

is supposed to be basically a public presentation to the crowd, is taken up with private instruction to the disciples. Kingsbury does not completely overcome this difficulty. Another aspect of his argument that will raise some doubt is the assertion that the affinity between the Parable of the Tares (13:24-30) and "the interpretation of the parable of the tares" (13:36b-43) is "formal and accidental rather than real and essential" (p. 14), so that in his opinion the interpreter should deal with each unit separately. The question here does not concern the authenticity of one or both of these passages but rather Matthew's understanding of the relationship of one to the other. Again, the chapter dealing with the last half of Mt 13 (Jesus' parables to the disciples in private) needs further development. He describes the intention of the Interpretation of the Parable of the Tares, and of the parables of the Hidden Treasure, the Pearl, and the Net as "paraenetic." Surely it is that, but in this reviewer's opinion, much more. Matthew's use of each of these parables needs to be more clearly delineated and integrated into the overall argument being developed. These last observations notwithstanding, Kingsbury has provided an exposition of Mt 13 with many new insights that will be of value to any student of the Gospels.

Walla Walla College
College Place, Washington

MALCOLM MAXWELL

Mays, James Luther. *Amos*. "Old Testament Library." Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969. viii + 168 pp. \$ 5.50.

Mays, James Luther. *Hosea*, "Old Testament Library." Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969. x + 190 pp. \$ 6.00.

Ever since Henderson published his monumental commentary on the Minor Prophets a little over a hundred years ago, English-writing scholars in nearly every decade have attempted to solve the manifold literary, historical, and philological problems of the earliest collections of canonical prophecy. To the distinguished list of commentaries and individual studies on Amos and Hosea may now be added the excellent exegetical study by Mays in "The Old Testament Library" series, one that not only demonstrates mastery of the secondary materials, but gives evidence of original insight in dealing with primary sources.

The format for each book includes a brief introduction which substantively brings out what the author has developed in the exegesis which follows. The bulk of the books is deceptively compact in content, and the works discuss with illuminating perception the traditional topics of authorship, time, composition, messages, editorial redaction, and personality of the prophets. The arrangement of a verse-by-verse commentary is carefully planned and should make the volumes very useful for the non-specialist in the field. The author's gallant attempt in part to make a new translation of the MT, supported by brief footnotes

at the end of the page, is to be commended but it is of limited value for one who has no knowledge of the Hebrew text or the versions. In the brief space allotted to textual comments, Mays is forced to compact a great deal of information in a few sentences. It appears that one must have a prior textual knowledge if he is really to understand the author's rendition. But any concerned reader, even without a proficiency in Biblical Hebrew, who is willing to work will find Mays' comments extremely rewarding. We suggest that the reader work through the volumes as a whole several times; he should then find himself in position to utilize effectively the exposition of the author in regard to particular problems in the books of Amos and Hosea.

The books by Mays, who is Professor of Biblical Interpretation, Union Theological Seminary, Virginia, do not innovate (as do several other volumes in "The Old Testament Library" series) new critical thought for the knowledgeable reader. His Amos commentary is a synthesis of the scholarship, to which he pays tribute in the preface, found in Wellhausen's commentary (³1898); E. Sellin, *KAT* (²1929-30); Harper, *ICC* (⁶1960); A. Weiser, *Die Prophetie des Amos*, "BZAW," LIII (1929); V. Maag, *Text, Wortschatz und Begriffswelt des Buches Amos* (1951); and H. W. Wolff, *BK* (1957). Likewise, his remarks on Hosea reflect a strong indebtedness to the works of H. W. Wolff, W. Rudolph, and J. M. Ward. But Mays does not blindly follow anyone. He knows the problems involved; he is able to identify the major areas of contemporary debate; and he offers a balanced critique of the extreme positions taken by H. Reventlow, R. Smend, A. S. Kapelrud, G. Östborn, and others. It represents the chief merit of Mays' contribution for the serious, but not specialized, Bible student, the audience whom the author is most interested in reaching.

These are some of Mays' more important conclusions: both Amos and Hosea were called by YHWH to bear witness to the God of Israel in times of crises, and both elevated the pathos of Israel to a universal plane of ethical monotheism, stressing the *mysterium tremendum* of the Deity who expresses himself in love and loyalty in Hosea, and in justice and righteousness in Amos. It is not the biography of Amos or Hosea that we know but their messages. Against the background of the cyclical fertility belief of the Canaanite world, Hosea, steeped in a proto-Deuteronomic tradition, reveals the historical antecedents of Yahwism when he proclaims that the covenant between YHWH and Israel is an everlasting one bound by God's inexhaustible *hesed* and *'ahabāh*. Israel's ubiquitous sufferings from the hands of neighboring powers are seen by the prophet as a necessary virtue and are interpreted by the commentator to be "the search of God for the repentance of his people." Similarly, Amos in his denunciation of superficial ritual and sacrifice proclaims that God, because of the *berit*, never openly stated but implicitly operative in Israel's birth credo (Amos 2:9-10), and in the formula *'ammī Yisraēl* (cf. Amos 7:15; 8:2; and with reservations in Amos 3:1; 4:12; 9:7), displays himself in a universal history which provides under divine guidance damnation

or salvation irrespective of time and nation but determined by honesty, fairness, and equity between man and man, nation and nation.

Where did Amos and Hosea declare their messages? For the *nōqed* from Tekoa it was at the main religious center at Bethel (Amos 2:8; 3:14; 5:5, 6; 7:13) and in the capital city of Samaria (Amos 4:1-3; 3:9-11, 12; 6:1-3; 8:4-8); in addition to expounding his moral messages at Bethel (Hos 4:15; 5:8; 10:5; 12:5) and Samaria (Hos 7:1; 8:5, 6; 10:5, 7; 14:1), Hosea denounces the corrupt practices of the people (Hos 4:15; 12:12) and its false leaders (9:15) at Gilgal.

What is the structure of the prophet's message? Most of Amos' declarations are announcements of judgments which often (cf. Amos 1:3-2:16; 3:2, 9-11; 4:1-3; 5:7, 10-12, 16, 17; 6:1-7, 13, 14; 7:16, 17; 8:4-7) but not always (cf. Amos 3:12, 13-15; 5:1-3; 6:9-11; 8:9-14; 9:9, 10) combine the elements of censure and punishment. Diatribe and threat characterize much of Hosea's oral delivery with a frequent sprinkling of the *rîb* speech-pattern (cf. Hos 2:2; 4:1, 4; 12:2) and the cultic salvation oracle (Hos 1:10, 11; 2:16-23).

What is the composition of the book? Hos is composed of material of two distinct types: (1) Chs. 1-3 serve as an introduction to the book and consist of biographical (Hos 1:2-9), autobiographical (Hos 3:1-5), chastisements (Hos 2:4-17), salvation oracles (Hos 2:1-3, 18-25), and additions by a Judahistic redactor who collected and assembled shortly after the fall of Samaria in 721 B.C. pertinent material dealing with Hosea's life and message; (2) Chs. 4-14 contain Hosea's prophecies in no very apparent order from the different periods of his *šeliḥūt*, but the redactor used common thematic material and mnemonic devices to organize the brief and ejaculatory messages of the prophet. For example, the content of chs. 1-3 shaped the format of chs. 4-11 and 12-14 with its alternation of judgment and salvation material. The general make-up of Amos consists primarily of first-person narratives, sayings by the prophet in carrying forth his mission, didactical questions, and hymnic poetry. The autobiographical narratives, many of the sayings, and the historical record of Amos' encounter with the priest Amaziah at Bethel (Amos 7:10-17) can be attributed with confidence to the activity of the *nābî'* who preached in the middle decades of the eighth century B.C. However, the Deuteronomic circles working in the exilic period composed the oracles against Tyre (Amos 1:9-10), Edom (Amos 1:11, 12), and Judah (Amos 2:4, 5). They are responsible for the hymnic sections in Amos 1:2; 4:13; 5:8, 9; 9:5, 6; the introduction (Amos 1:1); and the cryptic statement on the nature of prophecy (Amos 3:7). The post-exilic message of consolation and hope found at the end of the book (Amos 9:11-15) was added by the cultic community of Jerusalem to reflect the contemporary situation, *i.e.*, to assure a weeping remnant that redemption is near.

As for the ethical standards advocated by Amos, they are derived from a wisdom background handed down traditionally within the family, clan, and the court in the city gates. His "woe" oracles; the numerical sequence $x/x + 1$ in Amos 1-2; the free use of *neḫōḥah*,

mišpāt, *šedāqāh* and their alternatives; the concern for the poor, orphan, widow, and downtrodden are all characteristic of the wisdom circles, but they are not identified with the cultic traditions of the Temple in Jerusalem. Mays advances persuasively that Amos, a shepherd most of his life but skilled in the historical traditions of his people, was called by YHWH to proclaim a theology of doom, not like some of his predecessors, on a king or a class, but on a people, thereby inaugurating a new emphasis of the *b'eriš* theology between God and Israel. The statements of Hosea which know the proper name of God and are aware of the *'ehyeh* theology are indebted to the old Yahwist tribal league. Unlike Amos, Hosea directs no oracles to foreign nations and his mention of Assyria and Egypt are considered only as elements in YHWH's direct relationship with Israel. The writer agrees with the prevailing view that the erring wife of ch. 3 is Gomer the *'ēšēl zənānīm* of the first chapter. Hosea's marriage, the birth of his symbolically-named children, and the redemption of his unfaithful wife are interpreted as a kerygmatic parable of YHWH's love for Israel. He was a keen student of history, and he was quick to denounce Israel's rulers and priests (Hos 4:1-5:7), the people's corruption (Hos 6:4-7:2), misused property (Hos 10:1-8), and idolatry (cf. particularly Hos 10:9-15). On occasion his grim message was directed to Greater Israel, including the national states of Israel and Judah, as when he declared them equally guilty in their political maneuvers during the Syro-Ephraimite War (Hos 5:8-14).

One of the restrictions of Mays' commentaries is that the author does not elaborate sufficiently on critical matters but must be about the business of presenting a learned exegesis designed for classroom and individual use. In this he is very successful and his volumes are to be highly recommended. But this limitation prevents the student and scholar alike from comprehending fully the thoroughgoing universalism of Amos and Hos, their use of cultic materials, and their understanding of "covenant" as a categorical imperative. It prevents demonstration of the sources and the finer points of Palestinian Canaanite Baalism whose cult and mythology are the targets of most of Hosea's apologies and polemics. It also deters the exploration of other possible explanations to basic textual problems. For example, the absence of an orderly arrangement in the Hos material may very well stem, as Mays indicates, from the collection of the prophet's words whose recording for the most part is without transitions, introductions, and conclusions. However, in Hos' broken and restless sentences one finds a deeply emotional and sensitive nature filled with a rhythm of anger and indignation, tenderness and compassion. Yet this strong subjective way of the prophet, in sharp contrast to the vivid objectivity of Amos, is a major option never fully treated by the author to explain the disorder. Moreover, Mays shows his gratitude to the Bright and Noth schools in his canvassing of the 8th century B.C., but it is to be regretted that little attention is paid to the Jerusalem school of Mazar, Kaufmann, and Tadmor whose

important researches into the decline and fall of the Kingdom of Israel are little known to the English reader.

Unfortunately, the volumes lack indices of subjects, transliterated Hebrew words, and authors cited in the body of the text. The select bibliography is lost between introduction and commentary. Only occasionally does the author betray the bias of his church when he associates NT titles and references to the prophets, and for some readers of this journal Mays' erudition and wit may have gone too far when he labels Amos 8:4-8 as "Never on Sunday." Typographical improvements are suggested for *nēḥōhāh* (*Amos*, p. 65), *heḥerabīi* (*Amos*, p. 76), and *zākar* (*Hosea*, p. 123) where the plosives are made spirant by the preceding half-vowel or vowel; "flour" is *šemah* and not *semah* (*Hosea*, p. 120), and "prophet" is *nābī'* and not *nābī'* (*Amos*, p. 136). Nonetheless, these chapters by Mays stand as a carefully researched theological contribution to the study of the formative period when the main lines of Hebrew canonical prophecy were being drawn.

Los Angeles Valley College
Van Nuys, California

ZEV GARBER

Miskotte, Kornelis H. *When the Gods Are Silent*. Trans. with an Introduction by John W. Doberstein. New York: Harper and Row, 1967. xviii + 494 pp. \$ 10.00.

When this reviewer was asked by the editor of *AUSS* to review this book, he was overcome by a sense of uneasiness because he was already acquainted with this tome and had recognized that this is not the kind of book one can read in the easy chair by the fireplace. Those who like a book which departs from any obviously discernible order, which frequently quotes poetry and is itself written in poetic prose (much apparently in white heat), will have only superlative adjectives in praise of such an unusual volume, which is subtitled (on the dust-jacket only) "On the Significance of the Old Testament." Miskotte, a former professor of dogmatics, ethics, church laws, and missions at Leiden University, addresses primarily the Christian preacher, or "interpreter and witness" of Biblical faith, as he always calls him.

Miskotte's book, whose Dutch original dates from 1956 (the present translation has been prepared from the revised and augmented German translation of 1963), has essentially the same concern as Bishop Robinson's *Honest to God*, namely to speak meaningfully to modern man. Miskotte's theme is to bring out the "meaning of the Old Testament for the 'religionless' man in the midst of the silence of the Gods" (p. 161). He would agree with the Bishop of Woolwich in seeing modern man as post-religious, though he finds Bonhoeffer's term "man come of age" as over-optimistic (p. 81), and adopts instead Alfred Weber's designation the "fourth man." "When the Gods are silent" is the age of the fourth man (full-grown in Orwell's 1984), when religion has lost its values and even paganism is no