

Religious worship in the Book of Amos*

IN this section we intend to give a systematic account of the religious life of Amos' contemporaries based on the information examined in the preceding section and any other external data. We shall classify the evidence under various headings: the Deity to whom they directed their worship; the places whither they went; the personnel of the sanctuaries; the installation, and finally the cult itself.

a) *Their God.* Was he *Yahwe* or *Ba'al*? The reform of Jeroboam was a simple schism and not apostasy. In fact when the Omrides introduced *Ba'alism*, it was *Yahwism* which they supplanted; *Ba'alism* itself was displaced by *Yahwism* 1 Kg 12, 28; 1 Kg 17, 18; 2 Kg 13, 2.6. No one could fail to see to what dangers was *Yahwism* exposed through the representation of *Yahwe* by a Bull (1). The bull featured prominently in Oriental rites (2): it was the symbol of fertility and strength. In Israel the bull was considered as the pedestal of God and not as the deity itself. The breach was opened for all sorts of religious syncretism.

The text does not show us clearly what did the contemporaries of Amos worship. In 2, 4 Amos blames the Judahites that they were deceived by their idols, *their lies*, which expression is in harmony with the previous word *wayyete'um*. Their fathers in the desert, if Amos is referring to them, did not worship the bull but *Yahwe* under the symbol of the bull Ex 32, 4, 5. Their idols deceived them in so far as they led to the contamination of *Yahwism*. In 2, 7 we read *to violate my holy name* and *near the altar* implying that they practised these things in "honour" of *Yahwe*. In 4, 4.5 there is not the slightest hint that the offerings are brought to any god other than *Yahwe*. The same is applicable to 5, 21-25 where God is rejecting their offerings, their assemblies and their songs. Nothing definite could be drawn from

(*) The first part of this article appeared in Vol. III No. 2, pp 75-92.

(1) R.P.R. DE VAUX, *Le Schisme religieux de Jeroboam Ier* in *Angelicum* 20 (1943) 82. W.F. ALBRIGHT, *From Stone Age to Christianity*, Baltimore, 1946, p. 229.

(2) S. COOK, *The Religion of Ancient Palestine in the Light of Archaeology*, London 1930, p. 26.

v. 26; if our reading and explanation are right, it would harmonise with this interpretation. The idols of 7, 9 may be simply images of Yahwe; so also with the gods of Dan and Beersheba. In 9, 1 Amos saw Yahwe standing on the altar, most probably at Bethel.

The expression *He eloheka* would incline one to believe that the object of worship was an idol. It may be explained otherwise: These idols were installed as symbols of Yahwe; or simply as pedestals on which the invisible God stood as He was believed to do on the Cherubim of Solomon 1 Sam 4, 4; 2 Kg 19, 15; Ps 79, 2; 98, 1; Is 37, 16. Later on these idols came to be considered as the embodiment of Yahwe, and hence the worshipper's attention was drawn to them. Hos 8, 5-6 does not imply that the golden bull did not represent Yahwe, but that Yahwe could not be represented by any material body; for Hosea such things were nonsense and ridiculous, were it not for the tragic consequences entailed, a further approach to paganism.

We may conclude, therefore, that in the 8th century religion in Israel, in theory, was Yahwism but practically it was heathenism.

b) *Places of Worship*. Five places are enumerated in our texts: Samaria, Bethel, Gilgal, Dan and Beersheba; besides these there were many others scattered throughout Palestine 2 Kg 23, 4-19; 2 Chr 3, 3-7. We have already briefly traced the history of these sanctuaries; Bethel seems to have enjoyed special position: it was under royal protection and was considered as the sanctuary of the realm, much as Jerusalem was in Judah. This preeminence may mean some tendency towards centralisation without the destruction of the local sanctuaries. In order that the prestige of Jerusalem as the city of David might be effectively neutralised there was the absolute necessity of a city enjoying more or less similar preeminence above the others, without however irritating the decentralizing tendencies of the populace. From 4, 4.5 it seems that the same ritual was carried on, perhaps with various degrees of solemnity, in all the sanctuaries.

In 7,9 these places are called *bamoth* which is used as a synonym of *miqdash* which we have already explained above. Here we may give Vincent's definition of these *bamoth* (3): "the

(3) R.P.L.—H. VINCENT, *La Notion Biblique du haut-lieu* RB 55 (1948) 445.

word *bamoth* indicates a hill or mountain as a sojourn of predilection for the deity and consequently a normal place of worship; finally it became a familiar designation of the cult installation itself. Since the pagan populace of Chanaan had introduced in them idolatrous and licentious elements and rites the *bamah* was repressed severely in practice although in principle quite compatible with Yahwe worship".

c) *The Personnel*. In 1 Kg 12, 31 we read that Jeroboam I established a new priesthood in Bethel, whose members were not of the tribe of Levi. The writer of Kg 13, 33 sadly remarks that everyone who wished to have the imposition of hands was made a priest of the high-places. These priests were called *kohane habamoth*. Amaziah is called *kohen bethel*. In 2 Kg 23, 5 (Cfr Hosea 10, 5; Soph 1, 4) the writer calls them *Kemarim* to distinguish them from the priests of Jerusalem who were of Levite stock. Amaziah is called here *kohen* which makes one believe that he was of Levite descendancy; if this is so then there were also Levite priests who were not faithful to Jerusalem; in fact we read in 2 Kg 23, 9 that the *kehanim* were recalled to Jerusalem and the *kemarim* were simply suppressed by Josiah 2 Kg 23, 5 (4).

d) *The Installation*. We have already hinted at the nature of the buildings on these *bamoth*. Now we shall describe them in more detail taking into account what other writers have to tell us on the subject.

In 2, 7 there is a reference to an *altar*; so also in 9, 1; 3, 14 where the *horned altar* of Bethel is mentioned. This altar may be considered as the central part of the building erected on these high places. We explained above the sacredness and the import of these horns attached to the altars Ex 27, 2; Lv 4, 7. This altar formed the most important part of the temple which was a more or less impressive building. Around this temple were clustered the homes of the priests attached to it and of those who had some interest therein: 1 Kg 9, 31; 13, 32; 2 Kg 17, 29-32; 23, 19.

Within these temples there were enshrined the idols or images. In the Pt the Israelites are ordered to destroy, besides the altars, the raised stones, to cut down the *asherim* Ex 24, 13

(4) W.O.E. OESTERLY—Th. H. ROBINSON, *A History of Israel*, Vol. I 1945, p. 421.

and the *hammim* Lv 26, 30. That these objects were still found here at the time of Amos and even later is confirmed by Chr 34, 4 where there is a complete description of the *bamolh*: *and they (the officers of Josiah) broke down before him the altars of ba'alim and demolished the idols that had been set upon them; and he cut down the groves and the graven things and broke them into pieces and strewed the fragments upon the graves...* We may hence reconstruct this picture (5): on these sites, more or less high, there was a temple with a horned altar, a common liturgical object in the Ancient East, for sacrifices and libations; raised stones *massebah* and the sacred trees *asherah*, buildings for the personnel addicted to the service. The *masseboth* were either commemorative stones or at times representations of the local deity; the *asherah* represented goddesses. The *hammim* was an altar for incense (6).

e) *Ritual*. To these sanctuaries there was a large concourse of people; it seems, however, that the most popular, hence the most frequented, were Bethel, Gilgal, Dan and Beersheba. We cannot say how the number of these pilgrimages was regulated, whether, that is, they were restricted to the three main feasts of the Pass Over, of the Weeps and of the Booths. From 4, 4-5 it seems clear that these pilgrimages were quite frequent and hence probably more than three a year.

In these sanctuaries all kinds of sacrifices and tithes were offered; processions were held accompanied by music. The sacrifices were: *animal sacrifice* 4, 4; 5, 25; *burnt-offerings* 5, 22; *meal-offerings* 5, 22; *thanksgiving offerings* 4, 5; *voluntary-offerings* 4, 5; the nature of each of these sacrifices has been described above. Further on we shall study them in the light of Mosaic Legislation. Tithes were also brought to these sanctuaries; these, according to Mosaic Law, were to be offered every third year Dt 26, 12; 14, 22-29. Amos ironically invites these overzealous worshippers to bring them every third day; hence it is difficult to define exactly when and how frequently they were brought; it won't be wrong to suppose that this happened more than once every three years. The purpose of the tithes was to

(5) R.P.L.—H. VINCENT, *ibid* p. 250.

(6) W.F. ALBRIGHT, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*, 2 (1946) p. 215. INGHALT, *Le sens du mot hammam in Melanges... Dussand* t. II, 1939, p. 795-802.

support priests, the sanctuary service and the poor Lv 27, 30-33; Nm 18, 21-22; Dt 14, 22-29.

The feasts held in these sanctuaries were noisy ones 5. 23; Jud 9, 27; 1 Kg 18, 26-28; Is 28, 7; they were deeply contaminated with Canaanite ritual. Processions were held 5, 26; Is 46, 9; 45, 20; Jer 10, 5 in which the idols were carried along the streets. Philo of Byblos refers to the Phoenician *naos zugophroumenos* (7). The solemnity was enlivened by music and song 5, 23; 1 Kg 18, 26-28; Is 28, 7.

In 2, 7 we have a reference to ritual prostitution. This was a characteristic mark of the Ashtarte cult, which led to all sorts of legalized immoral practices (8). In spite of all efforts of all good Yahwists to keep it away from the right religion of God. Dt 23, 17-18; 1 Kg 22, 47; Ezek 16, 16, it penetrated deeply into the ritual of Israel, so far as to take a firm hold even in the temple of Jerusalem itself 2 Kg 23, 7; 1 Kg 15, 12; Hos 4, 14. No wonder then that Amos refers to it.

In the preceding paragraphs we outlined with the help of the data found in the book of Amos and elsewhere a picture of the religious life of the Israelites in the 8th century B.C. It is clear that Amos did not share in any way the idea of God which his contemporaries nursed in their minds and cherished in their hearts: the conception of an Almighty God which dominated the preaching of the prophets could in no way square with the popular idea of a god reduced to the level of a Phoenician Ba'al with whom they tried to strike a bargain of a give-and-take business type. It was natural that the prophet's views on the nature and efficacy of external religious practices would not harmonize with those of the people. We must remember, however, that the main purpose of Amos' preaching was to restore a sound moral life within his people, to recall them back to Yahwism, the religion of their fathers in its true form and spirit and not to correct their ritual, which after all was but one way of expressing that interior spiritual life which the prophet wants to recreate. One therefore should not expect a wholesale condemnation or approbation of a cult as such, at least directly: in fact the passages dealing with this subject are but parts of a larger context within which they

(7) S.A. COOK, *The Religion of Ancient Palestine in the Light of Archaeology*, 1930, p. 161.

(8) J—F CHARLES, *Le milieu biblique* t. III 1936, p. 283.

form an organic whole with other questions of no minor importance. Moreover one should take into account the rhetorical style of the prophet who uses scathing language so as to oppress, so to say, the mind of the hearers with the main point of his sermon, leaving the rest in the background.

With these premisses we may now answer this question: Did Amos approve religious external practices? All those (9) who explain 5, 25 in a way as to imply the non-existence of sacrifice in the desert, give a negative answer; the rest (10) distinguishing between external worship as such and external worship as in fact practised by the contemporaries of Amos maintain that Amos did not condemn cult as such but he rejected it in the form and spirit in which it was practised in the 8th century. An examination of the text would show us the sound basis of the second alternative; one must not forget that the prophet was a preacher and not a legislator.

In 2, 4 Amos is blaming Judah for its crimes, including their unfaithfulness to Yahwe and his commandments. As it was explained above, this text by itself does not necessarily mean a written law, but that considered, within the larger historical context of the 8th century, it may be considered as referring to a written law, which most naturally referred also to religious worship. Hence this text would rather incline one to state with some confidence that Amos was indirectly approving worship as it was prescribed in Judah. He approves it as a matter of principle.

In 3, 14 God is expressing his anger against the misdirected zeal of the people. His decision to wipe out the *bamoth* does not necessarily mean that He condemned cult as such; it would rather mean that since these places afforded the opportunity for the practice of this hypocrite worship they were only worthy of destruction. One may press further the argument and state: since the Mosaic Legislation regarding the centralization of wor-

(9) R.S. CRIPPS, *The Book of Amos*, London 1929, p. 341.

N. SCHMIDT, *On the Text and Interpretation of Amos*, 5, 26-27 in *JBLit* 13 (1894) 1-15.

A. WEISER, *Die Prophetie des Amos*, 1929 in *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* No. 53, p. 266ff.

E. SELLIN, *Das Zwölfprophetenbuch*, Leipzig 1929, 212-215.

M.-J. LAGRANGE, *La Nouvelle Histoire d'Israel et le Prophete Osee* RB 1 (1892) 222.

ship was in force at least in principle, all these sanctuaries even if they were the scenes of rightful worship, were illegal and schismatical and hence worthy of destruction. The Books of Kings and Chronicles several times condemned them 1 Kg 15, 14; 22, 14; 2 Kg 12, 13; 15, 4; 2 Ch 20, 23 etc., without in any way implying a condemnation of cult as such, as the reforms carried out by Ezechiah and Josiah plainly show 2 Ch 29, 3-31; 2 Kg 22, 3-23, 24; 2 Ch 34, 29-34, 29-35, 19. In the Book of Amos himself Jerusalem holds a special place in Judah and Israel, 2. All this can be clearly applied to 7, 9.16.

4, 4.5 and 5, 21-27 may lead us to believe that Amos is rejecting ritual as such, since sacrifice held such a prominent place in all oriental rituals. We have seen above, however, that 4, 4.5 forms but a part of an invective against *the cows of Samaria*, who notwithstanding their coming and going to the principal *bamoth* would not escape destruction. The phrase *ki ken'ahabta bene israel* means that Israel wanted to go on with ritual and at the same time lead an immoral life. We have also here but two strophes standing in opposition to one another.

In 5, 21-27 the problem is more complicated; the wording is much stronger and the anger of Yahwe falls upon sacrifices, festivals, meetings, singings and processions. The text, however, is by no means decisive against ritual as such; the context would throw much light thereon. Verse 18 is an introduction directed against those who, peacefully and enthusiastically, were eagerly waiting for the *great day of Yahwe*. Against such self-complacency the prophet retorts that *the day of Yahwe* will be a day of sorrow, a day of punishment, of weeping and torments. The people may have conceived the festivals as a kind of "miniature Lord's day", for which God Himself descended for his worshippers' merry-making and that by such gorgeous ritual they were ensuring Yahwe's favour against any misfortune on that terrible day. The prophet warns them in strong terms that far from being a foretaste of a joyful advent of the Lord, Yahwe was by no means pleased with these sacrifices and festivals because He prefers righteousness and justice to these noisy empty external practices. V 24, embedded right in the middle of the passage, is the basis of the whole section: put away your sacrifices that righteousness would flow easily as a mighty stream. The interpretation of v 25 given above harmonizes perfectly with the context. Sacrifice is not condemned as such; the main point of the pro-

phet is the lack of any connection between their daily conduct and their religious practices. V 26 might be a return to the subject of the noisy processions and festivals; Israel is contaminated by idolatrous worship, which would be the climax of her sins.

In 8, 14 the prophet is evidently condemning idolatry, whether it were under the form of the images of Yahwe or idolatry pure and simple.

The examination of these texts by themselves and in their contexts shows us that they are not decisive for an outright rejection of ritual as such. Amos was too deeply absorbed by the moral life of the people to pass a judgment on, or to give any prescription of a liturgical nature. The difficulty presented by 5, 25 which seems to do away with sacrifice is lessened and loses much of its force when one tries to put oneself in the place of Amos in opposition to his hearers engrossed in their gross religious ideas. They believed strongly that in olden days, beginning with the Patriarchal period, sacrifice was offered by their forefathers; it would have been a tactical mistake for the prophet to condemn sacrifice as such; they would have retorted: we are following in the footsteps of our fathers who were undoubtedly the friends of God who approved of their acts. A bare *no* from Amos would be against all Israelite traditions and all that oriental monuments have to offer us about the general use of sacrifice in all oriental eastern rites (11); they would have attacked him as an unorthodox innovator. There is not the slightest evidence for such a protest; Amaziah simply accuses him of preaching against the safety of the State, without in any way implying that he is introducing anything new; moreover this priest of Bethel wanted to hush up the matter by inducing Amos to cross over the border into Judah. If Amos was really an innovator it would have been much easier for Amaziah to awaken popular anger against the prophet, about which the prophet does not in any way speak. It seems that the opponents of Amos shared his views at least theoretically but did not follow them in practice.

Hosea 6, 4-6, Isaiah 1, 10-17 and Jeremiah 7, 21 have some-

(10) U. TOUZARD, Van Hoonacker, Tobac.

P. VETTER, *Die Zeugnisse der vorexilischen Propheten über den Pentateuch I Amos in Theol. Quartalschrift* 81 (1899) 512-552.

W.F. ALBRIGHT, *From Stone Age to Christianity*, p. 239.

D.B. MACDONALD, *Old Testament Notes in JBibLit* 18 (1899)

(11) R.S. CRIPPS, *ibid.* p. 340.

thing in common with Amos; they are more outspoken, but their spirit is his. They condemn sacrifice unaccompanied by right conduct. Dennefeld (12) considers Jeremiah 7, 21 as a rhetorical exaggeration; the prophet is emphasising his point without qualifying it in any way. That in these passages there is not an absolute rejection of worship external practices is proved by Is 1, 15 which reads: "*And when you stretch forth your hands, I will turn away my eyes from you: and when you multiply your prayers I will not hear: for your hands are full of blood.*" Evidently we cannot conclude that God rejects his faithful's prayers.

As a conclusion we may state that Amos is not rejecting external worship as such, but he is firmly opposed to any religious cult which is not the expression of an inner spiritual life expressed through right conduct in daily life.

WORSHIP IN AMOS AND IN MOSAIC LEGISLATION (13)

So far we have seen the outward form of worship as it is presented in the Book of Amos and the nature of this worship and Amos' stand with respect to it. It remains for us to study the relation between it and the Mosaic Law. The problem to be solved may be formulated thus: do we find in Amos enough evidence to state whether in the 8th century B.C. Mosaic Law existed or not? We have already seen that the evidence in the prophet's book does not in any way entitle us to affirm that Amos condemned external religious practices in principle; hence there is not any rejection of Mosaic worship. It is possible, therefore, that in the 8th century there existed some code of Law which agreed in its principles and outward form with that prescribed in the Pt and which was at least tacitly approved by the prophets. We shall pass in review all evidence which may have any relation with such laws and tradition. Since legislation and narratives are closely knit in the Pt we shall first consider the historical contacts and then the legislative ones.

Historical Contacts:

Amos did not narrate history for its own sake, but he uses it to illustrate or press home his arguments. One meets only short notices. He refers to the Book of the Sinai Covenant (3, 2; Ex 24); to the duration of the desert

(12) L. DENNEFELD, *Lés Grands Prophetes*, Paris 1946 p. 266.

(13) Cfr. P. VETTER, *ibid.* 512-522.

wanderings (2, 10; 5, 25; Dt 1, 3ff; 2, 7; 4, 44-5,6); to the deliverance from Egypt 4, 10; 3, 1.9.7.; Ex 7, 14-12; Dt. 7, 15; 28, 27.60; to the Amorites as a general designation of the inhabitants of Chanaan 2, 9; Gn 48, 22; Nm 13, 33; Dt 1, 7.19.20. 27-28; and he has also a reference to the destruction of Sodoma and Gomorrha 4, 11; Gn 19, 24-25; Dt 29, 22-23.

All these notices may have been drawn out of an oral tradition; what is important is that in so small a book there are so many historical references which taken together would lead one to believe that in the 8th century there was a historical tradition, oral or written, which agreed substantially with that in the Pentateuch (14).

Legislative contacts:

The centralization of worship: One of the most important prescriptions in the Pt is that requiring only one place of worship: the centralization of worship in that place which Yahwe would have selected. Did Amos know of such law? Nowack answers in the negative, because in 7, 9 *bama* and *miqdash* are used as synonyms. The weakness of this argument is that Amos was not a juridical writer making fine distinctions between one term and another, but a preacher using words according to the effect that these would produce in the hearts of his hearers. Further, Amos did not foretell their destruction because they were illegal places of worship—at least he does not say so—but because they were the places of a hypocritical religious life. In 1, 2 Jerusalem holds a prominent position as a place of worship; it cannot be definitely stated that Amos is insisting on the centralization of worship. It would not be rash to hold that at the time of Amos the law was in existence, but it was not seriously enforced on account of several difficulties in the way. Its history may be divided in various stages (15):

a) *The Judges period*: Regular sacrifices were offered in Silo; extraordinary ones even outside this national sanctuary: Gedeon Ju 6, 11-24; 6, 25-32; the parents of Samson 6, 25-32; a sacrifice was offered in Bethel because it was the place of a theophany 20, 26-28; 21, 24. The law therefore was interpreted

(14) J. ROBERTSON, *Amos in International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia*, Vol. I, p. 121.

(15) Cfr. L.H. VINCENT, *La Notion du haut-lieu* RB 50 (1948) 245ff. P. VETTER, *ibid.* p. 526.

in such a way as to prescribe that ordinary sacrifices be offered near the Ark of the Covenant and extraordinary ones in those places sanctified by Yahwe's apparitions.

b) *The first Days of the Monarchy* : A second stage was inaugurated with the capture of the Ark 1 Sam 4, 11. It was clear that Yahwe had not yet chosen his place of predilection; hence Samuel offered sacrifices in Mispah, Rama, Gilgal and Bethlehem; so also did David and Solomon. The tribes offered their sacrifices each in his own country.

c) *The Monarchy period* : The third stage began when Solomon built his temple; henceforth there was no doubt whatever as to the place chosen by Yahwe. The people however were not so easy to be weaned from the *bamoth*, where their forefathers in the preceding century had worshipped God. The strife between the *bamoth* and the temple of Jerusalem began. Asa and Josaphat, kings of Judah, fought against them 2 Chr 14, 2; 17, 6. In the Northern Kingdom things took a different course; here it was the policy of the civil authority to strengthen its position by raising an insurmountable barrier between the two states. It has been seen already how Jeroboam I established Bethel and Dan and other minor shrines 2 Kg 12, 26 to keep the people away from Jerusalem. Now, had the prophets preached or insisted that Jerusalem was the only and exclusive place of worship their preaching would have been rendered impossible and impracticable; they would have sacrificed their main purpose of the moral regeneration of the people. Thus the fact that prophet Elias raised an altar on Mount Carmel 2 Kg 18, 30 does not mean that Deuteronomistic legislation was still unknown.

d) *The Destruction of Samaria* : The fourth and final stage was reached when the schismatical city of Samaria was destroyed. The political barrier was destroyed and hence the prophets could press home with more eagerness 2 Kg 18, 4; Ch 30, 14; 31, 1 the reform which culminated with that of Josiah 34.3-35.19.

Amos preached during the third stage when this particular law was practically disregarded in Judah and held impracticable in Israel. If Amos therefore does not inveigh against this open disregard of such an important law it does not mean that he did not know of it or that it was non-existent; 1, 2 and 4, 4 on the other hand suggest that the prophet had at the back of his mind the idea of a central shrine.

Other Laws:

2, 8 is a condemnation of those who would keep the pledged garments of the poor to use them at night near the altar of the Lord; Ex 22, 25-26; Dt 24, 12.13 prescribed that such pledges be returned to their owners at nightfall. This law is found in all the four classical documents JEPD as outlined by the critics. Word-similarity, however, is missing and the wording and the general construction of the prophet's saying lays emphasis not on the fact that it is a transgression of a particular law but on the deep contrast that there is between one's relations with God and those with one's neighbours in need. It remains true, however, that the contents of the law and those of the prophet's saying are identical.

4, 4 refers to the tithes. There is good reason to suppose that here we have an exaggeration of an actual time-limit. Dt 14, 28. 29 prescribes that every third year tithes should be offered; this year is called the tithe year in Dt 26, 12. The time of three days would be an exaggerated ironical representation of the three-year time limit prescribed by the law.

In 2, 11.12 there is mentioned the Nazarite institution corresponding to Nm 6, 1-22 attributed to P. Amos restricts this institution to young people; the Pt includes all those who make a vow without any age limit.

8, 5 mentions the *Sabbath* and *Newmoon-days*; both of them are days of rest. The repose of the Sabbath is found in all the four documents. Newmoon days as a feast day and a day of rest is mentioned several times in historical and prophetic works; in the Pt, only P records it as a rest-day and insists on the sacrifice service. The prophet is referring to actual practice which might have had a legal basis.

5, 21-27 is of special importance. *Asera* recurs in D and P as a technical term. In P it indicates the 8th day of the feast of the Tabernacles; in Dt the 7th day of the Unleavened Bread; in Kg 10, 20 and Joel 1, 14; 2, 15 this technical meaning is impossible. It is impossible to decide which meaning Amos intended, the stricter or the wider one. 5, 22.25 together with 4, 4.5 gives a list of offerings brought to the sanctuaries. *Zebah* 4, 4; 5, 25; *'ola* 5, 22; *minha* 5, 22.25; *selem* 5, 22; *thoda* 4, 5. This order agrees with the one given in Lv 1-3. The dispositions with respect to the *selem* 4, 5 are identical with those in Lv 7, 11-21 though the prophet is speaking only of the *nedaboth* and not of the *neder*.

In 4, 4.5 the prophet is ironically exaggerating with respect to the tithes but not with regard to the daily sacrifice which was prescribed by P in Ex 29, 38-40; Lv 6, 1-6; Nm 28, 3-7. It might be objected that Amos is deriding their rich sacrifices of leavened bread which were prohibited by law; it does not seem probable, because the prophet mentions other sacrifices which he considers as one whole. Moreover daily sacrifice was in use in Jerusalem in the 8th century. In Bethel and Gilgal it may be that it was not in use. The use of leavened Bread was prohibited in JE Ex 23, 18 and P Lv 2, 11.

In 7, 10ff Amaziah is represented as a man of property in Bethel contrary to all legal prescriptions Nm 18, 20.23.24; 26, 62; Dt 10, 9; 12, 12; 18, 1.2; Nm 35, 1-8 (P). The tribe of Levi as such would possess the priest-cities; the individual priest would possess nothing of his own.

One may note here some verbal similarities. The phrase *to violate my holy name* in 2, 7 recurs most frequently in P in the laws against immorality Lv 18, 17; 19, 29; 3, 14; 22, 2-32. *I am he who led you out of the land of Egypt* is very close to Dt 29, 14; 8, 2. This expression by itself has nothing special about it, but it seems to be a peculiarity of Dt. It is more likely that Amos is writing under the influence of Dt than that he is drawing on a common source to both. Amos 4, 6-9; 5, 11; 9, 14 echo Dt 28. The expression *bassidafon u bayyeraqon* in 4, 9 corresponds to Dt 28, 22 joined with the *hiphil* of *nakah*. This *hiphil* recurs in Dt 28, 30.39; 5, 11b. Amos perhaps is quoting Dt. Amos 4, 11 recalls Dt 29, 23 without being a strict quotation; the word *Elohim* is absent in Amos in such context and in Dt there are grouped together no less than the names of four cities.

One may therefore conclude: in Amos we do not meet with a complete description of the Mosaic ritual, but only hints and references according to the context and subject matter in hand, since the purpose of the prophet was not instruction in the Law but the correction of morals. Although it is remarkable that in Amos not everything regarding cult agrees with Mosaic prescriptions there is no item which is substantially missing in the Pt. These legal contacts coupled with historical reminiscences some of which are practically verbal quotations, prove that much of the Pt legislation was in force even in the schismatical Kingdom of Israel. This presupposes a written code of Law containing all the four classical documents JEDP as traced by the Critics;

hence in Amos there is no evidence for the post-exilic origin of Pt in its actual literary form; nor for the absence of D in the Northern Kingdom in the 8th cent. Amos knew P in its main outline 2, 7; 5, 12; 7, 4; 4, 5; 5, 22; Lv. 1-3; 7, 11-21; Dt is the prototype for 2, 10; 4, 6-9; 5, 11; 9, 14. The differences are, at least partially, explained by the fact that religion in the Northern Kingdom was but the hand-maid of politics and it should not be expected to find all Mosaic prescriptions scrupulously observed in all their details, which was not even the case in the Davidic Jerusalem.

Summing up our results we may draw the following conclusions: The religious life of the people of the Northern Kingdom of Israel in the 8th cent. as pictured in the Book of Amos and other contemporary records reflected the social conditions of the time; the rich ritual was due to the spell of material prosperity under the rule of *Jerobo'am II*. This ritual indulged in with all pomp and solemnity in the principal sanctuaries of Bethel, Gilgal and Dan was rotten from within, being in sharp contrast to the morally corrupt daily conduct of the people. It is true that their religion was based on the worship of Yahwe, but God, the God of their fathers, was reduced to the level of the Phœnician Ba'al being represented by the bull and probably by other images. The prophet did not mean to condemn outrightly external worship; he was deeply angered however by its hypocrisy. It was but a screen for immorality and the cause of the moral rottenness of the people. The worship in Israel, presupposed in the preaching of the prophet, is, generally speaking, in harmony with Mosaic Law; minor differences are due to the tendency of keeping away as much as possible from Jerusalem and to the fact that law by its very nature tends to modify itself according to circumstances, without losing its special character. In the Book of Amos, therefore, one does not meet any evidence for the post-exilic origin of the Mosaic prescriptions with respect to worship in any part of the Pt.