[*JSOT* 27 (1983) 3-23]

PREFACE

The following paper and responses were delivered to a meeting of the Society for Old Testament Study in London on 6 January 1983. The Editors wished to publish the contents as a basis for further reflection and not as fully worked out positions. The authors generously agreed not to incorporate 'second thoughts' into their manuscripts. The final response of Dr Auld, however, was written for publication in *JSOT*.

PROPHETS THROUGH THE LOOKING GLASS: Between Writings and Moses

A. Graeme Auld
New College, The Mound, Edinburgh EH1 2LX

1.0 Orientation

The room this side of the glass.

This paper[1] seeks to extend a study on 'Prophets and Prophecy in Jeremiah and Kings',[2] and to explore some of its implications. To try to spread the blame, I should like to mention first some recent publications which appear to me to furnish the room through whose mirror I want to take you.

1.1 In his discussion of 'Poetry and Prose in the Book of Jeremiah' at the Vienna Congress, W. McKane has commented on the very different approaches—and indeed presuppositions—of Thiel and Weippert to the prose tradition in Jeremiah.[3] He follows this with an examination of closely related poetry and prose in Jeremiah 3.1-13 and 12.7-17. McKane concludes that 'the kind of activity uncovered in 3.6-11 and 12.14-17 . . . is a type of enlargement and elaboration which operates within narrow contextual limits and does not have the comprehensive systematic theological objectives which it is customary to ascribe to prose redactions of the book of Jeremiah'. Further: 'Those who claim a systematic theological activity for a

Deuteronomistic editor and identify compositions in which this is realised are perhaps professing to know more of the inner workings of his mind than can be gathered from the text'. I suggest that these comments may have a wider relevance—to the production of Joshua to Kings.

1.2 In his massive Genesis-commentary, C. Westermann has strongly advanced the argument—in itself not at all novel—that much of the present text of Genesis was generated from material already within earlier forms of the book.[4] He presents a cogent case for understanding Genesis 20 as a development from Genesis 12.10-20 for largely exegetical reasons. Having read the fuller subsequent account of Abraham's dealings with a foreign king over his wife, the reader becomes disposed to a 'proper' approach to the briefer and possibly misleading prior text. However the generation of narrative in Genesis from narrative already in the text does not always serve local exegetical needs. The use of the same material again in Genesis 26 may have been simply to help build up an 'independent' series of traditions about the middle patriarch Isaac.

1.3 E. Tov has usefully summarized his own and others' researches into the interesting textual history of the book of Jeremiah in his contribution to the Louvain Colloquium on Jeremiah: 'Some Aspects of the Textual and Literary History of the Book of Jeremiah'.[5] One welcomes his linkage of textual and literary matters. Tov and Bogaert are persuaded that the shorter Greek text of Jeremiah represents a first edition of that book, while our traditional Hebrew text is an expanded second edition. In somewhat similar vein to McKane's comments noted above Tov writes: 'Editor II was not consistent, so that the inconsistency of his rewriting cannot be taken as an argument against our working hypothesis. In fact, very few revisions are consistent—in the biblical realm only "inconsistent" revisers are known, such as the deuteronomistic reviser of Jos–2 Ki and Jer, the "Elohist" in the Psalms, the Lucianic reviser of the LXX, and, on a different level, the Samaritan Pentateuch'.

1.4 H.G.M. Williamson's note on the 'The Death of Josiah and the Continuing Development of the Deuteronomic History' seeks to account for the differences between Kings and Chronicles in their reporting of the death by positing 'a revised and expanded form of Kings, which the Chronicler can at most have worked over only lightly' as 'the best way of accounting for the literary development of this passage'.[6]

1.5 These four studies do not all tend in exactly the same direction. But it may be helpful to underline some elements in them before proceeding further: *a*. Poetic nucleus and prose development. *b*. Narrative generated from difficult material within a corpus, then added to that corpus. *c*. Greek Jeremiah as translation of an earlier version of the book than the familiar Hebrew. *d*. Biblical revisers as inconsistent. *e*. Development of the text of the book of Kings.

2.0 'Prophets and Prophecy in Jeremiah and Kings' Through the glass.

My own study mentioned above focusses on the usage of the noun *nābî'* ('prophet') and its related verbal themes in the books of Jeremiah and Kings.

2.1 In writings associated with the Latter Prophets, the attitude to 'prophets' appears to change radically during or soon after the exile. The eighth—and seventh century figures are mostly hostile, and at best neutral, about 'prophetic' contemporaries. (Hosea is the most neutral.) By contrast, post-exilic figures are readily titled 'prophet' and this title is extended in the writings associated with them to earlier individuals like Elijah and Isaiah. The large books of Jeremiah and Ezekiel stand at the cross-roads.[7] There is still critique of contemporary prophets in plenty within these collections. However each book as it now stands is concerned to present its hero as a 'prophet'. And in addition to the plentiful criticism of prophets there is a new theme of a tradition of faithful 'servants the prophets'. Exploration of these two larger books helps to locate where and how the change of attitude occurred. It may be significant that Ezekiel is not directly accorded the title 'prophet', although a hope is expressed concerning him twice (2.5; 33.33) that his people 'will know that a prophet has been among them'. If frequency of usage is significant, it may be more important to note that Ezekiel's words are introduced some thirty times by a reported command to 'prophesy'. Perhaps during the period when attitudes were changing the verb was more acceptable than the noun 'prophet' as a designation of acceptable 'prophetic' activity.

2.2 These rather broad generalizations about the book of Ezekiel as a point where certain trends intersect within the Latter Prophets as a whole can fortunately be tested with a degree of objectivity in the

book of Jeremiah—with its different editions, and its blend of poetry and prose. Of course argument is legitimate over the classification of this or that element of the text as poetry or prose, over the historical conclusions that are proper from such a decision, and even over the very relevance to the biblical material of the 'western' distinction between poetry and prose.[18] I still hold that such a decision is helpful—and hope that the following discussion may be held to offer it some support. However two versions of Jeremiah are objectively to hand; and the longer stresses a number of concerns which are either peripheral or much less formed in the shorter version. If the widely accepted distinction between earlier poetic nuclei and later prose development is combined with the evidence of less and more developed versions of Jeremianic prose, then three stages in the development of our inherited Hebrew text of Jeremiah are available for comparison: the poetry; the shorter prose development translated into Greek; and the familiar fuller prose development. The book of Jeremiah is doubly suited to our requirements: in the stratification of its traditions just described; and in the fact that *nābî'* ('prophet') and its related verbs are used as often in this book alone as in all the rest of the Latter Prophets.

Analysis of this rich stock of 'prophetic' terminology in the three sections of Jeremiah produces the following results:

2.2.1 'Prophets' are mentioned in Jeremiah's poetry mostly to be criticized. There a couple of exceptions in which they appear in a more neutral light.

2.2.2 In the prose common to Hebrew and Greek, such criticism still bulks very large; however some new features appear. The verb 'prophesy' comes to be used in passages critical not just of 'the prophets', but also of certain named individuals who are never so described. Even more novel, it is used positively of the activity of Jeremiah himself, and also of Uriah and Micah. Four times at this stage in the book's development Jeremiah is accorded the title 'prophet; and (perhaps more important) he is strategically designated 'prophet to the nations' at the beginning of the book (1.5). And finally we meet five positive references to an otherwise obscure group termed Yahweh's 'servants the prophets'.

2.2.3 And in the extra material of the received Hebrew text we find a further small expansion of censure of 'prophets'—the theme that dominates the other sections of the book. But most noteworthy is the multiple insistence (24 extra references) that Jeremiah is a 'prophet'

—not to speak of the further six times in chapter 26 in which Hananiah too is accorded this title.

2.2.4 It appears that the scattered instances of 'prophetic' terminology in other (Latter) Prophetic books can be successfully correlated with the more abundant—relatively datable—evidence in the book of Jeremiah. It was only after the exile that such figures became termed 'prophet'. And until this development was successfully completed, it may have been easier to use the verb 'prophesy' of them (whatever that means!) than to term them 'prophet'.

2.3 Kings is the other biblical book replete with talk of 'prophets'. Much of this is concentrated in the middle third of the book: the Elijah/Elisha narratives in 1 Kings 17–2 Kings 10. We find there all five instances of the verb; 33 of the 38 occurrences of the plural noun; but only 12 of the 41 appearances of the noun in the singular. Half the usage of the singular noun is in the form of the title 'prophet' with a proper name; and this title features only in the first and last thirds of Kings—once certainly in 1 Kings 18.36 (MT) but *not* LXX. The only other singular prophet in these parts of Kings is the unnamed one from Bethel in 1 Kings 13 and 2 Kings 23.

The textual leverage on this material is provided not by the LXX version of Kings, although it does offer two significant scraps of evidence, but by the alternative account of the monarchy in the book of Chronicles. Chronicles is also interested in the phenomenon of 'prophecy'; but what it has to report about 'prophets' and 'prophesying' diverges much more from the material in Kings than the broad similarities between the two books would lead us to expect. And variation over the title *hannābî'* is as interesting here as between MT and LXX in Jeremiah. For example, while Kings uses the title 'prophet' 20 times (and never in the special Elijah/Elisha material that is without parallel in Chronicles), and while part of Chronicles that mirrors the traditions in Kings uses this title 13 times, there is only one perfect overlap in usage: the mention of 'Huldah the prophetess' in 2 Kings 23.22 and 2 Chronicles 35.18. The Chronicler's mention of 'Isaiah the prophet' in 2 Chronicles 32.20 is clearly related to 2 Kings 19.1-2. But apart from these two cases, the title is used quite differently. This is all the more striking since the story linking the king of Israel, Jehoshaphat of Judah, and Micaiah son of Imlah, with its frequent use of 'prophet(s)' and 'prophesy', appears almost identically in 1 Kings 22.1-35 and 2 Chronicles 18.

The most economical account of the 'prophetic' materials in Kings

and Chronicles—and one that accords well with our account of 'prophetic' terminology within the Latter Prophets—is that each of the familiar books was developed from a common original that used the title 'prophet' rarely, and knew the Micaiah story.

The account of true and false prophecy in this story of Micaiah may well emanate from circles close to those who told similar stories about Jeremiah and his opponents. I argue that the distinctive expression in that story, 'a prophet of the Lord' (*nābî' l^{e}yhwh*), in 1 Kings 22.7, and 2 Chronicles 18.6, is in fact the source of the remaining limited biblical usage of the phrase: it appears elsewhere only in the neighbouring 1 Kings 18.22 of Elijah (where it is a later supplement), and 2 Kings 3.11 of Elisha (within a narrative largely dependent on the Micaiah story); at the end of the introduction to Samuel in 1 Samuel 3.20 (of which more anon) and then of Oded in 2 Chronicles 28.9—'a prophet of the Lord' in Samaria.

Three further appearances of the word 'prophet' in the singular occur in the Naaman story in 2 Kings 5. Elisha urges his king to invite the Syrian 'that he may know there is a prophet in Israel' (v. 8). Naaman's Israelite maid has already wished (v. 3) that her lord might be 'with the prophet who is in Samaria'. These expressions are most reminiscent of the hope that Ezekiel's people 'will know that a prophet has been among them' (Ezekiel 2.5; 33.33).

If many instances of the title 'prophet' in Kings may have been added after the Kings text was used by the Chronicler, and if the rare phrase 'a prophet of Yahweh' was coined in the Micaiah story with its links with the theme of true and false prophecy in Jeremiah, and if references to Elisha in the Naaman story remind us of the presentation of Ezekiel, then we have a plausible post-exilic context for almost all *singular* uses of 'prophet' in Kings. The main group remaining are the eight references in 1 Kings 13 (and the one back reference in 2 Kings 23) to the unnamed prophet from Bethel who encountered the 'man of God' from Judah: another story, like the Micaiah one, that handles questions about the true and false prophet, and may plausibly be related to those discussions of the proper norms for 'prophecy' which also shaped some of the Jeremiah prose traditions.

Most occurrences of 'prophets' in the plural are in a few localized groups: 'prophets of Yahweh', 5 times in 1 Kings 18 and 19; 'prophets of Baal (and Asherah)', 8 times and mostly in 1 Kings 18; 'prophets of the king of Israel', 7 times and only in the Micaiah story and the dependent story of Jehoshaphat and Elisha in 2 Kings 3; 'the sons of

the prophets', 4 times in 2 Kings 2 and 6 times more in chapters 4 to 9. No one within these prophetic groups is ever named but they all have a clear (even if only chorus-like) role to play in the stories that feature them.

The other 'prophets' in Kings are Yahweh's 'servants the prophets' who make five appearances: in 2 Kings 9.7; 17.13, 23; 21.10; 24.2. In the last two of these passages the relevant phrase is absent from the related passage in Chronicles. And I have suggested grounds for considering Yahweh's 'prophetic servants' an addition to the first three texts that mention them as well. These prophets have no narrative role—they are simply acknowledged agents of the divine 'word'. And it may well be the case that this acknowledgment was a theological afterthought.

3.0 The Wider Prophetic Family

Still in the room on the other side.

If it be granted, at least for the sake of argument, that the classical 'prophets' of the Bible began to be *called* so only some time after the exile, is it possible to strip away from the Biblical traditions this *nābî'* overlay and recover the prophets' own estimate of themselves? It may be helpful to review from our new vantage point the usage of some other related biblical expressions.

3.1 'Man of God' is used to introduce or address 'prophetic' figures several times in the Bible, but the usage is far from widespread. It occurs but once in the Latter Prophets: in Jeremiah 35.4, which gives no clue why Igdaliah is so designated. The term is used most often of Elijah (5 times) and Elisha (27 times) in Kings.[9] That book uses *'îš hā'ᵉlōhîm* also of Shemaiah in 1 Kings, 12.22 (= 2 Chronicles 11.2), who bears the word of God to Rehoboam that he should not attack the north after Jeroboam's defection; and a dozen times immediately afterwards in 1 Kings 13 of the 'man of God' from Judah who spoke against Bethel. Other unnamed men of God appear in Judges 13.6, 8 and 1 Samuel 2.27. Samuel himself is so introduced in 1 Samuel 9.7, 8, 10. The date of these passages may be variously assessed; however the remaining nine instances of 'man of God' are in certainly late texts, six referring to Moses and three to David.[10]

3.2 Haggai bears the title 'messenger of Yahweh' in Haggai 1.13. Then it is often supposed that *mal'ākî* ('my messenger') is a title not a name—at least in Malachi 3.1. And the set for our next problem is

complete when we note that in the intervening book of Zechariah a 'messenger' appears some twenty times—but this time as a visionary (*rō'eh*) intermediary.[11] Outside these three late books, Yahweh's 'messenger' figures in the Latter Prophets only in Hosea 12.5, of the opponent over whom Jacob prevailed, and in Is 37.36 (= 2 Kings 19.35; cf. 2 Chronicles 32.21) of the divine agent that disposed of large numbers of Assyrians in Judah. He reappears as a similar agent of death in 2 Samuel 24—and even more often in the parallel 1 Chronicles 21—in the punishment that follows David's census.[12] Then apart from Psalm 34.8 and 35.5, 6 the remaining scattered appearances of the 'messenger' are in earlier episodes of the biblical story: from Abraham to Elijah.[13] It is often unclear whether the *mal'āk* was human. In the promise of Samson's birth (Judg. 13), 'messenger' and 'man of God' are used side by side. Earlier in the same book, it seems likely that 6.7-10 was drafted to underscore that Yahweh's envoy in the following verses was in fact a human prophet. Maimonides understood Exodus 23.20 to refer to Moses. And we are left to speculate on what sort of being supplied food to Elijah (1 Kings 19.5, 7) or dispatched him to King Ahaziah (2 Kings 1.3, 15).

3.3 The regular Hebrew word for 'seeing' (*r'h*) is used not infrequently in the Bible of special, enhanced, second 'sight'. Quite exacting exegesis may often be necessary before deciding that such a sense is appropriate in any given occurrence of the *qal* theme. Of course interpretation is eased when we meet other themes of the verb with a divine subject—whether the *hiph'il* in the sense of 'show' or 'let see', or the *niph'al* in the sense of 'is seen' or 'shows himself'. God may make things seen, and may let himself be seen. The related noun *mar'eh*, often rendered 'vision', is used of phenomena as substantial or insubstantial as are denoted by the English 'appearance'.

Given all this, it is noteworthy that neither Amos nor Jeremiah is ever described as a 'seer' (*rō'eh*), although each is 'let see' things by Yahweh and asked what they 'see'.[14] In fact the title *rō'eh* is used very rarely in the Bible: (a) of Samuel, first in 1 Samuel 9, from halfway through the story in which he was first styled 'man of God', then in 1 Chronicles 9.22; 26.28; 29.29; (b) of Hanani in 2 Chronicles 16.7, 10; (c) in the plural and paired with *ḥōzîm* of 'seers' generally in Isaiah 30.10.

3.4 The other 'seeing' verb, *ḥzh* is used much less frequently, and occurs only in the *qal* theme although there are several related noun forms—*ḥāzôn*, *ḥāzût*, *ḥezyōn*, *maḥzeh*. Some would suggest that the

word is not Hebrew at all, but a loan word from Aramaic. Many of its appearances are in technical prophetic contexts, often in close association with *nābî'*. Accordingly, to achieve some 'purchase' on these, it may be helpful to review first those biblical passages in which this is *not* the case.

3.4.1 In one Psalm (63.3), *ḥzh* and *r'h* are used in close proximity —of gazing on God in the sanctuary. The four other Psalms in which *ḥzh* appears use it alone: in 11.4 and 17.2, of what God sees; in 11.7 and 17.15, of man seeing God; in 46.9, of seeing God's actions; while 58.9, 11 talk of the premature child never seeing the sun and the joy of the righteous at seeing vengeance. In Proverbs the verb is used of observation and discernment, twice alone and one paired with *r'h*. Then in Job *ḥzh* is used of insight in 15.17 and 34.32, and of seeing God in 19.26, 27 and 23.9. In Job the noun is always paired with 'dream', whether as a means of revelation (4.13 and 33.15), or as something ephemeral (20.8; cf. Isa. 29.7), or a divine visitation in a nightmare (7.14). Proverbs 29.18 pairs *ḥāzôn* with *tôrâ*.[15] And Psalm 89.20 recounts how God 'spoke in a vision' of his promise to the Davidic house.

The technical sense of both verb and noun which is almost standard elsewhere in the Bible is already encountered in some of these poetic texts. Indeed the only other non-technical usage is in Exodus 24.11, of the elders 'seeing' God on his mountain—and even there the reading is less than certain.[16] We meet the term in only two other Pentateuchal contexts: in connection with (Aramaean?) Balaam in Numbers, and in Genesis 15.1 of how the 'word of Yahweh' came to Abram.

3.4.2 In Chronicles, as we shall see shortly, *ḥōzeh* ('seer') alternates with *nābî'* (and indeed *rō'eh*) in a quite stylized way. The situation is quite different in Samuel—Kings. 'Seer' and 'vision' make only four appearances in these books—and 'prophet' *is* part of each context, though perhaps not always an original part. In 2 Samuel 24.11 and 2 Kings 17.13 they are paired. 1 Samuel 3 opens with a comment on the state of *ḥāzôn* in Samuel's youth and closes with him designated *nābî' l^eyhwh*. And 2 Samuel 7, which introduces Nathan as 'the prophet' in v. 2 and talks of Yahweh's word coming to him by night in v. 4, describes the whole event in v. 17 as 'this vision'. Perhaps we should note that of all the patriarchs it is Abraham, with whom Yahweh had communicated 'in a vision' and by his 'word' (Genesis 15.1), who bears the title 'prophet' in Genesis 20.7.

Within the *text* of the Latter Prophets, the 'seer' enjoys the same rating as the 'prophet'. Amos (7.12) side-steps the title with a denial that he is a 'prophet'. Micah (3.7) has 'seers' disgraced along with 'diviners'. Jeremiah mentions 'visions' only twice, and both times within critique of the 'prophets': in 14.14 blaming their 'lying visions', and in 23.16, 17 complaining of 'visions of their own hearts' which promise peace. These two themes recur in Ezekiel 13 (vv. 7 and 16); while problems of false or unrealized 'vision' are handled in 12.21-28. And in 7.26 'vision' is simply what is expected of a 'prophet' (just as Jeremiah 18.18 expects of him 'word'). We might note that Lamentations in much the same period mentions the 'prophet' four times: twice to link him with the 'priest' (2.20; 4.13), once to complain that they 'obtain no vision from the Lord' (2.9), and once to blame them for their 'false and deceptive visions' (2.14). Then in Zechariah 10.2 'diviners *see* lies', while according to 13.4 'every prophet will be ashamed of his vision'. In fact in the main text of the Latter Prophets it is only in Habakkuk 2.2, 3 and the manifestly late Joel 3.1 that 'vision' is a clearly positive term—and in Joel that goes also for prophecy, dreaming and possession by the spirit.

3.4.3 In a final group of passages, *ḥzh* and its related nouns are used in what is certainly a technical, broadly 'prophetic' context, but not in close association with the term *nābî'*. It is used in the title verse of many books: Isaiah, Amos, Obadiah, Micah, Nahum, and Habakkuk. Indeed in Isaiah its use is even more widespread: it heads individual sections of the book in 2.1 and 13.1; and figures also in 21.2; 22.1, 5; and 29.11—some at least of which may be post-Isaianic.

3.5 To return briefly to the *nābî'*, the burden of the first part of our argument was to show that the great majority of occurrences of this term belonged to the late biblical period. Although contemporary *n^{e}bî'îm* are often castigated in the Latter Prophets, some references to them are neutral, and even favourable.

3.5.1 We noted earlier that in Ezekiel and also in the earlier prose tradition in Jeremiah, the verb 'prophesy' was used very much more often than the noun 'prophet' in connection with these two figures. It may be appropriate to correlate this fact with two elements in the book of Amos. In the short narrative of his encounter with Amaziah, Amos refuses the appellation 'prophet' but accepts the divine command to 'go, prophesy' (7.14, 15). Then following the series of questions in 3.3-6, the conclusion is drawn that 'prophesying' after hearing Yahweh speak is as much anyone's business as is being afraid

after hearing a lion roar. May it be that the use of the verb in connection with these now classical figures preceded and facilitated the later application to them of the title *nābî'*? If so, what did the verb mean?

The verb is attested in only two themes—*niph'al* and *hithpa'el*—both of which themes are occasionally used in Hebrew to create verbs from nouns.[17] The use of this verb in connection with Amos, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, but not the noun—or at least the noun only very sparingly and perhaps only afterwards—may suggest an absence of appropriate terminology for these figures, filled by the application of a denominative verb meaning 'to act like a *nābî'*", 'to play the part of a prophet'.

3.5.2 Many of the non-redactional occurrences of *nābî'* have already been noted in other contexts. The remainder of our reduced stock of evidence for plotting the earlier biblical sense(s) of our term should now be mentioned. Amos complains equally of stopping 'prophets' and making 'Nazirites' break their vows. The Elisha stories portray their hero in some sort of association with the 'sons of the prophets'. Elijah is in despair over Jezebel's treatment of Yahweh's 'prophets' and in is conflict with Baal's. Saul has sought enlightenment from *'ûrîm*, dreams, and prophets before resorting to the medium at En-Dor.[18]

The remaining passages use verb as well as noun, and are notoriously hard to interpret. In the two stories of Saul falling in with bands of 'prophets', the related verb apparently denotes remarkable behaviour. Yet the interpretation of 1 Samuel 10 and 19 is immediately complicated by their offering different explanations of the same saying: 'Is Saul too among the prophets?' We can be sure that 'prophesy' in the intervening MT 'plus' in 1 Samuel 18.10 is pejorative: the second is caused by an 'evil spirit'. And this is equally true of the only use of this verb in Kings outside the Micah story—in 1 Kings 18.29, of what Baal's prophets do to arouse him. The only occurence of the verb in the Pentateuch (Num 11.25, 26, 27) describes behaviour that pillars of the community want to see stopped forthwith. We are left to ponder whether Saul's association with the prophets is evaluated in the text—or simply remarked on.

3.6 Remarkably little contemporary evidence for an estimate of pre-exilic 'prophecy' has survived this review. 'Man of God' and 'Yahweh's envoy' appear in scattered passages that may be early. On the other hand it is unlikely that *rō'eh* was used as a title until a later

writer used the occasion of Saul's visit to Samuel 'the man of God' to equate this designation with the subsequent 'seer' and 'prophet'. The use of *ḥāzâ* and *ḥāzôn* in the titles of several Prophetic books is similar to the positive development of 'prophet' and 'prophesy': *within* the text of several of the Latter Prophets its associations are pejorative. However non-prophetic parts of the Bible do use *ḥzh* positively, of insight and discernment; and they may have contributed to the development.

It seems unlikely that earlier designations of these figures were suppressed by later tradition. The evidence reviewed suggests refinement by supplementation, rather than alteration or suppression of terminology already in our texts. The earlier biblical tradition may have been less interested in designation—and so too perhaps in 'office'.[19] It remembered some of the names: of those who had 'stepped out of line'? of those whose words had a special quality? And, if this is so, then sound method requires us to start our quest from these words, and not from any institution or office.

4.0 Deuteronomist and Chronicler

Sortie down the corridor.

This section is only partly relevant to our main theme. But perhaps you will indulge this sortie—since we are in the room through the glass anyway—down a corridor which I can never properly see from our regular side of the mirror.

It is remarkable how little communication there is between students of Chronicles and students of Joshua to Kings. In treatment of the latter, there are often few if any references to the largely parallel biblical narrative of the Chronicler;[20] while those who focus on his work assume that what we know as the Deuteronomistic History was available to him in substantially the shape we know.[21] The actual text the Chronicler used may differ frequently from our MT of Samuel—Kings;[22] but the basic materials were all there. However some of our observations about the distribution of 'prophetic' vocabulary in the two corpora invite some reconsideration.

4.1 We have already noted that there is very little overlap between Kings and Chronicles in the way they use the title 'prophet'. And, with the notable exception of the Micaiah story, this is equally true of the way they use noun and verb as a whole. Chronicles uses 'seer' language very much more frequently than Samuel-Kings; and it may

help if we plot this richer usage before we proceed. Chronicles agrees with its assumed *Vorlage only* over titling Gad 'seer' and Nathan, Isaiah, and Huldah 'prophet(esse)s'.[23] Half the remaining titles (24) appear in the cross-references at the end of the report of a reign to the further available information in Samuel—Kings.[24] And only the remaining 12 occur in the 'main text' of Chronicles. There Samuel and Hanani are styled *rō'eh*; Jehu ben-Hanani is styled *ḥōzeh*—along with the heads of the three musical families whose business is to 'prophesy'; and Elijah, Nathan, Samuel, and Jeremiah are termed 'prophet'.[25]

4.2 Two quite different, but equally substantial attempts have recently been made (by Hoffmann[26] and Polzin[27]) to defend Noth's view that the Deuteronomist was a single writer, his history representing a unified conception.[28] Hoffmann even enhances Dtr's achievement by ascribing to him even more of the material in the relevant books than Noth had done. However most scholars are persuaded by either of two main accounts that reckon with a substantial revision of the history by a second Deuteronomist. These accounts differ in several ways, including whether Noth was right to deem the (first) Deuteronomist exilic (so Smend,[29] Dietrich,[30] Veijola[31]), or whether the earlier draft closed with its hero Josiah (so Cross,[32] Nelson[33]). However both accounts ascribe 'prophetic' material to their second hand. If our earlier observations have force, then the rewriting of the 'Deuteronomistic' traditions in 'prophetic' terms continued long after the exile. And the absence of Judges 6.7-10 (the major reference in that book to the 'prophetic' role) from the relevant Qumran fragment of Judges[34] only serves to confirm this conclusion.

4.3 In studies of the book of Joshua I have noted links between Chronicles and some elements of an *early* revision of the basic (Deuteronomistic?) draft of that book.[35] How much of Joshua—Kings was *not* available to the Chronicler? And if we have reasonable ground for suspicion that the Deuteronomistic History was far from complete before the Chronicler's work was being composed then several new questions will have to be asked. The more it is recognized that biblical revisers were inconsistent and that narrative could be generated piecemeal for exegetical purposes, the harder it may be to answer many of them.

4.4 Only one simple 'manipulation' of Noth's magisterial account of the Deuteronomistic History is required if we want to remove much of the evidence for the Chronicler having radically altered by

subtraction what he inherited from the Deuteronomist (plus a few supplements). The story of David in his court (2 Samuel 9-20 + 1 Kings 1-2) and the Elijah/Elisha narratives (much of 1 Kings 17–2 Kings 10) are readily identifiable and separable entities. Why not deem them *supplements* to the Deuteronomist's work, not *sources* for it? The Chronicler is deafeningly silent over each corpus. But *is* he the innovator?

4.5 Von Rad's argument is often quoted: that repeated examples of prophecy and fulfilment form one of the structural elements of the Deuteronomistic History.[36] To the extent that the main point is true, we should now say more cautiously that (before all the prophetic titles were added) it was a narrative about the fulfilment of what Yahweh had said. Yet this is another important feature of Joshua—Kings which looks different when viewed from Chronicles. Von Rad does not make explicit that only the first two of his eleven examples of Deuteronomistic notes of fulfilment write of Yahweh 'establishing the word he had spoken' (*hēqîm 'et-dᵉbārô ᵃšer dibber*). It is only these same two examples (1 Kings 8.20 = 2 Chronicles 6.10; and 12.15 = 10.15) that reappear in Chronicles. Selection from Deuteronomistic tradition—or common source? Williamson writes that Chronicles suppressed the story of Ahab's fate from the end of the Micaiah story in part because the fulfilment of a prophecy was involved which it had not reported.[37] But *was* it in his source? . . . Is there between the 'Matthew' of Samuel—Kings and the 'Luke' of Chronicles a lost 'Mark' that told the whole story of the Jerusalem monarchy? What relation does this 'chronicle of the kings of Judah' bear to Deuteronomistic thought and style?

5.0 Between Writings and Moses

Back to the room through the glass.

The discussion in the earlier part of this paper encourages the view that both parts of the 'prophetic' canon of the Hebrew Bible received much of their distinctive and positively intended 'prophetic' vocabulary over a briefer and in a later period of the biblical tradition than is regularly supposed. The process which has been sketched appears to imply recognition that these 'prophetic' writings were different from the other 'writings': it was on to these books and not others that 'prophetic' and 'visionary' terminology was grafted.

5.1 John Barton has recently discussed canonical development

relating to the 'prophets', and in particular Josephus' talk of the prophets after Moses writing the history of their times in thirteen books.[38] He suggests this points to a bipartite canon of Law and Prophets—with 'prophets' implying a certain level of inspiration or authority. It was a further stage that what we have inherited as Former and Latter Prophets were selected from Josephus' Prophets, with the remainder assigned to Writings.

Our own discussion belongs to a rather earlier period, and appears to point in a different direction. We have noted the emergence of two standard terms, 'prophets' and 'seer' in Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Twelve; and an analogous proliferation of 'prophetic' vocabulary in Kings, which extended into Samuel and even, in time, Judges. This process itself appears to recognize a 'prophetic' *je ne sais quoi*.

5.2 To an extent our account of the 'prophetizing' of Chronicles too would appear to undercut this conclusion. But the situation in that book is rather more complex. I incline to the view that the references in both Kings and Chronicles at the end of almost every king's reign to the availability of further information elsewhere are in fact cross-references between these two narratives that have diverged from their common source. This is widely recognized in the case of the Chronicler's references. But I wonder whether the references to 'chronicles of the kings of Judah' within Kings are not an invitation to scrutinize the other biblical book, and not extant state archives. Be that as it may, the form of many of the acknowledgments in the present text of Chronicles of material in Samuel—Kings recognizes those traditions as 'prophetic' or 'visionary',[39] or it notes that the familiar texts of Kings is a development, or exposition (*midrāš*) of an earlier 'book of kings',[40] or it points to 'prophetic' supplementation of a shorter account of the monarch:[41] the invitations in 1 Kings 29.29 and 2 Kings 9.29 to consult *dibrê nātān hannābî'* for further information on David or Solomon will more likely be a reference to the 'court history' which is not reflected in Chronicles, than to Nathan's dynastic oracle which is. Parts of the main text of Chronicles have received 'prophetic' supplementation—and of course this may be the contribution of the Chronicler himself. However the marginal references in Chronicles as we have received the work (the references to Samuel—Kings) tend to emphasize the prophetic character of that other parallel work. Perhaps those who drafted them would not have been averse to deeming Samuel and Kings part of restricted 'prophetic' canon that excluded Chronicles.

5.3 While late passages mainly in Jeremiah and Kings[42], but also in some other books,[43] talk in a stereotyped way of Yahweh's 'servants the prophets', the last chapter of Chronicles handles the same theme by making explicit—and unique—link between 'his prophets' and 'his messengers'.[44] I have already noted that I find this implied in Judges 6.7-10—the first prophetic passage in Joshua–Kings.[45] These verses attribute Israel's suffering under the Midianites to her spurning Yahweh's voice and revering Amorite gods. This developed understanding of a prophet's message prefaces the rather more practical approach taken to Gideon by Yahweh's messenger (6.11ff.) in response to Israel's lament over Midian. This preface deftly claims prophetic influences in other episodes of the Judges even where the actual accounts use different terminology—so helping to make explicit the prophetic character of yet another part of this whole narrative corpus.

5.4 This late addition to Judges rather takes away some of the force of 1 Samuel 3. There we encounter the heaviest concentration of words and phrases relating to the whole phenomenon of prophecy and its importance of any score of verses in the Bible. However ancient the origins of this story of Samuel's night-time audition, it seems clear that it has been redrafted to highlight the institution of biblical prophecy.[46] Noth may have been right to detect behind the present book of Judges and the opening chapters of Samuel an earlier 'Deuteronomistic' conception of a period of the Judges that extended to and concluded with Samuel's transfer of power to a king. Samuel had been the last judge (cf. 1 Samuel 7.15). This conception is largely neutralized by the present division of 'books'—with the birth narrative and this audition underscoring a prophetic portrayal of this early leader, a view again shared with Chronicles when we read of 'the days of Samuel the prophet' in preference to Kings' 'days of the judges . . .'[47]

5.5 H.-C. Schmitt has recently drawn our attention again to certain parts of the Pentateuch—or more strictly Genesis to Numbers—which have clear relations with prophetic concerns.[48] Elements of Exodus 3-4 are very like narratives of prophetic call. Chapter 4, and also the report of the act of exodus itself in chapter 14, both culminate in reports of the people's belief in Moses and his God. The terminology is that of Isaiah 7.9 and 2 Chronicles 20.20. Almost identical expressions constitute important moments in other blocks of Pentateuchal tradition: Exodus 19.9 at Sinai; Numbers 14.11;

20.12 in the desert; and Genesis 15.6 in the time of the patriarchs—and we have already noted other prophetic links in that chapter. Schmitt argues that these passages are part of a 'redaction of the Pentateuch in the spirit of prophecy'; and that they post-date the 'priestly' strata of the Mosaic tradition. Prophets before Torah!

5.6 It is commonplace to recognize Deuteronomy too, and its figure of Moses, as influenced by prophetic conceptions. He himself proclaimed 'the word of Yahweh', and promised the raising up of a *nābî'* like himself (18.15, 18). This passage is part of the same discussion of true and false prophecy as we have seen already in Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Polzin has recently attributed it to the Deuteronomist, who here claims authority equal to that of Moses for *his own* exposition of the divine will.[49] Mayes equally views 18.15ff. as a late addition to the Deuteronomistic law; and states that here Moses is not so much viewed as the archetypal prophet as the standard by which to judge the validity of the prophetic word.[50] Mayes' alternative I find puzzling: Moses is surely regarded as a 'prophet'—the sort of 'prophet' which Jeremiah and Ezekiel, and also Elijah and Samuel become. He is also the standard by which they are validated and their opponents condemned. Yet this is not the Pentateuch's last word on prophecy.

5.7 There are too many uncertainties about Numbers 12.6-8 for us to know whether Moses is there a privileged prophet, or of a different category. God speaks to him 'mouth to mouth' or 'face to face', and not in vision, dream or 'riddles'. The clue to his categorization may lie in the words: *bᵉkol-bêtî neᵉmān hû'*—'in all my house it is he who is established/faithful/trustworthy'. Now it is possible that these words have a similar force to Ahimelech's attempt (1 Samuel 22.14) to reassure Saul over David's intentions towards him: 'who among all your servants is faithful as David?' It could be that Moses is portrayed as *the* trusty servant. But Ahimelech's words have a deeper sense. Reinforced shortly afterwards by Abigail's 'Yahweh will make of (or for) my lord a sure (or established) house' (1 Samuel 25.28), they echo through Psalm 89, Samuel—Kings and Chronicles[51] as a promise of the institution of the Davidic line. Indeed we find this promise first, and rather obliquely at the end of 1 Samuel 2, concluding Eli's message from the man of God. It is surely to contrast Samuel with Eli, and to compare the institution of prophecy with that of monarchy, that the immediately following story of Samuel's call concludes with him *established* as a prophet of Yahweh.[52] It

is fanciful to see that claim outdone in Moses' favour in Numbers 12.7? Be that as it may, the concluding verses of the Pentateuch effectively neutralize the earlier promise in Deuteronomy 18. At whatever date they were penned they simply note that (despite all appearances to the contrary?) the expected prophet like Moses still has not arisen. Moses—and that means the whole Torah associated with his name—is incomparable.

5.8 They are surely right who see these verses as the end of the Pentateuch, and not just of its last book, and who hear them say something about Torah and Prophets and Canon, and not just something about Moses and historical successors.[53] Certainly, if our arguments have force, they confirm this reading. It is common to view the preaching of the prophets as one of the influences which helped form the teaching of Deuteronomy. I have attempted to show that the *nābî'*, the 'prophet' who Moses is or with whom he is compared is no historical 'prophet'—but the reconstructed, post-exilic 'prophet' of the Prophetic Canon. The last word of the Torah knows the Prophets substantially as we know them—even the earlier Deuteronomy 13 and 18 would seem to know Jeremiah 1 and 23.

5.9 Prophets then precede—but have no precedence over—Moses. Prophets are also 'Writings'—'writings' that have been redefined as 'prophetic' at a quite advanced stage in the development of the earlier of them. We must leave it to another study to clarify what about these writings let them become prophetic; but conclude with an Alice-like view of the Bible—with Prophets between Writings and Moses. Torah, having been nurtured at several stages by the prophetic traditions, sought to control them—and does so in the Hebrew Bible. Yet the argument between Sadducee (Jewish or Samaritan) and Pharisee was not whether to add Prophets as new scripture beside Torah, but whether to retain Prophets once it had been ensured that Moses had said enough.

NOTES

1. This is the text of a paper read to the winter meeting of SOTS on 6th January 1983. It was dedicated to Professor G.W. Anderson, whose 70th birthday fell later that month. And it was drafted to stimulate discussion over a whole morning session of the meeting.

2. Forthcoming in *ZAW* 96 (1984).

3. W. McKane, 'Poetry and Prose in the Book of Jeremiah', *Congress Volume, Vienna 1980* (SVT 32), 220-237.

4. C. Westermann, *Genesis*, BK 1, 1966—.

5. E. Tov, 'Some Aspects of the Textual and Literary History of the Book of Jeremiah', in P.-M. Bogaert (ed.), *Le Livre de Jérémie* (BETL 54), 1981.

6. H.G.M. Williamson, 'The Death of Josiah and the Continuing Development of the Deuteronomic History', *VT* 32 (1982), 242-248.

7. Full documentation is available in my *ZAW* article—see note 2 above.

8. So J.L. Kugel, *The Idea of Biblical Poetry: Parallelism and its History*, 1981.

9. Of Elijah, in 1 Kings 17.18; and 2 Kings 1.9, 11, 12, 13. Of Elisha, 10 times in 2 Kings 4; 4 times in 2 Kings 5; 6; 7; 8; and then in 2 Kings 13.19.

10. Of Moses, in Deuteronomy 33.1; Joshua 14.6; Psalms 90.1; Ezra 3.2; 1 Chronicles 23.14; and 2 Chronicles 30.16. And of David in Nehemiah 12.24, 36; and 2 Chronicles 8.14.

11. In fact, 20 times in Zechariah 1-6, and then once in 12.8.

12. We shall have more to say below on divergences between 2 Samuel 24 and 1 Chronicles 21. W.E. Lemke's 'The Synoptic Problem in the Chronicler's History', *HTR* 58 (1965), 349-363, has helpfully pinpointed the complex relationship between our inherited texts of Samuel—Kings and Chronicles.

13. See for example Genesis 16 (x4); 21.17; 22.11, 15; 24.7, 40; 28.12; 31.11; 32.2; Exodus 3.2; 14.19; 23.20, 23; 32.34; 33.2; Numbers 20.16; 22.22-35 (x10); Judges 2.1, 4; 5.23; 6.11, 12, 20, 21, 22; 13.3-21 (x12); 1 Kings 13.18; 19.5, 7; 2 Kings 1.3, 15.

14. Amos 7.1-8; 8.1-2; 9.1; Jeremiah 1.11-13 (cf. 4.23-26; 23.18).

15. McKane has noted (*Proverbs*, 640-1) that LXX took *ḥāzôn* as referring to a person—a 'guide'; but retains this 'solitary reference . . . to prophetic vision . . . in the book of Proverbs'.

16. MT's *wyḥzw* is certainly the *lectio difficilior*: LXX offers the passive 'were seen'; while some Samaritan MSS attest *wy'ḥzw*, 'caught'.

17. Gesenius—Kautzsch—Cowley cites for the *niph'al* (§51g) *nzkr* from *zkr*, *nlbb* from *lb* and *nbnh* from *bn*; and for the *hithpa'el* (§54i) *htyhd* from *yhwd(h)*, and *hṣṭyd* from *ṣydh*.

18. Amos 2.11-12; 2 Kings 4.1; 6.1; 9.1; 1 Kings 18-19; 1 Samuel 28.6, 15.

19. Two differences between the related 2 Samuel 24.11 and 1 Chronicles 21.9 seem relevant here—cf. note 12 above. The texts are as follows:

Sam	wdbr-yhwh hyh	'l-gd hnby'	ḥzh dwyd l'mr . . .
Chr	wydbr yhwh	'l-gd	ḥzh dwyd l'mr . . .

It is arguable that Chronicles preserves the earlier reading; and what we have read in Samuel has made plain that the divine communication came through the proper channels.

20. W. Dietrich's argument for three main Deuteronomistic strata in Kings (*Prophetie und Geschichte*, 1972) cites Chronicles not at all. Then neither R.D. Nelson, who advances Cross's arguments in *The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History*, 1981, nor H.-D. Hoffmann, who

argues for a single author of the History in *Reform und Reformen*, 1980, cites Chronicles more than a few times.

21. T. Willi insists, *Die Chronik als Auslegung*, 1972, 54-56, that the Deuteronomistic History in its present form was the Chronicler's main source—he paid close attention even to those sections of his source he did not repeat. P. Welten, in his conclusion to *Geschichte und Geschichtsdarstellung in den Chronikbüchern*, 1973, is clear that the Chronicler wrote some 300 years after the Deuteronomist.

22. Cf. above, notes 12 and 19. Willi (*op. cit.*) and Williamson (*1 and 2 Chronicles*, 1982) are fully aware of the textual problems.

23. Cf. 1 Chronicles 21.9 and 2 Samuel 24.11; 1 Chronicles 17.1 and 2 Samuel 7.2; 2 Chronicles 32.20 and 2 Kings 19.2; and 2 Chronicles 34.22 and 2 Kings 22.14.

24. In 1 Chronicles 29.29 and 2 Chronicles 9.29; 12.15; 13.22; 26.22; 32.32; 33.18. Contrast 2 Chronicles 20.34 which cites Jehu ben-Hanani without a title.

25. In fact in the inherited MT the remaining dozen instances form a neat pattern: each of the three titles appears four times:

rō'eh in I, 9.22; 26.28; II, 16.7, 10
ḥōzeh in I, 25.5; II, 19.2; 29.30; 35.15
nābî' in II, 21.12; 29.25; 35.18; 36.12

However some indications from both LXX and Syr suggest that later adjustments have been made to some of these verses.

26. Cf. above, note 20.

27. R. Polzin, *Moses and the Deuteronomist: A Literary Study of the Deuteronomistic History I*, 1980.

28. M. Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History* (JSOTS 15), 1981.

29. R. Smend, *Die Entstehung des Alten Testaments*, 1978.

30. Cf. note 20 above.

31. T. Veijola, *Die Ewige Dynastie: David und die Entstehung seiner Dynastie nach der dtr Darstellung* (STAT 193), 1975.

32. F.M. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 1973.

33. Cf. note 20 above.

34. Reported in R.G. Boling, *Judges*, Anchor Bible, 1975, 40—on the basis of a communication from F.M. Cross.

35. A.G. Auld, 'Judges I and History: A Reconsideration', *VT* 25 (1975), 261-285 (especially 280-282); and *Joshua, Moses and the Land*, 1980 (especially 101, 108f.).

36. G. von Rad, *Studies in Deuteronomy*, 1953 (especially 78-81).

37. H.G.M. Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, New Century Bible, 1982, 286.

38. J. Barton, '"The Law and the Prophets": Who are the Prophets?', forthcoming in *OTS*.

39. Cf. note 24 above.
40. On Joash, in 2 Chronicles 24.27.
41. Cf. 2 Chronicles 26.22, and also 13.22.
42. Jeremiah 7.25; 25.4; 26.5; 29.19 (not LXX); 35.15; 44.4. 2 Kings 9.7; 17.13, 23; 21.10; 24.2.
43. Amos 3.7; Zechariah 1.6; Daniel 9.6, 10; Ezra 9.11.
44. 2 Chronicles 36.15-16.
45. Cf. §4.2 above.
46. There is further discussion of this chapter in my paper in *ZAW*—cf. note 2 above.
47. Contrast 2 Chronicles 35.18 with 2 Kings 23.22.
48. H.-C. Schmitt, 'Redaktion des Pentateuch im Geiste der Prophetie', *VT* 32 (1982), 170-189.
49. Cf. note 27 above.
50. A.D.H. Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, New Century Bible, 1979.
51. Psalm 80.29, 38; 1 Kings 8.26 (= 1 Chronicles 6.17); 11.38; 1 Chronicles 17.23 (n.b.: not equivalent to 2 Samuel 7.25); 2 Chronicles 1.9.
52. Cf. 1 Samuel 2.35; 3.20.
53. J. Blenkinsopp, *Prophecy and Canon*, 1977, 85-95.