Hosea 4–14 in Twentieth-Century Scholarship

BRAD E. KELLE
Point Loma Nazarene University, San Diego, CA, USA
bradkelle@pointloma.edu

ABSTRACT

Twentieth-century scholarship on Hosea has addressed a wide range of interpretive questions that often reflect the common approaches to the prophetic literature in general, yet an inordinate amount of attention has been paid to the marriage and family imagery in Hosea 1–3. In recent years, scholars have corrected this tendency, exploring ways that texts throughout Hosea 4–14 offer insights into long-standing critical issues. Rather than exhibiting a movement in which newer methodological perspectives have replaced older traditional approaches, all of the established, modern scholarly pursuits remain prominent in the current study of Hosea 4–14. Scholars are now reformulating the traditional questions, however, from new angles largely generated by interdisciplinary influences. These influences have also given rise to previously unexplored lines of inquiry, such as synchronic, literary, and theological readings, Book of the Twelve studies, and metaphor theory. Studies using metaphor theory with an eye toward religious, political, socio-economic, and gender considerations seem likely to occupy the central place in Hosea scholarship in the immediate future.

Keywords: Baal, Book of the Twelve, covenant, eighth-century history, feminist criticism, form criticism, goddess, history of scholarship, Hosea 1–4, Israelian Hebrew, metaphor, religion of Israel

Currents in Biblical Research
© The Author(s), 2010. Reprints and Permissions:
http://www.sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav Vol. 8.3: 314-375
ISSN 1476-993X DOI: 10.1177/1476993X09346514

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

1. Introduction

The study of the book of Hosea in the twentieth century and the opening decade of the twenty-first century has been a curious mixture of breadth and myopia, tradition and innovation. On the one hand, scholarship has ranged broadly across interpretive issues relevant to all aspects of the book as a whole, and many of these issues represent the traditional questions that have long been germane to the critical study of all the Hebrew Bible's prophetic literature. On the other hand, Hosea scholarship in recent decades has witnessed the emergence of innovative approaches to various aspects of the book, including in particular the study of metaphor and its relationship to rhetoric, gender construction, and socio-economic ideologies and structures. Both the traditional and these innovative approaches, however, have operated with an overwhelmingly myopic focus on the marriage metaphor in Hosea 1–3, often to the exclusion of serious engagement with other parts of the book.

The contradictory tendencies toward breadth and myopia have shaped the modern study of Hosea 4–14 in particular (for major surveys of the history of interpretation of Hosea as a whole, see Craghan 1971; Clements 1975; Williams 1975; Seow 1992; Davies 1993; Heintz and Millot 1999; Neef 1999; Sherwood 2004; Kelle 2005). Interpreters have often overlooked the pressing issues found in chs. 4–14 in favor of those raised by the stories and sayings ostensibly related to Hosea's personal life. For some scholars, chs. 1–3 have served to establish the primary interpretive framework through which all subsequent portions of the book were understood. Witness the conviction of Achtemeier (1975: 482) that the 'rest of the oracles in Hosea are really expositions in detail of the message of chapters 1 to 3'. At the same time, other works that consider the material in Hosea 4–14 more extensively have manifested the contradictory tendency to see a sharp division between chs. 1–3 and 4–14 in genre, provenance, ideals, language, and character. For some interpreters, such a division has been the 'one organizing principle' for the interpretation of Hosea (Morris 1996: 114). Representing perhaps the most extreme example of this tendency, Kaufmann, followed by Ginsberg, asserted historically what others claimed functionally, namely, that Hosea 1–3 comes from a prophet who lived during the Omride dynasty in the ninth century BCE, while chs. 4–14 contain the words of a different prophet, who lived in the latter half of the eighth century BCE (Kaufmann 1961; Ginsberg 1971; cf. Ewald 1875: 214).

Since the final decades of the twentieth century, works within Hosea scholarship evidence an increasing move away from both of the tendencies to underemphasize the interpretive issues in chs. 4–14, and to drive a wedge

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

between the content and dynamics of chs. 1–3 and 4–14. This move has led to fresh considerations of the materials in Hosea 4–14, with, for example, new attention being placed on the text's metaphors on their own terms, and to the possible shared compositional settings and ideological functions for the book as a whole.

This article sketches the major contours and trends of the modern interpretation of Hosea 4–14, with particular attention being given to scholarship in the second half of the twentieth century (for a similar survey of Hosea 1–3, see Kelle 2009). Unlike the scholarly discussion of other major prophetic collections, such as the book of Isaiah, or even of the marriage imagery in Hosea 1–3, the study of chs. 4–14 does not exhibit a clear movement in which newer methodological perspectives have steadily replaced older, traditional approaches. Rather, nearly all of the long-standing scholarly pursuits concerning chs. 4–14 remain alive in the current critical conversation. Yet, scholars now ask the traditional questions from new angles and bring them into conversation with some previously unexplored lines of inquiry, both of which have largely been generated by interdisciplinary influences, especially those derived from social-scientific analysis and metaphor theory. Form criticism, for example, perhaps constitutes the classic approach to Hosea 4–14, and this perspective continues to occupy a prominent place in examinations of these chapters. But the scholarly literature now places Wolff's seminal form-critical analysis (1974) alongside Ben Zvi's reformulation of Hosea's genre, setting, and function in the provenance of scribal circles in post-exilic Yehud (2005). These reconsiderations of traditional pursuits take shape alongside previously unexplored lines of inquiry, such as synchronic, literary, and theological readings, Book of the Twelve studies, and metaphor theory, which are finding an increasingly prominent place in Hosea scholarship.

2. The Overall Contours of Scholarship on Hosea 4–14

For the better part of the twentieth century, the interpretation of Hosea 4–14 unfolded largely within the parameters of several shared points of consensus concerning the book as a whole, points which have only recently been challenged in an extensive way (see Sweeney 2000; Sherwood 2004; Ben Zvi 2005; Chalmers 2007). These consensus points include the views that: the prophet Hosea was a historical figure in the Northern Kingdom between about 750 and 725 BCE; the texts contain some of the original, distinctively northern Israelite preaching of Hosea, as well as additional elements from Judaean, exilic, and perhaps post-exilic editors; the book's primary concern

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

is Israel's apostasy through the abandonment or confusion of Yahweh for/with Baal; and Hosea's oracles have significant points of contact with earlier traditions, such as Jacob and the Sinai covenant, and later books in the deuteronomistic tradition, such as Jeremiah and Deuteronomy.

Overall studies of Hosea underwent a burgeoning period in the 1960s, with the publication of major critical treatments by Wolff (1974), Jacob, Keller, and Amsler (1965), Rudolph (1966), and others, and this increase in publications continued over the following decades (for a detailed survey of major commentaries on Hosea from the second half of the twentieth century, see Kelle 2009). From the 1960s to the 1980s, the typical scholarly commentary on Hosea revolved around the concerns of redaction, form, and tradition criticism (see especially Wolff 1974; see also Rudolph 1966; Brueggemann 1968; Mays 1969; for commentaries from before the twentieth century, see Neef 1999). Another cluster of critical commentaries emerged in the 1980s, and represented the expansion of scholarship on Hosea 4–14 beyond a focus on redaction, form, and tradition (e.g., Andersen and Freedman 1980; Jeremias 1983; Stuart 1987; Limburg 1988). Cultivating the seeds planted by this work in the 1980s, commentaries since the mid-1990s have increasingly engaged Hosea as a complex literary work through interaction with broader methodological perspectives such as feminist criticism, metaphor theory, and sociological analysis (see Yee 1996; Macintosh 1997a; Garrett 1997). The analyses found in the most recent English-language commentaries on Hosea 4–14 extend these broader considerations by adding various nuances drawn from canonical, confessional, ethical, and socio-materialist perspectives (e.g., Sweeney 2000; Pentiuc 2002; Ben Zvi 2005; Simundson 2005). Recent German scholarship continues to emphasize redaction-critical analysis, seeking to establish Hosea as a deliberate, redactional unity composed within specifically identifiable periods throughout Israelite and Judaean history (e.g., Gisin 2002; Rudnig-Zelt 2006; Vielhauer 2007).

3. Traditional Approaches and their New Formulations

a. Text, Philology, and Morphology

The area of text criticism provides a first example of the ways in which the critical study of Hosea 4–14 has largely continued to pursue traditional areas of inquiry, but has recently drawn upon interdisciplinary insights to broaden such pursuit into new aspects and with additional nuances. Hosea has garnered particular attention among text critics over the last century,

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

largely because the Hebrew text of the book is exceedingly difficult and often obscure. Virtually every major commentary from the modern period contains some statement that the text of Hosea is second only to Job in the Hebrew Bible in the number of textual problems, literary idiosyncrasies, unintelligible passages, and generally having 'many verses so badly preserved that the original sense can scarcely be determined with certainty' (Neef 1999: 522; see Mays 1969: 5; Andersen and Freedman 1980: 66; Stuart 1987: 13). Such linguistic difficulties include ellipses, *hapax legomena*, and other constructions out of keeping with standard Hebrew grammar (e.g., see *hapax legomena* in 5.2, 13; 7.9; 8.6).

Throughout the first three-quarters of the twentieth century, Hosea scholarship commonly attributed the obscurities of the book's language to textual corruption that had occurred in the transmission process, and thus proposed numerous emendations based on other available manuscripts and versions. The classic commentary on textual issues by Harper (1905) exemplified this perspective, which continued to find a place in subsequent works, such as Rudolph (1966) and Wolff (1974). This approach identified specific corrupt passages in Hosea (e.g., 4.18; 5.2; 6.3; 8.5a; 11.2-3; 13.1; see Harper 1905: clxxiii), and offered various reconstructions of the putative 'original' text. The discovery of comparative materials from places such as Ugarit in the early decades of the 1900s provided additional resources for this kind of study, especially given Hosea's presumed northern provenance. Nyberg (1935), for example, blended textual criticism with the study of the history of religions in order to argue for the priority of the MT as interpreted through comparative linguistics and a particular reconstruction of Israelite religion in its regional and cultural context.

The use of various versions and manuscript traditions throughout the first part of the twentieth century gave rise to a host of specific issues that generated much scholarly discussion. Numerous studies from the late 1800s onwards, for example, devoted special attention to the vexed relationship between the MT and LXX versions of Hosea, but drew differing conclusions (see Patterson 1890–91; Szabó 1975; Neef 1986; Bons 2004). Scholars observed significant differences in length and readings between the versions, noting that the LXX has a literalistic quality yet also contains, as do all other available textual sources, a number of incomprehensible passages. These observations led many interpreters in the first half of the twentieth century to conclude that the LXX was marginally useful for reconstructing the MT and perhaps based upon a different Hebrew *vorlage* (Harper 1905: clxxiii-clxxiv; Nyberg 1935). While some variations of this view remain (Neef 1986; Davies 1992), most contemporary commentators

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

reject the notion of a different Hebrew *vorlage* for the LXX, and see it as useful for establishing the MT, even more so than other available versions (Andersen and Freedman 1980: 66; Stuart 1987: 13; Macintosh 1997a: lx-lxxv). Textual data for Hosea from various fragments at Qumran (see Allegro 1959; Fuller 1991) and the possibility of Aramaic influence on the book (see Yoo 1999; cf. Macintosh 1997a) have also had a part in the text-critical conversation throughout the mid to late twentieth century.

The final quarter of the twentieth century witnessed a significant change in the assessment of the textual particularities of Hosea. In contrast to earlier scholars' explanations involving the corruption of the text during transmission, the present consensus concludes that Hosea's textual difficulties reflect a peculiar northern dialect of Hebrew, coming from Hosea's origins in Israelite territory, and evidenced in a few other places in the Hebrew Bible (e.g., Mays 1969; Stuart 1987; Davies 1992; Macintosh 1997a). The notion of the presence of a northern dialect with peculiar grammatical features and diction in the Hebrew Bible goes back at least to C.F. Burney's work on the books of Kings (1903), and some works on Hosea throughout the main part of the twentieth century picked up the idea in explicit but largely tangential ways (Nyberg 1935; Rudolph 1966). One of the earliest major formulations appeared in Kuhnigk's (1974) attempt to explain Hosea's language and concepts through extensive use of Ugaritic and other northwest Semitic parallels. More recently, the works of Seow (1992) and Yoo (1999) have argued that the presence of a dialect of 'Israelian Hebrew' is the definitive key to understanding the textual issues of Hosea. In the most comprehensive study, Yoo draws especially upon the earlier work of Rendsburg on Psalms and Kings (1990; 2002), which aimed to identify the characteristic features of Israelian Hebrew and the evidence for their presence in the Hebrew Bible, and concludes that nearly half of the verses in Hosea contain some characteristic of this northern dialect (Yoo 1999: 177-78). Yoo and others look to comparative data from Ugaritic texts and the Samaritan ostraca, and propose that the main characteristics of Israelian Hebrew include the practice of employing words known from standard biblical Hebrew in a different sense or with a different grammatical form, and the presence of numerous *hapax legomena* (see Macintosh 1997a: lvi-lvii).

Although the northern dialect theory has achieved consensus status, it continues to garner criticism in some quarters (see Andersen and Freedman 1980: 67; Fredericks 1996; Macintosh 1997a: liv). Additionally, other approaches to the text of Hosea have found a place in the scholarly conversation throughout the second half of the twentieth century. One such approach has emphasized a more intentionally morphological and stylistic interpretation of Hosea, which is less concerned to establish the book's

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

original text. Wolff's seminal commentary (1974) paid attention to the stylistic particularities of Hosea's prose and poetry, as well as his varied rhythmic structures, such as the patterned use of bicola and tricola. The most comprehensive morphological examination appeared in Buss (1969), which blended text, form, and redaction criticism in the service of a morphological study of the book's verbal patterns, stylistic tendencies, and grammatical constructions. Buss offered a translation and exposition that delineated rhythmic structures, word repetitions, shifts in speech forms, and figurative expressions, explaining how Hosea's morphology, style, and grammar contribute to the rhetorical acts of communication accomplished by the literary texts (see also Blankenbaker 1975; Morag 1984). Recently, Mulzer (2003) has given this morphological perspective a new formulation in the analysis of Hos. 5.8–8.14. Combining text criticism with the redaction criticism that remains typical of contemporary German scholarship on Hosea, Mulzer attends to the analytical and even statistical assessment of the syntactic formulations, semantic elements, and grammatical constructions that comprise the various rhetorical units in 5.8–8.14.

The last few decades have produced some new formulations of the long-standing interest in the textual and morphological study of Hosea that offer different options. These formulations are shaped in important ways by attention to interdisciplinary considerations. From a more traditional perspective, the Italian work by Borbone (1987) represents the only comprehensive critical edition of the book of Hosea produced in the twentieth century. He argues that all textual witnesses to Hosea go back to a single exemplar that pre-dates the Greek translation, while the MT of Hosea represents the work of a post-exilic Judaean author. Borbone gives a reconstruction of the putative original, Hebrew consonantal text, as derived from the available textual sources. Andersen and Freedman's textual work (1980) seeks a third way between the corruption/emendation and northern dialect proposals, arguing for a linguistic method based on comparative ancient Near Eastern texts, and concluding that many of the so-called 'problematic' features of Hosea (unusual verb forms, archaic spellings, etc.) are legitimate grammatical and syntactical elements when viewed in their broader linguistic context. Such data confirms the MT over other versions, but the text of Hosea's oracles must be understood not as 'finished oracular utterances, ready for public delivery,' but examples of the prophet's earlier, 'unformed, initial insights' (1980: 45).

More recently, Sherwood (2004) has drawn upon postmodernist literary theories to change common conceptions of the irregularities and complexities of the text of Hosea, including especially the *hapax legomena*, irregular structures, interrupted construct chains, and so on. She reads these features

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

as a ‘disjointed rhythm’ that serves to destabilize the text’s images of God and people, and disorient the reader in ways that engender multiple readings. This perspective, she argues, invites one to explore Hosea’s linguistic particularities through the lens of the postmodern conception of the ‘back-broke sentence’ and the ways in which prophecy uses ‘lexically and sexually exhibitionistic terms’ to confront the reader (2004: 329).

b. Form Criticism and Rhetorical Analysis

Beginning in the middle of the twentieth century, form criticism came to dominate Hosea scholarship, and this dominance would continue through the 1970s. From the mid-century until now, one of the central features of this approach has been an emphasis on the difficulties that the book presents for typical form-critical investigation. Scholarly treatments from various eras routinely assert that form criticism of Hosea is more complicated than that of other prophetic books for a number of reasons (e.g., Mays 1969: 5; Andersen and Freedman 1980: 45; Davies 1992: 35). The book generally lacks typical introductory and concluding formulas to delineate individual units, the characteristic ‘messenger formula’ of prophetic speech, the normal structures of many common prophetic genres, and clear distinctions between poetry and prose. In short, the ‘typical prophetic formal composition characteristics are either so subtly combined or so artistically modified in Hosea’s oracles that one has to consider each oracle on an ad hoc basis, i.e., on its own merits’ (Stuart 1987: 8). From these considerations, form-critical analyses of Hosea 4–14 have attempted to identify the major genres that are evident in the text, especially divine speech, prophetic speech, oracles of reproach and punishment, *rib*-oracles, and historical retrospectives. Perhaps more than any other genre category, however, the presence of apparently legal speech forms (e.g., 4.1-3; 8.1-3; 13.1-3) provided the impetus for much of the form-critical work on Hosea 4–14 prior to the 1980s.

The classic approach to the form criticism of Hosea appeared in its most pronounced form in Wolff (1974), although his work stood in the context of many such studies before and during his time (Lindblom 1928; Weiser 1949; Rudolph 1966; Mays 1969). This approach gave voice to the notion that Hosea 4–14 mainly consists of brief, complete, oral, and largely independent prophetic sayings, which represented conventional forms that could be linked to concrete institutional settings in ancient Israel. Hence, Wolff’s commentary provided an examination of the form, setting, and aim for nearly every major unit of speech, determining the smaller, original units by identifying various genre elements, and attempting to isolate the two major genres of divine speech (e.g., 4.4-9; 5.1-3; 5.8-15; 6.4–7.16; 8.1-12)

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

and prophetic speech (4.1-3; 5.4-7; 9.1-9; 10.1-8). The centerpiece of this classic form-critical study of Hosea 4–14, however, was the conviction that most of the genres of Hosea's oracles had a direct connection with the setting in life of legal institutions in ancient Israel, especially a dispute between two parties at the city gate (Wolff 1974: xxiii; see also Mays 1969: 35; Stuart 1987: 72). From this vantage point, Hosea's use of accusations and announcements of judgment, especially employing the term *rib* ('to contend, accuse'), reflects the language of established legal procedures (e.g., 4.1-3; 12.3 [MT]). While this perspective has remained in force over the last few decades, a number of more recent commentators have offered important nuances. Andersen and Freedman (1980: 316) have questioned the general form-critical assumption of the original independence of the oracles in Hosea 4–14, stressing that the oracles are too lengthy to fit the form-critical ideal and give the impression of constituting a 'sophisticated literary composition'. Macintosh (1997a: lxii), like Buss (1969: 79) before him, accepted that legal settings and traditions provide the background for some of Hosea's oracles, but he asserted no comprehensive, direct connection to forensic contexts can be established for the majority of the sayings.

As noted above, around the time of the original German edition of Wolff's commentary, Buss (1969) developed a morphological approach to Hosea that expanded the categories of classic form criticism, moving beyond a focus on legal contexts and adding a decidedly anthropological dimension. Unlike the majority of earlier form-critical studies, Buss's morphologically-oriented form criticism did not take the form of a commentary focused on genres and *Sitze im Leben*, but provided a systematic study of the book's verbal patterns and stylistic tendencies (see more recently, Israel 1989), attempting to relate such observations to sociological and anthropological conceptions of the structural elements in societies and repeatable human experiences. While still connecting some oracles to legal and cultic institutions (e.g., 6.1-3; 1969: 74), Buss focused on features such as the relationship in Hosea of non-specific threatening statements with divine first-person speech, and extrapolated the dimensions of human existence revealed by those features, including a certain 'element of receptivity toward the Other' (1969: 67).

Since the late 1980s, new formulations of the form-critical study of Hosea 4–14 have emerged that offer a substantially different approach, informed by other methodological and interdisciplinary considerations. Attention to literary perspectives, for example, has generated several attempts to read Hosea as poetry (Fisch 1988; Landy 1995a; Morris 1996). Although consideration of poetic style and syntax have been a feature of Hosea studies

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

throughout the twentieth century (e.g., Harper 1905: clxiv-clxxiii), these newer treatments foreground the book's literary qualities, such as verbal repetition and wordplay, arguing that the primary genre category of Hosea is poetry rather than oral proclamation or didactic literature. Morris (1996), for instance, labels the book of Hosea as a lyric poem, which uses repetition and wordplay to reshape popular conceptions of God and Israel. More recently, Sweeney (2000; see also 1998–99) blends a consideration of genre, morphology, and synchronic literary analysis to challenge the long-standing divisions of Hosea's structure based on the genre distinctions between narrative materials (chs. 1–3), oracles of judgment (chs. 4–11), and oracles employing Israelite traditions (chs. 12–14). By paying attention to markers of speakers and addressees in the text, Sweeney suggests that the core of oracles in 2.4–14.9, in which Hosea speaks to Israel, stands within a framework in which a narrator addresses an anonymous audience (1.2–2.3 [MT]; 14.10 [MT]). Hence, form-critical analysis should focus upon the genre of the whole book in its final form as a didactic work, designed by an anonymous narrator, and re-addressing Hosea's words to Israel as a lesson for the new audience of Judah, likely in the time of Josiah.

The most recent, comprehensive commentary on Hosea from a form-critical perspective (Ben Zvi 2005) also departs from classic form criticism's practice of dividing Hosea 4–14 into smaller, originally oral units. Like Sweeney, Ben Zvi examines the generic concerns of Hosea at the broader literary level of the final composition, and, drawing upon socio-historical analysis, contends that those concerns have been designed to function rhetorically for an audience in a particular socio-ideological situation, namely, the literati in post-monarchical Yehud. He identifies each individual oracle in Hosea as representative of a single genre: the 'didactic prophetic reading', which may evoke earlier genres such as the prophetic lawsuit, but has now been reformulated in the context of larger sections that form a 'Set of Readings' (e.g., 4.1–11.11 [MT]; 12.1–14.9 [MT]). These, in turn, stand within the larger macro-genre of the authoritative 'Prophetic Book' (Ben Zvi 2005: 11, 97, 111; see also Ben Zvi 2003). This macro-genre, designed to claim association with a prophetic personage and message of the past and re-present that message to a new readership as an authoritative word from Yahweh, should be the determinative factor for understanding the nature and function of the book's oracles (see also Conrad 2003). Thus, Ben Zvi concludes, the specific readings in the final form of the book do not exist individually. They came into being in their present form only as a part of the 'Prophetic Book' of Hosea, and only to serve the didactic purposes of the scribes in Yehud, as the oracles themselves are read and re-read in that context as an instructional word from Yahweh.

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

Attention to questions of genre throughout the modern period has also led to the development of a related avenue of recent research that deserves brief mention here. Beginning from the generic conception that the texts of Hosea first and foremost take the form of persuasive discourse, several works have employed the method of rhetorical criticism as a way of engaging various elements in the book and their function in particular historical circumstances. These analyses draw upon the classical understanding of rhetoric as persuasive discourse (rather than merely stylistic analysis), involving the interactions among a speaker, speech, and audience within a shared rhetorical situation. They build upon a host of studies related to the rhetorical analysis of biblical texts in general (e.g., Kennedy 1984) and the prophetic literature in particular (see especially Kelle 2005; see also Fox 1980; Gitay 1981; Barton 1990; Boadt 1997). As early as the 1950s, R. Lewis (1958) used categories of classical rhetoric (ethos, pathos, logos) to examine Hosea, along with Amos and Micah, in terms of their stylistic features and emotional appeals, with special focus on the interaction of speaker, original audience, and historical situation. In the last decade, however, the rhetorical criticism of Hosea has centered predominantly on the text's metaphors, as in the work on other prophetic books (e.g., Nielsen 1989; Galambush 1992). The metaphors, it is argued, are not merely decorative devices, but function as part of the intended communication designed to reshape the thinking and behavior of a particular audience in a specific rhetorical context. Such analysis allows an interpreter to move beyond historical concerns and offer a rhetorical *critique* of the metaphors in a book like Hosea, exposing how they work rhetorically to construct certain understandings of reality (see Kelle 2005; Haddox 2005 and 2006; Blair 2007). As the discussion of metaphor study below will show, other approaches to Hosea's metaphors, while not explicitly employing rhetorical criticism, interpret these metaphors as devices that the prophet uses to address social, political, and religious circumstances in eighth-century Israel (see Keefe 2001; Hong 2006).

c. Tradition and Redaction

As has been the case with most prophetic books, insights from tradition and redaction criticism played a significant role in the study of Hosea throughout the twentieth century, and these avenues have undergone new formulations in recent years, though in less dramatic ways than other approaches. For Hosea scholarship, the line between tradition and redaction study has often been blurry, especially when considering Hosea's relationship to books such as Deuteronomy and Jeremiah, with some scholars using tradition criticism largely in the service of redactional theories.

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

Few features of Hosea have been more apparent to interpreters throughout various periods than the book's use of traditions apparently identifiable from other places in the Hebrew Bible. Throughout the early and mid-twentieth century, interpreters often suggested that Hosea's heavy use of historical tradition should be explained as a deliberate effort to differentiate Yahwism from the cyclical and nature-based fertility religion of Canaan (so Östborn 1956: 25-28). More recently, however, commentators have directed their attention to the breadth of the traditions used by Hosea and the diversity of ways in which they are employed.

The consistent observation among investigations of the book's tradition history is that, in contrast to the other pre-exilic prophets, Hosea draws extensively from the traditions of northern Israel, especially those related to Jacob (e.g., 12.3-5, 13 [MT]), the exodus (e.g., 11.1; 12.10-14 [MT]; 13.4), and wilderness (e.g., 9.10; 13.4), rather than those concerning Zion and David. All of the traditions appear in a fragmentary form, and this has sparked ongoing debate over the origins of these traditions—that is, from where did they come and how did Hosea come to know them?—and their function in the book. While some interpreters have downplayed diachronic questions in favor of intertextual and literary readings of Hosea's traditions (Willi-Plein 1971; Sweeney 2000), most have suggested that either the traditions had already achieved a fixed and likely written form prior to the time of Hosea (Stuart 1987; Garrett 1997), or that the prophet derived his knowledge of the traditions from oral recitation by priests in various cultic settings, perhaps in the form of sacred legends transmitted at northern sanctuaries such as Bethel (see Wolff 1974: xxiii; Daniels 1990; Davies 1993: 70-72; Holt 1995). Either way, it is generally concluded, the basic elements of the traditions were established prior to Hosea's reformulations, although likely in variant forms from those later preserved in the Pentateuch.

A host of studies have examined the specific traditions present in Hosea's oracles. Traditions that have drawn scholars' attention and evoked a variety of understandings concerning the extent and nature of their presence in the book include the following:

1. Exodus/wilderness wandering (e.g., 9.10-17; 10.1-2; 11.1-7; 12.10 [MT]; 13.4-8; see Cassuto 1973; Wolff 1974: 34; Hoffman 1989; Boudreau 1993; Dozeman 2000; Jiménez 2006);
2. Sinai/covenant/Decalogue (e.g., 4.2; 6.7; 8.1, 4-6; 10.4; 12.2 [MT]; 13.1-4; see Brueggemann 1968; Stuart 1987);
3. Levitical/priestly backgrounds (e.g., 5.14-15; 6.11–7.1; 9.14; see Wolff 1956; Cook 1999);

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

4. Wisdom (e.g., 4.15; 5.12; 8.7; 12.8-9 [MT]; 14.10 [MT]; see Wolff 1974: xxiv; Seow 1982, 1992; Macintosh 1997b);
5. Song of Songs (see van Selms 1964–65; van Dijk-Hemmes 1989; Buss 1996).

The majority of scholarly attention in this regard, however, focuses on the traditions related to Jacob, Deuteronomy, and Jeremiah. The book's references to the ancestor Jacob (12.3-5, 13 [MT]) constitute one of its unique characteristics. Accordingly, a vast amount of critical studies devoted to this topic appear in scholarly literature, and it continues to generate new formulations (e.g., Ackroyd 1963; Good 1966c; Diedrich 1977; S. McKenzie 1986; Whitt 1991; Koet 2002). Similarly to other traditions, the areas of inquiry revolve around the origin of the Jacob traditions in Hosea, and the functions for which the text employs them. In contrast to earlier treatments (e.g., Vriezen 1942), most interpreters since the mid-twentieth century understand Hosea as drawing upon various oral traditions about Jacob, which were perhaps more extensive than and different from those ultimately preserved in Genesis (Good 1966c), and/or as sharing a common source with the pentateuchal materials, which Hosea adapts in divergent ways (Ruppert 1971; Diedrich 1977; Whitt 1991). Scholarship remains more divided, however, concerning the function of the Jacob references, particularly whether Hosea presents Jacob as a positive or negative example for his audience (cf. Ginsberg 1961; Ackroyd 1963; Good 1966c; Sweeney 2000: 5).

The question of Hosea's relationship to Jeremiah, and, especially, Deuteronomy has drawn even more sustained attention in tradition-critical study. It is at this point that the tradition-critical and redaction-critical inquiries into Hosea overlap most directly in the history of modern scholarship, as the study of possible dependence and adaptation at the tradition, writing, and editing stages has been significant since the early twentieth century (e.g., Gross 1930) and continues within recent research, primarily in German works (Weider 1993; Schulz-Rauch 1995). Hosea's relationship to Deuteronomy in particular also includes broader questions of provenance and theology. Virtually all modern commentators emphasize numerous similarities between Hosea and Deuteronomy, ranging from specific references ('Admah and Zeboiim', Deut. 29.23; Hos. 11.8) to theological language, such as election (Deut. 4.37; 7.6-8; Hos. 9.10; 11.1) and calls to repent/return (Deut 4.29-31; 30.1-10; Hos. 6.1-3; 14.2-3 [MT]). The shared northern provenance of Deuteronomy and Hosea provides the usual starting point for explaining these similarities, but modern scholars remain divided over the precise nature of the relationship between the books, and the question is complicated by the unsettled nature of the discussion concerning

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

the origins and composition of Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History. While some recent works posit the primacy of Deuteronomy as a direct source for Hosea (Stuart 1987), or the activity of a Josianic redactor upon both books (Yee 1987: 305-13; Yee 1996: 204-205), the majority of scholars continue to support the view that has been dominant since the time of Wellhausen, namely, that Hosea and Deuteronomy do not evidence direct literary dependence, but both draw upon a larger stream of northern tradition. In this view, Hosea, rather than Deuteronomy, stands near the beginning of that tradition and offers a formulation of it that shaped the theology of later works (Mays 1969; Buss 1969; Andersen and Freedman 1980; Davies 1993).

Gathering many of the insights about specific traditions, several major works devoted to the comprehensive analysis of traditions in Hosea have appeared since the 1950s, and the most recent examples represent a promising way forward for tradition-critical inquiry. These works attempt an integrated analysis of the traditions in light of their creative use and rhetorical function in the book. Already in 1968, Brueggemann focused on the function of the traditions in Hosea, suggesting that Hosea reformulated chronologically older historical and legal Torah traditions, especially Mosaic covenantal traditions, in order to bring them to bear on a new crisis in the life and faith of Israel. More recently, Neef (1987) has undertaken an extensive study of the presence of traditions related to Jacob, Moses, wilderness wandering, covenant, and the Decalogue. While Vollmer (1971) had argued that Hosea uses past traditions to show the discontinuity between Israel's past and present, Neef concludes that the prophet employs these older traditions in order to demonstrate the continuity and constancy of Yahweh's love for Israel, and thus as encouragement to his audience to move toward conversion. Operating from the broader conviction that Hosea inherited a coherent understanding of the early history of Israel, as articulated in priestly circles, Daniels (1990) examines several particular passages (2.16-25; 6.7-10; 8.1-3; 9.10-13; 11.1-7; 12.3-15 [MT]; 13.4-8) for evidence that these traditions existed in variant forms from those ultimately preserved in the Pentateuch, and that the traditions in Hosea, which constitute an integral part of his message, can be synthesized into a coherent understanding of the early history of Israel.

In the most recent comprehensive study, Holt (1995) shares the notion that Hosea inherited the basic elements of the book's traditions from earlier local, oral, and cultic settings, and that the book preserves the earliest written form of these traditions. She offers a theological interpretation of the book's references to certain traditions, especially concerning Jacob (12.3-7, 13-14 [MT])

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

and depictions of Israel as rebellious (6.7; 8.1b; 9.10-17; 10.11-13a; 11.1; 13.4a, 5-8), to demonstrate her conviction that Hosea uses the traditions to assert the exclusivity of Yahweh's claim on Israel. Hosea makes primary use of traditions that emphasize the interdependence between Yahweh and Israel and Yahweh's care for the people. Yet, since the basic historical and theological aspects of these traditions were known to the prophet's audience, we should understand Hosea to be re-reading them in order to accentuate the dimension of Yahweh's exclusive demands for worship.

It is evident, then, that the examination of traditions in Hosea scholarship has often involved redactional questions. The catalyst for virtually all redaction-critical analyses of Hosea since the nineteenth century has been the observation that the present book seems to consist of two relatively unconnected parts in chs. 1–3 and 4–14, leading some interpreters to posit that the present form of the book contains the oracles of two different prophets who lived in two different periods (e.g., Kaufmann 1961; Ginsberg 1971; see discussion of the redaction criticism of Hosea 1–3 in Kelle 2009). Additionally, the disjointed nature of Hosea 4–14's contents has long convinced scholars that the book shows evidence of the editorial work of a significant number of later hands, especially those that contributed material from the context of the southern kingdom of Judah in the generations after the time of the eighth-century prophet, Hosea. Hence, throughout most of the twentieth century, the primary redactional debate has revolved around whether the present book is a largely haphazard or accidental conglomeration of these materials, produced through diverse and disjointed phases of editorial activity that were not comprehensive, or an intentionally crafted, literary unity that coherently incorporates any and all secondary materials.

The majority of scholars working before the 1980s presumed that Hosea was a loosely connected, editorial composite of materials that had come together over time through an unsystematic process. As a result, most redactional studies, especially in the first half of the century, focused on identifying secondary additions in a quest to locate the supposed *ipsissima verba* of the prophet, Hosea, although there was wide disagreement over the extent, origin, and nature of the redactional materials. For example, Harper (1905) represents an early example of a host of interpreters who discounted a large amount of the book as coming from editors and contexts after Hosea's time (see also Marti 1904; Batten 1929; Nyberg 1935; Wolfe 1945). Among these scholars, the redactional debate over secondary materials particularly involved the book's 14 references to Judah and several oracles of restoration. Both of these kinds of materials were often debated as secondary additions, and even recent redactional works

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

continue this focus, especially regarding the Judah references, with most scholars assuming at least one Judaean redaction of some kind for the book (cf. Harper 1905; Clements 1975; Andersen and Freedman 1980; Emmerson 1984; Stuart 1987; Gisin 2002).

Wolff's commentary (1974) provided the most developed expression of this redactional perspective and established an approach to the book's composition that remained dominant until the 1980s. He argued that the book originated from three 'transmission complexes' (chs. 1–3; 4–11; 12–14) that developed independently from one another and were joined at a later date. Each complex contains a mixture of original words from Hosea and later editorial additions, and each has been structured to move from accusation to restoration. According to Wolff, the material in Hosea 4–14 in particular contains a significant amount of Hosea's original preaching, in roughly chronological order. Each of the transmission complexes achieved written but not final form during Hosea's lifetime. After the fall of the northern kingdom, however, a collection of Hosea's preaching made its way to Judah, where it underwent at least two Judaean redactions, and the final form of the book came about in the exile or early post-exile period, as various edited collections were joined together. In the years before, during, and after the publication of Wolff's commentary, other studies pursued the recovery of independent utterances in the book, stressed the attempts of later editors to join together and/or rework the original sayings, and identified Judaean redactional activity to varying degrees in the text's compositional history (e.g., Frey 1957; Good 1966a; Buss 1969; Mays 1969; Jeremias 1983, 1995).

A significant shift in the redactional study of Hosea began with the work of Willi-Plein in 1971. Aiming to rectify the devaluing of the supposed 'inauthentic' parts of Hosea among many scholars, Willi-Plein focused on the overall purpose and effect of the editorial elements throughout the book and how the book functions as a whole. She identified eight groups of sayings that redactors from various time periods added to an original written text of the book, yet these additions, in her view, were offered as interpretive commentary designed to function within the entire composition. Although Willi-Plein's work picked up some insights that had been present in earlier scholarship, this careful attention to the intentionality and function of the text's editorial elements initiated a trend in Hosea studies that drew sustained attention to the redactors as purposeful, theological interpreters whose aim was to produce an integrated, final composition.

Following Willi-Plein's work, approaches to the redactional questions of Hosea in the 1980s moved the discussion from an emphasis upon Hosea as a loosely connected, editorial composite of disparate materials to a

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

new focus on the intentionality and coherence of the final composition, achieved through the systematic and comprehensive editing of its apparent levels of material. Naturally, this move has led to a new debate over the social and ideological dynamics, circumstances, and purposes of the book's construction. Andersen and Freedman's commentary published in 1980, for example, allowed for an editorial process in which the oracles of Hosea 4–14 originated mostly as a product of the prophet himself and subsequently underwent collection and editing by Hosea's disciples until reaching their final form in the exile, yet concluded that this process produced a coherent, intentionally designed rhetorical composition that was 'not a mere hodgepodge' (1980: 66; from a more conservative perspective, see also Stuart 1987 and Hubbard 1989).

The comprehensive studies of Emmerson (1984) and Yee (1987) more fully developed this holistic emphasis upon the purposeful integration of original and editorial materials in the book of Hosea (see also Peckham 1987). Emmerson identified redactional materials in the book through the use of theological, historical, and linguistic criteria (e.g., references to Judah, attitudes toward the northern cult), specifically associating a comprehensive Judaean reworking of the original materials with the time of Josiah and the tradition of Deuteronomy. Paying close attention to the effect of these editorial materials and their integration into the book as a whole, however, she argued that the Judaean materials that now overlay the original texts do not simply extend the prophet's original message, but intentionally reshape it in order to bring new emphases and nuances within a composition deliberately designed to speak to a new situation. Yee (1987) used some of the same criteria to identify redactional materials related to four editorial stages, which span from the eighth-century prophet himself to a final redactor in the exilic period. The book's final form, she argued, constitutes an intentionally crafted composition, and the various redactors at each preceding stage were not simply collectors who joined materials or added minor glosses. Rather, each subsequent redaction purposefully reshaped the older, inherited materials into a 'new literary work' in keeping with the redactor's aims (1987: 48).

The approach represented by Emmerson and Yee in the 1980s exemplified the shift from seeing Hosea as a loosely connected, editorial composite of disparate materials to identifying a thoroughgoing intentionality and coherence in the final product, achieved through systematic and comprehensive editing. While a few recent works maintain that there is very little or no secondary material in the book (Garrett 1997; Gisin 2002), the majority of redactional studies published since 1990 accept the presence of

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

varying but usually high amounts of editorial material, yet also conclude that such material has been carefully integrated into a planned and unified composition (but cf. Mitchell 2004). The primary differences among recent works concern the point of emphasis, with some devoting their attention to the explication of the details, character, and provenance of the discrete redactional layers and their process of development, and others focusing on the dynamics and aims of the final, edited work. The main disagreements are over the questions of how far back the presumed process of writing, editing, and compiling goes, and under what circumstances and for what purposes it was done. For example, recent works divide over whether the planned composition was primarily in place before it made its way to Judah after the fall of the northern kingdom, and underwent only minor Judaean editing (e.g., Naumann 1991; Macintosh 1997a; Sweeney 2000), or the present book originated primarily as the work of an exilic or post-exilic redactor who used earlier materials to create a coherent and comprehensive whole for the first time (e.g., Nissinen 1991; Ben Zvi 2005).

The focus on the explication of the details, development, and provenance of the discrete redactional layers appears mostly in recent German scholarship on Hosea. Nissinen (1991) focuses on the development of the materials in Hosea 4 and 11 as a microcosm of the ongoing redactional process of the whole book, and ultimately emphasizes that such activity resulted in a present form of the book that should be approached as a 'collage', with varying styles, forms, and dissonant parts (1991: 336; see also Pfeiffer 1999). Adopting a different emphasis on the final product, Naumann (1991) concludes that the redactors' reshaping at each stage worked within a planned composition, so one cannot sort through the redactional layers to distinguish the earliest materials clearly. A more recent trend explores particular sections of Hosea, such as 4.1–9.9 and 5.8–8.14, or specific verbal and literary elements, such as speakers and addressees or place names, for how they may serve as centerpieces from which the stages of the book's compositional history developed (see Mulzer 2003; Schütte 2008). Vielhauer (2007), for example, follows the lead of Nissinen and proposes that the composition of the entire book of Hosea developed in stages from an original nucleus in chs. 4–9 (e.g., 5.1-2; 6.7–7.2; 7.3-7, 8-12). Later editorial layers both within and without chs. 4–9 broadened the prophet's original concern with political affairs to include the cult and historical retrospectives. By contrast, Rudnig-Zelt (2006) identifies multiple redactional layers in Hosea, but contends that none of these materials come from the eighth-century prophet or his disciples. Rather, the entire book is the result of successive phases of theological interpretation, all of which occurred in Judah between the fall of Samaria in 722 BCE and the Hellenistic period.

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

Recent redactional studies produced within English-language scholarship, while acknowledging the presence of significant editorial materials and activity, largely take up the question of the circumstances and purposes of the final composition. Macintosh's commentary (1997a), for instance, identifies some later materials, such as certain Judah references, but maintains that Hosea himself withdrew from public life around 733 BCE and reworked and expanded his own public oracles throughout chs. 4–14. Hence, Macintosh concludes, the book was a complete literary work prior to the time it was taken to Judah after the fall of the northern kingdom (1997a: lxvi-lxxiii). As discussed above in the context of form criticism, however, Ben Zvi's recent commentary argues that one should approach the book of Hosea as a 'self-contained literary unit', rather than a composite from which one should identify possible forerunners (2005: 4). While later writers clearly drew upon some largely unformed, earlier traditions, the book was constructed for the first time by scribes in postmonarchic Yehud, who used an association with a prophetic personage of the past to create an authoritative book designed to be read and re-read as a word from Yahweh (see also Trotter 2001).

d. History, Sociology, and Institutions

The debate within recent redactional scholarship concerning the various layers of material in the book of Hosea connects directly to another traditional scholarly pursuit that has also undergone significant reformulation in the last few decades. Building upon the common twentieth-century view that the book contains original material from the eighth-century prophet himself, modern scholarship has typically understood Hosea as a useable and important source for the historical reconstruction of pre-exilic Israel (for an early example, see Brown 1932). Interpreters have observed elements such as the book's apparent references to political actions and treaties involving Israel, Assyria, and Egypt (e.g., 5.13; 7.11; 8.9; 12.1 [MT]). Even though many of these texts are vague, offering no specific references or clearly identifiable personal names, throughout most of the twentieth century before the 1980s, the dominant view in scholarship professed a high level of confidence in Hosea as a useable historical source, and identified the historical information yielded by the book as directly relevant to the northern kingdom of Israel in the eighth century BCE. From this perspective, the book was particularly useful for the history of the northern kingdom because Hosea himself is commonly considered to be the only prophet who addressed the northern kingdom as a native (see Harper 1905: cxli-clv; Davies 1993: 13). Using the references to Jeroboam II and several Judaean kings in the book's superscription (1.1) as a starting point, most major

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

commentaries have highlighted other historical references (e.g., 'the house of Jehu', 1.4) to develop a general consensus that relates Hosea's preaching to the turbulent period between the final years of Jeroboam II and the fall of Samaria (ca. 750–720 bce). Interpretations may differ over the exact parameters of Hosea's career (cf. Harper 1905: cxli; Tadmor 1960; Andersen and Freedman 1980: 34-37; Davies 1993), yet the long-standing approach has maintained that Hosea's oracles in chs. 4–14 are essentially in chronological order, and that specific references in the book relate directly to internal and external socio-political activity in the eighth century (e.g., see Wolff 1974: xxi; but cf. Yee 1996: 234).

Examples of the use of Hosea 4–14 as a source of historical information for eighth-century Israel continue to appear in recent scholarship. On the level of large-scale, comprehensive studies, King (1988) attempts a commentary on Hosea from the perspective of history and archaeology, although he focuses less on political events than aspects of culture and society (see also Utzschneider 1980). Hayes and Kuan (1991) appeal to numerous references from Hosea in order to reconstruct very specific historical events and circumstances related to the final years of the northern kingdom. Hosea, in their view, 'provides a number of allusions which make possible a general reconstruction of the course of events' (1991: 166). Hence, Hayes and Kuan propose that the book of Hosea divides into two overlapping chronological panels (chs. 1–3; 4–14), with chs. 4–7 coming from the time between 747–725 bce, chs. 8–9 from the years of Israelite rebellions in 725–722 bce, and chs. 10–14 from the period of Sargon II's activity in the west around 720 bce (see also Frey 1957; Kelle 2005).

In addition to these more comprehensive works, a number of studies take up the relationship between specific texts and eighth-century history, reaching a variety of conclusions. Several works identify the enigmatic reference to 'Shalman' in Hos. 10.14, for example, as a piece of historical information, relating it variously to kings such as Shalmaneser V of Assyria in the 720s (Hayes and Kuan 1991: 163) or Salamanu of Moab in the 730s (Wolff 1974: 188). Others use texts such as Hos. 9.13 as references to Assyrian campaigns along the coast (Kuan 1991), and Hos. 8.8-10 as indications of renewed rebellions in Samaria after the time of King Hoshea (Irvine 1995; see also Arnold 1989). By far, however, the most common topic among historical interpretations of Hosea throughout the twentieth century is the attempt to relate particular texts in the book to the events of the Syro-Ephraimitic War (ca. 734–731 bce). Proposals for such connections center especially on Hos. 5.8–6.6 and go back to the work of Alt in 1919. While subsequent scholars throughout the last century have challenged and nuanced Alt's proposals (Good 1966b; Arnold 1989;

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

Yee 1996; Gangloff 2003), with some even rejecting the relationship of any texts in Hosea to the Syro-Ephraimitic War (Andersen and Freedman 1980; Sweeney 2000), the majority of critical works continue to view passages such as 5.8–6.6 as containing useful information related in some way to these eighth-century events (Rudolph 1966; Mays 1969; Wolff 1974; Stuart 1987; Davies 1992; Macintosh 1997a).

Despite the enduring nature of readings that use Hosea as a historical source for eighth-century Israel, there is a growing trend in scholarship since the 1980s that is much less confident about Hosea's ability to provide useable historical information. Some of these approaches are simply more cautious with regard to Hosea's potential historical information. Andersen and Freedman, for example, represent the first major critical commentary to resist dating the book's oracles, asserting that one 'can rarely identify people and events with any confidence' (1980: 73). Others have levied a stronger objection, often emphasizing that the kinds of poetic and metaphorical language found in the book do not permit historical investigation, and interpreters 'cannot easily correlate any text in Hosea with any known event of history' (Garrett 1997: 24; see also Nissinen 1991). Some of the most recent works on Hosea, however, have contributed a new formulation of this older line of historical inquiry. These works show a renewed openness to the possibility that the texts of Hosea can yield historical information, but, in keeping with some of the new formulations of redaction criticism, they assert that the historical information yielded by Hosea consists primarily, if not solely, of what the final form reveals about its authors, audience, circumstances, and concerns. Ben Zvi's commentary (2005), with its proposal that the book of Hosea was created to be read and re-read by the literati of postmonarchical Yehud, once again provides a primary example of this trend. He concludes that the book contains only enough specific historical references to establish a general framework (e.g., a sequence of Judaean kings), and that 'they cannot be taken as a reliable source for an understanding of the history of monarchic Judah…nor that of the northern kingdom in the days of Jeroboam' (2005: 18). Although one might argue that Ben Zvi underestimates some of the book's particularities and the general lack of indicators of a postmonarchic setting, other recent works have operated along similar lines. Trotter (2001) investigates how the final form of Hosea functioned in the context of Judah in the early Achaemenid period (ca. 539–516 BCE). Sweeney (2000) and Conrad (2003) likewise concede that the book is set against the backdrop of the Assyrian period, but argue that it yields little information relevant to that time and offers its primary information concerning the scribal community that produced the final composition.

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

A primary aspect within this twentieth-century historical study of Hosea 4–14 has been the investigation into the relationship between Hosea and the social, religious, and political institutions of his day, especially the monarchy, priesthood, and prophecy. Debate over the attitude in the book toward the institution of kingship has occupied a prominent place in this regard. Several passages in Hosea explicitly relate to kingship, often talking about the misdeeds and/or removal of the rulers and stressing inappropriate behavior by the king in political, military, and cultic activities (e.g., 5.1-2, 10; 6.11–7.7, 16; 8.4; 9.15; 10.1-4, 7-8a). The referent in most of these texts is the northern monarchy, with only 5.10 dealing with Judah alone within the context of chs. 4–14 (cf. 2.2; 3.4-5). While the references to kingship in 2.2 and 3.4-5 are positive, all of the references in Hosea 4–14 are negative. Among these, the enigmatic condemnation in 8.4 has consistently drawn the most attention, and its meaning continues to confuse (cf. Mays 1969; Wolff 1974; Hayes and Kuan 1991).

The discussion surrounding Hos. 8.4 is representative of the wider range of interpretations of Hosea's overall view on kingship that appears in commentaries and other studies throughout the modern period. The major question giving rise to divergent interpretations primarily centers on whether Hosea condemns the very existence of the institution of the monarchy, or only engages in a more specific critique. Along these lines, scholars read Hosea's references to kingship in several major ways, although their conclusions are, at times, partially determined by their views on the book's redactional history:

1. Hosea opposes the entire system and idea of kingship in principle (Mays 1969; Wolff 1974);
2. Hosea sees the northern monarchy as illegitimate in nature and function (Harper 1905; Rudolph 1966; Emmerson 1984; Macintosh 1997a);
3. Hosea condemns specific kings, especially of the northern kingdom, because of their particular acts of disobedience (Utzschneider 1980; Hayes and Kuan 1991).

Three significant studies devoted to the issue of Hosea's view of kingship appeared in the second half of the twentieth century, and further develop the usual scholarly interpretations. Published about a decade apart, Caquot (1961) and Gelston (1974) adopt fairly traditional perspectives on the topic, with Gelston, for example, concluding that Hosea is opposed to kingship in principle, but his specific criticisms are directed at the existence and nature of the northern monarchy. More recently, however, Machinist (2005) offers a complex analysis of the book's references to the monarchy,

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

and argues that Hosea's view of kingship is ambiguous. He resists the oversimplifications of many previous analyses, and demonstrates that all of the usual scholarly interpretations can find support within the relevant passages. In his view, it is unlikely that Hosea is focused upon the northern monarchy alone (contra Gelston 1974). Rather, by drawing upon traditions such as those in 1 Samuel 8, Hosea reflects the deep tension and ambiguity between the problematic nature of the very institution of the monarchy and the reality that kingship will play a role in the future of the restored community (Machinist 2005: 177-79).

Alongside this discussion of kingship, twentieth-century Hosea scholarship has participated heavily in the long-standing debate over the relationship between prophets and the priestly cult. Throughout the book, one finds criticisms of priests (e.g., 4.1-10), sanctuaries (e.g., 4.15; 9.15; 10.5, 8, 15), sacrifices (4.13-14; 5.6; 6.6; 8.11, 13; 9.4-5; 12.11 [MT]), and other religious elements and practices, such as idols, pillars, and images (e.g., 4.12; 8.5-6; 10.1-2; 13.2). Among these texts, ch. 4, which contains seemingly overt references to the misbehavior of priests, and 6.4-6, which appears to condemn cultic practices at major sanctuaries in favor of non-sacrificial religion, have drawn the most sustained attention, even while producing no agreement among interpreters on what they reveal about Hosea's view of the priestly cult. The traditional answers throughout much of the modern period as to why Hosea criticizes these cultic offices and practices have proposed that he operated from a general orientation of opposition to the priesthood and priestly religion (Ward 1966; Wolff 1974; Utzschneider 1980; Stuart 1987), or that he rejected particular priests because of their specific actions or faulty inner dispositions (Brueggemann 1968; Mays 1969; Andersen and Freedman 1980; Yee 1996). At the same time, a few scholars have concluded that the prophet's familiarity with and focus upon priestly religion indicate that Hosea himself came from priestly (Levitical) lineage, and that a loss of power experienced by his own priestly line gave rise to his condemnations of current priests and practices (Wolff 1956; Cook 1999). By far, however, modern scholarship's most widely shared conclusion has explained Hosea's predominantly negative view of the priestly cult as a reaction to the supposed influence of Baalism on the religious life and practices of eighth-century Israel. A virtual default position within Hosea scholarship has been to amass a collection of evidence from other sources that suggests Hosea sees Israel's priesthood and sanctuaries as sinful because of their sponsorship of the worship of Baal, or, at least, some form of worship that does not represent intolerant, polemical monolatry (e.g., Mays 1969; Yee 1996; see discussion of Israelite religion below).

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

A final aspect of Hosea's relationship to the institutions of ancient Israelite society that has only recently begun to produce some sustained investigation concerns his view of prophets and prophecy. Consideration of this topic goes back at least to Wilson's (1980) sociological examination of the phenomenon of prophecy in Israel, which identified Hosea as a peripheral prophet in the Ephraimite tradition, who opposed the central priesthood of the northern kingdom. In recent years, Odell (1996a; 1996b) has reopened this area of study by examining the brief references to prophets in the book (4.5; 6.4-5; 9.7-8; 12.11-14 [MT]). Based on this analysis, she concludes that the 'prophets' mentioned are not equivalent to Hosea and the other classical prophets who served as legitimate messengers for Yahweh, but are a part of the cult that Hosea condemns. These prophets 'perform only a negative role' in Hosea's view, as Yahweh has used them to intensify Israel's guilt in anticipation of judgment (Odell 1996a: 162). This kind of exploration into the possibly complex and, perhaps, even polemical relationship between Hosea and the phenomenon of prophecy holds much promise for future study of the socio-cultural dimensions of the book.

Since the 1980s, the traditional study of history and institutions has undergone one of the most significant reformulations in Hosea scholarship, and within the current decade this reformulation has come to occupy a central place in the study of the book. Under the rising influence of social-science perspectives within biblical studies generally, the final years of the twentieth century and the beginning of the twenty-first century have witnessed the expansion of the kinds of study outlined above into a complex socio-economic/socio-materialist analysis of the background and dynamics that gave rise to and are reflected in the texts of Hosea. While there had been a relative dearth of major sociological studies of Hosea (but see Utzschneider 1980), several such comprehensive analyses have appeared within the last decade. Taken as a whole, these works focus on the primary metaphors in Hosea, especially sexual metaphors related to promiscuity, and interpret them as tropes for particular social and economic developments in eighth-century Israel and Judah. By drawing upon anthropological and sociological perspectives from the comparative study of agrarian societies, these newer approaches identify the eighth century as a time when Israel underwent a dramatic change in its economic system and modes of production due to the expansion of royal power at home and the demands of political and economic relations abroad. Israelite society experienced increased disparity between elites and peasants, the emergence of a tributary economy with royal land grants and cash-crops, and the growth of foreign trade. Hosea's oracles and metaphors, it is argued, reflect these

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

developments, especially the ways in which all other elements of the cult, politics, etc. became embodiments of the social crisis.

Studies of this kind began to appear in earnest in the 1980s, often in the form of dissertations and articles dealing with prophets more generally. Premnath's dissertation (1984), finally published in 2003, argues that Hosea's language and imagery fit within the social history and socio-economic developments in eighth-century Israel, especially the process of latifundialization and the concomitant emergence of urban centers, militarization, and cash-cropping (see also Dearman 1988). Various works by Chaney (see 1989; 1993; 2004) have examined Hosea's promiscuity imagery as a metaphor for agricultural intensification, with the wanton female as a trope for the male, ruling elites. Similarly, in an unpublished dissertation, Green (1997) sets forth an extensive and nuanced analysis of the calls for justice in Hosea and other eighth-century prophets. Green relates such calls to changes in social and economic structures, in particular, changes in the differing evaluations and roles of the local and regional royal functionaries, who were secondary members of the ruling stratum. The critiques of Hosea and other prophets were aimed at these local figures, calling for justice within a proper patron-client system.

Within the present decade, the works of Keefe (2001) and Yee (2003: 81-109) make the most developed use of Hosea as a source for this socio-economic background. In particular, these works contribute especially to the study of the book's metaphors, especially the female and sexual imagery (see below), but they do so by reading such imagery as symbols of the structural violence in Israelite society produced by: changing modes of production, royally sponsored agribusiness, and forced land consolidation. The prophet's language and imagery are ultimately concerned with the social conflict and disintegration in Israel caused by the transition to a foreign-tributary mode of production and its requisite agricultural specialization and political instability, as wealthy elites and royal functionaries co-opted profits and surpluses to acquire luxury goods. Accordingly, Keefe (2001: 12) concludes that Hosea's female and sexual imagery is a symbol of Israel's disintegrating social body and the intertwined political, social, and religious aspects of the new royal economy. Likewise, Yee (2003: 90-91) understands much of Hosea's imagery and rhetoric as an attack designed to shame and condemn Israel's political and religious leaders for their role in creating the new, unjust socio-political situation. Even more recently, Hong (2006) has applied this perspective to the metaphor of illness and healing within Hosea, which he interprets as a social metaphor criticizing the influx of royal production demands, latifundialization, and profit

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

accumulation into eighth-century Israel. The interdisciplinary nature of the approach represented by these newer studies, especially its consideration of systemic or macro-sociological perspectives, holds significant potential for future inquiries into the book's relationship to the circumstances and dynamics of ancient Israel's history, society, and culture.

e. Israelite Religion

Among the traditional scholarly pursuits surveyed thus far, no approach to Hosea has dominated the critical discussion in the twentieth century more than the question of how the book relates to the development and nature of Israelite religion in the eighth century BCE. Although consideration of this topic has largely focused on the sexual metaphors and references to Baal in Hosea 1–3 (see Kelle 2009), the appearance of the term Baal (9.10; 11.2; 13.1) and the mention of other religious elements in Hosea 4–14 (e.g., 8.5-6; 10.5-6; 13.1-2) have produced a particular scholarly interpretation that was dominant throughout most of the last century: the book as a whole reflects a great religious conflict in the prophet's day between the polytheistic Canaanite worship of Baal and the Israelite worship of Yahweh. According to this view, virtually unchallenged until recent years, Israelite religion in Hosea's day was marked by a syncretism, especially in the form of competition between Yahwism and Baalism, and this situation constituted the main concern of Hosea's oracles. Hence, this conflict, although articulated in a variety of forms throughout the modern period, has been the main interpretive framework for the prophet's life and ministry and the book's language and imagery. As one representative comment asserted, '[T]he entire book of Hosea is a bitter polemic against the worship of Baal' (Ringgren 1966: 267). Recent reformulations of this area of inquiry, however, have moved away from the long-standing interpretations of the religious background of Hosea, with some rethinking the concept of Baal and Baalism, and others redefining virtually the entire history of Israelite religion.

Until as recently as the early 1990s, the vast majority of interpreters operated from the perspective that the references to Baal and other religious elements in Hosea should be understood as indicators that an established, foreign religious system of Baalism had invaded Israel from outside and led Hosea's contemporaries to forsake Yahweh in some manner. As a result, much of twentieth-century research on Hosea and Israelite religion has been intertwined with the debate over Baalism in modern scholarship (see the extended analysis in Dearman 2001). Within this debate, in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the majority of scholars interpreted the plural references to the 'baalim' in Hosea (2.15 [MT], 19 [MT]; 11.2)

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

as generic in nature, indicating a situation of general polytheism that involved a variety of local deities who remain largely undifferentiated in the prophet's condemnations (e.g., Cheyne 1884; Harper 1905). In this view, the terms 'baal' and 'baalim' in Hosea did not constitute references to a particular god in Hosea's day, but simply to any local deity. The discovery and analysis of the Ugaritic texts at Ras Shamra in 1929 and beyond, however, produced a sea-change in the interpretation of Hosea *vis-à-vis* Israelite religion. These texts seemed to indicate the prominence of a singular, powerful deity, the storm god Baal-Hadad, whose cult played a defining role among the peoples of Canaan in the late Bronze Age. Interpreters of Hosea were quick to extend these insights to the book's narratives and oracles, and a new scholarly consensus emerged that would dominate Hosea study in various forms until the final decade or so of the twentieth century. Rather than seeing Hosea's oracles as criticizing a general polytheism, interpreters after the 1930s broadly concluded that the prophet addressed a situation in which devotion to a particular, cosmic deity ('Baal') had emerged as a rival to the worship of Yahweh within the northern kingdom of Israel. In a circular fashion, subsequent scholarship used the texts of Hosea to fill out the details of this religious situation, and simultaneously relied upon the reconstructed religious environment, furthered by the use of other extra-biblical sources, such as the Samarian ostraca, as the interpretive key for the prophet's oracles.

Numerous studies throughout the twentieth century gave voice in sometimes dramatic ways to this notion that Hosea reflects a great religious struggle in the eighth century in which Yahweh 'wages his final battle against Baal for the soul of Israel' (Mays 1969: 1). In most of these readings, Baal came to be identified as a nature deity associated with various seasonal cycles and worshipped in agricultural festivals, in contrast to Yahweh who stood as the lord of history (e.g., Kinet 1977; cf. the critique of this distinction in Keefe 2001). Additionally, scholars ranged between interpretations that saw Baalism as displacing Yahwism, and those that hypothesized an amalgamation and identification of Yahweh with Baal. No agreement emerged, however, over the precise identity of the singular, Canaanite 'Baal' in question, with proposals including Baal-Shamem, Baal-Hadad, and others (see Eissfeldt 1939; Östborn 1956; Wolff 1974; Andersen and Freedman 1980). Even so, in the mind of most interpreters, the majority or entirety of the various religious elements and practices mentioned in Hosea were condemned because they had become co-opted or at least tainted by the worship of Baal. Nyberg (1935) provides the most extreme example of this consensus, arguing that the crisis addressed by Hosea was entirely

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

religious, and even the book's references to kings and princes should be interpreted as references to a god named *Melek* and related deities.

Within a few years of the discovery of the Ras Shamra texts, another major shift occurred in Hosea research, which thereafter created increased interest in the notion of a putative public cult of Baal. As noted above, much of the religious interpretation of Hosea in modern scholarship centered on the marital and family stories in chs. 1–3 (see Kelle 2009). Even within this focus, however, early twentieth-century interpreters viewed Gomer's actions in ch. 2 simply as a symbol used by Hosea to represent the people's apostasy with Baal, and the person and behavior of Gomer herself were not identified as specifically cultic in nature (e.g., Ewald 1867–68: 192; Lindblom 1928: 34-44). The 1932 publication of May's article, 'The Fertility Cult in Hosea', however, proposed a thoroughgoing interpretation of the book of Hosea in light of the notion that eighth-century Baalism was a sexualized fertility cult. Over the following years, the dominant interpretation of the religious background of Hosea operated with this conviction that not only was there a rival, public Baal cult in eighth-century Israel, but that it was a fertility cult featuring Baal, sex goddesses, and public sexual rituals. Hence, Gomer's infidelity, for instance, was literal not metaphorical, and specifically connected to participation in such sexualized rituals (see Mays 1969; Wolff 1974). Moreover, the various religious references and elements throughout all of Hosea, including the sexualized language of fornication, came to be interpreted within the fertility cult frame. As Mays (1969: 8) summarized, 'From the opening verses of ch. 1 to the concluding oracle in ch. 14, the cult and mythology of the god Baal is the foil of most of Hosea's sayings' (see also, e.g., Wolff 1974; Andersen and Freedman 1980).

This regnant interpretation took a variety of forms over the years leading up to the mid-1980s, with much disagreement over exactly what constituted the Canaanite fertility cult with which Hosea was concerned. Typically, scholars associated Baalistic religion, and consequently many of Hosea's oracles, with several practices that were not often clearly distinguished: cultic prostitution (Graham and May 1936; Mays 1969), ritual defloration (Wolff 1974: xxii, 14), and unofficial sexual activity in cultic settings (Fisher 1976; Andersen and Freedman 1980; van der Toorn 1992). Of these, the notion of cultic prostitution—a series of rites in which sacred personnel performed various sexual acts designed to ensure the fertility of land and inhabitants—as part of Baalistic worship dominated the modern discussion of Hosea (for the fullest example, see Östborn 1956). Evidence for this practice came largely from classical writers, as well as selected biblical texts (e.g., Deut. 23.17-18; Jer. 13.27). Within the biblical literature,

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

Hosea 4 often provided what scholars saw as prophetic condemnations of such activity (Ward 1966: 76; Brueggemann 1968: 49; Mays 1969: 72-79; McKeating 1971: 99; Stuart 1987: 21), although recent examinations of this text in light of broader study of the book's metaphors have produced new assessments (e.g., Adams 2008; see below).

In the 1980s, scholars began to challenge the very notion of a fertility cult in the ancient Near East, calling into question virtually every element of the commonly cited literary and archaeological evidence for sexual rites in ancient Israel, as well as their putative importance as a key to the interpretation of Hosea (see Oden 1987; Bird 1989; Nwaoru 1999; Budin 2008). The present consensus seems to be that the notion of an institution such as cultic prostitution that provides the background for texts like Hosea 4 can no longer be sustained without great caution. The recent works of Keefe (2001), Yee (2003), and Kelle (2005), for instance, demonstrate that the common critical judgment has moved away from even the general conception of sexualized cultic practices as the primary frame for interpreting the book's oracles, and thus develop new ways to use the texts of Hosea in conjunction with the history of Israelite religion. As Keefe summarizes, '[T]he popular thesis concerning a syncretistic fertility cult in eighth-century Israel does not rest on any firm textual or extratextual evidence' (2001: 11).

Even as the long-standing notion of a sexualized Baal fertility cult was losing its prominence, however, most interpreters in the last two decades maintained the older idea that Hosea's language and imagery nonetheless reflect a religious situation that featured widespread, *non-sexual* Baal worship in eighth-century Israel. While the sexual language of fornication, for example, may not refer to literal activity, it serves as a metaphorical condemnation of Israel's veneration of Baal, which remained the ruling interpretive framework for Hosea's oracles in these works (e.g., Stuart 1987; Stienstra 1993; Garrett 1997; Abma 1999). Yet other studies, such as Keefe (2001) and Kelle (2005), build upon earlier epigraphic and onomastic studies (e.g., Tigay 1986), highlight the lack of concern over Baal worship in the other eighth-century prophets, and examine the use of the term 'baal' as a metaphorical and political designation in ancient Near Eastern texts, arguing that there is no evidence of widespread, even non-sexual, Baal worship in eighth-century Israel, and that the religious situation in Hosea's day differed markedly from common scholarly understandings.

The space between the poles of the Baalistic and non-Baalistic interpretations of Hosea and the history of Israelite religion has been fertile ground for the development of newer formulations of this area of inquiry in some contemporary scholarship. These new developments move away from even the general categories of the traditional religious interpretation of Hosea,

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

and offer new frames within which to view the book's religious elements and background. Additionally, these newer formulations are more complex and variegated than the simple notion of some kind of conflict between Yahwism and Baalism. At the heart of many of the new perspectives is the sense that chs. 4–14 contain a wide variety of religious references to priests, practices, sanctuaries, and cultic items (e.g., 4.7; 8.4-5, 11; 10.5-6; 13.2), which should be considered more thoroughly and independently of the marriage and sexual imagery in the book's opening three chapters (see Drinkard 1993).

Some of these newer formulations operate within or close to the older Baal frame, with only slight reconfigurations. Jeremias (1994), for instance, identifies the religious background of Hosea's oracles not as the Israelites' abandonment of Yahweh for a rival, foreign Baal, but as their syncretistic practice of blending or identifying Yahweh and Baal (see also Niehr 1994). Thus, the situation addressed by the prophet is an inner-Israelite religious conflict involving a corrupted form of Yahweh worship. In a similar fashion, Yee (1996) and Bechtel (2004) see Hosea as reacting against a pre-exilic Yahwism that was much more heterodox than normally thought. At the time of Hosea, it is suggested, many of the practices condemned in prophetic and deuteronomic texts were long-standing and accepted forms of popular Yahwism. Rather than combating a newfound syncretism that had invaded a traditionally 'pure' Yahwism (cf. Stuart 1987: 10), Hosea's assertions represent an innovation into Israelite thought, namely, an emerging closed, polemical monolatry that labels many of these traditionally accepted Yahwistic practices as 'baalism' or otherwise condemns them. Although this view wades into the vexed issue of defining 'popular' versus 'official' religion in pre-exilic Israel, and which of these Hosea represents (see Drinkard 1993; Keefe 2001), it rightly builds upon the recently established consensus that an 'orthodox', monotheistic Yahwism was only an exilic or post-exilic development within Israelite religion. Moreover, the views expressed by Yee and Bechtel are a new modulation of an older perspective that identified Hosea as the first full articulation of a 'Yahweh-alone' movement, which arose as a minority voice in a polytheistic Israel in the time of Elijah and Elisha, and had fluctuating levels of acceptance until the ultimate triumph of monotheistic Yahwism in the exile. The earlier formulation of this view, which was articulated most fully by Smith (1987) and Lang (1983), cast the innovations of the Yahweh-alone group largely in terms of a supposed conflict between a Canaanite nature religion and a historically and ethically based Yahwism. Yee and others modulate this interpretive frame beyond the dichotomy of 'Canaanite' versus 'Israelite' religion into a conflict over practices and perspectives that existed within Yahwism itself.

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

Alongside the perspectives represented by Jeremias and Yee, some new interpretive frames for Hosea's religious background and message move well beyond both the long-standing Baal frame and even the traditional categories of Israelite religion. Emerging out of feminist criticism and devoting much sustained attention to the figure of Gomer in Hosea 1–3, some recent interpreters claim to find veiled indications within Hosea 4–14 of long-standing goddess worship within Baalistic and/or Yahwistic religion, arguing that the prophet both partially assimilated and opposed such practice. In two prominent examples, Balz-Cochois (1982) and Wacker (1995; 1996) draw upon extrabiblical evidence to connect texts such as Hos. 4.12, 17-19; 9.14; and 14.9 [MT] with the worship of Asherah, Anat, and/or Ashtarte, alternatively identified as established parts of Canaanite fertility religion or Israelite popular/domestic Yahwism (see also Emmerson 1974; Gangloff and Haelewyck 1995). The most recent study of Hosea's religious background, Chalmers (2007) follows Jeremias in seeing Hosea 1–2 as condemning the confusion of Yahweh and Baal, but reconfigures the religious conflict evidenced by chs. 4–14 as the confusion of Yahweh and El.

As mentioned in the preceding discussion of sociological context, Keefe (2001) and Yee (2003) push beyond strictly religious interpretation and argue that the cultic elements and practices under scrutiny in Hosea cannot be understood apart from their connection to broader political, economic, and social affairs driven by the dynastic state in eighth-century Israel. This interpretive frame is a complex socio-materialist interpretation, suggesting that Hosea opposes the 'official' state religion, which has become a tolerant, unpolemical Yahwism in which priests and sanctuaries serve the socio-economic interests of the dynasty, and the veneration of 'baals' and other practices have become symbols of an exploitative mode of production revolving around the demands of a foreign-tributary economy. In a related move, Kelle (2005) identifies Hosea's references to Baal throughout the book as metaphorical and/or rhetorical elements that refer not to the religious situation in Hosea's day, but to past religious practices that the prophet uses to symbolize current political maneuvers that he deems inappropriate. New formulations of the connection between Hosea and Israelite religion also include voices that raise a general opposition to the very use of Hosea as a source for eighth-century or even pre-exilic religion. Ben Zvi (2005), for instance, extends his proposals concerning the late date of Hosea's composition to conclude that the book's references to cultic practices shed light not on the situation in Hosea's day, but on the social and religious realities in postmonarchic Yehud (see also Lemche 1992).

The religio-historical study of Hosea in the twentieth century has garnered a massive amount of scholarly attention, and contemporary approaches

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

take many forms in present scholarship, including a conflict between the rival gods Yahweh and Baal, the veneration of numerous local deities, the blending of Yahweh and Baal in Israelite worship, and the presence of 'non-orthodox' forms of Yahwism as a part of 'popular' religion or royal/ dynastic agendas. The common critical judgment on this topic has moved from a relatively stable consensus in the middle of the century to a state of fragmented debate at present.

f. Theological and Hermeneutical Interpretation

Mainly due to the vivid and personal imagery with which the book portrays Yahweh, interpreters have long read Hosea in the service of theological construction and proclamation concerning the character of God and the nature of the divine–human relationship. Among these readings, one notion has dominated, namely, that Hosea's central theological message is the personal, enduring love of Yahweh, and how Yahweh responds to the people's unfaithfulness in accordance with that loving character by moving beyond judgment to restoration. One need only survey the titles and subtitles of many theologically oriented works within Hosea scholarship to see that modern critical interpretation has identified Hosea as a 'prophet of love', and Hosea's picture of Yahweh as a God of 'long-suffering love' (e.g., Knight 1960; Hubbard 1968; Doorly 1991; Pentiuc 2002). Most characteristically, twentieth-century scholars have drawn this theological interpretation from a preoccupation with the language, imagery, and ideals of Hosea 1–3. The interpretation of the prophet's marriage and family life as a symbol of the loving nature of God and the redemptive character of God's relationship with Israel (see Kelle 2009) has provided the interpretive key for the theological message of the book as a whole in the minds of the majority of interpreters. From this vantage point, the other oracles in Hosea proclaim the theological message that God brings judgment upon his people for their unfaithfulness, but God's unexplainable love ultimately transcends judgment and results in restoration (see Batten 1929; Knight 1960; Hubbard 1968; Seow 1992).

This focus on chs. 1–3 has had other implications for the book's theological interpretation. It has, for instance, produced a steady insistence among theological interpreters that Hosea gives a unique and penetrating glimpse into the inner emotions and personhood of Yahweh, especially revealing a mixture of irrational love, intimate emotion, and passionate anger. Especially when one considers texts such as ch. 11, Hosea, unlike any other prophetic book, it is argued, reveals the inner 'personality' of Yahweh, which manifests itself in a deep affection for Israel and a willingness to

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

bear the pain of their disloyalty in order to redeem them through long-suffering love (Hubbard 1968: 67; see also Knight 1960; Gaiser 2008). Additionally, the concentration upon the language and concerns of Hosea 1–3, especially when interpreted through the lens of a putative fertility cult, led many scholars from the early through the mid-twentieth century to articulate Hosea's theology in terms of the attempt to establish Yahweh as the incomparable lord of history who stands over against the natural and physical religion of Canaan. Harper's early statement is representative: 'The physical and sensual character of the cultus, taken over from the Canaanite worship of the Baalim, was wholly foreign and repugnant to Hosea's conception of a truly spiritual relation of Yahweh to his people' (1905: cli; see also Mays 1969; Wolff 1974; cf. Keefe 2001).

The classic example of these dominant tendencies in the theological interpretation of Hosea from the middle of the last century appeared in Eichrodt's '"The Holy One in Your Midst": The Theology of Hosea' (1961). In his view, the book reveals the 'inner amity and feeling' of God that provides the basis for all the divine actions depicted in the book, especially the ultimate reconciliation (1961: 263). Yet Hosea formulates his theology specifically in relation to Canaanite religion, aiming to exalt Yahweh and oppose Israel's tendency to place 'the unique lord of nature and history on the same plane as the lewd nature deities' (1961: 266). Overall, then, the theology of Hosea is about establishing the 'incommensurability' of Yahweh, and proclaiming that this sovereign lord of history 'strives in judgment and grace for the turning of his people to his saving love' (1961: 273).

Within the last few decades, new formulations of theological interpretation have emerged that question modern scholars' myopic focus on the language, imagery, and concerns of Hosea 1–3 as the key for the theological message of the book as a whole, and argue that interpreters should be more inclusive of the materials in chs. 4–14 (e.g., Davies 1993; Gowan 1998; Moughtin-Mumby 2008). When this occurs one notices, for example, an extensive amount of judgment material that is not obviated by divine forgiveness, as well as theological concerns that are much broader and more complex than a singular focus on religious wrongdoing, including ethical, social, and political issues. As this tendency developed, recent formulations of the theological interpretation of Hosea have taken the form of comprehensive theological readings, examinations of specific theological aspects, and engagements with the text from contemporary ideological perspectives, especially feminist criticism and Christian hermeneutics.

The comprehensive theological treatments of Hosea that have appeared in the last 15 years follow the path charted by older studies, such as Knight

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

(1960), Eichrodt (1961), Ward (1966), Hubbard (1968), and Beeby (1989), which attempted to set out the central theological affirmations found amidst the prophet's historically oriented oracles. Yet the more recent works also offer important nuances to older approaches. Birch's commentary (1997) reads Hosea by focusing on how the prophet (along with Joel and Amos) spoke to concerns that dominated his life, explaining that these issues—love, redemption, fidelity, and righteousness—are both deeply theological and presently relevant. Gowan (1998) offers an interpretation of Hosea within the context of a broader theological framework that incorporates the entire prophetic corpus. He operates from the premise that the prophetic books are 'works of theology' designed to 'explain what Yahweh, God of Israel and Judah, was doing' in the major events of the exile and restoration, cast theologically as the death and resurrection of Israel (1998: 1). Focusing only on the final, redacted forms of the books, Gowan contends that the characteristic message of the pre-exilic prophets was the announcement of judgment (death) for Israel, with no substantive vision of future hope. Yet Hosea, he argues, introduces a tension into the pre-exilic voices by giving a limited vision of judgment as only the first part of a larger divine plan of restoration, a tension that the prophet locates within the heart of Yahweh (see Hos. 11.8). Simundson's (2005) recent commentary, appearing in a series devoted to theological interpretation, focuses on the book's perspectives concerning Yahweh's character, the divine–human relationship, and their implications for the people's life, but does so with marked attention to feminist concerns, environmental issues, and questions of theodicy.

Alongside comprehensive treatments, numerous studies have appeared since the middle of the twentieth century that take up specific theological aspects of Hosea. One long-standing theological debate, for example, involves the question of whether Hosea draws upon an already established notion of a covenant between Yahweh and Israel in some formulation. The majority of scholars conclude that texts such as Hos. 4.1-3 evidence Hosea's dependence on the Sinai covenant tradition (Fensham 1964–65; Stuart 1987; Seow 1992; Yee 1996; Garrett 1997), which also undergirds the book's language of Yahweh's faithfulness and the people's unfaithfulness (e.g., 6.4, 6; 10.12). Others question the early development of the covenant concept and the connection of the book's vocabulary to covenant language elsewhere (see Davies 1993; Kelle 2005). Another long-standing theological aspect that continues to draw attention is the specific content of Hosea's designation, 'knowledge of God', which appears in descriptions of the people's failures and in admonitions concerning their future actions (e.g., 4.1, 6; 5.4; 6.3, 6; 8.2; 13.4; see Wolff 1953; 1955; Baumann 1955;

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

J. L. McKenzie 1955; Cotty 1971; Kratz 1997; Vall 2001). A large amount of studies debate whether the designation refers to:

1. cognitive knowledge of Torah observance and instruction transmitted through priestly/cultic tradition (Wolff 1953, 1955; Kratz 1997);
2. the all-inclusive obligations of Yahweh's people (Mays 1969);
3. a relationship of intimacy, love, and trust (Eichrodt 1961);
4. a subjective/existential act of acknowledging Yahweh's sovereign status, actions, and requirements (Baumann 1955; Limburg 1988; Davies 1992; Ben Zvi 2005);
5. Yahweh's attributes or deeds (Andersen and Freedman 1980; Jeremias 1983);
6. a deliberately undefined content, symbolizing Israel's lack of such 'knowledge' (Landy 1995a).

The difficult juxtaposition of judgment and salvation in Hosea's oracles (e.g., 11.8-9) is a third specific theological aspect that attracts much interpretive attention. Various proposals explain this tension by associating the salvation oracles with later additions (Harper 1905; cf. Garrett 1997; Hynniewta 2002) or a distant future restoration envisioned only after destruction (Stuart 1987). Others identify a deliberate paradox between divine love and wrath in the prophet's preaching (Mays 1969; Emmerson 1984), or a progression in Hosea's message from calls to repentance, to certain judgment, and back to calls to repentance (Davies 1993). Still other views emphasize the work of final editors who arranged each major section of the book (chs. 1–3; 4–11; 12–14) to move from doom to hope (Yee 1996; Ben Zvi 2005), and the presence of 'multivocality' in the book, either ultimately resolved through an overwriting of judgment with final hope, or left in an unresolved and unstable multiplicity of metaphors and images (Sharp 2008).

Some of the most recent theological interpretations of Hosea are not comprehensive treatments or examinations of specific issues, but offer an engagement with the text from particular ideological perspectives. One such perspective revolves around gender concerns and feminist criticism. Beginning in the 1980s, the rising tide of feminist criticism swept into Hosea scholarship alongside other primary areas of research (for a general survey, see Sherwood 2004). As one might expect, the vast majority of feminist analyses focus on the marital imagery in Hosea 1–3, and were discussed in detail in the earlier article on chs. 1–3 in this journal (see Kelle 2009). Only recently has such study began to extend to elements in chs. 4–14, examining especially the cultural, ethical, and theological problematics of various metaphors throughout the book, as well as the ancient Near Eastern conceptions upon which they are based, and challenging the tendency of biblical commentators to reinscribe the patriarchy and sexism of many of

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

these metaphors (see further the discussion of metaphors below). Despite such apparent problematics, however, Hosea has long attracted distinctively Christian theological and hermeneutical expositions, with many interpreters claiming that Hosea's and Yahweh's long-suffering love and willingness to bear pain represent the 'Cross of Hosea' and connect to the love manifested in Christ (e.g., Robinson 1949; Snaith 1953; Knight 1960). Even in recent years, this trend continues unabated, as some major commentaries look to Christian appropriation in varying degrees (see Limburg 1988; Beeby 1989; Hubbard 1989; Garrett 1997; Pentiuc 2002), and other specific works address Christian audiences and the task of Christian preaching (Achtemeier 1975; Aaron 2005; Gaiser 2008; Jacobson 2008; Mead 2008).

4. New Lines of Inquiry

The preceding discussion has indicated that the modern study of Hosea 4–14, especially in the last few decades of the twentieth century and the beginning of the twenty-first century, has been characterized by broader reformulations of traditional areas of study. Alongside these reformulations, recent years have also witnessed the development of new lines of inquiry that stand largely outside the conventional interpretive approaches. Not all of these lines of inquiry are novel; yet they are new inasmuch as they now receive a prominent place in Hosea scholarship on their own terms, and in ways not achieved in earlier periods.

a. Synchronic, Final Form, and Literary Studies

Two main factors have combined in modern scholarship to produce a recognizable yet diverse trend of the study of the final form of the book of Hosea from literary and synchronic perspectives: the increasingly prominent use of modern literary theory within biblical scholarship in general since the 1960s, and the developments within redaction criticism in the second half of the twentieth century that placed a greater emphasis upon the skill and significance of redactors, especially the ways in which they deliberately reworked their materials into a coherent presentation with its own theological and rhetorical purposes. These factors have led to the production of a number of recent works that approach Hosea 4–14, and the individual text units therein, through the literary and rhetorical dynamics of the final shape of the book as a whole. In addition to comprehensive commentaries on Hosea that adopt this perspective and individual studies that examine particular literary elements of the book, one may categorize the recent synchronic and

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

literary studies into four broad categories: poetic analyses, semiotic and deconstructionist treatments, final form readings from the perspective of Persian-period Judaean society, and canonical interpretations.

Full-length commentaries on the book of Hosea that rely heavily upon a final form, synchronic approach appear already with Andersen and Freedman (1980) and their attention to the stylistic features and literary coherency of the book's oracles. The commentaries of Yee (1996), Sweeney (2000), and Ben Zvi (2005), while emphasizing their own primary reading strategies (feminist criticism, Book of the Twelve studies, and the social-history of Persian Yehud), utilize synchronic literary analysis to interpret both the rhetorical effect of the book as a whole and the meaning of the individual units therein. A large number of specific monographs and articles also examine particular literary aspects and elements pertaining to Hosea 4–14 (for a recent general survey of literary features, see Silva 2007; for related studies of Hos. 1–3, see Kelle 2009). Catlett's dissertation (1988) studies the literary reversals in Hosea that establish connections between disparate parts of the book and overturn traditional notions of judgment and salvation. Israel's dissertation (1989) investigates the hermeneutical function of the protasis-apodosis speech pattern in Hosea, Amos, and Micah, arguing that the pattern depicts the future as growing out of the past, but in a dynamic way that goes beyond simple divine retribution. The articles by van Wieringen (1996) and Nwaoru (2004) treat semantic relationships, metaphorical imagery, and structural coherence in various sections of the book. In one of the most recent book-length studies, Kakkanattu (2006) combines synchronic, final form analysis with diachronic, redactional study to read Hos. 11.1-11 as an editorial unity within the context of both the book of Hosea and the Book of the Twelve. Literary elements such as tone, imagery, and repetition indicate that the text employs the metaphor of divine sonship as a means of emphasizing Yahweh's historic faithfulness to Israel, and his unique holiness, which is grounded in the ability to hold back judgment in favor of mercy. The synchronic study by Keita (2007) seizes upon the theme of land in Hosea and examines the treatment of the land across the different units in the book, with an eye to how they bear upon modern-day land disputes between Israelis and Palestinians.

In addition to commentaries and other studies, poetic analysis of Hosea has emerged as one form of synchronic literary study since the 1980s. Building upon the form-critical study of genre described above, these works attempt to read Hosea as poetry, arguing that specific literary qualities such as repetition and wordplay indicate that the book is primarily poetic, rather than rhetorical or argumentative. Attention to poetic elements of repetition,

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

parallelism, meter, and rhythm goes back to earlier works such as Harper (1905), Buss (1969), and Andersen and Freedman (1980; but cf. the recent rejection of this approach in Macintosh 1997a: lxv). The two most substantial examples of this approach are Fisch (1988) and Landy (1995a), who identify Hosea as great poetry, but primarily of a deconstructive and non-linear kind. Most recently, Morris (1996) offers a full-length study devoted to reading the book of Hosea as an example of the poetic genre that aims to engage and persuade the reader with truth through language that can both reveal and obscure. Verbal repetition, for example, functions as a clarifying device in rhetorical discourse, but appears in poetic discourse with variations and inconsistencies that produce tension and cultivate creativity. Morris concludes that the book of Hosea is a lyric poem that uses varied repetition and wordplay to obfuscate popular ideas of Israel and God, and creatively offer readers new conceptions of both.

Building upon the observation that Hosea 4–14's poetic language is unusual and uneven, recent interpreters also engage the final form of Hosea from the perspective of linguistic, semiotic, and, especially, deconstructionist interpretation (see also Jobling 2003 on Hos. 1–3). Fisch (1988) gives a Derridean reading of Hosea that examines the ways in which the text's poetry defies the conventional western kinds of linear logic and closure, and features incoherence through the repetition and oscillation of antithetical words and images. Even the character of Yahweh remains unsettled in the tension between love and hate, nearness and distance. In a similar vein, Landy (1995b) stresses that the literary elements like metaphors function as agents of disintegration, often shifting in meaning and deconstructing the identities of Yahweh, Israel, and others that the surface unity of the book's poetry claims to establish. Sherwood (2004) represents the most comprehensive semiotic and deconstructive approach to Hosea, echoing many of the conclusions in Fisch and Landy and including insights from comparative literary studies (especially Shakespeare scholarship) and feminist criticism. Although she focuses on Hosea 1–3, Sherwood contends that the book is characterized by non-linear, unresolved tensions and hierarchies that deconstruct themselves, which serve to provoke tensions in the book's readers and create multiple possible meanings.

Some of the most recent works that focus on final form readings of Hosea 4–14, however, remain historical in nature, building upon the reformulations of redaction criticism discussed above in order to read the book as a whole against the background of the Jewish community in Persian-period Yehud. Some of these studies are interested in revising scholarly conceptions of the compositional process of Hosea and demonstrating that the book as a whole was an original product of this time period. Ben Zvi (2005: 4),

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

we have noted, resists deconstructionist readings, and argues that Hosea is a 'self-contained literary unit', but one which came together for the first time in the Persian period to serve the theological and ideological needs of the literati of Yehud. They wrote the book as a means of socialization for their own ranks, as well as the public (see other notions of a late or postmonarchic production of Hosea in Emmerson 1984; Yee 1987). Avoiding the compositional arguments, Trotter (2001) likewise offers a reading of Hosea in light of the ways in which it may have been received and recontextualized in early Achaemenid Yehud (see also Hornsby 1999 on chs. 1–3). Clearly, this type of final form reading avoids the pitfalls of biographical approaches and highlights the importance of readers and reading, yet it suffers from a lack of any indications of postmonarchic circumstances in the book, and flattens the historical and rhetorical complexity seemingly reflected in Hosea 4–14's various oracles.

The last kind of final form/literary study that is recognizable in recent Hosea scholarship moves beyond a synchronic reading of the book itself to an interpretation that is shaped by dialogue with the larger canonical context of the prophetic corpus or the Hebrew Bible as a whole. As expected, most of these readings of Hosea appear in works devoted to broader interpretations of the prophets as a whole. Sweeney's commentary (2000) argues that one should set out a synchronic interpretation of the final form of Hosea through attention to how the book fits and functions within the overall movement from judgment to restoration found across the minor prophets as a whole. Likewise, Conrad (2003) uses the semiotic approach of Umberto Eco (1979) to read Hosea as a whole literary composition in distinctive intertextual and canonical contexts, especially the arrangement and intertextual codes found throughout the MT's ordering of the Book of the Twelve (see below). Seitz's most recent canonical interpretation (2007) nearly loses sight of Hosea as a particular work in the shadow cast by the overall movement of the Christian Old Testament canon and the normative claims of the Christian tradition. In his view, Hosea's meaning comes as part of the prophetic corpus that presents a single, unified witness to a new, providentially designed understanding of history as the accomplishment of the divine word through Christ in the world over time.

b. Hosea as Part of the Book of the Twelve

Some of the recent works using a synchronic approach to Hosea adopt a particular orientation that reads the book in light of its place in the so-called Minor Prophets or Book of the Twelve (see Sweeney 2000; Conrad 2003). Although attention to the Twelve as a whole goes back at least as far as the mid-1800s (see Ewald 1867–68), the years since 1990 have

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

witnessed a rebirth of this approach within prophetic research in general, with numerous publications and a multi-year, scholarly seminar ('Formation of the Book of the Twelve Seminar' of the Society of Biblical Literature) offering various advances. The overall angle has waned some in recent years under the weight of significant critiques (e.g., Ben Zvi 1996), but Book of the Twelve studies represents a new line of inquiry into Hosea that has produced some recognizable trends in contemporary scholarship.

Approaches to the study of the Book of the Twelve in general operate from the conviction that traditional scholarship has wrongly treated these books as discrete compositions, when, in fact, they should be seen as the product of intentional, holistic editing, reaching their final form not as independent books, but as related parts of a coherent 'Book' that developed in stages over time and was intended to be read as a unified composition (for surveys, see Schneider 1979; Collins 1993; Petersen 2000; Redditt 2000; 2001; 2003; Sweeney 2000: xix-xl). Within prophetic scholarship as a whole, one finds both diachronic and synchronic approaches to the Book of the Twelve. Through the observation of internal literary evidence among the books, such as catchwords, catchphrases, themes, and allusions, some interpreters claim to discern the various stages of composition, editing, and arrangement of the individual books and whole collection (cf. Nogalski 1993a and 1993b; Jones 1995). Others read the books synchronically apart from compositional considerations, looking for an overall literary cohesion, theological movement, and unified purpose to which each individual composition makes a contribution (e.g., House 1990). In the last two decades, the book of Hosea has played a role in the basic questions asked within the discussion of reading the Book of the Twelve as a whole from both the diachronic and synchronic perspectives. Several studies have investigated the book from these angles (Jeremias 1996; Odell 1996a; Sweeney 2000; Watts 2000; Tooze 2002; Braaten 2003; Bowman 2006). The attention to Hosea, however, has been markedly less than that given to other books in the Twelve, and the majority of recent studies have focused on Hosea's possible literary and theological role within the context of the unified collection, rather than on the diachronic issues of composition and editing.

From the composition/redaction perspective, Book of the Twelve scholars have consistently noted that every extant witness to the arrangement of the collection (MT, LXX, 4QXII[a]) lists Hosea as the first book. Accordingly, while scholars propose that various passages in Hosea have been edited in light of the development of the whole collection, they consistently place Hosea in the earliest redactional stage and literary precursor to the Twelve, often seen as including Hosea, Amos, Micah, and Zephaniah (Nogalski 1993a and 1993b; cf. Jones 1995). Jeremias (1996), for example, argues that the

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

structural and literary features in Hosea and Amos indicate that these books underwent joint editing, shared mutual influence upon each other, and were editorially crafted as associated compositions. Features such as the references to Judah in Hosea, for instance, are drawn from and extend Amos's judgment message to ensure that later Judaeans did not see themselves as exempt from the proclamations against the northern kingdom.

Hosea's position at the beginning of the Twelve has also influenced synchronic approaches to the book and collection. The most frequent interpretive move made with Hosea in this regard identifies the book as a comprehensive prologue that sets the stage thematically for the entire collection, providing a virtual 'summary of the message of the Twelve, not just the Hosean part of it' (Collins 1993: 66). The primary themes evident in Hosea develop more fully in the books that follow. Odell, for example, sees Hosea's language about the prophets as establishing a 'hermeneutical principle for evaluating the prophets in the rest of the Book of the Twelve' (1996a: 168). Recent Book of the Twelve interpretations evidence the particular practice of reading Hosea together with Malachi as an intentionally crafted framing device for the collection as a whole. Highlighting the similar language of marriage and divorce in both books, Watts (2000), for instance, compares God's threat of divorce in Hosea 1–3 with God's rejection of divorce in Mal. 2.16. He concludes that together they establish the theme of God's love for Israel, which then provides a 'softer context' for other themes such as the Day of Yahweh in the Twelve (2000: 213; see also Sweeney 2000; Tooze 2002). Likewise, Braaten (2003) highlights the imagery of God's sowing the land that appears in the Twelve's opening and closing oracles (Hosea 1–3; Malachi 3 [MT]). The majority of these approaches to Hosea deal only with the language and imagery of chs. 1–3. Yet the full-scale studies by Sweeney (2000) and Tooze (2002) expand the discussion to all of Hosea by examining features such as references to Jacob in both Hosea and Malachi. Moreover, Sweeney identifies varying literary and rhetorical functions for Hosea within the different arrangements of the Twelve found in the MT and LXX. In the MT, he argues, Hosea contributes to a focus on Judah, Jerusalem, and the nations from the outset, while in the LXX grouping, Hosea provides an initial model drawn from a focus on the northern kingdom alone.

As mentioned above, the critiques of this approach are significant, and they make the future of this line of inquiry an open question. Ben Zvi (1996) rightly questions whether the multiple canonical orders and discrete superscriptions on the Twelve undermine the notion of unity for the collection, and notes that the indicators adduced for unity may be apparent only because scholars have predetermined to read the Twelve as a whole. Even so, this

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

approach has provided Hosea scholarship over the last two decades with a new set of questions and a new collection of literary and theological insights.

c. Metaphor Studies and Feminist Criticism

Among the reformulations of traditional approaches and the new lines of inquiry that have taken shape since the 1980s, research on the book of Hosea through the study of metaphor has achieved the dominant position. Although a sense of the abundance and importance of metaphors for the book's discourse is long-standing (see Mays 1969: 7-9), contemporary Hosea scholars have increasingly employed insights from modern metaphor theory in their analyses. Yet, throughout the second half of the twentieth century, such study of Hosea's metaphors has primarily focused on the imagery in chs. 1–3, especially the marital and sexual metaphors concerning God, Hosea, and Gomer. As discussed in the previous article on Hosea 1–3 in this journal (Kelle 2009), it is in this regard that the major impact of feminist criticism has been felt in twentieth-century Hosea scholarship. The previous article detailed the nature and kinds of feminist studies of Hosea, and that discussion will not be repeated here. Whether from feminist or other perspectives, however, the study of the metaphors in Hosea even up to recent times has been generally characterized by a lack of attention to the materials in Hosea 4–14, and an overabundance of attention to marital and sexual imagery in general. Since the 1990s, some selected commentaries and comprehensive works have partially corrected this oversight by extending the analysis of metaphors to the imagery found throughout the entire book (e.g., Eidevall 1996; Moughtin-Mumby 2008). Even many of these recent works, however, continue to devote most of their analysis to the book's marital and sexual metaphors, often to the exclusion of full consideration of other kinds of imagery. Overall, developments in the metaphorical study of Hosea can be grouped into four categories: (1) attention to divine and human metaphors; (2) religious, socio-economic, and political interpretations; (3) the indeterminate and unstable nature of the book's metaphors; and (4) new variations in feminist (and masculinist) approaches to imagery throughout the book.

The first category of metaphor study, which explores the book's images for God and the people, is the most common, with some emerging engagement with Hosea's depictions of the natural world and their ecological implications (e.g., Loya 2008). Commentaries from throughout the twentieth century highlight the use of family images (husband–wife, parent–child) as the major depictions of the relationship between God and the people, but also stress the vast array of metaphors used for both God and the

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

people, especially in the oracles in Hosea 4–14 (see Östborn 1956; Wolff 1974; Limburg 1988). These metaphors fall into several clusters, including representations of God with personal imagery (judge, farmer, physician), animal imagery (moth, lion, she-bear), and plant imagery (cypress tree, rottenness), as well as representations of the people with similar animal and agricultural metaphors (stubborn heifer, silly dove, grapes, cake, chaff). The common critical judgment is that no single metaphor holds the key to the entire book, and one cannot use the presence of certain kinds of metaphors (e.g., baking) to reach biographical conclusions about Hosea's past (Landy 1995b; Eidevall 1996; J.P. Lewis 1997; but cf. Beeby 1989: 3).

A number of recent works offer comprehensive treatments of these divine–human metaphors. Light (1991) and J.P. Lewis (1997) represent the tendency to foreground the metaphors in Hosea 1–3 as constitutive for the meaning of all subsequent images in the book, especially for the sexual and marital imagery related to God and the people in chs. 4–14. Light identifies three related 'networks' of metaphors in Hosea that depict God as farmer, husband, and father, and J.P. Lewis offers a thorough description of metaphors related especially to the actions of Yahweh and Israel. The year 1996 saw the publication of one commentary and two major studies that focus on the interpretive dynamics of Hosea's divine and human metaphors. Yee's (1996) commentary approaches the book as a whole by identifying three central metaphors for the relationship between Yahweh and Israel that govern each of the book's major sections: husband–wife (chs. 1–3), parent–child (chs. 4–11), and a combination of husband–wife and parent–rebellious son (chs. 12–14). Similarly, Seifert (1996) concentrates on Hosea's imagistic language for God in order to develop a theological, rather than linguistic, theory of metaphor based on its function within culture (see also Nwaoru 1999 and 2004). She identifies four major themes in Hosea that portray the relationship between Yahweh and Israel (betrayed love, continuous care, threatened corruption, incomprehensible mercy), each of which is expressed by various specific metaphors in the book. Eidevall's monograph (1996) provides the most comprehensive study that deals with the metaphors in Hosea 4–14 on their own terms, apart from the imagery of chs. 1–3. Using the perspectival theory of metaphor outlined by Kittay (1987), with its emphasis on semantic fields, he argues that the specific metaphors in Hosea are connected to several 'models' that express the relationship between Yahweh and Israel/Ephraim in various ways. The representations of the people in particular feature metaphors based on personification and victimization, and these metaphors operate within larger 'relational models' that are monarchical, judicial, covenantal, parental,

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

and agricultural. The primary metaphor in Hosea 4–14, he concludes, is monarchical (God is king); yet the book's final vision in 14.2-9 [MT] effects a paradigm shift from a hierarchical to a reciprocal relationship between God and the people.

Alongside these comprehensive works on divine and human imagery, numerous specific studies since the late 1980s provide examinations of particular metaphors or individual passages (e.g., Kruger 1988; Landy 1995b; Oestreich 1998; Nwaoru 2004; van Hecke 2005; Blair 2007; Adams 2008; Moughtin-Mumby 2008). One aspect of Hosea's metaphors for God that has drawn increasing attention concerns the question of whether certain passages in the book portray God in feminine terms that counter the more prevalent masculine, animal, and royal imagery. The text of ch. 11 in particular has generated a large number of studies on this point, as some feminist interpreters claim that the chapter's language and imagery depicts Yahweh in feminine terms as a mother who breastfeeds an infant (Schüngel-Straumann 1986; Nissinen 1991; Seifert 1996). The presence of such language, it is argued, can give rise to a feminist theology that offers an alternative to the predominantly patriarchal nature of Hosea's metaphors, especially as seen in chs. 1–3. Yet some recent studies of the book's metaphors, including some works produced by feminist scholars, follow the trend of older commentaries and argue that the language of ch. 11 remains ambiguous, and overtly feminist interpretations rely too heavily on imported assumptions (see Mays 1969: 150; Kreuzer 1989; Eidevall 1996: 175; Yee 1996: 277-79; Sweeney 2000: 115).

The second major category of metaphor studies in Hosea scholarship, which offers religious, socio-economic, and political interpretations of the book's imagery, appears in recent works that try to elucidate the primary underlying issue(s) or rhetorical focus that stands behind Hosea's discourse. Naturally, such studies make use of insights from historical reconstruction, comparative data, and gender analysis, and many are intertwined with considerations of the marriage imagery in chs. 1–3 (see Kelle 2009). As we have noted concerning the use of Hosea in the reconstruction of the history of Israelite religion, the most long-standing interpretation of the book's metaphors, which has attained nearly unanimous support during various periods of the twentieth century, understands the imagery as addressing a widespread religious conflict in eighth-century Israel between Yahwism and Baalism. Hosea uses his metaphors to criticize Israel's apostasy through some form of the veneration of Baal (e.g., Harper 1905; Wolff 1974; Andersen and Freedman 1980; Stienstra 1993; Abma 1999). The above discussion indicates that this religious interpretation of Hosea's metaphors takes many forms in present scholarship, but moves beyond the

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

literal sex-cult readings from earlier in the twentieth century. While most of these religious interpretations concentrate on chs. 1–3, new examinations look also to religious imagery found in texts such as Hosea 4. Adams (2008), for example, asserts that the language in ch. 4 does not refer to literal sexual activity of any kind, but relies on dissonance to provide a religio-cultic metaphor for apostasy, especially in the form of female cultic practices that the prophet condemns as illegitimate (see also Keefe 2001: 100-102; cf. Eidevall 1996: 59; Moughtin-Mumby 2008: 73).

Although the religious interpretation of Hosea's metaphors continues to appear in commentaries and monographs (e.g., Garrett 1997), the new appreciation of the historical-political and socio-economic dimensions of the book's imagery described above is also finding an important place in recent studies of Hosea's metaphors. Some studies move toward a more thoroughly political interpretation of the metaphors, and many of these deal primarily with Hosea 1–3 as a lens for texts throughout the whole book. Kelle (2005), for example, examines the wife/mother image in Hosea 2 against its ancient Near Eastern background as a metaphor for the capital city of Samaria (and thus for the political rulers who rule there), producing a reading of the prophet's sexual imagery as a political condemnation designed to shame Israel's political leaders. Others observe the prevalent use of 'lovers' as a metaphor for allies in ancient Near Eastern political treaties and biblical texts such as Hos. 8.9 (Ackerman 2002; Yee 2003: 104). Nwaoru (2004) uses an analysis of metaphors and similes to argue that 7.8–8.14 is a unit that addresses Ephraim's improper conduct in international relations. Similarly, Haddox (2005; 2006) attempts a political interpretation of Hosea 4–14's gendered and sexual imagery (e.g., 4.5-10; 6.10; 7.3-16; 8.4-10), arguing that the prophet uses such language to criticize Israel's political leadership.

As noted in the above discussion of history and society, several recent works suggest a socio-economic reading of Hosea's metaphors, based largely upon reconstructions in newer sociological research. These works interpret the prophet's metaphors as symbols of shifting social and economic relationships among king, cult, priest, and peasantry within Israel's body politic. They typically devote the bulk of their consideration, however, to the feminine, sexual, and marital imagery in chs. 1–3. Keefe (2001), for instance, sees the female body being prostituted in Hosea 1–3 as a symbol of the social crisis in eighth-century Israel over communal identity and economic practices, with the metaphors of fornication and adultery serving to condemn the emerging market-based economy featuring land consolidation and cash cropping (see also Premnath 1984; Chaney 2004). While maintaining a focus on the imagery in Hosea 1–3, Yee (2003) extends the

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

analysis to include the sexual and gendered metaphors throughout chs. 4–14. Hosea, she argues, uses these metaphors to feminize and shame the ruling elite as acting faithlessly by supporting the move to a foreign-tributary mode of production and its concomitant unjust domestic policies. Most recently, Hong (2006) broadens the scope of the socio-economic interpretation of the metaphors in Hosea 4–14 beyond the sexual and marital imagery. He examines the book's explicit and implicit language of illness and healing (e.g., 5.13; 6.1; 7.1; 14.5 [MT]) as a metaphor figuring socio-economic changes (latifundialization, cash cropping, etc.) in eighth-century Israel that are destructive to the social body (see also Walker 1997). Dealing in depth with the representative passages of 5.8–6.3 and 7.1-7, Hong concludes that the language of illness figures the unjust policies of Israel's ruling elite, and the imagery of healing figures Hosea's desired restoration of intimacy with Yahweh and social unity based on mutuality.

The third category of metaphor study in Hosea scholarship has garnered less attention in recent years, but builds upon approaches influenced by postmodernist literary perspectives. Since the mid-1990s, a few important studies have stressed the interdeterminacy and instability of the metaphors in Hosea, extending observations about the book's language in general to the analysis of its metaphors in particular. The characterization by Landy is representative: 'Metaphorical language, especially in Hosea, is often fractured, baffling, and claims a status verging on madness' (1995b: 56). From this vantage point, Landy identifies a 'disintegration' of metaphors at work in the book, in which the metaphors remain inconsistent and resist coherent integration. God, for instance, appears as both the life-giving parent and the death-bringing lion. The book's attempt to construct a coherent identity for God remains unfulfilled, and thus Israel is also unable to construct a stable identity for itself in relationship to this God. Moughtin-Mumby (2008) also highlights the fragmented nature of the metaphors in Hosea 4–14, especially noting the inconsistent portrayals of Yahweh (cf. 13.6, 7), and concludes that the book's sexual imagery must be interpreted in the broader context of this metaphorical diversity.

The fourth category of metaphorical study consists of new variations on feminist approaches to Hosea's imagery. As noted in the discussion of Israelite religion, some feminist approaches to the book's metaphorical language published since the 1980s associate Hosea's female and sexual imagery with traces of goddess worship and other female religious practices that the prophet sought to abolish (Balz-Cochois 1982; Wacker 1996; cf. Adams 2008). More recently, however, Moughtin-Mumby's comprehensive examination (2008) of Hosea's sexual and marital metaphors in the context

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

of similar imagery found in Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel foregrounds with a new intensity the question of whether the marital metaphor in Hosea 1–3 should establish the meaning for all subsequent sexual and marital imagery in the chapters that follow. In contrast to older studies (Light 1991; J.P. Lewis 1997), Moughtin-Mumby answers in the negative (see also Eidevall 1996), asserting that the diverse types and uses of sexual imagery in Hosea resist any formulation of a 'standard' marriage metaphor concept. She argues for a 'cognitive contextual approach' that focuses on the specific context and rhetorical function of each use of sexual and marital imagery (2008: 31). Moreover, the other, non-marital and non-sexual metaphors in Hosea, she concludes, provide the wider interpretive frame for the sexual imagery in chs. 4–14.

One of the most promising new variations of feminist criticism turns from traditional feminist-critical questions to masculinity studies, exploring the literary, ideological, and theological aspects of masculine imagery for God and people in the book. Stone (2004), for instance, considers the social importance of the ability to provide food for dependents as a central aspect of ancient Israelite constructions of masculinity reflected in Hosea. The more comprehensive works by Haddox (2005; 2006) utilize masculinity studies' focus on the construction of the male gender, together with the use of gendered imagery in the political rhetoric of ancient Near Eastern inscriptions and reliefs, to trace the metaphorical imagery depicting sexual potency, military prowess, and male identity in Hosea. Looking to the metaphorical use of sexual relations, sticks, staffs, bows, and baking imagery, she proposes that the feminine imagery in Hosea combats challenges to Yahweh's masculinity by feminizing the male ruling elite in comparison with the deity's prowess and ability to provide. The book's masculine imagery, however, especially in chs. 4–14, constitutes a direct attack on the masculinity of the male rulers themselves, claiming they do not possess the shared cultural characteristics of masculine stature and prowess.

5. Conclusion

Twentieth-century scholarship on Hosea 4–14 has addressed an exceptionally wide range of questions and employed various methodological approaches that often reflect the changing trends within biblical studies in general. At the outset of the twenty-first century, several long-standing areas of study remain at the center of ongoing discussion, but new avenues of research have also emerged. The heart of the critical study of Hosea is

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

somewhere between the ongoing and more sophisticated reformulations of traditional ways of reading, and the new lines of inquiry that broaden the discussion beyond the conventional interpretive strategies of the modern period. Among these approaches, the use of metaphor theory to engage the nature and function of the book's language seems likely to continue to occupy the prominent position. Such analyses will surely employ metaphor study for a variety of ends and from a variety of perspectives, engaging the elements of the text with an eye toward religious, political, socio-economic, and gender considerations. These kinds of integrative and multi-dimensional analyses will yield exciting new insights into the dynamics of the text. Rather than simplifying the meaning(s) of Hosea 4–14, however, future study along these lines promises to produce a diversity of interpretation that accurately reflects the complexity of the chapters themselves.

Bibliography

Aaron, C.L., Jr
2005 *Preaching Hosea, Amos, and Micah* (Preaching Classic Texts; St. Louis: Chalice).

Abma, R.
1999 *Bonds of Love: Methodic Studies of Prophetic Texts with Marriage Imagery (Isaiah 50: 1-3 and 54: 1-10, Hosea 1–3, Jeremiah 2–3)* (SSN; Assen: Van Gorcum).

Achtemeier, E.
1975 'The Theological Message of Hosea: Its Preaching Values', *RevExp* 72: 473-85.

Ackerman, S.
2002 'The Personal is Political: Covenantal and Affectionate Love (ʾAHĒB, ʾAHĂBÂ) in the Hebrew Bible', *VT* 52: 437-58.

Ackroyd, P.R.
1963 'Hosea and Jacob', *VT* 13: 245-59.

Adams, K.
2008 'Metaphor and Dissonance: A Reinterpretation of Hosea 4: 13-14', *JBL* 127: 291-305.

Allegro, J.
1959 'A Recently Discovered Fragment of a Commentary on Hosea from Qumran's Fourth Cave', *JBL* 78: 142-48.

Alt, A.
1919 'Hosea 5,8–6,6: Ein Krieg und seine Folgen in prophetischer Beleuchtung', *NKZ* 30: 537-68.

Andersen, F.I., and D.N. Freedman
1980 *Hosea* (AB, 24; Garden City: Doubleday).

Arnold, P.M.
1989 'Hosea and the Sin of Gibeah', *CBQ* 51: 447-60.

Balz-Cochois, H.
1982 *Gomer: Der Höhencult Israels im Selbstverständnis der Volksfrömmigkeit: Untersuchungen zu Hosea 4, 1-5, 7* (Europäische Hochschulschriften, 23; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang).

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

Barton, J.
1990 'History and Rhetoric in the Prophets', in M. Warner (ed.), *The Bible as Rhetoric: Studies in Biblical Persuasion and Credibility* (Warwick Studies in Philosophy and Literature; London: Routledge): 51-64.

Batten, L.W.
1929 'Hosea's Message and Marriage', *JBL* 48: 257-73.

Baumann, E.
1955 '"Wissen um Gott" bei Hosea als Urform von Theologie?', *EvT* 15: 416-25.

Bechtel, L.M.
2004 'The Metaphors of "Canaanite" and "Baal" in Hosea', in J. Kaltner and L. Stulman (eds.), *Inspired Speech: Prophecy in the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of Herbert H. Huffmon* (JSOTSup, 378; London: T&T Clark): 203-15.

Beeby, H.D.
1989 *Grace Abounding: A Commentary on the Book of Hosea* (ITC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).

Ben Zvi, E.
1996 'Twelve Prophetic Books or the "Twelve": A Few Preliminary Considerations', in J. W. Watts and P.R. House (eds.), *Forming Prophetic Literature: Essays on Isaiah and the Twelve in Honor of John D. W. Watts* (JSOTSup, 235; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press): 125-56.

2003 'The Prophetic Book: A Key Form of Prophetic Literature', in M.A. Sweeney and E. Ben Zvi (eds.), *The Changing Face of Form Criticism for the Twenty-first Century* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans): 276-97.

2005 *Hosea* (FOTL, 21a; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).

Birch, B.C.
1997 *Hosea, Joel, and Amos* (Westminster Bible Companion; Louisville: Westminster John Knox).

Bird, P.
1989 'To Play the Harlot: An Inquiry into an Old Testament Metaphor', in P.L. Day (ed.), *Gender and Difference in Ancient Israel* (Minneapolis: Fortress): 75-94.

Blair, M.
2007 'God is an Earthquake: Destabilising Metaphor in Hosea 11', *ABR* 55: 1-12.

Blankenbaker, G.V.
1975 'The Language of Hosea 1–3' (PhD dissertation, Claremont Graduate School).

Boadt, L.
1997 'The Poetry of Prophetic Persuasion: Preserving the Prophet's Persona', *CBQ* 59: 1-21.

Bons, E.
2004 'Geschichtskonzeptionen des Hoseabuches: Ein Vergleich von Masoretentext und Septuaginta', *BZ* 48: 251-62.

Borbone, P.G.
1987 *Il Libro del profeta Osea: Edizione critica del testo ebraico* (Quaderni di Henoch, 2; Turin: Zamorani).

Boudreau, G.R.
1993 'Hosea and the Pentateuchal Traditions: The Case of the Baal of Peor', in M.P. Graham, W. Brown and J. K. Kuan (eds.), *History and Interpretation: Essays in Honour of John H. Hayes* (JSOTSup, 173; Sheffield: JSOT Press): 121-32.

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

Bowman, C.D.
2006 'Reading the Twelve as One: Hosea 1–3 as an Introduction to the Book of the Twelve (the Minor Prophets)', *Stone Campbell Journal* 9: 41-59.

Braaten, L.J.
2003 'God Sows: Hosea's Land Theme in the Book of the Twelve', in Redditt and Schart (eds.) 2003: 104-32.

Brown, S.L.
1932 *The Book of Hosea* (WC; London: Methuen and Co.).

Brueggemann, W.
1968 *Tradition for Crisis: A Study in Hosea* (Richmond: John Knox).

Budin, S.
2008 *The Myth of Sacred Prostitution in Antiquity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Burney, C.F.
1903 *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Book of Kings* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

Buss, M.J.
1969 *The Prophetic Word of Hosea* (BZAW, 111; Berlin: Töpelmann).
1996 'Hosea as a Canonical Problem: With Attention to the Song of Songs', in S.B. Reid (ed.), *Prophets and Paradigms: Essays in Honor of Gene M. Tucker* (JSOTSup, 229; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press): 79-93.

Caquot, A.
1961 'Osée et la Royauté', *RHPR* 41: 123-46.

Cassuto, U.
1973 'The Prophet Hosea and the Books of the Pentateuch', *Biblical and Oriental Studies, Selected Writings*, Vol. 1: *Bible* (Jerusalem: Magnes): 79-100.

Catlett, M.L.
1988 'Reversals in Hosea: A Literary Analysis' (PhD dissertation, Emory University).

Chalmers, R.S.
2007 *The Struggle of Yahweh and El for Hosea's Israel* (Hebrew Bible Monographs, 11; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix).

Chaney, M.L.
1989 'Bitter Bounty: The Dynamics of Political Economy Critiqued by the Eighth-Century Prophets', in R.L. Stivers (ed.), *Reformed Faith and Economics* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America): 15-30.
1993 'Agricultural Intensification as Promiscuity in the Book of Hosea' (Paper delivered at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature in Washington, DC).
2004 'Accusing Whom of What? Hosea's Rhetoric of Promiscuity', in M.L. Chaney *et al.* (eds.), *Distant Voices Drawing Near*: *Essays in Honor of Antoinette Clark Wire* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press): 97-115.

Cheyne, T.
1884 *Hosea* (The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges; London: Cambridge University Press).

Clements, R.E.
1975 'Understanding the Book of Hosea', *RevExp* 72: 405-23.

Collins, T.
1993 *The Mantle of Elijah: The Redaction Criticism of the Prophetical Books* (Biblical Seminar, 20; Sheffield: JSOT Press).

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

Conrad, E.W.
2003 *Reading the Latter Prophets: Toward a New Canonical Criticism* (JSOTSup, 376; London: T&T Clark).

Cook, S.L.
1999 'The Lineage Roots of Hosea's Yahwism', *Semeia* 87: 145-61.

Cotty, R.
1971 'Hosea and the Knowledge of God', *ABR* 19: 1-16.

Craghan, J.
1971 'The Book of Hosea: A Survey of Recent Literature on the First of the Minor Prophets', *BTB* 1: 81-100, 145-70.

Daniels, D.R.
1990 *Hosea and Salvation History: The Early Traditions of Israel in the Prophecy of Hosea* (BZAW, 191; Berlin: W. de Gruyter).

Davies, G.I.
1992 *Hosea* (NCB, 21; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).
1993 *Hosea* (OTG; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).

Dearman, J.A.
1988 *Property Rights in the Eighth Century Prophets: The Conflict and its Background* (SBLDS, 106; Atlanta: Scholars Press).
2001 'Interpreting the Religious Polemics against Baal and the Baalim in the Book of Hosea', *OTE* 14: 9-25.

Diedrich, F.
1977 *Die Anspielungen auf die Jakob-Tradition in Hosea 12,1–13,3 e. literaturwissenschaftl. Beitr. zur Exegese früher Prophetentexte* (FB, 27; Würzburg: Echter-Verlag).

Dietrich, W., and M. Klopfenstein (eds.)
1994 *Ein Gott allein? JHWH-Verehrung und biblischer Monotheismus im Kontext der israelitischen und altorientalischen Religionsgeschichte* (OBO, 139; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Doorly, W.J.
1991 *Prophet of Love: Understanding the Book of Hosea* (New York: Paulist Press).

Dozeman, T.B.
2000 'Hosea and the Wilderness Wandering Tradition', in Steven L. McKenzie and Thomas Römer (eds.), *Rethinking the Foundations: Historiography in the Ancient World and in the Bible: Essays in Honour of John Van Seters* (BZAW, 294; Berlin: W. de Gruyter): 55-70.

Drinkard, J.F., Jr
1993 'Religious Practices Reflected in the Book of Hosea', *RevExp* 90: 205-18.

Eco, U.
1979 *A Theory of Semiotics* (Advances in Semiotics; Bloomington: Indiana University Press).

Eichrodt, W.
1961 '"The Holy One in Your Midst": The Theology of Hosea', *Int* 15: 259-73.

Eidevall, G.
1996 *Grapes in the Desert: Metaphors, Models, and Themes in Hosea 4–14* (ConBOT, 43; Stockholm: Almquist and Wiksell).

Eissfeldt, O.
1939 'Ba'alsamem und Jahwe', *ZAW* 57: 1-31.

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

Emmerson, G.I.
1974 ‘A Fertility Goddess in Hosea IV 17-19?’, *VT* 24: 492-97.
1984 *Hosea: An Israelite Prophet in Judean Perspective* (JSOTSup, 28; Sheffield: JSOT Press).

Ewald, H.
1867–68 *Die Propheten das alten Bundes* (3 vols.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
1875 *Amos, Hosea and Zechariah* (trans. J. Smith; London: Williams and Norgate).

Fensham, F.C.
1964–65 ‘The Covenant-Idea in the Book of Hosea’, *OTWSA* 7.8: 35-49.

Fisch, H.
1988 ‘Hosea: A Poetics of Violence’, in his *Poetry with a Purpose: Biblical Poetics and Interpretation* (Indiana Studies in Biblical Literature; Bloomington: Indiana University Press): 136-57.

Fisher, E.
1976 ‘Cultic Prostitution in the Ancient Near East?: A Reassessment’, *BTB* 6: 225-36.

Fox, M.
1980 ‘The Rhetoric of Ezekiel’s Vision of the Valley of the Bones’, *HUCA* 51: 1-15 (repr. in R. Gordon [ed.], *The Place Is Too Small For Us: The Israelite Prophets in Recent Scholarship* [SBTS, 5; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1995]: 176-90).

Fredericks, D.C.
1996 ‘A North Israelite Dialect in the Hebrew Bible?: Questions of Methodology’, *HS* 37: 7-20.

Frey, H.
1957 *Das Buch des Werbens Gottes um seine Kirche: Der Prophet Hosea* (BAT, 23.2; Stuttgart: Calwer).

Fuller, R.
1991 ‘A Critical Note on Hosea 12: 10 and 13: 4’, *RB* 98: 343-57.

Gaiser, F.J.
2008 ‘Preaching God: Hosea 11: 1-11’, *WW* 28.2: 203-209.

Galambush, J.
1992 *Jerusalem in the Book of Ezekiel: The City as Yahweh’s Wife* (SBLDS, 130; Atlanta: Scholars Press).

Gangloff, F.
2003 ‘La “Guerre Syro-Ephraimite” en Osée 5: 8-14? Quelques Observations Critiques breves’, *BN* 118: 74-84.

Gangloff, F., and J.C. Haelewyck
1995 ‘Osée 4, 17-19: Un Marzeahen l’honneur de la déesse “Anat”?’, *ETL* 71: 370-82.

Garrett, D.A.
1997 *Hosea, Joel* (NAC, 19A; Nashville: Broadman & Holman).

Gelston, A.
1974 ‘Kingship in the Book of Hosea’, *OtSt* 19: 71-85.

Ginsberg, H.L.
1961 ‘Hosea’s Ephraim: More Fool than Knave: A New Interpretation of Hosea 12: 1-14’, *JBL* 80: 339-47.
1971 ‘Hosea’, *EncJud* 8: cols. 1010-24.

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

Gisin, W.
2002 *Hosea: Ein Literarisches Netzwerk beweist seine Authentizistät* (Berlin: Philo).

Gitay, Y.
1981 *Prophecy and Persuasion: A Study of Isaiah 40–48* (Forum theologiae linguisticae, 14; Bonn: Linguistica Biblica).

Good, E.M.
1966a 'The Composition of Hosea', *SEÅ* 31: 21-63.

1966b 'Hosea 5:8–6:6: An Alternative to Alt', *JBL* 85: 273-86.

1966c 'Hosea and the Jacob Tradition', *VT* 16: 137-51.

Gowan, D.E.
1998 *Theology of the Prophetic Books: The Death and Resurrection of Israel* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox).

Graham, W.C., and H.G. May
1936 *Culture and Conscience* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

Green, T.M.
1997 'Class Differentiation and Power(lessness) in Eighth-Century BCE Israel and Judah' (PhD dissertation, Vanderbilt University).

Gross, K.
1930 *Die Literarische Verwandtschaft Jeremias mit Hosea* (Leipzig: Robert Noske).

Haddox, S.E.
2005 'Metaphor and Masculinity in Hosea' (PhD dissertation, Emory University).

2006 '(E)Masculinity in Hosea's Political Rhetoric', in B.E. Kelle and M.B. Moore (eds.), *Israel's Prophets and Israel's Past: Essays on the Relationship of Prophetic Texts and Israelite History in Honor of John H. Hayes* (LHB/OTS, 446; New York: T&T Clark): 174-200.

Harper, W.R.
1905 *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Amos and Hosea* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark).

Hayes, J.H., and J.K. Kuan
1991 'The Final Years of Samaria (730–720 BC)', *Bib* 72: 153-81.

Heintz, J.G., and L. Millot
1999 *Le livre prophétique d'Osée: Texto-Bibliographie du XXème siècle* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz).

Hoffman, Y.
1989 'A North Israelite Typological Myth and a Judean Historical Tradition: The Exodus in Hosea and Amos', *VT* 39: 169-82.

Holt, E.K.
1995 *Prophesying the Past: The Use of Israel's History in the Book of Hosea* (JSOTSup, 194; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).

Hong, S.H.
2006 *The Metaphor of Illness and Healing in Hosea and its Significance in the Socio-economic Context of Eighth-Century Israel and Judah* (Studies in Biblical Literature, 95; New York: Peter Lang).

Hornsby, T.J.
1999 '"Israel Has Become a Worthless Thing": Re-Reading Gomer in Hosea 1–3', *JSOT* 82: 115-28.

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

House, P.R.
1990 *The Unity of the Twelve* (JSOTSup, 97; Bible and Literature Series, 27; Sheffield: Almond Press).

Hubbard, D.A.
1968 *With Bands of Love: Lessons from the Book of Hosea* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).
1989 *Hosea: An Introduction and Commentary* (TOTC; Leicester/Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press).

Hynniewta, M.J.
2002 'The Integrity of Hosea's Future Hope: A Study of the Oracles of Hope in the Book of Hosea' (PhD dissertation, Union Theological Seminary).

Irvine, S.A.
1995 'Politics and Prophetic Commentary in Hosea 8: 8-10', *JBL* 114: 292-94.

Israel, R.D.
1989 'Prophecies of Judgment: A Study of the Protasis-Apodosis Text Structures in Hosea, Amos, and Micah' (PhD dissertation,Claremont Graduate School).

Jacob, E., C.A. Keller and S. Amsler
1965 *Osée* (CAT, 11a; Paris: Neuchâtel, Delachaux et Niestlé).

Jacobson, R.A.
2008 'What Every Christian Should Know about Amos and Hosea', *WW* 28.2: 203-209.

Jeremias, J.
1983 *Der Prophet Hosea* (ATD, 24; Neuer Göttingen Bibelwerk; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
1994 'Der Begriff "Baal" im Hoseabuch und seine Wirkungsgeschichte', in Dietrich and Klopfenstein (eds.) 1994: 441-62.
1995 *Hosea und Amos: Studien zu der Anfängen des Dodekapropheten* (FAT; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck).
1996 'The Interrelationship Between Amos and Hosea', in Watts and House (eds.) 1996: 171-86.

Jiménez, C.S.
2006 *El Desierto en el Profeta Oseas* (Asociacion Biblica Espanola, 45; Estella: Verbo Divina).

Jobling, D.
2003 'A Deconstructive Reading of Hosea 1–3', in T.J. Sandoval and C. Mandolfo (eds.), *Relating to the Text: Interdisciplinary and Form-Critical Insights on the Bible* (JSOTSup, 384; London: T&T Clark): 206-15.

Jones, B.A.
1995 *The Formation of the Book of the Twelve: A Study in Text and Canon* (SBLDS, 149; Atlanta: Scholars Press).

Kakkanattu, J.P.
2006 *God's Enduring Love in the Book of Hosea*: *A Synchronic and Diachronic Analysis of Hosea 11,1-11* (FAT, 2.14; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Kaufmann, Y.
1961 *The Religion of Israel: From its Beginnings to the Babylonian Exile* (trans. M. Greenberg; London: George Allen and Unwin; orig. 1937–56).

Keefe, A.A.
2001 *Woman's Body and the Social Body in Hosea* (JSOTSup, 338; GCT, 10; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

Keita, K.
2007 *Gottes Land: Exegetische Studien zur Land-Thematik im Hoseabuch in kanonischer Perspektiv* (Theologische Texte und Studien, 13; Hildesheim: Olms).

Kelle, B.E.
2005 *Hosea 2: Metaphor and Rhetoric in Historical Perspective* (SBLAcBib, 20; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature).

2009 'Hosea 1–3 in Twentieth-Century Scholarship', *CBR* 7.2: 177-218.

Kennedy, G.A.
1984 *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism* (Studies in Religion; Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press).

Kinet, D.
1977 *Ba'al und Jahwe: Ein Beitrag zur Theologie des Hoseabuches* (Europäische Hochschulschriften. Reihe XXIII, Theologie 87; Frankfurt: Peter Lang).

King, P.J.
1988 *Hosea, Amos, Micah: An Archaeological Commentary* (Philadelphia: Westminster).

Kittay, E.
1987 *Metaphor: Its Cognitive Force and Linguistic Structure* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

Knight, G.A.
1960 *Hosea: God's Love* (Torch Bible Commentaries; London: SCM Press).

Koet, B.J.
2002 'Jacob, comme prototype d'Israël en Osée 12', *Bijdragen* 63: 156-70.

Kratz, R.G.
1997 'Erkenntnis Gottes im Hosebuch', *ZTK* 94: 1-24.

Kreuzer, S.
1989 'Gott als Mutter in Hosea 11?', *TQ* 169: 123-32.

Kruger, P.
1988 'Prophetic Imagery: On Metaphors and Similes in the Book of Hosea', *JNSL* 14: 143-51.

1992 'The Marriage Metaphor in Hosea 2: 4-17 against its Ancient Near Eastern Background', *OTE* 5: 7-25.

Kuan, J.K.
1991 'Hosea 9.13 and Josephus, Antiquities IX, 277-287', *PEQ* 123: 103-108.

Kuhnigk, W.
1974 *Nordwestsemitische Studien zum Hoseabuch* (BibOr, 27; Rome: Biblical Institute Press).

Landy, F.
1995a *Hosea* (Readings; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).

1995b 'In the Wilderness of Speech: Problems of Metaphor in Hosea', *BibInt* 3: 35-59.

Lang, B.
1983 *Monotheism and the Prophetic Minority: An Essay in Biblical History and Sociology* (Sheffield: Almond Press).

Lemche, N.P.
1992 'The God of Hosea', in E. Ulrich *et al*. (eds.), *Priests, Prophets and Scribes: Essays on the Formation and Heritage of Second Temple Judaism in Honour of Joseph Blenkinsopp* (JSOTSup, 149; Sheffield: JSOT Press): 241-47.

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

Lewis, J.P.
1997 'Metaphors in Hosea', in T.J. Sienkewicz and J.E. Betts (eds.), *Festschrift in Honor of Charles Speel* (Monmouth: Monmouth College Press).

Lewis, R.
1958 'The Persuasive Style and Appeals of the Minor Prophets Amos, Hosea, and Micah' (PhD dissertation, University of Michigan).

Light, G.W.
1991 'Theory-Constitutive Metaphor and its Development in the Book of Hosea' (PhD dissertation, Southern Baptist Seminary).

Limburg, J.
1988 *Hosea-Micah* (Interpretation; Atlanta: John Knox).

Lindblom, J.
1928 *Hosea: Literarisch Untersucht* (Acta Academiae Aboensis Humaniora, 5; Åbo: Åbo Akademi).

Loya, M.T.
2008 '"Therefore the Earth Mourns": The Grievance of the Earth in Hosea 4: 1–3', in N.C. Habel and P.L. Trudinger (eds.), *Exploring Ecological Hermeneutics* (SBLSymS, 46; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature): 53-62.

Machinist, P.
2005 'Hosea and the Ambiguity of Kingship in Ancient Israel', in John T. Strong and Steven S. Tuell (eds.), *Constituting the Community: Studies in the Polity of Ancient Israel in Honor of S. Dean McBride, Jr* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns): 153-81.

Macintosh, A.A.
1997a *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Hosea* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark).
1997b 'Hosea and the Wisdom Tradition: Dependence and Independence', in John Day *et al.* (eds.), *Wisdom in Ancient Israel: Essays in Honour of J.A. Emerton* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press): 124-32.

Marti, K.
1904 *Das Dodekapropheton: Hosea* (HKAT, 13; Tübingen: JCB Mohr).

May, H.G.
1932 'The Fertility Cult in Hosea', *AJSL* 48: 73-98.

Mays, J.L.
1969 *Hosea* (OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster Press).

McKeating, H.
1971 *The Books of Amos, Hosea and Micah* (CBC; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

McKenzie, J.L.
1955 'Knowledge of God in Hosea', *JBL* 74: 22-27.

McKenzie, S.
1986 'The Jacob Tradition in Hosea xii 4-5', *VT* 36: 311-22.

Mead, J.K.
2008 '"Let Us Press On To Know the Lord": Preaching the Knowledge of God in Hosea 5: 15-6: 6', *WW* 28.2: 196-202.

Mitchell, M.W.
2004 'Hosea 1–2 and the Search for Unity', *JSOT* 29: 115-27.

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

Morag, S.
1984 ‘On Semantic and Lexical Features in the Language of Hosea’, *Tarbiz* 53: 489-511 [Hebrew].

Morris, G.
1996 *Prophecy, Poetry and Hosea* (JSOTSup, 219; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).

Moughtin-Mumby, S.
2008 *Sexual and Marital Metaphors in Hosea, Jeremiah, Isaiah, and Ezekiel* (Oxford Theological Monographs; Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Mulzer, M.
2003 *Alarm für Benjamin: Text, Struktur und Bedeutung in Hos 5,8–8,14* (Arbeiten zu Text und Sprache im Alten Testament, 74; St. Ottilien: EOS).

Naumann, T.
1991 *Hoseas Erben: Strukturen der Nachinterpretation im Buch Hosea* (BWANT, 131; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer).

Neef, H.-D.
1986 ‘Der Septuaginta-Text und der Masoretic-Text des Hoseabuch im Vergleich’, *Bib* 67: 195-220.

1987 *Die Heilstraditionen Israels in der Verkundigung des Propheten Hosea* (BZAW, 169; Berlin: W. de Gruyter).

1999 ‘Hosea, Book of’, *DBI* 1: 521-25.

Niehr, H.
1994 ‘JHWH in der Rolle des Baalsamem’, in Dietrich and Klopfenstein (eds.) 1994: 307-26.

Nielsen, K.
1989 *There is Hope for a Tree: The Tree as Metaphor in Isaiah* (JSOTSup, 65; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).

Nissinen, M.
1991 *Prophetie, Redaktion und Fortschreibung im Hoseabuch: Studien zum Werdegang eines Prophetenbuches im Lichte von Hos 4 und 11* (AOAT, 231; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag).

Nogalski, J.D.
1993a *The Literary Precursors of the Book of the Twelve* (BZAW, 217; Berlin: W. de Gruyter).

1993b *Redactional Processes in the Book of the Twelve* (BZAW, 218; Berlin: W. de Gruyter).

Nogalski, J.D., and M.A. Sweeney (eds.)
2000 *Reading and Hearing the Book of the Twelve* (SBLSymS, 15; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature).

Nwaoru, E.
1999 *Imagery in the Prophecy of Hosea* (Ägypten und Altes Testament, 41; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz).

2004 ‘The Role of Images in the Literary Structure of Hosea VII 8-VIII 14’, *VT* 54: 216-22.

Nyberg, H.S.
1935 *Studien zum Hoseabuch: Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Klärung des Problems der alttestamentlichen Textkritik* (Uppsala: A.B. Lundequistska).

Odell, M.S.
1996a ‘The Prophets and the End of Hosea’, in Watts and House (eds.) 1996: 158-70.

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

1996b 'Who Were the Prophets in Hosea?', *HBT* 18: 78-95.

Oden, R.
1987 *The Bible without Theology: The Theological Tradition and Alternatives to It* (San Francisco: Harper and Row).

Oestreich, B.
1998 *Metaphors and Similes for Yahweh in Hosea 14: 2–9(1–8): A Study of Hoseanic Pictorial Language* (Friedensauer Schriftenreihe. Reihe A, Theologie, 1; Frankfurt am Main: P. Lang).

Östborn, G.
1956 *Yahweh and Baal: Studies in the Book of Hosea and Related Documents* (LUÅ, 1; Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup).

Patterson, G.
1890–91 'The Septuagint Text of Hosea Compared with the MT', *Hebraica* 7: 190-221.

Peckham, B.
1987 'The Composition of Hosea', *HAR* 11: 331-53.

Pentiuc, E.J.
2002 *Long-Suffering Love: A Commentary on Hosea with Patristic Annotations* (Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press).

Petersen, D.L.
2000 'A Book of the Twelve?', in Nogalski and Sweeney (eds.) 2000: 3-10.

Pfeiffer, H.
1999 *Das Heiligtum von Bethel im Spiegel des Hoseabuches* (FRLANT, 183; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Premnath, D.N.
1984 'The Process of Latifundation Mirrored in the Oracles Pertaining to the Eighth Century B.C.E. in the Books of Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, and Micah' (PhD dissertation, Graduate Theological Union).

2003 *Eighth Century Prophets: A Social Analysis* (St. Louis: Chalice).

Redditt, P.L.
2000 'The Production and Reading of the Book of the Twelve', in Nogalski and Sweeney (eds.) 2000: 11-33.

2001 'Recent Research on the Book of the Twelve as One Book', *CR:BS* 9: 47-80.

2003 'The Formation of the Book of the Twelve: A Review of Research', in Redditt and Schart (eds.) 2003: 1-26.

Redditt, P.L., and A. Schart (eds.)
2003 *Thematic Threads in the Book of the Twelve* (BZAW, 325; Berlin: W. de Gruyter).

Rendsburg, G.A.
1990 *Linguistic Evidence for the Northern Origin of Selected Psalms* (SBLMS, 43; Atlanta: Scholars Press).

2002 *Israelian Hebrew in the Book of Kings* (Occasional Publications of the Department of Near Eastern Studies and the Program of Jewish Studies, 5; Bethesda, MD: CDL).

Ringgren, H.
1966 *Israelite Religion* (trans. D.E. Green; Philadelphia: Fortress).

Robinson, H.W.
1949 *The Cross of Hosea* (Philadelphia: Westminster).

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

Rudnig-Zelt, S.
2003 'Die Genese des Hoseabuches: Ein Forschungsbericht', in K. Kiesow and T. Meurer (eds.), *Textarbeiten*: *Studien zu Texten und ihrer Rezeption aus dem Alten Testament und der Umwelt Israels: Festschrift für Peter Weimar zur Vollendung seines 60 Lebensjahres mit Beitragen von Freunden, Schulern und Kollegen* (AOAT, 294; Münster: Ugarit-Verlag): 351-83.
2006 *Hoseastudien: Redaktionkritische Untersuchungen zur Genese des Hoseabuches* (FRLANT, 213; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Rudolph, W.
1966 *Hosea* (KAT, 13.1; Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn).

Ruppert, L.
1971 'Herkunft und Bedeutung des Jakob-Tradition bei Hosea', *Bib* 52: 488-504.

Schneider, D.A.
1979 'The Unity of the Book of the Twelve' (PhD dissertation, Yale University).

Schulz-Rauch, M.
1995 *Hosea und Jeremia: Zur Wirkungsgeschichte des Hoseabuches* (Calwer Theologische Monographien. Riehe A, 16; Stuttgart: Calwer).

Schüngel-Straumann, H.
1986 'Gott als Mutter in Hos. 11', *Tübinger Theologische Quartalschrift* 166: 119-34.

Schütte, W.
2008 *'Säet euch Gerechtigkeit!': Adressaten und Anliegen der Hoseaschrift* (BWANT, 19; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer).

Seifert, B.
1996 *Metaphorisches Reden Gott im Hoseabuch* (FRLANT, 166; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Seitz, C.R.
2007 *Prophecy and Hermeneutics: Toward a New Introduction to the Prophets* (Studies in Theological Interpretation; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic).

Seow, C.L.
1982 'Hosea 14: 10 and the Foolish People Motif', *CBQ* 44: 212-24.
1992 'Hosea, Book of', *ABD* 3: 291-97.

Sharp, C.J.
2008 'Interrogating the Violent God of Hosea: A Conversation with Walter Brueggemann, Alice Keefe, and Ehud Ben Zvi', *HBT* 30: 59-70.

Sherwood, Y.
2004 *Prostitute and the Prophet: Reading Hosea in the Late Twentieth Century* (London: T&T Clark, 2nd edn; orig. 1996).

Silva, C.H.
2007 'Literary Features in the Book of Hosea', *BSac* 164: 34-48.

Simundson, D.J.
2005 *Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah* (Abingdon Old Testament Commentaries; Nashville: Abingdon).

Smith, M.
1987 *Palestinian Parties and Politics that Shaped the Old Testament* (London: SCM, 2nd edn; orig. New York: Columbia University Press, 1971).

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

Snaith, N.
1953 *Mercy and Sacrifice: A Study of the Book of Hosea* (London: SCM Press).

Stienstra, N.
1993 *YHWH Is the Husband of His People: Analysis of a Biblical Metaphor with Special Reference to Translation* (Kampen: Kok Pharos).

Stone, K.
2004 'Lovers and Raisin Cakes: Food, Sex, and Manhood in Hosea', in K. Stone (ed.), *Practicing Safer Texts: Food, Sex and Bible in Queer Perspective* (Queering Theology Series; London: T&T Clark): 111-28.

Stuart, D.
1987 *Hosea-Joel* (WBC, 31; Waco, TX: Word Books).

Sweeney, M.A.
1998–99 'A Form-Critical Rereading of Hosea', *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 2: 1-16.
2000 *The Twelve Prophets* (2 vols.; Berit Olam; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical).

Szabó, A.
1975 'Textual Problems in Amos and Hosea', *VT* 25: 500-524.

Tadmor, H.
1960 'The Historical Background of Hosea's Prophecies', in M. Haran (ed.), *The Yehezkel Kaufmann Jubilee Volume: Studies in Bible and Jewish Religion* (Jerusalem: Magnes): 84-88.

Tigay, J.H.
1986 *You Shall Have No Other Gods: Israelite Religion in the Light of Hebrew Inscriptions* (HSS, 31; Atlanta: Scholars Press).

Tooze, G. A.
2002 'Framing the Book of the Twelve: Connections between Hosea and Malachi' (PhD dissertation, Iliff School of Theology and the University of Denver).

Trotter, J.
2001 *Reading Hosea in Achaemenid Yehud* (JSOTSup, 328; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).

Utzschneider, H.
1980 *Hosea Prophet vor dem Ende: Zum Verhältnis von Geschichte und Institution in der alttestamentlichen Prophetie* (OBO, 31; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Vall, G.
2001 'Hosea and "Knowledge of God"', *TBT* 39: 335-41.

Van der Toorn, K.
1992 'Cultic Prostitution', *ABD* 5: 510-13.

Van Dijk-Hemmes, F.
1989 'The Imagination of Power and the Power of Imagination: An Intertextual Analysis of Two Biblical Love Songs: The Song of Songs and Hosea 2', *JSOT* 44: 75-88.

Van Hecke, P.
2005 'Conceptual Blending: A Recent Approach to Metaphor: Illustrated by the Pastoral Metaphor in Hos 4, 16', in P. van Hecke (ed.), *Metaphor in the Hebrew Bible* (BETL, 187; Leuven: University Press): 215-31.

Van Selms, A.
1964–65 'Hosea and Canticles', *OTWSA* 7.8: 85-89.

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

Van Wieringen, A.L.H.M.
1996 'Het boek Hosea', in E. Eynikel and A.L.H.M. van Wieringen (eds.), *Toen zond de Heer een Profeet naar Israël: Het voor-exilisch Profetisme van het Oude Testament* (Baarn: Gooi en Sticht): 47-62.

Vielhauer, R.
2007 *Das Werden des Buches Hosea: Eine Redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (BZAW, 349; Berlin: W. de Gruyter).

Vollmer, J.
1971 *Geschichtliche Rückblicke und Motive in der Prophetie des Amos, Hosea, und Jesaja* (BZAW, 119; Berlin: W. de Gruyter).

Vriezen, T.C.
1942 'La tradition de Jacob dans Osée XII', *OtSt* 1: 64-78.

Wacker, M.T.
1995 'Traces of the Goddess in the Book of Hosea', in A. Brenner (ed.), *A Feminist Companion to the Latter Prophets* (FCB, 8; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press): 219-41.
1996 *Figurationen des Weiblichen im Hosea-Buch* (Herder's Biblical Studies, 8; Freiburg: Herder).

Walker, T.W.
1997 'The Metaphor of Healing and the Theology of the Book of Hosea' (PhD dissertation, Princeton Theological Seminary).

Ward, J.M.
1966 *Hosea: A Theological Commentary* (New York: Harper and Row).

Watts, J.D.W.
2000 'A Frame for the Book of the Twelve: Hosea 1–3 and Malachi', in Nogalski and Sweeney (eds.) 2000: 209-17.

Watts, J.W., and P.R. House (eds.)
1996 *Forming Prophetic Literature: Essays on Isaiah and the Twelve in Honor of John D. Watts* (JSOTSup, 235; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).

Weider, A.
1993 *Ehemetaphorik in prophetischer Verkündigung: Hos 1–3 und seine Wirkungsgeschichte im Jeremiabuch: Ein Beitrag zum alttestamentlichen Gottes-Bild* (FB, 71; Würzburg: Echter).

Weiser, A.
1949 *Das Buch der Zwölf kleinen Propheten 1: Die Propheten Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadja, Jona, Micha* (ATD, 24; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Whitt, W.D.
1991 'The Jacob Traditions in Hosea and Their Relation to Genesis', *ZAW* 103: 18-43.

Willi-Plein, I.
1971 *Vorformen der Schriftexegese innerhalb des Alten Testaments: Untersuchungen zum literarischen Werden der auf Amos, Hosea und Micha zurückgeheaden Bücher im hebräischen Zwölfprophetenbuch* (BZAW, 123; Berlin: W. de Gruyter).

Williams, D.L.
1975 'Annotated Bibliography on Hosea', *RevExp* 72: 495-501.

Wilson, R.R.
1980 *Prophecy and Society in Ancient Israel* (Philadelphia: Fortress).

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015

Wolfe, R.E.
1945 *Meet Amos and Hosea, the Prophets of Israel* (New York: Harper and Brothers).

Wolff, H.W.
1953 '"Wissen um Gott" bei Hosea als Urform von Theologie', *EvT* 12: 533-53.

1955 'Erkenntnis Gottes im Alten Testament', *EvT* 15: 426-31.

1956 'Hoseas geistige Heimat', *TLZ* 81: 83-94 (repr. in H.W. Wolff, *Gesammelte Schriften I* [Munich: Chr. Kaiser, 1964]: 232-50).

1974 *Hosea* (trans. G. Stansell; Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress; orig. 1965 [German]).

Yee, G.A.
1987 *Composition and Tradition in the Book of Hosea: A Redaction Critical Investigation* (SBLDS, 102; Atlanta: Scholars Press).

1996 'The Book of Hosea', in L.E. Keck (ed.), *The New Interpreter's Bible*, VII (12 vols.; Nashville: Abingdon): 197-297.

2003 *Poor Banished Children of Eve: Woman as Evil in the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress).

Yoo, Y.J.
1999 'Israelian Hebrew in the Book of Hosea' (PhD dissertation, Cornell University).

Downloaded from cbi.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on April 28, 2015