

The Journal of Hebrew Scriptures

ISSN 1203-1542

<http://www.jhsonline.org> *and*

<http://purl.org/jhs>



Articles in JHS are being indexed in the ATLA Religion Database, [RAMBI](#), and [BiBIL](#). Their abstracts appear in Religious and Theological Abstracts. The journal is archived by *Library and Archives Canada* and is accessible for consultation and research at the Electronic Collection site maintained by [Library and Archives Canada](#) (for a direct link, click [here](#)).

Volume 11 Article 3

**MARTHA E. CAMPOS,
STRUCTURE AND MEANING IN THE
THIRD VISION OF AMOS (7:7–17)**

STRUCTURE AND MEANING IN THE THIRD VISION OF AMOS (7:7–17)

MARTHA E. CAMPOS
AZUSA PACIFIC UNIVERSITY

INTRODUCTION

There is structure and meaning in Amos's third vision (Amos 7:7–17), a text often considered obscure and problematic. It has a skillful and intricate design, and its poetics lead to the answer of its wordplay. The text is “deuteronomistic” because it renders the northern kingdom's demise: the sin of Jeroboam. Besides the books of Kings, it also has parallels with Jeremiah. It criticizes the northern kingship and priesthood and compares them to the southern prophetic role.¹ Such contrasts are elaborated. As Adele Berlin wrote:

The potential success of rhetorical criticism lies in the fact that the devices and symmetries that are present in a poem are not merely decorations—esthetically pleasing ornaments surrounding the meaning—but are pointers or signs which indicate what the meaning is. To understand how a poem is constructed is to begin to understand what it expresses.²

The story is told in two episodes: the vision report (vv. 7–9) and the Amaziah narrative (vv. 10–17). The events of the narrative follow those of the vision, and the narrative tells the fulfillment of the vision. There is an interim in which Amos prophesied the curse of Jeroboam. After reporting it to the king, Amaziah the priest “curses” the prophet. Amos returns those curses magnified. This dynamic is displayed in a chiasmic structure (vv. 11c–17).

In addition to demonstrating the above, the present analysis offers data and solutions for previously discussed problems including: what Amos saw, the vision's interpretation, the *hapax legomena* 'ānāk and bōlēs, Amos's “denial,” the “placement” and anomaly of the Amaziah narrative, the location of v. 9, the abruptness of v. 10,

¹ The vision shows what Marvin Sweeney wrote about the book of Amos: that it “presents a Judean political and religious critique of the north and a statement concerning the future course of the nation, i.e., it must return to Judean rule and religious observance.” M. A. Sweeney, *The Twelve Prophets*, (Berit Olam, vol. 1; Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical, 2000), 251.

² A. Berlin, “The Rhetoric of Psalm 145,” A. Kort and S. Morschauer (eds.), *Biblical and Related Studies Presented to Samuel Inuy* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1985), 17–22 (17–18).

the extra length of v. 17, why Assyria is not mentioned, and that Jeroboam II did not die by the sword.

STRUCTURE IN THE VISION REPORT (vv. 7–9)

OUTLINES OF THE VISION REPORT (vv. 7–9)

The vision proper (v. 7) and the ensuing dialogue between YHWH and Amos (v. 8) have been outlined generally as:

- I. Vision (7)
 - A. Introductory Clauses (7a–b)
 - B. Image: the Lord, a wall, and ^ʾ*ānāk* in his hand (7c–e)
- II. Dialogue (8)
 - A. YHWH's Question: What do you see? (8a–b)
 - B. Amos's Answer: ^ʾ*ānāk* (8c–d)
 - C. YHWH's Interpretation: He is setting ^ʾ*ānāk* in the midst (8e–g)
 - D. Concluding Clause: Never again will I pass over (pardon) him (8h)³

The vision proper is of the Lord standing by a wall.⁴ The wall is of ^ʾ*ānāk*, and there is also ^ʾ*ānāk* in his hand. Asked what he saw, Amos answers: ^ʾ*ānāk*. YHWH then explains that he is setting ^ʾ*ānāk* in the midst of his people, Israel. The next statement, “never again will I pass over him,” is considered by some to be the conclusion of the vision report.⁵ However, I include v. 9 in the dialogue and outline the vision report further as:

³ H. W. Wolff, *Joel and Amos: A Commentary on the Books of the Prophets Joel and Amos* (trans. W. Janzen, S. D. McBride, Jr. and C. A. Muenchow; Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977), 294–5; trans. of *Dodekapropheten*, II: *Joel und Amos* (BKAT 14.2; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969). J. Jeremias, *The Book of Amos: A Commentary* (trans. D. W. Stott; OTL; Louisville, Ky.: Westminster/John Knox, 1998), 130; trans. of *Der Prophet Amos* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995). S. M. Paul, *Amos: A Commentary on the Book of Amos* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 233. Shalom Paul also described the components although not as similarly as Wolff and Jeremias.

⁴ It has also been interpreted by some as YHWH standing “on” or “over” the wall.

⁵ Wolff, *Joel and Amos*, 294–295. There is discussion about the boundaries of the third and fourth visions. I label v. 8h a refrain because of its repetition in the fourth vision (8:2).

II. Dialogue (8–9)

...

- D. Divine Oath Refrain: Never again will I pass over (pardon) him (8h)
- E. Prophecy of the Fulfillment of the Curse of Jeroboam (9)
 1. Desolation of high places (9aA)
 2. Ruin of sanctuaries (9aB)
 3. YHWH will rise against the house of Jeroboam with the sword (9b)

The location of v. 9 has been debated. Because it is the prophecy Amos is to announce, revealed to him during the time of the vision, I locate it within the vision report.

THE PROBLEM OF THE LOCATION OF VERSE 9

The problem of the location of v. 9 is whether it belongs to the vision report, the narrative, or is an insertion between them.⁶ Shalom Paul located v. 9 within the vision report according to context.⁷ He saw in v. 9 the details of the vision's punishment to come. Gene Tucker appears to have located it within the vision report when he proposed that the narrative was placed adjacently because of the common use of "Jeroboam" and the theme of judgment against his house.⁸ Most scholars worked on the premise that the narrative was inserted.⁹ Upon noting that verbal link ("Jeroboam") and others ("sword," "Isaac," "Israel," "house," "sanctuaries"), several scholars came to see v. 9 as part of the narrative and not the vision. Also, the similar structures of the first and second, and third

⁶ H. G. M. Williamson, "The Prophet and the Plumb-Line: A Redaction-Critical Study of Amos vii," A. S. van der Woude (ed.), *In Quest for the Past: Studies on Israelite Religion, Literature and Prophetism* (OTS, 26; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1990), 101–121 (103–104). M. Dijkstra, "I am neither a prophet nor a prophet's pupil: Amos 7:9–17 as the Presentation of a Prophet like Moses," J. C. de Moor (ed.), *The Elusive Prophet: The Prophet as a Historical Person, Literary Character and Anonymous Artist* (OTS, 45; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2001), 105–128. C. Lombaard, "What is Isaac Doing in Amos 7?," E. Otto and J. LeRoux (eds.), *A Critical Study of the Pentateuch: An Encounter between European and African* (ATM, 20; Münster: Lit Verlag, 2005), 152–159.

⁷ Paul, *Amos*, 236.

⁸ G. M. Tucker, "Prophetic Authenticity: A Form-Critical Study of Amos 7:10–17," *Int* 27 (1973), 423–34 (425–426).

⁹ For examples of opinions on the placement of the narrative, see R. Gordis, "The Composition and Structure of Amos," *Poets, Prophets, and Sages: Essays in Biblical Interpretation* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1971), 217–229. See also Williamson, "Prophet and Plumb-Line," 103.

and fourth vision reports make v. 9 and the narrative anomalous.¹⁰ Peter Ackroyd located v. 9 within the narrative for that reason.¹¹ However, in the pattern of the character speeches, v. 9 does not fit in Amaziah’s speech report (vv. 10–11); it is not Amaziah speaking. Also, the style of v. 9 does not fit the narrative’s style.¹² The first two cola are parallel and form a chiasm as displayed in table 1.¹³

Table 1: The Chiastic Structure of v. 9a

A	and will be made desolate	9aA
B1	the high places	
B2	of Isaac	
B1’	and the sanctuaries	9aB
B2’	of Israel	
A’	will be ruined	

Not seeing much parallelism in the vision (vv. 7–8), H. W. Wolff thought the parallelism of v. 9 distanced it from the vision.¹⁴ He suggested that v. 9 was inserted as a transition from the vision to the narrative.¹⁵ Andersen and Freedman described it as a “bridge,” and Jörg Jeremias, a “hinge” connecting the vision and the narrative.¹⁶

The verbal links between v. 9 and the narrative do not necessitate that either of them be later insertions adjacent to the vision proper. There are verbal links between vv. 7–8 and the narrative also, and they lead to further information about the vision and events taking place, filling in the gaps.¹⁷

It has been thought that what Amos was to announce is YHWH’s setting ^ʾ*ānāk* (v. 8). Rather, he announced the prophecy of v. 9. Verse 9 follows naturally in the vision report sequence. YHWH speaks in the first person beginning in v. 8 and then in v.

¹⁰ First vision: 7:1–3. Second: 4–6. Third: 7–8[9][17]. Fourth: 8:1–2[3]. Fifth: 9:1[–6]. Delimiters vary by opinion.

¹¹ P. R. Ackroyd, “A Judgment Narrative Between Kings and Chronicles? An Approach to Amos 7:9–17,” G. W. Coats and B. O. Long (eds.), *Canon and Authority: Essays in Old Testament Religion and Theology* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977), 71–87.

¹² Wolff thought v. 9’s style does not match the vision report’s, but it does not match the narrative’s either, *Joel and Amos*, 295.

¹³ F. I. Andersen and D. N. Freedman, *Amos: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB, 24A; New York: Doubleday, 1989), 755, 760. Paul, *Amos*, 236 n. 87.

¹⁴ Wolff, *Joel and Amos*, 295.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 295, 300–301.

¹⁶ Andersen and Freedman, *Amos*, 754. Jeremias, *Amos*, 142. Jeremias also saw links with Hosea.

¹⁷ Terry Collins suggested that verbal links lead further along in the text to certain conclusions, “Threading as a Stylistic Feature of Amos,” J. C. de Moor (ed.), *The Elusive Prophet: The Prophet as a Historical Person, Literary Character and Anonymous Artist* (OTS, 45; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 94–104 (95).

9b, and not afterward. After telling Amos that he will never again pass over, or pardon, the northern kingdom (v. 8h), YHWH states the merited curses: there will be desolation and ruin of the cult sites, and he will rise against Jeroboam's house (v. 9). Then the narrative (vv. 10–17), or second episode, shows that Amos had indeed, in the interim, prophesied to the effect of v. 9.

THREADS BEGINNING IN THE VISION REPORT

There are links and threads that extend from the vision report (vv. 7–9) into the narrative (vv. 10–17) and form the vision's wordplay, carry themes, and connect events in the story (vv. 7–17). In describing structures of conjunction, Jerome Walsh distinguished that "links" normally connect successive units and "threads" serve more to unify a theme.¹⁸ I will use the term "thread" for the links and threads that extend, or thread, from the vision report into the narrative.

THE VISION'S WORDPLAY

The third vision was not generally thought by scholars to contain a wordplay, although, as Alan Cooper noted, Friedrich Horst did characterize it a *Wortspielvision* in 1900.¹⁹ Similarities between the third and fourth visions were noted more, and following the consensus that the fourth vision is a wordplay vision, some began to search the third vision for a wordplay also.²⁰ The words of the fourth vision's wordplay are the assonant *qāyīṣ* ("summer fruit") and *qēṣ* ("end"). The first word of the third vision's wordplay is commonly agreed to be *ʾānāk*. The problem has been in finding the second word. Because the second word of the fourth vision is held in YHWH's interpretation (8:2), most have searched for the second word of the third vision in its interpretation also (v. 8e–g). The first word, *ʾānāk*, is repeated there, so many considered *ʾānāk* to be the second word also, which remained a perplexity. Some suggested emendations for *ʾānāk* in v. 8, and also in v. 7.²¹ H. G. M. Williamson, however, suggested that the second word might be *ʾānōkī*, which is repeated three times in the narrative (v. 14).²² The two words are assonant and, as shown below (in bold text), the thread-points form a six-point thread:

¹⁸ J. T. Walsh, *Style and Structure in Biblical Hebrew Narrative* (Collegeville: Liturgical, 2001), 176.

¹⁹ A. Cooper, "The Meaning of Amos's Third Vision (Amos 7:7–9)," M. Cogan et al. (eds.), *Tebillah le-Moshe* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1997), 13–21 (17).

²⁰ The fourth vision's wordplay is in 8:1–2. Williamson, "Prophet and Plumb-Line," 118. Cooper, "Meaning," 16–18.

²¹ They are discussed in the section on the meaning of *ʾānāk*.

²² Williamson, "Prophet and Plumb-Line," 117.

- v. 7 . . .
ʾādōnāy niššāb ʿal hōmat ʾānāk
ûbēyādō ʾānāk
- v. 8 . . .
wā ʾōmar ʾānāk
 . . .
- v. 14 . . .
lō-nābī ʾānōkī
wēlō ben-nābī ʾānōkī
kī-bōqēr ʾānōkī
 . . .

Each of the thread-points occurs at the very end of its phrase. A fourth instance of *ʾānāk* occurs in YHWH's interpretation (v. 8g), but is central in the phrase: "Look, I am setting *ʾānāk* in the midst of my people, Israel." This is in YHWH's voice whereas each of the six thread-points is in Amos's voice. Also, the three *ʾānāk* end-of-phrase thread-points are separated from the fourth instance of *ʾānāk* by the second "look" (*hinēni*) that introduces YHWH's interpretation (v. 8f). The probability that the end-of-phrase pattern occurs in two sets of three, each set contained within one or two verses, and that the two words are written the same except for the extra *yōd* in *ʾānōkī* should support that the composer intended this design and wordplay.²³ On the consonantal level, the difference between *qāyīš* and *qēš* is also one *yōd*, which further supports intention and that the *ʾānāk/ʾānōkī* wordplay is as original as the fourth vision's *qāyīš/qēš*.²⁴

Differences between the third and fourth vision reports indicate that the third was originally intended to be longer than the fourth, and that the second word of the wordplay was meant to be farther along, in the narrative. The words of the fourth vision's wordplay occur a total of only three times.²⁵ *ʾĀnāk*, which I hold is only the first word, is used four times, and, unlike in vision four, is repeated in the interpretation.²⁶ The third vision has a second "look" (*hinēni*) (v. 8f) and the fourth does not. The Lord is present in the third vision proper and not in the fourth, and the interpretation of the fourth vision (8:2), that the end has come, is more succinct.

²³ See אָנַךְ and אָנַכִּי.

²⁴ See קָיִשׁ and קֶשׂ.

²⁵ *Qāyīš* is used twice: once in the vision proper and once in Amos's answer to what he saw. The second word, *qēš*, occurs once.

²⁶ *ʾĀnāk* is used twice in the vision proper, once in Amos's answer to what he saw, and once in the interpretation.

EVENT THREADS IN YHWH'S INTERPRETATION

YHWH's interpretation (v. 8) leads to corresponding events in the narrative that show the vision and interpretation fulfilled, that is, YHWH having set *'ānāk* in Israel's midst. There are two threads: "in the midst of" (vv. 8g, 10), and "my people, Israel" (vv. 8g, 15), and a link to the wordplay. "My people, Israel" occurs in both the third and fourth visions' interpretations (v. 8g; 8:2), and we can compare their uses.²⁷ In both visions, YHWH explains an event to happen to "my people, Israel." In the fourth vision, Amos sees a basket of "summer fruit" (*qāyis*) that is explained by "the end" (*haqqēš*) coming upon them. In the third vision, Amos sees YHWH standing by an *'ānāk* wall with *'ānāk* in his hand. YHWH explains that he is setting *'ānāk* in their midst. The *'ānāk* in the interpretation links to the six-pointed thread and wordplay, and we will see that they lead to Amos.²⁸ "My people, Israel" leads from YHWH setting *'ānāk* (v. 8) to YHWH having told Amos to prophesy to "my people, Israel" (v. 15).²⁹ The thread connects the setting of *'ānāk* with Amos's commission to prophesy. The second thread, "in the midst," also leads to Amos's commission. Amos had prophesied "in the midst" of the *bēt* of Israel and his words were unbearable (v. 10). This also explains the abrupt change of style at v. 10 and Amaziah's sudden appearance. Amos had announced the prophecy (v. 9) in the interim, and the second episode begins with Amaziah's reaction to it (v. 10).

THE PROPHECY

The prophecy of v. 9 is the base of four threads. The repetitions of "Jeroboam" (vv. 9, 11) and "by the sword" (vv. 9, 11) form two. The other two threads, composed of *Leitwörter*, begin in v. 9, cross in v. 13, and end in v. 16.³⁰ One is composed of "high places of Isaac" (*bāmôt yišhāq*), "temple of the kingdom" (*bēt mamlākā*), and "house of Isaac" (*bēt yišhāq*). The other is composed of "sanctuaries of Israel" (*miqdēšē yiśrā' ēl*), "sanctuary of the king" (*miqdaš-melek*), and ". . . Israel" (*yiśrā' ēl*). Table 2 shows the *Leitwörter* and their immediate pairing.

²⁷ The term "my people, Israel" used by YHWH occurs in Amos 7:8, 15; 8:2; 9:14; and in various locations in Samuel, Kings, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Chronicles. The Gospel of Matthew has it in a citation from Micah 5:2.

²⁸ Williamson suggested that *'ānāk* ultimately signifies Amos himself, "Prophet and Plumb-Line," 118.

²⁹ Cooper suggested this link noting its implicitness in the interpretation (v. 8g), "Meaning," 16.

³⁰ Robert Alter explained the *Leitwört* concept of exploring semantic ranges by repeating a word in different forms, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (New York: Basic Books, 1981), 94–95.

Table 2: *Leitwörter* in vv. 9, 13, and 16

v. 9	Cursed are:	<i>bāmôt</i>	<i>yīshāq</i>
		<i>miqděšē</i>	<i>yīsrā'ēl</i>
v. 13	Bethel is:	<i>miqdaš</i>	<i>-melek</i>
		<i>ubêt</i>	<i>mamlākā</i>
v. 16	Priest prohibited prophesying against:	...	<i>yīsrā'ēl</i>
		<i>bêt</i>	<i>yīshāq</i>

Words are repeated (*yīshāq*, *miqdaš*, *yīsrā'ēl*, *bêt*), orders switched, and there is an ellipsis. There is also further pairing. *Bāmôt* (v. 9) is paired with *bêt* (v. 16) as each are first paired with “Isaac.” These are the only occurrences of “Isaac” in the book of Amos. “Isaac” is paired with “Israel” both times, so their immediate pairing with *bāmôt* and *bêt* can also be assumed to be intentional. “Isaac” and “Israel” show assonance as both begin with “yīś,” and *bāmôt* and *bêt* are assonant.³¹

Paired vertically, the repetitions form a pattern on the macrostructural level, as shown in table 3.

Table 3: *Leitwört* Thread-points in vv. 9, 13, and 16 in Vertical Pairs

v. 9	<i>bāmôt</i>		<i>yīshāq</i>
		<i>miqděšē</i>	<i>yīsrā'ēl</i>
v. 13		<i>miqdaš</i>	<i>melek</i>
	<i>ubêt</i>		<i>mamlākā</i>
v. 16			<i>yīsrā'ēl</i>
	<i>bêt</i>		<i>yīshāq</i>

The center of the formation of the *Leitwörter* is on the king and kingdom, possibly emphasizing them. We can assume a primary reference to the northern kingdom because Bethel is the sanctuary and temple of the king and kingdom (v. 13). I include *bāmôt* as a *Leitwört* in the *bêt* column, also because both words are paired conceptually in Kings in reference to Bethel and Jeroboam.³²

³¹ “Isaac” is spelled here in vv. 9 and 16 with **ש** and not the usual **צ**.

³² 1 Kgs 12:31; 13:32. In 2 Kgs 23:19, Josiah destroyed the houses of the high places that remained in Samaria.

STRUCTURE IN THE NARRATIVE (vv. 10–17)

OUTLINES OF THE NARRATIVE (vv. 10–17)

Scholars have outlined the narrative (vv. 10–17) according to its characters' speech reports. James Mays demarcated three primary speech units: the priest's report to the king (vv. 10–11), the priest's command to the prophet (vv. 12–13), and the prophet's reply to the priest (vv. 14–17).³³ Tucker noted the same primary divisions and also distinguished two events: Amaziah's report to Jeroboam (vv. 10–11), and his confrontation with Amos (vv. 12–17).³⁴ Some noting poetic features also outlined the narrative according to its speeches. Harper and Jeremias each demarcated two units (vv. 10–13; 14–17) by distinguishing Amaziah's speech from Amos's.³⁵ Bovati and Meynet also distinguished the two characters' speech, but in four units and ordered chiastically (vv. 10–11 // 16–17, 12–13 // 14–15).³⁶ The speeches are complex as the priest and prophet quote themselves and others.³⁷ First Amaziah quotes Amos to Jeroboam, and then confronts Amos. Amos answers Amaziah, and then quotes YHWH, who had told him to prophesy. Amos repeats to Amaziah his prohibition of prophesying, as part of YHWH's word. Finally, Amos announces curses to Amaziah, quoting YHWH.

CURSE UNITS (vv. 10–11; 12–17)

The theme of punishment is not sufficiently represented in an outline of the characters' speeches. Curse units can also be delineated: the king's (vv. 10–11) and the priest's (vv. 12–17). The death of the respective character is mentioned at the end of each curse unit (vv. 11b, 17e), with a phrase about exile following it (vv. 11c, 17f).³⁸ The phrases about exile are identical (“wēyisrā’ēl gālō yigle(h)

³³ J. L. Mays, *Amos: A Commentary* (OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969), 134.

³⁴ Tucker noted that vv. 10–11 and 12–17 report two events and cited “Wolff, *Dodekapheten*, p. 354, and Grosch, *Der Prophet Amos*, p. 19,” Tucker, “Authenticity,” 427 n 5. Only Tucker’s major divisions are listed here, *ibid.*, 426–27.

³⁵ W. R. Harper. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Amos and Hosea* (ICC, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1905), 168. Harper also distinguished similar triple divisions in both parts: six, three, and six lines each. Jeremias, *Amos*, 137. Jeremias noted that the two parts are almost equal in length.

³⁶ P. Bovati and R. Meynet, *Le livre du prophète Amos* (Paris: Cerf, 1994), 297.

³⁷ Jeremias explained the complexity of the discourses, *Amos*, 137. See also Andersen and Freedman, *Amos*, 782.

³⁸ Williamson saw these points as framing Amos and Amaziah’s discussion. “Prophet and Plumb-Line” 116–117.

mē^c al ’admātō,” “And Israel will surely go into exile away from his land”) and serve as structural markers.

Threads from v. 9 extend into each curse unit. *Yārob^c ām* (“Jerroboam”) and *bḥrb* (“by the sword”) (v. 9b) crisscross into the king’s curse unit (v. 11). Into the priest’s curse unit (vv. 13 and 16), crisscross v. 9a’s *bāmôt*, *miqdēšē*, *yīšḥāq*, and *yīsrā’ēl*. *Bāmôt* transforms into *bēt* (vv. 9; 13), capturing themes from Kings. The people sacrificed at the high places (*bāmôt*) until the Jerusalem temple (*bēt*) was built (1 Kgs 3:2). To continue to do so after the temple was built was sin (2 Kgs 15:35). Also, Jeroboam I appointed a temple at Bethel for the high places (1 Kgs 12:31; 13:33–34). *Bēt* and *miqdaš*, in our v. 13, describe Bethel. Although the priest is cursed in his unit, the theme of Jeroboam’s sin is carried throughout. Jeroboam I appointed priests of the high places (1 Kgs 12:31–32), and the succeeding northern kings continued in his sins.

THE PRIEST’S CURSE UNIT’S CHIASTIC STRUCTURE (VV 11c–17)

Amaziah is cursed after having opposed Amos in the priest’s curse unit (vv. 11c–17). The unit is structured chiastically and has a plot reversal as displayed in table 4.

Table 4: The Chiastic Structure and Plot Reversal of 7:11c–17

A	<i>Inclusio</i> : Exile	11c
B	Priest curses prophet	12
1	<i>seer</i>	
2	<i>flee to Judah</i>	
3	<i>eat bread there</i>	
4	<i>prophecy there</i>	
C	Priest prohibits prophet	13
D	Amos not a prophet	14
D'	Amos to prophesy	15
1	<i>not a prophet</i>	(14)
2	<i>not a son of a prophet</i>	
3	<i>a herdsman</i>	
4	<i>a fig-plucker</i>	
4	<i>taken (plucked)</i>	(15)
3	<i>away from the flock</i>	
2	<i>spoken to by YHWH</i>	
1	<i>go, prophesy</i>	
C'	Priest prohibits prophet	16
B'	Prophet curses priest	17a–c
1	<i>wife will prostitute</i>	
2	<i>children will fall by sword (not flee)</i>	
3	<i>(bread-making) land apportioned</i>	
4	<i>priest will die on unclean land</i>	
A'	<i>Inclusio</i> : Exile	17f

The priest “curses” the prophet by accusing him of seeking gain and prohibits him from prophesying at Bethel. The prophet recites the prohibition and curses the priest in return. The curses correspond in parallel phrases. Within the plot reversal, Amos explains his commission, also in chiasmic order (vv. 14–15).

A/A': AN INCLUSIO ABOUT EXILE

The phrase about exile (*wēyisrā' ēl gālō yigle(h) mē' al 'admātō*) (11c; 17f) functions structurally in three ways. First, it concludes the characters' immediate speech: what Amaziah said that Amos said against Jeroboam (v. 11), and Amos's recitation of what YHWH said against Amaziah (v. 17). It also concludes the king's and priest's curse units (vv. 10–11; 12–17). Thirdly, it frames the extended chiasm in the priest's curse unit (vv. 11c–17).³⁹ The repetition is identical, which qualifies it as an *inclusio* according to Karl Möller's criteria.⁴⁰ Regarding framing inclusions, Walsh noted that they are “relatively separate from the subunits they enclose.”⁴¹ The phrase about exile, *wēyisrā' ēl gālō yigle(h) mē' al 'admātō*, refers generally to the kingdom, and specifically to Jeroboam and Amaziah as officials of that kingdom. Verses 11c and 17f form the A/A' correspondence.

B/B': THE PRIEST “CURSES” THE PROPHET AND THE PROPHET CURSES THE PRIEST

In B/B', the priest “curses” the prophet and the prophet curses the priest. Each phrase used by Amaziah to repudiate Amos's legitimacy (v. 12) corresponds to a parallel and intensified curse that he receives in return (v. 17). The correspondences are assonant as well as conceptual. Andersen and Freedman raised the issue of the extra length and “lack of parallelism” of v. 17.⁴² Recognizing the chiasmic structure we see that v. 17 is parallel to v. 12. From there we can see the phrasal correspondences. The extra length of v. 17 is due to its intensification of v. 12 where the priest first confronts the prophet.

In B1, Amaziah calls Amos a *hōze(h)* (“seer”). In return, Amos says that Amaziah's wife will *tizne(h)*, that is, be a prostitute (B'1). The concept is synonymous because both are said to be selling themselves. Amaziah accuses Amos of prophesying for gain, which is also in the wider context. In the following B phrases, Amaziah tells Amos to go back to Judah to earn a living by prophesying there. In v. 14, Amos's argument is that he does not need to

³⁹ Extending beyond two verses, the chiasm can be described as “extended.”

⁴⁰ K. Möller, *A Prophet in Debate* (JSOTSup, 372; London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003), 64–67.

⁴¹ Walsh, *Style and Structure*, 64.

⁴² Andersen and Freedman, *Amos*, 777.

prophesy in order to earn a living. By calling Amos a seer, Amaziah attacks his legitimacy. The insinuation is that he is a professional prophet, going to the north to sell his prophetic services. The corresponding curse is that Amaziah's wife will have to sell herself through prostitution, and he will not be able to provide for her. The two words are assonant, each having two syllables, a **ṭ**, and ending in הָ.⁴³

The next phrase, *lēk bērah-lēkā* (“go, flee for yourself”), contrasts the next curse, *ūbānēkā ūbēnōtēkā baḥereb yippōlū* (“your sons and your daughters by the sword will fall”). The prophet can flee for his life, but the priest's children cannot flee for theirs. Rather than escaping the captor's sword, they will fall under it.⁴⁴ “Flee” (ברח) and “sword” (חרב) contain the same letters, in opposite order. כ is repeated twice in each phrase: *ēk* and *ēkā*, *ēkā* and *ēkā*. The second *ēkā* is in “and your daughters,” which serves to intensify the curse both assonantly and conceptually. כ occurs once in the B2 phrase and three times in the B'2 phrase.

Amos is shooed to “the land of Judah,” which is shown in contrast to Amaziah's personal land and the “unclean” land upon which the priest will die. In B3, Amaziah tells Amos to return to Judah to “eat bread there” (*we'ēkol šām lehem*). The corresponding curse regards Amaziah's own land (*'admātēkā*) that “by line will be apportioned” (*baḥebel tēḥullāq*) (B'3).⁴⁵ Amaziah's own greed influences him to suspect Amos of prophesying for gain. He is the one gaining wealth because his land produces much bread; it is large enough to be apportioned! The assonance is perhaps not enough evidence on which to claim intention if this were the only instance. However, the other parallels support the reading. Besides the common ל in אכל and חלק, are the כ and ח, and a ק.

According to Amaziah, Amos should instead prophesy in Judah (*wēšām tinnābē'*) (B4). By contrast, Amaziah cannot serve as priest on an unclean land and will die there (*'al-'ādāmā tēmē'ā tāmūt*) (B'4).⁴⁶ The “t” sound is repeated, occurring once in *tinnābē'* and three times in *tēmē'ā tāmūt*. The curse is intensified in the latter, and the sound may be also.

C/C': THE PRIEST PROHIBITS THE PROPHET

C is echoed and multiplied into two in C'. Amos is prohibited from prophesying by Amaziah (v. 13), and then quotes the prohibition with an additional phrase (v. 16). “No longer (are) you to prophe-

⁴³ Although we cannot be certain about the vowels or sounds, this match is likely.

⁴⁴ Not being able to escape is a theme carried through the book, perhaps culminating at 9:1.

⁴⁵ “Line,” “lot,” “portion,” etc. are possible here for חבל.

⁴⁶ As Sweeney pointed out, the unclean land would lack the presence of an Israelite sanctuary, “Twelve Prophets,” 261.

sy” ($l\ddot{o}^2-t\ddot{o}s\ddot{i}p$ ‘ $\acute{o}d$ $l\acute{e}hinn\ddot{a}b\ \acute{e}^2$) becomes “do not prophesy” ($l\ddot{o}^2$ $tinn\ddot{a}b\acute{e}^2$) and “do not preach” ($l\ddot{o}^2$ $tatt\ddot{i}p$). $L\ddot{o}^2$ $tatt\ddot{i}p$ is assonant with $l\ddot{o}^2-t\ddot{o}s\ddot{i}p$, as is $l\ddot{o}^2$ $tinn\ddot{a}b\acute{e}^2$ with $l\acute{e}hinn\ddot{a}b\acute{e}^2$. The prohibition is the reason for the priest’s curse, the accusation in the announcement of punishment against Amaziah (v. 16).⁴⁷

The *Leitwörter* threads stemming from v. 9 cross and end in vv. 13 and 16, which further distinguishes the C/C’ chiastic correspondence. *Miqdaš* and *bēt* (v. 13) are in reverse order from *bāmōt* and *miqdēšē* (v. 9). *Yisrā’ēl* and *yīšhāq* (v. 16) are in reverse order also, from *yīšhāq* and *yisrā’ēl* (v. 9). The two multiplied phrases provide room for the *yīšhāq/yisrā’ēl* pair.

D/D’: AMOS IS NOT A PROFESSIONAL PROPHET BUT AN APPOINTED ONE

The chiasm’s center and the plot’s pivot point are in the D/D’ correspondence.⁴⁸ D/D’ has, in effect, its own chiasm and subplot that continue the wider chiastic order. It is Amos’s rebuttal of Amaziah’s accusation of seeking personal gain. The sub elements describe Amos’s prophetic commission and legitimacy. In D, Amos explains that he is not a professional prophet because he earns his living from two trades (v. 14). In D’, he explains that YHWH took him from his work and sent him to prophesy (v. 15). The plot pivots on this.⁴⁹ The two trades are described by *hapax legomena*: *bōqēr* and *bōlēs*. That *bōqēr* signifies “herdsman” is not much contested, but *bōlēs* is more discussed. Context for a possible definition of *bōlēs* is provided by the chiasm.

Amos’s rebuttal begins, “Not a prophet (am) I” ($l\ddot{o}^2-n\ddot{a}b\acute{i}^2$ ‘ $\acute{a}n\ddot{o}k\acute{i}$). The problem of Amos’s denial begins here as he appears to be saying that he is not a prophet.⁵⁰ Parallels and contrasts made by the chiasm provide data for the problem. They allow me to take the position that the implied tense is present and Amos *is* not a professional prophet. First I will describe the chiastic correspondence. “Not a prophet (am) I” (D1) corresponds with YHWH’s commission at the end of v. 15: “Go, prophesy to my people, Israel” ($l\acute{e}k$ $hinn\ddot{a}b\acute{e}^2$ $el-$ ‘ $amm\acute{i}$ $yisr\ddot{a}^2\ \acute{e}l$) (D’1). Paul, and Bovati and Meynet noted that “not a prophet” and “go, prophesy” are parallel.⁵¹ $L\ddot{o}^2$ may contrast $l\acute{e}k$. This is the apparent contradiction:

⁴⁷ C. Westermann, *Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech* (Cambridge: Westminster/John Knox, 1991), 130–131.

⁴⁸ Walsh described a double-centered structure (e.g., ABCC’B’A’) as “chiastic,” distinguishing it from a single-centered “concentric” structure (e.g., ABCB’A’), *Style and Structure*, 13.

⁴⁹ Tucker saw the importance of this point in the narrative and wrote: “The center of the story and its key are found in v. 15, Amos’s affirmation of his vocation and commission,” “Authenticity,” 428.

⁵⁰ Gary Smith provided a summary of the possibilities. G. V. Smith, *Amos: A Commentary* (LBI, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1989), 239. Andersen and Freedman listed some early references, *Amos*, 777.

⁵¹ Paul, *Amos*, 249 n 98. Bovati and Meynet, *Le livre*, 302. I translated

Amos is “not” (*lō*) a prophet, and YHWH told him to “go” (*lēk*) prophesy. By “prophet,” Amos means a professional one, for hire or by trade. *Lō*³-*nābī*³ and *lēk hinnābē*³ also show assonance. The remaining words, ²*ānōkī* and ¹*ammī yisrā*¹*’ēl*, have their own structural purpose as thread-points leading from the vision to these central phrases about Amos’s appointment and legitimacy.

The problem of the “denial” would be less difficult if Amos were stating that he *was* not a prophet, and *then* YHWH sent him.⁵² The problem with this is that the same tense would then likely be implied for the next phrase.⁵³ *Wēlō*³ *ben-nābī*³ ²*ānōkī* (D2) would be, “and I (*was*) not a son of a prophet.” Amos does not appear to have become a son of a prophet. The point of the D2/D’2 contrast is that having been sent directly by YHWH, Amos is not a son of a prophet. In the chiasmic order, the next phrase is “and YHWH said to me” (*wayyō*²*mer*² ¹*ēlay YHWH*) (D’2). It contrasts “son of a prophet,” which alludes to the northern prophetic guild described in Kings. Trained by their mentors, the “sons” were also sent on tasks by them. The northern guild is also at times expected to receive some type of recompense for prophesying. Amos, not part of such a guild, nor having inherited his prophetic role, was sent directly by YHWH.

The parallelism in D (v. 14) evidences that Amos is saying that he is not a professional prophet. Four D elements show that he is not a prophet *by trade*. Two pairs are formed conceptually and assonantly: *lō*³-*nābī*³ and *lō*³ *ben-nābī*³, and *bōqēr* and *bōlēs*. The statements “I am not a prophet (by trade) and I am not a son of a prophet (by trade)” (D1–2) fit the inner and outer contexts of earning a living or gain. They are what Amos is not. The next pair describes what Amos *is*: a herdsman (by trade) (*bōqēr*) and a fig-plucker (by trade) (*bōlēs*) (D3–4). Amos is not a professional prophet or a son of a prophet for he is a herdsman and fig-picker (D1–4).

The next chiasmic correspondence (D3/D’3) is between “for a herdsman (am) I” (*ki-bōqēr*³ ²*ānōkī*) and “flock” (*šō*³*n*). There is no assonance, but “herdsman” and “flock” are conceptually parallel.⁵⁴ In the plot reversal, Amos the herdsman was taken away from his flock.

The D4/D’4 correspondence is *bōlēs* and *wayyiqqāhēni* (“and he took me”). It is the center of the chiasm and where the plot reversal pivots. Like plucking a fig, YHWH “takes” Amos

from their French “non prophète” and “va, prophétise.”

⁵² See Smith, *Amos*, 239. See also Andersen and Freedman, *Amos*, 778.

⁵³ See Ackroyd and his citations of other arguments, “Judgment Narrative,” 85 ns 43–46.

⁵⁴ Paul, and Bovati and Meynet noted the parallel. Paul, *Amos*, 249 n 98. Bovati and Meynet, *Le livre*, 302. I translated from the French “bouvier,” and “bétail.”

away from his flock. A definition for *bōlēś* “fig-plucker” or “fig-picker” is supported by the context developed by the chiasm. We know that *bōlēś* is one of Amos’s trades and has to do with figs.⁵⁵ In modern English Bibles it is usually translated “dresser” or “grower.”⁵⁶ Wolff translated it, “who slits mulberry figs,” and defined בלס as “one who slits, tends,” and “to slit.”⁵⁷ Douglas Stuart used “sycamore fig slitter” in his translation.⁵⁸ Many supposed that Amos was a fig slitter because of the common practice in ancient Egypt to scrape figs in order to hasten their ripening.⁵⁹ T. J. Wright noted that the practice is not known in modern Israel nor necessary because the figs ripen quickly there.⁶⁰ According to a commentary by Theodoret of Cyrus, however, scraping was practiced there around the fifth century C.E.⁶¹ The chiasm indicates, rather than scraping figs, the task of picking or plucking them. “Pluck” better describes the action of pulling something away from its environment, such as Amos being sent from the south to the north.⁶² The English Koehler-Baumgartner lexicon did include “picker of sycamore figs” in its discussion of *bōlēś*.⁶³ According to Andersen and Freedman, the Roman Catholic Douay version of 1609 used “plucking.”⁶⁴ The King James Version used “gatherer.” “Fig-plucker” (*bōlēś*) will correspond with “taking” (לקח) Amos away from his flock (D4/D’4). The two words are not assonant, but the same is the case for D3/D’3.

The D’4 verb, לקח, can mean, “to take away from.”⁶⁵ It is used for plucking fruit and also for divine commission. In the sense of plucking fruit, Eve “took” (לקח) from the tree (Gen 3:6). Then the man was expelled “lest he put forth his hand, and ‘take’ also

⁵⁵ Paul, *Amos*, 248.

⁵⁶ The RSV, NRSV, and JPS used “dresser.” The REB translated *bōlēś* “grower” and the KJV, “gatherer.”

⁵⁷ Wolff, *Joel and Amos*, 307, 307 n h, 314.

⁵⁸ D. Stuart, *Hosea–Jonah*, B. M. Metzger (ed.) (WBC, 31; Waco: Word Books, 1987), 374, 377.

⁵⁹ As mentioned above, Wolff’s translation used: “who slits mulberry figs,” and he gave the following definitions for בלס: “one who slits, tends,” “to slit,” *Joel and Amos*, 307, 307 n h, 314. Stuart used “sycamore fig slitter” in his translation, *Hosea–Jonah*, 374, 377.

⁶⁰ T. J. Wright, “Amos and the ‘Sycamore Fig,’” *VT* 26 (1976), 362–68.

⁶¹ That is the time of the commentary in which Theodoret of Cyrus says he heard someone from Palestine “recounting how there fruit does not ripen unless first given a tiny incision beforehand.” Theodoret of Cyrus, *Commentary on the Twelve Prophets* (trans. Robert Charles Hill; Commentaries on the Prophets, 3; Brookline, Mass.: Holy Cross Orthodox, 2006), 123.

⁶² It is more common to use “pick” than “pluck” in English in regard to harvesting fruit. In German, a verb used for picking fruit is “pflücken.”

⁶³ L. Koehler, W. Baumgartner, J. J. Stamm, “בלס,” *HALOT* 1:134.

⁶⁴ Andersen and Freedman, *Amos*, 778.

⁶⁵ F. Brown, S. R. Driver, C. A. Briggs, “לקח,” *BDB* 542–44.

from the tree of life” (Gen 3:22). The cupbearer “plucked” (לקח) grapes from their branches (Gen 40:10–11).⁶⁶ In the sense of divine commission, being “taken” “from the flock” also happened to David. He was chosen and taken from the folds of the flock (Ps 78:70). Paul noted that “took” (לקח) and “chose” (בחר) are used together in the psalm, and that overtones for לקח are “to select, elect.”⁶⁷ Both David and Amos were “taken” (לקח) from following the flock (2 Sam 7:8; Amos 7:15).⁶⁸ David was taken and chosen to be king over “my people.” Amos was taken and sent to prophesy to “my people.”

THE MEANING OF ʾĀNĀK

The *hapax legomenon*, ʾānāk, has at least three levels of meaning in the third vision: the word’s literal meaning, what Amos saw in the vision, and what it means in the interpretation (what YHWH explained it to mean).

THE LITERAL MEANING OF ʾĀNĀK

The literal meaning of ʾānāk has been widely understood to be a metal. In the LXX it is translated “adamant,” a hard metal or substance. Medieval rabbis translated it as “tin” or “lead” according to their Arabic knowledge and studies; ʾanuk described both metals.⁶⁹ Yehuda Ibn Quraysh, in his late ninth or early tenth century *Risāla*, translated ʾānāk as Arabic *qazdir*, which usually means “tin.”⁷⁰ In his tenth century biblical lexicon, Menaheem ben Saruq, questioning the root, compared ʾānāk to Hebrew נכים (“destroyed”).⁷¹ Dunash ben Labrat responded that the correct definition is the same as the Arabic for “lead.”⁷² Rashi went further in his commentary to write that ʾānāk “is an Arabic expression for the plumbline.”⁷³ By the 19th century, Assyriologists found ancient Semitic words similar to ʾānāk meaning “tin.”⁷⁴ In 1965, Benno Landsberger wrote that the

⁶⁶ Ibid.

⁶⁷ Paul, *Amos*, 249 n 102.

⁶⁸ Ackroyd cited Hermann Schult on the similar form, “Judgment Narrative,” 83 n 42.

⁶⁹ Williamson, “Prophet and Plumb-Line,” 111. Also, tin and lead are paired, as are silver and gold, and bronze and iron in the Bible: Num 31:22; Ezek 22:18, 20; 27:12.

⁷⁰ Alan Cooper, private communication.

⁷¹ A. Sáenz-Badillos and J. Targarona Borrás, *La academia rabínica de Córdoba: Gramáticos hebreos de al-Andalus (Siglos x–xii)* (Cordova, Spain: El Almendro, 2003), 56. I translated the Spanish “destruidos.”

⁷² Ibid.

⁷³ A. J. Rosenberg, ed., *Twelve Prophets: A New English Translation, Translation of Text, Rashi, and Commentary*, vol. 1 (New York: Judaica, 1991), 154.

⁷⁴ B. Landsberger, “Tin and Lead: The Adventures of Two Vocables,” *JNES* 24 (1965), 285–96.

Akkadian *anaku* means “tin” specifically and proposed that in Amos 7, ^ʾ*ānāk* be translated “tin.”⁷⁵ The Akkadian Hymn of Ishtar supports the “tin” definition by its phrase, “the tin of bronze am I,” because tin is an alloy of bronze.⁷⁶ The hymn also has a wordplay very similar to the ^ʾ*ānāk*/^ʾ*ānōkī* wordplay: *anāku anāku* (“tin am I”). Besides the Akkadian “tin” definition, we are also fortunate to have an extant witness of this type of wordplay.

Emendations for ^ʾ*ānāk* were recommended and I list a few, but opine that emendation is not necessary. The omission of the first instance of **𐎗𐎎**, the one that describes the wall, was suggested in the critical apparatus of the BHS (K. Elliger).⁷⁷ The ancient versions, however, show all of the four instances of the word. The apparatus also suggested that “the Lord standing by a wall of ^ʾ*ānāk*” be read, “**𐎗𐎎** standing by a wall.”⁷⁸ Emendations of the word itself were also suggested. Cooper noted that *Lev. Rab.* 33.2 reads ^ʾ*ānākā* (“[metal] overlay”).⁷⁹ Andersen and Freedman noted that *b. B. Meṣiʿa* 59a reads the fourth instance of ^ʾ*ānāk* as “grief.”⁸⁰ “I will put grief in the midst of my people Israel.”⁸¹ Prätorius proposed ^ʾ*ānōk* (“I”) reading: “I am setting ‘the I’ in the midst of my people Israel.”⁸² One suggestion by D. L. Petersen was ^ʾ*ōnōk* (“you”): “I am setting *you* in the midst . . .”⁸³ I argue that no emendation is absolutely required because the wordplay is intact as the text stands.

WHAT AMOS SAW

The second question is what Amos sees in the vision—what the wall and ^ʾ*ānāk* in YHWH’s hand are. In the *Targum Amos*, the wall is described as being of “judgment” and the Lord is “exercising judgment.”⁸⁴ In the Vulgate, the wall is a “plastered wall” (*murum*)

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 287.

⁷⁶ Cited by Jeremiah as col. 41, lines 23–24 after A. Falkenstein: *anāku anāku anāk siparri [anāku]*, “Tin am I, the bronze of tin [am I].” *Amos*, 133 n 27. See also Landsberger’s citation of Ishtar, in Inanna and Ebih 86, where she speaks of “tin-ores” and their “mines,” “Tin and Lead,” 285–96.

⁷⁷ See BHS, n 7^{c-c}.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, n 7^{a-a}.

⁷⁹ See Cooper, “Meaning,” 19 n 22.

⁸⁰ The wall is of wrongs and in his hand were the wrongs. Andersen and Freedman provided this definition for the Mishnaic word: “grief, wrong, oppression,” *Amos*, 759.

⁸¹ It is generally noted that Amos’s name means “burden” and a play on it might be made in v. 10: “the land is not able to *bear* all of his words.”

⁸² Cooper, “Meaning,” 18–19. The translation from the German is mine.

⁸³ D. L. Petersen, *The Roles of Israel’s Prophets* (JSOTSup, 17; Sheffield: JSOT, 1981), 78.

⁸⁴ K. J. Cathcart and R. P. Gordon, eds., *The Targum of the Minor Proph-*

litum) and the other three instances of *ʾānāk* are a “trowel” (*trulla cementarij*). Theodoret of Cyrus used the LXX translation, “adamant.”⁸⁵ Ibn Quraysh and Dunash thought the *ʾānāk* in YHWH’s hand to be a “plumb-line” and were followed by Rashi and others.⁸⁶ The wall was thought to be made by a plumb-line, and the plumb-line to test the wall’s straightness. The medieval plumb-line interpretation, still in use today, is a good deduction based on the Arabic cognate and biblical context.⁸⁷ Ibn Quraysh compared Amos’s third vision with Isa 28:17 in which measuring instruments, one taken to be a plumb-line, will “set” judgment.⁸⁸ However, in 1966, Gilbert Brunet argued that no plumb-line is referred to.⁸⁹ Other biblical verses were also considered that were thought to speak of a “plummet,” such as 2 Kgs 21:13, which similarly refers to the punishment of the northern kingdom, and Zech 4:10. Those interpretations have also been refuted. Brunet alternatively suggested that the tin in YHWH’s hand is a sword, the tin wall being the prime material for its manufacture.⁹⁰ Jeremias suggested YHWH is standing on the tin wall with a weapon in his hand.⁹¹ However, it is not a weapon or sword but tin used for the wall’s construction. I am showing that YHWH is setting the wall and that the tin wall is a metaphor for the prophet Amos.⁹² The narrative (vv. 10–17) and chiasmic structure (vv. 11c–17) play it out.

WHAT ʾĀNĀK MEANS IN THE INTERPRETATION (v. 8g)

Because Amos sees a tin wall and tin in YHWH’s hand, he answers: “tin,” when asked what he sees. YHWH explains that he is setting tin in the midst of his people, Israel (v. 8g). YHWH acts metaphorically, setting the tin wall with a block or the form of tin he has in his hand. Perhaps the obvious is lost when comparing it to Amos’s answer in the fourth vision: “a basket of summer fruit” (*kēlūb qāyis*) (8:2).⁹³ The basket, the container, is included in Amos’s

ets: Translated, with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus, and Notes (ArBib, 14; Wilmington, Del.: Michael Glazier, 1989), 90–91.

⁸⁵ Theodoret of Cyrus, *Commentaries*, 122.

⁸⁶ Rosenberg, *Twelve Prophets*, 154.

⁸⁷ Such as Ibn Quraysh, Dunash, Rashi, Radak and others.

⁸⁸ Ibn Quraysh made the comparison in his explanation of the vision in the *Risāla*. Alan Cooper, private communication.

⁸⁹ Gilbert Brunet proposed that the line is a measuring cord and the plummet, a scale. The translation from the French is mine. G. Brunet, “La vision de l’étain, réinterprétation d’ Amos 7:7–9,” *VT* 16 (1966), 387–95 (389 n 5).

⁹⁰ Brunet located v. 9, with its topics of destruction and the sword, within the vision report, *ibid.*, 394–5.

⁹¹ Jeremias, *Amos*, 131–33.

⁹² Williamson requested the outworkings for Amos as a tin wall, “Prophet and Plumb-Line,” 121.

⁹³ For example, Petersen thought that the basket of summer fruit is

answer in the fourth vision report, but not in the third. Amos does not answer, “a tin wall,” which would include the container or destination of the tin in YHWH’s hand, but only “tin.” This does not exclude the wall. YHWH stands by it because he is constructing it. He is setting the wall with the tin in his hand, whether layering it with a trowel or building it block by block. It is more likely for him to set a tin wall “in the midst” than a single block “in the midst.” One can say, “I am placing goldfish in the center of the table,” and it would be assumed that the goldfish would be in their container, the bowl. By responding, “tin,” Amos means both the wall and the tin in YHWH’s hand in the answer to the question of what he saw.

Referring to the tin wall and the tin in YHWH’s hand that he is setting the wall with, *’ānāk* facilitates the wordplay.⁹⁴ In the interpretation (v. 8g), *’ānāk* links to the *’ānāk/’ānōkī* (tin/I) thread/wordplay (vv. 7–8, 14). The six-pointed thread entails the tin wall (v. 7) and Amos (v. 14).⁹⁵ Perhaps there is also play in the question that points to Amos: “What do you see, *Amos*?” (v. 8b), and in the answer, *’ānāk* (v. 8c), which could be understood, by sound or common knowledge of an *’ānāk/’ānōkī* wordplay, as “myself.”

It is revealed to Amos in the vision that he himself is the tin wall that YHWH is setting in order to prophesy to his people. The interpretation’s other two threads (v. 8g) also lead to the fulfillment of this. By the beginning of the second episode, Amos had already prophesied “in the midst” (v. 10). In his rebuttal to Amaziah, Amos explains that he had been sent by YHWH to prophesy to “my people” (v. 15).

METALLIC WALLS AND THEIR DYNAMISM

The metaphor of a prophet made into a metallic wall is also used in the book of Jeremiah.⁹⁶ As a bronze wall, Jeremiah can prophesy and stand against the kings, princes, priests and people of the southern kingdom (Jer 1:18). He will be fought against, but his opponents will not prevail (Jer 15:20; cf. 1:18–19). Similarly, Amos prophesies against the king, priest, and kingdom, not of the south but of the north. When opposed by Amaziah, like a tin wall, Amos resists, deflecting the repudiation.

The dynamic of the chiasmic structure (vv. 11c–17) simulates the function of the tin wall. Enemy arrows striking a metallic wall of defense will deflect back toward the shooter. They will return

not significant, other than to facilitate the wordplay, and so the same should be true of the tin wall, *Roles*, 78.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*

⁹⁵ Williamson proposed that Amos is the *’ānāk*, and that the plumb-line interpretation fits the context. “Prophet and Plumb-Line,” 116.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 121.

even hotter. In the chiasm, Amaziah shoots a barrage of slurs against Amos (B1–4) and, like a wall of tin, Amos reflects and magnifies them (B'1–4). Amaziah calls Amos a seer and emphatically tells him to leave (v. 12). Attacking the southern prophet's authority to prophesy in the north, the priest also rejects the union under YHWH of the north and south. Next Amaziah accuses Amos of prophesying in the north for personal gain, and that he should do so in the south instead. In C (v. 13), Amaziah prohibits Amos from prophesying at Bethel, further striking at his true appointment. In D (v. 14), Amos knows what Amaziah is attacking and refutes it. He is not a professional prophet, nor is he of such a guild, but has two trades. Having struck at YHWH's setting, or appointment, of Amos, the barrage begins to bounce off the wall (D') (v. 15). Amaziah's own words turn on him as Amos tells Amaziah that his prohibition is the reason for his curses (C') (v. 16). The priest's barrage returns to him, now quite horrific (B') (v. 17).

AMOS'S THIRD VISION (vv. 7–17) IS DEUTERONOMISTIC

Amos's third vision (vv. 7–17) is deuteronomistic because, not only does it contain links to Kings and Jeremiah, it is built on their concepts.⁹⁷ There are also transformations. The prophecy (v. 9) is a transformation of the curse of Jeroboam I, possibly following a "priestly" curse outline. Like Jeremiah, Amos criticizes the kingship and priesthood, albeit the north's.

W. H. Schmidt proposed deuteronomistic redaction in the book of Amos, but the phrases and style in the few verses hypothesized only persuaded some scholars.⁹⁸ Wolff and Jeremias proposed deuteronomistic redaction in the book, but not in our text.⁹⁹ Both saw the visions as early and the narrative as before the deuteronomists.¹⁰⁰ Williamson noted the themes in our narrative of prophetic role and authenticity, and exile, in common with Kings.¹⁰¹ He proposed that the deuteronomists inserted vv. 9–17. Miguel Alvarez Barredo, dating parts of v. 9 and the narrative later than

⁹⁷ By "deuteronomistic" I mean carrying themes particular to Deuteronomy and the Early Prophets.

⁹⁸ The reference to Schmidt's work here is Möller's: W. H. Schmidt, "Die deuteronomistische Redaktion des Amosbuches: Zu den theologischen Unterschieden zwischen dem Prophetenwort und seinem Sammler," *ZAW* 77 (1965), 168–93. K. Möller, "Reconstructing and Interpreting Amos's Literary Prehistory: A Dialogue with Redaction Criticism," C. Bartholomew et al. (eds.), *"Behind" the Text: History and Biblical Interpretation* (SHS, 4; Carlisle: Paternoster; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2003), 397–441 (402).

⁹⁹ Möller summarized works of Schmidt, Wolff, Willi-Plein, and Jeremias, "Reconstructing," 402–406.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 403, 405.

¹⁰¹ Williamson, "Prophet and Plumb-line," 113–121.

Wolff, identified them as deuteronomistic redactions.¹⁰² He saw the phrase about exile (vv. 11; 17) as being from the Babylonian exilic period.¹⁰³ Because of the repetition of “Isaac” and “by the sword,” he saw vv. 9 and 16–17 as inserted frames.¹⁰⁴ Alvarez Barredo thought “house of Israel” (v. 10) refers to Jeroboam II. Noting further structure and meaning in vv. 7–17, I posit that the whole text is deuteronomistic and that redaction was unnecessary.

Besides the obvious references to Jeroboam and the northern temple and cult at Bethel, Amos’s third vision links to and transforms parts of Kings.¹⁰⁵ We have seen several of the links so far. We saw the *bāmôt* to *bêt* theme that runs through Kings threaded in the third vision (vv. 9, 13, 16). The development in Kings from *bāmôt* to *bêt* (high places to temple) and the *bêt bāmôt* (temple of the high places) that Jeroboam I appointed at Bethel are played on by *Leitwörter* beginning in our v. 9. Amaziah makes the correlation when he interprets Amos’s prophecy against the *bāmôt* and *miqdšē* (v. 9) to be against Bethel itself (v. 13). The “midst” that Amos was sent to is Bethel (vv. 8, 10, 13), and both Amos’s third vision and 1 Kgs 13 share the perspective that it is the center for the sin of Jeroboam.

THE CURSE OF JEROBOAM

Amos 7:9b transforms the curse of Jeroboam I (1 Kgs 13:34) into the curse of the northern kingship. The first curse, that Jeroboam I’s house would be cut off and destroyed from the face of the earth for his appointing a temple of the high places and priests at Bethel, was fulfilled in 1 Kgs 15:25–30. Amos said, “rise against” (v. 9b) and to Amaziah it rings of conspiracy against the king (v. 10).¹⁰⁶ He reports it to Jeroboam and quotes Amos as having said that, “Jeroboam will die by the sword” (vv. 10–11). It sounds of the practice common in Kings of conspirators smiting kings in order to take over their thrones.¹⁰⁷ Amaziah misinterprets what Amos said be-

¹⁰² M. Alvarez Barredo, *Relecturas deuteronomísticas de Amós, Miqueas y Jeremías* (Serie Mayor, 10; Murcia, Spain: Instituto Teológico Franciscano, Espigas, 1993), 16.

¹⁰³ Alvarez Barredo, *Relecturas*, 81, 53. We saw that these phrases frame an extended chiasm.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 80–81. We saw “Isaac” and other terms forming threads starting in v. 9. “By the sword” in v. 17 is not necessarily linked with v. 9 since it is not about Jeroboam’s death. It is linked rather with its chiasmic correspondence (v. 12). The translations from the Spanish are mine.

¹⁰⁵ Other than in Kings and Chronicles, a “Jeroboam” is named only in the superscriptions of Hosea (1:1) and Amos (1:1), and in Amos’s third vision (7:9, 10, 11) (MT).

¹⁰⁶ See especially 1 Samuel 22:13 that besides using “rise against,” also used “conspired,” “sword,” and “bread.”

¹⁰⁷ Ackroyd noted that the theme of conspiracy is “particularly characteristic of the narratives of the books of Kings” and listed citations in the

cause Amos is not in a conspiracy to kill Jeroboam for the usurpation of the throne. We saw that he also misperceives Amos's motive for prophesying (v. 12). Perhaps instead of having said that Jeroboam will die by the sword (v. 11), Amos said that YHWH will rise against the house of Jeroboam with the sword (v. 9). Which Jeroboam is referred to is another question. Furthermore, it is not recorded that either Jeroboam died by the sword. Although Jeroboam I and II were not attacked and killed (1 Kgs 14:20; 2 Kgs 14:29), both of their sons were, losing their thrones to conspirators that way (1 Kgs 15:27–28; 2 Kgs 15:10). The dynasties of both Jeroboams did not end with them but with their sons. In this context, Amaziah hears “rise against,” “house of Jeroboam,” and “with the sword,” and suspects conspiracy against Jeroboam II. He should instead fear conspiracy against Jeroboam's son. He does so by abstraction. The king in reign is Jeroboam II, according to Amos 1:1.¹⁰⁸ The correlation that a son of a Jeroboam was conspired against transforms, or typifies, Jeroboam II into a “son” of Jeroboam I. In 1 Kgs 13:2, the prophet calls Josiah a “son” of the “house of David.” Although the northern dynastic lines were broken by conspiracy, because all the kings followed in the sin of Jeroboam I, Jeroboam I can be typified as their “father,” and they as “sons” of the “house of Jeroboam.”¹⁰⁹ The “house of Jeroboam” in our v. 9 is therefore the whole northern kingly line. If it is inferred in v. 11 that Amos did say that Jeroboam will die by the sword, then Jeroboam II is still typified as the “son” of Jeroboam I and in the narrative symbolizes the northern kingly line or office that will “die,” that is, be extinguished by the curse of v. 9b. Although Amaziah feared conspiracy against Jeroboam II, when Amos said that YHWH would rise against the house of Jeroboam with the sword, he was announcing the curse of Jeroboam, the end of the northern kingship.

VERSE 9 AFTER LEVITICUS 26:30–33?

The curses of v. 9 may follow an outline of the curses in Lev 26:30–33.¹¹⁰ Stuart and Paul noted the similarities in vocabulary and threats of punishment.¹¹¹ The high places and sanctuaries will

footnote, “Judgment Narrative,” 77 n 23.

¹⁰⁸ It is supported by the exorbitant wealth described in the book and Amaziah's greed in the narrative.

¹⁰⁹ First Kings says they walked in the way and sins of Jeroboam: 15:26, 34; 16:2, 19, 26; 22:52. Second Kings adds that they did not depart from them: 3:3; 10:29, 31; 13:2, 6, 11; 14:24; 15:9, 18. By contrast, Josiah did not depart from the way of David (2 Kgs 22:2). Ackroyd described an “overall pattern,” “Judgment Narrative,” 79.

¹¹⁰ With his JEPD chronology, Richard Friedman thought the deuteronomists were familiar with the priestly texts. R. E. Friedman, *Who Wrote the Bible?* (San Francisco: Harper Collins, 1987), 208.

¹¹¹ Stuart, *Hosea–Jonah*, 373–4. Paul, *Amos*, 237.

be ruined in both our v. 9 and Lev 26:30–31. *Miqdaš* (“sanctuary”) occurs only once in the Deuteronomistic History (Josh 24:26), but is common in the priestly texts, Later Prophets, and Writings.¹¹² Our v. 9 uses it in parallel with “high places” (*bāmôt*). In Lev 26:30–31, “high places” and “sanctuaries” are also used in parallel, although extended. The high places are the first objects to be ruined (26:30), and the sanctuaries are the last objects to be desolated (26:31). “Desolation” (*šāmēm*) and “sword” are also common to our v. 9 and Lev 26:31–33. YHWH will “rise against” with the sword in our v. 9, and he will “draw out” the sword in Lev 26:33. Stuart also called attention to Lev 26:25 in which, due to covenant infidelity, YHWH will “bring a sword upon . . .”¹¹³ He saw our v. 9 as an announcement of curse fulfillment.¹¹⁴ The northern kingship and cult are cursed due to the sin of Jeroboam. The structure of v. 9 follows this outline of Lev 26:30–33. Cola 9aA and 9aB are parallel, use “high places,” and then, “sanctuaries.” In colon 9b, YHWH will use “the sword,” against the house of Jeroboam. Amos 7:9 contains both priestly and deuteronomistic language and concepts.

AN ALLUSION TO THE DEUTERONOMIC PRIESTLY RULE

The illegitimacy of the northern priesthood is highlighted by Amaziah’s owning land. Representing that office, he is dedicated to the wealth provided by the kingdom and not truly to YHWH. The B3/B’3 chiasmic correspondence alludes to these concepts in the deuteronomistic priestly rule that the priests and Levites not own land and accumulate wealth from it (Deut 18:1; cf. Num 18:20). Besides conceptual allusions, two words are used from the deuteronomistic rule. Amaziah’s land being “apportioned” (*חלק*) (v 17) contrasts Amos’s being able to “eat” (*אכל*) bread (v 12). According to Deut 18:1, the Levites should have no “portion” (*חלק*), but “eat” (*אכל*) the offerings instead. The two words are repeated in the last verse of the rules: the Levites who come to the chosen place “shall have like “portions” (*חלק*) to “eat” (*אכל*) . . .” (Deut 18:8).

THE USE OF THE TERM “MY PEOPLE” IS A DEUTERONOMISTIC ALLUSION

The term “my people, Israel” is also a deuteronomistic allusion. First it alludes to the Deuteronomistic History and then to the Later Prophets. The term occurs first in 1 Sam 9:16 (MT). It is used in Samuel and Kings where YHWH makes an appointment of someone to some type of office in service of “my people, Israel.”¹¹⁵

¹¹² Rottzoll saw v. 9 as a “priestly-deuteronomistic redaction.” Möller, *Prophet*, 111–112 n 37.

¹¹³ Stuart, *Hosea–Jonah*, 373–4.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁵ 1 Sam 9:16; 2 Sam 3:18, 7:11; 1 Kgs 8:16, 14:7, 16:2. In 2 Sam 7:10,

In Jeremiah and Ezekiel, it is used where punishment and restoration are brought to his people.¹¹⁶ In the book of Amos, the term seems to be used for both appointment and punishment/restoration. In the vision report, YHWH sets ʾānāk in the midst of “my people, Israel” (v. 8g), which is the appointment of Amos to prophesy to them. In the narrative, Amos recounts that he was commissioned to prophesy to “my people, Israel” (v. 15). The third vision may be unique among the Later Prophets in using the term in an appointment of someone, alluding to the Early Prophets. The term is repeated in the fourth vision’s interpretation (8:2) that is also about the punishment of the northern kingdom. However, “my people, Israel” will see restoration in Amos 9:14. In Jer 30:3, “my people, Israel” will see restoration also, and they are the exiled of both the northern and southern kingdoms.

THE EXILIC STATEMENT FROM 2 KINGS

The *inclusio* about exile, *wēyisrāʾēl gālō yigle(h) mēʿal ʾadmātō* (vv. 11c; 17f), is most likely from Kings. Williamson and Meindert Dijkstra noted the similarity with 2 Kgs 17:23 and 25:21.¹¹⁷ The first four words of 2 Kgs 17:23 are used in our phrase, but a cognate construction, *gālō yigle(h)*, is added and so the order of the verb (“exile”) and “Israel” is switched. Second Kings 17:23 is also about the northern kingdom: *wayyigel yisrāʾēl mēʿal ʾadmātō aššûrâ ʿad hayyôm hazze(h)* (“and was exiled Israel from upon his land to Assyria until this day.”)¹¹⁸ The perfect tense changes to imperfect. Kings states the past: “and was exiled Israel from upon his land . . .,” and Amos the future: “and Israel will surely be exiled from upon his land.” The wording of 2 Kgs 17:23 is used also in 25:21 but it is about the southern kingdom instead: *wayyigel yēhûdâ mēʿal ʾadmātō*. Our text refers to *yisrāʾēl* both times. If indeed taken from Kings, then a reason is provided for the lack of explicit reference to Assyria in the book of Amos. There is no need to add that the northern kingdom’s exile will be to Assyria because it is already stated in 2 Kgs 17:23, to which vv. 11 and 17 apparently link.

A KINGS’ NARRATIVE STYLE

The affinity of vv. 7–17 with Kings and Jeremiah explains the narrative style of vv. 10–17 and its anomaly among the vision report structures. The narrative (vv. 10–17) was designed to follow the

the place for “my people, for Israel” to dwell is appointed. “His people” is used in 2 Sam 7:23. “My people, Israel” is also used in Chronicles.

¹¹⁶ Jer 7:12, 30:3; Ezek 14:9, 25:14, 36:12, 38:16, 39:7.

¹¹⁷ Williamson, “Prophet and Plumb-Line,” 120. Dijkstra, “Neither a prophet,” 124.

¹¹⁸ What I translated “his” in ʾadmātō is usually translated “its” or “their.”

narratives of Kings. Verses 9–17 have been thought to be closer to books such as Kings and Jeremiah than to the book of Amos.¹¹⁹ In addition to considering the narrative an insertion, which was almost the unanimous view, some suggested “original” or “better” locations for it.¹²⁰ J. A. Soggin, for example, expected the narrative to be at the beginning of the book, in line with the commission theme.¹²¹ Because v. 10 was considered abrupt and not an appropriate introduction, some thought the narrative was a fragment. Ackroyd suggested it might have originated in another book.¹²² Earlier, Riedel thought the verbal link, “Jeroboam,” is why the narrative is placed after the third vision report.¹²³ By the latter half of the 20th century, the catchword principle gained acknowledgement and scholars agreed on that and other verbal links. By the end of the century, Jeremias stated, “the narrative cannot be fully understood without that context.”¹²⁴ We have seen that the vision report (vv. 7–9) and the narrative (vv. 10–17) are best understood together. The prior episode, the vision report, introduces the narrative.

The reason the narrative is anomalous is because it was designed to imitate the narratives of Kings. Signs and words of the prophets through YHWH are shown fulfilled beginning around 1 Kgs 13. In Amos, the *ʾānāk* vision is shown fulfilled in our narrative. Amos was set like a tin wall in Bethel. As Ackroyd pointed out, our narrative is the only narrative in the book of Amos.¹²⁵ He also noted several affinities between our narrative and Kings, Jeremiah, and Chronicles.¹²⁶ Tucker noted parallels between our narrative, “a story of prophetic conflict,” and those in Jer 26 and 28.¹²⁷ Claus Westermann showed parallel structures between Amos’s announcement of punishment against Amaziah (vv. 16–17), 1 Kgs 21:18–19, and 2 Kgs 1:3–4.¹²⁸ He also showed that the judgment

¹¹⁹ Ackroyd, “Judgment Narrative,” 76.

¹²⁰ Gordis summarized, “All critics are agreed that [the narrative] is not in its proper place, but there is no unanimity as to its original position,” “Composition and Structure,” 217. See also Williamson, “Prophet and Plumb-Line,” 102–103; 116; 121.

¹²¹ J. A. Soggin, *Introduction to The Old Testament: From Its Origins to the Closing of the Alexandrian Canon* (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster/John Knox, 1989), 284.

¹²² Ackroyd, “Judgment Narrative,” 84. Ackroyd also improvised reconstructions for the opening, *ibid.*, 81–82.

¹²³ This is according to Harper, *Amos and Hosea*, 168. Harper cites Riedel’s book in his bibliography on page xxvii as: *Alttestamentliche Untersuchungen*, Part I. (1902), 1–36.

¹²⁴ Jeremias, *Amos*, 137.

¹²⁵ Ackroyd, “Judgment Narrative,” 71.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, 76–86.

¹²⁷ Tucker, “Authenticity,” 430.

¹²⁸ Westermann, *Basic Forms*, 130–132.

speeches to individuals are in Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, and, in the Later Prophets: our narrative, Isaiah (from Kings), several in Jeremiah, and one in Ezekiel.¹²⁹

AFFINITIES WITH JEREMIAH

We have seen some affinities with Jeremiah. Besides the metallic wall metaphor, both our vv. 7–17 and Jer 1:1–19 contain wordplay visions and are about the prophet’s commission. Aaron Schart thought it “safe to assume a direct literary dependence” of Jeremiah on Amos’s third and fourth visions.¹³⁰ However, it appears that Amos’s third vision did not influence Jeremiah, but that it was the other way around—Jeremiah influenced Amos’s third vision. Jeremiah’s commission has more detail; he will be made as not only a bronze wall, but also a fortified city and iron pillar (Jer 1:18). The third vision is more of an abstraction, as it is with Kings. There is also a possible indication of Babylonian influence. The two metals that occur in the Akkadian Hymn of Ishtar wordplay, tin and bronze, are the two metals that make up the walls of Amos and Jeremiah.¹³¹ Regarding possible composition by deuteronomists, Williamson wrote that the metallic wall instances in Jeremiah (Jer 1:18, 15:20) are in “Deuteronomistically influenced passages.”¹³²

The spelling of Isaac also links Amos’s third vision to the book of Jeremiah. Outside of vv. 9 and 16, “*yīshāq*” is found only in Jer 33:26 and Ps 105:9 (MT). It is used in reference to the patriarchal covenant in the psalm (Ps 105:6–9). The covenants of both the patriarchs and David are referred to in Jer 33. Given the other affinities also, the date of composition may be closer to Jeremiah’s than thought. *Yīshāq*’s parallelism with *yīsrā’ēl* in our text disallows that its spelling with *š* be a simple redaction. The rare spelling in the terse poetry of the *Leitwörter* threads (vv. 9, 13, 16), the shared theme of covenant, and the biblical formulaic use of “Isaac,” make the link possible.¹³³ Also thematic to Jer 33 is the endurance of the southern kingship and priesthood (vv. 17–18, 21–22, 26). Thematic to Amos’s third vision are the endurance of the southern prophets and the extinction of the northern kingship and priesthood. Amos is able to return to the south and continue prophesying, but Amaziah will die on an unclean land. Jeroboam,

¹²⁹ Ibid., 137.

¹³⁰ A. Schart, “The Book of Jeremiah and the Visions of Amos,” *Rev-Exp* 101 (2004), 267–286 (268).

¹³¹ Also, according to Landsberger, tributes of tin were “imposed by the Assyrians on their defeated foes.” “Tin and Lead,” 293. A question raised is whether the use of “tin” in Amos’s third vision might allude to Assyria, the captor of the northern kingdom and suzerain.

¹³² Williamson, “Prophet and Plumb-Line,” 121.

¹³³ Ackroyd listed the uses of “Isaac” and the phrase, “Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob,” “Judgment Narrative,” 74.

who symbolizes the kingship, will die by the sword. Set in the time of Jeroboam II, Amos's third vision tells of the exile of the northern kingdom.¹³⁴ Jeremiah 33:7 tells of return from exile, for both the northern and southern kingdoms.

CONCLUSION

The third vision of Amos (7:7–17) transforms the sin of Jeroboam I—the appointment of the temple of the high places and their priests at Bethel—into the curse of the northern cult and kingship. Whereas Jeremiah criticizes the southern kingship and priesthood, Amos's third vision criticizes the north's. The king and priestly characters' deaths symbolize the end of their respective offices. The southern prophetic role endures and Amos's resiliency is YHWH's appointment. Verbal links and a chiasm portray Amos as the tin wall. The wordplay vision is replete with poetics that form structure and meaning, and shows a sophisticated and dynamic design.

¹³⁴ Whether the third vision also alludes to the Babylonian exile is a question for further study.