2-1-2005

History of Research on the Book of Micah Chapters 4-5

Jun Kim
Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_kimj@csl.edu

HISTORY OF RESEARCH ON THE BOOK OF MICAH CHAPTERS 4-5

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty of
Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
Department of Exegetical Theology
In Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts

By
Jun Hyun Kim
February, 2005

Approved by_____
Prof. William W. Carr, Jr. Advisor

_____
Dr. Timothy E. Saleska Reader

_____
Dr. WonYong Ji Reader

CONTENTS

Chapters

I. Introduction

A. Background of Study of Micah Chapters 4-5

Reading the prophets is no simple task. Difficulties come in trying to interpret the prophets according to their own times. As a result the literary integrity and coherency of prophetic books are questioned and modern readers of the prophets' message identify different referents in the prophetic works. Such difficulties have been acknowledged by scholars: for example, B.S. Childs points out many problems in the history of examining the book of Micah, but states that the most critical issue of Micah is its coherence.[1]

The macro-structure of the book of Micah has been highly debated. While some deny any overall structure and understand the book as a loose collection of prophetic speeches, others have viewed the book as a single work but have identified as few as two and as many as six major divisions. Theses are (a) two-fold division-chapters 1-5 and 6-7 (Haupt) or chapters 1-3 and 4-7 (Mays, Hagstrom); (b) three-fold division-chapters 1-3, 4-5 and 6-7 (Smith); (c) four-fold division-chapters 1-3, 4-5, 6:1-7:7 and 7:8-20 (Wolff); or (d) six-fold division-chapters 1:2-16, 2:1-13, 3:1-4:8, 4:9-5:14, 6:1-7:7 and 7:8-20 (Shaw).[2] While the proposals are diverse, most scholars understand chapters 4-5 to be a unit, whether it is a major unit or only a subunit. They do so one the basis of vocabulary[3] and time periods.[4] The following analyzes past research of the

---

[1] B.S. Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980), 430. Also, James L. Mays insists that "Micah offers a provocative possibility for investigation" in "The Theological Purpose of the Book of Micah," *Beitrage zur Alttestamentlichen Theologie* (Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978), 276. He, then comments on Walter Zimmerli's opinion of Old Testament theology saying that: "Any Old Testament theology has the task of presenting what the Old Testament says about God as a coherent whole."

[2] Mignon R. Jacobs, *The Conceptual Coherence of the Book of Micah*, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 322 (David J.A. Clines and Philip R. Davies, eds. England: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 62. Jacobs provide a chart and she has four divisions.

[3] From the text, והיה and עתה are the evidence of vocabulary. והיה appears in 4:1, 6, 8, 9, 11, 14; 5:1, 9. עתה appears in 4:9, 11, 14.

[4] Eduard Nielsen, *Oral Tradition: A Modern Problem in Old Testament Introduction, Studies in Biblical Theology 11* (London: SCM Press, 1954), 85. Nielsen insists, "As to the delimitation of 4-5 as against 1-3 it is immediately evident that while 1-3 largely consist of didactic revelations and maledictions, chapters 4-5 are mainly a series of sayings concerning the future, proclaiming 'what is to happen,' 'in the last days' and 'on that day.'"

literary character of Micah 4-5, "admittedly the most difficult chapters in the book of Micah in which to demonstrate coherence."[5]

Different scholars use different approaches to address the difficulties, and scholars can be grouped according to their approaches. One such grouping differentiates between diachronic and synchronic approaches.[6] Diachronic approaches are virtually synonymous with historical-critical methods, which have dominated the field of biblical exegesis since the mid-eighteenth century. Each of the diachronic approaches has its own focus.

Literary (source) criticism focuses on original written sources. It reflects the basic assumption that the Bible should be treated as a compiled work.[7] According to Daniel Harrington, the purpose of this method is to show how the text which we have now relies on prior written sources.[8]

Form criticism, another diachronic approach, attempts to examine the oral tradition that is understood to lie behind much of the Old Testament. Gene M. Tucker defined form criticism as that method that "analyzes and interprets the literature of the Old Testament through a study of its literary types or genres. In particular, form criticism is a means of identifying the genres of that literature, their structures, intentions and settings in order to understand the oral stages of their development."[9] The goal of this method is twofold:

> First, it attempts to recover the full, living history of Old Testament literature, especially to gain insight into its oral stage of development, and to place all the stages of development into their settings in the life of Israel. Second, form criticism is a tool of exegesis *per se*. It attempts to facilitate the full understanding and interpretation of what

---

[5] John T. Willis, "The Structure of Micah 3-5 and the Function of Micah 5.9-14" *Zeitschrift fur die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 81*(1969), 198.
[6] Vern S. Poythress, *Course in General Linguistics* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966), 115. According to Poythress, Saussure's book appeared in 1915 in French and in 1966 it was translated in English. The distinction between diachronic and synchronic approaches appeared with Ferdinand de Saussure, a French scholar in 1915.
[7] Norman Habel, *Literary Criticism of the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), 6.
[8] Daniel Harrington, *Interpreting the Old Testament* (Wilmington: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1984), 84.
[9] Gene M. Tucker, *Form Criticism of the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), 1.

is essentially ancient religious literature that has a long and complicated history and prehistory.[10]

Redaction criticism, a third diachronic approach is, according to J. A. Wharton, "a special branch of Old Testament research devoted to the study of the way older elements of tradition were compiled, edited, and re-edited to produce the final form of the text."[11] Reed Lessing comments that redaction criticism examines "materials that have previously been edited, often for purposes different from those to which the redactor now puts them."[12]

In summary, diachronic approaches, including literary, form, and redaction criticism, stress historical background and *Sitz im Leben* in order to find the origin and development of the text. Broadly speaking, these historical approaches try to find the original form and setting or occasion of the Scripture and trace each step of the text's development.[13] These methods have greatly influenced the study and interpretation of the book of Micah. As R. Mason writes: "For more than a hundred years the small book of Micah has been a critical battlefield. The main points have been (i) how much of the present book comes from Micah himself? and (ii) how did the book achieve its present form?"[14]

In contrast to diachronic approaches, a synchronic approach focuses on the text as it exists at a single point in time. Synchronic approaches are becoming more and more popular. While diachronic approaches have been popular in the past, they fail to explain the Bible

---

[10] Tucker, 9.
[11] J.A. Wharton, "Redaction Criticism, OT," in *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible Supplementary Volume*, ed., Keith Crim (Nashville: Abingdon, 1976), 730.
[12] R. Reed Lessing, "Interpreting Discontinuity: Isaiah's Tyre Oracle" (Ph.D. diss., Concordia Seminary, 2001), 34-35.
[13] J. Maxwell Miller, "Reading the Bible Historycally: The Historyan's Approach," in *To Each Its Own Meaning: An Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Application*, ed., Stephen R. Haynes and Steven L. McKenzie (Kentucky: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993), 32.
[14] Rex Mason, *Micah, Nahum, Obadiah*, ed. R. N. Whybray, Old Testament Guides (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 27.

holistically[15] because they over-emphasize the text's alleged original meaning.[16] Thus many scholars who doubt diachronic approaches are seeking meaning in the text through synchronic approaches.

In brief, the synchronic approach is defined as "the approach to studying the meaning of words/signifiers which looks at their use at a cross-section of time, i.e., at a given point in history and which is not concerned to trace an 'original' meaning."[17] One example is the synchronic method of rhetorical criticism. Rhetorical criticism focuses on a text's final form and how it affects the reader. Lessing says that rhetorical criticism "examines the way discourses are constructed in order to achieve certain effects."[18]

---

[15] This thesis uses this term as far as synchronic scholars approach authorship and unity of text. It is true that synchronic scholars divide Micah into sections, but only for the purpose of grouping themes and ideas within Micah. Otherwise they see Micah as having coherence.

[16] James W. Voelz, *What Does This Mean?* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1997), 363.

[17] Voelz, 367-368. See also Vern S. Poythress, "Analysing a Biblical Text: Some Important Linguistic Distinction," T. F. Torrance, ed. *Scottish Journal of Theology* vol. 32 (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press,1979), 115.

[18] R. Reed Lessing, "Preaching Like the Prophets: Using Rhetorical Criticism in the Appropriation of Old Testament Prophetic Literature," *Concordia Journal* vol. 28 (2002): 399. For further studying, Barton also insists that rhetorical criticism is "interested in how writers or redactors do things to readers. Often this happens through 'structures'; but where structuralists are concerned with archetypal structures of myth or narrative, rhetorical criticism is interested in the structure and shapes of arguments." John Barton, *Reading the Old Testament* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996), 200.

B. Methodology

The primary approach of this study is to examine the history of the applicable research and to analyze the various methods (approaches). We have divided selected scholars into two categories (diachronic and synchronic) according to their methods. As we examine each method, this thesis will investigate the authors' treatment of the Hebrew text. Rigorous comparison is difficult, because scholars read some verses as a group, usually following the biblical order of the text, but they do not all group texts in the same way.

As previously stated, synchronic approaches are relatively new; therefore, in this category, fewer scholars will be examined. While studying the scholars' works, we will discover important differences between synchronic and diachronic approaches. These will be noted during the research and synthesized at the end of this thesis.

The following books and commentaries have been selected. Under the diachronic approaches, eight scholars will be analyzed: John M. P. Smith,[19] Paul Haupt,[20] Hans Walter Wolff,[21] James L. Mays,[22] Ehud Ben Zvi,[23] Jan A. Wagenaar,[24] L. M. Luker,[25] and D. R. Hillers.[26] These scholars' works are considered authoritative by other scholars in this field.[27] All

---

[19] John M.P. Smith, "Micah, Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Obadiah, Joel," ed., Samuel Rolles Driver, Alfred Plummer, and Charles Augustus Briggs, The International Critical Commentary (England: T&T Clark Limited, 1911).

[20] Paul Haupt, *The Book of Micah: A New Metrical Translation* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1910). The origin of this book is Haupt's two articles.

[21] Hans Walter Wolff, *Micah: A Commentary.* Trans. Gary Stansell (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1990).

[22] James Luther Mays, *Micah: A Commentary,* ed., John Bright, James Barr and Peter Ackroyd, et al., The Old Testament Library (London: SCM Press, 1976).

[23] Ehud Ben Zvi, *Micah,* ed., Rolf Knierim, Gene M. Tucker and Marvin A. Sweeney, et al., The Forms of the Old Testament Literature vol. XXIB (Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2000).

[24] Jan A. Wagenaar, *Judgement and Salvation: The Composition and Redaction of Micah 2- 5,* ed., H.M. Barstad, et al., Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, vol. LXXXV, (Leiden: Brill, 2001).

[25] Lamontte M. Luker, "Doom and Hope in Micah: The Redaction of the Oracles Attributed to an Eighth-Century Prophet," (Graduate school of Vanderbilt University, Unpublished Dissertation).

[26] D.R.Hillers, *Micah: A Commentary,* ed., Frank Moore Cross, et al., Hermeneia – A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984).

[27] For further study see Rex Mason, *Micah, Nahum, Obadiah* and Francis I. Andersen and David Noel Freedman, *Micah: The Anchor Bible,* vol. 24E, ed. William Foxwell Albright and David Noel Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 2000).

of them claim that Micah chapters 4-5 does not belong to the eighth century B.C. Under the synchronic approaches, four works by the following scholars will be analyzed: David Hagstrom,[28] Charles Shaw,[29] David N. Freedman and Francis I. Andersen,[30] and Mignon Jacobs.[31] These scholars insist that Micah 4-5 belong to the eighth century B.C. Even though there is no perfect way to interpret this text, may own study favors a synchronic approach because it values the unity of the text and explains the text best. On the other hand, the purpose of this study is not to defend or make a case for any particular method *per se*.

---

[28] David Gerald Hagstrom, *The Coherence of the Book of Micah – A Literary Analysis,* ed., J.J.M. Roberts, Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series, number 89 (Georgia: Scholars Press, 1988).

[29] Charles S. Shaw, *The Speeches of Micah: A Rhetorical – Historical Analysis, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 145,* ed. David J.A. Clines and Philip R. Davies (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993).

[30] Francis I. Andersen and David Noel Freedman, *Micah: The Anchor Bible,* vol. 24E, ed. William Foxwell Albright and David Noel Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 2000)

[31] Mignon R. Jacobs, *The Conceptual Coherence of the Book of Micah*, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 322 ed. David J. A. Clines and Philip R. Davies (England: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001).

II. Diachronic Approaches

In this chapter we will examine how the primary diachronic approaches interpret what we will call the text's external relationship, which is the relationship between chapters 4 and 5 as a unit and the preceding and following material, and also how they interpret the internal structure and coherence of chapters 4 and 5 alone. This chapter is divided into three sections: 1) literary criticism, 2) form criticism and 3) redaction criticism. Of the previously mentioned works, Paul Haupt and John M. P. Smith will be analyzed under literary (source) criticism. In form criticism, works of three major scholars will be analyzed: Hans Walter Wolff, James L. Mays, and Ehud Ben Zvi. Finally in redaction criticism, Jan A. Wagenaar, L. M. Luker, and D. R. Hillers will be examined.

A. Literary (Source) Criticism

A characteristic of the diachronic method of literary criticism is the assumption that texts "are not the work of a single author but result from the combination of originally separate documents."[1] Basically, literary critical scholars insist that

> we cannot adequately understand a text without the contexts to which it belongs. As a rule, the literary works to which the text belongs have not been written down in a single sitting, regardless of whether they cover the entire biblical book at hand. What we have before us in such a work, in many cases, is nothing more than the final literary state which has developed into a writing over time.[2]

---

[1] John Barton, "Source Criticism" in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary,* vol.6, ed. David Noel Freedman, et al. (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 162.

[2] Odil Hannes Steck, *Old Testament Exegesis: A Guide to the Methodology,* Trans. James D. Nogalski 2nd ed. (Georgia: Scholars Press,1998), 48.

Thus, literary criticism is the study of a text and its history, either brief or lengthy. It makes discussion about the text, such as the author, place and time possible.[3]

1. External Structure of Micah 4-5

In his literary criticism, Paul Haupt only covers poetry sections;[4] therefore, his approach cannot be compared with others for some verses. He divides the book of Micah into two sections according to date. Chapters 1-3 belong to the eighth-century, while chapters 4-7 represent a Maccabean appendix.[5] Chapters 4-7 contain five poems composed during 170-100 B.C. This content indicates John Hyrcanus' destruction of Samaria.[6] According to Haupt, the difference of time backgrounds between Micah's genuine poems and later poems can be identified by differences in poetic meter. Micah's poems exhibit 3+3, 2+2 and 3+2 meters, but the later poems have only 3+3 beats.[7] Also, Haupt dates the different styles by their contents. Haupt bases his position for the late date on the fall of Samaria. In Sargon's invasions in 721 B.C., there is no destruction of Samaria, but in the invasion by Ptolemy Lagi in 312 and by Demetrius Poliarcetes in 296, Samaria is destroyed.[8] Moreover Haupt argues that the book of Micah consists of Maccabean period texts because its contents exalt John Hyrcanus' destruction of Samaria.[9] He lived in 168 B.C. "John Hyrcanus' long siege of Samaria reminded the compiler of this

---

[3] Steck, 59.
[4] Haupt insists that Micah was a patriotic poet. Therefore only poetry sections are worth studying. He assumes that prose sections are later additions.
[5] Haupt, 14-15.
[6] Haupt, 6-13. The five poems are 6:2-4, 16, 9, 12, 10, 11, 13, 14; 7:1-4, 7-13; 7:14-17, 19, 20; 4:6, 7, 5:6, 7, 9, 11, 14, 4:1-5; and 6:6-8. He suggests that part of Micah's original poem appears in the book of Jeremiah. After Jeremiah's period, an editor added the first three chapters. Haupt seems to rearrange the text by theme.
[7] Haupt, 17. His idea indicates that a later composer collected only one type of poem for convincing the reader, but it can be treated as a pattern for Micah's poetry.
[8] Haupt, 16.
[9] However, at least two more destructions occurred, one at the hands of Ptolemy in 312 A.D. and the other in 296 A.D.

Maccabean oratorio of the ancient poet Micah's lines alluding to Sennacherib's siege of Jerusalem."[10] Based upon these historical events, Haupt believes that the 3+3 beat poems which mention the fall of Samaria belong to a late period.[11]

The fourth poem is located in chapters 4-5. It is hard to demonstrate the external relationship of chapters 4-5 with the other chapters since Haupt deals only with select verses in those adjacent chapters. Haupt does, however, give small indications for a relationship between 2:12 and 4:9-14.[12] According to him, these two sections have similar subjects; thus, these two texts must have similar dates which belong to the Maccabean period. Thus, Haupt suggests that these sections show editing. For instance, 4:9-14 comes from genuine Micah but was edited by an editor in the Maccabean period. On the other hand, 2:12 because of its restoration theme, was added from a later period than Micah. According to Haupt, 2:12 was inserted by someone who wanted to help the reader's understanding of the last four chapters.[13]

John M. P. Smith, on the other hand, divides Micah into three sections: chapters 1-3, 4-5 and 6-7.[14] He suggests that chapters 5-6 have some common elements, which are the "words of hope and cheer."[15] In spite of this, Smith insists that the unity of the book of Micah has been rightly denied by many scholars. For instance, Smith introduces K. Marti's view that 4:1-4 and 6:6-8 are connected by 4:5. This reflects the work of an unknown editor because 4:6-5:14 and 6:9-7:6 shows thematic unity.[16] Smith's opinion is that the book of Micah was entirely edited during the Maccabean period. Some of chapters 1-3 may belong to Micah himself, and chapters

---

[10] Haupt, 15-16.
[11] Haupt, 43. Haupt suggests one more piece of evidence when he compares Micah 4:1-5 with Isaiah and reaches the opinion that the prophecy originated with Micah and was adapted and inserted in its place in the book of Isaiah in the first century B.C.
[12] Haupt, 65.
[13] Haupt, 65.
[14] Smith, 8.
[15] Smith, 8.
[16] Smith, 16.

4-5 have miscellaneous fragments which are from various sources. Chapters 6-7 also have similar contents. Micah 7:11-13 belongs to the postexilic time because the contents reflect events which happened after the fall of Jerusalem. Smith suggests that at least four different authors worked with Micah.[17] Thus, the book of Micah is thematically connected due to editing.

2. Internal Structure of Micah 4-5

This section describes separately the general opinions of Smith and Haupt regarding chapters 4-5.[18] Then their analyses of individual groups of verses will be compared. Since Smith treats the whole of chapters 4-5 and Haupt extracts only the poems, this section follows Smith's division of verses.

Before Smith analyzes Micah 4 and 5, he begins his study with this claim:

> Chapters 4 and 5 have given much trouble to interpreters, great variety of opinion existing as to what portions, if any, may be attributed to Micah and as to the origin and date of the portions not thus assigned. All agree, however, that the chapters as they now stand are wholly lacking in logical continuity within themselves and must be regarded as composed of a series of more or less unrelated fragments.[19]

Smith affirms that the book of Micah has poetic form and that chapters 4-5 exhibit hope and the promise of salvation. He sees Micah 4-5 as a collection of short poems which bear little relation to one another.[20] He bases this observation on the alternation of oracles of doom and hope. He presumes that

> there are no pre-exilic "hope" passages, with the possible exception of 4:6-10 which dates from the time of Jerusalem's fall at the earliest (597 or 586) and is certainly post-Mican. The book of Micah "falls naturally into three parts," chapters 1-3, 4-5, and 6-7, which are related to each other in terms of doom-hope contrast.[21]

---

[17] Smith, 12-16.
[18] Even though Haupt's work is limited in that it only focuses on poems, his work is still directly applicable to this thesis.
[19] Smith, 82.
[20] Smith, 8.
[21] Smith, 8.

Smith divides chapters 4-5 into eight sections: 4:1-5; 4:6-10; 4:11-13; 4:14; 5:1-3; 5:4-5; 5:6-8; and 5:9-14. In every section he argues for post-Mican style.

According to Haupt, the final form of Micah has two messages: one is pessimistic and the other is optimistic.[22] That these two parts appear alternately tends to confuse readers because of two contradictory themes of judgment and restoration themes. Haupt's opinion is that originally Micah did not contain anything after chapter 4. Therefore, a later editor inserted verses like 2:12 and 4:9-14 in order to produce a more coherent work. Now let us consider various sections of the text.

4:1-5

Smith regards 4:1-5 as a poem and finds "progress of thought,"[23] which he accounts for with editorial expansion. He further divides this poem into three strophes. In the first strophe (4:1), the temple of YHWH in Jerusalem becomes the center of the world and then the second strophe (4:2) illustrates nations coming and learning YHWH's way. The last strophe (4:3-5) declares YHWH will be the judge of the world.[24]

Smith accents the phrase בְּאַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים (in the issue of days) in the first strophe. According to him, this phrase "occurs thirteen times in the Old Testament but belongs to the exilic and post-exilic circle of ideas, occurring only here and Hosea 3:5, Genesis 49:1, Numbers 24:14, aside from Jeremiah, Ezekiel and later books."[25] In the second the phrase

---

[22] Haupt, 65.
[23] Smith, 83.
[24] Smith, 83.
[25] Smith, 85-86.

וְנָהֲרוּ עָלָיו עַמִּים וְהָלְכוּ גוֹיִם רַבִּים וְאָמְרוּ (and people will flow unto it, yea, many nations will come and say; 4:1b-2a), he believes that the idea of this phrase belongs to the thought of "Deutero-Isaiah and later literature of Israel."[26] Smith emphasizes that "the prophecies of the eighth century contain no suggestions of this thought. Isaiah 11:10, 18:7 and 19:16-25, in which it is more or less fully expressed, are quite generally conceded to be of late origin."[27]

Smith makes note of the phrase in v. 2: לְכוּ וְנַעֲלֶה אֶל־הַר־יְהוָה וְאֶל־בֵּית אֱלֹהֵי יַעֲקֹב (come, let us go up to the mount of Yahweh, and to the house of the God of Jacob). He interprets this verse as implying "that the temple at Jerusalem is the only authorized sanctuary of YHWH."[28] Consequently, he insists that "this seems to force the dating of the passage in the post-deuteronomic period."[29]

Smith argues for discontinuity of verse 5 with verses 1-4. He discusses 4:1-5 as three different sections by two different authors: 4:1-3 and 4:4 are by one author while 4:5 is by a second. In 4:3 the phrase וְכִתְּתוּ חַרְבֹתֵיהֶם לְאִתִּים (they will hammer their swords into plowshares) is a vision that Judah will be a stronger country than her neighbors, so that they do not attack Judah. "They" in verse 4:3 indicates Judah. According to Smith, this was the typical expectation of the Maccabean period. Smith considers verse 4 as appended by a later composer because of the content. Until verse 3, editors' thoughts are expressed positively through verse 3 and then negatively in verse 4. Furthermore, the subject changes from nation (v.3) to individual (v.4).[30]

Smith's opinion depends on two elements: one is general opinion from other scholars and the other is content. He believes that the author of verse 4 is identical with the author of verses 1-3 because both describe peace. The contents of verse 5 differ from those of verses 1-3,

---

[26] Smith, 86.
[27] Smith, 86.
[28] Smith, 86.
[29] Smith, 86.

in that verses 1-3 indicate the future, while "verse 5 is vividly conscious of the discordant present."[31] He uses Isaiah 2:2-4 as evidence of origin because 4:4-5a cannot be found in Isaiah. Hence, 4:4 reveals editorial expansion.[32]

In 4:1-5, Haupt covers all the verses; however, his investigations are not as detailed as Smith's. In 4:1 Haupt insists that "will be placed at the head of the mountains" does not refer to a physical elevation of Jerusalem. It means simply that the small hill of Zion will become the most important mountain, just as the small country of Palestine will be one of the most important countries from a religious point of view.[33]

Haupt also points to the phrase וְשָׁפַט בֵּין עַמִּים רַבִּים (and he will judge among many nations) in 4:3 as evidence of late authorship. The expectation of Israel during the Maccabean period was that the Gentiles would convert to the Jewish religion.[34] Haupt's evidence for this interpretation is 4:2. His idea is that in the Maccabean period, Gentile people who convert to Judaism were not expected to keep the Law. That is, Maccabean leaders failed to hold Gentiles to the same expectations as Jews.[35] In summary, Haupt holds that this section reflects the post-exilic period, thus excluding the possibility of Mican authorship.

4:6-10

In looking at 4:6-10, Smith suggests that "this section reflects a period when Jerusalem was in imminent danger from an invader. It foretells the capture and exile as the inevitable outcome of the situation"[36] but also that YHWH will bring Israel into Jerusalem.[37]

---

[30] Smith, 87.
[31] Smith, 88.
[32] Smith, 84.
[33] Haupt, 50.
[34] Haupt, 51.
[35] Haupt, 51.
[36] Smith, 89.

Smith singles out "that day" in 4:6 as important for interpretation. He suggests that this phrase "marks the end of the exile."[38] Moreover, he emphasizes the words הַצֹּלֵעָה "halt" and וְהַנִּדָּחָה "outcast," because these words are "suggestive of a flock of sheep, designating the exilic community as a whole."[39] Furthermore, he states that "at the time when these words were written the '*diaspora*'[40] had already begun."[41] In 4:7, Smith also gives attention to the word "remnant" and comments:

> The parallelism [between "remnant" and "strong nation"] shows that the term 'remnant' is practically equivalent to the corresponding term 'strong nation.' This implies, as J. Wellhausen has noted, a much more advanced stage in the development of the idea of the remnant than can be imagined for the eighth century when Isaiah was first giving clear expression to the conception; cf. Is. 7:3, 8:16ff, 10:20ff, Am. 8:15. It presupposes a time when the idea had been long familiar and the mere mention of the term carried with it the suggestion of all the glory and splendor of the Messianic age that had gradually gathered around the thought of the remnant.[42]

Because of this statement, Smith asserts that this passage belongs to the exilic or postexilic period; nevertheless, his view of the relationship between "remnant" and "strong nation" is explained speculatively without firm evidence.

According to Smith, the historical reference in 4:8 cannot be fixed in a certain time period because the theme is too general. Thus, because of this observation, he designates this section's theme as post-Mican. He suggests, "allusion to the prosperous days of the double kingdom under Jeroboam II and Uzziah is less natural [than David or Solomon]; while to say that the implied contrast must be between the post-exilic regime and pre-exilic as a whole is without

---

[37] Smith, 89.
[38] Smith, 93.
[39] Smith, 93. Smith indicates the exile in Babylon.
[40] Henry Snyder Gehman, ed., et al.., *The New Westminster Dictionary of the Bible* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1970), 228. "Dispersion: Translation of Greek *diaspora;* the body of Israelites scattered abroad in other lands than their own."
[41] Smith, 93. Smith uses a word *diaspora* not only for the Babylonian captivity but also for the dispersed ones.
[42] Smith, 94.

any basis."[43] For instance, Smith points up the word הראשנה (first, chief) to support this time period. Moreover, he focuses on an Aramaic word תאתה (swelling) to support his dating of the text. These words indicate that Judah will be a powerful country, but this was not actualized in history.

Smith rearranges the order of verses 6-10. Verses 9-10 precede verse 6-8 because of logic. He regards verses 6-8 as a response to verses 9-10. After changing the order, he describes the order of events naturally, *viz*, "downfall of Jerusalem, exile, deliverance, restoration to power,"[44] and posits the date of the text to be 597 or 586, which was the fall of Jerusalem. He insists that this section belongs between the post-exilic and the pre-exilic period. Thus these two sections (vv.6-8 and 9-10) do not belong to Micah.[45]

In the section 4:6-10, Haupt covers only 4:6-7. He holds that the speaker of 4:6 is one of the leaders of the Maccabean period, not God. His basis for this is verse 7 where we see the idea of a "remnant," indicating a Maccabean context rather than an eschatological one. Thus according to Haupt, the word "remnant" reflects Maccabean leaders who tolerate repentant Jews but are very harsh to the renegades, those who have not reverted from Hellenistic ways. Maccabean leaders accept repentant people without any distrust. Therefore, Haupt thinks, the idea of a "remnant" can be better explained in a Maccabean context.[46] To Haupt, the term "remnant" means the people "who have survived the Syrian persecution."[47] Moreover, he points to the Hebrew phrase: הצלעה והנדחה (the stragglers and strays). He argues that the word "strays" refers to "the Jewish apostates at the beginning of the Maccabean period."[48]

---

[43] Smith, 95.
[44] Smith, 90.
[45] Smith, 90, 95.
[46] Haupt, 43.
[47] Haupt, 44.
[48] Haupt, 45.

Haupt also insists on a Maccabean context in 4:7 because at the beginning of the Maccabean period Israel's power was about the same as Syria's, but before this time Israel had been exhausted. Moreover, he believes the expression "the LORD shall reign over them in Mount Zion" represents the event of the Temple dedication in 165 B.C.[49]

4:11-13

Smith describes this section also as belonging to the post-Mican period. His view is that the setting revealed in verses 4:6-8 and 4:9-10 indicates the siege of Jerusalem. He explains:

> This passage reflects other conditions than those with which vv. 9, 10, 6-8 deal. In both descriptions Jerusalem is in a state of siege; but there the result of the siege is the fall of the city and the exile of its inhabitants; deliverance comes only after captivity has begun. Here, Jerusalem turns upon its foes and conquers those who came confident of victory. There, the enemy is evidently the Babylonian; here, the whole pagan world gathers against Yahweh's people. This last feature was first incorporated in the prophetic descriptions of the 'latter days' by Ezekiel (38:15, 39:4-6, 18) and in such a way as to indicate that it was original with him. Hence, this oracle must belong to a late exilic or post exilic date.[50]

Smith's opinion is that now the enemy is the "whole pagan world" and therefore indicates the late exilic or post-exilic period. This is consistent with his other views about what ideas are possible in the eighth century and what ideas are not.

Smith next takes up the phrase "many nations" (4:11). According to the text, "many nations" are not friends of Israel.

> The gathering of the nations in array against Jerusalem is a characteristic idea of exilic and postexilic prophecy. It belongs to the later eschatological aspect of prophecy. Pre-exilic prophecy sends its roots deep down into contemporaneous history; its visions of the future are indissolubly linked with the conditions of the present.[51]

---

[49] Haupt, 44.
[50] Smith, 97.
[51] Smith, 98.

These statements of verse 13 indicate a future event. During the history of Israel, neighboring nations are the enemy in almost every historical period; this section, however, describes then positively. Thus, this section must not belong to Micah.

4:14

Smith analyzes this verse alone because he sees no thematic connection between it and the surrounding passages. He states that this verse is disconnected "as shown by the absence of ו before עתה and by the totally different thought conveyed [by the text]."[52] He insists that the reference of this verse is to a real historical event, but there is no agreement on whether it is to Sennacherib, Nebuchadrezzar, or someone unknown. Hence he does not give a date for this verse.

5:1-3

Smith analyzes this section with verses 1 and 3 together and then verse 2 alone because the subject changes between verses 1 and 2. Because they announce the coming of the Messiah, verses 1 and 3 might be dated as post-exilic. Smith's understanding of the messianic expectation informs his view that, because of the mention of Zerubbabel, this passage must belong to the time of Haggai and Zechariah.[53] For instance, in 5:1 Smith focuses on the phrase: מִמְּךָ֨ לִ֜י יֵצֵ֤א לִהְיוֹת֙ מוֹשֵׁ֣ל בְּיִשְׂרָאֵ֔ל (from thee one will come forth for me who shall be ruler over Israel). This indicates that Israel does not have a king, and so points to the late origin.[54] He suggests that

[52] Smith, 100. The word "thought" is used many times in his commentary. This word indicates "an editorial idea."
[53] Smith, 102.
[54] Smith, 103-104.

because of "the attitude of respect for the Davidic dynasty" and "Messianic expectation," this oracle "must be assigned somewhere in the postexilic period."[55]

According to Smith, verse 3 continues the thought from verse 1, not verse 2. The connection between verse 1 and verse 2 is very loose. He points out that the subject is changed from first person (v. 1) to third person (v. 2). This is evidence for editorial work.

5:4-5

Smith analyzes this section as a poem which is irregular because of the phrase in verse 5, וְרָעוּ אֶת־אֶרֶץ אַשּׁוּר בַּחָרֶב (and they will shepherd the land of Assyria with the sword). He insists on dating this verse in the post-Mican period because "the verses seem to reflect later times when the Apocalyptists painted glowing pictures of the future with little reference to present conditions or to the possibility, from a human standpoint, of their ever being realized."[56] He points out "seven or eight princes" because it is not one great leader, but many leaders. Hence, the many leaders in verse 5 refer to political leaders, not the Messiah.[57]

5:6-8

In the seventh section, Smith takes the position that "this piece is quite generally denied to Micah." According to him, this section does not belong to Micah because this is opposed to the eighth-century prophecy.[58] The content of this section reflects Israel's scattered situation

[55] Smith, 102.
[56] Smith, 107.
[57] Smith, 107.
[58] Smith, 110.

after the fall of Jerusalem.[59] Smith points out the late understanding of *diaspora* which "is a familiar idea and has attained wide extent."[60] Micah uses this term with a different meaning. "The remnant is no longer the weak handful of Isaiah, but is endowed with invincible might, none can stand before it."[61] Because of this, he suggests that this section is an individual section from the previous verses 4-5. Also, in 5:6 the word "remnant" designates an exilic or scattered period. His opinion is that this verse is parallel to 4:7, which is a late text. Thus, the date of this text must also be from a late period. Moreover, "Jacob" used neither for northern Israel nor Judah but for the people of YHWH as a whole. This represents a late usage. Thus, this verse must be a post-eighth century passage.[62]

Haupt analyzes only 5:6-7. He shares Smith's opinion about the "remnant" in 5:6. He describes this word with more detail, stating that it indicates "the orthodox Jews" who have survived from the Syrian persecution.[63] He cites as evidence 1 Maccabees 3:35.[64] Thus Haupt asserts that 5:6-7 reflects the Maccabean period.[65]

5:9-14

Smith analyzes the structure of this text and divides verses 5:9-13 from 5:14 on the basis of theme. 5:14 has YHWH's "vengeance upon the heathen," and 5:9-13 concerns only Israel.[66] Smith states that "the original piece (vv. 9b-12) probably dates from a time in the Deuteronomic

---

[59] Smith, 110.
[60] Smith, 110. He does not provide the audience or reader; however, it designates Jews who live in the post-exilic period.
[61] Smith, 110.
[62] Smith, 111.
[63] Haupt, 45.
[64] *The Harper Collins Study Bible with the Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical Books*, ed. Wayne A. Meeks, et al. (New York: Harper Collins Publishers, 1989), 1655. "Lysias was send to a force against them to wipe out and destroy the strength of Israel and the remnant of Jerusalem; he was to banish the memory of them from the place."
[65] Haupt, 46.

period;"[67] however, the original piece "was thoroughly worked over in the post-exilic age."[68] He counters Marti's observations to support his view.[69] Marti's opinion is that this section (5:9-14) has an exilic or postexilic date. Smith summerizes Marti's opinions in four points. (a) Marti singles out the words מצבה and אשרה. These words do not have any reference for earlier date. Marti's idea is that these words were used during the Hezekian reform. (b) The image of war and idolatry are characteristic of a later period. The word "fortress," for example, appears in a later period. (c) The date of the parallel passages (Ho. 2:20, 8:14, 14:4) is from a late period. (d) The lack of the concept "high-place" is evidence of the late period. Smith next picks up the phrase וְהִשְׁמַדְתִּי עָרֶיךָ ("and I will cut off your cities"). He states that "the mention of fortified cities is hardly sufficient warrant for placing the prophecy in the Maccabaean age as Marti does."[70] Smith concludes that this section originated from Micah, but that someone probably changed it in the eighth century.[71]

Haupt only analyzes three verses: 5:9,11 and 14. He dates these three verses in the Maccabean period because of the word "chariot." This word is mentioned in the "Maccabean song of derision upon Antiochus Epiphanes in Is. 37:24 and in the Maccabean psalms 20: 8, 46: 10, 76: 7."[72]

Haupt insists that 5:11 indicates an attempt to reject the Hellenistic culture. He seeks a historical context in which there were diviners. He discovers such a situation in the Jezebel story during the period of Jehu, but this is too early for Micah.[73] In the Maccabean period the Palestinian cities were Hellenistic and engaged in divination also. Therefore, Haupt's conclusion

---

[66] Smith, 113.
[67] Smith, 113.
[68] Smith, 114.
[69] Smith, 114. Marti's opinion contains four articles.
[70] Smith, 115.
[71] Smith, 114.
[72] Haupt, 47.

is that the date is Maccabean. But he ignores the fact that diviners existed throughout the whole history of Israel. So this word cannot be evidence of a specific date.

Smith insists that most of chapters four and five belong to a time period after Micah. In many places, however, he mentions "original fragments." This reflects one of the limitations of his methods. For example, in 5:10 Smith insists that the original fragment of this verse possibly belongs to the eighth-century. When he uses "original fragment," he ignores one or two words, which are the "original fragment," in a whole verse. His method does not include the whole text in his investigation, hardly convincing other scholars who have different opinions.

In Haupt's case, he completely ignores the fact that Samaria was destroyed numerous times at earlier dates.[74] He does not give reasons why one should favor John Hyrcanus' destruction over any of the other ones.

Smith and Haupt generally use the tools of literary criticism. However, they break down Micah chapters 4-5 according to different sources. Their assumption is that different sources have different styles. While Smith concentrates on metrical style in chapters 4-5, Haupt only investigates poetry sections because he assumes that they are more genuine, but he does not support this claim with evidence.

As noted above, Smith's approach to the book of Micah is a typical of literary criticism. He mainly focuses on each passage's time period (the chief tenet of literary criticism). In Haupt's case, he studies the book of Micah using literary criticism. He believes that Micah has more than one source. Then he attempts to discover which source is more ancient than others. His research remains limited, though, because he covers only poetic sections. He tries to remain faithful to the

---

[73] Haupt, 48.

[74] It is included by the Greeks (for example, 167 B.C.) and Assyrians and even earlier. For further study see John Bright, *The History of Israel* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1981), 419-427.

school of literary criticism, providing author and time frame. In conclusion, although both scholars, Haupt and Smith, are faithful to literary criticism, they lose the unity of Micah.

B. Form Criticism

Let us now consider the use of form criticism. Marvin Sweeney insists that the oracles of the prophets are composed of "short and self-contained speeches."[75] Since however, the prophetic books as we have them today are lengthy, this suggests that they have been edited. This is the reason that form criticism has been commonly used by modern scholars. Sweeney notes that "a great deal of early form-critical research concentrated on stripping away the 'inferior' work of later redactors and tradents by using genre as a criterion to identify and reconstruct the theologically significant 'original' prophetic speeches."[76] John Barton characterizes form criticism as a method of study that identifies and classifies the smaller compositional units of biblical texts, and seeks to discover the social setting within which units of these types or literary genres were originally used.[77] While there are basic agreements about the understandings and aims of form criticism, scholars who use form criticism do not come to the same conclusions about the compositional units or about the social settings.

---

[75] Marvin A. Sweeney, "Isaiah 1-39 with an Introduction to Prophetic Literature," ed. Rolf P. Knierim and Gene M. Tucker, The Forms of the Old Testament Literature, vol.XVI, (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1996), 11.
[76] Sweeney, 11.
[77] John Barton, "Form Criticism," *The Anchor Bible Dictionary,* vol.2, ed. David Noel Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 838.

1. External structure of Micah 4-5

This thesis examines the work of the following form critical scholars: Hans Walter Wolff,[78] James Luther Mays,[79] and Ehud Ben Zvi.[80] They may use the same method, but their conclusions differ even at the level of an overall outline for the book. For instance, Wolff makes four divisions for the book of Micah while Mays divides the book of Micah into two sections (1-5 and 6-7). Ben Zvi divides Micah into three sections (1-3, 4-5, and 6-7). Their views on the book of Micah differ slightly concerning the date, but they are in general agreement about a post-exilic dating of the text.

Wolff focuses on the historical and sociological settings of each section.[81] He divides the book of Micah into four sections: chapters 1-3; 4-5; 6:1-7:7; and 7:8-20.[82] He makes these divisions on the grounds that the "four groups of texts can be clearly distinguished according to their chief themes and also according to their addressees, merely the scattered interpolations indicate that the juxtaposition of the four main complexes is rather like intricate meshwork."[83]

Wolff insists that some chapters (chapters 1-3) in the book of Micah can be dated as early as the eighth century B.C. Micah 4:10, however, indicates that the Babylonians stood in front of Jerusalem's gate. In support of this proposal, Wolff brings in 2 Kings 25:7, 8-13, 20 and

---

[78] Hans Walter Wolff, *Micah: A Commentary,* trans. Gary Stansell (MN: Augsburg, 1990).
[79] James Luther Mays, *Micah: A Commentary.* The Old Testament Library, ed. John Bright, James Barr and Peter Ackroyd (London: SCM Press, 1976).
[80] Ehud Ben Zvi, *Micah,* ed. Rolf Knierim, Gene M. Tucker and Marvin A. Sweeney, The Forms of the Old Testament Literature vol. XXIB, (MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2000).
[81] Wolff, 6-9.
[82] Wolff, 17-26.
[83] Wolff, 18. "Alongside these cross-connections within the text-groups we find longitudinal connections, thin but clear threads between the text-groups that link one group to the other, such as the connection of 1:2 with 5:14; of 3:8 with 6:8; or of 7:7 with 7:8ff." Also Paul Raabe, *Obadiah: The Anchor Bible* vol.24D, ed. William F. Albright and David N. Freedmann (New York: Doubleday, 1996), 172. Raabe suggests that the background of these verses can be 597/587 B.C.

Jer. 40:7, 13. Micah 4:11 represents the situation when Nebuchadnezzar's troops surrounded Jerusalem (Wolff compares 2 Kings 25:1-4 and Obad. 11-14).[84]

According to Wolff, the text of 4:1-4 belongs to the post-exilic period because it mentions the temple as already rebuilt. Consequently, this text is neither pre-exilic nor exilic. Moreover, the text (4:1-4) that has a relationship with the latest event, namely the dedication of the second temple in 515 B.C., is added by redaction, so that the prophecy continuously speaks of the exile situation and tries to explain the delayed Messianic promise. Thus, Wolff suggests that the book of Micah covers a 300-year period.[85] For example, Micah 1:8-16 reflects the time of Sennacherib's campaign in 701 B.C. and 7:11ff expresses messianic hope which can be dated to the time of Nehemiah about 445 B.C.

Wolff states that "in chapters 4-7 we find a text whose language is hardly comparable to Micah's."[86] According to him, 4:1-8 and 5:6-14 (7-15) have five "unconditional" promises and these promises are varied, and these promises "have been supplemented by cultic or redactional additions."[87]

In his analysis of chapters 4-5, Wolff assumes that the historical background is either exilic or post-exilic. He insists on dating all of chapters four and five no earlier than 587 B.C. For instance, 4:9-5:1, 3, 4a, 5a, 6b contain the oldest passages. In this part "now" appears three times (4:9, 11, 14 (5:1)). Each saying also has "then" sections to indicate the salvation which reflects eschatological prophecy.[88] As another example, Wolff holds that 5:6-14 (7-15) reflects "the early exilic promises of deliverance that begin with 'Now.' This word designates the

---

[84] Wolff, 4.
[85] Wolff, 5.
[86] Wolff, 13.
[87] Wolff, 13. He suggests that 4:1-8 contains three different complex sayings and that these sayings are quite different in style and content.
[88] Wolff, 20.

eschatological promises when it links with והיה, 'Then.'"[89] He insists that 4:1-8 constitutes "three eschatological sayings (4:1-4,6-7a,8), a liturgical statement of confession (4:5), and a redactional addition formulated in liturgical language (4:7)."[90] Wolff assumes that eschatological salvation oracles are later additions. Thus, chapters 4-5 belong to the exilic or the post-exilic period.

Wolff also sees chapters 1-3 and 4-5 as having a "setting in life" of liturgical character that reflects the historical situation from 587 B.C. to 515 B.C. He supposes that "the collection of various exilic and postexilic prophecies was used as part of the liturgical readings in ceremonies of lamentation by the Jerusalem community (according to Zech. 7:3, 5; 8:19)."[91] His proposition is that "this 'setting in life' of the collection, as well as the redaction which has linked chapters 1-3 with chapters 4-5, makes it understandable."[92] Wolff insists on an uncertain date for individual passages, but he suggests that the collection of individual passages appeared because the "guilt-judgment theme has been replaced by promises for Jerusalem, for the remnant of Jacob, and for the nations, after the time of the catastrophe brought by the Neo-Babylonians."[93] Therefore, the collection period can be extended to the post-exilic time. This indicates that chapters 4-5 can be no earlier than 587 B.C.

Wolff does not explain the relationship between chapters 4-5 and 6-7 extensively. His basic view point is that chapters 6-7 are separate from chapters 4-5 because 6:1 functions as an indication of a new section.[94] Thus Wolff concludes that 6:1 comes from other sources.

James Luther Mays also proposes that Micah is a collection of brief literary units, but he groups the literary units into only two large sections. He claims further that "when the chapters have been analyzed by the techniques of form criticism and literary criticism, the units and

---

[89] Wolff, 20.
[90] Wolff, 21.
[91] Wolff, 22.
[92] Wolff, 22.

redactional material fall into stages."[95] As previously stated, he divides the book of Micah into two large sections (1-5 and 6-7). Even though he connects chapters 4-5 to chapters 1-3, he does not hold that they all fall into the same period. He does not clearly explicate or provide any textual references for the nature of the relationship between the two sections (1-3 and 4-5). His idea for the relationship is YHWH's reign. He finds YHWH's universal rule in the first three chapters; because of this, YHWH will judge Samaria and Jerusalem and also redeem these two cities. Neighboring countries will be witnesses that "YHWH's coming kingdom faces them with a choice between submission (4:1-5) and punishment (5:10-15)."[96] Mays goes on to say:

> The pivot of movement, the point at which a breathtaking shift occurs with the chapters, clearly lies between 3:9-12 and 4:1-5. The announcement that Jerusalem will be totally destroyed and disappear is followed by the proclamation that Jerusalem will be the capital of YHWH's reign to which the nations shall repair. The sayings in 1-3 lay the foundations for the lead up to 3:12, and those in 4-5 support and expound 4:1-5.[97]

This statement expresses Mays' viewpoint that a connection exists between chapters 4 and 5.

For the connection between chapters 4-5 and 6-7 are the prophecies of salvation which appear in 4:1-5:9 and 7:7-20. A major concern of this prophecy is the restoration of "Zion as the center of YHWH's reign."[98] Thus YHWH's reign is the theme of Micah's mission and it is reflected in the book of Micah. Nevertheless, Mays holds to his assertion that "they [individual texts] have been brought into the Micah collection in the process of its continuing use."[99] As previously stated, Mays ultimately does not support authorship by Micah and doubts eighth-century background. Mays proposes that

> The sayings which can be attributed to Micah with confidence are collected in chs. 1-3. They were spoken during the period of his activity in Jerusalem toward the end of the

---

[93] Wolff, 22.
[94] Wolff, 22.
[95] Mays, 22.
[96] Mays, 3.
[97] Mays, 4.
[98] Mays, 14.
[99] Mays, 14.

> eighth century B.C. The latest material in the book comes from the post-exilic period after the temple had been rebuilt (515 B.C.). Early in the fifth century seems a likely *terminus ad quem* for the completion of the book in its present form. During that interval the tradition of Micah's message was cherished in faith, interpreted and applied, elaborated and extended in a process which was the expression of a confidence that Micah's words were the word of YHWH, the announcement of a divine purpose which transcended Micah's time and moved toward the establishment of YHWH's reign in the world. The profile of that confidence is the proclamation of the book as a whole.[100]

Mays admits that "the problem of reconstructing that process is as difficult as the undertaking to reconstruct the history of Israel and its faith during the period when the book was emerging. The latter can be accomplished in broad outline but much detail remains uncertain."[101] He recognizes that many critical methods are being used to investigate the book of Micah, but that many questions still remain unsolved.

Mays uses the phrase "growth of the book"[102] to describe his stance that the book of Micah is a gradual compilation of small segments. He observes that chapters 4-5 are a compilation of salvation oracles and chapters 1-3 are judgment oracles.[103] For instance, Mays points out that Micah 5:4 "would make an appropriate conclusion to the new shape of the collection."[104] He states that:

> The material includes independent sayings collected because they feature these themes and additions which belong to the redactional work of fitting the sayings into their present literary context. (a) Sayings featuring nations/peoples: 4:1-4 with its liturgical response, v.5; 5:5f. ('Assyria' is a type of the nations who threaten Israel); 5:7 and 8; 4:13, a prophetic summons to battle which has been attached to 4:11f, by the catch-word 'thresh.' (b) Redactional strands featuring the same theme: 1:2 and 5:15. (c) Sayings featuring the remnant:2:12; 4:6-7a; 5:7 and 8. (d) Redactional settings related to (c) : 2:13; 4:7b; 5:3(an apologetic insertion in 5:1-4 to co-ordinate the appearance of the new ruler with the return of the scattered remnant); 5:9 (to link vv. 10ff. to v.8).[105]

This statement indicates Mays' view that the book of Micah is the result of a long process.

---

[100] Mays, 21-22.
[101] Mays, 22.
[102] Mays, 22.
[103] Mays, 26.
[104] Mays, 27.
[105] Mays, 27-28.

As for Ehud Ben Zvi, he divides the book of Micah into four sections (not including the superscription (1:1) and conclusion (7:18-20)). These are 1:2-2:13 (first set of readings), 3:1-12 (prophetic reading explaining the fall of Jerusalem/Zion), 4:1-5:14 (a set of prophetic readings characterizing the future), and 6:1-7:17 (a final set of prophetic).[106]

He suggests that "the book of Micah is a written text that shows a great deal of literary sophistication."[107] Ben Zvi believes a number of actions are involved in a written text, such as collecting, editing, copying, distribution, etc.[108] This belief informs his statements about the received text arising from earlier texts:

> These texts provided the literati who wrote, copied, read, reread, and studied them with a necessary social role, that of intermediaries or brokers of the divine knowledge present in the written word and not directly accessible to those who are unable to read that written word competently.[109]

At this juncture, we point out the word "reread." This serves as Ben Zvi's basis to suggest the date of individual texts to be "post-monarchic." He clearly expresses his approach, saying that "this commentary is a form-critical and a historical-critical one."[110] His idea about the entire text's date does not necessarily indicate an original oracle's date or even the same time period. He insists that "a commentary on a book and the message that it carries within a readership has to be explicit about the identity of the readership to which it is referring."[111] Thus, he reveals his presupposition that "readership is located in post-monarchic Israel."[112] He makes reference to several verses to support his idea, such as 4:10 (explicit reference to the exile in Babylon); 2:4,

---

[106] Ben Zvi, 4.
[107] Ben Zvi, 4.
[108] Ben Zvi, 5.
[109] Ben Zvi, 5.
[110] Ben Zvi, 6.
[111] Ben Zvi, 6.
[112] Ben Zvi, 6.

10 (loss of land); 2:12-13, 7:12 (gathering of the exiles); and 4:10; 7:11-13 (salvation after exile, i.e. eschatological).[113]

Ben Zvi agrees "with the overwhelming majority of redaction-critical studies of the book of Micah that maintain that significant sections of the book, and hence the book as a whole, are post-586."[114] He goes on to suggest that the book of Micah has a "strong Jerusalem/Zion-centered theology or ideology" which points to the second temple community. He proposes that source texts already existed before the final form of Micah. Through time, the source texts were collected and edited. Thus the final form of the text has continuity in the sense of readership because the final form is read at a particular point in time, but not because the text was an original whole. Ben Zvi suggests that the reading of the book of Micah "represent(s) what authors want, or at best allow, their readers to think of these circumstances."[115] Ben Zvi concludes that the whole book of Micah comes not from just one author or even a school, but that the book is an assembled text involving work or editing of many people.

2. Internal structure of chapters 4-5

4:1-5

All three scholars point out the problem of disunity of theme in verses 1-5, but each proposes a different solution for this problem. Wolff observes that Micah 4:1-5 is composed of three different parts: verses 1-3, 4, and 5. He, like many others, thinks this portion is redacted, and suggests that verse 5 is a later addition.[116] The function of this verse is to comment on 4:1-4,

---

[113] Ben Zvi, 9.
[114] Ben Zvi, 9.
[115] Ben Zvi, 10.
[116] Wolff, 114. Wolff states that "the later addition in v.5 combines a three-stress bicolon with a two-stress tricolon, the latter giving emphasis to this confessional statement."

a result of compilation. He states that "4:4 goes a step further than vv. 1-3; it joins to the announcement of peace among nations, a promise about the life of individuals. This promise appears to be a redactional addition."[117] Verse 5 serves to emphasize Micah 4:1-4 so that this poem makes the promise contained in it a strong confessional statement.[118]

Ben Zvi defends his hypothesis, that the book of Micah was written for post-exilic readers, by using the concept of "postmonarchic readership." He argues that "from the perspective of the postmonarchic readership, for which the present book of Micah was primarily intended, there was no contradiction between an announcement that monarchic Jerusalem will be destroyed (as in 3:12) and an assurance that in the future Jerusalem will serve as a magnet to all peoples."[119] Here, he emphasizes the reading of the whole book without making reference to the date of this portion. Yet he plays it safe by not insisting on a date of authorship of the entire book. Herein lies a major weakness: he does not assert the time period of the "original readers," forcing his readers to guess about the date. He often implicitly, but rarely explicitly, suggests the postmonarchic period as its historical background.

In verses 3b-4a, Ben Zvi suggests that these verses are "written to allow the possibility that the main prophetic speaker has completed the citation of the nations' words by the end of v. 3b, and if so vv. 3b-4a are to be attributed to this prophetic speaker"[120] because of the varied authorship.

In contrast to Wolff, Ben Zvi insists that 4:1-5 cannot be divided into two units because "there is no solid evidence that either the text of vv. 1-4 or of v. 5 was uttered in or composed for

---

[117] Wolff, 114.
[118] Wolff, 115.
[119] Ben Zvi, 95.
[120] Ben Zvi, 98.

a liturgy."[121] In regard to the date of 4:1-5, "the intended readership of the book of Micah is asked to read 4:1-5 as a Mican, or Isaianic, passage."[122] He strongly proposes that this whole portion is well written and that it has coherence for the reader. He states:

> Moreover, if the starting point is the present text of 4:1-5 (rather than possible but speculative proto-texts and the theologies and intentions attributed to them), then it becomes clear that the language of v. 5 conveys a sense of textual coherence with vv. 1-4 (notice the references to הָלַךְ walk, אִישׁ a person, עַמִּים peoples), which suggests that the readers of the book of Micah were asked (and expected) to read 4:1-4 and 4:5 as a unit.[123]

This statement indicates how Ben Zvi uses his own concept of continuity. However, it does not necessarily show the true textual continuity because he still contends that Micah 4:1-5 was compiled. He argues only that it is well connected.

On the other hand, Mays' idea for this portion is different from that of other form critical scholars in that he argues for unity but he does not strongly insist on a date. Mays emphasizes that Micah 4:1-5 has theological unity.[124] He does not propose unity based on date, authorship, etc., but follows Micah's thematic continuity. He suggests that "the text as a whole portrays the way in which the appearance of YHWH's reign on earth will inaugurate an imperial peace that transforms the conditions of life for nations and individuals."[125] In spite of the fact that Micah 4:1-3 appears in Isaiah 2:2-4, it is still difficult to determine the date. His conclusion is that both sections come from the same oral tradition, but they differ in written form.[126]

---

[121] Ben Zvi, 102.
[122] Ben Zvi, 102.
[123] Ben Zvi, 102.
[124] Mays, 93.
[125] Mays, 93.
[126] Mays, 94-95. For example, "the participle 'established' stands at a different place in the sentence, a pronoun is not used as subject of 'be raised,' the preposition *'el* is used instead of *'al,* and 'all the nations' replaces 'peoples.'"

4:6-8

Three scholars are aware of thematic connection between 4:6-8 and 4:1-5, but they argue that the change of person indicates a redacting process.[127] They suggest that some of this portion was added at a later time. In 4:6-7a, the subject is "I" of Yahweh. In verse 7b, however the subject is changed to the third person.[128] This observation is also found in Mays' investigation. Mays proposes that "in v. 7b the first person style is dropped and a plural pronoun is used for the people."[129] This change in style suggests more than one author.

Mays finds a similar expression in Zephaniah 3:19 which is dated as a postexilic addition. Mays finds evidence for his position in the rare word "lame." He submits that "lame" by itself does not indicate a particular time period, but that together with other words connecting to this time, it might point to the post-exilic period.[130] He suggests that

> 4:6 is similar to Zeph. 3:19, a post-exilic addition to the Zephaniah corpus; the two contain three of the four occurrences of 'lame' in the Old Testament (the fourth in Gen. 32:31). The prophecy assumes the existence of the *diaspora* created by the fall of Jerusalem, and uses the term 'remnant' as a fixed notion of eschatological theology. It belongs to the late exilic or post-exilic salvation prophecies concerned with the recovery of the scattered exiles.[131]

He believes that the remnant theme gained new meaning in the post-exilic period. This period developed the understanding that YHWH rescued his flock and raised them from their weakness.[132]

Similar to Mays, Wolff believes that this portion belongs after the eighth century. He bases his argument on the form "messenger speech."[133] He asserts that in 4:6-8 "this 'messenger

---

[127] Mays, 100 and Wolff, 114.
[128] Wolff, 115.
[129] Mays, 100.
[130] Mays, 101.
[131] Mays, 100.
[132] Mays, 102.
[133] Wolff, 115.

speech' is an unconditional promise for a defeated and scattered people in exile."[134] "Messenger speech" in 4:6-8 connotes promise, and therefore this style reflects a later period.

Verse 4:8 is connected to the previous verses by its unconditional promise to Jerusalem-Zion.[135] Wolff also notes a connection between 4:8 and 5:1, 3:

> (1) the introduction of direct address with the word וְאַתָּה (2) the similarity of 'come forth from you'(מִמְּךָ יֵצֵא) and "to you shall come" (עָלַיִךְ תֵּאתֶה וּבָאָה) (3) the announcement of a 'ruler' (מוֹשֵׁל) and one 'who rules' (הַמֹּשֵׁלָה) (4) the ruler's origin "from of old, from ancient days" (מִקֶּדֶם מִימֵי עוֹלָם) becomes the "former" (הָרִאשֹׁנָה) (dominion) (5) the ruler is presented as a shepherd cf. עדר in 4:8. These numerous correspondences cannot be accidental. The difficulty is how to explain the levels of redaction that produced the present text.[136]

Wolff explains the process of redaction by suggesting that Micah 4:6-8 was redacted by someone with a particular purpose. He concludes that "Micah 4:8 takes the older promise addressed to Bethlehem (5:1) and connects it to Zion-Jerusalem."[137] He calls this "the redactor's interpretation."[138] Thus, he says, this portion cannot belong to the eighth century or Micah because of its style, as he has shown.

Ben Zvi views the text as possibly exilic or postexilic. He begins by investigating the content of this portion. His concern is the theological concept of salvation, which does not appear in 4:1-5.[139] He states that:

> This subunit addresses a common topos in announcements of salvation that was not present in (4:1-5).... This type of announcement presupposes the theological concept of the exile as a most significant deficiency from which Israel suffers, and whose removal is hoped and expected at some indefinite point in the future.[140]

---

[134] Wolff, 115.
[135] Wolff, 115-116.
[136] Wolff, 116.
[137] Wolff, 116.
[138] Wolff, 116.
[139] Ben Zvi, 108.
[140] Ben Zvi, 108.

This oracle may or may not come from the post-exilic period, and the purpose of this portion is describing the future.[141] Nevertheless, he feels there is a possibility that this section might have been written in the pre-exilic period.

4:9-5:5

In this section the work of the three scholars differs, especially that of Wolff. He insists that this whole portion is inserted. He says that 4:9-5:5 is a later addition because this section consists of three "now (ועתה)-sayings."[142] His concern is not only with content but also vocabulary. In 4:9-14, he focuses on עתה(ו) because this word occurs three times in this section and is evidence for "literary reworking."[143] He asserts that this section is a unit and that 4:9-14 is supported by 5:2-3. Furthermore, he suggests that verse 2 is evidence for the postexilic period.[144] This opinion comes from comparison to the traditional theme of birth in Isaiah 7:14. Wolff believes that 4:9-5:5b is based upon a preexistent text, namely Isa. 7:14. One of the redactors picked Isaiah chapter 7:14 and put it into 5:2. Wolff than claims that "then (והיה)-sayings" are inserted in the entire section of 4:9-5:5.[145] In support of this, he contends that the referent in 4:9, 11, and 14 is the Babylonian invasion in 587.[146]

Wolff comments on this phrase in Micah 4:11: "many nations gathered themselves against." His contention is that this expression is appropriate for the siege of Jerusalem, and he suggests the invasion of Nebuchadnezzar II reported in 2 Kings 24:2.[147] Wolff concludes:

---

[141] Ben Zvi, 110-111.
[142] Wolff, 136.
[143] Wolff, 136.
[144] Wolff, 136.
[145] Wolff, 137.
[146] Wolff, 137.
[147] Wolff, 137.

> Only with the postexilic redaction were the sayings in 4:1-8 inserted before the "now-sayings," which at the same time were reedited and brought into the grand conception of eschatological proclamation found in chaps. 4-5.[148]

Mays' opinion is similar to that of Wolff. In 4:10, Mays finds exilic terms and language which are exilic. For instance, the term "YHWH is liberator" is found in "Deutero-Isaiah....Jeremiah 31:11, and Ps. 106:10."[149] According to Mays, those sections are known to belong to the exilic period.

In 4:11-13 Mays concentrates on the statement "nations (peoples, kingdoms) are storming Jerusalem (Israel); they [nations] are overwhelmed (defeated, eliminated)."[150] He believes that this notion is developed in various ways. For instance, he references Isaiah 17:12-14, 29:5-8, Ezek. 38-39, Zech. 14:1-3, 12-15, 12:2-9, and Joel 3:1-3, 9-12,[151] and favors an exilic or postexilic setting for all these verses including the Micah passages. The idea is that "YHWH will decisively relieve Zion of the threat of the nations... The nations are the neighboring states who plagued Jerusalem after 587."[152]

Mays contends that the theological foundation of 4:1-5:3 is 2 Samuel 7, which depicts "YHWH's election of David,"[153] the representative for YHWH's reign. Despite this contention, he insists that "the promise has been attributed to Micah at the end of the eighth century, and dated in the exilic and post-exilic periods."[154] He tries to hold to both settings for Micah. He says that the promise can belong to the eighth century B.C. but at the same time he argues that it should be dated after Micah's period.

Ben Zvi divides this section into three parts, each beginning with ועתה "and now" (4:9-10, 11-13; 4:14-5:1). He seeks to show that these sections "evoke the genre and the expectations

---

[148] Wolff, 138-139.
[149] Mays, 106.
[150] Mays, 107-108.
[151] Mays, 108. These references reflect the concept of the Messiah.
[152] Mays, 108.
[153] Mays, 112.

of prophetic announcements of salvation."[155] The three ועתה parts (4:9-10, 11-13, 4:14-5:1) demonstrate that this section may have been edited at an undetermined date. He argues that

> The literary unit composed of these three sections neither resembles nor attempts to resemble closely a possible, real-life, oral announcement made by a prophet to a group of people at the time of a most threatening attack against monarchic Jerusalem by foreign foes, be they Assyrians, Babylonians, or any other historical enemy.[156]

For Ben Zvi, this section does not have a particular time reference such as "Hezekiah, Jehoiachin, Zedekiah, Sennacherib, or any individual king, friend or foe."[157] By contrast with Mays, however, he tries to date this section by using the contents of 4:14 (salvation). He holds that similar exilic or post-exilic contents are found in 4:9-10 and 11-12.[158] Thus, he believes that this section cannot refer to eighth century events.[159] Ben Zvi also sees this section as eschatological. He asserts that the "main intention of this unit is to convey an association between the past and the future."[160] Here, "past" indicates a difficult time period because the contents of this section reflect negative circumstances. "Future" refers to the future David. Ben Zvi's opinion is that the ועתה sections' contents can indicate YHWH's kingship.[161]

5:6-14

Wolff contends that 5:6-14 also reflects the exilic period. To support his claim, he focuses on the words "now" (עתה) and "then" (והיה). He holds that eschatological promises, which are promised to the "remnant of Jacob,"[162] make the connection between "now" and

---

[154] Mays, 112,
[155] Ben Zvi, 121.
[156] Ben Zvi, 121.
[157] Ben Zvi, 122.
[158] Ben Zvi, 121.
[159] Ben Zvi, 122.
[160] Ben Zvi, 123.
[161] Ben Zvi, 123.
[162] Wolff, 155.

"then." This is the reason for eschatological occurrences in this section.[163] Furthermore, he contends that "they [remnant] are people gathered from the *diaspora* of the exile by the power of Yahweh's promises summoned to make a new beginning in Jerusalem."[164] He then proceeds to show that this section indicates the exilic or post-exilic community seeking future hope.[165] Thus, he states that this section is a post-exilic redaction.

> It is probable that the later additions such as 4:5, 5:8, and v.13 belong to the universalistic redaction of the Persian era. These additions, given the forms of the confession (4:5), the petition (5:8), and the Yahweh oracle against foreign nations (5:13, 14), point to a connection with the lamentation ceremonies from the exilic and postexilic eras.[166]

Mays divides this section into two parts, 5:6-8 and 9-14, although his proposal for dating the material is similar to Wolff. In 5:6-8 Mays focuses on the term "remnant" and suggests again that this term is probably a post-exilic term and cites what he regards as parallel texts, such as Isaiah 41:14-16, and Zechariah 9:11-17; 10:3-12.[167] His opinion about Isaiah 41 is that the theme of salvation presupposes the exilic period.

For 5:9-14, Mays also states that "this basic oracle can hardly have come from Micah."[168] His reason is that the oracle shows signs of an "early exilic redaction of Micah tradition" by using the terminology of idols, horses and chariots.[169] According to Mays, these things are against YHWH, and they appear in literature at the end of the monarchy and at the beginning of the early exile period.[170] Therefore, this section cannot be from Micah himself or the Micah tradition.

---

[163] Wolff, 20. Wolff sees that "exilic promise" indicates eschatological promise.
[164] Wolff, 155.
[165] Wolff, 21.
[166] Wolff, 154.
[167] Mays, 121.
[168] Mays, 124.
[169] Mays, 124.
[170] Mays, 124.

Ben Zvi's view of Micah 5:6-8 is similar to that of Wolff. He suggests that "the pericope is written from a perspective that assumes exile and dispersion, and it refers to Israel as the 'remnant of Jacob.'"[171] His view is that the community understands itself as a powerless group. Thus this interpretation reveals a post-eighth century situation.

In regard to 5:9-14, Ben Zvi firmly states his position that the content of 5:11-13 does not belong to the Hezekian period because of concepts like cultic objects and practices, which are consistent with post-586 settings. As an example he cites Deuteronomy 4, which he views as from the post-exilic period.[172] He claims the "Deuteronomic style" of 5:11-13 to be evidence that this section also belongs to the exilic or post-exilic period.[173]

Under the heading of form criticism, three scholars have been studied. While they all explain Micah chapters 4-5 using form criticism, each scholar stresses different emphases. This indicates some weak points in their approaches. Wolff is good at providing the social settings; however he rarely shows which literary genres were originally used. Mays stresses the identities of biblical texts (not leaving himself enough space to deal with social setting, genre, etc). Ben Zvi tries to find what is the author's intention for the reader, but he focuses more on the time setting. Thus he falls short of his main goal. These three scholars do not measure up to the standards of their chosen critical method: "a great deal of early form-critical research concentrated on stripping away the 'inferior' work of later redactors and tradents by using genre as a criterion to identify and reconstruct the theologically significant 'original' prophetic speeches."[174]

---

[171] Ben Zvi, 134.
[172] Ben Zvi, 140.
[173] Ben Zvi, 140.
[174] Sweeney, 11.

C. Redaction Criticism

In considering redaction criticism, we will investigate the works of three scholars: D.R. Hillers,[175] L. M. Luker[176] and Jan A. Wagenaar.[177] We will begin with the external relationship and then examine the internal relationship.

Redaction criticism began as a supplement to the limitations of literary and form criticisms. Thus, redaction criticism was based upon the result of previous studies. Characteristic of redaction criticism is the idea that oral tradition or written sources have come down through history and, at a later time, a redactor collected those sources. Redaction criticism scholars presume that "most of prophetic books are certainly the result of a long process of editing or redaction."[178] They argue that "it makes sense to practice redaction criticism only when it is certain that a book is composite in character." Based upon this, redaction criticism is seen as rediscovering a redactor's intention.[179] Thus scholars who use redaction criticism trace tendencies, distinctive features, and emphases in a document. In fact, redaction criticism's foundation is unclear. They only investigate the Bible books which work best with their theory.

1. External structure of Micah 4-5

Under redaction criticism, an external relationship (as well as an internal relationship) of the text (Micah 4-5) is presupposed because the redactor intends the text to appear as a unified

---

[175] D.R.Hillers, *Micah: A Commentary,* ed. Frank Moore Cross et al., Hermeneia – A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984).
[176] Lamontte M. Luker, "Doom and Hope in Micah: The Redaction of the Oracles Attributed to an Eighth-Century Prophet" (Graduate school of Vanderblt University, unpublished dissertation, 1984).
[177] Jan A. Wagenaar, *Judgement and Salvation: The Composition and Redaction of Micah 2 – 5,* ed. H.M. Barstad et al., Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, vol. LXXXV (Leiden: Brill, 2001).
[178] John Barton, "Redaction Criticism: Old Testament," in *Anchor Bible Dictionary* vol. 5, ed. David Noel Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 645.
[179] John Barton, 644.

work. Luker observes that "almost every prophetic book" has oracles of doom and hope.[180] He investigates how those two concepts are related and how they influenced the book of Micah as we have it today. Luker's method combines form and redaction criticism, and he states that "this essay is a study of the redaction of the oracles of one pre-exilic prophet, Micah."[181]

Luker divides the book of Micah almost entirely according to its most commonly used chapter divisions: 1, 2, 3, 4:1-5:3, 5:4-14, 6, and 7. His division of chapters 4 and 5 does not follow this pattern because the theme of 4:1-5:3 is different from 5:4-16. The theme of the former section is "the temple of the Mountain" and latter section is "Zion, personifying her as a woman."[182]

In analyzing the book of Micah, Delbert R. Hillers' approach resembles a combination of historical, literary, form and redaction criticism. He claims that "the principle of arrangement [among the twelve minor prophets] seems to have been chronological, so that Micah is placed with books believed to be approximately contemporary."[183] Nevertheless, he states "I have speculated that the present text shows signs of editing or alteration with the needs of a later, exilic community in mind."[184]

To Hillers, external relationship is not an important issue, since he believes Micah is redacted and the external relationship does not come from the original author. He favorably introduces Lindblom's opinion that the Old Testament is a collection of older sources. This observation indicates Hillers' opinion that the book of Micah is collected and redacted as a book, which means that among the genuine elements there is little original relationship. He suggests a tripartite division for the book of Micah: "chapters 1-3 'doom'; 4-5 'grace'; 6-7 'further

---

[180] Luker, 1.
[181] Luker, 5.
[182] Luker, 175-176.
[183] Hillers, 1.

admonitions and comfort.'"[185] His observation is that in each section the book of Micah is thematically connected by a redactor.

Hillers insists that it is difficult to find a larger structure by which to understand the book of Micah as one original book (i.e. as we have it now). Still he sees the book of Micah as a larger unit because redaction criticism begins with and tries to explain the final form of the text, what we have today. This reveals a limitation of redaction criticism – that it depends on the conclusions of form and literary criticism. So where form or literary criticism does not provide evidence of external relationship or connections between larger units, redaction criticism cannot determine an external relationship. In other words, where form criticism cannot identify a seam, redaction criticism has nothing to work with.

Jan A. Wagenaar does not investigate the whole book of Micah. She covers only chapters 2-5, explaining little about the connection between chapters 1:2-5:14 and 6-7. She states that "the sayings of Micah in Moreshet collected in 1:2-5:14 were combined with the pre-exilic collection of sayings addressed to Israel and Samaria from an [anonymous] prophet from Northern Israel in 6:1-7:20."[186] The elements of connection are "the inclusion of the proclamation of judgment addressed to Samaria."[187] She also observes that a redactor included kings' names in chapter 1, verse 1. For her, this is evidence that the collections were combined.

---

[184] Hillers, 4. It is this author's opinion that he does heavily rely on redaction criticism, and indeed makes numerous references to it to bolster his claims. Thus he is included in this section about redaction criticism.
[185] Hillers, 8.
[186] Wagenaar, 324.
[187] Wagenaar, 324-325.

2. Internal structure of Micah 4-5

4:1-5

Let us look specifically at 4:1-5. Unlike other scholars such as Hillers, Wagenaar insists that these verses are similar to Isaiah 2:2-5 not only in form but also in function.[188] On this she borrows from form criticism's view point on Micah 4:1-5.[189] Form critical scholars (Mays, Wolff, and Ben Zvi) suggest that the background of this section is liturgy and a liturgical community.[190] Wagenaar, however, contends that the background of Micah 4:1-5 is not pre-exilic liturgy because 4:1-3 does not fit in the genre of this liturgy.[191] At this juncture she brings in the concept of "*Volkerwallfahrt*"[192](pilgrimage). For Wagenaar this concept is an important clue for deciphering the text and its date. The pilgrimage concept is defined as "a peaceful pilgrimage of the nations to Jerusalem. The nations have come to seek out YHWH and His תורה."[193] Her opinion is that the origin of this concept is in the post-exilic period.[194] In support of this opinion, she also looks at the *Volkerkampf* (war) concept. She claims that *Volkerwallfahrt* arises as a reversal of the concept of *Volkerkampf*. Thus, she asserts that the *Volkerkampf* (which comes from V*olkerwallfahrt)* is found in Micah 4:1-5, and therefore this seems to belong to the post-exilic period.

Within this whole section, Wagenaar sees the thematic connection between verses 1-2 and verse 3 as supported by Psalm 46:10, which also expresses YHWH's victory.[195] She suggests that because of the peaceful description, verse 4 seems to connect to the messianic era as 5:3b

---

[188] Wagenaar, 261.
[189] Wagenaar, 262.
[190] Wagenaar, 262.
[191] Wagenaar, 262.
[192] Wagenaar, 264-265. A complete discussion of *Volkerwallfahrt* motif can be found in G. Wanke, *Zionstheologie*, 70-99; H.M. Lutz, *Jahwe, Jerusalem und die Volker*, 11-130.
[193] Wagenaar, 266.
[194] Wagenaar, 271.
[195] Wagenaar, 268.

does.[196] She further suggests that the contradiction in the content between 3:12 and 4:1-5 is such that it indicates an editor was involved.[197] Here Waganaar introduces the recent tendency toward "Zion Theology."[198] According to her, scholars cannot decide a specific time for this concept; however, the pilgrimage "features stem from the post-exilic period (Joel 4:1-3; 4:9-23; Zech. 12:1-9; 14:1-3; 14:12-15; cf. Micah 4:11-13)."[199] In support of this opinion, she points to G. Wanke's observation that "the *Volkerkampf* motif did not come into existence before the post-exilic era."[200] She goes on to suggests that several words and phrases, for example הר בית יהוה and נהר, belong to the late exilic and post-exilic literature.[201]

Luker's assumption is that the book of Micah is redacted.[202] His approach is a kind of retrogression. He tries to find unity within the book of Micah or of chapters 4-5, but he offers no proof for the authorship or historical setting which he believes is eighth century. He does attempt to find thematic unity with a later time period.

First of all, Luker divides chapters 4-5 into two sections, 4:1-5:3 and 5:4-14. In the first section (4:1-5:3), he discerns two smaller units, 4:1-7 and 4:8-5:3. He observes that 4:1-7 is a kind of word play for making a connection to the previous portion. For instance, he notes that in the phrase וְהַר הַבַּיִת appears in 3:12, and similarly יִהְיֶה הַר בֵּית־יְהוָה appears in 4:1.[203]

Luker consistently points to continuity of theme: for instance, "section 2 (4:8-5:3) continues the subject of Zion, personifying her as a woman."[204] Like other scholars, he also points out ואתה and עתה for evidence of structural unity. He also insists that this portion (4:8-5:3)

---

[196] Wagenaar, 268.
[197] Wagenaar, 269.
[198] Wagenaar, 270.
[199] Wagenaar, 270.
[200] Wagenaar, 270.
[201] Wagenaar, 271.
[202] Luker, 5.
[203] Luker, 176.
[204] Luker, 176.

has wordplay and assonance.[205] Thus, he asserts the book of Micah was redacted to have a thematic continuity.

Hillers' viewpoint on this section is that the date is vague or undetermined.[206] However, he suggests that this section is connected to chapter 3 by the theme "plowed like a field," which serves as a bridge between chapters 3 and 4.[207] Thus he finds continuity in theme. This theory is uniquely his view, because many scholars claim that there is a break between chapters 3 and 4. Hillers suggests that Micah 4:1-4 possibly belongs to the exilic or post-exilic period.[208]

4:6-7

Wagenaar questions the unity of 4:6-7 and assumes that 7b was edited in later periods. She states that "the variation of a divine first person singular with a third person singular statement about YHWH elsewhere in the Old Testament is hardly an argument for the integrity of the saying."[209] Wagenaar also insists that 4:6-7b has elements (such as the "kingship of YHWH") from Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Deutero-Isaiah (Jer. 23:1-4; Ez. 34:11-19; Isa. 40:9, 41:27, 46:13, 51:11, 16, 52:7-8), which make it difficult to determine the date. These elements in Jeremiah and Ezekiel do not belong to the late or post-exilic period, but Deutero-Isaiah's elements do belong to the exile.[210] Her opinion is that because of the later elements, this part of the text belongs to the end of the exile.

On the basis of his analysis, Hillers claims that the date of this section is exilic or post-exilic period because of the term "remnant."[211] The word "remnant" here is used positively, and

---

[205] Luker, 177.
[206] Hillers, 51.
[207] Hillers, 50.
[208] Hillers, 53.
[209] Wagenaar, 273.
[210] Wagenaar, 274.
[211] Hillers, 54.

he holds that this is a "characteristic of late writers"[212] (e.g. Isa. 11:12-16 and Zeph. 5:18-20).[213] He also investigates the structure of the text suggesting that "the passage is clearly set off from the foregoing by a new introduction ("on that day") and by a formula of quotation ("Yahweh said")." Because of these phrases, this section is disconnected from the previous section. Thus Hillers holds that this section designates original composition.[214]

Luker suggests that this text is very unclear because of its content. He says that this section's oracle "is more clearly positive, though not without its own sober, sober truth."[215] He retains this viewpoint on 4:11-12 as well.

Luker briefly mentions thematically tying by wordplay in 4:1-7. He gives some examples for this that: נשא (4:1, 4:4), הלך (three times in v. 2, two times in v. 5) and כי/איש (repeat among verse 4 and 5).[216] These examples are evidence of editing for him; however, it can be argued as that the original author, Micah, likes these words and uses them in his poetry.

4:8[217]

As she considers 4:8, Wagenaar focuses on the phrases "you Migdal-Eder" in 4: 8 and "you Bethlehem" in 5:1. She finds similarities in form and structure between the two verses and suggests that these similarities are due to the redactor's activity. For structural similarity she points out three indicators: "(a) both use the emphatic personal pronoun אתה; (b) each place name is followed by a short specification; (c) each introduces a statement about the leadership of

---

[212] Hillers, 54.
[213] This thesis does not agree with the evidence because these sections belong to a pre-exilic period.
[214] Hillers, 54.
[215] Luker, 179.
[216] Luker, 176.
[217] Only Hillers and Wagenaar treat 4:8 as a independent section.

Israel."[218] She insists that "personified places may already have come into existence in the pre-exilic era." Consequently this verse can be connected with Micah 5:1-4a.[219] She points out that the origin of 4:8 and 5:1 are found in Genesis 49 and Deuteronomy 33 (the priestly code and the book of Deuteronomy).

Hillers claims that the theme of this verse is supported by 5:8. He explains that "there is a verbal link of 'and you' with 5:1, and a resonance between 'as at first' and 'from of olden times,' which confirms the understanding of the passage as referring to the Davidic empire"[220] as he analyzes both theme and the vocabulary and style of each passage. In the end, he maintains his position that the text is from the post-exilic period.

4:9-10, 14

Wagenaar includes verse 4:14 with verses 9-10 because of similarity in forms, structures and vocabulary. She also brings in "post-exilic" Jeremiah 6:24-26 because this portion has similar contents.[221] These verses (Jer.6:24-26) are not from the pre-exilic period. She states that "the similarities in vocabulary between Micah 4:9-10, 14 and Jer. 4:31; 6:24-26; 8:19, which are unparalleled in the pre-exilic literature, may indicate that Micah 4:9-10,14 stems from the same circles around Jeremiah which were responsible for the collection and revision of the words of Micah in Micah 2-3."[222] Consequently, these verses cannot belong to the eighth century. She insists that "the announcement of the deportation of the population to Babylon (4:10bab)

---

[218] Wagenaar, 275.
[219] Wagenaar, 278.
[220] Hillers, 56.
[221] Wagenaar, 278.
[222] Wagenaar, 286.

likewise suggests that 4:9-10, 14 have to be read against the background of Nebuchadnezzar's siege of Jerusalem."[223]

Hillers does not add verse 14 to 4:9-10. He points out that the themes of "kingship" and "distress and deliverance of Zion" are closely tied to the preceding section.[224] Hillers focuses on the word "king" in verse 9 because a similar theme occurs in verse 7 and Jeremiah 8:19.[225] Thus, for Hillers, the referent of this section is Babylon in the exilic period.[226]

4:11-13

Wagenaar suggests that the pilgrimage concept, *Volkerwallfahrt,* appears in this pericope.[227] She believes that this concept offers "important clues for the literary critical assessment of this passage."[228] In agreement with other scholars she holds that the pilgrimage motif of this portion justifies a late, post-exilic date.[229] In support of this position, she points out that "the vocabulary of Micah 4:11-13 is characteristic of the exilic and post-exilic period."[230] For instance, "אסף combined with גוי occurs in the Old Testament only in Hab. 2:5; Zeph. 14:2; Isa. 13:4; Zech. 12:3 Ez. 38:12; Zech 14:14." Thus, again, her opinion is that this portion was redacted in the post-exilic period.

In these verses, Hillers stands his ground on thematic continuity. He claims that the salvation theme of this section is well established in chapter 4.[231] He then proceeds to explore

---

[223] Wagenaar, 286.
[224] Hillers, 59.
[225] Hillers, 59.
[226] Hillers, 59.
[227] See p. 39.
[228] Wagenaar, 287.
[229] Wagenaar, 289.
[230] Wagenaar, 289.
[231] Hillers, 60.

this section structurally, focusing on ואתה because this word appears in verses 9-10 and 14. He suggests that this word is a linking word for the section, and perhaps also 4:8 and 5:14 as well.[232]

On 4:14 Hillers' opinion is somewhat similar to Wagenaar when he says it is a "fragment."[233] He theorizes that this fragment, "when complete, would have had the same sequence of ideas as 4:9-10, 11-12."[234] The reason for his using in the word "fragment" is that it creates problems in dating. He thinks that it is hardly appropriate for a time of siege, but there is no clue pointing to either the Assyrian invasion or the Babylonian period. Ultimately Hillers leaves this problem unresolved.

Luker sees thematic continuity in the subject of Zion. He introduces the idea that "the ancient tradition of Zion and David are prevalent in 4:1-5:3."[235] He does not, however, assert the authorship because of the word נֶאֱסְפוּ in verse 11. He sees that the niphal is quite ambiguous in 4:11, stating that "now gathering גוים רבים as an instrument of discipline for Lady Zion but, as part of the greater scheme of things, planning that these nations too will be gathered and punished."[236] Although Luker stresses thematic continuation, he provides evidence for redaction. Because of this, he asserts that book of Micah does not have a single authorship.

5:1-4a

Moving on to chapter five, Wagenaar determines that the text was edited in a time period later than Micah's. She points out a change from second person masculine to second person feminine. This change is found in 4:8 and she suggests that "the parallels in form and structure

---

[232] Hillers, 60.
[233] Hillers, 62. "Fragment that, when complete, would have had the same sequence of ideas as 4:9-10,11-12."
[234] Hillers, 62.
[235] Luker, 180. He treats 4:8-5:3 as one big section. However, he does not attribute this whole section to the same period.

between Micah 4:8 + 9-10a + 10b +14 and 5:1 + 2a + 2b + 3-4a are, therefore, the result of later editorial activity."[237] The author also suggests that this portion is a "secondary addition" to 4:9-10, 14 because its contents depict the "last days of Israel," "Babylonian exile," "restoration," and "return of the exile."[238] These descriptions belong to the fall of Jerusalem and Babylonian exile. She comes to the conclusion that this part is probably from the late exilic period.[239]

As a redaction critic, for Hillers, the main theme of "the rule of God" is continued between chapters 4 and 5; Micah 4:1-4 and this section are therefore connected thematically. He also points out that "the specific problem of the human king and restoration of 'the former kingdom' which pervades the rest of chapter 4 here finds its culmination."[240] He states:

> In my opinion, the prophet is at points alluding to or quoting, traditional material which we no longer possess. Moreover, the eighth century oracle has been reworked later in an exilic situation. As a result we may probably regard it as a prophecy of Micah, but we cannot restore the original form with complete confidence, or understand it, at all points.[241]

Therefore interpretation can go one of two ways. "Either the prophet is speaking of a new Messianic king who will be born of the old line, or he is talking about the reappearance of David himself."[242] For Hillers, this creates difficulty about the authorship.

5:4b-5

In this section, Wagenaar uses unique evidence to support her opinion; she suggests that "the form and structure of Micah 5:4b-5 reveals close similarities with a number of Ancient Near

---

[236] Luker, 179.
[237] Wagenaar, 293.
[238] Wagenaar does not provide a reference for each depiction.
[239] Wagenaar, 294.
[240] Hillers, 65.
[241] Hillers, 65.
[242] Hillers, 66.

Eastern incantations against evil."[243] The author brings evidence from outside of the Bible, such as "the Ugaritic prayer contained in the ritual KTU 1.119, 26-36."[244] This section (5:4b-5) is problematic for pinpointing a date because its content concerns the rejection of all magical practice and reflects the "Deuteronomistic reform movement (cf. Deut. 18:9-12)."[245] Furthermore, she suggests that "the appearance of the legendary Micah of Moresheth in the days of the Assyrian crisis may have occasioned a later editor to include a text which lists a series of measures against an Assyrian invasion in a collection of his prophecies."[246] Because of this, Wagenaar insists that the date of this section is ambiguous, proof that this section was edited.

Hillers also points out that many scholars believe this section was added to make the flow of the text seem smoother, and this serves to show the problematic nature of this section. He insists that there is "little" direct connection with the preceding section.[247] In 5:4, he focuses on the word "Assyria," which can mean many things incluidng "Babylon, Seleucid Empire or enemy of Seleucid Empire, or any enemy of the kingdom of God."[248] He does not suggest a specific date for the text of this section.

5:6-8

In these two verses, Wagenaar admits the difficulty in determing the date of origin; she examines "the proverb concerning the king in Proverbs 19:12."[249] Wagenaar's concern is for the

---

[243] Wagenaar, 294.
[244] Wagenaar, 294-295. Its content is very similar to Micah 5: 4b-5. Wagenaar provides the whole prayer; however, here is the last section:
'then Baal will hear your prayer:/
he will drive away the strong one from your gate/
the warrior from your walls.'
[245] Wagenaar, 300.
[246] Wagenaar, 300.
[247] Hillers, 69.
[248] Hillers, 69.
[249] Wagenaar, 304.

content of the "two similes,"[250] which are form and content. Her concern arises as she tries to determine the date of the text. She brings in Prov. 19:12 and 16:14-15 and shows that these sections and Micah 5:6-8 have similar expressions and words "two similes." Thus the three sections have the same historical background, which is the post-exilic period.

She insists that although "the two verses [5:6-7] seem at first sight to be simply a collection of two *similar* sayings, together they form a coherent statement."[251] Her opinion about these two verses though is that they are a supplement for verse 8. Therefore, 5:6-8 is a collection of "words of Micah of Moresheth."[252] This reflects her opinion that this part's date is the post-exilic era because 5: 6-8 has been redacted.[253]

Hillers believes that "though this passage is only loosely joined to what comes just before it, it does have close thematic ties to the section about the future beginning in 4:1."[254] He does not compare the immediate text to this section, but he notes some terms from the previous section (4:1-5:5) and suggests counterpart words like "remnant/ survivor" or "nations/many peoples."[255] He does not deal directly with the date of this section; however, with this comparison he implies a later exilic date.

---

[250] Wagenaar, 301. "Both sayings are introduced by והיה, followed by a statement about the relationship between the 'remnant of Jacob' and the nations."
[251] Wagenaar, 301.
[252] Wagenaar, 305.
[253] Wagenaar, 305.
[254] Hillers, 70.

5:9-14

Finally, let us look at the last few verses of chapter five. Here Wagenaar borrows Zimmerli's opinion of *Bannformel*.[256] Her opinion is that the "extermination formula" derived from *Bannformel* is found in 5:9-13.[257] She states that

> the 'extermination formula' is expressed by means of the *Hiphil* (Micah 5:9, 10, 11, 12; Zech. 9:10; 13:2; Lev. 26:30) or the *Niphal* (Zech. 9:10) of the verb כרת. Occasionally the *Hiphil* of the verb שמד (Micah 5:13; Lev. 26:30) or the *Hiphil* of the verb אבד (Micah 5:9) are used.[258]

By citing these texts, the author shows her opinion regarding the date of 5:9-14 as a later exilic date. Since similar expressions are found in attested post-exilic texts (Zech. 9:10, 13:2; Lev.26:30), she suggests that this concept comes from the post-exilic period. Thus, 5:9-13 comes from "a (late pre-) exilic or post-exilic era."[259] This idea is supported by a number of scholars.[260] The author does not give enough reasons to exclude an earlier time period for this text. She says that "the vocabulary of Micah 5:9-13, however, is reminiscent of Jeremiah and Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic literature."[261] According to Wagenaar, the redactor was probably a Deuteronomistic editor.[262] This shows her tendency to interpret the evidence through the lens of the presupposition that Micah has been redacted.

Wagenaar struggles with determining the date of Micah 5:14, noting that "form critical consideration offers little or no help."[263] Thus she suggests that "1:2 and 5:14 may constitute an

---

[255] Hillers, 70.
[256] Wagenaar, 305. The basic concept of this idea is that "People who violate the holiness of Israel are expelled from the community." Furthermore, she suggests that this concept occurs in the priestly code and Ezekiel.
[257] Wagenaar, 308.
[258] Wagenaar, 308.
[259] Wagenaar, 313.
[260] Wagenaar, 313.
[261] Wagenaar, 313. She comments on C.H. Wildberger's opinion, namely "the possibility that Isa. 2:6, bb may be the work of a later editor who re-interpreted the words of Isaiah."
[262] Wagenaar, 314.
[263] Wagenaar, 314.

editorial frame for the collection of the 'Words of Micah of Moresheth' in Micah 1-5."[264] She concludes that "the overall framework constituted by 1:2 and 5:14 supports the suggestion that in the course of the transmission 5:9-13 has been re-interpreted as a proclamation of judgment against the nations."[265] The author's view point is appropriate for the "frame idea," but she loses the coherence of chapters 4-5 as a whole, because of "collection of the 'words of Micah,'" which indicates that the book of Micah has been redacted.

Hillers points out the phrase "in that day" as a link between the preceding oracle and this one. Its linking function helps to determine the meaning.[266] He says, however, that because of its theme and words many scholars argue that this section should be dated at a late period. For instance, he explains that "opposition to steles (מצבות) and the theme of vengeance against the nations are most common in late compositions."[267] Thus he suggests:

> We do not know of any opposition by Hezekiah to horses and cities, for example! In principle, however, the passage seems congruent with the times of Hezekiah, and the situation of Micah and villagers in Judah, who prior to the onset of Messianic time look for a purging of the nation. Judgment on the nations is announced in the first sentence of the book (1:2), and though rare in early writings, the theme of vengeance on the nations is perhaps not unthinkable in an oracle of Micah.[268]

With regard to chapters 4 and 5, Hillers seeks to make a strong case for thematic continuity.

Luker divides chapters 4-5 into two sections. Chapters 4-5 function like a bridge among other chapters. In 5:4-14, Luker focuses on vocabulary and theme for the text's unity. He points out רעה because words which are related to רעה appear in 5:3, 4, and 5. He also picks out אֶרֶץ because related words or themes appear in 5:4 and 5.[269] Luker's analysis of the text in terms of the vocabulary is his strong point.

---

[264] Wagenaar, 315.
[265] Wagenaar, 315.
[266] Hillers, 72.
[267] Hillers, 73.
[268] Hillers, 74.
[269] Lukers, 182.

In summary, the diachronic approaches mostly deal with historical questions-for example, how the messages of Micah relate to the historical world of Israel. On this question, they make some contributions in the study area of Micah 4-5. For instance, they sometimes validate the date of the text and even more historical events. Eventually they divide the text into small sections. That is, they read the Bible with an eye of suspicion.

Hillers, Luker, and Wagenaar try to remain faithful to their method. Under redaction criticism, they make their hypotheses and seek to prove them. They cannot, however, capture the redactor's original agenda, the ultimate goal of redaction criticism. They focus their attention on minutiae, and they miss the forest for the trees. In the end, they fail to make their case. Take for instance, Micah chapters 2-5, Wagenaar deals with the redaction history of the book of Micah, focusing on the oracles of doom and salvation because they appear in alternation. She analyzes the text in terms of the form and literary development of the individual parts, and then concludes that 4:9-10, 14; 5:9-13 belong to the early exilic period, 4:6-7a, 8; 5:1-4a belong to the late exilic period, and 4:1-5, 7b, 11-13; 5:6-8, 14 belong to the post-exilic period. While she makes an impressive show of dating Micah's various sections, she disappoints the reader by not following through on her stated goal, to capture the redactor's agenda. This also applies to the other two scholars. Redaction criticism looks like form criticism because redaction criticism begins with a hypothesis that Micah has been compiled, and we must keep in mind that redaction criticism is supplementary to literary criticism.

III. Synchronic Approaches

This chapter deals with the works of scholars who use synchronic approaches in their treatment of Micah – David Hagstrom, Charles Shaw, Mignon Jacobs, Francis I. Andersen and David N. Freedman.

At this point, it is worth reviewing briefly the difference between synchronic approaches and diachronic approaches. Michael Gorman suggests that "synchronic means within time or 'close reading' and diachronic means across time."[1] Synchronic approaches focus on the text as we have it, but diachronic approaches seek to discern the prehistory of the extant text. Thus, with synchronic approaches, scholars read the Bible holistically, but scholars who have diachronic approaches divide it into small units.

A. Review of Methods

1. David Gerald Hagstrom[2]

Let us begin our review of the methods of various scholars with Hagstrom, who calls his method "A Literary Analysis." He focuses on the final form of the book of Micah and seeks to prove the literary coherence of the book of Micah itself. With this in mind, he announces that "I shall proceed inductively. That is, I shall seek by means of an analysis of the language of the book of Micah itself to compile features [theme, vocabulary, syntax, etc.] constitutive of coherence and thus to provide a description [of Micah] in terms drawn from the book itself."[3] Thus, to Hagstrom, "a literary analysis" means investigating the language of the book of Micah.

---

[1] Michael Gorman, *Elements of Biblical Exegesis: A Basic Guide for Students and Ministers* (Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 2002), 196-199.
[2] David Gerald Hagstrom, *The Coherence of the Book of Micah-A Literary Analysis,* ed. J.J.M. Roberts, Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series, number 89 (Georgia: Scholars Press, 1988).
[3] Hagstrom, 7.

Hagstrom states that his purpose "to arrive at a working hypothesis regarding the overall structure of the book of Micah. The resulting structural hypothesis will then function as a framework for the continuing investigation of the coherence of the book."[4] His structural hypothesis is that Micah can be divided into chapters 1-5 and 6-7. His opinion is that "dispute" is the theme for each section.[5] Before the author enters the main section of his investigation, he points out that chapter three has a key role for identifying unity or coherence. Hagstrom suggests that because "this chapter clearly does exhibit coherence, it serves as a helpful starting place to begin marking features which contribute to coherence," an assertion that is accepted by a number of scholars including Claus Westerman and John Willis.[6] Hagstrom posits that chapter 3 may be divided into three units (vv. 1-4, 5-8, and 9-12), and that "the units continue with a specification of addressees (in vv. 5-8 a specification of those under indictment), a list of charges against said persons, and an announcement of YHWH's judgment."[7] Hagstrom shows what his purpose (demonstrating unity) is and indicates how it is achieved.

2. Charles S. Shaw[8]

Shaw's rhetorical situation and discourse have a close connection in that there is a "set of circumstances which has invited the discourse and which may be modified through

---

[4] Hagstrom, 7.
[5] Hagstrom, 27. His division is as follows:
I. Chaps. 1-5 The First Dispute
A. Chaps. 1-3 Judgment
1. Chap. 1-2
2. Chap. 3
B. Chap. 3
II. Chaps. 6-7 The Second Dispute
A. 6:1-7:6 Judgment
1. 6:1-8
2. 6:9-7:6
B. 7:7-20 Salvation
[6] Hagstrom, 7.
[7] Hagstrom, 29.
[8] Charles S. Shaw, *The Speeches of Micah: A Rhetorical – Historical Analysis,* ed. David J. A. Clines and Philip R.

discourse."[9] On this basis he feels that "the major elements of the rhetorical situation are reflected in the discourse itself. It is therefore possible to reconstruct from the discourse those factors to which the speaker is responding and addressing."[10] With this understanding, he investigates the book of Micah and will eventually reach conclusions-the coherence.

Shaw makes two assumptions. One is that the "prophet did not speak in short, self-contained sayings, but delivered discourses which attempted to persuade the hearers of a particular conviction or to take a specific course of action."[11] To support this, he introduces Y. Gitay's idea is that "...these assumed independent units may be explained from the standpoint of speech analysis and reader-response criticism as intentional components of a larger whole."[12] Shaw explains that "larger whole" is more convincing to various styles and forms. And second, "the prophets of Israel played a role similar to that of the political orator of ancient Greece."[13] Shaw introduces Demosthenes' description of the role of "political orator" which is "to discern events in their beginnings, to foresee what is coming, and forewarn others."[14] The second assumption reflects Shaw's opinion that prophets have connections with their contemporary situation. Thus, the role of "political orator" designates that contemporary situations were analyzed by the prophets.[15]

Even though he uses a rhetorical criticism, Shaw does not follow James Muilenburg's definition,[16] but he follows G. Kennedy's steps. "First, there must be a preliminary determination

---

Davies, et al., Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 145 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993).

[9] Shaw, 25.

[10] Shaw, 25.

[11] Shaw, 19.

[12] Shaw, 20 Y. Gitay, 'Reflections on the Study of Prophetic Discourse: The Question of Isaiah I 2-20', *Vetus Testamentum* vol. 33 (1983), 212.

[13] Shaw, 21.

[14] Shaw, 21.

[15] The significance of prophet as political orator for Shaw is that the prophecy not only reflects his faith, but also the contemporary situation, which for Shaw is the eighth century. Thus, this idea is important for supporting Shaw's contention that Micah is eighth century.

[16] Shaw, 23. Shaw summarizes Muilenburg's definition by saying that "rhetorical criticism attempts to understand

of the unit. Second, the rhetorical situation should be investigated in some detail. Finally, the arrangement of the material is to be explored to determine what subdivisions it falls into, what the persuasive effect of the parts seems to be, and how they work together – or fail to do so – to some unified purpose in meeting the rhetorical situation."[17] Thus, Shaw "focuses on what the author intends to convey and how he achieves his goal."[18] He comments on Kennedy's view: "The ultimate goal of rhetorical analysis, briefly put, is the discovery of the author's intent and of how that is transmitted through a text to an audience."[19]

To achieve his purpose Shaw uses two basic steps. First, he makes "a preliminary determination of the limits of the discourse. This task attempts to define which material belongs together and how the various parts form a unity."[20] Further, he suggests that "thematic unity and common rhetorical situation are elements which unify material into a self-contained discourse."[21] Rhetorical setting comes from historical settings, but he does not provide a distinction between the two concepts. Second, Shaw reviews each unit according to "objective and subjective factors."[22] In the end, Shaw uses a "rhetorical-historical" approach and sees the book as coherent and primarily originating in the eighth century.

---

the composition of larger units by identifying the various devices used in them."

[17] George Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation Through Rhetorical Criticism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984), 33-38.

[18] Shaw, 23.

[19] Shaw, 23.

[20] Shaw, 24. Shaw also introduces Gitay's opinion that "The prophetic address must be defined on the basis of its rhetorical situation and its global theme." Y. Gitay, 'Reflections on the Study of Prophetic Discourse: The Question of Isaiah I 2-20,' *Vetus Testamentum,* vol. 33 (1983), 210-221.

[21] Shaw, 24.

[22] Shaw, 27. Objective factors include those events, conditions and attitudes to which the discourse responds and is addressed. Subjective factors focus on the speakers' views of the situation and their understanding and assessment of the consequences of the present course of events.

3. Mignon R. Jacobs[23]

The third scholar we review is Jacobs. Jacobs begins her study with a diachronic summery of the concept of "coherence." She explains that the dictionary term refers to something that is "connected logically; not rambling in speech or in reasoning."[24] From this basic term, the author develops her view that "coherence is the conceptual interrelationship of the parts of a work."[25]

Thus, in Jacobs' case, the use of "conceptual" or "conceptuality" is unique. The term "coherence" itself is not special; however, "conceptual coherence" is unique. She defines "conceptuality" as referring "to the generative principle responsible for the content, structure and logical progression of the text."[26] While Jacobs generally views the text as a whole, her understanding of "logical progression" reveals a somewhat diachronic approach, and she does not come out with a clear opinion about the date or authorship of the Micah.

Jacobs chooses the method of "concept-critical analysis"[27] because she would like to find the answer to "the question of the extent of the conceptual coherence of the book of Micah."[28] Jacobs does not directly claim that previous criticism has not succeeded; however, she argues indirectly that "Form Criticism" and "Literary Criticism" are incomplete methods. She believes that previous methods have limitations in "the discerning of the conceptual."[29] Thus she suggests that using "concept-critical analysis complements form criticism--analyzing the concepts in the

---

[23] Mignon R. Jacobs, *The Conceptual Coherence of the Book of Micah*, ed. David J.A. Clines and Philip R. Davies, et al., Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 322 (England: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001).
[24] Jacobs, 51.
[25] Jacobs, 51.
[26] Jacobs, 51.
[27] Jacobs, 54.
[28] Jacobs, 54.
[29] Jacobs, 54.

delimited text units--and literary criticism--in seeking to discern the literary integrity of the text."[30] Specifically, Jacobs uses four steps:

> (a) To identify the form of the extant text by means of structural analysis and both literary and conceptual indicators/signals. (b) To discern the various concepts within the whole in light of the distinctive units and their conceptualities. (c) To discern through exposition of the text its particular conceptualities, by looking contextually and intertextually at their typical characteristics-via the semantic field and etymology - and infratextually at their particular characteristics and functions. (d) To discern concept and the supporting concepts.[31]

4. Francis I. Andersen and David N. Freedman[32]

Andersen and Freedman's analysis of Micah focuses on the final form of the book. They favor a holistic view of the book of Micah. The authors suggest that the book of Micah is a unified and cohesive work with a theme that develops gradually from doom and desire to positive hope.

The beginning section of the commentary covers several topics: 1) the texts and translations of the Book of Micah, 2) the relationship within the Book of the Twelve, and 3) explanations of literary units. Next the authors provide a concise introduction to each section and extensive treatment of key words and themes. Andersen and Freedman divide the book of Micah into three sections: The book of doom (1:2-3:12); The book of visions (4:1-5:14); and The book of contention and conciliation (6:1-7:20). In each section, the authors present general discussion and previous studies on the book of Micah. After this, they present the book of Micah as a whole. In the commentary section, Andersen and Freedman provide their own translation and notes on the verse.

---

[30] Jacobs, 54. She claims that "the method seeks primarily to reconstruct the conceptuality of the extant text in light of its literary integrity." For explaining "complements of form criticism," she borrows this idea from James Muilenburg, "Form Criticism and Beyond", *Journal of Biblical Literature,* vol. 88 (1969), 1-18.
[31] Jacobs, 57

B. External Structure of Micah 4-5

1. Relationship Between Chapters 1-3 And 4-5.

The four works of authors who represent synchronic approaches-Hagstrom, Shaw, Jacobs, Andersen and Freedman-subdivide the book of Micah differently. For instance, Shaw suggests that 4:1-8 belongs with 3:1-4:8. The other two scholars maintain the usual chapter division between chapters three and four. The difference arises from their methods.

All four works focus on the unity of the book of Micah as a whole, and they see chapters four and five as being coherent. Even though all four works assert unity/continuity in chapters four and five, they use different methods to arrive at their purpose.

Hagstrom analyzes the coherence of book of Micah, and he concludes that the text has continuity. Moreover, he critiques and attempts to find how each unit links or coheres. Shaw does not agree with diachronic scholars who say that the time period of chapters four and five can be later than the eighth century.[33] He traces all the possible historical settings and then questions for each setting. To solve the historical setting, he assumes that the text has rhetorical settings.[34]

Jacobs argues that despite past studies which have focused on the disunity of the book of Micah, there is in fact a unity and coherence to the text, and that certain conceptual aspects of the text, especially theme, are fundamental to this coherence.

Andersen and Freedman assert that the book of Micah has literary unity, although they do not deny that the book of Micah might have undergone final editorial work. While

---

[32] Francis I. Andersen and David Noel Freedman, *Micah,* ed. William Foxwell Albright and David Noel Freedman, The Anchor Bible, vol. 24E (New York: Doubleday, 2000).
[33] Shaw, 24-25.
[34] Shaw, 26.

investigating the book of Micah, they provide evidence of unity, but nothing in the way of final editorial work by a redactor's.

Taking into account the approaches and opinions of Hagstrom, Shaw, Jacobs, Andersen and Freedman, this study analyzes their works on Micah 4-5 within the context of the whole book. Hagstrom and Jacobs divide the book of Micah into two sections, chapter 1-5 and 6-7. Shaw, however, divides the book of Micah into six divisions: 1:2-16, 2:1-13, 3:1-4:8, 4:9-5:14, 6:1-7:7, 7:8-20.

At this point, it is worth exploring why Shaw believes that 3:1-4:8 is one unit. He recognizes that the section 3:1-4:8 can be divided into five or more units, and understands that there is a contradiction between 3:1-12 and 4:1-8. Nevertheless, he finds thematic unity in the word-picture of "building up Zion" and unity of presupposition in the "rhetorical situation."[35] More detailed exploration will be taken up below.

Contrary to Hagstrom, Shaw and Jacobs, Andersen and Freedman divide the book of Micah into three sections, 1-3, 4-5, and 6-7; and chapters four and five, what they call the "book of visions," provide a transition between the two main sections (1-3 and 6-7).[36] The "book of visions" includes eschatological content in that "these visions contrast the current status and state of Jerusalem and Jacob with their future prospects,"[37] but it does not mean that the date is exilic or post-exilic. For instance, "Peoples who gathered to gloat over Zion's humiliation will gather in humiliation to marvel at Zion's glory."[38] No evidence of this sentence appears during the

[35] Shaw, 101-102.
[36] Andersen and Freedman, 7.
[37] Andersen and Freedman, 10.
[38] Andersen and Freedman, 10-11.

history of Israel,[39] i.e., the provenance of the "vision" could be from any time period. Despite the present difficult time, the prophet's message includes positive hope.

Andersen and Freedman suggest that chapters 4-5 do not refer to any identifiable historical events. In the beginning of their introduction to "the book of visions," they clearly admit that "its literary character, the history of its development, and its original setting are more difficult to determine."[40] So, according to Andersen and Freedman, one cannot determine with any certainty the referents of chapters 4-5.[41] The authors, however, hold that "Micah clearly anticipated an invasion of Israel by Assyria (5:4, 5) and that was being realistic."[42] So, these verses characterize the eighth-century political circumstances.

Andersen and Freedman also insist that the prophet Micah was too optimistic because Micah prophesies an imminent attack by Assyria and at the same time prophesies an Israelite counterattack; and the latter has not occurred (4:10). This is the reason that they regard chapters 4-5 as an eschatological section, which also means that an eighth century provenance of the book is not out of the question. By using the word/concept *eschaton*, they make a distinction between the current situation (eighth century B.C.) and oracles concerning the end of time. Thus they seek to establish the fact that eschatological oracles refer to future events regardless of the historical circumstances (i.e., eighth century B.C. or sixth century B.C.)[43] and thus advocating the eschatological nature of the oracles, supporting the integrity of the chapters.[44]

The authors insist on focusing on the final form of the book of Micah, which leads them to see coherence in the text. They agree to divide chapters 1-5 into two sections: chapters 1-3 and

---

[39] Andersen and Freedman, 10-11.
[40] Andersen and Freedman, 392.
[41] Andersen and Freedman, 11.
[42] Andersen and Freedman, 11.
[43] Micah 4:6-8 is good evidence.
[44] Andersen and Freedman, 10. "These visions contrast the current status and state of Jerusalem (prominent in chapter 4) and Jacob (chapter 5) with their future prospects."

4-5. The authors, however, do not lose unity of text; they insist that chapters 1-3 and 4-5 have "an inner structure as well as a clear onset and closeout."[45] Along the same lines, they find unity for the whole book of Micah. For instance, the beginning verses (1:1-4) and the ending words (7:18-20) clearly illustrate unity. Several key words appear in both sections. For instance, "God begins by treading on mountains (1:3); he ends by treading on iniquities (7:19 – different verb)."[46] One more piece of evidence which they provide is that the remnant theme (2:12; 4:7; 5:8, 9) has a close connection with 7:18.[47] Furthermore, the authors point out how the distribution of words contributes to continuity. For instance, "Zion"/"Jerusalem" and "high place"/"mountain" appear in alternating fashion throughout the book. The question of "transgression"/"sin"1:5, 1:7 is answered in 7:18-20.[48]

Andersen and Freedman observe that some scholars who argue against the unity of chapters 4-5 have difficulty with their argument because of its literary character, historical setting, development and original content.[49] Andersen and Freedman, however, hold that "an assemblage of thematically related prophetic pieces can be given some literary integrity by skilful editing, even if they arose from different historical circumstances."[50] By focusing on the word עתה, they find a crucial clue for the unifying structure of chapters 4-5.[51] This word becomes a marker for the organization of chapters 4-5. They show that "the five עתה pieces come in one block that breaks the והיה pieces into two blocks, and three blocks are of comparable length by syllable count."[52] They observe continuity in this structure: "these two sets of five pieces

[45] Andersen and Freedman, 23.
[46] Andersen and Freedman, 28.
[47] Andersen and Freedman, 28.
[48] Andersen and Freedman, 27-28.
[49] Andersen and Freedman, 392.
[50] Andersen and Freedman, 392.
[51] Andersen and Freedman, 393.
[52] Andersen and Freedman, 395.

identified by the similar use of catchwords at their onsets account for the whole of chapters 4 and 5."[53]

Shaw suggests that the theme "building up Zion" is the bridge between 3:1-12 and 4:1-5.[54] His idea is that the whole section of 3:1-4:8 is linked grammatically by a conjunction (4:1). Moreover, these two sections are thematically connected by presupposing a common rhetorical situation.[55] He shows that the two sections have the common historical background of the unavoidable disaster awaiting Jerusalem.[56]

Jacobs' view of the coherence between chapters three and four is similar to Shaw's in holding that 3:12 and 4:1-5 focus on Jerusalem/Zion.[57] Furthermore, Jacobs explains that the break between chapter three and four is not a major break. She contends that "it is a sub-division of the unit constituted by chapters 1-5."[58]

In Hagstrom's case, he explains chapters 1-3 and 4-5 separately and then he combines the two sections into one whole part. Hagstrom explains the connection stylistically and thematically. Stylistically, עַמִּים is the key word in the chapters 1-5, where it occurs fifteen times.[59] Thematically, the main idea is that the "Zion motifs" provide contact points between chapters 1-3 and 4-5.[60] He points out that Micah 1:13 has the "daughter of Zion motif," and the word "Zion" appears in the last part of chapter three and first part of chapter four. These two motifs tie chapters 1-3 and 4-5 closely together.[61]

---

[53] Andersen and Freedman, 395.
[54] Shaw, 101.
[55] Shaw, 102.
[56] Shaw, 102.
[57] Jacobs, 73.
[58] Jacobs, 71.
[59] Micah 1:2, 9; 2:4,7,8,9,11; 3:3,5; 4:1,3,5,13; 5:6,7 (including both singular and plural).
[60] Hagstrom, 84.
[61] Hagstrom, 84. Hagstrom gives common vocabulary from 3:9-12 to 4:1-5: ראש ציון כל ירושלם יעקב יהוה הר בית אמר and שפט.

It is Shaw's view that, even though there is a contradiction[62] of theme between 3:1-12 and 4:1-8, these two sections are linked thematically and grammatically. "Building up Zion"[63] is most likely the main theme because it most readily explains the content of both 3:9-12 and 4:1-5. 3:9-12 describes the present situation and 4:1-5 describes coming events as seen in YHWH "building up Zion."[64] Furthermore, Shaw asserts that 3:1-12 and 4:1-8 have the same rhetorical presupposition about reflections on the "speaker's certainty that disaster is inevitable for Jerusalem."[65] To confirm his assertion, he adopts Cuffey's observation: "Mic. 3:9-12 and 4:1-8 can…be taken as two ways of looking at the same idea of the corruption of national leaders and the righteousness of Yahweh."[66] This is very similar to Freedman and Anderson's view of "apocalyptic oracle."[67] Also, "the two sections (3:9-12 and 4:1-5) are linked grammatically by a conjunction (4:1) and by a progression of thought; after human efforts fail to build up Zion, Yahweh himself will exalt the city by his own deeds."[68]

Shaw explains the date problem of 4:1-4. Many scholars focus on the problem of its origin involving vocabulary, theme, and style.[69] These scholars claim that this unit is either later than the eighth century or that it shows evidence of redaction.[70] It is because of redaction that Micah 4:1-4 appears in Isaiah 2:2-4. Shaw, however, argues that the same theme, "building up Zion," can be found in the "Zion-psalms (Psalms. 46, 48, 68, 76)" which are eighth century. So it is hardly inconceivable that 4:1-4 belongs to Micah himself. Further, diachronic scholars contend

---

[62] Contradiction shows in theme. 3:1-12 has a salvation theme, but 4:1ff has a judgment theme.
[63] Shaw, 101.
[64] Shaw, 101.
[65] Shaw, 102.
[66] Shaw, 102. Cuffey, *The Coherence of Micah*, 347-355.
[67] Shaw's idea of the apocalyptic oracle and the suggestion of Freedman and Anderson are similar. "Apocalyptic oracle" does not necessarily include the current situation. Thus, it is quite convincing that this oracle may belong to the eighth-century.
[68] Shaw, 101-102.
[69] Shaw, 104.
[70] Shaw, 104. For further study, see footnote no. 6. Shaw includes Smith and Mays, both of whom have been examined in this thesis.

that the vocabulary of Micah 4:1-4 supports the post-exilic date. For instance, "in the latter days" in 4:1 uses a "Yahwistic source" of the Pentateuch.[71] Shaw holds this to be questionable evidence. It is just a simple occurrence and does not need to be connected to a source. He points out that this appears in Micah 3:10 and 3:12. Finally, the liturgical style can also be found in the eighth-century prophets' discourses.[72] Consequently these two verses should be accepted as Mican.

Jacobs' approach is somewhat similar to the other two scholars. She tries syntactically and thematically to demonstrate the continuity between chapters 1-3 and 4-5. In terms of syntax, והיה is a key word.[73] Jacobs holds that this word "marks the transition from the implied present to the future announced by the temporal transition formula."[74] In regard to structure, Jacobs recognizes that 3:9-12 and 4:1-5 constitute two sub-units. She suggests that the division between chapters 3 and 4 is not a major division. "The division between chs. 3 and 4 is supported in large measure by the presence of the temporal transition formula between the two units."[75] Jacobs explains the relation between chapters 1-3 and chapters 4-5 by showing that the two sections interrelate by their contents. First, she combines 1:5-7 and 1:16 as section A. Then section B comprises 2:1-5, 2:12-13 and 3:12. Finally, section C includes 4:1-5 and 4:6-7. Jacobs shows that each individual unit is related by vocabulary and theme with other units (1:5-7 and 2:1-5; 1:5-7 and 2:12-13; 1:16 and 3:12; 2:12-13 and 4:6-7; 3:12 and 4:1-5).[76]

In short, Hagstrom, Shaw, Jacobs, and Andersen and Freedman conclude that chapters 1-3 and 4-5 are closely tied or have continuity. They disagree with the diachronic scholars who suggest that chapters 4-5 belonged to the post eighth-century B.C. While the debate over

---

[71] Shaw, 106.
[72] Shaw, 107.
[73] Jacobs, 71.
[74] Jacobs, 71.

coherence and dating rages on, Hagstrom, Shaw, Jacobs and Andersen and Freedman make a strong case for the coherence of Micah 4-5.

2. Relationships Between Chapters 1-5 and Chapters 6-7

Chapters four and five are well known in Micah commentary because many scholars say that these chapters do not belong to the prophet Micah. The aforementioned four scholars, however, claim the opposite.[77] Thus this section will analyze and synthesize the relation between chapters four and five with six and seven as set forth by the scholars.

Many scholars who employ diachronic approaches consider Micah six and seven to have been redacted or added. Some of them suggest that the date of these two chapters is the eighth century. Even though they assert this, they do not evaluate the book of Micah as a whole because other parts are not from the eighth century. Hagstrom and Jacobs identify connections between chapters 1-5 and 6-7, but Shaw does not argue this strongly. In Shaw's case, however, concentrating on the historical setting is more important than proving the unity of the whole book of the Micah.[78] He divides the book of Micah into six small units: 1:2-16, 2:1-13, 3:1-4:8, 4:9-5:14, 6:1-7:7 and 7:8-20. For instance, in the case of 4:9-5:14, Shaw feels that this unit may be placed in pre-exilic time, the eighth century.[79] As for 6:1-7:7, Shaw suggests that this section can be divided into "three independent sections" (6:1-8, a rib; 6:9-16, an oracle of judgment; and

---

[75] Jacobs, 71.
[76] Jacobs, 72. See Figure 1.
[77] John T. Willis, "The Structure of Micah 3-5 and the Function of Micah 5:9-14," *Zeitschrift fur die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft,* vol. 81 (1969): 197. Willis says of chapters four and five: "Admittedly the most difficult chapters in the book of Micah in which to demonstrate coherence."
[78] Comparing the four works of scholars, we see that Shaw does not have a section on the relationship of chapters 1-3 and 4-5.
[79] Shaw, 156. Also see 139. "A pre-exilic date for all the material in 4:9-5:14 is thus not improbable."

7:1-7, a lament), with each section having its own genre.[80] In spite of the presence of multiple genres, Shaw insists that "the motif of the breakdown of the social order unites 6:1-7:7 into a single discourse."[81] With this in mind, Shaw argues against scholars who suggest that this text belongs to post-exilic periods.[82]

In both cases, Shaw supports his position that the eighth century is the historical setting for both sections, thus indicating continuity under the same author, Micah the prophet, and the same time background.[83]

Hagstrom uses five tools for demonstrating a relationship between Micah 1-5 and 6-7: "structural parallels," "verbal links and terminological correspondences," "common motifs," "other linking correspondences" and "theological interrelation."[84] In structural parallels, he points out the summons "hear," because both sections begin with this word. Moreover, שמע denotes judgment, evoking the setting of a lawsuit.[85] On a broader scale, he states that "both [chapters 1-5 and 6-7] are characterized by a sharp transition which functions as a partition between words of judgment and words of salvation."[86] Hagstrom points out several verbal links and terminological correspondences. First, שמע in 5:14 and 6:1 connects the two sections "phonetically."[87] Second, יהוה appears thirty-nine times in the book of Micah. Third, ישראל and יעקב are "significant nonetheless in that they form an inclusion framing the section."[88] Fourth, he points out the words for "sin": פשע and עון. These words appear in both 1-5 and 6-7. Concerning

---

[80] Shaw, 165.
[81] Shaw, 166.
[82] Shaw, 169.
[83] For deeper understanding, see the method section.
[84] For further study see Hagstrom, 116. Hagstrom also mentioned "the function of the superscription."
[85] Hagstrom, 116.
[86] Hagstrom, 116.
[87] Hagstrom, 117.
[88] Hagstrom, 117.

common motifs, Hagstrom uses four of them: טוב/רע, גוים/עמים, יום, and "the imagery of flock."[89] He shows that these four motifs are common in two sections. With these motifs Hagstrom demonstrates the continuity between Micah 1-5 and 6-7 because these "serve to link the two sections."[90] For theological interpretation, Hagstrom focuses on the function that "the language of the text does provide keys which lead to meaningful construal of the book as a whole."[91] Furthermore, he focuses on עתה because "the present is a time of judgment from which one looks forward to future salvation. So also in chapters 6-7, the present is a time of distress (6:13; 7:1-6, 9). The reader is thus situated between judgment and salvation."[92] Above all, he makes a good case for explaining the relation between chapters 1-5 and 6-7.

Turning now to Jacobs, we find that she divides the book of Micah into two sections (chapters 1-5 and 6-7); these two sections are similar in character because they both contain judgment and restoration.[93] Thus, her approach to the book of Micah is holistic. Jacobs focuses on the final form of the book of Micah even though she presupposes that the book of Micah is a product of redaction, though not necessarily the entire book.[94] Jacobs tries to balance previous methods with her own, which are about the same as form and literary criticism. Thus, it is to her credit that with similar methods Jacobs draws out different aspects than the diachronic scholars.[95]

Jacobs contends that on a large scale, the factors of coherence are "structural elements."[96] These elements are generic features, formulas, transitional phrases and thought

---

[89] Hagstrom, 118-119.
[90] Hagstrom, 118.
[91] Hagstrom, 121.
[92] Hagstrom, 121.
[93] Jacobs, 65. See a chart in the page.
[94] Jacobs, 63. According to Jacobs, at a certain point, the redactor involved gave final form to the book of Micah; however Jacobs does not follow "the reconstruction of the redactional process."
[95] Jacobs, 54.
[96] Jacobs, 64.

progression.[97] With this in mind Jacobs focuses on the words שמעו/שמעו־נא because they appear in 1:2, 3:1, 9, and 6:1-2, 9. To support her case she cites several scholars, such as Willis, Allen, and Hagstrom.[98] With Willis, the words mark off the texts in 1:2, 3:1 and 6:1. Thus Willis recognizes that the words are structural clues, but fails to discuss the matter any further. In Allen's case, he goes a step further by suggesting that "they mark off units whose language is from the legal setting, and whose contents are similar-that is, both contain Yahweh's accusation against his people and a hope section."[99] Thus, Allen sees a close connection between both sections (1-5 and 6-7). With this in mind, Jacobs concludes that "the immediately adjacent units to 1:2 and 6:2 are judgment and restoration, while judgment speeches are introduced by 3:1, 9 and 6:9. The focus of 1:2 and 6:2 is broad when compared to that of the units they precede."[100]

3. Internal structure of Micah 4-5

On the surface, there are some similarities among the four works of scholars regarding internal relationships. This, however, is not necessarily the case. Hagstrom, Shaw, Jacobs, Andersen and Freedman either claim or suggest the unity of chapters four and five with the rest of Micah. This is clearly the same general assertion, but they make different subdivisions of chapters four and five. For instance, Hagstrom makes eleven units: 4:1-4/4:5, 4:1/4:6-7, 4:6-7/4:8, 4:8/4:9-10, 4:9-10/4:11-13, 4:11-13/4:14, 4:14/5:1, 5:1/5:2-3,5:1-3/ 5:4-5, 5:4-5/5:6-8, and 5:6-8/5:9-14. Shaw, however, makes only two large units (3:1-4:8, 4:9-5:14), and Jacobs makes

---

[97] Jacobs, 64.

[98] Jacobs, 66-67. These three scholars examined the relations between Micah 1-5 and 6-7. For Willis' citation, see J.T. Willis, 'The Structure, Setting, and Interrelationships of the periscopes in the Book of Micah' (unpublished PhD dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1966).

[99] Jacobs, 66- 67. For Allen' citation, L.C. Allen, *The Books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, and Micah,* ed. R.K. Harrison, The New International Commentary on The Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976).

[100] Jacobs, 68.

four units (4:1-5, 4:6-7, 4:8-5:8, 5:9-14). Finally Andersen and Freedman make ten units: 4:1-5, 4:6-8, 4:9-10, 4:11-13, 4:14, 5:1-3, 5:4-5, 5:6-8, and 5:9-14.

The following discussion explores analyses by synchronic scholars which show that chapters four and five internally cohere.

4:1-5

Chapter 4 begins with the hope and the restoration of Zion following chapter 3, which concludes with a judgment. Chapter 5 contains salvation history, which seems to contradict the preceding portion. Consequently, some scholars suggest that this chapter does not belong to Micah. Hagstrom, Shaw, Jacobs, Andersen and Freedman, however, insist that this portion comes from the eighth century and belong to Micah the prophet.

Micah 4:1 begins with והיה. For the continuity between chapter 3 and 4, this is a key word because of the conjunction ו.[101] At first glance, 3:1-12 seems to contrast with 4:1-5; however, these two sections are connected. Hagstrom makes a good case for the opinion that "continuity within 4:1-4 is clearly evidenced by syntax, as well as by a clear flow of thought and continuity of subject matter. 4:1 begins with an important transition to the future expressed by means of a temporal clause introduced by והיה."[102] Shaw sees the consistency of this portion through theme and rhetorical situation. He is more focused on contents than syntax, as opposed to some other scholars (for example Cannawurf and Renaud).[103] Shaw insists that in "the thematic link between 3:1-12 and 4:1-8, a common rhetorical situation is presupposed."[104] With this link in mind, the author gives the following example: "There is obviously a contrast between

[101] Shaw, 101-102.
[102] Hagstrom, 59-60.
[103] Shaw, 105.

3:12 and 4.1, but the words of 4.1-4 'do not ease the indictment, they confirm it, for if the functions of authority continue, the functionaries disappear.'"[105] Thus, Shaw insists that 3:9-12 and 4:1-8 can be interpreted by "two ways of looking at the same idea of the corruption of national leaders and the righteousness of Yahweh."[106] Thus Shaw would date this portion in the eighth century.

Hagstrom and Jacobs focus on the כי clause in 4:5. Both similarly suggest that because of this clause Micah 4:5 is logically connected with 4:1-4.[107] Jacobs also agrees with Shaw and points out a "universal theme" which is "Yahweh's reign in Zion."[108] She opens the possibility that, even though this portion seems eschatological, "the nuance of the phrase may not necessarily be eschatological but indicative of a remote future, and a time within history. This interpretation makes sense of the attention to the present circumstances, if these are seen as necessary to the actualization of that future (4.8-5.8)."[109]

Andersen and Freedman say that this section is difficult to translate. This section (4:1-5) apparently is an apocalyptic prophecy. They interpret the prophecy by saying that it will be fulfilled when Yahweh reigns. With this understanding, the authors try to show the coherence of chapters 4-5. In trying to prove coherence, they suggest that "this vision is not a postexilic oracle of hope added to the text to cancel the terminal judgment of oracles like those in chapters 1-3. Those punishments were corrections applied within the covenant. They were purposeful, educational, and redemptive."[110] According to the authors here, 4:1-5's vision does not have any specific reference for the determination of the period because this vision is continually

---

[104] Shaw, 102.
[105] Shaw, 102.
[106] Shaw, 102.
[107] Hagstrom, 60 and Jacobs, 89.
[108] Jacobs, 144.
[109] Jacobs, 145.
[110] Andersen and Freedman, 402.

reaffirmed during the history of Israel (for example, Zechariah 8:20-23). In short, these scholars agree that 4:1-5 belongs to the eighth century B.C.

4:6-8

This section, 4:6-8 is linked with the preceding section on the basis of two phrases, ההוא ביום and נאם יהוה. By implication these two verses indicate present and future occurrence. Hagstrom and Jacobs' concerns are that these phrases signify a new oracle.[111] Hagstrom's opinion is that נאם יהוה has two roles: first, to connect with verse 1, and second, to establish the authority of the text itself.[112] The use of ביום ההוא has a function that connects 4:6-8 with the previous section. He makes a good case that ביום ההוא and נאם יהוה "maintain an element of continuity: the temporal clause points back to v. 1a; and, by correspondence to v. 4c, נאם יהוה establishes the authority of 4:6-7 as identical to that of 4:1-4."[113] In verse 8, Hagstrom points out a theme, "Zion," which serves as a bridge from the preceding verses.[114] Jacob's idea is similar to Hagstrom's, but she feels that it (v. 8) is an introduction for the following verses (4:8-5:8).[115] This is a different linking function than Hagstrom suggests, but still Jacobs supports continuity. Even though they have slightly different opinions, the three scholars all share the holistic viewpoint.

Scholars such as Wolff, Ben Zvi, and Mays insist that this prophecy is post-exilic, but Andersen and Freedman disagree asserting that "the Bethlehem tradition" and "the Zion tradition" are combined in verse 4:8. According to them, the whole picture is that "one of David"

---

[111] Hagstrom, 60 and Jacobs, 89.
[112] Hagstrom, 60.
[113] Hagstrom, 60.
[114] Hagstrom, 61.
[115] Jacobs, 150.

came to Zion and he will reign. Both traditions are evident in Psalm 2. Thus these scholars suggest that "the picture was available to the pre-exilic prophets of Israel."[116] Furthermore, they say that "v. 8 is so integral to the whole presentation, that we wonder how the other pieces could have existed without it."[117] With this insight they affirm their position of finding continuity in chapters 4-5. In this way Andersen and Freedman concentrate on the thematic coherence, which is restoration, especially in verse 8.[118] They conclude that this section belongs to Micah's time.

4:9-10

For this section, Hagstrom uses syntactical clues and vocabulary clues (i.e.עתה), but he does not ignore thematic clues to demonstrate coherence. He suggests that in looking at "syntactical clues [כי clause], its [4:8-10] coherent flow of thought serves to establish linear continuity within 4:9-10."[119] In addition, the theme "daughter of Zion" provides a good case for unity. This theme has a role in giving continuity from verse 8 to verse 10. "Proximity, continuity of theme, and continuation of direct address prompt the reader to identify the addressees."[120] Moreover, Hagstrom focuses on the word שָׁם which ties together 4:9-10. It functions as a temporal adverb[121] and provides coherence for verses 9-10.[122] His use of multiple techniques in approaching the text helps him to be complete in his analysis.

Shaw also tries to prove the time period of these two verses. Accordingly, he argues with other scholars' stances (Willis, Rudolph). Shaw believes that verse 10b or even the whole of verse 10 should be treated as a later addition. He holds that verse 10 is the beginning of

---

[116] Andersen and Freedman, 429.
[117] Andersen and Freedman, 429.
[118] Andersen and Freedman, 429.
[119] Hagstrom, 61.
[120] Hagstrom, 61-62.

"questions to reproach the audience."[123] Thus he states that "if v. 10 is a series of questions which make the point that deliverance will not be found in fleeing from the city, the exhortation in v. 11 is a natural logical conclusion."[124] He assumes that this comes from Zion theology.

In the case of Jacobs, she chooses a couple of words (For example, עתה and כי clause) that show unity of the two verses. עתה functions to introduce this section and the rhetorical question that follows. Jacobs's position on these verses is similar to that of Shaw. Jacobs holds that this section (v. 9) begins with a question. Because of this question, Jacobs intimates that Judah has no king or leader. She addresses Wolff's idea that a king or leader in these verses refers to Yahweh. At this juncture Jacobs argues with Wolff that it is a "rule of a powerless king."[125] A powerless king can hardly do anything for his people. Wolff's opinion is that this section is a relic of exilic or post-exilic periods, but Jacobs disagrees, saying that a "powerless king" does not necessarily indicate Yahweh. Jacobs does not give a clear opinion of the origin date. She observes that these verses of the oracle are fulfilled in Babylon, and thus keeps open the possibility of an eighth-century date.[126]

Andersen and Freedman address theme and structural clues. They suggest that "scene and mood" are indications of the theme. The authors state that in v. 9 "the splendor of Zion's recovery and the glory of YHWH's universal acclamation along with the return to the power of David (v.8) and the peace of Solomon (v.4) give way to disaster and agony"[127] which are themes throughout this section. In verse 10 they suggest that "several pairs of words are in the reverse of

---

[121] Hagstrom, 62.
[122] Hagstrom, 62.
[123] Shaw, 134.
[124] Shaw, 135.
[125] Jacobs,151.
[126] Jacobs,151.
[127] Andersen and Freedman, 447.

logical order (i.e., "come" precedes "settle")."[128] This observation leads to the conclusion that this section has continuity. For instance, some scholars (Mays and Allen) break down verse 10, "And thou wilt come as far as Babylon" from "there he will rescue thee," (4:10) but Andersen and Freedman insist that this section be taken all together.

4:11-13

Hagstrom compares this portion with the preceding verses, 4:9-10. His viewpoint is that 4:9-10 and 4:11-13 are parallel in structure. Both sections begin with עתה.[129] He explains this parallel structure thus: "עתה description of daughter of Zion explanatory כי clause promise of deliverance/victory."[130] By this observation, he is consistent in holding to the coherence of the text. He insists that "continuity with vv 11-12 is here maintained with respect to theme, YHWH's plans for the nations, and imagery (gatherer of sheaves to be threshed). Moreover, by repetition of the phrase 'daughter of Zion,' the reader is led to make a connection back to vv. 9-10."[131]

As previously stated, Shaw is concerned with the date of each portion. In this text Shaw focuses on the theme "summons to battle."[132] He shows that this motif is found in Ezekiel 38-39. On that basis many scholars suggest that these verses belong to the post-exilic period. However, Shaw makes a good argument that the motif in Ezekiel 38-39 and Micah 4:11-13 is dependent on "Zion Theology."[133] Accordingly, it does not have to fit with the fifth century; rather it can indicate the eighth century.

---

[128] Andersen and Freedman, 447.
[129] Hagstrom, 62.
[130] Hagstrom, 62. Hagstrom borrowed this idea from Renaud.
[131] Hagstrom, 62.
[132] Shaw, 136.
[133] Shaw, 136. For further study of Zion theology, Shaw cites Roberts, "Zion Tradition." *The Interpreter's*

Jacobs suggests that two aspects are continued from the preceding part (4:9-10): The two and the lack of leadership and the captivity of Zion. These two concepts are expanded in Micah 4:11-13.[134] She notes that "one nation" comes up in the text without any further reference, but she suggests that this nation is Babylon.[135] Furthermore, for her "many nations" means Israel's general enemies which are brought by God. So this oracle indicates the imminent future. Thus she concludes that this section does not belong to the post-exilic time period.

Andersen and Freedman focus on the structure of these verses as a poetic form. This poem speaks to Zion and has parallelism. For instance, "many nations" in verse 11 matches "many peoples" in verse 13. Thus they suggest "that vv 11-13 are a highly integrated poetic composition."[136] Andersen and Freedman keep their viewpoint based on coherence, emphasizing that "[f]rom a literary point of view they [the oracles] are unified around Zion, but there is no systematic chronological development from which we can reconstruct a single scenario."[137] Their conclusion is that verse 13 hardly has historical precedent. Their conclusion has value because Andersen and Freedman point out that this is a poem, and therefore it can be interpreted in more than one way.

4:14

Here, Hagstrom makes a good case for coherence because of the repetition of עתה. The word not only introduces a section but also a logical connection.[138] While other scholars focus

---

Dictionary of the Bible Supplementary Volume, ed. Keith Crim (Nashville: Abingdon, 1976), 985-987. In his article, Shaw concludes that "if one believes that the Zion tradition reflects historical circumstances, Roberts is correct in pointing to the Davidic-Solomonic period rather than the exilic/post-exilic era as a likely time for the emergence of such traditions."

[134] Jacobs, 151.

[135] Jacobs, 151-152.

[136] Andersen and Freedman, 450.

[137] Andersen and Freedman, 455.

[138] Hagstrom, 63.

only on the relation with the previous two sections, Hagstrom asserts that עתה in verse 14 is also a bridge word for coherence with the rest of verse 14. Jacobs' idea for this verse is similar to that of Hagstrom. She suggests that this verse is more of a present resolution than a future resolution, because the object of the command is different than in the previous two sections (4:9, 4:11).[139] But in spite of her detailed explanation, Jacobs does not clearly show coherence in this verse.

Many scholars hold that the date of this text is the end of the exile.[140] Shaw argues against this opinion. Renaud suggests that this text can be later than the time of Jeremiah.[141] Shaw disagrees, pointing out that this entire text shares the same common tradition. Moreover, eighth century prophets "could have characterized the time of David as 'ancient.'"[142] Thus, the date of this text can be the eighth century.

In regard to verse 4:14, even many diachronic scholars such as Wolff[143]and Hillers[144] uphold the connection between this verse and the previous section. Andersen and Freedman propose that this verse is connected with the previous section by the word עתה "now."[145] They further suggest that the subject in verse 14 is possibly a king and that, similarly in verse 9, the subject is also a king. This is evidence that verse 14 is structurally linked as a unit as part of the "book of visions."[146] This suggestion can be another indicator for continuity between this part and the previous section (4:9-13).

---

[139] Jacobs, 152.
[140] Shaw, 136.
[141] Shaw, 137. For example, Renaud's opinion is that Micah 4:14-5:3 is similar to Jeremiah 30:20-21 on several points. B. Renaud, *Structure et Attaches litteraires de Michee IV-V* (Cahiers de la Revue Biblique 2; Paris: Gabalda, 1964)
[142] Shaw, 137.
[143] Andersen and Freedman, 458. "Wolff is sufficiently impressed by the linkages that v. 14 has with both the preceding and the following text that he finds a single collection of related speeches in 4:9-5:5 (1982: 104)."
[144] Andersen and Freedman, 458. "Hillers (1984: 62) considers 4:14 to be a 'fragment,' and he leaves it on its own."
[145] Andersen and Freedman, 459.
[146] Andersen and Freedman, 461.

5:1-3

Hagstrom claims that at first glance there seems to be a contrast between 4:14 and 5:1. However, "this contrast displays both the logical connection between 4:14 and 5:1 and an element of continuity with 4:9-10 and 4:11-13 in which this present distress/future salvation sequence is paralleled."[147] To support this assertion, Hagstrom focuses on two words, שפט and מושל. Other scholars investigate these same words, but they then focus on the period problem (late period) and in so doing they lose sight of the continuity. Hagstrom, however, is able to maintain the coherence. He also points out a large scale connection between 4:8 and 5:1 in two distinct ways: (a) style and (b) logical development.[148] As for 5:1-3, Hagstrom maintains that this is a single unit. In line with the contents of verses 1 and 3, these verses show continuity, and עתה in verse 3 ties closely with עת in verse 2.[149]

Jacobs' case for coherence focuses on the word לָכֵן. She suggests that "in its use of לָכֵן, v. 2 indicates that the present distress is already factored into the promise. Yahweh will give up Israel until a specified time, that is, the appointed time and the return from exile."[150]

In connection with the previous section,[151] Shaw asserted that these verses can belong to the eighth century. The section 5:1-3 has presented many problems for scholars.[152] Andersen and Freedman refer to Alt's position that in the original oracles Jerusalem does not exist. Alt holds that Micah 3:9-12 is parallel with 5:1-3. By contrast Andersen and Freedman argue that "Alt's scenario, while making sense only if Micah 5:1-3 contains authentic Mican material, jars with the preeminence of Zion in the "book of visions," and with the use of 'Israel' as the name of the

---

147 Hagstrom, 63.
148 Hagstrom, 63.
149 Hagstrom, 64. He also mentioned Willis' opinion for content.
150 Jacobs, 152.
151 Shaw's case is treated in section on 4:14, because he groups the verses thus: 4:14-5:3.
152 Andersen and Freedman, 470. For instance, the referent to Bethlehem and the shepherd is unclear.

future community."[153] Again, by implication Andersen and Freedman hold that this section (Micah 5:1-3) belongs to Micah and the eighth century B.C.

5:4-5

Hagstrom introduces the somewhat peculiar suggestion that "this articulation displays characteristics of both continuity and discontinuity."[154] Nevertheless, Hagstrom aims to prove the unity of the text. According to Willis, והיה becomes a problem of discontinuity, but it need not be a problem because the conjunction ו (and) is frequently used for future events.[155] Hagstrom, however points to "the shift in 5:4 to the first person plural form [from third person masculine singular]" so that this form shows the continuity of the text.[156] The change in the subject can be a bridge between 5:1-3 and 5:4, and thus these two sections show continuity. Accordingly, Hagstrom analyzes this portion saying "5:4-5 functions as a communal response to 5:1-3."[157] In spite of the text's difficulty, his syntactical approach furnishes strong evidence in support of the text's continuity.

Jacobs focuses on the first word זה. Through this word Jacobs explains the conceptual unity of the text because זה indicates a preceding text (4:11-13). Thus this part has continuity

---

[153] Andersen and Freedman, 470-471.
[154] Hagstrom,65. Willis insists that this section is work of an elaboration. J.T. Willis, "Micah IV 15-V 5: A Unit." *Vetus Testamentum* vol. 18 (1968): 529-547. Hagstrom quotes: "... the most natural explanation of ו, "and", at the beginning of vs. 4 is that the final redactor intended for vss. 4-5 to be understood as the continuation of that which precedes."
[155] Hagstrom,65. Hagstrom adopts Gesenius' idea that: "the perfect consecutive may carry a kind of independent force and depend only loosely on sentences to which it stood only in a wider sense in the relation of a logical or temporal sequence." Gesenius, *Hebrew Grammar*, §112x-z (334-335).
[156] Hagstrom, 66.
[157] Hagstrom, 66-67.

within the large "context and logical progression in chs. 4-5."[158] Shaw also makes a good case here for continuity, saying that

> Whether or not an eighth-century prophet would have imagined Israelite domination of Assyria is simply not possible to know. As we shall see, however, an even more basic question which must be explored is whether these verses really refer to Israelite domination of Assyria. In any case, the possibility must be kept open that Mic. 5:4-5 is an example of the prophetic imagination which envisioned a completely transformed future.[159]

Shaw is suggesting continuity with "prophetic imagination," and Jacobs emphasizes the word זה.

According to Andersen and Freedman, Micah 5:4-5 is united under one theme. "It tells a simple story of the invasion of Israel by Assyria and of a successful counterattack."[160] They, however, suggest that these verses are problematic because of verse 4a. The function of the word והיה is hard to determine. It does not seem to fit in this section, but rather in the other section (vv. 4b-5). Many scholars hold that this section (vv. 4-5) does not have continuity with the previous section. However, Andersen and Freedman assert that "[H]ere the verb seems to be equative, with זה 'this,' as the subject; a literal translation would be 'and this will be peace.'"[161]With this understanding, verse 4a fits in this section. They suggest that each part serves as bridge for the other parts. This indicates that Andersen and Freedman approach the interpretation with an assumption of unity, and they look for textual features in support of unity.

5:6-8

Hagstrom states that "again והיה provides the transition at the beginning of v. 6. The major theme of revenge over one's enemies is continued; especially compare vv. 7-8 with

---

[158] Jacobs, 154.
[159] Shaw, 138.
[160] Andersen and Freedman, 473.
[161] Andersen and Freedman, 472.

v. 5a."[162] In spite of Hagstrom's explanation, it seems that this section has discontinuity with the previous sections because the remnant motif is prominent in 5:4-5 but is lacking in 5:6-8. Hagstrom, however, suggests that this is a "summary section."[163] The imperfect tense in verse 8 has a function of reviewing "the picture presented in v. 7-a summary which, however, by means of its use of the divine passive brings out the role of YHWH in this exaltation of the remnant over the nations."[164] Hagstrom maintains coherence throughout chapters 4-5.

Jacobs differs in that she includes the preceding sections (4:6-7 and 4:10) to demonstrate coherence. She argues for the unity of the text using these preceding sections. For instance, 4:6-7 shows that Israel will be scattered, but 5:6-8, shows that the remnant will be gathered.[165]

Shaw focuses on the concept of "remnant" because many scholars suggest that the date of this text is late post-exilic.[166] However, he makes a strong counterargument, showing that the term "remnant" is simply a military term. "Remnant" indicates people who live through or outlive a battle. In the eighth century Israel had many battles with neighboring countries like Syria and Assyria.[167] Therefore scholars can treat this text as an eighth century period text.

Andersen and Freedman claim that this section has a "remnant" theme and that this theme appears throughout the entire book of Micah, showing coherence.[168] Here Andersen and Freedman review the continuity from 5:1-8. The key is מושל in verse 1. This word gives this section great cohesion because it can act as the subject of the whole section.[169] Andersen and Freedman's opinion is that מושל works as a "retroactive double-duty complement of the

---

[162] Hagstrom, 67.
[163] Hagstrom, 67.
[164] Hagstrom, 67.
[165] Jacobs, 155.
[166] Shaw, 138.
[167] Shaw, 138.
[168] Andersen and Freedman, 483.
[169] Andersen and Freedman, 487.

infinitive."[170] In short, the they assert the coherence of this section, and thus they disagree with redactional scholars. Andersen and Freedman suggest that this section is thematically connected with Micah 1:6-7 and Isa. 2:6-8. They pick out several nouns such as מרכבת and עוננים which are used in both Micah and Isaiah. This connection reveals that this section of Micah belongs with Isaiah in the eighth century B.C.

5:9-14

Hagstrom's position is that this part is similar to 5:6-8. For example, both sections have נאם יהוה which appears to refer back to 4:1-7 and 5:6-8.[171] This section seems to stand in tension with v. 8 because of the word כרת. Hagstrom observes that in the first action Israel destroys its enemies and in the second action YHWH destroys Israel. Despite the apparent irony, Hagstrom makes good case for continuity. He asserts that "this unit proclaims future hope for Israel in spite of YHWH's destruction of her own weapons."[172] Hagstrom then concludes that "within each of these, linear continuity is clearly maintained. Their articulations, however, are characterized by strong tension more so than by continuity." His solution helps support the continuity of Micah in its entirety.

Jacobs brings 4:1 and 4:6-7 as referents of this section and introduces an "introductory formula."[173] Moreover, she sees that this element is an inauguration of YHWH as king over the whole world. Thus, she suggests that Yahweh's promise is fulfilled here and Micah 4-5 is that it

---

[170] Andersen and Freedman, 466.
[171] Hagstrom, 68.
[172] Hagstrom, 68.
[173] Jacobs, 155.

is future. When YHWH rules the world, all nations should purify themselves.[174] Because of this, chapters 4-5 are closely connected in each section

Shaw focuses on style, motif, and vocabulary in these verses because some scholars have used the verses to deny the pre-exilic authorship.[175] He cites correspondences with psalms 46:10 and 76:3-4 which belong to the pre-exilic time. In these psalms Shaw finds similar style, motif and vocabulary.[176] Thus Shaw asserts that this portion also belongs to the eighth century.

Andersen and Freedman state that "Micah 5:9-14 balances 4:1-5. Each has a full eschatological rubric. The cleansing of the cult and the elimination of war in the latter are preliminary to the peace and security in the universalized cult of the former."[177] It appears that they focus on unity and integrity. They also see a connection to the next big section, "the Book of Contention and Conciliation (Micah 6:1-7:20)." As previously mentioned, these scholars contend that the entire book of Micah has a gradually developing theme, and thus they assume that the content of this section (5:9-14) points to the next step.

In summary, the term "synchronic approach" is an umbrella term that covers each scholars own method, but their ultimate goal (to demonstrate the coherence/unity of Micah) is the same. This indicates that the synchronic approach will continue to developed. It will be a huge endeavor, but it is well worth the work.

The synchronic scholars (Hagstrom, Jacobs, Shaw, Andersen and Freedman) are faithful to their methodology. They reveal their core values to be close reading, coherence of text, and unity among Micah chapters 4-5. Compared to literary criticism in the diachronic approach,

---

[174] Jacobs, 156.
[175] Shaw, 138. The scholars are Mays, Jeremias and Duhm.
[176] Shaw, 138.
[177] Andersen and Freedman, 491.

synchronic scholars do not focus outside or behind the text. They investigate the nature of the text itself and come to the conclusion that Micah 4-5 has unity.

Andersen and Freedman make a strong case for coherence and integrity of chapters four and five. They are able to maintain this point against previous higher critical methods of scholars. Hagstrom, Shaw, and Jacobs also point to the unity/coherence factor. Each scholar, however, has his own approach. While Hagstrom and Shaw adequately support their conclusion, Jacobs fails to overcome elements of unclarity about the time period. Jacobs tries to argue with the diachronic perspective, but as long as she relies on diachronic approaches (i.e., form criticism and literary criticism), her unclear position on the date of the text limits her conclusions. These synchronic scholars make good case for their methodologies, yet there exist a couple of weak points. First, stronger evidence is needed to pin down a more accurate time frame. Second, more disciplined use of synchronic methods is needed.

IV. Conclusion

The focus of this study has been the history of the more recent (20th century) interpretation of Micah chapters 4-5 by way of the categories of diachronic and synchronic approaches. This conclusion will summarize how these approaches engage the text and discuss some advantages and disadvantages.

In general, under the diachronic approaches, there are three methods; literary, form, and redaction criticism. Generally, these methods are used to discover the process by which the text we have today was formed. These criticisms focus on histories and/or social backgrounds located behind the text.

Under the diachronic approaches, most scholars deny the authorship and unity of the text. Moreover, they do not accept the eighth century for the date of chapters four and five. Some of them do not give specific or clear statements regarding certain sections.

In literary criticism, generally Smith and Haupt, who are relatively early scholars, do not regard authorship as a significant question. Their shared assumption and belief is that the text was compiled from various sources. When one looks at Smith and Haupt in detail, however, their views are not the same. In his commentary, Smith uses literary (source) criticism to analyze Micah 4-5 and insists that Micah chapters 4-5 are compiled. Because of differences in various sources, he insists that chapters 4-5 contain at least several "original fragments," and that the shorter text is the more original or earlier text. However, according to Haupt, poems are older sources than other sources. He refers to external evidence (i.e., historical data) to support his claims.

In form criticism, the scholars Wolff, Mays, and Ben Zvi commonly insist on the integrity of the text. They hold this position because their presumption is that someone, namely a

redactor, assembled the text with intention. Their approaches are limited in that they deny the time period and the unity of the text, like literary critics.

Differences appear also among these three scholars' works. A major principle of Wolff's commentary is uncovering the historical setting. Because of this, he tries to classify form in each section in order to establish the historical setting. He suggests that each time period has its own distinct content.[1] Thus he does not believe different contents can be reflective of the same time period. Furthermore, he insists that the book of Micah has at least a 300-year writing history. Mays' major concern for the book of Micah is the developmental scheme that he sees evidenced in virtually every verse of the book. Based upon this view, he believes that Micah passed through a reconstructing and editing process. He stresses that "the book is not just a collection of prophetic sayings, but is the outcome of a history of prophetic proclamation and is itself in its final form prophecy."[2] Ben Zvi observes that the book of Micah is a product of a later period. To support his observation, he stresses words and contents in the text.

In redaction criticism, the stance of Wagenaar, Hillers, and Luker relies on the work of literary and form criticism. The three scholars have similar opinions concerning the time period and authorship, denying eighth century authorship. Their differences are found in their approaches or conclusions. Wagenaar's analysis of the book of Micah can be considered as redactional investigation with help from form and literary criticism. Wagenaar divides the text into four distinguishable groups: pre-exilic "disciples of Micah," late/postexilic epoch, later post exilic materials and materials for which he cannot determine the periods. What we have now was collected and redacted within these periods. Hillers believes that Micah's final form was the result of collection. He focuses on historical data to show some sections belong to the eighth

[1] Wolff, 26-27. For example, he thinks chapters 1-3 reflect the eighth- century because of judgment themes. Chapters 4-5 has a salvation theme.

century while others belong to the fifth century. Luker clearly states his principle when he calls it, "study of the redaction of the oracles."[3] He thinks that Micah is a collection of small units redacted over a period of time. His purpose is "concentrated on the larger units in an attempt to discover what redactor(s) has done with the smaller units."[4]

While this thesis observes the diachronic approaches (literary, form, and redaction criticism), it finds a common problem among those methods. The problem arises from their preconception that the Hebrew Bible, or the text, was compiled. This preconception influences the scholars' views of investigation. As a result, these scholars pull the Bible to pieces and lose their reason to study the Bible. The synchronic approaches arose to solve this problem.

Under the synchronic approaches, the methods of Hagstrom, Andersen and Freedman, Shaw, and Jacobs, are reviewed separately but side by side within each section. We have studied each scholar's work focusing mainly on the integrity of the text, authorship and historical setting. Normally, they do not look behind the text but instead emphasize three things: close reading, coherence of text, and unity in Micah chapters 4-5.

As for the synchronic scholars, we find that they clearly claim the coherence of the text and unity of authorship not only in chapters four and five but also for all of Micah. Their holistic viewpoint is indicative of their approach to chapters 4-5. Hagstorm clearly claims the unity and coherence of chapters four and five. Andersen and Freeman strongly demonstrate their position on authorship and coherence of the text. Shaw also makes a very good case for this. The only weak point in his approach is that it is somewhat general. Jacobs' direction, however, is not the same as Hagstrom, Shaw, Andersen and Freedman. Jacobs does not focus on the historical date

---

[2] Mays, ix.
[3] Luker, 5.
[4] Luker, 6.

or authorship. Although she maintains some interest in the questions of authorship and historical date, Jacobs ultimately makes her conclusions based on coherence of the text.

The differences are found only in their methods: Hagstrom proceeds inductively, Shaw relies on the rhetorical situation, Jacobs looks at conceptual interrelationships, and Andersen and Freedman consider holistic and final form. Hagstrom, Shaw, Jacobs, Andersen and Freedman stress the text of Micah itself. They show how the text affects the reader. The scholars show how the word of God in the Bible, specifically Micah 4-5, is revealed and works on the reader.

Although presenting new insights, synchronic methods need to solidify their assertion because at certain points, they fail to make strong arguments. For instance, Andersen and Freedman often use the word "possible," and Jacobs often does not give enough concrete evidence. This needs to be overcome.

This thesis favors the synchronic scholars' approaches. These methods provide a challenging study of the book of Micah. Previously most scholars used diachronic methods in this area. Since synchronic presuppositions[5] differ from diachronic ones, the synchronic methods can open new dimensions of study.

[5] The difference lies mainly in the fact that synchronic approaches come to the text assuming coherence while

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, Leslie C. *The Books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah and Micah.* The New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983.

Andersen, Francis I. and David N. Freedman. *Micah.* ed. William Foxwell Albright and David Noel Freedman The Anchor Bible vol. 24E. New York: Doubleday, 2000.

Anderson, G. "A Study of Micah vi. 1-8." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 4 (1951): 191-197.

Archer, Gleason Jr. "Micah." In *The New Bible Commentary: Revised.* ed. D. Guthrie and J.A. Motyer, 822-833. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981.

Barker, Kenneth L. "A Literary Analysis of the Book of Micah." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 155(1998): 437-448.

Bright, John. *A History of Israel.* Philadelphia: Westminster. 1981

Bullock, C. Hassell *An Introduction to the Old Testament Prophetic Books.* Chicago: Moody, 1986.

Cannawurf, E. "The Authenticity of Micah IV:1-4." *Vetus Testamentum* 13 (1963): 26-33.

Cathcart, K. J. "Micah 5.4-5 and Semitic Incantations" *Biblica* 59 (1978): 38-48.

_____ "Notes on Micah 5.4-5" *Biblica* 49 (1968): 511-514.

Childs, B.S. *Introduction to the Old Testament As Scripture.* Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980.

Clements, R. E. *Prophecy and Tradition.* Atlanta: John Knox, 1978.

Craigie, Peter C. "Micah." In *Twelve Prophets.* Vol. 2. 1-57. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1985.

Crook, Margaret B. "The Promise in Micah 5." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 70 (1951): 313-320.

Cuffey, Kenneth Hugh. "The Coherence of Micah: A Review of the Proposals and a New Interpretation." Ph. D. diss., Drew University, 1987.

---

diachronic approaches assume disunity.

Habel, Norman. *Literary Criticism of the Old Testament.* Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971.

Hagstrom, David G. *The Coherence of the Book of Micah: A Literary Analysis.* ed. J.J.M. Roberts. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series Number 89. Georgia: Scholars Press. 1988.

Haupt, Paul. *The Book of Micah: A New Metrical Translation.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1910.

Hillers, Delkert R. *Micah.* ed. Frank Moor Cross, et. al. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.

Jacobs, Mignon R. *The Conceptual Coherence of the Book of Micah* ed. David J.A. Clines et. al. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series vol. 322. England: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.

Janzen, Waldemar. *Mourning Cry and Woe Oracle.* Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1972.

Jeppesen, Kund. "How the Book of Micah Lost Its Integrity: Outline of the History of Criticism of the Book of Micah with Emphasis on the 19th Century." *Studia Theologica* 33 (1979): 101-131.

_____ "New Aspects of Micah Research." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 8 (1978): 3-32.

Lessing, Reed, R. "Interpreting Discontinuity: Isaiah's Tyre Oracle." Ph.D. diss., Concordia Seminary, 2001.

Longman, Tremper, III. "Micah." ed. Walter A. Elwell. In *Evangelical Commentary on the Bible.* Grand Rapids: Baker, 1989.

Luker, Lamontte M. "Doom and Hope in Micah: The Redaction of the Oracles Attributed to an Eighth-Century Prophet." Vanderbilt University, Ph.D. diss., 1985.

Mays, James L. *Micah: A Commentary.* ed. John Bright, James Barr and Peter Ackroyd, et. al. The Old Testament Library. London: SCM Press, 1976.

Muilenburg, James."Form Criticism and Beyond." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 88 (1969): 1-18.

Raabe, Paul R. *Obadiah.* ed. William Foxwell Albright and David Noel Freedman. The Anchor Bible vol. 24D. New York: Doubleday, 1996.

Shaw, Charles S. *The Speeches of Micah: A Rhetorical-Historical Analysis*. eds. David J.A. Clines and Philip R. Davies. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series, Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.

Smith, John Merlin. *The Books of Micah, Zephaniah, and Nahum*. ed. Samuel Rolles Driver, Alfred Plummer, and Charles Augustus Briggs. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, originally published in 1911.

Steck, Odil Hannes. *Old Testament Exegesis*. ed. Marvin A. Sweeney. Trans. James D. Nogalski. Society of Biblical Literature Resources for Biblical Study Number 39. Georgia: Scholars Press, 1998.

Sweeney, Marvin A. "Micah's Debate with Isaiah." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 93(2001): 111-124.

Van Zyl, A. H. "Messianic Scope in the Book of Micah." *Ou-Testamentiese Werkgemeenskap in Suid-Afrika.* Papers read at eleventh meeting held at the University of Pretoria (1968): 62-72.

Voelz, James, W. *What Does This Mean?* 2d ed. Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1997.

Wagenaar, Jan A. *Judgement and Salvation: The Composition and Redaction of Micah 2-5*. ed. H. M. Baarstad, et al. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum vol. 85. Brill: Leiden, 2001.

Waltke, Bruce K. "Micah." In *The Minor Prophets*. vol. 2. ed. T. E. McComiskey, 591-764. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1993.

Watson, Duane F. and Alan J. Hauser. R*hetorical Criticism of the Bible: A Comprehensive Bibliography with Notes on History and Method.* ed. H.M. Barstad, et. al. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994.

Westermann, Claus. *Prophetic Oracles of Salvation in the Old Testament*. Trans. Keith Crim. Louisville: W/JKP, 1991.

Willis, John T. "Fundamental Issues of Contemporary Micah Studies." *Restoration Quarterly* 13 (1970): 77-90.

_____ "The Structure of the Book of Micah." *Svensk Exegetisk Arsbok* 34 (1969): 5-42.

Wolff, Hans. W. *Micah*. Continental Commentary. Trans. Gary Stansell Augsburg: Fortress, 1990.

Woude, A. S. Van der. "Three Classical Prophets: Amos, Hosea and Micah." In *Israel's Prophetic Tradition: Essays in Honour of Peter R. Ackroyd*. ed. Richard Coggins, Anthon Phillips and Michael Knibb. 32-57. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

Zvi, Ehud Ben. *Micah.* The Forms of the Old Testament Literature Vol. XXIB. ed. Rolf P. Knierim, Gene M. Tucker, and Marvin A. Sweeney. Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2000.