

Jeremiah's Relations with the "Minor Prophets"

A Window into the Formation of the Book of the Twelve

Georg Fischer SJ

The introductory verses of prophetic books often assign dates to the respective prophets. Thus a relative sequence among them is established, allowing them to be perceived in a specific order. However, there are books like Joel, Obadiah, Nahum, Habakkuk, and Malachi, which do not offer such information at the start. Even more critical is the fact that there is a time gap between the prophets and their books. This necessitates investigation of the relationship between the prophets *primarily on literary grounds*.

My aim is to present some findings with regard to the links between the book of Jeremiah and the corpus of the Twelve Minor Prophets. In the course of writing a commentary on the book of Jeremiah,¹ I checked its connections with other biblical books and came across an interesting, unexpected result with regard to the Twelve. Some of them seem to have been *sources* for Jeremiah, whereas others could have picked up expressions and ideas from Jeremiah. This observation may contribute an additional standpoint from which to view the ongoing debate on the Twelve Minor Prophets and the process of their formation.²

In the following, I will present some close connections between Jeremiah and these other prophetic books, distinguishing four different cases:

1. As one might expect, Amos, Hosea, and Micah, the prophets dated to the 8th century B.C.E., form a group of their own.
2. Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah are normally assigned to the 7th century B.C.E.; they thus come from the same time as Jeremiah and offer a surprise.
3. Zechariah is set in Persian times, and therefore later than Jeremiah; this is confirmed on a literary level.
4. With regard to Obadiah, discussion is ongoing as to the direction in which the relationship with Jeremiah might be interpreted.

¹ G. FISCHER, *Jeremia 1–25* (HThKAT; Freiburg: Herder, 2005); idem, *Jeremia 26–52* (HThKAT; Freiburg: Herder, 2005).

² James Nogalski, Rainer Albertz, Marvin Sweeney, Jakob Wöhrle, and E. Ben Zvi are among the prominent researchers in this field; for an overview of earlier studies see I. WILLI-PLEIN, "Das Zwölfprophetenbuch," *ThR* 64 (1999), 351–395, and for a more recent hermeneutical understanding of the Twelve cf. C. R. SEITZ, *Prophecy and Hermeneutics* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2007).

Finally, I will sum up the observations and reflect on what their impact is for the debate on the formation of the Twelve Minor Prophets and dating biblical texts to the Persian period.

I. The Cases of Amos, Hosea, and Micah

Generally, there is widespread agreement that the “prophets of the 8th century B.C.E.” like Amos, Hosea, and Micah, *precede Jeremiah*, whose career is connected with the last 40 years of the Judean monarchy (Jer 1:2f; 627–587/6 B.C.E.). The three mentioned antedate the prophet Jeremiah by approximately 100 years or more. If there are relationships between them and Jeremiah, it is to be supposed that Jeremiah draws on them in his proclamation.

Since their books are products of a later time, as is also commonly acknowledged, this direction of dependence (Amos, Hosea, Micah → Jeremiah) might be reversed; nevertheless, most authors accept that the *books attributed to these three prophets largely antedate* that of Jeremiah (Amos, Hosea, Micah → Jeremiah).³ This means that the author⁴ of Jeremiah could draw on the scrolls ascribed to these three earlier colleagues.

In fact, there are quite a number of observations which point in this direction. The *most obvious case is Mic 3:12* being quoted in Jer 26:18, with explicit reference to its source in Micah. Although Jun-Hee Cha leaves open the question of a literary dependence based on a written version of Micah,⁵ scholars like Christof Hardmeier⁶ and Silvana Manfredi⁷ assume that Jeremiah uses the book of Micah in some form. There are also other instances of close relationships between the two prophets. In Mic 3:11, priests and prophets in Jerusalem say: “Is not the Lord

³ The distinction between “prophet” and “book” is relevant for this whole investigation; I do not mention it again in the later instances.

⁴ The question of who is responsible for the book of Jeremiah is still open to debate. Most assume several authors for it, thinking that there have been various redactions over a considerable period of time. In my view, however, Jeremiah, despite its pluriformity and diversity of texts, displays a composition and an overall message which is the product of an individual author. I do not deny that he may have used earlier and other materials; yet, Jeremiah, as we have it in the current version of the MT, shows a highly complex, but deliberate, arrangement and dynamic; for a recent treatment of the issue see G. FISCHER, “A New Understanding of the Book of Jeremiah. A Response to Robert R. Wilson,” in *Jeremiah’s Scriptures: Production, Reception, Interaction, and Transformation* (ed. H. Najman and K. Schmid; JSJS 173; Leiden / Boston: Brill, 2017), 22–43, here 33–37.

⁵ J. -H. CHA, *Micah und Jeremia* (BBB 107; Weinheim: Beltz, 1996), 131, prefers the oral tradition even in this case.

⁶ C. HARDMEIER, “Die Propheten Micha und Jesaja im Spiegel von Jer xxvi und 2 Regum xviii–xx,” in *Congress Volume Leuven 1989* (ed. J. A. Emerton; VTS 43; Leiden: Brill, 1991, 172–189), here 183.

⁷ S. MANFREDI, *Geremia in dialogo. Nessi con le tradizioni profetiche e originalità in Ger 4, 5–6, 30* (Caltanissetta: Salvatore Sciascia, 2002), here 357.

in the midst of us? No evil shall come upon us."⁸ The last phrase is identical with Jer 5:12, and the beginning is very close to Jer 14:9.

The same direction is assumed for the books of Amos and Hosea. Walter Beyerlin sees Amos's visions as the source for Jer 1 and 24.⁹ Judith Pschibille points to further correspondences between Amos and Jeremiah where the latter uses the former.¹⁰ Similarly, Andreas Weider, J. Gordon McConville, Martin Schulz-Rauch, A. R. Pete Diamond / Kathleen O'Connor, and Richtsje Abma see Jeremiah as being *dependent on Hosea*, especially with regard to the marital metaphor. Hetty Lalleman-de Winkel confirms the usage of both Amos and Hosea by Jeremiah.¹¹

We may therefore conclude:

- a) The studies of all of the above, and other scholars, confirm that the writings attributed to these previous prophets seem to have influenced the book of Jeremiah.
- b) They also allow us to perceive a kind of literary working technique that deliberately made use of earlier texts, which in German is called *Schriftgelehrsamkeit*.
- c) That Jeremiah obviously drew on various prophets is a sign that its author combined and synthesized several other expressions and positions in his book.

II. The Cases of Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah

Having dealt with three prophets of the "first half" of the Twelve, we now turn to the "third quarter" of this collection, prophets "seven to nine," who by their superscriptions or contents are connected with the 7th century and are thus contemporaries of Jeremiah. Although only Zephaniah has a dating at the beginning of the 7th century, the two other prophets also point toward the end of the Assyrian hegemony, that is, to the time when Jeremiah is said to have started his proclamation of the divine word:

- a) Nahum 1:1 begins with "An oracle concerning Nineveh," and refers in the final chapter to Nineveh's fall which occurred in 612 B.C.E.
- b) In Hab 1:6, God declares in his answer in the first dispute, "I am rousing the Chaldeans." This may be connected with the victory of the Neo-Babylonian army at Carchemish in 605 B.C.E.

⁸ Most translations in this article are taken from the NRSV.

⁹ W. BEYERLIN, *Reflexe der Amosvisionen im Jeremiabuch* (OBO 93; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989).

¹⁰ J. PSCHIBILLE, *Hat der Löwe erneut gebrüllt? Sprachliche, formale und inhaltliche Gemeinsamkeiten in der Verkündigung Jeremias und Amos* (BThSt 41; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2001).

¹¹ H. LALLEMAN-DE WINKEL, *Jeremiah in Prophetic Tradition: An Examination of the Book of Jeremiah in the Light of Israel's Prophetic Traditions* (Leuven: Peeters, 2000).

- c) Zephaniah 1:1 begins the book with the reference to “[...] the days of Josiah, son of Amon, King of Judah.” His reign can be dated to approximately 639–609 B.C.E.

Because the time span at the end of the 7th century is attributed to both Jeremiah and these prophets, we have to look for a suitable method for understanding their relationship. In my experience, a helpful technique for literary comparisons is to pay attention to “*exclusive relationships*,” namely phrases or expressions that occur only in two literary corpora and nowhere else. They may indicate a deliberate linking of the two texts in question. Let us view three examples:

- a) The last verse of the book of *Nahum* (Nah 3:19) begins with:

אִי־כֹהָה לְשִׁבְרְךָ נַחֲלָה מִכְתָּךְ

“There is no assuaging your hurt, your wound is grievous [...]”

The second poem of the scroll of consolation (Jer 30–31) starts after the introduction formula with: אָנוּשׁ מִכְתָּךְ נַחֲלָה לְשִׁבְרְךָ “Your hurt is incurable, and your wound is grievous” (Jer 30:12).

Three words in sequence are completely identical with regard to the consonants,¹² and they are not encountered elsewhere in the Bible. The combination is thus specific to these two texts, and one might therefore consider a connection between Nahum and Jeremiah. Nahum deals with the fate of Nineveh, Jeremiah with Zion’s suffering.¹³

In Nahum this statement comes at the end of a long description of Nineveh’s downfall, and thus is suitably inserted into the context. In Jeremiah, on the contrary, this phrase opens a new unit and comes as a *surprise*, in a three-fold sense: It starts a new poem within the scroll of consolation; it is not clear who is addressed by the 2nd person feminine singular; and after the salvation alluded to in the previous verses (Jer 30:10–11) we do not know what “hurt and wound” refer to. These are some of the indicators which seem to suggest that Jeremiah could have used Nahum’s phrase and applied a description of Nineveh’s destruction to Jerusalem.

- b) The center of Habakkuk is formed by five woe-oracles. The one in the middle condemns whoever “builds a town with blood, and founds a city on iniquity” (Hab 2:12). The next verse, 2:13, says:

הֲלוֹא הִנֵּה מֵאֵת יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת וַיִּגְעוּ עַמִּים בְּדִי־אֵשׁ וְלֵאמֹים בְּדִי־רִיק יַעֲפוּ

“Behold, is it not from the Lord of hosts that people labour only for fire, and nations weary themselves for nought?”

¹² There is a difference in the vocalization: Nahum has masculine suffixes and Jeremiah feminine ones.

¹³ The last line of this second poem (Jer 30:17) indicates the identification with Zion.

Quite similar to this is the very end of the oracles against Babylon in Jer 50–51. The last verse, 51:58, is introduced by: "Thus says the Lord of hosts: [...]" and the last line¹⁴ of his speech reads:

ויגעו עמים בדיריק ולאמים בדי־אש ויעפו

"The peoples labour for nought, and the nations weary themselves only for fire."¹⁵

The two sayings are very close. No other text can compare with them in this regard. This makes it probable that one of them has been written making use of the other. The inversion of the words "fire" and "nought," a technique often to be observed with quotations, may also point in this direction. Habakkuk continues with a positive outlook,¹⁶ whereas in Jeremiah this is God's final commentary on Babylon's fate, confirmed by the following symbolic act of sinking a scroll into the river Euphrates (Jer 51:59–64).

In Jeremiah, the phrase is more complicated, as it sets apart the last word; thus the verse should correctly be translated: "The peoples labor for nought, and the nations for fire, and they weary themselves." This rendering lays more stress on the futility of all the peoples' actions. The reversal of "nought/fire," with "fire" occurring in the final position in Jeremiah, lays additional weight on the destruction. In the opinion of Luis Alonso-Schökel,¹⁷ Gunther Wanke,¹⁸ and myself,¹⁹ Jeremiah is dependent on Habakkuk and uses the quote from Habakkuk as a fitting conclusion to the oracles against Babylon, demonstrating how delusional are all human efforts to gain power, glory, and/or wealth.

c) The connections of Jeremiah with Zephaniah are not as strong as with the two aforementioned prophets. However, there is one exclusive relationship, in the exclamation of Zeph 2:15:

איך היתה לשמה

"What a desolation she has become [...]"¹⁹

¹⁴ The immediately preceding line in v. 58 has "[...] and her high gates shall be burned with fire."

¹⁵ I have left this translation of the NRSV, although it is not exact, because of the correspondence with Hab 2:12; for the precise wording see below.

¹⁶ Verse 14 mentions "the knowledge of the glory of the Lord" filling the earth.

¹⁷ L. ALONSO-SCHÖKEL and J. SICRE DIAZ, *Profetas. Introducciones y comentario, I. Isaías. Jeremias* (NBE; Madrid: Ediciones Cristiandad, 1980), 650.

¹⁸ G. WANKE, *Jeremia. Teilband 2: Jeremia 25,15–52,34* (ZBK 20.2; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2003), 460.

¹⁹ FISCHER, *Jeremia 26–52, 625–626*; also G. FISCHER, *Jeremia: der Stand der theologischen Diskussion* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2007), 26–27 and 141. The correspondence of Jer 51:58 with Hab 2:13 is also an excellent example for the comparison of the Masoretic Text with the Septuagint version of Jeremiah.

In Jeremiah this phrase can be found twice, each time applied to Babylon:

איך היתה לשמה

“What a desolation she has become [...]!” (Jer 50:23; 51:41).²⁰

Zephaniah’s saying is directed against Nineveh, mentioned in v.13 together with Assur. It could be that, similarly to Nah 3:19 where an expression regarding the Assyrian capital is applied to Jerusalem, here it is transferred to the other Mesopotamian capital.

This exclusive link between Zephaniah and Jeremiah is short and not as specific as the two previous cases and it is therefore difficult to come to a sure conclusion as to the direction of dependence. Nevertheless, the sequence in time, namely that Nineveh’s fall is earlier than that of Babylon, could point to Jeremiah picking up the exclamation from Zephaniah. This procedure occurs quite often in Jeremiah.²¹

The above texts show that Jeremiah and the “third quarter” of the Twelve Minor Prophets are interrelated. Moreover, the considerations about a possible dependence give the impression that Jeremiah draws on Nahum, Habakkuk, and, probably, also Zephaniah. The reuse of earlier sayings in Jeremiah, now applied to Babylon’s downfall instead of Nineveh’s ruin, points to a later time, presumably the Persian period, as background for Jeremiah.

III. The Other Way Round: Zechariah

In the last quarter of the Twelve, Zechariah is not only the longest book; it also displays a large number of close links with Jeremiah. This has been investigated by several scholars, among them Konrad Schaefer,²² Risto Nurmela,²³ and Eibert Tigchelaar.²⁴ They unanimously conclude that Zechariah picks up ideas and expressions from Jeremiah. This would mean that Zechariah, in its entirety, is later than the book of Jeremiah, and, to some extent, reverses it. Whereas Jeremiah, throughout many chapters and in the development towards the end of the book,

²⁰ Ps 73:19 is very close, but uses the verb in the plural.

²¹ There are other cases where Jeremiah seems to apply sayings borrowed from elsewhere in a new way, e. g., in Jer 6 expressions taken from Judg 19–20 (against Gibeah) and Amos 3 (against Samaria) now refer to Jerusalem.

²² K. R. SCHAEFER, “Zechariah 14: A Study in Allusion,” *CBQ* 57 (1995), 66–91. Schaefer concentrated his investigation on the final chapter Zech 14.

²³ R. NURMELA, *Prophets in Dialogue: Inner-biblical Allusions in Zechariah 1–8 and 9–14* (Åbo: Åbo Akademis Förlag, 1996). Nurmela shows connections with the whole book of Zechariah.

²⁴ E. TIGCHELAAR, “Some Observations on the Relationship between Zechariah 9–11 and Jeremiah,” in *Bringing out the Treasure. Inner Biblical Allusion in Zechariah 9–14* (ed. M. J. Boda and M. H. Floyd; JSOTS 370; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003), 260–270. Tigchelaar’s focus is on the connections between Jer 23:1–8; 30–31, and Zechariah, especially chapter 10.

is full of Jerusalem's downfall and destruction, Zechariah describes positively the new role of Judah's capital.

Exclusive relationships between Jeremiah and Zechariah are, e.g., גַּאֲוֹן הַיַּרְדֵּן "the jungle of the Jordan" (Jer 12:5; 49:19; 50:44; Zech 11:3), אֶרֶץ צָפוֹן "the land of the North" (Jer 3:18; 6:22, seven times in Jeremiah; Zech 2:10; 6:6, 8 [twice]). The change in God's attitude towards his people, as described in Jer 31:28 and Zech 8:14–15, also shows a strong connection between the books.

Although these expressions are either very short or, in the latter case, the correspondence is not very precise, it is in my opinion very probable that the author(s) of Zechariah used motifs and ideas from Jeremiah to communicate his/their message.²⁵ Zechariah thus succeeds in overcoming the negative portrayal of Jerusalem in Jeremiah. By using the same terms and similar ideas as Jeremiah, but in a new context and direction, he manages to go further than the book attributed to his prophetic predecessor.

IV. A Disputed Case: Obadiah

James Nogalski has investigated thoroughly the connections of Jeremiah with Obadiah and has arrived at the conclusion that the latter takes up the former.²⁶ In fact, the similarities between Obad 1–9 and Jer 49:7–16 are so many and so close that we have to assume a redactional process.

One key for Nogalski seeing Obadiah as dependent on Jeremiah is עליה "upon her" in Obad 1:1. For Nogalski, "her" has no reference, whereas the corresponding verse in Jer 49:14 can easily refer to the earlier usage of the feminine singular, e.g., in v. 13 "her cities." Yet, "her" in v. 1 of Obadiah can be understood as referring to "Edom," mentioned in the introduction before. And even if one does not want to accept this, the surprising use of the feminine singular at the beginning of an oracle was also present in the scroll of consolation – for this see above (II, a)

²⁵ For further links between Zechariah and Jeremiah see the discussion in P.L. REDDITT, "Zechariah 9–14: The Capstone on the Book of the Twelve," in *Bringing out the Treasure. Inner Biblical Allusion in Zechariah 9–14* (ed. M. J. Boda and M. H. Floyd; JSOTSup 370; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003), 305–332, here 308–312. R. MASON, "The Use of Earlier Biblical Material in Zechariah 9–14: A Study in Inner Biblical Exegesis," in *Bringing out the Treasure. Inner Biblical Allusion in Zechariah 9–14* (ed. M. J. Boda and M. H. Floyd; JSOTSup 370; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003), 1–208, here 204, perceives a "continuity of tradition" between First and Second Zechariah. The various parts of Zechariah seem to handle their sources in a very similar way.

²⁶ J. D. NOGALSKI, *Redactional Processes in the Book of the Twelve* (BZAW 218; Berlin / New York: de Gruyter, 1993), 58–73, and, more recently, idem, "Not Just another Nation: Obadiah's Placement in the Book of the Twelve," in *Perspectives on the Formation of the Book of the Twelve: Methodological Foundations – Redactional Processes – Historical Insights* (ed. R. Albertz et al.; BZAW 433; Berlin / Boston: de Gruyter 2012), 69–107, here 93–95.

the possible quote of Nah 3:19 in Jer 30:12. This could be a means to attract the attention of the addressees.

Birgit Hartberger²⁷ and Theodor Lescow²⁸ arrive at the *opposite conclusion* in their studies. For them, Obadiah is prior to Jeremiah, and Jeremiah uses it as a source text. In my opinion, too, a deliberate reworking and reshuffling²⁹ on the part of Jeremiah gives a more plausible explanation for the literary differences and variations between Obadiah and Jeremiah. Furthermore, the women who are said to scorn and mock King Zedekiah in Jer 38:22 seem to take up Obad 7, with “your trusted friends,” literally “the men of your peace” (אנשי שלמד), forming an exclusive link between the two passages.

V. Conclusions

The books of the twelve minor prophets dealt with above provide instances where the investigation seems, with the exception of Obadiah, to arrive at results which are quite probable. We find *two directions of dependence*. Mostly Jeremiah draws on other prophetic books, starting with Hosea, and up to Zephaniah. On the other hand, Zechariah picks up expressions and motifs from Jeremiah.

Four books of the Twelve *have not been treated*, for specific reasons. In the cases of Joel and Jonah, most of the connections with Jeremiah are not clear, so that it is difficult to decide in which direction,³⁰ if at all, a redactional process might have gone. In the books of Haggai and Malachi, the links with Jeremiah are so slight that it is hard to arrive at firm conclusions, so I have omitted them from the considerations here. However, they do merit investigation and seem to point in the direction of being dependent on Jeremiah,³¹ in a similar way as could be observed with Zechariah.

²⁷ B. HARTBERGER, “An den Wassern von Babylon ...” *Psalm 137 auf dem Hintergrund von Jeremia 51, der biblischen Edom-Traditionen und babylonischer Originalquellen* (BBB 63; Frankfurt am Main: Hanstein, 1986), 182–183 and 201–203.

²⁸ T. LESCOW, “Die Komposition des Buches Obadja,” ZAW 111 (1999), 380–398.

²⁹ Obad 5 → Jer 49:9; Obad 1–4 → Jer 49:14–16; for the details cf. G. FISCHER, *Jeremia 26–52*, 542–546.

³⁰ Recently P. WEIMAR, *Jona* (HThKAT; Freiburg: Herder, 2017), 325–328, has suggested, in an excursus, that Jonah 3 might be seen as contrasting Jer 36 (“gegenbildlich”). He also points to the expressions “everybody turns back from his evil way” and מִי־יֹדֵעַ “who knows / maybe ...” in Jonah 3:8–9, as possibly alluding to Jer 18:11; 25:5; 26:3; 35:15; 36:3, 7, and to Jer 26:3, respectively (pp. 342 and 349). Whereas the first phrase establishes an “exclusive relationship” between Jeremiah and Jonah and thus forms a strong bond, the latter often occurs also elsewhere. The contrastive use in Jonah as a parody makes more sense if it were derived from Jeremiah, rather than the other way round.

³¹ The main connections are: Hag 2:23 uses “signet ring” for Zerubbabel, possibly taking up Jer 22:24 where this expression is applied to King Jehoiachin, cf. M. LEUENBERGER, *Haggai* (HThKAT; Freiburg: Herder, 2015, 248f). For R. KESSLER, *Maleachi* (HThKAT; Freiburg:

For this paper I have not addressed the *possibility of a longer-lasting process of formation* of these prophetic books, with the exception of the short remarks in n. 4. I am aware of this option, but have not yet encountered observations that would generally undermine the results achieved above.

If we try to form an overall picture of the various relationships of Jeremiah with the twelve so-called "Minor Prophets," it clearly posits the writing of the book of Jeremiah somewhere in the second half or maybe even *towards the end of the development of the Twelve*. Whereas most of these prophetic books, at least six of them, have inspired the author of Jeremiah, Zechariah, and possibly also Jonah, Haggai, and Malachi, seem to have known of Jeremiah.

In the reverse perspective, we may gaze, as through a window, *into the process of formation* of the twelve minor prophets, and perceive their evolution as occurring in various stages: an early stage, already quite developed, serving as source for Jeremiah, and a later one,³² which uses Jeremiah for its inspiration.

For the book of Jeremiah itself, the relationship with the books of the Twelve provides *some clues which may contribute to* resolving the problem of its time setting. Jeremiah makes abundant use of Amos, Hosea, and Micah, the latter even for the legitimation of the prophet Jeremiah in Jer 26:18. Jeremiah applies sayings on Nineveh, taken from Nahum and Zephaniah, to the downfall of Babylon that occurred in 539 B.C.E., and picks up Obadiah to put emphasis on Edom's ruin. On the other hand, at a later stage, Zechariah reuses Jeremiah for describing Jerusalem's new, positive role. To my mind, these observations clearly point to the Persian period, both for the composition of Jeremiah and for the development of the Twelve. The study of the links between Jeremiah and the various books of the Twelve allows us a glimpse into their formation process, suggesting the existence of at least half of them prior to the writing of Jeremiah, probably in the 4th century B.C.E.³³ At the same time, a continuing process in the composition of the Twelve becomes apparent, which shows that some of the books were still being written and were thus able to draw on Jeremiah.

Herder, 2011), 63, the Edom oracle in Jer 49:13–22 serves, among other texts, as background for the first disputation in Mal 1:2–5.

³² The use of the singulars "early stage" and "a later one" does not exclude the possibility of various phases in both cases, to the contrary: Most probably their growth as individual books and later on towards what we now call the "Twelve Minor Prophets" has been a very complicated process, involving a considerable amount of time, as the studies of Nogalski, Wöhrle, and many others have shown.

³³ Jeremiah's use of the entire Torah, all the Former Prophets and several of the Latter Prophets as sources does not allow us to assume an earlier dating of the book: FISCHER, *Jeremia 1–25*, 73f and 120. I am grateful to Mrs. Felicity Stephens for the correction of the English of this article.