# **Profanation of God's name in Amos 2,7b**

## **Abstract**

In this article, I demonstrate that Amos 2.7b is a late addition influenced by the Holiness Code in Leviticus 18.21. The article goes through three steps to come to this conclusion. The first part of the article offers a thorough analysis of Amos 2.6-16, an oracle against Israel. The analysis concentrates, however, on vv. 6-8 and concludes that vv. 6-8 belong to the ancient prophecy of the Kingdom of Israel; while v. 7b is a later addition to the ancient prophecy.

The second part of the article is dedicated to the expression 'to profane my holy name' in the Holiness Code. The sentence appears 7 times in these chapters (Lev. 18,21; 19,12; 20,3; 21,6.12; 22,2,32). The study treats mostly Leviticus 18. The conclusion is that the original and most ancient part of the law is to be found in Lev. 18,6-18, the laws prohibiting incest. The other stipulation in 18,21 is a later addition, that was influenced by Lev. 20:3, orally or literary. This means that we have in Leviticus 18, a core of laws against incest that in a later stage of editing was concluded by the sentence 'so that my holy name is profaned'.

The third part of the article comes back to Amos 2:6-8. The original kernel is to be found in accusations against social crimes in Amos 2:6-7a, 8. A second addition is v. 7b. This sentence was added, after the composition of the canonization of the Torah by a redactor who draw the sentence from Leviticus 18.
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1. **Introduction**

Amos 2.7bb is part of a longer oracle (Am. 2.6-8) criticizing the exploitation of poor people within the Kingdom of Israel.

כה אמר יהוה על שלשה פשעי ישראל ועל ארבעה לא אשיבנו

על מכרם בכסף צדיק ואביון בעבור נעלים

השאפים עד עפר ארץ בראש דלים ודרך ענוים יטו

ואיש ואביו ילכו אל הנערה למען חלל את שם קדשי

ועל בגדים חבלים יטו אצל כל מזבח ויין ענושים ישתו בית אלהיהם

Verse 7ba describes a crime in which a man and his father 'go to the girl.'[[1]](#footnote-1) This crime ends in 7bb with the judgment: למען חלל את שם קדשי ('and thereby profane my holy name.') Several commentators have drawn a line between the expression in Amos 2.7bb to the Holiness legislation terminology.[[2]](#footnote-2) However, they have not gone into the depth of the expression in H, and the way it resonates in the book of Amos. This is the goal of the present study.

In the following discussion, I will demonstrate that the phrase חלל את שם קדשי together with the accusation ואיש ואביו ילכו אל הנערה is a secondary addition to Amos 2.6-8. I would suggest that the scribe[[3]](#footnote-3) of Amos 2.6-8 interpolated the Holiness legislation terminology and worldview in order to refer to sexual crimes within the social-economical criticism prophecy of Amos. The scribe was familiar with the incest and other sexual transgressions as they are detailed in the Holiness legislation (Lev. 18.6-20). In order to create harmonization between the canonical Tora law and the prophet's accusations, he interpolated sexual transgression together with the consequences of that kind of transgression as it appears in the holiness legislation: profanation of the name of God.

## **Amos 2.7b is a late addition to verses 2.6-8**

The complexity and stratification of the prophecy to Israel in Amos 2.6-16 has been widely debated in scholarship. Most of the commentators identify verses 9-16 as independent from verses 6-8.[[4]](#footnote-4) While verses 6-8 share close structure and terminology with the previous oracles against the nations (Amos 1.3-2.5), verses 9-16 contain other themes, which are missing from the previous oracles.[[5]](#footnote-5) In the following discussion, however, I would concentrate on the unity of verses 6-8, and on the difference character of 7b among them.

‏Verse 6a is a stereotypical repetition formula phrase which is common to all the oracles against the nations: כה אמר יהוה על שלשה פשעי ישראל ועל ארבעה לא אשיבנו ('For three transgressions of Israel, for four, I will not revoke it,' e.g., Amos 1.3,6,9,13; 2.1,4).[[6]](#footnote-6) Verse 6b continues with a description of the transgression by using the particle עַל ('because,' e.g., Amos 1.3,6,9,13; 2.1,4): על מכרם בכסף צדיק ('Because they have sold for silver those whose cause was just'). Verse 6 is, thus, closely related to the preceding oracles against the nations by using the same standard introduction, and by describing the transgression, opening with the particle .על [[7]](#footnote-7)

Verses 7-8 are more complex to define as a continuation of the previous oracle.[[8]](#footnote-8) On the one hand, they continue describing Israel's social corruption, as verse 6 does.[[9]](#footnote-9) On the other hand, they describe these corruptions in rich detail, far beyond the preceding oracles. However, a comparison between the detailed corruptions in Amos 2.7-8 and other social-economical issues that appear throughout the book of Amos makes it possible to assume that these verses are a continuation of the ancient authentic criticism of the kingdom of Israel. Let us start with 2.6, which I have already defined as a continuation of the previous oracles against the nations. Amos 2.6b על מכרם בכסף צדיק ואביון בעבור נעלים alludes to ideas and terminology that are found in Amos 8,6: .לקנות בכסף דלים ואביון בעבור נעלים [[10]](#footnote-10) Amos 2.7aa השאפים על עפר ארץ בראש דלים is a parallel restatement of 6b, and alludes to issues and terminology which appear in Amos 8.4: שמעו זאת השאפים אביון ולשבית ענוי [עניי] ארץ (cf. the term דלים in Amos 4.1; 5.11).[[11]](#footnote-11) Amos 2.7ab ודרך ענוים יטו alludes to Amos 5.12: ואביונים בשער הטו.[[12]](#footnote-12) Up to now, it can be concluded that v. 6 is closely matched, in structure, terminology and content, to the verses presenting the oracles against the nations, and that vv. 6b-7a together contain content that is found throughout the book of Amos and may be another version or summary of the accusation throughout the book. All this could be a feature in favor of the authenticity of vv. 6-7a as a part of the ancient criticism of the book of Amos.

Verse 7b is more problematic to associate to another part of the book of Amos, as it does not address direct issues that are raised throughout the book.[[13]](#footnote-13) The accusation ואיש ואביו ילכו אל הנערה is obscure because it does not specify what kind of transgression was committed.[[14]](#footnote-14) Most of the commentators interpreted that this illicit sexual act is the exploitation and violation of young weak or poor girl by making her a concubine for all the men of Israel (man and his father).[[15]](#footnote-15) In the book of Amos, one does not find any reverberation to sexual act or to women as oppressed.[[16]](#footnote-16) Instead, as Houston notices: 'Women otherwise appears in Amos as subject to judgment in 4.1-3 and 7.17'.[[17]](#footnote-17)

Verse 8 continues vv. 6-7a by criticizing the exploitation of debtors by two accusations, which are part of a general frame of accusations, which are appearing throughout the book of Amos, relating to exploitation and oppression in the 8th century Israeli's society, and therefore, could be part of the ancient criticism of the prophet.[[18]](#footnote-18) These two charges share terminology, which is found throughout the book of Amos, and contain the same social criticism focusing on economic exploitation (e.g., Amos 4.1; 5.11-12; 6.4-5; 8.4-6).[[19]](#footnote-19) Amos 2.8a ועל בגדים חבלים יטו אצל כל מזבח may resonate with Amos 6.4: ‏השכבים על מטות שן וסרחים על ערשותם ואכלים כרים מצאן ועגלים מתוך מרבק. In both cases, the rich people lie down (יטו, שכבים) on a platform that symbolizes their corrupt wealth (בגדים חבלים, מיטת שן) and perform a religiously significant sacrificial ceremony (מזבח, כרים מצאן ועגלים מתוך מרבק). However, verse 2.8a refers to the hypocrisy of the rich people who use the clothes' pledge for a debt of the poor people for worshiping God,[[20]](#footnote-20) while v. 6.4 emphasizes the gluttony of the rich people. Amos 2.8b ויין ענושים ישתו בית אלוהיהם resonates with Amos 6.6: ‏השתים במזרקי יין וראשית שמנים ימשחו. These two verses express the greed of the rich people by using the symbol of wine. However, similarly to the previous example, Amos 2.8b refers to the hypocrisy of the rich people who are using the wine of such as have been fined, for worshiping God, while Amos 6.6 emphasizes the gluttony of the lazy rich people who are drinking wine, but are not grieved for the affliction of Joseph.

Vv. 6-8, therefore, resonant Amos's prophecies, referring to the economical-sociologic exploitation, and therefore belong to the ancient prophecy of the Kingdom of Israel. V. 7b does not belong to the sociological-economical world-view of the book of Amos, and does not appear in the parallel text of Amos 8.4-6 or of Amos 6.4-6. Amos, in his prophecies does not relate to sexual exploitation. Therefore, it seems to me that v. 7b is a secondary layer (to be discussed below).[[21]](#footnote-21) Why was this charge interpolated to the ancient prophecy? Under what kind of circumstances or ideology was it done?

## **חלל את שם קדשי within the Holiness Legislation[[22]](#footnote-22)**

The phrase [[23]](#footnote-23).חלל שם קדשי//אלהיםappears 7 times in the holiness legislation (Lev. 18,21; 19,12; 20,3; 21,6,12; 22,2,32).[[24]](#footnote-24) The broad distribution of the term within H is a strong proof for its essential part in the theological though of the Holiness school. The Holiness School usually deals with the definition of the pure and the impure. The significance of the term חלל is to empty a sacred place from its pureness, or a sacred man from its holiness. In that sense, the term חלל שם קדשי//אלהים fits well within the social-theological definitions that the Holiness School tries to outline.

There are several uses of the phrase חלל שם קדשי/אלהים in H. First, it refers to the holiness that is required by the priests, which are the main personnel responsible for the purity of Israel (Lev. 21,6; 22,2). If they do not adhere with precision and meticulousness to the sacrificial laws, they profane Yahweh's name. Not only the priests are required to be careful with the sacrifices, but all of the Israelites (Lev. 22,32).[[25]](#footnote-25) H extends the concept of holiness, and therefore all Israelites, and not only the priests, may desecrate the name of Yahweh, if they do not obey the law of sacrifices.[[26]](#footnote-26)

The Holiness legislation's phrase, חלל שם קדשי//אלהים does not refer only to sacrificial laws, but also to two other kinds of transgressions which are related to the pureness of the name of Yahweh: Moloch worship (Lev. 18,21; 20,3); a false oath in the name of God (Lev. 19,12). In these two cases, the disobedience of the people detracts the holiness of Yahweh, as Bryan Bibb notes: 'These acts profane Yahweh's name because they publically declare that Yahweh has no authority over that's person's actions. These sins show flagrant malice toward Yahweh and his rule in the community'.[[27]](#footnote-27)

In the following discussion, I will refer to the appearance of the term חלל את שם אלוהים in Lev. 18,21, as, in my view, it has a direct relationship to the editing of Amos 2,7b.

Lev 18 contains two lists of sexual transgressions; each list consists of different layers of itself.[[28]](#footnote-28) The first list in verses 6-18 relates to incest transgression.[[29]](#footnote-29) The title of the list in v. 6 is a general prohibition of all sexual relations between blood relatives which are mentioned in the list:[[30]](#footnote-30)איש איש אל כל שאר בשרו לא תקרבו לגלות ערוה אני יהוה ('None of you shall come near anyone of his own flesh to uncover nakedness: I am the LORD'). The next sexual list in verses 22-23 relates to different kinds of sexual transgressions: homosexuality (22) and carnal relations with beasts (23). These verses differ from the incest laws, direct the commands to men and women together, and not just to the man who is the head of the family or of the tribe. Therefore, it is logical to suggest that these verses are an epilog addition to the first incest list.[[31]](#footnote-31)

The phrase 'and do not profane the name of your God Yahweh', appears at the end of the first incest list, to which I will refer now.

As stated above, the different types of incest crimes are listed in vv. 7-18. The list considers not just blood relationships, but rather those normally living together in the circle of the head of the family.[[32]](#footnote-32) Verses 19, which comes right after the incest list, contains other kind of sexual transgression: 'Do not come near a woman during her period of uncleanness' (19). This prohibition comes right after v. 18 because of the connecting link לגלות ערותה, which appears in the incest prohibition in v. 18, as well as during the completely forbidden sexual relations in 7-18.[[33]](#footnote-33) V. 20 is not connected to the previous prohibitions by terminological association but by content association: 'Do not have carnal relations with your friend's wife.' This ban extends the circle of incest, and includes not only those within the nuclear family but also the one who is connected to the family by friendship relations. These two sexual transgressions are not part of the incestuous transgressions and are located at the end of the list, which probably indicates a secondary addition to the originally incest list. However, as Alexander Rofé notes, these addition might have happened at the orally stage of transmission: 'the theory regarding the associative arrangement serves as a basis or support for the argument that the bulk of the material was transmitted orally before being written down'.[[34]](#footnote-34)

Verse 21, with the prohibition of Moloch worship, has no affinity to incestuous sexual relationships, and seems to be out of context in the chapter.[[35]](#footnote-35) However, the word מזרעך ('your offspring' in 21) in the Moloch worship prohibition is a connecting link to the sexual prohibition key word in v. 20 לזרע.[[36]](#footnote-36) Indeed, v. 21 could be a secondary addition to the incest list, thought this addition could have been happened during the orally transition of the text, using the terminological association for the memorization of the text.[[37]](#footnote-37)

It is possible that the addition of the Moloch worshiping crime to the list is due to the effect of Lev. 20.3 on Lev. 18.21. Leviticus 20 consists of similar prohibitions to those that appear in Leviticus 18, however, the form and the arrangement of the laws are different.[[38]](#footnote-38) While chapter 18 expresses prohibitions in an apodictic form, without regard to the consequences, chapter 20 regards the same prohibitions with their death punishment.[[39]](#footnote-39) Scholars generally agree that these are two independent lists, which contain the same materials but developed separately.[[40]](#footnote-40) The same subject matters have been treated differently in two different lists, each of which 'originally possessed its peculiar life'.[[41]](#footnote-41) I generally accept this argument of two separated lists. However, in my opinion, at some point of the evaluation, formation and composition of the Law of Holiness code/scroll, the lists began to influence one another. Verses 20,2-5, which relate to Moloch worship at length, and which are being set within a suitable context of idolatry (20,6), contains the original prohibition of the Moloch worshiping in the Holiness legislation. This transgression, as being part of the theological worldview of the Holiness school, is defined as a profanation of Yahweh's name (Lev. 20,3). At some point of the composition of H, in order to create harmonization between the two lists, was that the prohibition of Moloch worship in 20,3 to be interpolated into the incest list of 18,6-18/20. That is how the terminology in 18,21b, ולא תחלל את שם אלהיך, that was related, originally, to the Moloch cult prohibition in Lev. 20:3, got affinity to the incest sexual prohibition list as well. The outcome of this process is that the phrase חלל את שם אלהיך, which originally was an outcome of the worshiping of Moloch, could have been understood, after the addition of 21b, to an outcome of sexual crimes.

With this possibility of reading the Holiness legislation phrase in Lev 18,21 חלל שם אלהים//קדשי as an outcome of the incest sexual transgression, I will return now to the phrase in Amos 2,7b. I would argue that the scribe of Amos 2,6-8 was aware of the redacted version of Lev. 18,6-18,21b.

## **Amos 2.7b**

As I have shown above, the phrase חלל את שם קדשי together with the charge ואיש ואביו ילכו את הנערה, is a secondary addition to Amos 2.6-8 that occurred under the influence of the Holiness legislation terminology.[[42]](#footnote-42) One might appeal to the stylistic distinctiveness of v. 7b between vv. 6-8.[[43]](#footnote-43) As there is a tight connection linking between v. 6-7a and v. 8, who deals clearly with the exploitation of the poor people, and relating to the community of Israel as a whole, v. 7b brings sexual crime, relating specifically to men and a girl, and ending with the holiness code phrase. V. 7b might be identified as supplementary because it draws on the Holiness code phraseology in a creative way, and by that, it is creating a new text.

Inside Lev. 18,6-18 incest list, there are several references that might reflect the act of a man and his father that 'go to the girl', for example, Lev. 18,7: 'Do not uncover the nakedness of your father’s wife; it is the nakedness of your father'.[[44]](#footnote-44) Lev. 18,15 could sound similar to the transgression is Amos 2,7ba: 'Do not uncover the nakedness of your daughter-in-law: she is your son’s wife; you shall not uncover her nakedness'. In two those cases, Lev 18,7,15 and in Amos 2,7ba, there is a situation in which a father and his son could have a sexual relationship with the same female.[[45]](#footnote-45) In the holiness Legislation that woman is clearly part of the family, but in Amos 2.7ba, the relationship of the girl to the family is unknown. However, the late scribe of Amos 2.6-8 interpolated a kind of sexual transgression to the Amosian social transgression under the influence of the sexual prohibitions in the Holiness code. He refined it by the Holiness legislation terminology that appears in the same list of Lev. 18, חלל את שם קדשי. The composer had been familiar with the incest bans in Lev. 18,6-19, which ended with the formula in v. 21, ולא תחלל את שם אלהיך. He then created an affinity between the Holiness legislation's terminology of the incest transgression to the transgression in Amos 2.7ba.

The interpolation of the phrase into Amos 2.6-8 is an interesting example for the ongoing literary reworking and supplementation (*Fortscheibung*) of the older oracle collection.[[46]](#footnote-46) I am aware of the lack of documented empirical textual evidence as give exemplary insight into the editorial process.[[47]](#footnote-47) However, in most of the texts in the Hebrew scripture, the documented empirical evidence is missing.[[48]](#footnote-48) Literary or reduction criticism assumes that editorial changes took place at earlier stages.[[49]](#footnote-49) Although there is no empirical evidence of such changes, there are other indications of linguistic, textual and literary data for the reduction process, such as inconsistencies of content and vocabulary, which provides primary evidence for source criticism.[[50]](#footnote-50)

The reason for H's terminology and content interpolation in Amos 2, 6-8 was in order to harmonized between the crimes of Israel as Amos's defined, to the kind of crimes of the Holiness Code. The goal of the interpolation might be the addition of sexual exploitation to the Amosian list of social-economic crimes. The scribe, who added 7b to the text, related to the incest crimes from the Holiness code as those, which could bring disaster to the nation, as is written in the conclusions of the incest-sexual laws in Lev. 18,28:ולא תקיא הארץ אתכם בטמאכם אתה כאשר קאה את הגוי אשר לפניכם ('So let not the land spew you out for defiling it, as it spewed out the nation that came before you'). The continues of the prophecy against Israel in Amos 2.10 relates to the land of the Amorites that God has given to the Israelites, and the threat of losing the land because of Israelites crimes (vv. 13-16). The law in Lev. 18,24-30 relates, as well, to the threat of losing the land because of the crimes of Israel, if they would be the same as the crimes of the Canaanites. The major difference between the prophetic text of Amos to the Holiness code, is the social-economical accusation of Amos, compared to the sexual character crimes of the Holiness code in Lev. 18. As Krats notes: 'The interpretation of the prophetic books already begins within the writings themselves'.[[51]](#footnote-51) The Amosian accusation was dealing mainly in the socio-economical tension in ancient Israel. The scribe rewritten of the text made it to expand the field of crimes to which the prophet referred, and adapt them to the field of sexual crimes, which are written in the Holiness code.

1. **Conclusions**

Using terminology and content from the holiness legislation raises two possible explanations regarding the composition of Amos 2,6-8. One suggestion is that the Amos's 2,6-8 scribe is a member of the holiness legislation school. Another suggestion is that the scribe is not actually part of the holiness legislation school, but rather is a late composer who created interpolation in the ancient text, in order to harmonize the scripted canonical texts together.[[52]](#footnote-52)

Was the scribe of Amos 2.6-8 a part of the Holiness school? If that were the case, we would have expected to find more than one interpolation of the Holiness legislation terminology in the book of Amos. The holiness legislation term חלל את שם קדשי appears in the book of Amos in a socio-economic-moral context, rather than in a priestly context of pureness or impureness, as found in the holiness school. In the book of Amos, the holiness legislation term takes on a broader meaning, a fact that reinforces the assumption that the H terminology interpolation in 2.7b is not typically coming from a member of the holiness legislation school.

Tchavdar S. Hadjiev, in his inspiring research on the composition and redaction of the book of Amos, suggests that Dtr thinking and style inspired the editing of chapter 1-2.[[53]](#footnote-53) However, he emphasizes that the redactor was not a Deuteronomist himself, but he had knowledge of the Deuteronomistic scriptures, and that those scriptures inspired him.[[54]](#footnote-54) As for the H-terminology addition in 7b, Hadjiev was satisfied with a short comment dealing with a priestly influence on the scribe's work. Following his short comment, I argue that the growth of Amos 2,6-8, is evidently a result of scribble activity, and that the interpolation of 2,7b did not belong to the Deuteronomistic school, nor to the holiness legislation school. Rather, it occurred under the consequences of the canonization of the Torah, when the Pentateuchal text became authoritative.[[55]](#footnote-55) The author reflects independent theologically creativity who had his own position and perception towards the older text, and as Bernard Levinson notes: 'The concern of the authors of Deuteronomy was not to explicate older texts but to transform them'.[[56]](#footnote-56) The late scribe who interpolated the priestly verse into the criticism in Amos 2,6-8 was well acquainted with both the prophetic and the priestly scriptures. The old narrative of Amos 2,6-8 was reworked in the light of H's laws and terminology. Using a short phrase from the canonical Tora source, interpolating it into the prophetic text, the scribe produced a line between the sources, showing that the word of Yahweh is uniform throughout Scripture.[[57]](#footnote-57) From the holiness legislation, he aspirated the idea of profanation of Yahweh's name, as the most severe transgression, which threatens Israel's future. Then, he adopted this concept into the social-ethical criticism of Amos. In order to produce a uniform message throughout the canon, and between the priestly literature and the prophetic social message, he did not need more than one intervention in the text, which painted Amos's social-economic critique in a theologically-priestly sense.
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