Landas 29:2 (2015) 119–143

ARE THE ALLUSIONS TO JACOB AND MOSES IN HOSEA 12 LATE INSERTIONS?

Felipe Fruto Ll. Ramirez, S.J.

Among the prophets, Hosea seems to have the most number of references to the stories of the Patriarchs. For instance, Hos. 2:1a—"Yet the number of the people of Israel shall be like the sand of the sea, which can be neither measured nor numbered"—seems to reiterate the covenantal promise made to Abraham in Gen. 22:17 and to Jacob in Gen. 32:13. Hos. 11:8a—"How can I give you up, Ephraim? How can I hand you over, O Israel? How can I make you like Admah? How can I treat you like Zeboiim?"—apparently refers to the story of the destruction of the cities of the plain (Gen. 19:24–29; Deut. 29:22). Hosea 12 in particular is replete with allusions to Israel's eponymous ancestor, Jacob.[1]

בבטן עקב את־אחיו	4	In the womb he tried to supplant his brother,
ובאונו שׂרה את־אלהים׃		and in his manhood he strove with God.
ויּשׂר אל־מלאך ויכל	5	He strove with the angel and prevailed,
בכה ויתחנן־לו		he wept and sought his favor;
בית־אל ימצאנו		he met him at Bethel,
ושׁם ידבר עמנו		and there he spoke with him.

[1]For an intertextual comparison between the Jacob stories in Genesis and Hosea's allusions to them, see Felipe Fruto Ll. Ramirez, "Typology of Sin, Repentance, and Grace in Hosea 12:3–7," *Landas* 26:2 (2012): 41–78.

ויהוה אלהי הצבאות	6	The Lord the God of hosts,
יהוה זכרו		the Lord is his name!
ויברח יעקב שׂדה ארם	13	Jacob fled to the land of Aram,
ויעבד ישׂראל באשׁה		there Israel served for a wife,
ובאשׁה שׁמר		and for a wife he guarded sheep.

Verse 4a alludes to the birth story of Jacob and Esau (Gen. 25:21–26), and how Jacob had managed to supplant his twin brother Esau, first by acquiring his birthright (Gen. 25:27–34), and second, by deceiving his father into giving him the blessing (Gen. 27:1–46). Verses 4b and 5a refer to the incident at the Jabbok crossing where Jacob wrestled with an old man who turned out to be God; Jacob prevailed over him, for which reason he bestowed on the patriarch a new name, Israel (Gen. 32:23–33). Verse 5b possibly points to a tradition, now lost, connected with "the oak of weeping" in Gen. 35:8,[2] or possibly to the reconciliation of Jacob and Esau in which the verbs *bākāh* ("to weep") and *hitḥannēn* or *māṣā' ḥēn* ("to find favor") are recurring keywords (Gen. 33:1–16).[3] Verse 5cd most likely refers to Jacob's dream at Bethel in which YHWH promised to protect him on his journey and bring him back safely to Canaan (Gen. 28:10–22). Verse 13 hints at Jacob's flight to Haran and his service of Laban to acquire Leah and Rachel as his wives (Gen. 29:1–35).

Hosea also has many references to the traditions connected with Moses. He alludes to the liberation of the Israelites from Egypt (Exodus 13–15): "When Israel was a child, I loved him, and out of Egypt I called my son" (Hos. 11:1; 12:14; also Hos. 2:17). For Hosea, the wilderness sojourn was the time when the LORD wooed the heart of

[2]According to E. M. Good, "In Gen. xxxv 8 is the unexplained naming of a place, אלון־בכות 'the oak of weeping'. All we are told is that Deborah, Rebekah's nurse, died and was buried under the oak below Bethel, which was given the otherwise unexplained name. There must have been a story behind this that we do not have; but perhaps Hosea did" ("Hosea and the Jacob Tradition," *VT* 16 [1966]: 144).

[3]Ramirez, "Typology," 59–61.

Israel (Hos. 2:16–17; 9:10a; 13:5). It was there at Sinai where God made a covenant with Israel, constituting them as his people and he as their God (Hos. 2:25; cf. 6:7; 8:1), a holy people consecrated to God: "Like grapes in the wilderness, I found Israel; like the first fruit on the fig tree, in its first season, I saw your ancestors …" (Hos. 9:10a).[4] Without mentioning the prophet's name, Hos. 12:14 alludes to Moses and to his role in leading the Israelites out of Egypt and safeguarding them.

ואנכי יהוה אלהיך	10	I am the LORD your God
מארץ מצרים		from the land of Egypt;
עד אושיבך באהלים		I will make you live in tents again,
כימי מועד		as in the days of the appointed festival.
ובנביא העלה יהוה	14	By a prophet the LORD brought up
את־ישׂראל ממצרים		Israel from Egypt,
ובנביא נשׁמר		and by a prophet he was guarded.

Pentateuchal research has established the separate origin of the patriarchal traditions from the Mosaic traditions. It has long been held by source critics that the patriarchal narratives (Genesis 12–36), along with the primeval history (Genesis 1–11) and the Joseph story (Genesis 37–48), were combined with the stories of the Exodus, the wilderness sojourn, and the Covenant at Sinai only at a much later time. We do not know for sure when the two traditions were put together, but if Hosea's allusions to both traditions are original and not a later addition, it may well be that we have already begun to see the epic narration of Israel's *Heilsgeshichte* taking shape towards the end of the 8th century BCE.

[4]Hosea seems to know also some of the legal materials in the Torah. For example, in Hos. 4:2, the prophets seems to be hinting at the Decalogue (Exod. 20:1–17; Deut. 5:6–21). In Hos. 4:17; 8:4; 11:2; and 13:2, he echoes the prohibition of idolatry in Lev. 19:4; 26:1, 30. Cf. Deut. 29:17; 32:21. In Hos. 5:3 and 6:10, he knows that adultery causes defilement (Lev. 18:20). Similarly, in Hos. 9:4, he is aware that a corpse pollutes everything in its vicinity (Num. 19:14–16).

A. Refuting the Arguments for a Late Date

The dating of the patriarchal allusions has long been a point of contention among scholars. Early in the previous century, most of those who took up *Literarkritik* regarded the patriarchal materials as a late addition. The reasons given for this may be summarized as follows: a) the order in which they are presented in Hos. 12 does not conform to the chronology of the Genesis account; b) the present text does not exhibit a regular meter and stichometry; c) the ambiguous presentation of Jacob is the result of a gloss that was made to mitigate the harsh view of the prophet; d) the vocabulary and grammar show them to be a late composition; e) some of the ideas and motifs found in them have affinities with Deuteronomic or post-exilic thought; and f) the other pre-exilic writings are curiously silent about the patriarchs.

By the middle of the last century, scholars were evenly divided on the question of date. On the one hand, most form critics defended the authenticity of the patriarchal allusions, even if they could not agree on the nature of their source—whether they were oral or written, and whether they were basically the same as those in Genesis or not. On the other hand, the scholars who took up the *Überlieferungsgeschichte* approach thought that the entire book was fixed in writing only at a later date, even though the process of oral transmission may have preserved some of the authentic sayings of the prophet.

Today, there seems to be a trend—if one can speak thus of the number of books and articles published recently—advocating a late date for the patriarchal stories. The issue is now often related with the new theories about the composition of the Pentateuch[5] and the

[5]H. H. Schmid, *Der sogennante Jahwist* (Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1976), 24–41, 61–84; J. van Seters, *Abraham in History and Tradition* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1975), esp. 309–313; R. Rendtorff, *Das überlieferungsgeschichtliche Problem des Pentateuchs*, BZAW 147 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1977), 2–28, 75–79; E. Blum, *Die Komposition der Vätergeschichte*, WMANT 75 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1984), esp. 202–203,

prophetic corpus,[6] yet the claim and reasoning put forward by modern proponents are still basically a rehash of the old arguments.

We shall bypass the larger issue of the compositional history of the *Tōrāh* and the *Nebî'îm*, and simply focus on the arguments used for proving the patriarchal allusions to be a late redactional work and dating them to the Deuteronomic or even post-exilic period. Ultimately, any grand theory about the formation of the biblical literature must come to grips with the results of the investigation of smaller units, and not the other way around.

1. *The order in which the patriarchal allusions are presented in Hosea 12 does not conform to the chronology of the Genesis account.* This is the weakest argument, a *non sequitur*, really. As far as we know, only Wellhausen and Nowack used it.[7] They probably thought that Hosea was incapable of rearranging the traditional materials, and that any disarray in the present text was the result of tampering by a later hand. Moreover, it probably never occurred to them that Hosea may have relied on an oral presentation of the life of the patriarch in which the "correct" sequence of some vignettes did not as yet matter so much.

2. *The present text does not exhibit a regular meter and stichometry.* This is another flawed argument, based on a false premise that Hebrew poetry essentially contains a fixed number of verse lines and a regular pattern of stresses, and thus any jaggedness in the present text is thought to be the result of a conflation of two or more poems with different structures, or an intrusion of foreign elements into the original text. Some early literary critics such as Harper, Duhm, Praetorius, and others went as far as presenting their own reconstruction of the original text

---

258–261; R. N. Whybray, *The Making of the Pentateuch*, JSOT Sup. Ser. 53 (1987), esp. 221–242.

[6]B. Peckham, *History and Prophecy: The Development of Late Judean Literary Traditions* (New York: Doubleday, 1993).

[7]J. Wellhausen, *Die kleinen Propheten* (Berlin: G. Reimer, 1898), 128–129; W. Nowack, *Die kleinen Propheten*, 2nd ed., HKAT III/4 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1903), 76.

based on a neat and orderly strophic structure.[8] But in every case, symmetry was achieved only by doing violence to the text.

Today, however, scholars seek to define Hebrew poetry on its own terms, using norms that are more appropriate to the Semitic way of composing verses.[9] Thus, for instance, O'Connor's constriction of the Hebrew verse sidesteps altogether the issue of meter and latches simply onto syntactic requirements.[10] In addition, modern literary critics are also more sensitive to the idiosyncratic style of a particular author. Andersen and Freedman, for example, call attention to Hosea's distinctive manner of blending prose and poetic features, the recognition of which could have avoided a variety of errors in treating his materials.[11]

The early literary critics who insisted on a regular meter and stichometry can thus be justly accused of imposing alien criteria on Hosea's poetry.

3. *The ambiguous presentation of Jacob is the result of a gloss that was made to mitigate the harsh view of the prophet.* This explanation, favored by the

---

[8]W. R. Harper (*Amos and Hosea*, ICC [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1904], 373) reconstructed a poem consisting of ten-liner strophes in trimeter movement; B. Duhm ("Anmerkungen zu den zwölf Pro-pheten," *ZAW* 31 [1911]: 37–38) considered the present chapter a conflation of three original poems in quatrains of two or three stresses; F. Praetorius (*Neue Bemerkungen zu Hosea* [Berlin: Verlag von Reuther und Reichard, 1922], 30, 33) insisted that the original poem was a *Doppeldreier* and thus fitted all the verses into this scheme.

[9]M. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure* (Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1980), 29–54.

[10]O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 65.

[11]"Chief among these is the notion that the prophet himself spoke in a lyric poetic style and therefore we must attempt to disentangle the pristine material from accretions which have crept in, or the paraphrases provided by editors and commentators" (F. I. Andersen & D. N. Freedman, *Hosea*, AB 24 [New York: Doubleday, 1980], 65).

early critics[12] and recently taken up by Yee,[13] may have some merit to it; after all, a consistent point of view is a mark of a unified composition. Nevertheless, too rigid an insistence on it can be a liability.

If the function of literature is to mirror human life in all its subtlety, then there must be room for ambiguity in character portrayal. Even in the classic stories of Greek heroes the authors often allow some tragic flaw to shine through. This is also true of the characterization of Jacob in Genesis: it is not evident to the reader whether the ingenious ploy by which Jacob bamboozles Esau is recounted simply to be censured. That Jacob is depicted with warts and all makes his story convincingly human and therefore accessible to all.[14]

Moreover, the ambiguity serves the purpose of making a profound theological statement. The patriarchal narrative never really creates the impression that Jacob's standing with God is grounded on piety, or given as a prize after testing (like that of Abraham in Genesis 22). Still in his mother's womb, Jacob had already been chosen to receive the blessing (Gen. 25:23). "The point is made in the way the story is told that his covenant status is always a gift, never a reward for his virtue, and is in no way neutralized by his personality traits as a 'cheat.'"[15]

Should we expect the patriarchal allusions in Hosea 12 to be less nuanced and less profound?

---

[12]Nowack, *Die kleinen Propheten*, 76; Harper, *Amos and Hosea*, 373; K. Marti, *Das Dodekapropheton*, Kurzer Handkommentar 13 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr / Paul Siebeck, 1904), 95.

[13]G. A. Yee, *Composition and Tradition in the Book of Hosea: A Redaction Critical Investigation*, SBL Diss. 102 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 245.

[14]The portrayal of Jacob is not always edifying even at a later period when one might expect greater reverence for the patriarch on account of the growing canonical status of his stories (see Jer. 9:3 and Isa. 43:27, which contain veiled criticisms against Jacob; cf. Mal. 9:3).

[15]Andersen & Freedman, *Hosea*, 600. Similarly, according to P. R. Ackroyd, "the emphasis [in Hos. 12:4–5] lies upon the mysterious nature of divine purpose" ("Hosea and Jacob," *VT* 13 [1963]: 259).

4. *The vocabulary and grammar of some verses mark them out as a late composition*. Proponents of this argument cite the following example: שׂדה ארם (field of Aram) in v. 13 is thought to be a Hebrew translation of *Paddan-aram* from the Priestly source.[16] The noun *paddan* has an Arabic cognate that means "field," and hence it is conjectured that Aramaic may also have had this as the regular meaning of the word.[17]

The basis of the argument is very precarious. The usual meaning of the word *paddan* in either Aramaic or Syriac is "plough" or "yoke." Even in Arabic, the primary meaning is "yoke" as well. The derivative meaning "field" is probably the result of a development confined to Arabic.[18]

Furthermore, even if one grants for the sake of argument that שׂדה ארם is the Hebrew rendering of *Paddan-aram*, no conclusion in favor of a late date can be drawn from this. Although the place name *Paddan-aram* appears only in the later Priestly writings, it may have been derived from a tradition that was already current in Hosea's time.[19]

---

[16]Duhm, "Anmerkungen," 39. Also see R. de Vaux, "Les patriarches hebreux et les découvertes Modernes," *RB* 55 (1948): 321–347.

[17]For another explanation of the name *Paddan-Aram*, see R. T. O'Callaghan, *Aram Naharaim*, AnOr 26 (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1948), 96.

[18]W. T. Pitard, *s.v.* "Paddan-Aram," *Anchor Bible Dictionary* 5 (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 55.

[19]Contrary to prevalent belief, many of the traditions found in the Priestly source are ancient. This is shown by its language which is pre-exilic (A. Hurvitz, "The Language of the Priestly Source and Its Historical Setting—The Case for an Early Date," *PWCJS* 8 [Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1981], 83–94; A. Hurvitz, *A Linguistic Study of the Relationship between the Priestly Source and the Book of Ezekiel—A New Approach to an Old Problem*, CahRB 20 [Paris: Gabalda et Cie, 1982]; A. Hurvitz, "Dating the Priestly Source in the Light of the Historical Study of Biblical Hebrew a Century after Wellhausen," BZAW 100 [Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1988], 88–99).

That the shorter name *Paddan* (Gen. 48:7)[20] and another name, *Haran* (Gen. 28:10; 29:4), are also used for the place indicates that there were probably various traditions existing side by side in ancient times.

Another example offered in support of a late date is the passive *niphal* נִשְׁמַר in v. 14, the use of which is considered uncharacteristic of an ancient author.[21]

It is true that many grammarians think the *niphal* had primarily (and purely?) a medio-reflexive sense;[22] only later on did it also acquire a passive sense, so that eventually it replaced the *qal* passive form in the Hebrew verbal system.[23] However, the dislodging of the *qal* passive by the *niphal* may have happened much earlier than Hosea because the use of the *niphal* with a passive sense was already relatively pervasive by the eighth century BCE.[24]

5. *Ideas and motifs found in some verses have affinities with Deuteronomic or exilic concerns.* Two examples are usually offered for this argument: a) the designation of Moses as a prophet in v. 14 appears nowhere else in the writings of the pre-exilic prophets but is mentioned first

[20]Source critics cannot decide whether Gen. 48:7 belongs to the Priestly writer or not (see G. von Rad, *Genesis*, OTL, trans. J. H. Marks [London: SCM Press, 1972], 414–415).

[21]Wellhausen, *Die kleinen Propheten*, 130.

[22]C. Brockelmann, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen* Vol. 1 (Berlin: Reuter und Reichard, 1908), 536; C. Brockelmann, *Hebräische Syntax* (Neukirchen Kreis Moers: Buchhandlung des Erziehungsvereins, 1956), 37; B. K. Waltke & M. O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 378–380, #23.1a–j; P. Joüon & T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* Vol. 1 (Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1991), 150.

[23]Waltke & O'Connor, *Syntax*, 385, #23.3ab.

[24]To cite only a few examples of a *niphal* with a passive sense: Gen. 2:23 (J); 4:18 (J); 21:8 (E); 31:15 (J); Exod. 14:5 (JE); Exod. 22:2.

in Deuteronomy,[25] and b) the Exodus motif in v. 14 is said to reflect an exilic concern.[26]

This kind of argumentation, which may be called "typology of ideas," has been fashionable among historians of religion. Just as archaeologists determine the date of a particular stratum by comparing, say, a potsherd found on that level with a pottery typology based on shape, make, material, etc., so too do historians of religion claim that a certain theological concept can be dated by locating its proper place within the developmental stages of Israelite religious thought.

There are several difficulties with this type of argumentation. First, the history of Israelite religion is still, for the most part, obscure. Hence, theological ideas are hard to pin down on a particular period.[27] Second, editors and compilers of the Israelite tradition sometimes retroject later materials into an earlier period; hence, certain religious ideas are no longer found *in situ*.[28] Third, it is not enough to be able to detect

---

[25]Wellhausen, *Die kleinen Propheten*, 128–129; T. H. Robinson, "Hosea," in T. H. Robinson & F. Horst, hrsg., *Die zwölf kleinen Propheten*, HAT 14 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr / Paul Siebeck, 1964), 49; E. Day, "Is the Book of Hosea Exilic?" *AJSL* 26/2 (1909–1910): 125. The argument finds its fullest expression in Yee (*Composition and Tradition*, 240–246) who assigns Hos. 12:14 to a Deuteronomistic editor (R2).

[26]Yee, *Composition and Tradition*, 245.

[27]A good example of this is the development of monotheism and the prohibition of icons (Morton Smith, *Palestinian Parties and Politics that Shaped the Old Testament*, 2nd ed. [London: SCM Press, 1987], 11–42; R. Albertz, "Der Ort des Monotheismus in der israelitischen Religions-geschichte," in W. Dietrich & M. A. Klopfenstein, hrsg., *Ein Gott allein? JHWH-Verehrung und biblischer Monotheismus im Kontext der israelitischen und altorientalischen Religionsgeschichte*, OBO 139 [Freiburg: Universitätsverlag / Göttingen: Vandehoeck & Ruprecht, 1994], 77–96; B. Lang, "The Yahweh-Alone Movement and the Making of Jewish Monotheism," *Monotheism and the Prophetic Minority: An Essay in Biblical History and Sociology* [Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993], 13–59).

[28]There are many Deuteronomistic and Priestly injunctions (e.g., prohibition of images, centralization of worship in Jerusalem, observance of the Sabbath

similarities of ideas. One must also establish dependence in order to determine their relative chronology; thus, if Hosea's ideas are similar to the Deuteronomist's, one should ask further: who depended on whom? There are four possibilities in this regard: a) the Deuteronomist inserted his material into Hosea's work;[29] b) Hosea's ideas influenced the Deuteronomist; c) both Hosea and the Deuteronomist got their ideas from a common source, a tradition that antedates both; and d) Hosea and the Deuteronomist, working independently of each other, produced similar ideas by sheer coincidence, and hence there was no dependence at all.

Let us thus look into the examples and try to establish the nature of the dependence between the following statements:

> By a prophet [Moses] the Lord brought up Israel from Egypt,
> and by a prophet he was preserved. (Hos. 12:14)

> The Lord your God will raise up for you a prophet like me [Moses]
> from among you …. (Deut. 18:15, also v. 18)

> And there has not arisen a prophet since in Israel like Moses, whom
> the Lord knew face to face, none like him for all the signs and wonders
> which the Lord sent him to do in the land of Egypt …. (Deut. 34:10–12)

There are similarities, no doubt: a) Both Hosea and Deuteronomy emphasize the role of a prophet as God's instrument. Hos. 12:14 underscores this by the double use of בנביא (note also the *bêth instrumentalis* in 12:11 ביד הנביאים and בנביאים in 6:5), while Deut. 35:11

---

rest, clean-unclean animals, etc.) that are now found in the early narratives (see W. G. Dever, "Ancient Israelite Religion: How to Reconcile the Differing Textual and Artifactual Portraits?" in W. Dietrich & M. A. Klopfenstein, hrsg., *Ein Gott allein? JHWH-Verehrung und biblischer Monotheismus im Kontext der israelitischen und altorientalischen Religionsgeschichte*, OBO 139 [Freiburg: Universitätsverlag / Göttingen: Vandehoeck & Ruprecht, 1994], 105–125).

[29]D. Stuart's opinion that Hosea incorporated materials from Deuteronomy (which he holds to be Mosaic in origin!) would fall under this category (*Hosea-Jonah*, WBC 31 [Waco, Texas: Word Books Publisher, 1987], 15).

conveys the same idea by the commission "the Lord sent him to do."[30] b) Both Hosea and Deuteronomy speak of other prophets whom the Lord will send to Israel. In Hosea we can deduce this from his other statement in 12:11 ("I spoke to the prophets … through the prophets I gave parables"),[31] while in Deut. 18:15–18 the Lord is said to have promised the Israelites that he would raise another prophet like Moses, and Deut. 35:10–12 assumes that there were in fact other prophets in Israel.

The crucial differences, however, between Hosea and Deuteronomy—ones that show a real advance in the theological thinking of the latter over the former—are the following: a) The Deuteronomist, on the one hand, presents Moses as a model of all later prophets of Israel (note the stress on "like Moses" [35:10 כמשׁה; 18:15 כמני; 18:18 כמוך]).[32] Hosea, on the other hand, never suggests that the figure of Moses defines the role of prophets in Israel.[33] Hos. 12:11 ("I spoke to prophets … through the prophets I gave parables") describes prophecy in its own terms and not in relation to Moses. b) The statement in Deut. 35:10f ("there has not arisen a prophet since in Israel like Moses …") represents a further development in the theology of prophecy. It seems to preempt later prophets from claiming equal status with Moses on the basis of Deut. 18:15–18. As J. Blenkinsopp notes, it "denies parity between the mode of revelation proper to Moses ('face to face') and prophetic mediation …."[34] By defining the limits of prophetic authority, the Deuteronomic historian seems to want to

---

[30]Also Deut. 18:18–19: "I will put my words into his mouth, and he shall speak to them …."

[31]Also Hos. 6:5: "I have hewn them by the prophets …."

[32]Cf. 2 Kgs. 17:13–14.

[33]See H. Mowvley, who assumes that Hosea regarded Moses as first in the line of prophets (*The Books of Amos and Hosea*, Epworth Commentaries [London: Epworth Press, 1991], 160).

[34]J. Blenkinsopp, *A History of Prophecy in Israel* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1983), 189–190.

bring prophecy within an institutional grid.[35] This is a perspective of someone who has seen through the period of prophecy. In contrast, Hosea probably never thought of Moses as somehow more privileged than the other prophets. He was just *a prophet* (note the indefinite article in 12:14) like other intermediaries mentioned in 12:11. By not mentioning Moses by name, Hosea seems to be emphasizing more the office rather than the person.

Therefore, between Hos. 12:14 and Deut. 18:15–18; 34:10–12, the latter appears to be the more developed statement on the subject of prophecy and its relation to Moses.[36] It is thus more likely that Hosea's identification of Moses as a prophet may have influenced the Deuteronomist rather than the other way around, or else both of them reflect the theology of their support group (proto-Deuteronomists?). The latter, in fact, is the opinion of more recent scholars.[37]

Now, with regard to the assertion that the Exodus motif in v. 14 reflects an exilic concern, the following points militate against such an interpretation: a) Hosea 12 still looks forward to the punishment of Ephraim. The Judah gloss in v. 3a may presuppose the end of the northern kingdom, but it has not changed the future orientation of

[35]Blenkinsopp, *History of Prophecy*, 190.

[36]The same conclusion can be drawn from the comparison of the traditions concerning the destroyed cities—Hos. 11:8 mentions only "Admah and Zeboi'im," while Deut. 29:22, representing a more developed tradition, has "Sodom and Gomor'rah, Admah and Zeboi'im." It is thought that Deuteronomy combined the northern tradition ("Admah and Zeboi'im") with the southern tradition ("Sodom and Gomor'rah") of Gen. 19:24; Isa. 1:9; Jer. 49:18; and Zeph. 2:9.

[37]C. L. Seow, *s.v.* "Hosea," *Anchor Bible Dictionary* 3 (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 296. H. W. Wolff attributed the similarities between Hosea and Deuteronomy to "forerunners of the Deuteronomic movement" (*Hosea*, Hermeneia, trans. G. Stansell [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974], xxxi). E. W. Nicholson argues that Hosea drew from the core of the Deuteronomic teachings that had been preserved in the north (*Deuteronomy and Tradition* [Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1967], 188). Cf. H. L. Ginsberg, *s.v.* "Hosea," in C. Roth, ed., *Encyclopedia Judaica* Vol. 8 (Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House, 1971), 1024.

the prophecy: it is basically still a prediction of the destruction of Ephraim and a warning to Judah. There is no clue whatsoever that it is now addressed to the exiles. b) The Exodus is a recurring and a well-integrated theme in Hosea's writings.[38] The prophet uses the Egyptian bondage as a grim reminder of the impending Assyrian captivity (7:16; 8:13; 9:3–6; 11:5).[39] He gives the flight from Egypt a far-reaching significance when he applies it to Israel's future restoration (2:17; 11:11).[40] He introduces judgment oracles by recalling this past saving event (12:10; 13:4). Moreover, for Hosea, the days of the Exodus and the desert wandering symbolize the idyllic period of God's relationship with his people (2:17; 11:1).[41] There is thus no reason to deny Hosean authorship to 12:14.

6. *The other pre-exilic writings are curiously silent about the patriarchs.* Some exegetes deduce from this that the patriarchal narratives as we know them in Genesis are the product of late Judean history.[42]

---

[38]S. L. McKenzie, "The Exodus Typology in Hosea," *Restoration Quarterly* 22 (1979): 100–108; R. Vuilleumier, "Les traditions d'Israël et la liberté du prophète Osée," *RHPR* 59 (1979): 491–498.

[39]T. E. McComiskey, "Hosea," in T. E. McComiskey, ed., *The Minor Prophets—An Exegetical and Expository Commentary* Vol. 1 (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Publishing House, 1992), 184, also 117.

[40]One possible exception is Hos. 11:11 which may presuppose the collapse of 587 BCE and the exile (C. Westermann, *Prophetic Oracle of Salvation in the Old Testament*, trans. K. Crim [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1991], 105f; H. Simian-Yofre, *El desierto de los dioses: Teología e historia en el libro de Oseas* [Córdoba: Ediciones El Almendro, 1993], 149, 152). Other scholars, however, think that even this may be original (J. L. Mays, *Hosea*, OTL [London: SCM Press, 1969], 159; Wolff, *Hosea*, 197; Stuart, *Hosea-Jonah*, 177; McComiskey, "Hosea," 184, 195).

[41]Hosea may have had an influence on Jer. 2:2: "I remember the devotion of your youth, your love as a bride, how you have followed me in the wilderness …." Cf. W. Holladay, *Jeremiah 1*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986), 83–84; J. Bright, *Jeremiah*, AB 21 (New York: Doubleday, 1965), 14; R. P. Caroll, *Jeremiah*, OTL (London: SCM Press, 1986), 119.

[42]Mic. 7:20 and Isa. 29:22, both of which contain references to the patriarchs,

Consequently, the patriarchal references in Hosea are considered to be a late insertion,[43] or else they reflect a tradition very different from those of Genesis.[44] Even more radically, B. Peckham thinks that the whole Book of Hosea is the work of a seventh century BCE author who wrote his interpretation of the destruction of the northern kingdom many decades after it happened,[45] but whose editor made him prophesy in the eighth century![46]

Not only is this an argument from supposed silence, it is also an imposition of a more stringent demand on the rule of evidence: it requires that the testimony of Hosea be corroborated by another testimony! But really, one valid witness suffices. The burden of proof now lies on those who would want to disqualify the evidence.

---

belong to materials inserted by later editors in the writings of these two eighth century prophets. In late Judean history, we find Jeremiah perhaps alluding to Jacob by the use of the verb עקב in Jer. 9:3—"… put no trust in any of your kin; for all your kin are supplanters (*'āqōb ya'qob*) …," and he explicitly refers to the patriarchs in Jer. 33:26—"would I reject the offspring of Jacob and of my servant David and not choose any of his descendants as rulers over the offspring of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob." The exilic prophets Ezekiel and Deutero-Isaiah refer to the patriarchs in Ezk. 28:25; 29:22; 37:25; Isa. 41:8f; 51:2.

[43]According to R. E. Wolfe, Hos. 12:4–6 and 13–14, among others, were inserted into the Book of Hosea by early scribes who wanted to make cross references to the Pentateuch ("The Editing of the Book of the Twelve," *ZAW* 53 [1935]: 115–116).

[44]Whybray, *Making of the Pentateuch*, 48–49, 103.

[45]Peckham, *History and Prophecy*, 1–18, esp. 5.

[46]Peckham says that "it was [the] editor who made him a contemporary of Isaiah and Amos in the eighth century" (*History and Prophecy*, 14). "The editor also added oblique references to other earlier incidents recounted in the Deuteronomistic history, and these, on the assumption that prophecy is a reflex of its occasion, have been used to establish an eighth century date for Hosea" (*History and Prophecy*, 27, fn. 24). See also B. Peckham, "The Composition of Hosea," *HAR* 11 (1987): 344f.

B. A Case for an Eighth Century BCE Date

Although the Pentateuch reached its final form only after the exile, many of the traditions on which it is based are certainly ancient.[47] How ancient? It would be impossible to fix a date. But the following consideration makes it more likely that the Jacob stories already circulated during Hosea's time.[48]

1. The interchangeable use of the national names Israel=Jacob in the eighth century prophetic writings would make sense only if there was already at that time a national legend pertaining to the origin and linkage of the two names.[49]

The equation of the two names, as far as evidence goes, is found only in the Bible. Archaeological findings from neighboring countries, while giving ample references to Israel, Judah, and *bit humria*,[50] provide

[47]W. D. Whitt, "The Jacob Traditions in Hosea and Their Relation to Genesis," *ZAW* 103 (1991): 18–43. Whitt wrongly assumes that previous scholars, except for F. Foresti ("Hos. 12: A Prophetical Polemic against the Proto-Elohistic Patriarchal Tradition," *EphCarm* 30 [1979]: 179–200), were not aware of the priority of the Hosean tradition over that of Genesis ("Jacob Traditions," 18). If these scholars have tended to see Hosea's references to Jacob in the light of Genesis it is because there is no other access to the early sources except through Genesis.

[48]In addition to our arguments, see S. Ausín, "La tradición de Jacob en Oseas 12," *EstBib* 49 (1991): 5–23.

[49]*Ya'ăqob* as a name for the nation occurs six times in Amos, three times in Hosea, fifteen times in First-Isaiah, and eleven times in Micah. Although some of these may come from a later hand, Amos 3:13; 6:8; 7:2–5; 8:7; 9:8; Hos. 10:11; 12:13; Mic. 3:1–8, 9; Isa. 8:17; and 9:7 appear to be original.

[50]Also *bêth dawîḏ*? A stone fragment from Tel Dan is alleged to contain the first known reference outside the Bible to the "house of David." The language of the inscription is early Aramaic and is dated to the middle of the ninth century BCE. It appears, according to A. Biran and J. Naveh, that the monument is celebrating a victory in battle, possibly by a king of Aram over a king of Israel ("An Aramaic Stele Fragment from Tel Dan," *IEJ* 43/2–3 [1993]: 81–98; H. Shanks, "'David' Found at Dan," *BAR* 20/2 [March/April 1994]: 26–39.

no attestation for the national name Jacob. Apparently, the latter was not known to foreigners, but only to Israelites who were steeped in the religious history of their nation.

Even in the Bible, the ordinary "secular" way of referring to the nation is Israel,[51] with the national name Jacob confined for the most part to writings that are religious in character, such as the Psalms and the prophetic oracles.[52] This would imply that Jacob had meaning only within the context of Israel's sacred traditions.

The increasing use of the national name Jacob in the later prophetic writings probably attests to the growing popularity and canonical status of the Jacob stories.[53]

2. The same may be said of the national names Isaac (Amos 7:9–16)[54]

See also S. Ahituv, "Suzerain or Vassal? Notes on the Aramaic Inscription from Tel Dan," *IEJ* 43/4 [1993]: 246–247; Z. Kallai, "The King of Israel and the House of David," *IEJ* 43/4 [1993]: 248; F. H. Cryer, "'House of David' Inscription," *SJOT* 8/1 [1994]: 3–19). The reading, however, is rejected by P. R. Davies ("House of David Built on Sand," *BAR* 20/4 [July/August 1984]: 54–55; P. R. Davies, "*Bytdwd* and *Swkt Dwyd:* A Comparison," *JSOT* 64 [1964]: 23–24; see also N. P. Lemche & T. L. Thompson, "Did Biran Kill David? The Bible in the Light of Archaeology," *JSOT* 64 [1994]: 3–22; and E. Ben Zvi, "On the Reading *bytdwd* in the Aramaic Stele from Tel Dan," *JSOT* 19/64 [1994]: 25–32).

[51]The Books of Samuel and Kings, which may have been culled from non-religious archival sources, refer to the nation as *yiśrā'ēl* six hundred and thirty-five times but as *ya'ăqob* only five times!

[52]*Ya'ăqob* as a name for the nation occurs one hundred and forty-four times in the Bible, most of which are in the prophetic writings (ninety times) and the Psalms (thirty-two times).

[53]In Amos, six times; Hosea, three times; First Isaiah, fifteen times; Micah, eleven times; Jeremiah, sixteen times; Ezekiel, four times; Second Isaiah, twenty-seven times.

[54]The parallelism between *Isaac* and *Israel*, occurring only in Amos, has not yet been satisfactorily explained, and it is all the more unusual since Isaac has been identified mostly with Beersheba in the south. Could it be a reflection of the eighth century theology of Bethel since Amos 7:6 quotes the high priest Amaziah? These passages are thought to be the work of early

and Joseph (Amos 5:6, 15; 6:6)[55] that were used for Israel by Amos or his early disciples. They are not the regular designations of the northern kingdom, but are merely substituted for its real name in order to evoke the common ancestry, ethnicity, and history of its people. Their use presumes a tradition like Gen. 48:1–22 that traces the origin of the two major Israelite tribes Ephraim and Manasseh to a common father, and a story like Gen. 25:19ff that links Jacob to Isaac.

Although we cannot determine the exact shape of the traditions that lie behind Amos' reference to Isaac and Joseph (whether or not they are the same as those found in Genesis), the use of the symbolic names demands a context known to the eighth century BCE audience. In the case of Hosea's allusion to Jacob, we are in a better position to discern the contours of the tradition he used—they are astonishingly similar to the ones in Genesis. This is the reason why modern scholars in the first place are able to recognize them as allusions—because of their knowledge of the stories in Genesis.[56] Likewise, the contemporaries

disciples of Amos (H. W. Wolff, *Joel and Amos*, Hermeneia, trans. W. Janzen, S. D. McBride, & C. A. Muenchow [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977], 295, also 108–110; J. L. Mays, *Amos*, OTL [Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969], 13; cf. I. Willi-Plein, *Vorformen der Schriftexegese innerhalb des Alten Testaments*, BZAW 123 [Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1971], 46ff). For various explanations on the reference to Isaac, see A. van Selms, "Isaac in Amos," *Studies in the Book of Amos*, OTWSA 8 (Potchefstroom: Pro Rege-Pers Beperk, 1964), 157–165, esp. 158; Wolff, *Joel and Amos*, 301–302.

[55]For the authenticity of these passages, see S. M. Paul, *Amos*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), 165–166, 178, 209; Mays, *Amos*, 102. Although Wolff considers them to be the work of a disciple, he nevertheless regards the expressions "remnant of Joseph" (5:15) and "ruin of Joseph" (6:6) as allusions to Israel's condition between 738–733 BCE (*Joel and Amos*, 240, 251, 277; cf. J. A. Soggin, *The Prophet Amos*, trans. J. Bowden [London: SCM Press, 1987], 87–88, 105).

[56]Although Hosea and Genesis have a number of words in common, there are not enough of them to be able to reconstruct a common source (*pace* Foresti, Fishbane), and even less to be able to tell whether that source is written or oral (*pace* Neef, Whitt). Hence, all that can be affirmed are the similarities in the general features, not details, of the Jacob story.

of Hosea would know the significance of the interchangeable names Israel=Jacob only if there existed already at that time a story of how Jacob got the new name Israel, perhaps a legend like the one found in Gen. 32:22–32 to which Hos. 12:4b–5a alludes.

3. Hosea alludes to one incident not found in Genesis: v. 5b "Jacob wept and pleaded for [God's] grace." This in itself may indicate the antiquity of the stories used by the prophet relative to the fixing of the patriarchal traditions in Genesis or even the so-called "Jacob cycle" of late Judean history.

Summary

The one and only evidence we have that some of the stories of Jacob and Moses already existed in the second half of the eighth century BCE is Hosea 12. Various attempts to invalidate this evidence on the basis of poetic structure, vocabulary, grammar, typology of ideas, etc. prove to be unsatisfactory. On the contrary, the use of the binomial *Israel/Jacob* in eighth century prophetic writings as well as the gentilics *Isaac* and *Joseph* in Amos presumes the existence of patriarchal stories that explain the connection of these names to the northern kingdom. Moreover, Hosea's allusion to an incident not found in Genesis may attest to an early period before the fixing of the patriarchal traditions in late Judean history.

Hosea's allusions to both patriarchal and Mosaic traditions may thus give us a good indication that the epic legend of Israel's salvation history narrated in Genesis-Exodus was already beginning to take shape during his prophetic ministry in the eighth century.

Bibliography

Ackroyd, Peter R. "Hosea and Jacob." *Vetus Testamentum* 13 (1963): 245–259.

Ahituv, Samuel. "Suzerain or Vassal? Notes on the Aramaic Inscription from Tel Dan." *Israel Exploration Journal* 43/4 (1993): 246–247.

Albertz, Rainer. "Der Ort des Monotheismus in der israelitischen Religionsgeschichte." *Ein Gott allein? JHWH-Verehrung und biblischer Monotheismus im Kontext der israelitischen und altorientalischen Religionsgeschichte*, hrsg. W. Dietrich & M. A. Klopfenstein, 77–96. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 139. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag / Göttingen: Vandehoeck & Ruprecht, 1994.

Andersen, Francis I. & David Noel Freedman. *Hosea*. Anchor Bible 24. New York: Doubleday, 1980.

Ausín, Santiago. "La tradición de Jacob en Oseas 12." *Estudios Biblicos* 49 (1991): 5–23.

Ben Zvi, Ehud. "On the Reading *bytdwd* in the Aramaic Stele from Tel Dan." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 19/64 (1994): 25–32.

Biran, Avraham & Joseph Naveh. "An Aramaic Stele Fragment from Tel Dan." *Israel Exploration Journal* 43/2–3 (1993): 81–98.

Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *A History of Prophecy in Israel*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1983.

Blum, Erhard. *Die Komposition der Vätergeschichte*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 75. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1984.

Bright, John. *Jeremiah*. Anchor Bible 21. New York: Doubleday, 1965.

Brockelmann, Carl. *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen* Vol. 1. Berlin: Reuter und Reichard, 1908.

———. *Hebräische Syntax*. Neukirchen Kreis Moers: Buchhandlung des Erziehungsvereins, 1956.

Caroll, Robert P. *Jeremiah*. Old Testament Library. London: SCM Press, 1986.

Cryer, Frederick H. "'House of David' Inscription." *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 8/1 (1994): 3–19.

Davies, Philip R. "*Bytdwd* and *Swkt Dwyd:* A Comparison." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 64 (1964): 23–24.

———. "House of David Built on Sand." *Biblical Archaeological Review* 20/4 (July/August 1984): 54–55.

Day, Edward. "Is the Book of Hosea Exilic?" *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures* 26/2 (1909–1910): 105–132.

de Vaux, Roland. "Les patriarches hebreux et les découvertes Modernes." *Revue Biblique* 55 (1948): 321–347.

Dever, William G. "Ancient Israelite Religion: How to Reconcile the Differing Textual and Artifactual Portraits?" *Ein Gott allein? JHWH-Verehrung und biblischer Monotheismus im Kontext der israelitischen und altorientalischen Religionsgeschichte*, hrsg. W. Dietrich & M. A. Klopfenstein, 105–125. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 139. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag / Göttingen: Vandehoeck & Ruprecht, 1994.

Duhm, Bernhard. "Anmerkungen zu den zwölf Propheten." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 31 (1911): 1–43, 81–110, 161–204.

Foresti, Fabrizio. "Hosea 12: A Prophetical Polemic against the Proto-Elohistic Patriarchal Tradition." *Ephemerides Carmeliticae* 30 (1979): 179–200.

Ginsberg, Harold Louis. *s.v.* "Hosea." *Encyclopedia Judaica* Vol. 8, ed. C. Roth, 1010–1024. Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House, 1971.

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

Harper, William Rainey. *Amos and Hosea.* The International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1904.

Holladay, William Lee. *Jeremiah 1.* Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.

Hurvitz, Avi. "Dating the Priestly Source in the Light of the Historical Study of Biblical Hebrew a Century after Wellhausen." *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 100, 88–99. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1988.

———. "The Language of the Priestly Source and Its Historical Setting—The Case for an Early Date." *Proceedings of the VIII World Congress of Jewish Studies*, 83–94. Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1981.

———. *A Linguistic Study of the Relationship between the Priestly Source and the Book of Ezekiel—A New Approach to an Old Problem.* Cahier Revue Biblique 20. Paris: Gabalda et Cie, 1982.

Joüon, Paul & Takamitsu Muraoka. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* Vol. 1. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1991.

Kallai, Zechariah. "The King of Israel and the House of David." *Israel Exploration Journal* 43/4 (1993): 248.

Lang, Bernhard. "The Yahweh-Alone Movement and the Making of Jewish Monotheism." *Monotheism and the Prophetic Minority: An Essay in Biblical History and Sociology*, 13–59. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.

Lemche, Neils Peter & Thomas L. Thompson. "Did Biran Kill David? The Bible in the Light of Archaeology." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 64 (1994): 3–22.

Marti, Karl. *Das Dodekapropheton*. Kurzer Handkommentar 13. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr / Paul Siebeck, 1904.

Mays, James Luther. *Amos.* Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969.

———. *Hosea.* Old Testament Library. London: SCM Press, 1969.

McComiskey, Thomas Edward. "Hosea." *The Minor Prophets—An Exegetical and Expository Commentary* Vol. 1, ed. T. E. McComiskey, 1–237. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Publishing House, 1992.

McKenzie, Steven L. "The Exodus Typology in Hosea." *Restoration Quarterly* 22 (1979): 100–108.

Mowvley, Harry. *The Books of Amos and Hosea.* Epworth Commentaries. London: Epworth Press, 1991.

Nicholson, Ernest Wilson. *Deuteronomy and Tradition*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1967.

Nowack, Wilhelm. *Die kleinen Propheten*. 2nd ed. Handkommentar zum Alten Testament III/4. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1903.

O'Callaghan, Roger Timothy. *Aram Naharaim*. Analecta Orientalia 26. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1948.

O'Connor, Michael Patrick. *Hebrew Verse Structure*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1980.

Paul, Shalom M. *Amos*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991.

Peckham, Brian. "The Composition of Hosea." *Hebrew Annual Review* 11 (1987): 331–353.

———. *History and Prophecy: The Development of Late Judean Literary Traditions*. New York: Doubleday, 1993.

Pitard, Wayne T. *s.v.* "Paddan-Aram." *Anchor Bible Dictionary* 5, 55. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Praetorius, Franz. *Neue Bemerkungen zu Hosea*. Berlin: Verlag von Reuther und Reichard, 1922.

Ramirez, Felipe Fruto Ll. "Typology of Sin, Repentance, and Grace in Hosea 12:3–7." *Landas* 26:2 (2012): 41–78.

Rendtorff, Rolf. *Das überlieferungsgeschichtliche Problem des Pentateuchs*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 147. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1977.

Robinson, Theodore Henry. "Hosea." *Die zwölf kleinen Propheten*, hrsg. T. H. Robinson & F. Horst, 1–54. Handbuch zum Alten Testament 14. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr / Paul Siebeck, 1964.

Schmid, Hans Heinrich. *Der sogennante Jahwist*. Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1976.

Seow, Choon Leong. *s.v.* "Hosea." *Anchor Bible Dictionary* 3, 291–297. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Shanks, Hershel. "'David' Found at Dan." *Biblical Archaeology Review* 20/2 (March/April 1994): 26–39.

Simian-Yofre, Horacio. *El desierto de los dioses: Teología e historia en el libro de Oseas*. Córdoba: Ediciones El Almendro, 1993.

Smith, Morton. *Palestinian Parties and Politics that Shaped the Old Testament*. 2nd ed. London: SCM Press, 1987.

Soggin, J. Alberto. *The Prophet Amos*, trans. J. Bowden. London: SCM Press, 1987.

Stuart, Douglas K. *Hosea-Jonah*. Word Biblical Commentary 31. Waco, Texas: Word Books Publisher, 1987.

van Selms, Adrianus. "Isaac in Amos." *Studies in the Book of Amos*, 157–165. Ou Testamentiese Werkgemeenskap in Suid-Afrika 8. Potchefstroom: Pro Rege-Pers Beperk, 1964.

van Seters, John. *Abraham in History and Tradition*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1975.

von Rad, Gerard. *Genesis*. Old Testament Library, trans. J. H. Marks. London: SCM Press, 1972.

Vuilleumier, René. "Les traditions d'Israël et la liberté du prophète Osée." *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* 59 (1979): 491–498.

Waltke, B.K. & M. O'Connor. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1990.

Wellhausen, Julius. *Die kleinen Propheten*. Berlin: G. Reimer, 1898.

Westermann, Claus. *Prophetic Oracle of Salvation in the Old Testament*, trans. K. Crim. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1991.

Whitt, William D. "The Jacob Traditions in Hosea and Their Relation to Genesis." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 103 (1991): 18–43.

Whybray, Roger Norman. *The Making of the Pentateuch*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Sup. Ser. 53. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987.

Willi-Plein, Ina. *Vorformen der Schriftexegese innerhalb des Alten Testaments*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 123. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1971.

Wolfe, R. E. "The Editing of the Book of the Twelve." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 53 (1935): 90–129.

Wolff, Hans Walter. *Hosea*. Hermeneia, trans. G. Stansell. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974.

———. *Joel and Amos*. Hermeneia, trans. W. Janzen, S. D. McBride, & C. A. Muenchow. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977.

Yee, Gale A. *Composition and Tradition in the Book of Hosea: A Redaction Critical Investigation*. Society of Biblical Literature Diss. 102. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.