Introduction

Grammatical Type: n. m.
Occurrences: (Total: 25): 1

Epigraphy - none
Qumran – 7 occurrences: 1QM XI:8, 1QH² X:15; XII:10; XII:20, 4QPs 16:2, 4Q174(MidrEschat) f5:4, 4Q280 f:7.
Ben Sira – 1 occurrence: Sir 46:15.

Text doubtful

A.1 The word קז, entirely restored in 4Q266 f2ii:12 [=CD II:12-13] on the basis of T.-S. 10 K 6:12, is probably not to be connected directly with קז, as the term functions as a verbal participle (‘those who see’) in this text and not as a professional title (‘seer’). 2 The same is true for 4Q270 f2ii:14 where the word is reconstructed on the basis of CD II 12-13. 3

A.2 The two unidentified fragments 4Q517 Unidentified fragments f1:5:1 and 4Q518 Unidentified fragments f:2:1, published in DJD 7, only contain one word each: קז and קז respectively. It is clear that in this fragmentary state it is impossible to assess whether they function as verbal participles or as professional titles here.

A.3 1QH² 10:15 uses קז in parallel with ברית נבואה וחי in the lists of returnees in Neh 3:15 and 11:5 do not furnish us with further information. The commentators regularly understand this as a family name (‘all seers’). 6 The versions transiterate: LXX: Χολοζή, Χαλαζία and Vulg: Cholooza, Coloza.

---

1 These numbers correct those given in DCH III:44 for this lemma (Clines lists 16 attestations in Biblical Hebrew, 1 in Ben Sira and 3 in Qumran).
3 There is no real equivalent to the content of 4Q270 f2ii in CD, see WACHOLDER (2007).
4 Thus also EWALD (1863:§156e). HOFFMANN (1883:95) disagrees and translates ‘wir haben in der Hölle einen Propheten angestellt’.
5 DRIVER (1937:44) suggests deriving קז from Arabic hadā and Sabean ḥdṭ here. WILDBERGER (1982:1065) urges caution when deriving Hebrew words from Arabic/Sabean but maintains the translation found in the LXX which is in line with Driver’s suggestion. With reference to Isa 28:15 and elsewhere, WERNBERG-MOLLER (1959) suggests that what looks like an active participle can at times ‘denote the action as such, or the abstract idea of a certain action or condition, with no reference to the agent.’ While this may be the case generally, it does not appear plausible for our verse, as it would lead to a translation ‘We have made a covenant with Death, concluded a seeing with Sheol.’
A.6 Similarly, in 2 Chr 33:19 MT has חָזָה, which NJPS understands as a name, while NRSV and most of the commentators follow LXX’s ὀρώντων (‘of the seers’) and read חָזָה, suggesting that the γ later dropped out due to haplography. The Peshitta has ḫmn ḥby (‘of Hanan the prophet’), while the Targum and the Vulgate support MT and read the name Hozai: חזה and Ḫzai.

B.1 Nitzan, the editor, restores the word in two fragments, 4Q286 f7īi:12 and 4Q287 f6:11, 4QBēr and 4QBēr respectively as they are very similar to 4Q 280 2 6-7. 7

B.2 The restoration 4QpIsa 15-16:2: [...]נָּבָן is certain as it is a direct quote from Isa 29:10. 8

Qere/Ketiv: none

1. Root and Comparative Material 9

A.1 The root ḥzy is the standard root for ‘to see’ in Aramaic and is thus widely attested in Aramaic inscriptions. 10 It refers to both normal seeing as well as seeing in a dream or having a vision. While the root itself (see under קן) is used frequently, there are only two texts which contain the nominalised participle in its meaning of the professional title: the Zakkur inscription (KAI 202A:12) has ḫyn and Deir Alla i:1 hzh ḥmn. The general consensus is that קן is an Aramaic loanword in Hebrew. 11

A.2 It is unclear whether Punic hzh in KAI 69:11 should to be linked to ḥzy.

A.3 Hamilton has recently proposed to read seal UC 51354 from Deir Rifa in Egypt as written in proto-Canaanite. If that is the case and if his reading is correct, the seal bears the inscription ṭqn ḥz, which he interprets as ‘belonging to Ḫn, the seer’. 12

A.4 The root is also operational in later forms of Arabic as ḥazā (‘to see’) and ḥāzī (‘seer, soothsayer’). 13 This is normally attributed to Hebrew influence, but Aramaic influence or a mixture of the two could also have caused this development.

A.5 The root is attested in Ugaritic. Initially, opinions differed considerably whether Ugaritic ḥdy could be linked to Hebrew ḥzh because, according to Ginsberg, Phoenician (here: Ugaritic) and Hebrew share the sound-change of Proto-Semitic ḏ to ḫ. 14 Conversely, Dahood insists on the etymological relation between Hebrew ḥzh and Ugaritic ḥdy. 15 Aistleitner’s and Ginsberg’s view is in part a critical reaction to Dahood’s additional theory that Hebrew also knows a root II קן (‘to see’) which is linked to Ugaritic ḥdy. 16

A.6 On the basis of Ugaritic ḥdy, Wagner suggests that it is possible that the word is not an Aramaic loan but a genuinely Hebrew word. 17 He goes on to state that it is impossible to

---

8 ALLEGRO (1968).
9 A fuller version of the etymological discussion will be presented in the entry on קן. Contrary, to JEFFERS (1996:36) the etymology of קן is not quite as straightforward as it appears.
11 See VETTER (1971) and JEPSEN (1976) (ET JEPSEN (1980)).
12 HAMILTON (2009).
14 E.g. GINSBERG (1938 and 1967) and AISTLEITNER (1963:905).
15 DAHOOD (1964:407-408); more cautiously GORDON (1965:839).
16 DAHOOD (1964:407) KBL 3 (and therefore HALOT) followed this decision. See also BLAU (1970) Against such a view see e.g. BONNARD (1960:226).
17 WAGNER (1966:53-54).
verify this. Allowing for a Hebrew origin of the verb and its derivatives, he reasons that Aramaic influence is at least partly responsible for the increased number of post-exilic attestations. However, Fuhs argues that it is impossible that Hebrew had two entirely synonymous verbs (חזה and הנביא).

A.7 A further problem for the etymology of the Hebrew root חזה (‘to see’) is that there is at least a second root חזה in Hebrew from which the word חזה (‘chest’) is derived, and which in other Semitic languages has a meaning ‘to sit/be across’. The term חזה in Isa 28:15 should be connected to that root, which is attested in the form ḥdyt in Old South Arabic with the meaning ‘agreement’.

A.8 There is no etymological equivalent to חזה in Akkadian. Functionally, amāru, barū and naṭālu are equivalents, expressing ‘seeing’ in the physical sense as well as in the divinatory sense (particularly in dreams and liver omens). The noun barū (‘seer’) denotes a classical haruspex, a technical diviner.

2. Formal Characteristics

A.1 qôtēl of a חז, nominalised qal masculine active participle.

3. Syntagmatics

A.1 חזה is the subject of the following verbs: אכל (‘eat’) in Am 7:46, חרב (‘flee’) in Am 7:46, חיה (‘play’ in Am 7:12, חים (‘go’) in Am 7:12, נב nif. (‘prophesy’) in Am 7:15 and ח Osborne (‘warn’) in 2 Ki 17:13.

A.2 Additionally, the following verbs are used with individuals who in the same pericope are identified as a חזה: חום (‘burn’) in 2 Chr 19:2, חישר (‘be ashamed’) in Mic 3:7, חיר pi (‘speak’) in Isa 30:10 and 2 Chr 33:18, חישה (‘walk’) in Am 7:13, חウ (‘see’) in Isa 30:10, חמעס (‘continue/add’) in Am 7:12-13, חימ (‘go out’) in 2 Chr 19:2, חיחן hif. (‘turn aside’) in Isa 30:10-11, ח SATA hif. (‘remove’) in Isa 30:10-11 and, through apposition, חכס pi. (‘cover’) in Isa 29:10.

A.3 חזה is the nomen regens for חנה (2 Sam 24:11, 1 Chr 21:9, 2 Chr 35:15), חח (1 Chr 25:5, 2 Chr 29:25, 35:15), חיח (1 QH² 10:15), וחיח (1 QH² 12:10), חיח (1 QH² 12:20), חיח (1 QM 11:8).

A.4 חזה is the nomen rectum of ח½ח (1 Chr 29:29, 2 Chr 33:18) and ח½ח (2 Ki 17:13, 4Q174 f5.4).

A.5 חזה is used as a prepositional augment for the verb ח Osborne ח ‘warn’ (2 Ki 17:13).

A.6 Only Gad is described as a ח ח (2 Sam 24:11 || אבר, 1 Chr 21:9), while Gad (2 Chr 29:25 || אבר, ח ), Heman (1 Chr 25:5) and Jeduthun (2 Chr 35:15)²¹ are described as ח ח ח.

A.7 The following individuals are described as ח ח ח: Asaf (2 Chr 29:30), Gad (1 Chr 29:29), Iddo (2 Chr 9:29, 12:15)²², Jehu (2 Chr 19:2)²³. Amos is once referred to as ח ח ח ח by Amaziah (Am 7:12).

¹⁸ For literature see FUHS (1978:58-66).
¹⁹ See also DRIVER (1937:44).
²¹ The LXX and Vulgate use a plural here and therefore understand Asaph, Aeman (Heman) and Idothom (Jeduthun) as prophets (προφήται/prophetae) collectively.
²² In the LXX the name of this seer is Joel, not Iddo.
²³ Syntactically, Hanani could be the seer here: ח ח ח ח ח (אבר, ח).
4. Versions

a. LXX:

ὄρον  active participle present tense of ὀρῶ (‘to see’): 2 Sam 24:11, 2 Ki 17:13, 1 Chr 21:9, 2 Chr 9:29, 12:15, 29:25, 33:18, 33:19, Am 7:12, Mic 3:7.

ὁρῶ  active participle present tense of ὁράω (‘to see’): 2 Sam 24:11, 2 Chr 9:29, 12:15, 29:25, 33:18, 33:19, Am 7:12, Mic 3:7.

βλέπων  active participle present tense of βλέπω (‘to see’): 2 Chr 9:29, 12:15, 29:25, 33:18, 33:19, Am 7:12, Mic 3:7.

προφήτης:  2 Chr 19:2, 29:30, 35:15.


ἀνακρούµενος  medium participle present tense of ἀνακροῦω (in music: ‘to strike up’): 1 Chr 25:5.


b. Peshitta


Verse not extant: 1 Chr 25:5, 2 Chr 9:29, Sir 46:15
Differing text: 2 Chr 12:15
No equivalent 2 Sam 24:11

c. Targum

rebbe  2 Sam 24:11

מבר  1 Chr 21:9, 25:5, 2 Chr 9:29, 12:15, 29:25, 33:18, 33:19, Am 7:12

טבש  Mic 3:7

כפי  1 Chr 29:29, 2 Chr 19:2, 29:30,

נלב  pa part. נלב (‘to teach’): 2 Ki 17:13, Isa 30:10

ספרי  Isa 29:10

חתי  2 Chr 33:19

Not extant: Sir 46:15

d. Vulgate

videns  active participle present tense of videre (‘to see’): 2 Sam 24:1, 2 Ki 17:13, 1 Chr 21:9, 25:5, 29:29, 2 Chr 9:29, 12:15, 19:2, 29:25, 29:30, 33:18

videre  Am 7:12, Mic 3:7, Sir 46:15

propheta:  2 Chr 35:15

aspiciens  Isa 30:10

princeps  Isa 29:10 (V understands the text differently here)

Ozai (pr.n.)  2 Chr 33:19

A.1. There is a clear distinction between the versions: LXX and the Vulgate render נבי with an active participle of a verb ‘to see’ (LXX: ὀρῶν and βλέπων; Vulgate: videns) in almost all cases.
A.2 In most instances, the versions attempt to find a word in the semantic range of 'seeing' in their respective target languages. An exception is the Peshitta which prefers כֻּסָּה to הַנָּבִיא, presumably to distinguish between normal 'seeing' and the seeing of visions. Alternatively, it may have picked up on the later use of the term כֻּסָּה in Hebrew which seems to denote a range of diviners.

A.3 The LXX and the Vulgate understand κρυπτά in Isa 30:10 as a verbal participle and therefore translate as τῶν τα ὀράματα ὀρθῶν ('those who are seeing visions') and aspicientibus ('to those who are seeing').

A.4 The case of Isaiah is interesting in the Peshitta. In the MT Isa 29:10 and 2 Ki 17:13 have כֻּסָּה and כֻּסָּה in parallel and the Peshitta translates them with nby and ḥzy respectively. In Isa 30:10, however, which in MT has כֻּסָּה and כֻּסָּה in parallel, כֻּסָּה is translated with ḥzy and כֻּסָּה with nby, indicating that the meaning of these three terms is not clearly distinguished in the Peshitta of Isaiah.

A.5 In Isa 29:10 LXX and the Vulgate understand the syntax of MT differently and regard כֻּסָּה as a participle expressing an entire relative clause; this requires them to understand כֻּסָּה as a puʿal (כֻּסָּה). It is possible that they also had a text which supplied the normally required nota accusativi and the article: כֻּסָּה כֻּסָּה. LXX has: καὶ τῶν ἁγίων αὐτῶν οἱ ὀρθῶν τὰ κρυπτὰ ('and their princes who see that which is hidden'); the Vulgate has principes vestros qui vident visiones operiet ('your princes who see visions he covers').

A.6 In Am 7:12, the Vulgate understands כֻּסָּה as a participle expressing a relative clause qui vides ('who sees'). The same also occurs in Mic 3:7: qui vident visiones ('who see visions').

A.7 The Targum of Am 7:12 uses the root לַדַּב to translate the noun (כֻּסָּה) and the verb (כֻּסָּה, nif.) which Amaziah uses to describe Amos. This indicates that the difference between the two roots in Hebrew found no reflex in the translation.

A.8 The Peshitta understands 2 Chr 12:15 completely differently and therefore does not translate the term כֻּסָּה.

A.9 The following verses are not attested in the Peshitta: 1 Chr 25:5, 2 Chr 9:29 and Sir 46:15.

5. Lexical/Semantic Field(s)

A.1 Can stand parallel with יָדַע (IQHb 10:15) and with מַמשֵׁה in (CD 2:12, IQM 11:8).
A.2 Occurs in parallel with other divinatory titles such as כֻּסָּה (Isa 30:10, 1 Chr 29:29), כֻּסָּה (2 Sam 24:11, 2 Ki 17:13, 1 Chr 29:29, 2 Chr 9:29, 12:15, Isa 29:10) and כֻּסָּה (Mic 3:7).
A.3 Used almost as a term for historian when describing Gad (1 Chr 29:29 || שֵׁם אֱלֹהִים אֲשֶׁר לְגַד רִאוֹן; 2 Chr 9:29 || אֲשֶׁר לְגַד רִאוֹן; 2 Chr 12:15 || אֲשֶׁר לְגַד רִאוֹן).
A.4 Once, כֻּסָּה is used in apposition to כֻּסָּה (Isa 29:10).
A.5 According to Wilson the כֻּסָּה represents a Northern ('Ephraimite') seer who disappeared shortly after the introduction of the monarchy.
A.6 According to the comprehensive study of the root כֻּסָּה in biblical Hebrew by Fuhs, כֻּסָּה is used almost literally as someone who sees a revelation in Am 7:12 and Isa 30:10 and in 1 Sam 9:9-19 (5x), while it refers to the receiver of a revelation, without suggesting 'seeing' and in parallel to other divinatory titles, in Mi 3:7, 2 Ki 17:13, Isa 29:10 and 2 Chr 33:18-19.

---

24 1-2 Chronicles according to GORDON (1998). For Ben Sira DE LAGARDE (1861) is correct, as has been affirmed by Wido van Peursen in a personal communication (May 7th 2010) for which I would like to thank Prof. van Peursen. The Peshitta of Ben Sira represents a modified form of the book, e.g. VAN PEURSEN (2007).

25 WILSON (1980:139-140).
In 1 Chr 29:29, 2 Sam 24:11 and elsewhere it is used as a professional title in parallel to other such titles. Finally, in 2 Chr 29:30 it refers to a temple singer.

6. Exegesis

A.1 The dictionaries keep with the obvious (and correct) sense and translate נביא as ‘seer’. Zorell translates videns sc. Divina, a Deo sibi revelata, vates, prophetæ. KBL and GES translate ‘Seher’. BDB and DCH have ‘seer’. The only confusion is with Isa 28:15 which is not always distinguished, and often translated as ‘vision’ (BDB), while KBL and DCH list this word as II נביא (‘agreement’).

A.2 Adducing Lee and Jastrow, Paul and Zevit suggest that נביא should be understood as a technical term for a court diviner, while רוא as refers to any kind of prophet. Jastrow does not merely identify the נביא as a court diviner, but argues that because the term is also used to describe (Levitical) singers Heman, Asaf and Ethan, it follows that it ‘belongs to an early period in the religious history of the Hebrews, when divination formed a part of the priestly office and before the period of the differentiation of the diviner from the true prophet of Jahweh and the concomitant differentiation between “prophet” and “priest.”’ This connection to music means, according to Jastrow, that they were of a lower status similar to those of the ‘singing dervishes whom Saul encounters’, i.e. נביא. The difference between the נביא and the נביא lies in that the נביא is available to everybody while the נביא is the official diviner. Jastrow further distinguishes between the two titles and describes the נביא as a technical diviner who works on materials which are to some extent controllable (i.e. hepatoscopy, where the diviner has access to the liver through slaughtering an animal), whereas the נביא is a technical diviner who reads more haphazard signs such as bird-flight or clouds.

A.3 Many scholars take the term נביא to be the Judean term for ‘seer’ and thus as the Southern equivalent of the Northern נביא. While Fuhs interprets נביא as an old technical term he argues against Zevit’s thesis that it is a loan from an Aramaic technical term on account of the few attestations in Aramaic inscriptions and because most of the biblical attestations for a court diviner are in the Chronistic History and therefore late. Further, according to Fuhs, Am 7:12 also militates against such a reading as in that verse Amaziah acknowledges Amos’ office as ‘seer’. Fuhs’ argument here relies both on the antiquity of Am 7:12, that it relays the wording correctly, and that Amaziah uses the term correctly.

A.5 In 1 Chr 25:5, 2 Chr 29:30 and 35:15 נביא is applied to various individuals who are (according to 2 Chr 29:30, levitical) singers whose actions are described with נgetProperty, nif. While

27 JASTROW (1909:50), PAUL (1971) and ZEVIT (1975), WILSON (1980:254-256). This thesis is sometimes attributed to LEE (1860:458-459). Lee, however, says something slightly different. He distinguishes between the royal office of ‘seer of the king’ (who may or may not have a prophetic gift) and the prophetic ‘office’, which does not need to be connected to the court.
28 JASTROW (1909:50-51).
29 JASTROW (1909:51).
31 ZEVIT (1975) and FUHS (1978:245-248).
32 FUHS (1978:187-192), SMEND (1963:416-418) also argues that Amos identifies with the title נביא and denies being a נביא, but he does not elaborate on what a נביא-seer is.
it is true that this seems to suggest that these singers are acting prophetically, it is equally likely that חֹזֶה and נבָא, nif. have changed their meaning sufficiently so that they can be used for the performance of cultic music and possibly dance. If, following Mowinckel, there was an institution of cultic prophecy in pre-exilic (Israel and) Judah, the transfer of the two verbs to the musical cult performers appears plausible.

A.6 While most attestations of נבָא occur in 1-2 Chronicles, a late text, it appears that Chronicles uses the word mostly in conjunction with court ‘employees’, more specifically specialists who are connected to David. This suggests that in Chronicles the term signifies some form of a court diviner. As the related verb has the meaning ‘to see’ it appears reasonable to assume a meaning ‘seer’ for נבָא. It must remain unclear whether or not this ‘seeing’ was necessarily transcendent (‘seeing of visions’) or could include the ‘seeing’ and subsequent interpretation of ominous signs.

7. Conclusions
The classical theory, as expressed by Lindblom, is that no distinction can be made in meaning between נבָא and רֹאֶה, and that people described by either term are indistinguishable from the נבָא. Contrary to this, Hölscher distinguishes between the ecstatic נבָא and the non-ecstatic נבָא. Chronicles appears to use נבָא, רֹאֶה and חֶזֶה almost interchangeably. Focussing on נבָא and רֹאֶה, the distribution of the two titles within Chronicles indicates that the רֹאֶה seems to have been a diviner available to the general public while the נבָא was employed at the court – and in the case of the Levitical singers, at the temple. The connection with the verb נבָא plausibly suggests that at least initially the translation ‘seer’ for נבָא is correct, but it must remain unclear which form this ‘seeing’ took. It is likely that visionary experiences are implied, as they are with many of the other derivatives of the root חזה such as חִזָּיוֹן and חָזוּת. This holds true particularly in later texts, as by the time of their composition other forms of divination had acquired a negative status. Most of the attestations are late, suggesting the possibility that the term itself is either an Aramaic loanword or at least that the root became more productive as contact between Hebrew and Aramaic grew stronger.

Jonathan Stökl

---

34 LINDBLOM (1962:90). See also DAVIDSON (1903:81), VANDEN OUDENRIJN (1925), JEPSEN (1934:43-44) and HENTSCHKE (1957:150). See e.g. also BLAU (1970:439-440) and JOHNSON (1962:12) who understands the two verbs נבָא and רֹאֶה as being slightly distinct in that רֹאֶה is used more for normal seeing while נבָא refers more to the seeing of visions.
35 HÖLSCHER (1914:125-126).
36 See the table in FUHS (1978:245-249).
37 Both verbs included synaesthetic perception, that is, they are used in contexts in which we may expect to find a verb ‘to hear’, see KEDAR-KOPFSTEIN (1988).
38 WAGNER (1966:53-54).
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