In this article, I demonstrate that Amos 2.7b is a late addition influenced by the Holiness Code in Leviticus 18.21. **[[1]](#footnote-1)** 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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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 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.

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 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. The accusation ואיש ואביו ילכו אל הנערה is obscure because it does not specify what kind of transgression was committed. 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). In the book of Amos, one does not find any reverberation to sexual act or to women as oppressed. Instead, as Houston notices: 'Women otherwise appears in Amos as subject to judgment in 4.1-3 and 7.17'.

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. These two charges share terminology, which is found throughout the book of Amos, and contain the same social criticism focusing on economic exploitation

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). Why was this charge interpolated to the ancient prophecy? Under what kind of circumstances or ideology was it done?

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.[[2]](#footnote-2) 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.

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. 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. 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.

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.

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,. One might appeal to the stylistic distinctiveness of v. 7b between vv. 6-8. 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',

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.

I am aware of the lack of documented empirical textual evidence as give exemplary insight into the editorial process.[[3]](#footnote-3) However, in most of the texts in the Hebrew scripture, the documented empirical evidence is missing.[[4]](#footnote-4) Literary or reduction criticism assumes that editorial changes took place at earlier stages.[[5]](#footnote-5) 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.[[6]](#footnote-6)

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'. 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.

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'.
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