

parallels, finds its model in practices within the didactic, cultic, or legal sphere of Israelite culture. To be sure, the stylistic components of Jer 3 1-5 are complicated, and it is not clear what priority if any one can give to the *hen* statement, or to the rhetorical question-disputes in both wisdom and legal circles. It may not be finally an important question. However, it is helpful to be aware of these components, and probably most crucial to study the actual content and function of these disputations in Jeremiah.

Jer 3 1-5 ist nicht eine didaktische Frage, sondern eine Disputation mit folgender Struktur: 1. rhetorische Fragen, 2. Anklagen, die sich auf die Vergleiche in den Fragen gründen und über sie hinausgehen. Die besten Parallelen dazu finden sich in weisheitlichen Disputationen (Hi 15 2-6 22 2-11) und in prophetischen Texten wie Mal 2 10-13. Aber der mit *hen* beginnende Satz Jer 3 1 und weitere Züge lassen ebenso den stilistischen Einfluß rechtlicher Dispute vermuten, ohne daß sich eine Priorität feststellen läßt.

Jér 3 1-5 n'est pas une question didactique mais une dispute dont la structure est la suivante: 1. questions rhétoriques, 2. accusations qui se fondent sur les comparaisons établies dans les questions et qui les prolongent. Les meilleurs parallèles se trouvent dans les débats sapientiaux (Job 15 2-6 22 2-11) et dans des textes prophétiques comme Mal 2 10-13. Mais cette construction en *hen* sur laquelle s'ouvre Jér 3 1 ainsi que d'autres traits font également penser à une influence stylistique du débat juridique, sans qu'il soit possible d'établir une priorité.

## Form, Occasion and Redaction in Jeremiah 20

By D. J. A. Clines and D. M. Gunn

(Department of Biblical Studies, The University, Sheffield)

Jer 20 7-18, commonly referred to as one of the "confessions" of Jeremiah, is misunderstood if it is read in its present context in the book of Jeremiah simply as a transcript of the prophet's emotions<sup>1</sup>. The alternative to such a naive understanding is not, however, a one-sidedly form-critical interpretation which sees here no Jeremiah at all except by way of redactional application<sup>2</sup>. A satisfactory interpretation will (a) give full weight both to the stereotyped form and language, behind which indeed the author's feelings and thought inevitably lie hidden to some extent, *and* to indications that Jeremiah has impressed upon the conventional form and language something of his own prophetic experience; and (b) recognise different levels of meaning which the material has had at different stages in the course of its redaction.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. e. g. J. Skinner, *Prophecy and Religion*, 1922, 201—230; W. Rudolph, *Jeremia*, HAT I/12, 1968<sup>3</sup>, 129—134.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. A. H. J. Gunneweg, *Konfession oder Interpretation im Jeremiabuch*, ZThK 67 (1970), 395—416.