Baruch, came, and Jeremiah, whose heart was found pure from sins, and who had not been captured when the city was taken.

This passage seems to allude to Nebuzaradan’s release of Jeremiah which is narrated in Jer 40:1–6. Yet it is noteworthy that in *2 Bar* 9:1 Jeremiah’s sinlessness and deliverance are mentioned together. This indicates that Jeremiah’s personal experience of deliverance has become a theological event that gives support to the principle of individual retribution. Moreover, given that such a theological interpretation of the fate of Jeremiah immediately follows the account of the Babylonian capture of the city in *2 Bar* 8, it is most likely that the Jeremiah figure as portrayed in 9:1 reveals the author’s intention to shift the people’s focus from the fate of Jerusalem and the Temple to that of righteous individuals.

The author of *2 Baruch* did not deny Jeremiah’s pro-Jerusalem and pro-Temple Tendenz but he relativized Jeremiah’s theological significance for the fate of Jerusalem and the Temple. We see in the author’s portrayal of Jeremiah that Jeremiah is gradually disassociated from the fate of the city and the Temple and becomes a paradigmatic figure for individual retribution in accordance with the author’s concern to strengthen all the post-destruction generations of Jews with Torah righteousness in view of the eschatological judgment and salvation in the world to come.

---

222 The prophet Jeremiah has special significance for individual retribution in that he and the prophet Ezekiel are the two ancient prophets who defended divine justice by rejecting collective and transgenerational retribution (cf. Jer 31:29–30; Ezek 18:1–4). Moreover, the divine promise of life given to Ebed-melech and Baruch (Jer 39:15–18; 45:1–5) further accentuates Jeremiah’s significance as a prophet of individual retribution.
5.1.2.2 Jeremiah in Babylon

The author’s creative construction of Jeremiah is found in 2 Bar 10:1–5, in the account of Jeremiah’s departure to Babylon:

10 And it happened after seven days, the word of the Lord came on me and he said to me, 2Tell Jeremiah to go to Babylon and support the captive people. 3But you, remain here in the midst of the desolation of Zion, and I will show you, after these days, what will happen at the end of days.” 4And I told Jeremiah as the Lord commanded me. 5And he then went away with the people. But I, Baruch, returned and sat in front of the gates of the temple.

In the passage above, God commands Baruch to tell Jeremiah to go to Babylon to support the exiles, and Jeremiah obeys. We may understand Jeremiah’s role in Babylon in terms of his well-established reputation as a preacher of Torah obedience to the exiles (cf. The Epistle of Jeremiah, the Apocryphon of Jeremiah C, 2 Macc 2:2–3). The Apocryphon of Jeremiah C is particularly pertinent to the discussion. According to the Apocryphon, Jeremiah accompanies the deportees to Babylon as far as the river and exhorts them to keep the commandments of the Lord in the land of captivity (4Q385a 18 i). In 2 Baruch, Jeremiah is to live among the exiles in the land of Babylon in order to support them. If we construe Jeremiah’s ‘support’ of the Babylonian exiles as his Torah instruction, it seems certain that Jeremiah’s departure to Babylon indicates an extension and intensification of his Mosaic role of teaching and preaching Torah obedience to the exiles.

It is worth stressing that the account of Jeremiah’s departure to Babylon in 10:1–5 immediately follows the author’s portrayal of Jeremiah as a sinless person who escaped the Babylonian capture. This means that the Jeremiah who is sent to Babylon to support the exiles is none other than a paradigmatic figure for individual retribution. In this regard, Jeremiah in Babylon is functionally analogous to Baruch’s letter which is sent to the nine and a half tribes (chs. 78–87). According
to this letter, the Lord will preserve and save the righteous at the time of the final judgment and, therefore, they must diligently observe the Torah. Jeremiah can convey the same message to the Babylonian exiles since his paradigmatic experience of salvation prefigures the eschatological salvation of the righteous on the day of judgment. As a paradigm for individual retribution, Jeremiah in Babylon inculcates the importance of Torah obedience and prepares the exiles for ‘life’ in the world to come. In this respect, the Jeremiah who goes to Babylon to support the exiles may be seen as the embodiment of Baruch’s letter to the Babylonian exiles which is mentioned in 2 Bar 77:17 but not included in the book.  

As regards Jeremiah’s departure to Babylon, Henze has argued that Baruch takes over as a prophetic successor of Jeremiah, independent from his predecessor. Yet this does not imply the end of Jeremiah’s prophetic career. As noted above, he is commissioned by God to support the exiles in Babylon. The people’s words to Baruch in 2 Bar 32:9–33:3 also testify to the prophet Jeremiah’s ongoing ministry among the exiles:

33 1 Are these the commands which your companion, Jeremiah the prophet, commanded you, and said to you, 2 ‘Look after this people until I go and prepare the rest of the brothers in Babylon, against whom the sentence has been declared that they should be taken into captivity’?

In this passage, “Jeremiah the prophet” is not subordinated to Baruch’s authority. Before his departure to Babylon, Jeremiah even “commanded” Baruch to look after the remnants in the Land.

G. W. E. Nickelsburg has argued that 2 Bar 33 betrays the author’s knowledge of a narrative

---

223 According to Christian Wolff (Jeremia im Frühjudentum und Urchristentum, 33), the prophet Jeremiah working in Babylon renders Baruch’s letter unnecessary.

224 Henze, Jewish Apocalypticism, 97, 109, 111. Henze writes, “In 2 Bar, it would be difficult not to interpret Jeremiah’s departure within the context of his diminished role in general. Jeremiah leaves the scene so that Baruch can take over” (p. 111).
tradition which asserts Jeremiah’s superiority, a tradition which he tried to transform. However, what is transformed in 2 Baruch is Jeremiah’s close association with the fate of Jerusalem and the Temple. Jeremiah’s superiority and his prophetic authority are not a problem at all in 2 Bar 33:1–2 as long as he is theologically disassociated from the fate of Jerusalem and the Temple. Hence, “Jeremiah the prophet” goes to Babylon to serve the exiles, whereas Baruch, who is left behind, serves the remnants in the Land with his vision and instruction. According to this collaborative model, Jeremiah’s prophetic ministry in Babylon parallels Baruch’s own ministry in the Land. As Christian Wolff has suggested, Jeremiah’s departure to Babylon is a matter of ‘a division of labor.’

As we can see, Jeremiah’s departure to Babylon does not necessarily imply a decline in his prophetic function and authority. Rather, it indicates Jeremiah’s physical relocation to Babylon and the reassignment of his prophetic function, through which he is distanced not just from Jerusalem and the Temple but ultimately from his enduring theological significance for the unfolding fate of Jerusalem and the Temple. Jeremiah’s departure to Babylon is indeed the most essential part of the author’s innovative reconfiguration of Jeremiah which derived from his concern to reconstruct and reconsolidate the people through the Torah, rather than through a heightened hope of another fulfilment of the restoration of Jerusalem and the Temple in the imminent future.

---


226 Wolff, Jeremia im Frühjudentum und Urchristentum, 32.
5.1.3 Summary

The marginalization of Jeremiah as a peripheral figure in 2 Baruch was closely associated with the author’s theological and practical concern to reconsolidate a devastated people through the Torah apart from the Jerusalem institutions. The author of 2 Baruch was fully aware of Jeremiah’s enduring significance for the fate of Jerusalem and the Temple and tried to deal with it. True, Jeremiah’s pro-Jerusalem and pro-Temple significance is not denied in 2 Bar 2:1–2 and 5:5–7. However, the author relativized Jeremiah’s significance by placing him among many other righteous ones in Jerusalem who are pro-Jerusalem and pro-Temple figures just like him. Moreover, by describing Jeremiah as a sinless person who escaped the Babylonian capture in 2 Bar 9:1–2, the author constructed Jeremiah as a paradigm for individual retribution and theologically disassociated him from the fate of the city and the Temple. The author reinforced Jeremiah’s theological disassociation in 2 Bar 10:1–5 and 33:1–2 by relocating him to Babylon as a Mosaic preacher of Torah obedience to the exiles. Thus we see in 2 Baruch that the author downplayed Jeremiah’s enduring significance for the fate of Jerusalem and the Temple in keeping with his own concern to reconstruct the post-destruction generations of Jews through the Torah. It is reasonable to assume that the author’s marginalization and reconfiguration of Jeremiah were intended to check Jeremiah’s possible influence on the ongoing Jewish expectation of the imminent restoration of Jerusalem and the Temple in the post-70 period.

5.2 4 Baruch (Paraleipomena Jeremiou)

The fictitious setting of 4 Baruch is the national catastrophe in the 6th century B.C.E., but its real historical setting is the Jerusalem crisis that began with Hadrian’s reform in Judaea (ca. 129–130 C.E.). Hadrian’s decision to build Aelia Capitolina on Jerusalem meant that Jerusalem was to
become a pagan city with a new temple to Jupiter. Given that Hadrian likened himself to Jupiter, the erection of a temple to Jupiter also meant the beginning of the imperial cult of emperor worship in Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{227} Therefore, it is not difficult to imagine that Hadrian’s building project was perceived by many as an outrageous act, not only by those who had high hopes for the reconstruction of the Jerusalem Temple,\textsuperscript{228} but also by those who concerned themselves mainly with the continuity of the Jewish people as an \textit{ethnos} under a general Roman policy of permitting its subject peoples to keep their ancestral traditions.\textsuperscript{229} From the Jewish perspective, the construction of Aelia Capitolina was more than a sacrilege against God’s chosen, holy city. It also meant a suppression of the Jewish people and their cultural and religious identity.

The geographical extent of the Bar Kokhba Revolt (132–135/6 C.E.) clearly shows how offensive Hadrian’s building project must have been in the eyes of the Judeans. In their joint article, Amos Kloner and Boaz Zissu have argued that most, if not all, of the Jewish population in Judaea participated in the Bar Kokhba Revolt.\textsuperscript{230} Such a massive mobilization of the Judeans is indicative of the Jewish political-militant nationalism which survived through the post-70 period and which was rekindled in the face of Hadrian’s paganization of Jerusalem. We find in the inscriptions and the images on the Bar Kokhba coins that the rebels aimed to restore the nationalistic symbols,


\textsuperscript{230}Amos Kloner and Boaz Zissu, “The Hiding Complexes in Judaea: An Archaeological and Geographical Update on the Area of the Bar Kokhba Revolt,” in \textit{The Bar Kokhba War Reconsidered}, 181–216. According to Kloner and Zissu, the map of the hiding complexes, the map of the distribution of the Bar Kokhba coins and the map of the Jewish settlements in Judaea coincide.
Jerusalem and the Temple, and to reestablish an independent Jewish nation freed from Roman occupation.231

Despite the initial victory of the rebels, however, the Second Jewish Revolt also ended in failure. In a truer sense, this signalled the beginning of the real crisis for the Jewish people. After the revolt, the Romans regained complete control over Jerusalem, and the devastated city became a legionary station again. All Jews, including Jewish Christians, were expelled from Jerusalem and they were forbidden to enter the city. Jerusalem was rebuilt as Aelia Capitolina and pagan temples and idols were erected in it. The province of Judaea was renamed Syria Palestina and it began to be repopulated with gentiles. Hence, the Palestinian Jews remaining in the Land suddenly found themselves surrounded by gentiles and their pagan culture and religion. According to Seth Schwartz, rabbinic authority and influence were minimal in Syria Palestina during the period of 135–350 C.E. and the majority of the Palestinian Jews lived as Greco-Roman pagans during this time.232 If his assessment is correct, the social, cultural and religious disintegration of the Jewish people who were left without religious-spiritual guidance must have been a real problem in the post-135/6 period. In this respect, the devastating effect of the Bar Kokhba Revolt was far greater than that of the First Jewish Revolt. After 70 C.E., the Jewish religious leadership survived to provide guidance through the difficult times. Jerusalem could serve as the ideological centre of Judaism even after the destruction of the Temple. After 135/6 C.E., however, the Jewish people

---


232 Seth Schwartz, *Imperialism and Jewish Society, 200 B.C.E. to 640 C.E.* (Princeton: Princeton University, 2001), 103–176. Smallwood (*The Jews under Roman Rule*, 466) also mentions the loss of the religious and political Jewish authority after the revolt, but she assumes that the reconsolidation began around 200 C.E. Schwartz, however, argues that the rabbinic authority to reconsolidate and rejudge the people was minimal until around 350 C.E. See also Shaye J. D. Cohen, “The Rabbi in the Second-century Jewish Society,” *CHJ* 3: 922–990.
were confronted with the loss of Jerusalem which signalled the beginning of the “templeless-cityless age” in Jewish history. Moreover, the religious and spiritual leadership of the rabbis was not strong enough to reconsolidate the people who lost the religious and symbolic centre of their world.

The fact that 4 Baruch does not show an anonymous Jewish author’s knowledge of the Bar Kokhba Revolt has often led to the opinion that 4 Baruch was composed before the war. Hence, the earlier scholarly view, that the 66 years of Abimelech’s sleep from 70 C.E. would point to the year 136 C.E. as the most likely date of composition, is no longer taken seriously. Christian Wolff has suggested that the number 66 in 4 Baruch may not be taken literally since it merely connotes that the time of return and restoration is imminent. However, we still wonder why the author of 4 Baruch would choose that particular number to convey the sense of imminence. Jens Herzer has proposed that the centrality of the Law and the eschatological-heavenly orientation of the book reflect the theological stance of the rabbinic school of ben Zakkai before the Bar Kokhba war. Yet those theological ideas and perspectives do not necessarily compel us to date 4 Baruch to the pre-war period.

As will be shown below, some aspects of the Jewish narrative of 4 Baruch give us glimpses of the historical circumstances of the “templeless-cityless age” in the post-135/6 period. For example,

---


234 Wolff, Jeremia im Frühjudentum und Urchristentum, 115.

235 Jens Herzer, 4 Baruch (Paraleipomena Jeremiou) (Writings from the Greco-Roman World 22; Atlanta: SBL, 2005), xxx–xxxvi.
the author’s emphasis on separation from gentiles as the precondition for entry into Jerusalem seems to reveal his strong concern to protect the ethno-religious purity and identity of the Jewish people living in a predominantly pagan world. It is also very likely that the idea of reentry into Jerusalem, which is central to the author’s idea of restoration, was influenced by the expulsion of the Jews from Jerusalem in the post-war period. Moreover, Jeremiah is the protagonist in the author’s account of exile and return. Jeremiah’s prominence in 4 Baruch strongly suggests that the major concern of the author was very different from that of the author of 2 Baruch. Even a cursory overview of the outline of 4 Baruch indicates that Jeremiah the protagonist affirms the centrality of Jerusalem and its Temple in the salvation history of God’s people. Therefore, consideration must be given to the possibility that the Jewish narrative of 4 Baruch was composed against the backdrop of the loss of Jerusalem and the social, cultural and religious disintegration of the Jewish people in the post-135/6 period.

In this respect, the earlier view that 136 C.E. is the most likely date of composition cannot be dismissed out of hand. Of course, we are unable to ascertain that this particular year is the exact date of composition. Yet it is very likely that the author of 4 Baruch was fully aware of the significance of 136 C.E. as the year in which the Bar Kokhba Revolt ended in failure and in which the “templeless-cityless age” began in Jewish history. Most probably, he regarded this critical time as a theologically appropriate time to reinvent the past history of exile and return in order to envision the end of the “templeless-cityless age” in the future history of the people. The point is this: 4 Baruch can be read as a theological response to the Jerusalem crisis that did not end with

the war but persisted into the post-war period of the “templeless-cityless age.”

5.2.1 The Jewish Narrative of 4 Baruch (1:1–9:9)\(^\text{237}\)

In order to facilitate the discussion, I provide here the brief outline of the Jewish narrative of 4 Baruch: God reveals to Jeremiah His plan to punish Jerusalem and commands him to go to Babylon to live with the exiles. Jeremiah hides the sacred vessels and sends Abimelech out of Jerusalem before the destruction, and then he accompanies the deportees to Babylon (chs. 1–4). Abimelech returns to Jerusalem with fresh figs after the 66 years of sleep (ch. 5). After seeing Abimelech, Baruch sends a letter to Jeremiah in order to inform him of the imminent return of the exiles and to reveal the precondition for reentry into Jerusalem. Jeremiah also writes a letter to Baruch in which he describes the life of the exiles. Jeremiah, then, teaches the exiles the requirements for their return to Jerusalem (chs. 6–7). He leads them back to the city of Jerusalem, but half of them disobey his instruction and build their own city in Samaria. Jeremiah preaches repentance to them. He then officiates at Yom Kippur in Jerusalem with the obedient returnees and dies at the altar (8:1–9:9).

Jeremiah, as in 2 Baruch, is sent to Babylon to serve the exiles, but his return to Jerusalem is portrayed as the climax of the Jewish narrative in 4 Baruch.\(^\text{238}\) While the Jeremiah of 2 Baruch

\(^{237}\)Due to a long history of the Christian transmission of 4 Baruch and the lateness of the earliest Greek manuscript that is available to us (the 10\(^{\text{th}}\) century C.E.), we cannot assume that 4 Bar 1:1–9:9 which we read today is the original Jewish version of 4 Baruch. Nevertheless, given that the Christian redaction of 4 Baruch is most conspicuous in the Christian ending placed at the end of the narrative in 4 Bar 9:10–32, we may postulate that a Christian redactor was interested in creating a new conclusion to the narrative and that the Christian tampering with the Jewish narrative was rather minimal. Hence, I will take 4 Bar 1:1–9:9 as a Jewish work, although it is unlikely that this represents the original form of the Jewish narrative. On this issue, see Marinus de Jonge, “Remarks in the Margin of the Paper ‘The Figure of Jeremiah in Paralipomena Jeremiae’ by J. Riaud,” JSP 22 (2000): 45–49.

\(^{238}\)This does not imply that 4 Baruch is an apocalyptic-revelatory sequel to 2 Baruch. 4 Baruch is a narrative recreation of the past history of exile and return, devoid of apocalyptic visions and revelations about the end-time or the heavenly world. Although there is an angelic revelation to Baruch, what is disclosed to him is the divine
is theologically disassociated from Jerusalem and the Temple, the Jeremiah of 4 Baruch is reassociated with them in the author’s account of exile and return. This clearly indicates that Jeremiah’s close association with the fate of Jerusalem and its Temple played a significant role in the author’s theological response to the “templeless-cityless age” and in his construction of the future of the Jewish people. That said, let us examine the author’s creative account of Jeremiah’s exile and return more closely.

5.2.1.1 Jeremiah in Jerusalem

The narrative begins with the conversation between God and Jeremiah. When Jeremiah learns of God’s plan to destroy Jerusalem, he begins to intercede on its behalf. Jean Riaud makes an important observation that this Jeremiah who speaks face to face with God is not an ordinary interlocutor/intercessor but a special one vested with Mosaic authority (cf. 4 Bar 1:11; 3:13). What is noteworthy about Jeremiah’s Mosaic intercession is that he continues to affirm the special status of Jerusalem before God: Jerusalem is “the chosen city” (τὴν πόλιν τὴν ἐκλεκτὴν) and “God’s holy city” (τὴν ἱερὰν πόλιν τοῦ Θεοῦ) that cannot be handed over to the Babylonians (1:5–6). Jeremiah’s pro-Jerusalem significance is thus revealed in his intercession on behalf of God’s chosen, holy city.

---

239 Jean Riaud, “Le figure de Jérémie,” 379. Jeremiah is portrayed as a Mosaic interlocutor in 1:11 (“Having said these things, the Lord departed from Jeremiah”) and in 3:13 (“Having said these things, the Lord ascended from Jeremiah into heaven”).

240 The Greek text of 4 Baruch and its English translation are Herzer’s. I also follow Herzer’s versifications.
Jeremiah’s intercession continues in ch. 2. He enters the sanctuary to make intercession for the people (v. 1). Here, Jeremiah is presented as a priest of Jerusalem. As indicated in v. 3, intercession has been Jeremiah’s standing priestly function and his intercession has been effective: “whenever the people sinned, Jeremiah would put dust on his head and pray for the people until their sin was forgiven.” This implies that his effective intercession has been protecting Jerusalem from being destroyed on account of their sin (cf. 2 Bar 2:1–2). In this, Jeremiah’s priestly intercession for the people is compatible with his Mosaic intercession for the city which we have observed in the first chapter of 4 Baruch, and it is also in continuity with his prayer for the people and the holy city which is mentioned in 2 Macc 15:14. As we can see, our author’s construction of Jeremiah as a Mosaic-priestly intercessor points to Jeremiah’s enduring significance for the fate of Jerusalem and the people (cf. Jer 5:1–9).

We find in the third chapter of 4 Baruch another long conversation between God and Jeremiah which takes place just before the destruction of the city. Here, Jeremiah inquires of God about the fate of the sacred vessels and then about the fate of Abimelech, the Ethiopian. Let us begin with Abimelech. In response to Jeremiah’s good words about him, God promises to protect Abimelech until the return of the people to the city (v. 10), and then commands Jeremiah to go to Babylon to preach the good news to the exiles until the time of their return to the city (v. 11):

3 And Jeremiah said, “I beseech you, O Lord, show me what I should do to Abimelech, the Ethiopian, for he has done many good deeds to the people and to your servant Jeremiah. For he pulled me out of the pit of mud. And I do not want him to see the destruction and devastation of the city. He rather should not be grieved.”

10 And the Lord said to Jeremiah, “Send him to the vineyard of Agrippa by the mountain (trail). And I will protect him until I return the people to the city.”

11 And the Lord said to Jeremiah, “Go with your people to Babylon and stay with them,

---

An important title given to Jeremiah in 4 Baruch is “the priest” (4 Bar 5:18; 9:8). Some manuscripts have “the high priest” or “the high priest of God” in 5:18.
announcing to them the good news, until I return them to the city!

According to this passage, the divine protection of Abimelech and Jeremiah’s service in Babylon have direct implications for a future return of the people to God’s chosen, holy city. Abimelech will be protected and Jeremiah will serve the exiles until God returns the people to the city (vv. 10–11). In a way, the divine response to Jeremiah is a programmatic statement that sets the narrative to develop in a predetermined way. We read later in the narrative that Abimelech’s awakening from the 66 years of sleep and his safe return to Jerusalem signal the imminent return of the exiles to Jerusalem under Jeremiah’s leadership. Although Jeremiah’s prophecy of ‘seventy years’ is not mentioned in 4 Baruch, we find in the divine response to Jeremiah in 3:10–11 that God has placed a time limit on the duration of exile. Hence, Jeremiah emerges in this particular passage as the bearer of the divine promise of a future restoration centred on the holy city of Jerusalem. Moreover, when this passage is read in relation to Jeremiah’s Mosaic-priestly intercession in chs. 1 and 2, we can clearly see that Jeremiah the protagonist serves to affirm the sanctity and centrality of Jerusalem in the unfolding history of the salvation of God’s people. This passage thus suggests that Jeremiah’s timeless significance for exile and restoration was acknowledged once again as important by our Jewish author through the changing fate of the people and the holy city under Hadrianic rule.

God also responds to Jeremiah’s inquiry about the fate of the sacred vessels. God instructs him to consign them to the earth, more specifically, to the altar (4 Bar 3:6–8):

3 And Jeremiah said, “Behold, Lord, now we know that you are handing over your city into the hands of its enemies, and they will carry the people off to Babylon. 7 What shall we do (with) your holy (things), (with) the holy vessels of your temple service? What do you want us to do (with) them?” 8 And the Lord said to him, “Take them and consign them to the earth, that is, to the altar, saying, ‘Hear, O earth, the voice of him who created you in the abundance of waters, who sealed you with seven seals, with
In 2 Macc 2:4, it is God who takes the initiative in preserving the Temple vessels. Jeremiah, having received God’s oracle, hides them in a cave at Mount Nebo. In 2 Baruch 6, it is an angel who entrusts the sacred vessels to the earth.

In this passage, Jeremiah is presented as a priest of Jerusalem who is genuinely concerned about the fate of the Temple vessels and takes the initiative in safeguarding them. His pro-Temple significance is further revealed in that his preservation of the vessels at the altar in Jerusalem ensures their future revelation and, by implication, the restoration of the Jerusalem Temple itself.

We also read in 4 Bar 4:1–4 that Jeremiah takes the keys of the Temple and throws them to the sun, saying “we” are unfaithful stewards. Here, Jeremiah is portrayed as a representative figure, or the high priest of Jerusalem, whose authority over the Temple far surpasses that of the other priests. There is no question that the author’s account of Jeremiah’s preservation of the Temple vessels and keys affirms Jeremiah’s enduring significance for the fate of the Jerusalem Temple.

Nevertheless, it is worth stressing that our Jewish author emphasized God’s absolute sovereignty over the matter of a temple restoration. Jeremiah’s hidden vessels will be restored eschatologically, at the time of God’s great ingathering of the people (3:8). The sun must guard seven epochs; and thereafter you will receive your beauty. Guard the vessels of the temple service until the gathering of “the beloved one”!


242 In 2 Macc 2:4, it is God who takes the initiative in preserving the Temple vessels. Jeremiah, having received God’s oracle, hides them in a cave at Mount Nebo. In 2 Baruch 6, it is an angel who entrusts the sacred vessels to the earth.

243 Compare 2 Bar 10:18. There, the priests as a whole take the keys of the Temple and throw them to heaven with the confession that they are not true stewards. In Pes. Rab. 26., the high priest takes the keys and throws them to heaven. In the Garshuni and Coptic versions of the Jeremiah Apocryphon, it is the prophet Jeremiah who hides and restores the vessels and keys of the Temple, but he acts like the high priest of Jerusalem by entering the holy of holies and preparing the sons of Aaron to officiate at a restored Temple worship. For the Garshuni version, see Alphones Mingana and J. R. Harris, “A New Jeremiah Apocryphon,” Woodbrooke Studies L2, John Rylands Library Bulletin 11 (1927): 125–191. For the Coptic version, see K. H. Kuhn, “A Coptic Jeremiah-Apocryphon,” Muséon 83 (1970): 95–135, 291–350.

244 Compare 2 Macc 2:4–8. There, Jeremiah’s hidden vessels are to be revealed at the eschatological time of God’s great ingathering of the people into the holy place. The author of the second prefixed letter believed that its fulfilment was imminent. There is no clear indication in 4 Baruch that our Jewish author was expecting its...
the keys until the day when the Lord will retrieve them (4:3). It is God who determines when to gather the dispersed Jews to Jerusalem, when to retrieve the Temple keys and when to restore the Jerusalem Temple. The implication is that the day of the restoration of the Jerusalem Temple is unknowable. This coheres with what we have seen in 4 Bar 3:10–11 regarding a future return of the exiles to Jerusalem. There, the duration of the Babylonian exile is not specified. Jeremiah himself does not know when God will return the people to the city. The only thing he knows is that there will be an end to the exile. God’s absolute sovereignty over the matter of a temple restoration, in conjunction with God’s promise of a future return of the people to the city, strongly suggests that the author’s hope of restoration has been transferred to an unknown point in the future. Most probably, this has to do with the historical circumstances of the author’s world in the post-135/6 period. After the Bar Kokhba Revolt, Jerusalem was reconstructed as Aelia Capitolina and all Jews were expelled from the city. Given the hegemony of the Roman empire, the imminent fulfilment of return and restoration must have seemed like a dream to the majority of the Jewish people and, not to mention, to our author. This may partly explain why in 4 Baruch the duration of exile is metaphorically conceived of as the 66 years of Abimelech’s sleep rather than as a divinely-preordained seventy-year period of time revealed through the prophet Jeremiah.

5.2.1.2 Jeremiah in Babylon

4 Baruch is different from 2 Baruch in that it offers a detailed description of the life of the Babylonian exiles under Jeremiah’s leadership. The author of 4 Baruch created two important exilic letters: Baruch’s letter to Jeremiah in Babylon that contains a divine instruction and Jeremiah’s letter to Baruch that describes the life of the Babylonian exiles. It is in these two letters imminent fulfilment.
that we can discern both the author’s idea of exile and his theological responses to it.

When Abimelech returns to Jerusalem after his 66 years of sleep, Baruch tries to inform Jeremiah of the divine protection of Abimelech and the imminent return of the exiles to the city (4 Bar 6:1–8; cf. 3:10). He prays to God since he does not know how to convey the message to Jeremiah in Babylon and, in response, an angel of the Lord appears to him and commands him to write a letter and reveals what to write in it:

6 So write in the letter, ‘Tell the children of Israel: Let “the stranger who comes among you” be separated, and let fifteen days pass; and after this I shall lead you into your city, says the Lord. 14 He who is not separated from Babylon, O Jeremiah, shall not come into the city; and I will censure them so that they are not welcomed again by the Babylonians, says the Lord.’

This angelic revelation is essentially an instruction given to Jeremiah in Babylon. Jeremiah is to tell “the children of Israel” in Babylon that God will return them to their city after fifteen days of preparation. More importantly, he is to teach them the sole condition for their return — separation. This message is slightly modified and amplified in Baruch’s letter to Jeremiah (6:17–23):

6 These, then, are the words that the Lord, God of Israel, who led us out of the land of Egypt, out of the big furnace, has spoken. 21 Because you did not keep my ordinances but your heart became haughty and you were stubborn in my presence instead, I became angry and in wrath I surrendered you into the furnace in Babylon. 22 If you, therefore, says the Lord, listen to my voice that comes out of the mouth of Jeremiah, my servant, the one who does heed I will bring back out of Babylon, but the one who does not listen will become a stranger to Jerusalem and to Babylon.

According to Baruch’s letter, the God of exodus has a plan for the exiles. There will be a new exodus from Babylon, but only those who listen to the voice of God that comes out of the mouth
of Jeremiah can return to Jerusalem. Here, Jeremiah is presented as a mouthpiece of God, but he is no ordinary prophet. God calls him “my servant” (v. 22). In the Hebrew Scripture, many are called God’s servant, from Abraham to Nebuchadnezzar. In the ‘Exodus-Wilderness’ context, however, only Moses is called God’s servant (Exod 14:31; Num 12:7–8; Deut 34:5), and his identity as such is always connected to his unique role as a lawgiver (cf. Josh 1:7, 13; 22:5; 2 Kgs 21:8; Neh 9:14; Mal 3:22 [ET 4:4]). Likewise, in the context of a new exodus from Babylon, Jeremiah emerges as a new Moses who reveals a divine instruction to the children of Israel in preparation for their reentry into Jerusalem.

However, Jeremiah is never portrayed as teaching the people the Torah or exhorting them to keep the Law of Moses in 4 Baruch. 245 It is said in 4 Bar 7:32 that Jeremiah, having received Baruch’s letter, continued to teach the exiles “to abstain from the defilement of the Gentiles of Babylon.” It is also said in 8:2 that Jeremiah was commanded by God to instruct the people at the shore of the river Jordan with the following words: “Let everyone who desires the Lord forsake the works of Babylon, as well as the man who took wives from them and the women who took husbands from them as well.” Jeremiah’s instruction is in agreement with what the angel of the Lord has revealed as the precondition for reentry in 6:13–14 — separation. In this respect, Jeremiah’s Mosaic role and function among the Babylonian exiles seem to reveal our Jewish author’s strong priestly concern for purity and holiness. 246 Although this does not necessarily suggest that the author was uninterested in Torah obedience and its significance in the daily life of the people, it
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245 Sayler, *Have the Promises Failed?*, 141; Schaller, *Paralipomena Jeremiou*, 685. Both Sayler and Schaller note that the references to the Law are very rare in 4 Baruch.

is most likely that his major concern was separation towards purity.

The author’s concern for purity and holiness which is revealed in Jeremiah’s Mosaic-priestly teaching of separation allows us to read the account of exile and return in 4 Baruch against the backdrop of the social, cultural and religious disintegration of the Jewish people in Syria Palestina in the post-135/6 period. As mentioned earlier, after the Bar Kokhba Revolt, the Palestinian Jews were suddenly surrounded by gentiles and the Jewish towns and villages in Palestine became more vulnerable to Greco-Roman culture and religion.247 Yet the rabbinic leadership was not yet well-organized to provide any authoritative religious instruction and guidance to the devastated Jews. Hence, the gradual paganization of the Palestinian Jews must have been a real problem. This is most probably why our Jewish author felt that separation was fundamental to the preservation of their Jewish identity and purity. In this respect, Jeremiah’s Mosaic-priestly instruction of separation given to the exiles may be taken as the author’s own instruction directed to the Palestinian Jews of his day.248

That said, let us turn to the author’s portrayal of the life of the exiles in order to better understand his idea of exile. When Baruch’s letter was delivered to Jeremiah in Babylon by an eagle, a divinely-sent courier, Jeremiah and the people were about to bury a dead person outside the city of Babylon (7:13–14). We are told that Nebuchadnezzar had granted a burial place for the dead people at the request of Jeremiah. According to Riaud, this Jeremiah resembles Moses who

247 In this regard, it is worth considering Daniel Smith-Christopher’s view that the priestly concerns about separation and purity reflect a subordinate minority group’s self-conscious resistance towards surrounding, dominant culture. See Daniel Smith-Christopher, “Reassessing the Historical and Sociological Impact of the Babylonian Exile (597/587-539BCE),” in Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions, 7–36, especially 33–36.

248 Schaller (Paralipomena Jeremiou, 686) argues that 4 Baruch concerns itself with edifying and strengthening “popular piety (volkstümliche Frömmigkeit)” of Jews in the Land.
negotiated with Pharaoh on behalf of his own people. Riaud then suggests that this Jeremiah may be compared to an “exilarque.” However, the author’s real interest seems to lie not so much in affirming Jeremiah’s Mosaic leadership among the exiles as in revealing the miserable condition of the people that is symbolically expressed in their death and burial. In this regard, Jeremiah’s letter to Baruch (7:23–29) is particularly important since Jeremiah’s grief over the affliction of the exiles is well-noted in it:

7 For grief has not left us since we entered this place sixty-six years ago today.  
24 For frequently as I went out (of the city) I found (some) of the people hung up by King Nebuchadnezzar, weeping and saying, ‘Have mercy on us, god Zar!’  
25 When I heard these things, I would grieve and weep a twofold weeping, not only because they were hung up but because they were calling on a foreign god, saying ‘Have mercy on us!’ But I remembered the day of the festival we celebrated in Jerusalem before we were taken captive.  
26 And as I remembered, I groaned and returned to my house feeling pains and weeping.  
27 Now, then, pray in the place where you are, you and Abimelech, that this people might listen to my voice and to the decrees of my mouth, so that we may get out of here.  
28 For I tell you: All the time that we have spent here, they prevented us from leaving, saying: “Sing for us a song of the songs of Zion, the song of your God!” And we would reply to them, ‘How shall we sing for you while we are in a foreign country?’"

Here, Jeremiah is portrayed as weeping over the exiles continuously. This Jeremiah is surely in continuity with the weeping prophet who lamented “the destruction of Daughter My People” (cf. Jer 8:21–23; Lam 2:11). In 4 Baruch, however, Jeremiah also laments the religious destruction of the beloved people. Jeremiah says in 7:25–26 that he wept “a twofold weeping” not only because of the people’s severe suffering under Nebuchadnezzar but also because of their idolatry in calling upon the name of a foreign god. This clearly indicates that the author’s idea of exile was shaped, not only by the affliction of the Jewish people under Roman rule, but also by the
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immediate danger of their apostasy and idolatry in the post-135/6 period of the “templeless-cityless age.” We also read in the letter that Jeremiah felt pain and wept as he remembered a day of festival that the people used to celebrate in Jerusalem (vv. 26–27). At first glance, Jeremiah’s nostalgic memory of Jerusalem as the centre of Jewish worship and his weeping over the reality of the people who can no longer celebrate a Jewish festival in Jerusalem seem to reflect the post-70 period of the “templeless age.” Note, however, that Jeremiah’s letter concludes with a quotation from Ps 137:3–4: the captors asked the exiles to sing a song of Zion, but they could not (4 Bar 7:29). Although Jeremiah’s letter ends here, the Psalmist continues to express his longing for Jerusalem in Ps 137:5–6:

5 If I forget you, O Jerusalem, let my right hand wither!
6 Let my tongue cling to the roof of my mouth,
    if I do not remember you, if I do not set Jerusalem above my highest joy.

We can infer from the author’s quotation from Psalm 137 that his exilic perspective was influenced by the onset of the “templeless-cityless age,” when the paganization of Jerusalem as Aelia Capitolina, the introduction of the imperial cult of emperor worship and the expulsion of the Jews from the city crushed the hope of worshiping the God of Israel in Jerusalem. Most probably, our Jewish author wanted to express his own anguish and sorrow by portraying Jeremiah as the weeping priest of Jerusalem in exile. It is very likely that Jeremiah in Babylon was the author’s self-portrayal or self-projection which derived from his own reflections on the fate of the people and the city in the post-war period of the “templeless-cityless age.”

251It is plausible and possible that our anonymous Jewish author was affiliated with priestly circles or was himself a priest. Note that the author pays close attention to Jeremiah’s priestly role and function throughout the narrative, as the priestly intercessor, the preserver of the Temple vessels and keys, the weeping priest in Babylon, the teacher of separation towards purity and the high priest officiating at Yom Kippur in Jerusalem. The author’s portrayal of Jeremiah as the (high) priest of Jerusalem seems to have stemmed from the priestly background of the author himself. For ongoing vitality of priestly circles in the post-70 period, see Matthew Grey, “Jewish Priests and the Social History of Post-70 Palestine” (Ph. D. diss., University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2011), especially chapter 4.
The significance of Jeremiah’s letter cannot be overemphasized. We can discern the author’s idea of exile in the life of the Babylonian exiles described in the letter. Our author conceptualized exile in close relation to the loss of the city and Temple of Jerusalem and its aftermath. He perceived that exile was an ethno-religious problem, rather than a political one, although there was a political component to it in the sense that an ethno-religious problem was experienced under “the jurisdiction of this lawless king” (4 Bar 7:23). From the author’s post-135/6 perspective, the Babylonian exile marked by affliction and idolatry was an ongoing reality in Syria Palestina, and it was necessary for the Palestinian Jews to protect their ethno-religious identity and purity during the “templeless-cityless age.” In this respect, we may argue that Jeremiah in Babylon, as the weeping priest of Jerusalem and the Mosaic-priestly teacher of separation, was intended to serve the author’s theological and practical concern to influence the life of the people in the post-135/6 exilic age.

5.2.1.3 Jeremiah’s Return to Jerusalem

The author’s account of a new exodus from Babylon begins with the divine instruction given to Jeremiah on the day of departure to Jerusalem (4 Bar 8:2–3): Jeremiah must teach the exiles the precondition for reentry into Jerusalem one last time when they reach the river Jordan. He must command them to abandon the works of Babylon and to separate themselves from foreign spouses. Only those who obey can enter Jerusalem. Here, Jeremiah is portrayed as a new Moses (or even a new Joshua) for a new exodus who delivers a divine instruction to the people before crossing the Jordan.

Jeremiah’s instruction to abolish mixed marriages draws on the Ezra-Nehemiah tradition. In Ezra
9–10, separation from foreign spouses is commanded to the returnees to Jerusalem as part of the religious reform because intermarriage is the source of religious ‘uncleanness’ (ἔοντος, 9:11). Hence, Ezra’s instruction of separation is ascribed to his priestly function (10:10–11). Nehemiah also condemns intermarriage because it is the source of idolatry and defilement (Neh 13:23–31). We can infer from Ezra-Nehemiah that Jeremiah’s Mosaic-priestly instruction to dissolve mixed marriages has great implications for the purification of the exiles who have been calling upon the name of a foreign god and also for the restoration of their unique identity as God’s people chosen out of all the peoples to become “a priestly kingdom and a holy nation” (Exod 19:6).252 It is, therefore, understandable that in 4 Baruch the divine instruction of separation is directed to “the children of Israel” (6:13) and that Baruch’s letter containing this instruction is directed to “the chosen people of God” (7:11). This clearly indicates that Jeremiah’s Mosaic-priestly instruction of separation was intended to perform an identity-reaffirming function for God’s people and to serve the author’s concern to protect the ethno-religious purity of the Palestinian Jews in the post-135/6 period.

Such a concern of the author continues to be shown in the intriguing account of Samaria. According to the passage in 4 Bar 8:4–9, the half of those who had the Babylonian spouses did not obey Jeremiah’s instruction. They crossed the Jordan and came to Jerusalem, insisting on entering the city with their foreign spouses, but Jeremiah did not allow them to do so. As a result, they decided to return to Babylon which they called “our place” (τὸν τόπον ἢμῶν, v. 6). When

the Babylonians also refused to receive them back, they built a city for themselves — Samaria. Jeremiah then exhorted them to repentance so that they might enter “[their] exalted place” (τὸν τόπον ὑμῶν τὸν ὑψηλόν, v. 9).

Riaud has argued that the author’s construction of Jeremiah as a new Moses is an implicit appeal to the Samaritans to accept the authority of Jeremiah as a prophet like Moses and renounce Mt. Gerizim.253 Herzer has suggested that the author of 4 Baruch advocates here “a Samaritan-friendly position” affirming their Jewish identity and the unity of God’s people.254 Herzer’s view sounds more convincing than Riaud’s, given the fact that the Jewish-Samaritan relationship took a friendly turn when the Samaritans joined in the Jewish resistance to the Romans during the First Jewish Revolt. Yet we need to note that their friendly relationship did not last long when the Samaritan community, reestablished in Neapolis (Shechem) after the First Jewish Revolt, accepted and supported the religio-political policy of Hadrian in Palestine. When Hadrian decided to build a temple to Zeus Olympius at Tell-er-Ras on Mount Gerizim, most of the Samaritans accepted Hadrian’s decision without much resistance.255 Therefore, it is very likely that our Jewish author was critical of the Samaritans’ assent to Hadrian’s paganization of their sacred mountain and their participation in the imperial cult.256


254Herzer, 4 Baruch, 135–139.


256Emmanuel Friedheim, “Some Notes about the Samaritans and the Rabbinic Class at the Crossroads,” in Samaritans: Past and Present: Current Studies, ed. Menachem Mor and Friedrich V. Reiterer (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2010), 193–202, especially 197. Friedheim contends that the paganization of the Samaritan religion under Hadrian is likely to have raised a red flag in the Jewish-Samaritan relationship in the 2nd century C.E.
Nevertheless, it would be unwise to focus exclusively on the historical problem of Jewish-Samaritan relations. Rather, we should pay attention to the rhetorical function of the account of Samaria in the present literary context of a new exodus in order to understand the main point of the story. Note that the people of Samaria are portrayed in 4 Baruch as the disobedient Jews who have rejected Jeremiah’s instruction of separation. They are not in exile in the ordinary sense of the term since they have crossed the Jordan and entered the Land, but they continue to defile themselves with gentiles and live under ongoing ‘exilic’ conditions through their social, cultural and religious adherence to Babylon, even to the point of calling it “our place” (8:6). In this respect, the account of Samaria seems to reveal the author’s exilic perspective on Jewish life in the post-135/6 Palestine. The life in the Land was not any better than the life outside the Land. The Jewish people were living in a predominantly pagan world of gentiles, not only in the Diaspora but also in Palestine. A huge influx of gentiles, the influence of Greco-Roman culture and religion and the ongoing Jewish subjugation to Rome must have made it very difficult for the majority of the Palestinian Jews to maintain their ethno-religious purity and identity. Therefore, we may construe Jeremiah’s exhortation to repentance in 4 Bar 8:9 as the author’s message directed to those Palestinian Jews who lived like the people of Samaria. The author’s intended message is simple: they must repent because “the children of Israel” and “the chosen people of God” must not defile themselves with the abominable things of Babylon (Rome) and the ways of gentiles. They must endure this exilic age under Roman rule, protecting their Jewish identity and sanctifying Jerusalem in their hearts as “[their] exalted place” to which God’s chosen people of Israel shall return someday.

Jeremiah’s call to repentance that closes the account of Samaria is directly followed by the account
of his observance of Yom Kippur in Jerusalem with the obedient returnees (4 Bar 9:1–9). Jeremiah’s own return to Jerusalem indicates that he is a new Moses for a new exodus who is superior to the old one in that he crosses the Jordan and enters Jerusalem. Jeremiah is also the high priest of Jerusalem who officiates at Yom Kippur after the return. This Jeremiah is the reverse of the weeping priest in Babylon in the sense that his nostalgic memory of Jerusalem as the centre of Jewish worship (cf. 7:26–27) is now actualized in his observance of Yom Kippur at the altar in Jerusalem with the obedient returnees. This cultic-religious ceremony observed in Jerusalem undoubtedly signifies a radical reversal for God’s people and city: God’s chosen people now purify themselves and renew their relationship with God and God’s chosen, holy city is reestablished as the centre of Jewish worship. In this regard, the author’s innovative account of the return of the exiles to Jerusalem under Jeremiah’s Mosaic-priestly leadership was not merely his way of reacting to the loss of Jerusalem and reclaiming it as eternally belonging to God and His people. It was also his way of expressing his hope and vision of a future when God’s chosen people will worship the one true God in God’s chosen, holy city.

As regards Jeremiah’s return to Jerusalem, Christian Wolff has correctly noted that the author’s use of the exodus model, the Urbild of Jewish hope for salvation, gives the account of the homecoming of the people an eschatological character. True, our Jewish author projected the return of the people and the restoration of Jerusalem and its Temple far into the remote future.
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257 Riaud, Les Paralipomènes du prophète Jérémie, 53–54. Cf. Herzer (4 Baruch, 149) thinks that Jeremiah is superior to Moses only in his death, through which he enters the heavenly realm, the real “promised land.”

258 Mittmann-Richert (Supplementa, 152) correctly notes that Jeremiah’s observance of Yom Kippur restores the cultic purity of the people.

Yet, unlike the author of 2 Baruch, he presented the future that he envisaged as the past history of the people and affirmed that the divine fulfilment of the promised restoration would surely take place in the future history of the people. Moreover, Jeremiah’s theological reassociation with the fate of Jerusalem and the Temple, which is most clearly illustrated in his physical return to (the altar in) Jerusalem at the end of the Jewish narrative of 4 Baruch, indicates that Jeremiah’s timeless significance for the fate of the city and Temple of Jerusalem was acknowledged and affirmed in the author’s theological construction of the future of God’s beloved people.

5.2.2 The Transformation of the Jewish Narrative

It has often been argued that Jeremiah’s return to Jerusalem must be understood as a metaphor for the entry into the heavenly Jerusalem. According to this view, the major theme of 4 Baruch is postmortem eschatological salvation in the heavenly Jerusalem and the primary significance of Jeremiah lies in his Mosaic role of teaching the Law. However, as we have noted above, Jeremiah’s Mosaic significance is revealed in his intercession on behalf of Jerusalem. Jeremiah’s Mosaic-priestly instruction remains focussed on separation towards purity and holiness, rather than on Torah obedience. His Mosaic authority culminates in a new exodus from Babylon. Moreover, it is Jeremiah’s priestly identity that is emphasized throughout the narrative. Jeremiah is a priestly intercessor in the Temple, the weeping priest in Babylon and the high priest of Jerusalem. It is, therefore, difficult to assume that 4 Baruch concerns itself with Torah obedience in view of the postmortem eschatological salvation of the righteous in the heavenly city.

Herzer is of the opinion that the author of 4 Baruch tried to warn against “the one-sided hope of political and temple-cultic restoration held by an influential part of the population.”

I agree with Herzer in that our Jewish author was not inclined towards political nationalism. However, given Jeremiah’s prominent priestly role and function that permeate the narrative, it is unlikely that the author was uninterested in a temple-cultic restoration. Herzer also argues that the Temple vessels and keys “were preserved not for another earthly temple but for an eschatological, heavenly temple,” and contends that the fact that their retrieval is not mentioned in the account of Jeremiah’s return to Jerusalem relativizes Jeremiah’s Temple worship. However, even in 2 Bar 4:1–6, the significance of the pre-existent heavenly Jerusalem and Temple lies, not merely in that they relativize the destruction of their earthly counterparts, but also in that they, as the heavenly archetypes, ensure the future restoration of the earthly city and Temple. As Lorenzo DiTommaso suggests, the hidden vessels “will be returned to the future-time Temple, since they would not be required in the pre-existent heavenly Temple.” Moreover, Jeremiah’s return to the altar in Jerusalem, where the Temple vessels remain hidden, seems to attest to the author’s hope of the restoration of the Jerusalem Temple and its cultus. Furthermore, Jeremiah’s observance of Yom Kippur in Jerusalem opens up possibilities for the present and future of God’s people. Purified from the sin and defilement accrued during the exile, they are now given a chance to start anew as God’s chosen, holy people. It is unlikely that the observance of Yom Kippur in
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261 Herzer, 4 Baruch, xxxiv; also Mittmann-Richert, Supplementa, 143.

262 Herzer, 4 Baruch, 144.

263 Ibid., xxxiv.


265 Lorenzo DiTommaso, The Dead Sea New Jerusalem Text: Contents and Contexts (TSAJ 110; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 134, n. 177.
Jerusalem is a metaphor for the postmortem eschatological purification of the people in the heavenly Jerusalem and, for that matter, it is difficult to assume that the author of 4 Baruch believed that a chance for a new beginning would be given to God’s people only in the eschatological heavenly Jerusalem but never in the future earthly Jerusalem.

That being said, I would like to reexamine the internal evidence for the eschatological-otherworldly orientation of 4 Baruch. The following discussion is not intended to deny such an orientation of the book but only to question its priority and originality in the Jewish narrative of 4 Baruch.

5.2.2.1 Abimelech’s Words in 4 Bar 5:34

The Abimelech narrative in ch. 5 is an account of Abimelech’s return to Jerusalem after awakening from his 66 years of sleep. When he returns to Jerusalem, he is unable to recognize the city because it has changed so much: the houses, the neighbourhood and even the people are not the same. The transformation of Jerusalem is such that he says repeatedly, “I got lost” (vv. 9–12). A certain old man identifies the city as Jerusalem and says that 66 years have passed since the destruction. At the end of the narrative, Abimelech speaks to the old man, giving some of his fresh figs to him, “God will lead you with light to the city above, Jerusalem” (v. 34). It seems that these concluding words of Abimelech point to the eschatological entry into the heavenly Jerusalem.

Note, however, that the motif of Abimelech’s figs, which is pregnant with the eschatological-otherworldly hope of salvation in 5:34, has a completely different connotation in the Jeremiah narrative of exile and return. Right before the destruction of Jerusalem, Jeremiah sends
Abimelech out of the city to gather some figs for ‘the sick’ among the people (3:15–16; cf. 5:25); After Abimelech’s return, Baruch sends fifteen figs to Jeremiah in Babylon along with his letter that contains the hopeful message of the imminent return of the exiles after fifteen days of preparation (7:8); Jeremiah distributes the figs to ‘the sick’ among the people for whom these were originally meant (7:32). Here, the motif of Abimelech’s fresh figs has to do with the recuperation and revitalization of the exiles. It has no clear implications for the eschatological-otherworldly salvation of righteous individuals.

It is tempting to harmonize these two different connotations of the motif of Abimelech’s figs and interpret the Jeremiah narrative of exile and return as a metaphorical story about the eschatological entry into the heavenly Jerusalem. However, such a conceptual harmonization is not without problems. As regards the transformation of Jerusalem that left Abimelech bewildered, Riaud suggests that it refers to the desolation of Jerusalem in the post-70 period. Herzer connects it to Hadrian’s foundation of Aelia Capitolina. DiTommaso, however, suggests that the transformation of Jerusalem which Abimelech witnesses is a positive transformation, or the eschatological renewal of the earthly Jerusalem. The reading by DiTommaso can be supported on both internal and external grounds. In light of the divine promise to protect Abimelech until the return of the people to the city (4 Bar 3:10), Abimelech’s safe return to Jerusalem signals the
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266 The fig motif was borrowed from Jeremiah’s vision in Jer 24:5–6, in which the good figs are associated with the divine promise of the preservation and restoration of the exiles: “I will bring them back to this land” (v. 6). Note that the same connotation of the fig motif is found within the exile-return framework of the Jeremiah narrative in 4 Baruch, although the author of 4 Baruch did not characterize the exiles as the righteous vis-à-vis the remnants in the Land. Cf. Kaestli, “L’influence du livre de Jérémie dans les Paralipomènes de Jérémie,” 227.


268 Herzer, 4 Baruch, xxxiii–xxxiv.

imminent return of the exiles to the city. As the old man says in 5:30, Abimelech slept for 66 years because God did not want him, a righteous man, to see the desolation of the city. If so, it is very likely that the Jerusalem that Abimelech sees after awakening from his sleep is not the desolated city but the exalted one, completely renewed and restored as a glorious city of God, to which Jeremiah and the people shall soon return. This is also how the Abimelech tradition is interpreted in the *Jeremiah Apocryphon* (3rd–4th centuries C.E.). In the Garshuni and Coptic versions of the *Apocryphon*, the old man reveals to Abimelech, who is bewildered by the transformation of the city, that Jerusalem has been restored. It is to this glorious city that Jeremiah and the exiles shall return:

The old man answered then and said: “You are truly a holy man, and God spared you the sight of the destruction of Jerusalem, the great tribulations of the road and the subjection to Nebuchadnezzar. He has brought down sleep upon you in order that you may see Jerusalem reconstructed as in the days of her glory. If you wish to ascertain the truth of my words: this is the first day in which the prophet Jeremiah arrived accompanied by all the people; this should be a proof for you that Jerusalem has returned to its former state. You are truly a holy man of the Lord, who had pity on you and granted you rest for seventy years, until the people came back to their place...”

The old man said to him: Truly, O my son, thou art a righteous man whom God did not let see the destruction of Jerusalem. Therefore God brought this sleep upon thee until today. Thou art seeing it (i.e. Jerusalem) in its joy. It is the first day since Jeremiah sent (and) adorned the gates of Jerusalem, for they have released the people from captivity...}

In these passages, the Jerusalem that Abimelech sees after awakening from his sleep is a new earthly Jerusalem, eschatologically restored as the ingathering centre. Crucial here is that the *Jeremiah Apocryphon* attests to the narrative tradition of Abimelech that envisions the this-worldly fulfilment of the eschatological restoration of God’s city and people. We cannot dismiss
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270 Quoted from the Garshuni version. Mingana and Harris, “A New Jeremiah Apocryphon,” 187.

the possibility that the author of the Jeremiah Apocryphon learned of such a narrative tradition of Abimelech from the original Jewish narrative of 4 Baruch. It is plausible and possible that the Abimelech narrative was originally created by the author of 4 Baruch as a story about the eschatological renewal of the earthly Jerusalem in reaction to its present paganization as Aelia Capitolina. This suggests that the eschatological entry into the heavenly Jerusalem which is indicated at the very end of the Abimelech narrative in 4 Bar 5:34 is external to the original extent of the Abimelech narrative, and that Abimelech’s speech to the old man in v. 34 is most probably a later redaction through which the entire Abimelech narrative transformed into a story about the eschatological salvation of the righteous in “the city above, Jerusalem.”

5.2.2.2 Baruch’s Prayer in 4 Bar 6:3–7

The Baruch narrative in ch. 6 begins with Baruch’s reunion with Abimelech. When he sees Abimelech’s figs that have been preserved fresh for 66 years, Baruch begins to pray and says that God who preserved them will preserve his body as well (vv. 3–7). Abimelech’s fresh figs thus become the symbol of the postmortem bodily resurrection of the righteous. Note, however, that Baruch’s prayer in 6:3–7 does not have any immediate connection to the subsequent developments in the narrative of exile and return. Baruch tells Abimelech that they should pray together, for he does not know how to send a message to Jeremiah in Babylon (v. 8). The message that he wants to deliver is that the fulfilment of the divine promise to protect Abimelech signals the imminent return of the exiles to Jerusalem. Baruch prays for divine wisdom and knowledge as to the way to send the message to Jeremiah in Babylon (vv. 9–10). In response to his prayer, an angel appears to Baruch, commands him to write a letter to Jeremiah, and reveals what to write in it (vv. 11–15). Baruch’s letter does not mention anything about Abimelech’s figs or bodily resurrection but only
the precondition for reentry into Jerusalem as instructed by the angel (vv. 17–23). The Baruch narrative in ch. 6 thus flows smoothly, from Baruch’s reunion with Abimelech in v. 2 to his decision to send to Jeremiah the message of the imminent return of the exiles in v. 8, without the intervening prayer about bodily resurrection. Hence, there is a great possibility that Baruch’s prayer, which interprets the motif of Abimelech’s figs in relation to the postmortem eschatological salvation of the righteous, is a redactional interpolation.272

That said, let us consider the account of a miracle of resurrection in 4 Bar 7:17. The eagle, a divine courier that reaches Babylon with Baruch’s letter and Abimelech’s figs, miraculously revives a dead person in front of the exiles so that they may believe the message of their imminent return from Babylon. The miracle of resurrection which takes place in the context of a new exodus may lead us to conjecture that Baruch’s prayer about bodily resurrection is, perhaps, integral to the original Jewish narrative of exile and return.273 It is, however, clearly indicated in 7:17 that the eagle’s miracle of resurrection took place in order to authenticate the message of the imminent return by demonstrating to the despondent exiles the divine power to redeem them. This is reminiscent of the rhetorical function of ‘resurrection’ in Ezek 37:1–14. There, God says that the vision of resurrection is given to Ezekiel on behalf of the people in exile who say that they have no hope. The vision is to assure them that God will bring them up from the graves and bring

272We cannot ascertain that 4 Bar 6:3–7 is a Christian redaction since bodily resurrection is originally a Jewish idea. For its Jewish origin, see James H. Charlesworth, with C. D. Elledge, J. L. Crenshaw, H. Boers and W. W. Willis Jr., Resurrection: The Origin and Future of a Biblical Doctrine (Faith and Scholarship Colloquies Series; New York: T & T Clark, 2006).

273Herzer (4 Baruch, 125) suggests that the miracle performed by an eagle is closely associated with Baruch’s prayer about bodily resurrection which is followed by his assurance of the imminent return of the exiles. Herzer writes, “the miracle gives notice of the salvific content of the eagle’s message and seeks to awake the same faith in the coming salvation that Baruch had demonstrated earlier. The eagle shows itself through the resurrection miracle to be a symbol of self-renewing life.”

It is also interesting to note that the resurrection motif plays an important role in the Baruch narrative of 4 Baruch. Baruch remained in a tomb during the period of exile but came out of it right before the return of the exiles (4 Bar 4:11; 7:1). It is most likely that Baruch’s symbolic ‘resurrection’ from his tomb signifies the end of the Babylonian exile marked by death and burial and ultimately a great reversal in the fate of the people.

Hence, we need caution in harmonizing Baruch’s prayer in 6:3–7 and the eagle’s miracle of resurrection in 7:17. In the context of a new exodus from Babylon, the eagle’s miracle of resurrection is not so much an expression of the real belief in postmortem bodily resurrection as an affirmation of God’s power to bring about a great reversal in the fate of the people. This further allows us to question the originality of Baruch’s prayer and the priority of the eschatological-otherworldly orientation of the Jewish narrative of 4 Baruch.

5.2.2.3 Jeremiah’s Words in 4 Bar 8:9 and 9:5

We find in 4 Bar 8:9 Jeremiah’s exhortation to repentance directed to those who disobeyed his instruction of separation and built their own city of Samaria: “Repent, for the angel of

---


275 It is also interesting to note that the resurrection motif plays an important role in the Baruch narrative of 4 Baruch. Baruch remained in a tomb during the period of exile but came out of it right before the return of the exiles (4 Bar 4:11; 7:1). It is most likely that Baruch’s symbolic ‘resurrection’ from his tomb signifies the end of the Babylonian exile marked by death and burial and ultimately a great reversal in the fate of the people.
righteousness is coming and he will lead you to your exalted place.” In 4 Baruch, “the angel of righteousness” is first mentioned in Baruch’s prayer in 6:3–7, where Baruch says that his body shall be preserved as the result of his obedience to “the angel of righteousness.” Here, the function of “the angel of righteousness” is directly associated with the postmortem eschatological salvation of the righteous. Therefore, the same angel mentioned in Jeremiah’s exhortation in 8:9 leads us to construe the “exalted place” as the heavenly Jerusalem that the penitent shall enter eschatologically.

This, however, renders Jeremiah’s exhortation puzzling. We would expect the penitent to enter the earthly Jerusalem that the obedient have already entered with Jeremiah. Yet Jeremiah’s exhortation in its present form implies that the disobedient, if they repent, shall enter the heavenly Jerusalem. Jeremiah’s words thus insinuate a relative insignificance of the fate of the obedient who returned to the earthly Jerusalem and observed Yom Kippur under Jeremiah’s Mosaic-priestly leadership. It is difficult to assume that the eschatological entry of the penitent into the heavenly city is the original message intended by the author. It is more likely that the “exalted place” that the penitent are entitled to enter refers to an eschatologically transformed, new earthly Jerusalem that is prepared for God’s great ingathering of the people.276

Given the secondary nature of Baruch’s prayer in 6:3–7, there is a great possibility that Jeremiah’s exhortation was redacted by an anonymous Jewish redactor who espoused the eschatological-otherworldly salvation of the righteous in the heavenly Jerusalem and incorporated the eschatological function of “the angel of righteousness” into Jeremiah’s exhortation to repentance.

276 It is also possible that the “exalted place,” as a reference to Jerusalem, was intended to express the glory of God’s chosen, holy city against Babylon (Rome) which was regarded by some as “our place” (4 Bar 8:6).
By revising Jeremiah’s exhortation in keeping with Baruch’s prayer, the redactor generated ambiguity with respect to the identity of the “exalted place” and modified the original message of Jeremiah’s exhortation that we have discussed earlier.

The same angel is mentioned again in Jeremiah’s prayer offered at the altar before his death (4 Bar 9:3–6). Here, Jeremiah expects Michael, “the archangel of righteousness,” to lead in the righteous (v. 5). The designation of Michael as “the archangel of righteousness” is peculiar since he is known as the archangel of the protection of Israel. Given that Michael’s role of leading in the righteous is in line with the eschatological function of “the angel of righteousness” as indicated in Baruch’s prayer (6:3–7) and Jeremiah’s exhortation (8:9), we may suggest that Jeremiah’s final prayer was also redacted in view of the eschatological salvation of the righteous in the heavenly Jerusalem. Although we cannot ascertain the original form and extent of Jeremiah’s prayer, the original prayer, in all likelihood, anticipated the eschatological ingathering of God’s beloved people that is mentioned in 4 Bar 3:8. Note that the return of the exiles to Jerusalem under Jeremiah’s leadership was incomplete. There is no mention of the retrieval of the Temple vessels and keys at the time of their return. Hence, it is very likely that Jeremiah’s original prayer anticipated the fulfilment of the divine promise given in 3:8, that the hidden vessels shall be revealed at the time of God’s great ingathering of the people. The place of ingathering is not mentioned in 3:8 and 9:5, but we may safely assume that it is a new earthly Jerusalem, the “exalted place” for all Jews. This original prayer was reworked by the redactor who presented Michael

277Schaller (Paralipomena Jeremiou, 749–750) rejects the authenticity of 9:5 because of its thin relationship with the rest of the prayer. Schaller is correct in saying that Jeremiah’s prayer in 4 Bar 9:3–6 is not the original form of the prayer, yet there is no way of retrieving its original form.

278Delling (Jüdische Lehre, 61–62) also suggests that the place of the end-time salvation implied in 4 Bar 9:5 is a new earthly Jerusalem.
as the archangel of the eschatological salvation of the righteous in keeping with Baruch’s prayer (6:3-7) and Jeremiah’s exhortation (8:9).

5.2.3 The Earthly Jerusalem vs. The Heavenly Jerusalem

We have discerned in the foregoing discussion that the major evidence for the eschatological-otherworldly orientation of 4 Baruch is found in the speeches of three main characters — Abimelech, Baruch and Jeremiah. This is indicative of a systematic and deliberate redaction that aimed to make all three figures proclaim in coordination the hope of an eschatological salvation in the heavenly Jerusalem. The original Jewish narrative of exile and return was pregnant with the eschatological hope of the salvation of God’s chosen people and the renewal of His holy city. This narrative was redactionally overlaid with the idea of the eschatological salvation of the righteous in the heavenly Jerusalem. In this respect, we need to take Marinus de Jonge’s hypothesis more seriously. Here I quote de Jonge:

Should we, perhaps, assume the two stages in the writing of the Jewish Paralipomena, one concerned with the return, one with the entry into the heavenly city — a hypothesis strongly rejected by J. Herzer? If the emphasis is no longer on an actual return to Jerusalem or a rebuilding of the city and the temple, is there any reason to stick to a date in the time of Hadrian, a date that is commonly accepted?

My reading of 4 Baruch corroborates de Jonge’s idea of the two-stage composition of the Jewish narrative of 4 Baruch. The Jewish author, who most probably had a priestly background, produced a creative narrative account of exile and return, affirming the sanctity and centrality of Jerusalem as ‘God’s chosen, holy city’ (1:5-6) and also as ‘our exalted city’ (7:20-21; 8:9) in reaction to the paganization of Jerusalem as Aelia Capitolina. His theological and practical

---

279 De Jonge, “Remarks in the Margin,” 47.
concern was the preservation of the ethno-religious identity and purity of the Jewish people during the “templeless-cityless age,” and he envisaged the definitive end of the “templeless-cityless age” at the eschatological time of God’s great ingathering of the beloved people in a new earthly Jerusalem. The Jewish redactor, by amplifying and modifying the words of Abimelech, Baruch and Jeremiah (5:34; 6:3–7; 8:9; 9:5), transformed the original Jewish narrative of exile and return into a metaphorical story about the eschatological salvation of the righteous in the heavenly Jerusalem.

Thus we find in the Jewish narrative of 4 Bar 1:1–9:9 two different foci on salvation that developed through the process of transmission and redaction: the earthly Jerusalem vs. the heavenly Jerusalem. The scholarly interpretations of 4 Baruch have suffered from the anxiety to harmonize all internal conceptual discrepancies and to read 4 Baruch as an organic unity. Gerhard Delling, for example, tried to combine the this-worldly and the otherworldly orientation of 4 Baruch and interpreted “the city above, Jerusalem” (5:34) as a reference to a new earthly Jerusalem of a heavenly origin.280 He argued that the return of the exiles to Jerusalem points, not only to the postmortem eschatological salvation of the righteous in the heavenly city, but also to the long-awaited Endheil of the people of Israel in the earthly city.281 Berndt Schaller was also torn between the heavenly Jerusalem and the earthly Jerusalem. 4 Baruch, he thought, can be read as a story of the return of the people and also as a symbolic parable about the fate of the righteous. He then speculated that either the theme of the eschatological salvation of the righteous was

---

280 Delling, Jüdische Lehre, 59–60; Riaud, “Paraleipomena Jeremiou,” in Outside the Old Testament, 225. Riaud has also argued that this expression may allude to the heavenly Jerusalem descending on earth.

281 Delling, Jüdische Lehre, 63. For Delling, the divine word about the revelation of the Temple vessels at the time of the ingathering of the beloved (3:8) ensures the this-worldly fulfilment of restoration centred on the earthly Jerusalem.
imposed on the story of the return of the exiles or the motif of return was strategically employed in the symbolic account of the eschatological salvation of the righteous in the heavenly Jerusalem. Yet he dismissed the second option by saying that God’s chosen people, the children of Israel, are too significant in 4 Baruch to pass merely as a metaphoric reference to righteous individuals. By implication, God’s chosen, holy city is also too significant in 4 Baruch to pass merely as the heavenly abode of the resurrected. Schaller’s intuitive observation further supports de Jonge’s hypothesis of the two-stage composition of the Jewish narrative of 4 Baruch.

The two-stage development of the Jewish narrative has great implications for our understanding of the theological significance of Jeremiah. In the original Jewish narrative of exile and return, the author’s portrayal of Jeremiah as a superior new Moses and the high priest of Jerusalem who participated in the fulfilment of the promise and witnessed the very future promised by God, albeit partially, affirms Jeremiah’s timeless significance for exile and restoration and his close association with the fate of the city and Temple of Jerusalem. This indicates that Jeremiah’s historical and theological significance for the future of the earthly city and Temple continued to be acknowledged in the ongoing Jewish reflections on the present and future of God’s people in the post-135/6 period of the “templeless-cityless age.” In the redacted version of the Jewish narrative of 4 Baruch, Jeremiah is portrayed as an eschatological prophet/priest who anticipated

Schaller, Paralipomena Jeremiau, 687–8.

On this, see W. D. Davies, The Territorial Dimension of Judaism (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982). Davies asks, “How much spiritualization of territoriality?” (p. 81). According to Davies, the land promise and the promise of a new earthly city and Temple came to be subordinated to the Torah in the post-70 and post-135/6 period. Yet the Torah centrality, he argues, is an interim ethic to some extent since the divine promise of the land, city and temple is never wholly deterritorialized in Jewish thinking. Davies correctly notes that there is no uniform territorial doctrine in Judaism since various groups had different understanding of a “place” for salvation at different times. Therefore, it would be unwise to presume that the Jewish hope of restoration centred on Jerusalem and its Temple was spiritualized all together after the first and second Jewish wars.
the eschatological salvation of the righteous in the heavenly Jerusalem (8:9; 9:5) and his return to
Jerusalem is relativized and spiritualized as a mere metaphor for the eschatological entry into the
heavenly city. This means that Jeremiah’s theological significance was gradually disassociated
from the fate of the earthly Jerusalem and Temple through the process of transmission and
redaction.

Jeremiah’s theological disassociation from the fate of the earthly city and Temple was intensified
by a Christian author/redactor. In the Christian appendix (4 Bar 9:10–32), Jeremiah is portrayed
as a Christian prophet who proclaimed the first and second comings of Jesus Christ and who died
as a persecuted Christian martyr. Riaud has suggested that the Christian author christianized
Jeremiah because he could not accept the Jewish portrayal of Jeremiah as “the Prophet and High
Priest of the end of time, the Messiah in a way.” Possible, but it is more likely that the Christian
author was intrigued by the idea of the eschatological ingathering of the righteous in the heavenly
Jerusalem. From the Christian perspective, the second coming of Jesus Christ will be the
consummation of the age when He will judge between the righteous and the wicked. Therefore,
our Christian author probably wanted to subordinate the Jewish narrative of exile and return to
Christian eschatology by creating a new ending and reconfiguring Jeremiah as a Christian prophet.
As we can see, Jeremiah’s enduring significance for the future of Jerusalem and the Temple was
further undermined through the Christian transmission and redaction of 4 Baruch.

284 Cf. In Vita Jeremiae, Jeremiah is also portrayed as a Christian prophet who prophesied the coming of the
Lord (2:12–13).

285 Jean Riaud, “The Figure of Jeremiah in the Paralipomena Jeremiae Prophetae: His Originality; His
‘Christianization’ by the Christian Author of the Conclusion (9.10–32),” JSP 22 (2000), 40–44, here 40.
5.2.4 Summary

The original Jewish narrative of 4 Baruch was the author’s theological response to the “templeless-cityless age” when the social, cultural and religious disintegration of the Jewish people in Syria Palestina was the real problem. The author addressed his concerns and expressed his hope of restoration in his creative narrative account of exile and return with Jeremiah as its protagonist.

Jeremiah is portrayed as a Mosaic-priestly figure throughout the Jewish narrative. He is a Mosaic-priestly intercessor who interceded with God on behalf of the city and the people, the high priest who preserved the Temple vessels at the altar in Jerusalem for their eschatological restoration to the future-time Temple, the weeping priest in Babylon who felt pain and wept as he remembered a solemn day of Jewish festival that the people used to observe in Jerusalem, a Mosaic-priestly teacher of separation who taught the exiles the precondition for reentry into Jerusalem, and a Mosaic-priestly leader whose leadership culminated in a new exodus from Babylon and a renewal of Jerusalem as the centre of Jewish worship. The Jeremiah figure as such reveals his enduring significance as the prophet/priest of exile and restoration with a strong pro-Jerusalem and pro-Temple Tendenz.

The author’s configuration of Jeremiah was closely associated with his concern to protect the ethno-religious identity and purity of the Jewish people who lost the centre of their world, Jerusalem in addition to the Temple, and also with his hope and vision of the eschatological return of God’s chosen, holy people of Israel to an eschatologically transformed, new earthly Jerusalem. In the original Jewish narrative of 4 Baruch, Jeremiah’s well-established reputation as the prophet of exile and restoration and his enduring significance for the fate of the earthly city and Temple
were indeed crucial to the author’s theological response to the “templeless-cityless age” in the post-135/6 period.

The Jewish redactor transformed the original narrative of exile and return into a metaphorical account of the eschatological salvation of the righteous in the heavenly Jerusalem. The Christian author further transformed it into a symbolic account of Christian eschatology. In this way, Jeremiah’s enduring significance for the fate of the earthly city and Temple, which was so crucial to the Jewish author’s conceptualization of exile and restoration, receded further into the background.

5.3 Conclusion

The Roman destruction of the Second Temple in 70 C.E. signalled the onset of the second “templeless age” in Jewish history. The scribal sage who authored 2 Baruch, reinventing the first “templeless age,” tried to come to terms with the disaster that had fallen upon the people. His aim was to reconsolidate the post-70 generations of Jews through the Torah rather than through the nationalist hopes of recapturing Jerusalem and rebuilding the Temple, hopes that remained strong and active among the Jewish people. Hence, he downplayed Jeremiah’s enduring significance for the fate of Jerusalem and the Temple by constructing him as a paradigmatic figure for individual retribution and as a preacher of Torah obedience among the Babylonian exiles. The Jeremiah of 2 Baruch thus conformed to the author’s concern to establish the centrality of the Torah for the well-being of the people through the second “templeless age.”

The historical problem that confronted the Jewish author of 4 Baruch was the onset of the “templeless-cityless age” after the failed Bar Kokhba Revolt. The author offered his own
theological response to the loss of Jerusalem and its ramifications for Jewish life in Palestine by reimagining the history of exile and return. Unlike the author of *2 Baruch* who marginalized Jeremiah as a peripheral figure, the author of *4 Baruch* brought Jeremiah to the fore, fully acknowledging his enduring significance as the prophet of exile and restoration and his close association with the fate of Jerusalem and the Temple. By constructing Jeremiah as a Mosaic prophet/priest of exile and return, the author, not only attempted to protect the purity and holiness of God’s chosen people living in the “templeless-cityless age” of exile, but also tried to express his eschatological hope of salvation and restoration centred on God’s chosen, holy city of Jerusalem. It was only through the process of transmission and redaction that Jeremiah’s theological association with the fate of the earthly city and Temple was spiritualized and marginalized.

We can infer from the Jeremiah figure as portrayed in *2 Baruch* and *4 Baruch* that Jeremiah’s enduring significance for the fate of Jerusalem and the Temple continued to be acknowledged as important in the post-70 and the post-135/6 period. True, some people de-emphasized Jeremiah’s ongoing relevance and significance for the future of the earthly city and Temple in order to promote Torah obedience in view of the eschatological salvation of the righteous in the world to come. It is their theological voices that we hear in *2 Baruch* and in the redacted version of the Jewish narrative of *4 Baruch*. The author of *2 Baruch* theologically disassociated Jeremiah from the city and the Temple and the Jewish redactor of *4 Baruch* spiritualized Jeremiah’s association with them. Yet Jeremiah’s enduring significance for the earthly city and Temple that is reaffirmed and reinforced in the original Jewish narrative of *4 Baruch* clearly indicates that Jeremiah’s theological association with the fate of the city and Temple of Jerusalem was not wholly
relativized or spiritualized in the post-70 and the post-135/6 period but retained its this-worldly implications for eschatological salvation and restoration.
Chapter 6
Conclusion and Implications

The present study began with the question — Why Jeremiah? The memory of Jeremiah’s historical connection to the national catastrophe in 586 B.C.E. certainly played a significant role in the ongoing development of the Jeremiah tradition during the Second Temple period. The memory of Jeremiah was activated whenever the fate of the people, the city and the Temple was at stake under oppressive gentile control. Yet we have observed in the expanding traditions of Jeremiah that it was not merely Jeremiah’s association with the destruction and affliction of the people and the city that was engraved in the collective memory of the people. Jeremiah’s reputation as the prophet of exile and restoration and his ongoing relevance and significance for the fulfilment of restoration centred on the city and Temple of Jerusalem continued to be acknowledged in the ongoing Jewish reflections on, and responses to, the changing fate of God’s people, city and Temple through and beyond the Second Temple period.

Louis Stulman has said, “[T]he book of Jeremiah is a complex and multifaceted response to the[se] tragedies.” We can infer from his statement the most likely explanations for the textual fluidity of Jeremiah during the Second Temple period. As we have considered in Chapter Two, the fact that the book of Jeremiah does not have a final form evidences the ongoing scribal process of reading, interpreting, composing and redacting Jeremiah materials over a long period of time in response, not only to the Babylonian crisis, but also to subsequent developments in history that...

---

affected the fate of God’s people, city and Temple. Such a process is clearly indicated, especially in JerMT, in the growing concern with the fate of Jerusalem and the Temple and in the growing interest in the fate of the king(dom) of Babylon/Sheshach. Whenever Jerusalem and the (Second) Temple became vulnerable to the threat of violence, and whenever the people’s perception of a continuing state of exile and expectation of a future restoration were heightened in response to that, the Jeremiah tradition in the apocrypha and pseudepigrapha also expanded in accordance with the ongoing Jewish attempt to understand their present and future in light of Jeremiah’s legacy. Consequently, the prophet Jeremiah gradually developed as a paradigmatic figure standing between two historical and theological poles of exile and restoration, becoming a timeless metaphor for exile and restoration.

We have seen in Chapter Three that Jeremiah’s theological significance as the prophet of exile and restoration developed through the historical experience and memory of the Babylonian crisis and the reconstruction of Yehud under Persian rule, and that Jeremiah’s significance as such was perceived and interpreted in close relation to the fate of Jerusalem and the Temple. The Jeremiah persona developed in Lamentations suggests that Jeremiah’s sympathy, empathy and solidarity with the city in ruins and his genuine concern for its future restoration were acknowledged by the post-destruction Jerusalem community. Hence, the lament tradition that developed in the post-destruction Judahite context during the time of the Babylonian exile is most likely to have contributed to the memory and perception of Jeremiah as a pro-Jerusalem figure who personally engaged with the suffering of Jerusalem and concerned himself with the unfolding fate of the city toward its vindication and restoration. We find in the Chronistic history that Jeremiah’s significance as a royal lamenter and advisor was closely associated with the Chronicler’s idea of
exile marked by the declining fate of Jerusalem and the Temple and eventually their destruction by the Babylonians. Yet the Chronicler perceived and presented Jeremiah ultimately as the major prophet of restoration whose prophecy of ‘seventy years’ had been completely fulfilled in the construction of the Second Temple after the repatriation, that is, in the re-manifestation of the theocratic kingdom of Yahweh centred in Jerusalem. The Chronicler indeed played a crucial role in setting the stage for the subsequent development of the Jeremiah tradition by authenticating Jeremiah’s words of restoration and reinforcing his pro-Jerusalem and pro-Temple significance as the major prophet of restoration.

In this respect, it is truly significant that the authors of Daniel 9 and 2 Maccabees turned to Jeremiah and invoked his authority on restoration during the pivotal time of the Antiochene crisis and the ensuing Maccabean restoration in the 2nd century B.C.E. We have observed in Chapter Four that the author of Daniel 9, anticipating the end of Jerusalem’s desolation and affliction under Seleucid rule, turned to the ‘seventy years’ prophecy of Jeremiah. He believed that the divine punishment of Antiochus IV and the reconsecration of the Temple would signal the termination of the extended period of exile decreed for the people and the holy city and the fulfilment of restoration promised through Jeremiah’s prophecy. The author of Daniel 9 thus affirmed Jeremiah’s historical and theological significance for (continuing) exile and restoration in close relation to the fate of God’s people, city and Temple of his day. In the epitome of 2 Maccabees, the author interpreted Judas’ liberation of Jerusalem from Seleucid rule as a great reversal in the history of the people, and substantiated his idea of reversal by means of the Jeremiah figure. Jeremiah, as a pray-er for the city and the people and an advocate of violent resistance, served the author’s conceptualization of the Maccabean restoration as terminating the exilic condition for
God’s people and city under imperial rule which had been an ongoing reality since the time of the Babylonian crisis. The author of the second letter prefixed to the epitome, utilizing the tradition of Jeremiah’s hidden vessels, affirmed that Judas’ purification of the Temple inaugurated the eschatological time of fulfilment foreseen by Jeremiah. As we can see, these authors reinterpreted and reshaped the received traditions of Jeremiah and expressed their common view that the exilic age which had begun with the Babylonian crisis was coming to an end in their own time in history with/through the restoration of the city and Temple of Jerusalem. This clearly shows that Jeremiah’s significance as the prophet of exile and restoration transcended the original historical context of the Babylonian crisis and the reconstruction of Yehud in the 6th century B.C.E. and extended to the time of the authors in the 2nd–1st centuries B.C.E. More importantly, this further indicates that Jeremiah’s enduring significance for the fate of Jerusalem and the Temple came to be firmly established during this pivotal time in Jewish history.

Therefore, it is not difficult to assume that Jeremiah was acknowledged once again as an important figure against the backdrop of the Roman assaults on the Temple and the holy city. As discussed in Chapter Five, the author of 2 Baruch wanted to deal with the persistent memory and perception of Jeremiah as the major prophetic authority on the restoration of Jerusalem and the Temple because his plan was to reconsolidate a devastated people through the Torah rather than through the hope of the imminent restoration of the city and the Temple. Hence, he marginalized Jeremiah as a peripheral figure and theologically disassociated him from the fate of Jerusalem and the Temple. The author of the Jewish narrative of 4 Baruch, however, reaffirmed Jeremiah’s theological association with the fate of the city and Temple of Jerusalem in his creative narrative account of exile and return. Writing from the post-135/6 period of the “templeless-cityless age,”
the author expressed his eschatological hope of salvation centred on a new earthly Jerusalem by portraying Jeremiah as the major prophet/priest of restoration who himself witnessed the fulfilment of the divine promise of return and restoration. This indicates that Jeremiah’s timeless significance for exile and restoration and his theological association with the fate of the earthly city and Temple were acknowledged and further reinforced in the author’s theological response to the “templeless-cityless age.”

What I find noteworthy in the ongoing development of the Jeremiah tradition is that a series of restorations centred on Jerusalem and the Temple continued to be interpreted and conceptualized in close association with Jeremiah. True, the presentation of the Jeremiah figure constantly changed at the hands of the Jewish authors who tried to understand their present and future in light of the Jeremiah tradition. Some contemplated the words and deeds of Jeremiah. Others created Jeremiah’s words and deeds, becoming the innovators of new traditions. Yet, from the Jeremiah of Chronicles to the Jeremiah of 4 Baruch, we can identify a trend in the development of the Jeremiah figure as the major prophet of exile and restoration with a strong pro-Jerusalem and pro-Temple Tendenz. The Chronicler’s Jeremiah was the bearer of the word of Yahweh (דִּבְרֵי יָהֹウェָה) concerning the fulfilment of restoration at the completion of Babylon’s seventy years. The prophet Jeremiah as portrayed in 2 Maccabees was directly or indirectly involved in the Maccabean restoration through his activities of praying for the people and the holy city, endorsing Judas’ armed resistance and preserving the sacred vessels for a new temple. For the author of 4 Baruch, Jeremiah was a new Moses and the high priest of Jerusalem who himself participated in the divine fulfilment of return and restoration. Such a development of the Jeremiah figure testifies to his growing reputation as the prophet of exile and restoration during the Second Temple period and
shows that his authority on restoration was perceived and interpreted in close relation to the changing fate of Jerusalem and the Temple.

It is not my intention to assert that Jeremiah’s close association with the fate of Jerusalem and the Temple was the only motif that served as the key driving force behind the ongoing development of the Jeremiah tradition. As mentioned in Chapter Four, the Jeremiah tradition was able to become a living tradition through Second Temple times also by virtue of Jeremiah’s reputation as a prototypical prophet of exile. Jeremiah was considered very important by those who viewed their communities as still living in a continuing state of ‘exile’ under the threats of Hellenistic culture and civilization. They tried to strengthen their communities by employing Jeremiah’s authority as an ideal exilic leader and teacher. Thus we find that Jeremiah’s Mosaic role of preaching Torah obedience to the exiles is an important theme that is multiply attested in the apocrypha and pseudepigrapha. Jeremiah writes a letter to the Babylonian exiles to warn against idolatry (The Epistle of Jeremiah); he preaches Torah obedience to those who are about to be deported to Babylon (2 Macc 2:2–3); he accompanies them as far as the river and exhorts them to keep the commandments of the Lord in the land of captivity (4Q385a 18 i); he goes to Babylon and lives among the exile to provide them with religious and spiritual guidance through the Torah (2 Baruch). Here, we can clearly see a trend in the development of Jeremiah as an ideal exilic leader and teacher: Jeremiah, who preached Torah obedience to the people of Judah and Jerusalem, becomes a prophet to the exiles, and then a prophet among the exiles. This suggests

---

287 The Jeremiah of 4 Baruch is also portrayed as a Mosaic prophet/priest who goes to Babylon and dwells among the exiles to serve them. Yet his life in Babylon is marked by his weeping and grieving rather than by teaching and preaching. Note that his instruction of separation begins after the arrival of Baruch’s letter only 15 days prior to departure from Babylon. Nevertheless, it is significant that the author of 4 Baruch acknowledged Jeremiah’s authority as a prototypical prophet of exile when he described Jeremiah as God’s servant and mouthpiece who speaks the word of the Lord to the exiles (4 Bar 6:22).
that Jeremiah’s reputation as a prototypical prophet of exile and his authority as an ideal exilic leader and teacher continued to develop in keeping with the growing Jewish perception of a continuing state of exile across and beyond the Second Temple period.

Also consider another trend in the development of Jeremiah as a lamentor. In the book of Jeremiah, Jeremiah laments the impending destruction and captivity of the beloved people and the city. His lamenting voice continues to be heard in the ruined city of Jerusalem during the post-destruction period (Lamentations), in the reconstituted Jerusalem community during the Persian period (2 Chr 35:25), and later on in the lands of exile, Egypt and Babylon (4Q385a 18 ii; 4 Baruch). Jeremiah thus emerges as an archetypal lamentor of and in exile. It is reasonable to assume that Jeremiah’s ongoing development as an archetypal lamentor was also closely associated with the Jewish idea of continuing exile.

Although these trends attest to Jeremiah’s enduring significance for ‘exile,’ it would be unwise to stereotype Jeremiah as the prophet of exile. As the present study has shown, Jeremiah’s ongoing theological relevance and significance were also acknowledged and affirmed with respect to his role and function vis-à-vis restoration centred on the city and Temple of Jerusalem. His pro-Jerusalem and pro-Temple personality continued to be revealed, not only in his genuine concern for the well-being of the city and the Temple and in his ongoing lament over their destruction, but also in his positive role in ensuring and achieving their restoration. One question that arises at this juncture is whether we can identify certain trends in the development of other ‘biblical’ figures. For instance, is there a trend in the development of David or Isaiah who may be designated as pro-Jerusalem and pro-Temple figures?
David’s theological significance for the Zion tradition is affirmed in 2 Samuel with respect to the establishment of Jerusalem as the political-religious centre of all Israel. In Chronicles, David’s Temple-cultic association comes to the fore. He appointed the Levitical singers to minister before the ark and prepared the building materials for a temple construction before his death (1 Chr 16:4; 22:5). Ben Sira further notes that David himself sang praises to the Lord and introduced music as an important part of the Temple worship (Sir 47:8–10). As Patrick W. Skehan and Alexander A. Di Lella have suggested, this may point to David’s authorship of psalms of praise. At Qumran, David is seen as composing all liturgical psalms through divinely-revealed wisdom and is designated as a prophet (11QPs VXVII:2–11). Josephus mentions that David was a prophet who prophesied in the context of his anointing as king by Samuel (Ant. 6.8.2 §166). In the New Testament, David is presented as a prophet who, through divine revelation, had foreknowledge of the coming and the resurrection of the Messiah (Acts 2:30–31; cf. Ps 132:11). As we can see, David’s association with Jerusalem and the Temple contributed to his development as a liturgical figure and ultimately as a full-fledged prophet during the Second Temple period.

What about Isaiah? The Isaiah of Chronicles is a writing prophet who recorded history, but he appears as a living character who prayed to God in the face of Sennacherib’s invasion of Jerusalem (2 Chr 32:20 ff.). Ben Sira also acknowledges Isaiah’s role in the divine deliverance of Jerusalem.

---


in the time of Hezekiah, and he further notes that Isaiah “saw the future” (Sir 48:24–25). This “future” refers not only to the restoration of Jerusalem that is closely associated with Deutero-Isaiah but also to the visions of the end time that allude most probably to the Isaiah Apocalypse and other eschatological prophesies of Isaiah. As Michael A. Knibb has argued, the Isaiah of Ben Sira emerges as an apocalyptic seer and this paved the way for Isaiah’s ongoing development as a visionary prophet in the Ascension of Isaiah, in which his visionary experience is both the cause of his martyrdom and the source of the revelation of Christ the Messiah. The use of Isaiah in Qumran indicates that the prophet Isaiah’s eschatological significance was acknowledged as important by the community as it tried to understand its own time and place in history. Josephus remains silent about Isaiah’s Davidic-messianic prophecies or his visionary experiences. Instead, he mentions, in addition to Isaiah’s role in protecting Jerusalem from Sennacherib’s army, Isaiah’s predictions of the reconstruction of the Jerusalem Temple under the aegis of king Cyrus and the building of Onias’ temple in Leontopolis (Ant. 11.1.2 §5–6; J.W. 7.10.3 §432). In the Lives of the Prophets, Isaiah’s role in the deliverance of Jerusalem from Sennacherib is linked to his prayer for water which God answered with the pool of Siloam. As we can see, Isaiah’s pro-Jerusalem significance for its salvation from Sennacherib’s invasion continued to be remembered
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294 Unlike the Chronicler, Josephus interprets the restoration of the Temple in the early Persian period as the fulfilment of Isaiah’s prediction rather than that of Jeremiah’s prophecy of ‘seventy years.’ The pro-Temple significance of Josephus’ Jeremiah is found in his advice of submission to Babylon since it expresses Jeremiah’s genuine concern for the safe preservation of the Temple. Hence, Josephus portrays himself as a second Jeremiah in his self-apology. See Rebecca Gray, Prophetic Figures in Late Second Temple Jewish Palestine: The Evidence from Josephus (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 72–74.
by the Jewish authors. Nevertheless, this particular tradition does not seem to have been reread, reinterpreted and reconstructed in any significant way in order to become a meaningful tradition for new circumstances through the changing fate of Jerusalem during the Second Temple period. It was rather Isaiah’s apocalyptic visions and eschatological prophecies that were regarded as more important by those who tried to understand their past, present and future in light of the Isaiah tradition.

So it seems that David, Isaiah and Jeremiah, who may be viewed as pro-Jerusalem and pro-Temple figures in their respective traditions in the Hebrew Scripture, took different paths in their afterlife. In this regard, it is truly noteworthy that Jeremiah’s pro-Jerusalem and pro-Temple significance continued to be cultivated in the ongoing Jewish conceptualizations of exile and restoration, reinforcing his ongoing theological relevance and significance through the unfolding history of the people paradigmatically understood as the history of exile and restoration.

When all things are taken into consideration, I think that there is a great possibility that the Jewish perception of Jeremiah’s authority on restoration centered on Jerusalem and the Temple grew out of the memory of the historical Jeremiah which was preserved in the early stage of the development of the tradition. Although searching for the historical Jeremiah was not the major interest of the present study, Matthijs de Jong’s sociological approach to the biblical presentation of the prophet Jeremiah and his reconstruction of the earliest stratum of the Jeremiah tradition that may be traced back to the historical prophet are worth considering at this juncture. De Jong’s main argument is that the major function of ancient prophets was to sustain the existing socio-political order. According to this view, Jeremiah’s pro-Babylonian policy and his prophetic warning of the coming disaster, accompanied by his utterance of laments, may be assigned to the
historical Jeremiah’s “pro-society” function to avert the decreed disaster and protect the well-being and security of Judah, Jerusalem and the Temple. I find de Jong’s analysis convincing because it is Jeremiah’s “pro-society” function that was remembered and further developed, not only through the Jeremianic lamenter in the book of Lamentations which I consider to be the earliest reception of the Jeremiah tradition, but also through the Chronicler’s historiography that legitimized the Second Temple as the divine fulfilment of the promised restoration revealed through the prophet Jeremiah. What we see in these early reception and interpretation of the Jeremiah tradition is the cultivation of the memory of the historical Jeremiah as a “pro-society” figure with a strong pro-Jerusalem and pro-Temple Tendenz.

This may account for a qualitative difference between the figures of Isaiah and Jeremiah in terms of their pro-Jerusalem significance. Second Isaiah, in particular, is well-known for his oracles of salvation and consolation of Jerusalem. In this respect, Second Isaiah comes very close to the Jeremiah figure, and there are some scholars who read Second Isaiah as an extension or continuation of the Jeremiah tradition. However, the Second Isaiah who appeared at the end of the Babylonian exile ultimately served the Golah community by striving for the reintegration of returning exiles into the Jerusalem community. This indicates that Second Isaiah’s pro-Jerusalem significance is more apparent than real. Note also the historical gap in the Isaiah tradition. The period of the Babylonian destruction and exile is passed over in the transition from Isaiah 39 to Isaiah 40. This gap in the Isaiah tradition marks a significant difference from what we see in the early reception and interpretation of the Jeremiah tradition, in which the prophet Jeremiah, his persona and his words lived through the historical continuum of

destruction–exile–restoration. It is in this historical continuum that the memory of Jeremiah as a “pro-society” prophet continued to be cultivated in close relation to the unfolding fate of Jerusalem and the Temple, from destruction to restoration.

The comparison between Isaiah and Jeremiah indicates that the two different paths that they took in their respective afterlives must not be explained away as accidental and legendary developments. It is very likely that the memory and perception of these prophets preserved in the ‘biblical books’ bearing their names were significant factors that influenced the development of their respective traditions. This is further corroborated by Lutz Doering’s discussion of the literary tradition of the ‘Diaspora Letters’ prompted by the memory of Jeremiah as a letter-writer to the exiles (Jer 29:1–9; 51:59–64). Another case in point is Nehemiah. As Theodore A. Bergren has cogently argued, the occurrence of Nehemiah in the second letter prefixed to the epitome (2 Macc 1:10–2:18) was most probably influenced by the ‘biblical’ Nehemiah, who was a builder and a military leader and who purified the Temple by removing the things of Tobiah out of it. In this respect, it seems necessary to take into consideration the role of ‘biblical’ traditions in the development of the traditions tied to ‘biblical’ figures in the apocrypha and pseudepigrapha.

That said, let us turn for a moment to Najman’s distinction between ‘a discourse’ and ‘a tradition’ tied to a founder. According to Najman, unlike ‘a discourse’ tied to a founder, in which the founder already has a distinctive personality, ‘a tradition’ tied to a founder incorporates the texts of disparate characteristics and genres associated with the founder, and the founder begins to

---


develop a distinctive personality as the tradition grows. Jeremiah the founder developed a strong pro-Jerusalem and pro-Temple personality as the tradition grew, and his tradition incorporated diverse genres such as lament, historiography and haggadah. Yet the seed of Jeremiah’s pro-Jerusalem and pro-Temple personality was already sown by the historical Jeremiah through his “pro-society” function on behalf of Judah, Jerusalem and the political-religious institutions established in it. In other words, his pro-Jerusalem and pro-Temple personality was more or less a given, and this personality was remembered, preserved and reinforced over time. In this respect, Najman’s distinction between a founder of ‘a discourse’ who already has a distinctive personality and a founder of ‘a tradition’ who develops a distinctive personality over time is blurred when it comes to Jeremiah the founder.

Also consider Jeremiah’s Mosaic personality as teacher of Torah. As Christl Maier has cogently argued, the portrait of Jeremiah as teacher of Torah was created during the Persian period, most probably as part of the social process of reconstructing Yehud by adopting Mosaic Law as constitution, and this Mosaic personality also continued to develop as the tradition grew. Thus we find that Jeremiah was associated with more than one distinctive personality, and that Jeremiah the founder betrays the features that could overlap with both categories discussed by Najman. Moreover, the fact that Jeremiah’s Mosaic personality as teacher of Torah found its way into the book of Jeremiah allows us to see that the ‘biblical’ tradition of Jeremiah is not to be conceived of only as an authoritative tradition that prompted new interpretations and compositions in the

---


apocrypha and pseudepigrapha. It was also a fluid tradition that continued to be (re-)constructed by other interpretative traditions which developed in response to the concrete experiences and ideologies of scribal authors and their communities.

It is not my intention to point out the conceptual flexibility or blurred boundary of modern categories employed by scholarship. Rather, these problems inherent in academic approaches to early Jewish literature testify to the fact that the development of the Jeremiah tradition was indeed a dynamic and complex process through which Jeremiah’s distinctive personalities were shaped and reshaped, and remembered and reaffirmed. In the present study, I was able to tackle only one particular trend in the Jeremiah tradition and argued that Jeremiah’s pro-Jerusalem and pro-Temple personality was an extension of the historical prophet’s “pro-society” function, and that such a personality of Jeremiah both influenced and was influenced by the expanding Jeremiah tradition through the changing fate of the city and Temple of Jerusalem which was crucial to the ongoing Jewish reflections on exile and restoration. Although Jeremiah’s pro-Jerusalem and pro-Temple personality was not the only personality that was cultivated in the Jeremiah tradition, it is noteworthy that this particular personality contributed to his enduring authority as the prophet of exile and restoration during and beyond the Second Temple period.

I believe that Jeremiah’s pro-Jerusalem and pro-Temple significance must be given its rightful place in Second Temple Judaism. The Jeremiah tradition in Rabbinic Judaism is largely focused on the Torah/Torah study and repentance on the one hand, and the destruction of the Temple and lamentations on the other hand. It almost seems that the Jeremiah tradition has come full circle in Rabbinic Judaism, since the earliest reception of the Jeremiah tradition after the Babylonian destruction of the First Temple evolved around the lament tradition (cf. The Book of
Lamentations), and the earliest reception of the Jeremiah tradition during the reconstruction period evolved around the preaching tradition elevating the Law of Moses (cf. Zech 1:3–6; 7:8–14). Jeremiah scholarship has been influenced by such a dominant interpretive tradition and has tended to focus on Jeremiah’s stereotypical roles as the weeping prophet and as a prophet like Moses. Yet we need to note that in Pesikta Rabbati — although it is a very late tradition (ca. the 9th century C.E.) — Jeremiah is remembered as comforting Mother Zion by declaring her future restoration (Pes.Rab. 26), and he is also seen as revealing God’s plan to build the Latter Day Temple (Pes.Rab. 28; cf. Jer 10:20). This suggests that Jeremiah’s pro-Jerusalem and pro-Temple significance, which was affirmed and reaffirmed during the Second Temple period, survived in the collective memory of the Jewish people for generation after generation. Although Jeremiah’s historical and theological association with the unfolding fate of Jerusalem and the Temple was not the only key driving force behind the expanding tradition of Jeremiah, it was nevertheless a very important element of the traditioning processes by which the Jeremiah tradition continued to find ongoing relevance and vitality through the changing fate of the Jewish people across and beyond the Second Temple period.

I hope the present study has made a small contribution to Jeremiah scholarship for its ongoing discussion of the Jeremiah tradition in Second Temple Judaism, and has shed some light on the importance of a diachronic approach to the traditions of ‘biblical’ figures since it reveals their theological significance as perceived, interpreted, constructed and promoted by the generations of Jewish authors who tried to conceptualize their past, present and future in light of the sacred traditions. It is also my hope that more work will be done on the development of ‘biblical’ figures, not merely to show how rich their traditions have become over time, but especially to discern the
ways in which their traditions have become rich, so that we may truly understand and appreciate the theological values and significance of these ancient figures for the Jewish people and their history.
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