

CLARIFYING
BAFFLING
BIBLICAL PASSAGES

CHAPTER TWENTY FOUR

AMBIGUITIES IN AMOS'
RÉSUMÉ
AMOS 1:1 AND 7:14

Thomas F. McDaniel, Ph.D.

©

2007

All Rights Reserved

XXIV

AMBIGUITIES IN AMOS' RÉSUMÉ AMOS 1:1 AND 7:14

INTRODUCTION

Amos 1:1

הָיָה בְּנִקְדִּים מִתְּקוֹעַ

[Amos] was among the ranchers from Tekoa

οἱ ἐγένοντο ἐν νακκαριμ ἐκ Θεκουε

[the words of Amos]

which occurred in *nakkarim* from Tekoa

Amos 7:14

לֹא־נָבִיא אֲנִי וְלֹא בֶן־נָבִיא אֲנִי

I (am/was) not a prophet and I (am/was) not the son of a prophet

οὐκ ἤμην προφήτης ἐγὼ οὐδὲ υἱὸς προφήτου

I am not a prophet nor the son of a prophet

בֹּקֵר אֲנִי וּבֹלֵס שְׂקָמִים

I am a herdsman, and a dresser of sycamores

ἀλλ' ἢ αἰπόλος ἤμην καὶ κνίζων συκάμινα

but I am a goat herder and a scrapper of sycamores

The résumé of Amos is limited to the above verses, which together in Hebrew consists of fourteen words—excluding prepositions and conjunctions—seven of which are repeated words. Only six of these words are relatively unambiguous: the pronoun אֲנִי “I” (three times), the verb הָיָה “he was,”¹

and the noun נְבִיא “prophet” (twice). The other eight words are, to varying degrees, ambiguous and warrant continued investigation. The ambiguities are here examined in sequence.

AMBIGUITY OF נְקָרִים “RANCHERS”

Perhaps the most conspicuous difference is the transliterated $\nu\alpha\kappa\kappa\alpha\rho\iota\mu$ in the Septuagint of 1:1 for the MT נְקָרִים “ranchers,” which was obviously read as נְקָרִים and treated as a name or a noun unrelated to the stem נָקַר “to bore, to pick, to dig” (BDB: 669); otherwise one would have expected a translation rather than a transliteration.² Were the נְקָרִים original it could be a very appropriate assessment of Amos’ character—from Amaziah’s point of view—given the semantic range of the Arabic cognate نقر (*naqara*) which includes “to offend, vex, hurt, insult, revile, malign, and defame,” as well as “to investigate, to examine” (Lane 1893: 2838; Wehr 1979: 1161). However, Amos’ reference to צֹאֵן “flock” in 7:15 mitigates against reading נְקָרִים (with the Septuagint’s $\nu\alpha\kappa\kappa\alpha\rho\iota\mu$) instead of the MT נְקָרִים.

However, there may be more to נְקָרִים than first meets the eye. It is not a simple synonym of the more general רעה “to pasture, tend, graze.” In Arabic نقد (*naqd*) is used for “a kind of sheep of ugly form . . . having short legs and ugly faces” (Lane 1893: 2836) and “a kind of sheep with very abundant wool” (BDB: 667). In I Kings 14:3, it is noted that מִישַׁע מֶלֶךְ מוֹאָב “Mesha king of Moab was a נֹקֵד” and “he had to deliver annually to the king of Israel 100,000 lambs, and the wool of a hundred thousand rams.”³

In light of Mesha's being a נִקְדָּה on a grand scale, Anderson and Freedman (1989: 188) admitted that נִקְדָּה “. . . can designate a wealthy pastoralist, which has made some people wonder whether Amos was a sheep owner and not merely a tender of flocks, as the language of 7:14 suggests.” They concluded, however, “Amos lived in a different country, in a different century, and in differing economic circumstances from Mesha, so similarity need only be slight.” But there may be more than a hint of wealth with נִקְדָּה since نَقْد (naqada) also means “he examined money, he separated the bad from the good, he paid the price in cash or ready money” (Lane 1893: 2836; Wehr 1979: 1160).

Amos as a נִקְדָּה may have been an *affluent* rancher once it is realized that נִקְדָּה has multiple levels of meaning. The Arabic نَقْد (naqada) permits even a third level of meaning, namely, “to examine critically, to criticize, to call to account, to find fault, to show up the shortcomings” (Wehr 1979: 1160–1161). As an *affluent rancher* (נִקְדָּה) Amos may well have had enough *money* (נִקְדָּה) to be invited as the speaker at Amaziah's royal sanctuary where, instead of offering *cash* (נִקְדָּה) he proffered devastating *criticism* (נִקְדָּה), and, not surprisingly, he insulted and offended (נִקְדָּה = Septuagint ὑπεβλάθη) his audience.

AMBIGUITY ABOUT תִּקְוָה

There is no uncertainty about the location of תִּקְוָה Tekoa, identified with *Hirbet Tequa* ten miles south of Jerusalem. It was “exactly on the border between the cultivated land to the west and steppe, the ‘wilderness of Judah,’ to the east” (Wolff 1977: 123). However, the derivation of the name has been problematic since any connection with תִּקְוָה “to thrust (a

weapon), to blow (a horn), to clap (the hands)” and **תִּקְוֵעַ** “a wind instrument, horn” (BDB: 1075) seems dubious. But if the **תִּ** of **תִּקְוֵעַ** is only a prefix attached to the stem **קוּעַ** — like **רוּם** and **תִּרְוַמָּה** — the Arabic cognate **قاع/قوع** (*qw^c / qâ^c*) “an even place, plain or level land that produces nothing” (Lane 1893: 2994; Wehr 1979: 932) is very suggestive. If this is the derivation of Tekoa, it is ironic that one of the Israel’s greatest prophets came from a town which, by name, was “a place that produced nothing.”

AMBIGUITY OF **לֹא**

One of the most surprising statements in prophetic literature is Amos’ declaration **לֹא־נָבִיא אֲנִי**, literally, “not a prophet I (am).”⁴ Lacking a verb, the tense of the phrase is ambiguous, consequently the debate whether Amos intended to say, (1) “(formerly) I was not a prophet,” implying that he acknowledged at that moment though he was *now* a prophet, or (2) “I am not (now) a prophet, implying he never was and never intended to be a prophet.

Even if a temporal modifier like **עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה** “until this day” or **מִן הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה** “from this day” had been used, ambiguity would remain since the **לֹא** may not have been the negative particle **לֹא־** “not” but the emphatic particle **לֵא** “indeed, surely, verily.” Richardson (1966: 89) noted: “[Amos] not only spoke well of the **נָבִיאִים** but implied that he was one of them (3 8). Moreover he twice used the verb **נָבֵא** to characterize his own ministry (38; 715).” Following Richardson’s

proposal, the לֹא־נָבִיא אֲנִי should be revocalized and read as לֹא נָבִיא אֲנִי “Indeed, I am a prophet!”⁵

Richardson rightly read the לֹא of לֹא בְּיָנֵי as the negative particle, reconstructing paronomasia with לֹא . . . לֹא rather than simple repetition of לֹא . . . לֹא. A good analogy of Amos’ affirmation that he was indeed a *prophet* but not of the *corps of prophets* can be found with Micaiah ben Imlah and his four hundred colleagues (I Kings 22:6–33). Jehoshaphat inquired, הֲאִין פֹּה נָבִיא לַיהוָה עוֹד “Is there not here another prophet for Yahweh?” King Jehoshaphat acknowledged the *corps* of prophets (בְּנֵי־נְבִיאִים),⁶ but he was looking for someone outside the *corps*. Amos, like Micaiah, was *surely* (לֹא) a prophet, but just as surely Amos and Micaiah were *not* (לֹא) members of the *corps*.⁷

In terms of today’s clerical terminology Amos was a lay preacher who was not among the ordained and credentialed clergy. As an independent lay preacher he was (1) free to speak his mind—not the institutional line—and (2) free to be bi-vocational. As with Amos’ prophetic vocation, there were also ambiguities concerning his other jobs.

AMBIGUITY OF בּוֹקֵר

The meaning of בּוֹקֵר “herdsman” has been problematic for the Septuagint reads αἰπόλος “goatherd,” whereas other Greek texts have βουκόλος “[cattle] herdsman.” Wolff (1977: 306) identified בּוֹקֵר (which occurs only in this passage) “as a substantized participle, denominative from בָּקָר, ‘cattle.’” As such one would expect Amos to have been involved with cows and bulls rather than with a צֹאן of sheep

and goats. Andersen and Freedman (1989: 778) settled for “cattleman,” suggesting “that Amos was a kind of jack-of-all-trades: cowboy, shepherd, seasonal farm worker; *but not a prophet*” (italics mine). Wolff (1977: 306) opted for a “live-stock breeder.” The Arabic cognate بقار (*baqqâr*) is equally ambiguous since it can mean “cowhand, cowboy” as well as “an owner or possessor of oxen, bulls, cows” (Lane 1863: 234; Wehr 1979: 84).

The verb בִּקֵּר “to inquire, to seek” (BDB: 183) is well attested in Hebrew in the *Pi^cel*, consequently no one has proposed to read בּוֹקֵר as a *Qal* participle “examiner, investigator.” However, the Arabic بقر (*baqara*) in form I (= *Qal*) is clearly attested meaning “he examined, or inspected” and “he inquired, he searched” (Lane 1863: 233). In light of this, בּוֹקֵר could be the *Qal* participle “inquirer,” rather than the singular example of the denominative meaning “cattleman.” In view of the Septuagint βακκαριμ (= נִבְרָיִם “investigators, examiners”) in 1:1, the possibility that בּוֹקֵר means “examiner” cannot be discounted—not to mention that נֹבֵךְ can also mean “an examiner (of money).” If Amos was an “examiner” the object of his investigation will be hidden in the ambiguities in the last two words of his résumé.

AMBIGUITY OF בּוֹלֵם

Just as בּוֹקֵר is the only example in the Hebrew Bible of a denominative from בָּקַר “cattle” becoming the participle “cattleman,” בּוֹלֵם is the only example of a denominative from the Arabic cognate بلس (*balas*) “fig” meaning “a tender of figs” (Harper 1905: 174). The Targum omitted בּוֹלֵם but

it noted that the sycamores were in the Shephelah, not in the highlands of Tekoa. The Septuagint translated בּוֹלֵם as κνίζων “scraping,” and Theodotian rendered it as χράσσων “marking.” Wright (1976: 368) has well summarized the varied evidence, ancient and modern, about what Amos did to the Shephelah figs, concluding “one of the tasks of Amos was to nip the sycamore fruit in order to hasten ripening. . . . [or] the concern of Amos with the sycamore was in providing fodder for those [animals] in his charge.”

Because the Arabic س (s) regularly appears in Hebrew as a ש rather than שׁ, the original spelling of בּוֹלֵם may have been בּוֹלֵשׁ. This seems to have been the reading of Aquila who translated בּוֹלֵם as ἔρευνον “he examined,” as though this verb was from בָּלַשׁ “to inquire” (Jastrow 1903: 175, BDB: 119, n. pr. בִּלְשָׁן “inquirer” [?]). Because Aquila is renowned for extreme literalisms, בּוֹלֵשׁ warrants serious attention. The interchange in Hebrew of שׁ and ס is well attested, as with (1) סוּג or שׁוּג “to backslide” and “to fence about” (2) סוּר or שׁוּר (Hosea 9:12) “to turn aside,” and (3) סִפְחָת “scab” but שִׁפַּח “to cause a scab” (BDB, 705). Aquila’s translation suggests that the *Vorlage* was בּוֹלֵשׁ (= בּוֹלֵשׁ “searcher”) which was *misread* as בּוֹלֵשׁ and changed to בּוֹלֵם when שְׁקָמִים was read as “sycamores.” If בּוֹלֵשׁ was originally in the text and בּוֹלֵם was secondary, the question arises, “Did Amos search for sycamores trees or really have anything to do with figs?” This question leads to the final ambiguity in Amos’ résumé

AMBIGUITY OF שְׁקָמִים

There is more than one way to read and interpret שְׁקָמִים. It can obviously be vocalized שְׁקָמִים “sycamores” as traditionally understood.” But it can also be pointed as שְׁקָמִים and read as the relative particle שְׁ affixed to the plural participle of קָם. The relative שְׁ followed by a participle of קָם is attested in Jud 5:7, עַד שְׁקָמְתִי דְבוֹרָה “until the rising of Deborah.” (שְׁ + קָמְתִי + י [the *hireq compaginis*, GKC 90^m]). Instead of speaking of *tending* cattle and *searching* for sycamores, Amos may have stated: בּוֹקֵר אֲנִי וְבוֹלֵשׁ שְׁקָמִים “I am an inquirer and an investigator of what are the happenings.”⁸ (The participle suggests that the events under investigation were current events.) Had Amos simply said אֲנִי בּוֹקֵר אֶת אֲשֶׁר-יָהִי “I am investigating what will come to pass” rather than בּוֹלֵשׁ שְׁקָמִים, the “figs” and “sycamores” would never have made it into his résumé.

CONCLUSION

Ambiguities can seldom be resolved into certainties, but ambiguities addressed can provide probabilities. Concerning Amos' résumé, the reference to צֹאן in 7:15 (“the Lord took me from following the *flock*”) corroborates the tradition that Amos was a נוֹקֵד “rancher” of sheep/goats (probably on a grand scale like Mesha of Moab) and was successful enough to have time, energy, and finances for an *avocation* as well as a *vocation*. While tradition asserts that Amos' second vocation was a lowly job working with figs and fodder, the consonantal Hebrew text suggests—upon reading שְׁ for ס—that Amos' other occupation (or preoccupation) was that of a

researcher and an examiner of what was happening in his time.

In support of this untraditional interpretation of 7:14, one can appeal not only to cognates and the semantic range of all the lexemes, but also to Amos' oracles themselves which are as erudite as they are artistic. Amos demonstrated a breadth of knowledge which came as much by education as from direct revelation. His inquiries may have been the by-product of his success as a rancher, which accorded him leisure for an avocation of search and study. Far from being a jack-of-all-trades, Amos may well have been a master of two: ranching and research. Personal wealth from ranching may have been the "credential" which opened the doors of the royal chapel to him as a prophet; and his personal integrity in declaring the truth he learned may have closed those same doors against him. Being a בֹּלֵשׁ "searcher" and a בּוֹקֵר "researcher" was preparation for Amos's becoming a prophet. His *avocation* became primary, culminating in a career change from *rancher* to *prophet*.

NOTES

1. The Septuagint reads the plural ἐγένοντο as though the Hebrew was הָיָה rather than הָיָה, with the initial דְּבַר־יְהוָה as the subject rather than עָמוֹם.
2. Theodotian also had difficulty with דְּבַר־יְהוָה and simply transliterated it as νωκεδείμ (Hatch and Redpath 2: 956; Wolff: 116, citing Jerome's commentary, as *nocedim*).
3. The Septuagint reads καὶ Μωσα βασιλεὺς Μωαβ ἦν νωκηδ "and Mesha, king of Moab was a *nôqēd*," having only a transliteration of the Hebrew נֹקֵד.

4. It should also be noted that the Arabic cognates of נבא / נביא are: (1) نبيء (*nabīʾ*) or نبي (*nabī*) “a prophet who acquaints or informs mankind, or who is acquainted or informed, respecting God and things unseen” (Lane 2752–2753); or (2) نبو (*nabū*) / نبا (*nabā*) “to be in conflict, to irk, to offend”; or (3) نبه (*nabih*) “noble, famous, distinguished, perspicacious,” with نبا (*nabāʾ*) meaning “news, information, intelligence, report” (Wehr 1100, 1104–1105). On the interchange of נ and ה, see GKC §19^a.

5. Wolff (1977: 306) noted Richardson’s proposal but followed tradition. Andersen and Freedman (1989: 777) made no reference to Richardson’s proposal; but Driver’s article (1955: 91–92) is noted, though not discussed. Driver observed that “the simple *lōʾ* ‘not’ is used with interrogative force, which easily becomes as-severative, strange as this may seem . . .” The literature on the emphatic ל and נל continues to grow. In addition to references cited by Richardson, note McDaniel (1968) 206–208; Dahood (1975): 341–342; Whitley (1975: 202–204; and Huehnergard (1983) 569–593, especially 591. See also Chapter XV, 129–130, above.

6. Ackroyd (1956: 94) has well summarized the options on the ambiguous בְּיָנֵי־נְבִיאִים,

Either it means ‘I belong to a prophetic family’ where the word family may be equivalent to ‘guild’ or ‘profession,’ just as in the expression ‘sons of the prophets’ we have in such associations in Israel (cf. also I S 10⁵). Or it means ‘I have the quality which belongs to a prophet,’ just as בְּיָנֵי־חַיִל means ‘a man who has the quality of חַיִל’ and the בְּיָנֵי־אֱלֹהִים are ‘beings which have the quality of אֱלֹהִים.’

7. See also Wolff (1979) 313, especially the final paragraph of his excursus on “The Vocation of Amos,” where he stated “Amos

establishes a sharp contrast . . . between a prophet by virtue of office . . . a salaried cult official and his own independent activity sanctioned by Yahweh alone.”

8. For the semantic range of אָרַב, see See BDB: 877 and Wehr 1979: 934–938, where the following definitions are included, “to come to pass, take place, be on-going; to happen.”