

The Non-mention of Amos, Hosea and Micah
in the Deuteronomistic History

Christopher Begg - Washington, D.C.

Introduction

Fifteen years ago in the second von RAD Festschrift, F. CRÜSEMANN called attention, once again, to a curious fact, i.e. the Deuteronomistic History (hereafter Dtr), despite its obvious interest in prophets and prophecy, nowhere, Isaiah excepted, mentions the "classical prophets"¹. He goes on to note: "Diese Tatsache hat in den Diskussionen um das dtrG bis jetzt eine erstaunlich geringe Rolle gespielt"². CRÜSEMANN further affirms:

Die dahinterstehenden Gründe sind sicher vielschichtig, und so wenig eine Einheit wie die 'Schriftprophetie'. Sie aufzuhellen ist für eine Verhältnisbestimmung der dtr Theologie zur Prophetie unerlässlich und damit für das Verständnis dieser Theologie³.

It would not be accurate to say that, in the ensuing decade and a half, scholarship has taken to heart CRÜSEMANN's just cited statements⁴. I know of only one subsequent study of the overall problematic raised by CRÜSEMANN. And its author, K. KOCH, CRÜSEMANN's remark about the "sicher vielschichtige dahinterstehende Gründe" notwithstanding, presents what is basically a "mono-

-
- 1 Kritik an Amos im deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk, Probleme biblischer Theologie (Fs G. von RAD; ed. H.W. WOLFF), München: Kaiser, 1971, 57-63, P. 57.
 - 2 Ibid., pp. 57-58.
 - 3 Ibid., p. 58, n. 10.
 - 4 One earlier author who did note the phenomenon is E. DAY; for him the non-mention of the various classical prophets in Kings provides confirmation of his view that the books attributed to them are rather late, post-Exilic, pseudonymous compositions. See his various articles: (with W.H. CHAPIN), Is the Book of Amos Post-Exilic?, AJSL 18 (1902) 65-93, pp. 68-69; The Search for the Prophets, The Monist 15 (1905) 386-397; Is the Book of Hosea Exilic?, AJSL 26 (1909-1910) 105-132, p. 108.

causal" explanation for the phenomenon⁵. Other authors who have interested themselves in the question recently have concentrated on the one particular case of the absence of Jeremiah from Dtr⁶.

The problem has then yet to receive the kind of comprehensive exploration called for by CRÜSEMANN. More particularly, subsequent scholars have not followed through on CRÜSEMANN'S suggestion that the case of each of the classical prophets should be considered for itself in terms of the question: what features to the words/ministry of this figure might help account for the Deuteronomist's non-mention of him? In view of this state of affairs, I wish in this paper to examine the case of three classical prophets conspicuously absent from Dtr, i.e. Amos, Hosea and Micah.

In selecting these particular prophets, I was influenced by several considerations. First, given both the temporal proximity of their ministries and the overall similarity of their respective messages as primarily words of doom for the nation and its leadership, findings with regard to the Deuteronomist's non-mention of one of the three might reasonably be expected to cast light also on the case of the other two. Secondly, as will emerge, the words of each of these prophets do contain elements which appear to cohere quite well with the purposes and theological emphases of the Deuteronomist⁷, a fact which makes his non-mention to them all the more a matter calling for explanation.

-
- 5 Das Profetenschweigen des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks, *Die Botschaft und die Boten* (Fs H.W. WOLFF, ed. J. JEREMIAS, L. PERLITT), Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1981, 115-128. For KOCH the Deuteronomist avoids mentioning the classical prophets primarily because, as announcers of irrevocable doom, they did not cohere with his own conception of the prophet as rather preacher of repentance.
- 6 K.-F. POHLMANN, *Erwägungen zum Schlusskapitel des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerkes. Oder: Warum wird der Prophet Jeremia in 2 Kön 22-25 nicht erwähnt?*, Textgemäß. Aufsätze und Beiträge zur Hermeneutik des Alten Testaments (Fs E. WÜRTHWEIN; ed. A.H.J. GUNNEWEG, O. KAISER), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979, 94-109, esp. pp. 107-109; C.T. BEGG, *A Bible Mystery: the Absence of Jeremiah in the Deuteronomistic History*, forthcoming in *Irish Biblical Studies*.
- 7 Throughout this paper I shall speak of the Deuteronomist in the singular. In contrast to many contemporary authors, I continue to view M. NOTHS' conception of a single main Exilic Deuteronomistic redaction of Deuteronomy-Kings as the most adequate one available. Recently, it has received powerful new support from H.-D. HOFFMANN, *Reform und Reformen. Untersuchungen zu einem Grundthema der deuteronomistischen Geschichtsschreibung* (ATANT 66), Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1980.

Finally, there is the widespread supposition in contemporary scholarship that the words of each of these prophets have undergone what might be called a "Deuteronomizing" redaction⁸. This supposition has, however, several significant implications. First, it militates against the most obvious explanation of the three prophets' absence in Dtr, i.e. the Deuteronomist was simply ignorant of them and their words⁹, since it entails that there were, in fact, some "Deuteronomists" who did know these figures. In addition, this suppositions of a Deuteronomistic circle, clearly related to that responsible for Dtr, which did find positive possibilities in these prophets' words, gives further urgency to the question why the particular Deuteronomist behind Dtr failed to make room for them. Thus in several respects, the problem of the non-mention of just these three prophets does seem worthy of particular consideration.

Prior to considering the case of each prophet in turn, however, I wish to make several preliminary remarks which may help place the subsequent presentation in context:

1) As indicated, our working hypothesis in this study is that the Deuteronomist omitted mention of our three prophets because he found objectionable or problematic for his wider purposes specific features of their words as known to him. This hypothesis takes on a certain antecedent probability in view of the procedure of other ancient Jewish writers. The Chronicler, e.g., certainly knew the Deuteronomist's account of the northern kings. Yet, in his rewriting of his source, he virtually bypasses this material. His doing so eloquently testifies to his conviction that the renegade Northern monarchy is simply unworthy of notice. Similarly, Jesus Sirach can hardly have been unaware of the achievements of Ezra. And yet, in the segment of his "Praise of the Fathers" where he cites the post-Exilic notables Zerubbabel, Joshua and Nehemiah (Sir 49,11-13), Ezra is conspicuously absent. The reason for this is a matter of dispute, but there can be little doubt that Ezra's

8 The major contemporary exponent of this view is H.W. WOLFF; see his commentaries on the three prophets' books in the *Biblischer Kommentar*. See also J. VERMEYLEN, *Du prophète Isaïe à l'apocalyptique*, t. II (EB), Paris: Gabalda, 1978, 519-601 who distinguishes a "Deuteronomistic" redaction in the books of Amos and Micah.

9 This was the explanation of the absence of the classical prophets in Dtr put forward by M. NOTH, see his *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1967, 97-98.

absence is due to a deliberate, ideologically motivated decision on the part of the author¹⁰. These examples make it a priori not inconceivable that also the Deuteronomist would have chosen to express his disapproval of particular past figures (in casu our three prophets), not by holding them up for condemnation (as he does e.g., with his "bad kings"), but simply by leaving them unmentioned.

2) A problem suggests itself here at the start of our investigation. It is widely held in modern scholarship that much of the material now found in the books attributed to the three prophets stems, not from those figures themselves, but from various later redactors working contemporaneously with, or even later than, the Exilic Deuteronomist. But given this supposition, what assurance do we have that those passages of the three prophet's books to which I shall point as causing difficulties for the Deuteronomist and so provoking him to leave their "authors" unmentioned did, in fact, constitute part of the collection of their words available to him? In the face of this difficulty, it is obviously not possible for me to work out here a personal analysis of the books in question, nor to date the strata that might be distinguished within them in relation to Dtr. What I can and will do, however, is to take a "minimalistic" starting point for my discussion, i.e. I abstract, in my argumentation, from those passages in the three books which are widely viewed as "inauthentic", e.g., the salvation oracles and the references to Judah in Amos and Hosea. Such a procedure offers some minimal assurance that those passages on which I shall base myself are the ones most likely to have been actually known to the Deuteronomist.

3) Beyond the specific content of particular words of the three prophets which will be considered below as a factor behind the Deuteronomist's non-mention of them, reference should be made here to several more general characteristics of their messages overall which could well have lessened the interest the Deuteronomist might otherwise have taken in them. First of all, it is striking how in the royal period of Israel's history, i.e. the period of the three prophets' ministry, as told by the Deuteronomist prophets are so consistently presented as addressing their words to kings; in Samuel and Kings the

10 On the question, see P. HÖFFKEN, Warum schwieg Jesus Sirach über Esra?, ZAW 87 (1975) 184-202.

king is the addressee for what the prophets have to say¹¹. The words of Amos, Hosea and Micah, on the other hand, while they do occasionally concern the king, are never directly addressed to him. Rather, their words are directed to the people as a whole or to a wider group within it. This divergence concerning the primary addressee of the prophetic word could well have militated against the Deuteronomist's incorporating our three prophets into his presentation. A second relevant general factor is the rather different focus to the presentation and evaluation of Israel's behavior which we find in Dtr and the three prophets, respectively. The Deuteronomist, in contrast to the core of the book of Deuteronomy itself, concerns himself almost exclusively with Israel's activity- whether good or bad- in the cultic sphere¹². In Amos and Micah (and to a lesser extent in Hosea), on the other hand, the emphasis is clearly on the doing of justice among persons¹³. Conversely, these prophets lack a positive interest in the cult; they condemn, not illegitimate cultic forms, but rather the cultic system as such in so far as it attempts to substitute or compensate for Israel's injustices, see e.g., Amos 5,21-27. Such a divergence would, however, surely have worked, from the start, against the Deuteronomist's utilization of these figures and their words¹⁴.

After the foregoing remarks, I now turn to a consideration of each of the three prophets. I begin with the case of Hosea whose absence from Dtr is the most noteworthy of the three.

-
- 11 This feature is in line with the predominant attention given to the kings as representatives of their people throughout the Deuteronomist's presentation of the royal period.
 - 12 This point may be supported by several observations: in 2 Kgs 23,4-25 the Deuteronomist relates Josiah's implementation of the cultic requirements of Deuteronomy. On the other hand, he has nothing to say about any attempt by Josiah to put into effect the humanitarian provisions which make up a significant portion of the Deuteronomic Code. Again, while by way of exception, the Deuteronomist does take up a story of economic and judicial oppression in the Naboth narrative of 1 Kgs 21,1-20, his own additions to that story in 21,21-29 focus, not on that point, but rather on the idolatry of Ahab and Jezebel.
 - 13 On this theme, see J.L. SICRE, "Con los pobres de la Tierra". La justicia social en los profetas de Israel, Madrid; Cristiandad, 1984.
 - 14 Note that while the Deuteronomist does introduce the figure of Isaiah into his work (see 2 Kgs 18,17-20,19), he makes no utilization of the "Amos-like" words of e.g., Is 1,10-20; 5,11-30; 10,1-4.

A. Hosea

In order to put Hosea's non-appearance in Dtr in perspective, I begin with several considerations which would lead one to expect mention of him by the Deuteronomist: The influence of Hosea on the book of Deuteronomy, the Deuteronomist's primary inspiration, has often been noted¹⁵. Moreover, in a whole series of points (anti-Baal and image polemic, reservation towards kingship, role of prophets), Hosea's emphases seem to converge with those of the Deuteronomist. In addition, citation of one or other of Hosea's words against the North would have enabled the Deuteronomist to construct one of his characteristic "fulfillment schemas"¹⁶ in connection with his account of the North's demise. Finally, we might recall the view of H.W. WOLFF for whom Hosea, the author of Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomist all pertained to a common religious movement¹⁷.

In view of all these considerations, how then can the Deuteronomist's non-mention of Hosea be explained? In answering this question, I would call particular attention to the elucidation given the name of Hosea's initial son in Hos 1,4:

... Call his name Jezreel; for yet a little while and I will punish the house of Jehu for the blood of Jezreel, and I will put an end to the kingdom of the house of Israel.

Yahweh's reference to the "house of Jehu" which is to be punished "for the blood of Jezreel" here is clearly an allusion to Jehu's acts of violence as known to us from 2 Kgs 9-10. Scholars disagree about which of Jehu's slaughters is being cited here as well as about the grounds for Hosea's objections to Jehu's bloodletting. What is clear, however, is the contrast between the disapproval manifested towards Jehu in Hos 1,4 and the stance adopted towards him throughout 2 Kgs 9-10 with its absence of any negative com-

15 See most recently H.-J. ZOBEL, Hosea und das Deuteronomium. Erwägungen eines Alttestamentlers zum Thema "Sprache und Theologie", ThLZ 110 (1985) 13-23.

16 On this feature in Dtr, see e.g., G. v. RAD, Studies in Deuteronomy (SBT 9), London: SCM, 1953 74-91 and W. DIETRICH, Prophetie und Geschichte. Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk (FRLANT 108), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972, 64-70.

17 Hoseas geistige Heimat, Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament (TB 22), München: Kaiser, 1972, 232-250.

ment on Jehu's killing-streak. This contrast has, of course, often been noted¹⁸. To our knowledge, however, no one has yet adduced it as an explanation for Hosea's absence from Dtr. That, however, a word like Hos 1,4 could have influenced the Deuteronomist against mention of the prophet does appear plausible considering the role and significance of the Jehu-segment in Dtr as a whole. The Deuteronomist, we note initially, devotes rather considerable space- two whole chapters- to Jehu. His doing so is readily understandable seeing that Jehu's measures represent the only extended Northern parallel to the various Judean royal cultic reforms which receive so much attention in Dtr¹⁹. Noteworthy too are the insertions the Deuteronomist makes within the pre-existing Jehu-account²⁰. Thus in 2 Kgs 9,7-10a he expands the original brief address of Elisha's prophetic protégé to Jehu (9,6b) with a characteristic formulation of his own opening "and shall strike down the house of Ahab..." Then in 10,30a he concludes the account of Jehu's doing with a divine word to him which is quite unprecedented for other Northern kings in the praise it expresses:

Because you have done well in carrying out what is right in my eyes and have done to the house of Ahab according to all that was in my heart, your sons of the fourth generation shall sit on the throne of Israel.

(Keep in mind that the praise and promise of this word are evoked precisely by Jehu's bloody elimination of all those associated with Ahab). It is, of course, true that the Deuteronomist "frames" the divine word of 10,30 with qualifying notices in 10,29 and 31 bearing on Jehu's (culpable) failure to eliminate the calves of Jeroboam. The fact remains, however, that the Deuteronomist clearly wants us to understand that, as far as they went, Jehu's deeds- deeds of blood- were ordered by Yahweh, pleasing to him and rewarded by him. Overall then, Jehu, for a Northern king, comes off remarkably well in Dtr, his only defect being his failure to take equally strong measures against

18 See e.g., the representative remark of J.A. SOGGIN, *Profezia e rivoluzione nell'antico Testamento. L'opera di Elia e di Eliseo nella valutazione di Osea*, *Protestantesimo* 25 (1970) 1-14, p. 13: "il colpo di stato di Jehu... viene valutato in maniera sostanzialmente diversa dal redattore di I-II Re e dal profeta Osea".

19 On the theme of Cultic reform in Dtr, see the work of HOFFMANN cited in n. 7 and H. SPIECKERMANN, *Juda unter Assur in der Sargonidenzeit* (FRLANT 129), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982, 17-225.

20 For the analysis of 2 Kgs 9-10, see the commentaries.

the calf-cult as he had against Baal-worship²¹. And in view of these considerations, it seems not inconceivable that a word like Hos 1,4 might have sufficiently disturbed the Deuteronomist to cause him to avoid mentioning the prophet. This suppositions may receive further confirmation from our remarks on Amos to whose case we now turn.

B. Amos

Just as with Hosea, the words of Amos seem, at first sight, to offer much that the Deuteronomist might very well have made use of, e.g., his announcements of Israel's end, and above all his denunciations of Bethel, the arch-rival of the Deuteronomist's favored Jerusalem (see Amos 4,4-5; 5,5-6; 7,9; cf. 1 Kgs 12,25-31). Again, Amos 7,10-17 is the sort of prophetic confrontation narrative which would appear very much at home in Dtr where many such narratives are related. How is it then that when the Deuteronomist comes to relate the reign of Jeroboam II, the king under whom Amos preached (Amos 1,1) in 2 Kgs 14,23-29, he makes no mention of Amos, but instead, as P.R. ACKROYD notes²², cites the salvation oracle of a prophet Jonah (14,25) which found fulfillment in the military achievements of Jeroboam? Similarly, as has long been noted, the story of the nameless "man of God from Judah" in 1 Kgs 13 exhibits a number of tantalizing parallels to the account of Amos 7,10-17²³. But what prompted the Deuteronomist to incorporate the former account, set under Jeroboam I, rather than the latter with its link to Jeroboam II?

In response to the above questions, I wish to focus attention precisely on the narrative of Amos 7,10-17. In 7,10 Amaziah reports to Jeroboam that "Amos

21 More in general it may be noted that the Deuteronomist evidences no qualms about the use of violence in a good cause, whether that be Israel's occupying and retaining control of its land or campaigns of cultic purification, see e.g., his relating- with no suggestion of disapproval- the massacres of the Canaanites by Joshua, Josiah's slaughter of the Northern priests (2 Kgs 23,20) and the prophetic condemnations of Saul (1 Sam 15) and Ahab (1 Kgs 20) for sparing captured enemy kings.

22 A Judgment Narrative between Kings and Chronicles? An Approach to Amos 7: 9-17, Canon and Authority, Essays in Old Testament Religion and Theology, Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977, 71-87, pp. 78-79.

23 One the relationship between the two texts, see e.g., J.L. CRENSHAW, Prophetic Conflict. Its Effect upon Israelite Religion (BZAW 124), Berlin-New York: de Gruyter, 1971, 41-42.

has conspired against you in the midst of the house of Israel", while in 7,11 (cf. 7,9) he reports Amos' word of doom for the king: "Jeroboam shall die by the sword". What I suggest is that this presentation of Amos agitating against Jeroboam whose violent death he announces is not in line with the picture of that king's reign- and more generally the whole period of Northern history from Jehu to his great-grandson Jeroboam II- that the Deuteronomist wished to convey. With regard to that picture, we have already noted the remarkably positive depiction of Jehu which the Deuteronomist offers in 2 Kgs 9-10. Here, reference might be made to some additional features to the Deuteronomist's presentation of Jehu's dynasty in 2 Kgs 13-14. Note first of all that whereas the Deuteronomist himself formulates prophetic words of doom against each of the three northern dynasties which preceded Jehu's (Jeroboam I, 1 Kgs 14,7-11, 14-16; Baasha, 1 Kgs 16,1-4; Omri, 1 Kgs 21,20-23(24-26); 2 Kgs 9,7-10a), he nowhere relates such a word concerning Jehu's line- compare rather the qualified dynastic promise of 2 Kgs 10,30. Similarly, while it is true that, just as with Jehu himself (2 Kgs 10,29, 31), the Deuteronomist does remark with disapproval on the continuation of the calf-cult under each of his three immediate successors (Jehoahaz, 2 Kgs 13,2, 6; Joash, 2 Kgs 13,11; Jeroboam II, 2 Kgs 13, 24), he takes pains to counter-balance these notices with more positive items in all three instances. Thus, he tells of Jehoahaz's successful appeal to Yahweh which results in Yahweh's dispatching a "savior" who repulses the Syrian aggression (2 Kgs 13,4-5)²⁴, just as he notes the divine compassion which the remembrance of the patriarchal covenant evokes during this king's reign (13,22-23). Jehu's grandson Joash, in turn, is the recipient of a salvation oracle from the prophet Elisha promising him repeated triumphs over the Syrians (2 Kgs 13,14-19), and likewise victor over Amaziah of Judah (2 Kgs 14,8-14). And his whole presentation reaches its high point precisely with Jeroboam II. Jeroboam rules long, forty-one years (2 Kgs 14,23). He is the "savior" whome Yahweh, conscious of Israel's affliction (14,26) and in accordance with his promise not to blot out Israel's "name" (14,27) enables to win back Israel's lost territories (14,25a), thereby fulfilling a word of the prophet Jonah (14,25b).

24 On this text, see D.J. McCARTHY, 2 Kings 13,4-6, *Biblica* 54 (1973) 409-410.

In view of the above observations, it seems clear that the Deuteronomist does want the period from Jehu to Jeroboam II to be seen as a period of respite in the downward spiral of Israel's fortunes, this notwithstanding the continuation of the reprobate calf-cult (compare the case of the "good kings" in the South whom the Deuteronomist nevertheless taxes with tolerating worship on the high places). In particular, the period is one of dynastic stability (in contrast to most of their predecessors and successors, all four kings die peacefully), and of repeated turnings by Yahweh to his afflicted people who are thereby enabled to repulse foreign aggressions. It is further a period when the prophets are no longer fomenting rebellion (as they were under the Omrides, see 2 Kgs 9), and when the divine word to the kings is consistently- if sometimes qualifiedly- supportive, see 2 Kgs 9,6-10; 10,30; 13,4,17,19; 14,25. And as noted, all these features of the period reach their culmination with Jeroboam II.

But now, Amos, who was remembered as one who "conspired" against Jeroboam and announced his "death by the sword" would, obviously, not fit in very well in such a presentation. Accordingly, the Deuteronomist, I propose, in relating the reign of Jeroboam II has adduced, not Amos and his words of doom, but rather the prophet of salvation Jonah whose message coheres with his image of Jeroboam's reign. Similarly, he opted to use the confrontation narrative of 1 Kgs 13 associated with Jeroboam I, rather than that of Amos 7,10-17 linked to Jeroboam II.

In summary then, I suggest that, as with Hosea, it was Amos' stance towards the line of Jehu which may have occasioned the Deuteronomist's omission of him²⁵.

25 With this suggestion, I am proposing a certain modification of the explanation for Amos' absence in Dtr proffered by CRÜSEMANN, *Kritik*, pp. 61-63. For him, the Deuteronomist passed over Amos because he found unacceptable that prophet's radical claim, "the end has come for my people Israel" (Am 8,2). From a reading of 2 Kgs 17- and of the following 2 Kgs 18-25 where nothing is reported of any revival in the territory of the North- it seems difficult however to maintain that the Deuteronomist did not, in fact, reckon with the definitive demise of Israel as a people. Accordingly, my suggestion is that what the Deuteronomist found objectionable in Amos' words was not so much his announcement concerning Israel's annihilation- to which he could subscribe without much difficulty- but rather his more specific statements regarding Jeroboam II.

C. Micah

This brings us to our final prophet, the Judean Micah. Here again, I begin by noting several factors which make this prophet's omission from Dtr a cause for surprise. First, the Deuteronomist does have much to relate concerning the "classical prophet" contemporaneous with Micah, Isaiah (see 2 Kgs 18,17-20,19)²⁶ - an indication that for him the reign of Hezekiah is, as such, a period of prophetic intervention in Judah's history²⁷. In addition, Micah's famous announcement of the desolation of Jerusalem (Mic 3,12) might seem to very well cohere with the Deuteronomist's overarching purpose in the final segment of his work (2 Kgs 18-25) of representing the city's fall as a happening which had been prophetically foretold long in advance (see 2 Kgs 20,18; 21,10-15; 22,15-18; 23,26-27; 24,3-4). All the more so is the case in that, in the view of several recent authors, it was precisely a (related) Deuteronomistic redactor who introduced the citation of this word into the context of Jeremiah's "Temple Sermon" in Jer 26,18-19²⁸. How then to account for the fact that our Deuteronomist made no mention of Micah as he does of Isaiah?

Perhaps, the just cited passage of Jeremiah can provide a clue here. Jer 26,18-19 reads:

¹⁸Micah of Moresheth prophesized in the days of Hezekiah king of Judah and said to all the people of Judah:

'Thus says the Lord of hosts,
Zion shall be plowed as a field;
Jerusalem shall become a heap of ruins,
and the mountains of the house a wooded height'.

26 On this sequence, see e.g., R.E. CLEMENTS, *Isaiah and the Deliverance of Jerusalem* (JSOT Supp. Ser. 13), Sheffield: JSOT, 1980, 52-71.

27 Note that Isaiah is the first prophet active in the south to be cited by the Deuteronomist since Shemiah under Rehoboam (1 Kgs 12,21-24) some two hundred years before.

28 On the presence of a Deuteronomistic redaction in Jer 26, and specifically in 26,18-19, see e.g., E.W. NICHOLSON, *Preaching to the Exiles*, New York: Schocken Books, 1970, 52-55; F.L. HOSSFELD and I. MEYER, *Der Prophet vor dem Tribunal. Neuer Auslegungsversuch von Jer 26*, ZAW 86 (1974) 30-50; R.P. CARROLL, *From Chaos to Covenant: Prophecy in the Book of Jeremiah*, New York: Crossroad, 1981, 91-95.

¹⁹Did Hezekiah king of Judah and all Judah put him to death? Did he not fear the Lord and entreat the favor of the Lord, and did not the Lord repent of the evil which he had pronounced against them?...

The reference in Jer 26:19 to Hezekiah's "fearing the Lord" and "entreating his favor" spontaneously evokes the Deuteronomist's account of Hezekiah's reform in 2 Kgs 18,4:

He removed the high places, and broke the pillars, and cut down the Asherah. And he broke in pieces the bronze serpent that Moses had made...

What is now striking about this "reform notice" is its extreme brevity, particularly when compared with the Deuteronomist's elaborate account of Josiah's reform in 2 Kgs 22-23, or the Chronicler's extended report of Hezekiah's reform measures in 2 Chron 29-31. In the past, scholars have generally taken the line that, as 2 Kgs 18,4 would suggest, Hezekiah's reform was a quite low-key affair, far less comprehensive than that of Josiah, and that the Chronicler has retrojected elements of 2 Kgs 22-23 (e.g. the Passover observance and the extension of the royal measures also to the territory of the North) into his presentation of Hezekiah's reforms out of a desire to magnify that figure. Recently, however, J. ROSENBAUM has put forward a new perspective on the relationship among the texts in question²⁹. On the one hand, he avers that the Deuteronomist himself was not free of tendentiousness in his presentation of Hezekiah's reform, i.e. he deliberately minimalizes its extent and significance so as not to detract from the role of Josiah as reformer king par excellence. Conversely, ROSENBAUM advances arguments for ascribing a basic historicity to various of the features of the chronicler's account of Hezekiah's reform which are unique to him. Here, I wish to taken the first of these affirmations of ROSENBAUM as starting point. Keeping that affirmation in mind, one notes that, in the presentation of 2 Kgs 22-23, the Deuteronomist has Josiah proceed to his reform measures only upon receipt of the prophetic word of Huldah in 22,15-20, a word which, in its content, is not so different from Mic 3,12. But if now, as ROSENBAUM avers, the Deuteronomist's handling of Hezekiah's reform was guided by the concern not to have him "steal Josiah's thunder" as reformer, then one can understand his unwillingness to re-

29 Hezekiah's Reform and the Deuteronomistic Tradition, HTR 72 (1979) 23-44.

present Hezekiah already undertaking his reform in response to a prophetic word, à la Jer 26,18-19. Such a representation is reserved for the case of Josiah.

Another factor may also have come into play here, however. Taken as a whole, the reign of Hezekiah, in the Deuteronomist's presentation (2 Kgs 18-20) stands out as period of special security and divine protection for Jerusalem³⁰. In such a presentation, however, mention of Micah, who, as Jer 26,18-19 indicates, was remembered especially for his so radically negative announcement concerning Jerusalem's fate, would have introduced a jarringly discordant note, nullifying the whole Stimmung the Deuteronomist wants to develop around Hezekiah's reign. From this perspective too then one understands that the Deuteronomist did have his reasons for leaving Micah unmentioned.

Conclusion

In concluding, I am very much aware of both the hypothetical and incomplete character of the above suggestions. They will, however, whatever their inadequacies, have served a purpose if they help stimulate further reflection on the problem- which has yet to receive due or sufficiently differentiated attention from scholarship- of the Deuteronomist's Prophetenschweigen.

30 It is true that the account closes with a word of doom addressed to Hezekiah for his involvement with the Babylonian envoys, 2 Kgs 20,18. This word speaks, however, of a despoilation/depeopling of Jerusalem, comparable to similar incidents in its earlier history (see 1 Kgs 14,25-26; 15,18; 2 Kgs 12,18; 16,8; 18,15-16), rather than an actual destruction of the city. Note too Hezekiah's response in 20,19 articulating his conviction that, whatever awaits Jerusalem in the future, his own time will be one of "peace and security".