

1

INNER BIBLICAL EXEGESIS:
HOSEA AND THE JACOB TRADITIONS

By
LYLE MARK ESLINGER

A Thesis
Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies
in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements
for the Degree
Master of Arts

McMaster University

September, 1978

INNER BIBLICAL EXEGESIS:
HOSEA AND THE JACOB TRADITIONS

MASTER OF ARTS (1978).
(Religious Studies)

McMASTER UNIVERSITY
Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: Inner Biblical Exegesis: Hosea and the Jacob Tradition

AUTHOR: Lyle Mark Eslinger, B.A. (University of Calgary)

SUPERVISOR: Dr. A. M. Cooper

NUMBER OF PAGES: vii, 103

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the thesis is to study certain phenomena in the biblical texts as products of purposeful exegesis. Through the study of examples of inner biblical exegesis a better knowledge may be obtained of the compositional and transmissional techniques which resulted in the present shape of the biblical literature. It is suggested, therefore, that inner biblical exegesis offers empirical evidence which must be taken into consideration in any formulation of theories on the composition or transmission of the biblical materials.

The major emphasis of the thesis is that examples of inner biblical exegesis seem to indicate a greater freedom in the handling of authoritative traditions than has sometimes been suggested. While the latter emphasis is not new to biblical studies, it has not gained complete acceptance.

In order to illustrate the functioning of inner biblical exegesis a detailed textual study of Hosea 12 was made. In the course of the latter study several new suggestions were made concerning the structure of the chapter and its meaning.

The thesis will hopefully contribute to a better knowledge of Hosea 12 and the Bible in general.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My thanks to Dr. A. M. Cooper for suggesting the topic of the thesis; compiling a major portion of the bibliography, and many comments and criticisms. Without his suggestions the thesis would truly not exist. To Drs. A. E. Combs and T. R. Hobbs for helpful suggestions and criticisms.

To my wife Gloria, who typed, retyped, re-retyped and edited the thesis thanks are not enough. It is to her that this thesis is dedicated.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--------------------|-----|
| Abstract | iii |
|--------------------|-----|

CHAPTER I

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| INTRODUCTION | 1 |
|------------------------|---|

REVIEW OF THE SECONDARY LITERATURE

| | |
|--|----|
| 1. "The <u>Haggada</u> Within Scripture" | 11 |
| 2. " <u>Midrash</u> and the Old Testament" and "Psalm Titles and Midrashic Exegesis". | 19 |
| 3. "Psalm 89: A Study in Inner- Biblical Exegesis" | 26 |
| 4. <u>From Bible to Mishna</u> | 29 |
| 5. Summary of the Results | 33 |

CHAPTER II

THE JACOB TRADITION IN HOSEA 12

| | |
|--|----|
| 1. Introduction | 42 |
| 2. Definition of the Unit | 43 |
| 3. Context of the Unit | 44 |
| 4. Structure of the Unit | 46 |
| 5. Detailed Exegesis of Chapter 12 | 54 |

CHAPTER III

CONCLUSION

| | |
|---|----|
| 1. Hosea's Use of the Jacob Traditions | 86 |
| 2. The Relationship of Hosea 12 to Genesis 25:19 - 35:22 | 89 |
| 3. Inner Biblical Exegesis and <u>Midrash</u> | 93 |

| | |
|--|----|
| 4. Inner Biblical Exegesis and Biblical Studies | 95 |
|--|----|

| | |
|---------------------------|-----|
| LIST OF SOURCES | 100 |
|---------------------------|-----|

LIST OF CHARTS

| | |
|---|----|
| Diagrammatic Representation of Rhetorical Structures in Chapter 12 | 50 |
|---|----|

1. INTRODUCTION AND REVIEW OF THE SECONDARY LITERATURE

The term inner biblical exegesis has been applied to such interesting phenomena found in the biblical text as doublets or triplets, modernizing or archaizing glosses, and cases of conflicting viewpoints within the biblical text. The usual explanations for these phenomena are sought for in the methods of the standard critical approaches to the Bible, eg. source, form, and redaction criticism. Often the latter approaches have only served to isolate the anomalous phenomena without understanding their significance.

Two presuppositions underlying these approaches would seem to account for the above mentioned shortcoming. First, the interest in reaching the hebraica veritas leaves no room for examination of secondary addition or development. It is the dross which must be discarded. Second, the understanding of biblical compositional technique as additive compilation of existent materials relegates secondary usage or addition to a non-essential late status.

Proponents of the study of inner biblical exegesis (i.b.e.) seek to understand the meaning of the secondary materials, and their importance for the ongoing process of composition and compilation by accretion and addition which resulted in the biblical text. Thus i.b.e. seeks to restore to the accretion

or addition their status as original biblical thought. This viewpoint may also lead to an understanding of biblical composition which differs from the view mentioned above. In this emphasis on the equal importance of all levels, early or late, in the biblical text, i.b.e. is consonant with the recent trends in biblical studies. "The original meaning of the final form of the text is, to coin a phrase, no less original than the original meaning of its separate units.", (Sawyer:1974:68). Students of i.b.e. seek to elevate the importance of neither the earliest nor latest materials in the text. Rather all the different levels are viewed as equally important expressions of the biblical tradition.

A rudimentary definition of i.b.e. is that it is the attempt by a biblical composer to explain, interpret, or develop some part of the biblical tradition. Such explanatory efforts may vary in size from a single word gloss (Genesis 21:20 robeh) (Driver:1957:136) to an entire book (Chronicles), and may or may not be compatible with the meaning of the text or tradition in its prior context. Given this definition it might seem that i.b.e. as an area of research is already covered by the discipline of redaction criticism. This is, in part, true. However, the difference between redaction criticism and the study of i.b.e. is to be found in the greater scope of the latter. Redaction criticism is limited to the study of the redactor's influence on his source materials. The study of i.b.e. is also devoted to such considerations, but can also go further to

attempts to enhance the reader's understanding by placing the contemporary equivalent after an old name for the city. However the possibility that the appended modernizations may also be an exegesis of the old names must not be overlooked. If someone today were to say that Bethel was the Las Vegas of its day we would recognize this as a statement about the nature of activity in the city and not as a geographic statement.¹

2. Close in kind to this type of exegesis are exegetical attempts to base contemporary views and customs on the events of the past as they are portrayed in the text. In Genesis 25:30 there is a parenthetical note which explains that it is because of Esau's actions in the preceding lines that he is now called Edom.² Scholars might wish to disagree with his etymology, but that would miss the opportunity to see how the exegete expresses his contempt for the Edomites by means of the etymology.

A similar example is seen in the wife-sister theme found in Genesis 12, 20, and 26. According to E. A. Speiser the Genesis narrators no longer knew the full significance of their traditional subject matter.. Tradition had retained the details but not the import. The details were then interpreted

1: In fact this possibility is quite strong in the case of Gen. 35:6 which has a close parallel in Gen. 28:19. The root of the name Luz applied to Bethel is also the root of a verb and a noun. In both of the latter forms the meaning can connote deviousness or crookedness in character and actions. To say that Jacob, the supplanter of brother and deceiver of father, came to Luz is to make more than a simple geographic statement.

2. On the literary-critical reasons for isolating this part of the verse as a gloss see B.O. Long(1968:9).

in the light of local circumstances and customs. Speiser states that, "In Hurrian society the bonds of marriage were strongest and most solemn when the wife had simultaneously the juridical status of a sister, regardless of actual blood ties. That is why a man would sometimes marry a girl and adopt her at the same time as his sister,..." (Speiser:1964:92). In the early form of this tradition Abraham was honoring his wife by calling her his sister. Speiser states that the interpretation now seen in the Bible was in keeping with more familiar conditions and common human inclinations and so the indicated recourse to half-truth was merely anachronistic (Speiser:1964:93).

Speiser's explanation of the possible background to the wife-sister motif is very interesting and points out that, as it appears in the Bible, the motif is exegetically rendered. Since the import of the motif had been lost it must also be asked what the import of the exegetically rendered motif is. Speiser links it with the concern over purity in genealogies. A pure mother bears pure children. However, as the text in Genesis 12:15 now stands it is not at all clear that Sarai was not violated. What is central to each appearance of the motif is God's care and protection of the patriarch in a difficult situation. Abram and Isaac function as paradigms for later Israel. Their lives illustrate God's shepherding care of his chosen ones.

In order to demonstrate that the basis for a contemporary understanding or belief lies in the historical past and is

recorded in the authoritative tradition, the exegete borrows from the authority of the tradition to justify and strengthen contemporary opinion or thought.

3. With these last two examples the exegetical ground has shifted from an apparently innocuous explanation to a less covert reinterpretation that uses the text to make a new point not necessarily consonant with the prior purpose of the text in its prior setting. In Genesis 32:32 an exegete makes use of the events of verse 25 to justify a contemporary dietary practise. He does not add in any way to the reader's understanding of the divine-human struggle of the preceding verses and in fact may even detract from it by distracting the reader's attention from what has just occurred. Thus Genesis 32:32 has moved even further from a simple elucidation of the text's given contextual meaning. Either the exegete was not aware of the significance of Jacob's struggle or he was unconcerned with it.

4. Next in this graded deviance of exegetical concerns from the concerns of the exegeted text is the case wherein the exegete's opinions are in conflict with opinions expressed in the text. An example of the exegesis which can result from this conflict may be seen by comparing II Samuel 22:7 with Psalm 18:6. The verse from II Samuel ends 'and my cry in his ears' whereas the corresponding line in the Psalm ends 'and my cry before him shall come into his ears'. Both readings share the words 'and my cry in his ears'. II Samuel, however, lacks the verb 'come' which can be supplied from the Psalm. The missing

verb can be accounted for by haplography in an undivided text.

However, it is the 'before him' in the Psalm which attracts interest here as an example of exegesis. The addition appears to be an attempt to mitigate the harshness of the anthropomorphism of the cry coming 'into his ears' (Weingreen:1976:42-43).

In this case the exegete, in the course of pursuing his own ends, has actually obscured the passage by supplying an alternate and yet not removing the offensive phrase. Sandmel in his article "The Haggada Within Scripture" explains that such additions to the text once added, meant to the exegete that what he was emending now had the same meaning as that which was the result of the emendation. According to Sandmel the disinclination to expunge such troublesome statements in the text was a result of the exegetes' respect for the authority of the tradition.

Perhaps, but it may be the case that these types of additions were made after the fixation of the text so that any offensive or obscure term could not be expunged.

Such exegesis is usually catalogued under the title of "The Emendations of the Sopherim". It was the editorial policy of these scribes to remove indelicate expressions and anthropomorphisms by substituting euphemisms (Ginsburg:1966:347).

There is some question as to whether this sort of exegesis is actually deviant from the concerns of the text in its unexegeted form. In one sense the exegete is not deviating from the prior sense but is only clarifying what was obscure by removing the anthropomorphism. Both texts relate the same meaning. The

difference lies in the conceptions of God's manner of hearing a cry. Whether the author of Samuel actually had an anthropomorphic theology or not is a moot question. But there is no reason why he could not have had one. The psalmist sought to correct what was to him a theological error, by making it more explicit that God's ears are only figures of speech.

5. Finally, there are exegeses which remove a text or tradition from its prior context and place it in a new context. Thereby the exegete appropriates the emotive and cognitive associations clustered around the text in its prior context, and illuminates them in the new context. A prime example of this (to be dealt with in detail below) is to be found in Hosea 12:4-6, 13. As this material appears in the individual pericopes of Genesis it is generally favorable towards Jacob. Hosea places Jacob's actions in an entirely different light. He revives the dissident tradition which surfaces clearly in only one other place in the Bible, Genesis 27:35-36. The negative etymology of Jacob's name is brought into the open and Jacob's actions are depicted as deceitful and arrogant by means of word play and negative associations with the wrongdoings of contemporary Israel.

Another example of such a turnabout in a text is found in Job 7:17-18 which is an ironic usage of Psalm 8:4 (Robertson: 1977:39). The psalmist praises God for giving the insignificant creature, man, such attention and grace. The author of Job turns this praise into bitter criticism using the same basic

theme; God does pay a great deal too much attention to insignificant, helpless man. He asks why God has to be such an omnipresent tormentor. Certainly this thought was far from the psalmist's original intention. Again the exegete has used a text to suit his own purposes. His exegesis uses the text as a powerful means of making his own statement which in this case is diametrically opposed to the original meaning of the text. The power of the device comes from the ironic reversal of traditional thought on the subject.

Further examples are found in Joel 3 and Lamentations 3:1-3. In Joel 3:10 the proclamation of peace found in Isaiah 2:4 and Micah 4:3 is reversed, becoming a proclamation of war. In Lamentations the author composes a bitter parody of Psalm 23. The comforting rod and staff of the psalm become the rod of wrath in the lament. Instead of being shepherded through the valley of the shadow of death the man is driven into it. God is no longer with him, rather his hand is turned against him.

To summarize, i.b.e. may function to clarify obscurities in the text, update archaic expressions or geographic locations, etymologize a contemporary word or aetiologicalize a contemporary custom, align statements in the text with contemporary belief, or to lend force to an exegete's statement by expropriating the power of traditional material. This is not intended to be an exhaustive list of every kind of i.b.e.; rather it will provide a working basis from which further examination of the subject may begin.

In the recent history of biblical studies there has been a growing interest in the study of i.b.e. Some scholars feel that as an explanation of puzzling phenomena in the text, for instance divergent appearances of the same or similar motifs, it may offer an alternate and perhaps even preferable paradigm to that offered by old biblical literary criticism, or as Sandmel calls it, the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis (1961:105). What is interesting about Sandmel's statement is that Wellhausen was aware of i.b.e. when he formulated his classic position. He said, "Under the influence of the spirit of each successive age, traditions originally derived from one source were variously apprehended and shaped; one way in the ninth and eighth centuries, another way in the seventh and sixth, and yet another in the fifth and fourth" (Wellhausen:1973:171). Wellhausen's analyses of D and P pay close attention to the nuances and vested interests which these sources displayed in their writings. Therefore, it is better to see the study of i.b.e. as an alternative not to Wellhausen's textual analysis of the sources and multiple viewpoints in the Bible, but to his evaluation of those varying viewpoints. He had a tendency to overvalue the most ancient traditions while rejecting the latest developments.

The study of i.b.e. also offers evidence for an alternative method of textual growth by accretion and additive exegesis rather than what has been characterized as the scissors and paste theory of the documentary hypothesis.

In order to determine whether this brief summary of

i.b.e. is approximately correct some space must now be devoted to an examination of the relevant secondary literature. While most of the existent studies are devoted to particular examples of i.b.e. enough theoretical statements accompany the latter to check the formulations made above.

"The Haggada Within Scripture"

S. Sandmel's article (1961:105-22) offers i.b.e. as an alternative to the documentary hypothesis which he presents in a decidedly negative light. According to Sandmel the proponents of the documentary hypothesis saw the authors of the sources (JE, D, P) as 'hack writers' using a scissors and paste approach to their sources and adding no overarching insight or viewpoint of their own to the material. Sandmel should also have noted that Wellhausen takes pains to show exactly how the Priestly writer has reworked portions of the Jehovistic and Elohist sources to bring them into accord with contemporary practise and belief. Granted that Wellhausen did place more emphasis on the reworkings as historically conditioned, this is merely a difference of emphasis from the position that Sandmel holds. At any rate Sandmel himself disclaims any attempt at putting another nail into the coffin of the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis. His central purpose is to point out and discuss the various instances of haggadic exegesis which he sees in the Bible.

He notes one instance of an haggadic exegesis in the three similar stories of a patriarch and his wife found in

Genesis 12:10-20; 20; 26:6-11. Genesis 12:10-20 is regarded as the 'bare incident' while Genesis 20 seems to be an embellished recasting of the same incident. Apparently he is basing his opinion on the embellishing detail of Genesis 20. This judgment is supported by, and possibly based upon, the rule of thumb that a tradition will increase in size through gradual accretion and agglomeration in the process of transmission. Yet the story in 26:6-11 has even less detail than Genesis 12:10-20, but it is not regarded as the 'bare incident'. His criteria for judging which version is an exegesis of the other is that the exegesis will tend to present the patriarch in a more acceptable moral stance. He says,

The redactors turn out to have counter-balanced the disinclination to expunge by adopting what we may call a process of neutralizing by addition. The haggadic item once added, meant to the redactor that which he was emending had the same meaning as that which was the result of the emendation. The Abraham of Genesis 20 thus determines the character of the Abraham of Genesis 12:10-20 (Sandmel:1961:105-22).

However, this solution neglects Genesis 26, which probably should be linked to the other two occurrences of the pattern. In order to provide a proper alternative to the source-critical viewpoint Sandmel should have dealt with all three occurrences. Nor does he explain why Genesis 12:10-20 appears in its present state at all. He regards the Abraham material as late and filled with haggadic elaborations and didactic teachings: "...virtually the only primitive aspect of the Abraham material is the supposition, coming from later times

that he dwelled in primitive times." (Sandmel:1961:118). If this is so, why did the authors compose the negative portrait of Abraham in Genesis 12?

A further difficulty in Sandmel's treatment of the wife-sister stories is his assumption that Genesis 20 is an embellishment of Genesis 12. This assumption is based upon a modern perception of the moral superiority of Abram's actions in Genesis 20 over those detailed in Genesis 12. To also attribute this moral judgment to the exegete, who supposedly constructed Genesis 20, is to assume that the exegete also saw Abraham's actions in Genesis 12:10-20 as less than upright. However, this equivalence of outlook between Sandmel's and the exegete's moral views is undemonstrated.

A more recent study of these three pericopes has been done by Robert Polzin (1975:81-97). He emphasizes what he calls the synchronic connections between the stories and is able to discern certain transformations of key motifs between the stories. Such transformations can be fit within the compass of i.b.e. so it will pay to devote some attention to Polzin's literary study of the three narratives.

Polzin sees the three stories as providing a cumulative answer to two key questions: 1) How does one know when a certain man is blessed by God? and 2) How does man learn the will and purpose of God (1975:93-94)? The answer to the second question is different in each of the three versions and each version reflects the answer of one of the three divisions of

the Old Testament. In Genesis 12 and in Torah God's intervention in history is the means of man's coming to know God's will. In Genesis 20 and in Nebiim it is through the prophetic vision, and in Genesis 26 and Ketubim it is through man's own abilities and powers of observation.

Polzin's analysis of the answer to the first question, how does one know when a man is blessed by God, is involved and contains difficulties. The answer to the question, which Polzin sees arising out of the cumulative result of the three versions, is that when man acquires wealth and progeny under the conditions established by Yahweh, he is blessed. In Genesis 12 Abram acquires wealth through the actual adultery of Sarai, therefore, he is expelled and given no progeny. However, Abraham is not yet explicitly blessed. He has yet to pass a test of proper possession of progeny, just as he has to pass a test concerning proper possession of wealth. This is, says Polzin, the function of Genesis 22. Following this in Genesis 24 Abraham is said to be blessed.

There are certain difficulties in these proposals. First, it is hard to see Abraham as having passed any test in Genesis 20 that he did not pass in Genesis 12. In both cases it is God who intervenes on behalf of the ancestress, and also in both, Abraham gains wealth. The only real difference is that in Genesis 20 it is clear that God intervenes before any sexual infelicity occurs. In fact it is only in Genesis 22:1 that God begins to test Abraham, "After these things God tested

Abraham...." In Genesis 20:13 Abraham himself equates his and Sarah's actions in Genesis 20 with those occurring in Genesis 12. According to Polzin the birth of Isaac is a result of Abraham's test-passing in 20, but in Genesis 21:2 it is stated that Isaac was born at the time of which God told Abraham. Isaac is a result of a promise made, not a test passed.

Further difficulties are encountered in the case of Genesis 26. Isaac comes into the paradigmatic situation already possessing progeny. In chapter 26 what he must do is rectify the potentially adulterous situation so as to possess wealth. Having accomplished this, he gains wealth through God's blessing in 26:12-13. However, from chapter 25:5 it is known that Isaac was wealthy long before 26:12-13; he had everything Abraham owned. Secondly, in 25:11, God actually blesses Isaac before he has progeny. Polzin's scheme seems at this point (if not already in the case of Genesis 12 and 20) to have broken down completely. He attempts to use 25:11 to strengthen his position by calling it a general orientation to and synopsis of what is about to take place, that is Isaac is about to be blessed through progeny and wealth. However, 25:5 destroys this possibility - Isaac is already very wealthy.

If it is correct to say that "Our three versions concern some of the tests Yahweh required of the patriarchs." (Polzin: 1975:92-93), then it seems that they failed those tests, excepting of course the text involved in the binding of Isaac.

In none of the three stories does the patriarch actually initiate the attempt to remove the risk or act of adultery. It is God and the foreigners who do that. The stories do reveal how man comes to know God's will but this does not appear to be central. The stories center on the patriarchs not God. The stories do not tell us consistently that a man is blessed only when he correctly possesses wealth and progeny. What two of the stories (Genesis 12 and 20) may reflect is God's protection of his chosen ones. In a situation where the patriarch felt so endangered that he gave away his own wife in order to survive, God not only returned his wife to him but also made him prosper at the expense of his competitors for the land and his wife.

With respect to the question of which story is a development or exegesis of the other there can be no definite answer at this point. Perhaps it is best to see the stories as different performances of a traditional theme. The third version is even more different from Genesis 12 and 20 than they are from each other. In this case it is Abimelech, both a foreigner and a man, who puts an end to the potentially adulterous situation. Isaac, the patriarchal hero, appears less than noble in this situation. God does not intervene to protect the patriarch or his wife. Clearly this version of the wife-sister motif, while related to the other two in important ways, is ultimately aimed at some other purpose.

Since it is the tendency of versions of a story to multiply in oral transmission, R. C. Culley has suggested that

the three wife-sister stories are products of such transmission (1976:40). One can then argue that the wife-sister story was composed of a stock episode and can be defined in terms of the common elements. The variations can be explained as the product of each author's exegetical concern. In this sense there can be no conception of an original version from which the other two developed, nor of an original version from which all three developed. The story exists only in a developed exegeted form. Thus no development from one version to another would be expected. Culley cautions that "one cannot argue that this is so, only that it may be so." (1976:40). Since the efforts to link the versions either as developments based upon another (Sandmel), or as unified answers to selected problems (Polzin) have ~~not~~ seemed too helpful, Culley's option is perhaps best for the present. What remains as a separate task is to examine each version carefully to see how it uses the wife-sister motif for its own ends.

Sandmel also sees elements of haggada in the Jacob cycle. The material is said to be based on an ancient folk tale of a clever deceiver with low moral attributes. Subsequent generations began to have reservations about this ancestor, who fell below their contemporary moral standards, and so began to incorporate exculpations into the stories. In Genesis 25:26 an exegete has given a contrived etymology for Jacob's name as the 'heel grabber' which tends to tone down the association of the name with the meaning "to supplant". Sandmel sees

another haggadic aspect in the narrative, 25:23, which transforms Jacob into a national symbol. "Rebekah has two nations in her womb; nations will serve Jacob. (Genesis 27:29) and Esau will also, though not forever (Genesis 26:40)." (Sandmel: 1961:116). Again it is difficult to see Sandmel's point i.e. what concern might this reflect? A possible answer might be that if God prophesies Jacob's supplanting activities to Rebekah then Jacob's actions are morally blameless—he is merely doing God's will. Another suggestion is that 25:23 is a part of the redactional structuring of the Jacob cycle which is generally critical of Jacob's wrong-headed acts. In this reading the verse functions as a telling judgment of Jacob's attempts to take the blessing. He already possesses it from the beginning by way of Yahweh's promise. Therefore, all his efforts to gain the blessing are needlessly harmful to others and indicate a lack of trust in Yahweh (Sarna:1966:183).

Sandmel supplies many other examples, most of which fall into category four of my provisional list, the conflict between the exegete's opinion or belief and statements made in the text. This is to be expected since his article focuses on Pentateuchal materials. Later exegetes would have had many exculpatory concerns in bringing ancient moral standards up to contemporary expectation. On the other hand if one holds the view that many of the patriarchal narratives reflect the concerns of the monarchy, being written in the monarchical period and so not aimed at recounting pious patriarchs'

histories, then these exculpatory additions may be viewed as being based upon the misunderstandings of post-monarchical exegetes. The latter took the stories at face value as actual accounts of the patriarchs' deeds and saw some need for the improvement of the characters' moral qualities.¹

"Midrash and the Old Testament" and "Psalm Titles and Midrashic Exegesis"

B. Childs defines midrash as "...above all, an interpretation of a canonical text within the context and for the religious purposes of a community...what is constitutive of midrash is that the interpretation does attach itself to a text." (Childs:1972:45-59). For Childs the heart of the midrashic method is that the interpretation moves from the text to apply to the new contemporary situation and then the actualization of the interpretation in the new situation returns to illumine the text.²

1. There is a good deal of similarity between the understanding of certain patriarchal materials as exegesis and as monarchic apology. For instance Genesis 25:23 is interpreted as exculpatory haggadic material by Sandmel, but may also be seen as a possible Solomonic legitimation. Both explanations of the verse depend upon its status as an exegetical addition or comment upon a tradition, and differ only in the postulation of the end to which the exegesis was directed.

2. It is interesting to compare Childs' estimation of this process with that of Wellhausen. "Like ivy it overspreads the dead trunk with extraneous life, blending old and new in a strange combination. It is a high estimate of tradition that leads to its being thus modernized; but in the process it is twisted and perverted, and set off with foreign accretions in a most arbitrary way." (Wellhausen:1973:227). Wellhausen's interest in reaching a non-Judaistically biased history of the past is

One of the major difficulties in Childs' position is that it relies so heavily on analogies drawn from rabbinic exegesis for the understanding of i.b.e. In doing so Childs is forced to omit the type of i.b.e. which may have existed in the period of oral transmission, and also the momentous exegesis which occurred when the tradition were committed to writing. Midrashic analogy cannot add a great deal to the understanding of these periods of i.b.e. because they served different functions and operated under different constraints. They must be studied by and for themselves. Of course any postulation as to exegesis in the oral tradition is purely hypothetical. Yet if oral tradition is admitted as a phenomenon of which there are perceptible traces in the written text and also as having been foundational to the generation of the written text, then one should recognize the possibility of exegeses occurring within the oral tradition.

Furthermore, Childs' emphasis on the new situation illuminating the text is problematic. He says that "...the persistent attempt to actualize the ancient text, while at the same time evaluating the present in the light of the past, provides the distinctive features of both the literary genre and the exegetical activity of midrash." (Childs:1972:52). Sometimes, however, traditions needed to be completely changed;

reflected in his negative attitude to such reworking, but he seems to be essentially correct against Childs' opinion that reinterpretation will illumine the text is interprets.

the present had to be cut off from the light of the past.

Tradition is a very flexible process.

During the period of the monarchy when consolidation was not only a political but also a religious goal, certain nuances and time-conditioned exegeses were performed upon the patriarchal traditions. For instance Jacob's rise to superiority over Esau (Edom) may have been applauded. However, as time passed the peoples' reliance upon the monarchical exegeses began to have detrimental effects upon their actual political and religious well being. They became complacent. The prophets, while dependent upon tradition and even in favour of its fundamental goals, saw the need for a revision of the outdated exegeses of tradition. For example, Hosea saw the reliance upon the Jacob tradition, in which Jacob appears a clever fellow who has God's approval and the blessing of Abraham and Isaac, as less than a good thing. Therefore, he sought to change completely the picture of Jacob which had been drawn up probably in the time of the monarchy. In Hosea 12 Jacob becomes a cheating scoundrel.

Now in one way Hosea's exegesis of the Jacob traditions did reilluminate the prior exegesis.¹ It revealed the real religious meaning which lay behind the former exegesis. As time progresses the time-conditioned elements of any given

1. See below p. 63ff. for a discussion of Hosea's reillumination and reevaluation of the Jacob traditions.

exegesis must be changed. If they are not then the tradition, in the fullest sense of the term, will degenerate. Therefore, Hosea 12 was similar to the monarchical exegesis of the Jacob tradition in expressing some aspects of God's will for Israel. However, in another way Hosea 12 was completely different than any known prior exegesis of the Jacob tradition (excepting of course Genesis 27:35-36 and the events of 29:21-26). It did not illuminate the positive view of Jacob seen in the JE material at all, but rather contradicted it. Neither was it an actualization of the prior exegesis. Its purpose was to undercut the latter which had become a support for Israel's decadent self-complacency. Not all examples of i.b.e. are like Hosea. But even one such example should cause analogies drawn from later midrashim to be used with care in composing definitions of genre and technique in midrash and its Old Testament prototypes.

Childs notes a unique type of exegetical concern in Daniel 9:2ff. This is Daniel's reinterpretation of Jeremiah's prophecy of the seventy years. Jeremiah's prophecy, as it stood in Daniel's time, was not literally correct. Daniel adjusted the number of years to the correct number thereby reinterpreting the old prophecy, yet still understanding the new situation on the basis of the old prophecy's meaning (Childs: 1972:55). Such exegesis most closely fits the category of simple clarification. Another phenomenon which would fit into the category of simple clarification of a text is seen in the harmonization of discrepancies in the text. In Exodus 9:31-32

the exegete is concerned to let the reader know how it is that crops which were seemingly destroyed previously in 9:25, are now destroyed again (Childs:1972:56). In this case he resorts to a technical agricultural explanation.

In both "Midrash and the Old Testament" and "Psalm Titles and Midrashic Exegesis", Childs main concern is generally to point out enough similarities between i.b.e. and midrash to justify calling the former proto-midrashic. This concern is obvious in his dating of the psalm titles which are placed roughly between the Chronicler and Qumran Psalm scroll.¹ Childs sees this late date as a positive check against indiscriminate projection of midrashic exegesis back into the pre-exilic period without due caution.

However, recent study of oral tradition has tended towards the view that oral transmission was a continuous stream of interpretation and adaptation of traditional themes and motifs.

Oral composition during performance, then, is composing by the use of traditional elements of various kinds. The traditional outline of the work and the stock of traditional language used provide

1. See B.S. Childs(1971:12). The terminus a quo is set after the Chronicler for whom the superscription form, had it existed would have been useful. The terminus ad quem is set in the Qumran document where the technique is fully developed. For an earlier dating of the superscription form see G.M. Tucker, "Prophetic Superscriptions and the Growth of a Canon". G.W. Coats and B.O. Long eds., Canon and Authority. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977, p. 65-70. Tucker argues that the superscriptions are later additions to prophetic books and tentatively dates some of them in the mid-sixth century B.C.

a stable element. Thus orally composed literature is by its very nature traditional. Nevertheless... there is always scope, because of the fact that there is an unfixed text, for the performer to be creative(Culley:1963:121).

This type of adaptation and reuse of tradition is similar to what has been seen to take place in i.b.e. and in a more developed form later in the midrashim. The opportunity for adaptation of tradition to new needs and circumstances appears to have existed long before written composition appeared. It is important to note that there is a continuity of tradition, the aspect of a sense of authority, in oral literature which is similar to that existing in the written stage of a tradition.

Childs' suggestion is that this sense of authoritative scripture arose with the advent and procession of a written tradition(Childs:1972:53). Culley's study might be used to modify this assertion. The authority of certain basic traditional elements is the very basis of oral tradition. The tradition elements are the building blocks of the different performances. Old Testament traditions, no matter what form they take, deal with important religious concepts which are either accepted or rejected by the people to whom the traditions are directed. Authority then is not a function of a written document, nor is its existence even guaranteed by the appearance of a written tradition.¹

1. Wisdom literature, to name one example which is usually located in the period of a written tradition, offers many examples of refusals to accept the 'authoritative' tradition. See J. L. Gresham(1977:235-58).

According to P.L. Berger, "Religious legitimations arise from human activity, but once crystallized into complexes of meaning that become part of a religious tradition they can attain a measure of autonomy as against this activity." (Berger:1967:41). Human activity is not limited to any particular period of tradition transmission. Once a given exegesis (a human activity) is legitimated by consensus it crystallizes. Then as new situations and views come about the crystallized tradition must again be adapted. Authority and exegesis go hand in hand to produce what might be called the dialectics of tradition. Once again Berger's ideas illustrate this:

Externalization is the ongoing outpouring of human being into the world,...Objectivation is the attainment by the products of this activity...of a reality that confronts its original producers as a facticity external to and other than themselves. Internalization is the reappropriation by men of this same reality.... (Berger:1967:4).

The process of internalization must always be understood as but one moment of the larger dialectic process that also includes the moments of externalization and objectivation. If this is not done there emerges a picture of mechanistic determinism, in which the individual is produced by society as cause produces effect....he is formed in the course of a protracted conversation (a dialectic, in the literal sense of the word) in which he is a participant (Berger:1967:18).

Exegesis in Berger's scheme would take place in the externalization of a previously internalized tradition. This position is in basic agreement with Childs' statement that i.b.e. is the result of a formation of a sense of authoritative scripture but differs in not restricting i.b.e. to any single

stage or period of tradition transmission. It has seemed better to propose the existence of the dialectic of tradition (a component of the dialectic of society) from the "oral period" up to the present, with i.b.e. offering evidence of this process up to and including the canonization of scripture.

✓ "Psalm 89: A Study in Inner-Biblical Exegesis"

Nahum Sarna(1963:29-46) is in agreement with Childs that the phenomenon of exegesis and exposition of a text evolves from the idea of the authority and even immutability and sanctity of the text.¹ He goes beyond Childs in affirming that the roots of such thinking are much earlier than any biblical notion of canon and can be found in ancient near eastern thinking as early as the nineteenth century B.C. If this is so it makes room for earlier incidents of i.b.e. than Childs seems willing to allow.² Sarna cites the reinterpretation of the Enuma Elish in the Assyrian version as an example of prebiblical exegesis of an authoritative text. In the Assyrian version the hero is Ashur rather than Marduk, and the temple is resituated in Ashur's city instead of Babylon.³

1. (Sarna:1963:33) This would offer further support for the proposal advanced above that i.b.e. is not to be limited to any stage in the process of tradition composition.

2. Childs does comment on Sarna's article in footnotes to "Psalm Titles and Midrashic Exegesis" and "Midrash in the Old Testament" calling it a more guarded approach than Sandmel's and also impressive.

3. (Sarna:1963:34) For further observations supporting Sarna see W.W. Hallo (1962:13-26).

Psalm 89 is a prime example of the alternative explanation which i.b.e. has to offer in explaining multiple appearances of a textual unit. It includes a version of Nathan's oracle to David, which is also found in II Samuel 7:4-17 and in I Chronicles 17:3-15. Literary critics in the past have sought to explain the relationship among the three in a variety of ways. One view is that the prose versions are original and Psalm 89 is a free poetic paraphrase. Another sees the prose recensions as dependent on the earlier poetic form. Finally, a third view suggests that all three are equally and independently based on a fourth common source, long since lost, which contained the text of the original oracle (Sarna:1963:36-37). Sarna believes that the divergencies between the poetic form and the prose reflect deliberate changes made by the author/exegete of the psalm.

The psalmist here has, for his own purposes, made use of a very early exegetical tradition in departing from the original language of the oracle.— He had not the slightest interest in the original occasion of the oracle, the Temple project,....— His sole concern was the Divine Pledge of perpetuity to the Davidic dynasty as such and with the glaring contrast between the promised ideal and the present reality.—...there is no question of deciding upon the relationship of the prose to a supposed poetic version. These verses constitute, rather, an exegetical adaptation of the oracle by the psalmist to fit a specific historic situation (Sarna:1963:38-39).

Sarna studies both the oracle in Samuel and its occurrence in Psalm 89. After a consideration of the possible historical occasions which could have led to the new emphases in the oracle as it appears in the psalm, Sarna concludes that it

was inspired by the Syro-Ephraimite invasion of Judea in 735-34 B.C.E., when an attempt was made to depose Ahaz and replace him by a non-Davidic king.

Psalm 89 is another example of the type of exegesis which literally uses the textual object of its attentions in order to express a new point of view. In this case it is a very daring effort in that it calls on God to keep a promise which is not exactly the one he made in the first place. Unless God (or the reader) reads carefully he is likely to be convinced by what Sarna has demonstrated to be a tightly knit and compelling literary unit.

Again, however, as was the case with Childs' study of psalm titles, this particular example is unique, and so evades attempts to formulate generalizations which will govern other examples of inner biblical exegesis. What is clear is that the different versions of any unit which appears more than once may be explained more satisfactorily by i.b.e. than by source-critical analysis. Since both methods of explanation are based upon a desire to explain certain phenomena in the text, the one which satisfies this desire best should take precedence over the other.¹

1. The basis for this eccentric statement is the consensual nature of reality. The most satisfying answer is also going to be the most widely accepted explanation and so also the truest i.e. in accord with the current consensual reality of biblical scholarship. On this see, for example, P.L. Berger and T. Luckmann (1967).

In the case of Psalm 89, exegesis seems the best explanation. There will still remain many cases in which multiple textual appearances are most satisfactorily explained by source analysis; each case must be decided on its own merit.

From Bible To Mishna

Weingreen's (1976) stated purpose is to demonstrate that some of the rabbinic literary and legal processes of exposition may be detected sporadically in rudimentary form, throughout the Old Testament. "Our main contention is that the rabbinic approach to the study of the Old Testament, as evidenced by the Talmudic passages quoted, is but the continuation of the attitude and spirit which animated the authors and editors of the sacred writings." (Weingreen:1976:26). Thus throughout his book he characterizes each exegesis according to its similarity to one of the rabbinic categories of exegesis. He comments that one is only able to find objective rules for such exegetical procedures in scattered references throughout the talmudic period. This confirms the impression gained thus far in the present review that each case is unique and difficult to use as a basis for a catalogue of generalizations about i.b.e.

Weingreen avoids the difficulty of categorization by using the rabbinic categories of peshat and derash, both halakic and haggadic to describe the various expositions.¹ In

1. His main purpose, however, in using these categories is to demonstrate the continuity of the oral tradition which

the peshat category of exegesis Weingreen places the gloss, which was generally a short one or two word comment on a word or phrase in the text. It was designed to clarify the sense or draw attention to some relevant piece of information to the text. Also some editorial notes, which are distinguished from glosses by their non-interruption of the flow of thought in the text, are strictly clarifications of the text. Glosses are easily seen as intrusions in the text; they were never intended to appear as a part of the text but were likely marginal comments which were incorporated in the process of copying. Editorial notes were purposefully integrated into the text to appear as part of the authorized text. Weingreen states that the actual incorporation of these editorial notes into the final edited form of the Pentateuch suggests that there was a tradition of authorized teaching—exegesis of Torah—at least prior to this finalization (Weingreen:1976:61).

The derash category of exegesis is exemplified by certain editorial notes, and by larger compositions such as the books of Chronicles and Deuteronomy.¹ The editorial notes are categorized

accompanies the authoritative written tradition back to its very beginnings. In this emphasis Weingreen is in accord with Sarna that this tendency to rework and make new applications of traditional material is a common heritage of the entire ancient Near East. As an example he notes that the Israelites used the raw materials of religion, literary norms, legal rules, and practices which were common throughout the ancient Near East and reworked them into a new vehicle for the expression of their own unique way of life whilst claiming divine directive for them.

1. One of the central purposes of Weingreen's book is to show, by way of a detailed study of parallel verses between

according to their function, which depends upon the nature of the material they modify. They are either halakah--the authoritative explanation of the promulgation of biblical laws and for the extension of their scope, or haggadah--the embellishment or detailing explanation of recorded historical events, and dramatic episodes in the lives of the biblical characters; as well haggadah indicates the significance of these events (Weingreen:1976:57).

The major division in i.b.e. thus falls between simple clarification--peshat, and exegesis with some other goal in mind, the latter not necessarily related to the literal plain sense meaning of the text--derash. Within the latter category Weingreen also places more practical importance on halakic exegesis presumably because it was the laws which governed people's everyday lives.

Another major emphasis in Weingreen's approach is that the presence of these exegetical glosses and notes in the Hebrew Bible implies that there was a body of the faithful to whom the sacred texts were expounded (Weingreen:1976:48). Furthermore, keeping in mind the priority of halakah, when the addenda to the basic decalogue are examined the indications are that the exposition was directed to the common people, not the sophisticated or professional elements of society (Weingreen:1976:66).

Deuteronomy and Exodus-Leviticus, that Deuteronomy is an authoritative interpretation of the Torah--a second Torah. See chapters seven and eight of his book.

Weingreen believes that most exegesis was designed as a tool for religious and moral instruction of the common people. However, there may be contrary examples, such as the Chronicler's attempts to reconcile the conflicting accounts of Goliath's slaying in Samuel (Weingreen:1976:12-13), or the very technical exegetical handling of the problem of Israelite slavery in Deuteronomy 15:12ff.¹

A general criticism of Weingreen's work is its over-dependence on rabbinic midrash as a model for i.b.e. His purpose to trace the continuity of rabbinic type exposition back to its earliest manifestation is valid in itself. It weakens, however, in the resulting conclusions which necessarily come about concerning inner biblical exegesis. Certainly there are elements of continuity between Judaism and Israelite religion but there are also differences. This also holds true for the patterns (or lack of such in i.b.e.) of exegesis. Weingreen cannot be faulted for his attempt to find continuity but neither can his book be used as an 'objective' source for the study of i.b.e. By attempting to maintain such a close connection between the inner-biblical and post-biblical exegesis, the unique features of the less familiar are muted and overshadowed by the well-known phenomenon.

In spite of this single deficiency for our purposes,

1. See Weingreen(1976:133-41). The problem of the intended audience is beyond the scope of the present discussion.

Weingreen's book has brought several important emphases forward.

1. I.b.e. as yet presents no organized pattern from which it is possible to deduce the working of a set of exegetical rules such as is found in late rabbinic exegesis.

2. The tendency to rework and reapply traditional material is found throughout the ancient Near East.

3. Early examples of exegesis were incorporated into the text and share in its authority. Thus some sort of accepted exegetical activity which worked to contemporize the Bible must have existed early in the history of the written tradition.

4. Even as large and important a unit as Deuteronomy can be seen as a product of this authoritative exegetical tradition. This has important implications for tradition-historical studies (Weingreen: 1976:152).

Summary of the Results of the Articles

All of the articles reviewed above have in one way or another expressed the opinion that i.b.e. can provide explanations for difficulties in scripture better than the main alternative-- literary source-critical analysis based on a theory of the text's history. The latter is itself dependent upon assumptions drawn from source-critical or literary explanations. Criticism is not levelled against the apparent circular nature of the literary source-critical approach; rather it is simply stated that, on the basis of a more complete understanding of Near Eastern attitudes towards tradition, as well as the social and political

influences on the composition of the text, the explanations based on i.b.e. are better. Weingreen's comments illustrate this feeling:

While literary critics have, indeed, conceded that Deuteronomy reflects the changed circumstances and attitudes of a later age, they have not stressed the point that this fact must involve the notion of a continuous growth of law, much of which was derived by exposition from earlier laws, leaving them intact, while fresh laws were being continually added. The inevitable conclusion which we draw is this. Instead of our speaking of the literary sources of the Pentateuch almost in terms of their arrangement in neat, horizontal, chronological strata in a literary tell and using our ingenuity to recognize fragments in one stratum as belonging to another one, should we not rather conclude that there were areas of religious, cultural and sociological growth which flourished and developed side by side in a continuing process (1976:152)?

The problem that now faces proponents of i.b.e. as an alternate paradigm is to make a consistent and coherent statement of its possibilities and limitations. For the present only selected examples have been put forth in preliminary sketches. Scholars, such as Weingreen, who are capable of also detailing the limitations of i.b.e., refrain from doing so. "While I am conscious of the major literary problems which this thesis raises, particularly with regard to the implications for the Documentary Hypothesis, I must remain content for the time being with the presentation of the thesis, based as it is upon facts and arguments flowing from them." (Weingreen:1976:152).

One does not have to struggle to find instances of puzzling phenomena in the text which balance out the optimism over the potential of i.b.e. In Genesis 14 the great differences

in the type of material in the two parts in the chapter is best explained by a literary division of sources. Sandmel states that the necessary conclusion to draw from this chapter is that it is a late haggada relating the military prowess of Abram (Sandmel:1961:117). However, that is both to make an unwarranted assumption and to neglect the great differences in the type of material within the chapter. The military prowess of Abraham is but one of several important themes which compete for supremacy over the chapter. In this case i.b.e. and source analysis might be used conjunctively to best understand the text.

In the rejection of literary analysis in favour of the possibilities shown by preliminary studies of i.b.e. no mention has been made of the traditio-historical approach which is a direct descendant of source-critical analysis. Among the proponents of the method there remains much disagreement as to exactly what tradition history is (Knight:1973:21-25). However, since Noth's position is generally recognized as central in the field his definition will suffice. He stated that the task of tradition history is to investigate the process of biblical composition from beginning to end--from separate oral traditions to clusters of tradition to larger literary works to the great redactions which result in the Bible (Noth:1972:1). This sounds very much like the proposed goal for the study of i.b.e.

Noth does, however, make several assumptions which soon reveal a great difference between tradition history and the

approach through i.b.e. First is his emphasis on the importance of the oral stage of composition "—the decisive steps on the way to the formation of the Pentateuch were taken during the preliterate stage, and the literary fixations only gave final form to material which in its essentials was already given." (1972:1-2).

In the article by Sarna (1963:34) the emphasis on the early beginnings of the exegetical process is also apparent. The exegetical process works on the interpretation of a received tradition and even of non-Israelite traditions. Also it must work on the interpretation of the original events in the case of the great Pentateuchal themes. Here, however, the similarity ends. For Noth the creative forces end with the literary fixation. This assumes a dichotomy between the tradition in its written and oral forms which is neither immediately evident in the texts nor theoretically necessary. The problem of the shift from oral to written transmission has yet to be discussed in any way that approaches definition. It is obviously an important shift in the transmission process even if only because it involved the use of an important new means of communication. Those who propose that an essential shift occurred when the change¹ from oral to written transmission took place, base their assumptions on the difference between these two modes of communication.² Such assumptions do not deal with the problem

1. Even speaking about 'a change' prejudices the issue. It is equally possible that there was no change but only a gradual protracted process of coming to use written communication in favor of oral.

2. Oral transmission is supposed to be creative while

adequately.

There is no forbidding reason why a continuity of content and process in transmission could not have existed during 'the change'. The various instances of i.b.e. (inner tradition exegesis) from an early period favour such continuity. I.b.e. points to a continuity in the process of reappropriating tradition; from the oral period (Culley) through the post-biblical midrash. It provides the link between Culley's suggestion of varying performances of a single tradition, and post-biblical midrashic exegesis of a biblical text. The process of reinterpretation and renewal is evident through all periods of the text's composition. It can be seen throughout the Bible and continue through the reinterpretations of Judaism and Christianity.

Related to Noth's dichotomy between oral and written tradition is his statement that it is the chief task to ascertain the basic themes from which the totality of the transmitted Pentateuch developed (1972:3). This is because these oral themes, the sources, "...were combined through a purely literary procedure of addition; it is clear that the result was simply a compilation in which not only the narrative materials but also the theological concerns are juxtaposed and interwoven with one another just as plainly and incongruously as the individual sources had presented them." (Noth:1972:250). Yet

written transmission is merely preservative.

proponents of i.b.e. attempt to understand these same juxtapositions and incongruities as evidence of rethinking and adaptation of the basic themes in the Pentateuch. From the latter viewpoint the reinterpretation and reapplication of the basic themes are equal in importance to the basic themes themselves. In addition the basic themes themselves are no more than interpretations; either of more ancient and more basic themes which may recede into a basis in the mind itself,¹ or of the actual events which generated the initial interpretations.

All aspects of the tradition reveal creative modification and development in Israelite religious history. Speculation about the preeminence of the basic events and their historicity becomes less important. This is an important and valuable development. Scholarly speculation as to the historicity and consequent impressiveness of these basic events no longer has to bear the weight of historical reconstruction. From the great debates over the opposing reconstructions it has become obvious that these assumptions have never been strong enough, in the view of many scholars, to bear the weight which was placed upon them.

1. C.G. Jung(1938) makes the following two statements: "...religion is uncontestably one of the earliest and most universal activities of the human mind"(p.1), and "Since the dawn of mankind there has been a marked tendency to delimit the unruly and arbitrary "supernatural", influence by definite forms and laws. And this process has gone on in history by the multiplication of rites, institutions and creeds."(p.21-22). Within the present context the latter statement might also be applied to the tradition. From such an ancient perspective the basic themes of the Pentateuch are relatively late exegetical developments.

Noth's historical assumptions have been criticized especially because of the reciprocal reliance between his textual and historical reconstructions.¹

It appears that the principal advantage that has been proposed for the study of i.b.e. over other methods is its greater, although not complete, freedom from the need of supportive hypotheses and suppositions in the process of clarifying problems in the text. It remains to be seen if it can be an inclusive paradigm for explaining all or even most of the difficulties without resorting to such hypotheses. This can only be determined after the text has been read and studied for a lengthy period of time as a product of such an interpretive process. In the attempt to see why the authors of the articles on i.b.e. have proposed that it may be a better alternative to other approaches its possibilities have been opposed to the actual results obtained by those other methods. These possibilities are based upon the rather slim catalogue of cases presently available. The task of examining all of the examples of i.b.e. lies ahead.

It is with this task in mind that we now turn to examine one of the prime examples of i.b.e. The author of Hosea 12 refers to the Jacob traditions in his prophetic message

1. (Polzin:1977:200) Sarna's establishment of a date for Psalm 89 might also fall prey to this criticism (1963:42-45). The criticism of circularity is easy to make, given the nature of biblical studies which generally begin and end in the biblical text, and so must be used with caution.

to Israel. By comparing the relevant verses from Hosea with the Jacob material found in Genesis it becomes apparent that Hosea is not quoting Genesis. He may be alluding to the latter, or a common source from which both are derived, but he is not quoting Genesis.

Three possibilities suggest themselves: 1. that Hosea's Jacob belongs to a different tradition than that found in Genesis, 2. that Hosea is doing a free exegesis¹ of Genesis, 3. that both Hosea and Genesis are based on variant oral recitations (Culley: 1976: 30-32). It should be noted that in any of these three possibilities one may regard Hosea's reference to Jacob as exegetical. Proponents of i.b.e. try to explain any divergencies between two textual units in the Bible which are based upon the same character or event, as i.b.e. Whether these explanations will then seem satisfactory must be asked after comparing them to alternatives offered by the other critical approaches to the biblical text.

In the following examination of secondary literature on Hosea 12, both the possibility that Hosea is dependent on another tradition than Genesis (Good, Ackroyd) and the possibility that Hosea is directly dependent on Genesis (Gertner, Holladay) will appear. In addition it will be suggested that the oral variant explanation is also possible

1. With respect to the provisional categories formed above, this type of free exegesis would fall into category five. See above page 8 and 9.

and may even be the best explanation of the relationship between Hosea 12 and the Jacob cycle in Genesis. However, before the question of relationship can be dealt with one must first attempt to understand what Hosea 12 is about, and how the Jacob material fits into the context of chapter 12.

2. THE JACOB TRADITION IN HOSEA 12

Among the commentaries and secondary literature on Hosea 12 there are two interpretations of Hosea's presentation of the patriarchal material. On one hand there are those who hold that Hosea is presenting Jacob, in all respects, as a model for the Israelites to emulate. Jacob's attempt to supplant Esau at birth (Hosea 12:4, Genesis 25:26) and his wrestling match with an angel are seen as the marks of a determined hero of God who actively pursued the blessing of God from the moment of birth until he finally got it much later in life. According to Calvin:

But the Prophet subjoins, that Jacob by his strength had power with God, and had prevailed also with the Angel. He reproaches here the Israelites for making a false claim to the name of Jacob, since they had nothing in common with him, but had shamefully departed from his example. ...so also the Prophet says, "Come now, ye children of Jacob, what sort of men are ye? He was endued with a heroic; yea, with an angelic power, and even more than angelic; for he wrestled with God and gained the victory; but ye are slaves of idols; the devil retains you devoted to himself; ye are, as it were, in a bawdy-house; for what else is your temple but a brothel? And then ye are like adulterers, and daily commit adultery with your idols...." This difference between the holy patriarch Jacob and his posterity must be marked, otherwise we shall not understand the object of the Prophet; (1846:420)

More recently P.R. Ackroyd has attempted to defend a similar interpretation of Hosea's Jacob (1963:245-59).

The opposing and majority view (Wolff, Ward, Gordis,

Harper, Good, Vriezen) is that Hosea presents elements of the Jacob cycle in order to demonstrate that the contemporary state of affairs is the fruit of seeds sown long in the past. The Jacob traditions are especially suited to this purpose because of Jacob-Israel's status as the nation's eponymous ancestor.

Now the mere fact that there are two such opposing interpretations suggests that there is a certain amount of ambiguity in the text. Ackroyd states that in order to decide which view is correct, clues are to be found first in the immediate context and second in the general indications of the tradition here alluded to (1963:246). While one might agree with the suggestion to take the context into consideration, the second suggestion does not seem likely to be helpful and may even be misleading. Hosea has represented and arranged the Jacob material as a part of his message; that is to say he has performed an exegesis of the traditions. To be aware of the Genesis viewpoint (exegesis) of Jacob is one thing, but to then say that the Genesis, or any other, exegesis of the Jacob material can be used to determine what Hosea was doing with those traditions begs the question. Only a close examination of the kind of language Hosea uses to describe Jacob, and the context within which such description is set can properly determine Jacob's place in Hosea.

Definition of the Unit

There are clear indications that chapter 12 is separate from chapter 11. The subject is named once more and the theme

changes from humble return, a positive action by Israel, to treachery and deceit. There is some agreement on this division (Wolff, Ward, Buss). The division at the end of the unit containing the Jacob material is not as easy to distinguish. Wolff states that 13:1 is the beginning of a new unit with the subject named anew and no stylistic or thematic connections with chapter 12 being recognizable (Wolff:1974:222). However, the subject of 12:15 is Ephraim who is also the subject of 13:1. Furthermore, in both verses Ephraim is condemned to death (also 13:12) and in 13:1 he dies as a result. Therefore, there does seem to be some thematic carryover.¹ It does not appear to be possible to make a simple division between chapters 12 and 13 upon the basis of such thematic considerations. Perhaps the internal structure of the unit beginning at 12:1 will be more helpful in this respect.

General Context of the Unit Beginning at 12:1

There have been many proposals for dividing Hosea into separate collections of material. One of the main groupings is recognized by many scholars from 9:10-14:10 (Eissfeldt:1965:160ff). This section is characterized as a series of historical retrospects which reveal the beginnings of contemporary Israel's sinfulness (Wolff:1974:xxvi-xxvii). A different division is made by Buss (1969:31-34) in which the material of 12:3-15 is grouped

1. Note also the interesting play on the reversal of the east wind's role, 12:2, 13:15.

with chapters 13 and 14. Regardless of how one divides the book it is the meaning of the context which is most important to the present investigation. A detailed examination of the context would lead too far from the central concern of the present discussion, and so some statements from the secondary literature must suffice.

The bulk of Hosea's prophecy consists of accusation and threat (Buss:1969:119). "Wherever Israel's beginnings are examined, her present immediately appears; indeed, the present is the end of the early beginnings of that history." (Wolff:1974:xxvii), "the historical retrospects show how God's intensive struggle with Israel reaches from her past down to Hosea's present time." (Wolff:1974:xxvii). Harper(1905:cxlvi) briefly sums up Hosea's message:

(a) Israel is wicked through and through, and her condition morally is that of rottenness. (b) Israel is politically doomed... (d) Israel fails to comprehend Yahweh; has a totally wrong conception of him;

Whatever grounds for hope there are lie with Yahweh. The movement of human life is toward doom, but Yahweh's purpose is directed toward the good of his people(Buss:1969:126). What exhortation there is calls for an attitude of dependence on Yahweh rather than one of self-assertion(Buss:1969:128). Israel is unable to learn from God's chastenings (Hosea 7:9, 10, 14-16) and so it must be utterly desolated before they give up hope in themselves and return to depend on Yahweh alone (Hosea 14:3-4).

Structure of the Unit

Several scholars have stated that the basic form of the unit is that of a lawsuit (Wolff:1974:208, 211; Coote:1971:389; Holladay:1966:53; Good:1966:139; Ginsberg:1961:341-342). However, there is some question about the degree to which the unit exhibits the lawsuit form. Martin Buss(1969:89) states that, "No elaborate details of the controversy are given, the style appears to be a technical one known to the audience." Buss does not indicate what he means by a technical style so it is difficult to understand the latter part of his statement. However, his statement that elaborate detail is missing seems correct. In fact key elements of the lawsuit or covenantal trial scene are missing. According to H. Huffmon the lawsuit form must contain an appeal to the heavens, earth, mountains, hills, and foundations of the earth to hear the controversy (eg. Isaiah 1:2, Micah 6:2, and modified in Jeremiah 2:12). "The natural elements appealed to in the "lawsuit" oracles discussed above are addressed because they are witnesses to the (prior) covenant.— The literary framework is dependent on the tradition of the inanimate (in Israel) elements of the natural world being witnesses to the covenant." (Huffmon:1959:292).

Obviously Hosea 12 has no such appeal to natural elements. Since this is so crucial to the form and meaning of the covenant lawsuit it seems that Hosea deliberately chose not to make use of the latter. However, "Another indication of the covenant background of this type is the basis given for the indictment.

The oracles include a recitation of the mighty acts of Yahweh, that is, the historical prologue of the covenant." (Huffman:1959:294). In 12:10, 11, and 14 are found allusions to the exodus, and to God's shepherding activity through the prophets. Also in his article "The Root רִיב and the Prophetic Lawsuit Speeches", James Limburg suggests that the word rib itself is at home in the sphere of international treaties and relationships (1969:304). Given that Hosea also uses the word in chapter 4, and there again without the key components which would definitely identify it as a prophetic covenant lawsuit, it seems possible that the complete form did not develop until after Hosea. The other prophetic books which have the full form are all post-Hoseanic, with the possible exception of Micah, whose dating is close to Hosea's. Thus Hosea's usage of the word rib in chapter 12, and the conjunction of that usage with the recitation of God's mighty act in the exodus, are enough to suggest that the chapter functions as a trial of Israel.

A categorization of the verses as part of a lawsuit may be made as follows:

- | | |
|---------------------------|----------------|
| 1) Announcement of a case | 3 |
| 2) Accusation | 1, 2, 8, 9, 15 |
| 3) Exhortation | 7 |
| 4) God's acts | 10a, 11, 14 |
| 5) Judgement | 3, 10b, 12, 15 |

The appearance of category 3, exhortation, suggests that the chapter may be more than a trial. It is not a simple trial in

which charges are read out and the appropriate judgment is put into effect. The purpose of the judgments is the rehabilitation of Israel; the exhortation in verse 7 suggests that the purpose of the trial is to get Israel to return to God. Chapter 12 itself may form a part of the series of historical retrospects. There are two trials in chapter 12; one with the patriarch and one with contemporary Israel as the defendant. The chapter is thus an historical record of God's continued controversy with Israel; from patriarch to state.

Ward(1966:214) has divided the unit into five parts, each part consisting of an accusation or an 'historical' recollection of two to four lines followed by a one line threat.

- I
1. With lies Ephraim encompasses me,
with treachery the house of Israel.
But Judah still goes with God,
is loyal to the holy ones
 2. Ephraim befriends the wind
and chases the east wind all day.
[Lies and violence he multiplies.]
With Assyria they make an alliance,
to Egypt they deliver oil.
 3. Yahweh has a lawsuit with Judah (Israel),
to call Jacob to account according
to his ways;
according to his deeds he will requite
him.

- II A
4. In the womb he tricked his brother,
in his manhood he strove against God.
 5. He fought with an angel and prevailed.
He wept and made supplication to him.
In Bethel he finds him,
and there he speaks with us.
 6. And Yahweh God of hosts,
Yahweh is his name.

- B 7. And you shall return to your God,
shall preserve loyalty and justice;
and wait continually upon your God.

- III A 8. In the Canaanite's hand are false scales;
he loves injustice.
9. And Ephraim says, "I'm rich!"
"I have found wealth for myself,
all my exertions bring me no wrong in
which would be sin."

- B 10. But I am Yahweh, your God;
from the land of Egypt.
I will again make you dwell in tents
as in the days of meeting.

- IV A 11. I spoke to the prophets,
I multiplied visions;
By the prophets' hand I made similitudes.
12. If Gilead was evil
they have surely become empty.
In Gilgal they sacrifice bulls.

- B Therefore their alters will become
stone heaps on the furrows of the field.

- V A 13. Jacob fled to the field of Aram,
Israel served for a wife,
for a wife he kept (sheep).
14. But by a prophet Yahweh brought up
Israel from Egypt,
by a prophet he was kept.

- B 15. Ephraim has bitterly grieved.
he will leave his bloodguilt upon him;
His Lord will return his reproach to him.¹

1. The translation is my own. At this point it is expedient to avoid the difficulties of deciding upon valid emendations; exact meanings, allusions, etc. See following pp. 54-85.

Diagrammatic Representation of
Rhetorical Structures in Chapter 12

1. סכנני בכחש אפרים ובמרה בית ישראל
ויהודה עד רד עם אל ועם קדושים נאמן
2. אפרים רעה רוח ורדה קדים כל היום
כזב ושד ירבה
וברית עם אשור יכרתו ושמן למצרים יוכל
3. וריב ליהוה עם יהודה
ולפקד על יעקב כדרכיו כמעלליו ישיב לו
4. כבטן יעקב את אחיו ובאונו שרה את אלהים
5. וישר אל מלאך ויכל בכה ויתחנן לו
בית אל ימצאנו ושם ידבר עמנו
6. ויהוה אלהי הצבאות יהוה זכרו
7. ואתה באלהיך תשוב
חסד ומשפט שמר וקרה אל אלהיך תמיד
8. כנען בידו מאזני מרמה לעשק אהב
9. ויאמר אפרים אך עשרתי מצאתי און לי
כל יגיעי לא ימצא לי עון (אשר חטא)
10. ואנכי יהוה אלהיך מארץ מצרים
עד אושיבך באהלים כימי מועד
11. ודברתי על הנביאים ואנכי חזון הרביתי
וביר הנביאים אדמה
12. אם גלעד און אך שוא היו כגלגל שורים זכתי
גם מזבחותם כגלים על תלמי שדי
13. ויכרח יעקב שרה ארם ויעבד ישראל באשה ובאשה שמר
14. ובנביא העלה יהוה את ישראל ממצרים ובנביא נשמר
15. הכעים אפרים תמרורים ודמיו עליו יטוש
וחרפתו ישיב לו אדניו

Holladay's
chiasmus p. 66ff.

inclusion by yashb lo p. 51
inclusion by sound similarity p. 51

prophets and
Yahweh p. 80ff.

Jacob-like
acts p. 76ff.

The body of the unit follows the announcement of a rib in verse 3 and is bracketed by verses 3 and 15. This bracketing is accomplished by the repetition of the words "he will requite him" (יִשְׁכִּיב־לוֹ, v. 3b) in verse 15b. This inclusio is further strengthened by the words תַּמְרוּרִים and הַכַּעֲסִים in verse 15, which echo the מַרְמָה and כָּחַשׁ of verse 1.

In other details the chapter shows careful attention to literary structuring. First, the rib begins (verse 4) and ends (verse 13) with the Jacob cycle, forming an inclusio within the larger unit verses 3b-15.

- 4. In the womb he supplanted his brother and in his maturity he strove with God.
- 13. And Jacob fled to/from the field of Aram Israel served for a woman, and for a woman he kept (livestock).

Within the Jacob inclusio verses 8-9 are linked to verse 12 because both of these discuss the sins of contemporary Israel.

- 8. In the Canaanite's hand are false scales, he loves injustice.
- 9. Ephraim says, "I'm rich!"
"I've found wealth for myself.
All my exertions bring me no wrong in which would be sin."
- 12. If Gilead is evil,
they have surely become empty.
In Gilgal they sacrifice (to) bulls...

Finally, the two speeches of God are fortuitiously placed. The first (verse 1) declares "Ephraim encompasses me with lies...." The second, in verses 10-11, is roughly centered within the rib and is, in fact, "encompassed" by descriptions of Ephraim's wickedness.

There is also a progressive development of the root swb through the set of five units in the chapter. This word occurs four times in the course of the chapter; verses 3b, 7a, 10b, and 15b. In the first instance (3b) it is part of the declaration of a lawsuit against Israel. In this context it is used strictly as a verb of punishment. The second occurrence of swb (7a) is in an exhortation to Israel to repent, with God's help, and to give up its evil ways. The third (10b) is part of a direct statement of God. Since Israel seems unable to return on its own (cf. 5:4) God states that he himself will cause them to return. Presumably this is accomplished by the judgments spoken by the prophets (verses 11, 14; cf. 6:5).

Finally (15b) swb appears not as an attempt to get Israel to turn or be turned at all, but simply as punishment. According to Leviticus 20:9, 11, 12, 13, 16, and 27 from which Hosea borrows the legal formula concerning bloodguilt (15a), the punishment of death is the sole responsibility of the evil-doer, "...their blood is upon them". Hosea alters the formula slightly, adding the bitter note that the Lord himself aids and abets this punishment. This repetition of the root swb brings out the progression of thought in the different contexts within which it occurs. The chapter begins and ends with the same usage of swb. Thus it constitutes a completed cycle of God's attempt to get Israel to mend its ways.

The chapter offers the reader a completed sequence of Hosea's perception of Israel's history in which the most

important aspect is Israel's relationship to God. This paradigm appears in one other place in Hosea, 5:15 - 6:6. The initial punishment (12:3; 5:14, 15a) is administered to turn Israel back towards God (5:15; cf. 2:9). Following this, exhortation is made to Israel to turn again (swb) to God (12:7, 6:1) with the realization that the initial punishment was intended to be corrective (6:1-2). The second punishment comes as a result of Israel's failure to make complete voluntary return (12:8-10; 6:4-5). With the implicit failure of the second punishment, which is administered through the wilderness and the prophets (12:10-11; 6:5) a third punishment is administered (12:15; 6:11; 7:12f). By using swb in both 12:3 and 15 Hosea indicates that the process has come full circle and the attempt to reform Israel is a failure.

The initial reason for examining the structure of the chapter was to determine to what extent it could be called a rib in the form-critical sense of the term. The conclusion was that while it may participate in the rib form in an incomplete prototypic way, the chapter is not primarily a lawsuit. A more accurate characterization of chapter 12 is that it is a paradigm of God's attempt to reform Israel. The Jacob traditions are particularly useful to Hosea because they also demonstrate God's struggle with Israel, and reinforce Hosea's point that God is constantly struggling to get Israel to reform. Jacob, the eponymous ancestor, also proves to have been involved in similar wrong doings as contemporary Israel.

The elements of the Jacob cycle appear to be neither completely positive or negative in Hosea. Hosea neither holds Jacob's intra-uterine acts and theomachia as an example for the Israelites to emulate (Keil, Calvin, Ackroyd), nor does he present them negatively merely for the sake of demonstrating how contemporary Israel is like its disreputable ancestor. For one of the many possible readings of the crucial verses (4-7) Jacob is changed in character because of his struggle against God. If the latter reading is plausible, then Hosea portrays Jacob as having his bad points (pre-Peniel acts) and then his good point, the conversion at Peniel. Hosea then uses the example of Jacob, the eponymous ancestor and archetypical character, to exhort Israel to return to God.

Detailed Exegesis of Chapter 12

The central concern of this study is i.b.e. The Jacob tradition in Hosea has been chosen as an example of i.b.e. which will illustrate some of the methods and concerns which the biblical exegetes demonstrate in their writings. Therefore, it is necessary to examine chapter 12 in detail in order to determine the place and significance of the Jacob traditions in the chapter.

1. Ephraim surrounds me with lies,
the house of Israel with deception.
But Judah still roams with God,
and is faithful to the holy ones.

Chapter 12 begins a new transmission complex and begins

by studying what will be two of the central issues in the chapter: the *מַרְמֶה* and *שָׁחַ* of Israel-Ephraim. There is some question as to who is speaking in verse 1a, Yahweh or Hosea? Wolff suggests that it is the prophet since the two words *מַרְמֶה* and *שָׁחַ* elsewhere in the Bible concern only the neighbour (with the exception of Psalm 17:1). He draws further support from 1b which speaks of God (El) in the third person (1974:207). The problem may be avoided by understanding that the people in effect surround God when they surround his agent, the prophet. The importance of the surrounding is that in doing it the Israelites cut themselves off from any possible contact with God (5:4, 7:2).

It is also not certain whether 1b commends or condemns Judah. Coote solves the difficulty by allowing Judah to mean Israel in parallelism; 1b is, then, one more instance of Israel's apostasy (1971:389, 390; cf. Gertner:1960:282). The verse must in this reading be translated as "Judah again strays with El, and with the Holy Ones he is faithful". 'El and the Holy Ones refer to Canaanite deities. Wolff differs, stating that Hosea never uses 'El to refer to the Canaanite deity and that the usage of *וְי* implies contrast with the actions preceding it (1974:210). In neither case is the understanding of the Jacob tradition in Hosea affected greatly and so this difficult problem is best avoided in this study. The translation above is left reflecting the ambiguity of the original.

2. Ephraim associates with the wind,
and chases after the east wind all day.
(He multiplies deception and vanity)
They make a covenant with Assyria,
and carry¹ oil to Egypt.

Ginsberg correctly notes that the words 'wind' and 'east wind' are "sterling Hebraisms" for futile and foolish actions (1961:340). Verse 2a is chiastically interpreted by 2c; the chasing after the east wind refers to the covenant Hosheah ben Elah made with Assyria in 733 B.C. (5:13, 8:9; II Kings 17:4). The friendship with the wind refers to the more recent disastrous attempt to ally with Egypt after Tiglath-pileser III's death, the oil being sent to ratify the agreement (Wolff:1974:211).²

The phrase in brackets (2b) disrupts the chiasm of verse 2 and has been labelled an interpretive gloss (B.H. Stutt., Wolff). However, it does offer an interesting comparison between Ephraim's actions (multiplying deception and vanity) and Yahweh's actions (verse 11 multiplying visions) beside its obvious comment upon Ephraim's treaty making efforts; Yahweh works to save the people and they only work to destroy themselves.

3. Yahweh has a lawsuit with Israel,³
to visit Jacob according to his ways,

1. B.H. Stutt suggests the removal of the 1 from verse 3 וְיָרֵם and its placement at the end of verse 2.

2. An interesting parallel to these actions is found in Isaiah 30:6.

3. The occurrence of Judah here is widely understood as a Judean redactor's appropriating gloss. However, E. Jacob says

according to his practises he will
repay him.

This verse constitutes the announcement of the lawsuit against Jacob-Israel. That Hosea is not closely following the form of covenant lawsuit found in other prophetic books is evidenced by his shuffling of the usual order. He has placed what would be the initial accusation (verses 1 and 2) before the summons (verse 3) (Huffman:1959:285). Good draws further support for the emendation to Israel in 3a by noting that the allusions which follow in verses 4 and 5 demonstrate the justice of the rib and so it is fitting that the names Israel and Jacob, which are central to the misdeeds of 4 and 5, should be stated defendants in the lawsuit(1966:139). Judah is possible in parallel with Jacob (cf. 10:11), but in the present case Israel seems more likely given the importance of the names for the charges in the case.

It is important to note at this point that Hosea, when referring to Jacob or Israel, is referring both to the patriarch and to contemporary Israel. Hosea proceeds to demonstrate that the latter shares not only a name with its ancestor but also his less desirable characteristics.

"cette correction n'est nullement une infidélité, car Jacob designe toujours l'Israël des 12 tribus"(1965:86). In contradiction to this view Gertner(1960:282-83) equates the verbs of 1b. יָדַע, יָדַע with יָדַע and יָדַע of 4b and 5a and states that the controversy really is with Judah and Jacob. Judah is merely another parallel to Jacob. Cf. Keil(1880:146) who states that Judah's sins require only a trial and reproof while Jacob's require a visitation from God.

The word translated as 'practises' (מעללין) recalls 7:2 where the same word appears although there its decidedly negative sense is more obvious. 7:2 is also very similar to 12:1; in both cases the evil deeds 'surround'.

7:2b עתה סבבום מעלליהם נגד פני ה'

12:1 סבבני נכחש אפרים וכמרמה בית ישראל

In 7:2 the peoples' deeds surround themselves while in 12:1 they surround Hosea/God. In both cases it is the evil deeds that are a barrier between man and God. This similarity and equivalent usage of 'surround' makes it possible to equate the מרמה and נכחש of 12:1 with the מעללין of 12:3. Again this makes it more than clear that contemporary Israel is equally on trial with the ancestor—they share in his practises.¹

Hosea's exegetical plan of attack begins to unfold with this verse. By indicting Jacob and contemporary Israel through the equation of their acts he calls into question the contemporary lifestyle of Israel and also the symbol of Israel's divine election, Jacob.

4. In the womb he supplanted his brother
and in his strength he strove with God.

With this verse Hosea begins his exegesis of the Jacob traditions. In Genesis 25:26 the meaning of Jacob's name is given in a neutral etymology. Jacob's actions in the womb are described neutrally, "his hand took hold of Esau's heel."

1. Cf. 4:9b where the identical phrase to 12:3 occurs except that it is explicitly directed at contemporary Israel.

Hosea on the other hand, plays on the negative meaning of Jacob's name, by saying that the latter supplanted (גָּזַל) his brother. Jacob is portrayed as having begun his career of living up to his name even before he sees the light of day.

The negative portrayal of Jacob is also found in Genesis 27:36, wherein he is also called the supplanter and cheater. Immediately before 27:36 in 27:35 his actions are described as גָּזַל . גָּזַל functions as an equation between Jacob and contemporary Israel in Hosea 12. Just as the strand of tradition which was responsible for Genesis 27:35-36 depicted Jacob as guilty of deceit, so Hosea charges contemporary Israel as guilty of the same sin (12:1). Vriezen suggests that although the pejorative verb גָּזַל was familiar to the Israelites in connection with the name Jacob, the author of the Genesis narrative purposely avoided its use in connection with the birth story (1942:70). The latter statement must be restricted to the author of Genesis material other than Genesis 27:35-36. Probably then Hosea is exposing what would have been a sore spot to many who shared the main Genesis source's sentiments.

Both Wolff and Good think the other half of the allusion in 12:4—i.e. its contemporary significance—may be the enmity shown by Ephraim to Judah. Good specifically suggests the Syro-Ephraimite coalition as the possible referent (1966:140). An alternate possibility is that the contemporary significance is to be found in all of the evil deeds of Israel. In 6:8

Gilead is described as a city of evil doers ($\text{לֵךְ} \text{רָעָה}$) tracked (הִלָּךְ) with blood. The Israelites were all supplanters of each other. (cf. Jeremiah 9:4). It is unnecessary to restrict Hosea to specific allusions in this verse. The sins were multiple and could all be included in the general categories of the evil deeds and ways of verse 3, and the deceit and lying of verse 1.

Ackroyd, who wishes to obtain a laudatory sense from verse 4 has difficulties here (1963:248-49). He cites all possible instances where לָךְ may not be negative and translates it as 'overtook'. In 4b he translates לֵךְ as 'maturity' this being warranted as a more logical parallel to 'the womb' than 'evil'. Textual support for this translation is meager. Ackroyd recognizes that the LXX rendering $\epsilon\nu \kappa\omicron\pi\omicron\iota\varsigma$ envisages לָךְ and is a negative rendering. However, he still attempts to use this to support his position by translating $\kappa\omicron\pi\omicron\iota\varsigma$ as 'toil, weariness'. His justification of this rendering is that it describes Jacob's physical and mental state before his struggle with God.

The main criticism of such a rendering is that it neglects the word play which is carefully built into the verse and the rest of the chapter in favour of a rendering with slim textual support. Also ignored is the fact that Israel-Jacob is the object of the lawsuit in verse 3 and that Jacob is to be requited and visited for his evil ways.

The word לֵךְ in 4b is especially rich in allusive

power in Hosea:

1. As pointed in M.T. it can mean either manly vigor, strength or wealth. In any case the meaning is clearly that Jacob in his self-sufficiency fought with God. Wolff's translation as 'wealth' is probably wrong; given its parallel position to 'in the womb', manhood with connotations of strength and self-sufficiency is more appropriate. However, in 12:9 Ephraim finds wealth (יִלְכ) for himself through his deceitful ($\text{מִדְמָה$) scales and sinful ($\text{אֲשָׁם$) practises. The connection being made is obvious, both Jacob and Ephraim are guilty of self-sufficiency; Ephraim depends on his wealth, forgetting the real source of his wealth (2:8), and Jacob depends on his own means of deceit and 'strength' (יִלְכ) - sin - wickedness (יָיִף) to steal his blessing and retain it.

2. יִלְכ is similar in sound to יָיִף 'iniquity' which is Hosea's choice characterization of Israel's evil doings (4:8, 5:5, 7:1, 8:13, 9:7, 9:9, 12:9, 13:12, and 14:23). Hosea deliberately calls attention to this word play in 12:9 where the two are equated. The meaning of verse 4 is clear, Hosea accuses both Jacob and Ephraim of a false self-sufficiency dependent on deception, and evil practises in dealing with their fellow men. Both are guilty of יָיִף in their יִלְכ .

Hosea's exegetical treatment can be illuminated by comparing it with the Genesis account of the same events.

First, as was mentioned above, Hosea traces the roots of Jacob's character to actions done by Jacob in the womb. Even in the

negative etymology in Genesis 27:35-36 Jacob's supplanting character only appears in his early manhood when he takes away Esau's birthright and blessing. Second, with respect to the Peniel story, Hosea states that Jacob was wrestling with God there. In Genesis Jacob's opponent is said to be a man (32:24-25). Hosea wants to make it clear that Jacob was guilty of hubris and rebellion against God, the same crime with which he charged contemporary Israel (7:13).

In two short lines Hosea has listed Jacob's major crimes, supplanting of fellowmen and rebellion against God; the same crimes he has been charging the nation with.

5a But God ruled, the messenger prevailed.

b He wept and supplicated him.

Verse 5 is generally considered to be the most difficult verse of chapter 12. There are a number of textual difficulties and interpretive possibilities.

1. Many scholars feel that לָחַם must be distinguished from לָחַם of verse 4. Its root is said to be לָחַם 'to rule over' rather than לָחַם 'to strive, wrestle'. Gertner reasons that if they are the same verb then 5a is a "meaningless repetition of one detail" previously given in 4b with the use of an unsuitable preposition.¹ Further, he states, such an omission would also destroy the organic unity of the passage

1. Gertner is not consistent in applying this meaningless repetition requirement. He does not question the double 'for a woman' in verse 13 (1960:276).

for it omits details of the Genesis account such as Jacob's request for a blessing, his question about the name of his assailant, and God's command to go to Bethel(1960:282). By organic unity Gertner apparently means a complete retelling of the tale as it appears in Genesis. But Hosea did not set out to recount Genesis, his purpose was to demonstrate Israel's guilt. Therefore, it is wrong to assume that all of the Genesis account must be found in Hosea.¹ Gertner's suggestion to read 777 as from 777 depends on this questionable requirement.

Ackroyd, while opting for 777 recognizes that 777 is equally possible but requires emendation of 7N to 7N.

777, though, requires 7y rather than 7N (Judges 9:22) and so appears to be no better. Ackroyd says that 7N is commonly interchangeable with 7y but does not provide any evidence to back up his statement(1963:250). However, Ackroyd has made a case for the grammatical validity of 777 as an option. In such a case the exegete must turn to the structural and semantic indications of the unit in question in order to make a decision.

Wolff objects to 777 because it is unlikely that the same verb would appear with 7N in verse 4 and 7N in verse 5. Therefore, Wolff deems it likely that a different

1. See Gertner's article(1960:277) where he states that we must look for seven missing elements of the Peniel story in verses 5 and 6.

verb, לָחַם , is being used in verse 5. However, he later undercuts this reason for reading לָחַם by reading the לָחַם which follows לָחַם as 'El, subject, and dropping the לָחַם as a gloss (1974:212). His reason for reading לָחַם rather than לָחַם is therefore removed.

Wolff, among others, has recognized that there is contradiction in verse 5ab if the same subject is assumed for both parts. First Jacob strives with lords it over a messenger and prevails. Then he weeps and makes supplication to him. This contradiction suggests that the subject in 5ab has changed. If it has changed then the sentence needs a subject. A subject can be provided, as Wolff has suggested, by reading לָחַם as subject rather than following the pointed text which in any case makes no sense. Now verse 5a can be read as either "And God strove..." (לָחַם), or "And God ruled..." (לָחַם).

In deciding which reading to adopt it must be remembered that Hosea is attempting, in his exegesis, to correct certain misimpressions about Jacob. In verse 4a he substitutes a pejorative etymology of Jacob's name for the one given in Genesis 25:26. Now in verse 5a he does the same thing with Jacob's other name, Israel. In Genesis 32:28 the etymology of Israel is "for you have striven with God". In this traditional etymology the Israelites would have obviously taken great pride. Jacob their father was a mighty God-battler. Part of Hosea's task was to demolish any such false pride (7:16). Therefore, in verse 5a he gives a new meaning to the name

Israel, "God rules". God is the ruler not Jacob nor contemporary Israel. The decision to adopt לַיהוָה has thus been made upon the basis of a semantic consideration. God as ruler is more suitable to the context of judgment in verse 3 and exhortation in verses 6 and 7. God is a ruler of men, not an equal or rival who must strive with men in order to persuade them.

Hosea's intention is clear. Instead of seeing themselves as a nation of God-strivers reliant on their own resources (verse 4b, 9) the Israelites are to be ruled by God. Hosea's exegesis, then, is as much as to say "You have misunderstood your name and role, and your actions show it".

2. The second difficulty is the appearance of the לַיהוָה who is not a part of the Genesis account. Scholars following Gertner's lead here excise לַיהוָה as a marginal gloss. According to Gertner the glossator could have read verse 5a with God as the subject of all the verbs. The glossator may not have liked the idea of God crying and supplicating, and so wrote the word "messenger" in the margin. A later copyist then inserted the gloss into the text (1960:280-81).

Ackroyd thinks that Gertner's hypothesis introduces unnecessary complication. The interchange between God and messenger is found in other narratives (1963:250). However, if the "messenger" is a gloss then 'El may be taken as the subject of both verbs. A more interesting reading can be obtained if it is recalled that in the first part of this verse Hosea was exegeting an etymological tradition which appears in Genesis

32:28.

Francis Andersen has established that the etymology in Genesis 32:29 is chiastic and symmetrical,

כי שרית עם אלהים For you struggled with God
(8 syllables)

ועם אנשים וחורכל And with men you did succeed
(8 syllables)

Andersen states that "The key to the recovery of this poetic oracle lies in recognition of postpositive (so-called wāw emphaticum) with the final verb" (1969:200). Such may also be the case with Hosea's verse 5,

וישר אל And God ruled

מלאך ויכר And (the) messenger prevailed.

The chiastic structure, a favorite device of Hosea's, now becomes evident. The significance as far as Jacob is concerned is much the same as the first part of verse 5, Jacob loses the contest. What is interesting is Hosea's change of "men" to "an angel". Hosea not only substitutes the angel, but also makes ~~him~~ the subject of the verb. Perhaps Hosea had a special interest in this substitution since it stands out so clearly as a new element in the etymology of Israel. Instead of Jacob prevailing over men, God's messenger prevails over Jacob.

One's imagination does not have to be too active to see that Hosea is making a suggestion to his contemporaries. Just as the messenger prevailed upon Jacob so Hosea should prevail upon contemporary Israel.

Holladay (1966:53-64) has discovered a chiastic structure

from verses 3-6 which reveals the object of Jacob's weeping and supplication after God sets him straight in verse 5a.

The chiasmus is:

verse 3a a Yahweh

verse 3a b Israel (accepting the emendation in 3a)

verse 3b c Jacob

verse 4a d Jacob and Esau at birth

verse 4b e Jacob with the divine being

verse 5a e Jacob with the divine being

verse 5b d Jacob and Esau at their reunion

verse 5c c God and him (Jacob the patriarch) at Bethel

verse 5d b God and us (Israel the nation) at Bethel

verse 6 a Yahweh

A change takes place in Jacob's life as a result of God's actions in verse 5a. Jacob the trickster is dominated by God and prevailed upon by a messenger. His hybris is conquered. The result is that Jacob is reconciled to his former rival and asks for his forgiveness (verse 5b). On the basis of the chiastic structure Holladay is able to name Esau as the object of Jacob's weeping and supplication (1966:55). The establishment of proper relation between man and God in verse 5a results in proper relation between man and man in verse 5b.¹ The

1. Holladay differs, understanding that, "Verses 4-5, then affirm that Jacob-Israel has always had a "character defect", and that this built-in defect is reflected in his names. He got the better of his brother in the womb, he was guilty of hybris in the highest degree in his battle with the divine stranger, and then, the same old trickster, he came weeping and whining to his brother;" (1966:63).

Genesis accounts support Holladay's suggestion. In Genesis 33:4 the brothers weep upon meeting and in 33:10 (cf. 32:6, 33:8, 15) Jacob does supplicate Esau.

Jacob's actions towards Esau after the struggle at the Jabbok reveal a changed man. This change is exactly what Hosea expects contemporary Israel to make. They are to seek the face of God in their distress (5:15). Just as Jacob was prevailed upon by the messenger so Israel is to be prevailed upon by Hosea.

5c. At Bethel he will find him,
d and there he will speak with us.

There is disagreement amongst scholars as to who is finding whom in verse 5. Those who regard verses 3-6 as a polemic against a Bethel cult see this as Hosea's quotation of the people who foolishly depend on the weakling Bethel.

Thus Good translates, "At Bethel, he (that imposter deity finds him/us, and there he speaks with him/us)." (1966:146). While it is difficult to demonstrate any certain proofs against reading Bethel as a deity, the evidence against it may be cumulative:

1. As Holladay recognized (1966:59), Bethel appears to be parallel to *DW* and so adverbial; 2. Hosea attacks Baal worship throughout the book (eg. 2:10, 15, 18; 9:10) but not Bethel worship; 3. According to Wolff (1974:164) *NYD* is a verb of election in both 9:10 and 12:5. When Wolff's observation is connected with Holladay's discovery of the chiasmus in verses 3-6, Bethel must be taken as a place name. The

correlated passages in Genesis are 35:1, 7. God tells Jacob to go up to Bethel and there blesses him with the patriarchal blessing, that is, it is at Bethel that Jacob finally receives the patriarchal election. According to Hyatt(1939:95), "Bethel in these passages is more likely to be the name of the place rather than the name of the god, although it must be admitted that the evidence is not entirely conclusive...."; 4. Finally, since there is no conclusive indication in the text of a change in the subjects of verse 5 and since verse 5 is about a changed Jacob, it seems unlikely that Hosea would have him consorting with a god Bethel in verse 5c after 'El in verse 5a.

If it is granted that Bethel may be read as a place name in verse 5c, then it seems likely that Hosea is speaking of Jacob's election in verse 5c. God elects Jacob in Bethel and there he will speak with the Israelites. In this reading verse 5 also contains a subtle attempt to reclaim Bethel for Yahweh. God will meet with the Israelites in the center of their apostasy to Baal. By stating that it was at Bethel that Jacob received his post-Peniel election, Hosea is making the claim that Bethel is a place for Yahwism, not Baalism.

Verse 5c is the beginning of Hosea's direct exhortation to Israel. At the same place (both physical and psychological) $\square W$ where God found Jacob he will speak with us. Hosea includes himself in this, at least if the reading לְיִשְׂרָאֵל is accepted. The prophet does not hold himself above the people but joins them as corporate men before God. If לְיִשְׂרָאֵל is translated as

"with us" in verse 5d further reason is provided for not accepting Ginsberg's suggestion that the subject of this verse is the god Bethel. Hosea would hardly have included himself with the devotees of Bethel (of course Ginsberg makes an emendation to לֵאמֹר).

Hosea's first exegesis of the Jacob traditions is completed at the end of verse 5. By comparing the exegesis with the Genesis version of the same events it is possible to fill out Hosea's allusive usage of the traditions, and also to see how he molds and adapts the traditions to suit the needs of his preaching. The old Jacob who in verse 3 stood trial with the Israelites for similar crimes confessed his sins and was rehabilitated by God. As Israel, the God-ruled one, Jacob now stands as an example for contemporary Israel.

6. And Yahweh God of hosts,
Yahweh is his name.

Wolff states that the entire verse is a doxological insertion to be understood in terms of the administration of sacral law. The people hearing these words were to acknowledge Yahweh's holiness and confess their own sinfulness (1974:164). This would be a parallel action to Jacob's crying and supplication. Of לֵאמֹר Childs states that in verse 6 it is virtually synonymous with לֵאמֹר (1962:70-71). In other cases לֵאמֹר is the name which is spoken while לֵאמֹר describes the cultic act of utterance which Wolff describes. At the other end of the scale is Gertner who sees in verse 6 an ingenious midrashic blending

of the experiences of Jacob in Bethel (apparently God Almighty of Genesis 35:11 equals God of hosts of verse 6), Moses in Midian (Exodus 3:15, מִצְרַיִם), and Israel in Egypt (Exodus 12:41, מִצְרַיִם) (1960:279). In addition to whatever cultic usages or midrashic allusions the verse commands, in its present context it also defines and praises the subject of verse 5d. It is Yahweh who dealt with Jacob and who will speak with the Israelites. And while the "God of armies" may be intended to command the people's respect it may also be seen as an appropriate title for the being who fought with Jacob, and who is still striving with his descendants.

7. So you by means of your God return,
keep loyalty and justice,
and stick to your God always.

Hosea continues his exhortation to his contemporaries. Just as Jacob had God's help in returning to God so contemporary Israel is offered that help. Jacob experienced God's help in the form of a battle with God. In the same manner contemporary Israel is given God's help in returning. In 2:8ff God hedges her in and builds a wall against her so that she cannot continue in her evil ways. "And she will say I will go and return to my first man....," (2:9). God takes away his bounteous gifts from her (2:11) so that she may stop misguidedly thinking that it is her lovers who supply them. God visits (בָּרַךְ) upon her the Baalim days (2:15) just as he visits Jacob according to his ways (12:3). Verse 4:9 is especially significant in this regard due to its exact phraseological equivalence to 12:3.

Both Jacob and his descendants have their ways visited upon them and their deeds returned unto them.

The purpose of these actions was to get Israel to seek God, so that in their distress they say, "Come, and let us return (*וְשׁוּבוּ*) to God..." (5:15-6:1). Of course with this return Hosea makes his characteristic demands for *דִּין* and *צֶדֶק* amongst the people (see Wolff 1974:119-21), just as Jacob had to repair his relationship with Esau before receiving the patriarchal blessing.

- 8. In the Canaanite's hand are deceitful scales,
he loves to extort.

Canaanite here is used pejoratively in its application to Israel. For Israel trade was supposed to be a task for Canaanites who had to secure their own livelihood (Wolff:1974:214). Israel's needs on the other hand were met by Yahweh (2:10). Therefore, its task was to attend to Yahweh and not to trade.

Verse 8 is clearly set in contrast to the exhortation of verse 7. Israel-Ephraim has been exhorted to return and to keep justice and love for his fellow man. Instead verse 8 finds him once again in his deceitful ways cheating his fellow men. After verse 7 Hosea expected to find Ephraim prostrated in humble supplication. Instead he is caught red-handed in the marketplace with false scales in his hands. Jacob, bad as he was, managed to change his ways. Contemporary Israel does not even try. Therefore, the lawsuit of verse 3 is now directed solely against contemporary Israel and Jacob is used as evidence

against it.

9. And Ephraim says, "I'm rich!"
 "I've made a fortune for myself.
 All my profits do not bring me guilt
 which is sin."

Wolff notes that the quotation from the defendant here is further proof of his guilt(1974:214). Ephraim is guilty of the evil of self sufficiency (ךך) as Jacob was in verse 4b. The play on ךך and ךך is obvious. The ךך that Ephraim is relying on is really ךך. The relative clause, "which is sin", was likely added to reinforce the equation of ךך and ךך and to make clear to a listener that two different words were being used(Wolff:1974:214).

10. But I am Yahweh your God
 from the land of Egypt.
 Once more I will return you to the tents
 as in days of old.¹

The first half of this verse qualifies the nature of the action done in the second half. Obviously the exodus is being recalled in verse 10a. Since Israel-Ephraim had not returned voluntarily, the God who brought about the exodus would now make Israel return (hiph'il of ךך). The difference between the exodus and the movement of verse 10 is that this is a reversal of the direction of the exodus, which was a movement towards fulfillment of the patriarchal promises. It is important to note here, if the direction of the remainder of

1. Reading ךך ךך with Driver(1938:162).

chapter 12 is to be understood, that Yahweh does not cause Israel to return to himself, but only "to the tents as in days of old". This distinction is necessary because it leaves the actual positive response to God as Israel's responsibility. What Yahweh is saying here is exactly what was said in 2:10-17. Israel cannot respond to Yahweh in its present state of social and moral decay. So Yahweh will strip it of all distractions and return it to a wilderness situation. "And there she will answer as in the days of her youth and as in the day she went up out of Egypt.", (2:17).

Both Wolff(1974:215) and E. Jacob(1965:89) state that the days of meeting (days of old) here simply refer to Israel's first encounter with God and not any festive occasion (cf. 2:13; 6:6; 9:4-6). It was in the wilderness encounter that Israel made a covenant with God. Here in verse 10 such a response is asked for again. The difference from verse 7 is that now it should be even easier for Israel to respond. Jacob responded while keeping his wealth. Contemporary Israel is unable to do so and so must lose its wealth.

11. I spoke by the prophets,
I multiplied visions,
I made similitudes by the prophets.

Between verses 10 and 11 lies the center of the chapter. Prior to this the individual units, II verses 4-7 and III verses 8-10, were structured with Jacob-Israel's misdeeds in the first two or three verses followed by a single verse response to those misdeeds. The first response (verse 7) was made by the

prophet on God's behalf while in the second (verse 10) God himself entered the picture to address Israel.

Now in division IV of the chapter the established pattern is disrupted. The section begins with what should have been Yahweh's response to verse 12. That the response of God appears before Israel's action suggests a change in the course of interactions between Yahweh and Israel. In conjunction with the return to a wilderness situation Yahweh immediately provides interpretations of these destructive events, namely the words, visions, and similitudes of verse 11. This is done so that there can be no mistaking what is taking place and who is causing it. Apparently Israel misunderstood the source of its affliction and turned any way but to God for relief (4:12, 14: 5:13; 7:11-15). In verse 11 Hosea claims that it is through the prophets' visions and similitudes, which come in conjunction with the devastation, that God makes known his will. Also as Wolff (1974:215) states, "By recalling the prophetic proclamation of God's will, verse 11 elucidates Israel's present guilt just as verse 7 did by referring back to the ancient exhortation to Jacob".

It was made very easy for Israel to return according to verse 10. It should have no reason or excuse not to. By immediately following verse 10 with verse 11 the return to Yahweh becomes compelling. No one who experienced the chastening hand of Yahweh in the historical events of those years, and was told the meaning of those events by the prophets,

could do other than return to God. Yahweh had done everything for Israel.

The change in structure may also reflect Hosea's views on the contemporary state of the saving history. After making his offer in verse 10 Yahweh, without waiting to see what the people's response will be, acts again in a further effort to bring Israel back to himself. This appears to be Yahweh's final offer. He has laid down his last cards at once.

12. If Gilead is evil,
they are surely wasted.
(If) in Gilgal they sacrifice bulls,
yea their altars become like stone heaps
on the furrows of the field.

As Coote notes (1971:397), verses 12-14 are examples of the similitudes God gives in verse 11. There may be veiled allusions to Jacob's treaty with Laban (Genesis 31:44-55) in this verse. There is certainly a connection between verse 12 and verse 13, which does deal with events in Jacob's life with Laban, through the connecting words 'עַד and עַדָּה. Also, Hosea mentions Gilead in one other place (6:8). There again the association with Jacob is made, "Gilead is a city of evil doers (פְּעֻלֵי אָרָן), tracked (עֲקָרָה) with blood". Both of these clues point towards the Jacob tradition, specifically Jacob at Gilead.

According to Noth (1972:92-94), there is a historical basis behind the legend of Jacob's and Laban's treaty on Gilead.

The historical fact lies in the role played by a certain height of "Mount Gilead", marked by

a stone heap or an erected stone. It was respected as a boundary by both sides: by the Israelites living west of it--that is, the Ephraimite settlers of this region--and by the Arameans living on the eastern side.... This custom was then sanctioned by the narrative of the treaty in which Jacob represents the Israelites of Gilead, while "the Aramean Laban" and "his brothers" represent the neighbors east of the boundary....

Now, this agreement probably included, at the same time, the provision that any pursuit of an offence came to an end at the border and that the offender would be exempted from punishment once he had successfully passed this line, since there was no mutual extradition. This led, however, to the one-sided view among the Israelite neighbors that the contract once had been made only to protect stolen property which had been taken surreptitiously and successfully from the Arameans and which was safe once a person reached the boundary line of "Mount Gilead". Jacob himself once had rescued a successfully acquired booty in this manner, in that he had succeeded in getting to "Mount Gilead" and there had concluded that very agreement whose terms stood as historically given.... It is easy to understand that this narrative theme of the outwitting, cheating, and perhaps even robbing of the Aramean neighbor, with its happy ending of the safe arrival at the boundary of "Mount Gilead", enjoyed great popularity....

Granted that there is a good deal of conjecture in Noth's statement, it is still possible to see that Hosea may have been addressing just such a popular understanding of Gilead. The Israelites may have even been justifying some of their own evil deeds by such an understanding. If Jacob the patriarch did it, why shouldn't they? But Hosea has already demonstrated that the Jacob traditions have been wrongly interpreted (verses 4 and 5). Jacob's pre-Peniel acts are no longer to be emulated. If the covenant made on "Mount

Gilead" was based on לֵאנִי it has surely now become an empty and useless thing. The long history of evil deeds based upon the actions of Jacob has arrived at an empty covenant among men.

Verse 12 is a continuation of Yahweh's statement that he will return Israel to the wilderness.¹ The covenant between men is persistently evil (6:8-9) and so they are surely devastated. The word play in verse 12 is on the meanings of לֵאנִי and אֵינִי ; The workers of ruin (6:8) will themselves become ruined; the wealth (לֵאנִי) accrued in Gileadic actions becomes empty and useless. In 12b the play revolves around אֵינִי , לֵאנִי , and אֵינִי . The sacrificial altars, which have already been declared useless (6:6, 9:4) will become more than useless, they will become a nuisance to the farmers. The altars of Gilgal become useless heaps, destroyed like Gilead, the empty covenant. Through such actions Yahweh destroys both the agricultural and the foreign religious pursuits of Israel. With these gone Israel is returned to the nomadic life of the tent dweller.

13, 14 Jacob fled to/from the field of Aram.
Israel served for a wife, for a wife he kept (cattle).
But by a prophet Yahweh brought Israel from Egypt,
and by a prophet he was kept.

1. Cf. Job. 30:3, 38:26, 27 where אֵינִי is used of the desert.

Many scholars have argued that these two verse are out of place and so proposed various rearrangements. However, no single reconstruction has gained much support. There is some warrant for leaving the verses where they are (other than the demands of the chapter's existing overall structural symmetry), this being found in the literary connection between verses 12 and 13 by the word וְיָצָא.

Interpretations of these verses vary as much as suggested reconstructions of the chapter. Since the two verses are parallel it is first necessary to determine what is being compared before making any proposals about meaning.

| | <u>subject</u> | <u>verb</u> | <u>object</u> | <u>dative / indirect of / object means</u> |
|-------------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|--|
| <u>1st clause</u> | | | | |
| verse 13 | Jacob | fled | (self defence) | |
| verse 14 | Yahweh | brought up | Israel | by a prophet |
| <u>2nd clause</u> | | | | |
| verse 13 | Israel | served | (Laban) | |
| | | kept | (cattle) | for a woman |
| verse 14 | Israel | was kept | | by a prophet |

According to Ackroyd the clue to the significance of verse 13 can only be found in the context due to the vague and allusive nature of the verse (1963:246). However, since verse 13 is inextricably linked with verse 14, affecting and being affected by it, it is necessary to look beyond verse 14 for such indications. Ackroyd does the opposite of this. He

ignores verses 12 and 15 and instead uses only verse 14 to determine the context for verse 13. The next step then becomes easy. Since verse 14 stresses God's protective activity on behalf of Israel and verse 13 is in parallel to verse 14, verse 13 must also do this. Therefore, both the flight to Aram, and the acquiring of a wife represent the establishment of hope for Jacob's descendants, just as the exodus from Egypt is the beginning of new hope for the nation of Israel.

However, I would suggest that by taking into account the context of verse 13 and 14 together, i.e. 1-12 and 15, this interpretation can be shown to be wrong.

It was noted above that there is likely some allusion to the Jacob-Laban material in verse 12. If this is granted then there is also the possibility of a veiled chiastic pattern from verses 11-14. Verses 11 and 14 refer to God's messengers to Israel, the prophets. Verses 12 and 13 allude to events in the Jacob-Laban story. Verses 11 and 14 refer in positive tones to their subjects who are God's agents. Verse 12 refers negatively to its subjects, the Israelites. What should be expected from verse 13? Even, if this chiasmus is denied there is still the condemnatory context surrounding verses 13 and 14. Sure punishments are promised both in verse 12 and especially in verse 15, which is the result clause of verses 13 and 14. The unit speaks of judgment, not hope.

Returning to the comparison between verses 13 and 14

העלה יהוה כנניא ... וכנניא נשכר

יעבד ישראל באשה ... ובאשה שמר

According to E. Jacob(1965:89),

En insistant sur la femme, Osée ne veut pas dire que l'ancêtre Jacob s'était adonné aux rites de sexualité sacrale après lesquels courent les Israélites de son temps (cf. 4:14); mais il trouve dans l'attrait pour l'"éternel féminin" une constante de la nature d'Israël: la femme et toujours la femme—et ma propre femme aussi, hélas! pense le prophète.

C'est donc aux thèmes primordiaux de l'élection et de l'alliance que nous sommes renvoyés et à l'exode qui en est toujours l'expression la plus adéquate dans l'histoire; à toutes les entreprises des hommes Osée oppose le "Je" de Dieu(1960:86).

Jacob's interpretation solves the controversial problem of a possible reference to the fertility cult in verse 13 by relegating the latter concern to a secondary level in Hosea's preaching in verse 13. The comparison is rather between a life of mundane concerns and duties associated with marriage and the free life of the religious group Israel whose needs are met by Yahweh through the prophet. Although the latter comparison is most visible in the opposition of the woman and the prophet it can also be seen in the verbs of verses 13 and 14. In Jacob's pre-Peniel life his actions cause him to flee from home to a foreign country. There he must serve as a menial laborer and a livestock tender¹ to get a wife. Thus his secular

concerns lead him to an estranged life of drudgery. The religious life on the other hand, leads from a life of slavery in Egypt to a free life in which Yahweh takes care of needs through the prophets.

However, even this noncommittal interpretation leads back to the question of whether or not Hosea is preaching against some sort of cult prostitution or harlotry in verses 13 and 14. In 4:10 Hosea exclaims "Indeed! They have forsaken Yahweh to devote (נָשָׁו) themselves to fornication." Wolff (1974:82) states,

"To devote themselves to fornication" (נָשָׁו נָשָׁו) apparently is not without an ironic undertone. נָשָׁו can especially denote worship of a god (Psalm 31:7; Proverbs 27:18) thus נָשָׁו would appear to have replaced Yahweh in Israel's worship. But it is more likely that נָשָׁו followed by a nonpersonal object belonged originally in Hosea's circle of disciples and as in Deuteronomy (sixteen times) had the content of the נָשָׁו אֱלֹהִים as its object. The priests have replaced this, the true object of their careful observance and cultic practise, with נָשָׁו i.e., with Canaanite sex rites.

In both Jacob's and Wolff's statements there is an opposition between what the people were doing (נָשָׁו) and what Hosea expected of them. Also in both 12:13 and 4:10ff. women are mentioned as the objects of the mens' wrong actions. "For these men go aside with whores, and share sacrificial meals with temple prostitutes.", (4:14). Also in Yahweh's initial

tending of cattle, was one of the hardest and lowest descriptions of servitude (cf. Genesis 30:31; 31:40; I Samuel 27:20)."

directive to Hosea the prophet is ordered to go and take on an וְיִלְכָּד נָשָׁא . The connection in Hosea between women and some sort of sexual misconduct seems at least visible (1:2; 2:7; 4:13-14).

The word נָשָׁא in verse 13 may also point towards an apostasy on the part of Israel since it often refers to idolatry, eg. Deuteronomy 4:19, 28; 28:14; Jeremiah 5:19, 13:10. Thus there are three separate indications in verse 13, that Hosea is preaching against some sort of apostasy by Israel which likely involved sexual misconduct. Although none of the three indications is conclusive in itself, their combined force permits the modern exegete to note the veiled attack on Israel's preference for sexual liaisons rather than the prophetic word.

As an example of i.b.e. ~~verse 13~~ is similar to verses 4-6. Hosea uses the Jacob tradition as an apt comparison for the exodus tradition, and at the same time, as a paradigm within which contemporary Israel's actions may also be understood. Granted that Jacob does not appear as an apostate to a sexual cult in Genesis, neither is it Hosea's purpose to make Jacob into such an apostate. It is contemporary Israel, whose actions are hinted at in key words of verse 13, that Hosea is preaching to. Within the setting of verses 13 and 14 Hosea attempts to demonstrate that Israel's present course of actions lead to enslavement. The Jacob tradition in verse 13 is just a vehicle in which to present a message to Israel.

Contained within verse 14 is a subtle plea for the

Israelites to heed the prophet as the authoritative representative of God. The plea is made by way of an exegetical recombination of two separate traditions. The result is a completely new tradition with subtle, but important, differences from either of the parent traditions. Certainly, Jacob's flight to Aram was not negatively portrayed in the Genesis versions of the tradition. (In the first of the two reasons given for Jacob's flight it is because of Esau's anger over Jacob's treachery that Jacob must flee. But the way that text has been worded, "your brother Esau comforts himself by planning to kill you." (Genesis 27:42), make Esau appear as a villain rather than as being righteously indignant.) With respect to the exodus traditions, Hosea 12:14 may be among the earliest instances exhibiting the view of Moses as a prophet. According to J. Blenkinsopp (1977:41) even the Deuteronomic representation of Moses as prophet may be dependent on Hosea 12:14. By so characterizing Moses, Hosea borrows the Mosaic authority and the fundamental importance of the exodus for all Israel, and assigns them to the new Moses, the prophet. That this was a radical shift in authority hardly needs saying. But for Hosea it was a necessary shift. The priest had shirked his responsibility as a teacher of the law of God (4:4-6) and the political leaders had become corrupt and degenerate (5:10, 7:3-7). The only one left to lead the people out of the ruined society was the prophet.

He will leave his bloodguilt upon him;
His Lord will return to him his reproach.

This is the result clause both of the final plea and of the entire chapter. According to Wolff **ס'כע** is a catchword in the theology of Deuteronomy, Jeremiah, and the Deuteronomist, always pointing to the provocation of Yahweh by pagan worship(1974:217). This is a statement of grief by the prophet, on his own and also Yahweh's behalf. Obviously the attempts of chapter 12 have failed to turn Ephraim from its ways. The judgment is then put in a particularly severe form. The expression "he will leave his blood guilt upon him" is a cultic legal formula (Leviticus 17:4; 20:9) in which the punishment is a direct result of the defendant's crime, the sentence being death(Wolff:1974:217). In addition to this Ephraim's Lord puts his own seal of approval on the decree (verse 15c) and so guarantees its necessity. Ephraim will not turn from its ways, therefore, it must suffer the consequences.

3. CONCLUSION

Hosea's Use of the Jacob Traditions

The first and most important result of the investigation is that Hosea's use of the tradition is dictated by the needs of his preaching. Therefore, he was not necessarily concerned with the "correct" ordering of the events, nor with agreeing to any traditional or widely held opinions of the eponymous ancestor.¹ In fact, it appears from his persistently negative exegesis of the Jacob tradition that he may even have been combatting some such popular exegesis of the Jacob tradition. The power of Hosea's exegesis lay in its ability to call into question some of the most fundamental presuppositions of Israelite thought. They were not to see themselves as the sons of a mighty God-battler, but of one ruled by God. They were not to revel in Jacob's treacheries, for the latter were sinful and left behind by the Jacob who became the patriarch Israel at Peniel. In this sense Hosea was independent of popular tradition.

Once the nature of Hosea's use of the traditional material is recognized the problem of the different order of events from the Genesis account disappears. Those who argue

1. Ackroyd's arguments falter at exactly this point, see pages 246-47 in his article.

otherwise are setting requirements for chapter 12 which it was never intended to fulfil. Such rearrangements as Ginsberg's (1961:341-42) are dependent on two presuppositions: first, that the Genesis account was always normative and all others should be made to agree with it, and second, that there was such a thing in Hosea's time as a normative account. It is one of the lasting contributions of source criticism to have revealed that Genesis, and in this particular case the Jacob cycle, is by no means a singular normative expression. Rather there are many, and sometimes conflicting, layers of normative traditional expressions which arose in different groups, places, and times.

The question of whether there was a normative tradition in Hosea's time, reaches to the centre of many statements and questions about chapter 12. It has been stated above that Hosea may have been combatting a popular appreciative exegesis of Jacob and his various misdeeds. This assumes that there was such a favorable popular Jacob tradition. Similarly, Ackroyd, in defense of a favorable exegesis of Jacob in Hosea, cites the patriarchal stories, "themselves clearly earlier than the prophets", as indications that a positive view was normal.¹

1. Ackroyd's statement (1963:257) is problematic. Certainly the patriarchal stories do contain ancient elements in them, but the redactional exegetical handling of them in the interests of various groups and viewpoints has been done in various periods. For instance the P redaction of the Jacob material would generally be regarded as later than Hosea. Cf. J. Van Seters, Abraham in History and Tradition. New Haven:

Both my own and Ackroyd's statements involve a great many unproved assumptions. Even in the Genesis account Jacob is by no means completely innocent. Fishbane(1976:15-38) and Sarna(1970:181-210) have demonstrated that the Genesis Jacob cycle has been carefully structured with certain concerns in mind. In other words, even the Genesis account is not a simple redactional collage of traditional stories which take the Jacob traditions as delightful pieces of roguish folklore.

It is probably more accurate to say that there are many levels of meaning inherent in the Jacob traditions, wherever they occur. These levels of meaning are a product of the long history of transmission through which the material has passed. As R. Culley notes, "if we speak of biblical material as literary or written, we would have to keep in mind that it is closer in time to a period of traditional oral literature and so may still bear a relationship to or reflect the influence of oral tradition.", (1976:66). That is, it is close to a period of Israelite history wherein the culture was predominantly involved in oral composition and transmission of its traditions. Based on contemporary studies of modern folklorists, Culley suggests that oral transmission of stories is a very flexible process allowing a narrator much room for

Yale University Press, 1975, p. 310, 311, Van Seters sees the J Abraham as an exilic phenomenon with P being post-exilic.

embellishment and recomposition during each performance (1976: 30-31). In such a process of transmission there is no "original" version of a given story from which all other variants derive (1976:117). Rather there is a continual process of variance, with variants continually being replaced by others. In the written text the Genesis account may reflect one such exegesis, and Hosea's, another.

On this basis Ackroyd's position appears to be untenable. He states that because the Jacob stories are told virtually without embellishment in their final form, set within the P material, with no overtones of condemnation, the popular tales were evidently accepted. Allusions found in Malachi 1, Romans 9, and Hebrews 11 also exemplify a positive acceptance of Jacob's actions. Ackroyd concludes that Hosea also must have accepted Jacob (1963:257-58). The problem is that Hosea does not approve of Jacob's actions, and if Culley is right, need not. The recognition of the existence of such types of i.b.e. as are found in Hosea 12 thus may open the door to a new understanding and acceptance of conflicting viewpoints within the Bible.

The Relationship of Hosea 12 to Genesis 25:19-35:22

There are two opposing positions on the question of the relationship between Hosea and Genesis. Holladay believes that Hosea, in the chiasm from verses 3-6, has reproduced the order of events in Genesis, and so thinks that Hosea is using those

1 traditions(1966:64). Verse 13 contradicts this assertion and unfortunately Holladay omits it from his discussion. If Hosea had been purposely giving the events in their Genesis order of occurrence verse 13 would lie in the middle of verse 4. In Harper's commentary this is exactly where verse 13 is repositioned. Therefore, Holladay's conclusion is unacceptable unless, of course, he would be willing to accept Harper's reconstruction of the chapter.

Gertner also opts for the above-mentioned relationship (although by implication only). He states that the chapter contains a full report, in organic sequence, of those legends and sources as found in Genesis(1960:284). Gertner does not explicitly state that Hosea was dependent on the Pentateuch as we know it, but his method for exegeting Hosea depends on that assumption. He labels chapter 12 an old prophetic midrash which applied methods and techniques which were later to become the backbone of rabbinic midrash(1960:284). These techniques, word bridges, word plays, and text blendings which Gertner admits having borrowed from rabbinic midrash, depend for their existence on a written text, and, according to Gertner's exegesis of Hosea's exegesis, upon the pentateuch as we now know it. Obviously this is an unproved and even an undefended assumption. What Gertner has done is to demonstrate not how Hosea midrashically exegetes Genesis, but how Hosea's chapter 12 can be midrashically related to Genesis by one skilled and familiar with the methods of midrashic exegesis.

Good, on the other hand, supposes that Hosea was dependent at least once upon a tradition other than the Genesis traditions. He bases this proposal on the difference in attitudes towards Jacob which Hosea has from the Genesis account. However, there was nothing to prevent Hosea from holding different opinions about Jacob than the Genesis redactor and so changing the stories. Good also finds a tradition element in 12:5a ("he wept") which he believes is from a source other than Genesis(1966:150). Good rejects the possibility that ככה refers to Jacob's actions upon meeting Esau (Genesis 33:4) in favor of a hypothetical tradition which is not extant in the Bible other than this possible appearance in Hosea(1966:144). Holladay's solution(1966:60) to this question seems preferable since it is less dependent on assumption.

De Boer also thinks Hosea depended on a source other than Genesis because the order of events is different and because Hosea denies that Jacob's god is Yahweh(1946-47:162-63). The problem of the different ordering of events is solved by recognizing that chapter 12 was not intended to be an accurate transcription of Jacob's life. As to whether Hosea thought Jacob's god was Bethel see the discussion on verse 5 above.

A third position has been suggested by Vriezen(1942:76). Just as one cannot supply direct evidence of Hosea's knowledge of the patriarchal narratives as we have them in Genesis, neither can it be definitely stated that he depended on an alternate version. Vriezen goes on to state that since Hosea's

evaluation of Jacob has apparently not affected the Genesis account, it is likely that the Jacob tradition had received its definitive form before Hosea(1942:77).

One must certainly agree with Vriezen that it is not possible to demonstrate either Hosea's dependence on or independence from Genesis. However, just as it is not possible to demonstrate Hosea's independence from Genesis so one cannot rule out the possibility that Hosea has influenced the Genesis account. In fact, if Sarna's remarks(1970:183, 206) are accepted the Genesis Jacob is quite similar to Hosea's Jacob. They are both initially morally condemned and later redeemed at Peniel.

However, I do not wish to press for the similarity of the two accounts. If Culley is correct in seeing the transmission process as a series of variants, then dependence determined on the basis of content or even similar words, is mootable and even meaningless. It is exactly through such key words, stock situations, and characters that the story is transmitted. Such similarities only reveal that both variants are based upon the same tradition. It is this very similarity and basis on the same tradition that enables scholars to use Genesis to unravel what Hosea is saying in chapter 12. The key words, phrases, and situations, the elements of continuity upon which each narrator builds his own version, allow a reconstruction of an allusive use of the tradition, by making use of a more detailed and embellished variant such as the

Genesis account. It is a mistake, however, to then say that the allusive use is dependent on the embellished use. The relationship can only be assumed to be one of family, and not direct dependence, until such dependence is explicitly demonstrated.

Attempts to show the direct influence of one variant upon the other can only become convincing when two conditions are fulfilled. First there must be equivalence of phraseology and not just key words. Second, there must be some assurance as to the respective dates of the two variants in order to verify the chronological possibility of the proposed dependence. Without these conditions being fulfilled, debate is meaningless. A negative appraisal of Jacob may submerge in the series of variants and reappear two hundred years later immediately following a positive appraisal. Which has influenced which? Therefore, it is a moot question at this point to ask of Hosea's Jacob is a reworked Genesis Jacob. Both are variants of the archetypal Jacob of tradition.

Inner Biblical Exegesis and Midrash

The acknowledged purpose of Weingreen's collection of articles (1976) is "to provide the materials for the tracing of a direct line of continuity in tradition from the historical period of the Old Testament to early rabbinic times", (ix). There is nothing wrong with the latter goal, but for the biblical scholar an emphasis solely on the continuity between i.b.e. and midrash would be wasteful of the valuable resources

available in i.b.e. The continuity which has been observed between i.b.e. and midrash¹ suggests the possibility of an historical study of the developing exegesis.

However, if a history of the phenomena is to be attempted, then the differences between different periods of exegesis become very important. It is only in the differences in types of exegesis that important events such as the change from oral to written composition, or the change from a non-canonical to a canonical text, may be apprehended.

By using midrash as the, comparatively speaking, fixed point from which the categorizations and developments of i.b.e. may begin, the history of i.b.e. may begin to form. This mapping process will be aided by making use of existing proposals for the dates of biblical materials. On the other hand, if the proposed history of i.b.e. works out acceptably, it may function as a corrective to existing historical reconstructions of the biblical material.² In either case midrash should not be used merely as a convenient system of categories into which i.b.e. may be fitted. Rather midrash can function best if its differences from and likeness to i.b.e. are fully

1. Cf. Childs(1972:58), "Although the early biblical parallels to full-blown rabbinic midrash are often only remotely connected, there is enough similarity between the two to speak of proto-midrashic forms within the Old Testament."

2. Cf. Weingreen's discussion of Deuteronomy as a proto-Mishnaic collection of an early oral Torah(1976:151-52). As Weingreen notes this would raise major literary problems especially with regard to the Documentary hypothesis.

realized so as to make the proposed history of early Bible exegesis possible.

Inner Biblical Exegesis and Biblical Studies

Whenever a new insight or explanation appears in the field of biblical studies scholars seem to think in terms of "either...or..." logic. For example, Sandmel spoke of the need to depart from the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis by way of recognizing the haggadic character of Scripture (1960:122). In the present discussion it has also been suggested that the study of i.b.e. may have some advantages over other critical approaches to the biblical text in its greater freedom from speculation and hypothesis. However, in order to grant it a greater freedom from speculative foundations the study of i.b.e. must be restricted to examples in which there are at least two distinguishable viewpoints given about any single item within the tradition. For example, the presentation of Jacob in Hosea 12 could not easily be recognized as exegetically divergent if there were no other presentations of Jacob in the Bible.¹ Thus far, no supportive hypotheses were needed to

1. J. A. Sanders (1972:xiv) disagrees with this limitation in the study of i.b.e. He says, "Any definition of midrash which limits its scope to the citation and use of an actual biblical passage is deficient." By requiring two distinguishable viewpoints before labelling a passage as i.b.e., I am making what Sanders calls a deficient definition. However, if one agrees with Sanders, and it is not difficult to do so, then the utility of i.b.e. in questions of tradition transmission becomes vague. Everything in the Bible becomes midrash, "exposition of tradition". "When one studies how an ancient tradition functions in relation to the needs of the community, he is studying

say that Hosea's Jacob is an example of i.b.e.

However, when attempting to answer the typical scholarly questions such as whether Hosea is dependent on Genesis (or vice versa), or what kind of tradition transmission such divergence might represent, or, in the case of Hosea 12:13, about what specific contemporary misdeed Hosea was preaching, it appears that not only must students of i.b.e. revert to hypothesis and assumption, but they also must revert to those very critical approaches to which i.b.e. was supposed to be superior. For example, the discussion of Hosea 12 was dependent on literary source analysis of the Pentateuch, speculative datings of biblical material, form criticism, theories of oral composition and tradition transmission. In fact, it seems that whenever an attempt was made to answer the usual critical questions about biblical literature, the answer could only be attempted by operating from within the framework of the traditional biblical-critical paradigm. I.b.e. of itself does not project answers to any of the critical approaches; questions may be put to it and answers drawn from it, but that is all.

midrash.", (Sanders:1972:xiv). It is perfectly fine to say that every tradition in the Bible is an interpreted tradition geared to some need in a community, but such generalizations lead nowhere when it comes to studying the mechanism of tradition transmission. By limiting the study of i.b.e. to cases of distinguishable viewpoints, in which the mechanics of exegesis can be seen, further knowledge of tradition transmission, and the history of tradition transmission may be gained. Then, from this relatively firm basis of knowledge, one may return to the other exegeses in the Bible which do not evidence two or more distinguishable viewpoints.

Granted that i.b.e. is just a textual phenomena and not the basic element of a paradigm from which to view the Bible, one might ask if i.b.e., as a piece of evidence, has any particularly important contribution to make to any of the critical approaches to the Bible or to any other contemporary view of the Bible and biblical tradition. The most obvious (and perhaps least illuminating) answer is that i.b.e. should be taken into consideration in any statement about the nature of tradition transmission. Neither, on the latter question, is the evidence of i.b.e. unequivocal. On the one hand, a single word explanatory gloss may suggest a fixed text which could not be rewritten and so had to be explained or altered by addition. On the other hand, a case such as Hosea 12 suggests a fluid unrestrictive tradition. Either of these two examples might be of great importance to tradition history, but only within the context of an overarching theory of tradition transmission which would explain the different types of i.b.e. as products of different social, historical, or political situations.¹ Such

1. For example the importance of continued study of i.b.e. is confirmed by the necessity of compiling a complete catalogue of all examples of i.b.e. before beginning to theorize on the historical positioning of a particular type of i.b.e. By careful coordination of all the available examples of i.b.e. with existing speculative dates of the texts from which the examples are drawn, patterns of developing exegetical methods and tradition transmission may begin to appear. One expected pattern might be that the majority of free exegeses would lie in the pre-canonical period. Later exegeses would be hypothetically limited to glosses or minor adjustments to the traditions. The obvious danger is that the examples of i.b.e. will be made to conform to pre-conceived schemeworks. Any particular free

a theory would also likely have to include the canonization process, midrash, and Jewish and Christian exegesis, as well as theories of oral tradition within its purview.¹


I.b.e. may also be used to provide a corrective influence on existing theories of tradition transmission. For example, Noth's statement that the pentateuchal materials are simple compilations arrived at by a purely literary procedure of addition (1972:250) can be criticized from the vantage of either Sarna's (1970:181-210) or Fishbane's (1976:15-38) analysis of the Jacob cycle in Genesis. Both Sarna and Fishbane claim that the careful literary structuring of the traditional stories constitutes a moral critique of Jacob, and also changes the meaning of the Jacob traditions. Even in this case, however, it is not just the unique contribution of i.b.e. to provide a corrective to Noth's view, but also it is the result of a careful study of the text.

The great importance of i.b.e. to biblical studies is

exegesis might just as well be the product of a post-canonical free-thinking splinter group who were redefining the traditions to suit their own needs.

1. G. Vermes (1975:88) has also suggested a similar history. "The historian of the legal, social and religious ideas of post-Biblical Judaism, seeking to make decisive progress towards a reconstruction of their complicated evolution, will in his turn find Bible exegesis [i.b.e.] that precious thread of Ariadne which will lead him safely through the literary labyrinth of Targum, Midrash, Mishnah and Talmud. He will also discover there the unifying bond which ties biblical and post-biblical Judaism together. There, too, lies the answer to a great many real problems confronting the New Testament scholar."

especially illustrated by this last example. Noth's statements to the effect that the composition of pentateuchal materials was essentially preliterate (1972:1, 250) were not made upon the basis of any textual support, or at least Noth does not make reference to such support. I.b.e. provides empirical evidence for compositional techniques and tradition transmission in the literary composition of the Bible. Any scholar dealing with the general question of the composition or transmission of the biblical materials cannot afford to neglect the evidence of i.b.e.



List Of Sources

- Ackroyd, Peter R. "Hosea and Jacob", Vetus Testamentum, 13 (1963); 245-259.
- Andersen, Francis I. "Note on Genesis 30:8", Journal of Biblical Literature, 88 (1969), 200.
- Berger, Peter L., and Thomas Luckmann. The Social Construction of Reality. New York: Anchor Books, 1967.
- Berger, Peter L. The Sacred Canopy. New York: Anchor Books, 1969.
- Blenkinsopp, Joseph. Prophecy and Canon. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1977.
- Buss, Martin J. The Prophetic Word of Hosea. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1969.
- Calvin, John. Commentaries on the Twelve Minor Prophets. vol. 1 [Translated by Rev. John Owen], Edinburgh: The Calvin Translation Society, 1856.
- Childs, Brevard S. Memory and Tradition in Israel. SBT 37. London: SCM Press, 1962.
- . "Midrash and The Old Testament", in John Reumann, ed., Understanding The Sacred Text. Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1972.
- . "Psalm Titles and Midrashic Exegesis", Journal of Semitic Studies, 16 (1971), 137-150.
- Coote, R.B. "Hosea 12", Vetus Testamentum, 21 (1971), 389-402.
- Crenshaw, James L. "The Human Dilemma and Literature of Dissent", in Douglas A. Knight, ed., Tradition and Theology in The Old Testament. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977.
- Culley, Robert C. "An Approach to The Problem of Oral Tradition", Vetus Testamentum, 13 (1963), 113-125.
- . Studies in The Structure of Hebrew Narrative. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976.
- deBoer, P.A.H. "Genesis 32:23-33; Some Remarks on Composition and Character of the Story", Nederlandisch Theologisch

Tijdschrift, 1 (1946/47), 149-163.

Driver, G.R. "Glosses in the Hebrew Text of the Old Testament",
Orientalia et Biblica Lovaniensia, 1 (1957), 123-161.

---."Linguistic and Textual Problems: Minor Prophets. I",
Journal of Theological Studies, 39 (1938), 154-166.

Eissfeldt, Otto. The Old Testament: an Introduction. [Translated by Peter R. Ackroyd]., New York: Harper and Row Pub., 1976.

Fishbane, Michael. "Composition and Structure in the Jacob Cycle (Genesis 25:19 - 35:22)", Journal of Jewish Studies, 26 (1976), 15-38.

Gertner, M. "The Massora and the Levites, Appendix: an Attempt at an Interpretation of Hosea 12", Vetus Testamentum, 10 (1960), 241-284.

Ginsberg, H.L. "Hosea's Ephraim, More Fool than Knave", Journal of Biblical Literature, 80 (1961), 339-347.

Ginsburg, C.D. Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible. New York: KTAV Pub. House Inc., 1966.

Good, Edwin M. "Hosea and the Jacob Tradition", Vetus Testamentum, 16 (1966), 137-151.

Hallo, W.W. "New Viewpoints on Cuneiform Literature", Israel Exploration Journal, 12 (1962), 13-26.

Harper, William Rainey. Amos and Hosea. I.C.C. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1905.

Holladay, William L. "Chiasmus, the Key to Hosea 12:3-6", Vetus Testamentum, 16 (1966), 53-64.

Huffman, Herbert B. "The Covenant Lawsuit in the Prophets"
Journal of Biblical Literature, 78 (1959), 285-295.

Hyatt, J. Philip. "The Deity Bethel and the Old Testament",
Journal of the American Oriental Society, 59 (1939), 81-98.

Jacob, Edmond. "La Femme et le Prophète" in Jean Cadier, ed.,
Hommage a Vilhelm Vischer. Montpellier: Causse, Graille, Castelnau Imp. Eds., 1960, 83-87.

- . Osée, Joël, Abdias, Jonas, Amos. C.A.T. XIa. Paris: Delachaux et Niestlé Neuchâtel (Suisse), 1965.
- Jung, Carl Gustav. Psychology and Religion. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1938.
- Keil, Carl Friedrich. The Twelve Minor Prophets. 2 vols.. [Translated by Rev. James Martin]., Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1880.
- Knight, Douglas A. The Traditions of Israel. S.B.L. Dissertation 9, Missoula: Society of Biblical Literature, 1973.
- Limburg, James. "The Root rib and the Prophetic Lawsuit Speeches", Journal of Biblical Literature, 88 (1969), 291-304.
- Long, Burke O. The Problem of Etiological Narrative in the Old Testament. BZAW 108. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1968.
- May, H.G. "The Fertility Cult in Hosea", American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures, 48 (1932), 73-98.
- Noth, Martin. A History of Pentateuchal Traditions. [Translated by Bernhard W. Anderson]., Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1972.
- Polzin, Robert M. " 'The Ancestress of Israel in Danger' in Danger", Semeia 3 (1975), 81-98.
- . Biblical Structuralism, Method and Subjectivity in the Study of Ancient Texts. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977.
- Robertson, David. The Old Testament and the Literary Critic. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977.
- Sanders, James A. Torah and Canon. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972.
- Sandmel, Samuel. "The Haggada Within Scripture", Journal of Biblical Literature, 80 (1961), 105-122; reprinted in Samuel Sandmel ed., Old Testament Issues. New York: Harper and Row Pub., 1968.
- Sarna, Nahum N. "Psalm 89: A Study in Inner Biblical Exegesis" in Alexander Altmann ed., Biblical and Other Studies. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963.

---. Understanding Genesis. New York: Schocken Books, 1970.

Sawyer, J.F.A. "The 'Original Meaning of the Text' and Other Legitimate Subjects for Semantic Description", in C. Brekelmans ed., Questions Disputées d'Ancien Testament: Méthode et Théologie. Louvain: Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 33, 1974.

Speiser, E.A. Genesis. New York: Doubleday and Co. Inc., 1964.

Torczyner, H. "A Psalm by the Sons of Heman", Journal of Biblical Literature, 68 (1949), 247-249.

Tucker, Gene M. "Prophetic Superscriptions and the Growth of a Canon", in George W. Coats, and Burke O. Long eds., Canon and Authority. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977.

Vriezen, Th. C. "La Tradition de Jacob dans Osée 12", Oudtestamentische Studiën, 1 (1942), 64-78.

Ward, James M. Hosca: A Theological Commentary. New York: Harper and Row Pub., 1966.

Weingreen, J. From Bible to Mishna. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1976.

Wellhausen, Julius. Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel. [Translated by Messrs. Black and Menzies]., Gloucester Mass.: Peter Smith, 1973.

Wolff, Hans W. Hosea. [Translated by Gary Stansell]., Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974.