

## INFORMATION TO USERS

This dissertation was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

### **University Microfilms**

300 North Zeeb Road  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

A Xerox Education Company

73-16,378

PETERSEN, David Lee, 1943-  
ISRAELITE PROPHECY AND PROPHETIC TRADITIONS  
IN THE EXILIC AND POST-EXILIC PERIODS.

Yale University, Ph.D., 1972  
Religion

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

© 1973

DAVID LEE PETERSEN

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN MICROFILMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

Israelite Prophecy and Prophetic Traditions  
in the Exilic and Post-Exilic Periods

A Dissertation  
Presented to the Faculty  
of the  
Graduate School  
of  
Yale University  
in Candidacy for the Degree  
of  
Doctor of Philosophy

David L. Petersen

New Haven, Connecticut

1972

PLEASE NOTE:

Some pages may have

indistinct print.

Filmed as received.

University Microfilms, A Xerox Education Company

## SUMMARY

This dissertation investigates the transformations which classical Israelite prophecy underwent beginning in the sixth century B.C. The classic prophetic office is characterized using a political-religious model, the prophet as mediator between the divine suzerain and his earthly vassals. Examination of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Haggai, and Zechariah, suggests that the prophetic role became problematic when the institution of kingship was disrupted. The study then contends that, with the end of Davidic claimants to the throne, individual prophets ceased to appear. In examining certain post-exilic texts, the study has found that traditions about prophecy developed consistently within two of the basic theological streams: the theocratic and the eschatological. In Chronicles, the Levitical singers are called "prophets" in order to legitimate their claim to authority in the post-exilic cult. Chronicles depicts the Levitical prophets as mediators between Yahweh's temple rule and the worshipping community. In the deutero-prophetic collections, the result of exegetical-like reflection on the oracles and visions of the classical prophets, prophecy is no longer part of the present age. Rather, the return of prophecy is expected, both as a general pouring out of Yahweh's spirit and as a specific prophet who will precede the advent of Yahweh's cosmic rule. Hence the prophetic role of mediator between the suzerain Yahweh and the Davidic community remained of constitutive importance for prophecy in the exilic and post-exilic periods.

## PREFACE

This dissertation has grown out of several Yale seminars. While studying Ezekiel and Deutero-Zechariah, I became interested in the development of Israelite prophecy in the exilic and post exilic periods. The research here presented is an attempt to discover: what classical Israelite prophecy was in the sixth century; what transformations prophecy underwent in the sixth century; and what appropriations were made of Israelite prophecy in the post-exilic period.

For help offered in the course of my work, I am grateful to Brevard Childs, Hartmut Gese, and W. Sibley Towner. My Doktorvater, S. Dean McBride, has helped immeasurably on issues from macrocosmic to microscopic proportion. In matters of financial assistance, thanks go to Yale University, the Yale Divinity School's Two Brothers' Fellowship for supporting a year at the Universität Tübingen, Presbyterian Graduate Fellowships, and my wife's noble efforts at Hamden High School.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter I. Introduction.....	1
Chapter II. Jeremiah and Ezekiel.....	24
A. Jeremiah and Monarchy.....	25
B. Ezekiel and Monarchy.....	40
C. Two Prophets and Two Royal Communities.....	60
Chapter III. The Post-Exilic Prophets: Haggai and Zechariah.....	73
A. Haggai.....	80
B. Zechariah.....	94
Chapter IV. The Deutero-Prophetic Collections.....	117
A. Deutero-Isaiah.....	118
B. Trito-Isaiah.....	125
C. Deutero-Zechariah.....	134
D. Joel.....	143
E. Malachi.....	151
Chapter V. Chronicles and Levitical Prophets.....	158
A. Heman, the King's Seer.....	174
B. Levitical Prophets and Holy War.....	182
C. Hezekiah's Temple Cleansing.....	199
D. Prophets to Levites.....	217
E. Josiah's Passover and Levitical Prophets.....	218

Chapter VI. Conclusions: Continuity in Change.....	222
Notes to Chapter I.....	231
Notes to Chapter II.....	239
Notes to Chapter III.....	249
Notes to Chapter IV.....	258
Notes to Chapter V.....	267
Notes to Chapter VI.....	281
Abbreviations.....	282
Bibliography.....	285



## INTRODUCTION

The study of Israelite prophecy has always been an important component of Old Testament scholarship and ancient intellectual history. Amos, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel have provoked comparisons with the ancient Greeks and the Sages of the East. These prophets are Israel's claim to a place in Jaspers' axial age: a period of a few centuries in which a basic transformation of man's self-understanding took place.<sup>1</sup>

And yet what a multiplicity of explanations and theories have developed about Israel's prophets in contrast to other members of this axial age. We know Plato to have been a peripatetic philosopher and Gautama Buddha, a mendicant sage; but the prophets have been labelled everything from unbalanced mantics to sober poets of doom.

One might spend a great amount of time collecting and classifying theories about the nature of Israelite prophecy and its origins. Much research on prophecy has in fact centered on the problem of origins and then attempted to explain prophecy aetiologically. Albright, for example, argues that the word nābî' was derived from a passive form of naba'um, "one who is called." He then suggests "the nabi was accordingly, one who was called by God for a special purpose, or who believed that he had received such a call."<sup>2</sup>

Accordingly, the key to understanding Israelite prophecy is provided by a search for its origins. Hence the task which I propose--to pick up the story of prophecy in the sixth century--may seem somewhat presumptuous, the more so since I must have a working hypothesis about the essential character of Israelite prophecy in order to understand the way in which it radically changed in the sixth century. The rationale for this procedure is the desire to understand what happened to prophecy and the prophetic office when Israelite society underwent severe restructuring.

First then, what was classical Israelite prophecy?

I do not intend to review here what various Old Testament scholars have thought to be prophecy's essential characteristics. Robinson and Fohrer have surveyed the important scholarship of this century.<sup>3</sup> In their essays and other studies, we find numerous models purporting to explain Israelite prophecy. The prophet is seen to be an intensely religious man (Hölscher, Guillaume), a cultic official (Johnson), a social reformer (Weber), a covenant mediator (Kraus, Muilenburg), a messenger of Yahweh (Ross), a traditionist (Rohland, Porteous), a man of prophetic consciousness (Buber). The list could go on indefinitely, since there has been no generally accepted model for Israelite prophecy.

## I

One tempting way to search for an appropriate definition of prophecy would be to turn to the historians of religions' work on prophecy. I have examined a rather broad swath of

this literature and have found it difficult to appropriate to this dissertation for several reasons.

First, the historian of religions approaches texts and religious phenomena in an attempt to see interconnections and patterns in human religious performances which transcend their cultural manifestations. On the other hand, students of a given culture or historical period--as I attempted to be in writing this dissertation--are usually interested only in data which illumine an event or a group of people. An historian of the latter sort is guided by a belief in historical particularity and discreteness and is not interested in non-contiguous cultural similarity. The difference between the two approaches is a matter of academic interest and habit. The historian of Ancient Near Eastern cultures usually feels that Chinese prophetic phenomena do not significantly illumine Israelite prophecy.<sup>4</sup> The usual canon is: if the comparative data had no direct or prior contact with the phenomenon in question, then the comparative enterprise is illegitimate. Heschel phrases this view well: "Is it admissible to equate phenomenon widely separated in space and time and profoundly different in their essential nature?"<sup>5</sup> His answer is no. I suggest that to answer Heschel's question yes is legitimate for those in the history of religions enterprise, for those asking questions about the structure and nature of religious belief and practice. The attempt to discover continuities and patterns in man's religion is simply a different enterprise than that of the historian's study of ancient cultures in Syria-Palestine.<sup>6</sup>

Second, difficulties may arise when these two different approaches encroach upon each other. For example, when Heiler starts with the general category "manifestation of religion," moves to the sub-category "holy man," and calls a sixth type of holy man "prophet," statements under this final rubric depend on the particularist historian's research.<sup>7</sup> If historians of religions decide to study the primary texts without the aid of critical literature, as many have done with the easily accessible Old Testament translations, they run the risk of missing important insights into the literature and hence become somewhat irrelevant to specialists in the area. If they do adopt the views of specialists in the field, a proclivity for latching on to certain rather one-sided studies exists. For example, Hölscher's study, Die Propheten, Untersuchungen zur Religionsgeschichte Israels, has dominated the field until very recently and still remains important for the way in which categories for analysis are established by historians of religions, e.g. the emphasis on ecstasis in Heiler, Goldammer, and Lindblom.<sup>8</sup> Whatever model the historians of religions adopt, the particularist historian coming to such a study often finds summaries of studies in his own specialty simply set within a new framework.

A third problem, already implied, is the circularity of dealing with the history of religions work on prophecy. Very often Israelite prophecy is the paradigm case for all other reflection, a case which controls the categories and evaluations of other types. Guarglia, for example, states:

"In order to better explicate and more clearly comprehend the form, we first consider the most typical form of prophecy, the prophets of the Hebrew people..."<sup>9</sup> Comparative theories tend to be so derivative of the very phenomenon I intend to explore, that they provide little creative insight. For all the above reasons I have been unable to proceed by first defining prophecy using Guarglia's six or Lindblom's four essential characteristics, and then placing Israelite prophecy as a sub-category of prophecy in general.

## II

An important component of recent scholarship about prophecy has been the attempt to identify the context within Israelite society for prophetic activity. This search for a social setting of prophecy has been attempted from a number of different approaches: Weberian analysis, Gattungs-geschichte, and cultic prophecy theories. I find this general approach a valuable corrective to the sort of theories that attempt to define prophecy by concentrating on psychological or intellectual characteristics.

A refutation of this search for a location in society has been offered by Williams in a critique of Berger's defense of the cultic prophecy thesis.<sup>10</sup> Williams would criticize any attempt to search for a social location for prophecy, since he says: "...in Israel's classical prophets we encounter creative experience and speech that is simultaneously iconoclastic."<sup>11</sup> This anti-institutionalism, which is clearly derivative of Weber's theories, makes any specific social

location for classical Israelite prophecy ipso facto impossible. I do not want to defend here the cultic prophecy thesis, but I do want to hold out for the possibility, indeed the probability, of identifying a specific social location of Israelite prophecy. Williams' assertions about pre-monarchic prophecy make such a theory unavailable to him. He has not defended his assumption that the possibility of Yahweh's self revelation at any time or any place may be equated with a proto-prophetic authority, much less with a proto-prophetic office.<sup>12</sup> This proto-prophecy is essential to Williams' protestations against seeing a social setting for Israel's prophets, and it remains unproved.

A recent observation by Frank Cross provides an important insight into the social location and essential character of Israelite prophecy. He notes:

The intimate relationships between the office of king and the office of prophet have not been sufficiently stressed in the past. Of course, it is commonly recognized that prophecy sensu stricto emerged as an office with the rise of kingship. The standard oracle types--royal oracles, war oracles, oracles of legal judgement against king and people--were political as well as religious functions of Israelite prophecy.<sup>13</sup>

It is striking that what we call Israelite prophecy only began with the monarchy and ended about the time that Israel ceased to be a nation. This correlation is, I suggest, not accidental, but an important clue to the nature of Israelite prophecy.

In an unpublished Union dissertation, Stephen Szikszai has argued that there was an integral connection between

the prophet and king in early Israel. That Samuel, Nathan, and Gad were in some way royal advisors and royal anointers is clear. As Szikszai says: "The prophet's original role in the court was very likely to continue the line started by Samuel, i.e. to counsel the king, the theocratic representative, about the will of Yahweh."<sup>14</sup> Though I can not accept Szikszai's theory about the prophetic and royal offices having developed out of a bifurcation of the judge's role, I think he has identified the close relationship between prophet and king in the earliest period of the monarchy.

That all Israel's prophets were political advisors is, of course, difficult to prove. However, there are strong indications that the prophetic office was a political one and closely related to the monarchy. The number of prophets who are pictured as involved with the accession and investiture of the king is striking: Samuel, Nathan, Elijah, Elisha, and Ahijah. The figure of Ahijah is particularly informative since he proclaimed the political division of Judah and Israel to Jeroboam and then gave him his royal commission (1 Kgs 11.26-40). More generally, the close correlation between Isaiah's ministry and the specific reigns of Ahaz and Hezekiah shows a demonstrable concern with the royal house. Further, the oracles against the nations, in virtually all the prophetic books except Hosea, are difficult to explain unless the prophet was integrally related to the foreign policy center of his society, the royal court.<sup>15</sup> Cross has convincingly argued that the oracles of Amos 1-2 against the nations

reflect a knowledge of the Davidic covenant and of the identities of the participating vassal states.<sup>16</sup> One can see similar patterns in the books of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel. It will be one task of this dissertation to suggest that political concern is valuable in explaining the activity of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Haggai, and Zechariah: the last of Israel's classical prophets.

### III

Recent discussions of Ancient Near Eastern oracular practices suggest that the model I am proposing for Israelite prophecy is not improbable.<sup>17</sup> The studies of Dossin and Moran on Mari prophecy, for example, demonstrate the concern of these prophets for royalty. Moran, in discussing the texts of ARM X says: "Here only four [texts] have any manifest interest other than the person of the king, either his personal safety, the threat of insurrection or--this most frequently--his military successes."<sup>18</sup>

Baltzer has argued that the office of the Egyptian vizier closely approximates that of the Israelite prophet. The vizier was a royal advisor responsible for establishing the facts, deciding the sentence, and discussing the sentence's legal precedent.<sup>19</sup> Baltzer suggests that, in Israel, the prophet was a vizier for Yahweh, the royal king. In doing this, I think Baltzer overstates the lack of respect which Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel supposedly evinced toward the earthly king. Baltzer's case is further weakened, since Hermann and Fohrer



have demonstrated that little evidence exists for an Egyptian influence on Israelite prophecy (see note 17). Hence Baltzer's vizier model, while being an helpful analogy, functions as a parallel and not a formative influence.

Ross has shown that a central characteristic of the Israelite prophet from the eleventh to the sixth centuries was to be a messenger of the divine council.<sup>20</sup> The prophets were messengers of the divine council, messengers from Yahweh to someone.<sup>21</sup> This messenger of the divine council had direct analogues in the polity of Ancient Near Eastern governments.<sup>22</sup> Such a function is yet another indication that Israelite prophets had a political-religious office.

Holladay summarizes the role of the messenger well:

The messenger was an official representative of the sender himself. The royal messenger stood in the court of the Great King, participated in the deliberative processes of the court, received the declaration of the king's wishes from the king's own mouth, and then carried the tablet or sealed roll of papyrus to its destination--in the case of imperial state administration, to the court of the vassal king. Here, received in the manner befitting a representative of the Great King, he would break the seals, hold up the letter, and proclaim, "To PN<sub>1</sub>, thus (says) PN<sub>2</sub>: I am well, may your heart be at peace. Now concerning the matter of...."<sup>23</sup>

Holladay goes on to argue that this was the model for the pre-writing prophets. For the writing or classical prophets, he contends, the new model of the Assyrian imperial messenger was normative. These messengers and consequently the prophets now spoke to entire population groups. Holladay sees this to be a significant revision of the prophetic office. And indeed it was. But it was not a wrenching of prophecy from its

political context. The new model was still that of a political messenger. Contact between prophet and king remained, and the prophets addressed themselves to domestic political issues as well as problems in international relations. One would be correct in saying that the prophetic office and audience had enlarged instead of shifting entirely.

Identifying the political role of the Israelite prophet seems to me the most valuable way of characterizing classical Israelite prophecy. It was a dialectical political role: the prophet functioned as messenger for Yahweh and the Divine Council, and he functioned as messenger for the earthly king. The Ancient Near Eastern world recognized no inconsistency in this dual role since the king and the gods participated in the same governing economy. The prophet mediated the two hierarchies. He could bear messages from either of the royal figures, Yahweh or the king. He participated in the Divine Council and in the more mundane earthly deliberations. As Wright says, "The prophet was an official of the divine government of Israel...."<sup>24</sup> This political-religious model of prophet as mediator is the one I adopt to help understand and define classical Israelite prophecy.

#### IV

Just as Holladay identifies a significant revision of prophetic function in the eighth century, so I want to point to an even more momentous change in the sixth century. Much has been said about the death or demise of classical prophecy.

Though very few scholars agree about what signifies the end of classical Israelite prophecy, it is clear that after some point no one uttered oracles or wrote tracts in the way Isaiah or Jeremiah had; or at least, the canon did not preserve or accept such "prophetic" efforts. Hence the issue of what constitutes the end of the prophetic enterprise is a legitimate and important issue.

Theories to explain the demise of prophecy abound. Such theories depend necessarily upon a model of what Israelite prophecy was. Those who argue that the spirit of prophecy flickered out, think that this spirit was the constitutive element of Israelite prophecy. Pfeiffer offers such a view when he suggests that the authority of the law, beginning in the time of Josiah, supplanted the need for and possibility of prophetic words.<sup>25</sup> Von Rad posits another explanation based on his premise that prophets always acted within large historical contexts. Since, in the Persian and Hellenistic periods, world events passed Israel by, no context existed for prophetic activity.<sup>26</sup> Another recent tack is represented by Johnson who sees the problem of false prophecy and the consequent distrust of the prophetic enterprise to be the issue which brought prophecy down.<sup>27</sup> Such explanations could go on indefinitely. Suffice it to say, the plethora of attempts to explain the demise of, or radical change in, Israelite prophecy demonstrates the centrality of the issue for the study of late Israelite prophecy.

Hammershaimb, among others, has proposed a different way of looking at this change:

In considering what factors caused or contributed to the change in prophecy during the Exile and the period immediately following, with an almost complete disappearance of the pre-exilic prophecy of doom in its characteristic form, I believe it is of decisive importance to stress the change in the structure of Israelite society which was already far advanced in the time of the later monarchy and was further hastened by the exile.<sup>28</sup>

Though I can share neither his emphasis on the shift from doom to hope in later oracles nor his denial of the importance of kingship for the change in prophecy, Hammershaimb's emphasis on searching for causes in the structures of the society instead of inside the prophet's mind is an important caveat.

Rather than speak about the end of Israelite prophecy, I should perhaps speak of the transition from classical prophecy to a connected but profoundly different enterprise. Plöger rightly insists that the question is not so much that of the disappearance of prophecy but of a submerging (Untertauchung): "...a living on under fully different circumstances and in a fully changed form in which something really new has come to exist."<sup>29</sup>

In trying to understand the transformation of prophecy, one must look at the changing role of the prophet, given the model of prophecy I have proposed. One has now to ask at what point the prophet as mediator between Yahweh and the royal community no longer functioned in Israel. I think we may safely see the end of this type of prophetic performance in the

sixth century. This dissertation will examine the way in which Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Haggai, and Zechariah functioned within this political-religious model. And then, with the end of Davidic kingship and the end of concrete royal expectations for the Davidic line after 520 B.C., we can discern a basic revision in the self-conception of prophecy reflected in the deuteroprophetic books: Deutero-Zechariah, Joel, and Malachi. Deutero- and Trito-Isaiah present us with a transitional stage between the classical prophets and the deuteroprophetic view.

The only direct criticism of this way of understanding the demise of classical Israelite prophecy has been made by Robert Hanhart who wants to see the time in which prophecy disappeared as a geistesgeschichtlich designation for the advent of Judaism.<sup>30</sup> (The überlieferungsgeschichtlich designation for the beginning of Judaism is the rise of apocalyptic as well as certain elements represented by Chronicles and the wisdom tradition.) Hanhart denies that there was a simple cause and effect relationship between the downfall of the state and the demise of prophecy.<sup>31</sup> As evidence, he cites the continuation of prophecy after the defeat of the Northern Kingdom and after the destruction of Jerusalem, as well as after the growth in the importance of the law. This, of course, I admit. Prophecy did not end abruptly with the downfall of the independent Israelite state. Instead the significant change came with the absence of Davidic rulers and pretenders. The prophets were closely

related to the royal house and not just the monarchy in abstract (see below on Ezekiel with Jehoiachin in exile, Haggai and Zechariah with Zerubbabel). Hanhart has not taken this integral relationship into account.

To sum up with Cross: "...prophecy and kingship in fact expired together."<sup>32</sup> Or as Hanson says: "In the post-exilic period, the monarchy ceased and with the passing of the king, the office of prophet as vizier also passed."<sup>33</sup>

## V

Up to this point, I have suggested that a radical change took place in classical Israelite prophecy during the sixth century. To proceed further, we must ask, what happened to the prophetic enterprise? To investigate this issue, I wish to contrast the political-religious model which was constitutive of classical Israelite prophecy with the "prophecy" which followed. It is to this question which recent studies concerned with the rise of apocalyptic literature have addressed.

One of the constants in Old Testament research is the desire to get behind the present text in order to discover the conditions and people who wrote or spoke that which we have recorded. This has often resulted in the search for individuals: the Psalmist, the Yahwist, Jeremiah. With the recent emphasis on the importance of traditions continuing through many centuries of Israelite history, Zion and Holy War to name two, the search for individuals had to be

abandoned in lieu of various tradition-preserving groups. And as the inquiry moves beyond designating individual traditions to investigating theological perspectives, the search for the literature-producing communities has expanded in scope. No longer do we search for a group intent on preserving a tradition, but instead we look for groups which participated in the life and conflicts of the times and in so doing appropriated and revised the old and created new traditions.

This identification of theological streams and the groups responsible for them has been most informative when certain Old Testament literatures reflect a context of conflict.

I wish to rehearse briefly three successful demonstrations of this approach: Plöger, Steck, and Hanson.<sup>34</sup>

Plöger has, in Theocracy and Eschatology, argued that there are two dominant groups in the post-exilic period: the eschatologists and the rulers of the theocracy. He suggests that the viewpoint of the ruling priestly group was inimical to the eschatologists who preserved the prophetic literature.<sup>35</sup> The groups responsible for the Priestly work and the Chronicler's history understood Israel to be ruled by God.<sup>36</sup> This community "embodied the theocratic ideal to such an extent that there was no longer any need for eschatological expectation."<sup>37</sup> The eschatological conventicles comprised the groups which produced the so-called deutero-prophetic texts of which Plöger treats Isa 34-37, Deutero-Zechariah, and Joel. According to Plöger the views of the

classical prophets contained an inherent forward looking quality, a prophetic eschatology. This, however, lost its historical concreteness and developed into an apocalyptic view of the future. Hence there was a basic difference between the theocratic and the eschatological groups, which was rooted in their respective evaluations of eschatology. I am here little concerned with describing what apocalyptic is and how it developed, which is Plöger's overriding purpose. What is important for this dissertation is the continuity he demonstrates between the prophetic books and the eschatological groups.<sup>38</sup> My major criticism of Plöger is his dating schema; he dates much of the deutero-prophetic literature late. Hanson's work is a necessary corrective.

A more general statement of this approach may be found in O. H. Steck's work. His essay is perhaps the best argument of the need for and character of the "theological streams" approach. It is more than Traditionsgeschichte. The search for parallel features in other texts, even when literary contact is not demonstrable, informs the search for the "theological stream" where such parallels could not inform the tradition-history enterprise.<sup>39</sup> The "theological-streams" approach moves 'from the textual evidence (Textaussage) to tradition, from the tradition to the intellectual/spiritual life, from the intellectual life to the theological stream.' Wolff's attempts to reconstruct the thought world of Hosea and Amos are very similar to the "theological-streams" approach. The goal of the search is an



"historisch-theologie-geschichtlichen Synthese."<sup>40</sup>

For an example of this approach, Steck contrasts the penitential prayers embedded in the Chronicler's history (Ezra 9, Neh 1;9) with the viewpoint of the Chronicler's history. These two streams demonstrate the same antithesis which Plöger discovered in other texts. The Chronicler's work viewed the Cyrus edict, the return from exile, and the rebuilding of city and temple as new acts of Yahweh providing a restoration of his rule. There is no room for eschatological expectation.<sup>41</sup> The perspective is quite the opposite in the prayers. Israel has yet to be restored; the return of some to the land and the Cyrus edict are not seen to have significant importance; there has been no unification of the twelve tribes; Persians have authority over the government; and the temple, though rebuilt, is not the focus for Israel as it was of old. Steck accepts the analysis of Plöger, that we may speak of a theocratic and an eschatological group. Steck believes that the former group derives from traditions like the Priestly thought-world and the latter is very similar to the Deuteronomistic position. He further suggests that we must speak about more than two streams to give an accurate picture of the post-exilic situation. He identifies four: the priestly-theocratic, wisdom, prophetic-eschatological, and Levitical-Deuteronomistic.<sup>42</sup>

A final example of work in a similar vein is Paul Hanson's Studies in the Origins of Jewish Apocalyptic. Though he has not availed himself of either Plöger's or Steck's work,

Hanson has made detailed examinations of Deutero-Zechariah and Trito-Isaiah. In suggesting that these collections represent the movement from prophetic eschatology to apocalyptic, he places the literature in a context of conflict: the prophetic-visionary groups (Ezek 40-48) versus the hierarchy (Chronicles).<sup>44</sup> Like Plöger, Hanson is primarily concerned with the development of apocalyptic; but his work also points to the continuity between classical Israelite prophecy and the deutero-prophetic collections.

I should make clear at this point that I do not intend to assert that there is an inherent developmental structure from the office of prophecy to traditions about prophecy. Traditions are one thing; religio-social institutions are quite another.<sup>45</sup> Furthermore, traditions about prophecy existed prior to the demise of classical Israelite prophecy, e.g. the Deuteronomistic statements about Mosaic prophecy.<sup>46</sup> Nevertheless a study of the traditions about prophecy provides one of the few ways to understand what happened to Israelite prophecy in the post-exilic period. And fortunately, traditions about prophecy are preserved in two radically different sorts of post-exilic literature: Chronicles and the deutero-prophetic collections. In Chronicles, the Levitical singers are called prophets in order to legitimate a claim to authority in the post-exilic cult. The presupposition of such a claim is that prophecy still functions, albeit in altered fashion. In the deutero-prophetic books, however, prophecy is no longer part of the present age. Rather it is

expected as a part of the eschatological scenario and envisioned both as a general pouring out of Yahweh's spirit on the elect of Israel and as manifest through a prophet (usually Elijah) to precede the coming of Yahweh's universal reign. The essential difference between the Chronicler's and the deutero-prophetic views buttresses Plöger's, Steck's, and Hanson's theory of a basic antithesis in the post-exilic community. My use of this bi-polar schematization is not meant to imply a denial of the multiplicity of theological streams. Rather I suggest that the texts I studied present traditions about prophecy developing consistently within two basic theological streams of the post-exilic period.

## VI

This dissertation picks up the story of prophecy in the sixth century and leaves it in the fifth century or perhaps a bit later. The study hopes to show that the sixth century was a crucial turning point when classical Israelite prophecy as a political-religious office ceased. This radical transformation of prophecy provided the occasion for the development of traditions about prophecy of significant variety, some of which we see in revised form in the literatures of Qumran, the New Testament, and the Rabbinic texts.<sup>47</sup>

That prophecy had in some sense passed from the scene is suggested by 1 Mac 9.27 ("Thus there was great distress in Israel, such as had not been since the time that prophets ceased to appear among them"), by the survey of famous men

in Sir 49.10, and by the tradition complex which speaks of the violent fate of the prophets in the New Testament (Matt 5.11ff; 23.29-36; Luke 6.22ff; 11.47-51; 13.31-33).<sup>48</sup> This latter tradition finds precursors in the general period discussed in this dissertation (Neh 9.26; 2 Chr 36.16).

Another tradition is that of the expected return of prophecy in general form. Israel is to become a prophetic people by the pouring out of Yahweh's spirit. The prophetic phenomenon in the Lucan infancy narrative surely reflects this expectation: "Zechariah 'prophesied' (1.67), Simon was subject to revelation by the Holy Spirit (2.25-27), and Anna was a 'prophetess' (2.36)"<sup>49</sup> This tradition may also be observed in early Christian reflection on Pentecost with the appropriation of Joel 3.1-5 into Acts 2.

One final tradition is that of the coming prophet. 1 Macc 4.46 preserves a view of this figure: "(and they) stored the stones in a convenient place on the temple hill until there should come a prophet to tell what to do with them."<sup>50</sup> Two exceedingly important texts from Qumran also allude to a prophetic figure prior to the coming of the Messiah.<sup>51</sup> 4Q Flor is a "collection of Messianic proof-texts" of which the first is a juxtaposition of two passages from Deuteronomy (5.28-29; 18.18-19).<sup>52</sup> The emphasis appears to rest on the latter text: "I will raise up for them a prophet like you from among their brethern..." Following this text are two more Old Testament quotations intended to foretell the appearance of two other coming figures: the royal

(Num 24.15-17) and the priestly (Deut 33.8-11) Messiahs. In this context, the prophet stands before the Messianic figures.

A more specific statement of this expectation is made in the Community Rule. IQS 9.11 speaks about the prophet who shall come: "They shall depart from none of the counsels of the Law to walk in the stubbornness of their hearts, but shall be ruled by the primitive precepts in which the men of the Community were first instructed until there shall come the prophet and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel." That the prophet was indeed a precursor and not a royal or Messianic figure is certain, since as Brown noted, there is no place at the eschatological banquet for the prophet.<sup>53</sup>

Starcky has published an Aramaic translation of Mal 3.23 (4Q Mess ar) which, he contends, shows that Elijah was thought to be the eschatological prophet by the community at Qumran.<sup>54</sup> There is, however, no other evidence that Elijah was designated as the precursor prophet. Rather it seems that the expectations of a Moses and an Elijah figure had merged. As Vermes says:

The figure of the Prophet probably evolved from two biblical sources, the first being Deut 18.18-19, where Moses announces the coming of a Prophet similar to himself..., and the second being Mal 4.5, where it is prophesied that Elijah will return before the coming of the day of the Lord.<sup>55</sup>

The teacher of righteousness complicates the picture of the eschatological prophet at Qumran since he appears to have certain prophetic qualities. Some scholars have sought

to identify the teacher of righteousness with the eschatological prophet.<sup>56</sup> Following Raymond Brown, I am more inclined to say that the teacher of righteousness achieved a quasi-prophetic status because he was an interpreter of prophetic words. For example, the following description appears in IQpHab, "...the Teacher of Righteousness, to whom God made known all the mysteries of the words of His servants the Prophets."<sup>57</sup> He is never referred to as the precursor or eschatological prophet because he died before the last times. CD 9.29 shows the gap between the death of the teacher and the coming Messiahs.<sup>58</sup> Hence the eschatological prophet remained part of the community's expectation for the age to come.

In the New Testament, the tradition of the eschatological prophet is still very much alive.<sup>59</sup> In John 6.14 we find: "When the people saw the sign which he had done, they said, 'This is indeed the prophet who is to come into the world.'" John the Baptist was judged to be a prophet (Matt 11.14; 14.5; and 21.26). That he was the prophet, the prophet who was to precede the Messiah, was a new contention because it implied that the last days had come:

And they asked him, "Why do the scribes say that first Elijah must come?" And he said to them, "Elijah does come first to restore all things; and how is it written of the Son of Man, that he should suffer many things and be treated with contempt? But I tell you that Elijah has come, and they did to him whatever they pleased, as it is written of him." (Mark 9.11-13)<sup>60</sup>

Jesus, too, was accorded prophetic status.<sup>61</sup> But since the prophetic figure was a predecessor of the Messiah or

king, this appellation was inadequate for the early Christians' claim about Jesus as implied in Matt 16.14:

Jesus asked his disciples, "Who do men say that the Son of man is?" And they said, "Some say John the Baptist, others say Elijah, and others Jeremiah or one of the prophets." He said to them, "But who do you say that I am?" Simon Peter replied, "You are the Christ, the Son of the living God." (Matt 16.13-16)

Johannine Christology solved the dilemma by using both eschatological prophet and royal Messianic traditions to describe Jesus, a radically new configuration of the tradition history.<sup>62</sup>

It is, however, not my purpose to investigate these later traditions about prophecy. Rather I intend to provide an explanation of questions like: how is it that writers in the Greco-Roman world wrote about a time without prophecy? How is it that traditions about coming prophecy and prophets came to develop?

CHAPTER II  
JEREMIAH AND EZEKIEL

In order to investigate Israelite prophecy in the sixth century, I first propose to examine Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Why these two? Because they lived in a period when the Judahite monarchy ceased, and yet they are recorded as having had significant statements about individual kings or the monarchy. For Jeremiah and Ezekiel, the case is especially interesting, because they lived during a period when Judah had, in effect, two kings. Such an uncommon historical situation was of determinative effect on the work of these two prophets.

The methodology required is a sensitive listening to the emphases made in the prophetic literature in question. One cannot simply do a word study on "king" or "David." The prophetic function is presented differently in the two books. The prophets and their traditionists were addressing different problems on the basis of varying theological perspectives. Consequently, the character of the individual prophetic book is the single most important feature in methodological consideration.

An important distinction must be made before the investigation may proceed. There is a difference between discussing the office or self-conscious function of Jeremiah



and Ezekiel with respect to the king and discussing the prophet's ideas about monarchy and attitudes towards specific kings. The one centers on an internal view of the prophet's activity, while the other focuses on one facet or product of that activity. Defining the self-conception of prophecy vis-à-vis kingship would be ideal. Unfortunately, we do not have the sort of evidence at hand that might prove productive for such an inquiry. The call narratives are stereotypic and not purely autobiographic accounts. Self-reflections on the royal responsibility of the prophet are minimal in these two books. Instead I propose to study the manner in which Jeremiah and Ezekiel wrote about the king so that I might examine one component of the political-religious model for classical Israelite prophecy.

#### JEREMIAH AND THE MONARCHY

How then to speak intelligently about the relationship between Jeremiah and individual kings and his views about individual kings and about kingship or monarchy in general?

At least one background note is helpful. In the interest of discussing the more general hypothesis about kingship and prophecy, we should take note of the other prophets active in the period of Jeremiah's public work. If we accept the basic chronology offered to us in the book of Jeremiah, his prophetic period spanned the rule of five kings: Josiah, Jehoahaz, Jehoiakim, Jehoiachin, and Zedekiah. Following the conclusions of critical scholarship, the oracles

of Zephaniah, Nahum, and Habakkuk fall into this period. Further, we have recorded two instances in which kings consulted with prophets. When Josiah was presented with the newly found law book, after rending his clothes, his first response was to inquire of the Lord from Huldah the prophetess (2 Kgs 22.14-20). Jehoiakim was bothered not only by Jeremiah (Jer 36), but also by Uriah the prophet (Jer 26.20), whom Jehoiakim had brought back from Egypt and slain. All this is to say that Jeremiah was not the only prophet who could have and did hold the attention of one of the kings of his time.

I think it possible to discuss the significance of Jeremiah's thought on our topic within the context of three basic rubrics: (I) Jeremiah's use of the shepherd theme, (II) his reflections about the Davidic house, and (III) his oracles concerning royalty (Jer 21.11-23.8) and his relationship with Zedekiah.

#### I

Jeremiah used the image of the shepherd and his flock to describe the relationship of the king to his nation.<sup>1</sup> Not only Judahite kings are so depicted, but foreign rulers as well (Jer 6.3; 12.10; 49.19; 50.44; 51.23). Within the context of this metaphor, Jeremiah envisions both judgement and promise. At the most general level, he accuses the kings, along with other important functionaries in Israel, as having sinned against Yahweh (Jer 2.8). As shepherds they have been

stupid and have not inquired as they should have (see Jer 37.1ff for a  $\psi\tau\tau$  by Zedekiah). They have also neglected their flocks (Jer 10.21). As a result of these sins, the flock has been scattered.

There is a real ambivalence in the Jeremianic traditions about the culpability of the royal leader. In some places Jeremiah charges the king with an active role: in Jer 50.6a he charges the leader with having caused his people to err. But in v.6b the people are described as having forgotten their fold, and in Jer 50.7, "they have sinned against Yahweh." In these latter two instances, the people as well as the monarch bear responsibility for the exile.<sup>2</sup>

Surely one of the reasons for this dialectic is the desire of Jeremiah and his redactors to argue that Yahweh was responsible for the exile--that it was a just punishment for Israel's sins and a necessary requisite before restitution. Both king and Yahweh participate in the ruling process.

This dialectic becomes even clearer when we move within the shepherd imagery from indictment to promise. Responsibility for the scattering in Jer 31.10 is made without equivocation: "Hear the word of the Lord, O Nations, and proclaim it on far away coasts; The one who scattered Israel will gather and will watch over it like a shepherd his flock."<sup>3</sup> This contrast of responsibility is the result of theological reflection about the justice

of the exile and Yahweh's responsibility for destruction and renewal.<sup>4</sup>

In the shepherd imagery, therefore, Jeremiah has used a way of speaking about royal responsibility which allows for consideration of Yahweh's power to destroy and create, since the earthly and divine kings participate in the same governmental economy.<sup>5</sup>

## II

A second concentration of issues revolves around the Davidic house. Jeremiah constantly characterized the royal house and individual representatives thereof by reference to David. Most commonly, the image of "the throne of David" is used with indictments of and judgements on the royal house. This usage occurs in both the prose and poetic sections of the book (Jer 13.13; 17.25; 21.12; 29.16). Further, Jeremiah uses this idiom in refusing a royal legacy to Jehoiachin and Jehoiakim (Jer 22.30; 36.30). The throne idiom is often used for negative evaluation of the monarchy and specific monarchs. But Jeremiah also uses the throne imagery in positive references to the monarchy. Jer 33.14-26 contains a group of oracles which refer to the Davidic house.<sup>6</sup> One oracle incorporates the Deuteronomistic perspective-- Jer 33.17-18:<sup>7</sup>

For thus says the Lord: David shall never lack a man to sit on the throne of the house of Israel, and the Levitical priests shall never lack a man in my presence to offer burnt offerings, to burn cereal offerings, and to make sacrifices for ever.

Jer 33.19-22 expands the preceding oracle within a context of covenantal reflection. Many commentators have seen vv.20-21 to be a conditionalizing of the Davidic covenant, on the basis of the way the proposition is framed in v.20. But this misunderstands the position of this oracle in the Davidic collection (Jer 33.14-26). Jer 33.20 states rhetorically that if man can break the covenant with day and night, then Yahweh can break his covenant with David. The proper question is, of course, how can man break Yahweh's covenant with his creation? How can man disturb the cosmic order? Clearly the expected answer is that he cannot. The possibility of man's disturbing either covenant is illusory. The Davidic covenant is given a cosmic guarantee. This is positively expressed in v.22 through the promise that the number of Davidic descendants will be as innumerable as the host of heaven and the sands of the sea. The prophet sees the Davidic monarchy to be an essential part of the cosmic order and economy.

This same device is used in the final oracle in the collection (Jer 33.25-26), in answer to the charges that David has been rejected: 'If I have not established the covenant with day and night and the ordinances of order, then I will reject David.' Since Yahweh had established the created order, such a rejection was of course impossible. So we read in v.26b, "I will restore them." Jer 33.17-18, 19-22, and .23-26 all argue the same point, that the throne

of David is inviolate--there will always be a Davidic ruler. Such is the use of the throne idiom within the context of Davidic restoration.

Jeremiah also speaks about the coming Davidic ruler as a specific individual. Most prosaically, this is reflected in Jer 30.9, in which Yahweh promises to raise up "David their king" for Israel. The more significant statement is contained in two versions:<sup>8</sup> one in terse poetic-like form, Jer 23.5-6:

Behold, the days are coming, says the Lord  
When I will raise up for David a righteous Branch  
He shall reign as king  
and deal wisely,  
and he shall execute justice  
and righteousness in the land.  
In his days,  
Judah will be saved  
and Israel will dwell securely  
And this is the name by which he shall be called,  
'The Lord is our righteousness.'

and the other in prose, Jer 33.14-16:

Behold, the days are coming, says the Lord, when  
I will fulfil the promise I made to the house of  
Israel and the house of Judah. In those days and  
at that time I will cause a righteous Branch to  
spring forth for David; and he shall execute justice  
and righteousness in the land. In those days Judah  
will be saved and Jerusalem will dwell securely.  
And this is the name by which it will be called:  
'The Lord is our righteousness.'

In both oracles, Jeremiah foresees that Yahweh will raise up a righteous branch for David. His reign will mean prosperity for Judah and he will be called "Yahweh is our righteousness" ( יהוה צדקנו ).<sup>9</sup>

The two versions are, however, slightly different. The prose rendition appears to be an expanded and prolix

version of the succinct oracle. The promise-covenant theme of Jer 33 is made explicit in v.14. Perhaps the most important deviation is that in the longer version less emphasis is placed upon the royal individual. Jer 33.15 omits "he shall reign as king." Likewise the time designation in v. 16 is the neutral "in those days," whereas in Jer 23.6, we find "in his days." Finally, Jer 33.16 is ambiguous about the referent for the theophoric appellation, "this is what it shall be called," while 23.6 is quite precise in designating the Davidic branch as the recipient of this name. It thus seems quite clear that the version in 33.14-16 is both an expansion of the earlier oracle and an attempt to remove the royal specificity from the earlier oracle.<sup>10</sup>

In sum, Jeremiah, while indicting the various holders of the Davidic throne, never indicts the Davidic tradition. He may condemn certain rulers to 'no progeny,' but there is always some other individual by which the lineage of David could be carried on. Davidic rule and the rule of Yahweh are inextricably connected for Jeremiah, a view necessary for and consistent with the political-religious model for Israelite prophecy.

### III

A third focus on Jeremiah and kingship leads us to the figure of Zedekiah, the only king who appears to have had close contact with Jeremiah. Several passages depict Zedekiah's formal inquiry (דרש) of the prophet:

Jer 21.1-7,8,10; 37.1-10. In answer, Zedekiah receives an oracle of defeat. On other occasions, the ox-yoke incident (Jer 27,12-15) and a meeting in the temple (Jer 38.14-28), Jeremiah offers the alternatives of surrender or die. We are even presented with some personal vignettes about the direct conflict between the words of Jeremiah and the policies of Zedekiah.

One episode reveals the character of Jeremiah's conception of Zedekiah's task and fate: Jer 34.1-7. The oracle is in two parts. First, Jeremiah gives a prediction of defeat for the city and of capture and exile for the king. Ensuing is a word of promise to Zedekiah: he shall receive a proper burial after a peaceful death. Such a promise is noteworthy since it contrasts with the burial of a sinful or rejected king (Jer 22.18ff, so also 2 Chron 21.19). Jeremiah has put a stamp of approval on Zedekiah.

However, to continue examining the place of Zedekiah in Jeremiah's work and to further examine the relation of Jeremiah to monarchy and other monarchs, we must turn to what I call the royal collection: Jer 21.11-23.8. This is a group of prose and poetic pieces about the monarchy and monarchs.<sup>11</sup>

Recent investigation of the Jeremianic prose traditions has not been able to speak convincingly about these sections, which contain poetic oracles as well as prose pieces.<sup>12</sup> Nicholson has, of course, claimed that the prose units, e.g. Jer 23.14, are of the Jeremianic-Dtr provenance, which rather



implies that the collections postdate the prose section. The sum requires its parts. Yet what are these parts? Can we, with Nicholson, make the neat distinction between poetry and prose? Is Jer 23.5-6 poetry or prose? And if we agree that a passage is prose, do we necessarily assign it to the Jeremianic-Deuteronomistic stream of tradition? These are not easy questions.<sup>13</sup>

There is a basic question to address to this royal collection: is reference to Zedekiah intended by either the redactors or Jeremiah? At first glance, the answer is no; the name does not appear. We have mention of Jehoahaz or Shallum in Jer 22.11; Josiah (by implication) in Jer 22.15-16; Jehoiakim in Jer 22.18; and Jehoiachin in Jer 21.24. However, a positive answer to the above question is suggested by Eissfeldt, who maintains that the oracle against Zedekiah and Jerusalem in Jer 21.1-10 provides the occasion for the insertion of the royal collection.<sup>14</sup> Therefore, Zedekiah is a part of the collection by dint of this redactional placement. Though Eissfeldt is probably correct in his theory about the reasons for the placement of this collection, it cannot be denied that the collection begins with the title, **לְבֵית מֶלֶךְ יְהוּדָה**. Juxtaposition or no, this is the forward boundary of the collection, just as Jer 23.9 begins with **עַל דְּבַר יְהוָה הַנִּצְרָה** and 14.1 with **עַל דְּבַר יְהוָה הַנִּצְרָה**. Consequently, I would argue that the reason for the collection's present place in the book of Jeremiah and the issue of what is inside the collection are separate.

Why is there no explicit reference to Zedekiah here? One answer might be that the collection was made before the time of Zedekiah. Two items count against this suggestion: the prose in the collection most likely post-dates the exile, and the exile itself is presupposed in the poetic sections. It might also be argued that there was no material about Zedekiah available for inclusion, but the presence of Jer 21.1-10 and 34.1-7 belies this. Third, material about Zedekiah could have fallen out. There is, however, no evidence textually or otherwise for this view.

A fourth possibility is that there is mention of Zedekiah, but we do not immediately recognize it. I make this suggestion following the insights of many others. It is based upon the wordplay in Jer 23.6; there is an obvious similarity between יהוה צדקו and צדקיהו. Klausner expresses this thesis well:

This compound name will not seem so strange if we take into consideration that it actually has the same meaning as Zedekiah (the name of the last king of Judah). "Jozedek" (or "Jehozedek") of the Septuagint, "the Lord is our righteousness" of the Hebrew text, and the name "Zedekiah" are basically one name.... On the basis of all this, it appears to me that in this verse (Jer 23.6) Zedekiah himself is indicated, he and no other.<sup>15</sup>

Yet how could this Zedekiah, who scurries to secret meetings to confront Jeremiah, be the Davidic branch? For this query, there is no easy answer.

Nicholson, and many others, argue that this could only have been written after Jehoiachin's release from prison, since Davidic hopes only came at this late date.<sup>16</sup> Nicholson asserts

that  $\rho\tau\varsigma$  terminology is part of kingship ideology and, therefore, is not to be taken as a wordplay on Zedekiah or as evidence that the oracle comes from Jeremiah himself. He further argues that the oracle is inconsistent with the condemnation to extinction leveled against Jehoiachin. He then asserts that the Jehoiachin oracle (Jer 23.28-30) is an earlier stage of the tradition, not after 521--the date for the reappearance of hopes concentrated around Jehoiachin. The Jehoiachin oracle is, he claims, part of an early Jeremianic tradition which counters any type of tradition about a continuing Davidic lineage. However, a careful reading of the oracle against Jehoiachin suggests that none of Jehoiachin's sons will succeed him. This hardly excludes the progeny of Zedekiah. To extrapolate from the oracle against Jehoiachin a general condemnation of the Davidic house is unjustified. Consequently, the force of Nicholson's objections are diminished and the wordplay remains an important consideration.

Further, it is important to remember that Jer 23.5-6 is a poetic-like piece which has its prose counterpart in 33.14-16. The earlier, poetic oracle is more concerned with the royal individual than the later, prosaic revision.

Sekine has defended the thesis that after the time of Jehoiakim, the Davidic covenant as promise received virtually no attention in Jeremiah, while there was renewed interest in the Sinai covenant. Sekine's claims are relevant to our argumentation in several ways.

(1) He asserts that Jer 22.29 is addressed against the entire Davidic line and not just against the offspring of Jehoiachin. No argument is proffered in favor of this suggestion.<sup>17</sup> (2) He also claims that no statements about the Davidic throne occur in the time of Zedekiah. It is difficult to assess this proposition since, in reading the book of Jeremiah, he makes no distinctions between the prose and poetic sections. Further, the nature of statements like Jer 13.13 are difficult to assign to any specific monarch--this oracle could have been spoken in the time of Jehoiakim or Zedekiah, or it could be the exegetical work of the redactor. (3) He contends that Jer 23.5-6 is earlier than the time of Zedekiah, most probably before the incident recorded in Jer 36, i.e. early in the reign of Jehoiakim. His reason is the lack of interest in the Davidic covenant in later Jeremianic prophecies. This a priori argument seems hard to support in light of our analysis. Further, discounting the wordplay in Jer 23.6 simply because the root  $\text{p}^{\text{t}}\text{s}$  is used in v.5 and is thereby a sort of explication, seems highly dubious. Therefore, I seriously question Sekine's general thesis that the Davidic line received little of Jeremiah's attention after the time of Jehoiakim and his interpretation of Jer 23.5-6.

A third way of vitiating the wordplay has been suggested by Rudolph. He theorizes that the referent might be Ishmael "of the royal house" (Jer 41.1). Though this prince rids himself and the community of Gedaliah, we are

never told that he attempts to rule or has such pretensions. He is apparently a fervent nationalist with few cohorts. More than that, we can not say.

Having seen that objections against the identification of Jer 23.6 with Zedekiah are not particularly weighty, I would add that certain epigraphic evidence supports the wordplay argument. The Lapethos inscription (c. 275 B.C.) contains the same construction which we find in Jer 23.6:

על חיי ועל חי זרעי ים מן ים לזמח צדק.<sup>19</sup> Sacrifices

offered to Melqart are "for my life and the life of my offspring, day after day (forever?), and the legitimate scion...." Donner and Röllig note that this phrase has to do with the legitimate royal line.<sup>20</sup>

The analysis of Swetnam corroborates Donner and Röllig's suggestion. He has shown that the heir of Ptolemy II, Philadelphus, was the youngest son of Ptolemy I and that his right of succession had been in dispute.<sup>21</sup> Basing his argument on much supporting North West Semitic evidence, Swetnam summarizes the relevance of the Lapethos inscription to the Jeremiah passage:

What has been indicated is that the historical background of Jer 23.5 with its smh sdya is the same as the Larnax Lapethos 2, with its smh sdq in that both involve questions of legitimate succession. In light of other evidence for the meaning of sdq as legitimate this is a coincidence with which exegetes must reckon.<sup>22</sup>

This sense of צדק as designating legitimate royal lineage is also very important in the Jeremianic text, since we are dealing with a period in which Israel had two kings.

The wordplay upon the name of Zedekiah thus incorporates the whole issue of legitimacy.

The epigraphic evidence is impressive testimony for relating the oracle not only to the time of Zedekiah, but to Zedekiah himself. We can go even further and attempt to provide the context of its origin. One could propose that we understand this phrase as a part of Zedekiah's enthronement, perhaps as a part of his reception of the new regnal name-- from Mattaniah to Zedekiah.<sup>23</sup> That Nebuchadrezzar provided the new regnal names seems unlikely (cf. 2 Kgs 34.17). Nor can I accept Malamat's hypothesis that Zedekiah changed his name on the basis of this oracle which had been spoken in the immediate past.<sup>24</sup> If Jer 23.5-6 is not a late, non-Jeremianic tradition, how is it possible to read it as part of the Jeremianic oracular material, and in what period would it have been presented?

The reason that I would relate this oracle to the figure of Zedekiah is two-fold. The absence of Zedekiah from this royal collection would be hard to explain; Jehoahaz, Jehoiakim, and Jehoiachin all appear in the chronological order in which they reigned. Hence, we should expect some mention of Zedekiah; and we see that mention in the wordplay of 23.6.

What we must now do is be more precise about the exile and this oracle. We know that there were two exiles; one following the initial defeat in 598 and another with the fall of Jerusalem in 587. After the initial defeat,

Jehoiachin was exiled and Zedekiah ruled in his place. I would argue that it is in the decade after the first defeat that the oracle was given. Whether the oracle actually pins Davidic hopes on Zedekiah or on his progeny is uncertain. What it does do is assert Jeremiah's position that the Davidic line is to be carried on through Zedekiah and not through Jehoiachin (see Jer 22.30 and below). The reasons for this allegiance to Zedekiah will become clear later in the chapter.

In sum, what may we conclude about Jeremiah on kingship in Israel? He used a particular image in speaking about royal persons and their responsibility: the shepherd-flock metaphor. The phrase, 'Davidic throne,' was often used in indictments of the royal house. Though often criticising individual monarchs, he always held a place for the Davidic figure in the governmental economy, a polity in which both Yahweh and the Davidic figure ruled. Jeremiah apparently was closely associated with Zedekiah, more so than with the other four kings during whose reigns he prophesied. Jeremiah's relationship to Zedekiah depicts a working-out of the political-religious model of classical Israelite prophecy. And Jeremiah saw the future hope for Israelite rule tied to the figure of Zedekiah--he not only receives a decent burial; but figures as a capstone in the structure of the royal oracle collection. It is to this royal line of Zedekiah which Jeremiah looked for Judah's future.

## EZEKIEL AND MONARCHY

A discussion of the relationship between monarchy and prophecy in the book of Ezekiel might initially appear to be a strange or even impossible enterprise. Ezekiel was in Babylon when his prophetic ministry began, after the exile of Jehoiachin;<sup>25</sup> and his ministry continued after the final defeat of Judah. In what sense then can we talk about attitudes toward and relationships with Judahite kings and the monarchy?<sup>26</sup>

Since I am interested in understanding the views of Ezekiel in so far as that is possible, I have eliminated the section, chapters 40-48, from full consideration despite the fact that the prince is a prominent figure in these traditions. The word,  $\tau\lambda\alpha$ , appears only in Ezek 43.7-9. Whether this is an argument against the temple as royal chapel or an attempt to sever the divine rule from its human counterpart is unsure. Proksch argues that the presence of  $\tau\lambda\alpha$  in these verses and their absence in the remainder of Ezek 40-48 is evidence of an insertion by a later commentator. Ezek 43.7b $\beta$ , 8b, and 9 would be additions according to this view.<sup>27</sup> Gese thinks this conclusion is unnecessary, since the text both explains the removal of Yahweh's holiness and provides a requisite for the construction of the new temple--the removal of the royal



monuments and tombs from the temple area.<sup>28</sup> In either case, Ezek 43.7-9 is a post-Ezekielian development.<sup>29</sup>

## I

One of the most potentially misleading ways to discuss Ezekiel and the monarchy has been to expound upon the usage of the terms  $\chi\dot{\iota}\dot{\omega}\dot{\nu}$  and  $\tau\lambda\mu$ . The book of Ezekiel, as is well known, describes royal figures as "prince." Some critics have contended that the original levels of Ezekielian tradition used  $\chi\dot{\iota}\dot{\omega}\dot{\nu}$  to describe monarchs, whereas  $\tau\lambda\mu$  was a more universal royal appellation.<sup>30</sup> To explain the contradictions to this theory, these critics have argued that in later redaction,  $\tau\lambda\mu$  was inserted in places where originally only  $\chi\dot{\iota}\dot{\omega}\dot{\nu}$  would have stood.

Hammershaimb argues that in the present redacted product there is no basic difference in the use of these terms (with the obvious exception of 40-48 in which Proksch and Gese have shown  $\chi\dot{\iota}\dot{\omega}\dot{\nu}$  to be some sort of cultic official not to be confused with the royal figure in Ezek 1-39). If anything, Hammershaimb thinks that  $\tau\lambda\mu$  was the more original of the two terms, being superseded by  $\chi\dot{\iota}\dot{\omega}\dot{\nu}$ , perhaps on the basis of its later importance in 40-48:

This theory can be supported by the fact that the tendency which it is held possible to observe in MT continues in LXX. In 7.27, where MT has both  $\tau\lambda\mu$  and  $\chi\dot{\iota}\dot{\omega}\dot{\nu}$ , LXX omits  $\tau\lambda\mu$  and retains only  $\chi\dot{\iota}\dot{\omega}\dot{\nu}$  (translated βασιλευς). In 28.12, again LXX does not use βασιλευς of the King of Tyre, but the word  $\chi\dot{\iota}\dot{\omega}\dot{\nu}$ . In the description of the future in 37.22, where MT twice uses the word  $\tau\lambda\mu$  (the king over both Israel and Judah)

LXX renders the first by <sup>v</sup>αρχων and omits the second. David also, who in 37.24 is described as  $\tau\lambda\alpha$  in MT, is in LXX termed <sup>v</sup>αρχων, et passim.<sup>31</sup>

This versional evidence is interesting and perhaps an indication of a redactional tendency. I am more impressed by passages like 37.24 and v.25 where the terms are obviously to be equated: v.24, "My servant, David, shall be king over them;" v.25, "David, my servant, shall be prince over them."

On closer examination, however, a basic distinction may be observed in the terminological usage. "King" usually refers to the major rulers, foreign or Davidic, whereas "prince" is reserved for minor figures, Israelite or Edomites (Ezek 32.29). As Zimmerli states: "In the book of Ezekiel, the title  $\chi\acute{\omicron}\nu\iota$  is used of lesser kings, the  $\tau\lambda\alpha$  title is mostly (not exclusively, vgl. perhaps 17.12) reserved for the great kings in Mesopotamia and Egypt."<sup>32</sup> This distinction holds at least three-quarters of the time. There are important exceptions other than those Zimmerli mentions-- Ezek 30.13; 27.12; 37.24--but the basic distinction remains impressive.

We might leave the matter by saying the force of this distinction seems to be that Ezekiel was perceptive in his evaluation of the relative importance of foreign powers in the Ancient Near East just as he was strikingly insightful in describing Israel's cultural heritage (so also Ezek 16.45). However, this distinction is not absolute; it has been smoothed over in redaction and has lost its force in Ezek 40-48.

The foregoing is a legitimate statement about Ezekiel and the monarchy; but it is incomplete--for two reasons. First, whether Noth or Fohrer is correct about origins, the use of  $\chi\acute{\omega}\iota$  is further evidence of the use of archaic language by Ezekiel, a calling upon Israel's ancient language and traditions.<sup>33</sup> Second, and extremely important for this dissertation, Ezekiel has used this terminology in a way which indicates his evaluation of Zedekiah and Jehoiachin. Twice he calls Jehoiachin "king"--a most unusual break with the apparent pattern of usage. Jehoiachin was hardly a major king. He was an exilarch in Babylon. Eichrodt has also caught this peculiar usage and interpreted it well:

In Ezekiel the title of king in the full sense is reserved for the great king, and all lesser rulers have to be satisfied with being entitled princes (Jehoiachin receives exceptional treatment in two passages: 1.2 and 17.12, evidently in order to assert the legitimacy of his claim).<sup>34</sup>

## II

In proceeding further, I propose to survey two areas: (1) Ezekiel's use of the terms the "prince" (12.1-16; 21.23-32) and the "princes of Israel" (19.1-14; 21.17; 22.6), and (2) two metaphorical texts--the shepherd chapter (Ezek 34) and the allegory of the two sticks (37.15-28).<sup>35</sup>

The phrase "princes of Israel" is used in Ezek 19.1; 21.17; and 22.6. The first case refers to the king for whom the ensuing lament is composed: consequently, since Ezek 19.9 is apparently an allusion to Zedekiah's captivity,

we may assume the referent of 19.1 to be Zedekiah. Ezek 21.17, however, allows no generalization. Likewise, the figures in Ezek 22.6 are undefined kings or perhaps kings in general. The use of the term "prince" in 21.30 is within an essay or collection on the word; the historical context indicates that this imprecation is directed against the figure of Zedekiah.<sup>36</sup>

For a more detailed study of prince terminology, then, we turn to Ezek 12.1-16, a symbolic action concerning the baggage of exile, apparently also addressed against Zedekiah. Most modern critics have suggested that those verses which refer to the prince are part of a later redaction.<sup>37</sup> Consequently, one can not simply say, as we could with Ezek 21.23-32, that this is corroborating evidence that Ezekiel had a basically negative evaluation of Zedekiah.

Zimmerli has argued quite effectively that one of the reinterpretations (Nachinterpretation) is to be found in Ezek 12.6,7,10,12-15 (v.16 is yet a third layer of the text). בעל טה הוציא in both vv.6 and 7 appears to have been inserted on the basis of the description in v.12, the more so since the symbolic action was to have been carried out in public view during the daytime.<sup>38</sup>

Granting Zimmerli the validity of his identification of this later redaction, what may we say about the reason for this work? Why did someone insert or create this reflection? What does it tell us about Ezekiel or those loyal to his traditions? How may we interpret this text in our study of Ezekiel's view of Jehoiachin and Zedekiah?

The first ploy is to ask about chronology. The original symbolic act would have been relevant to the situation prior to 587. It was addressed to those who remained after the first deportation assuring them that there was to be no escape from exile. Those who had not been taken away in 598 would be removed in the future.

However, the reinterpretation carries the marks of vaticinium ex eventu, the reference to a king, who, having gone out in a breach in the wall at night, was blinded, and died in exile in Babylon. That is to say, we can comfortably assume that the reinterpretation was made after Zedekiah had been taken to Babylon and had perished there. When he died, we do not know. That he died in prison, we are told in the Jeremianic conclusion, Jer 52.11. That he remained a prisoner for a long while seems unlikely, especially since Jehoiachin was recognized as king of Judah in Babylon.

Who then bears responsibility for this interpretation? I will argue that we should look to Ezekiel himself or a circle very close to him.<sup>39</sup> A retrospective critique of Zedekiah would be consistent with the critical view of that figure which we have earlier noted in Ezekiel--both with respect to the  $\chi\acute{\omega}\eta$  terminology and the "sword essay" (Ezek 21). Such a reinterpretation is simply a continuation of the Ezekielian view of kingship with regard to Jehoiachin and Zedekiah.

However, a more forceful argument can be made on form critical grounds. For the reinterpretation that we

have here is not just a few verses, lines penned in by a later editor. It has an integrity of its own, while at the same time being dependent on the earlier symbolic action. The reinterpretation is made in the pattern of an Erweiswort structure, though not in its simplest form.<sup>40</sup> It is of the two-part variety: Gerichtswort or predication and Erkenntnisformel (v.15). But it is at the same time an explanation of the symbolic action, a Fortschreibung. V.10 comprises the new exegetical claim--that the symbolic action is really about Zedekiah. Likewise it is couched in the messenger formula for authority and continues in the first person oracle in v.13.<sup>41</sup> Therefore we may suggest that Ezekiel, or someone who can be identified as having a consistent Ezekielian persuasion, was responsible for this statement about Zedekiah.

To this point the book of Ezekiel has given us a rather consistent picture of kingship. The lexical usage of  $\alpha\gamma\omega\eta$  and  $\tau\lambda\alpha$  as well as the oracular material dealing with princes paints an unfavorable picture of Zedekiah while being less harsh with Jehoiachin. Whether all this material can be attributed to the person of Ezekiel is unsure. What is impressive, though, is the consistency in attitude and formal characteristics between the so-called original sayings or writings and the reinterpretations.

### III

Two final texts which give a more general view of the monarchy are the shepherd collection (Ezek 34) and the

two-stick allegory (Ezek 37.15-28). We advance here from texts written c. 587 to writings more concerned with restoration after the final defeat of Israel. With a view towards a renewed Israel, there is less interest in polemicising against various kings. In both texts the image of the shepherd is used to describe the future beneficent rule of a Davidic figure. In both texts, the promises of a Davidic ruler and ensuing benefits are preceded by figurative sections, the allegories. Consequently, a rather consistent picture of the expected ruler appears.

The most impressive characteristic of Ezek 34 is the apparent homogeneity of the chapter. It is a panoply of shepherd and flock language. In only one other verse (Ezek 37.24), does Ezekiel use the word "shepherd." Thus, it is surprising, and significant to find such a lengthy, even baroque, expansion on this term. Evaluating the chapter as expansion reveals my hand, for I can see no other reason for this concentration of shepherd sayings than to understand it to be a deliberate collecting of oracles and writings about the shepherd and his flock.

The question most important to this investigation is: how does the reference to the Davidic figure, vv.23-24, fit into this collection? To give an answer requires an examination of the chapter's construction.

Attention to form critical data reveals a surfeit of material. As Zimmerli observes, there are introductory formulae (vv.2,10,11,17,20), concluding formulae (vv.8,15,30,31),

attention formulae (vv.7,9), a finalizing formula (v.24), Erkenntnis formulae (vv.27,30), as well as others like the "swear" formula (v.8) and the "challenge" formula (v.10).<sup>42</sup> This might lead one to search for now submerged earlier oral units.<sup>43</sup> I am not sure that it is legitimate to do so, nor am I overly impressed by Zimmerli's form critical conclusions that vv.1-6,9-15, and .17-22 comprise two units consisting of Scheltwort, Gerichtswort, and Heilswort, while vv.25-30 is a two level Erweiswort. Of course, these descriptions summarize the content, but I am not sure they do anything more than provide a sophisticated outline of the material.

A careful reading of the first six verses reinforces the initial impression of basic literary activity. The woe oracle in vv.2-4 is directed against the shepherds. V.2 is an expansive use of the  $\eta\gamma$  theme; it occurs five times in this one verse. V.3 serves as the initial indictment of the shepherds' misuse of the flock. The shepherds reap the benefits from the flock (eating from the flock and clothing oneself in wool are legitimate prerogatives of a shepherd); but they have not fulfilled their obligations of feeding the flock.<sup>44</sup> V.4 describes, in carefully cadenced fashion, an explication of this lack of care; the sins of omission are catalogued. Since all of this woe oracle is phrased in second person form, it seems likely that we could best understand it as having been addressed to some royal figure prior to the exile.



The historical retrospect in vv.5-6 speaks of the exile using the root  $\gamma\text{ש}$ . The charge is now "no shepherd." This could be explained as a logical conclusion of the shepherd's shirking his duty. However, vv.2-4 emphasize the presence of the shepherd--his use of the flock. The argument seems to have shifted from a critique against shepherds to providing an explanation of the exile: there was no shepherd.

Moving to vv.7-10, we find two sections introduced by the messenger formula (v.7 and v.9) and in the third person. V.8 begins the first section with the "swear" formula which has no self-evident function as it had in former times with covenant oaths. V.8 also summarizes vv.2-6 in reverse order--no shepherds causing the scattering of the flock and shepherds not feeding their flocks. V.10 is the word of judgement, still in the third person--the shepherds can no more derive benefit from the flock. The content of the judgement section (v.10) is a direct response only to the indictment of vv.2-3, but not to that of either v.4 or vv.5-6. One wonders then, if verses v.2-3 and 10 comprised an original pre-exilic oracle against the kings or royalty which has been expanded on the basis of the exilic experience.

Since, as we have already noted, shepherd imagery is particularly prominent in the book of Jeremiah, and since Jer 23.1ff contains similar thoughts and language to Ezek 34, some have proposed a direct connection between the two books.<sup>45</sup>

However, agreeing that there is a striking similarity of language (  $\text{וַיִּבְרַחְוּ, וַיִּפְּצוּ, וַיִּשְׁבְּרוּ}$  ) and of formulae (the initial woe) there is a basic distinction. The Ezekielian indictment (vv.2-4) is probably a pre-exilic threat to royalty while the Jeremianic prose is an exilic reflection. The indictment in Jer 23 is based upon the shepherds having caused the sheep to scatter while Ezek 34.2-4 does not presuppose the actual scattering.

Aside from this difference in original historical perspective, there is a forceful argument to be made for a structural connection of Ezek 34.1-15 and Jer 23.1-4: they both share a tripartite pattern of woe indictment, judgement, and word of salvation. In Jeremiah, the indictment is in the third person, while in Ezekiel, it is in the second person. The judgement is the reverse: second person in Jeremiah while third person in Ezekiel. It seems hard to deny the formal relationship between the two passages, though I am still impressed by the apparent pre-exilic unit in the Ezekiel passage, which does not appear in Jeremiah.

Vv.11-15 provide little evidence of a layering of tradition.<sup>46</sup> Yahweh says he will gather the scattered sheep, will bring them to Israel, and will be their shepherd. What is significant is that in the Jeremianic passage, Yahweh does indeed gather the flock and bring them back to the land. But he establishes shepherds for them. The Jeremianic salvation oracle says nothing of Yahweh as the new shepherd.

The salvation depicted in Ezekiel 34.11-15 has therefore achieved a more cosmic character than that in Jeremiah. We can see this even in the way the fall of Jerusalem is described in v.12-- **בְּיוֹם עֲרֹפֶל**. This is no ordinary description of defeat, but is colored with the imagery of the **יוֹם יְהוָה**. For Ezekiel, the catastrophe demands a restoration of a sort which only Yahweh can create.

Some commentators have read the Ezekiel passage as an anti-monarchic revision of the Jeremianic text, since Yahweh himself has become Israel's shepherd. I doubt that this is the point of the text. Rather, Ezekiel seems driven by his own logic to affirm both the mighty sin, the terrible punishment, and now the magnificent restoration which only Yahweh himself can provide. That there is provision for the Davidic figure, we see in the next section.

Apparently, the shepherd image provided so fertile a context for reflection that the writer felt obliged to continue it, concentrating now on the flock. But that is to beg the question, for the issue being continued is not at all transparent, though it has been for most critics. At the beginning of the next section, there are two parallel judgement oracles: **הֲנִי אֲנִי וְשֹׁפְטֵי** (vv.18-19) parallel to **הֲנִי אֲנִי וְשֹׁפְטֵי** (vv.20-22). Most critics have seen these as words of judgement addressed to the community.<sup>47</sup> Not only the king but ordinary folk share responsibility for Israel's sin. However, in the exilic period, or, more specifically, the period between 598-587, there was no one community to which these

remarks could have been directed. It could have been the group in Babylon before 587, the group in Babylon after 587, or the group in Judah before or after 587. Beyond the simple problem of identifying this flock of Yahweh, the nature of the full indictment is unclear. The questions (vv.18-19) twice present the same ecological complaint: eating more of the pasture than is allowed and dirtying the water. This is, of course, action appropriate to the sheep (not the shepherds, as is the case in the other indictment in v.21--manhandling the sheep). The nature of the indictment rises above an intra-flock dispute in v.19, "and must my flock eat what you have trod and fouled." Some sort of distinction seems to have been made between the flock and the person being indicted, as in v.21--"till you have scattered them abroad." There is a difference between the "you" and the "them."

This indictment fits the sins of the shepherd or royal figure, already described, and not the sins of the flock. He is the one who is responsible for the scattering, as in vv.5-6. Consequently, I find a certain unrefined quality about the imagery in this flock discussion. It almost seems as if the raw material of vv.18-19 had been taken and appropriated into a shepherd-flock schema—a schema intent on a working out of the  $\eta\gamma\gamma$  imagery. In vv.17-22 the writer was unable to create as consistent a figurative picture as he had in vv.1-15.

This inability to work out the imagery is also reflected when we look at the formal categories. Zimmerli says we

have, as in vv.1-15, Scheltwort, Gerichtswort, and Heilswort. It is, I think, difficult to show the progression from Schelt- to Gerichtswort. The material in the two units-- vv.17-19 and vv.20-22--is virtually identical. In both, an indictment is present; and in both, the judgement וַיִּשְׁפֹּט occurs. Further, if one wants to insist on the presence of a salvation portion to the unit, vv.23-24 become important. Their position follows the summary clauses which Zimmerli gives the dignity of Heilswort. And yet here too, there is something curious. Neither indictments nor punishments have explicitly referred to the lack of feeding or the lack of a shepherd. But just such a solution is provided-- a shepherd, David, to feed them. This is corroborating evidence that the imagery is at best mixed, with the basic motif still that of the inadequate shepherd.

Ezek 34.23-24 are not without their own problems. A common opinion is that they are insertions into the text by a redactor. Perhaps the clearest indication that all is not well is the flexibility in the use of suffixes; both masculine and feminine suffixes are haphazardly inter-mixed (masculine suffixes are used in vv.17ff even though יָשׁוּב is feminine).<sup>48</sup> Zimmerli concludes that v.23 is directly related to the preceding verses, whereas v.24 was added later, the miscellaneous suffixes of which contaminated v.23. This explanation would be fine if we had feminine suffixes in vv.17-22, but we do not. Perhaps an early author

harmonized v.23 with the gender of  $\text{רָעָה}$ . There is no easy explanation.<sup>49</sup>

How then to evaluate the relationship of Ezek 34.23-24 to vv.17-22? Zimmerli concludes that they were originally separate: vv.17-22 treat the flock with a Stichwort connection,  $\text{רָעָה}$ ; whereas vv.23-24 center on the shepherd. However, as we have seen, the imagery isn't all that uniform. And as Zimmerli himself notes, the formal characteristics suggest a structural connection.<sup>50</sup>

Ezekiel 34.25-31 continues the words of weal, though these verses would fit best after v.15 in a development of the restoration under Yahweh. With the exception of the apparent summary in v.31, the imagery of shepherd and flock does not appear. The section is, most probably, an expansion based on Lev 26.3. The formulae of the Ezekielian tradition (vv.27,30) are present, but the promises seem lost in this detailed working out of the shepherd and flock imagery.

In answer to the questions of how the Davidic figure fits into this collection and what view of the monarchy is provided, the following may be said. The shepherd imagery is inherently one of royalty. The Ezekielian writer took this theme and worked out an indictment of Israelite kings and showed that their sin resulted in the exile. At the same time he depicted Yahweh as shepherd. There was no inconsistency, since both human and divine shepherd participated in the same rule. The naming of the future human shepherd as Davidic was natural, an inherent part of the shepherd imagery, as we

have also seen in the Jeremianic passages. To speak of shepherds was to speak of the Davidic line, but to speak of the error of shepherds was not to speak of the end of the Davidic lineage.

#### IV

A final Ezekielian passage important to this discussion of monarchy is Ezek 37.15-28, a chapter not unrelated to Ezek 34. The perspective has, however, changed now that the exile is presupposed. The goal is a gathering and reinstatement of the people in their land. The implied indictment is not against the king, but against prior general apostasy (v.23). The presence of a new Davidide, a new shepherd, will--with the presence of the sanctuary (a guarantee of Yahweh's presence)--provide a new life. Formulae as well as the central symbolic action reveal the Ezekielian stamp: messenger formula (vv.19,21), Erkenntnis formula (v.27). Again our central question is, how do these verses inform us about Ezekiel's view of the monarchy?

The first verses, through v.23, are an apparently clear and uninterrupted recitation of a symbolic action and its explanation. The tale has to do with the reunification of Judah and Israel. This datum is in itself important. The restoration comes not tabula rasa, but out of the earlier political units; there is continuity. The political organization for the new life is, as it was for Israel, of an earlier time.

But how are we to interpret these sticks and the script thereon? V.16 reads "Son of man take one stick and write upon it 'for Judah and for the sons of Israel his companion' and take another (reading  $\aleph\aleph$  with LXX, S, V) and write upon it 'for Joseph, this is the stick for Ephraim, and all of the house of Israel, his companion.'" There are two sticks representing Judah and Israel. And yet Ezekiel uses the same terms to identify the  $\aleph\aleph$ , companions: sons of or house of Israel. Is he suggesting that the political designations are subdivisions of the people of Israel as a whole? For some reason this pattern is broken in v.19 which refers to "the stick of Joseph (which is in the hand of Ephraim) and the tribes of Israel associated with him; and I will give them over to the stick of Judah; and I will make them one stick that they may be one in my hand" (LXX: and they will be one stick in the hand of Judah). Only the Northern Kingdom is described as the tribes of Israel. Is this implicit in a description of Judah? Further, we are not presented with an equal combination of the two sticks, but with a giving over to Judah, an emphasis understood and further emphasized in LXX. If these sticks are understood as royal scepters as seems likely, the giving over of one into the hand of another is indicative of a virtual vassal status for the Northern Kingdom.<sup>51</sup>

I would consequently hypothesize that Ezek 37.19 indicates the original meaning of this symbolic act, that Israel is to be subsumed into Judah. A further suggestion



would be to preserve the reading **חברו** and understand these to be the royal companions of the political entities, i.e. the kings. The Qere readings in vv. 16 and 19, **חבריו**, do not make much sense. As for the use of "Israel" in both cases, this probably signifies the real Israel since Ezekiel usually uses "Israel" to describe the people of God as a totality.<sup>52, 53</sup>

In all probability, this prediction of a future unification of the two kingdoms was, for those who heard it, hopeful and yet somehow unclear. A unification of those who had been exiled, either from Israel or Judah, a unification which gave precedence to Judah, might be expected. But this unification with Judah having priority was empty. There was no talk of restoration to the land, just of unification of two now extinct kingdoms. How was Judah to have priority?

To answer this question, the author appended the second explanation of the symbolic action which gives a threefold answer: they will be taken back, given one king, and the covenant will be renewed.<sup>54</sup> Emphasis is, as to be expected in a Yahweh speech, on Yahweh's initiative and action--'I will take, gather, bring, make, save, cleanse, and be their God.' One temporal manifestation of this divine initiative is the renewal of the monarchy over a single nation.

The location of Ezek 37.24a has occasioned some controversy. Zimmerli has argued that the verse belongs

with vv.20-23 since the word  $\tau\lambda\mu$  is a return to the usage in v.22.<sup>55</sup> Further he thinks that the picture of  $\kappa\iota\psi\ ]$  as a coming Israelite monarch is consistent such that we should exclude a verse which uses the word  $\tau\lambda\mu$ . However, the covenant formula is almost always indicative of the end of a section, v.23. V.24a does not fit into the Yahweh speech of first person address as well as it does in vv.24-28. Likewise the usage of  $\kappa\iota\psi\ ]$ , as we saw earlier, is not all that consistent. Consequently, it makes sense to keep v.24 together and separate the preceding verses.

Almost in footnote fashion, the chapter continues in a further explanation of the symbolic action. The topics of Ezek 37.24-28 are Davidic kingship and temple. The theme, as indicated by the Stichwort  $\mu\epsilon\lambda\epsilon$  (vv.25,26,27,28), is eternality. Just as vv.21ff spoke of restoration to the land, vv.24-28 add the stamp of permanence to this renewed life. They also provide two foci around which that life is to be organized: government and religion.

This unit is a reprise of Ezekielian statements about David. He is shepherd--alluding to the working out of that theme in chapter 34. He is  $\iota\pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\upsilon$ , prince, and king. And just as in chapter 34 an extended statement about the benefits of the peace covenant followed the Davidic collection, so in Ezek 37.26, a covenant of peace again appears, this time expressed in the establishment of the sanctuary in the land.

The picture we receive after studying Ezek 37 is a symbolic action depicting the unification of the original kingdoms under the aegis of Judah. This has been reinterpreted twice: first to emphasize that this is not a unification in abstraction but a restoration, and second to assert that a new David and a new temple will remain forever.

Summary statements of the following sort may be made about Ezekiel and his views of monarchy. (1) The primary strata of the book yield a distinction in usage between **מֶלֶךְ** and **שֹׁרֵט**, a distinction which Ezekiel used to give status to Jehoiachin who was twice called "king." (2) Likewise there are indications that Ezekiel's attitude toward Zedekiah was not one of approbation (Ezek 19.19; 21.30). (3) The metaphorical texts, Ezek 34 and 37, show that the Davidic monarchy was an inherent part of the coming restoration to the land. The references to the monarchy, though implicit in the symbolic actions, are made specific by use of Davidic terminology in the reinterpretations. These are products of exegetical or reflective activity consistent in viewpoint with the primary material.

## TWO PROPHETS AND TWO ROYAL COMMUNITIES

On the basis of what has been garnered from the separate investigations of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, I propose to take the investigation a step further. Both prophets affirm the continuation of the Davidic line. However, there is a significant difference in their evaluation of specific monarchs. Jeremiah seems to favor Zedekiah while Ezekiel supports Jehoiachin. To put this contrast in perspective, I will now examine two Ezekielian texts, their historical background, and their ramifications. Ezek 11.15 and 33.24 purport to identify a controversy between the exilic group and the community still in the land.<sup>56</sup>

## I

First we take a close look at the way in which these two verses are integrated into the literary structure of Ezekiel. Both appear within rather lengthy units. Ezek 11.15 occurs in the context of an oracle of restoration (11.14-21) and 33.24 occurs in one of the Erweiswort forms so common to Ezekiel (33.23-33). These oracles are the largest units we can identify. Both of these larger units contain verses which report a claim on the land by those still in the land, and each of these verses is part of a somewhat larger section-- a quotation argument. But are we justified in isolating these quotation arguments? Do they have their own integrity

beyond the larger contexts which we have already identified? The following observations may help answer this question.

Two sections of the large units--11.14-16 and 33.23-26-- have the following features in common: (1) an introductory formula, (2) the words "son of man," (3) an identification of the party which asserts the argument, (4) a quotation giving the argument for the right to possession of the land made by those still in the land, (5) a messenger formula introducing the refutation, and (6) a refutation of the land claim. Once we move beyond these units of six elements, the controlling features of the larger forms--restoration and Erweiswort--are evident. In Ezek 11.17, the oracle turns to hopes of restoration, while in 33.27 development of the Erweiswort is continued by an introduction of the oath-formula.

Another factor which allows us to distinguish these smaller units is the change in person addressed. In 11.17, another messenger formula introduces a statement of Yahweh to an audience addressed in the second person, whereas the unit which precedes it is written in the third person. Similarly, the unit--33.25-26--is written in the second person, whereas v.27 uses the third person.

Zimmerli suggests that in 33.23-33, we have a "three-part Erweiswort structure: .23-26, .27-29, .30-33."<sup>57</sup> He contends that vv.23-29 and vv.30-33 were originally separate units redactionally joined because they reflect a post-587 date. He further singles out vv.27-29 as the Gerichtswort aimed at those making the pious claim on the land. However,

he maintains that it is in vv.25-26 that Ezekiel presents the actual refutation of the legal claim made by those in the land. Zimmerli's analysis would thus seem to buttress our view that 33.23-26 have their own integrity within the larger Erweiswort form.

Zimmerli provides less comfort in our dealing with Ezek 11, since he views 11.14ff as having the renewal of the covenant as its basic theme.<sup>58</sup> If we proceed to isolate 11.14-16, these verses contain nothing of the covenant theme. However, I would appeal to a very interesting feature of both chapters 11 and 33 to justify the argument. Zimmerli himself has suggested that 33.23-26 can be isolated. Ezek 33.27 seems to build upon the earlier unit which offers a Gerichtswort based upon the refutation of the land claim. It is dependent on and yet not essential to the functioning of Ezek 33.23-26. I contend that the same model holds true for chapter 11. Ezek 11.14-16 comprise the disputation form. V.17 then builds upon the refutation to offer hopes of restoration. In this context, vv.17ff depend on v.16 to provide the theological vindication of the exilic community's worship and existence. My conclusion is that our two units have presented refutation to the land claim, which in turn provides a theological basis for judgment (chapter 33) and hope for restoration (chapter 11).

## II

The literal meaning of these verses is relatively clear.<sup>59</sup>

But if our contention is that they are part of an argument and its refutation, we now need to rehearse this controversy in its historical perspective. To add this, we need to sketch an historical picture of the period from which these units derive. We have two significant areas of information: several seal impressions and the Weidner tablets.

Albright published the seal of Eliakim in 1932. It was translated "To Eliakim, steward of Jokin." Albright took יֹכִיָן to be an hypocoristicon of יְיָיִן on the basis of a pre-exilic seal in which "Yauqim is an hypocoristicon of Yoyaqim pronounced Yauyaqim."<sup>60</sup> Albright further contended that יָעַר has Biblical (Ruth 2.15; 2 Sam 9.1ff) and Akkadian attestation for meaning "royal steward." The Akkadian phrase arad Sarri corresponds exactly in primary meaning to יָעַר הַמֶּלֶךְ as a royal officer.<sup>61</sup> We consequently assume that this Eliakim was an officer in Judah for Jehoiachin who was in exile. As Albright says:

Moreover, Joiachin, who pursued a more or less normal life in Babylonia, as we may infer from his large family, all, or most of whom were born there, naturally required an income, which doubtless came from his Palestine estates--after all the profits of the intermediaries had been deducted. We may be absolutely certain, a priori, that the Babylonians followed the same practice as the Romans, requiring the vassal princes and nobles who were compelled to live in Babylonia to provide for their own maintenance.<sup>62</sup>

Jehoiachin must have held land in Judah after his exile and must have been viewed as king by some in Judah during the period which these seals represent.

H.G. May concluded that the two other seals--Jaazaniah ("to Jaazaniah, Servant of the King") and Gedaliah

("To Gedaliah, who is over the House")--referred to similar instances of stewards for the exiled Jehoiachin. May argues that the Jaazaniah seal could refer only to Jehoiachin, since its archaeological context suggests a use during the Gedaliah regency, i.e. after the death of Zedekiah.<sup>63</sup> May contends that the Gedaliah seal is more problematic: it may represent a period when Zedekiah was still alive. However, the phrase "over the house" is so typical of a royal steward that May thinks Gedaliah can only here be a representative for Jehoiachin.<sup>64</sup>

Further corroboration of Jehoiachin's kingship after his deportation is provided by the Weidner tablets. E.F. Weidner published four neo-Babylonian tablets which contained references to oil delivered to prisoners or those dependent on royal disbursement.<sup>65</sup> Significant is the mention of Jehoiachin, King of Judah, and his five sons. Though both his name and "Judah" are spelled several different ways, we can be quite certain that the referents are the exile king of Judah and the land of Judah. Weidner contends these tablets show that Jehoiachin was considered by the Babylonians to be king and consequently had certain royal prerogatives.

However, one might suggest that all this evidence comes after the downfall of Jerusalem in 587, after the death of Zedekiah, and therefore reflects no conflict in the period between the first deportation and the final fall of Jerusalem. If this were true, the application of this evidence to Ezek.11 would not be relevant since Ezek 11.14-16 reflects a



pre-587 date. Thus, to show that this attitude toward Jehoiachin was present from the beginning of his exile, we must turn briefly to Jeremiah's letter to the exiles.

Albright interprets the evidence this way:

It was possible to demonstrate rather conclusively that Eliakim had been steward of the crown property of King Joiachin while the latter was a captive in Babylonia. During the years 598-587, Joiachin's uncle Zedekiah was in control, and since his nephew was still considered by many, perhaps most, of the people of Judah as the legitimate king who might return any day (Jer 18.1-4), Zedekiah would scarcely dare to appropriate his nephew's property.<sup>66</sup>

For over a decade, there were two kings of Judah: one residing in Judah and one in Babylon. Malamat further substantiates this thesis when he suggests a parallel instance of Babylonian policy:

We know besides of other similar circumstances in the time of Nebuchadnezzar of enthroning a vassal in place of an exiled king, who nevertheless continues to be the legal ruler. So when Tyre was captured in 574, a regent named Baal was appointed instead of the exiled Itobaal.<sup>67</sup>

### III

Now let us return to the passages with which we began. The assumed context of Ezek 11.14-16 is the period between 598 and 587. Ezekiel refers here to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, a phrase he uses only in a pre-587 setting. He is presenting, then, an argument claiming the right to possess the land. We have already shown that there was a period of conflicting reigns and can assume that this dual regency manifested itself in conflicting parties in Israel: some loyal to Zedekiah and some loyal to Jehoiachin.

Ezekiel quotes and then refutes an argument of a party in Jerusalem. Can we not assume that this quotation represents the sentiments of the adherents of Zedekiah or even Zedekiah himself? Contrary to Albright's assumption that Zedekiah would not have appropriated Jehoiachin's property, if Zedekiah had had no royal property, he would have had no means of supporting his regime. And we know, in retrospect, that Zedekiah intended to do more than simply tend Jehoiachin's royal estate.

Certainly such a claim on the land would have been near heresy to those in Babylon, especially to those who held the land dear and yet who felt that the exile was Yahweh's will for Israel, as Ezekiel did. Just exactly what the phrase  $\text{מֵעַל יְהוָה}$  means is not absolutely clear. But, in the context of Ezekiel's answer, its significance derives from the temple-piety of Israel. This, I think, is made clear in Ezek 11.16; Yahweh says, "I have been a sanctuary to them." Going far from the  $\text{שְׂדֵרָא}$  and going far from the Lord are coterminous; since the  $\text{שְׂדֵרָא}$  may be identified with God's person.<sup>68</sup> The  $\text{שְׂדֵרָא}$  was Yahweh's dwelling place (Exod 15.17; 25.8; Ezek 37.26-28). Any Israelite divorced from the temple was, in effect, divorced from Yahweh. The charge that the exiles had been dispossessed because they had gone far from the Lord must have seemed extremely cruel; though they had departed from the land, they had not gone willingly. It is at this point that Ezek 11.16 fits into the argument. For here the prophet establishes a defense

for the exilic community. They have not been far from the Lord because "I took them far away" (they did not do it themselves) and "I have been a sanctuary to them" (they have not been far from the Lord). Therefore, Ezek 11.14-16 seems to be a theological defense of the exilic community in a property dispute.

In dealing with Ezek 33.23-26, we must first resolve the question of dating. In its literary context, this controversy occurs after the fall of Jerusalem. This context seems doubly reasonable on the basis of the identification of the party making the charge, the inhabitants of the waste places in the land. This would certainly reflect the devastation in Judah during 587. However, there is one serious problem of consistency. The argument in Ezek 33.24b asserts, 'Abraham was one, but we are many; therefore the land should be ours.' Clearly, here is an appeal made to a large population group; larger than those in exile.

If we accept Albright's rough estimate that the population in Israel dropped from 250,000 to 20,000, then this argument does not seem very forceful.<sup>69</sup> Yet the claim must have borne some semblance to reality, because Ezekiel responds by condemning the population for their unrighteousness and not by denying the demographic count.<sup>70</sup>

Janssen has taken another tack by suggesting "the greater part of the population remained in the land."<sup>71</sup> He appeals for evidence to our passage in Ezek 33, Lamentations, and chapters 40 and 42 in Jeremiah. Even though Lamentations

presents a tale of woe, Janssen believes that it presupposes a substantial remnant in the land. While recognizing that this population bemoans its plight, Janssen says, we must interpret their words in light of the general principle, "men laments one dead person, but do not mention the many who remain alive."<sup>72</sup> Referring to Jer 40.7ff, he asserts that the population increased significantly after the exile as a result of "all the Jews who were in Moab and among the Ammonites and in Edom and in other lands" (Jer 40.11).<sup>73</sup>

Janssen also attempts to square Ezekiel's description of the inhabitants in waste places with living conditions of this period. He suggests the "living in pits" (1 Sam 13.6; 14.11; Judg 6.2; 1 Kgs 18.4) is probably meant in Ezek 33. This would corroborate what we know about the lack of urban occupation during this period and the return to a more primitive life-style. These conditions obtained at Tell en-Naşbeh (=Mizpah?) (Jer 40.8) which contained virtually no buildings from this period but which yielded ceramic and epigraphic evidence from an exilic-period occupation.<sup>74</sup>

Therefore, this group making a claim on the land seems to be a population like that described in Jer 40.7ff: living in primitive conditions (non-fortified cities), but of significant numbers buttressed by several immigrations, and of a mentality which would threaten the exilic community.

Ezekiel answers their claim by challenging the acceptability of those making the claim, thereby challenging the claim itself. Zimmerli's analysis of Ezekiel's answer

is most convincing. It is an argument on two levels: ritual and social.<sup>75</sup> Ezekiel accuses those in the land of breaking the blood ordinance (Lev 19.26). Furthermore, they shed blood and resort to the sword (Jer 41.2). With such violations of Israel's law, Ezekiel asks, 'How can you appeal to a tradition and covenant which you are continually disobeying?' The parallel verses, Ezek 33.25-26, with their concluding rhetorical questions, provide an exceedingly close knit and forceful refutation.

#### IV

Having laid out the arguments and having attempted to set out the historical context for these arguments, what can be said about the origin of the units with which we began? Do they represent historical arguments between the exilic community and the people in the land? I think we have established strong probability for an affirmative answer.

The changes brought to Israel by the exile cannot be overestimated. However, this study has seen one constant: Israel's desire for the land. The quoted arguments included in the book of Ezekiel derive from those still in the land both before and after 587. That people remained in the devastated land and that other Israelites immigrated to it are evidence for the position the land held in Israel's self-understanding. That these claims on the land angered those in exile and required an answer by the exiles' theologian further demonstrated the importance of the land to anyone who considered himself an Israelite.

Disputes over the land were nothing new in Israel's history, as witness Isa 5.8 and Micah 2.2.<sup>72</sup> There must have been a place of legal redress for such controversies. In the period of restoration after the exile, we find that the "officials and elders" had jurisdiction and authority over property and its distribution (Ezra 10.8). That the elders had had such jurisdiction earlier is most likely. Consequently, it is possible that the two units which we have isolated and examined represent a type of argument before the assembled elders. Such an hypothesis receives support from the prominence of this assembly in Ezekiel.

Perhaps our units represent actual land-claims discussed by the assembly in exile or are distillations of such debates. Or they may be (and probably function best as) arguments used by Ezekiel as formulary assurances to the exilic community. He assures them that they are participating in an exile declared necessary by Yahweh, and that, within the context of their own legal procedures, they (the exiles) do not give over their right to the land to those people who are not in exile. The exile is necessary for repossession of the land just as the first exodus and wandering in the wilderness preceded Israel's possession of Canaan. Ezekiel's position goes to the limits of consistency by affirming the justice and necessity of the exile, while, on the other hand, defending the rights of the exilic community to their land in Israel, albeit a uniquely restored Israel (Ezek 11.17ff). In the units themselves, Ezekiel never actually allocates the land to those in exile. Instead, he

is concerned with denying the right of those still in the land. In this sense, the units function more as a defense of the exile itself and less as a defense of the individuals in exile.

Two generalizations seem to grow out of and buttress this study. Jeremiah and Ezekiel are at odds on two levels. First, Jeremiah tends to support those who remain in the land as the remnant out of which Yahweh's plan will work (Jer 42.10).<sup>78</sup> Ezekiel defends the exile as necessary and just, while condemning those still in the land to the sword (Ezek 33.27). Second, Jeremiah tends to defend Zedekiah's right of kingship. Malamat's conclusions here seem strong: Jeremiah denies the right of succession to Jehoiachin (Jer 22.30).<sup>79</sup> Moreover, Jeremiah, though reproving Zedekiah, is constantly sympathetic to him.<sup>80</sup> Ezekiel, on the other hand, as Noth recognizes, appears to sympathize with Jehoiachin and his right to kingship.<sup>81</sup> Ezekiel's chronology reflects this proclivity (Ezek 1.2).

This investigation of the two-kings' period attempts to show how these transitional figures, Jeremiah and Ezekiel, related to the two royal communities. And we have found that the prophets aligned themselves with the two separate communities. Both prophets supported one monarch in opposition to another. And both supported the principle of Davidic monarchy as an inherent mode of Yahweh's economy for their times and the future.

In the introduction to this dissertation, I have proposed a political-religious model to characterize classical Israelite prophecy. The relationship between the Davidic king and the prophet is an essential component of this model. As a way of explicating this model and as a way of beginning the examination of sixth century prophecy, I have examined texts in Jeremiah and Ezekiel which speak about kingship and, more particularly, the two prophets' relationship with Zedekiah and Jehoiachin. I have found: (1) that Jeremiah and Ezekiel each had consistent attitudes toward monarch and kingship; (2) that Jeremiah and Ezekiel each had a consistently positive view of the Davidic monarchy; (3) that Jeremiah and Ezekiel each had a consistently different view of the two kings, Jehoiachin and Zedekiah; (4) that Jeremiah supported Zedekiah's kingship and his community in the land, while Ezekiel supported Jehoiachin's kingship and his community in Babylon; (5) that, while neither Jeremiah nor Ezekiel appeared as a court prophet like Gad or Nathan, their prophetic activity, which polarized around Jehoiachin and Zedekiah, was consistent with their views of kingship and with the political-religious function of the classical Israelite prophet.



CHAPTER III  
THE POST-EXILIC PROPHETS:  
HAGGAI AND ZECHARIAH

The appearance of the prophets Haggai and Zechariah at a time when Israel was no longer a nation ruled by monarchy might seem to provide a serious problem for the general approach of this dissertation. The conjunction of persons (Zerubbabel with the prophets) and historical forces (the return of the Israelites from Babylon), however, helps explain why we find these classical prophets after the end of the Judahite kingdom.

Much has been said about these two books being the "last gasp" of prophecy. The usual reasons for this assertion are wrong, but the assessment itself is fairly accurate. It was the last time prophets could function in relation to a contemporary Davidide aspiring to the throne. Hence my investigation concentrates on the nature of the prophetic function in the context of temple reconstruction in the royal community.

By way of introduction, it was not long after the restoration prophecies of Ezekiel 34 and 37 that some concrete attempts at restoration were made. How to interpret the status of Jehoiachin's treatment at the hands of Evil-Merodach recorded in 2 Kgs 25 is a difficult issue, but it proffers an insight into the hopes for restoration of

those in exile. Most commentators have wanted to see this as a spurious addition to the Deuteronomistic history, a positive look at the Davidic house tacked on to an explanation of its essential failure.<sup>1</sup> Zenger has recently made an attempt to demonstrate the historical plausibility of the account in 2 Kgs 25.27-29.<sup>2</sup> Herewith Nicholson's excellent summary of the argument:

- (a) **שנת מלכו** (2 Kgs 25.27) refers to the accession year of Amel-Marduk and this coupled with the probability that the accession of a new monarch necessitated or provided the opportunity for a re-affirmation of the oath of vassaldom on the part of Babylon's vassal kings renders it likely that the release of Jehoiachin took place on such an occasion and for such a purpose. (b) This finds further support in the expression (v.27) **וידבר אתו טובות** (lit. he lifted up the head of Jehoiachin) which Zenger, on the basis of an examination of the phrase in both the Old Testament and Accadian texts, argues does not mean simply "Amel-Marduk freed Jehoiachin from prison" but, in this context, "summoned Jehoiachin from prison for an audience before the king." (c) Furthermore, Zenger following W.L. Moran, "A Note on the Treaty Terminology of the Sefire Stelas," *JNES* 22(1963) p. 174, shows that the expression **וידבר אתו טובות** (v.28) is incorrectly translated "he spoke kindly with him" and refers rather to the amity established by treaty. (d) Zenger also finds a context for Amel-Marduk's action in placing Jehoiachin's throne "above the thrones of the kings who were with him in Babylon" (v.28) within the context of the royal enthronement ritual in Babylon at which the vassal kings were present to witness the accession of their overlord. Zenger suggests also, however, that the choice of the word **כסא** "throne" may have been a deliberate allusion on the part of the Deuteronomist to the words of Nathan in 2 Sam 7 (cf. esp. vv.13,16). (e) It is also suggested that the note that Jehoiachin "put off his prison garments" (v.29) may indicate that Jehoiachin was re-robed in his royal apparel.<sup>3</sup>

If Zenger is correct, then to speak of the first two decades of the exile in Babylon is to be aware that even at this early stage, hope for restoration under Davidic authority was alive and was given impetus by the rulers in Babylon.

Dark though this period of Israelite history is, we can advance some historical reconstructions. The Aramaic documents of Ezra (Ezra 5.14ff) declare that one Sheshbazzar was given the temple vessels taken by Nebuchadrezzar, made governor, **פִּתְחָה**, ordered to place the vessels in the **הַיְכָל** and rebuild the house of Yahweh on its site, **אֶתֶרָה**. The narrative continues, "Sheshbazzar came and set the foundations (**אֶשְׁׁרָא**) of the house of God in Jerusalem, but from that time building has gone on and it is not yet completed" (Ezra 5.16).

The only other place this Sheshbazzar appears is in the first chapter of Ezra, another description of Cyrus' beneficence in his first regnal year. This time, however, Sheshbazzar is appelled "the prince of Judah" and made responsible only for taking care of the temple vessels. Nothing is said about his part in the rebuilding of the temple.

Perhaps because we hear tantalizingly little about this Sheshbazzar, scholars have tried to prove that he is two other persons: Shenazzar or Zerubbabel. Though the arguments in favor of the former identification are weighty, the significance is limited. The reverse is the case for the latter. If Zerubbabel were in fact Sheshbazzar, we would have to do much adjusting of chronologies. But as indicated, the arguments for this identification are virtually non-existent.<sup>4</sup>

That Sheshbazzar and Shenazzar (1 Chr 3.18) are one and the same person represents an interesting argument. It is of both a linguistic and a logical sort. On the

linguistic side, Albright has argued that both names derive from the common neo-Babylonian name Sin-ab-usur, in transliterated form--𐤰𐤌𐤁𐤀𐤎.<sup>5</sup> 𐤰𐤌𐤁𐤀𐤎 then resulted from haplography of 𐤰𐤌.<sup>6</sup> The derivation of Sheshbazzar is slightly more complex. Albright suggests that 𐤰𐤌𐤁𐤀𐤎 resulted from omission of the 𐤰. The second šin entered in an orthographic error (the 𐤰 is very similar to 𐤱 in cursive Aramaic of that period--𐤰 𐤱--)) resulting in the final 𐤰𐤌𐤁𐤀𐤎 form. This argument is plausible at every stage.

There are two other possible ways of explaining the anomalous 𐤰𐤌𐤁𐤀𐤎. It could result either from Šin-bal-usur, a suggestion first made by E. Meyer,<sup>7</sup> or from Šamaš-abal-usur as suggested by C.C. Torrey.<sup>8</sup> The latter suggestion is not without merit and would mean that 𐤰𐤌𐤁𐤀𐤎 has nothing to do linguistically with 𐤰𐤌𐤁𐤀𐤎. Yet Albright thinks (1) that the labial interchange is difficult to explain, although Torrey cites several examples, e.g. 𐤱𐤌 for šmš; and (2) šmš is rare in the hypocoristic formations of that period--but again Torrey has examples.

At this point the logical argument enters. It makes sense, Albright and others contend, to expect that Cyrus would have picked a Davidide, a member of the royal family, to represent his interests in Israel. (The second or later governor was of the Davidic line). Usage of 𐤰𐤌 rather buttresses this contention since it is often used to describe Davidic progeny.<sup>9</sup> Thus, if Sheshbazzar and Shenazzar are the same person, we would have Zerubbabel's uncle serving

a term as governor to help reestablish legitimate cult practices in Jerusalem.

What did this Sheshbazzar actually accomplish? This question has also been addressed within the context of a similar query: who built the second temple? And this quest has drawn academic response because, in a surface reading of Haggai, Zechariah, and Chronicles-Nehemiah, there are two different answers. The prophets accord responsibility for temple rebuilding to Zerubbabel, whereas the Chronicler, as we have seen, speaks of the reconstruction of Sheshbazzar. The resolution of this problem has focused on a detailed discussion of construction terminology in the texts and theories about the nature of "laying the foundations." If Sheshbazzar laid the foundations, one argument goes, then Zerubbabel could not have done it.

Gelston has offered the easiest answer. Neither Sheshbazzar nor Zerubbabel redid the foundations or the foundation deposit since, he contends, they were never destroyed.<sup>10</sup> He argues that  $\tau\delta$  (Ezra 3.10ff) is a general term for completing construction and that  $\chi\psi\chi$  is unclear. Andersen, too, has pointed to the wide semantic range of  $\tau\delta$  and argued at some length that the phrase in Ezra 3.10ff, though to be translated "the laying of the foundations," reflects a continuing building activity.<sup>11</sup> The most important study was made by Tuland when he showed that  $\chi\psi\chi$  (Ezra 5.16), a Sumerian loan--uš--through Akkadian to Aramaic, means "foundations," specifically a footing on

bed rock type of construction.<sup>12</sup> He goes on to argue convincingly that Sheshbazzar did, in all probability, receive authorization for and did begin the reconstruction of the second temple by relaying the foundations.

That Sheshbazzar was unable to make significant progress in his reconstruction efforts seems clear. It is this failure to complete the temple which the books of Haggai and Zechariah record. Why the rebuilding was slowed is difficult to determine. Galling's theories are as acceptable as any. He has interpreted the  $\text{וְהָיָה}$  office of Sheshbazzar as responsibility for religious affairs and not a provincial administrative office since Judah was, until much later, still a part of the Samaritan district.<sup>13</sup> It is unlikely, Galling thinks, that Sheshbazzar would have gone to Israel with great sums of money. Instead, he probably went with authorizations to draw upon the royal accounts administered in Samaria. It makes sense then to expect passive resistance on the part of the provincial officials toward this reconstruction of Judah's cult site. The small numbers of returned and returning Judahites would hardly have created sufficient political impact to mitigate this inherent attitude of regional administration. Neither could this small group, without funds, have done much work on the actual reconstruction. So Galling concludes, "That Sheshbazzar planned the beginning of the building is assured, but it would have required many workers many weeks for the rewalling of the hill of rubble. They simply were not there. The hill of rubble existed then

when Zerubbabel and the High Priest Joshua came in 520 to work."<sup>14</sup>

What happened to Sheshbazzar is difficult to ascertain. Three explanations are possible:<sup>15</sup> he died or was murdered in office; he remained in Judah unable to marshal support; or he returned to Babylon, his term of office having expired. Following the analogy of Nehemiah's terms of office, the third possibility seems preferable.

If Jeremiah and Ezekiel picture the working out of the Israelite prophetic office in the first part of the sixth century, Haggai and Zechariah furnish us with a picture of what it was to be a prophet in the society of those who had returned to their land in the latter part of that century. I have argued above that the relationship of Jeremiah and Ezekiel to their respective political communities was integral to their prophetic work. And so now, though we have to do with only one community, we find these two later prophets associated with the power groups of this society and more particularly with one central figure, the Davidide Zerubbabel. Taking the chronological designations within these two books at face value, we meet two figures active in the year 520, and in Zechariah's case through 518. It is important to note the direct correspondence between the presence of the Davidic Zerubbabel and the appearance of these two prophets.<sup>16</sup> Whether or not these prophets returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel is difficult to assert.<sup>17</sup> Jewish tradition suggests that Haggai was a prophet in Babylon, but this is

impossible to verify.<sup>18</sup> What does seem probable is that with the reappearance of a royal figure in Israel, the prophet once again functioned as a mediator. Rather than hypothesize further, I opt for a look at the books of Haggai and Zechariah: the nature of their oracles and the sorts of situations to which we might reasonably expect these words to be directed.

#### HAGGAI

Two types of material in this little collection of oracles appear to be useful in evaluating the connection between the king and prophet in our search to understand the character of late Israelite prophecy--the oracles themselves and the framework of the book. That I still speak of a king is anachronistic; Israel was never to have another invested and independent ruler. But the presence of a member of the Davidic line as the appointed official of the Persian authorities over the Jewish community evidently gave hope of such royal restoration to many of that time. One of those was Haggai.

We learn of Haggai's concern with Zerubbabel and Joshua the High Priest from repeated references to these individuals in the introductory formulae before the oracles. A superficial reading presents us with a picture of a prophet who speaks only to the governor and the high priest, although the content of the oracles appears to be directed to the people. Scholars have noted this difference and often declared the



framework, and even some of the oracular material, to be of a secondary and organizational character. Beuken's recent study is perhaps the best example.<sup>19</sup> While I do not wish to spend a great deal of time with the secondary literature, this scholarly overlay has raised a question: which parts of the book describe the prophet's work?

The value of the introductory material in Haggai is a particularly difficult problem, for, with the exception of the final oracle in Hag 2.20-23 and, perhaps, Hag 2.4, all the references to Zerubbabel occur in the framework of the book. If this material is secondary and a good bit later than the oracles, some questions may be legitimately raised about its worth in evaluating the relationship of Haggai to Zerubbabel.

Since Beuken's study is solid and important, perhaps we would do well to begin by summarizing it. In examining Haggai and Zechariah I, he has demonstrated that these two collections were passed on by a redactional tradition very much like that represented in the book of Chronicles. To this tradition he attributes the better part of the introductory formulae and references to Zerubbabel and Joshua in Haggai. His analysis is based on form critical observations as well as on matters of style and content. Prior to the Chronistic redaction, Beuken contends, Haggai was a collection of dated oracles addressed to the people, with the exception of Hag 2.20ff. Haggai was a prophet who remained in the land during the exile and who spoke to a rural population

from the background of a pre-exilic Yahwistic faith.

Of special interest to our investigation is the way Beuken deals with the picture the Chronistic redactor gives of Haggai speaking to Zerubbabel. Beuken admits that this picture is not pure invention, since there is no reason to deny Haggai the oracle in 2.20-23.

We place two questions to this analysis: (1) why did the Chronist give us this picture? (2) is it pure invention or did Haggai have some close connection with Zerubbabel? The first issue is never addressed as such by Beuken. A possible answer does appear in his study of Hag 1.15b-2.9-- what he calls "the investiture."<sup>20</sup> He contends that Hag: 2.3,6-9 contain the original oracle addressed to the people encouraging them in the rebuilding enterprise. This has been revised to include the words of encouragement (Ermutigungswörter) to Zerubbabel and Joshua as well. At this point, form criticism helps out. In vv.4-5, Lohfink has seen similarities with the investiture form (Amtseinsetzung), the framework of which follows:<sup>21</sup>

Encouragement Formula

Designation of a Task

Assistance Formula

Beuken seizes on this observation since the investiture form is particularly common to the Deuteronomistic and Chronistic historical works. Particular to the use in Haggai is  $\text{לַעֲשׂוֹת}$ , used in an absolute sense, "Go, Do," which has replaced the more specific designation of the task. Beuken realizes

that the phrase כל עס הארץ is out of place in such an investiture but argues that it represents an element left over from the earlier word to the people. According to Beuken, the Chronistic redactor has apparently taken a word of encouragement, originally delivered to the people, and turned it into a schema designed to depict the investiture of Zerubbabel and Joshua.

Why? There are several possible answers: (1) the Chronist wanted to create a fictive investiture; (2) the Chronist wanted to show the prophet as someone who installs governmental and/or priestly officials; (3) the Chronist wanted to emphasize the fact that Zerubbabel and Joshua had been inducted into their offices. There are no plausible grounds for the first suggestion and the last two options are hardly mutually exclusive. One tack would be to suggest that the Chronistic redactor thought it necessary to demonstrate the official character of Zerubbabel and Joshua, since they were responsible for the rebuilding of the temple and the reinstatement of the cult. This restoration could, as with Solomon, only be carried out by legitimate figures in the Israelite society.

But why use the prophet as the installing figure? As we have seen earlier, there is ample precedent for presenting the prophet in an installing position: the depictions of Samuel, Nathan, and Elijah. Consequently, we could argue that the picture of Haggai is consistent with Israelite prophetic practice, the more so since we have his words

of blessing to the king, words which are in effect a dynastic oracle (2.20ff). Thus, the picture of investiture may well reflect the historical activity of the prophet.

Beuken is led away from accepting this explanation for, I think, two reasons. First he implies that if the formal schema for investiture has been provided by the Chronicist, we can not speak of there actually having been anything like an investiture. This is a dangerous move based on form criticism. However, Dennis McCarthy, in work on the investiture genre, argues that its setting is hortatory and cultic with a dominant connection to the Davidic monarchy.<sup>22</sup> He demonstrates the independence of the genre from its usage by the Deuteronomist and the Chronicist historian. Second, Beuken believes that the closeness between prophet and king depicted in Haggai is derivative of the Chronicler's views. His evidence is, of course, impressive. Westermann has noted that prophets in the Chronicler's history virtually always address kings.<sup>23</sup> And in his essay on the purpose of the Chronicler, Freedman remarked that "...monarchy and prophecy go hand in hand."<sup>24</sup> On the other hand, the evidence is impressive because the Chronicler has preserved an important characteristic of Israelite prophecy. This view of the interconnection between monarchy and prophecy is hardly the invention of the Chronicler. It is of the essence of Israelite prophecy. Thus, I find it difficult to accept Beuken's argument that the position of Haggai vis-à-vis the king is entirely

derivative from the Chronicler. The Chronistic redactor's framework emphasizes this relationship to be sure; but it also includes the figure of Joshua at virtually every step of the way. One could say, more accurately, that the redactional framework and schema of Haggai includes the Chronicler's view of king and prophet. However, this should not lead us to miss an essential part of Haggai's function-- that of speaking words of blessing to the governor, the Davidic seed of Haggai's time.

To these words of Haggai (2.20-23) we now turn:

- .20 and the word of the Lord came to Haggai<sup>a</sup>  
a second time on the twenty-fourth  
day of the month,
- .21 Speak to Zerubbabel, governor of Judah, saying:
- .22 I will shake the heavens and the earth  
I will overthrow the rule<sup>b</sup> of kingdoms  
I will destroy the strength of the nations<sup>c</sup>  
I will overthrow the chariots and their drivers  
Horses and their riders shall go down<sup>d</sup>  
Each man by the sword of his companions<sup>d</sup>
- .23 On that day, says the Lord of Hosts
- I will take you  
O Zerubbabel, son of Shealtiel<sup>e</sup>  
My servant,  
says the Lord  
I will set you as a seal  
because I have chosen you  
says the Lord of Hosts.<sup>25</sup>

To remain true to the recent tradition of interpreting this oracle (Sellin, Elliger, Nowach, Horst) demands immediate reference to Rothstein's influential monograph, Juden und Samaritaner, in which he argued that the book of Haggai is a reaction to and reflection of the religious and civil strife

between the returned community and the people of the land as well as the population of Samaria. Rothstein makes much of the fact that Hag 2.20-23 receives the same date as 2.10-14. If the two pronouncements were made on the same day, he contends, there must be a significant interconnection.<sup>26</sup> Reading the situation in light of the struggles recorded in Ezra 4-5, he sees Hag 2.10-14 as an oracle directed against allowing the unclean--the Samaritans and the people of the land--from working on the reconstruction of the temple. To prohibit the Samaritans from aiding in the temple reconstruction would have required the help of some authoritative figure such as the governor Zerubbabel. Thus, according to Rothstein, Haggai used the ploy of appealing to Zerubbabel's Davidic lineage and concomitant aspirations. Ezra 5.5ff provides the "outward" authority for Zerubbabel's decision vis-a-vis Persian authority, while Haggai invokes the "inner" inherent power of the Davidic line and the coming restoration of that lineage. Hag 2.20 gives the message, a personal, Messianic one, which is conveyed in a more geistliche way than in the weltliche words of Hag 2.10ff. Hag 2.20-23 becomes, according to this interpretation, a ruse designed to convince Zerubbabel to prohibit unacceptable people from helping in the rebuilding of the temple.

I see only one problem with this interesting interpretation. It is based exclusively on the fact that Haggai speaks to Zerubbabel on the same day that he pronounces the

words recorded in Hag 2.10-14. It is not based on the contents of 2.20-23. Rothstein has summarized the oracle as a promise of restoration and not looked further. He has taken more seriously the chronological relationship of the two oracles than he has their content. Consequently, we move to consider what the oracle itself means.

That we are dealing with an oracle and not just redactional addenda seems clear. It is strange that with all this emphasis on king and prophet that Beuken attributes to the Chronistic redactor, virtually none of these redactionally characteristics appear in this final pericope where the prophet speaks to the king. Beuken himself says, "In the last episode of the Haggai chronicles, the Chronistic tradition is now scarcely visible."<sup>27</sup>

What then are we to make of this oracle which apparently appears untouched by the redactor's hands? I make three divisions for the purpose of analysis: vv.20, 21-22, 23. In the first, we meet the introductory framework to the oracle, a characteristic feature of the book. But the initial formula is not in the form in which it typically appears in other parts of the book. The verb is imperfect, 'אָרַךְ, whereas it is perfect in all other cases in Haggai. Further in Hag 2.20, the word-event formula stands before the date. Haggai's name is not followed by אֲדַבְרָה, and the agency of the oracle is not modified by אֲדַבְרָה.<sup>28</sup> Why has the consistency of the editorial framework been broken? Beuken, following Rothstein, suggests that the redactor wanted to

continue the theme of Hag 2.10ff by compressing the customary introductions. This argument may explain the presence of שְׁנִית, but not the reversing of the traditional date formula and word-event formula. Further, Beuken has observed that the clause וַיְהִי דְבַר יְהוָה אֵל חֲגִי is very close in form to those introducing the I-reports in Ezekiel (e.g. Ezek 24.1 וַיְהִי דְבַר יְהוָה אֵלַי), which are also followed by a date. And he suggests that similar formulae are present in Haggai. That the word-event formula has been expanded by the inclusion of a date and then again by שְׁנִית seems forced. We would have expected the Chronistic redactor to have used the same order that he did in the other formulae. Of course, one could posit the existence of yet another unattested redactor, but Occam's razor would then be in order.

It seems much more likely to me that we have here something approaching the form in which Haggai's oracles were originally collected, שְׁנִית being a later expansion. That they were passed on with accompanying dates seems most probable. The best answer then to the question, why do the usual formulae occur in different order, is to respond, that is the way this oracle was originally written down. In contrast, Hag 1.1; 2.1; 2.10 represent the assimilation of the original dates into the Chronistic schema.

To look at the oracle itself is to be struck first by the obvious similarity to Hag 2.6-7, a description of Yahweh's theophany. Beuken has schematized the



comparison as follows:<sup>29</sup>

Shaking of Nature	.6	.21b
Shaking of the People	.7a	.22
Concrete Holy Act	.7b,8,9a	.23a
Framework	.9b	.23b

In a synoptic view, the immediacy of 2.21 is underlined negatively by the absence of the formulae present in v.6--  
 עִוְד אַתָּה עֲשֵׂהָ--something like "once more, in a short time."<sup>30</sup>  
 This confusing phrase must mean that someone thought the  
 פְּרָעָה for riches was still a way off. Not so with 2.21ff.  
 The sense of immediacy is unmitigated.

Just as the talk in the first pericope turns to riches in Hag 2.7, so 2.22 presents the basic concern, rule by monarchy. The pericope makes no claim for being a classic description of Yahweh's theophany. Jeremias notes that the shaking is not of the mountains but of the entire universe. It is not a description of Yahweh's coming but a depiction of a new historical act--the restoration of temple and monarchy.<sup>31</sup> Haggai has used phrases drawn from the theophanic genre to emphasize that this restoration by investiture of Zerubbabel is Yahweh's doing, and not just his appearance.

Beuken contends that v.22 is material of a very general sort, derived essentially from the Unheilsverkündigung--particularly the דָּבַר Sodom tradition (Gen 19.25,29) and יָרַד, a going down to death (Is 32.19).<sup>32</sup> This material serves to highlight v.23a as the central point of the oracle, the promise to Zerubbabel. Hag 2.22 adds a note of futurity

and preparation. The dominion of the kingdoms is abrogated. Their military power is destroyed for the purpose of providing the Davidic house a place for rule.

As the focal point of the oracle, v.23a is embarrassingly unprecise: "I will take you, O Zerubbabel, son of Shealtiel, my servant." One looks in vain to find a special meaning for לָקַח. Beuken says what can be said. The root לחק often occurs as a general first element in a parallel statement of election (Auserwählung),<sup>33</sup> It is hardly a terminus technicus for election in the mode of בָּחַר, but it does mean "choose" and it is followed by a second element in v.23a.

The case is more interesting with עָבַדְתִּי. The term harkens to the Deuteronomistic descriptions of David and the guarantee for his progeny, as in 2 Kgs 11.36: "Yet to his son I will give one tribe, that David my servant may always have dominion before me in Jerusalem, the city where I have chosen to put my name."<sup>34</sup> Hag 2.23a, then, ties the figure of Zerubbabel to the Davidic election tradition.

The waters muddy a bit with 2.23b, "I will set you as a seal because I have chosen you." Here we do have בָּחַר, a phrase often used by the Deuteronomist to describe Israel's election. For this reason, Beuken argues that v.23b is probably secondary since בָּחַר is a favorite of the Chronicist redactor as well as the Deuteronomist. Von Rad has shown that the Chronicler uses the root eleven times without a literary Vorlage for special acts of election--that is, other than the election of Israel as a whole.<sup>35</sup> Consequently,

Beuken feels that the use of **בחר** in v.23b fits perfectly in the Chronistic tradition. But this view surely ignores the fact that **בחר** is not limited to the Deuteronomistic and Chronistic histories, but is part of the larger royal election traditions (Pss 78; 132).

Beuken's "if it is possible, it is" argument ignores the essential relationship between prophet and king that goes beyond the Chronistic or Deuteronomistic descriptions of that relationship. To rule out of court the integrity of this half-verse on such grounds seems hypercritical. Following this logic, any questionable text from the post-exilic period which uses **בחר** of any entity other than Israel is to be attributed to the Chronistic redactor. So much emphasis on one lexical item seems dubious, especially when we find the term in Ps 78.70 referring to David and used to denote Jerusalem in Is 14.1; 41.8; 43.10; and 49.7. The Deutero-Isaianic usage rather suggests that **בחר** had a wider usage in post-exilic times than Beuken would allow.

However, even if one would admit that **כי בך בחרתי** is a later addition, one could still argue that v.23b is original. By so doing, a terse first person oracle addressed to Zerubbabel appears:

<b>אֶחָד עֲבָדִי</b>	I will take you (as) my servant
<b>שָׁמִיךְ כְּחֹתֶם</b>	I will set you as a seal

One could just as easily advance a counter argument-- that the use of **חֹתֶם** represents a continuity of tradition

with the group who remained in the land--represented initially by Jer 22.24--a tradition which used חותם to describe the royal figure. Haggai has, however, taken the oracle of doom which Jeremiah spoke against Jehoiachin and countered its assertion by suggesting that there will be a Davidic successor.

Further, the Chronist never uses חותם to describe the Davidic line, nor for that matter is the term used by the Deuteronomist, with the possible exception of 1 Kg 21.8. Consequently, we have forceful grounds for regarding v.23b as part of the original oracle.

The exact meaning of ושמתיך כחותם in the oracle is difficult to ascertain. The connotation of חותם is however revealing. The referent is surely the royal seal, and Zerubbabel is identified with its power: Zerubbabel is Yahweh's seal. Zerubbabel reigns as part of Yahweh's economy. In addition, the seal was a concrete object as well. We have no seals which can be related to Zerubbabel's regency, but the seals of Jehoiachin offer an analogy. There were seals for important citizens as well as the royal seals: Gen 41.42; 1 Kgs 21.8; Esth 3.10,12; 8.2ff; and Dan 6.17. Ezek 28.12, a corrupt text, appears to reflect this same idea in addressing the royal house of Tyre: "You were a perfect signet ring (reading חותם תכניתי), full of wisdom and perfect in beauty." That the signet was a symbol for royalty is explicit--1 Mac 6.15, "the crown, the robes, and the signet"--see also Josephus Antiq XX,ii,2. Tufnell

and Tushingham's work further specifies the character of the royal seals and the claims inherent in them.<sup>36</sup> Hence, the use of the term in Hag 2.23 is clearly a royal symbol.

What is the background of this oracle? Beuken himself recognizes, as had Vriezen before him, that the oracle is made up of more than just words of weal. Vriezen had stated: "The elected is the person raised up from the mass for a specific reason and a specific task."<sup>37</sup> Beuken contrasts this concept with the election to an office. But such an election tradition, as he recognizes, is used to describe the nature of the Davidic kingship. Beuken emphasizes the task--rebuilding the temple--as the essential purpose of the election. The promise of kingship to Zerubbabel is, for Beuken, a movement from an "...actualizing to a transcendentalizing interpretation." Zerubbabel's kingship was something to come in the future: "Vv.20-23 are less an historical episode than an Heilswort for the future."<sup>38</sup> Though Beuken recognizes that hopes of kingship for Zerubbabel were current in the time of Haggai and that it is quite possible that vv.20-23 reflect the views of Haggai, the oracle is, for him, more probably the product of the Chronistic redactor.

I wish to argue quite the opposite. Based on the above analysis, I see little reason to suspect that vv.20-23 are secondary. And if they are primary, we may hypothesize a context. Here I would agree with Vriezen and Beuken that election is very specific. The words of weal are not general

but refer specifically to the office of kingship, especially to royal leadership in the immediate rebuilding of the community. As we have seen earlier, the prophet could be present for the king's coronation. The heart of this oracle reflects the royal investiture with the references to Yahweh's choice and royal symbols. The language is that of Davidic royalty: עֲבֹדֵי, חֹתֶם. No mention is made of temple rebuilding in the oracle. The issue is instead Yahweh's choice and support of Israel's ruler expressed by a prophet, the prophetic function in classic form.

Haggai then was a prophet whose words were apparently revised by a later redactor of the Chronistic persuasion. The use to which his words were put should not keep us from observing his obvious concern with the Davidic figure, Zerubbabel. If our analysis is correct, Haggai was involved in a movement to crown this royal descendant of Judah's royal house. Such an action fits the history of Israelite prophets. It provides a legitimate explanation of Hag 2.20-23, and would correspond with Haggai's desire to secure support for temple reconstruction.

#### ZECHARIAH I

In the same year in which Haggai advocated the kingship of Zerubbabel, Zechariah began to preach both admonitions to leaders of the people and promises of restoration. Within this context, our interest is with his view of and relationship to Zerubbabel. Three passages deserve our

attention: Zech 3.8-10; 4.6-10; and 6.9-14; although Zerubbabel is only explicitly named in 4.6-10. Isolating oracular material from Zechariah, particularly within the night vision cycle, is defensible, as Petitjean's work has shown.<sup>39</sup> In Zechariah, we are apparently presented with two sorts of material from the prophet: the night visions and an oracular collection, the latter comprising (according to Petitjean) 1.1-6; 1.14b-17; 2.10-17; 3.8-10; 4.6b-10a; 6.9-15; 7.4-14; 8.1-23; all of which share certain thematic and stylistic features.<sup>40</sup>

As with Haggai, the primary questions which must be answered are those of redaction and tradition history. Do we have to do with the words or ideas from Zechariah and his time or are we presented with later reflections by traditionists who gathered and edited the prophetic collections? Once we have answered this issue nexus, we will be able to address the problem of prophetic function vis-à-vis kingship in the relationship of Zechariah to Zerubbabel.

I

ZECHARIAH 3.8-10

3.8 Hear now Joshua, the High Priest,  
 You and your friends  
 who are sitting before you  
 men<sup>a</sup> of omens<sup>b</sup>

For behold, I am bringing my servant, the Branch.

.9 For behold, the stone which I set before Joshua,  
 upon one stone with seven glints<sup>c</sup>  
 Behold, I will engrave its inscription  
 says the Lord of Hosts  
 and I will remove the guilt of this land  
 in one day.

3.10 In that day, says the Lord of Hosts,  
 Each man will call to his neighbor  
 from under his vine and under the fig tree.<sup>41</sup>

Joshua, the High Priest, is informed that "the Branch, my servant" is coming. As we have already seen in Haggai and as we will also see in Zech 6.12, such a reference to **יְרֵכָה** has a particularly Davidic connotation, as does **נֹמֵץ**, (cf. Jer 23.5; 33.15).<sup>42</sup> Consequently this passage is of prima facie importance for an investigation of prophecy and the royal figure in this period.

However, it is difficult to ascertain any homogeneity within these three verses; complexities abound. V.8 begins with an audition formula, **וְשָׁמַעְתִּי**. When Joshua and his cohorts are addressed in the third person, this group is appelled **אֲנִי מִן־הַכֹּהֲנִים**, which has, as yet, received no convincing explanation. Petitjean (pp 168ff, 190ff) and Beuken following him (p 301), suggest that the reference is to the "college of priests." Petitjean draws upon the background of the giving of the Priestly torah (à la Begrich) as well as certain unspecified Mesopotamian parallels in which such sacerdotal colleges approve temple construction (cf. Hag 2.10-14; Zech 7.1-3). For Petitjean, the college gave an affirmative decision for temple rebuilding on the basis of the God-given stone.

Beuken further shows that **וְשָׁמַעְתִּי** used with a substantive, here **מִן־הַכֹּהֲנִים**, expresses habitual activity: in this context, the giving of omen-based decisions. For some reason, Beuken demures to seeing this Priestly group as giving



a sign or decision, since the sign is the God-given and inscribed rock. It is a sign of the legitimacy of Zerubbabel. This view, however, leaves the sacerdotal college without a significant function.

Zech 3.8b is a clause in the third person, so introduced and placed as to provide the subject of the audition formula—a Davidic branch is coming. However, v.9, which could also contain the sign, shifts away from any explicitly royal statement and carries on in third person references to Joshua. Another enigmatic phrase, שׁוֹבֵה עֵינַיִם, clouds this verse. Something is to be engraved which will provide an expiation for the sin of the land. Finally, v.10 speaks of an idyllic day for the people of the land.

To work backwards, v.10 seems to be an addition to the original oracle. This residence under vine and fig tree is stereotypical language for the imagery of peaceful living (cf. Is 36.16; 1 Kgs 4.25; Mic 4.4). It is likely that an editor, with the Stichwort connection of וְיָשַׁב, used this symbolism to depict the day in which sin would be removed from the land.

Proposals for explaining the meaning of v.9 are legion. The verse is cast in the garb of a Yahweh oracle addressed in the third person and is a promise to engrave and to remove sin. The connection between the engraving and expiation depends entirely on how one interprets the stone. For the meaning of this stone, the following proposals have been offered: the cap-stone of the temple (Hag 4.7,10);<sup>43</sup>

the corner-stone of the temple; a stone of the Holy of Holies; a stone as the representation of the royal kingdom; a scarab; a stone for the crown of Zerubbabel; a signet symbol of royal power (Hag 2.3); a stone for the High Priest's cultic equipment (Ex 28.36ff); a metaphor for Zerubbabel; an hitherto unknown symbol further defined in Zech 4.10 as the seven eyes of Yahweh.<sup>44</sup>

Two explanations seem more plausible than the others: an High Priestly ornament and a foundation deposit. Sellin's argument that the seven  $\square\text{י}^{\prime}\text{י}$  are to be interpreted as the letters  $\text{י}^{\prime}\text{י}^{\prime}\text{י}^{\prime}\text{י}^{\prime}\text{י}^{\prime}\text{י}^{\prime}$ , as in the High Priestly turban engraving, is plausible (Ex 28.36; 39.30). Though we are not sure the High Priestly engraving was on a stone, the engraving to which Sellin refers did have a special expiatory power, the guilt-bearing ability of the Aaronite priesthood, which would go far in clarifying the removal of guilt from the land recorded in Zech 3.9.

However, Petitjean, again followed by Beuken, has suggested that instead of a High Priestly ornament, this oracle should be read in connection with Zech 4.6ff. This conjunction, he argues, means that the stone is the foundation stone of the temple. Petitjean refers to Mesopotamian foundation deposit practices, the part which kings had in such ceremonies, and the general expiatory character of these rituals (e.g. Zech 8.9ff).<sup>45</sup> Unfortunately, we are treated to many 'Akkadian texts tell us; new Babylonian parallels show,' with few specific examples.<sup>46</sup> Further it

is reasonable to think that Sheshbazzar relaid the foundation deposit. Thus, I find it unlikely that the referent of Zech 3.9 (or 4.6ff for that matter) is a foundation deposit laid by Zerubbabel, and would maintain that the identification of the engraved stone of Zech 3.9 with the High Priestly expiatory ornament is still the preferable interpretation.<sup>47</sup>

As for any specific Sitz im Leben, assuming the High Priest signet interpretation, the presence and function of the sacerdotal college may still be accepted. Whether there was some initiation of the new cultic garb is unsure. Perhaps the unusual use of  $\psi\lambda$  is evidence of some cleansing rite derivative of exilic practice.<sup>48</sup>

This leaves us with Zech 3.8b, "Behold, I will bring my servant, the Branch." This clause was probably inserted into the original oracle as an attempt to connect the signet imagery of Hag 2.23 or the coronation imagery of Zech 6.9ff with the oracle of weal for the land, using the Stichwort connection of  $\text{כִּי הִגַּנְרִי}$ .<sup>49</sup> In conclusion, an oracle originally about cultic affairs acquired royal connotations in the redactional process. The passage thus tells us little about Zechariah's relationship to or thoughts about Zerubbabel.<sup>50</sup>

## II

ZECHARIAH 4.6a $\beta$ -10.6a $\beta$ -7

.6a This is the word of the Lord  
to Zerubbabel saying:  
Not by might,  
Not by power,  
but by my spirit,  
says the Lord of Hosts.

.7 What are you?  
A great mountain?  
Alongside of Zerubbabel  
You are a plain.

He will bring out the former stone<sup>a</sup>  
(There will be) shouts of  
"Grace, Grace" for him<sup>b</sup>

.8-10

.8 And the word of the Lord came to me saying:  
.9 The hands of Zerubbabel founded this house  
his hands will finish it  
in order that you might know<sup>c</sup> that  
the Lord of Hosts sent me.  
.10 For whoever despised the day of small things  
will rejoice and see  
the tin tablet<sup>d</sup>  
in the hand of Zerubbabel.  
These are the seven eyes of Yahweh  
which quickly scan the whole earth.<sup>51</sup>

Zech 4.6a $\beta$ -10a is, like 3.8-10, to be found within the night visions material. After he is told of the golden lamp stand and the two olive trees, Zechariah is unable to explain the vision (Zech 4.6a). The explanation of the allegorical elements does not come until 4.10b. In between the vision and the explanation of the allegorical elements, this pericope has to do with Zerubbabel and the rebuilding of the temple.

Content and formulary characteristics rather suggest, again, that our material is not uniform. The introductory

statement of address has a very literary stamp, the sort of thing we might expect at the head of a series of statements. And we have, I think, two subsequent statements: vv.6a<sup>β</sup>-7 and vv.8-10.<sup>52</sup>

Suppose for the moment that alongside the night visions, Zechariah left another series of prophetic statements,<sup>53</sup> a part of which concerns Zerubbabel; material like Zech 4.8-10 and Zech 6.12-13 would be the type of oracles we would expect to find. The continuity of subject matter--the rebuilding the temple--and the presence of petrographic imagery in both pericopae strengthen this assumption.

A traditionist would, most rationally, have felt 4.6b-7 to also be a part of that material because of the presence of Zerubbabel's name in v.7. There is, however, good reason to think that Zech 4.6b-7 was not addressed to Zerubbabel. V.7 contrasts Zerubbabel with someone else, as my translation indicates; the someone else being the "you" to whom the oracle is addressed.<sup>54</sup> Seen in this light, the addressee would have to be someone of authority whom we could expect to challenge Zerubbabel's initiative in temple reconstruction. The most obvious figure is Joshua, who is here being warned to leave matters of reconstruction to the royal house. The imagery in v.7 is that of contrast: Zerubbabel, the mountain, versus someone, the plain. If the other party were the High Priest, the *הנהר הגדול* is a deft play on *הכהן הגדול*. The identification of the adversary as the High Priest is tentative. More certain is the admonishing

character of the oracle: the spirit is on the side of Zerubbabel and no might nor power will be able to overpower his efforts.

That Zechariah thought the initiative for rebuilding lay with Zerubbabel is not difficult to ascertain from Zech 4.8-10 and 6.12-13. That Zechariah cautioned Joshua in other places is, of course, extraordinarily difficult to show since a pro-Priestly or Chronistic redaction has probably leveled such objections. The implication of divine initiative, addressed to Joshua (3.8ff), rather suggests such a stance.

Assuming that the pericope reflects a caution to Joshua, it is at the same time and perhaps more importantly, a reflection of the king's building responsibility. That the king was at least titular temple builder, and many times participant in the actual construction, has been demonstrated by Kapelrud and Ellis.<sup>55</sup> Consequently, the scene described in Zech 4.6a $\beta$ -7 is part and parcel of Ancient Near Eastern building rites, rites in which the royal figure participated in temple construction.

In attempting to clarify the enigmatic  $\text{הַבֵּן הָרִאשׁוֹן}$ , we may learn even more about such construction rituals. We have already had occasion to draw the analogy between this stone and the libittu mahritu (see n. 47). Unfortunately, this analogy yields no absolute clarity since the precise meaning of the libittu is undecided. Ellis has proposed a revision in the traditional translation "first brick"

in light of the Kalû ritual text (previously cited) and other evidence.<sup>56</sup> Though all is tentative, there is evidence to suggest that the meaning is "former brick." In an attempt to define the significance of this "former brick," Ellis says:

What does show clearly in these texts is the peculiar symbolic significance of the brick. The success of Gudea's brick-molding was an omen of the happy outcome of the entire construction. The veneration of the old brick prescribed by the Kalû ritual probably had the purpose of preserving the continuity of worship. The single brick embodied the essence of the god's home and bridged the gap between the destruction of the old building and the founding of the new.<sup>57</sup>

Thus, the reference here is probably not to a capstone nor to a foundation deposit--which was probably laid by Sheshbazzar--but to a building deposit which signified continuity with the former temple by the use of a "former brick." In a larger view, the oracle is emphasizing Zerubbabel's prerogative in the ceremony, pointing to royal participation in temple construction, a custom inherent to Ancient Near Eastern building and rebuilding traditions.

The second statement, Zech 4.8-10a, is perhaps more straightforward. Introduced by the same formula that we find in Zech 2.13,15 and 6.12. the prophet says that Zerubbabel will finish what he started--the reconstruction of the temple.<sup>58</sup> How v.10 fits into this promise is the puzzling feature. The beginnings of restoration were of no comparison in grandeur to what had gone before. This we

may also infer from the account in Ezra 3.12. Somehow, the significance of the **הבדיל האבן** assuages the previous times of inferiority. If this phrase denotes the tin plummet, as LXX and many commentators suggest, it is difficult to understand how the presence of a building tool guarantees the overcoming of "the days of small things." Though there has been no satisfactory interpretation of this phrase, four possible interpretations could be offered.<sup>59</sup>

(1) The phrase was originally **בדלן האבן** and is a reference to some royally symbolic signet stone (cf. for **בדלן**, Num 11.7; Gen 2.12). (2) Again reading the phrase as **האבן בדלן**, it is a reference to a resin or gum accompanying the building deposit ritual (cf. Ellis p.133ff). (3) Reading with LXX, the verse indicates that the plummet will shortly be seen in the hand of Zerubbabel and not in the hands of someone else, e.g. Joshua or any other usurper. (4) Reading with MT, the reference is to a building deposit, a tin or metallic tablet. Reference may be made again to Ellis' work where he has described the tablets, not only stone but metallic, which were described in building texts and found in archaeological investigations. For example, in Sargon II's palace at Khorsabad, the following inscription was found along with tablets of gold, silver, copper, lead, and magnesite; "I wrote my name on tablets of gold, silver, copper, tin, lapis lazuli, and alabaster, and I deposited (them) in (several places) in the foundations."<sup>60</sup> And as Ellis notes, and the archaeological evidence showed,



the tablets were not located in the foundations, but in the thick walls of the temple. Hence, the reference is to a building and not a foundation deposit.

The historical distribution of this metallic tablet usage is particularly interesting. Such tablets were widely used in the Middle Babylonian period and for some reason died out in Neo-Babylonian times. The Achaemenid period, however, saw a renaissance of this practice, as texts from Darius II and Xerxes attest, though these latter tablets often did not carry inscriptions. (We are not told of inscriptions on the "former stone" in Zech 4.10.)<sup>61</sup> Such a use of this metallic tablet by Zerubbabel would clearly fit with concomitant building practices to the East.

The presence of such metallic objects helps to explain the contrast to the "day of small things."

As Ellis notes:

Much of the reason for deposits of valuables is probably to be seen in a desire to enhance the value of the buildings and the validity of the ceremonies connected with its construction, by the use of impressive and costly substances. To found a building on gold, silver, and precious stones, gives a theoretical sumptuousness pleasing to the builder and, hopefully, his gods.<sup>62</sup>

The prophet is concerned here to emphasize the task of temple reconstruction by the king. The pericope underlines the presence of the king in almost an Erweiswort form (v.9b). The prophet's words will be authenticated--considered valid in opposition to anyone else--when the task is done. And the task can legitimately only be done by Zerubbabel.<sup>63</sup>

In sum, I think it is preferable to understand the interpolation, Zech 4.6a -10, as comprised of two independent oracles: vv.6a -7 originally directed against a challenge to the rebuilding activity of Zerubbabel, probably by Joshua; and vv.8-10, an oracle of weal based on a building deposit laid by Zerubbabel. Both attest to prophetic concern with royalty, here manifested in the king's responsibility in temple building.

## III

## ZECHARIAH 6.9-15

- .9 And the word of the Lord came to me saying:
- .10 Take from the exile  
       from Heldai, Tobiyah, and Jedaiah  
       who arrived from Babylon on this day;  
 and go to the house of Josiah, son of Zephaniah  
       who came from Babylon.
- .11 You shall take silver and gold,  
 Make crowns<sup>a</sup>  
 And place it on the head of Joshua  
       son of Jehozadak, the High Priest;
- .12 And you shall speak to him saying:  
 Thus says the Lord of Hosts,  
 Behold the man whose name is the Branch:  
       He will grow under it<sup>b</sup>  
       He will build the temple of the Lord<sup>c</sup>  
 .13 He will build the temple of the Lord  
       He will bear royal majesty  
       and sit and rule on his throne.  
 A priest will be at this throne<sup>d</sup>  
       and a peaceful counsel will be between them.
- .14 And the crowns will be a memorial  
       for Heldai,<sup>e</sup> Tobiyah, and Jedaiah  
       and Josiah,<sup>f</sup> the son of Zephaniah  
       in the temple of the Lord.

.15 And those far away will come and  
build the temple of the Lord;  
and you shall know that the Lord of Hosts  
sent me to you.  
And it will happen, if you obey the voice<sup>64</sup>  
of Yahweh your God.

Zech 6.9-15 presents us with the most difficult of the three Zechariah passages. Virtually all commentators, no matter how avid their defense of the MT textually or literally, have had recourse to rerouting the material and emendations of one sort and another. There has been a rather consistent exegetical tradition. In the last century Sellin, Wellhausen, Horst, Elliger, et al. have seen the oracle as basically one piece about Zerubbabel which has undergone a redaction in favor of Joshua. So all would strike "Joshua the High Priest" and replace it with "Zerubbabel" in the coronation statement of v.11.<sup>65</sup>

More recently, two new proposals have appeared: Beuken's and Petitjean's. The issue at stake is not that of redaction. Virtually everyone thinks that the original elements of this pericope have been tampered with to provide a more favorable picture of Joshua. Instead, the arguments revolve around the identification of the more original units and their significance.

According to Beuken, the important feature of this pericope is the pre-history of vv.12-13. Referring to five texts, beginning with the famous dynastic promise of 2 Sam 7.13, Beuken suggests that Zechariah is appealing to the dynastic promise which incorporates the royal responsibility of

temple building.<sup>66</sup> The similarity between the phraseology in these texts is striking, the five parallel texts being products of Deuteronomistic or Chronistic efforts. Further, Beuken through a careful syntactic analysis, shows that v.13a should not be omitted as a doublet, but that it is to be seen as a proper articulation of the royal predicates:  $\chi\lambda\eta\eta\dots\chi\lambda\eta\eta\dots$  and then with hendiadys, "he will rule..."<sup>67</sup> V.13c and the presence of Joshua in v.11 are then to be read as later inserts. The difference in the names, v.10 versus v.14, holds little meaning for Beuken, I find his analysis of 6.12-13 most helpful; but it hardly solves the problem of the entire pericope.

Petitjean's explanation is, as might be expected, quite different, providing a more macrocosmic picture. He concludes that vv.10-12 provide an older symbolic action concerned primarily with the figure of Zerubbabel, while vv.13-15a,c are a late promise of reconstruction in which the High Priest has achieved parity with the royal figure. Zech 6.15b and 6.9 are, according to Petitjean, redactional connections added by an editor.<sup>68</sup>

My view is that we have two originally separate pieces: (1) vv.10-11a,14,15a; and (2) vv.12-13a, with later additions due to a redactional interest in Joshua (vv.11b,13b) and more additions of a neutral and purely editorial character (vv.6,9,15b,c). Summarily stated, the first of these oracles reflects a fund-raising venture designed to restore royal-cultic paraphernalia, the crowns.<sup>69</sup>

These crowns were to be given in such a manner that the donors would be memorialized as in contemporary memorials in churches, gymnasiums, libraries, and the like.<sup>70</sup> The second, vv.12-13a, comprises an oracle of weal concerning the royal aspirations of Zerubbabel as with Nathan's oracle.

It is at this point clear that I accept Beuken's analysis of vv.12-13. To do this is to reject Petitjean's views. Hence the argumentation commences. I have two difficulties with Petitjean's contentions. (1) In Zech 6.12, Petitjean wants to follow MT and read "Joshua." Yet he argues that vv.11-12 concentrate on Zerubbabel. This is a basic contradiction. To side step this inconsistency, Petitjean thinks that Joshua's coronation is a symbolic action for the coming reign of the Davidide, just as the priests are symbolic in Zech 3.8ff (hardly a clear analog).<sup>71</sup> Petitjean suggests that the verse is prior to 520 and thus announces or presages the restoration of the royal figure.

This theory strikes me as highly unlikely, the more so since such a history would be inconsistent with a later emphasis on Joshua. If Joshua was symbolically crowned propaedeutically for Zerubbabel, we can hardly call this an emphasis on Zerubbabel as Petitjean does. Also, there is little form critical evidence to suggest a prophetic-like symbolic action. Further, such a move or symbolic action would have been impolitic. We are probably not amiss in thinking that v.13c presumes a not-so-peaceful misunderstanding--

the sort of friction that Zechariah would not want to have provided or recorded in a symbolic coronation. Finally, there is no evidence that Zechariah had included the High Priest in his restoration views prior to 520. As both Petitjean and Beuken have shown, the High Priest becomes significant in later redaction.

(2) Petitjean wants to see vv.12-13 as two separate pieces. This I cannot accept. His arguments depend on: (a) the difference between the first of the proper names, יִדְּוּ in v.10 and ׀לן in v.14; and (b) the repetition of the clause "he shall build the temple of the Lord" in vv. 12b and 13a. Against Petitjean's view that the latter instance is a doublet, Beuken has, as mentioned earlier, shown that the introductory character of ׀לן in v.13a precludes its omission. The personal pronoun has a well-known function of relating the same subjects to a new fact; here the fact is the High Priest's auxiliary status.<sup>72</sup>

The case is more complicated with יִדְּוּ and ׀לן. The proper names in v.14 diverge from those in v.10 in two ways; instead of יִדְּוּ we find ׀לן and instead of יִאֲשִׁירָה we have ׀ן.<sup>73</sup> Petitjean, following Rignell and Noth, proposes that יִדְּוּ is a sobriquet for an original ׀לן. Comparative textual evidence does not support this assertion. Further, this theory hardly supports his other argument that the two verses represent originally independent units.

As for v.14's ׀ן versus יִאֲשִׁירָה in v.10, some have sought to see here simply two names for the same person:

LXX and T have read  $\eta\eta$ ; V, - $\sigma\eta$ . Consequently, we have reason to think that the different names are inherent to MT. To explain this difference, I prefer to see a disruption where  $\eta\eta$  has replaced the original  $\eta\alpha\psi\eta$  in v.14.  $\eta\eta$  might have been part of a now obscure dedicatory clause, something like  $\eta\eta\alpha\lambda\alpha\eta\eta\eta$ .

No certain assertions may be made about this hypothetical problem. What may be concluded, though, is that there is no sufficient reason to think that vv.10 and 14 are parts of originally different pericopae.

Without these two arguments, Petitjean's case for dividing vv.1-12 from vv.13-15a,c can not stand. Hence I propose a new interpretation: reading vv.10-11,14-15a as one oracle and vv.12-13 as yet another (of divisions and such surgery there is no end). The formulaic introduction in v.12 designates the formal break between these two units. As for the redactional pieces, vv.11b,13b,15; more anon.

The first oracle has nothing to do with a coronation of either Zerubbabel or Joshua. It does have to do with securing precious metal for royal-cultic accoutrements, the crowns. I take seriously here the MT plural, "crowns," something Petitjean untypically avoided. We know little about the function of such gold and silver crowns, but we do know that gold and silver were considered necessary for the proper outfitting of the new temple. (Hag 2.8ff). We do know that crowns were part of the ritual equipment which, several centuries later, Antiochus Epiphanes took from

the temple (1 Mac 1.22). Whether they functioned as the High Priest's crowns, the royal crowns, or both, we do not know. However, it does seem most likely that this plea from Zechariah reflects the conditions of his times, an appeal to newly returned members of the diaspora for funds to replace the ritual equipment.

This explanation could, however, be given to the material in Haggai just referred to or to the first several chapters of Ezra with their concern over the diaspora returning with gold and silver. What we have in Zechariah 6 is a very concrete case of fund-raising. We are told the names of those who are to contribute this particular gift. And we are presented with the "memorial technique" of fund-raising. As with the modern analogy, when money is given, a plaque or some such memorial, זכרון, is placed in the building, on a window, or on a piece of equipment. I suggest that the analogy is apt for the case of the returnees Heldai, Tobiyah, Jedaiah, and Joshiah. They are promised, in v.14, this very sort of memorial status by their contributing to the replacement of the temple's ritual apparatus.

A glance at the language used in Zech 6.14 verifies this analogy. The memorial, זכרון, was, more often than not, tied to a special event or object: stones (Josh 4.7) and bronze censers (Num 17.5) as memorials to the people of Israel.<sup>74</sup> However, just as the memorial offering, אֲזָכָרָה, and other cultic rites had to do with the individual and not just the nation, so the זכרון could be something which



individuals accomplished. In Neh 2.20, Nehemiah's response to the Samaritan provocations was, "You have no portion, right or  $\text{רֶכֶּשׁ}$  in Jerusalem." It was just such a memorial that the returning Israelites listed in Zech 6.10,14 received after giving gold and silver for crowns. And with the background of Neh 2.20, such a memorial would have helped verify their right to participation in the restored community. That the crowns, as  $\text{רֶכֶּשׁ}$ , also had an atoning function for the individuals named is probably implied (cf. Exod 30.16; 28.12,29). However, the major point is the memorial quality of the gifts being presented to the cult on behalf of the returnees.

I think it altogether reasonable to think that v.15a belongs with this oracle. The clause serves as a fitting admonition to other members of the diaspora. That it is the exilic community to which this discussion about memorial gifts is addressed is clear from the outset in v.10. Hag 2.2-9 as well as Isa 60.9-10 rather imply that such an appeal to the people in exile was not an isolated example.<sup>75</sup>

Moving to the other primary unit in the material comprising Zech 6.9-15, we delimit vv.12-13a. Its initial boundary is given with the introduction, "Thus says the Lord of Hosts" and the turning of the subject matter to the Branch or Zerubbabel.<sup>76</sup> We have already seen the grammatical reasons for keeping vv.12 and 13a together. The major issue here is the point of this original piece about Zerubbabel. Following Beuken, we maintain that these verses are a

rendition of the dynastic oracle in 2 Sam 7.13--the promise of an established throne and a temple for Yahweh built by the king. Interestingly, contrary to what we might expect from the historical circumstances, the reworking of this promise centers not on the rebuilding of the temple but on the royal predicates of Zerubbabel. Though we do not understand the significance of the  $\text{נצח וְיִבְנֶה אֶת הַמִּקְדָּשׁ}$ , it is part of a word play on the root  $\text{נצח}$ , a theme which implies growth related to the Branch expressed in two ways: temple building and royal rule. We are probably correct in seeing such an oracle given in much the same context as that of Hag 2.20ff, an oracle of weal buttressing the royal aspirations within the context of temple reconstruction.

This analysis has omitted vv.9,11b,13b, and 15b,c. Vv.11b and 13b include the specific references to Joshua and the figure of the High Priest. I theorize that these were included at the time when the two original pieces were synthesized into their present form. V.11b is a blatant attempt at giving authority to the High Priest while v.13b is an exercise in explaining how this powerful High Priest is related to the secular, royal authority. V.15b is a clause which appears in the oracular material of Zechariah, and not in the night visions, e.g. Zech 2.13,15; 4.9. Whether we ought to attribute it to the redaction which also inserted v.11b and v.13b is moot. It does however belong to the strand of oracular tradition present in the book. V.15c recalls the Deuteronomistic phraseology of covenant

conditions found in Deut 28.

In summary, the picture we have of Zech 6.9-15 is one of two originally independent units: vv.10-11a,14-15a and vv.12-13a with redactional additions in vv.9,11b,13b, and 15b,c. Both of the original pieces can be understood as coming from the times and conditions to which Zechariah spoke--the need for a refurbished temple cult and for a royal temple builder. The two units were combined because they offered symbolism--crowns and throne--which could be used to explain the new power of the High Priest in the exilic community.

#### IV

We have just examined what I argue to be Israel's last classical prophets, the last prophets associated with an Israelite ruler, the Davidic Zerubbabel. Both prophets spoke to the community busy with the task of reconstruction. In their eyes, reconstruction of the temple was a priority issue. Another essential feature of this reestablishment of the returned community was the recognition of the Davidic ruler. To this extent, we have royal oracles: Hag 2.20ff and Zech 6.12-13a. The prophets apparently supported the Davidic figure against possible encroachments on his authority, though later redactions have clouded this picture. Contrary to Sauer's view, there is no evidence that Zechariah adopted an anti-Zerubbabel position.<sup>77</sup> While admitting that Haggai is a court prophet, Sauer thinks Zech 4.6ff presents

Zerubbabel as a tool of temple reconstruction. His analysis, however, fails to (a) understand the centrality of the royal figure in Ancient Near Eastern temple construction, (b) to comprehend the literary difficulties inherent in the books of Haggai and Zechariah, and (c) to note the significance of the dynastic oracle in Zech 6.12-13a. I likewise find it difficult to accept Hanson's theory that Haggai and Zechariah represent the hierocratic forces in an hybrid of prophetic eschatology and hierocratic loyalties.<sup>78</sup> His analysis confuses the material of Haggai and Zechariah with the programmatic use to which their message was put by later redactors. Hanson is, I think, correct in saying that these two prophets represent the last of Israelite prophecy; but contrary to what Hanson thinks, it was a prophecy of a rather traditional sort. Consequently, I argue that the oracular material in Zechariah as well as that in Haggai witness to an essential prophetic function as related to institutional life of Israelite society, particularly the monarchy.

If Haggai was advocating the rights of Zerubbabel as king and Davidic successor, Zechariah was anxious to present this royal figure as temple builder. And yet this should not lead us to neglect an essential part of Zechariah's view of Zerubbabel. Zech 6.12-13a is the clearest pro-monarchic stance in either of the books, representing phraseology and ideology directly out of the court prophet traditions of Nathan. Both prophets served as advocates on behalf of the royal figure.

CHAPTER IV  
THE DEUTERO-PROPHETIC COLLECTIONS

In the previous chapters, we have observed the prophetic concern with specific kings in Israel reflecting the integral relationship between monarchy and prophecy. This inherent facet of the prophetic function is part of a political-religious model suggested in the introduction. According to this thesis, the Israelite prophet also participated in the cosmic rule, as a member of the divine council and as a messenger of the divine king. It is the contention of this dissertation that classical Israelite prophets held two clients in balance, the divine and earthly rulers. They mediated between the two kings. In the exilic and post-exilic period, the prophetic office was transformed since there were no Israelite rulers. Prophetic traditionists proclaimed the kingship of Yahweh, and supported no royal office in the present age. The writings of these traditionists are preserved in what are commonly named the deutero-prophetic books.

Concomitant with this shift in the prophetic role came a shift in the actual composition of the prophetic collections. The deutero-prophetic books are characterized by preservation and interpretation of older, that is pre-exilic, prophetic oracles and traditions, a process which reflects the

beginning of a fixity or canon of prophetic literature.

#### DEUTERO-ISAIAH

To speak of sixth century prophecy and not to consider the chapters known since Duhm's work as Deutero-Isaiah is unthinkable. Just how to proceed to think about this prophetic collection is a difficult question.<sup>1</sup> Rather than delay by rehearsing previous scholarly detritus of which there is much, I propose to address briefly several issues which will hopefully illumine our study of how prophecy was shifting and changing under the various forces created by the exilic experience. We are of course interested in the two themes central to this entire dissertation: the relationship between kingship and prophecy, and the beginnings of the eschatological prophet tradition.

How does the book of Deutero-Isaiah relate to these issues? One may initially say, it relates only indirectly. We are presented with oracles, psalms, and poems, which refer to no specific social setting of the prophet. There has been a good bit of theorizing about Deutero-Isaiah's importance for the worshipping community of the exile.<sup>2</sup> Rather than mount a new search for a now obfuscated social location for this book, I propose to accept its lack of precise moorings as a primary datum for our understanding of the book. The lack of precision we find in attempts to define the original function of the songs and oracles is a direct corollary to our lack of ability to say much about the author of the book.

We are able to identify historical allusions, e.g. Isa 45.1-3 concerning Cyrus' victories. But trying to identify material about the prophet or his understanding of the prophetic office has not been a terribly fruitful enterprise. This inability should not surprise us, since, in this late exilic time, we could predict a disintegration of the classic prophetic role. No longer could we expect a client relationship with politically impotent Davidic progeny. The basic institutions of Israelite society had suffered serious permutation in the diaspora. Just how significant these changes were, is revealed by several texts in the Deutero-Isaianic collection.

## I

Claus Westermann has entitled one segment of the introduction to his commentary "The Prophet Himself," suggesting the possibility of finding something specific about the enigmatic author. He says: "Only once, and even then only for a moment, does he let himself be seen. This is in the prologue, in 40.6-7, which gives his call."<sup>3</sup> Isa 40.6 is the single place where the first person is said to have been used autobiographically.<sup>4</sup> The verse has traditionally been read, "A voice says, 'Cry;' and I said, 'What shall I cry?'" On the basis of I QIs<sup>a</sup>, "A voice says, 'Cry;' and she said, 'What shall I cry?'" is a preferable translation.<sup>5</sup> The speaker is not the author but the prophetess Zion. This rendition of Isa 40.6

upsets the view that the Deutero-Isaianic call is present in these verses. Rather it appears that we have the call of the Zion figure.

Following Habel's analysis of the prophetic call Gattung, we provide the following schema:<sup>6</sup>

The Introductory Word	40.1-2
The Commission	.3-5,6a
The Objection	.6-7
Reassurance	.8-11

This is a pattern which developed within the prophetic traditions (Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel) based upon the call traditions of Moses and Gideon.<sup>7</sup> That is to say that the prologue of the book participates in a stereotypical form of Israelite prophetic traditions. This is not to deny that the passage is a well-wrought composition utterly consistent with the aim of the book. But it is said as a caution to Westermann's assertion that we are in fact allowed to see the prophetic figure. As Habel says, "The call narratives, therefore, are not primarily pieces of autobiographical information but open proclamations of the prophet's claim to be Yahweh's agents at work in Israel."<sup>8</sup> Frank Cross's emphasis on the divine council setting for Isa 40.1-8 should act as a further caution against an immediate appropriation of this text as evidence about Deutero-Isaiah the person.<sup>9</sup> Without an autobiographical "I" in Isa 40.6, the book of Deutero-Isaiah is virtually devoid of an identifiable prophetic voice.<sup>10</sup>



To deny this specific first person prophetic character to the book is not to deny its place in prophetic tradition. The presence of the call narrative Gattung emphasizes participation in prophetic tradition as does the placement of the book with its thematic precursor, Isaiah 1-39. Westermann has further argued, on the basis of texts like Isa 43.22-28, that Deutero-Isaiah stands in a tradition consonant with the prophets of doom.<sup>11</sup> The emphasis on the power of the word of the Lord, made explicit in both the prologue (Isa 40.8) and epilogue (Isa 55.10-11), is part and parcel of both an earlier and a later prophetic perspective: Jer 23.28ff; Zech 1.4-5; Is 59.21. Likewise the clause "Have I not told you beforehand?" recalls both a view about the continuity of prophetic task and message, see Jer 7.25.<sup>12</sup> Hence, Deutero-Isaiah stands within an explicit prophetic tradition.

## II

The heavy emphasis on the Exodus tradition in Deutero-Isaiah is directly related to a lack of interest in the Davidic tradition. Deutero-Isaiah never uses the appellation מלך for an Israelite king. For him, only Yahweh is king over Israel (Is 41.21; 32.15; 52.7). Likewise, we have no reason to think that Deutero-Isaiah looks forward to a time of Davidic restoration. As Eissfeldt notes, "...for our Exilic prophet does not count the Davidic kingdom among the blessings hoped for in the coming Day of Salvation."<sup>13</sup>

Only once does "David" appear. Even though there is a promise of renewal of the Davidic covenant (Isa 55.3), the promise is attenuated, as many have recognized. Eissfeldt's analysis of the relationship between Ps 89, a lament over the loss of the Davidic king, and Isa 55.1-5 shows clearly that the interest in the Davidic king in Deutero-Isaiah is minor. In Ps 89, ~~דוד~~ and ~~דוד~~ refer to David. In Deutero-Isaiah, they are used of Israel and Jacob who represent all of Israel in exile.<sup>14</sup>

As an expression of the mercy offered by Yahweh to his people, the following promise is given: "I will make with you an everlasting covenant, my steadfast, sure love for David" (Isa 55.3), a promise which harkens back to the promises of Nathan (2 Sam 7.8ff), and the themes of Ps 89. But, as many have seen, the benefits accrue not to the Davidic house but to the people of Israel.<sup>15</sup> There is a brief recitation of Davidic glory in Isa 55.4, but the glorification of the people provides a culmination. The election of David has been converted into a statement of election for the people of Israel. We can, I think, conclude that the importance of the royal house and the place of the prophet within that social location have diminished significantly in the work of Deutero-Isaiah.<sup>16</sup> He has reworked the Davidic royal election traditions into a promise of glory for the people.

### III

The servant songs comprise a final venue in our considerations.<sup>17</sup> I have no magic solutions to bring; the

identity of the servant remains cloudy, as was probably initially intended. This lack of precision about the figure left later reflection about the figure able to appropriate varying emphases or facets. Since we are primarily interested in traditions about prophecy, I wish here to point to those features of the servant songs which have to do with prophecy.

That I do not beg the question in assuming certain prophetic qualities inherent to the servant figure is obvious. As Westermann says:

This much, however, is certain; the Servant has a task imposed on him by God and it embraces the Gentiles as well as Israel. It is also certain that his function is that of proclaiming God's word, and to this extent it very closely approximates to a prophet's...The Servant has a place in the history of the office of the mediator, which begins with Moses, who is also designated as servant of God. The terms used of the servant have direct links with that stage in the history of prophecy which immediately preceded Deutero-Isaiah; these are clear echoes of the complaints of Jeremiah, the last prophet before the exile.<sup>18</sup>

The case is even stronger than Westermann has supposed. The call of the servant (in the Second Servant Song: Isa 49.1-6) follows very closely the Gattung of the call narrative discussed earlier:<sup>19</sup>

The Introductory Word	49.1-2
The Commission	.3
The Objection	.4
Reassurance	.5-6

The similarity of the formal elements of the call Gattung, and the thematic similarity of the pre-natal calling to Jer 1.4 are striking, as well as the complaint also found in the

call of Deutero-Isaiah--the implication that such labors are in vain.

This servant was one who spoke to more than a national constituency: the nations (Isa 49.6; 52.15) and the coastlands (Isa 49.6). Instead of counseling kings or being interested in Davidic traditions, this enigmatic figure can speak, "kings will shut their mouths" (Isa 52.15). He is more an emissary of Yahweh, the divine king to various earthly rulers than a classical Israelite prophet who, though sent from the divine council, had a closer relationship to individual monarchs or pretenders.

One characteristic of this servant figure requires further statement. There is a strong implication that the servant is one whose time is not yet; he is someone of the future. Many early commentaries caught this tendency and developed a full-blown Messianic interpretation of the suffering servant. More recently, proponents of the sacral kingship theory have piled up arguments attempting to show the similarity to the ritual for Babylonian kings in the New Year's festival.<sup>20</sup> But Muilenburg, is able to emphasize this futurity without attempting unwise precision: "...the servant is a figure of the coming age...the servant stands at the eschaton. It is precisely in this kind of setting that all that is said concerning him and all that he has to say have meaning and relevance."<sup>21</sup> More than this we can not say. The eschatological scenario is not yet fully developed in Deutero-Isaiah, nor is the servant's place in that new world

view fully defined. But as Mullénburg has noted, it seems clear that the servant participates in the eschatological age.

The enigmatic servant has provided certain options for appropriation, certain tendencies of what might happen to a quasi-prophetic figure. One of these is the basic futurity of the figure; the servant may be understood as participating in the age to come. No longer is the prophetic figure simply an office to be occupied but it is becoming a more cosmic figure about which prophetic traditions may collect. In effect, it becomes a prophetic tradition.

#### TRITO-ISAIAH

One could, I suppose, move immediately from the writings of Deutero-Isaiah to the other deutero-prophetic books. To proceed in such a manner would, however, omit an enigmatic prophetic collection, a collection which, while not offering historical data, provides us with an example of how a prophetic traditionist of the diaspora, now returned to the land, appropriated earlier Israelite literature and traditions in constructing his message.<sup>22</sup> I hesitate to call the author(s) prophets since the literature and the activity which produced Trito-Isaiah is rather widely removed from the classic model, as will become evident.

To my mind, the most satisfactory approaches to placing Trito-Isaiah in its milieu, have been those of Westermann, and even more, Hanson.<sup>23</sup> These commentators suggest that the nucleus of the book reflects the period just prior to 520.

This is, of course, not to deny that there may be pre-exilic portions as well as later additions contained in the collection. But it is to say that there is a certain consistency of argument and style which may be explained by reference to the latter half of the sixth century and the concerns then current about the reestablishment of the cult in Jerusalem.<sup>24</sup> The author was probably entrusted with the Isaianic collections, one of those who returned to the land prior to the arrival of the group which included Zechariah and Zerubbabel.<sup>25</sup>

## I

The function of the prophetic individual is an important indication of the character of this collection. Not surprisingly, there is little to be seen of this figure. There is no prophetic call narrative. Instead we have two passages which use the first person in a way which might inform us about the prophetic task: Isa 61.1-3 and Isa 62.1-12.<sup>26</sup> Happily most commentators agree that these texts belong to the nucleus of early or original material. In Isa 62, a voice, most probably to be interpreted as that of the prophet, proclaims its task:<sup>27</sup> Isa 62.1 "I will not keep silent...I will not rest," and perhaps also in v.6 "I have set watchmen." The compulsion to perform on behalf of Zion is the raison d'etre of the oracle. The necessity to so speak is consistent with earlier classical prophetic statements, e.g. Amos 3.8. Here then the writer stands in the prophetic traditions of an earlier era.

Isa 61.1-3 is not a clear strophe, though it is made up of a very consistent metric pattern.<sup>28</sup> Two basic options for interpreting the identity of the "I" are available. One can argue either that the servant is speaking or that the voice is the prophet's. Many recent commentators are content to read this as the prophetic first person.<sup>29</sup> I, however, favor the former possibility.

Cannon, among others, has suggested that this strophe should be read as a part of the servant songs in Deutero-Isaiah. Certain similarities in vocabulary, metric style, and theme attest to a similarity between Isa 61.1-3 and the servant songs. This thesis is substantiated, because Isa 61.1-3 does not fit well into the surrounding material, Isa 60-62. Perhaps the most interesting of Cannon's conclusions, is that Isa 61.1-3 bears striking similarities to the first three servant songs, but not to the final one.<sup>30</sup> Whether this shows a line of development from Isa 42.1-7 through 61.1-3 to 52.13-53.12 must remain moot. The basic thrust of the argument --the similarity between Isa 61.1-3 and the Deutero-Isaianic servant songs--is difficult to deny, whether or not we accept his contention that Isa 60-62 is impossible to distinguish from the writings of Deutero-Isaiah.

The particular elements which make up this oracle are unique. The "spirit" achieves prominence, as with Ezekiel and in opposition to so much of classical Israelite prophetic writings.<sup>31</sup> The use of "spirit" in Mic 3.8 and in the first servant song, Isa 42.1, is similar; in both cases the juxtaposition of spirit with justice parallels Isa 61.1ff. Anointing is a most unusual characteristic. We expect

anointing and the consequent bestowal for kingship ritual, as in 2 Sam 23.1ff, but not for prophets.

After these two authorizing signs--spirit and anointing--the rest of the oracle is comprised of many descriptions of the task. To my mind, the most significant feature of these descriptions is the contrast between Isa 61.1-2 and v.3. Isa 61.1-2 are general (the prophet shall comfort the afflicted, the broken-hearted, the captives, all who mourn) whereas in v.3, the focus shifts to a precise location, Zion, and more specific lament techniques (ashes, garlands, and unctions).<sup>32</sup> V.3 suggests what it is to provide comfort and how these good tidings were to be received.

One can, I think, contend that the oracle, Isa 61.1-3, represents a confluence of servant and call traditions. The task of the servant has informed the classical commission of the prophet. The "introductory word" and the "commission" penetrate the servant's task as they did with the classical call Gattung in Isa 49. The writer has composed an oracle which treats of the same arena of topics one finds in the prophetic call narrative, but he concentrates on the area we designate as the "commission." The necessity for such a concentration should be obvious--the task of the prophet after Deutero-Isaiah had radically changed. The people were now gathered back to the land. A new commission was necessary--to provide comfort for the people.

Within this perspective, it is extraordinarily difficult to be dogmatic about the relationship of the task



expressed in this oracle and the self-conceived duty of the author of Trito-Isaiah, the more so since commentators like Muilenburg describe the figure of this oracle as "the eschatological prophet in a superlative degree."<sup>33</sup>

## II

Since we are unable to discover much about the prophetic self-understanding represented by the writer of Trito-Isaiah, another option is to search for traditions about the prophetic task. In virtually all classical Israelite prophetic books, the royal or Davidic traditions play an important part. In Trito-Isaiah, the name David does not appear. This may not be explained as just an absence of that specific name since there is little evidence of concern for any royal tradition. Zion and Jerusalem traditions are present, but without their royal counterparts. Neither is the royal character of the servant traditions present in Trito-Isaiah. A probable explanation for this omission is to be found in the particular time and place in which this book was written--prior to 520 in Palestine. The Davidic progeny was still in Babylon. There was no possibility for the prophetic traditionist to practice a role as royal advisor. Instead, ritual questions as well as specific intra-community strife held the attention of the writer.

Concern with the word of Yahweh, another way of identifying classical prophetic concerns, is present in both Deutero- and Trito-Isaiah. The word of Yahweh is the basis for the reassurance offered in the call of Deutero-Isaiah (Isa 40.8).

Likewise, "the Lord God has given me the tongue of those who are taught, that I may know how to sustain with a word him that is weary," (Isa 50.4). Trito-Isaiah also mentions the word of the Lord (Isa 66.3,5). But the references to the word display a new awe; one should tremble at the word of the Lord. This new awe is a definite step beyond the challenging or comforting words of earlier prophetic writers. The word has gained a new fixity and authority.

One way of understanding the rather different prophetic status of this collection may be had by reference to the question, how was the book composed? Elliger's arguments that the author of Trito-Isaiah stands in the tradition of Deutero-Isaiah have been convincingly made. But the authors were different, as Zimmerli has shown.<sup>34</sup> The style of Trito-Isaiah has its own integrity.

We must, I think, proceed beyond the assertions about "standing in a tradition," since this is at best a figurative way of describing the place of the literature. Diethelm Michel has argued that Trito-Isaiah treated the received Isaianic material as authoritative religious literature and expounded these traditions in exegetical fashion.<sup>35</sup> Accordingly for Michel, Isa 62.1 is the text, with vv.2-5 functioning as interpretation; Isa 56.1 is text, v.2, interpretation and vv.3-7, a situational application of the interpretation; Isa 62.6a, text, vv.6b-7 comprise the interpretation.<sup>36</sup> On the basis of these examples and his other work, we may posit an exegetical activity for those preserving the

Isaianic prophetic traditions. Plöger's work further buttresses this view of the collecting-editorial work which went into the post-exilic prophetic collections.<sup>37</sup>

The attitude toward the word of Yahweh and the indications of an exegetical enterprise in Trito-Isaiah suggest that we are now dealing with traditionists, preservers, and interpreters of authoritative traditions, rather than innovators in the use of Israel's religious past. Israel's classical prophets were preservers and interpreters of tradition as well. But traditions and oracular collections had acquired a new authority in the post-exilic period. Likewise, the prophetic traditionists were speaking within a different sociological setting. Their place had become a more "scholarly," if we may use that term, a more consciously literary activity than that of the classical Israelite prophet. Michel expresses this change well:

...Trito-Isaiah may scarcely be called a prophet. For him the tradition is apprehended in such a manner that it can only be interpreted, not reinterpreted... One must see that with him a new epoch dawns: the scribal (schriftgelehrte) exegesis, which regards the tradition as a fixed, unchangeable entity.<sup>38</sup>

### III

To suggest that Trito-Isaiah is primarily a reflective, literary product is not to suggest that the book was composed in a vacuum. The concerns of the writer are much too intense to allow such an interpretation. One such evident concern is revealed by a conscious polemical tone (Isa 66.5).

Hanson's treatment of Trito-Isaiah has sought to understand

the development of this polemic and to identify the context of the dispute.<sup>39</sup> In discussing various sections of the collection, Hanson argues that a development from "mild reprimand (Isa 64.7) to acrimonious attack (Isa 57.3ff) took place."<sup>40</sup> Basing his analysis on a contextual-typological method of prosodic investigation as well as a more general assessment of the content, Hanson traces the increasing sharpness of the presupposed controversy from Isa 60-62 and Isa 57.14-21 representing the earliest stages; followed by Isa 63.7-64.4; 58; 59; 65; and 66.1-16; up to the most argumentative section, Isa 56.9-57.13.

The setting, according to Hanson, for these growing tensions may be found in opposing religious parties--the visionaries who preserved the prophetic eschatology increasingly expressed in mythic terms versus the more established hierarchy. Hanson sees a direct conflict between the program of restoration offered by Ezek 40-48 and that of the visionaries in Isa 60-62.<sup>41</sup> In other terms, the conflict is between the returning Zadokites versus the visionary traditionists of the Isaianic school, which probably included some Levites as well.<sup>42</sup>

Hanson's analysis--visionaries versus the hierarchy--follows much the same sociological approach as does that of Plöger--eschatological conventicles versus the theocracy. The main difference comes in their dating schemas. Plöger wants to see the Isaianic Apocalypse (Isa 27) derive from the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, and the rest (Isa 24-26) from

Ptolemaic times.<sup>43</sup> Hanson, on the other hand, suggests that Isa 34-35 come from the same period as Isa 60-62, a time immediately after that of Deutero-Isaiah and before the struggles of c. 520.<sup>44</sup> By dint of his prosodic analysis, Hanson has been able to take the two-group theory of apocalyptic origins advocated by Plöger, apply it to Trito-Isaiah, and push the dating for this development into the sixth century.

For our purposes, the most important discovery is the type of activity which produced what we call Trito-Isaiah--an exegetical enterprise--which took place in times of increasing conflict. Such a view provides a direct contrast between the classical social setting of the prophet's function in Israelite society and his post-exilic role. It was a permutation created in great part by the absence of a royal pretender in the land and a concomitant change in the attitude toward the authority of earlier traditions and collections. When the royal progeny returned to Israel c. 520, the classical prophetic model was once more, for the last time, in force.

## DEUTERO-ZECHARIAH

It is, of course, difficult to be precise about the conditions of the community living in Israel after 520 and before the Hellenistic period. What we may take for granted is the end of the Davidic royal line as a source of government. The demise of Zerubbabel is unexplained,<sup>45</sup> and we know of no political aspirations in whatever progeny he may have had.<sup>46</sup> In order to examine this area we now approach the collections of post-exilic prophetic traditionists which defy precise assignation of authorship and date. The reasons for no longer speaking of Israelite prophecy in a classical sense have been suggested in the introduction. To further explore this development of Israelite prophecy, I propose to examine several additional texts in the deutero-prophetic collections: Zech 13.2-6; Joel 3.1-5; and Mal 3.23-24. These are all additions to earlier prophetic books. They all come from a time when classical prophecy had been transmuted into a different phenomenon. And they all have something to say about how prophecy was viewed in that period by the prophetic traditionists, providing a contrast to the view of prophecy from about the same time which we will garner from the Chronicler's history.

There are three basic themes present in this material: an anti-prophetic motif; an expectation of a coming prophet and prophecy with a pouring out of the Spirit of Yahweh; and the presentation of Yahweh as king with the prophetic traditionist as exegetical and theological client. To discover

the nature of these traditions we turn first to an extremely difficult text, Zech 13.2-6, which has yielded significant results for this study.

#### Zechariah 13.2-6

- .2 And it shall happen on that day, says the Lord of Hosts  
 I will cut off the names of the idols from the land,  
 and they shall no more be remembered, and  
 I will burn out<sup>a</sup> the prophets and the unclean spirit  
 from the land.
- .3 And it shall happen, that when anyone should  
 still prophesy,  
 his father and his mother shall say to him;  
 "You shall not live  
 for you speak lies in the name of the Lord."  
 And his father and mother shall kill<sup>b</sup> him  
 when he prophesies.
- .4 And it shall happen on that day,  
 every prophet shall be ashamed of his vision  
 when he prophesies<sup>c</sup>  
 and they shall not put on a hairy mantled<sup>d</sup>  
 in order to deceive,
- .5 but he shall say "I am no prophet  
 I am a worker of the land  
 the land is my possession<sup>e</sup>  
 from my youth.
- .6 And when one says to him,  
 "What are these wounds on your back?"<sup>f</sup>  
 He will answer,  
 "that was when I was wounded  
 in the house of my friends."<sup>g</sup> 47

The choice of Zech 13.2-6 is appropriate for such a task if for no other reason than that its subject matter is prophecy. To justify my delimitation of these verses, I appeal to the formula "on that day," the stylistic Leitmotiv in Zech 12-14. This expression occurs at the beginning of Zech 13.1,2, and 4. Zech 13.7 does not begin with this phrase; the developed shepherd imagery in vv.7-9 indicates, as it does in Zech 10 and 11, another concern. Admittedly, the shepherd figure may be interpreted as prophetic or royal,

although the latter is surely preferable. In either case, the concern for a restored remnant in Zech 13.7-9 points to a different interest than the more negative pronouncement in vv.2-6.

To delimit this unit should not blind us to the fact that this pericope about prophecy is a part of a larger and redactionally unified whole. Saebo has pointed to the almost monotonous repetition of similar introductory formulae in Zech 12.2-13.6 based on the phrase גַּיְוֹן הַהוּא.<sup>48</sup> Also important in Zech 12.2-13.6 is the variation between Yahweh speech and prophetic speech which serves as a way of emphasizing the Kernwörter of the composition: Zech 12.3; 12.9; and 13.2.<sup>49</sup> The various themes included in this larger unit are varied, as is the whole of Deutero-Zechariah.<sup>50</sup>

Form critical observations also provide evidence for an evaluation. Zech 13.2 is a first person sentence (legal) which usually occurs only at the conclusion of a judgement oracle.<sup>51</sup> In Zech 13.2, the sentence initiates the unit. Likewise unusual, there is no mention of the prophet as messenger. Yahweh himself is making the judgement; there is no intermediary. In v.3, we find what appears to be casuistic legal language, the "if....then" so common to the Deuteronomic formulations. Zech 13.4-6 provide something akin to what Wildberger and Westermann have called prophetic accounts or reports.<sup>52</sup> Typically in these accounts, the prophet has the last word, (cf. Amos 7.10ff). However, here the account, instead of providing a prophetic word



of judgement, depicts the past of the prophet as one of questionable motive and physical mutilation. The account is a word of self-judgment.

Having described these formal characteristics, form criticism would be counterproductive if we insisted strictly on oral traditions behind these verses. There is no indication that such a tradition existed. Instead the classical categories appear to have been appropriated into a literary admixture for the purpose of denigrating the prophetic enterprise.

The allusions in Zech 13.2-6 run the gamut of Israel's prophetic experience: the Canaanite ecstatic, the bemantled Elijah, the iconoclastic Amos. Zech 13.2 begins with the oft-stated prohibition against idols. Such a law is hardly unique or surprising, especially when the prohibition against images and likenesses had been such an important part of Israel's legal heritage. But the addendum, that Yahweh hates the prophets as well as the unclean spirit (an hapax), creates the new polemic. To discover that this combined polemic against prophet and spirit was not a universal view in post-exilic times, we need only refer to the Chronicler's description of Joash's reign in 2 Chron 24.18ff. The people served Asherim and אֲשֵׁרִים in contradistinction to the prophets who were sent to save the people.

Zech 13.3 appears to incorporate a Deuteronomic perspective. The warrant whereby parents derive authority is, of course, dependent on another of the basic commandments.

However, it was more fully spelled out in Deut 21.18ff. The nature of the recalcitrant offspring is specified: disobedient, stubborn, rebellious, gluttonous, drunken. In the Deuteronomic case, the parents were to turn over the son for prosecution and punishment. In Zechariah, the parents act as prosecution, judge, and executioner. The obvious implication is that the nature of this transgression--prophesying--is much more serious than the disobedient son and requires immediate extermination. The further implication that anyone who prophesies is immature, subject to one's elders, and not protected by the normal judicial procedures, can hardly be interpreted as a favorable overview of the prophetic office.

Within the "bad son" legal framework, we might expect to find the formal Deuteronomic charge against bad prophets: if what he says does not come true, he shall die (Deut 18.15ff); or the further refinement in Deut 13.2ff, that if the prophecy does come true, but the prophet is speaking on behalf of another god, he shall die. Instead, the writer plugs in the  $\text{רַשָּׁעִים}$  language, derivative of the prophetic conflicts in Jeremiah (Jer 14.14; 23.25; 29.21). A striking example is the accusation made by Jeremiah against prophets and other diviners of weal in Jeremiah 27.8-11. Here the prophets have recommended resistance against Babylon. Jeremiah argues that these words are lies "with the result that you will be removed from the land, and I will drive you out and you will perish"--very nearly the same argument employed here in Zechariah

(if one reads אַעבִיר). However, in Zechariah, the sentence will fall not on the people but on those prophets who spoke falsely in Yahweh's name. The sentence has been switched from the people to the prophets.

שָׁקַר language is used in a special nexus. Speaking שָׁקַר is to break the covenant which governs human action (Exod 20.16; Deut 19.8). Those who swear falsely incur the curses enjoined for breach of covenant. In the Sefire treaty, if either party should יִשָּׁקֵר, the curses would be activated.<sup>53</sup> Men may break the covenant, but the treaty has divine authorization and therein lies the source and force of the curses.<sup>54</sup>

As we move to Zech 13.4, the allusions to Israel's traditions continue. Immediately, the prophetic enterprise is thrown into question when the mode of prophecy is limited to visions. In the Jeremianic critique (Jer 23.16) the false prophets are speaking "visions of their own minds, not from the mouth of the Lord." These prophecies are of a second-rate genre.

Further, the theme of shame harkens back to the threat against eighth century purveyors of peace. Micah 3.5-8 gives an oracle against such שְׁלוֹמִים prophets. One of the threats is that they will be ashamed of their visions. The corollary threat is that the prophets will have nothing to say; Yahweh will give them no answer; they will not be prophets.

The אֲדָרְתֵי שָׂרָא complicates matters because the prophetic mantle of Elijah and Elisha is undoubtedly part of the reference (1 Kgs 19.19; 2 Kgs 2.13). The Elisha and Elijah

cycles would have called to mind legitimate prophetic activity (2 Kgs 2.8,14). How is it an anti-prophetic polemic? In a semi-midrashic move, I point to the use of the term to describe Esau in Gen 25.25. However, it was using such an hairy mantle that Jacob was able to deceive Isaac and gain Esau's birthright. Such a literary connection would have been a distinct option to post-exilic exegetes and could have thus provided a tie between legitimate prophecy and deceptive technique.

The famous disclaimer of Amos is probably the literary precursor of v.5. The use of this same phrase and the repetitive  $\text{וְכִי־יִשְׁכַּח}$  is unclear in our passage, as is the nature of the final claim  $\text{אֲדַם הַקְּנוֹרִי}$ . As indicated above, Otzen's attempt to link the MT with the Targum and Peshitta root qn' seems unsatisfactory, though it would offer a handy parallel for interpreting v.6.

A presupposition in the analysis thus far has been that vv.2-6 are a basic unit. This view is not universally accepted and not without reason. "And on that day," the stylistic motif of Zech 12.2-13.6 recurs in vv.2 and 4, giving at least formal reason to think that more than one piece is involved. One might argue that there is a difference in content between the two sections; vv.2-3 have to do with removal and punishment of prophets, while vv.4-6 are more concerned with self-ostracism. These differences are slight though; and the theme of prophecy carries through consistently, as the presence of  $\text{וְנִבְיֵאִים}$ , perhaps as Stichwörter,

in both vv.2 and 4 shows.

Elliger suggests that vv.2-3 comprise the original oracle about the death of prophets while vv.4-6 is a later addition.<sup>55</sup> Saebo is more inclined to think that the unit, vv.2-6, is the result of a "successive growth process" which developed out of the Kernwort (v.2).<sup>56</sup> That, of course, sounds reasonable; but we have no internal evidence to demonstrate the successive character of this growth. Rather, because of the richness of the allusion to prior traditions about prophecy, I think one can argue that Zech 13.2-6 is a conscious exegetical drawing on statements about and allusions to prophecy. The unit is a devastating polemic against everything prophetic.<sup>57</sup>

There have been many suggestions about the addressee of this piece (I depend on Otzen's survey here, pp. 195ff). Early on, many felt that the pre-exilic false prophets were indicated and consequently that the composition was pre-exilic (König, 1893). More recently, some have argued that not false prophets, but prophets in general are under attack (Sellin, 1929; Horst, 1954). Otzen thinks that exegetes like Mitchell (ICC) walk a middle road when they say "the word prophet was (in post-exilic times) almost synonymous with false prophet."<sup>58</sup> Otzen himself concludes that the author is attacking syncretistic prophets.<sup>59</sup> He thinks that this problem was paramount in pre-exilic times, but that passages like Neh 6.10-14 point out that similar problems occurred in the post-exilic community (though this passage hardly proves

his point). Basing his analysis on Janssen's reconstruction of exilic Israel, Otzen contends that the polemic derives from a religious degeneration when "heathen mantics flared up in Judah," most probably as a result of traffic with the Northern population.<sup>60</sup>

Otzen's solution seems attractive because the supposed syncretistic prophecy fits the composite nature of the passage. But this is also his crucial error. Just because the pericope is comprised of and refers to disparate elements does not mean that the attack is against a group that is doing all those things. On the basis of the above literary analysis, I would suggest that instead of reflecting syncretistic prophets, the author is attacking prophecy any way he can. He is culling the literary sources for ammunition. Otzen's impression of syncretistic, heathen mantics is really a tribute to the invective launched by the polemicist.

It is possible to theorize the object of this polemic. Paul Hanson has observed in a brief look at this passage:

The passage is intriguing as evidence that the age of prophecy had passed and that those who claimed to be prophets were in fact false prophets. This explains why the visionary group, though the true successors of the prophets, refused to designate themselves as נְבִיאִים.<sup>61</sup>

We have see here how the "intriguing" quality of the passage was achieved by the exegetical-allusive work on earlier prophetic traditions. And we will discover in our investigation of Chronicles the identity of the group who claimed to be prophets in this period, the Levitical singers, a claim

designed to enhance their status in the post-exilic cult. A claim of this sort would have been repugnant to traditionists of earlier prophets. And if the traditionists represented different cultic traditions--non-Jerusalemite--this friction would have added even more heat to the strife.

#### JOEL

On the basis of the harsh words directed at prophecy in the Deutero-Zechariah text, we might expect a consistently negative attitude toward the prophetic enterprise in the rest of the late prophetic collections. Not so. In both the books of Joel and Malachi, we find renewed interest in a future prophecy. This interest is not inconsistent with the section in Zechariah we have just studied. The subject there was prophecy as it could occur, while the material in Joel and Malachi purports to express a hope for prophecy in the future.

Conjecture about a date for this material yields no firm conclusions. I hold out for a placement not later than the beginning of the Hellenistic period.<sup>62</sup>

The first text to be examined is Joel 3.1-5:

- 3.1 And then it shall happen<sup>a</sup>  
 I will pour out my spirit<sup>b</sup> upon all flesh;  
 Your sons and your daughters shall be prophets,<sup>c</sup>  
 Your old men shall dream dreams,  
 Your young men shall see visions.
- .2 ~~Even~~ upon<sup>d</sup> the menservants and maidservants  
 I will in those days pour out my spirit.
- .3 And I will set signs in the heavens and on the earth  
 blood and fire; and columns of smoke.<sup>e</sup>

- .4 The sun will be turned to darkness  
and the moon to blood,  
before the day of the Lord comes  
which is a terrible and great thing.
- .5 And all who call upon the name of the Lord<sup>f</sup>  
will be saved;  
because there will be salvation on Mount Zion  
as the Lord said  
and survivors whom Yāhweh will summon<sup>g</sup> 63

Before examining the place of this pericope in the development of a theory about prophecy, we must take note of its place in the book of Joel. There is a good bit of controversy on this latter point. Plöger has argued that chapter 3, along with chapter 4, is part of an eschatological section, but that Joel 3 is later than chapter 4.<sup>64</sup> Rudolph, who thinks Joel to be a unified product, suggests that chapters 3 and 4 comprise an integrated subsection.<sup>65</sup> Wolff gives the most detailed analysis in asserting that Joel 2.18-3.5 comprise a large Erhörungsanspruch of which Joel 3.1-5 make up three smaller sections: vv.1-2 Heilsanspruch, vv.3-4 Zeichenansage, v.5 Heilsansage.<sup>66</sup> Wolff's proposals seem to be the most adequate way to classify 3.1-5; but his arguments for a structural connection between chapters 2 and 3 seem weak.

A more tangled problem is the inner connection of Joel 3.1-5. That vv.1-2 belong together is suggested by the similarity of theme as well as the **TSW** root which opens and closes the verses. Likewise, vv.3-4 demonstrate an homogeneity of symbolism in chiastic order. V.5 acts, as Wolff has noted, as an announcement of salvation for those called and for Zion. Rather than argue for a unity of text on



form critical grounds, as Wolff has done, I would rather simply suggest that what we have here is a description of the preliminaries to the eschatological age, a part of the eschatological scenario, or as Rudolph puts it, Vorzeichen of the final age.<sup>67</sup>

One of the pressing questions posed by this text is that of its futuristic connotation. When are these signs to be manifest? We have three phrases which are liable to a temporal interpretation. The first, והיה אחריו, is surely to be read as an editorial connecting piece, a Verknüpfungsformel.<sup>68</sup> The בְּיָמֵי הַהֵמָּה of v.2 is commonly used in Jeremiah, in both oracles of weal and woe, to point to the future: Jer 3.16,18; 5.18; 31.29; 33.15,16; 50.4,20; and also Zech 8.23. One might want to argue that the phrase denotes the eschatological age, as Jer 31.15ff. But to contend that the phrase is an eschatological terminus technicus is probably to overstate the case. In v.4 we meet the much discussed יָוֵם יְהוָה.<sup>69</sup> We have heard enough about holy war in recent years to know that such martial activity is most probably the origin of this term.<sup>70</sup> This war could be directed either at Israel's enemies or at Israel herself when she was disobedient. But to simply launch off on a discussion of the Day of Yahweh concept ignores what is said in the Joel text. For the extraordinary signs are to occur לְפָנָי, before the day of Yahweh comes. Once we recognize the pre-quality of v.4, v.5 makes a bit more sense. For we are talking about the conditions for

a successful existence through the fateful day of Yahweh. We have to do in this pericope with a scenario of the preparatio. This is part of what is to happen before Yahweh works his victory and reestablishes a visible kingship on Zion. These five verses contain themes and traditions gathered from the Israelite repository and used to describe the coming days. We now examine these three individual elements: the pouring out of the spirit, the cosmic signs, and salvation on Zion.

In vv.1-2, the writer has synthesized thoughts about a pouring out of the spirit with the return of prophecy for the whole people. Aside from the uses of **טָּוַעַף** for pouring out of the spirit in Joel, we find the phrase used in Ezek 39.29 and Zech 12.10, two other deutero-prophetic texts.<sup>71</sup> In both places, this pouring is used to describe the coming day of Yahweh.<sup>72</sup> In Zech 12, a spirit of grace and supplication will be poured out upon the house of David. In Ezek 39, Yahweh will pour out his spirit to demonstrate his presence with Israel. (Note also Ezek 36.27; 37.14 for Yahweh's placing his spirit within the believer.) At these places in the description of the coming age, the pouring out of the spirit was not a theme of specific prophetic connotation; but it was a part of the imagery used to describe the coming beneficence of Yahweh.

That the return of prophecy was seen as a good sign and not a curse, we may infer from the implied reference to Num 11.29.<sup>73</sup> Moses, when confronted with the activity of

Eldad and Medad, is reported to have said, "Would that all the people were prophets, that the Lord would put his spirit upon them." Even at this stage, there was a junction between Yahweh's bestowal of spirit and consequent prophecy. The Numbers text provides the conceptual raw material for the contention that a pouring out of the spirit will result in prophetic gifts for all Israel. The Joel text functions as an answer to the rhetorical question of Moses. The unclean spirit generating evil prophets, Zech 13.2-6, is an obvious contrast to the spirit of Yahweh which will be poured out upon Israel for prophetic gain in the future. Also serving as a counterfoil to the Joel passage are those Chronicles' texts which speak of the bestowal of the spirit as the gift of prophetic certainty (2 Chr 15.1; 20.14; 24.20).<sup>74</sup>

With vv.3-4, we find another way of describing what will happen in the coming days--cosmic signs will be placed in the heavens. Joel 2.10 records a similar darkening of the sun and moon, as does Isa 13.10 where the darkness is part of the day of Yahweh description (see also Amos 5.18,20; Joel 2.2; 4.15). But fire, columns of smoke and a blood-colored moon have been added to the scene in Joel 3.3-4.

One way to attempt to understand these signs is to search back for origins. But that is particularly difficult. Are the fire and smoke taken from the theophanic description (Exod 19.18)? Are the signs an indication of Yahweh's presence in Zion (Isa 4.5)? Do they represent sacrifices on behalf of Yahweh?<sup>75</sup> Jeremias argues that the darkness

imagery belonged originally to the day of Yahweh traditions.<sup>76</sup> The turning of the moon to blood, representing massive carnage, could be a logical inference from another day of Yahweh tradition component, the destruction of mankind.<sup>77</sup> I am more inclined to see the reddening of the moon as an expression of a more universal mythic element of the moon and blood. As Heiler says, "The moon stands together with human life, it is considered as the cause of menstruation and sickness."<sup>78</sup> Hence the reference to the copper color of the lunar eclipse which Robinson makes is reductionistic.<sup>79</sup> Whatever the mythological or traditio-historical background of the moon changing to blood, the appearance of blood was to become a stock item in later apocalyptic visions (Rev 6.13; Mark 13.24; Matt 24.29). Joel was the first to combine the blood imagery to the darkening traditions of the day of Yahweh.

Another indication of the particular quality of this description may be had by examining the final clause of Joel 3.4. The adjectives "great and very terrible" are also used in Joel 2.11 to describe the day of Yahweh. Joel 3.4, however, provides a striking innovation. It introduces לַפְּנֵי. The signs are preparatory to the coming of the day of Yahweh. This is no accidental qualification, since the same clause appears in the Malachi text describing Elijah's arrival.

The final piece of this collection, v.5, in the form of a prophetic speech, is united by the roots for speaking, אָמַר and קָרָא. This promise of salvation includes another

traditional element of the eschatological scenario--the partial salvation in Zion after an attack by the nations.<sup>80</sup> That we are here dealing with a mixture of Zion traditions as well as the day of Yahweh material, exemplified particularly in Obad .15a,16-18, is clear. The Obadiah text is relevant: v.17, "but in Mount Zion there shall be those that escape...."<sup>81</sup> Recognizing this background, we discover that v.5 functions as a contrast to the picture of universal benefit depicted in the earlier part of the oracle. Joel 3.1-2 give a picture of all Israel receiving the gift of prophecy, whereas Joel 3.5a suggests that only those who call on the name of Yahweh will be saved. V.5b goes even further in stating that only those in Zion will escape, and culminates with v.5c in which only those who are called by Yahweh will survive.

One is tempted to suggest that the lack of universality of the salvation is integrally connected to the dialectical nature of the day of Yahweh tradition in the later period. It was an event that threatened both the foreign nations and Israel herself: Zech 14 and Joel 1.15; 2.1,11 depict the day of Yahweh against Israel whereas in Joel 3.4; 4.14 it is directed primarily against the nations. This represents a melding of earlier holy war (against the nations, Isa 13.6ff) and prophetic traditions (against Israel, Amos 5.18a).<sup>82</sup>

The key to understanding the partiality of the salvation on Zion is the "calling" theme. But how are we to understand this dual calling--man on Yahweh and Yahweh on man?

To call upon Yahweh's name is a fairly common idiom with a rather broad series of uses in the Old Testament. Texts like 1 Kgs 18.24 show there is a direct connection between calling on the name of Yahweh and allegiance to Jerusalem and Zion (cf. also Isa 12.4; Ps 105.1 in the cultic sphere). But even more, it appears that this calling on the name of the Lord is a part of the eschatological scenario (Zech 13.9; Isa 41.25). The Zechariah text is very important since we find there a chiasmic presentation of the double calling which we found in Joel 3.5: "They will call on my name and I will answer them; I will say they are my people; and they will say, the Lord is my God" (Zech 13.9). This text is particularly relevant in explaining the Joel passage since the context of Zech 13.7-9 is also that of a remnant being saved, this time from a refining fire. The argument in both the Joel and Zechariah texts is the same--that in the coming day of Yahweh, only some will be chosen. They must call on Yahweh, and they will be called by Yahweh.

We may thus conclude about these five verses that they are a part of the eschatological scenario. There are striking parallels to the individual traditions in other deutero-prophetic texts. Likewise, the Joel text is built upon earlier traditions whose stages we can identify in Ezek 39.29 and Obad v.17. There are three stock items: the pouring out of the spirit, the cosmic signs, and salvation on Zion. Each has been revised or presented in a new way, e.g. the moon to blood revision. Further, they have been

presented in such a way as to make them a preparation for the coming day of Yahweh. Prophecy and cosmic signs will precede this event. And most important for the purposes of this study, the text allows of an interpretation consistent with what we what we discovered in Zech 13.2-6. The present age is to be without prophecy. Prophecy is something to be polemicised. Only in the days to come, may we speak of prophecy as legitimate, and then only in the context of the eschatological scenario depicting the prerequisites for the appearance of Yahweh.

#### MALACHI

Perhaps the best rationale for ending this chapter with a brief look at Malachi is that it presents us with "the missing link."<sup>83</sup> In the Introduction, I referred to the eschatological prophet tradition in the Greco-Roman world. This was a tradition about prophecy rather than a statement defining extant prophets. Up to this point in our examination of various traditions and prophetic collections, we have discovered an expectation for the return of prophecy for an elect portion of Israel. But this expectation of prophecy returning in corporate fashion is a step away from the traditions cited earlier, those of Qumran, the New Testament, and the Rabbinic literature. The collection of Malachi provides evidence for the specification of this expectation upon an individual.<sup>84</sup>

The reasons for treating this prophetic collection in

conjunction with the Joel text are: both describe the coming day of Yahweh; both have a pointed concern for the preliminaries--what is to precede the appearance of Yahweh; both use similar phraseology--"the great and terrible day of Yahweh;" and both, I will argue, refer to prophecy in the coming times. Hence, the book of Malachi gives every indication of belonging to the same theological stream as Joel 3-4 does.

To turn to Malachi is to move from the expectation of the return of prophecy to the expectation of a coming figure. There are two classical texts: Mal 3.1 and vv.23-24, the expectation of מלאכי and Elijah.

To be dogmatic about Mal 3.1 would be unwise. In this Yahweh speech, we are told that a messenger, the prophetic "author" of the book, is to be sent before Yahweh arrives. Vv.1-5, with the exception of "and the Lord whom you seek will come suddenly into his temple," apparently all refer to the action of this מלאכי. He is a judging figure whose work of purification will allow the requisite purity of cult for Yahweh to appear. The action of this messenger is defined by his cleansing of the Levites.<sup>85</sup> Only when the Levites have been cleansed, and the offerings of Israel are thus acceptable, will Yahweh himself draw near in judgement.

The formal context in which the messenger figure appears is one of the disputation-words of the book.<sup>86</sup> The argument of the people is disbelief in divine justice. The writer refutes this by predicting the coming of the messenger of the covenant.





incorporates a theme common to other post-exilic prophetic traditionists in which messenger language is used to denote a type of prophetic activity. Deutero-Isaiah defines the servant activity with the appellation "messenger:"

Isa 42.19      Who is blind but my servant,  
or deaf as my messenger whom I send?

Isa 44.26      Who confirms the word of his servant,  
and performs the counsel of his messengers?

The book of Haggai evinces this same proclivity: "Haggai the messenger of the Lord" (Hag 1.13) in place of the more typical phrase in the book, "Haggai the prophet."

This prophetic connotation of "messenger" in the post-exilic writings is not limited to the eschatological stream, for we find it in the Chronicler's history as well:

The Lord, the God of their fathers, sent persistently to them by his messengers, because he had compassion on his people and on his dwelling place; but they kept mocking the messengers of God, despising his words and scoffing at his prophets, till the wrath of the Lord rose against his people, till there was no remedy.  
(2 Chron 36.15-16)

The **נָבִיא** of Exodus has been inserted into a conceptual environment in which such a figure was prophetic.

One is tempted to suggest that we have an extension here of the classical prophetic model, the prophet as integrally related to the king, in this case, the divine ruler Yahweh. There are probably several reasons why a prophetic figure was deemed necessary to appear before Yahweh came to stand in judgment. It was part of a more general expectation for the return of prophecy. The prophet had an official standing with a king, divine or mortal. But more important,

Israel had already seen the prophets appear prior to a judgement by Yahweh. This is the Chronicler's observation on the place of Israel's earlier prophets. They had come and warned the nation. Yahweh then appeared in judgement; and since Israel had not repented, his judgement fell on them. The Chronicler observed that the prophets were precedent to Yahweh's coming, that they had attempted to prepare the people for it. Now this memory was turned into an expectation for prophecy to precede Yahweh's appearance on his day.

If the precursant messenger of Mal 3.1 is a prophetic figure, how are we to interpret the final two verses of the book? That they are, along with v.22, late addenda to the book is universally recognized. In all probability, vv.23-24 are the third ending of the collection; "says the Lord of Hosts" comprising the first, and the appeal to Mosaic piety the second.

Since we have discovered the idea of a coming prophetic figure in Joel 2.17-3.5, we have prima facie reason to think that there is at least thematic similarity between vv.23-24 and that earlier passage. Eissfeldt has, I think, caught part of the significance of this addition: "Mal 3.23-24, however, are intended to make precise the proclamation of 3.1, of a heavenly messenger who is to precede Yahweh when he appears for judgement, and to correct this by indicating that Elijah is this messenger."<sup>88</sup> According to this view, vv.23-24 provide a specification of the earlier expectation.

There was a prophet, who, because he did not die, was available for such a reappearance (e.g. 2 Kgs 2.11 and also Enoch 89.52).

The pericope, Mal 3.23-24, is however, more than just an identification of this coming prophet. It continues the theme of the eschatological scenario; the prophet will come as a part of the preparatio for the day of Yahweh. Malachi uses the same phrase as Joel 3.4, "before the great and terrible day of the Lord comes." The coming of the prophet in Malachi occupies the same syntactic position as do the sun turning to darkness and the moon to blood in Joel. The theme of the sons and fathers is probably less a matter of appeal to texts like Mic 7.17 but more a typical manner of speaking in certain eschatological texts--the resolution of opposites. Both Joel 3.1--the sons, daughters, and fathers prophesy--and Mal 3.24--the co-mutuality of fathers and sons--demonstrate this theme. And this theme functions less as an ethical imperative than as a way of describing the period just prior to the arrival of Yahweh in the eschatological age (e.g. Isa 3.5; Mic 7.17; Jer 9.1-5 for statements in earlier prophetic books and more importantly the development of this theme in Jub 23.16-21).<sup>89</sup> The curse, v.24b, recognizes the possibility that the prophet will be unable to create the requisite ritual and ethical cleanliness for Yahweh's coming to be safe for Israel.

To summarize what I have said about Deutero-Zechariah, Joel, and Malachi is to observe what the writers of the prophetic collections after 520 thought about Israelite prophecy and its future. The classical prophet gave words, oracles, and collections, which provided a source for reflection. The deutero-prophetic writers' work was in many ways an exegetical task. What they said may be schematized as follows: classical Israelite prophecy was a thing of the past. The appropriate enterprise for their followers was reflection on the earlier texts and a reexpression of their views, but without claiming prophetic authority for their own work. This was implicitly done by later revisers and redactors who placed these collections in their present position in the Hebrew Bible. The writers expect prophecy to return as a necessary sign of the time just prior to Yahweh's theophany in the **יום יהוה**. This was conceived of both as a return of a general prophecy and as the return of a single figure. Both expectations remained open as viable traditions, as Acts 2 and Matt 17.10 demonstrate.

CHAPTER V  
CHRONICLES AND LEVITICAL PROPHETS

So far, we have examined the character of prophecy in the post-exilic prophetic collections and have attempted to delineate the nature of the development from a prophetic office--which apparently ceased with the end of the Davidic line's role as political leaders--to certain traditions about prophecy which became a part of the eschatological scenario. In so doing, we have attempted to show the developing tradition from prophecy to prophetic traditions in the deuteroprophetic literature.

However, there is another side to the coin. The deuteroprophetic writers were not the only members of the post-exilic Israelite community talking about prophecy and making claims about the proper use of prophetic titles. Prophecy plays an important part in the Chronicler's history also. Failure to recognize the significance of prophecy in Chronicles has misled the studies of Plöger and Hanson. They have been intent on demonstrating the development of apocalyptic thinking from its prophetic precursors. When they posit a bi-polar schema, the implication is that the non-apocalyptic group is, in some fashion, non-prophetic or anti-prophetic.

For the Chronicler's work, such an implication is untenable. Prophecy was the mode by which the monarchy was founded, informed, and ultimately destroyed.<sup>1</sup> In 1 Chron 11.3, we learn that David was made king (the Chronicler considers him to be the first "real" king) "according to the word of Lord by Samuel." The Chronicler also evaluated the monarchy's fate on the basis of Israel's response to the prophets:

The Lord, the God of their fathers, sent persistently to them by his messengers, because he had compassion on his people and on his dwelling place; but they kept mocking the messengers of God, despising his words, and scoffing at his prophets, till the wrath of the Lord rose against his people, till there was no remedy. (2 Chr 36.15-16)

The dogma for Israelite success was also closely connected with the prophets:

Hear me, Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem. Believe in the Lord your God, and you will be established; believe his prophets and you will succeed. (2 Chr 20.20)

The long succession of prophets who accompanied Israel's kings further testifies to the significance of prophecy for the Chronicler.<sup>2</sup> Prophecy was the primary mode of communication to the Davidic state. Hence to suggest that Chronicles, as part of the hierocracy, is anti-prophetic or that Chronicles is a work in which prophetic traditions are insignificant, is a serious misunderstanding of the text.

For the Chronicler's history, prophecy did not cease with the end of the nation. Ezra 5-6 depict the prophets, Haggai and Zechariah, in pivotal roles. Innumerable

commentators have observed the centrality of the temple for the Chronicler. And it is with the reconstruction of the second temple that the Chronicler records the end of prophetic activity. The account of these prophets' work sandwiches the missives of Tattenai and Darius. Work on the temple had stopped when Artaxerxes was advised that Jerusalem was a troublesome city. Then, without receiving any dispensation from their overlords, the citizens of Jerusalem and Judah, under impetus from the prophets, began to work again on the temple:

Now the prophets, Haggai and Zechariah the son of Iddo, prophesied to the Jews who were in Judah and Jerusalem, in the name of the God of Israel who was over them. Then Zerubbabel the son of Shealtiel and Jeshua the son of Jozadak arose and began to rebuild the house of God which was in Jerusalem; and with them were the prophets of God, helping them. (Ezra 5.1-2)

After the Tattenai and Darius exchange, the account continues: "The elders built and prospered, through the prophesying of Haggai the prophet and Zechariah the son of Iddo" (Ezra 6.14).

The remarkable feature of these two chapters in Ezra is the contrast they present to the accounts in the prophetic books. In both Haggai and Zechariah, the prophets work for the reinstatement of the monarchy as well as the reconstruction of the temple. In Chronicles, they are responsible only for temple reconstruction. Their relation to Zerubbabel plays no role in the Chronicler's history. This contrast can not be overestimated, especially because



of the Chronicler's proclivity to juxtapose prophets with royal figures. Attempts to crown Zerubbabel were unacceptable for the Chronicler, as we have already seen in the redaction of Haggai and Zechariah. Reinstitution of the monarchy was needless since David, the sufficient monarch, had already given Israel the temple. With proper prophetic aid, the temple was to serve as the sole focal point of the new community, a theocracy in which Yahweh's rule was manifest.

Many commentators have observed a lack of Davidic expectation in the Chronicler's work. A corollary of this is a lack of any expected prophecy. Instead there is a type of realized eschatology. Just as the Davidic ideal is bound up with the reconstructed temple, so prophecy is, in the post-exilic period, tied to the work of the Levitical singers. Once Haggai and Zechariah have completed their task of aiding temple reconstruction to its completion, there is no place for traditional prophecy.

With the Chronicler's work containing a consistently presented view of prophecy, it is no wonder that the deutero-prophetic writers took a polemical stance when making statements about prophecy. Assuming a basic dichotomy of outlooks on prophecy in the post-exilic period, it is therefore also necessary to examine the literature of those who had been characterized variously as the 'theocracy,' 'those in power,' the 'hierocracy,' or the 'non-eschatological group.'

To carry out this examination, I have chosen certain passages in the books of Chronicles which speak about prophecy. The rationale for choosing Chronicles is virtually self-evident. As both Rudolph and Plüger have said, "the Chronicler seeks to portray the realization of theocracy on the soil of Israel."<sup>3</sup> I should make clear that I make no claims for exhaustive treatment of the theme, "Prophecy in Chronicles."<sup>4</sup> I have omitted discussions of prophetic oracles and prophetic writings in order to examine more fully one problematic genre. Within the Chronicler's work, there are passages which use the various appellations for prophet--נביא, חזה, ראה--to designate members of the Levitic groups. Though there are only five such texts (1 Chr 25; 2 Chr 20; 2 Chr 29; 2 Chr 34.30; and 2 Chr 35.15), and of these only three demand lengthy study, these passages have signal importance since the Chronicler is here using prophetic titles to describe one of his favorite motifs--the function of the Levites. This area seems to me an extremely fruitful way of seeking how a post-exilic writer wanted to use the prophetic title and authority, and therefore of trying to understand his concept of prophecy.

Before beginning with the specific texts, two inceptive topics require discussion. First, there is the matter of date, authorship, and redaction. Since Chronicles have been relatively ignored books, there is no widely accepted scholarly consensus on these issues. The nature of the

Chronicler's work has been explained in basically three ways by critical scholarship. Some scholars have been satisfied to see the books as free from systematic redaction and basically the product of one hand. Myers' Anchor Bible commentary is the most recent exposition of this viewpoint. Most critics who adopt this stance recognize that there are additions and revisions in the text, but attempts to explain or identify these instances are usually not made. A mediating position has been taken by some like Galling, who, noting the redactional activity, proposes two basic authors: "the Chronicler" who wrote the basic document in the last decades of the Persian period, and "the Chronicler\*\*" who was responsible for the total work: Chronicles through Nehemiah.<sup>5</sup> A more radical position growing out of the work of Rothstein and Hänel's commentary identifies a plethora of redactional activity. Rothstein argued that at least four identifiable hands were observable in I Chronicles with two dominant strands, as well as other unidentifiable additions. While no one today is willing to proceed with the certainty of Rothstein in distinguishing between the "Chronicler's redactor" and the "younger Chronicler's redactor," many have found his source critical arguments compelling. Welch's Work of the Chronicler follows in this tradition as does the commentary of Rudolph. Rudolph simply states that we can see a number of late additions from more than one hand and period.<sup>6</sup> But systematic identification of these hands is virtually impossible.

I find myself in agreement with the basic position which Rudolph has taken--deriving as it has from Rothstein's brilliant commentary.

As for the date of composition, the following chart depicts the rather wide range given to that elusive problem by various scholars:

500	450	400	350	300	250
Freedman			Eissfeldt		Pfeiffer
		Rudolph		Gese	
		Myers		Noth	
		Albright			
			Plöger		
			Galling		

The dominant reason that only uncertainty is certain in such dating claims is the way in which the redactional levels have been evaluated. Some would argue, as Galling does, that the main work was written at the end of the Persian period and that a redaction occurred a century later. Myers makes no such distinctions and opts for a lump date. Since I am working on a rather narrow nexus of material, the dating issue is not of overriding concern. Furthermore, Gese's tradition history analysis of much of this material has provided at least a relative chronological picture. More macrocosmically considered, I agree with the basic dating period of Rudolph, Myers, et al.

A second matter of initial consideration is the problem of Levitical singers. The decision to examine this theme or putative group was made because, in the accounts of the activities of Levitical singers, prophetic titles and nomenclature often appear. To draw back from that specific

rubric, there can be little doubt that a dominant interest of the Chronicler was the Levites (1 Chr 9.23; 2 Chr 35).<sup>7</sup> Within this context, a smaller subgroup receives major attention. Köberle's monograph drew attention to the special nature of this group as a significant post-exilic development in some way related to the Korachite traditions. Köberle argued that the predecessor of this group was in some way connected to the pre-exilic temple functionaries--door keepers or singers.<sup>8</sup>

However, his study did little more than focus attention on the topic. On the other hand, von Rad's treatment of the Chronicler's work devoted a special section to the Levitical singers. He showed that the interest in the Levitical singers was directly related to ark traditions (e.g. 1 Chr 15, a situation not unlike that depicted in Deut 10.8; 18.5). Von Rad said: "The post-exilic Levitical movement appealed to their ark tradition in obvious opposition to the priestly-Aaronite tabernacle because the ark was given over exclusively to Levitic protection."<sup>9</sup> The Levites were given a new task, the temple song (1 Chr 6.16), when the ark was taken into the temple. And this new function rested on none other than Davidic authority.

Von Rad's second contribution was to note that the description of the singer activity was not homogeneous. He argued that two phases of Levitical activity are represented in Chronicles. The first phase merely distinguishes between specializations in cultic function: Levites as

singers and as door keepers.<sup>10</sup> The second stage sees the singing as the more important of the Levitic functions, at least in the tradition buttressed by the ark and Davidic authorizations.

The third area of von Rad's analysis deals with distinctions within the singer groups. He makes several significant observations. (1) In Ezra-Nehemiah, the familial trinity of Asaph, Heman, Etan/Jedutun is not present; only Asaph is named. (2) There is no connection between the singers and the ark in the early stages. (3) The first Chronicler was unaware of the threefold family division. (4) The name "Jedutun" is probably an artificial hypocoristic formation (later replaced by Etan). (5) The name change from "Jedutun" to "Etan" is concomitant with the change in Levitical service, from ark carrier to singer. (6) Rothstein went too far in seeing rivalries between Levitic families. Instead, von Rad wants to theorize a simple case of Hemanite ascendancy and a consequent de-emphasis on other parties.<sup>11</sup> Though most of these observations were cogent and have been accepted by later scholarship, von Rad was unable to make sense of the heterogeneity in singer traditions: why there were two and then three divisions, and how the variations developed.

Gese's short study completed the traditio-historical work on the cultic singer traditions in the second temple period.<sup>12</sup> Briefly summarized, Gese was able to demonstrate four stages of development. The earliest (I) may be found

in Ezra 2 and Neh 7, the Heimkehrliste. At this point the singers are not called Levites and are only spoken of as the sons of Asaph. A second stage (II) is represented by Neh 11.3-19 and 1 Chr 9.1b-18. Here we find the singers appelled Levites (still in opposition to the door keepers) and derived from two progenitors: Asaph and Jedutun. Moving from the Chronicler's sources to the Chronicler himself, we approach stage IIIA, where the Levitical singers are now three strong: Asaph, Heman, and Jedutun (1 Chr 16.4; 2 Chr 5.12; 2 Chr 29.13ff; 2 Chr 35.15), and Asaph still receives primary attention. However, with stage IIIB (1 Chr 6.16-32; 15.16-24; 16.4-42), we note more than just a change in names--Ethan for Jedutun. For now Heman receives the lion's share of interest while Asaph fades into the background. Gese notes that those passages assigned to IIIB occur in what can be assessed as secondary passages. His proximate dating yields the following chronology: I, before 515 or the last one third of the sixth century; II, middle of the fifth century; IIIA, second half of the fourth or towards the end of the fourth century; IIIB, the end of the fourth century or soon after 300.<sup>13</sup>

Gese goes on to explain that this stratification of tradition tells us about actual groups of singers in post-exilic Israel. It seems that in the fifth century, a second group of singers, called Jedutun, appeared alongside the Asaph group--an originally non-Levitic group who were apparently singers in the pre-exilic period. This Jedutun

clan, included among the Levites on the basis of an artificial name and loose genealogical derivation, was not comprised of a returning singer group from Babylon, but apparently developed in Israel.<sup>14</sup> The origins of the Hemanite group are, in all probability, to be seen as a part of the artificial construct--the Jedutun group--and yet distinguished within the Jedutun construct from the very beginning.<sup>15</sup>

With reference to 2 Chr 20, which speaks of an Asaph and a Korach group, Gese concludes that the Jedutun group is implied when the Korach group is mentioned since Jedutun is the name used when only two singer groups are present. Ergo, the Korach group and at least part of the Jedutun group are identical. Gese concludes that the Chronicler designated the non-Asaphite singers as descendants of Korach. This derivation holds true entirely for Heman (that is Heman=Korach) and only partly for Jedutun.<sup>16</sup> In short, the story of the second temple Levitical singers reveals the ascendancy of the Korachites at the expense of the pre-exilic Asaphite group, neither of which were originally Levites.

I find this explanation of the Levitical singers' traditions very illuminating and intend to utilize it to pursue a question central to this dissertation--how are the prophetic titles and references in these singer traditions to be understood? It should be stated at the outset, that, for many critics, this question has already been answered.



Both von Rad and Gese assert that the prophetic material used to describe the post-exilic singers is a carry-over from pre-exilic cultic prophecy of which these second temple singers are a remnant.<sup>17</sup> Their assertions rest directly on one monograph, Mowinckel's Kultprophetie und prophetische Psalmen.<sup>18</sup> Before briefly sketching Mowinckel's argument, let me say that this move of von Rad and Gese is natural in a way, but odd in light of the tradition history evidence. For it has become apparent that the prophetic terminology was used only in the latest stages of the singer traditions. Rather than being a residue or carry-over from the pre-exilic period, the prophetic appellations appear to be an innovation on the part of the Chronicler. This fact in itself should restrain the immediate appeal to cult prophecy, a remarkably fuzzy phenomenon in its own right.

The third part of Mowinckel's Psalmstudien is an attempt to show the place of the prophetic in Israel's cult. Less time is spent with the psalms than with discussing the origins of Israelite prophecy and the nature of its manifestations through Israel's history. He follows Hölischer in the older view of the seer as a native Israelite institution whereas the nābî' is seen, as the etymology shows (sic), as non-Israelite, i.e. Canaanite, phenomenon. The prophet is, according to Mowinckel, a figure whose prophecy functions in society, who gives information on command, and who gives information directly from the deity. The Israelite seer was originally both priest and prophet, Samuel and Moses

being the paradigmatic figures.

Since I have considered the more general questions about Israelite prophecy earlier, I want to examine here Mowinckel's specific allusions to Chronicles.<sup>19</sup> 1 Chr 15.22 and 27 are the keystone verses to his argument. According to Mowinckel, this passage demonstrates the existence of cult prophecy at the temple. His thesis rests on the translation of the word bamaśśā which Mowinckel takes to mean "oracle," thereby justifying the claim that his passage is about prophecy. Since his method is similar to my own, this claim has to be taken seriously. Mowinckel concludes that since there is an explicitly prophetic term connected to a Levitical figure, with a cultic function, this connection demonstrates the existence of cultic prophets.

Even if Mowinckel's translation were justified, this argument runs counter to his other uses of the Chronicler's texts.<sup>20</sup> In other places, he cites Chronicles to describe the nature of cultic prophecy in the second temple period. Yet he assumes 1 Chr 15 to be an accurate description of the historical event described. The grounds for a non-anachronistic reading of 1 Chr 15, for accepting this chapter as an accurate description of Davidic times, is not given.

The passage Mowinckel has cited as proof is also a problem. The Chronicler is describing the bringing-up of the ark to Jerusalem, an event of signal importance, as von Rad has shown. In this context (vv.16-24), we are presented with a description of Levitical classifications and

more specifically with the divisions of the musicians' duties. In v.22, Chenaniah is described and charged with the following statement: שׂר הַלְוִיִּים יִסֵּר בַּמִּשְׁכָּן כִּי מִבִּין הוּא

There are three possible translations of this verse.

(1) אָשַׁר can mean "a bearing or carry" (BDB, p. 672). Since 2 Chr 35.3 uses this same word to describe the Levites carrying the ark, this meaning is a valid option. The translation would then be, "Chenaniah, leader of the Levites in carrying, was in charge of carrying because he was expert in it" (i.e. in the proper method of carrying the ark).

(2) A second option is to derive a meaning from the root אָשַׁר--something like an uplifting of the voice or singing (cf. Rudolph's anstimmen). The RSV chooses this option by translating: "Chenaniah, leader of the Levites in music, should direct the music, because he understood it." (3)

A final possibility accepts Mowinckel's use of the meaning "oracle," also found in 2 Chr 24.27, with the resultant rendition: "Chenaniah, leader of the Levites in oracles, since he was skillful at the art of giving oracles."

LXX reads καὶ χωνεὶν ἀρχαὺ τῶν Λευιτῶν ἀρχαὺ τῶν ᾠδῶν "and Chononia, head of the Levites, leader of music," not translating or omitting the first bamaśśā'. Further, LXX apparently translated יִסֵּר as an infinitive absolute instead of the nomen agentis which it surely must be.<sup>21</sup> Rothstein argues that MT was originally יִשָּׁר יִשָּׁר and then under Aramaic influence became יִסֵּר, יִשָּׁר deriving from the denominative יָשַׁר, as in V and T: "he was the greatest." He further

suggests that we omit the first bamaśśā with LXX as well as the **שר הלויים**, leaving an original description of Chenaniah as "head of the bamaśśā because he was expert."

Rothstein is correct, I think, in arguing that since the controlling theme in the chapter is the carrying of the ark, we should see this same concern reflected in **אֲשָׁמ**: Chenaniah is chief of those in charge of carrying the ark. Again I refer to von Rad's demonstration that the Levitical office and the ark themes are central to the Chronicler.<sup>22</sup> Rothstein does not want to exclude the musical allusion which has been emphasized in the LXX versions. Perhaps we have some sort of rough double entendre.

The only textual evidence to which Mowinckel can appeal for support is the Vulgate rendition, prophetiae praeerat. And this is almost surely, as Rothstein has said, a further paraphrase of the confusing MT text.

V.27 presents a similar problem, though here the theme of song would seem to be more explicit. The clause is: **הַשָּׂר הַמְשָׁח הַמְשַׁרְרִים**. Most have translated it something like, "Chenaniah the leader of the music of the singers" (so also the RSV in changing **הַמְשָׁח** to **בַּמְשָׁח** as in v.22). Mowinckel's decision to render **אֲשָׁמ** as oracle would create some translation difficulty. Perhaps he would say: "the leader of the oracles of the singers." LXX reads: "and Chonenia the leader of songs," **αδουτων** being a participle of an Attic contraction from **αειδω**. The Hebrew syntax is considerably less clear than the Greek. Rothstein thinks

הַמְשָׁרִים is a later gloss. Following his excisions in v.22, we would be left with the same phrase in v.27, הַשָּׂר הַמְשָׂא. Bertheau's ingenious suggestion that הַמְשָׁרִים is a corruption of הַשָּׂרִים on the basis of confusion with הַמְשָׂא seems forced.<sup>23</sup> In sum, a translation of v.27 which sees some thematic continuity, i.e. leader of the music of the singers, seems more acceptable than the rendition proposed by Mowinckel.

In light of the difficulties presented by the translations of v.22 and v.27 in 1 Chr 15 and the concomitant lack of probability in Mowinckel's translation, his assertions about the existence of a group of cultic prophets based on this chapter in Chronicles seem somewhat tenuous. Rather than go so far as to claim non-belief in cultic prophets, I simply want to enter a caveat against von Rad and Gese's acceptance of Mowinckel's argument as a way of understanding Chronicles texts which speak of Levites and prophets in the same breath. Instead, I propose to examine five texts in detail to understand why the Chronicler or subsequent redactors have used this prophetic terminology to describe Levitical singers. In this search, I hope to analyze texts roughly contemporary with those examined in the last chapter, thereby gaining a counterpoise to the deutero-prophetic view of prophecy.

## HEMAN, THE KING'S SEER

## 1 Chronicles 25

The first text to be examined has stood as a monument to confusing theories about the Levitic functions and prophecy. Prophecy with musical instruments as well as the description of Heman as the king's seer are hardly themes liable to simple explanation. And in tandem with the typically forbidding genealogical lists, the chapter creates a not-inviting prospect for serious work. None the less, this segment of the Chronicler's work is of critical importance for what it reveals about the process by which these prophetic appellations were made and incorporated into the historical self-understanding of Israel.

## 1 Chr 25

- .1. David and the cultic leaders<sup>a</sup> designated<sup>b</sup> for service the sons of Asaph, Heman, and Jedutun, who were to prophesy<sup>c</sup> with zithers, harps, and cymbals. The number of men so commissioned with respect to their service was:
- .2 Of the sons of Asaph: Zaccur, Joseph, Nethaniah and Asarelah; the sons of Asaph were under the authority of Asaph who prophesied under the authority of the king.
- .3 Of Jedutun, the sons of Jedutun: Gedaliah, Zeri, Jeshaiiah,<sup>d</sup> Hashabiah, and Mattithiah; six, under the authority of their father Jedutun, who prophesied with the harp for the thanksgiving and praise of Yahweh.
- .4 Of Heman, the sons of Heman: Bukkiah, Mattaniah, Uzziel, Shebuel, Jerimoth, Hananiah, Hanani, Eliathah, Giddalti, Romamti-Ezer, Joshbekashah, Mallothi, Hothir, Mahazioth;
- .5 All these were the sons of Heman, the king's seer, in the words of the Lord, to raise up his horn.<sup>e</sup> God gave to Heman fourteen sons and three daughters.
- .6 All these were under the authority of their father(s) for song, in the house of Yahweh, with cymbals, harps, and zithers--for the service of the Lord's house<sup>f</sup> under the authority of the king, Asaph, Heman, and Jedutun.

- .7 The number of the skilled ones, together with their brothers instructed in Yahweh's music was 288.  
 .8 And they cast lots for the service:  
     the old as well as the young,  
     the teacher as well as the student.<sup>24</sup>

The most famous problem in this chapter is the series of names beginning with Hananyahu in v.4. Early on, scholars noted that these names fell somewhat outside the normal gamut of hypocoristic formations.<sup>25</sup> Forthwith began a scramble to read the names as parts of a poetic composition, hymn fragment, or whatever. While the most thorough linguistic treatment has been offered by Haupt, the specific translations presented by Curtis, Rudolph, Myers, et. al. appear to have won majority acceptance in reading the verse as a hymn fragment.<sup>26</sup>

An interesting, though mostly ignored, proposal has been offered by Torczyner.<sup>27</sup> Idiosyncratic and rather free with the text, he has focused on a problem earlier depicted by Rothstein: the singers occur in a different order in v.4 than they do in vv.23ff. Rothstein's chart showed this very clearly.<sup>28</sup> Torczyner, unimpressed by earlier efforts at translating v.4b and evidently noting the same arrangement as that depicted by Rothstein, translated the names as a hymnic piece in the order in which the names occur in vv.23ff. Though this effort recognizes a real problem, the lack of correspondence between vv.2-4 and vv.9-31, Torczyner's rendition fails to offer the linguistic arguments to refute earlier work and, as mentioned earlier, requires rather drastic textual surgery.<sup>29</sup>

Ehrlich's words should remain as a reminder about the difficulty of these verses; "Out of the last nine names of the sons of Heman, scholars have recently made a prayer. And yet, what sort of Hebrew is the result?"<sup>30</sup> The following rendition of the supposed Hebrew Vorlage hopefully does justice both to the complexities of the text and previous exegetical traditions:

חֲנוּנֵי יְהוָה חֲנוּנֵי<sup>a</sup> Be gracious to me, O Yahweh,  
Be gracious

אֵלֵי אֱתָהּ<sup>b</sup> Come my God

שֶׁגִדְלֵתִי וְרִמַּמְתִּי<sup>c</sup> Whom I praise and extol

עֲזָרִי בְקִשְׁתִּי מְלָא<sup>d</sup> My helper, fulfil my request

הוֹתִיר נְחֻמֵי אֵתִי<sup>e</sup> Give abundant visions.<sup>31</sup>

One of the obvious questions to be asked of this psalmette is that of the chicken or the egg? Which came first, the names or the poem? The fact that I have produced a reconstruction of the present text suggests that I think the present form was adapted from an earlier hymn and is not a freely created piece. Proving this assumption is another matter. Supposing that one could delimit a Gattung of which the psalm fragment was a part, we could be fairly sure that the psalm fragment was primary. And one can, I think, sense the flavor of the individual lament on the basis of the introductory use of חֲנוּנֵי, cf. Pss 6.3; 31.10; 51.3.<sup>32</sup> However, behind this evanescent whiff, no traditional elements appear other than the appeal for help from ones foes.

Rudolph has suggested that the hymnic fragment be



understood as demonstrating the same interconnection between names and cultic songs as in certain supposed Sumerian analogues, thereby demonstrating the lack of artificiality in v.4b.<sup>33</sup> However, in examining Gemser's statements, we find a series of Sumerian names (e.g. Lugal-šibir-za-gin-šū-du, "the King rules with a lazur scepter") which Gemser says reminds one of a hymn or liturgical fragment.<sup>34</sup> That there were "actually Psalmquotes as real names" as Rudolph states, is never claimed by Gemser nor, so far as I am able to ascertain, by van Selms.

The apparent purpose of this poetic piece is to advance one of the claims made by the Levitic singers. And within this nexus, the emphasis in 1 Chr 25 is on the Hemanite line: the raising of his horn (v.5). Surely this artifice in v.4b, the poetic piece intermeshed with the sons of Heman and the mention of visions within a chapter which is using prophetic appellations, is a striking technique--a double entente by which the redactor was able to press his Levitic-prophetic and pro-Hemanite argument.<sup>35</sup>

Moving to another issue, the nature of the present text, we may discern several stages of growth within this chapter. To maintain that the chapter as a whole does not represent an original unity would not provoke much objection. A number of observations speak for this thesis. (1) The 7500 which occurs in v.1 rather demands a specific number to follow it. However, we do not find this numerical complement until v.7. This breach has led many to argue

that vv.2-6 are an insertion. Although Curtis contends that the same stylistic element may be observed in Ezra 2.2b and Neh 7.7b where  $\text{וְיָצְאוּ}$  is used and the numerical complement does not occur until Ezra 2.64 and Neh 7.66, in opposition to Curtis' argument, it should be noted that in the Heimkehrliste, we are dealing with something other than the Chronicler's own style.<sup>36</sup> Further, the dual usage of  $\text{וְיָצְאוּ}$  in 1 Chr 25, in vv.1 and 7 (it only occurs once in the Ezra and Nehemiah passages), is so pleonastic as to suggest a disrupted text. (2) The doublet beginnings in vv.5 and 6 seem a bit odd. They could indicate a copying error, an attempt to legitimate an insertion or a conflate text. (3) The order of the names of the three fathers and the instruments is not regular. In v.1, we find Asaph, Heman, and Jedutun whereas in vv.2-4, it is Asaph, Jedutun, and Heman. In v.1, the order is harps, psalteries, cymbals whereas in v.6, cymbals, psalteries, and harps. (4) The inclusion of the hymnic fragment shows that the chapter is not an homogeneous creation. (5) The numerical evaluation of the progeny of the three fathers is missing in v.2 with Asaph. (6) The pattern of the temple service seems at best irregular. Rothstein<sup>37</sup> when charting the rotation of the singers in vv.9ff, discovered that the composition was unsymmetrical.<sup>37</sup> Of the twenty-four singers, Heman's group did not begin until the sixth turn--Asaph and Jedutun had divided the first five stations. Furthermore, the hymnic names were stuck on at the end. Beginning with Hananiah,

the names are exclusively Hemanite; and yet strikingly, they are not in the same order that we meet them in v.4:

<u>Asaph</u>	<u>Jedutun</u>	<u>Heman</u>
1. Joseph	2. Gedalyahu	-----
3. Zakkur	4. Yisri	-----
5. Natanyahu	-----	6. Bukkiyyahu
7. Yesar'ela	8. Yesa'yahu	9. Mattanyahu
-----	10. Sim'i	11. 'Azariel
-----	12. Hasabiah	13. Suba'el
-----	14. Mattiyahu	15. Jeremot
	16. Hananyahu	17. Yosbekasa
	18. Hanani	19. Malloti
	20. 'Eliatan	21. Hotir
	22. Gidalti	23. Machaziot
	24. Romamti-Ezer	

(7) Most interesting, at least for me, is the lack of congruence between the names in vv.2-4a and vv.9ff. The supposedly identical names in these two sections occur in slightly different form in their respective lists. The differences are not easily capable of monolithic resolution. However, there seems to be a rather definite tendency that the longer or more complete names are to be found in the list beginning with v.9 which has unanimously been accepted as a later addition.<sup>38</sup>

On the basis of an analysis of these names, I find it easier to explain the linguistic differences if we understand the series of names in vv.9ff as having the more original hypocoristic forms. A further observation should be noted, that in v.4b the names are suddenly virtually identical to those in vv.23ff. These are the very names which comprise the psalmette. This homogeneity of form is striking because if any names should have suffered in written transmission, it should have been these unusual formations.

The nature of the name differences already cited and the homogeneity of the hymnic names in both sections lead me to the conclusion that the redactor of the present chapter had two editions of Levitical singer lists, one already embedded in the basic Chronicles document--that is, vv.2-4a--and one of linguistically earlier form in the hands of the redactor--vv.9ff--to which he added the Psalm fragment as names, thereby creating v.4b. To further specify the nature of this redaction, we should be aware that the division of the twenty-four singers depends on the revisor's division of the Levitical names; i.e. reading Romanti-Ezer as one name. Without his inclusion of the hymnic fragment as proper names, we would have no such divisional schema.

Here then at least two stages are visible in the present composition. However, this is not the end of the business. On the basis of the earlier mentioned evidence for lack of unity, I would argue that we can discern the presence of three basic stages in the text. The oldest was most probably concerned just with Asaph. It included the mention of David and the separation of the sons of Asaph as well as the list of Asaph's sons in v.2 thereby explaining the absence of the numerical evaluation. A second development came with the insertion of the three-fold singer schema; this would have included most of vv.1-4, 6-7. The third would have embraced the emphasis on Heman, the appellation of Levitical singers as prophets, and the insertion of the

hymnic fragment as names, and the division into twenty-four courses. I intentionally refrain from getting too specific about each word as Rothstein has done because the evidence of such different levels of redaction is not that complete.

Referring back to Gese's traditio-historical analysis, where does 1 Chr 25 fit in? The most obvious move would be to place it just before IIIB. While the name Jedutun still appears, characteristic of IIIA, we find the dominant interest in Heman, characteristic of IIIB. However, such a synchronistic solution, Gese charges, ignores the comparison of 1 Chr 25 to the fourteen singer classes in 1 Chr 15.18, which he assigns to IIIB.<sup>39</sup> And if 1 Chr 15.18ff is later than 1 Chr 25, we would, he says, expect it to reflect the same or at least similar understanding of the service courses. However, this is hardly the case, since 1 Chr 15 speaks of only fourteen musicians distinguished on the basis of their instruments--eight harp players and six lyrists--whereas the courses in 1 Chr 25 are clearly based on the priestly pattern represented in 1 Chr 24. This argument based on the lack of correspondence between the two patterns of service is not convincing. The service courses of 1 Chr 25 are so idiosyncratically based on the hymn fragment construction--which itself is based on an argument of a very specific sort (pro-Hemanite)--that I would be very surprised to see it picked up in the same way any place else. It seems to me quite possible that the writer of 1 Chr 15 could have ignored the pattern created by the redactor of 1 Chr 25

since his material and purpose were not the same. The importance of the three names still seems primary. I would consequently opt for classifying 1 Chr 25 as part of IIIA, albeit late in this period.

To summarize, this chapter presents us with a description of certain Levites, the singers, as prophets. The central focus is placed upon Heman, an emphasis which appears in the redactional process. On the basis of a rather complicated sorting process, we have seen the redactor at work, inserting a, (to him) relevant hymn fragment into the Hemanite genealogy further substantiating the claim to superior status for Levitical singers. The use of prophetic titles and the claim for special attention for Heman appear interrelated.

#### LEVITICAL PROPHETS AND HOLY WAR

##### 2 Chronicles 20

From genealogies, we turn to a battle account. Jehosaphat, one of Judah's kings of whom the Chronicler approves, is being challenged by a coalition approaching from the South. After a long speech appealing to Yahweh, the spirit of Yahweh descends upon Jahanziel, an Asaphite Levite who then prescribes the proper conduct for the Israelite forces and forecasts the outcome of the battle. The war commences with songs of praise by the Korachites and ends in the total extermination of the coalition. This therefore is also a text which sheds some light on the nature of prophetic titles and activity.

## 2 Chr 20.1-30

1 And it happened that when the sons of Moab, and the sons of Ammon, as well as the Meunites<sup>a</sup> came to make war against Jehosaphat, 2 messengers came and told Jehosaphat, "A great force is coming from across the sea, from Edom.<sup>b</sup> They are already at Hazezontamar, that is Engedi." 3 Jehosaphat was afraid and decided to seek the Lord. He proclaimed a fast in all Judah. 4 Judah gathered to seek Yahweh. All the cities of Judah came to seek the Lord. 5 Jehosaphat stood in the congregation of Judah and Jerusalem in the house of the Lord, before the new court; 6 and he said, "O Lord God of our Fathers, Are you not the God of the Heavens and the ruler of all the kingdoms of the nations? Are not power and strength in your hand so that no one can stand against you? 7 Have you not, our God, dispossessed the inhabitants of this land from before your people Israel and established the seed of your beloved Abraham forever? 8 And they dwelled in it and built for you a sanctuary for your name saying: 9 "If evil, the sword, flood,<sup>c</sup> pestilence, or hunger come upon us, we will stand before this house and before you, because your name is in this house; and we will cry out to you on account of our trouble; and you will hear and save us." 10 And now behold, the Ammonites, the Moabites, and those from Mt. Seir--whose countries you did not allow Israel to go into when they came out of Egypt since they turned aside from them and did not destroy them-- 11 they pay us back in this way, by coming to drive us out from your possession which you gave to us as an inheritance. 12 O our God, will you not judge against them, because there is not sufficient strength in us against this great force which has come against us. Since we do not know what to do, our eyes are on you." 13 All Judah was standing before the Lord, even the little ones, wives, and sons. 14 Then the spirit of the Lord came upon Jahaziel, the son of Zechariah, the son of Beniah, the son of Jeiel, the son of Mattaniah, the Levite from the sons of Asaph, in the midst of the congregation, 15 and he said; "Pay attention all Judah and every inhabitant of Jerusalem and King Jehosaphat. Thus says the Lord to you: Do not fear and do not be dismayed before this great force because the war is not yours but God's. 16 Tomorrow, go down against them, for they will come up at the valley of Ziz<sup>d</sup> and you will find them at the end of the valley before the wilderness of Yeruel. 17 You do not have to fight in this battle. Just take up<sup>e</sup> your positions; stand and watch the salvation of the Lord on your behalf, O Judah and Jerusalem. Do not fear and do not be dismayed tomorrow. Go out against them and the Lord will be with you." 18 Then Jehosaphat

bowed his face, and all Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem fell down before the Lord to worship the Lord. 19 And the Levites of the Kohathites, more specifically the Korachites,<sup>f</sup> rose up in order to praise the Lord, the God of Israel, with a very loud voice; 20 and they got up early in the morning and went out to the wilderness of Tekoa. And while they were going out, Jehosaphat stood and said, "Hear me, O Judah and citizens of Jerusalem, trust in the Lord your God and you will be vindicated. Trust in his prophet and you will be successful." 21 Having consulted with the people, he appointed singers to praise the Lord in sacral ornaments<sup>g</sup> as they went out before the troops saying, "Praise the Lord for his mercy is eternal." 22 And at that moment that they began to sing and to praise, the Lord set ambushes<sup>h</sup> against the sons of Ammon, Moab, and those of Mt. Seir, and they were struck down. 23 The sons of Ammon and Moab rose up to exterminate and destroy those from Mt. Seir. When they had finished off the inhabitants from Seir, each helped<sup>i</sup> to destroy the other. 24 When Judah came to a look-out point over the wilderness, they turned to look at the forces; and behold, there were fallen bodies on the ground; no survivors. 25 And when Jehosaphat and his people came to plunder the spoils, they found many cattle,<sup>j</sup> goods, garments,<sup>k</sup> precious vessels; and they took for themselves more than could be carried. The plundering took three days since the spoil was so large. 26. On the fourth day, they assembled together in the valley of Berechiah because there they blessed the Lord; therefore, they call the name of that place the valley of Berechiah up till today. 27 Then every man of Judah and Jerusalem returned, with Jehosaphat in the lead,<sup>m</sup> to Jerusalem rejoicing because Yahweh had given them pleasing results over their enemies; 28 and they came to Jerusalem with harps, zithers, and trumpets to the house of God. 29 Consequently the fear of God was over all the kingdoms of the earth when they heard that the Lord had fought against the enemies of Israel. 30 The reign of Jehosaphat was peaceful because his God gave him rest from all sides.<sup>40</sup>

Before considering the passage in detail, two problems of an historical nature demand attention. The first is the genealogy given for Jahaziel in v.14. Clearly one of the goals of this listing is to substantiate Jahaziel's right to make a prophetic statement since such authority had been given to Asaph and was presumably capable of being



handed down through the generations. Further, as Gesse has shown, the derivation of Mattaniah from Asaph himself is avoided, though the genealogical schema would put us back to within the time of David--Jehosaphat, Asa, Abijah, Rehoboam, Solomon.<sup>41</sup> It would appear that simply receiving the spirit did not provide enough authority for Jahaziel in the Chronicler's eyes. And to provide the authority, a group of Levitical singers, the Asaphites, were called upon. Either that, or the author was attempting to use prophecy to enhance the Asaphite status. Whichever, prophecy and the Asaphites are closely interconnected for the Chronicler.

Second, there is a major problem regarding the historicity of the battle recorded in this chapter. Briefly stated, the author depicts an assembly of Moabites, Ammonites, and Meunites, who come up against Judah from the South. At first report, they are already in the vicinity of Engedi (Hazezontamar). After Jehosaphat's cultic actions, Judah goes out to find the Moabites and Edomites, moved further into the area near Tekoa, destroying the Meunites (now called the inhabitants of Mt. Seir) and finally the mutual self-destruction of Moab and Edom. The plunder of the battle is gathered in the valley of Berechiah, just south of Tekoa. This summary contains virtually all the data given to us by the Chronicler--with the exception of v.16, Ziz and Jeruel. The problem is that this incident is presented to us only in this one account. There is no parallel in the book of Kings.

Recent solutions have been three-fold to this apparent lack of consistency between Israel's two historical annals. The first or harmonizing solution is represented by Kautsch, Wellhausen, and Benzinger. Their argument goes as follows: the mention of a fight against the Moabites eliminates any other story than 2 Kgs 3 as a parallel.<sup>42</sup> Further the self-destruction of the enemy is a common element to both accounts. Consequently, the version in Chronicles may be viewed as an historical midrash on 2 Kgs 3. Also, though this particular point has never been made by the above commentators, there is some connection between the nature of the Kings' account as a prophetic legend of Elisha and that of the role of Jahaziel in the Chronicler's story. Just as Elisha predicted the character of the victorious campaign against Moab, so Jahaziel gave instructions and predicted the outcome of the Judahite "campaign" against the southern coalition. The first solution has been rather ignored by present commentators, though the nature of prophetic activity which is central to both accounts gives the argument more weight.

Second, Noth has argued at great length that the tale is based upon a local tradition. He is, as others, unimpressed by the scanty parallels between 2 Kings 3 and Chronicler's accounts. And he is enough impressed by the specific place names to argue that the account is not an invention out of whole cloth. Noth's thesis is quite simply that the place names, with the exception of those in v.16 which are no longer

capable of precise identification, revolve around the Tekoa area. The mysterious Hazazontamar could refer to a terrace between Engedi and the coast of the Dead Sea or to an area ten kilometers north of Engedi on the way to the mountains.<sup>43</sup> Noth believes that the report is about an attack by early Nabataeans, Meun designating an area southeast of Petra in the Edomitic Seir mountain chain, in either the latter half of the fourth century or the early part of the third.<sup>44</sup> The Chronicler's apparent familiarity with the material can only be explained by seeing this area as his homeland. Consequently, we should not think that there was any Vorlage prior to our account. As for the relationship between the Chronicles and the Kings passages, Noth says: "One can say at most, that the Chronicler has replaced the prophetic legend, 2 Kgs 3.4-27, by another only distantly comparable narrative, to which the basic stuff was supplied for him from a, to us, unknown source."<sup>45</sup>

Thirdly, Rudolph modifies Noth's position by contending:

- (1) that the term, Meunites, is motivated by a desire to delimit more precisely the nature of the Edomites in the fight, i.e. that we need not seek so late a group as the Nabataeans;
- (2) that there was a coalition against Jehosaphat as described in the Chronicler's narrative while Noth has theorized that the Moabites were added on the basis of the replaced Kings' narrative, while the Ammonites are there just to make a good third enemy;
- (3) that there was a literary Vorlage as shown by the Chronicler's explication of Hazazontamar by Engedi,

i.e. that the source was more than a little-known local tradition; (4) that the dating c. 300 is unnecessary, even on Noth's grounds, because such early Nabataean elements could have been present as early as 400. The resort to these Nabataean Meunites is unnecessary. In summarizing Rudolph's position, I use his own words, "...the external circumstances of the tale in 2 Chr 20 rest on good tradition."<sup>46</sup> Myers apparently accepts Rudolph's modifications of Noth's argument.<sup>47</sup>

It seems difficult to deny the force of Noth's contention that this battle story is set in a small section of land around Tekoa. The questions of just who was involved and when the battle was fought are probably today unanswerable. The important question to be addressed to our text, however, does not deal with these two historical questions, which remain cloudy. But with regard to the synoptic problem, one must, as does Noth, notice that the Chronicler has replaced the account of 2 Kgs 3 with the modified local tradition in 2 Chr 20. The question we must answer is why he has done so. What did the Chronicler gain or achieve by the replacement of the older by the newer story? To answer this question, we now turn to consider the character of this rendition of Jehosaphat's war.

One of the most striking features of this text is the two speeches and the importance they have for the sequence of events resulting in the victory over the

attacking nations.<sup>48</sup> The first of these is the so-called "prayer of Jehosaphat." This section, vv.3-15, seems remarkable because it is easy to fit into a pattern of Israelite cultic practice--the national lament accompanied by fasting and finally answered with a divine oracle (cf. especially 1 Kgs 8.21; Joel 1-2). Form critics have long noted that a number of Psalms were probably used in such a way (Pss 44; 60; 74; 79; 83; 89).<sup>49</sup> The stereotypical features, following Eissfeldt's analysis of Ps 44 would be: the complaint--vv.10-17,20,26; the plea for help--vv.24-25,27; the recitation of prior acts of Yahweh--vv.2-4; indication of present trust in Yahweh--vv.5-9; protestations of innocence--vv.18-19;21-22; and the assertion that loyalty to Yahweh has brought on the disaster--vv.23. We may rather easily see many of these elements in the lament recited by Jehosaphat: vv.6-7--recitation of past favors; vv.8-9--protestation of innocence and statement of trust; vv.10-11--complaint; v.12--plea. However, two characteristics of this lament strike us as unusual. First, the use of the third person in v.8 and its implicit continuation in v.9, "Yahweh gave the land to the descendants of Abraham and they built the sanctuary saying..." It implies that the present generation had not and was not now saying these sorts of things, that is, saying them spontaneously on their own. The character of this quotation of the older generation is almost liturgical. I have in mind here an analogy in the way the Lord's Prayer is introduced into low church services in the United States.

The officiating clergy may say, "...and the prayer which our Lord taught us to pray saying, Our Father...." Perhaps we have something of the same thing in this Chronicler's piece--the use of an earlier prayer, v.9. It is almost the theological precipitate of the national lament drama: 'If trouble comes, we will go up to the temple which is the place where Yahweh's name is, and recite a prayer of lamentation, and receive an oracle of assurance.' V.9 is, in effect, a summary of the whole proceedings included within one of the elements of the cultic lament act.

Second, the plethora of questions in the introductory section of the lament deviates from the stereotypical pattern. When the deeds of old are recited, these are the data of faith; Ps 74.13, "You divided the sea with your strength and broke the heads of the dragons of the waters." Yet, in Jehosaphat's prayer these acts are more general than in other laments: v.6, "In your hand are power and might, so that none is able to withstand you." Further, in this text, these assertions are phrased as questions, a literary device almost never found in laments. Questions, to be sure, are part of the national lament pattern, but they occur as a part of the plea; Who will help? How long Oh Lord? (cf. Pss 60.9-10; 74.1-2,10; 79.5; 80.4; 89.46,48; as well as 2 Chr 20.12). One could dismiss the questions as rhetorical questions. But such a dismissal ignores the character of rhetorical questions. The device is intended to create a deeper impression on the hearer than would have been obtained by making a direct statement.<sup>50</sup>

To see this effect at work in our text, we must follow what the writer has done by passing over rather lightly the three general questions asserting the power of Yahweh and focus on the final one--that Yahweh drove the inhabitants of the land away. It is upon this element, contrasted to the earlier and more general claims that the element of recitation in the lament rests. And this very element serves as a foil or counterpoise to the subject of the complaint: Yahweh's sin of omission. He did rid Israel of those in the land, but not those outside of the land. In this method of contrasts, the author of this lament has used the recitation of Yahweh's prior deeds to heighten Israel's complaint, both against the enemy and against Yahweh.

Moving to the second speech, we find another part of the national lament ritual, the oracle of mercy,<sup>51</sup> the answer to the complaint. This represents the theorized solution to the often sudden change in the tone of national laments. Scholars have suggested that the more positive tone which often ends such sections represents an answer by some cult official. Begrich's study of the priestly Heilsorakel provided the data by which we now understand this cultic response. In the simplest form the saying has three parts: (1) the phrase 'Fear not' (Lam 3.57); (2) the designation of the addressed party (Isa 41.10); (3) the assurance that Yahweh has heard (Isa 41.14).<sup>52</sup> This basic form underwent many permutations as it was revised by Israelite prophets. Pertinent to our Chronicles text is that v.15 mirrors the

early form of the priestly salvation oracle: all three of the basic elements are present. The parties are most explicitly designated; the phrase 'Fear not' is present (also in the reprise, v.17); and the assurance is given in a promise of battle support. This oracle is the very sort of answer we should expect from the national cultic lament pattern.

The only problem with letting our analysis end with this last element of the public lament is that the narrative continues. To simply label 2 Chr 20.3-17 as a public lament, as Eissfeldt has done, rather ignores its place in the story of Jehosaphat's war. A more perceptive reading of Jahaziel's speech allows us to see that the Chronicler was interested in giving us more than just a lament. This speech represents a turning, not a break; for it, as well as several earlier parts of the chapter, may be viewed within the context of one of Israel's oldest institutions, the holy war. The 'Fear not' formula tips us off (cf. Exod 14.13; Josh 8.1; 10.8; 1 Sam 23.16); and thereby opens up the passage for further analysis of these apparently welded forms: national lament and holy war.<sup>53</sup>

Seen from the holy war context, we may retreat for a moment and review the earlier parts of the chapter. The people have assembled to Jerusalem, though not the עַם יְהוּדָה of old. Instead of a short query as to the success of the operation, e.g. 1 Sam 14.37, we find a long lament of



Jehosaphat which functions as the shorter question since it draws out the divine answer about the future of the war. Jahaziah's speech then functions in two ways: as the salvation oracle in the lament pattern and as the divine decision about Yahweh's action in the holy war.

Von Rad argues, surely correctly, that the phrases "the battle is not yours but Yahweh's," (v.15) and "take your positions, stand still, and see the victory of the Lord on your behalf," (v.17) echo respectively 1 Sam 17.47 where in challenging Goliath David says, "the battle is Yahweh's;" and Exod 14.13 where Moses, at the edge of the Reed Sea says to the Israelites, "Fear not, stand firm, and see the salvation of the Lord."<sup>53a</sup> This speech is replete with features of the holy war ideology: the perfect certainty of victory, it is Yahweh's war, Yahweh will fight for them, Israel shall not fear but believe.<sup>54</sup> These elements all indicate the attempt by the Chronicler to relate this narrative to the oldest traditions of Israel.

As the story continues, the pattern of the holy war undergoes a major revision. Consequently, the purpose of the writer becomes much clearer. We would normally expect the battle scene with confusion wrought upon the enemy. This comes to be sure, but in v.23. In between, we have a further preparatory interlude, the interjection of an element foreign to the older accounts. The author has placed a new party of functionaries before us, the Korachite Kohatites. It is with this group that the narrative is bound up

until the battle is won.

Following this interjection, the next interesting feature is the speech of Jehosaphat. The first element, "Believe in the Lord your God and you will be established," is a normal and expected part of the holy war procedure, though such admonitions to faith are usually connected with the phrase 'Fear not.'<sup>55</sup> One is strongly tempted to see this phrase as a direct, and exegetical, borrowing from Isa 7.9b.<sup>56</sup> Isaiah had been directed to speak to Ahaz as he faced a Syro-Ephraimitic coalition. And at the end of an oracle intended to hearten Ahaz, Isaiah says, "...if you will not believe, surely you shall not be established." In this case, the negative phrasing seems to prefigure the negative response of Ahaz. In our passage, the threatening quality is mitigated. It is phrased in a positive fashion. Instead of being a counsel from prophet to king, it is now used as an admonition from king to people.

Then in nicely parallel fashion, we find Jehosaphat adjuring the gathered assembly to "believe in his prophets and you will succeed." It is difficult to view this as anything more than a most innovative and unusual claim. There are at least three facets to this assertion--all three of which can, I think, be accepted as a part of the Chronicler's purpose. Initially, he is calling attention to the fact that the phrase's basic claim--"believe in the Lord your God and you will be established"--is a claim not of his own making. It is a claim made within Israel's past--now known in a

collection of Isaiah's words, albeit here in a slightly altered form. Further, a prophetic figure, Jahaziel, has just spoken to Israel as a part of the holy war pattern, and his message demands attentive obedience. Finally, the Korachites are of the same warp and woof as the Asaphite singers (see below) and carry, for the Chronicler, a prophetic force. To believe in their activity, in the ensuing battle is also required.

Following the narrative, Jehosaphat designates individuals to perform the singing, surely the singers mentioned in v.19, and gives them the libretto for their song or chant: "Give thanks to the Lord, for his steadfast love endures forever." And then the battle; or more accurately, and then the song of praise, for at the very moment these Levitical singers strike up the song, Yahweh wreaks havoc upon the enemy. This I take to be the crucial point of the story--that the Korachite singers are those responsible for bringing Israel to victory.<sup>57</sup>

It is instructive to again compare the more traditional elements of the holy war procedure with the action described in 2 Chr 20. Normally, the battle is begun with a war cry.<sup>58</sup> In our narrative, this cry has been altered into a more cultic, or with von Rad, spiritual form. Instead of the  $\text{אָרְוֵנוּ}$ , (e.g. Judg 7.20), we now have a Psalmic chant. And instead of the entire company uttering the battle cry, a group of cultic officials was designated for the task.

Von Rad's statement provides a concise summary:

The cultic...has now become again, through the emphasis on the varied divine service celebrations, the most important characteristic of the whole...Above all, the supporting function, which is now incumbent on the cultic personnel, is noteworthy. The characteristic of the older holy war was that it was carried out with a minimum of extra officials. In opposition, here a large apparatus of cultic officials function; and it makes the impression that the divine help dovetails exactly with the entrance of the cultic activity.<sup>59</sup>

To end our examination of the narrative, nothing is said about the  $\text{אָלֵן}$ . Instead, a service of praise was held on the battlefield; and then again in Jerusalem--a service of harps, lyres, and trumpets (again an implicit mention of the Levitical singers' activity, cf. 1 Chr 15.16ff).

One further problem remains after we have seen the way in which the Chronicler has revised the holy war model to emphasize the place of the Levitical singers as prophets, that is an attempt to fit this story into the tradition history schema of Gese. The complicating feature is that the typical names of Levitical singers present, when the normal traditions allow of two groups, are Asaph and Jedutun. In 2 Chr 20 we have two groups, but they are described as Asaphite and Korachite. Since there are only two groups accounted as Levites, the story must represent a stage prior to IIIA. And since two groups are presupposed, the classification could not predate stage II. The necessary question is asked by Gese: are the Korachite singers in 2 Chr 20.19 now identical with the Jedutun group? He answers: since the Jedutun group continues on from stage II, only to appear in

IIIB with another name, we must assume that in 2 Chr 20, the Jedutun group is implied (along with the Korachites). That one can count a Korachite to the Jedutun group, we are able to ascertain in the case of Obed-Edom, who is listed as a Korachite in 1 Chr 26.4,8,15 and as a member of the Jedutun group in 1 Chr 15.18(21). For some reason, the more prevalent name, Jedutun, was used as a pseudonym for the increasingly powerful Korachite group.

Gese contends that to fully understand the character of this emphasis on the Korachites we must recall the well-known rebellion of Korach in Num 16.<sup>60</sup> This chapter must surely reflect some of the strife in late exilic or post-exilic cultic status. According to this theory, the Korachites sought to achieve priestly status and were refused. And since the priestly office was thus closed to them, the only possibility for cultic status would have been in the Levitical offices--specifically, that of Levitical singers. Gese goes on to suggest that we may explain the existence of the Hemanite group within this context. 1 Chr 6.18ff and Ps 88 make it clear that the Hemanites derive from Korach. And in stage IIIB, we see that the Hemanites grow strong as the Asaphite group is pushed into the background. Gese thus argues that 2 Chr 20.19 reflects a period just prior to IIIA, when this Korach group was gaining strength but was not yet the cohesive group of Heman in IIIB. In this period before IIIA, the non-Asaphites were called ... מְנוּי הַקֹּהֲתִים since there may have been non-Korachites in the Jedutun group.

"[That] the designation of the non-Asaphite singers as descending from Korach could have been taken over by the Chronicler as a genealogical designation proves itself correct totally for Heman and at least partly for Jedutun."<sup>61</sup> According to Gese's relative chronology, our passage would have originated in the latter part of the fifth century.

We are now left with the task of summarizing the varied emphases and directions noted in this chapter of 2 Chronicles. First, it is an especially important chapter. Plöger's analysis of the significance of prayers and speeches in the Deuteronomistic and Chronistic historical works clearly shows this.<sup>61a</sup> 2 Chr 20 is replete with a long prayer and a salvation oracle. The Chronicler has underlined the chapter in red for us by his use of this device. Secondly, we have seen two formal patterns--the national lament and the holy war--appropriated by the writer to depict an event. However, the chapter is less an historical description, in its present state, than it is an occasion for telling about the character of the Levitical singers in the Chronicler's day. The success of the war is directly linked to the functioning of the Asaphite and Korachite Levites, both of whom are described as prophetic. Third, the chapter is not an historical midrash in the normally accepted use of that term. The Chronicler evidently had some tradition of a local fight in the region of Tekoa which he was able to use in place of the 2 Kgs 3 report of Elisha's activity in the context of a war against Moab. More important than the parties involved, is to

understand that the Chronicler has substituted not so much one war story for another; he has substituted for one prophetic legend another tale depicting not the actions of a popular prophetic figure but the character of prophecy in his own day. The picture given is a retrojection--how the Asaphites and Korahites would have functioned in Israel's past thus substantiating their present function in post-exilic cultic life.

#### HEZEKIAH'S TEMPLE CLEANSING

##### AND THE LEVITES

##### 2 Chronicles 29

The final major text to which we turn our attention is yet another tale about royal initiative and consequent response from cultic officials. Hezekiah is another king favored by the Chronicler. His passover is a well-known episode to those concerned with the historical development of that cultic event. However, the prefatory purification of the temple and the officials is usually overlooked. And yet it is here that we find another narrative in which the enigmatic Levites receive attention and where we find the appellation of prophet given to one of the Levitical singers.

##### 2 Chr 29

1 Hezekiah began to rule when he was twenty-five years old, and he reigned twenty-nine years in Jerusalem. The name of his mother was Abiyah, the daughter of Zechariah. 2 He acted uprightly according to all which his father David had done. 3. In the first month of the first year of his reign,<sup>a</sup> he opened the doors of the house of the Lord and repaired them. 4 And he brought the priests and the Levites and gathered

them to the eastern plaza,<sup>b</sup> 5 and he said to them, "Hear me, O Levites; sanctify yourselves now and sanctify the house of the Lord, the God of your fathers; and bring out the impurity from the holy place, 6 because our fathers were unfaithful and acted wickedly in the eyes of the Lord our God and abandoned him and turned their faces from the dwelling of the Lord and turned their backs. 7 They even shut the doors of the porch and extinguished the lamps and did not burn incense or offer burnt offerings in the holy place of the God of Israel. 8 Consequently the anger of the Lord is upon Judah and Jerusalem; and it has made them a terror, a desolation, and a derision, as you can see with your own eyes. 9 Behold, our fathers fell by the sword and our sons, daughters, and wives were in captivity because of this,<sup>c</sup> 10 Now it is in my heart to make a covenant with the Lord God of Israel so that his violent wrath may turn away from us. 11 Now, my sons, do not be negligent because the Lord has chosen you to stand before him, to serve and to be servants and incense burners for him." 12 Then the Levites arose--Mahath the son of Amasai, and Joel the son of Azariah, of the sons of the Kohatites; and of the sons of Merari, Kish the son of Abdi, and Azariah the son of Jehallel; and of the Gershonites, Joah the son of Zimmah, and Eden the son of Joah; 13 and of the sons of Elizaphan, Shimri and Jeuel; and of the sons of Asaph, Zechariah and Mattaniah; 14 and of the sons of Heman, Jehuel and Shimei; and of the sons of Jedutun, Shemaiah and Uzziel-- 15 and they gathered their brothers, sanctified themselves, and went to clean the house of the Lord according to the command of the king by the words of the Lord.<sup>d</sup> 16 And the priests entered the inside of the house of the Lord, to clean it; and they brought out all the unclean things which they found in the temple of the Lord to the court of the house of the Lord; and the Levites received it to take it outside to the Kidron valley. 17 They began to sanctify on the first day of the month. By the eighth day of the month, they had come to the porch of the Lord. Then they sanctified the house of the Lord eight more days, and on the sixteenth day<sup>e</sup> of the first month they had completed the work. 18 They went in before Hezekiah the king and said, "We have cleaned all of the house of the Lord: the altar for the burnt offering, all its vessels, and the table for the rows of bread and all its vessels; 19 and all the vessels which Ahaz the king rejected during his apostate reign, we have prepared and consecrated; and they are now before the altar of the Lord." 20 Hezekiah the king rose and gathered the princes of the town and went up to the house of the Lord. 21 They brought seven bulls, seven rams, seven lambs, and seven



he-goats as a sin offering for the monarchy, for the sanctuary, and for Judah. He commanded the sons of Aaron, the priests, to offer them up on the altar of the Lord. 22 And they killed the bulls and the priests received the blood and sprinkled it upon the altar. They slaughtered the rams and sprinkled the blood upon the altar; and they killed the sheep and scattered the blood upon the altar; 23 and they brought the goats for the sin offering before the king; and the congregation set their hands upon them. 24 The priests killed them and made a sin offering with the blood on the altar to atone for all Israel because the king had commissioned a burnt offering and a sin offering for all Israel. 25 He set the Levites in the house of the Lord with cymbals, harps, and zithers according to the command of David, Gad the seer of the king, and Nathan the prophet, because by the hand of Yahweh the command was by the hand of his prophets.<sup>f</sup> 26 And the Levites stood with the instruments of David, and the priests had the trumpets; 27 then Hezekiah ordered the burnt offerings to be offered on the altar. With the beginning of the offering, the song of the Lord and the trumpeting also began, accompanied by<sup>g</sup> the instruments of David, king of Israel. 28 The entire congregation worshipped. And the singers continued to sing and the trumpeters kept on trumpeting until the burnt offering was finished. 29 And when the burnt offering was completed, the king and those with him bowed down and prostrated themselves. 30 Then Hezekiah the king and the princes ordered the Levites to praise the Lord with the words of David and Asaph the seer, and they sang praises with great joy and bowed down and prostrated themselves. 31 Hezekiah said, "Now that you have devoted yourselves<sup>h</sup> to the Lord, come near and bring sacrifices and thank offerings to the house of the Lord. And the congregation brought sacrifices and thank offerings, and all who had a willing spirit brought burnt offerings. 32 The number of burnt offerings which the congregation brought was: seventy bulls, one hundred rams, two hundred lambs; all these were as burnt offerings for Yahweh. 33 The dedicated offerings amounted to six hundred bulls and three thousand sheep. 34 However, there were too few priests. Since they were unable to flay the burnt-offerings, their comrades, the Levites, aided them until the work was finished and until the priests consecrated themselves. For the Levites were more dedicated in consecrating themselves than the priests. 35 As well as the great abundance of burnt offerings there were the pieces of fat from the peace offering and the libations for the burnt-offering; thus was the service of the Lord established. 36 Hezekiah and all the people rejoiced over what the Lord had done for the people, because it was accomplished so quickly.<sup>62</sup>

Hezekiah's temple cleansing seems, on the face of it, a rather innocuous enough event, an incident in which we would not expect the Chronicler to take any great interest. However, this one chapter, closely connected to the famous telling of the passover of Hezekiah, is replete with complexity--perhaps more so than any other chapter this dissertation investigates. That it is connected to the passover plot of Hezekiah--a story which the Chronicler tells in a version so different from that of the Deuteronomist--might give us an inkling of this chapter's importance.

Briefly summarized, Hezekiah is portrayed as initiating the cleansing of the temple by calling certain cultic officials and telling them to sanctify the temple. Then, after a short genealogy of the Levites, we are told how the temple was rededicated. From vv.20ff, a variety of sacrifices prepared by uncertain parties is described. It is in this section that the greatest difficulty lies. And it is in this section that the reference to Levitical prophets occurs, thereby compounding the difficulties for the interpretive enterprise.

The first trouble comes in the audience designations; in v.4 the audience is referred to as "priests and Levites" but in v.5, as "Levites." Many critics have at this point wanted to begin the search for other signs that there are two levels in the text--levels intended to depict the role of the Levites as distinct from the more composite "priests and Levites." A superficial overview shows that there is more such evidence.

In v.12 only the Levites are addressed when a Levitic genealogy is introduced. There is a rather clear-cut division of priestly responsibility in vv.20-24 and Levitical activity in vv.22,25-30. Finally, v.34 is indicative of some tension between Levites and priests: the priests were unable to prepare all of the burnt offerings and required help from the Levites, since they had been more rigorous in preparation than the priests. These instances are at least indicative that the final product, chapter 29, represents more than just a simple description of Hezekiah's temple rededication. We have probable cause to suspect special interests represented in a multi-layered document.

Now we turn to a more exacting analysis of the chapter. The first issue is the speech of Hezekiah. Keeping in mind Plöger's thesis that speeches are signs of importance in the Chronicler's work, how do we evaluate that importance? The Chronicler is arguing that the event--the rededication--is important and that Hezekiah as a figure in Judah's history is to be given special accord. But these rather obvious inferences ignore the content of the speech. And as we have noted, the juxtaposition of the first line of that speech with the prior description of the audience, priests and Levites, is quite revealing. On the basis of "Hear me, O Levites," the Levites become the sole addressees. The admonition to self-sanctification and to the removal of the filth from the temple is closely tied with what the Levites are depicted as having

done in vv.15-16. It is striking that this charge to the Levites dovetails so neatly with the narrative's description of what they did--the carrying of the **אֵשׁ/הָרִיח** and at the same time ignoring the priests' bringing of the **אֵשׁ** to the Levites. After the introductory charge, the speech chronicles the cultic sins of the fathers (vv.6-8) and then recounts the consequences that Israel had experienced (vv.8-9). V.10 gives us a statement of Hezekiah's intention to form a new covenant to break the pattern of retribution.<sup>63</sup> And then v.11 returns to the addressee--the Levites--and gives them a four-fold task: not to be negligent, to minister, to be ministers,<sup>64</sup> and to burn incense, correcting the omission of incense offering in the past (v.7).

It is within the context of the mention of incense that I wish to discuss this part of the chapter. The definitive work on incense in the Ancient Near East and in the Old Testament has yet to be written. The force of the charge against the fathers for not having burned incense and the corollary admonition to the Levites to burn incense is somewhat unclear. According to Haran's study, there were three cultic rites using incense: (1) the use of spice as a supplement to a meal offering; (2) the censer incense rite, performed in long-handled censers within the general temple precinct by the Aaronite priesthood; and (3) the altar incense rite, **קִטְרוֹת סַמִּים**, limited to the main altar and performed only by the High Priest.<sup>65</sup>

The only trouble with Haran's neat organization is

that he has omitted Chronicles from his consideration. For example, he argues that the Aaronite line has exclusive control only of the **קטרת אהרן**. This phrase does occur in 2 Chr 2.3 and 13.11 where it is connected to the functioning of the Aaronite priesthood, aided by the Levites in the second of the two passages. However, in 2 Chr 26.18-20, in the description of Uzziah's reign, a breakdown of the three-fold schema becomes evident. The Aaronites claim that the burning of incense is their exclusive prerogative since a portable censer is involved, though the incense burning involved is probably the second of Haran's types (a confusing of types two and three).

As for 2 Chr 29, since the appellation **עֲטֹת** is not present in the text, according to Haran, we should see this as the ordinary censer incense ritual. One purpose of the story was to give censer burning rights to the Levites.

Our inability to fit the Chronicler's depiction of the incense ritual into the general schema reflects a problem in Haran's approach. He is at pains to argue that the censer rite is more general and available than the altar rite which is limited to the High Priest. It seems to me that one stream of tradition insists that the censer sacrifice is to be limited to the sons of Aaron. Haran has spent time with the Nadab and Abihu (sons of Aaron) account in Lev 10.1-3 and has argued correctly that the point of this story is that improper fire was used to ignite the censers; it was not from the cultically acceptable flames. And he

contends that the same holds true for the Dathan and Abiran episode in the Korach rebellion (Num 16); the issue is not who performs the censer rite but how it is done. With this interpretation I can not agree, especially since Haran ignores the different narrative strands of this difficult chapter. The JE story of Dathan and Abiram has nothing to do with censers or incense. It is only in the P traditions that these issues become important. In the original P version, Korach is challenged by Moses to a trial by fire and incense (v.6--doublet in P<sub>2</sub>, v.17). The censers were lit (v.8, P<sub>1</sub>) and fire consumed the Korach group (v.35, P<sub>1</sub>). It was left to the P<sub>2</sub> redactor for editorial comment, which he gave in v.40: no one but the Aaronite priests may burn incense, not **אֵשׁ**, but the ordinary incense before the Lord. Korach has suffered double punishment: he is smitten because he tried to achieve priestly status in P<sub>1</sub> and, according to P<sub>2</sub>, because he offered incense. The issue is thus a bit more complicated than Haran would have us believe. In neither the JE nor the P versions does the issue appear to be the result of the wrong fire being used, as Haran contends. Instead, one of the concerns is the preservation of the censer ritual for the Aaronites.

This story is interesting because of its intertwined complexity and because of what it tells us about the incense rituals. However, the relationship between the Korach rebellion and our text is deeper than just the issue of incense. This pivotal episode in Numbers deals with the

very group which figures importantly in the Levitical singers' development in Chronicles: the Korachites. We should not ignore the small P<sub>2</sub> addition in Num 16, "son of Kohath, son of Levi," for this is the very group that the Chronicler presents to us as part of the Levitical group who responded to the speech of Hezekiah--in v.22 explicitly and, as argued earlier, perhaps in v.14 implicitly--as a part of the Heman/Jedutun construct. If we can assume that the final redaction of Num 16 is not terribly distant chronologically from the Chronicler's text, we may have reflected in Num 16 a viewpoint rather different from that supposed in Chronicles, a difference based upon varying evaluations of the Levitical role in cultic affairs--especially of the role played by the Levitical groups appelled as singers and prophets in the Chronicler's narrative.

The genealogy presented to us in vv.12-14 is, to put it bluntly, odd. We are given the three classic Levitic tribes: with Kohath in first position; then Elizaphan, no stranger to such lists (cf. 1 Chr 15.8); and finally a tri-partite division of the Levitical singers, this time as Asaph, Heman, and Jedutun (the names and ordering of phase IIIA). In comparison with the 1 Chr 15 list, the three singer divisions replace Hebron and Uzziel in vv.9-10. As Møhlenbrink has noted, Kohath is accorded the signal position in this genealogy as he is in 1 Chr 6 and 15.5.<sup>66</sup> Møhlenbrink's inference is that the division represents a reworking of the classic patterns to fit the reality of

the Chronicler's times, i.e. that the Kohathite line had achieved some sort of priority. It is probably to be viewed as an insertion into the narrative intended to show the importance of these Kohathites and to reflect the growing significance of the singers, though not in the most complete form. This we see in 1 Chr 6 where the Heman group (the most important singer group in IIIB) has been assimilated into the Kohathite genealogy, which includes Korach.

Turning back to the narrative of chapter 29, we are told that "they" began the work. Whether "they" originally meant both priests and Levites or just Levites is now impossible to determine. Within the final redaction, both are implied. The priests are described as entering the temple in the very next verse.

V.16 has turned many heads by its mention of both priests and Levites, a description which some have taken to be a degradation of the Levites. Though Kidron is a place for the destruction of improper cultic objects for the Chronicler (cf. 2 Chr 15.16 where Asa has an Asherah demolished, as well as the populist iconoclasm of Hezekiah in 2 Chr 30.14), the inference that because the Levites carried out the dirty work of the priests into an unclean place they became unclean is not proved. No such inference about the parties carrying out this activity in the other two passages is acceptable. And since the Levites are presented as eager helpers to the priests in 2 Chr 29.34, perhaps this readiness to do the dirty work of the priests



was intended to redound to the glory of the Levites.

In any case, is the verse primary? Welch thinks that it is an intrusion, as are the words **בַּזְבוּרֵי יְהוָה** in v.15; since he argues that there was a basic document emphasizing the Levitic interests which later suffered a Priestly redaction.<sup>67</sup> Others have contended quite the opposite, that this verse represents one of the few original parts of the narrative, emphasizing the role of the priests. I think the latter is a more convincing position.

Passing from the cleansing of the temple to the reinstatement of the sacrificial service, we meet the most serious questions posed in the chapter. Organizationally, it appears that there are three separate rites described: burnt and sin offering (vv.20-24), burnt offering (vv.25-30), a melange of sacrifices (vv.31-36). Let it be said that some commentators see this string of descriptions as an harmonious whole.<sup>68</sup> However, there seems to be good reason in perceiving a multi-faceted goings-on. Of the three aforementioned divisions, the first has received the most attention because of its anomalous handling of the parties involved. Briefly stated, Hezekiah and the officials of the city bring a number of animals up to the temple for a sacrifice. Hezekiah is quoted as ordering "the priests, the sons of Aaron" to offer them on the altar of the Lord. From then on, vv.22ff, no other group is specified, rather implying that the priests were responsible for both the killing and the manipulation of the blood. But for several reasons, the matter is not quite

that simple. First, the priests are said to receive the blood. If the priests slew the animals, then it makes little sense to talk about priests receiving the blood; especially since the subject of v.22a--"they killed"--is not defined and is followed by "the priests received." This anomaly has resulted in several theories. Hänel thought that in an earlier version of this text, the king and people slaughtered the animals and then gave over the animals for sacrifice; whereas the redactor wanted to show that the laity were responsible for the killing.<sup>69</sup> The argument that the phrase "the priests the sons of Aaron" is an addition makes a good deal of sense. It seems odd to find the priests designated in the latter part of v.21, referred to generally in v.22a, and then respecified as "the priests" in the next clause. We should thus understand "the sons of Aaron" in v.21 to be an insertion and most probably "the priests" as well. The implication of this earlier version is that the slaughter was accomplished by the king and the officials while the priests were responsible for the blood rite.

To buttress this lay slaughter theory, we need to turn to the Priestly laws concerning the 'olah in Lev 1. In v.4, it is quite clear that after the laying on of the hands, the person giving the animal for the burnt offering kills the animal. Then Aaron's sons, the priests, Lev 1.4, manipulate the blood. The same emphasis on the identification of the Aaronites that we found in 2 Chr 29. 21a is present in Lev 1.4.<sup>70</sup>

The sin offering comprises another element in the tradition. The burnt offering is not mentioned, as such, in v.21 whereas the sin offering is specified. This has caused controversy. Some commentators have argued that these designations are inconsistent. In v.21, the sin offering is made on behalf of the monarch, the sanctuary, and Judah, whereas in v.22 the sin offering is on behalf of Israel. It seems altogether probable that v.24b is a redactional element intending to clarify that the burnt offering was a part of the prior sequence, since it had not been mentioned by name up to that point. This explanatory gloss is probably dependent upon the temple dedication description of Ezra 6.16, where a sin offering is said to have been made for Israel.

More important than the statements describing on behalf of whom the sacrifices were made is the character of the sin sacrifice. It is a sacrifice on behalf of the royal house, on behalf of the king. (cf. Lev 4.22ff). Had it been meant to describe an intercession for all Israel, a bull would have been used (Lev 4.13ff). However, if this sacrifice had been performed according to the prescriptions in Leviticus, the king and his cohorts would have slaughtered the goat and presented the blood to the priests. 2 Chr 29.24 states that this was not the case, that the priests both killed the animals and manipulated the blood on the altar.

Thus, in the final product, vv.20-24, we have more than one layer of tradition. In opposition to the sacrificial laws of Leviticus, there was a tendency to make the Aaronite

priesthood responsible for both the slaying of the burnt offering and the sin offering as well as their traditional functions with the blood.

Moving from a discussion of burnt and sin offerings with the dominant redactional interest focused on the priestly role, we turn to a section where the interest centers primarily on the burnt offering, though the sin offering is present; but here the dominant cultic functionaries are now the Levites. Unlike vv.20-24, the description in vv.25-30 gives the impression of a relatively cohesive unit. The writer has gone to some trouble to make clear that the Levitical praise is of critical importance to this cultic act.

The first of two central questions around which this text revolves is: is the burnt offering the same as the one described in vv.20-24 or are we presented with two separate events? This is exceptionally difficult to answer. The best responses, positive and negative, are those of Welch and Rudolph respectively. Welch argues that vv.20-24 and vv.25-30 represent different ceremonies--burnt offering with sin offering and burnt offering, with concomitantly different emphases on the cultic officials in each of the stories.<sup>71</sup> Rudolph has stated that even with these difficulties, the Chronicler's basic purpose was to show the simultaneity of the Levitical action: the singing with the burnt offering.<sup>72</sup>

I propose an harmonistic solution, accepting both answers. I think it is clear that we have two originally separate episodes described. The presence of the sin offering

in vv.20-24 simply does not fit with vv.25-30. However, the final product works as a continuous event for a reason that even Rudolph has overlooked. If we turn back to the description of the burnt offering in Lev 1.4-9, we find that the blood rite is not the final part of the burnt offering. The actual burning is the cultic completion. And it is into this two-fold sacrificial system of blood rite and altar burning that the Chronicles redactor has fit his two components.

The second basic question is: how are we to understand the role of the prophetic figures and appellations in this section? In answer, it must be noted that something more is at stake than just an appeal to prophetic titles. The name of David appears four times in these verses. Thus, it is quite apparent that the author is trying to get authority for his description. The Davidic appeal is used to sanction the Levitical instruments (vv.25-27--the same instruments as those in the important passage, 1 Chr 25) and the words of praise (v.30). In both these cases, the prophetic figures are present. It is as if the Davidic figure provides the ultimate sanction with the result that the present generation is given this Davidic admonition through the mediation of the penultimate prophetic figures. Surely this is the function of that difficult phrase at the end of v.25; explaining how the commandment of David and Yahweh work together in the messages of Gad and Nathan. Likewise, Asaph and David share the authority for the words of praise.

What is truly remarkable about this passage is the identification of the roles of Asaph and Gad. The presence of Nathan and Gad with the differing titles of "prophet" and "seer" is interesting (though pressing this difference between "prophet" and "seer," especially in late material, can be overemphasized).<sup>73</sup> This application of "seer" to Asaph is as explicit a statement of intention by the Chronicler as is possible. Asaph, the first, and in the early stages, the most important of the Levitical singers, is called "seer," a move which creates a direct link with the entire activity of the Levites in this section. It underlines vv.25-30 in red. The goal of the author seems to have been a synthesis of the roles of the Levites with those of the early court prophets in an attempt to give the Levitical singers Davidic authority.

Finally, we turn to the last section of this chapter, vv.31-36. Three items are noteworthy. First, the collection of sacrificial offerings is not patently clear. Whether or not the waw introducing תודות is epexegetical is moot. Lev 7.12 states that a peace offering may be given as either a תודה, a נדר, or a נדב; that is, as a thanksgiving, a votive, or a freewill offering. Rudolph's attempt to subsume the קדשים, שלמים, and תודה under the rubric עלה seems forced, especially since we know so little about the קדשים. It was apparently an offering over which the Levites could have specific charge (2 Chr 31.12; 35.13), even in its more generic and perhaps non-sacrificial sense (1 Chr 26.20,26; 28.12).

Whichever way we divide up or classify these offerings, the author had one intention: to show that the temple sacrificial system had been reinstated in a fully successful fashion. Whether or not, as Rudolph wants to assert, the covenant is to be seen as implicitly renewed is difficult to say.<sup>74</sup> We do not have the divine affirmation in the form of a consuming fire as it appeared in 2 Chr 5. The emphasis is less on covenant than on the role of the Levites in the reestablishment of the sacrifices.

A second problem reflects the issue of lay versus priestly participation. Hezekiah states that a group, though undefined, has consecrated itself. I have shown above that this phrase does not refer to a priestly ordination. In v.31b, we find the assembly as the party bringing the sacrifices called for in v.31a. And the offerings of the  $\text{לֶחֶם}$  are the two types of  $\text{זָבַח}$  offering: the thanksgiving and the freewill offering (Lev 7.11ff). There is a shift of sacrificial terminology in v.32. The congregation is now depicted as bringing the burnt offering, and then the uncertain  $\text{זָבַח}$  in v.33. Switching back to the burnt offering in v.33, the Chronicler speaks of the difficulty the priests were having in flaying the animals. When we look back to the laws in Leviticus, this change is strange since Lev 1.6 implies that the offerer of the sacrifice is to flay the animal himself. Clearly, the verse disrupts the theme of the lay participation in the sacrifices begun earlier in this section.

Third, the Chronicler focuses on the continuing theme of the prominence of certain Levites. He has adeptly used two themes--the plethora of sacrifices in the reinstated cult and the necessity for cultic aides--to create a context for his statement about the Levites in v.34. As pointed out, v.34 seems to be out of order; it would appear more appropriate after v.32. The verse itself contradicts normal sacrificial practice (cf. Lev 1.6 and above). The author must have synthesized statements like 2 Chr 30.3 and 2 Chr 35.11 from two separate Passover celebrations to create the charge against the priests stated here. That the verse is anti-priestly seems hard to deny. Welch equivocates for a while and then says such an anti-priestly tone would be consistent with the original pro-Levitic document.<sup>75</sup>

What then may be said about this chapter, especially about vv.20ff? That it represents different layers of emphases cannot be denied. That it is somehow related to the accounts in Ezra 6.17; 7.1 and 1 Chr 5.12, probably in an expansionary way, is likely. That we should locate the pro-Levitic traditions on the basis of the prominence of Asaph early in the Levitical singers tradition history and see the genealogical insertion (vv.12-14) as a product of later times is reasonable. The basic goal of this chapter was to describe the Hezekiah temple rededication in a way most conducive to giving certain Levitic families, the singers, authority--authority based upon the old court prophet position.



## PROPHETS TO LEVITES

## 2 Chronicles 34.30

In this text, the problem is how to understand the seemingly insignificant change in one word. When we read the Kings account of Josiah's public reading of the law book, we find that among those listening were "the priests and the prophets" (2 Kgs 23.2). In Chronicles, we find "the priests and the Levites" in the audience (2 Chr 34.30). An inadvertant slip? A change reflected by current practice? A textual error for which no variants remain?

Most commentators have felt that cultic prophets, more specifically, Levitical singers, are intended by this "Levitical slip."<sup>76</sup> However, it is of course possible that the terminology of 2 Chr 35.18, "the priests and the Levites," has influenced the wording of 2 Chr 34.30.

Since the change occurs in a relatively seamless narrative about the Josianic period, we can theorize that this terminological idiosyncrasy was current with the basic Chronicler's narrative--correlative with Gese's IIIA. The fragmentary character of the issue dictates caution. However, I think that this is another way that one of the Chroniclers established authority for the Levites by putting them in prophetic garb.

## JOSIAH'S PASSOVER AND LEVITICAL SINGERS

## 2 Chronicles 35.15

Finally we come to a tantalizingly short reference to the classic names within the Chronicler's treatment of Josiah's Passover. One of the major, if not the dominant, themes in this text is the stress on the importance of the Levitical function in the Passover proceedings.<sup>77</sup> Much ink has been spilled over the strange directions and nature of this Passover celebration.<sup>78</sup> Welch has argued that the passage is a confusing interweaving based on a redactor's attempt to make the original Chronicler's description consonant with the Deuteronomistic practices, those described in Exodus and Numbers. According to Welch, at least parts of vv.6,12,13,14,16 were the responsibility of a later redactor.<sup>78a</sup>

I have great difficulty with the sections which describe the uncertain nature of the animal sacrifices. Why do the bulls originally designated as paschal offerings (v.7) seem to end up as burnt offerings (v.12, following MT לְבָקָר)?<sup>79</sup> Why are שְׁלָמִים included at all; and why are they, when included, not prepared according to the normal Passover regulations? These perhaps unanswerable questions indicate the puzzling quality of the narrative.

However, it is to the single v.15 to which we now turn:

The singers, the sons of Asaph, were functioning according to the command of David and Asaph and Heman, and Jedutun, the king's seer; and the gatekeepers were at each and every gate. It was not necessary for them to cease their service, because their brethren the Levites prepared for them. 2 Chr 35.15

This verse strikes a dissonant chord on several counts. Initially, the singular  $\text{הַיָּחִיד}$  breaks the movement, "...Jedutun the seer." If this reading were correct, we would have to see Jedutun as somehow superior to his two cohorts. But we know of no such stage in the singer traditions. Consequently, the plural  $\text{יָחִידִים}$ , supported by LXX, V, S, and T, should be adopted. At least it allows the text to make sense. However, one can argue that the singular reading represents an older edition and that the phrase  $\text{כַּעֲצוֹת...וַיִּדְוֹתוּ}$  was later inserted at the IIIA stage of development. The earlier document--reading "the sons of Asaph, the king's seer"--would then be related to the 2 Chr 29 text where Asaph occurs alone as the seer.

A further problem occurs when we attempt to be precise about the meaning of "their brethren the Levites." Are we to think that the doorkeepers and the singers are Levites, that neither are, or that the singers are and the doorkeepers are not? The syntax implies that both singers and doorkeepers have the same relation to the Levites. If our theory about the existence of an earlier text is correct, that Asaph was present without any other singers, then the conditions of that earlier edition must influence our understanding of the problem of the relationships between Levites, singers, and doorkeepers. The stage of Levitical singers

traditions in which Asaph occurred alone was Gese's IIIA. And in this stage, neither the singers nor the doorkeepers were accounted as Levites. Consequently, v.15 preserves a description of the singers as non-Levitic even though it has included the IIIA description of the singer divisions, a revision prior to the heavy push of the Korachites.

One way to resolve the "brethren" problem is to contend that v.15 is related to v.6 (which Welch has stated is a later interpolation). For it is in v.6 that the Levites are charged to take care of their "brethren." The specification of this group comes in v.15.<sup>80</sup>

This text is another example of the use of the prophetic title to give authority to the Levitical singers. The verse is a product of two stages of tradition: one in which Asaph, though not a Levite, was appelled "seer" and a second in which the triumvirate complement was inserted to receive similar honor.

## SUMMARY

The texts in Chronicles here analyzed show the prophetic titles and authority used in conjunction with the Levitical singers. Such language most probably does not reflect a remnant of cultic prophecy, but instead describes a fluid state of events: the changing importance of various cultic groups and the ways in which these associations made claims for authority. The dominant theme was the shift of importance from the Asaphites to the Korachites.

## CHAPTER VI

### CONCLUSIONS:

#### CONTINUITY IN CHANGE

In treating the exilic and post-exilic periods, much Old Testament scholarship has seen fit to talk about an age of discontinuities. This was supposedly a time in which the nation of Ancient Israel became the religious community of Judaism. Institutions like monarchy ended and new ones like the synagogue developed. A typical description of the post-exilic period has been "an age without prophecy." Prophecy was putatively one of those ancient Israelite institutions which ended with the demise of Israel as a nation. More recently, some scholars have argued that instead of abruptly ending, prophecy developed into apocalypticism. But even in this attempt to see a progression, the cessation of Israelite prophecy is predicated.

This dissertation suggests that to speak of prophecy in the exilic and post-exilic periods is to talk of continuity within change. As a literary enterprise, the prophetic corpus kept expanding. In these later periods, the Isaianic school, whose exegetical work and reflection created the Isaianic Apocalypse, Deutero-, and Trito-Isaiah, exemplifies the type of activity which produced the deutero-prophetic corpus. The formation of literature within the prophetic

traditions did not cease with the end of the Israelite nation.

In purely historical terms, the presence of Haggai and Zechariah as well as the Levitical prophets, indicates that certain individuals were understood to stand in a continuum with Israel's classical prophets. Whether or not they performed in the same fashion as had the pre-exilic prophets is another issue. These post-exilic individuals claimed to be prophets and were recognized as such by at least some of their contemporaries and by later editors.

And from the tradition history perspective, the views of prophecy found in the New Testament, Qumran, and the Rabbinic literature which link prophecy to the rule of Yahweh (and sometimes to Yahweh's vassal, the Messiah) evince a continuity of ideology with classical prophecy, a continuity articulated and preserved by the deutero-prophetic traditionists. Thus, from the literary, historical, and tradition history points of view, Israelite prophecy continued into the exilic and post-exilic periods.

## I

These strands of continuity between pre- and post-exilic times should not lead us to overlook the transformations which occurred in classical prophecy. Israel's classical prophets had functioned as a part of the cosmic government of which Yahweh was suzerain and Israelite kings were vassals.<sup>1</sup> The prophets participated in the divine council

and functioned as its messengers to the human world. In reciprocative fashion, the prophets were also sought out by kings in order to discern the plans of the divine suzerain. We also noted the close correlation between the appearance and cessation of individual prophets in Israel with the rise and fall of monarchy as an institution. On the strength of these and other data, I chose to describe the office of the classical Israelite prophet as "political-religious:" "political" because the prophet operated within the context of the cosmic economy and mediated between the divine and earthly kings, and "religious" because the suzerain was Yahweh, Israel's god.

Using this model of political-religious mediator, I then discussed the exilic and post-exilic canonical material dealing with prophecy. We discerned the high regard Jeremiah and Ezekiel held for the Davidic monarchy as an institution. It was an inherent part of Israel's relationship to Yahweh and was a part of these prophets' expectations for future weal. This outlook was typical for classical Israelite prophecy. Untypical were the historical circumstances in which these prophets found themselves. After 597 Israel's monarchy was disrupted: there were two kings. In these conditions the prophetic responsibility and role became problematic. Hence we discovered Jeremiah siding with Zedekiah while Ezekiel remained loyal to the cause of Jehoiachin. With no single ruler at the head of the state, these two prophets were



forced to align themselves as mediators of the divine council to two separate individuals and their respective communities.

Haggai and Zechariah represent quite another picture. Instead of two monarchs, there was now a prince around whom many expectations centered. With their concern to restore the community cultically and politically, Haggai and Zechariah apparently abetted exaggerated claims for the future based on temple reconstruction and restoration of the monarchy. My investigation focused on the last of these two goals, Davidic restoration. We found in both books that these prophets engaged in activity, such as uttering a dynastic oracle and showing a concern for royal building responsibility, which treated the prince Zerubbabel as if he were king. As messengers to the royal pretender, these prophets operated within the classical model of prophecy as they counseled and expedited the cause of Davidic restoration.

## II

After Haggai and Zechariah, there was a moratorium on individual prophets in the classical mold. Many have designated this as the death of prophecy. Our investigation has shown that this assessment is not entirely accurate. Even before the time of Haggai, revisions in the prophetic function were beginning. In both the Isaianic Apocalypse and Deutero-Isaiah, the work of oracle giving as earlier practiced was transmuted into a more exegetical enterprise.

Traditions were preserved, interpreted, and embellished. Trito-Isaiah presents further evidence of the exegetical quality in this deutero-prophetic work. I chose to call these writers "traditionists."

Not only the method of production, but the concept of prophecy itself underwent revision. The prophetic "I" disappears. For Deutero-Isaiah, Israel as a whole is commissioned as Yahweh's "prophet to the nations." Not a Davidide, but Cyrus is the vassal king, Yahweh's "messiah" on earth. The Deutero-Isaianic corpus depicts the prophetic task expanded and personified on cosmic scale. In degree it is different from the classical mode, but it represents nonetheless an attempt to reassign the role of mediator between Yahweh and the world from an individual to a nation.

Though the other deutero-prophetic authors herein investigated worked in a reflective and exegetical fashion similar to that of the Isaiahs, they did not adopt the Isaianic schematization for the preservation of individual prophecy. Instead they were content to talk of an age in which prophecy was no more, as clearly shown in Deutero-Zechariah. Israelite society had changed significantly; it was a minor satrapy of the Persian empire. There were no mediators between the divine ruler and a Judahite king. This was an age in which Yahweh's rule had no concrete political manifestation. Any attempts to identify such a rule (such as those made by the Chronicler for the theocracy)

were to be rejected. Thus, the deutero-prophetic writers looked away from their interim age to the future for the reinstatement of Yahweh's rule and the return of prophecy.

Rather than searching for prophecy in the present, Deutero-Zechariah, Joel, and Malachi looked to the future. Prophecy would return prior to the Day of Yahweh, the day in which Yahweh would triumph and reign as universal king. Expectations for this return of prophecy were of two sorts. It was hoped that Yahweh would pour out his spirit over all Israel; the entire people would become prophets. This was an expectation which made prophecy a part of the eschatological scenario. Also, an individual prophet was expected to mediate on behalf of the people just prior to the appearance of the divine king Yahweh. He was a sign that Yahweh was about to arrive.

These traditions, rather than those of the Deutero-Isaianic corpus, outlived their preservers and remained as live options for the writers of Qumran, the New Testament, and the Rabbinic literature. The New Testament provides an interesting test case because it describes a community which believed that the final age was dawning and that the Messiah had or was about to come. Hence the appropriation of these options, the outpouring of the spirit in Acts 2 and the many attempts to identify the eschatological prophet, was a most natural development.

## III

To leave the analysis at this point would ignore the context in which these traditions developed. For in the post-exilic period, prophecy did not develop exclusively in the deuteroprophetic traditions. Prophecy was important to other groups as well. To treat apocalyptic or any other conceptual construct as the only heir of classical prophecy ignores the importance of prophecy for the Chronicler. Even more than the deuteroprophetic writers, the Chronicler had worked out a consistent and precise conception of prophecy. It functioned several ways in the Chronicler's history. The various oracles depicted the classical prophets as royal advisors, the sharpest example of prophets in the political model. They were intermediaries between the divine and earthly kings. The citations of the prophetic historical sources demonstrated the peculiar authority that prophets' words could have, since the Chronicler was at great pains to legitimate the authority of his own historical work. Individual prophets ceased appearing in the Chronicler's history with the construction of the second temple. After Haggai and Zechariah, individual prophets were no more, nor was there room in the Chronicler's accounts for hopes of Davidic restoration with Zerubbabel. Human kings were no longer needed, since with the institution of the theocracy, Yahweh ruled from his temple. Under these conditions, the Chronicler saw no need for prophets as mediators of Yahweh's word.

However, the Chronicler did make provision for prophecy to continue after the demise of individual prophets: the Levitical singers. These singers, authorized as prophets by David, were the "prophets" of the post-exilic period. With the cessation of individual prophets, the Levitical prophets took over responsibility for mediation. And since Yahweh's reign was now evidenced in temple-affairs, this mediation took place between Yahweh and the worshipping community. Prophetic mediation between Yahweh and his people had shifted from oracle and admonition to cultic act, song, and prayer. Perhaps the clearest examples are the descriptions of the Levitical prophets' prayer and song in the holy war (2 Chr 20) and their sacrificial intercession in Hezekiah's temple cleansing (2 Chr 29).

The Chronicler's laying claim to the use of the prophetic titles in the post-exilic period to describe cultic officials, especially the Korachites, proposed a description of prophecy diametrically opposed to the theory of prophecy propounded by the deutero-prophetic writers. The deutero-prophetic authors' exegetical-theological work was predicated upon the theses that (1) prophecy was a thing of the past, and (2) prophecy would only return as a part of the eschatological scenario; whereas the Chronistic authors viewed the Levitical singers as continuing in the tradition of Israel's earlier prophets.

But both the Chronicler's and deutero-prophetic views of prophecy share a primary concern, a concern for

authority in tradition. One purpose of the Chronicler was to identify the authority of the Levitical prophets with that of the individual classical prophets. In so doing he legitimated the post-exilic cultic mediation of the Levitical singers on the basis of the pre-exilic mediation of the classical prophets. For the deutero-prophetic writers, earlier prophetic collections provided the material out of which their exegetical work progressed. The original oracles and visions gained a certain force by coming from a now absent activity. These collections evidence a proto-canoncity. Thus, though their respective ideas about prophecy differ radically, both theological streams herein represented, depended upon classical prophecy for authority. Prophecy, then, did not perish with the end of Judah but lived on in transformed fashion and was appropriated by various parties in the post-exilic period.

## Notes to Chapter I

<sup>1</sup>Karl Jaspers, "The Axial Age of Human History, Identity and Anxiety (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1960), 597ff. My citation of Jaspers is not meant to deny the significant ties which Israelite prophets had to earlier traditions.

<sup>2</sup>W.F. Albright, Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan (Garden City: Doubleday, 1968), 208ff. See also Albright's Samuel and the Beginnings of the Prophetic Movement (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1961).

<sup>3</sup>T.H. Robinson, "Neuere Propheten Forschung," TR 3(1931), 15-103; and Georg Fohrer, "Neure Literatur zur alttestamentliche Prophetie," TR 19(1951), 277-346; TR 20 (1952), 192-361, 295-361; "Zehn Jahre Literatur zur alttestamentliche Prophetie," TR 28(1962), 1-75, 235-297, 301-374.

<sup>4</sup>I choose this example because Rowley did see some interesting similarities between the prophetic phenomena of these two non-contiguous cultures. H.H. Rowley, Prophecy and Religion in Ancient China and Israel (London: The Athlone Press, 1956). One might also mention Lindblom's comparison of Scandinavian prophets like St. Bridget of Sweden with Israelite prophecy. J. Lindblom, Prophecy in Ancient Israel (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1962), 18ff.

<sup>5</sup>A. Heschel, The Prophets (New York: Harper and Row, 1962), 252.

<sup>6</sup>I am unable to accept Morton Smith's fusillade at the history of religions enterprise. M. Smith, "Historical Method in the Study of Religion," On Method in the History of Religions (Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan Univ. Press, 1968), 8-16.

<sup>7</sup>F. Heiler, Erscheinungsformen und Wesen der Religion (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1961), 395ff.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., 396, 554ff. K. Goldammer, Die Formenwelt des Religiösen (Stuttgart: Alfred Kroner, 1960), 167ff. Lindblom, Prophecy, 4, 46. G. Hölischer, Die Profeten. Untersuchungen zur Religionsgeschichte Israels (Leipzig: J. Hinrichs, 1914).

<sup>9</sup>G. Guariglia, Prophetismus und Heilserwartungs Bewegungen als völkerkundliches und religionsgeschichtliches Problem (Vienna: Ferdinand Berger, 1959), 33. See for a similar approach, H.H. Schaefer, "Die Idee der orientalische Religionsgeschichte," Studien zur Orientalischen Religionsgeschichte (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1968), 6ff.

<sup>10</sup>J. G. Williams, "The Social Location of Israelite Prophecy," JAAR 37(1969), pp. 153ff., in response to P. Berger, "Charisma and Religious Innovation: the Social Location of Israelite Prophecy," ASR 28(1963), 940-950.

<sup>11</sup>Williams, "Social Location," p. 165.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., pp. 158 and 159 n. 11.

<sup>13</sup>F. Cross, "New Directions in the Study of Apocalyptic," Apocalypticism, ed. R. Funk (New York: Herder and Herder, 1969), p. 161. Paul Hanson follows Cross in this view; "This accomplishment of the prophets is of course consonant with their office of vizier or counselor to the king: the structure of which they were a part was a political one...." Studies in the Origins of Jewish Apocalyptic (Harvard Dissertation, 1969), p. 9.

However, Hanson's theories about the essential characteristics of the prophetic enterprise range beyond the political model when he offers a Weberian approach (pp. 214ff.) as well as an history of ideas schema (pp. 11-17). It is unclear how Hanson wishes to fit the Weberian thesis of prophet as one who has a call to break with the established order with his acceptance of a political model for Israelite prophecy. Also troublesome is his suggestion that pre-exilic prophets and post-exilic visionaries are "carriers of the eschatological-apocalyptic tradition." This tradition-history view presumes a rather monolithic view of mythopoeic thought and tradition. Moreover, what is the inherent connection between the political-religious model and the constant vision which "remains continuous throughout the history of prophecy and apocalyptic, the vision of Yahweh's people restored as a holy community in a glorified Zion?" (p. 8).

<sup>14</sup>S. Szikszai, An Investigation of the Relationship of the King and Prophet at the Rise of the Israelite Monarchy (Union Dissertation, 1954), p. 230.

<sup>15</sup>A convincing study of these collections against the nations remains to be written. Wright's essay is suggestive of the direction in which the search must proceed, an investigation of the oracles' legal and treaty functions, G. E. Wright, "The Nations in Hebrew Prophecy," Encounter 26(1965), 225-237. Hayes rather arbitrarily opts for an interpretation which sees significance for the oracles only within the domestic Israelite community, J. H. Hayes, "The Usage of the Oracles against Foreign Nations in Ancient Israel," JBL 87(1968), 81-92. H. Donner's monograph is rather limited in scope, providing a reconstruction of the texts with few generalizations, H. Donner, Israel unter den Völkern. Die Stellung der klassischen Propheten des 8. Jahrhunderts v. Chr. zur Aussenpolitik der Könige von Israel und Juda (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1964).



<sup>16</sup>Wright, "The Nations," p. 236.

<sup>17</sup>Aside from Baltzer's study of the Egyptian vizier, the search for prophetic phenomenon in Egyptian society has not been fruitful. Lanczkowski's theory of a general Egyptian prophetic movement arising with rural dissatisfaction at the end of the Old Kingdom has been roundly criticized, G. Lanczkowski, "Ägyptischer Prophetismus im Lichte der Alten Testament," ZAW 70(1958), 31-38, and his Altägyptischer Prophetismus (Wiesbaden: O. Harrassowitz, 1960). Criticisms may be found in S. Herrmann, "Prophetie in Israel und Ägypten. Rect und Grenze eines Vergleichs," VT Supp #9, Bonn Congress Volume (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963), 47-65, and in Fohrer's "Zehn Jahre Literatur," p. 307.

<sup>18</sup>W. Moran, "New Evidence from Mari on the History of Prophecy," Bib 50(1969), p. 17. There are many more studies on Mari prophecy, some of dubious quality. Another worthwhile essay is G. Dossin's, "Sur le prophétisme à Mari," in La Divination en Mésopotamie ancienne et dans les régions voisines (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1966), 77-86.

<sup>19</sup>K. Baltzer, "Considerations Regarding the Office and Calling of the Prophet," HThR 61(1968), p. 574.

<sup>20</sup>J. Ross, "The Prophet as Yahweh's Messenger," Israel's Prophetic Heritage, ed. B. Anderson (London: SCM Press, 1962), pp. 98ff.

<sup>21</sup>The messengers of Yam to El's divine council surely represent the same phenomenon that Ross has identified. Yam's messengers speak with such authority that the god's heads drop to their knees (CTA #2, lines 10ff). I am indebted to S. Dean McBride for this insight.

<sup>22</sup>On the close connection between mythic expressions and historical-cultural manifestations of such political models, see Thorkild Jacobsen's "Primitive Democracy in Ancient Mesopotamia," Toward the Image of Tammuz, ed. W. Moran (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1970), 163ff.

<sup>23</sup>John Holladay, "Assyrian Statecraft and the Prophets of Israel," HThR 63(1970), p. 31.

<sup>24</sup>G. E. Wright, "The Lawsuit of God: A Form-Critical Study of Deuteronomy 32," Israel's Prophetic Heritage, ed. B. Anderson (London: SCM Press, 1962), p. 63, n. 68.

<sup>25</sup>R. H. Pfeiffer, "Canon of the Old Testament," IDB Vol. 1, ed. G. Buttrick (New York: Abingdon, 1962), pp. 501ff.

<sup>26</sup>G. von Rad, Old Testament Theology, Vol 2 (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1965), p. 297.

<sup>27</sup>A. Johnson, The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1962), pp. 66ff.

<sup>28</sup>E. Hammershamb, Some Aspects of Old Testament Prophecy from Isaiah to Malachi (Aarhus: Rosenkilde og Bagger, 1966), p. 109.

<sup>29</sup>O. Plöger, "Prophetisches Erbe in den Sekten des frühen Judentums," ThLZ 79(1954), p. 291.

<sup>30</sup>R. Hanhart, "Zur geistgeschichtlichen Bestimmung des Judentums," ThExH 140(1967), pp. 23ff.

<sup>31</sup>Ibid., p. 27.

<sup>32</sup>Cross, "New Directions," p. 161.

<sup>33</sup>Hanson, Studies in the Origins, p. 9.

<sup>34</sup>D. Rössler carries this bi-polar approach of the origins of apocalyptic into the Christian era, Gesetz und Geschichte. Untersuchungen zur Theologie der jüdischen Apokalyptik und der pharisaischen Orthodoxie (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1960).

Two other similar works come to mind as examples of this method, but for important reasons fail as vigorous models. A. Bentzen suggests that a fundamental division existed throughout Israel's history, a division between religious officials and the laity. The defeat of 587 and ensuing exile provided the context for the ascendance of the lay viewpoint. For example, Malachi represents the lay group (Mal 3.1-4), a period in which the priests become objects of reform instead of carriers of reform, "Priesterschaft und Laien in der jüdischen Gemeinde des fünften Jahrhunderts," AfO 6(1930/31), p. 283. Bentzen's approach recognizes the polarities in post-exilic Israel but fails to take into account the priestly or theocratic element in the dominant post-exilic group.

A more recent study of Old Testament literature and history bears surface resemblance to this approach, M. Smith, Palestinian Parties and Politics that Shaped the Old Testament (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1971), Smith has attempted to explain the development of the Old Testament by reference to two opposing parties: a Yahweh-alone group versus syncretistic parties. One might call this a study in the history of ideas or even Yahwistic heresiology. Plöger, Steck, Hanson, and Rössler have shown that the parties are more complex in number and ideology than Smith suggests. Likewise, the dominant interests in the sixth century community were not heresy versus true faith--though strife between religious parties could be expressed in these terms--but instead

arguments such as who controlled the cult, which religious traditions were authoritative, and who was loyal to earlier traditions, dominated the literature.

Many of Smith's insights are interesting. Yet his categories and his explanations of them make the insights difficult to appropriate. For example, I find it difficult to accept his statements about Ezekiel and Deutero-Isaiah that both represent the Yahweh-alone party while the differences between the two are explained on the basis of their belonging to different proto-synagogues in Babylon (pp. 102-103). Surely this overlooks the vast tradition-historical and theological differences which separate these two books.

<sup>35</sup>Plöger, "Prophetisches Erbe," pp. 292ff.

<sup>36</sup>Plöger thinks that, in spite of the significant differences in the two tradition complexes, Chronicles is a self-conscious continuation of the Priestly view of Israel.

<sup>37</sup>O. Plöger, Theocracy and Eschatology (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1968), p. 39

<sup>38</sup>See Cross, "New Directions," pp. 159ff. for the same argument.

<sup>39</sup>O. Steck, "Das Problem theologischer Strömungen in nachexilischer Zeit," EvTh 28(1968), p. 447.

<sup>40</sup>Ibid., p. 448.

<sup>41</sup>For the following analysis, see Steck, "Das Problem," pp. 451-455.

<sup>42</sup>Ibid., p. 457 and O. Steck, Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1967), p. 205.

<sup>43</sup>For another statement of Hanson's general approach, see "Jewish Apocalypticism against its Near Eastern Environment," RB 78(1971), 31-58.

<sup>44</sup>Hanson's inclusion of Ezek 40-48 as part of the hierocratic program strains the limits of his bi-polar schema. How did a motif like the fructifying water (Ezek 47.iff), which figures importantly in the eschatological scenario, become an integral part of the hierocratic program? Furthermore, it is difficult to accept the conclusion that there is no significant anti-Levitic or pro-Zadokite tone to the the basic traditions of Ezek 40-48. Cf. H. Gese, Der Verfassungsentwurf des Ezechiel (Kap 40-48) traditionsgeschichtlich untersucht (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1957), passim.

<sup>45</sup>See the important caveat against the reification of tradition by M. L. Henry, Prophet und Tradition. Versuch einer Problemstellung (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1969).

<sup>46</sup>Mention of the Deuteronomistic view of prophecy requires citation of a significant movement in recent scholarly interpretation about prophecy: the prophet as covenant mediator. The most important statements of the thesis in English may be found in H. J. Kraus, Worship in Israel (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1966), pp. 102-11; M. Newman "The Prophetic Call of Samuel," Israel's Prophetic Heritage (New York: Harper and Row, 1962), pp. 88-97; E. W. Nicholson, Deuteronomy and Tradition (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967), pp. 76ff; E. W. Nicholson, Preaching to the Exiles (London: Blackwell, 1970), pp. 45-50. Muilenburg traces this view of the prophetic office from Moses to the prophets from northern Israelite traditions: E, Samuel, Elijah, Hosea, Deuteronomy, Jeremiah, and less so, Deutero-Isaiah. He sees this to be a contrast to the conception of the prophetic office as member and messenger of the divine council, "The Office of the Prophet in Ancient Israel," The Bible in Modern Scholarship (New York: Abingdon, 1965), 74-97. An unfinished Göttingen dissertation by Diettrich, Der Deuteronomist und die Prophetie, promises to further explicate Krause's views on the subject.

The emphasis on Moses as both prophet and covenant mediator is the dubious segment of this structure. Moses as covenant mediator seems to me the more acceptable of the appellations. At what point the conclusion that since (1) Moses was a messenger of Yahweh as were the prophets, and (2) Moses was a spokesman for Yahweh as were the prophets, (3) therefore Moses was a prophet, has not been demonstrated, (Muilenburg, pp. 96-97). There is little evidence that the office of a covenant mediator post-dated Samuel, Hosea and Jeremiah notwithstanding. Hence I am tempted to see Mosaic prophecy and prophet as covenant mediator to be a retrojective Deuteronomistic theological construct having little to do with the performance of classical Israelite prophecy.

<sup>47</sup>Fascher's PROPHETES: Eine Sprach- und Religions-geschichtliche Untersuchung (Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1927) remains the standard work on prophecy in the Greco-Roman world. Two tradition history works on prophecy deserve special mention: O. Steck, Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten and W. Meeks, The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967). As for views of prophecy in the Rabbinic literature, there are few adequate studies. See provisionally: J. Bowman, "Prophets and Prophecy in Talmud and Midrash," Evang Quart 22(1950), 107-114, 205-220, 255-275; N. Glatzer, "A Study of the Talmudic Interpretation of Prophecy," Rev Rel 10(1946) 115-137; P. Krüger, "Die Würdigung der Propheten im Spätjudentum," Neutestamentliche Studien (Fest. G. Heinrici)

(Leipzig: J. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1914), 1-12; O. Michel, "Spätjüdisches Prophetentum," Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolph Bultmann (Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1954), 60-66.

<sup>48</sup>See Steck's Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten where he argues that this tradition is more a way of speaking about Israel's apostasy than an historical report on the fate of the prophets.

<sup>49</sup>M. Shepherd, "Prophet in the New Testament," IDB Vol 3, 919.

<sup>50</sup>Other important apocryphal and pseudepigraphical texts dealing with the end of prophecy and the expectation of its return include: 1 Mac 9.27,54; 14.41; Sir 24.33; 49.6-10; Wis 7.22-27; 1 Enoch 108.6; T Levi 8.13-19; T Benj 3.8; 9.2; Sib Or 3.670-840; As Mos 1.5; 11.16; 2 Apoc Bar 85.3-4.

<sup>51</sup>On prophecy in the Qumran texts, see M. Burrows, "Prophecy and Prophets at Qumran," Israel's Prophetic Heritage, 223-232; J. Giblest, "Prophetisme et attente d'un Messie prophete dans l'ancien Judaisme, L'Attente du Messie" (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1954), 85-130; W. Meeks, The Prophet-King, 168-171; R. Schnackenburg, "Die Erwartung des 'Propheten' nach dem Neuen Testament und den Qumran Texten," Studia Evangelica (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1959), 622-639.

<sup>52</sup>G. Vermes, The Dead Sea Scrolls in English (Baltimore: Penguin, 1962), 245.

<sup>53</sup>R. Brown, "The Messianism of Qumran," CBQ 19(1957), 61. Furthermore, in light of the integral relationship between prophet and king in classical Israelite prophecy, I find it most interesting that this relationship is projected into future expectations that the prophet will precede the royal Messiah, cf. Mark 9.11-13.

<sup>54</sup>J. Starcky, "Un texte messianique araméen de la grotte 4 de Qumran," Ecole des Langues orientales anciennes de l'Institut Catholique de Paris: Méorial du cinquantenaire (Paris: Bloud et Gay, 1964), 51-66.

<sup>55</sup>Vermes, The Dead Sea Scrolls, 50.

<sup>56</sup>See Meeks, The Prophet-King, 169-171, for a summary of the argument.

<sup>57</sup>Vermes, The Dead Sea Scrolls, 236.

<sup>58</sup>Brown, "The Messianism of Qumran," 73ff.

<sup>59</sup>On prophecy in the New Testament, see provisionally, H. A. Guy, New Testament Prophecy (London: Epworth, 1947) and H. Teeple, The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet (Philadelphia: SBL, 1957).

<sup>60</sup>It is interesting that in Justin's "Dialogue with Trypho" Elijah is also depicted as the forerunner of the royal Messiah. A. R. Higgins, "Jewish Messianic Belief in Justin Martyr's 'Dialogue with Trypho,'" Nov Test 9(1967), 298ff.

<sup>61</sup>For example, Matt 13.57; 21.11,46; 23.37; Luke 4.24; 7.16; 13.33-34; 24.19; Mark 6.4; John 1.21-25; 4.19,44; 7.40; 9.17. See also provisionally, P. E. Davies, "Jesus and the Role of the Prophet," JBL 64(1945), 214-254; F. W. Young, "Jesus the Prophet: A Reexamination," JBL 58(1949), 285-299.

<sup>62</sup>This statement is obviously too brief to allow for the full complexities of New Testament Christology. For a more complete discussion of the merging of prophetic and royal traditions, see F. Hahn, Christologische Hoheitstitel: Ihre Geschichte im frühen Christentum (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963) and W. Meeks, The Prophet-King.

## Notes to Chapter II

<sup>1</sup>Lorenz Dürr, Ursprung und Ausbau der israelitisch-jüdischen Heilsandererwartung (Berlin: Schwetschke, 1925), 117ff, has shown that this image derives from the Ancient Near Eastern court style for the depiction of kings.

<sup>2</sup>The charge of sin by commission is also found in the royal oracle collection. Shepherds have scattered the flock (23.1-2) and will be punished (22.21). But here again, royalty does not bear sole responsibility, for in v.3 Yahweh says, "...where I have driven them."

<sup>3</sup>This emphasis reappears in the words of weal at the end of the royal oracle collection in 23.3--"then I will gather the remnant of my flock out of all the countries where I have driven them"--and is in direct contrast to the accusation of scattering the flock in v.2.

<sup>4</sup>Fragments like 3.15 and 23.4, which simply promise shepherds, could either be the building blocks for such dialectical reflection or a dependent and displaced spin-off from the final theological product, the latter possibility being the more probable.

The relationship of 3.15 to 23.4 is difficult to assess. Most commentators have felt 3.15 to be unrelated to its context. This seems highly doubtful. Jer 23.3 speaks about being fruitful and multiplying before the shepherd theme commences whereas the same words, רבה and פורה, appear in 3.16 after the predictions in v.15. The juxtaposition of the two themes in reverse order is interesting. Both are part of the Jeremianic prose. The basic theme of 3.15-18 is the coming unification of Israel with Jerusalem as the throne of Yahweh--an obvious appeal to royal imagery but with the emphasis on Yahweh as king. The kingship context of 23.1ff is also dominant, though here concern is with shepherds and Davidic rulers.

<sup>5</sup>As an addendum for the sake of completeness, Jer 13.18-19, 20-27 should be mentioned, since these verses fall outside the four rubrics of our discussion of monarchy and yet have to do with a royal figure and perhaps the flock. The problem is the possible line of demarcation separating vv.18-19 from vv.20-27. Jer 13.18-19 addresses the king and queen with a prediction of exile. Contextually, and on the basis of 2 Kgs 24.8,12--the queen mother's presence--the addressee is most probably Jehoiachin. On the basis of the flock imagery in v.20, the separation Bright *et al.* make is dubious, especially since Jerusalem in v.27 and with LXX in v.20 can mean royal city (cf. 3.17 and 23.20-23).

<sup>6</sup>The same two parties--David and the Levitical priests--are present in the four separate units in this collection. The theme of restoration of the Davidic house is common to the four sections. The logic of the last two units is the same and is consistent with the views of the first two sections, i.e. that the Davidic ruler will always be present.

<sup>7</sup>In doing this, the writer reflects the language and ideology of the Deuteronomistic tradition which sees the throne as a Davidic legacy (2 Sam 2.4; 7.16; 8.25). Reinforcing this Deuteronomistic relationship is Jeremiah's concern with Levitical priests, a term idiosyncratic to the Deuteronomistic historical work.

<sup>8</sup>See Nicholson's, Preaching to the Exiles, 89.

<sup>9</sup>Many commentators have felt that this clause is an attempt to refer to Zedekiah. So Rudolph, "an unmistakable relation to the name of Zedekiah," Jeremia (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1968), 147. See also A. Weiser, Das Buch des propheten Jeremia (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1952-1955), 205 and J. Bright, Jeremiah (Garden City: Doubleday, 1965), 146.

<sup>10</sup>Perhaps Ringgren is correct in seeing the transition from an oracle about a king (though not Messianic as Ringgren contends) to an oracle about Judah/Jerusalem. H. Ringgren, "König und Messias," ZAW 23(1952), 138.

<sup>11</sup>Jer 21.11-23.8: 21.11-14, introductory poetic judgment; 22.1-5, introductory prose judgment; 22.6-9, the royal city destroyed; 22.10-11, against Jehoahaz; 22.13-19, against Jehoiakim; 22.20-23, lament over the royal city; 22.24-30, against Jehoiachin; 23.1-4, the new shepherd; 23.5-6, the Davidic Branch; 23.7-8, the new Exodus. Jer 23.9-40 is a similar mixture of poetry and prose concerned with the theme of prophecy. Likewise, Jer 14.1-15.4 is a poetry and prose collection built around the theme of drought.

<sup>12</sup>See especially Nicholson, Preaching to the Exiles, passim.

<sup>13</sup>A necessary question which I can unfortunately address here only briefly is, how did 'the royal collection' happen to be composed and/or gathered together? No one has been able to give a satisfactory answer. Something more complicated than just the pasting together of poetic and prose strips seems evident.

For example, the introductory oracle to the house of David is no uncomplicated poem:

Jer 21.12-14

v.12 House of David!

Thus says the Lord

"Execute justice every morning,<sup>a</sup>

Save the robbed one from the hand of the oppressor



- Lest my anger go out like fire  
and burn without being extinguished  
because of the evil of your deeds.<sup>b</sup>
- v.13 Behold, I am against you  
O Enthroned one<sup>c</sup> over the valley,<sup>d</sup>  
O Rock<sup>e</sup> of the plain, who says  
'Who will descend against us?  
Who will enter our habitations?'<sup>f</sup>
- v.14 I will punish you  
according to the consequences of your actions  
says the Lord.  
I will kindle a fire in her forest,  
it will consume all that surrounds her."

## Notes:

- a. Read לבקרום, א omitted by haplography. Cf. the idiomatic usage in Isa 33.2.
- b. Reading the Qere instead of "their deeds."
- c. Following Weiser, Jeremia, 187; Bright, Jeremiah, 140; 1 Sam 4.4; 2 Sam 6.2; and against Rudolph, Jeremia, 138.
- d. See Jer 48.8 for "valley" and "plain" used together in a judgment oracle.
- e. צור as "rock" is not entirely satisfactory. "Besieged One" or "Foe" might be preferable.
- f. The tone is ironic--the use of den or lair to describe the secure haven of the royal family.

This pericope is comprised of two basic sections: v.12 and vv.13-14. The first is an admonition to the king to rule justly. This sort of language and ideology is part and parcel of Israelite theories about monarchy (cf. Ps 72.1ff and in the Jeremianic prose, Jer 7.5; 22.3). In the admonition, there is no immediate pejorative content, any more than a command to be good implies that the moral agent is something less than perfect. Following the admonition comes a threat: "Lest my wrath go forth..." (cf. in Jeremianic prose, Jer 17.4). It is instructive to note an exact parallel in Jer 41.4 which also follows the same basic pattern: admonition ("Circumcise yourselves...") followed by threat ("the wrath of Yahweh will come"). Both threats appear to be independent formulations.

The second section, vv.13-14, begins with the challenge formula, הווי אליך, which usually indicates the opening of a new oracle (see Rudolph, Jeremia, 137; P. Humbert, "Die Herausforderungsformel, hinnenī élékā," ZAW 10(1933), 101ff). The context indicates that the addressee is still the royal house, whether we are to take the original meaning to be the Solomonic forest house or some originally foreign description does not matter (Rudolph, Jeremia, 137). The basic charge is presented in the words of the addressee, v.13b, an assertion that the Davidic house is secure against all threats. This basic pattern may also be identified in the Jeremianic prose, the collection about prophets: in Jer 23.30-32, Yahweh is against the prophets because they say, "says the Lord."

The pattern is one of challenge formula followed by the reason for opposition in the form of a quotation.

However, the oracle is not at an end. V.14 presents a dual threat-punishment, "according to their deeds," as paralleled in Jer 17.10 (poetic) and Jer 32.19 (prose). The fire has an analogue in "a devouring fire" (Jer 17.27), a prose passage against kingship where this two-staged threat is specified--the forest becomes the gates of Jerusalem and the "all-around-her" are the palaces of Jerusalem. This second threat in v.14 is addressed in the third person whereas the rest of Jer 21.13-14 is in the second person. It is also noteworthy that both concluding threats, vv.12b and 14b, describe a judgment by fire. The threats are in chiasmic order: v.12b, fire--your doings; v.14b, your doings--fire.

It would be difficult to deny the connection between these two threats and the events recorded in Jer 53.13: "and he (Nebuchadrezzar) burned the house of the Lord and the king's house and all the houses of Jerusalem; every great house he burned down." Consequently this introductory poetic section was probably compiled on the basis of that judgment by fire. Whether or not vv.12a and b originally belonged together, they comprise here a traditional oracular form. Likewise, vv.13a and b as well as vv.14a and b were added to reinforce the theme of judgmental fire. One must argue, though, that these elements were not creations of the writer. They were instead part of the Jeremianic collection, to be used either in prose or poetic form: v.14a with its parallels in 17.10 and 32.19 is a good example.

One more observation about the way in which this first unit relates to its "parallels" is interesting. With the exception of Jer 4.4b and 17.10, the parallel usages of phraseology and form occur in prose passages, the sort of prose that Nicholson *et al.* have identified as Jeremianic-Deuteronomistic. And on the basis of the redactional direction we can observe, i.e. v.14b towards 17.27, we suggest that 21.12-14 is primary.

This analysis of Jer 21.12-14 suggests that even before the knitting of the poetic and prose pieces in the royal collection, significant redactional activity had taken place. Consequently, as stated earlier, we enter difficult terrain in our search for the relationship of Jeremiah to Zedekiah and the monarchy.

<sup>14</sup>O. Eissfeldt, The Old Testament. An Introduction (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965), 356.

<sup>15</sup>J. Klausner, The Messianic Idea in Israel (New York: Macmillan, 1955), 104; Weiser, Jeremia, 204ff; Rudolph, Jeremia, 146ff; Bright, Jeremiah, 146; Ringgren, "König und Messias," 137.

- <sup>16</sup>Nicholson, Preaching to the Exiles, 90ff.
- <sup>17</sup>M. Sekine, "Davidsbund und Sinaibund bei Jeremia-buch," VT 9(1959), 49.
- <sup>18</sup>Rudolph, Jeremia, 147.
- <sup>19</sup>KAI #43; see commentary in Vol 2, 60ff.
- <sup>20</sup>So also פדן צדק in KAI #16, a Phoenician temple inscription.
- <sup>21</sup>J. Swetnam, "Some Observations on the Background of פדן צדק in Jer 23.5a," Bib 46(1965), 30.
- <sup>22</sup>Ibid., 40.
- <sup>23</sup>A. Honeyman, "The Evidence for Regnal Names among the Hebrews," JBL 67(1948), 19.
- <sup>24</sup>A. Malamat, "Jeremiah and the last two Kings of Judah," PEQ 83(1951), passim.
- <sup>25</sup>To prove this assertion is difficult. To deny it is, I think, impossible. I follow the arguments of Eichrodt, Zimmerli, et al., for a Babylonian venue of Ezekiel's activity.
- <sup>26</sup>Hammershaimb has devoted an essay to this topic, the conclusions of which I basically agree with. His treatment, however, of the מלך and נשיא material is difficult to accept. E. Hammershaimb, "Ezekiel's View of the Monarchy," Some Aspects of Old Testament Prophecy from Isaiah to Malachi, 51ff.
- <sup>27</sup>O. Proksch, "Fürst und Priester bei Hezekiel," ZAW 17(1940/41), 125ff.
- <sup>28</sup>Gese, Der Verfassungsentwurf des Ezechiel, 39.
- <sup>29</sup>Gese has made a lengthy analysis of the entire tradition complex, chapters 40-48; and they are, if he is correct, incredibly complex. Chpts. 40-42, a description of the temple, are comprised of five redactional stages and are the result of architectural restatements based on the construction of the second temple. Chpts. 43-48 are even more difficult. They represent the welding of two originally unrelated traditions: one describing the nasi's cultic role, the other a pro-Zadokite document--the latter view eventually overpowering the former. Ibid., passim.
- <sup>30</sup>On the origin of the usage of נשיא there are two opposing views, Noth has argued that the nasi institution is derivative from the period of the amphictyony when nsiim were representatives of the tribes at the holy places,

M. Noth, Das System der zwölf Stämme Israels (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1930), 151-162. Fohrer (on the basis of Nystrom's Beduinentum und Jahwismus, 193ff) thinks that the term comes from the Stammeshauptling of the Bedouin period, Ezechiel (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1955), 193ff. Cf. also, E.A. Speiser, "The Background and Function of the Biblical Nasi," CBQ 25(1963), 111-117; J. Böhmer, "נָשִׁי וְנָשִׁי וְנָשִׁי bei Ezechiel," ThStKr 73(1900), 112-117.

<sup>31</sup>Hammershaimb, Some Aspects of Old Testament Prophecy, 55-56.

<sup>32</sup>W. Zimmerli, Ezechiel (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969), 178.

<sup>33</sup>W. Zimmerli, "The Special Form- and Traditio-Historical Character of Ezekiel's Prophecy," VT 15(1965), 516ff, 525.

<sup>34</sup>W. Eichrodt, Ezekiel (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1970), 301.

<sup>35</sup>The temptation to include Ezek 17, the eagle allegory, in this survey is strong, but its interpretation is so problematic that I relegate it to footnote status. Though one must always be tentative about identifying personages in an allegory, 17.3-10 gives every evidence of depicting the figures of Nebuchadrezzar and Jehoiachin (vv.3-4), and Nebuchadrezzar and Zedekiah (vv.7-9). Jehoiachin was reestablished in Babylon, while Zedekiah, ruling in Israel, turned toward Egypt. Following the allegory is a decoding. Both the original allegory and its decoded version end with a series of rhetorical questions suggesting the ultimate failure of the figure identified as Zedekiah. In answer to these questions, we have two responses: vv.16-18 and vv.19-20. (Whether one is secondary is not of dominant importance, cf. Eichrodt, Ezekiel, 226 on vv.16-18). These two units provide sequential answers: vv.16-18 predict lack of Egyptian help and punishment by death in Babylon for breaking the Babylonian treaty, while vv.19-20 raise the issue to a Yahweh speech, since Zedekiah had abrogated Yahweh's treaty as well. Thus, the judgment has both international and theological overtones. The final section ends with phraseology very similar to the Nachinterpretation of 12.13ff, especially the Erkenntnisformel--17.12b and 12.16b. What is significant in Ezek 17 is the consistency between the original allegory and the reinterpretations as well as the more general resonance this passage has with the other passages in Ezekiel which describe the figures of Jehoiachin and Zedekiah.

<sup>36</sup>So Zimmerli, Ezechiel, 492; Eichrodt, Ezekiel, 301; Fohrer, Ezechiel, 123.

<sup>37</sup>So Zimmerli, Ezechiel, 64; Eichrodt, Ezekiel, 152; Fohrer, Ezechiel, 256ff.

<sup>38</sup>Zimmerli suggests that the basis for this reinterpretation is to be found in 2 Kgs 25.4-7; Jer 39.4-7; 52.7-11.

<sup>39</sup>For a similar view, see Fohrer, Ezechiel, 64.

<sup>40</sup>Cf. Ezek 29.1-5 with the Fortschreibung in vv.6b-9a discussed by Zimmerli, Ezechiel, 107.

<sup>41</sup>That כִּשְׁבִי in v.10 is to be seen as an answer to Jer 23.33 ("What is the burden?"), as some have suggested, seems unlikely. Rather the wordplay based on כִּשְׁבִי (vv.6,7,10,12) is important. This is a primary reason for thinking that the כִּשְׁבִי was the central point of a symbolic action about a lifting up, כִּשְׁבִי, of the baggage for exile.

<sup>42</sup>Zimmerli, Ezechiel, 832.

<sup>43</sup>Brownlee has, as a part of his continuing attempt to depict Ezekiel as a poet, argued that 34.1-10 contain a poem of between nine and ten tristich lines written before the exile, "Ezekiel's Poetic Indictment of the Shepherds," HThR 51(1958), 197. His scheme works quite well for vv.2-4, for good reason. However, vv.5-8a have, he contends, suffered heavy glossing. Rather than accept the entire unit as an oracle, I find it easier to accept vv.2-4 to be an oracle prior to 587 but after 597. Brownlee's thesis that Ezekiel would not have further developed earlier oracles has been overcome by Zimmerli's development of the Nachinterpretation evidence.

<sup>44</sup>Zimmerli denies that the eating of the fat and fatlings is a legitimate prerogative of the shepherds (cf. Lev 3.17; 7.25; Deut 32.38). I rather doubt that the sacrificial legislation applies to this case (Job 1.16; Deut 32.14; Ps 63.6; Ezek 39.19).

<sup>45</sup>Zimmerli, Ezechiel, 835. J. Miller, Jeremia und Hezekiels sprachlich und theologisch untersucht (Assen: Royal van Gorcum, 1955) 106.

<sup>46</sup>V.16 is a summarizing insertion based on vv.3 and 4; see Zimmerli's analysis, Ezechiel, 839-840.

<sup>47</sup>Zimmerli, Ezechiel, 840ff; Eichrodt, Ezekiel, 473; Fohrer, Ezechiel, 194.

<sup>48</sup>See Zimmerli, Ezechiel, 830-831.

<sup>49</sup> אנח is masculine in Eb 24; עליהם is probably a variant form; cf. להם in Eb 24 and other manuscripts. (Driver restores to עליהן thereby indicating that v.23 may be read with just feminine suffixes while v.24 contains only masculine suffixes.)

<sup>50</sup> Zimmerli, Ezekiel, 844.

<sup>51</sup> See KAI #25 for evidence of the royal scepter. Cf. for another view, E. Power, "The Shepherd's Two Rods in modern Palestine and in some passages in the Old Testament," Bib 9(1928), 434ff.

<sup>52</sup> Zimmerli, Ezekiel, 1258-1261; "Israel im Buche Ezekiel," VT 8(1958), 58ff.

<sup>53</sup> The use of the rod-joining imagery to designate superior status is also to be found in Num 17.2-3, where we find the use of rods in the murmuring traditions to advocate the position of Aaron in a Levitical controversy. The rods represent the twelve tribes on which the names of the fathers are inscribed. Yahweh chooses one, Aaron, to be above all others. Hence Ezekiel is again employing a figurative element from earlier Israelite traditions.

<sup>54</sup> Zimmerli argues for the covenant renewal on the basis of covenant formulae in v.23, (Ezekiel, 251).

<sup>55</sup> Zimmerli, Ezekiel, 912ff.

<sup>56</sup> Brownlee reconstructs these two texts with accompanying arguments in "The Aftermath of the Fall of Judah according to Ezekiel," JBL 89(1970), 393-404. I share none of his persuasions: that Ezekiel was active only in the land of Israel; that he was only a poet; that the use of poetic canons may be used to discover the "genuine" poems; and that the two texts under discussion postdate 587.

<sup>57</sup> Zimmerli, Ezekiel, 818.

<sup>58</sup> Ibid., 249-250.

<sup>59</sup> Two problems of translation need brief discussion. (1) LXX, Ld, and the Syriac have גלותך, "men of your exile," instead of the more difficult גאלתך, "men of your redemption." Zimmerli defends MT by contending that Ezekiel demonstrates ties of kinship with the exilic community by appeal to the parallel uses of גאלתך in the Sabbath year regulations (Ezekiel, 246). Brownlee agrees by identifying the issue of one kinsman holding property in custody for another kinsman ("The Aftermath of the Fall of Judah," 393).

(2) The most difficult phrase is **למקדש מעט**. Is the **מעט** used as an adverb of time or as an adverb of degree? Is it "a sanctuary for a while" or "a minor sanctuary?" There is evidence of both usages in the Old Testament: degree--2 Kgs 10.18; Zech 10.15; time--Job 10.20b. The **ἀγίασμα μικρόν** of the LXX and the **בתי כנשתא** of the Targum interpret it as an adverb of degree: "a small sanctuary" or "a synagogue." However, these interpretations reflect a later period and are probably unjustified as explanations of the phrase in Ezekiel. Brownlee's omission of the term, **מעט**, metri causa is unjustified, missing the point of Ezekiel's argument. I prefer to interpret **מעט** as a temporal adverb.

<sup>60</sup>W.F. Albright, "The Seal of Eliakim and the Latest Pre-Exilic History of Judah, with some Observations on Ezekiel," JBL 51(1932), 81.

<sup>61</sup>Ibid., 80-82.

<sup>62</sup>Ibid., 102-103.

<sup>63</sup>H.G. May, "Three Hebrew Seals and the Status of Exiled Jehoiachin," AJSL 56(1939), 146-147.

<sup>64</sup>Ibid., 148.

<sup>65</sup>E.F. Weidner, "Jojachin, König von Juda, in babylonischen Keilschrifttexten," Bibliothèque Archéologique et Historique 30(1935) 925-926.

<sup>66</sup>W.F. Albright, "King Joiachin in Exile," BA 5(1942), 50.

<sup>67</sup>Malamat, "Jeremiah and the Last Two Kings of Judah," 82 note 4.

<sup>68</sup>Zimmerli, Ezechiel, 250.

<sup>69</sup>W.F. Albright, The Biblical Period from Abraham to Ezra (New York: Harper and Row, 1963), 87.

<sup>70</sup>Martin Noth has been impressed by the argument of inconsistency and has stated: "As its content shows, this passage (Ezek 33.23-29) must belong to the period before Jerusalem fell in 587." "The Jerusalem Catastrophe of 587 and its Significance for Israel," The Laws in the Pentateuch and other Studies (London: Oliver and Boyd, 1966), 271.

<sup>71</sup>E. Janssen, Juda in der Exilszeit (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956), 39.

<sup>72</sup>Ibid., 41.

<sup>73</sup>P. Ackroyd's assessment of the evidence tends to support Janssen, Exile and Restoration (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1968), 22ff.

<sup>74</sup>C.C. McCown, Tell en-Nasbeh: Archaeological and Historical Results (Berkeley: Palestine Institute of the Pacific School of Religion, 1947).

<sup>75</sup>Zimmerli, Ezekiel, 819-820.

<sup>76</sup>Cf. R. de Vaux, Ancient Israel: Social and Religious Institutions (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965) 167.

<sup>77</sup>Zimmerli, "The Special Form- and Traditio-Historical Character of Ezekiel's Prophecy," 517.

<sup>78</sup>Cf. Ackroyd, Exile and Restoration, 57-58.

<sup>79</sup>Malamat, "Jeremiah and the Last Two Kings of Judah," 85-86.

<sup>80</sup>Ibid., 84.

<sup>81</sup>Noth, "The Jerusalem Catastrophe of 587 and its Significance for Israel," 271.



## Notes to Chapter III

<sup>1</sup>M. Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1967), 108.

<sup>2</sup>E. Zenger, "Die deuteronomistische Interpretation des Rehabilitierung Jojachins," BZ 12(1968), 16ff.

<sup>3</sup>Nicholson, Preaching to the Exiles, 79, note 2.

<sup>4</sup>J. Gabriele, Zorobabel, 48ff, a work unavailable to me, argues for their identity.

<sup>5</sup>W.F. Albright, "The Date and Personality of the Chronicler," JBL 40(1921), 108ff.

<sup>6</sup>One should note another possible approach based on š'i' as a theophoric element in West-Semitic for Šin. S. Kaufman, "Ši'gabbar, Priest of Sahr in Nerab," JAOS 90(1970), 270-272.

<sup>7</sup>E. Meyer, Die Entstehung des Judentum (Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1896), 77.

<sup>8</sup>C.C. Torrey, Ezra Studies (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1910), 136.

<sup>9</sup>So Gese in Der Verfassungsentwurf des Ezechiel, 118, where he follows Proksch.

<sup>10</sup>A. Gelston, "The Foundations of the Second Temple," VT 16(1966), 232ff.

<sup>11</sup>F. Andersen, "Who Built the Second Temple?" ABR 6(1958), 10ff.

<sup>12</sup>C. Tuland, "'Uššayā' and 'Uššarnā': A Clarification of Terms, Date and Text," JNES 17(1958), 270.

<sup>13</sup>K. Gallig, "Serubbabel und der Hohepriester beim Wiederaufbau des Tempels in Jerusalem," Studien zur Geschichte Israels im persischen Zeitalter (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1964), 132-133.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid., 134.

<sup>15</sup>Following Ackroyd, Exile and Restoration, 144.

<sup>16</sup>The exact date of Zerubbabel's arrival is virtually impossible to determine. But I find no problem in seeing that date fall in the first years of Darius' reign, 522-520. Ackroyd's argument that it belongs earlier, in the reign

of Cambyses, seems unnecessary (Exile and Restoration, 147). Ackroyd thinks that if Darius had appointed Zerubbabel, some mention should be present in Ezra 5.6-17. But this presumes that Zerubbabel was appointed by Darius to rebuild the temple, a presumption never stated in the texts. Rather he was appointed as פּוֹה for Jewish affairs for the sub-district Judah of the larger Samaritan satrapy, a semi-political appointment (cf. 1 Esdr 3.5-6).

<sup>17</sup>If Beuken is right, Haggai never was in Babylon; W. Beuken, Haggai-Sacharja 1-8 (Assen: Royal van Gorcum, 1967), 216ff. Zechariah, on the other hand, is not mentioned in the return lists, though Petitjean, Ackroyd, and Beuken think he was of Babylonian origin. Perhaps the Iddo of Neh 12.4 and 16 was Zechariah's grandfather. If so, one could argue that Zechariah and Zerubbabel came at the same time (cf. Ackroyd, Exile and Restoration, 148).

<sup>18</sup>W. Neil, "Haggai," IDB Vol. 2, 509.

<sup>19</sup>Beuken, Haggai-Sacharja 1-8.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid., 49ff.

<sup>21</sup>N. Lohfink, "Die deuteronomistische Darstellung des Übergangs der Führung Israels von Moses auf Josue," Scholastik 37(1962), 32ff.

<sup>22</sup>D. McCarthy, "An Installation Genre?" JBL 90(1971), 31ff.

<sup>23</sup>C. Westermann, "Excursus: Prophetic Speeches in the Books of Chronicles," Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1967), 163ff.

<sup>24</sup>D. Freedman, "The Chronicler's Purpose," CBQ 23(1961), 440.

<sup>25</sup>Notes to Hag 2.20-23:

a. LXX gives two harmonistic readings on the basis of other passages in Haggai: Ἀγγαίων τὸν προθέτην (cf. 1.1,12) and καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ τὴν ξηρὰν (cf. 2.6).

b. See H. Mitchell, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, and Jona (New York: Charles Scribners, 1912), 77; and 1 Kgs 1.37.

c. Omit מלכות metri causa; it probably entered from v.22a.

d. Wellhausen's and Nowack's suggestion that a verb, possibly יָפִיל, must have fallen out ignores the fact that the final bicolon in Hebrew poetry is often shorter than the preceding ones. (J. Wellhausen, Die Kleinen Propheten [Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1963]; W. Nowack,

Die Kleinen Propheten Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1922.) Some would argue that v.22b is a gloss since Yahweh is the subject in the first part of the verse. But וִירָדוּ intervenes and counters the first person sequence.

e. Why Horst and others insist on deleting בִּן שְׂאֵלֵי אֱלֹהִים in v.23 after having inserted it in v.21 is a bit puzzling. The abundance of stock Old Testament formulae in the first part of the verse has caused many to look for possible additions and/or textual corruption. Perhaps a cleaner or neater text results from such efforts, but the argument based on sweeping up is not always convincing.

<sup>26</sup>J. Rothstein, Juden und Samaritaner (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrich, 1908), 42 and passim.

<sup>27</sup>Beuken, Haggai-Sacharja 1-8, 78.

<sup>28</sup>On pp. 78-79, Beuken, Haggai-Sacharja 1-8, makes similar observations.

<sup>29</sup>Ibid., 226.

<sup>30</sup>LXX apparently omits מַעַט הָיָא and reads ἔτι ἄραξ , "yet once."

<sup>31</sup>J. Jeremias, Theophanie. Die Geschichte einer alttestamentlichen Gattung (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1965), 68.

<sup>32</sup>Beuken, Haggai-Sacharja 1-8, 80.

<sup>33</sup>Ibid.; cf. Exod 6.7; Num 3.12; Deut 4.20; Josh 24.3; 2 Sam 7.8; 2 Kgs 14.21; 23.30; Amos 7.15.

<sup>34</sup>So also 1 Kgs 11; 2 Kgs 5.6; 19.34; 20.6; 21.8; Isa 37.35. For וִירָדוּ as "dominion" or "sovereignty," see Paul Hanson, "The Song of Heshbon and David's NĪR," HThR 61(1968), 310ff.

<sup>35</sup>Beuken, Haggai-Sacharja 1-8, 81, citing von Rad, Old Testament Theology, Vol 1 (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1962), 353.

<sup>36</sup>On the basis of Wiseman's study, one may suggest that the seal was to be viewed as the property of Yahweh since certain neo-Assyrian royal seals were considered to be the personal property of the gods, D.J. Wiseman, The Vassal Treaties of Esarhaddon (London: The British School of Archaeology in Iraq, 1958), 18-19. More generally on royal stamps see: O. Tufnell, Lachish, Vol 4 (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1958), 92ff; A. Tushingham, "A Royal Israelite Seal (?) and the Royal Jar Handle Stamps," BASOR 200(1970), 71ff;

H. Darrell Lance, "The Royal Stamps and the Kingdom of Judah," HThR 64(1971), 315-321; Paul Lapp, "Late Royal Seals from Judah," BASOR 158(1960) 11-22.

<sup>37</sup>Beuken, Haggai-Sacharja 1-8, 81.

<sup>38</sup>Ibid., 82.

<sup>39</sup>A. Petitjean, Les Oracles du proto-Zacharie (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1969), passim.

<sup>40</sup>I am not convinced by Petitjean that Zech 8.1-23, for example, is demonstrably from either the hand or mouth of Zechariah.

<sup>41</sup>Notes to Zech 3.8-10:

a. Omit כִּי before אֲנֹשִׁי; it probably entered as dittography from v.8b or 9.

b. Omit הַמָּה, an early corruption based on third person material in v.8bff.

c. RSV "facets" is impossible since the techniques of faceting were unknown to ancient lapidaries. Semantically, there are two possibilities: (1) reference to the planes of the stone or (2) reference to the play of light. Mineralogically speaking, the reference could be to a stone with a star effect such as a ruby or sapphire; to a crystal with seven clear faces; or to a bright metallic piece with seven prominent cleavage planes. For a meaning such as "glint" or "gleam" for עֵינַן, cf. Ezek 1.4,7,16,22,27; 8.2; 10.9; Dan 10.6; Prov 23.31. Engraving either a gem or a precious metal could also cause a sparkling of light. Zech 4.10b would appear to be a later attempt to allegorically explain the seven eyes in 3.9 (anti Petitjean, Les Oracles du proto-Zacharie, 180ff). It is of course possible, but improbable, that שִׁבְעָה עֵינַיִם is secondary, entering after 4.10b.

It is difficult to see how vv.8-10 fit into the context of the fourth vision, Beuken's attempts not withstanding, Haggai-Sacharja, 300ff.

<sup>42</sup>Whether or not these passages are original to Jeremiah is not important here. The Davidic association remains significant.

<sup>43</sup>A cap-stone is, however, a phenomenon of Gothic architecture, and a rather inappropriate image for early Persian-period architecture.

<sup>44</sup>For even more suggestions see: Beuken, Haggai-Sacharja 1-8, 284ff; Petitjean, Les Oracles du proto-Zacharie, 173ff; E. Sellin, Das Zwölfprophetenbuch übersetzt und erklärt, Vol. 2 (Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1930), 499; F. Horst, Die zwölf kleinen Propheten. Nahum bis Maleachi (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1954), 229.

<sup>45</sup>A. Petitjean, "La Mission de Zorobabel et la Reconstruction du Temple, Zach 3.8-10," ETHL 42(1966), 54ff; Les Oracles du proto-Zacharie, 184-188.

<sup>46</sup>Petitjean, "La Mission de Zorobabel," 54; Beuken, Haggai-Sacharja 1-8, 288.

<sup>47</sup>Recent work on the character of foundation and building deposits as well as the concomitant rites has greatly increased our understanding of these phenomena. Ellis' work on Mesopotamian practices yields a very interesting parallel in the matter of the reconstruction of a temple. It seems that in the event a temple was to be rebuilt, a brick or stone, the libittu mahritu, "the first or former brick," was removed by the cultic singer or kalû, R. Ellis, Foundation Deposits in Ancient Mesopotamia (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1968), 26ff. Ellis comments:

The usual function of the kalû was to placate the gods; in this case the essential part of the ritual was the removal of the brick from the old temple. The brick was set aside, offerings were made and lamentations were sung before it, while the old temple was being demolished, until the foundations of the new temple were laid. The purpose of this ritual was apparently to bridge the gap between the existence of the old and new temples. (Ellis, Foundation Deposits, 13)

A Seleucid text from Warka records the ritual:

When the wall of a temple falls into ruin, in order to demolish and refound that temple, the diviner shall investigate (?) its site...The builder of that temple shall put on clean clothes and put a tin bracelet on his arm; he shall take an axe of lead, remove the first brick, and put it in a restricted place. You set up an offering table in front of the brick for the god of foundations, and you offer sacrifices.

(Ellis, Foundation Deposits, 184)

The relation between the kalû ritual and certain texts in Zechariah I is striking: [1] both speak of putting on clean clothes (Zech 3.3); [2] both imply divine sanction given by men of omen (Ellis, Foundation Deposits, 6ff; Zech 3.8); [3] both speak of a stone of importance (the libittu mahritu and the first stone, Zech 4.7); [4] both use the theme mussu/šim. (Mussu was used in Assyrian purification rites to refer to removal of trash and debris; Ellis, Foundation Deposits, 16; W. Baumgartner, "Untersuchungen zu den akkadischen Bauausdrücken," ZA 36 [1925], 31-32.)

These parallels are, as I have said, remarkable. Unfortunately, they occur in three separate elements in the Zechariah material: new clothes in the fourth night vision, men of omen in the oracle of Zech 3.8-10, and the important stone in Zech 4.6-10. This is not homogeneous material. Consequently, I am unable to translate a kalû ritual into Zechariah. What seems more reasonable is to speak micro-

cosmically. The fourth night vision represents a cleansing similar to that recommended in the kalû text. The libittu mabrîtu is most probably similar in function to the first stone in Zech 4.7, see below.

<sup>48</sup>Sellin, Das Zwölfprophetenbuch, 501.

<sup>49</sup>Elliger thinks 3.8b is secondary because Zerubbabel was, for Zechariah, someone present and not a coming or future ruler; K. Elliger, Das Buch der zwölf kleinen Propheten (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1950), 115.

<sup>50</sup>The reason for the pericope's present place is rather clear. Joshua the High Priest is central to both sections. There is also thematic continuity, cleansing: cleansing of the High Priest in the fourth vision and of either the cultic equipment or the land in the oracle.

<sup>51</sup>

Notes to Zech 4.6~~a~~-10:

a. See the discussion of libittu mabrîtu in note 47. Sellin, Horst, et al. read "cap stone" following 1 Mac 4.57; T Sol 22.8. LXX, not understanding MT, read "stone of inheritance" καὶ ἐξοίσω τὸν λίθον τῆς κληρονομίας presupposing אֶבֶן הַיְרֵשָׁה.

b. Reading לֵה instead of לֵה.

c. Reading קֵם with S, T, V, and Cairo Genizah and with Zech 2.13; 6.15.

d. See text for discussion of this translation.

e. Cf. 2 Chr 16.9 for this use of שׁוּט with לֵיךְ.

<sup>52</sup>I find it difficult to follow Horst's (Die zwölf kleinen Propheten, 232) and others' suggestion that v.6b comprises a separate oracle directed at Zerubbabel, especially since it yields "no real clarity" for Horst.

<sup>53</sup>Eissfeldt, The Old Testament, 431ff; Petitjean, Les Oracles du proto-Zacharie, passim.

<sup>54</sup>My translation here obviates the appeal to Babylonian imagery of the šadu rabû and Enlil texts made by Petitjean, Les Oracles du proto-Zacharie, 258ff.

<sup>55</sup>A. Kapelrud, "Temple Building, A Task for Gods and Kings," Or 32(1963), 56ff; Ellis, Foundation Deposits, 20ff.

<sup>56</sup>Ellis, Foundation Deposits, 27 note 120, "la précédent brique" following Thureau-Dangin; cf. Petitjean, Les Oracles du proto-Zacharie, 249ff.

<sup>57</sup>Ellis, Foundation Deposits, 29.

<sup>58</sup>See Petitjean, Les Oracles du proto-Zacharie, 229-230, on the significance of the royal hands in temple building.

<sup>59</sup>For other possibilities, see Sellin, Das Zwölfprophetenbuch, 504-505; Petitjean, Les Oracles du proto-Zacharie, 230ff.

<sup>60</sup>Ellis, Foundation Deposits, 101-102.

<sup>61</sup>Ibid., 104.

<sup>62</sup>Ibid., 140.

<sup>63</sup>Beuken's approach to this fifth vision is quite unique. Instead of interpreting 4.6a~~β~~-10a as a later interpolation, he argues that the core of the original night vision included part of what has traditionally been thought to be secondary. According to his analysis, 4.1-3, 4-5, 6a~~α~~, 10b, and 6a~~β~~-7 comprise the original vision and word of Yahweh. His arguments are summarized as follows. (1) The introductory formula in v.8 demonstrates that the verse is separate from vv.6a~~β~~-7 and like Zechariah 6.9-15 is probably secondary. (Beuken, 261). (2) The introductory formula in 6a~~β~~ does not usually accompany the issuance of a Yahweh word; rather it is more a Wortmitteilung pronouncement (Beuken, 262). (3) V.10b is a continuation of 6a~~α~~ providing the interpretation of the seven lamps in the vision and thereby becoming an essential key to the pericope (Beuken, 263-264). (4) Following Petitjean, Beuken contends that the seven eyes and the phrase, "Grace, Grace to it," are part of the building deposit ritual and texts (Beuken, 267). (5) Vv.8-10a are a later expansion in the form of an I-report. (6) The literary pattern is based on a question-explanation form (Beuken, 260-264). (7) The seven lamps, known archaeologically, are the central symbol of the vision (Beuken, 265). (8) V.10b is a classical Heilswort, cf. 2 Chr 16.9, (Beuken, 265). (9) In vv.6b-7, though the exact identity of the stone is unsure, the mountain is a symbol for resistance. The important feature is that the Heilswort is related to the reconstruction of the temple. (10) Vv.11,13,14, and later, 12 comprise a secondary and allegorical explanation of an original parable (Beuken, 262). (11) Vv.11-14, especially v.14, do not agree well with the original vision (Beuken, 270ff). (12) The figures of Zerubbabel and Joshua are not possible interpretations of the trees during the time of Zechariah.

Many of these arguments would support the more usual assertion that 6a~~β~~-10a is an interpolation. Though I tend to disagree with (3), the essential points with which I disagree are (10), (11), and (12). They all involve the fittingness of the interpretation contained in this explanation of the night vision. I contend that v.11 fits v.3 at least as well as v.10b fits v.2. V.12 may well be an expansion. And just because anointing was not the issue in the vision, does not mean that vv.13-14 are inappropriate. Beuken's

basic presupposition is that Joshua would not have been considered to have equal status with Zerubbabel in Zech-ariah's time. Our exegesis of these texts has shown, however, that there is every reason to think that just such claims were being made against the status of Zerubbabel, and that Joshua is the most likely figure as an opponent. Both vv.6a-7 and vv.8-10a counter such claims and advocate the superior royal status of Zerubbabel as builder.

Petitjean's approach is more akin to the one proposed in this study. He spends a great deal of time defending the veracity of MT and pointing to as many parallels as possible in Ancient Near Eastern building inscriptions and practices. Thus, (1) the importance of the royal hands in Zech 4.9a is reflected in Akkadian building inscriptions (Les Oracles, 229-230). (2) The metal stone of 4.10a reflects the metal tablet of Assyrian building deposits (Les Oracles, 236). (3) Zech 4.7b refers to the old foundations, the ašru, or foundation stone (Les Oracles, 249-251). (4) The היה הגדול in Zech 4.7 refers to the ruins of the temple and to the power of Enlil, the šadu rešu, and thereby offers a denigration of Babylonian power, since the "rough places" (Isa 40.35; 42.14-17) are to be made low. Some of these arguments, as we have seen, are more impressive than others. However, his theory about the character of the pericope depends little on the parallels which he has adduced. Basing his theory on the homogeneity of the elements, he plays musical verses and reorganizes the pericope around the building foundation theme into one original whole, the basic structure of which was Zech 4.8,6a-7,9,10a (Les Oracles, 267). To my mind, no convincing proof is given for this reorganization.

<sup>64</sup>Notes to Zech 6.9-15:

- a. MT here and in v.14 reads "crowns" as does LXX.
- b. וּמִתְחַתֵּיהֶם remains unclear but is probably part of a word play on צַמָּה.
- c. Whether LXX omits the end of v.12 or the beginning of v.13 is unsure. The syntactical analysis of Beuken, Haggai-Sacharja 1-8, 277, precludes omitting either clause.
- d. Cf. LXX "and there will be a priest at his right hand," probably an interpretive revision.
- e. Reading Heldai with v.10 instead of MT חֵלֶם.
- f. Again reading with v.10 instead of MT וְהָרָה.

<sup>65</sup>On the passage as a Zeichenhandlung, see Sellin, Das Zwölfprophetenbuch, 520; Horst, Die zwölf kleinen Propheten, 237ff; Elliger, Das Buch der zwölf kleinen Propheten, 121. There are diverging opinions. L. Rignell thinks that vv.9-12 are a symbolic action with vv.13-15 providing a commentary, Die Nachtgesichte des Sacharja (Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1950), 198ff.



<sup>66</sup>The five texts are 2 Sam 7.13 // 1 Chr 17.12; 1 Kgs 5.19; 1 Kgs 8.19 // 2 Chr 3.6,9; 1 Chr 22.10; 1 Chr 28.5-7. All provide variations on the "I will establish his throne and he will build my house" theme. Beuken, Haggai-Sacharja 1-8, 278.

<sup>67</sup>Ibid., 277.

<sup>68</sup>Petitjean, Les Oracles du proto-Zacharie, 303.

<sup>69</sup>Morton Smith suggests that the crowns are part of the temple treasure, "a typical phenomenon of fifth-century Greek culture," Palestinian Parties and Politics that Shaped the Old Testament, 246 note 48.

<sup>70</sup>The recording of individuals who contribute to Yahweh's cause is corroborated by the Elephantine collection list. A. Cowley, Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923), 71-76; B. Porten, Archives from Elephantine: The Life of an Ancient Jewish Military Colony (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1968), 320-327.

<sup>71</sup>Petitjean depends here on the views of Junker, Les Oracles du proto-Zacharie, 148-150.

<sup>72</sup>Beuken, Haggai-Sacharja 1-8, 277.

<sup>73</sup>Petitjean, Les Oracles du proto-Zacharie, 274ff.

<sup>74</sup>Cf. on זָכָר, B. Childs, Memory and Tradition in Israel (London: SCM Press, 1962), 66-70; W. Schottroff, 'Gedenken' im Alten Orient und im Alten Testament: die Wurzel zakar im semitischen Sprachkreis (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1964), 299-328 and especially 308-309. Further, the use of זָכָר in 2 Sam 18.18 reflects the idea of establishing one's presence by means of stele or other cultic memorial.

<sup>75</sup>Cf. here Petitjean, Les Oracles du proto-Zacharie, 300.

<sup>76</sup>See Petitjean, Les Oracles du proto-Zacharie, 283ff; Beuken, Haggai-Sacharja 1-8, 276, for this now universally accepted designation.

<sup>77</sup>G. Sauer, "Serubbabel in der Sicht Haggais und Sacharjas," Das Ferne und Nahe Wort (Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1967), 206. A recently published study (which I have not yet seen) treats this issue in greater detail. K. Beyse, Serubbabel und die Königserwartungen der Propheten Haggai und Sacharja (Stuttgart: Calwer, 1972).

<sup>78</sup>Hanson, Studies in the Origins of Jewish Apocalyptic, 228.

## Notes to Chapter IV

<sup>1</sup>That Isa 24-27, and perhaps chapters 34-35, are part of the deutero-prophetic material, I do not deny. These chapters, however, provide little insight into the prophetic task. They do demonstrate the importance of Yahweh as divine king and warrior in the eschatological scenario.

S. Paul's recent study suggests that the exegetical and literary activity I have discerned in Zechariah, Joel, and Malachi is also present in Deutero-Isaiah, "Literary and Ideological Echoes of Jeremiah in Deutero-Isaiah," Proceedings of the Fifth World Congress of Jewish Studies (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1972), 102-120.

<sup>2</sup>P. Volz contends that Deutero-Isaiah contains the stuff of worship, Jesaia II (Leipzig: A. Deichertsche, 1932).

<sup>3</sup>C. Westermann, Isaiah 40-66 (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969), 6.

<sup>4</sup>Isa 48.16d is probably secondary; Westermann, Isaiah, 203; J. Muilenburg, "The Book of Isaiah, Chapters 40-66," IB, Vol. 5 (New York: Abingdon, 1956), 429.

<sup>5</sup>Reading ואומר with I QIs<sup>a</sup>, instead of ואמר with MT, LXX, V. The universal proclivity to read ואומר as a first person form is puzzling. To defend this interpretation, one would need to theorize a cohortative form which makes little sense in this context. A first person reading could be based upon ו orthography which usually writes the the first person with ה; but such an interpretation is dubious. The internal waw would also remain unexplained.

Rather the form is more easily understood to be a feminine singular participle. The speaker is the prophetess Zion. Such an interpretation accords well with the context which is an admonition to the prophetess in the divine council, "Speak tenderly to Jerusalem," (Isa 40.1) and the direct address to Zion, "Get you up to a high mountain, O Zion," (Isa 40.9).  
(S. Dean McBride, Private Communication)

<sup>6</sup>N. Habel, "The Form and Significance of the Call Narrative," ZAW 77(1965), 314ff.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., 297ff.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., 317.

<sup>9</sup>F. Cross, "The Council of Yahweh in Second Isaiah," JNES 12(1953), 274-275.

<sup>10</sup>Muilenburg, "The Book of Isaiah," 429.

<sup>11</sup>Westermann, Isaiah, 7, 131ff; Muilenburg, "The Book of Isaiah," 397.

<sup>12</sup>Westermann, Isaiah, 23.

<sup>13</sup>O. Eissfeldt, "The Promises of Grace to David in Isaiah 55.1-5," Israel's Prophetic Heritage, 203.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid., 204.

<sup>15</sup>Volz, Jesaia II, 140; Westermann, Isaiah, 283; Muilenburg, "The Book of Isaiah," 646; von Rad, Old Testament Theology, Vol. 2, 240; J. McKenzie, Second Isaiah (Garden City: Doubleday, 1968), 144.

<sup>16</sup>For a similar view on the decreasing importance of the Davidic tradition in Deutero-Isaiah, see D. Baltzer, Ezechiel und Deuterjesaja (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1971), 141-149.

Replacing the Davidic lineage in the eyes of the prophet was another ruler anointed by Yahweh, Cyrus (Isa 45.1). Not limited to the Judahite monarchy, Deutero-Isaiah's assessments and expectations focus on the international or cosmic plane with the Persian monarch.

<sup>17</sup>See the commentaries and especially C.R. North, The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1948), on the problems inherent in this material.

<sup>18</sup>Westermann, Isaiah, 21; see also O. Kaiser, Der königliche Knecht (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959), 65 and passim, for prophetic qualities in what Kaiser argues is essentially a royal figure.

<sup>19</sup>Habel, "The Call Narrative," 316 note 40.

<sup>20</sup>For example, Engnell and Johnson cited in Muilenburg, "The Book of Isaiah," 412.

<sup>21</sup>Muilenburg, "The Book of Isaiah," 413; McKenzie, Second Isaiah, 55.

<sup>22</sup>See Hanson, Studies in the Origins of Jewish Apocalyptic, 18-28, for a survey of critical literature and arguments in favor of a "Trito-Isaiah."

<sup>23</sup>Westermann, Isaiah, 295-296; Hanson, Studies, 48ff. Kessler's study, though placing the collection in the first post-exilic century, does little more to suggest a precise socio-historical setting; W. Kessler, "Studien zur religiösen Situation im ersten nachexilischen Jahrhundert und zur Auslegung von Jesaja 56-66," Wiss Zeit M Luther Univ 6(1956), 41-45.

<sup>24</sup>One must admit the striking similarities in style and language between Deutero- and Trito-Isaiah. Elliger has forcefully argued that the relation between the two is rather like teacher and disciple; K. Elliger, Deuterocesaja in seinem Verhältnis zu Tritojesaja (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1933). A chronological placement of Trito-Isaiah before 520 certainly strengthens such a view.

<sup>25</sup>Cf. Hanson, Studies, 53.

<sup>26</sup>Westermann, Isaiah, 299.

<sup>27</sup>Muilenburg, "The Book of Isaiah," 717.

<sup>28</sup>Hanson's prosodic analysis recognizes the uniformity of the pattern. And yet in treating the text, he includes v.4 as part of the unit without justification. This casualness with the delimitation of the sections in the text allows him to avoid the possibility of the prophetic first person, as he has also done with Isa 62.1,6, Studies, 54.

<sup>29</sup>For example, Muilenburg, "The Book of Isaiah," 709; Westermann, Isaiah, 366; Kessler, "Studien zur religiösen Situation," 54-55.

<sup>30</sup>W. Cannon, "Isaiah 61.1-3 as Ebed-Yahweh Poem," ZAW 6(1926), 287.

<sup>31</sup>S. Mowinckel, "The 'Spirit' and the 'Word' in the Pre-Exilic Reforming Prophets," JBL 53(1954), 195-227.

<sup>32</sup>לשום לאבלי ציון might be secondary; Hanson, Studies, 40; Muilenburg, "The Book of Isaiah," 711. But the specificity of this supposed gloss fits well with the rest of the verse.

<sup>33</sup>Muilenburg, "The Book of Isaiah," 709.

<sup>34</sup>W. Zimmerli, "Zur Sprache Tritojesaja's," Schweizer Theologische Umschau 20(1950), 110-122.

<sup>35</sup>Hanson hints at this explanation, "...the material in 56-66 was so intimately related to Second Isaiah, often assuming the form of a passer on that corpus...", Studies, 33.

<sup>36</sup>D. Michel, "Zur Eigenart Tritojesajas," Theologia Viatorum 10(1965-1966), 217ff.

<sup>37</sup>Plöger, Theocracy and Eschatology, 110.

<sup>38</sup>Michel, "Zur Eigenart Tritojesajas," 230.

<sup>39</sup>It is rather surprising that Plöger's work was not utilized significantly in Hanson's investigation since both are working on the origins of apocalyptic using a very similar sociological hypothesis.

<sup>40</sup>Hanson, Studies, 30.

<sup>41</sup>Ibid., 55-60.

<sup>42</sup>Ibid., 80-81.

<sup>43</sup>Plöger, Theocracy and Eschatology, 77-78.

<sup>44</sup>Hanson, Studies, 119-121.

<sup>45</sup>"...Seder 'Olam Zuṭa asserts that Zerubbabel returned to Babylon after the temple was completed and there succeeded his father, Shealtiel, as an exilarch, or prince of the exile;" IDB, Vol 4, 955. However, this sixth century A.D. Jewish Chronicler is interested in establishing Davidic legitimacy for later exilarchs, a concern which mitigates the tract's historical value; cf. M. Seligsohn, "Seder 'Olam Zuṭa," The Jewish Encyclopaedia, Vol 11 (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1905), 149-150.

<sup>46</sup>It is extraordinarily difficult to assess the reliability or purpose of the genealogy of Zerubbabel in 1 Chr 3. Rothstein argues that it is basically a fictive product to describe the family of Jehoiachin; J. Rothstein, Die Genealogie des Königs Jojachin und seiner Nachkommen (1 Chr 3.17-24) in geschichtlicher Beleuchtung (Berlin: Reuther und Reichard, 1902). Albright, on the other hand, while asserting that Zerubbabel probably perished without children, thinks the genealogy may be followed to a terminus in the end of the fifth century; Albright, "Date and Personality," 108-111. Cf. the short discussion on the difficulties of interpretation in Rudolph's Chronikbücher (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1955), 29-31.

<sup>47</sup>Notes to Zech 13.2-6:

a. In v.2, MT reads אָלוּרִי. LXX<sup>W</sup> provides an option which makes sense both textually and in context. W reads εκκαυσω, to "burn out" instead of εβαλω, to "drive out". W reflects a reading, αλοει, as against αλορι in MT. One can easily see how a copyist mistake might have occurred. This picture of the fire-produced destruction, so common to Ancient Near Eastern treaty curses, fits nicely into the Zechariah threat (especially with the theme of purifying fire in vv.7-9).

b. LXX translates with ακκοδοζειν, "to bind the feet together;" so also S--wn'srwnh; see M. Saebø, Sacharja 9-14. Untersuchungen von Text und Form (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969), 103. This is the only place that LXX has so translated dqr, κεντεω and its various affixed forms being the normal rendition of dqr. Further complicating this problem is the LXX translation of the same root, dqr, in Zech 12.10 where LXX has κατορχεσμαι, "to dance in triumph" or (metaphorically), "to insult." Aq, Σ, Θ read και εκκευθησουσιν αυτου, the expected translation of dqr. For a more detailed



on the versions, his defense of the MT, reading an hapax hiphil use of קנה, "to cause to possess," without much force. I favor the solution of Wellhausen and Kittel.

f. Most LXX witnesses follow the idiomatic usage of קני with χείρων. Compare the Ugaritic phrase in CTA #2, col 14, lines 14 and 16, bn ydm--"between the shoulders"--and the same basic idiom in 1 Kgs 9.24. However, Sc, L'(86txt)-407mg read ωμων, "side." Mitchel thinks this reading indicates an Hebrew Vorlage קני, "...this being the word required by the context and the one favoured by LXX<sup>1</sup>, which has ωμος here as well as in Isa 60.4; 66.12 where MT has צד. So also A,Σ,Θ," Haggai, Zechariah, 340. However, the fact that there is a North West Semitic idiom which was correctly translated by LXX makes Mitchell's reconstruction unnecessary.

g. For בית אהבה the majority of LXX witnesses read εν τω οικω των αγαπητων μου, "in my beloved house" instead of MT "house of my lovers." LXX: A'-544 L 91 CoArm Cyr<sup>f</sup> Tht.P. Hi read του αγαπητου, "house of my lover." The Coptic reads εν τω οικω των αγαπητων, "house of love."

Otzen wants to push בית אהבה beyond "my friends." He argues that there is a close parallel to Jer 5.7 בית זונה i.e. Canaanite cult prostitution. For Otzen, בית אהבה "...may have become a technical designation of the deity comparable to בית זונה," B. Otzen, Studien über Deuteriosacharja (Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1964), 197. He also adduces May's study on the fertility cult in which May wants to see בית אהבה as a name for the sacred male prostitute; an assertion which he attempts to establish on the basis of the Proto-Sinaitic inscriptions. May himself recognizes that the phrase "...does not, of course, necessarily refer to sacred prostitution," H.G. May, "The Fertility Cult in Hosea," AJSL 48(1931) 90 note 3. To be sure. A brief look at the inscriptions shows that the phrase actually appears only once, in #345, in unreconstructed form; W.F. Albright, The Proto-Sinaitic Inscriptions (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1969), 16. And if we accept Albright's translation "Swear to give a sacrifice" and "in order that we may sacrifice to Baalath," the reference is not to male cult prostitution. Consequently, a translation without בית אהבה as a terminus technicus for male cult prostitution is to be preferred.

<sup>48</sup>The debate over whether this phrase is an eschatological terminus technicus, as Gressman and others have argued, or is simply a temporal adverb, as stated by P. Munch, The Expression bajjôm hāhū'. Is it an Eschatological terminus technicus? (Oslo: I Kommisjon Hus Jacob Dybwad, 1936), is not terribly important, though Munch seems to have overstated his case. Cf. Saebo, Sacharja 9-14, 262ff.

<sup>49</sup>Saebo, Sacharja 9-14, 266-267.

<sup>50</sup>On the problem of disparate and even conflicting themes in Deutero-Zechariah, see H.M. Lutz, Jahwe, Jerusalem und die Völker. Zur Vorgeschichte von Sach 12.1-8 und 14.1-5. (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1968).

<sup>51</sup>Compare Nah 1.14 and Zeph on the אַכְרִית sentence in late prophetic speech.

<sup>52</sup>Westermann, Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech, 48.

<sup>53</sup>J. Fitzmyer, The Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefire (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1967), 14.

<sup>54</sup>Ibid., 20.

<sup>55</sup>Elliger, Das Buch der zwölf kleinen Propheten, 173.

<sup>56</sup>Saebo, Sacharja 9-14, 274.

<sup>57</sup>Whether one can accept Lamarche's thesis that vv.2-6 are a consistent unit because of a chiasmic structure (vv.2-3, idols, suppression, punishment; vv.4-6, punishment, suppression, idols), I am not sure. Perhaps the chiasm is in the eye of the beholder. P. Lamarche, Zacharie IX-XIV. Structure litteraire et messianisme (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1961), 89.

<sup>58</sup>Mitchell, Haggai, Zechariah, 337.

<sup>59</sup>Otzen, Studien über Deuteriosacharja, 198.

<sup>60</sup>Ibid., so also Saebo, Sacharja 9-14, 274.

<sup>61</sup>Hanson, Studies, 331.

<sup>62</sup>Plöger, Theocracy and Eschatology, 105; H.W. Wolff, Dodekapropheten 5. Joel (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1963), 3.

<sup>63</sup>Notes to Joel 3.1-5:

a. This should be understood as a redactional clause and not a temporal designation; A. Ehrlich, Randglossen zur hebraischen Bibel (Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1968), Vol 5, 222.

b. Acts 2.17 reads "from my spirit." The LXX and Acts 2:17-21 readings should, however, not be considered as evidence of an earlier variant text.

c. Following Wolff who reads the piel denominatively here, Joel, 65.

d. For this meaning of אָגַם, cf. Gen 19.22; 27.34.

e. תִּימָרוֹת is difficult. The usual explanation is to refer to the root תָּמַר, "date palm," and suggest that the form in Joel is a cloud of similar shape. Cf. the same



phrase in Cant 3.6 where it is also plural; Wolff, Joel, 66; W. Rudolph, Joel-Amos-Obadja-Jona (Gutersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1971), 70; T.H. Robinson, Die zwölf kleinen Propheten. Hosea bis Micha (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1954), 66.

f. ב... קרא is an idiom used to denote an intensive relationship; Wolff, Joel, 66.

g. ב... שרידים is unclear. It is probably secondary, following the concluding formula כאשר אמר יהוה. There have been a good many proposals to explain its meaning: Ehrlich, "the angel of death;" Jerome, "an obscure place name." My solution is to omit ב on the basis of vertical dittography and to read "survivors." The point of the gloss seems to be the contrast between certain individuals calling on Yahweh, v.5a, and the necessity for the survivors to be called by Yahweh, v.5c.

<sup>64</sup>Ploger, Theocracy and Eschatology, 101ff.

<sup>65</sup>Rudolph, Joel, 69ff.

<sup>66</sup>Wolff, Joel, 67-68.

<sup>67</sup>Rudolph, Joel, 69.

<sup>68</sup>Wolff, Joel, 78.

<sup>69</sup>Cf. Munch, The Expression bajjôm hāhū', passim.

<sup>70</sup>G. von Rad, "The Origin of the Day of the Lord," JSS 4(1959), 97-108. F. Cross has argued that the Day of Yahweh is the culmination of the cosmic battle, a day of victory and a celebration of Yahweh's kingship; "The Divine Warrior in Israel's Early Cult," Biblical Motifs: Origins and Transformations (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1966), 24ff. Of these two tradition elements, the martial activity would seem to be primary for the Biblical Day of Yahweh traditions.

<sup>71</sup>The spirit poured out from on high (Isa 32.15), a fructifying force, is an earlier stage in the spirit-pouring tradition.

<sup>72</sup>Cf. Rudolph, Joel, 72, where he argues that the Ezekiel and Zechariah texts present the spirit being poured out in the End-time whereas in Joel it is preliminary to the eschaton.

<sup>73</sup>Rudolph, Joel, 72 note 6, who cites P. Volz, Der Geist Gottes, 110, 92ff.

<sup>74</sup>Wolff, Joel, 79.

<sup>75</sup>A. Kapelrud, Joel Studies (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells, 1948), 141.

<sup>76</sup>Jeremias, Theophanie, 98ff.

<sup>77</sup>Wolff, Joel, 81.

<sup>78</sup>Heiler, Erscheinungsformen und Wesen der Religion, 56.

<sup>79</sup>Robinson, Die zwölf kleinen Propheten, 67.

<sup>80</sup>On Zion as Rettungsort and Fluchtberg, see Wolff, Joel, 81-82. Also note the tradition of the nations against Jerusalem and Zion discussed by Lutz, Jahwe, Jerusalem, und die Völker, passim.

<sup>81</sup>Wolff, Joel, 81.

<sup>82</sup>See Wolff's discussion of the two Day of Yahweh traditions, Joel, 38-39.

<sup>83</sup>Holladay's observation is most enlightening, "Although the term מַלְאָךְ, 'messenger,' only rarely appears in the books of the pre-exilic prophets, and never...with the intended meaning 'heavenly messenger,' it is hardly a chance matter that the last prophet in the Hebrew canon styled himself (or was named) Malachi, 'my messenger;' " Holladay, "Assyrian Statecraft and the Prophets of Israel," 30-31.

<sup>84</sup>This is not to say that the more general expectation of prophecy did not continue as a viable option in its own right. See the use of Joel 3 in Acts 2.

<sup>85</sup>This implied criticism of the Levites in a late deutero-prophetic collection provides an informative contrast to the Levitical bias in Chronicles, cf. also Mal 2.8.

<sup>86</sup>R. Pfeiffer, "Die Disputationsworte im Buche Malachi," EvTh 19(1959), 546ff.

<sup>87</sup>Note the Deuteronomistic stamp of the admonitions in Mal 3.5 (cf. Deut 18.10 to the legal material in the Book of the Covenant).

<sup>88</sup>Eissfeldt, The Old Testament, 442.

<sup>89</sup>Against Robinson, Die zwölf kleinen Propheten, 275; Sellin, Das Zwölfprophetenbuch, 617; who emphasize the ethical demands; and those who see here evidence of disruption of Jewish family life by Hellenistic culture.

## Notes to Chapter V

<sup>1</sup>Welch amply demonstrates the significance of prophecy for the Chronicler. A. Welch, The Work of the Chronicler (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1939), 42ff.

<sup>2</sup>After Samuel, the group includes: 1 Chr 17, Nathan to David; 1 Chr 21, Gad to David; 2 Chr 10, Ahijah to Jeroboam; 2 Chr 11-12, Shemaiah to Rehoboam; 2 Chr 15, Azariah ben Oded to Asa; 2 Chr 16, Hanani to Asa; 2 Chr 18, Micaiah ben Imlah to Ahab; 2 Chr 19, Jehu ben Hanani to Jehosaphat; 2 Chr 20, Eliezer to Jehosaphat; 2 Chr 21, Elijah to Jehoram; 2 Chr 24, prophets to the princes; 2 Chr 25.6-12, unnamed prophets to Amaziah; 2 Chr 25.13-16, another unnamed prophet to Amaziah; 2 Chr 28, Oded to Ahaz; 2 Chr 32, Isaiah to Hezekiah; 2 Chr 33, seers to Manasseh; 2 Chr 34, Huldah to Josiah; 2 Chr 36, Jeremiah to Zedekiah.

<sup>3</sup>Plöger, Theocracy and Eschatology, 38; W. Rudolph, Chronikbücher (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1955), VIII.

<sup>4</sup>There are a good many reports of prophetic activity and concomitant speeches which parallel the Deuteronomistic account. These are interesting and deserve lengthy treatment. Also there are the many references to prophetic written records which have been recently studied in Thomas Willi's dissertation.

Willi has studied the numerous citations which the Chronicler makes to putative, prophetic-historical sources. He has argued that they represent not a prophetic strain in Chronicles (so Jepsen) nor evidence of source material peculiar to Chronicles. Instead, they inform us about the tradition history theories of the Chronicler.

Willi makes three significant observations about these source references: (1) "The concluding notes belong not only, as Noth has already observed, to the material of the Deuteronomist appropriated by the Chronicler, but with the single exception of 2 Chr 35.26-27 (and obviously 1 Chr 29.29, a verse without parallel in the Deuteronomistic history), all Chronicles' source references appear exactly at the place where they stand in the Deuteronomistic history, T. Willi, Die Chronik als Auslegung: Untersuchungen zur literarischen Gestaltung der historischen Überlieferung Israels (Diss. Tübingen, 1970), 291. (2) In both Chronicles and Kings, such references cease after the account of Jehoiakim's reign. (3) Such source citations do not occur in Ezra-Nehemiah.

On the basis of these close correlations between the Deuteronomistic history and Chronicles, Willi concludes that the Chronicles' prophetic citations function as interpretations of the Deuteronomistic history. For the Chronicler, the prophetic history writers represent the primary historians:

"God's deed and word are one; what he says happens. History operates as the prophets have to do with God's word." So they are entrusted as the first ones with the attested written record of the holy history as a basis of belief," (cf. 2 Chr 26.22).

A further stage is the appropriation of these prophetic accounts into a general history which make up, according to Willi and most other commentators, the annals of the northern and southern kingdoms. But even at this level, Willi argues that the authority of the sources rests on the prophetic reports. He even sees a primary (v.19) and secondary (v.18) tradition history stages in the same report (2 Chr 34,18ff), Willi, Die Chronik als Auslegung, 300.

Willi is at pains to deny that the prophetic citations in any way reflect prophetic phenomena in the sense that Israel's classical prophets were prophets. But this contention, with which I agree, seems to stop him from asking questions about what the Chronicler used prophetic authority for in his history. He does say that the Chronicler's use of the citations reflects a need for divinely authorized documents in a God-guided history. But why do the prophets write history and how is the Chronicler participating in this line of transmission? Why do the prophets have such powerful authority? Willi asserts that the Chronicler sees himself as an exegete of the prophets. Is this all? How do the Levitic prophets fit into this scheme of the Chronicler's view of prophetic authority.

<sup>5</sup>J. Myers, Chronicles, Vol. 1 (Garden City: Doubleday, 1965), LXIII; K. Gallig, Die Bücher der Chronik, Esra, Nehemia (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954), passim.

<sup>6</sup>J. Rothstein and J. Hänel, Kommentar zum ersten Buch der Chronik (Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1927); Welch, The Work of the Chronicler; Rudolph has also rightly observed that the number of such insertions and/or redactions decreases in 2 Chronicles, Chronikbücher, VIII.

<sup>7</sup>See Welch, The Work of the Chronicler, 55ff; Rudolph, Chronikbücher, XV and passim; G. von Rad, Das Geschichtsbild des chronistischen Werkes (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1930), 80ff.

<sup>8</sup>J. Köberle, Die Tempelsänger im Alten Testament (Erlangen: Verlag Fr. Junge, 1899), 182ff.

<sup>9</sup>Von Rad, Das Geschichtsbild, 99-100. For another position arguing that the ark and tabernacle comprise a continuous religious institution, see F. Cross, "The Priestly Tabernacle," The BA Reader (Garden City: Doubleday Anchor, 1961), 214ff.

<sup>10</sup>Von Rad, Das Geschichtsbild, #07.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., 110-114.

<sup>12</sup>H. Gese, "Zur Geschichte der Kultsänger am zweiten Tempel," Abraham unser Vater: Juden und Christen im Gespräch über die Bibel (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1963), 223-226.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid., 228-229.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., 230.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., 232-234.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid., 223; von Rad, Das Geschichtsbild, 113-114.

<sup>18</sup>This is not meant to deny that Johnson, Haldars, and Jeremias, as well as many others, have said significant things about cultic prophecy. It is simply to say that the first important and most referred to explanation of the Levitical singers as cultic prophets is Mowinckel's study. S. Mowinckel, Psalmstudien III. Kultprophetie und prophetische Psalmen (Amsterdam: P. Schippers, 1961).

<sup>19</sup>Mowinckel also mentions 2 Chr 20 and 1 Chr 25; which will be considered later in this chapter.

<sup>20</sup>Mowinckel, Kultprophetie, 22.

<sup>21</sup>See here Rudolph, Chronikbücher, 119; Rothstein, Der Chronik, 280.

<sup>22</sup>Von Rad, Das Geschichtsbild, 110.

<sup>23</sup>Bertheau, Die Bücher der Chronik, cited in Rudolph, Chronikbücher, 119.

<sup>24</sup>Notes to 1 Chr 25.1-8:

a. That what we have intended by וְשָׂרֵי הַצִּבּוּא is not military leaders, but the leaders of the Levites has been clearly shown by E. Curtis, The Books of Chronicles (New York: Charles Scribner's, 1910), 279 note 1; though I do not accept Curtis inclusion of לְעֹבְדָה as a genitival description of this leadership.

b. Rothstein's protestations against MT on the basis of LXX<sup>B</sup> καὶ ἐστῆσαν appear groundless. Not only is בָּדַל used in similar ways to mean "designate" or "appoint" but Rudolph has advanced a quite possible thesis that καὶ ἐστῆσαν is a scribal error for διέστῆσαν; Rudolph, Chronikbücher, 164.

c. Most modern commentators are quick to adopt the Qere, הַנְּבִיאִים, attested by LXX, V, and T, though MT makes good sense. To read a participle instead of a noun offers no significant change in meaning: Ketib "the prophets with..." versus Qere "who were to prophesy with...." Rudolph recognizes the problem in his notes but finesses the solution in his translation, "who should practice proclamation with....," avoiding the term "prophesy;" Rudolph, Chronikbücher, 164. Curtis cites v.2 הַנְּבִיאִים as evidence for a participial reading (actually v.3b is better for his argument). This form is not without its difficulties because there is textual evidence for a nominal reading; Curtis, Chronicles, 279. Consequently one has to reckon with the possibility that a noun was also intended in v.1. The solution based solely on textual grounds is moot. The issue easily turns into an argument based on context. Were the singers, in the Chronicler's eye, performing prophetically before this order of the king? If one wants to stress the importance of the Davidic figure and initiative in Chronicles (as most commentators do), then the participial reading more closely fits this goal.

d. Most commentators insert the name שְׁנַיִ after Jeshaiiah on the basis of v.17. Without the name, which is included by LXX, we have only five singers, when the verse expressly states that there were six. To simply restore the text may lead one to ignore the question, why is the name missing? Is it a scribal mistake or do we have two different lists? (see below).

e. My translation is purposefully ambiguous. We might expect לְהַרְיֵם קֶרֶן to mean another instrument allocated to the Heman group after the mention of other instruments. Though this interpretation has been proposed (T, Bertheau), there is an idiomatic usage which precludes such a reading. As Rudolph notes "...to raise or exalt the horn is to raise the fortunes of someone," (Rudolph, Chronikbücher, 166 and Rothstein, Der Chronik, 450); "...it is a sign of success or well-being," (Johnson, The Cultic Prophet, 70 note 3); cf. also 1 Sam 2.10; Deut 23.17; Lam 2.17; Pss 75.5; 89.18; 92.11; 112.9; 148.14. Clearly the numerical superiority of Heman's progeny is to be seen as a raising of his fortunes.

But then the exact sense of בְּדִבְרֵי הָאֱלֹהִים is unclear within this context, if taken literally; for we have no record of a divine promise of progeny to Heman which could serve as the referent of this phrase. Rothstein and Ehrlich have both suggested that the phrase should be interpreted as "theological matters" (Rothstein) or "things of religion" (Ehrlich). The phrase thereby modifies the character of the seer's office--Heman advises the king in matters of religion. Rudolph, on the other hand, wants to see the words connected with the first part of the sentence and not in apposition to חֲזֵה הַמֶּלֶךְ. Consequently, he preserves the phrase, "words of God," as a promise, but does not clarify the nature of this unknown promise. I would prefer, with Ehrlich and Rothstein, to see the phrase related directly to the חֲזֵה. However,

I would still insist on a more literal emphasis on the "words of God," especially since a prophetic title is here being used. This **דבר** terminology would further enhance the prophetic function. One might translate "seer of the king based upon the words of God," i.e. making explicit the authority of the prophet (KB, 104 #16); cf. for similar usages 1 Kgs 13.5; Dan 10.12.

f. LXX<sup>BA</sup> omit **לעבודת בית האלהים** and the verse reads more smoothly without this apparent insertion.

<sup>25</sup>J. Böhmer, "Sind einige Personennamen in 1 Chr 25.4 'kunstlich geschaffen'?" BZ 22(1934), 93-100.

<sup>26</sup>P. Haupt, "Die Psalmenverse in 1 Chr 25.4," ZAW 34(1914), 142-145.

<sup>27</sup>H. Torczyner, "A Psalm by the Sons of Heman," JBL 68(1949), 247-249.

<sup>28</sup>Rothstein, Der Chronik, 453.

<sup>29</sup>At one time, I thought it might be possible to detect an Aramaic original behind this Hebrew hymnic fragment. One could argue for this on several grounds. (1) **חנני** could be an Aramaic form since **ע"ע** verbs may be identical to the strong verb morphology (F. Rosenthal, A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic [Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1963], #157), though this usually happens only in the elevated stems. (2) The roots **אנה** and **מלל** enjoy greater frequency in Aramaic than they do in Hebrew. (3) **נמטתי** could be read as the not uncommon Aramaic polel. However, certain phonological considerations make this Aramaic interpretation improbable. If the poem were originally Aramaic, we would not expect **עדר** and **ישב** (if one accepts the reading of Rudolph), though it should be noted that both **עדר** and **ישב** do occur in the Aramaic material. Further, the last two cola are virtually impossible to interpret within the context of Aramaic morphology. Finally, both **אנה** and **מלל** (or **מלא** as with Haupt) are used in BH. Perhaps the most one can say is that the piece possesses an Aramaic flavor consistent with a composition date late in the Persian period.

<sup>30</sup>Ehrlich, Randglossen, Vol. 7, 350.

<sup>31</sup>Notes to the Hymn Fragment:

a. Gunkel and Begrich note that very similar phrases are to be found in the Babylonian psalm material (H. Gunkel and J. Begrich, Einleitung in die Psalmen [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1933], 220).

b. Cf. 2 Chr 35.21 for the term used in a martial sense which might not be foreign in a request for aid such as we find here. The apparent Deut 33.2,21 parallel usages are still interesting even though Cross and Freedman

have erased them from the earlier Yahwistic text (F. Cross and D. Freedman, "The Blessing of Moses," JBL 67[1948], 191-210).

c. Reading the relative particle ש. Cf. Ps 34.4 for the same verbs paired together.

d. Cf. 1 Chr 12.1. If we were correct in noting a military flavor in אתה, the use of עזר buttresses this tendency. Note H. Ginzburg's treatment of the term in Ugaritic and BH, "Ugaritic Parallel to 2 Sam 1.21," JBL 57(1938), 210-211.

e. Cf. Esth 5.7,8; 7.3 for this form of בקש. Note also the semantically identical מלא שאל in Ps 20.6 and in Syriac (Haupt, "Die Psalmenverse in 1 Chr 25.4," 143).

f. Following Haupt, "Die Psalmenverse in 1 Chr 25.4," 143, a scribal error for מליתי = מלאתי.

g. Also with Haupt, a plural form equalling מחזיות of singular מחזית which can be explained by analogy with singular משכית and plural משכיות where we also find the form משכיאת.

h. Haupt, et al. have argued that we should translate not "oracles" or "visions," but something like the Targum for Exod 3.3 חזונה רבה (cf. BH המראה הגדל), "a noteworthy event or occurrence." This example of Haupt's is predicated on the assumption that the nominal form מחזית may be equated with חזיה and hence with מראה. However, there are other nominal forms from חזה which offer the alternative "vision," מחזה to cite one. Haupt has simply opted for one semantic bundle which the two roots share, ראה and חזה, when there is an equally legitimate and more probable bundle, "vision" or "oracle." Both these roots have nouns, מראה and מחזות--to cite two--which are used very consciously to describe the prophetic range of activity. Consequently I fail to see how Haupt's example eliminates the translation, "oracle" or "vision." And in opposition to Haupt and Rudolph (Chronikbücher, 167), the translation "oracle" or "vision" makes a good deal of sense.

<sup>32</sup>See on the form critical matter, Rudolph, Chronikbücher, 167; Eissfeldt, The Old Testament, 115ff.

<sup>33</sup>Rudolph, Chronikbücher, 168.

<sup>34</sup>B. Gemser, De Beteekenis der Persoonsnamen voor onze Kennis van Het Leven en Denken der oude Babyloniërs en Assyriërs (Wageningen: H. Veenman & Zonen, 1924), 22.

<sup>35</sup>Welch, The Work of the Chronicler, 90.

<sup>36</sup>Curtis, Chronicles, 276.

<sup>37</sup>Rothstein, Der Chronik, 453.



<sup>38</sup>Notes to 1 Chr 25.2-4a and 9ff:

Some of the names are the same: **גְּדִלְיָהוּ, יוֹסֵף, זְכוּר**, **גְּדִלְיָהוּ, יוֹסֵף, זְכוּר**. Then there are three cases in which we may note minor orthographic differences: v.22 **יְרֵמוֹת** parallel to v.4 **יְרֵמוֹת** reflect the same vowel, while v.2 **וְתַנְיָהוּ** parallel to v.12 **וְתַנְיָהוּ** and v.4 **חֲשַׁבְיָהוּ** parallel to v.19 **חֲשַׁבְיָהוּ** simply reflect the orthographic possibilities of rendering the theophoric element **יָהוּ/יְהוּ**. The other differences are more complex. (1) V.2 **אֲשֶׁר־אֵלֶּהָ** parallel to v.14 **יִשְׂרָאֵלֶּהָ** is especially difficult. Noth has suggested that the primary form is to be found in v.2 and is to be connected with the Arabic *ašira* and to be translated "God has filled with joy" (W. Noth, Die israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der gemeinsemitischen Namengebung [Stuttgart; W. Kohlhammer, 1928], 183). Rothstein, on the other hand, wants to see v.14 as primary, being an altered form of **יִשְׂרָאֵל**. The versions are ambiguous, though there is some evidence that LXX translators read a form without a **ר**. The versions (LXX and V) are more uniform with **יִשְׂרָאֵלֶּהָ**. I think it is easier to explain the existence of the two forms if one sees **אֲשֶׁר־אֵלֶּהָ** as a product of an early misreading of **א** for **י**. Noth's attempt to explain the form on the basis of **שׁ** ignores the present textual variants. (2) V.3 **צָרִי** parallel to v.11 **יְצָרִי** is another problem. The respective presence and absence of the **י** is supported by the versions: The question is: can we argue that **צָרִי** is an apocopated form of **יְצָרִי**, itself short for **יְצַרְיָהוּ**, "God created." Rudolph says the issue is moot. However, since **צָרִי**, "balsam," is never used as a proper name and since **יְצָרִי** is not unknown to Hebrew names, probability would rest with interpreting **צָרִי** as derivative of **יְצָרִי**. Noth asserts that the converse is the case, that **צָרִי** has been expanded to **יְצָרִי**; though probability is against such a move (Noth, Die israelitischen Personennamen, 247). (3) The presence of **שִׁמְעִי** in v.17 and its absence in v.3 where it is needed to make up the progeny of six can be explained (following Rudolph) by haplography due to the similarity of the preceding word; so also with LXX<sup>BA</sup> and V. Again it should be noted that, copyist mistake or no, the fuller list is preserved in vv.9ff. (4) The names **עֲזַרְיָהוּ** (v.4) and **עֲזַרְיָהוּ** (v.18) create a problem because both may stand as legitimate North West Semitic names: "El is my strength" and "El helped." One could argue that either **ר** and **י** could have been misread for the other, but it is impossible to ascertain which way the error would have progressed. I would prefer to see **יְרֵמוֹת** but it is mere preference. Many commentators (e.g. Rudolph, Chronikbücher, 166) have pointed to the possibility that we have a similar case as with the Judahite king name, **עֲזַרְיָהוּ** or **עֲזַרְיָהוּ**. But one has to ask, what sort of similar case? Are we to understand the differences in the king's names as orthographic variants or the difference between regnal and personal names? Following Honeyman and Albright, I would argue that the Uzziah/Azariah differences are bound up in the traditio-historical assimilations of the

regnal versus personal names within Israel's historical documents. (A. Honeyman, "The Evidence for Regnal Names among the Hebrews," JBL 67 [1948], 13ff; W.F. Albright, "The Chronology of the Divided Monarchy in Israel," BASOR 100 [1945], 16-22.) And this is surely not the case in the Chronicles passages. (5) The לְשׁוֹבֵי אֶל of v.4 (and also 1 Chr 23.16 and 1 Chr 26.24) most probably reflects a misreading from לְשׁוֹבֵי אֶל in v.20 (following Noth, Die israelitischen Personennamen, 257). The versions support this analysis since LXX<sup>B</sup> reads Σουβανλ and V, Subuel, in v.4.

<sup>39</sup>Gese, "Der Kultsänger," 227.

<sup>40</sup>Notes to 2 Chr 20:

a. Reading Ammonites, again, makes little sense, cf. 2 Chr 26.7. As Curtis notes (Chronicles, 405), three groups of people are presumed in vv.10,22,24. The LXX<sup>BA</sup> reading, מֵהַמִּצְרִיִּים, is to be preferred.

b. Though there is a manuscript which reads מֵהַיָּם הַדָּרְוִם, this correction could also be made on the basis of suggesting a misreading of ד to ר. S and Ethiopic read "Red Sea," יָם אֲדָם.

c. שְׂפֹת, infinitive construct, does not read easily here. Ehrlich suggests שִׁוּשׁ as in Job 9.23. However, an explanation based upon a metathesis of ש and פ seems more satisfactory, thus giving us שִׁפּוּשׁ, "flood."

d. Restore the ל before פְּנֵי. Omission due to haplography because of ל at the end of הַנְּחָל.

e. Though Ehrlich's suggestion that הַתִּיצֵבו be translated "notice" or "pay attention" is not without merit, (cf. 1 Sam 12.16) the context would seem to favor a more military connotation, as in Jer 46.4.

f. Reading waw explicativum (וּמֵת) as Gese, Galling, and Rudolph have suggested. Cf. GK #154aN(b) and Deut 1.3, a classic example.

g. After examination of the other occurrences of הַדְרַת קֹדֶשׁ (1 Chr 16.29; Pss 29.2; 96.9) we may reject Ehrlich's suggestion that the phrase is to be read "for the beautification of the holy action."

h. Quite apart from the phonological difficulties such a solution raises, Ehrlich's proposal that we read עֹב "to mix" and here "confusion," on the basis of a Mishnaic text, ignores the obvious battle imagery present in מֵאֲרִיבִים.

i. Rudolph's attempt to get rid of the ironic tone of the help by reading a polal, עִוְרָן, based on T might be defended if עִוְרָן made no sense (Chronikbücher, 262). However, the semantic range of עִוְרָן is larger than Boy-Scout type aid. (cf. Zech 1.15).

j. Reading בְּהֵמָה with LXX.

k. V probably presents us with the original reading, וּבְגָדִים, though probably as the result of a correction and not on the basis of some textual tradition. LXX glossed the issue and translated στυλα, "booty."

1. Omit לָשׁוּב following LXX<sup>BA</sup>, though not אֶל יְרוּשָׁלַיִם. The double use of the verb is redundant.

<sup>41</sup>Gese, "Der Kultsänger," 230 note 2.

<sup>42</sup>J. Wellhausen, Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel (New York: World Publishing Co., 1957), 208.

<sup>43</sup>M. Noth, "Eine palästinische Lokalüberlieferung in 2 Chr 20," ZDPV 67(1945), 52.

<sup>44</sup>Ibid., 60, 71.

<sup>45</sup>Ibid., 48.

<sup>46</sup>Rudolph, Chronikbücher, 259.

<sup>47</sup>Myers, Chronicles, Vol 2, 114-115.

<sup>48</sup>The fact there are speeches is in and of itself significant. Plöger has argued that speeches are devices used by both the Deuteronomist and the Chronicler to emphasize specific historical events. The frequent use of prayers by the Chronicler (especially 1 Chr 29.10ff; 2 Chr 20.6ff; Ezra 9.6ff) distinguishes his use of this literary device from the Deuteronomist and, most probably, reflects the liturgical practice of his time. (O. Plöger, "Reden und Gebete im deuteronomistischen und chronistischen Geschichtswerk," Aus der Spätzeit des Alten Testaments [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971], 50-66). On 2 Chr 20, see pp 61-64.

<sup>49</sup>Eissfeldt, The Old Testament, 112.

<sup>50</sup>W. Thrall and A. Hibbard, A Handbook to Literature (New York: Odyssey Press, 1960), 416.

<sup>51</sup>Gese, "Der Kultsänger," 230.

<sup>52</sup>J. Begrich, "Das priesterliche Heilsorakel," ZAW 52(1934), 82ff.

<sup>53</sup>Though I should not want to press this point too far; for as von Rad has noted, in certain instances, a rite of penance and public lacrimation may be a part of the holy war preparation (G. von Rad, Der Heilige Krieg im alten Israel [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969], 7). However, in the usual pattern, we hear very little about such a ceremony. And since we know that such laments were enacted in times other than the holy war, there seems to be some justification in viewing it as a separate entity, at least for the purposes of analysis.

53<sup>a</sup>G. von Rad, "The Levitical Sermon in I and II Chronicles," The Problem of the Hexateuch and other Essays (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966), 273.

54Von Rad, Der Heilige Krieg, 9.

55Ibid.

56Von Rad, "The Levitical Sermon," 274; Noth, "Eine palastinische Lokalüberlieferung," 47 note 1. Such dependence is difficult to prove since this language is used in other sorts of Old Testament accounts (cf. Exod 14-14).

57Gese asserts that the basic interest is in the activity of the singers, more specifically, in the effect of the holy song ("Der Kultsänger," 231).

58Von Rad, Der Heilige Krieg, 11.

59Ibid., 81.

60Gese, "Der Kultsänger," 232-233.

61Ibid., 234.

61<sup>a</sup>Plöger, "Reden und Gebete," passim.

62Notes to 2 Chr 29:

a. LXX<sup>BA</sup> reads "and it happened when he was over his kingdom in the first month," probably a paraphrastic rendition of MT.

b. A broad plaza apparently near the city gate, and therefore not the temple court. Cf. Neh 8.1,3; 2 Chr 32.6; Job 29.2. (Myers, Chronicles, 168; Curtis, Chronicles, 463; Rudolph, Chronikbücher, 292.)

c. The Hebrew at the end of v.9 and at the beginning of v.10 reads **בשבי על זאת עתה**, "...in captivity because of this now...." LXX has been somewhat free and read **עתה** as a part of v.9, "and thus it is now," i.e. they are still in captivity. I take this to be a legitimate reading of the Hebrew, though an interpretation based on the historical circumstances of the LXX translator. The style of this speech with its repeated use of **עתה** (cf. vv.5,10,11) suggests that **עתה** should begin v.10.

d. Ehrlich's proposal to read **בדבר** instead of **בדברי**, assuming error by dittography of **י**, allows for an easier reading.

e. Rudolph has given the most convincing interpretation for the LXX<sup>B</sup> replacement of .16 by .13 as well as several other minor changes: "LXX<sup>B</sup> changes the sixteen days to thirteen. Thereby the cleansing work would be finished before the beginning of Pesah; since the translator noticed that the usual dates did not correspond. At the

beginning of the verses  $\eta\mu\epsilon\sigma\varsigma \eta\tau\eta \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\eta$  was placed between  $\eta\tau\eta$  and  $\gamma\omicron\upsilon\mu\eta\tau\eta$  as a correction (5=8=13), then  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\eta$  in LXX<sup>B</sup> was replaced by  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\eta$  so that  $\gamma\omicron\upsilon\mu\eta\tau\eta$  now exists superfluously" (Rudolph, *Chronikbücher*, 294).

f. The translation of  $\text{בִּיד יְהוָה}$  is difficult. There is no parallel usage in the Old Testament to denote some sort of mediation. The phrase is always used literally (e.g. Exod 16.3; Jer 51.7; 1 Chr 21.13). Most modern commentators have attempted to read the phrase in a way designed to indicate agency (Galling, "...because the commandment was issued by the Lord, mediated by his prophets," *Die Bücher der Chronik*, 155; Myers, "...for such was the command of Yahweh through his prophets," *Chronicles*, 167). Rudolph has proposed a rather different reading (*Chronikbücher*, 296). According to Rudolph, " $\text{בִּיד יְהוָה}$  is obviously an induced disturbance of  $\text{בְּדוֹד יְהוָה}$  because of the second  $\text{בִּיד}$ ...; the Peshitta and Arabic versions also speak of David in v.25b. V.25b wants to explain why, in v.25a, the two prophets were appended to David." I think that neither the textual evidence nor the argument based on the supposed intention of v.25b are strong enough to warrant this change. The Chronicler appears less interested in the figure of David as such than he is in gaining authority for the Levites. Consequently, I would opt for a literal translation (so also Mitchell, *Chronicles*, 468). It emphasizes not only that Yahweh is the mediatory figure, but that the prophets also have mediated the message--down to the present Levitical prophets, i.e. Asaph and his lineage.

g.  $\text{לִי-יְדִי}$  denotes agency here as shown by LXX  $\eta\mu\epsilon\sigma\varsigma$  .

h. There is an idiom, "to fill the hands" which is most often used to denote the consecration or ordination into the Aaronide priesthood. However, to charge that in this passage the addressee of v.31a is the priesthood on the basis of this idiomatic usage is to overlook both the obvious sense of v.31b (which is exceedingly difficult to separate from the first part of the verse) and to ignore two passages (Exod 32.29 and 1 Chr 29.5) in which this idiom requires a more reflexive translation. The Exodus passage, an enigmatic and probably corrupt text, presents Moses as saying either "Fill your hands" or "You filled your hands," i.e. qal imperative or piel perfect, and most probably the latter. This holy and intra-family slaughter is hardly to be thought of as a paradigmatic priestly investiture. Rather we have a reflexive use of the idiom, "to devote oneself." So also with 1 Chr 29.5 where, on appeal from Hezekiah, the citizens devote themselves to the Lord by giving up gold for the building of the temple. Consequently, it is difficult to follow the assertion of Myers that as a "...technical term for the consecration of

priests...Hezekiah was addressing the priests exhorting them to carry on their functions now that the temple was dedicated" (Myers, Chronicles, 169).

Rudolph's solution is a bit more complicated. Also recognizing the priestly consecration idiom, Rudolph feels that the priests must be the addressees. But he further argues: (1) there was no priestly dedication in the narrative; and (2) in vv.31a and b the people are addressed, and the speech can not change in the middle of the sentence, something Myers has overlooked. He notes Ehrlich's suggestion of מלא אתם, (cf. 1 Chr 29.5): "...the insertion of לעם after ויאמר, which either intentionally fell out (in the jump from ע to ע and the deletion of the then unmeaningful ל) or, after the reading mistake מלא אתם had entered, they were omitted as unsuitable" (Rudolph, Chronikbücher, 298). The reconstructed text of Ehrlich and Rudolph would read ויאמר לעם עתה מלא אתם ידכם.

This solution is interesting. The insertion of לעם, though the sense requires such a noun, is not textually attested. Nor is the division of מלא אתם. We may understand this verse, I think, equally well if we understand the sense to be one of self-dedication, as in the Exodus passage. The meaning of the verse remains the same, whether my solution or that of Ehrlich and Rudolph is adopted.

<sup>63</sup>The use of the word "covenant" is intriguing, the more so since we find no other notice of a covenant ceremony in the description in Hezekiah's reign. However, the term is not inconsistent with the Chronicler's way of describing kings and covenants. For example, in 2 Chr 15.12; 23.16; and 34.31, we find Asa, Jehoida, and Josiah described as having made covenants as a part of a program to cleanse the cult from foreign influence; this is most probably also the case in 2 Chr 29.

<sup>64</sup>The dual use of the root שרת is puzzling. Welch contends that this ministry "...is the dignity which the law denied to the Levite and reserved to the priest" (Welch, The Work of the Chronicler, 104). Though he is correct in seeing that the P tradition describes the function of the Aaronide priesthood with שרת, this P terminological usage hardly excludes the Levites. We often find the statement made that the Levite shall minister to the High Priest (Num 3.6; 8.26; 18.2). But other passages are less clear in their limitation of the Levitical service (Num 8.23ff; 16.9). Furthermore, once we turn to the Deuteronomistic traditions, which are closely related to those of the Chronicler, the sense of the שרת language is more general and clearly not intended to separate Levitical service from that of the priests. The writer of v.11 in 2 Chr 29 most probably did not give the Levites a function they had not previously held.

<sup>65</sup>M. Haran, "The Use of Incense in the Ancient Israelite Ritual," VT 10(1960), 113-125.

<sup>66</sup>K. Möhlenbrink, "Die levitischen Überlieferungen des Alten Testaments," ZAW 11(1934), 230ff.

<sup>67</sup>Welch, The Work of the Chronicler, 105.

<sup>68</sup>Myers, Chronicles, Vol. 2, 171-172.

<sup>69</sup>J. Hänel, "Das Recht des Opferschlachtens in der chronistischen Literatur," ZAW 14(1937), 47ff. See further on the nature of the burnt offering: W. Stevenson, "Hebrew 'olah and zebach Sacrifices," Festschrift für Alfred Bertholet (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1950), 488-497; L. Rost, "Erwägungen zum israelitischen Brandopfer," Von Ugarit nach Qumran (Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1961), 177-183.

<sup>70</sup>It should be noted that there is a tradition contrary to lay slaughter; that of the Levitical slaying of the animals (Ezek 44.11).

<sup>71</sup>Welch, The Work of the Chronicler, 105.

<sup>72</sup>Rudolph, Chronikbücher, 293.

<sup>73</sup>See above, and especially Haag's attempt to see this distinction reflect the difference between nomadic versus sedentary influences in the early monarchy (H. Haag, "Gad und Nathan," Archäologie und Altes Testament (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1970), 135-143.

<sup>74</sup>Rudolph, Chronikbücher, 298-299.

<sup>75</sup>Welch, The Work of the Chronicler, 107-108.

<sup>76</sup>So Myers, Chronicles, Vol. 2, 208; von Rad, Das Geschichtsbild, 114; Johnson, The Cultic Prophet, 72; Galling, Die Bücher der Chronik, 176.

<sup>77</sup>So with Rudolph, Chronikbücher, 325; Curtis, Chronicles, 515; I. Benzinger, Die Bücher der Chronik (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1901), 131.

<sup>78</sup>The best two treatments are: Hänel, "Das Recht des Opferschlachtens," 49ff; and Welch, The Work of the Chronicler, 138ff, for a more redaction critical approach.

<sup>78a</sup>Welch, The Work of the Chronicler, 139ff.

<sup>79</sup>One is sorely tempted to adopt לְבָקָר with Syriac and LXX<sup>BA</sup> and see a time description as we have with דָּ-לִילָה in v.14 (cf. 1 Chr 9.27; 16.40; 2 Chr 2.3).

<sup>80</sup>Welch suggested, wrongly, that these "brethern"  
are either the worshippers in v.5 or the priests in  
vv.10ff (Welch, The Work of the Chronicler, 140).



## Notes to Chapter VI

<sup>1</sup>De Vaux has convincingly argued that the Davidic kings were understood to be Yahweh's vassals (R. de Vaux, "The King of Israel, Vassal of Yahweh," The Bible and the Ancient Near East [London: Darton, Longman, & Todd, 1972], 152-166. P. Calderone has also shown that the dynastic oracle, 2 Sam 7.8-16, is comprised of elements common to suzerainty treaties in the Ancient Near East. The members of the Davidic dynasty are Yahweh's vassals in perpetuity (P. Calderone, Dynastic Oracle and Suzerainty Treaty [Manila: Loyola House of Studies, 1966]).

## ABBREVIATIONS

AB	<u>The Anchor Bible</u>
ABR	<u>Australian Biblical Review</u>
AfO	<u>Archiv für Orientforschung</u>
AJSL	<u>American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures</u>
ANVAO	<u>Avhandlingar utgitt av det Norske Videnskaps- Akademi i Oslo</u>
ARM	<u>Archives royales de Mari</u>
ASR	<u>American Sociological Review</u>
ATD	<u>Das Alte Testament Deutsch</u>
BA	<u>The Biblical Archaeologist</u>
BASOR	<u>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</u>
BDB	<u>F. Brown, S.R. Driver, and C. Briggs, A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament with an Appendix containing the Biblical Aramaic</u>
BH	Biblical Hebrew
Bib	<u>Biblica</u>
BK	<u>Biblischer Kommentar</u>
BWANT	<u>Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament</u>
BZ	<u>Biblische Zeitschrift</u>
BZAW	<u>Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</u>
BZNW	<u>Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</u>
CBQ	<u>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</u>

CTA	<u>Corpus des tablettes en cunéiformes alphabétiques découvertes à Ras Shamra-Ugarit de 1929 à 1939</u>
EB	<u>Études Bibliques</u>
EQ	<u>The Evangelical Quarterly</u>
EThL	<u>Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses</u>
EvTh	<u>Evangelische Theologie</u>
FRLANT	<u>Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments</u>
GK	W. Gesenius and E. Kautzsch, <u>Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar</u>
HAT	<u>Handbuch zum Alten Testament</u>
HThR	<u>Harvard Theological Review</u>
HUCA	<u>Hebrew Union College Annual</u>
IB	<u>The Interpreter's Bible</u>
ICC	<u>The International Critical Commentary</u>
IDB	<u>The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible</u>
JAAR	<u>Journal of the American Academy of Religion</u>
JAOS	<u>Journal of the American Oriental Society</u>
JBL	<u>Journal of Biblical Literature</u>
JE	<u>The Jewish Encyclopaedia</u>
JNES	<u>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</u>
JTC	<u>Journal for Theology and the Church</u>
KAI	H. Donner and W. Röllig, <u>Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften</u>
KAT	<u>Kommentar zum Alten Testament</u>
KB	L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, eds., <u>Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros</u>
KHC	<u>Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament</u>

LXX	Septuagint: A. Brooks and N. McLean, eds., <u>The Old Testament in Greek; J. Ziegler, ed., Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum</u>
MT	Massoretic Text: R. Kittel, ed., <u>Biblia Hebraica</u>
NovTest	<u>Novum Testamentum</u>
Or	<u>Orientalia</u>
PEQ	<u>Palestine Exploration Quarterly</u>
RB	<u>Revue Biblique</u>
RSV	Revised Standard Version
S	Syriac
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SCM	Student Christian Movement
T	Targum
ThExH	<u>Theologische Existenz Heute</u>
ThLZ	<u>Theologische Literaturzeitung</u>
ThR	<u>Theologische Rundschau</u>
ThStKr	<u>Theologische Studien und Kritiken</u>
V	Vulgate
VT	<u>Vetus Testamentum</u>
WMANT	<u>Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament</u>
WissZeitM LutherUniv	<u>Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Martin-Luther- Universität, Halle-Wittenberg</u>
ZA	<u>Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und vorderasiatischen Archäologie</u>
ZAW	<u>Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</u>
ZDPV	<u>Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins</u>

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ackroyd, P. Exile and Restoration: A Study of Hebrew Thought in the Sixth Century B. C. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1968.
- Albright, W. F. The Biblical Period from Abraham to Ezra. New York: Harper and Row, 1963.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Chronology of the Divided Monarchy in Israel," BASOR 100 (1945), 16-22.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Date and Personality of the Chronicler," JBL 40 (1921), 104-124.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "King Jojachin in Exile," BA 5 (1942), 49-55.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Proto-Sinaitic Inscriptions and their Decipherment. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Samuel and the Beginnings of the Prophetic Movement. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1961.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Seal of Eliakim and the Latest Pre-Exilic History of Judah, with Some Observations on Ezekiel," JBL 51 (1932), 77-106.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan. Garden City: Doubleday, 1968.
- Andersen, F. I. "Who Built the Second Temple?" ABR 6 (1958), 1-35.
- Baltzer, Dieter. Ezechiel und Deuteronesaja. Berührungen in der Heilserwartung der beiden grossen Exilspropheten. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1971.
- Baltzer, K. "Considerations Regarding the Office and Calling of the Prophet," HThR 61 (1968), 567-581.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Das Ende des Staates Juda und die Messias-Frage," in Studien zur Theologie des alttestamentlichen Überlieferungen, ed. by R. Rendtorff. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 1961, 34-43.

- Le Bas, E. E. "Zechariah's Climax to the Carcer of the Corner Stone," PEQ 83 (1951), 139-155.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Zechariah's Enigmatical Contribution to the Corner Stone," PEQ 82 (1950), 102-122.
- Baumgartner, W. "Untersuchungen zu den akkadischen Bauausdrücken," ZA 36 (1925), 29-40, 123-38, 219-253.
- Beasley-Murray, G. R. "The Two Messiahs in the Treatment of the Twelve Patriarchs," JTSZ 48 (1947), 1-12.
- Begrich, J. "Das priesterliche Heilsorakel," ZAW 52 (1943), 81-92.
- Bentzen, A. "Priesterschaft und Laien in der jüdischen Gemeinde des Fünften Jahrhunderts," AFO 6 (1930/31), 280-286.
- Benzinger, I. Die Bücher der Chronik. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1901.
- Berger, P. "Charisma and Religious Innovation; the Social Location of Israelite Prophecy," ASR 28 (1963), 940-950.
- Beuken, W. A. M. Haggai-Sacharja 1-8. Studien zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der frühnachexilischen Prophetie. Assen: von Gorcum, 1967.
- Beyse, Karl-Martin. Serubbabel und die Königserwartungen der Propheten Haggai und Sacharja. Eine historische und traditions-geschichtliche Untersuchung. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1972.
- Bič, M. Die Nachtgesichte des Sacharja. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 1964.
- Bloomhardt, P. F. "The Poems of Haggai," HUGA 5 (1928), 153-195.
- Böhmer, J. "תְּלָא und אֲרִוּי bei Ezechiel," ThStKr 73 (1900), 112-117.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Sind einige Personennamen I Chr 25.4 'Künstlich geschaffen'?" BZ 22 (1934), 93-100.
- Bowman, J. "Prophets and Prophecy in Talmud and Midrash," EQ 22 (1950), 107-114, 205-220, 255-275.
- Bright, John. Jeremiah. Garden City: Doubleday, 1965.

- Brown, R. E. "The Messianism of Qumran," CBQ 19 (1957), 53-82.
- Brownlee, W. H. "The Aftermath of the Fall of Judah according to Ezekiel," JBL 89 (1970), 393-404.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Ezekiel's Poetic Indictment of the Shepherds," HThR 51 (1958), 191-203.
- Brunet, A-M. "La théologie du Chroniste théocratie et messianisme," Sacra Pagina I. Gembloux: Editions J. Duculot, 1959, 384-397.
- Burrows, M. "Prophecy and Prophets at Qumran," in Israel's Prophetic Heritage, ed. by B. Anderson. London: SCM Press, 1962, 223-232.
- Calderone, P. J. Dynastic Oracle and Suzerainty Treaty. Manila: Faculty of Loyola House of Studies, 1966.
- Cannon, W. "Isaiah 61.1-3 as Ebed-Jahweh Poem," ZAW 60 (1929), 284-288.
- Childs, B. S. Memory and Tradition in Israel. London: SCM Press, 1962.
- Cook, S. A. "The Age of Zerubbabel," in Studies in Old Testament Prophecy, ed. by H. H. Rowley. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1946, 19-36.
- Cooke, G. A. A Text-Book of North-Semitic Inscriptions. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1903.
- Cowley, A. Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B. C. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923.
- Cross, F. "The Council of Yahweh in Second Isaiah," JNES 12 (1953), 274-277.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Divine Warrior in Israel's Early Cult," in Biblical Motifs: Origins and Transformations, ed. by A. Altmann. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966, 11-30.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "New Directions in the Study of Apocalyptic," in Journal for Theology and the Church: Apocalypticism, VI, ed. by R. Funk. New York: Herder and Herder, 1969, 157-165.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Priestly Tabernacle," in The Biblical Archaeologist Reader, I, ed. by G. E. Wright and D. N. Freedman. Garden City: Doubleday (Anchor), 1961, 201-228.
- \_\_\_\_\_. and D. Freedman. "The Blessing of Moses," JBL 67 (1948), 191-210.

- Curtis, E. L. and A. A. Madsen. The Books of Chronicles. New York: Charles Scribner's, 1910.
- Davies, P. E. "Jesus and the Role of the Prophet," JBL 64 (1945), 214-254.
- Delcor, M. "Un problème de critique textuelle et d'exégèse: Zacharie 12.10, et aspiciant ad me quem confixerunt," RB 58 (1951), 189-199.
- Donner, H. Israel unter den Völkern. Die Stellung der klassischen Propheten des Achten Jahrhunderts v. Chr. zur Aussenpolitik der Könige von Israel und Juda. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1964.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and W. Röllig. Kanaanaische und aramaische Inschriften. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, (I) 1966, (II) 1968.
- Dossin, G. "Sur le prophétisme à Mari," in La Divination en Mésopotamie ancienne et dans les régions voisines. Paris: Presses Université de France, 1966, 77-86.
- Duhm, B. Das Buch Jesaja. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1968.
- Dürr, L. Ursprung und Ausbau der israelitisch-jüdischen Heilsanderserwartung. Ein Beitrag zur Theologie des Alten Testaments. Berlin: Schwetschke, 1925.
- Ehrlich, A. B. Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel. Vol. I-VII. Hildesheim: Olms, 1968.
- Eichrodt, W. Ezekiel: A Commentary. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1970.
- Eissfeldt, O. The Old Testament: An Introduction. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Promises of Grace to David in Isaiah 55:1-5," in Israel's Prophetic Heritage, ed. by B. Anderson. New York: Harper and Row, 1962, 196-207.
- Eliade, M. Shamanism, Archaic Techniques of Ecstasy. New York: Pantheon, 1964.
- Elliger, K. Das Buch der zwölf kleinen Propheten. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1950.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Deuterjesaja in seinem Verhältnis zu Tritojesaja. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1933.
- Ellis, R. Foundation Deposits in Ancient Mesopotamia. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968.



- Fascher, E. ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ, eine sprach- und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung. Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1927.
- Field, F. Origenis Hexaplorum. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1964.
- Fitzmeyer, J. The Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefire. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1967.
- Fohrer, G. Ezechiel. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1955.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Neure Literatur zur alttestamentlichen Prophetie, 1. Teil: Literatur von 1932-1939," ThR 19 (1951), 277-346.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Neure Literatur zur alttestamentlichen Prophetie, 2. Teil: Literatur von 1940-1950," ThR 20 (1952), 192-271, 295-361.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Zehn Jahre Literatur zur alttestamentlichen Prophetie (1951-1960)," ThR 28 (1962), 1-75, 235-297, 301-374.
- Freedman, D. N. "The Chronicler's Purpose," CBQ 23 (1961), 436-442.
- Galling, K. Die Bücher der Chronik, Esra, Nehemia. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1954.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Serubbabel und der Wiederaufbau des Tempels in Jerusalem," in Verbannung und Heimkehr, ed. by A. Kuschke, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1961.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Studien zur Geschichte Israels in persischen Zeitalter. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1964.
- Gelman, H. S. "Some Types of Errors of Transmission in the LXX," VI 3 (1953), 399-400.
- Gelston, A. "The Foundations of the Second Temple," VI 16 (1966), 232-235.
- Gemser, B. De Beteekenis der Persoonsnamen voor onze Kennis van Het Leven en Denken der oude Babyloniërs en Assyriërs. Wageningen: H. Veenman en Zonen, 1924.
- Gese, H. "Zur Geschichte der Kultsänger am zweiten Tempel," in Abraham unser Vater: Juden und Christen im Gespräch über die Bibel, ed. by O. Betz. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963, 222-234.

- Der Verfassungsentwurf des Ezechiel (Kap 40-48) traditionsgeschichtlich untersucht. Tübingen: J. G. B. Mohr, 1957.
- Giblet, J. "Prophétisme et attente d'un Messie-prophète dans le Judaïsme," in L'Attente du Messie, ed. by L. Cerfaux. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1954, 85-130.
- Giesebrecht, F. Das Buch Jeremia. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1907.
- Ginsberg, H. L. "A Ugaritic Parallel to 2 Sam 1.21," JBL 57 (1938), 209-213.
- Glatzer, N. N. "A Study of the Talmudic Interpretation of Prophecy," The Review of Religion 10 (1946), 115-137.
- Goldammer, K. Die Formenwelt des Religiösen. Grundriss der systematischen Religionswissenschaft. Stuttgart: Alfred Kroner, 1960.
- Guariglia, G. Prophetismus und Heilserwartungs--Bewegungen als völkerkundliches und religionsgeschichtliches Problem. Wien: Ferdinand Berger, 1959.
- Guillaume, A. Prophecy and Divination among the Hebrews and other Semites. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1938.
- Gunkel, H. and J. Begrich. Einleitung in die Psalmen. Die Gattung der religiösen Lyrik Israels. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1933.
- Guy, H. A. New Testament Prophecy. Its Origin and Significance. London: The Epworth Press, 1947.
- Haag, H. "Gad and Nathan," in Archäologie und Altes Testament, ed. by A. Kuschke. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1970, 135-143.
- Habel, N. "The Form and Significance of the Call Narratives," ZAW 77 (1965), 297-323.
- Hahn, F. Christologische Hoheitstitel: Ihre Geschichte im frühen Christentum. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1963.
- Haldar, A. Associations of Cult Prophets among the Ancient Semites. Uppsala: Almqvist och Wiksells, 1945.
- Hammershaimb, E. Some Aspects of Old Testament Prophecy from Isaiah to Malachi. Aarhus: Rosenkilde og Bagger, 1966.

- Hänel, J. "Das Recht des Opferschlachtens in der chronistischen Literatur," ZAW 55 (1937), 46-67.
- Hanhart, R. "Drei Studien zum Judentum: II, Zur Geschichtlichen Bestimmung des Judentums," ThExH 140 (1967), 23-37.
- Hanson, P. "Jewish Apocalypticism against its Near Eastern Environment," RB 78 (1971), 31-58.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Song of Heshbon and David's NĪR," HThR 61 (1968), 297-320.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Studies in the Origins of Jewish Apocalyptic. Dissertation, Harvard, 1969.
- Haran, M. "The Use of Incense in the Ancient Israelite Ritual," VT 10 (1960), 113-129.
- Haupt, P. "The Coronation of Zerubbabel," JBL 37 (1918), 209-218.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Inauguration of the Second Temple," JBL 33 (1914), 161-169.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Die Psalmenverse in I Chr 25.4," ZAW 34 (1914), 142-145.
- Hayes, J. H. "The Usage of Oracles against Foreign Nations in Ancient Israel," JBL 87 (1968), 81-92.
- Heiler, F. Erscheinungsformen und Wesen der Religion. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1961.
- Henry, M-L. Prophet und Tradition: Versuch einer Problemstellung. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1969.
- Herdner, Andr. Corpus des Tablettes en cunéiformes Alphabétiques. Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1963.
- Hermann, S. "Prophetie in Israel und Ägypten. Recht und Grenze eines Vergleichs," VT Supp #9: Bonn Congress Volume, ed. by P. A. H. de Boer. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963, 47-65.
- Heschel, A. The Prophets. New York: Harper and Row, 1962.
- Higgins, A. R. "Jewish Messianic Belief in Justin Martyr's 'Dialogue with Trypho'," Nov Test 9 (1967), 298-305.

- Hoftizer, J. "A propos d'une interpretation recent de deux passages difficiles: Zech 12.11 et Zech 11.13," VT 3 (1953), 407-409.
- Holladay, J. S. "Assyrian Statecraft and the Prophet of Israel," H Th R 63 (1970), 29-51.
- Hölscher, G. Die Profeten. Untersuchungen zur Religionsgeschichte Israels. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1914.
- Honeyman, A. M. "The Evidence for Regnal Names among the Hebrews," JBL 67 (1948), 13-25.
- Horst, F. "Exilsgemeinde und Jerusalem in Ez 8-11," VT 3 (1953), 337ff.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Die zwölf kleinen Propheten. Nahum bis Maleachi. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1954.
- Humbert, P. "Die Herausforderungsformel 'hinnenf éléká'," ZAW 10 (1933), 101-108.
- Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible, The. Ed. by G. A. Buttrick. New York: Abingdon, 1962.
- Jacobsen, T. "Primitive Democracy in Ancient Mesopotamia," in Toward the Image of Tammuz, ed. by W. Moran. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970, 157-170.
- Jansma, T. Inquiry into the Hebrew Text and Ancient Versions of Zechariah 9-14. Leiden; E. J. Brill, 1949.
- Janssen, E. Juda in der Exilszeit. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1956.
- Jaspers, K. "The Axial Age of Human History," in Identity and Anxiety: Survival of the Person in Mass Society, ed. by M. Stein. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1960, 597-605.
- Jepsen, A. Nabi; Soziologische Studien zur alttestamentlichen Literatur und Religionsgeschichte. Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1934.
- Jeremias, J. Kultprophetie und Gerichtsverkündung in der späten Königszeit. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 1970.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Theophanie: Die Geschichte einer alttestamentlichen Gattung. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 1965.
- Johnson, A. The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1962.

- Kaiser, O. Der Königliche Knecht. Eine traditions-  
geschichtlich-exegetische Studie über die Ebed-  
Jahwe-Lieder bei Deuterojesaja. Göttingen:  
Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1959.
- Kapelrud, A. Joel Studies. Uppsala: Almqvist ett Wiksells,  
1948.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Temple Building, A Task for Gods and Kings,"  
Or 32 (1963), 56-62..
- Kaufman, S. "Ši'gabbar, Priest of Sahr in Nerab," JAOS  
90 (1970), 270-272.
- Kessler, W. "Studien zur religiösen Situation im ersten  
nachexilischen Jahrhundert und zur Auslegung von  
Jesaja," Wiss Zeit M Luther Univ 6 (1956-57),  
41-73.
- Kellermann, U. Nehemia. Quellen, Überlieferung und Geschichte  
Zur Auseinandersetzung zwischen zionistisch-messian-  
ischem und theokratischen Israel. Berlin: A.  
Töpelmann, 1967.
- Kittel, R. Die Bücher der Chronik. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck  
und Ruprecht, 1902.
- Klamroth, E. Die jüdischen Exulanten in Babylonien.  
Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1912.
- Klausner, J. The Messianic Idea in Israel. New York:  
Macmillan, 1955.
- Köberle, J. Die Tempelsänger im Alttestament. Ein Versuch  
zur israelitischen und jüdischen Cultusgeschichte.  
Erlangen: Verlag Fr. Junge, 1899.
- Kraus, H. Worship in Israel. Richmond: John Knox Press,  
1966.
- Kröger, P. "Die Würdigung der Propheten im Spätjudentum,"  
in Neutestamentliche Studien. Leipzig: J. Hinrichs'-  
sche Buchhandlung, 1914, 1-112.
- Lamarche, P. Zacharie 9-14. Structure litteraire et  
messianisme. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1961.
- Lance, H. D. "The Royal Stamps and the Kingdom of Judah,"  
HTHR 64 (1971), 315-332.
- Lanczkowski, G. "Ägyptischer Prophetismus im Lichte der  
Alttestament," ZAW 70 (1958), 31-38.

- \_\_\_\_\_. Altägyptischer Prophetismus. Wiesbaden: O. Harrassowitz, 1960.
- Lapp, P. "Late Royal Seals from Judah," BASOR 158 (1960), 11-22.
- Lindblom, J. Prophecy in Ancient Israel. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1962.
- Lohfink, N. "Die deuteronomistische Darstellung des Übergangs der Führung Israels von Moses auf Josue," Scholastik 37 (1962), 32-44.
- Lutz, H-M. Jahwe, Jerusalem und die Völker. Zur Vorgeschichte von Sach 12,1-8 und 14,1-5. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 1968.
- Lys, D. Rûach. Le Souffle dans l'Ancien Testament. Enquête anthropologique a travers l'histoire théologique d'Israel. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1962.
- McCarthy, D. J. "An Installation Genre?" JBL 90 (1971), 31-41.
- McCown, C. C. Tell en Nasbeh. Archaeological and Historical Results. Berkeley: Palestine Institute of Pacific School of Religion and The American Schools of Oriental Research, 1947.
- McKenzie, J. L. Second Isaiah. Garden City: Doubleday, 1968..
- Malamat, A. "Jeremiah and the last two Kings of Judah," PEQ 83 (1951), 81-87.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Last Wars of the Kingdom of Judah," JNES 9 (1950), 218-227.
- May, H. G. "The Fertility Cult in Hosea," AJSL 48 (1931), 73-88.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Three Hebrew Seals and the Status of Exiled Jehoiakim," AJSL 56 (1939), 146-148.
- Meeks, W. The Prophet-King. Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967.
- Mendenhall, G. H. "Election," IDB Vol II, 76-82.
- Meyer, E. Die Entstehung des Judentum. Eine Historische Untersuchung. Halle: M. Niemeyer, 1896.

- Michel, D. "Zur Eigenart Tritojesajas," Theologia Viatorum 10 (1965-66), 213-230.
- Michel, O. "Spätjüdisches Prophetentum," in Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann. Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1954.
- Miller, J. W. Das Verhältnis Jeremias und Hesekiels sprachlich und theologisch untersucht mit besondere Berücksichtigung der Prosareden Jeremias, Assen: Royal Van Gorcum, 1955.
- Mitchell, H. G., et al. Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, and Jonah. New York: Charles Scribners, 1912.
- Möhlenbrink, K. "Die levitischen Überlieferungen des Alttestament," ZAW 52 (1934), 184-231.
- Moran, W. "New Evidence from Mari on the History of Prophecy," Biblica 50 (1969), 15-56.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Note on the Treaty Terminology of the Sefire Stelas," JNES 22 (1963), 173-176.
- Mowinckel, S. Psalmstudien. III--Kultprophetie und prophetische Psalmen. Amsterdam: P. Schippers, 1961.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "'The Spirit' and 'the Word' in the Pre-Exilic Reforming Prophets," JBL 53 (1934), 199-227.
- Muilenburg, J. "The Book of Isaiah, Chapters 40-66," in IB Vol 5. New York: Abingdon, 1956.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The 'Office' of the Prophet in Ancient Israel," in The Bible in Modern Scholarship, ed. by J. P. Hyall. New York: Abingdon, 1969, 74-97.
- Munch, P. A. The Expression bajjôm hāhū. Is it an Eschatological terminus technicus? Oslo: I Kommissjon Hus Jacob Dybwad, 1936.
- Myers, J. Chronicles (2 Vols). Garden City: Doubleday, 1965.
- Neil, W. "Haggai," IDB Vol II. 509-511.
- Newman, M. "The Prophetic Call of Samuel," in Israel's Prophetic Heritage, ed. by B. Anderson. New York: Harpers, 1962.
- Nicholson, E. W. Deuteronomy and Tradition. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1967.

- \_\_\_\_\_. Preaching to the Exiles. London: Blackwell, 1970.
- Noordtzijs, A. "Les intentions du Chroniste," RB 21 (1940), 161-168.
- North, C. R. The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah. London: Oxford University Press, 1948.
- Noth, M. Die israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der gemeinsemitischen Namengebung. Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 1928.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Jerusalem Catastrophe of 587 and its Significance for Israel," in The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Studies. London: Oliver and Boyd, 1960, 260-280.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Eine palastinische Lokalüberlieferung in 2 Chr 20," ZDPV 67 (1945), 45-71.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Das System der zwölf Stämme Israels. Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 1930.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien. Die sammelnden und bearbeitenden Geschichtswerke im Alten Testament. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1967.
- Nowack, W. Die kleinen Propheten. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1922.
- Otzen, B. Studien über Deuterosecharja. Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1964.
- Paul, S. "Literary and Ideological Echoes of Jeremiah in Deutero-Isaiah," in Proceedings of the Fifth World Congress of Jewish Studies. Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1972, 102-120.
- Petitjean, A. "La Mission de Zorobabel et la Reconstruction du Temple, Zech 3.8-10," ETHL 42 (1966), 40-71.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Les oracles du proto-Zacharie. Un Programme de restauration pour la communauté juive après l'exil. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1969.
- Pfeiffer, R. H. "Canon of the Old Testament," IDB Vol I, 498-520.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Die Disputationsworte im Buche Malachi," EvTh 19 (1959), 546-568.



- Plöger, O. "Prophetisches Erbe im den Sekten des frühen Judentums," ThLZ 79 (1954), 291-296.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Reden und Gebete im deuteronomistischen und chronistischen Geschichtswerk," in Aus der Spätzeit des Alten Testaments. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1971, 50-66.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Theocracy and Eschatology. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1968.
- Porten, B. Archives from Elephantine: The Life of an Ancient Jewish Military Colony. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968.
- Porteous, N. W. "Prophecy," in Record and Revelation. Essays on the Old Testament by Members of the Society for Old Testament Study, ed. by H. W. Robinson. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938, 216-249.
- Power, E. "The Shepherd's two Rods in modern Palestine and in some Passages of the Old Testament," Bib 9 (1928), 434-442.
- Procksch, O. "Fürst und Priester bei Hesekiel," ZAW 17 (1940/41), 99-133.
- von Rad, G. Das Geschichtsbild des chronistischen Werkes. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1930.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Der Heilige Krieg im alten Israel. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1969.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Levitical Sermon in I and II Chronicles," in The Problem of the Hexateuch and other Essays. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966, 267-280.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Old Testament Theology. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, (I) 1962, (II) 1965.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Origin of the Day of the Lord," JSS 4 (1959), 97-108.
- Rehm, M. Der königliche Messias im Lichte der Immanuel-Weissagungen des Buches Jesaja. Kevelaer: Butzon und Bercker, 1968.
- Rignell, L. G. Die Nachtgesichte des Sacharja. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1950.
- Ringgren, H. "König und Messias," ZAW 23 (1952), 120-147.

Robinson, T. H. "Neuere Propheten Forschung," ThR  
3 (1931), 15-103.

\_\_\_\_\_. Die zwölf kleinen Propheten. Hosea bis Micha.  
Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1954.

Rohland, E. Die Bedeutung der Erwählungstraditionen  
Israels für die Eschatologie der alttestamentlichen  
Propheten. Dissertation, Heidelberg, 1956.

Rosenthal, F. A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic. Wiesbaden:  
Otto Harrassowitz, 1963.

Ross, J. F. "Prophecy in Hamath, Israel and Mari," HThR  
63 (1970), 1-28.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Prophet as Yahweh's Messenger," in Israel's  
Prophetic Heritage, ed. by B. W. Anderson. London:  
SCM Press, 1962, 98-107.

Rössler, D. Gesetzt und Geschichte. Untersuchungen zur  
Theologie der jüdischen Apokalyptik und der phari-  
saischen Orthodoxie. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner  
Verlag, 1960.

Rost, L. "Erwägungen zum israelitischen Brandopfer," in  
Von Ugarit nach Qumran, ed. by J. Hempel. Berlin:  
A. Töpelmann, 1961, 177-183.

Rothstein, J. W. Die Genealogie des Königs Jojachin und  
seiner Nachkommen (I Chr 3,17-24) in geschichtlicher  
Beleuchtung. Berlin: Reuther und Reichard, 1902.

\_\_\_\_\_. Juden und Samaritaner. Die grundlegende Scheid-  
ung von Judentum und Heidentum. Eine kritische  
Studie zum Buche Haggai und zur jüdischen Geschichte  
im ersten nachexilischen Jahrhundert. Leipzig:  
J. C. Hinrichs, 1908.

\_\_\_\_\_ and Ha Hänel. Kommentar zum ersten Buch der Chronik.  
Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1927.

Rowley, H. H. Prophecy and Religion in Ancient China and  
Israel. London: University of London, The Athlone  
Press, 1956.

Rudolph, W. Chronikbücher. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1955.

\_\_\_\_\_. Jeremia. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1968.

\_\_\_\_\_. Joel-Amos-Obadja-Jona. Güttersloh: Gerd Mohn,  
1971.

- Saebø, M. Sacharja 9-14. Untersuchungen von Text und Form. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 1969.
- Sauer, G. "Serubbabel in der Sicht Haggai und Sacharjas," in Das Ferne und Nahe Wort, ed. by F. Masss. Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1967, 199-207.
- Schaeder, H. H. Studien zur Orientalischen Religionsgeschichte. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1968.
- Schnackenburg, R. "Die Erwartung des 'Propheten' nach dem Neuen Testament und den Qumran Texten," in Studia Evangelica. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1959, 622-639.
- Schottroff, W. 'Gedanken' im Alten Orient und im Alten Testaments: Die Wurzel zakar im semitischen Sprachkreis. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 1964.
- Sekine, M. "Davidsbund und Sinaibund bei Jeremia," VT 9 (1959), 47-57.
- Seligsohn, M. "Seder 'Olam Zuta," in The Jewish Encyclopedia, ed. by I. Singer. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1905, 149-150.
- Sellin, E. "Noch einmal der Stein des Sacharja," ZAW 59 (1942/43), 59-77.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Der Stein des Sacharja," JBL 50 (1931), 242-249.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Das Zwölfprophetenbuch übersetzt und erklärt. (2 Vols) Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1929, 1930.
- Shepherd, M. "Prophet in the New Testament," IDB Vol 3, 919-920.
- Siebeneck, R. T. "The Messianism of Aggeus and Proto-Zacharias," CBQ 19 (1957), 312-328.
- Smith, J. M. P. et al. Micah, Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Obadiah, and Joel. New York: Charles Scribner's, 1911.
- Smith, M. "Historical Method in the Study of Religion," in On Methods in the History of Religions, ed. by J. S. Helfer. Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press, 1968, 8-16.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Palestinian Parties and Politics that Shaped the Old Testament. New York: Columbia, 1971.

- Speiser, E. A. "The Background and Function of the Biblical Nasi," CBQ 25 (1963), 111-117.
- Starcky, J. "Un texte messianique araméen de la grotte 4 de Qumran," in Ecole des langues orientales anciennes de l'institut Catholique de Paris: Méorial du cinquanteaire 1914-1964. Paris: Bloud et Gay, 1964, 51-66.
- Steck, O. H. Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten: Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbildes im Alten Testament, Spätjudentum und Urchristentum. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 1967.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Das Problem theologischer Strömungen in nach-exilischer Zeit," EvTh 28 (1968), 445-458.
- Stevenson, W. B. "Hebrew 'oPah and zebach Sacrifices," in Festschrift für Alfred Bertholet, ed. by W. Baumgartner. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1950, 488-497.
- Swetnam, J. "Some Observations on the Background of פְּטָרָה in Jeremiah 23.5a," Bib 46 (1965), 29-40.
- Szikszai, S. An Investigation of the Relationship of the King and Prophet at the Rise of the Israelite Monarchy. Dissertation, Union Theological Seminary, 1954.
- Teeple, H. M. The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet. Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1957.
- Thrall, W. and A. Hibbard. A Handbook to Literature. New York: Odyssey Press, 1960.
- Torczyner, H. "A Psalm by the Sons of Heman, I Chr 25.4," JBL 68 (1949), 247-249.
- Torrey, C. C. Esra Studies. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1910.
- Tufnell, O. Lachish. Vol 4. London: Oxford University Press, 1958.
- Tuland, C. G. "'Uššayā' and 'Uššarnā': A Clarification of Terms, Date and Text," JNES 17 (1958), 269-275.
- Tushingham, A. D. "A Royal Israelite Seal (?) and the Royal Jar Handle Stamps," BASOR 200 (1970), 23-35.
- de Vaux, R. Ancient Israel: Social and Religious Institutions. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The King of Israel, Vassal of Yahweh," in The Bible and the Ancient Near East. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1972, 152-166.

- Vermes, G. The Dead Sea Scrolls in English. Baltimore: Pinguin, 1962.
- Volz, P. Der Geist Gottes und die verwandten Erscheinungen im Alten Testament und im anschliessenden Judentum. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1910.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Jesaja II. Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche, 1932.
- Wanke, G. Die Zionstheologie der Korachiten in ihrem traditions-geschichtlichen Zusammenhang. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1966.
- Weber, M. The Sociology of Religion. Boston: Beacon, 1963.
- Weidner, E. F. "Jojachin, König von Juda, in babylonischen Keilschrifttexten," Bibliothèque Archéologique et Historique 30 (1935), 923-935.
- Weiser, A. Das Buch des propheten Jeremia. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1952-55.
- Welch, A. C. The Work of the Chronicler: its Purpose and Date. London: Oxford University Press, 1939.
- Wellhausen, J. Die kleinen Propheten. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1963.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel. New York: World Publishing Company (Meridian), 1957.
- Welten, P. Literatur und Geschichte in den Chronikbüchern, II Chr 10-36. Habilitationsschrift, Tübingen, 1971..
- Westermann, C. Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1967.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Isaiah 40-66. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969.
- Willi, T. Die Chronik als Auslegung. Untersuchungen zur literarischen Gestaltung der historischen Überlieferung Israels. Dissertation, Tübingen, 1970.
- Willi-Plain, I.. Vorformen der Schriftexegese innerhalb des Alten Testaments. Untersuchungen zum literarischen Werden der auf Amos, Hosea, und Micha zurückgehenden Bücher im hebräischen Zwölfprophetenbuch. Dissertation, Tübingen, 1970.
- Williams, J. G. "The Social Location of Israelite Prophecy," JAAR 37 (1969), 153-165.

- Williams, R. Hebrew Syntax. An Outline. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967.
- Wiseman, D. J. Chronicles of Chaldean Kings in the British Museum. London: British Museum, 1956.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Vassal Treaties of Esarhaddon," London: The British School of Archaeology in Iraq, 1958.
- Wolff, H.. Dodekapropheten 5, Joel. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 1963.
- Wright, G. E. "The Lawsuit of God: A Form-Critical Study of Deuteronomy 32," in Israel's Prophetic Heritage, ed. by B. Anderson. New York: Harper, 1962, 26-67.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Nations in Hebrew Prophecy," Encounter 26 (1965), 225-237.
- Young, F. W. "Jesus the Prophet: A Re-examination," JBL 58 (1949), 285-299.
- Zenger, E. "Die deuteronomistische Interpretation der Rehabilitierung Jojachins," BZ 12 (1968), 16-30.
- Zimmerli, W. Ezechiel. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 1969.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Israel im Buche Ezechiel," VT 8 (1958), 75-90.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Special Form- and Traditio-historical Character of Ezekiel's Prophecy," VT 15 (1965), 515-527.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Zur Sprache Tritojesajas," Schweizer Theologische Umschau 20 (1950), 110-122.