



Thirsty Business: Abandoning the Spring of Living Waters
By Charles Sigler, D.Phil.

To a large extent in our culture, the role of the prophet as a mediator between God and man has been replaced by the psychologist and counselor. In his book *Inside Out*, Larry Crabb made Jeremiah 2:13 a key passage to illustrate how people have two motivational elements embedded in the their hearts: 1) thirst or deep longings for what they do not have and 2) stubborn independence reflected in wrong strategies for finding the life they desire (Crabb, 1988 pp. 53–55). For this reason, a particular interest in my examination of the passage is to see if there is exegetical support for Crabb to say: “God assumes His people are thirsty but He never condemns them for that thirst.” (Crabb, 1988, p. 54)

Crabb is fundamentally a “Biblical” counselor. He believes that the message of God in the Bible is the necessary foundation for building a model of biblical counseling (Crabb, 1987, p. 65). “One of my personal ambitions is to think through every common human problem in light of biblical categories, to arrive at an understanding of what causes the problem and what can be done to solve it. . . . Good exegesis and careful theology enable us to recite God’s truth to others accurately. Insightful reflection about the implications of those truths to real-life questions makes it possible to *present truth with relevance*. But only living the truth with growing consistency equips us to *communicate with power*. . . . We must study the Bible, define our doctrinal positions, think through the implications of our doctrines as we honestly confront life, and seek to develop in our own lives the reality of power and joy which we claim is available in Christ.” (Crabb, 1987, pp. 70; 72; emphasis in the original) If the Bible claims to be the word of life, then we should find within its pages all that is needed to counsel effectively. “And we must find that

information without stretching the text to allow interpretations that simply aren't there." (Crabb, 1987, p. 58)

I can stand, and do stand, beside the man who wrote these words. But does God never condemn His people for being thirsty? Does Jeremiah 2:13 illustrate the motivational principles which Crabb says exist deep within us, within the empty part of us yearning to be filled, our Hollow Core? (Crabb, 1987, p. 105)

Introductory Discussion of the Text

"The world of the late seventh and early sixth centuries B.C. was going through a time of extraordinary change. Old and established empires were beginning to crumble, new and threatening world powers were emerging on the horizons of history, and the ordinary citizens of that world were gripped by fear and tossed about by the uncertain waves of a new era that was dawning." (Craigie, Kelly and Drinkard, 1991, p. xxx) Jeremiah was an eye witness to these changes. He was called "in the midst of it all," to proclaim the word of God. He offered blessing if the nation would repent, then assurance of future restoration when the divine judgment could not be avoided (Dillard, n.d., p. 4). This future restoration was described by Jeremiah as a new covenant (31:31). The significance of this language for the history of the church is clearly seen as the two parts of the Scriptures began to be referred to as the "Old Covenant" and the "New Covenant." This distinction helped the followers of Jesus Christ give expression to their self-understanding as a people of the New Covenant; anticipated from the time of Jeremiah (Craigie et al., 1991, p. xxxi).

There is widespread disagreement on the historical setting of much of the book of Jeremiah. The materials appear to have no clear logical plan; no chronological order. If there was an internal logic to their arrangement, it seems to have escaped interpreters (Dillard, n.d., p. 9). Craigie et al. describe it as "an anthology of anthologies." (1991, pp. xxxi-xxxii) Traditionally, critical scholars such as Duhm have made distinctions between the poetic and the prose material. Others such as Mowinkel, see three types of material in Jeremiah. The prophetic or poetic oracles ("A"), biographical accounts ("B") and prose sermons ("C"). Critical scholars such as Childs and McKane, and conservative scholars

such as Craigie, Kelly and Drinkard; Dillard, Holladay, and Thompson all acknowledge the presence of these tendencies to some extent in Jeremiah.

The prophetic oracles of Jeremiah contained in chapters 1 to 25 are generally agreed upon to be authentic (Childs, 1979, p. 348). Both critical and conservative scholars speculate that these chapters contain some form of the second scroll which Baruch wrote out after Jehoiakim burned the first scroll of Jeremiah (36:28). McConville suggests that the change from primarily oracle to primarily narrative at chapters 26-29 indicates the awareness in Jeremiah at this point that Judah could not or would not repent. So the call to repentance, present in Jeremiah to this point, turns to one of the certainty of God's judgment, followed by His restoration (McConville, 1993, p. 87). Dillard cites McConville as further suggesting that the structure of Jeremiah could reflect an editing by the prophet himself recorded in the light of his later and mature reflection (Dillard, n. d., p. 13).

Jeremiah was called by the Lord to be a prophet to the nations (Jer. 1:10); he was "to pluck up and to break down, to destroy and to overthrow, to build and to plant." This call is followed by Jeremiah's first oracle of judgment in chapter 2. This positioning then draws attention to the importance of its content. Thompson (1980, p. 159) and others see the presence of a *riḥ* pattern—a prophetic lawsuit—in chapter 2. In fact, chapter 2 of Jeremiah is regularly considered to be a typical example of this pattern. Daniels and others dispute the validity of such a form. He further believes verses 12 and 13 to be a redactional link between verses 4-11 and verses 14-19 (Daniels, 1987, pp. 339-360; 345). Thompson, on the other hand, does not see the redactional disunity in the chapter. Rather, he notes "a clear thematic unity and skillful arranging of material which gives a remarkable coherence and artistry to the whole." He too recognizes the arrangement of several originally independent segments, but sees an overriding theological purpose: the prophet's charge of flagrant, inexcusable apostasy. The entire chapter is thus a powerful indictment of the nation's rebellion. It is representative of Jeremiah's early preaching; the product of a preacher with some passion (Thompson, 1980, pp. 160-161).

Translation and Exegetical Analysis

- 12 “Be deserted, O heavens, at this,
Shudder with terror and be very dry,” says the Lord.
- 13 “For my people have done two evils:
They have abandoned *Me*-
The spring of living waters-
To hew cisterns for themselves,
Broken cisterns,
That cannot hold waters.”

Analysis of Verse 12

“Be deserted, O heavens” has a distinct alliteration in the Hebrew. It also seems to satirically parody Isaiah 1:2: “hear, O heavens” (Holliday, 1986, p. 91). The verb for be deserted (*shāmam*), and related derivatives appear often in Jeremiah. A sampling of verses includes: 2:15, 4:7, 5:50, 18:16, 25:9, 29:18, 32:43, 49:20 and 51:37. Some examples of its use outside of Jeremiah include: Lev. 26:32; 1Ki. 9:8; 2Ch.7:21; Isa. 52:14, 59:16 and 63:5; Eze. 4:17, 26:16, 27:35 and 28:19; and Dan. 8:27. Basic to the idea of the root verb is that the desolation caused by some disaster, usually divine judgment. So it could also have the sense of devastated or appalled, which is how it is more commonly translated.

The verb translated shudder with terror (*śā' ar*) means “bristle, be struck with terror so that the hair stands on end.” It only occurs three other times in the Old Testament; two times with this meaning: in Eze. 27:35 and 32:10. The sense in each verse is the terror that results from seeing the desolation of the judgment of sin. Both times desolation is associated with *śā' ar*.

Hārab has as its basic idea a state of dryness or heat with a lack of vegetation. It can be a result of divine judgment, but is not necessarily so (Harris, Archer, and Waltke, 1980, p. 936). It does seem to have that connotation in this verse, as we shall see. Harris et al. note that while Brown, Driver, Briggs (1979, p. 351) separates the verb into two roots: 1) be dry and 2) be wasted, they see this word as one root with a semantic extension. Harris et al. also recognize that the literal meaning of the use in Jeremiah 2:13 is “be exceedingly dried up.” (1980, 318) Holladay

remarks that the double meaning of “be dry” or “be desolate” for *hārab* is involved in Jer. 2:12. *Shāmam* is often found in association with *hārab* “to be dry,” as it is in this verse. The idea of “drought” leads into the implied dry land in v. 13 when the people abandon the spring of living water to dig leaky cisterns. “The heavens are to be dry, since the people have made themselves dry.” Holladay notes four occasions when these two verbs are associated: Amos 7:9; Zeph. 3:6; and Ezek. 12:20 and 29:12. In each case the context is one of judgment (Holliday, 1986, p. 91).

The combination of three qal imperatives for these verbs: *shāmam* (be deserted), *śā’ ar* (shudder with terror) and *hārab* (be dry), heightens the dramatic urgency that something of unprecedented proportions is about to be witnessed by the heavens. The discussion above suggests the heavens are about to witness some type of judgment. The preferred meaning of “be dry” for *hārab* here influences me toward the given translation of “be deserted” instead of “be devastated” for *shāmam* in this context. The call for the heavens to be deserted, to shudder with terror, to be very dry, then communicates a call for the clouds of the heavens to flee away in terror.

The consequence of drought as judgment for idolatry is a common one in the Old Testament. In Jeremiah this is seen in Jer. 3:3a and 14:1f. Jeremiah 3:3a is an important verse in this context because it occurs within the poetic section of Jeremiah 2:1- 3:5 which contains the verses we are examining here. “Therefore, the showers have been withheld, and there is no spring rain,” because of the harlotry and wickedness of Judah. The drought spoken of by Jeremiah in 14:1 is because Judah loved to wander. So the Lord will remember their iniquity and call their sins into account (14:10). Further support for this interpretation is found in the appeal as given only to the “heavens” and not the “heavens and earth.” Holladay appears to assume the use here of the *riḥ* pattern for covenant lawsuit in an appeal to the earth and the sky as witnesses. So he finds it odd that the “earth” is not mentioned (1986, p. 91). This omission makes sense if the call of the verse is for the withdrawal of clouds for the impending judgment of drought.

Analysis of verse 13

“My people have done two evils.” The feminine of evil here in verse 13 is also found in v. 2:3 and 2:19 (Brown et al., 1979, p. 949), suggestive of the unity of verses 4-13 with 2:1-3 and 14-19. The evil that came upon all who ate the first fruits of His harvest (Israel in verse 3), is the same evil committed by Israel (verse 13); and this evil itself will chastise them so that they may see that it is evil (masc. sing.) and bitter to

forsake the Lord (verse 19). The shift in person from second feminine singular in 2:1-3 to third masculine plural in 2:4-13, then back to second feminine singular in v. 14-19 (Thompson, 1980, pp. 160-161), thus indicates simply a change of address. The Lord speaks first to Jeremiah alone in v. 2:1-3, then to all Israel in v. 2:4-13, returning to speak again to Jeremiah alone in v. 14-19. Verse 2:1 “Now the word of the Lord came to me saying,” and verse 2:4 “Hear the word of the Lord . . . all the families of the house of Israel,” both support this conclusion. Thus it is not necessary to view v. 12-13 as a redactive insertion into the material of v. 2:1-3 and v. 14-19.

“They have abandoned Me-” is disjunctive, as is the first colon discussed above and a colon to follow “broken cisterns that cannot hold water.” The cumulative force of the three disjunctions in the verse underscores the disruption and evil of abandoning the spring of Living Waters. This specific disjunction (they have abandoned *Me*) emphasizes that it is the central charge against Israel in v. 4-13, as well as the specific evil which they have done: “they have abandoned *Me*.” In verse 1:16 the Lord says to Jeremiah that He will pronounce His judgments on Israel because “they have abandoned Me,” without the disjunction. Verses 10-11 also reinforce this conclusion as the Lord wonders that such a thing as a nation changing its gods is unheard of even among the pagan nations that surround Israel. Yet Israel has exchanged their glory for that which does not profit.

“The spring of living waters.” Holladay noted that *māqôr* is a natural spring; and “living waters” (*hay mayim*) is a normal idiom for running water. He also noted that the phrase is a standard for “the source of life.” The Lord is then metaphorically portrayed as a spring of Living Water, the source of life. “Fountain of living water,” found in the RSV, NASB and others is misleading, as the contrast in the verse is between the running water of the spring and the collected water of the cistern (Holladay, 1986, p. 92). The abandonment of the cool fresh waters of a living spring for the stagnant, brackish waters of a cistern is a metaphor that would speak powerfully to Jeremiah’s audience. It is as unthinkable that they would abandon their God and worship other gods, as it is that they would prefer the brackish waters of a cistern to a living spring.

“Broken cisterns that cannot hold water.” Not only has Israel hewn out cisterns for themselves, these cisterns are broken cisterns! They cannot even fulfill the absurd task for which they were dug. Israel’s abandonment of the spring of Living Waters for a broken cistern—the work of their own hands (v. 1:16)—further underscores the insensibility of their actions. They abandon the very source of life itself for that which

cannot hold any life. There is a chiasmic structure here that strengthens the metaphoric comparison discussed above.

The spring of living waters (A)	(B) cisterns
broken cisterns (B ¹)	(A ¹) that cannot hold waters

Yahweh the source of life (A) is abandoned for cisterns (B); broken cisterns (B¹) that cannot hold any life (A¹).

Genre and the Covenant Lawsuit

Holladay remarks that one would expect Jeremiah to name the “earth” here along with the “heavens” in Jeremiah 2:12 (1986, p. 91). He seems to assume the use of the *riḅ* pattern for covenant lawsuit in an appeal to the earth and the sky as witnesses. The appeal seems out of place in verse 12. A summons to the earth and sky as witnesses typically came first, followed by a series of questions that carried an accusation (v.5-6), then a recollection of past benefits for the vassal with some statement of his offenses was third. The fourth element of the *riḅ* pattern is a reference to the futility of ritual compensations, going after other gods, or other kinds of aid; the fifth element is an accusation of guilt and a threat of judgment (Thompson, 1980, pp. 159-160). This puzzling disjunction has a clear purpose, which we discussed above.

Daniels suggests that verses 12-13 could have originally been the initial address (v. 12) and concluding characterization (v. 13), making the *yam* (people) at the beginning of v. 13 proleptic. He says this would help explain why verses 12 and 13 were used to expand on verses 10-11. Yet he seems to prefer to view them as a redactional insertion between v. 4-11 and 14-19, as noted above. His conclusion is that the genre of verses 4-11 is a prophecy of disaster. The crucial connection between the witness of the heavens and *the earth* would then be a secondary redactional development, supporting his contention that a ‘prophetic lawsuit’ genre does not exist (Daniels, 1987, pp. 344-345).

Daniel’s argument seems to hinge on the assumed presence of redactional activity in the passage to explain the strange disjunctions of

imagery and form. Further, he also appears to assume a rigid genre structure for the prophetic lawsuit, which he then demonstrates is not present in this passage. As Longman suggests, a dynamic or fluid sense of genre is more theoretically and practically justified than a rigid, static sense (Longman, 1987, p. 79). So the reorganization of the expected order of the elements for a prophetic lawsuit does not necessarily refute its presence in this passage. However, it does raise the need to ask what the purpose may be.

Above, the absence of the expected reference to the “earth” was suggested as fitting with the purpose of the Lord. He calls for the withdrawal of the clouds (Jer. 2:12), anticipating the coming judgment of His withholding the rain. The joining of verse 12 with verse 13 makes further sense when we recognize that Jeremiah is making use of satire within the passage, regardless of whether it is a covenant lawsuit or a prophetic oracle. In fact, verses 12 and 13 themselves meet the requirements of satire independent of the larger passages of 2:4 -13, or even 2:1-3:5.

The Use of Satire

Ryken suggests four ingredients to satire: 1) object(s) of attack, 2) a satiric vehicle that embodies the attack, 3) a satiric norm by which things are criticized and 4) a satiric tone (Ryken, 1993, p. 338). *The object of attack* in view here is Israel’s continued tendency throughout their history to follow after other gods, abandoning their God in the process. *The satiric vehicle* is the striking use of metaphor within the two verses. The Lord calls to the heavens to be deserted, to shudder with terror and be dry. An unimaginable preference of water from a cistern, to that from a living spring is the heart of a metaphor in which the Lord charges the people with two evils. *The satiric tone* has a sharp biting edge: “They have abandoned *Me!*” for cisterns that cannot hold water. *The satiric norm* implied within the verses themselves is that the people of God should cling to the spring of Living Waters. The larger context of the passage has a further norm: not even the surrounding nations have changed their gods (v. 2:10, 11). The prophetic lawsuit or oracle of judgment itself could itself be the satiric vehicle of the larger context, with the Sinai Covenant then being the satiric norm. Ryken comments that the largest section of satire in the Bible is the prophetic books; that the best literary approach to the oracle of judgment is satire (Ryken, 1984, p. 162).

I would argue that based upon the above discussion, the unity of the passage is original. A fluid conception of genre accounts for the supposedly unorthodox structure of a prophetic lawsuit here. The satiric edge of verses 12 and 13 is muted if they are separated from each other or their existing context by some assumed redactional activity. The above interpretation in verse 12—God commanding the heavens to be deserted, shudder with terror and be very dry—accounts for the omission of the earth in the lawsuit formula. Whether verses 4-13 are felt to be an example of a prophetic lawsuit or an oracle of judgment, the satire of verses 12 and 13 underlines the outrageousness of Israel's sin.

Biblical Theological Discussion

Abandonment of God results in judgment. God will allow the consequences of a person's disobedience to correct them (Jer. 2:19; Rom. 1:24f). The metaphors of dryness and thirst are used repeatedly in Scripture to picture the consequences of abandoning the Lord.

Within the larger poetic section of Jer. 2:1-3:5, there are several references to thirst and dryness. The Lord reminds Israel that He brought them through the wilderness, a land of deserts and pits; a land of drought and deep darkness (Jer. 2:6). He brought them into a fruitful land, but they defiled it (v. 2:7). They defiled it by abandoning Him—the spring of living waters—and seeking to fashion their own cisterns, which could not hold water (v. 2:13). They sought to drink from the waters of the Nile and the waters of the Euphrates (v.18). The hopelessness of quenching their thirst apart from the Lord is portrayed in the metaphor of a wild donkey of the wilderness (v. 2:25). God calls for Israel to examine all the land for a spot where they have not polluted it; there is none (v. 3:2). “Therefore, the showers have been withheld, and there is no spring rain” (v. 3:3).

The Lord established the earth and covered the mountains with waters. At His rebuke, the waters flee (Ps. 104:6–7). In Isa. 44:27, God directly claims that it is He who says to the sea “Be dried up.” *Hārab* is in the *qal* imperative here, as it is in Jer. 2:12. The waters also come forth at the command of the Lord. He judged the earth by opening the floodgates of the sky and sending rain for forty days and nights (Gen. 7:11f). When

the Lord established His covenant with Noah after the flood, He promised to never again destroy the earth by a flood (Gen. 9:11).

Rain then becomes one of the promised blessings of the Lord for obedience (Lev. 26:4). In Deut. 11:14f the promise is repeated, along with the consequences for disobedience. Moses warns Israel that if they turn away to serve and worship other Gods, that the Lord will shut up the heavens so there will be no rain (Deut. 11:17). The judgment process is now reversed. The *withholding* of rain occurs if Israel turns from the Lord. When Israel renews the covenant on Mount Ebal, the promised blessing of rain and curse of no rain is repeated again. The Lord will make the heaven like bronze; powder and dust will be their only rain if they disregard Him (Deut. 28:12 & 23f). Serving their enemies in hunger, thirst and nakedness is part of the curse against Israel if they fail to obey the Lord and keep the covenant (Deut. 28:48). Despite the warning, God's people disregarded Him and went after other gods. So He sent the prophets to confront Israel with her disobedience.

Elijah declares that Israel is to be judged for her idolatry by the Lord withholding the rain (1Ki. 17:1f). Amos laments how Israel failed to return to the Lord despite His withholding the rain (Amos 4:7). Zechariah remarks that the nations who refuse to worship the Lord will have no rain (Zech. 14:17-18). The sins of the people are responsible for the withholding of rain. God withholds the rain as judgment for the disobedience of his people. Dryness and thirst naturally follow.

In the midst of a lament for the princes of Israel, the nation is likened to a vine planted by abundant waters which is plucked up and cast down. Afterwards, it is planted in the wilderness; in a dry and thirsty land (Eze. 19:10-13). The destruction of Ephraim is likened to the wind of the Lord coming from the wilderness. Ephraim's fountain will become dry; his spring will be dried up (Hos. 13:15). Here, *hārab* is the verb for become dry. The Lord is portrayed as the One who causes the drying up. He plants Israel in a dry and thirsty land because of their sin. Because the Lord's people have not paid attention to Him or considered the work of His hands, they will go into exile and will be parched with thirst (Isa. 5:13). Their thirst is a result of their sin.

In Ezekiel 37, the bones in the valley are *very dry*- note the semantic parallel to Jer. 2:12. These dry bones are the whole house of Israel. Not

only are the bones very dry, but their hope has perished and they are completely cut off (Eze. 37:1f). Dryness is here associated with a loss of hope and being completely cut off from the Lord. The association of dryness and death is clear. The bones come to life at the prophetic word of the Lord. He causes the graves to open, and the dry bones to come forth and live. Only the word of the Lord can bring what was dead to life again (John 11:41f).

The time of the New Covenant will be like life in a watered garden (Jer. 31:12). The water of the New Covenant will flow from the altar and temple of the Lord Himself (Eze. 47:1f; Rev. 22:1). Christ calls to all who are thirsty to come and drink. From those who believe in Him, rivers of living water will flow (John 7:37, 38). If they ask Him, He will give them living waters to drink (John 4:10). Whoever drinks of the waters He gives shall never thirst again. The waters He gives shall become a wellspring of water inside the person, overflowing to eternal life (John 4:14). The idealized portrayal of life in the New Covenant age is that of abundant water. There is no thirst or dryness. Whoever drinks from the living waters of Christ will never thirst again. The dryness and thirst due to sin are gone in the New Covenant Age, as are all other consequences of sin (Rev. 7:17).

Conclusion

Along with Thompson, I see a remarkable unity to chapter 2 of Jeremiah. Verses 12 and 13 have an integral role in that unity, rather than being the result of the later redaction of some unknown editor. The evidence, I have suggested, points toward the Lord calling for the withdrawal of rain because of Israel's idolatry. Abandoning the spring of Living Water for broken cisterns is insanity beyond the comprehension of a desert people. The satiric edge to it is clear, adding to the purpose of the passage: to confront the rebellion and idolatry of Israel. Together, verses 12 and 13 impact the reader with a biting satirical metaphor that drives this home. It does not seem to me to be of crucial importance to come down on the side of the passage being either part of a prophetic lawsuit or a prophetic oracle of judgment. Elements of both genres are discernible within the context.

The exegetical and Biblical theological evidence overwhelmingly indicates that Crabb's interpretation of Jer. 2:13, namely that God never

condemns his people for their thirst in the passage, is in error. Their thirst is a direct consequence of God withholding the rain because Israel abandoned Him. His error seems to proceed from two sources. First, Crabb presents an argument from silence—the verse content is silent regarding thirst—but the context is not. Second, he makes his appeal from selective evidence (Carson, 1984, pp. 140 and 98, respectively).

This analysis does not result with a call for the abandonment of Crabb’s use of the metaphor of longing or thirst, even though Jeremiah 2:13 is a key passage for him as he expounds his psychological system on thirsty people in *Inside Out*. It does underscore the critical importance of rightly handling Scripture when using it for support of our developing psychological theories and thoughts. In this passage God does condemn his people for their thirst; because they try to satisfy it independent of the spring of living waters. Deep personal thirst *for God* is a legitimate longing. Crabb’s problem is that he wants to say that “It’s okay to desire” without any qualification.

Larry Crabb points to three Scripture passages that talk of our thirst, but in each case God Himself is the proper object of our thirst (Crabb, 1987, pp. 107–109). Psalm 42:1–2 uses the metaphor of a panting deer to say “so my soul pants for you, O God. My soul thirsts for God, the living God.” And in Isaiah 55:1–6 “Come, everyone who thirsts, come to the waters. . . . Seek the Lord while he may be found.” And in John 6:35 Jesus says “I am the bread of life; whoever comes to me shall not hunger, and whoever believes in me shall never thirst.” We could add the conversation Jesus had with the Samaritan woman, where he says “Everyone who drinks of this water will be thirsty again, but whoever drinks of the water that I will give him will never be thirsty again. The water that I will give him will become in him a spring of water welling up to eternal life.” (John 4:13–14)

The message of God in Scripture is the necessary foundation for building a model of biblical counseling (Crabb, 1987, p. 65). As biblical Christians, believing in the Scriptures as the clear revelation of our God, we must begin and end as Jeremiah does: “Now the word of the Lord came to me saying” (Jer. 1:4). We must think God’s thoughts after Him, as Van Til says; always doing so in the clear light of Scripture. *This is crucial as our culture has replaced the prophetic intermediary with the psychologists and counselors.* Let us stand with Augustine and say:

“From all temerity and all lying circumcise my lips, both my interior and my exterior lips. May your Scriptures be my chaste delights! May I never fall into error in my reading of them, may I never deceive others by misuse of them.” (Augustine 1960, p. 278) Let it be that as fellow Christians, we can urge one another on to clearer expression of the truths of Scripture. Let it be that within the cultural role of prophetic intermediaries we point one another back to the Scriptures, back to Christ.

Works Cited

- Anderson, F., and Forbes, A. D. (1978). *A linguistic concordance of Jeremiah*. Bible Research Associates, Inc.
- Augustine. (1960). *The Confessions of St. Augustine*. Garden City, New York: Image Books.
- Brown, F., Driver, S. R., and Briggs, C. A. (1979). *The new Brown-Driver-Briggs-Gesenius hebrew and english lexicon*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.
- Carson, D. A. (1984). *Exegetical fallacies*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House Company.
- Childs, B. S. (1979). *Introduction to the old testament as scripture*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Crabb, L. (1987). *Understanding people*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House.
- Crabb, L. (1988). *Inside out*. Colorado Springs, CO: NavPress.
- Craigie, P., Kelly, P. and Drinkard, J. (1991). *Jeremiah 1-25 world biblical commentary*, vol. 26. Dallas, TX: Word Books.
- Daniels, D. R. (1987). "Is There a 'Prophetic Lawsuit' Genre?" *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, vol. 99 no. 3. pp. 339-360.
- Dillard, R. (n.d.) "Jeremiah," unpublished manuscript.
- Goodrick, E. W. and Kohlenberger, J. R. (1990). *The NIV exhaustive concordance*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House.
- Harris, R. L., Archer, G., and Waltke, B. (1980). *Theological wordbook of the old testament*. Chicago, IL: Moody Bible Institute.
- Holladay, W. (1986). *Jeremiah: A commentary on the book of the prophet Jeremiah, chapters 1-25*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press.
- Longman, T. (1987). *Literary approaches to biblical interpretation*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House.
- McConville, J. G. (1993). *Judgement and promise*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, Inc.

McKane, W. (1986). *A Critical and exegetical commentary on Jeremiah*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.

Powlison, D. (n.d.) "Larry Crabb and Biblical Counseling," unpublished manuscript.

Ryken, L. (1984). *How to read the bible as literature*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House.

Ryken, L. (1993). "Amos," in *A complete literary guide to the bible*. L. Ryken and T. Longman, eds. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House.

Thompson, J. A. (1980). *The book of Jeremiah*. Grand Rapids, MI: William Eerdmans Publishing Co.