וַאֲנִי לֹא אָחוּס עַל-

הָעִיר הַגְּדוֹלָה אֲשֶׁר

יֶשׁ-בָּהּ הַרְבֵּה מִשְׁתֵּ

Journal of
HEBREW SCRIPTURES

VOLUME 21 | ARTICLE 4

COLIN M. TOFFELMIRE

*Cohesion and Genre Blending in Prophetic
Literature, Using Amos 5 as a Case Study*

COHESION AND GENRE BLENDING IN PROPHETIC LITERATURE, USING AMOS 5 AS A CASE STUDY

COLIN M. TOFFELMIRE
AMBROSE UNIVERSITY

INTRODUCTION

Amos 5 is a prophetic text that contains within it several identifiable pieces, which have in the past been understood as distinct underlying genres with their own *Sitz im Leben*.[1] In this paper, I will explore Amos 5 as an example of prophecy that blends various genres into a single cohesive and rhetorically effective text. To explain this state of affairs I will draw upon theory from two schools of linguistic thought: Systemic Functional Linguistics, and Cognitive Theory. The former will provide a framework for how sub-ordinate genres relate to the super-ordinate genre of a given text, as well as a definition of linguistic texture, including ways to analyze a text for coherence and cohesion. The latter will provide a cognitive account of categories and genre, as well as a linguistically adequate explanation of the ways in which people blend and manipulate existing categories in the creation of meaning.[2] Using these two perspectives I will demonstrate that form and genre analysis remain fruitful tools for exploring the construction of meaning in biblical texts, and that such analyses can move beyond both atomizing dissection and naïve unified literary readings by considering the ways in which readers might infer cohesion and the ways in which sub-ordinate genres can be blended in a reader's imagination to form a single super-ordinate text

---

[1] The parade example of this approach is found in Wolff's commentary (Hans Walter Wolff, *Joel and Amos*, Hermeneia [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977], 227–68).

[2] To a significant degree the approach taken here has been influenced by a similar combination of approaches used by Beth Stovell at various points. See esp.: Beth M. Stovell, *Mapping Metaphorical Discourse in the Fourth Gospel: John's Eternal King*, LBS 5 (Leiden: Brill, 2012); idem, " 'I Will Make Her Like a Desert': Intertextual Allusion and Feminine Agricultural Metaphors in the Book of the Twelve," in *The Book of the Twelve and the New Form Criticism*, ed. Mark J. Boda, Michael H. Floyd, and Colin M. Toffelmire, ANEM 10 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2015), 37–62.

with its own identifiable genre. Amos 5 will function as a case study for this analysis.

In her work on linguistic register and literary genre, Ruqaiya Hasan has noted that a key feature of "textuality" (i.e., the notion of an identifiable communicative act), is cohesion, including cohesion of register.[3] That is to say, to be a text a text must, in some sense, have a single register. This suggestion is problematic when the issue of certain kinds of texts is raised. How might one account for texts that seemingly contain a variety of text-types, some of which may stand in rhetorical tension with one another. This very question also appears to lie at the heart of traditional biblical form criticism. The dissection of a given text based on proposed underlying genre features, or forms, is a hallmark of the form-critical method. Yet, in recent years it has been suggested that this aspect of form criticism has been one of its least fruitful features, and is increasingly being abandoned in favor of a preference for analyzing whole texts.[4]

This move to studying whole texts, however, may also neglect the necessary observation and analysis of various genres, sometimes consistent with forms identified by classical form critics, found in larger cohesive texts. What is necessary is an effective way of engaging the various biblical texts in their complete form, while still acknowledging and exploring the generic elements that might make up some given cohesive text. To that end this paper explores Amos 5 both as a potentially coherent and cohesive text, and as a text built using various identifiable types/genres of prophecy. Indeed, by using this specific sub-division of Amos (i.e., the entirety of chapter 5), I am complicating my account by including passages not traditionally considered as part of the unit of 5:1–17.[5] Yet, this complication emphasizes the difficulties in both assigning structural divisions (especially using form-critical arguments), and in gaining some sense of a synchronic whole built by means of a diachronic process.

In order to examine these passages with reference to their various generic elements I will leverage the work of functional linguists Michael Halliday and Ruquaiya Hasan, who have provided very help-

---

[3] Terminology is a problem in theoretical discussions of genre, register, form, or text-type, because not all theorists or schools of thought make use of the same terms, and the terms in question are not totally interchangeable. My normal habit will be to use the term "genre" as a catch-all term, but when discussing the work of specific theorists, I will tend to make use of their preferred terminology (thus my use of "register" here when discussing Hasan's work).

[4] On this history, see Colin M. Toffelmire, "Form Criticism," in *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Prophets*, ed. J. Gordon McConville and Mark J. Boda (Grand Rapids, MI: IVP Academic, 2012), 257–71.

[5] See, for example, Eidevall's breakdown of the structure of the chapter (and the book as a whole): *Amos: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AYB 24G (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017), 10–11, 152, 163, 166, and 169.

ful tools both for the examination of genre and the examination of particular instances of text.[6] I will also engage the work of cognitive linguistic accounts of prototypicality in the analysis of genre, and leverage cognitive theories of conceptual blending for an account of the blending of genres. The first order of business will be a discussion of the concept of genre (or register)[7] and cohesion in Systemic Functional Linguistics, and a discussion of genre and conceptual blending in cognitive theory.[8] When this is done, we will turn to Amos, exploring both the genres found in Amos 5, and the form and linguistic features of the text specifically.[9]

---

[6] As is normally the case in both critical theory and linguistics, "text" does not mean simply "written document" but is a general term used to refer to any kind of communication involving language. Therefore, both a poem and a conversation at the grocery store can be referred to as "text" in this sense. This is over-against other, non-linguistic forms of human communication.

[7] The relationship between genre and register is complex, and remains one of the relatively ill-defined elements of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL). Indeed, even among SFL theorists there is a lack of agreement as to the relationship between the two (see, for instance, Helen Leckie-Tarry, *Text and Context: A Functional Linguistic Theory of Register*, ed. David Birch [London: Pinter, 1995]; J.R. Martin and David Rose, *Genre Relations: Mapping Culture* [Sheffield: Equinox, 2008]).

[8] For a brief introduction to the goals and aims of SFL (sometimes known as Hallidayan linguistics) see: M.A.K. Halliday, *Introduction to Functional Grammar,* 2nd ed. (London: Edward Arnold, 1985), xiii–xxxv. For a short introduction to SFL as applied to biblical studies, see: Colin M. Toffelmire, *A Discourse and Register Analysis of the Prophetic Book of Joel*, SSN 66 (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 17–46. The most important concepts tied to this branch of socio-linguistics are that language is a system of interrelated components, that language is system of realization moving from the broad social sign-system to the semantic system to the lexical and grammatical system to the phonological system, and that language is a functional system of signs, used to mean and do things. Though such a socio-semiotic approach is by no means the only available here, when the social element of language is of particular interest, as it is in religious literature, then these types of analysis can be helpful (Halliday and Hasan, *Language*, 4–5). This interest in language as social phenomenon fits comfortably within the form critical project, both past and present (Rolf Knierim, "Old Testament Form Criticism Reconsidered," *Int* 27 [1973]: 435–68, here 436).

[9] On the complexity of the terms "genre" and "form" in form-critical theory, see: Antony F. Campbell, "Form Criticism's Future," in *The Changing Face of Form Criticism for the Twenty-First Century*, ed. Marvin A. Sweeney and Ehud Ben Zvi (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 15–31, here 24–25.

LINGUISTIC ACCOUNTS OF GENRE (AND COHESION)

A. SYSTEMIC FUNCTIONAL LINGUISTICS AND GENRE[10]

Genre, when considered from an SFL perspective, is "a semantic concept."[11] It is a set of meanings attached to a kind of social situation and encoded using language. As Halliday notes, these meanings are at times instantiated with particular lexico-grammatical[12] elements, or even particular words or sounds.[13] But there need not be particular words, or even a particular structure, in order to refer to two texts under the same genre category. Because genre is related primarily to semantics, and not to the lexico-grammar (i.e., to meaning more than to wording), we can therefore have two structurally, or verbally, or grammatically, variant realizations of the same genre.[14] What linguistic features, then, help to indicate the nature of genres and genre relations?

Literary texts are somewhat different from many of the genres that Halliday and Hasan explore, as literature values uniqueness, but the principles are similar. As Halliday notes, "every text is in some sense like other texts; and for any given text there will be some that it resembles more closely."[15] One of the factors when speaking about genre is that there are various levels of abstraction at which two texts might be considered similar.

Whether and to what degree texts are similar to one another is tied at least in part to the level of abstraction at which we are working. All texts are, at the least abstract level, unique. Put another way, at the most abstract level, all texts are generic.[16] What we need is sensitivity to both the ways in which two (or more) texts are the same, and the ways in which they differ. At some point (and this point is perhaps impossible to fix precisely), the proliferation of difference makes it impossible to group by genre category. At some

---

[10] This account draws heavily on Toffelmire, *Discourse*, 17–46.

[11] M.A.K. Halliday and Ruqaiya Hasan, *Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective*, 2nd ed. (Language and Education; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), 38.

[12] Halliday uses this term to indicate that vocabulary and syntax, or lexicon and grammar, function at the same level of the linguistic system, Halliday, *Grammar*, xiv.

[13] Halliday and Hasan, *Language*, 39.

[14] Halliday and Hasan, *Language*, 113. Cf. Erhard Blum et al., "Formgeschichte – A Misleading Category?," in *The Changing Face of Form Criticism for the Twenty-First Century*, ed. Marvin A. Sweeney and Ehud Ben Zvi (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 38–43; Knierim, "Old Testament Form Criticism Reconsidered," 456.

[15] Halliday and Hasan, *Language*, 42.

[16] Ibid., 105. Hasan speaks here also of levels of delicacy in the examination of social contexts, which also may be categorized from the highest to the lowest level of abstraction (or from the lowest to the highest level of delicacy).

other point (also impossible to fix precisely) the utter lack of specificity makes genre categories meaningless with regard to particular instances of text.

Let me illustrate with regard to our passage from Amos. At a moderately high level of abstraction, we might describe this as an example of ancient Hebrew writing. This is certainly true. It is moderately useful, but still tells us only a little about how this text is different or the same from any other ancient Hebrew text. Additionally, the range of uses and meanings of examples of ancient Hebrew writing is quite varied, and so this level of abstraction will tell us little about the nature of this example from the Hebrew Bible except in relation to some other culture's written record (and indeed, such a perspective may also exclude texts from the written record of other cultures that could otherwise provide interesting points of comparison). Conversely, if we were to describe every particular feature of the text, down to the very letters of the words, we would be given the impression that any two texts in the Hebrew Bible are utterly different. They are certainly different in many ways, but even a cursory exploration shows areas of marked similarity between similar texts, many of which are interesting and instructive. In between these extremes there is a flexible space where we can speak of important similarities and differences. This space, as I have noted already, is most closely related to the semantics of the text, to the patterning of meaning relationships in this text.

Consequently, different things matter at the level of text and the level of genre. At the level of text, the specific wording matters very much. Thus, "when it comes to the actual unfolding of a text, both the speaker and the addressee must attend precisely to these opportunistically selected meanings. . ."[17] By "opportunistic" Hasan here means the specific selections of meanings that can be generated within some genre. For a particular text those meanings matter a great deal. At the level of genre, they matter "only to the extent that they are manifestations of a higher order abstraction."[18] The reverse, however, is not true. Though the particular wording and meaning of a text does not matter at the level of genre categories, the selection of genre category matters a great deal to the particular wording and meaning of a text. The genre helps to orient the reader/listener to the text. It tells us what kinds of features we can expect to find. Having said this it is also vital to note that the use of a genre does not necessarily predetermine the structure or the verbal realizations of particular texts.[19]

---

[17] Ibid., 114.
[18] Ibid.
[19] Ibid., 112.

B. TEXTUAL COHESION AND COHERENCE

Another key component of my analysis here are the concepts of textual cohesion and coherence. There are a variety of elements that go into creating cohesion in a text. Hasan identifies three particular kinds of relationships between words that help to create cohesion. These are, co-referentiality (both terms have the same referent), co-classification (both terms belong to the same class of thing or process, but have different referents), and co-extension (semantic overlap).[20] Co-reference often includes elements like pronominal reference, use of the article, use of demonstratives, and metaphor.[21] Co-referential ties may also be either endophoric (referring to something within the text), or exophoric (referring to something not found in the text itself, that is, deictic). Endophoric ties may be either anaphoric (referring to something in the preceding text), or cataphoric (referring to something in the following text). Co-classification is often instantiated by ellipsis or substitution. Finally, co-extension refers to a relationship between two lexical items with some relationship of similarity. These may be synonyms, antonyms, hyponyms (class and sub-class), or meronyms (part-whole relationships).

At all times grammatical cohesion requires cooperation between co-reference, co-extension, and co-classification.[22] Just one does not provide strong cohesion; we must have a combination of two or three working together. This process is referred to as the formation of identity chains, in which "every member of the chain refers to the same thing, event, or whatever. . ." and similarity chains, in which we find "items that refer to non-identical members of the same class of things, events, etc., or to members of non-identical but related classes of things, events, etc."[23] Identity chains are related to co-reference and similarity to co-extension and co-classification. These chains work together to create cohesion in the text.

An additional component of textual cohesion, which relates directly to genre, or text-type, must also be introduced here. As I have noted above, Hasan argues that a basic feature of a cohesive text is that it instantiates a single register, or genre. Yet, she also acknowledges that there are many instances in which a single cohesive text appears to contain various diverse registers. She explains this apparent tension by describing the interrelationship between what she calls the "primary text" and "sub-texts."[24] The primary text is a single

---

[20] Ibid., 73–82.

[21] Ibid., 74. Hasan does not note metaphor here, but clearly one of the purposes of metaphor is to exploit a tension between sense and reference. On this tension see Paul Ricœur, *Rule of Metaphor: Multi-disciplinary Studies of the Creation of Meaning in Language* (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1977).

[22] Halliday and Hasan, *Language*, 82.

[23] Ibid., 84.

[24] Hasan, "Speaking with Reference to Context," 249–50. Note that here I am briefly summarizing the fuller description provided in Toffelmire,

cohesive whole, satisfying the requirements for cohesion in SFL theory, and the sub-texts, which appear to instantiate a register that differs from the primary text, are embedded components of the primary text. Sub-texts do not exist alone as cohesive, free-standing texts, but serve the communicative capacity of the primary text in which they are found. As an example, consider a novel that contains within it a letter, written from one character to another. The novel is the primary text, and the letter the sub-text.[25]

Of course, like all communicative phenomena, textuality is not simply a feature of the text as such, but is a process in which readers engage as they read. It is possible to describe the textual features that encourage textual cohesion, but the actual creation of coherence occurs in the process of hearing/reading.[26] As Zvi Brettler notes, this raises interesting issues with texts that, like Amos, have clearly been through a process of collection and redaction.[27] The text in question is most likely a compilation of various prophetic oracles, but different readers naturally assign different degrees of coherence to the text as it stands. Indeed, with our test-case, the inclusion of Amos 5:18–27 involves a breach with the normal unit delimitation that takes 5:1–17 as a centre-point of the book as a whole.[28] Yet, for my discussion here, this creates an interesting point of analysis.

I am not interested in making an argument for the necessary intrinsic coherence of this passage, or about the ways in which an author/redactor intended to use and group diverse sub-genres within a superordinate text. Instead, I am suggesting that cohesive cues in the text allow (though do not require) readers to engage this chapter as a coherent primary text making use of various sub-texts. As van den Broek, Risden, and Husebye-Hartmann note, "readers do not make inferences simply because there are *there* to be made. Instead, they make backward and forward inferences in order to create a representation that is coherent vis à vis the standards of coher-

---

Discourse and Register, 35.

[25] Martin and Rose, *Genre Relations*, 88.

[26] Marc Zvi Brettler, "The 'Coherence' of Ancient Texts," in Jeffrey Stackert, Barbara Nevling Porter, and David P. Wright (eds.), *Gazing on the Deep: Ancient Near Easter and Other Studies in Honor of Tzvi Abusch* (Bethesda: CDL Press, 2010), 411–19, here 414. Cohesion and coherence tend to be paired terms, and refer to closely related concepts. Whereas cohesion usually refers to textuality as such (i.e., the various textual phenomena noted above), coherence refers to the creation of textuality from the perspective of the reader. Obviously, the concepts are related, as the readerly act of generating a coherent reading depends, to greater and lesser degrees, on the cohesive features of the text in question. On coherence as a readerly concept, see, Ellen Van Wolde, "The Creation of Coherence," *Semeia* 81 (1998): 159–74, here 161.

[27] Zvi Brettler, "Coherence," 414.

[28] Cf. Eidevall, *Amos*, 11.

ence that they employ."[29] Consequently, while it is important to ground observations about textual coherence in textual features, I am considering plausible connections a reader could make, given the text before us.

Van den Broek, Risden, and Husebyue-Hartmann also make the interesting observation that a reader's capacity, or skill at reading, can impact whether or not a given text appears coherent. A highly skilled reader is more likely to see breakdowns in cohesive relationships, and less likely to infer coherence where such gaps occur.[30] An analysis of readers of Amos and their relative willingness to infer coherence in this text is beyond the scope of this paper, but would provide an interesting additional point of data. That said, my argument here is that, observed redactional seams notwithstanding, Amos 5 is a text that a reader could plausibly see as cohesive given the various identity and similarity chains present. In such a case, it is worth considering how the diverse text-types identified in this chapter of Amos might interact. In order to consider this question, it is helpful to turn to cognitive theories of categorization and genre, as well as conceptual blending, before considering the text of Amos 5 itself.

C. A COGNITIVE ACCOUNT OF GENRE

As form critics have come to realize over the past half-century, the notion of form/genre as a fixed and pure reality underlying the textual messiness of the biblical texts is neither helpful nor accurate. This is consistent with developments in cognitive theory related to the concept of categories and prototype theory. Michael Sinding has used prototype theory as a way to approach the question of the nature of literary genre by means of the way that the mind appears to create and sustain categories more generally.

The basic argument offered by cognitive theorists is that "people identify certain prototypical members of the category, and then view other instances in relation to the prototypes."[31] Membership in the category is not dependent upon possession of all (or any) of the typical features of the prototype, but members of a category tend to have some connection (developed along various lines) to the prototype.[32] "Categories are arranged not hierarchically, but in the first

---

[29] Paul van den Broek, Kirsten Risden, and Elizabeth Husebye-Hartmann, "The Role of Readers' Standards for Coherence in the Generation of Inferences During Reading," in *Sources of Coherence in Reading*, ed. Robert F. Lorch and Edward O'Brien (Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1995), 353–74, here 371.

[30] Van den Broek, Risden, and Husebye-Hartmann, "The Role of Readers' Standards," 369–70.

[31] Michael Sinding, "The Mind's Kinds: Cognitive Rhetoric, Literary Genre, and Menippean Satire" (PhD diss., McMaster University, 2003), 12.

[32] Ibid., 20.

place at a psychological basic middle level, and are developed up-wards and downwards from there according to need."[33] The common example for category theory that cognitive theorists provide is the way that people think about, and categorize, birds. While any given person in, say, Croatia, might have a slightly different "ideal" or "normal" bird, when asked to simply draw or describe a bird such a person is very unlikely to produce a representation of a penguin or ostrich. Much more likely is something like a robin or a sparrow. This is not because robins or sparrows are more intrinsically "bird-ish", but because they are commonly encountered by some people in some places, and so become a kind of cognitive archetype that represents the class "bird" in the minds of such people. Other kinds of birds are thought of as derivations of this archetype, regardless of how scientifically accurate this might be.[34] Consequently, it is not particularly accurate or useful to imagine some rigid ideal to which all other examples must conform in order to be included in a genre category, nor is it more than heuristically useful to develop catalogues or lists of "types" of any given genre.[35]

Consequently, form and genre criticism should focus neither on Gunkel's rigid oral precursor forms, nor on more recent definitions of prophecy that tend toward very broad and abstract descriptions.[36] In fact, it may well be that Westermann's interest in basic oracles (consistent with Sinding's "basic middle level") may be the preferable starting point.[37] This provides a broad definition for prophecy in a general sense, and also a framework for thinking about how various sub-genres of prophecy, like some of those we will consider below, fit within that broad or basic definition.

This way of thinking about genre essentially treats a genre like a cognitive frame or network. Sinding, following Lakoff, describes frames as cognitive "screens or filters or lenses that put the objective

---

[33] Ibid., 13.

[34] Elizabeth E Shively, "Recognizing Penguins: Audience Expectation, Cognitive Genre Theory, and the Ending of Mark's Gospel," *CBQ* 80 (2018): 273–92, here 282.

[35] Shively, "Recognizing Penguins," 273–92.

[36] Naturally the classic reference here is to Gunkel's work, but there remain various examples of contemporary scholarship that continue to operate out of this traditional paradigm of form criticism. E.g., Gavin Cox, "The 'Hymn' of Amos: An Ancient Flood Narrative," *JSOT* 38 (2013): 81–108. See also Shiveley's description of certain views of genre related to the Gospel of Mark (Shively, "Recognizing Penguins," 279). For an example of the more recent trend to broader descriptions of genre, see: Ehud Ben Zvi, "The Prophetic Book: A Key Form of Prophetic Literature," in *Changing Face of Form Criticism for the Twenty-First Century*, ed. Marvin A. Sweeney and Ehud Ben Zvi (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 276–97.

[37] Claus Westermann, *Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech*, trans. Hugh Clayton White (Louisville: John Knox, 1991).

world in a certain light."[38] Fauconnier and Turner describe frames as "long-term schematic knowledge."[39] This is as opposed to temporary mental models, which people create at all times in their various interactions with the world, including when we read texts.[40] While each reader creates a sustained temporary mental space while reading a text, pre-existing frames orient the reader to the text. The same process is at work in the creation of a text. Given this, we should think of genre as a kind of flexible framing device, and our descriptions of genres as abstractions from instances of communication that attempt to represent these theorized mental frames (note here the connection to SFL genre theory).

These theorized frames may be thought of as abstractions from pre-existing literary texts, but they may also be abstractions from any other relatively common schematized experience. In this way, a cognitive account of genre can engage both more current form-critical theories that relate to literary texts, and more traditional form-critical theories that focus on non-literary texts (analogous to oral precursors). In a text like Amos 5, this helps to explain the presence of prophetic genres like "dirge" and "woe oracle," which were traditionally connected to real embodied experiences in ancient Israel. While it is unwise to return to any attempt to reconstruct the "real" world behind these instances of prophetic literature, it is reasonable to imagine the ways in which the embodied experience of sadness over death, and its related mental frame, might connect to the use of a "dirge" in a prophetic text.

The second theoretical component of cognitive theory that is helpful to us here is the concept of conceptual blending. Conceptual blending has been widely appropriated by biblical scholars in the analysis of metaphor, [41] but serves just as well for the consideration

---

[38] Michael Sinding, "Mythology on the Move," *HA&L Magazine* 8.1, n.d.,https://samiz-datpress.typepad.com/hal_magazine_issue_eight1/mythology-on-the-move-by-michael-sinding-1.html.

[39] Gilles Fauconnier and Mark Turner, *The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind's Hidden Complexities* (New York: Basic Books, 2002), 40.

[40] Fauconnier and Turner describe these as the "small conceptual packages constructed as we think and talk." Fauconnier and Turner, *The Way We Think*, 40.

[41] Pierre Van Hecke, "Conceptual Blending: A Recent Approach to Metaphor, Illustrated with the Pastoral Metaphor in Hos 4, 16," in *Metaphor in the Hebrew Bible*, ed. Pierre Van Hecke, BETL 187 (Leuven: Peeters, 2005), 215–31; Beth M. Stovell, *Mapping Metaphorical Discourse in the Fourth Gospel: John's Eternal King*, LBS 5 (Leiden: Brill, 2012); Ellen J. Van Wolde, *Reframing Biblical Studies: When Language and Text Meet Culture, Cognition, and Context* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2009); Nicole L. Tilford, *Sensing World, Sensing Wisdom: The Cognitive Foundation of Biblical Metaphors*, AIL 31 (Atlanta: SBL, 2016).

of any combination of concepts, including genres. In a given text of prophetic literature, it is often possible to identify various genres. Recent analyses of this phenomenon have, quite rightly, eschewed the practice of textual disassembly in favor of a rhetorical analysis of these texts that considers how the various pieces contribute to the whole.[42] Conceptual blending is helpful for this process of rhetorical analysis because it gives a linguistically and cognitively adequate theoretical framework to describe the process that makes these texts more than a fragmentary pastiche of disparate elements. If genres can be thought of as analogous to mental frames, the combination of various genres into a single text represents a kind of conceptual blending.

Though the genre may orient the reader to the kinds of things one might expect, and the kinds of relationships that might occur, it does not determine the meaning of the text.[43] When one encounters הוֹי plus a substantive participle describing those who are addressed by the oracle, certain expectations are cued, though of course this will occur in different ways for various readers, and will be a principally unconscious phenomenon. The text that will follow will likely contain information about sin, and outrage, and most likely some consequence, but this does not encompass the meaning of the particular passage (cf. Isa 10:1–4; Jer 22:13; Ezek 13:3, 18; Zeph 3:1). It creates a situation and expectations, but the particular text must itself be encountered, and from that we can derive a meaning. The genre, then, influences meaning but is not constitutive of meaning. Similarly, the particular text creates meaning, but the generic components of that text orient the reader/hearer to how that meaning is being deployed.[44] That is, the generic components of the text are a shorthand for the receiver, as she processes the specific information being communicated.[45]

Given the preceding account of genre, cohesion, and cognitive framing, let us turn our attention to Amos 5 itself. Here I will describe the various cohesive ties in this section of the prophetic book,

---

[42] This well-known trend began with Muilenberg's programmatic essay: James Muilenburg, "Form Criticism and Beyond," *JBL* 88 (1969): 1–18. See also Mark J. Boda, "Form Criticism in Transition: Penitential Prayer and Lamen, Sitz im Leben and Form," in *Seeking the Favor of God, Vol. 1: The Origins of Penitential Prayer in Second Temple Judaism*, ed. Mark J. Boda, Richard Falk, and Rodney A. Werline (Atlanta: SBL, 2006), 181–92.

[43] Roy Frank Melugin, "Recent Form Criticism Revisited in an Age of Reader Response," in *Changing Face of Form Criticism for the Twenty-First Century*, ed. Marvin A. Sweeney and Ehud Ben Zvi (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 46–64, here 48.

[44] Campbell, "Form Criticism's Future," 24–25.

[45] And this is certainly not the only example of a mental cue in a given text (consider metaphor), but it is the example with which we are currently concerned. Specific examples of this will follow below.

and suggest various ways in which genres interact and create potential meaning in this text.

AMOS 5 – WEAVING A QUILT OF GENRE

Amos 5 represents a mosaic of different prophetic genres bound together with relatively strong cohesive ties.[46] All of the genre elements are themselves related, and build together a nuanced, but generally dark and negative picture. Additionally, the use of co-extension, co-reference, and co-classification create identity and similarity chains that run through the chapter, bringing these genres into explicit interaction. The resulting interplay between various genres, and the specific use and function of those genres, pushes the reader/listener to a reassessment of the nature of the theophanic Day of the Lord.

Amos 5 can be sub-divided into several smaller oracles and hymns. Though the common divisions are not precisely the same, the following represents a workable outline:[47]

> 5:1-3 – Funeral Dirge
>
> 5:4-6 – Divine Saying
>
> 5:7 – First Woe Oracle
>
> 5:8-9 – Hymn
>
> 5:10-13 – First Woe Oracle continued
>
> 5:14-15 – Call to Repent
>
> 5:16-17 – Lamentation
>
> 5:18-20 – Second Woe Oracle
>
> 5:21-24 – Divine Saying

---

[46] Note that Amos 5, while it is composed of sub-units, and is itself a sub-section of a larger unit, does stand on its own (Francis I. Andersen and David Noel Freedman, *Amos: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 24A [Garden City: Doubleday], 462). As an exhaustive examination of even chs. 5–6 is beyond the scope of this paper, I will confine myself to an exploration of the function of function of genre within the context of Amos 5.

[47] This outline represents my hybridization of the work of Mays (James Luther Mays, *Amos: A Commentary*, OTL [Philadelphia: Westminster:1969], 84–111) and Andersen and Freedman (*Amos*, 469–70). Note that Eidevall connects 5:21–27 with the first portion of ch. 6 (Eidevall, *Amos*, 11). Garrett also ties ch. 5 to ch. 6, though differently from Eidevall. See: Duane A. Garrett, *Amos: A Handbook on the Hebrew Text*, Baylor Handbook on the Bible (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2008). Paul (Shalom Paul, *Amos: A Commentary on the Book of Amos*, Hermeneia [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991], 158–98) subdivides the chapter into three larger units, though this arguably fits with the argument presented here (they are not, at least, incommensurate).

5:25-27 – Threat of Exile

Not all of these sections make use of a traditionally recognized prophetic genre, but some do (particularly the dirge, the oracles of woe, and the hymn of praise), and all of these sub-sections do seem to draw on mental frames that can reasonably be referred to as genres.

The dirge of 5:1–3 has several features that are also found in other examples of prophetic dirges (essentially all of which are found in Amos and Ezekiel), as well as in narratives concerning the funeral dirge. The verbal processes of prophetic dirges are generally existential, indicating the state or qualities of the subject of the dirge (Ezek 19; 27; so also the dirge in 2 Sam 1:23–27). The time reference is past. Even though it is not clear in some cases if the destruction or death described in the dirge has in fact occurred, the dirge is still spoken in terms of the past, as though the subject were already destroyed (Ezek 28:12–19). As is normal in most prophetic literature, the dirge is characterized by indicative verbs, statements, and monologue as opposed to dialogue, and the prophetic voice functions as speaker to a nation or group who function as passive addressee (Ezek 19; 27; 28; 32). All but this last feature is obviously in line with what one might expect from a speech or saying uttered over the dead. But if the subject of the dirge is dead (as in 2 Sam), then how can the subject also be an addressee? This uncovers part of the rhetorical purpose of the dirge as a genre. The addressee is treated as though dead. "As such it is tantamount to a death sentence."[48]

This use of a dirge in the midst of a prophetic text appears to be a good example of what Fauconnier and Turner refer to as a "single-scope network."[49] Single-scope networks are conceptual blends in which one of the contributing frames takes an organizational role in the creation of the final blend.[50] Here the two components are the mourning related to death (the dirge), and the frame of prophecy itself. The funeral dirge is a response to the death of a person, and appears to be especially connected to experiences like sadness, regret, and loss.[51] The prophecy frame, in contrast, includes elements like divine communication, usually in the form of warning/threat or promise/hope. The product of this blend of the two conceptual frames is a prophetic text that is influenced heavily by the contribution of the dirge frame, but remains nevertheless a prophetic text.

In this particular instantiation of the dirge, we find the expected prophetic voice as speaker, and the house of Israel as addressee.

---

[48] Andersen and Freedman, *Amos*, 473.

[49] Fauconnier and Turner, *The Way We Think*, 126.

[50] Ibid.

[51] On the experiential basis of metaphor (a concept which transfers analogically to our understanding of genres as mental frames), see: George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live by* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1980), 14–21.

Note that here the use of both the partial (v. 1) and full (v. 3) messenger formulas indicate that the prophet is acting as the mouthpiece of YHWH. The hierarchical relationship between Israel and the prophet (who functions as YHWH's mouthpiece) is instantiated in the imperative mood of the opening verb. The prophet commands Israel to listen, indicating his superiority to Israel as the messenger of YHWH. As in the other instances of prophetic dirges, this is not a dialogue but a monologue, and the various clauses take the form of statements. Temporally these statements are presented as past. All of these are commonly expected features of a prophetic text.

The textual systems of the passage show varied cohesive ties. The demonstrative הַזֶּה creates a co-referential relationship with קִינָה, and functions as a cataphoric reference to the coming speech. This has the effect of establishing that the prophet will speak a word (note the partial messenger formula), that this word is a dirge, and that what follows is the content of that dirge.[52] There is also an identity chain running through verses 2–3. Israel is referred to as a virgin, establishing metaphorical co-reference, after which we find two co-referential feminine pronouns that refer anaphorically to the virgin, and thus to Israel, but also cataphorically to the feminine city of v. 3. The city is also connected to Israel meronymically, where the city is a part of the nation.

Mays ties the second unit to various psalms in which one is exhorted "to turn to Yahweh as the source of life."[53] He cites particularly Psalms 24, 27, and 105. It is difficult to say if this constitutes a particular genre, or if seeking is merely a common metaphor for the spiritual journey towards YHWH. As far as generic features of this unit, it has the kinds of features one would expect of divine speech. We have the speaker and addressee, a string of imperatives indicating the hierarchy of the speaker/addressee relationship, and a set of verbs that are primarily related to movement, either toward or away from the desired state.

Cohesion abounds in this unit. Bethel, Gilgal, and Beersheba can be considered co-classificatory, indicating undesirable alternatives to YHWH, though with different referents. Also, Bethel and Gilgal are repeated in v. 5, and Bethel again in v. 6, all of which are co-referential ties. Throughout we find verbs of motion, journeying, and seeking. There is a string of co-referentiality in v. 6, where YHWH, and the implied masculine subject of יִצְלַח are equated with אֵשׁ via simile, and are therefore co-referential with the feminine subject of וְאָכְלָה. Additionally, the command to seek YHWH in v. 6

---

[52] This contra Mays, who sees the word/dirge relationship as an indicator that what will follow is *not* the divine word, but "Amos' own contribution in which he self-consciously speaks concurrently with the divine *dābār*." Mays, *Amos*, 85.

[53] Mays, *Amos*, 87.

combined with the conjunction פֶּן implies that those who do not seek YHWH will be consumed like Bethel.

Verse 7 is generally recognized as the beginning of a woe oracle, even though the expected הוֹי is absent.[54] We do find the expected substantive participle, indicating the subject of woe.[55] The addressee is thus identified with a fair degree of specificity, and is simultaneously evaluated. In an oracle of woe, the verbal processes generally have to do with actions the accused has taken on behalf of self and against others. These acts are generally located in the past, but the condemnation is a present event with future consequences. Woe oracles are monologues, where YHWH is the speaker and the addressee is usually the accused, though in some instances the accused is spoken of (at least partly) in the third person (e.g. Ezek 13:3; Zeph 3:1).

The present woe oracle, split between v. 7 and vv. 10–13, has a hymn of praise to YHWH interposed within it. Klein notes that the prophetic hymn is similar to the hymns of praise found in the psalter.[56] These hymns seem to take the form either of a direct address to YHWH (e.g. Ps 8; 65) or a general address to an unidentified addressee describing YHWH (e.g. Ps 19; 95). In the former case there is a clear hierarchy in which the speaker places him/herself in obeisance to YHWH (the addressee). The mood is indicative and there is extensive description of YHWH and the acts of YHWH. In the latter case the relationship between speaker and addressee appears to be essentially equal. We find cohortatives used to encourage the addressee to join the speaker in praise of YHWH.

Though Mays wishes to move the offending hymn,[57] we must ask why this hymn is interjected in the woe oracle. Linville and Eidevall both suggest that this hymn is, in fact, central both to this chapter and to the book of Amos as a whole, though the latter notes that it is likely a later insertion that has changed the character of the chapter (and book). YHWH is here juxtaposed with the addressees of the woe oracle in v. 7.[58] Linville also notes several elements that I have referred to as cohesive ties. In v. 7 the subjects of the woe oracle are identified as those who turn "justice into metaphorical weeds,"[59] while YHWH turns darkness to morning. This is an example of co-classification, as both הַהֹפְכִים and YHWH turn or change something (note the use of the same verb). There are ties between the darkness/night and morning/day of v. 8, and the darkness and light of vv. 18–20. This is an example of co-classification since the

[54] Mays, *Amos*, 90–91; Andersen and Freedman, *Amos*, 483.

[55] Claus Westermann, *Basic Forms*, 191. For examples of the woe oracle see: Isa 10:1–4; Jer 22:13; Ezek 13:3, 18; Zeph 3:1.

[56] Klein et al., *Interpretation*, 363.

[57] Mays, *Amos*, 90.

[58] James Richard Linville, *Amos and the Cosmic Imagination* (New York: Routledge, 2008), 105. Eidevall, *Amos*, 158.

[59] Linville, *Amos*, 105.

change between light and darkness does not refer to the same event in the two verses. There is also a relationship of co-extension based upon synonymy and antinomy. Note the six words used to refer to the opposition between light and dark: יוֹם/בֹּקֶר/אוֹר and לַיְלָה/צַלְמָוֶת/חֹשֶׁךְ.

There is more co-extension in the relationship between the hymn and the second part of the woe oracle. Note that both YHWH and הַהֹפְכִים are builders or makers. YHWH has made the stars (v. 8), and הַהֹפְכִים have built houses (v. 11b). There is also a co-classificatory relationship between the stronghold and fortress, which YHWH destroys in v. 9, and the addressees of the woe oracle. The addressees are described as tyrannical landlords (v. 11), as people who harass the righteous and the poor (v. 12), and as builders of strong houses (v. 11). They are clearly powerful people who live in large homes. The implied statement is that just as YHWH destroys the stronghold and fortress, so also, he is able to destroy these powerful people and their large homes. We see, therefore, that the hymn of praise to YHWH is tied deeply both to the woe oracle of vv. 7, 10–13, and to the rest of the chapter.

The interposition of this hymn of praise within a woe oracle is a kind of (rather messy) double-scope conceptual blend. "A double-scope network has inputs with different (and often clashing) organizing frames as well as an organizing frame for the blend that includes parts of each of those frames and has emergent structure of its own."[60] In this case the two sub-genres (woe oracle and hymn) are quite different frames, but they are bound together here by the discussion of relative power, and the implication of responsibility related to power. YHWH has true power, and exercises true responsibility, and is therefore worthy of the praise offered in the hymn. Those who turn justice to wormwood fail to exercise their power correctly, and are therefore worthy only of condemnation and derision. Though the various connections between the two sub-genres are significant, it is unsurprising that careful readers find the hymn intrusive, as it does represent a significant formal difference from the woe oracle. The solution to this is neither to excise the hymn, nor to pretend that the intrusion is not there, but to realize that this nested hymn of praise is interacting with the woe oracle in order to produce something greater than the sum of its parts.

Following this we have another exhortation to seek YHWH,[61] though this time the speaker is the prophetic voice and not the voice of YHWH specifically (note the use of the 3rd person in references

---

[60] Fauconnier and Turner, *The Way We Think*, 131.

[61] Andersen and Freedman suggests that the sense here is not to seek some moral good over against some moral evil, but instead to seek the Good, which is to say, YHWH, over and against other gods. According to such a reading this call to repentance is an extension of the first call to seek YHWH. See Andersen and Freedman, *Amos*, 507–8.

to the deity in v. 15). The generic elements are fundamentally the same as the earlier divine saying. The language of good and evil is co-extensive (synonymy) with the language of sin and righteousness found in v. 12. The addressees of the imperatives of vv. 14–15 are co-referential with the referents of the pronouns of v. 12 and subjects of the verbs of vv. 10–11. There is also a co-referential relationship between the gate of v. 15 and the gate of v. 10, and thus a condemnation of the failure to act justly in the gate in v. 10.

Directly after an expression of the possibility of salvation the call to repentance ends, and we find a lamentation. A call to lamentation and mourning is also found in several other prophetic passages. Isaiah 23 and Joel 1 both contain calls to lamentation.[62] Joel begins with a messenger formula and Isaiah 23 with the proclamation of an oracle. In both cases the speaker provides a string of imperatives, indicating acts of mourning that should be undertaken by the addressees (wail, be silent, be shamed, awake, gird oneself with sackcloth, declare a fast). In both cases all of the verbal processes describe negative situations for the addressees of the laments, and YHWH is either the implicit (as in Joel) or explicit (as in Isaiah 23, see vv. 9, 11) cause of those situations. Temporal reference points to an event that has begun and is ongoing.

The lament of Amos 5:16–17 differs slightly in character from the laments just mentioned. There are no imperatives, and instead the acts of mourning are described. Verbal mood does not, consequently, establish the hierarchy of relations as it does in the other two laments. That hierarchy is established, however, through the verbal processes. YHWH describes the wailing in the streets, the mourning of the farmer, and the wailing in the vineyard. These are actions that come as a response to some cause. The cause is found in v. 17b, with YHWH's action of passing in the midst of the addressees. Thus, YHWH's action creates the mourning, as indicated by the כִּי in v. 17.

Textual cohesion is created within the lament itself by the chain of co-extensive words related to mourning. It is also created by the co-classificatory terms בְּכָל־רְחֹבוֹת and בְּכָל־חוּצוֹת (kinds of places in or around a city). Cohesive ties to the rest of the chapter are also numerous. The co-classification just mentioned extends back to v. 15 and the mention of the gate. So, failure to establish justice at the gate leads to mourning in the streets and plazas. This might also extend to the mention of the בָּתֵּי גָזִית of v. 11. Note the co-referential (or perhaps co-classificatory?) relationship between the vineyards of v. 11 and those of v. 17. Finally, there is the co-extensive relationship between the language of mourning and lamentation in vv. 16–17, and the הוֹי that introduces the following verse and its oracle of woe.

The call to repentance and the lamentation continue the blend begun with the preceding woe oracle and hymn of praise. The most

---

[62] Andersen and Freedman, *Amos*, 518.

interesting element of this blend, which will also relate to the follow-
ing woe oracle, is the interplay between the expectations set by the
call to repentance as a frame, and the other sub-genres at play here.
The call to repentance sets the expectation of the possibility that re-
pentance could occur. This is juxtaposed with the relentlessly nega-
tive expectations set by the first woe oracle, and by the lamentation
that follows immediately on the heels of the call to repentance. There
will be no turn or change. This is not because the deity refuses to
relent. As the hymn of praise and the call to repentance together
suggest, YHWH is both able and willing to be gracious (v. 15). But,
as the woe oracle and the lamentation both indicate, the addressees
will not change their ways. The interaction of these two positive sub-
genres and these two negative sub-genres creates an interplay of in-
tersecting expectations for the reader, throwing the justice and good-
ness of the deity, and the wickedness and intractability of the ad-
dressees, into the sharpest possible focus.

　　Amos 5:18 is generally considered to be the opening of a new
section or sub-section within the macro-structure of the book. As I
have noted above, various scholars, like Eidevall and Linville, see
5:1–17 as the centre-piece of the book (v. 8 especially so), and mark
a division here at v. 18.[63] My observations thus far have suggested
strong continuity within vv. 1–17, and in what follows the reader will
note that identity and similarity chains especially bind 18–20 and 21–
27 (and bind those sub-sections with one another). That said, there
certainly are various connections (discussed below) between vv. 1–
17 and 18–27 that suggest some kind of cohesion. It is not my inten-
tion to make any argument in particular about the editorial structure
of the chapter. As I have noted above, my interest here is in the way
that various kinds of weak and strong cohesive ties can bind subor-
dinate genres into a super-ordinate text. This tension between two
seemingly differentiated sub-sections and the apparent existence of
at least some cohesive ties across the section boundaries simply un-
derscores the issue of the complicated realities of cohesion in a com-
posite text. Must a reader connect vv. 18–27 to the preceding portion
of the chapter? Certainly not, and there is evidence to suggest this is
related to the editorial design of the book. Might a reader make such
a connection? Based on the cohesive ties I note below, this seems
plausible.

　　Verses 18–20, in which we find a reference to the Day of the
Lord, is an oracle of woe that follows the expected pattern and char-
acter described above, but with one significant difference. As Ander-
sen and Freedman note, the participle that follows the introductory
הוֹי is generally concerned with "acts of social justice or self-indul-
gence," as opposed to religious or theological outlook.[64] Here, how-
ever, the condemnation of the woe oracle is attached to a longing or

---

[63] See n. 58.

[64] Andersen and Freedman, *Amos*, 519.

expectation of the Day of the Lord.[65] It is obvious from the description of the Day that the addressees of the oracle believed that the Day of the Lord would be a positive experience for them, a time of light. Clearly the use of the woe oracle inverts this expectation.

The cohesive ties are again very strong both within the oracle itself and between this oracle and the rest of the chapter. Note the co-extensive nature of the light/darkness language in vv. 18 and 20, as well as the co-referential repetition of "Day of the Lord" in vv. 18 and 20. The conjunctive כַּאֲשֶׁר connects v. 19 to v. 18, and through the cohesive ties already noted to v. 20. Within v. 19 the animal references are connected through co-classification. Additionally, the conjunctive sense of כַּאֲשֶׁר equates the ironic reversals of the person fleeing the lion with those who longed for the Day of the Lord. The אִישׁ of v. 19 is therefore co-referential with הַמִּתְאַוִּים אֶת־יוֹם יְהוָה.

This identity chain runs through the entire chapter, connecting the addressees of the various oracles through co-reference. The generic ties between the implicit woe oracle of v. 7 and the explicit woe oracle of vv. 18–20 strengthen this identity chain. It is through this connection that might infer why the prophet is so derisive in his condemnation of those who long for the Day. Those who long for the Day are also those who turn justice to bitterness or wormwood. Therefore, though Andersen and Freedman are correct in a sense that the referents of woe in v. 18 are guilty of theological and not ethical error, in the broader arc of the chapter as a whole they are guilty of both.

In fact, it is the interplay of expectations between these two uses of the woe oracle genre that suggests a potential interactive meaning between these portions of ch. 5. The first woe oracle focuses on the ethical failure of the powerful of Israel, and the second woe oracle focuses on the religious failure of the powerful of Israel. This blend, which in Fauconnier and Turner's terms would be described as a type of "mirror network",[66] leverages the repetition of the woe oracle genre to show that the powerful of Israel are not making two distinct errors (ethical and religious), but that their ethical errors are religious errors, and vice versa.

The divine speech of vv. 21–24 begins with a shift in speaker, from the prophet to the voice of YHWH. The cohesive ties within the unit itself are very strong. Note the co-extensive language of sac-

---

[65] For a précis of research regarding the Day of the Lord see: Elizabeth Boase, *The Fulfilment of Doom? The Dialogic Interaction Between the Book of Lamentations and the Pre-Exilic/Early-Exilic Prophetic*, LHBOTS 437 (New York: T&T Clark, 2006), 106–113. See also Ishai-Rosenboim's contribution to the discussion, which appeared after Boase's book was completed: Daniella Ishai-Rosenboim, "Is Yom H' (the Day of the Lord) a Term in Biblical Language?" *Bib* 87 (2006): 395–401.

[66] "A mirror network is an integration network in which all spaces – input, generic, and blend – share an organizing frame." Fauconnier and Turner, *The Way We Think*, 122.

rifice, cult, and worship found in vv. 21–23. Also, the numerous second person plural suffixes indicate a co-classificatory relationship between these various festivals. They are not the same festivals, quite clearly, but they are all performed by the same people, the addressees. Thus, anything that falls into the class or category of an act of worship done by the addressees is rejected. Finally, we have the disjunctive *waw* of v. 24, which establishes, for the purposes of this passage at least, an antonymic (and thus co-extensive) relationship between מִשְׁפָּט וּצְדָקָה and the various festivals and sacrifices of vv. 21–23.

This reference to justice also establishes co-referential ties to vv. 7 and 15. The justice that is neglected in v. 7 and called for in v. 15 is the self-same as that which is called for in v. 24. Related to this is the co-classificatory relationship between the rejected worship of vv. 21–23, and the recourse to Bethel, Gilgal, and Beersheba, in vv. 5–6. Both religious festivals, and recourse to external powers, represent attempts to appease YHWH without actually performing the justice that he has called for.

Though the divine speech of vv. 21–24 may seem like a marked departure from the preceding woe oracle, the connection to my argument above about the way the chapter's two woe oracles blend into a comment about the relationship between religion and ethics should be quite obvious at this point. The repeated use of the 1st person divine voice also creates a blend with the lamentation of vv. 16–17, juxtaposing lamentation related to economic and agricultural suffering with the rejection of religious festivals in the divine speech of vv. 21–24. The connection developed through various conceptual blends throughout the chapter up until this point is finally made specific and overt in vv. 23 and 24, where ethical failure invalidates religious ritual. Consequently, while some textual cues (like the shift in voice) suggest a demarcation between sub-sections, those feature I have just noted suggest a sense of continuity. Again, this is the kind of experience of coherence/incoherence one can reasonably expect of a carefully edited but composite text.

The final sub-section of chapter 5 does not appear to fall into any classically identified genre, but provides a closing threat or epilogue to the rest of the oracles.[67] As above we find cohesive ties based on co-classification, referring once again to yet another set of sacrifices. The references to סִכּוּת and כִּיּוּן, which appear to be celestial deities of some kind, operate as co-extensive ties to וּכְסִיל כִּימָה of v. 8 by hyponymy. Note also that this reference to the worship of non-Israelite deities also suggests continued violation of the exhortation of v. 6, creating another cohesive tie. Therefore, though we do find a difference in syntactic character, and a slight shift in subject

---

[67] See Andersen and Freedman, *Amos*, 530, where these verses are called a "strange conclusion" due to their notably different structure and linguistic complexity.

matter in these final verses, they are tied to the rest of the chapter and can consequently be interpreted in light of their literary context.

Amos 5, with its several units of varied genre, presents a coherent message and sense with regard to the addressees. They stand condemned, their eulogy has been read, their destruction has been lamented. They were told to turn but did not. They were called upon to act justly but did not. And in the midst of this we find the rumor and threat of YHWH's coming. The appearance, the theophany, of YHWH is promised at the close of the lamentation in v. 17, and we move immediately from there to the Day of the Lord, which is the day of the theophany. By the time that we as readers reach this passage it is already painfully clear that the addressees of these prophecies simply do not understand. They are clearly blinded, believing that YHWH is for them when he is against them.

I have made note of various conceptual blends related to the use of multiple genres in the passage. While all of the diverse genres in the passage interact with one another in the chapter, it is important to note that all of these genres also interact with the super-ordinate genre (i.e., primary text) frame of "prophecy." This is a single-scope network in which the genre prophecy provides the conceptual underpinning for the passage, as all of the various sub-ordinate genres interact with one another in various ways (some of which I have noted above), but always also interact with the structuring frame of the genre prophecy. Reader expectations are guided by this underlying frame at all times.[68]

CONCLUSION - ORIENTING THE EVENT

While the analysis of genre is valuable as deployed by form-critics, as a tool for describing the social background of a text's creation, maintenance, and reception,[69] it may also be used to examine the way that the use of genre creates meaning in a given text. Of additional interest is the use of and interrelationships between different genres within a single, relatively cohesive, text. Amos 5 is a representative example of a common occurrence in the prophetic literature,[70] in which various genres are combined, or nested, within a broader con-

---

[68] A full exploration of the rhetorical power of this interaction is beyond the scope of this paper, and would also require a clearer definition of the genre of prophecy, or prophetic literature, using prototype theory. On this, see: Ehud Ben Zvi, "The Concept of Prophetic Books and Its Historical Setting" in *The Production of Prophecy: Constructing Prophecy and Prophets in Yehud*, ed. Diana V. Edelman and Ehud Ben Zvi (London and New York: Routledge, 2009), 73–95.

[69] For a recent attempt to redeem the concept of *Sitz im Leben*, see: Colin M. Toffelmire, "Sitz Im What? Context and the Prophetic Book of Obadiah," in *The Book of the Twelve and the New Form Criticism*, ed. Mark J. Boda, Michael H. Floyd, and Colin M. Toffelmire, ANEM 10 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2015), 221–44.

[70] Indeed, in all kinds of literature. See Martin and Rose, *Genre Relations*.

text, which itself may represent a genre. An examination of genre need not, therefore, lead only to questions regarding the background and redaction of a given book, but may also lead to questions regarding the inclusion of and interaction between various genres within a larger textual unit, and the ways in which these features frame the text for readers.

Multiple conclusions can be drawn from this study. First, with reference to the delimitation of sections and sub-sections within a prophetic book, an analysis of patterns of cohesion and coherence is preferable to the use of idealized genre categories. As we have seen, Amos 5 functions as a plausibly coherent text, and yet comprises a variety of identifiable genres, all of which are working together to reinforce the communicative goals of the passage. To extract a given portion of the passage because it "belongs" to some genre, or to excise certain clauses or verses from a portion of the passage because those elements "do not belong" to some genre, breaks the rhetorical integrity of this portion of Amos, and does so based on theoretical notions of genre that are simply unsound.

Second, the identification of multiple genres within the cohesive text does help to clarify the rhetoric of the passage. While they have a kind of cohesion and situational background of their own, in this new context these diverse genres blend with one another and with the super-ordinate genre of prophecy to create diverse rhetorical effects. Far from being exceptional, this is a perfectly ordinary way for human beings to make use of existing genres, and is consistent with existing theories of cognition and category theory.

Third, while there may be value in referring to the typological situations from which a generic space like, for example, the "woe oracle" is drawn, this value is due less to any historical insight that this might give us into the underlying realities of ancient Israelite culture (as per the History of Religions School), and more due to an understanding of how using such pre-existing genres helps to communicate additional information to the informed reader. The use of sub-ordinate genres like the "dirge" or "woe-oracle" in Amos 5 helps to create more rhetorical impact in a very efficient way. The real value here is, therefore, an increased understanding of the rhetorical fashioning of prophetic books and the (supposed) impact on informed readers (both ancient and modern).

Moving forward critics should continue to eschew Gunkel's original goals of recreating supposed oral precursors to the prophetic literature. That said, the analysis of genre continues to be a fruitful area of research, and can help us to understand how prophetic (and other) texts were crafted, and how they were and are received by readers. Scholars will continue to borrow fruitfully from various methodological frameworks, but for the purposes of analyzing genre I suggest that SFL and cognitive linguistics offer fruitful perspectives for the working exegete.