Here I alter the M.T. into hammasiā'ī. Others take hammasiā' as an equivalent to the following nē'ēm. See, for instance, the discussion by Franklyn, pp. 239-40.

A discussion on the extent of the words of Agur is to be found in any commentary on Proverbs. See, for instance, Gemser, p. 103; McKane, p. 643. Most scholars take only vv. 1-14 as the words of Agur. The fact that these verses in the LXX are placed behind Prov. xxiv 22 may support this opinion. On the other hand, the collections of Proverbs often include material of different origin and character, brought together under the same heading. Therefore, the LXX does not offer convincing evidence.

ANNOUNCEMENTS


As was stated in VT 46 (1996), p. 265, the Sixteenth Congress of the International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament will be held 2-7 August 1998 in Oslo under the Presidency of Professor Dr Magne Sæbo. The Secretary of the Congress is Professor Dr H.M. Barstad, Department of Biblical Studies, Faculty of Theology, University of Oslo, P.O. Box 1023, Blindern, N-0315 Oslo, Norway. Nominations for the Presidency from the Congress in 1998 until 2001 should be sent to the Secretary of the I.O.S.O.T., Professor Dr A. van der Kooij, Faculteit der Godgeleerdheid, Postbus 9515, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands, to reach him not later than 1 April 1997.

COLLOQUIUM BIBLICUM LOVANIENSE JULY-AUGUST 1997

The theme of the Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense XLVI, which will be held 30 July-1 August 1997 in the Catholic University of Leuven under the chairmanship of Professor Antoon Schoors, will be Qohelet in the Context of Wisdom. Proposals for short papers should be submitted to Professor A. Schoors, Faculteit Letteren, Blijde-Inkomststraat 21, B-3000 Leuven, Belgium.

BOOK LIST

A.G. Auld, Kings Without Privilege. David and Moses in the Story of the Bible's Kings. x + 203 pp. T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1994. £16.95. This book's title hides its potentially revolutionary character. At least since the time of W.M.L. de Wette, scholars have worked on the presupposition that the Chronicler used Samuel and Kings more or less as we know them as his main source. He consciously excluded what he did not include and was responsible for the differences where the two texts do not run parallel. Kings
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is exilic and Chronicles post-exilic. On this premiss, not only the interpretation of Chronicles, but also the usual understanding of the history of the religion of Israel as formulated by J. Wellhausen and the hypothesis of a Deuteronomistic History (to name only the most prominent examples) have been developed. Auld confesses that he cannot see things in this way, however. He has hinted at the direction his thinking has been going in several articles over the last ten or more years, but now sets out his case in book-length form. Even so, as he admits, this can only be exploratory and sketchy. His main proposal is that both Kings and Chronicles have developed from a “shared text”, which he boldly reconstructs; therefore, what is not in Chronicles is quite as much post-exilic elaboration in Kings as what is not in Kings is elaboration in Chronicles. The shared text is just what it says: the material which both books have in common, and it is usually only over small details that Auld actually has to make a choice between them where they differ within parallel passages. He uses a variety of arguments to claim both that this shared text has a coherence of its own and that the development of our Kings from it is as intelligible ideologically as Chronicles has always been thought to be. The consequences for the relative dating of biblical material, our understanding of what is meant by Deuteronomistic, our model for Pentateuchal source criticism and more besides will be obvious, and they are touched on in the concluding chapter. It is also serious for historical reconstruction of the pre-exilic period, for it will quickly be appreciated that none of the history of the northern kingdom of Israel (nor the synchronistic dating system) derives from the shared text; all of that too is part of the post-exilic elaboration in Kings, and has no greater claim to historical reliability than the material peculiar to Chronicles.

Whatever we finally make of Auld’s thesis, it is certainly valuable to be obliged regularly to go back and test some of the fundamental assumptions which we have inherited and on which much of our scholarship is built. A short notice is not the place to undertake such a task, but here at least are a couple of places where one might begin. At 1 Kgs xii 15 there is a reference to a divine word “which the Lord spake by the hand of Ahijah the Shilonite to Jeroboam the son of Nebat”, and this appears to refer back to 1 Kgs xi 29-39. The former verse has a parallel in 2 Chr. x 15, and it is therefore included as part of Auld’s shared text (see p. 105). The latter passage is not in Chronicles, however, so that his retention of 1 Kgs xii 15 at x 15 has usually been explained either as a careless oversight or as an example of where he assumes his reader’s knowledge of his Kings Vorlage. Since 1 Kgs x 29-39 is not part of the shared text, however, Auld must assume (but does not discuss, so far as I can see) that this reference was unattached in the shared text and that this was the trigger for the Kings plus in x 29-39. In view of the regular prophecy-fulfilment schema in Kings, however, this seems improbable. Secondly, 2 Chr. xxii 7-9 (the death of Ahaziah) seems to be based on 2 Kgs ix 1-28 and x 12-14. Although there are some differences of presentation in the course of abbreviation, these can probably be attributed to the Chronicler’s own ideology (cf. my 1 and 2 Chronicles [London, 1982], pp. 311-12; R.B. Dillard, 2 Chronicles [Waco, 1987], pp. 172-3; S. Japhet, I & II Chronicles [London, 1993], pp. 822-4). For Auld, however, the common text is an even briefer version of this abbreviated account, so that, for instance, “he set out with Jehoram to Jehu son of Nimshi” is left without any explanation and so would appear to mean little to those with no possibility of knowing the fuller account in 2 Kgs ix-x; this too seems unlikely. Finally, although Auld gives greater attention to the matter (e.g. pp. 98-103), the account of Sennacherib’s invasion in 2 Chr. xxxii still seems to me to be more easily explained as a harmonizing conflation of the accounts in 2 Kgs xviii-xix than that both are independent expansions of an originally even shorter common text. These are but examples of a possible basis for a counter-argument, but Auld cannot always be so easily challenged. He makes some shrewd observations in the course of his presentation, including interesting use of the variant forms attested by the LXX of Kings, and one of the