<대중적 수사학과 성서학의 소통>

Prophetic Discourse and Popular Rhetoric in the Hebrew Bible

Jan Joosten*

In biblical literature, prophets are consistently depicted as orators. The historical books have the prophets deliver speeches in a court setting-think of Nathan accusing David of the murder of Uriah (2 Sam 12), or of Micah ben Yimlah announcing defeat in the war against the Arameans (1 Kgs 22). Likewise, in the prophetical books, the prophets are presented as public speakers addressing the King (e.g. Isa 7) or the assembly (e.g. Jer 7). The style of oracles contained in the prophetic books agrees with this picture. Formulas such as: "Thus says the Lord" (*koh 'amar Adonai*), or: "Oracle of the Lord" (*ne'um Adonai*), are suggestive of public declamation. Moreover, the oracles are full of rhetorical devices showing that they are rooted in oratorical practice.[1] The story told in Jer 36, and isolated passages in

* Prof., Faculty of Protestant Theology, University of Strasbourg

1) See Y. Gitay, *Isaiah and his audience. The structure and meaning of Isaiah 1-12*, Studia Semitica Neerlandica 30 (Assen/Maastricht: Van Gorcum, 1991); C. Shaw, *The Speeches of Micah*, JSOTS 145 (Sheffield: Academic Press, 1993); Th. Renz, *The Rhetorical Function of the Book of Ezekiel*, VTS 71 (Leiden: Brill, 1999); K. Möller, *A Prophet in Debate. The Rhetoric of Persuasion in the Book of Amos*, JSOTS 372 (Sheffield: Academic Press, 2003); more generally: Y. Gitay, "The Realm of Prophetic Rhetoric," S. E. Porter and Th. H. Olbricht, eds., *Rhetoric, Scripture and Theology. Essays from the 1994 Pretoria Conference*, Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 131 (Sheffield: Academic Press, 1996), 218-229; Klaus Seybold, *Poetik der prophetischen Literatur im Alten Testament*, Poetologische Studien zum Alten Testament 4 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2010).

Isaiah and Habakkuk suggest that prophecies would be declaimed orally before they were written down and combined with other texts in prophetic anthologies.[2] Although the precise relationship between the "former" and "latter" prophets remains unclear,[3] and although the relationship between the latter prophets and the texts contained in the books named after them is debated, the oratorical element is clearly a constant.

If the prophets were orators, and to the extent they were so, the question arises where they learnt their craft. The prophetic writings attest to a sophisticated "art of communicating." We may not understand everything we read, but we certainly feel the force of what we read: "For three transgressions of Moab, and for four, I will not turn away the punishment thereof" (Am 2:1): the sentence is obscure, its translation uncertain; but no one will deny its expressive force. Whence comes this way of speaking, or writing? Is it a matter of genius, of innate talent? Did divine revelation go hand in hand with artistic inspiration? Certainly there is something to say for this. But even the greatest genius needs to be schooled, and training is needed to appropriate inspiration.

The verbal skills manifest in Hebrew prophecies may at least partly have developed within a prophetic tradition. The historical books report on prophetic communities headed by a leader called "father."[4] Next to nothing is known about these groups. But we may speculate that everything having to do with inspired speech would have been treated there with utmost interest.

---

2) See e.g. Isa 8:16; 30:8; Hab 2:2-3.

3) See e.g. M. Haran, "From Early to Classical Prophecy: Continuity and Change," *VT* 27 (1977), 385-397; more critically: F. Gonçalvez, "Les 'Prophètes Écrivains' étaient-ils des *nebî'îm*?" P. M. M. Daviau, J. W. Wevers, and M. Weigl, eds., *The World of the Aramaeans: Biblical Studies in Honour of Paul-E. Dion*, JSOTS 324 (Sheffield: Academic Press, 2001), 144-185.

4) See e.g. 1 Sam 10:5ff; 19:20ff; 2 Kgs 2:3ff; 4:38; and compare also Num 11.

Prophetic literature too witnesses to such tradition. It is not rare that later texts quote or allude to earlier ones: Isaiah elaborates on motifs developed by Amos, Habakkuk follows Isaiah; Jeremiah picks up on Hosean themes, and so on.[5] The prophets learnt their art through close study of the words of their predecessors.

But the art of verbal communication attested in the prophetic writings draws also on another source. The prophets, as it seem, borrowed elements from popular rhetoric, from the verbal exchanges between their contemporaries in day-to-day life. Like Martin Luther when he translated the Bible into German, the prophets have "*dem Volk aufs Maul geschaut*"-taken expressions right out of the mouth of the people. Each nation possesses a set of stylistic and pragmatic conventions, a store of tropes and figures, an inventory of root metaphors making up its peculiar fashion of speaking and arguing. The oratory of the prophets links up with this typical rhetoric of their own people.

1. Israelite rhetoric

Confirming the link between prophetic speech and popular rhetoric is difficult for many reasons, not least because we hardly have access to the popular speech of Israelites in the biblical period. What we do have a fair amount of, however, is popular speech imitated, or recreated in literature: Judah speaks to Pharaoh's intendant in the hope of freeing his younger brother who is accused of theft in Gen 44:18-34; Abigail pleads with

5) See e.g. R. Fey, *Amos und Jesaja. Abhängigkeit und Eigenständigkeit des Jesaja*, WMANT 12 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1963); M. Schulz-Rauch, *Hosea und Jeremia. Zur Wirkungsgeschichte des Hoseabuches* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1996); M. Greenberg, "Notes on the Influence of Tradition on Ezekiel," *JANES* 22 (1993), 29-37.

David to save the life of her husband in 1S 25:24-31; Jotham son of Gideon accuses the citizens of Shechem because they have financed the massacre of his family in Jud 9:7-20. These speeches, and many others, are not samples of real discourse pronounced spontaneously by Israelites on specific occasions, but artful constructs integrated into a larger literary whole.

Indirectly, this kind of material does give access to popular rhetoric. The speeches are not real, but they are verisimilar: the characters staged in the Pentateuch and historical books are credible human beings experiencing the same crises as do the audience of the stories. One may suppose that the authors have their heroes speak more or less the way an Israelite might have spoken if he or she had been in the same situation. If things didn't happen the way they are told, they might have happened this way.

The rhetoric deployed in reported speech is subtle and complex. It is as diverse as are the characters playing a part in biblical narrative: men do not speak in the same way as women; the king's counselors express themselves in a more polished way than simple peasants; among family members the tone differs from that among strangers. The narrators have a perfect feel for all these different registers of speech, and exploit them to literary ends. Direct discourse is an important tool by which they characterize their heroes. One gets to know each individual by the way he or she speaks.

In spite of this discursive diversity, it is possible to observe a measure of constancy. Biblical characters as a group express themselves in ways that would not be fitting for the heroes of Homeric epic. They also speak in ways that would be uncommon in our modern world. Wherever it is possible to define precisely what is peculiar to discourses incorporated into biblical narrative, the rhetoric of the people that produced this literature stands revealed.

2. Figures of speech shared by popular discourse and prophetic texts

Convincing traits will have to be found in the realm of what is called *elocutio* in classical rhetoric: rhetorical style in the restricted sense. The realms of argumentation (*inventio*) and composition (*dispositio*) may provide interesting analogies as well, but these analogies will typically become apparent only after prolonged analysis, thus weakening their probative force. Stylistic features, however, are visible on the surface of the text and can therefore easily be observed.

This does not mean that all stylistic traits occurring in both prophecy and reported discourse necessarily indicate a relation between these two groups of texts. Let us consider an example. In the speech of Jotham announcing the dramatic end of Abimelech's reign, fire is used as a figure of destruction:

> Jud 9:20 Let *fire* come out from Abimelech, and *devour* the men of Shechem.

The same trope is found also in the book of Amos:

> Am 1:4 I will send a *fire* into the house of Hazael, and it will *devour* the palaces of Ben Hadad.

The parallel is striking, but the figure is not unique. In Homeric epic too, destructive battles are repeatedly presented under the image of fire (*Iliad* 17.737-9 and 4.342 // 12.316). The trope cannot serve as an instance of typically Israelite rhetoric.

Take a more formal trait. Both prophecy and reported speech regularly use elaborate similes of the following type:

> 2S 17:12 We will light on him as *the dew falls on the ground*
> Isa 25:11 He shall spread forth his hands..., *as he who swims spreads forth his hands to swim*

The syntax is the same in these two examples, and so is the stylistic effect. But again, the use of comparisons of this type is probably universal in human discourse, and in persuasive speech in particular. The presence of this feature in the two genres of biblical texts is not necessarily significant. One could multiply examples of this type without ever establishing that prophecy and popular discourse are directly related.

3. Typical examples of biblical figures of rhetoric

The family-relationship between these genres is to be illustrated with stylistic figures that are rare, striking, and well profiled. Fortunately, figures answering to these criteria do indeed occur in biblical literature. Biblical rhetoric makes use of features that are not listed in inventories of classical rhetoric like the famous manual of Heinrich Lausberg, and appear to be peculiarly Israelite.[6] When such features are found in both reported speech and prophetic oracles, the relationship between the two textual genres is thrown into relief.

3.1. "Dialectic negation"

The prophets at times use the negation in a figurative way.

---

6) H. Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik. Eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft*, mit einem Vorwort von A. Arens (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1990[2]).

A fairly certain example is found in the book of Hosea:

> Hos 6:6 I desire faithfulness, and *not* sacrifice, and the knowledge of God more than burnt offerings.

As is shown in this case by the parallelism, the meaning of Hos 6:6a is not that God doesn't like sacrifice, but only that he doesn't like it as much as he likes faithfulness *(hesed)*. In other prophetic passages, the attestation of the figure is less certain:

> Jer 7:22-23 I *didn't* speak to your fathers, *nor* command them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt offerings or sacrifices: but this thing I commanded them, saying, Listen to my voice, and I will be your God, and you shall be my people; and walk you in all the way that I command you, that it may be well with you.

Many critics have deduced from these verses that the numerous prescriptions on sacrifice contained in the Priestly Code were still unknown in the time of Jeremiah. A literal reading can easily lead to this conclusion. If, however, the negation in verse 22 is to be taken figuratively, as in Hos 6:6, the passage would state only that the commandments given after the Exodus were not intended to define the Israelite cult as much as they aimed to instill a sense of faithfulness to the covenant.

The figurative use of the negation in Hebrew rhetoric was analyzed in depth by Heinz Kruse, who termed it the "dialectic negation."[7] He finds tens of examples in all kinds of biblical texts. The prophetic instances are confirmed and illuminated by the use of the same figure in reported speech. Thus in the book of Exodus, Moses says to the murmuring people:

---

7) H. Kruse, "Die 'dialektische Negation' als semitisches Idiom," *VT* 4 (1954), 385-400.

> Ex 16:8 Who are we? Your murmurings are *not* against us, but against the Lord.

In this case, the reader knows full well that the Israelites have complained against Moses and Aaron. Indeed, this is stated explicitly in verse 2. What Moses wants to say is that the complaints of the Israelites are not so much directed against them as against God. This use of the negation may seem strange to a western reader, particularly one who is not steeped in biblical literature. In the Bible, however, the figure is completely normal. Joseph says to his brothers, after he has made himself known to them: "It *wasn't* you who sent me here, but God"(Gen 45:8); and Moses says to the Israelites of the second generation after the Exodus: "The Lord didn't make this covenant with our fathers, but with us, even us, who are all of us here alive this day"(Deut 5:3).

All these examples are literary. Nevertheless, it is difficult to escape the impression that the narrative passages imitate a feature of day-to-day speech. As to the prophetic instances, they appear to be more elaborate and sophisticated. Having taken the "dialectic negation" from the mouth of the people, the prophets proceeded to give it a new tone.

3.2. Pseudo-quotations

Another somewhat egregious phenomenon found in the prophetic writings is the figurative use of quotations. Where speech is attributed to a person, this does not necessarily imply that he or she actually said the words in question. The quotation may instead reflect the prophetic judgment on the person involved. The first exegete who clearly conceived of the systematic use of "pseudo-quotations" in the prophetical books was

Hans-Walter Wolff.[8] Wolff showed that many explicit quotations in the prophets are not to be taken literally. In some cases, they twist the words that were really spoken, while in other cases they do not refer to speech at all, but to a course of action or an attitude. The words "he said this or that" means really "it is as if he were saying this or that":

> Isa 28:15 You have said, "We have made a covenant with death, and with Sheol are we at agreement."

The bizarre statement ascribed to Isaiah's opponents most probably doesn't purport to reflect words they really spoke, but to characterize the haughty and callous attitude of the royal counselors. In playing off Egypt against Assyria in a dangerous game of international diplomacy (this is what is at issue in the context), the counselors are acting as if death were no menace for them. Wolff provides numerous other examples of possible pseudo-quotations in the prophetic books. Many of them pose real problems of understanding to modern-day readers. In the biblical world, however, this stylistic feature seems to have been well known, and appreciated.

Indeed, similar instances are found in discourses incorporated into narrative texts. When one character attributes speech to another, it is not always possible to understand the words as a real quotation. A good example is found in the plea David addresses to Saul begging him to stop pursuing him. In this speech, David calls up the image of men who incited Saul against him:

> 1S 26:19b Cursed be they before the Lord: for they have

8) H. W. Wolff, "Das Zitat im Prophetenspruch. Eine Studie zur prophetischen Verkündungsweise," *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament*, Theologische Bücherei Altes Testament 22 (München: Kaiser, 1964), 36-129.

> driven me out this day that I shouldn't cling to the Lord's inheritance, saying, "Go, serve other gods."

Many exegetes have understood that the words David sets on the lips of his adversaries have never really been spoken. The Jewish medieval commentator David Qimhi, in his commentary on Samuel, glosses as follows: "*It is as if* they were saying: 'Go serve other gods.'" There are several other examples of this figure of speech in the narrative texts. Judah, in his speech addressed to Pharaoh's intendant quotes his father Jacob as follows: "My father said to us, 'You know that my wife gave me two sons'"; it is unlikely that Jacob ever really said this to Judah and his brothers, but his attitude toward them showed that this was his point of view: he had had only one wife, and by her two sons.

The attribution of words to some person in order to qualify his or her behavior must have been conventional in Israelite culture. David did not mean to lie, nor should we think his audience was deceived. Saul and his men must have understood that the ostensible quotation: "Go, serve other gods" was in reality a pseudo-quotation.

The prophets, it seems, adopted this convention from popular speech and exploited it in their own oratory, turning it into an art form.[9)]

3.3. The antonomastic vocative

A third uncommon figure of speech is encountered where the prophets call a person or a group by a proper name that isn't theirs. A well-known example is found in the opening

9) See also J. Joosten, "La prosopopée, les pseudocitations et la vocation d'Isaïe (Is 6,9-10)," *Biblica* 82 (2001), 232-243.

speech of the book of Isaiah:

> Isa 1:10 Hear the word of the Lord, you rulers of Sodom!
> Listen to the law of our God, you people of Gomorrah!

Addressing inhabitants of Jerusalem, the prophet gives them the names "rulers of Sodom" and "people of Gomorrah." Another possible instance of this stylistic feature is found in Jeremiah:

> Jer 6:1 Flee for safety, you Benjaminites, out of the midst of Jerusalem.

As I have argued at length in an article published in 1999, the expression "Benjaminites" is not to be taken at face value in this passage. It alludes to the Benjaminites of Judges 19, who had withdrawn to the city of Gibeah to defend themselves against the expedition organized by the other tribes to punish them for a particularly heinous crime committed in their mids t.[10] Jer 6:1-9 contains several additional allusions to the story in Judges 19. What the prophet wants to say to the inhabitants of Jerusalem is: "You are like those Benjaminites, impenitent and secure in their city walls-but the same fate awaits you."

The figure finds an exact analogue in a narrative text. When Jehu, after having killed the king of Israel, comes to the royal palace to assume power, Jezebel, the queen mother, addresses him with the words:

> 2 Kgs 9:31 Is it peace, you Zimri, your master's murderer?

The "antonomastic vocative" here alludes to Zimri, a general

---

10) J. Joosten, "Les Benjaminites au milieu de Jérusalem. Jérémie vi 1ss et Juges xix-xx," *VT* 49 (1999), 67-72.

who, according to 1 Kgs 16:15-19, killed his overlord, installed himself as king in his stead, and reigned all of seven days before being killed in turn.[11] "You are like Zimri, says Jezebel to Jehu, because of what you have just done, and in view of what will likely happen to you soon."

As far as I can see, there are no other attestations of this figure in the Hebrew Bible. But even this one occurrence suggests that the feature was habitual in verbal exchanges among Israelites of the biblical period. Admittedly, Jezebel is of Phoenician birth. Nothing indicates, however, that her way of speaking is strange. Jehu, who is fully Israelite, appears to have no problems in understanding what she means. If the use of this type of vocative was indeed conventional in Israel, the prophetic instances will have been much clearer to an Israelite audience than they are to us. It is to be noted, nevertheless, that the prophetic examples are more elaborate than the one in 2Kgs 9: while Jezebel uses the antonomastic vocative in isolation, the two prophetic passages combine it with other references to the historical figures alluded to by the proper name.

Each of these figures of speech merits more ample discussion, which time doesn't allow. Three points may briefly be emphasized, however. Firstly, these three stylistic traits are most clearly rhetorical in nature: they serve to attract interest, to charm by the use of a striking expression, and thus to enhance the persuasive force of the discourse. Secondly, one should note that the three figures are typologically somewhat similar: all three are very concise and laconic. They leave to the audience the task of figuring out what is meant. In a way they enlist the audience in the persuasive effort. As I have argued on other occasions, this is a constant feature of persuasive speech in the Bible in general: biblical rhetoric is cooperative in nature.[12]

11) S. Olyan, "Jehu as Zimri," *HTR* 78 (1985), 203-207.

Thirdly, these striking and typical features are attested both in speech incorporated in narrative and in prophetic oracles. This shared attestation is not to be attributed to the influence of one corpus on another on the literary level, but to the fact that both genres draw from the same source. What underlies these stylistic usages is the particular way of speaking of the Israelite people. This "way of speaking" is artistically recreated in speeches incorporated into narrative, and exploited by the prophets within their own rhetorical strategies.

4. Conclusion

At the end of this paper I would like to come back to a phenomenon that has already been alluded to at the beginning, namely, the great difficulty of many prophetic texts. Anyone who has any acquaintance with these texts can attest to this: one understands globally what is at issue, but the precise meaning of many passages remains obscure.

The incomprehensibility of prophetic texts in the Hebrew Bible may seem to contradict the idea that they are oratorical in nature. If the prophets were orators, why did they not take better care to be understood? A moment's reflection will show, however, that this objection is without force. If prophetic oracles started out as public speeches, they would not have been addressed to us, but to a contemporary audience. The speeches would have been declaimed in response to a specific situation, a crisis: the orator and his audience knew the circumstances of the situation; the speech presupposed many elements that

12) See Jan Joosten, "La persuasion coopérative dans le discours sur la loi: Pour une analyse de la rhétorique du Code de Sainteté," A. Lemaire, ed., *Congress Volume Ljubljana 2007*, VTS 133 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 381-398.

don't need saying. When such a discourse was taken out of its original situation and transmitted in isolation, it could easily become opaque for readers of a different epoch. This seems to be the principal problem of many prophetic texts. Disconnected from the specific circumstances to which they were meant to respond, they no longer make sense. The obscurity of the oracles is an argument for their oratorical origin, not against.

To recover the meaning of prophetic oracles it is sometimes possible to reconstruct the historical circumstances in which they were composed. Alongside this historical approach, one may try and recover the rhetorical conventions upon which they rest. The comparison of prophetic texts with speeches reported in narrative offers a promising avenue of investigation in this regard. The rhetoric of imbricated speeches, although far from simple, is easier to apprehend than that of the oracles. The narrative context in which they are incorporated reveals their pragmatic framework-fictional though it may be. What is forever lost for most prophetic texts is provided for the reported speeches by their narrative frame. It is possible to illuminate the rhetoric of the prophets by a comparison with argumentative strategies deployed in texts imitating popular rhetoric. As the present paper has tried to demonstrate, such illumination is often worth having.

<주요어>

예언 선포, 민간 수사학, 변증법적 부정, 허위 인용, 환칭의 호격

<Key Words>

Prophetic Discourse, Popular Rhetoric, Dialectic Negation, Pseudo-Quotation, Antonomastic Vocative

* Received May 09, 2013, Revised September 07, 2013, Accepted September 07, 2013.

Reference

Fey, R., *Amos und Jesaja. Abhängigkeit und Eigenständigkeit des Jesaja*, WMANT 12, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1963.

Gitay, Y., *Isaiah and his audience. The structure and meaning of Isaiah 1-12*, Studia Semitica Neerlandica 30, Assen/Maastricht: Van Gorcum, 1991.

Gitay, Y., "The Realm of Prophetic Rhetoric," S. E. Porter and Th. H. Olbricht, eds., *Rhetoric, Scripture and Theology. Essays from the 1994 Pretoria Conference*, Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 131, Sheffield: Academic Press, 1996, 218-229.

Gonçalvez, F., "Les 'Prophètes Écrivains' étaient-ils des *nebī'îm*?" P. M. M. Daviau, J. W. Wevers, and M. Weigleds., eds., *The World of the Aramaeans: Biblical Studies in Honour of Paul-E. Dion*, JSOTS 324, Sheffield: Academic Press, 2001, 144-185.

Greenberg, M., "Notes on the Influence of Tradition on Ezekiel," *JANES* 22 (1993), 29-37.

Haran, M., "From Early to Classical Prophecy: Continuity and Change," *VT* 27 (1977), 385-397.

Joosten, J., "La prosopopée, les pseudo-citations et la vocation d'Isaïe (Is 6, 9-10)," *Biblica* 82 (2001), 232-243.

Joosten, J., "Les Benjaminites au milieu de Jérusalem. Jérémie vi 1ss et Juges xix-xx," *VT* 49 (1999), 67-72.

Joosten, Jan, "La persuasion coopérative dans le discours sur la loi: Pour une analyse de la rhétorique du Code de Sainteté," A. Lemaire, ed., *Congress Volume Ljubljana 2007*, VTS 133, Leiden: Brill, 2010, 381-398.

Kruse, H., "Die 'dialektische Negation' als semitisches Idiom," *VT* 4 (1954), 385-400.

Lausberg, H., *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik. Eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft*, mit einem Vorwort von A. Arens, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1990.[2]

Möller K., *A Prophet in Debate. The Rhetoric of Persuasion in the Book of Amos*,

JSOTS 372, Sheffield: Academic Press, 2003.

Olyan, S., "Jehu as Zimri," *HTR* 78 (1985), 203-207.

Renz, Th., *The Rhetorical Function of the Book of Ezekiel*, VTS 71, Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Schulz-Rauch, M., *Hosea und Jeremia. Zur Wirkungsgeschichte des Hoseabuches*, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1996.

Seybold, Klaus, *Poetik der prophetischen Literatur im Alten Testament*, Poetologische Studien zum Alten Testament 4, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2010.

Shaw, C., *The Speeches of Micah*, JSOTS 145, Sheffield: Academic Press, 1993.

Wolff, H. W., "Das Zitat im Prophetenspruch. Eine Studie zur prophetischen Verkündungsweise," *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament*, Theologische Bücherei Altes Testament 22, München: Kaiser, 1964, 36-129.

<Abstract>

Prophetic Discourse and Popular Rhetoric in the Hebrew Bible

Prof. Jan Joosten
(University of Strasbourg)

The prophetic texts of the Old Testament exhibit a sophisticated rhetoric that is at times hard to understand. Partly the difficulty stems from lack of familiarity with the stylistic conventions current among ancient Israelites. A possible approach to the study of prophetic oracles is afforded by the observation that some of their stylistic features are encountered also in samples of reported speech contained in the historical books. The phenomenon tends to show that prophetic rhetoric is rooted in popular modes of persuasive speech. Since the reported speeches are generally easier to understand than the oracles, the comparison throws light on prophetic oratory. The article illustrates the approach by the help of a few striking figures of speech that are found in both prophetic oracles and speeches imbricated in narrative texts: 1) the "dialectic negation" implying that what is negated is not denied absolutely but only relatively; 2) the "pseudo-quotation" that consists of attributing to someone words that were never spoken with a view to characterizing the person or his behavior. 3) the "antonomastic vocative," whereby someone is addressed by a different name expressing an implicit judgment.

<초록>

히브리 성경의 예언 선포와 대중적 수사학

얀 요스튼
(스트라스부르대학교 개신교신학부 교수)

구약 성경의 예언서 본문에는 때때로 이해하기 힘들 정도로 복잡한 수사법이 나타난다. 부분적으로 그러한 어려움은 고대 이스라엘 사람들이 두루 사용하던 문체의 규약에 익숙하지 않은 데에서 비롯한다. 예언자의 신탁에 대한 연구는 그 문체의 일부 특징이 역사서에 보존되어 있는 기록된 화법의 표본에서도 드러나는 점을 관찰함으로써 접근 가능하다. 그 현상은 예언자의 수사법이 민간의 설득 화법 양식에 뿌리박고 있다는 것을 보여주는 경향이 있다. 일반적으로 신탁보다 기록된 화법을 더 쉽게 이해할 수 있기 때문에, 그들을 비교하여 예언자의 연설을 이해하는 데 도움을 받을 수 있다. 이 논문은 방법론적으로 예언자의 신탁과 이야기 본문에서 조성된 화법에서 발견할 수 있는 몇 가지 두드러진 화법의 특징을 간파하는 접근법을 사용한다. 그러한 공통된 특징들은 첫째, 부인되는 것은 절대적이 아니라, 상대적으로 부정된다는 것을 보여주는 '변증법적 부정', 둘째, 어떤 인물이나 그의 행동을 특징짓기 위하여, 결코 하지 않은 말을 어떤 사람에게 돌리는 것으로 이루어진 '허위 인용', 셋째, '환칭(換稱)의 호격'으로서, 그 안에서 어떤 사람이 암묵적으로 판단하는 다른 이름으로 불리는 것이다.