1

What is prophecy, and can it be validated?

> If truth be told, the contemporary academy does not find the appeal to divine revelation at all attractive. Outside theology, and often within theology itself, the appeal to revelation is simply not permissible.
>
> – WILLIAM J. ABRAHAM (2002:254)

In this study I wish to examine how the Bible presents the phenomenon of human speech on behalf of God – for which the prime biblical designation is 'prophecy' – and its disciplined critical appraisal – 'discernment'. My purpose is to understand the Bible in its own right with a view to being able to appropriate it and bring it to bear upon issues of contemporary understanding and practice: how, in a contemporary context where, as in antiquity, numerous different conceptions of life and reality jostle in the market place, may it be possible to speak meaningfully of Christian faith in God and divine revelation as a matter of public, albeit contested, truth?[1]

In this first chapter, there are three main aims. First, I wish to set out a preliminary biblical portrayal of the phenomenon of prophecy, in such a way as to clarify its basic conceptuality. Secondly, I will consider some of the obvious prima facie difficulties that are raised by attempts to regard the biblical conceptuality as genuinely meaningful and potentially valid, and look at the handling of these issues in some modern scholarship.

1. The issues with which I engage are, in certain forms, live issues for Jews and Muslims as well as for Christians. Yet the ways in which they are configured within the wider contexts of Jewish and Muslim thought and practice may make profound differences, and these lie beyond my remit and competence. My focus is on the disciplines of Christian thought and life (hence my usage of 'Bible' is in the Christian sense of Old and New Testaments together), where there are quite sufficient divergences on the issues of prophecy for a Christian theologian to be going on with. I will, however, sometimes touch on issues within Judaism and Islam where it seems appropriate.

Thirdly, I will briefly suggest a possible way ahead. Taken together these will set the stage for the more extended engagement with selected portions of both Old and New Testaments in the chapters that follow.

1 Preliminary outline of the conceptuality of prophecy

Human speech on God's behalf: two succinct biblical depictions

A convenient starting point is afforded by some words of St Paul in 1 Thess. 2:13:

> We also constantly give thanks to God for this, that when you received the word of God that you heard from us,[2] you accepted it not as a human word but as what it really is, God's word, which is also[3] at work in you believers.

The context of these words (to which we will return later) is Paul's moving exposition of his apostolic lifestyle among the Thessalonians, a lifestyle characterized by integrity and practical concern for his converts (2:1–12). For the present, what matters is the pure statement of one of our prime concerns: the word of God in human words. Paul's claim is as fundamental and far-reaching as could be – that when the Thessalonians heard his human words, they rightly heard these words as the address of God to them.

Paul expresses himself with a favourite rhetorical idiom of emphasis, '*not* a human word *but* . . . God's word', an idiom whereby Paul does not deny the human reality of his words, but transforms their significance. In other words, his idiomatic meaning is that the words are *not only* human

2. Perhaps preferable is 'the word which you heard from us, which is from God'. This attempts to draw out the significance of the awkward word order, in that 'of God' (*tou theou*) is directly adjacent not to 'word' but to 'from us' (*par' hēmōn*) (my Greek may be at fault, but I am unpersuaded by Richard 1995:112, who says that 'the entire, compact construction, *logon akoēs par'hēmōn tou theou*, conforms to classical usage'). This awkwardness, which was not modified in the manuscript tradition, is smoothed by NRSV. Yet it deserves attention since *tou theou* might easily have been omitted altogether, as *logos akoēs* could stand on its own (as in Heb. 4:2), and the juxtaposition of 'us' with 'God' is probably intentional. This means that 'the awkwardness of the construction . . . draws attention to Paul's concern to bar any distinction between his and God's word' (Malherbe 2000:166). In grammatical terms, as J. B. Lightfoot (1895:31) puts it, '*tou theou* is emphatic by its position, and is intended to deprecate any false deduction from *par' hēmōn* . . . *Tou theou* is therefore a subjective genitive "proceeding from God, having God for its author", as its emphatic position requires.'
3. The precise sense of this *kai* is debatable, but I am inclined to take it to be ascensive, i.e. 'indeed'.

but also divine;[4] or, the nature of his human words is so constituted by God that their full reality is not adequately rendered by an account which does not simultaneously depict the divine as well as the human. Moreover, the divine nature of his words is implicitly attested by their continuing impact amongst the believing Thessalonians; there is thus an implicit nexus between divine origin ('God's word'), transformative impact ('at work'), and the responsiveness of faith ('in you believers'). Paul is of course well aware that the hearing of his words as the word of God may not happen – as it did not happen on numerous occasions during his ministry, as both Acts and his letters make clear. This is why he in no way takes such hearing for granted but sees it as the cause of thanksgiving, a thanksgiving which for him is not a one-off but a continuing reality.

Beyond the immediate context of 1 Thessalonians, the 'deep' context for Paul's words is a Jewish conceptuality that is rooted in Israel's scriptures. For here we find articulated that conceptuality which Paul presupposes – that is the concept of prophecy.[5] The prime Hebrew term for 'prophet' is *nāvi'*, and the basic characteristic of the *nāvi'* is nicely captured in Exod. 7:1, a passage frequently cited in this regard.[6] The context is the renewed commissioning of a reluctant, professedly tongue-tied, Moses to act as God's agent in delivering Israel from Egypt and the power of Pharaoh.

4. For Paul's idiom 'not . . . but' meaning 'not only . . . but also' with reference to the presence of God/Christ in his life see, e.g., Gal. 2:20, 'I live – no longer I, but Christ lives in me', or 1 Cor. 15:10, 'I toiled more than them all – though not I but the grace of God which is with me.' For a comparable idiom within the Old Testament, see, e.g., Deut. 8:17–18.

5. 'In many respects the NT apostle was the functional equivalent of the OT prophet' (Aune 1983:202, cf. 248).

6. For example, in the seventeenth century, Hobbes in *Leviathan*, ch. 36 (1996:290) says, 'The name of PROPHET, signifieth in Scripture sometimes *Prolocutor*; that is, he that speaketh from God to Man, or from man to God: And sometimes *Praedictor*, or a foreteller of things to come: And sometimes one that speaketh incoherently, as men that are distracted. It is most frequently used in the sense of speaking from God to the People.' Hobbes then proceeds to cite Exod. 4:16, 7:1 in illustration of the primary sense. Similarly Spinoza says at the very outset of ch. 1 of his *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus* (1951:13): 'Prophecy, or revelation, is sure knowledge revealed by God to man . . . The Hebrew word for prophet is "*nabi*'", i.e. speaker or interpreter, but in Scripture its meaning is restricted to interpreter of God, as we may learn from Exodus vii. 1.' It is not possible here to look at the fascinating treatment of prophecy by Hobbes and Spinoza, but in their different ways they shared a concern (if one may be permitted a sweeping simplification) to disengage questions of religious truth from the public life of the state. Whatever good reasons they may have had for so doing in their respective historical contexts – not least, of course, the 'wars of religion' fuelled by ambitious nation-states – the legacy of their arguments has been to contribute to the ultimate marginalizing of the biblical conception of prophecy in the public life of modern Western culture.

> The LORD said to Moses, 'See, I have made you like God[7] to Pharaoh, and your brother Aaron shall be your prophet [*nāvi'*].'

Moses will be the godlike figure of authority and power, but it will be Aaron who will do the talking, who will speak on Moses' behalf.[8] Thus the *nāvi'* is in essence *one who speaks for God*, a spokesman (or spokeswoman, since the Old Testament recognizes several female prophets, *nevi'āh*). When Paul speaks of his ministry as an apostle, he is not in principle, *mutatis mutandis*, speaking of anything different from the Old Testament conception of a prophet.

Closely linked to the notion of speaking for God is the natural correlative notion that the initiative for such speech lies with God. This is characteristically expressed in terms of the prophet being 'sent' by God, as a messenger by his/her master. The verb 'send' (*shālah*) appears at the heart of God's commissioning of Moses, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel.[9] In the New Testament the very term 'apostle' means 'one who is sent' (*apostolos* is etymologically related to the verbal root *apostellō*), and so the New incorporates within its depiction of those who foundationally speak for God in Christ the conceptuality of the Old.[10]

Human speech on God's behalf: Moses as paradigmatic prophet in Deuteronomy 5

The basic conceptuality of prophecy as articulated in Exod. 7:1 receives what is perhaps its fullest depiction in Deuteronomy, a book which presents Moses as *the* prophet *par excellence*.[11] The passage in question is Deut. 5:22–33, which develops and transforms a shorter account of the same issue in Exod. 20:18–21. Its nature as a paradigmatic portrayal of prophecy is not at all well known – I can find no discussion of it in any of

7. Or perhaps 'a god'. The generic use of *'elōhim* does not require capitalization.
8. Compare Exod. 4:15–16, 'You [Moses] shall speak to him [Aaron] and put the words in his mouth; and I [YHWH] will be with your mouth and his mouth, and will teach you what you shall do. He indeed shall speak for you to the people; he shall serve as a mouth for you, and you shall serve as God [*or* a god] for him.' Interestingly, as the narrative of the encounters with Pharaoh unfolds, Moses in fact regularly speaks on his own behalf – perhaps because, in context, YHWH's words in 7:1 are a reassurance to overcome Moses' sense of inadequacy as a speaker (6:30, cf. 6:12), and so it may be that we are to imagine Moses gaining confidence as events proceed and no longer needing the help of Aaron in this way.
9. Exod. 3:13, 15, Isa. 6:8, Jer. 1:7, Ezek. 2:3.
10. Representative accounts of the divine initiative are Gal. 1:1, John 20:21.
11. So, perhaps most famously, Deut. 34:10, 'Never since has there arisen a prophet in Israel like Moses, whom the LORD knew face to face.'

the standard studies of prophecy on my (reasonably well-stocked) shelf.[12] Yet its significance is considerable.[13]

The context is as important as it could be – Israel gathered at Horeb to hear the Ten Words of YHWH that constitute the covenant.[14] Moses is speaking, and he retells the scene to make clear its enduring significance and its consequences:

> 22 These words the LORD spoke with a loud voice to your whole assembly at the mountain, out of the fire, the cloud, and the thick darkness, and he added no more. He wrote them on two stone tablets, and gave them to me. 23 When you heard the voice out of the darkness, while the mountain was burning with fire, you approached me, all the heads of your tribes and your elders; 24 and you said, 'Look, the LORD our God has shown us his glory and greatness, and we have heard his voice out of the fire. Today we have seen that God may speak to someone and the person may still live.[15] 25 So now why should we die? For this great fire will consume us; if we hear the voice of the LORD our God any longer, we shall die. 26 For who is there of all flesh that has heard the voice of the living God speaking out of fire, as we have, and remained alive? 27 Go near, you yourself, and hear all that the LORD our God will say. Then tell us everything that the LORD our God tells you,

12. It would be tedious to list books in this context, though they include Buber 1949, Heaton 1958, Heschel 1962, Lindblom 1962, von Rad 1965, Koch 1983, Blenkinsopp 1996, Petersen 2002; also Neumann 1979, which is an overview of modern German research on prophecy. The reason for the neglect of Deut. 5:22–33 is not hard to discern, at least in general terms. The common modern approach has been to offer a historical, developmental, and thematic account of prophecy in Israel and its world. The recognition that the biblical portrayal of Moses as a *nāvi'* may well belong less to the origins than to the flowering of Israelite prophetic thought (though the case for this is not straightforward, at least within Exodus) has tended to mean that the portrayal, especially in Deuteronomy, is treated dismissively as a (mere) rationalization or retrojection (or whatever other term indicates a lack of fit with the modern historian's priorities in unscrambling Israel's religious history). If, however, one seeks to work with the biblical text as the mature distillation of what is of enduring value in Israel's religious history, in a portrayal which may in varying degrees invert and transpose the course of that history but which has value in its own terms, then the depiction of Moses as *nāvi'* can properly become a key to discerning the nature and meaning of biblical prophecy for those who wish to appropriate its legacy.

13. Von Rad's only discussion of the passage is in his commentary on Deuteronomy. Here he notes that 'the report of these events is far from being an historical report in our sense; instead it is a complete theological statement' (1966:60). But this recognition of the text's genre and function – 'a complete theological statement' – does not lead him to make the kind of use of it which one might have expected.

14. For some reason the Hebrew of Exodus and Deuteronomy consistently depicts YHWH's direct address to Israel as 'words' (*devārim*) rather than 'commandments' (*mitswōt*) – which does not, of course, mean that the familiar labelling 'Ten Commandments' fails to capture the nature of the text.

15. Perhaps preferable is 'a deity may speak to humanity and humanity may still live'. The concern of the text is the communication between two generically different realities, deity (*'elōhim*) and humanity (*hā'ādām*).

> and we will listen and do it'. [28] The LORD heard your words when you spoke to me, and the LORD said to me: 'I have heard the words of this people, which they have spoken to you; they are right in all that they have spoken. [29] If only they had such a mind as this, to fear me and to keep all my commandments always,[16] so that it might go well with them and with their children for ever! [30] Go, say to them, "Return to your tents." [31] But you, stand here by me, and I will tell you all the commandments, the statutes and the ordinances, that you shall teach them, so that they may do them in the land that I am giving them to possess.' [32] You must therefore be careful to do as the LORD your God has commanded you; you shall not turn to the right or to the left. [33] You must follow exactly the path that the LORD your God has commanded you, so that you may live, and that it may go well with you, and that you may live long in the land that you are to possess.

YHWH spoke directly, 'face to face', with Israel, out of the fire upon the mountain (Deut. 5:4, 22). The fire is the awesome symbol of the divine presence, as in YHWH's initial appearance to Moses at the burning bush (Exod. 3:1–6);[17] here its combination with cloud and darkness is in some ways suggestive of the visual accompaniments of a volcanic eruption, the point being that these most awesome of phenomena convey something of the awesomeness of the divine presence and speech. Although YHWH 'only' (so to speak) spoke the Ten Commandments – the continuation 'and he added no more' (5:22aβ) draws a clear line under the divine address, as does the writing of the divine words on stone tablets (5:22b) – the experience of hearing YHWH speak was utterly overwhelming for Israel. They felt that in hearing the deity speak[18] they had gone to the

16. 'Always' should surely qualify Israel's state of mind, i.e. 'If only they had such a mind as this always.' YHWH's wish is that Israel's present correct attitude should be enduring.
17. Presumably one reason for the appropriateness of fire as a prime symbol of YHWH's presence is that it is something that both attracts (by its colour, movement, and warmth) and repels (by the intensity of its heat and the danger of burning if one comes too close). It thus embodies that polarity which was famously depicted by Rudolph Otto (1924) in relation to holiness as *mysterium tremendum et fascinans*.
18. Interestingly the formulation of Israel's leaders uses the generic terms 'deity' and 'humanity', not the specific terms 'YHWH' and 'Israel', and uses the imperfect/*yiqtol* form of the verb for open-ended, repeated action, not (as one might expect) the perfect/*qatal* form for completed action. The point would seem to be to locate Israel's encounter with YHWH within basic conceptual and existential categories, so that the unparalleled nature of their specific encounter with YHWH may best be appreciated. There is a similar use of generic categories in Deut. 4:32–40, esp. 32–4a (and compare 4:7–8), where the point seems to be to express YHWH's dealings with Israel in categories which allow for comparison with other accounts of deity and humanity, but only so as to emphasize the unrivalled nature of what YHWH has done with Israel, so that Israel is to recognize YHWH not just as a deity (*'elōhim*, i.e. 'god') but rather *the* deity (*hā'elōhim*, i.e. 'God'), the one and only, the incomparable (4:35, 39; see MacDonald 2003:79–81).

very edge of endurable human experience, so that any further divine speech would risk destroying them entirely – to hear the words was to be exposed to the heart of the fire that is the divine presence and so they wanted henceforth to withdraw to a safer distance (5:24–6). This led to their crucial request to Moses (verse 27):

> Go near, you yourself, and hear all that the LORD our God will say. Then tell us everything that the LORD our God tells you, and we will listen and do it.

Moses is to be so close to God that he is able to hear what God is saying – the assumption is that, with the possible exception of the direct address of YHWH to Israel in the Ten Commandments, God does not (as it were) shout, so that proximity to God matters for hearing God. The purpose of this is that Moses can then transmit what he has heard to Israel, with a view to Israel thus knowing what God wants of them so that they can live accordingly. Here we have, spelled out with clarity and precision, the prime sense of what it is to be a particular kind of mediator – not a priest (though a priest may speak for God, Mal. 2:4–7), but one whose prime responsibility is to speak for God, a prophet (*nāvi'*).

Israel's request is then approved by God (5:28–9), with an approval that is the more striking because so consistently elsewhere in the surrounding context Israel is depicted as hard-hearted, stiff-necked, and persistently rebellious (esp. 9:7–10:11); presumably this approval is at least in part because the requested mediator is to enable Israel's obedience to YHWH's will, an obedience which Israel undertakes to live out.[19] The approval leads directly into instructions to Moses to carry out what has been approved. Israel is to disperse, while Moses fulfils his commissioned role (verse 31):

> But you, stand here by me, and I will tell you all the commandments, the statutes and the ordinances, that you shall teach them, so that they may do them in the land that I am giving them to possess.

19. It is, of course, possible to read this (as indeed everything within the Bible) in an oblique way, with an eye to the human interests (of varying, often problematic, kinds) that 'must' underlie the text; so, e.g., even Alter 2004:909 (perhaps drawing on Levinson 1997:145), 'One may detect in all this the interest of a royal scribal elite promoting itself as the necessary authoritative mediators of God's words for the people.' Insofar as such comments are not merely reductive and dismissive, they serve as a reminder that, among other things, there are heavy moral and spiritual responsibilities laid upon those who put forward such a text to be taken seriously.

This restates verse 27 in terms of YHWH's directive rather than the people's request, but the content remains the same in depicting Moses' role as mediator: Moses' proximity to YHWH is to enable him to receive that divine teaching which will guide Israel in living faithfully in accordance with the divine will.

The section then concludes with a general exhortation by Moses to Israel to obey what he will mediate to them from God (5:32–3) – the content of which Moses immediately goes on to convey to them in the form of a brief preamble (6:1–3) followed by the Shema (6:4–9), which thus becomes the keynote of Moses' commissioned prophetic teaching of the will of God for Israel.

Three reflections on this passage.[20] First, although the specific term *nāvi'* is not used here, the conceptuality is unambiguous. Moreover, later in Deuteronomy, there is an important section to do with YHWH's future guidance of Israel (18:9–22), where Israel is forbidden to follow the practices of other nations in trying to get some leverage upon divine guidance (verses 9–14), but is promised that YHWH will raise up other Israelites to be to Israel as Moses has been:

> [15] The LORD your God will raise up for you a prophet (*nāvi'*) like me from among your own people; you shall heed such a prophet. [16] This is what you requested of the LORD your God at Horeb on the day of the assembly when you said: 'If I hear the voice of the LORD my God any more, or ever again see this great fire, I will die.' [17] Then the LORD replied to me: 'They are right in what they have said. [18] I will raise up for them a prophet (*nāvi'*) like you from among their own people; I will put my words in the mouth of the prophet, who shall speak to them everything that I command.'

Moses is described as a *nāvi'* himself and as the model for Israel's other prophets,[21] all with explicit reference to the scene at Horeb where Israel's request (5:24–6), YHWH's approval (5:28–9), and the depiction of the *nāvi'*

20. See also Excursus 1 for a remarkable misreading.

21. The numerically singular and anarthrous form in Deut. 18:15, 18, 'a prophet' (*nāvi'*), has not infrequently encouraged interpreters to see reference to one particular prophetic figure who would definitively reveal God's will; and the text is certainly open to such a reading. Within the deuteronomic context, however, the prime sense must be that the singular is collective, as is the 'I' voice with which Israel speaks in 18:16. Thus the reference is to a succession of prophets over time, raised up by YHWH as and when Israel needs appropriate guidance. This portion of Deuteronomy speaks of various kinds of leadership within Israel, judges (16:18–17:13), kings (17:14–20), priests (18:1–8), prophets (18:9–22); the depiction of the king in 17:14–20 is consistently singular, yet the possibility of more than one king seems clearly to be envisaged.

as the one who speaks YHWH's words to Israel (5:27, 31) constitute the basis for God's continuing provision of prophets.

Secondly, Moses' prophetic role is explicitly based upon his proximity to God, his standing in the divine presence. Although this could be construed geographically, in terms of being on, or close to, the holy place, Mount Horeb, there is remarkably little emphasis upon this in the narrative,[22] especially when this account is compared to the narrative of Exodus 19 with its numerous references to approaches to, and ascent and descent of, the mountain. This suggests that, even if a geographical element is not entirely lacking, the concept of proximity to God is primarily a 'moral' and 'spiritual' concept,[23] to do with a certain mode of being, i.e. attentiveness, faithfulness, and obedience to God. To put the matter differently, and to anticipate subsequent discussion, the portrayal here of Moses' proximity to God that enables knowledge and communication of God's will is a portrayal that is not in essence different from the perhaps better-known depiction in prophetic literature of the 'divine council'. For the point of the divine council, that prophets may have appropriate proximity to God such that they come to know God's will, is identical to the point of Moses' proximity to YHWH at Horeb. Prophets, as we will see, need proximity to Horeb not geographically but morally and spiritually, in terms of obedience to the divine instruction associated with Horeb.[24]

22. It is perhaps most explicit in the instructions to Israel to depart for their tents (verse 30).
23. I put the adjectives 'moral' and 'spiritual' in inverted commas in order to indicate that they are in important ways problematic. For they very readily conjure up certain modern categories and classifications which may all too quickly skew the sense of the biblical text by construing it in inappropriate ways, predominantly through greatly narrowing the sense and scope of the terms. Nonetheless it is difficult to deny the contemporary interpreter any use of modern abstract or general categories, potentially misleading though they may be (what about 'history' or 'theology'?). As long as the terms are used tentatively and heuristically, with the sense that is to be ascribed to them being allowed to arise inductively out of immersion in the biblical text, I hope the terms will be helpful rather than misleading.
24. The obvious exception that proves the rule is Elijah in 1 Kgs. 19. However, one possible way of understanding the richly suggestive story of Elijah's journey to Horeb, and the theophany there, is that Elijah (and, through him, the hearer/reader of Israel's scripture) has to learn that such a journey is unnecessary. YHWH's repeated question to Elijah is the apparently uncomplimentary 'What are you doing here?' (verses 9b, 13b). The point of the theophany (verses 11–12) appears to be that, despite YHWH's appearing to Moses in earthquake, wind, and fire (Exodus 19) and passing before Moses (Exodus 33–4), this is not the sole or privileged mode of YHWH's appearing; rather it is implied that the 'sound of a fine silence' (which is probably a more accurate rendering than the time-honoured and resonant 'still, small voice') is to be the mode of YHWH's self-revelation to a prophet – at least, if one follows the LXX's gloss on the sound: 'and YHWH was there'. This is something intrinsically independent of potent public display or geographical restriction, being instead dependent for reception upon the kind of attentive disposition which can learn to hear such a divinely charged and diaphanous silence.

Thirdly, it follows from the previous point that this portrayal of Moses as prophet can be read (again, to anticipate aspects of our wider thesis) as an implicit critique of all suppositions that prophetic revelation requires the kind of abnormal psychological conditions (possession, ecstasy, trance, vision, locution, etc.) that are so well attested as regularly accompanying claims to encounter with the divine, not only in ancient Israel but also in countless other contexts both ancient and modern. The point, to which we will return, is that such psychological phenomena neither validate nor invalidate the supposed divine revelation – they are as it were optional extras – since it is the content of the encounter with the divine that is determinative of its validity and significance; that content is here understood in terms of that which enables fuller engagement with the will of YHWH as revealed in the Ten Commandments, through the Shema and all that follows.

Characteristic Christian extensions of the concept of prophetic speech

These Pauline and Mosaic texts concisely depict a claim that recurs constantly in the Bible, that human words can in reality be the word of God. Indeed, it has been characteristic of Christian faith to extend this claim, made primarily for prophets in the Old Testament and apostles in the New Testament – and, of course, supremely for Jesus Himself as the Word – in more than one way.

First and foremost, it has been extended to the words of the Bible as a whole. Although numerous Christians, especially in modern times, have expressed greater or lesser degrees of unease with this usage, usually on the grounds that it can encourage an undifferentiated and insufficiently critical handling of the text, the usage has nonetheless remained characteristic of Christian thought and practice.[25] From among the many accounts of this, both ancient and modern, I cite solely the words of Karl Rahner (1991:221–2):

> Scripture is a human word, a human product, insofar as in it human beings bear witness that God is no longer the mysterious ground of a history that presses on into the unforeseeable future, but that God hastens to meet history as its absolute future and introduces it into his own infinity and luminous sovereignty . . . But Scripture is also God's

25. For a theologically nuanced unease over too readily extending the prophetic notion of revelation and inspiration to the rest of Scripture, see Ricoeur 1981:75–7.