social, cultural, and educational level. Weber described them as demagogues and pamphleteers, others have found the designation of poet, orator, or dissident intellectual more appropriate.[6] After working through the texts, the reader can decide for himself or herself which, if any, of these designations is appropriate. Third: although the four in question come from different environments, are very different in other respects, and never refer explicitly to one another, their public pronouncements coalesce in a single but multiform tradition that will have a powerful effect throughout the remaining two centuries of the monarchy and far beyond.

9. AMOS

F. I. **Andersen** and D. N. **Freedman,** *Amos: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary,* New York and London: Doubleday, 1989; H. M. **Barstad,** *The Religious Polemics of Amos,* Leiden: Brill, 1984; K. **Budde,** "Zur Text und Auslegung des Buches Amos," *JBL* 43 (1924): 46–131; J. F. **Craghan,** "Amos in Recent Literature," *BTB* 2 (1972): 242–61; G. **Farr,** "The Language of Amos, Popular or Cultic?" *VT* 16 (1966): 312–24; F. C. **Fensham,** "Common Trends in Curses of the Near Eastern Treaties and Kudurru-Inscriptions Compared with the Maledictions of Amos and Isaiah," *ZAW* 75 (1963): 155–75; R. **Gordis,** "The Composition and Structure of Amos," *HTR* 33 (1940): 239–51; W. R. **Harper,** *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Amos and Hosea,* Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1905; Y. **Hoffman,** "Did Amos regard himself as a *Nābî'* ?" *VT* 27 (1977): 209–12; A. S. **Kapelrud,** *Central Ideas in Amos,* Oslo: Oslo University Press, 1961²; P. J. **King,** *Amos, Hosea, Micah—An Archaeological Commentary,* Philadelphia: Westminster, 1988; K. **Koch,** *The Prophets,* vol. 1, *The Assyrian Period,* London: SCM Press, 1982, 36–75; J. L. **Mays,** *Amos: A Commentary,* Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969; S. M. **Paul,** *Amos,* Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991; M. E. **Polley,** *Amos and the Davidic Empire: A Socio-Historical Approach,* New York: Oxford University Press, 1989; H. **Reventlow,** *Das Amt des Propheten bei Amos,* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962; S. N. **Rosenbaum,** *Amos of Israel: A New Interpretation,* Macon, Ga.: Mercer Press, 1990; W. H. **Schmidt,** "Die deuteronomistische Redaktion des Amosbuches," *ZAW* 77 (1965): 168–93; L. A. **Sinclair,** "The Courtroom Motif in the Book of Amos," *JBL* 85 (1966): 351–53; J. A. **Soggin,** *The Prophet Amos,* London: SCM Press, 1987; S. L. **Terrien,** "Amos and Wisdom," in B. W. Anderson and W. Harrelson, eds., *Israel's Prophetic Heritage,* New York: Harper & Row, 1962, 106–14; J. M. **Ward,** *Amos and Isaiah: Prophets of the Word of God,* Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1969; J.D.W. **Watts,** *Vision and Prophecy in Amos,* Leiden: Brill, 1958; B. E. **Willoughby,** "Amos, Book of," *ABD,* 1:203–12; H. W. **Wolff,** *Amos the Prophet: The Man and His Background,* Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1973; *Joel and Amos,* Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977; E. **Würthwein,** "Amos-Studien," *ZAW* 62 (1949–1950): 10–52.

It has become part of the conventional wisdom to date the beginnings of "classical" prophecy to Amos in the middle decades of the eighth century. Periodizations of this kind seem to be inevitable, but they may lead us to overlook lines of continuity with the past and mislead us into accepting without question certain implied generalizations about prophecy. One of these is that paranormal psychic states were characteristic of the "primitives" in contrast to the "classical" prophets, whose authority rested on the spoken word rather than on extraordinary manifestations of the spirit. But this assumption, characteristic of nineteenth-century liberal Protestant scholarship, overlooks evidence for ecstatic experiences among the prophets of the eighth to the sixth century, not to mention the frequency with which verbal communications are described as rooted in extraordinary inner experience; witness the opening lines of several of the prophetic books, for example, "the sayings of Amos . . . which he *saw in vision*" (Amos 1:1; cf. the opening verses in Isaiah, Micah, and Habakkuk).

To repeat a point made earlier: The impression of discontinuity in the mid–eighth century has much to do with the compilation of prophetic sayings in which the biographical element, where present, is minor and incidental. In the Elijah narrative, sayings are introduced with the formula "the word of Yahweh came to him" (e.g., 1 Kings 17:2), which in the prophetic books is transposed into the first person (e.g., Hos. 1:1). When Elijah passes on such sayings to others, he uses the standard incipit "thus says Yahweh" (e.g., 1 Kings 17:14) or the somewhat less common "as Yahweh the God of Israel lives" (e.g., 1 Kings 17:1). Yet his sayings were not collected to make a Book of Elijah. On the other hand, biographical *legenda* occur in the prophetic books (Isaiah 36—39; Jeremiah 52); we also have what appear to be parallel versions of the same event, one in the third, the other in the first person (e.g., Hos. 1:2–2:1; 3:1–5; Jer. 7:1–20; 26:1–6). The account of Amos' confrontation with the priest of Bethel (7:10–17) is the only biographical passage about this individual, one which stands in some relationship to Dtr's account of the reign of Jeroboam II (2 Kings 14:23–29), the prediction of whose violent end by Amos was the occasion for the confrontation in the first place.

The greater importance attached, from the eighth century on, to what the prophet said rather than what the prophet did, may be further explained by the fact that the sayings are now addressed for the most part to the entire people rather than to an individual, generally the ruler. This relatively novel feature may in its turn be explained by the new situation, one of absolute threat, facing the nation on the international scene.[7] Once events had run their course and the two kingdoms had been swallowed up by the great empires, attention would focus once

again on the person and work of the prophet, a situation that can be observed with respect to Jeremiah, the Isaian Servant, and the Deuteronomic portrait of Moses.[8]

Amos is third (second in the LXX) in the Book of the Twelve or Dodekapropheton, a collection that was already in existence by the time of Ben Sira in the early second century B.C.E. (Sir. 49:10). The principle according to which the Twelve are arranged appears to be chronological, though critical scholarship has found it necessary to revise it in some respects. The juxtaposition of Joel with Amos may be due to the many themes that the two books have in common: a plague of locusts, drought represented as fire, ritual lamentation, the Day of Yahweh, cosmic disturbances, the promise of miraculous fertility. The motto at the beginning of Amos (1:2) also occurs, in a slightly different form, toward the end of Joel (3:16 [MT 4:16]), and it appears that the books have been linked intentionally by the theme of Yahweh's presence in the temple. These and other indications suggest a Jerusalemite recension of the prophetic books sometime during the period of the Second Temple. And this brings us to the crucial issue of the editorial history of Amos.

The book falls fairly easily into three parts: (1) after the superscription (Amos 1:1) and the motto (1:2) there are eight sayings against various nations, the last being Israel, condemning them for different atrocities and crimes (1:3–2:16); (2) the central part of the book contains a collection of mostly short sayings attributed to Amos (3—6); (3) the last section (7—9) consists of five vision reports (7:1–3, 4–6, 7–9; 8:1–3; 9:1–4) with expansions and interpolations. We shall deal with these three sections briefly in order.

1. The syntax of the first verse, with its double relative clause, suggests that the phrase "who was among the shepherds of Tekoa" has been inserted into a title that read "words of Amos which he saw in vision concerning [or: against] Israel in the days of Uzziah king of Judah and in the days of Jeroboam the son of Joash, king of Israel." This type of introduction, which prefaces other prophetic books (Isaiah, Jeremiah, Hosea, Micah, Zephaniah), is reminiscent of Dtr's practice of synchronizing reigns in the two kingdoms (cf. Hos. 1:1). It has therefore given rise to the suggestion that the Deuteronomic school put out a collection of prophetic books, perhaps restricted to those listed above, which have this characteristic title.[9]

The motto following the superscription (1:2) derives the judgments pronounced by Amos from the Jerusalem temple as their ultimate source—the first of several indications that the sayings underwent a Judean redaction after 722 B.C.E. There follow oracles against a series of neighboring states, which is to say enemies, in a counterclockwise direction from north to east (1:3–2:5).[10] Rooted in age-old ritual practice connected with warfare, this kind of saying could be readily recycled to fit the changing international situation; and, in fact, it is generally agreed that at least the sayings against Tyre, Edom, and Judah are later than Amos. If so, we are left with a series of five (the first of several pentads in the book[11]) ending, in crushing paradox, with Israel itself. The Judah saying (2:4–5) is couched in typical Deuteronomic language, while the other two (Tyre and Edom) could have been added, or updated, anytime during the exilic or early Second Temple period (cf. Joel 3:4–8 [MT 4:4–8]). It also seems likely that the historical reproach against Israel (2:9–12), again reminiscent of well-known Deuteronomic themes, has been inserted between the indictment (2:6–8) and the verdict (2:13–16), which usually come together in Amos.[12]

2. The opening apostrophe of the sayings source (3:1–2), of Deuteronomic character, applies the prophet's message to all Israel, not just the kingdom of Samaria, and therefore reinforces the point made by the insertion of the anti-Judah saying. The poem about prophetic inspiration (3:3–8), often taken as evidence of sapiential influence on Amos,[13] has been annotated with a very telling Deuteronomic gloss at v. 7:

> Surely Yahweh God does nothing
> without revealing his secret
> to his servants the prophets.

The preceding verse,

> Does evil befall a city
> unless Yahweh has done it?

could easily have been read as an indictment of Israel's God for actually willing the destruction of Samaria, and indeed also of Jerusalem. The interpolation, therefore, served as an apologia, in keeping with one of the dominant Dtr themes, that is, that Yahweh cannot be held responsible for the disasters that had overtaken the kingdoms because he had warned the people through "his servants the prophets," definitely a Deuteronomic expression.[14] This is the first of several hints in the book of disquietude at certain aspects of the message of Amos; others will be noted as we read further.

It also seems likely that at least some of the references to Bethel (3:14 and especially the gloss "concerning Bethel" at 5:6) reflect the extension of Josiah's reforms into the territory of the Northern Kingdom absorbed a century earlier into the Assyria empire (see 2 Kings 23:15–20). Dtr never tires of condemning the setting up of the Bethel cult by Jeroboam,

and includes in the history a prophetic legend about a man of God who came from Judah during the reign of Jeroboam I to predict the ignominious end of the Bethel sanctuary and cult (1 Kings 13).[15]

The origin of the hymn stanzas or "doxologies" (4:13; 5:8–9; 9:5–6) has long been discussed, with most scholars denying them to Amos. The hymnic motif of divine power on a cosmic scale nevertheless serves to reinforce one of the major themes of the book, that is, that Israel's warrior god, the god of the ecstatic prophets of the earlier period, has now declared war against his own people. The first of the three in particular (4:13), coming directly after the threatening "prepare to meet your God, O Israel," appropriately closes out the preceding five reproaches (4:6–11).[16]

The series of three exhortations to seek Yahweh rather than the provincial sanctuaries or, alternatively, to seek good rather than evil (5:4–5, 6, 14–15), poses a special problem. These sayings appear to substitute a "perhaps" (5:15) for the unconditional "no" with which Amos elsewhere confronts the kingdom of Israel. Furthermore, the exhortatory and homiletic mode is characteristic of the Deuteronomic style more than it is of Amos. The Deuteronomists enjoin the "seeking" (verbal form *drš*) of Yahweh, especially in connection with the cult at the one legitimate sanctuary (Deut. 4:27–31; 12:2–7), often adding the motivational clause "that you may live . . ." (e.g., Deut. 4:1; cf. Amos 5:4, 6, 14). It can therefore be plausibly suggested that here too sayings have been added to the book in response to the new hope for the irredentist northern territories awakened by the religious revival during Josiah's reign.[17]

3. The nucleus of the third part of the book is the series of five vision reports in the first person. The first two (7:1–3, 4–6), threatening locusts and drought, respectively, are constructed in the same way and record the successful intercession of the prophet. The third, the vision of the plumb line (7:7–9),[18] threatens earthquake, the destruction of the high places, and the violent end of the dynasty. At this point the time for intercession has passed, and the last two visions (8:1–3; 9:1–4) make it clear that judgment on Israel is now final and irreversible. Possibly the visions formed a separate collection originating with the prophet himself and transmitted by a disciple. If so, they have been expanded here and there,[19] a particularly important case being the prediction of the violent end of the Jehu dynasty, added after the coup of Shallum in 745 B.C.E., and with the additional intent of correcting Amos' unverified prediction of the violent end of Jeroboam II (7:9; cf. 7:11).

The only biographical narrative in the book (7:10–17) was inserted between the third and the fourth vision. It records how Amaziah, priest-in-charge at Bethel, forwarded to the king an accusation against Amos of

conspiracy, based on the prophet's public prediction that Jeroboam would die by the sword and the people would go into exile. Amaziah ordered Amos to leave the state sanctuary and find employment in Judah, a surprisingly mild sentence, perhaps testifying to the fear that such individuals were capable of generating. In replying, Amos denied that he was a *nābî'* or a member of a prophetic conventicle (a *ben-nābî'*), asserted that he had his own occupation that provided the needed support, and informed Amaziah that he had nevertheless been called by Yahweh to carry out an ad hoc commission to prophesy to the people of Israel.[20] Not content with this, he went on to predict an atrocious fate for Amaziah and his family, assuring him that both he and the whole people were destined to end up in exile.

This passage, of different provenance from that of the sayings and the visions, has been inserted at this point because of the immediately preceding reference to the impending fate of the dynasty (7:9). It has the appearance of having been excerpted from a longer narrative, and it may have begun its career as an alternative account, less favorable than 2 Kings 14:23–29, of the reign of Jeroboam.[21] As was pointed out earlier, in the latter passage Dtr goes to the trouble of denying that Yahweh had passed final and complete judgment on Israel (2 Kings 14:27), which leaves one wondering whether he had Amos in mind, especially considering that he passes over Amos's activity in silence. If the tradition represented by Amos 7:10–17 was known to Dtr, it is understandable that he would have favored a different and more benign judgment on this king. Also, not unimportant in view of the Deuteronomic criteria for true prophecy (Deut. 18:21–22), Amos's prediction of the violent end of Jeroboam apparently did not come true. In the context of the book as a whole, the episode functions not only to legitimate Amos's mission but to show what happens when the prophetic message is disregarded.[22]

The fourth and fifth visions have been separated by a supplementary collection of sayings (Amos 8:4–14; 9:7–10) including several variants of utterances in the main corpus.[23] The strong saying putting Israelites on the same level in the eyes of God as Nubians and Philistines (9:7–8) has been quite radically modified by a later editor who, like the historian (2 Kings 14:27), was not prepared to accept the verdict of unconditional and total destruction ("except that I will not utterly destroy the house of Jacob," v. 8b). The eschatological finale, promising the restoration of the Davidic dynasty, the reintegration of dispersed Israel, and a golden age in which ancient curses would be turned into blessings (9:11–15), matches the hopes entertained by different circles during the exilic and early Second Temple period and could not have been part of the book before that time.

We can now present a tentative summary of the editorial history of the book. We are not told that Amos had disciples, but he must have had a support group of some kind in which his sayings and some account of his activities were preserved. The initial impetus to their preservation may have been the great earthquake (1:1) that Amos was perhaps thought to have predicted, to judge by frequent allusions in the book as well as the chronological indication (two years before the earthquake) in the title.[24] Some additions and modifications (e.g., 7:9) may have been made following the coup of Shallum in 745 that brought the Jehu dynasty to an end. The message of Amos would inevitably have been applied to Judah after the fall of the Northern Kingdom in 722 B.C.E., and this too has left some traces in the book (6:1, 5), as also here and there in Isaiah (e.g., the [prophetic] word sent against Jacob/Israel, Isa. 9:8). Somewhat later, Josiah's attempt to reincorporate the territory of the Northern Kingdom, together with his destruction of the Bethel sanctuary, may lie behind those editorial editions that bear the hallmark of the Deuteronomic school that, as noted earlier, brought out a collection of prophetic material as a supplement to the history some time in the sixth century B.C.E. At this stage the title was expanded into the typically Deuteronomic form, the oracle against Judah added (Amos 2:4–5), the diatribe against the cult expanded (and its meaning rather radically modified, 5:25–27), and other additions introduced to make the book serviceable for the needs of that age. Later still, the eschatological finale (9:11–15) transformed the grim harbinger of doom into a messenger of hope and herald of a new age dawning. Judgment and death do not, after all, have the last word.

Since we are concerned with historical and social realities, we must now ask what we can learn from this book, so long in the making, about the person whose name is on the title page. The superscription dates his activity to the reigns of Uzziah in Judah (783–742) and Jeroboam (second of that name) in Israel (786–746). The additional information that his revelation came to him two years before the earthquake would be helpful if we knew when this earthquake took place. Since an earthquake during Uzziah's reign was still being talked about centuries later (Zech. 14:5) it must have been high on the Richter scale, and it may be the same one that left its mark on stratum VI at Hazor, dated by pottery finds to the eighth century, more probably the first half of the century.[25] Allusions to historical events in the sayings, especially the invitation to inspect Calneh and Hamath Rabbah (Amos 6:2), Syrian city-states taken by Tiglath-pileser III in 738, have led some scholars to date his activity after the westward drive of Tiglath-pileser had begun, and therefore after the death of Jeroboam II. But we are then left with the problem that the

book, and this passage in particular (Amos 6:1–8), in no way reflect the dangerous and stressful situation in the kingdom of Samaria in and after the year 738. We therefore prefer to date Amos' activity in the north, which may have been of quite brief duration, to about the middle of the eighth century B.C.E.

The expanded form of the superscription describes Amos[26] as one of the sheep breeders (*nōqᵉdîm*) of Tekoa, a settlement about eight miles south of Jerusalem in the Judean wilderness. It does not say that Amos was *from* Tekoa, which in any case is the wrong location for sycamores, so that we may entertain the alternative hypothesis that he began his career as an official of some kind in the kingdom of Samaria.[27] In the account of his arrest at Bethel he himself describes his profession as tending herds and dressing sycamore fig trees (7:14), which, whatever we make of it, does not warrant the image of an uneducated rustic visionary.[28] Any interpretation must allow for the knowledge of international affairs, acquaintance with sacred tradition, and poetic skill attested by the sayings deemed to be authentic. On the other hand Amos was not, on his own admission, and at least at the time of his confrontation with Amaziah, a "professional" *nābî'* (7:14), and the same can be said of Hosea, Micah, and Isaiah, all more or less contemporary with him. No label covering the role and activity of these individuals will be entirely satisfactory, but perhaps the designation, suggested earlier, of "dissident intellectual" will not be entirely inappropriate.

The biographical memoir (7:10–17) records Amos' arrest in the state sanctuary at Bethel on a charge of sedition. If Jeroboam's expansionist policy involved him in warfare with Judah, as was the case during the previous reign (2 Kings 14:11–15), it would have been natural to interpret the activity of Amos, whatever his origin, as an attempt by the agent of a hostile power to undermine morale.[29] The command to "prophesy to my people Israel" (Amos 7:15) probably came to him accompanied by the visions recorded in the third part of the book, though we don't know whether the five visions were thought to have been spread over a period of time or as occurring in rapid succession, as with Zechariah in the late sixth century (Zech. 1:7–6:15). The first two (7:1–3, 4–6) threaten disasters that were averted by prophetic intercession. The third, the vision of the plumb line (?) (7:7–9), appears to predict an earthquake, while in the last two Amos could only look on helplessly as the panorama of destruction by earthquake and military action, the piles of corpses and the deadly harvesting, unfolded before his eyes. The visions of Amos, as described here, successfully convey an impression of one who has seen it happen, one who, as has been said, walks among people condemned to death who do not know it.

While the original nucleus of the sayings reveals a remarkable variety of forms, a constant structural feature, already apparent in the sayings against foreign nations, is the sequence indictment-verdict, the latter element generally introduced by the particles "therefore" (*lākēn*) or "behold" (*hinnēh*).[30] Though exact parallels are lacking, there are grounds for believing that this indictment-verdict pattern is taken over from the language of international relations, especially those between imperial overlord and vassal. The different forms taken by the verdict correspond quite closely to curses incorporated into treaties, with special reference to the threat of exile in Assyrian vassal treaties (*ANET*, 532–41; Parpola and Watanabe).[31] The theme of calamitous military defeat, occupation by a foreign power, and eventual exile is taken up in the traditional language of the holy war, with the difference that Yahweh is now warring against his own people (see especially Amos 4:12). In keeping with this reversal, the traditional theme of the Day of Yahweh is turned upside down: It will not bring salvation but destruction, not light but darkness.[32]

One of the most remarkable features of Amos's diatribe is this systematic reversal of the traditional symbols and images that sustained the common life of the state and came to expression in the national cult. It is apparent from the beginning of the book with the inclusion of Israel among the nations falling under the curse, a device that not only distorts the sense of a traditional oracle of salvation but, in effect, turns the rest of the book into a condemnation of Israel as one nation among many. The point is made clearly near the end:

> "Are you not like the Ethiopians to me,
> O people of Israel?" says Yahweh.
> "Did I not bring up Israel from the land of Egypt,
> and the Philistines from Caphtor and the Syrians from Kir?
> Behold, the eyes of Yahweh God are upon the sinful kingdom,
> and I will destroy it from the surface of the ground."
> (9:7–8a)

Amos applied the same reversal of expectations to the cult, especially the great autumn festival of the ingathering, a joyful occasion, with the prospect of disaster taking the place of salvation and mourning that of joy.[33] One of the more remarkable aspects of the book is the presentation of worship as the expression of a radically sinful way of life (Amos 4:4–5). The entire apparatus of festivals, sacrifice, religious music, and tithing is rejected as hateful to Yahweh (5:21–24), a rejection repeated often in prophetic books (e.g., Hos. 6:6; 8:13; Isa. 1:10–17; Jer. 6:20). Much of the critical discussion of these passages has been clouded by denominational assumptions about what are thought to be appropriate or inappropriate forms of *Christian* worship. The idea of anyone in eighth

century B.C.E. Israel rejecting worship as such in favor of a purely spiritual and ethical religion is, however, quite implausible. Rather, the point seems to be that worship was (as it still is) a very powerful way of legitimating the current political and social status quo. Quite simply, Amos was not taken in by the religiosity of his contemporaries.

A further and more specific point is that state cults were wealthy and complex operations, owning land, employing slaves, and supported by contributions, not all voluntary, from the population at large. Cultic personnel were, in addition, tax exempt,[34] and the sacrificial system must have represented a significant drain on commodities and livestock; all of which will help to explain the frequent denunciations of priests and the sacrificial cult in the prophetic literature.

Any attempt to elaborate a prophetic ethic will have to start with the indictments on the basis of which the prophet passed judgment on and predicted disaster for contemporary society.[35] Since the basic situation that Amos is addressing is the encroachment of the state system on a traditional way of life, it is understandable that his animus is directed in the first place against the ruling elite in Samaria, the capital (3:15; 4:1–3; 6:1–7). The drive toward centralization, the need to subsidize a royal court and an elaborate cult, heavy taxation ("exactions of wheat," 5:11), frequent confiscation of patrimonial domain following on insolvency, military service, and forced labor were the major factors undermining the old order and leading to a kind of rent capitalism. The great expansion of trade, especially with the Phoenician cities, and the wealth confiscated during successful military campaigns brought about a new prosperity that, however, did not trickle down to the lower social levels. In this situation Amos, like Hesiod a little over half a century later, took up the cause of the dispossessed and marginalized, and did so in the name of traditional values.

For the eighth century prophets the sphere of morality is the social and political domain, and therefore includes what for us falls under international law, social justice, and civil rights. Amos is much less concerned than Hosea with forms of worship and much more concerned to excoriate what he takes to be an oppressive and exploitative sociopolitical set up. In doing so he itemizes: selling into slavery for trivial debts (2:6; 8:6), excessive fines (2:8), falsifying weights and measures (8:5), dishonest trade practices (8:6), corrupting the legal process (2:7; 5:10, 12), and so on. These accusations are not random nor are they based simply on his own ethical perceptions. In most cases his indictments draw on a traditional, consensual ethic that finds partial expression in Israel's aphoristic and instructional literature and in formulations of apodictic and casuistic law (especially the so-called Covenant Code in

Ex. 20:23–23:19). One example will suffice. The refusal to return a pawned cloak to a poor man by evening (Amos 2:8) violates a stipulation of law in the above-mentioned code designed to protect the disadvantaged:

> If ever you take your neighbor's garment in pledge, you shall restore it to him before the sun goes down; for that is his only covering, it is his mantle for his body; in what else shall he sleep? And if he cries to me, I will hear, for I am compassionate. (Ex. 22:26–27)

What appears to be a parallel to this situation came to light with the discovery of the Yavneh-Yam ostracon (from Meṣad Ḥashavyahu south of Tel Aviv), from about a century after Amos, in which a farm laborer petitions the local governor for the return of his cloak, confiscated probably for failure to repay a loan.[36] Neither Amos nor the anonymous petitioner refers to the stipulation of law quoted above, so it is possible that all three draw on a traditional, humanitarian community practice, one facet of a consensual ethic in danger of disappearing under pressure from the coercive power of the state.

A further and final point: By linking indictment and verdict as cause and effect, and by affirming that the verdict is to be carried out by means of natural events (locusts, drought, earthquake), but even more through political events, and specifically the Assyrian campaigns in the west,[37] Amos laid the basis for a certain understanding of divine action in history that would be immensely influential but also very problematic. His is only one prophetic voice, and some of the limitations of his vision were already apparent to those who preserved and transmitted his words. It is arguable, nonetheless, that his career marks a major turning point in the religious history of Israel, indeed of the ancient world in general.

10. HOSEA

P. R. **Ackroyd**, "Hosea and Jacob," *VT* 13 (1963): 245–59; F. I. **Andersen** and D. N. **Freedman**, *Hosea: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, Garden City: Doubleday & Co., 1980; E. **Baumann**, "'Wissen um Gott' bei Hosea als Urform von Theologie?" *EvTh* 15 (1955): 416–25; M. J. **Buss**, *The Prophetic Word of Hosea*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1969; J. F. **Craghan**, "The Book of Hosea: A Survey of Recent Literature," *BTB* 1 (1971): 81–100, 145–70; G. I. **Davies**, *Hosea*, Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993; G. I. **Emmerson**, *Hosea: An Israelite Prophet in Judean Perspective*, Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984; G. **Fohrer**, *Die symbolischen Handlungen der Propheten*, Zurich: Zwingli Verlag, 1968²; A. **Gelston**, "Kingship in the Book of Hosea," *OTS* 19 (1974): 71–85; W. R. **Harper**, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Amos and Hosea*, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1905; E. **Jacob**, "L'Héritage cananéen dans le livre du prophète Osée," *RHPR* 43 (1963): 250–59; A. W. **Jenks**, *The Elohist and North Israelite Traditions*, Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977, especially 112–17; P. J. **King**, *Amos, Hosea, Micah—An Archaeological Commentary*, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1988; K. **Koch**, *The Prophets*, vol. 1, *The Assyrian Period*, 76–93; M. **Köckert**, "Prophetie und Geschichte im Hoseabuch," *ZTK* 85 (1987): 3–30; N. P. **Lemche**, "The God of Hosea," in E. Ulrich et al., eds., *Priests, Prophets and Scribes*, Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992, 241–57; H. G. **May**, "The Fertility Cult in Hosea," *AJSL* 48 (1932): 73–98; J. L. **Mays**, *Hosea: A Commentary*, Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969; H. S. **Nyberg**, *Studien zum Hoseabuch*, Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1935; H. H. **Rowley**, "The Marriage of Hosea," *BJRL* 39 (1956): 200–23 (= *Men of God*, London: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1963, 66–97); W. **Rudolph**, *Hosea*, Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1966; M. **Scott**, *The Message of Hosea*, London: S.P.C.K., 1921; C. L. **Seow**, "Hosea, Book of," *ABD* 3:291–97; J. A. **Soggin**, "Hosea und die Aussenpolitik Israels," in J. A. Emerton, ed., *Prophecy*, 131–36; J. M. **Ward**, *Hosea: A Theological Commentary*, New York: Harper & Row, 1966; "The Message of the Prophet Hosea," *Int* 23 (1969): 387–407; H. W. **Wolff**, "'Wissen um Gott' bei Hosea als Urform der Theologie," *EvTh* 12 (1952–53): 533–54; "Hoseas geistige Heimat," *TLZ* 91 (1956): 83–94; *Hosea*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974; T. **Worden**, "The Literary Influence of the Ugaritic Fertility Myth on the Old Testament," *VT* 3 (1953): 273–97.

The title of Hosea is similar to that of Amos, naming Jeroboam (second of that name) as ruler of Samaria but adding the three Judean kings who followed Uzziah, namely, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah (Hos. 1:1). This notice, possibly of Deuteronomic origin, is not very helpful, however, since Jeroboam's reign ended in 746 and Hezekiah came to the throne in 715, therefore *after* the fall of Samaria in 722.[38] It is generally assumed, nevertheless, that the prophet's career spanned a period of more than thirty years, but it came to an end before 722. This conclusion would be consistent with the absence of allusion to the fall of Samaria in the book, though a passage toward the end implies that the monarchy has come to an end (13:9–11), presumably with reference to the fate of Hoshea last ruler of the Northern Kingdom and the prophet's namesake. We take it, then, that Hosea was a contemporary of Amos but that his prophetic activity lasted longer.

The historical allusions in the book support, or at least are not inconsistent with, a career covering the last two decades of the kingdom of Samaria. The early chapters (Hosea 1—3) presuppose a period of political stability, and the condemnation of the Jehu dynasty (the reference to Jezreel in 1:4–5) would most naturally be understood as preceding the coup of Shallum in 745 B.C.E. The frequent denunciations of the monarchy and of those who "devour their rulers" (7:7) in the rest of the book fit the last quarter century of the Northern Kingdom during which four out of six kings were assassinated. The allusion to Ephraim's going to