Contents

Preface

Many scholars are honored with a celebratory volume in their honor; few receive this honor twice over. In our humble opinion, our father, Michael Fishbane, is most worthy of a second volume and much more to honor what has been (and which we pray will continue to be) a truly extraordinary career. Fourteen years ago, our father was the recipient of his first Festschrift, a volume edited by two former students, Deborah Green and Laura Lieber. The present volume is therefore the second Festschrift to honor our father's legacy, and yet it differs from its predecessor in two important respects. The first volume honored our father as an outstanding scholar and appropriately included contributions from senior colleagues in the field, only three of whom studied directly with our father. This volume, for its part, seeks to celebrate his remarkable legacy as a teacher and mentor, and the wide-ranging scholarship that has emerged from his mentoring. As a result, it solicited articles from former doctoral students and a few individuals who studied with him in less formal settings. In recognition of our father's unique contributions as a teacher, scholar, and theologian both in academia and in the broader community, its contributions consist of traditional scholarship as well as some modern applications by student practitioners whose work has been profoundly impacted by the teaching and writings of our father.

As a scholar who has spent his entire career in university life and leadership, our father has always been something of an anomaly in the world of academia.

In the example he set for exacting standards both in writing and in the classroom and in his visionary role as builder of an academic program of Jewish studies at the University of Chicago, our father has earned the reputation of a consummate scholar. And yet, in at least three ways, his proclivities have always been more capacious than the institutions he inhabited. First, in a world of ever-increasing specialization, his scholarly interests have been far too broad for any single field of study, shifting and expanding considerably over the course of his career—from Bible to Midrash to Kabbalah to Piyyut to Jewish thought and theology—each one not replacing the other but encompassing and enhancing one another in the process. This is a broad vision and practice of Jewish Studies and scholarship as a vocation that our father learned and consciously adapted from his own formative teachers at Brandeis University—particularly Professors Nahum Glatzer, Alexander Altmann, and Nahum Sarna. In turn, this Festschrift spans multiple disciplines, from Bible and biblical exegesis to rabbinic tradition to medieval, early modern, and modern Jewish thought and literature. The scope of this volume captures but a glimpse of our father's capaciousness not only as a scholar but as a mentor of students across many disciplines.

Second, despite the often introverted demands of university life, our father's scholarly vision has frequently led him beyond the halls of academia. His insatiable drive to teach led him to connect to students and readers across diverse backgrounds and commitments. In addition to his purely academic writings, he invested much effort to reach a broader public and have a meaningful impact on individuals and communities beyond the university. He used the medium of biblical commentary to stimulate his fellow Jews with innovative volumes on the *Haftarot* and Song of Songs, whose glosses are both historically grounded and oriented to the quest for religious meaning in the modern reader, works which also deeply reflect our father's own spiritual and theological creativity, his powerful insight in contributing to contemporary Jewish thought. And his two volumes of contemplative Jewish theology, aimed at an intellectually sophisticated yet disenchanted postmodern society, have ignited a dynamic discussion on the cultivation of the inner life. Their considerable impact both within and beyond the Jewish community continues to take shape as of this publication. His dual commitment to academia and the public is well represented in the contributions included in this volume.

Finally, despite the professional and hierarchical role of scholarly mentorship, his dedication to the full scope of his students' lives is too sincere and personal to be purely academic. Each and every one of his doctoral students knows the depths of his care and the lengths to which he is prepared to go to help them reach their own potential. And each of them can give many anecdotes of how

they were personally touched by the kindness and devotion of their mentor. Our father was and continues to be invested in their total growth as human beings in and out of the classroom. The result of this fierce devotion to his students is that the affection is mutual. The articles in this volume are a beautiful witness to this reciprocal care. Each expression of affection and gratitude in the articles that follow reflect the unique relationship our father cultivated with his dear students over the years.

As each of us has grown in our own developments as scholars and teachers, we are deeply aware of the tremendous debt that we owe to our father (together with our brilliant and caring mother!) in our respective formations as academics, as Jews, and as human beings. We are blessed as sons to have been nourished from the well of wisdom and learning in our father as well as from an overflowing well of love. As each of us has grown and learned to fly in our own ways, we have both been sustained by our father's guidance and devotion through the years—the learning he shared with us, the support he provided as we found our own footing, and the generosity of spirit to allow us the strength and independence to become scholars and teachers in our own unique ways. Eighty is a birthday imbued with reverence in the Jewish tradition; it is known as the age of *gevurot*, of strength, an age that already shines with the blessings of a long life. In the spirit of how our father has found both scholarly and personal meaning in the Jewish mystical tradition, it is also the mystery of seventy plus ten. Seventy faces of Torah that reflect a life filled with learning, manifold creativity, and teaching, imbued with the vitality of the ten rivers of divine light, the ten dimensions of divine Oneness. According to the kabbalists, these ten *sefirot*, found in God as in the human being, are first and foremost flooded with the light of *raḥamim*, of love, compassion, and empathy. The *gevurot* that are attained at eighty are simultaneously softened with the love of a compassionate and caring heart. The age of *gevurot* for our father is a state of strength and fullness that shines with the gentle and loving light of *raḥamim* and *ḥesed*, a life experience of balance, energy, and health that we pray will continue for many years to come.

As both his sons and his students, not only in our areas of research but also in the school of life and character, it is a privilege to wish our father great pride and satisfaction, *naḥat ruaḥ*, at the many students he has raised and nurtured—the scholarship and teaching that has been a defining feature of his life for more than fifty years. May blessing and joy only increase.

—Eitan P. Fishbane and Elisha Russ-Fishbane

1

The Spiritual Vocation of a Teacher: A Meditation

Michael Fishbane

The soul of a teacher stands at the nexus of many voices and faces—of teachers past, and their gifts of instruction and guidance; and of students past and present, whose faces and voices are etched in memory and mind. True teachers are the embodiments or living bearers of tradition, personalizing the primacy of texts and their vitality across the generations. A teacher is responsible to this legacy of learning—witness to records of cultural continuities, revisions and reformulations, and diverse mentalities and beliefs. Cultural legacies reach backward and forward, as interpreters of texts try to link the past and present with hermeneutical dexterity, sometimes in full view and at other times with diverse strategies of concealment. Being aware of this vital cultural process at the conjunction of diverse generations instills the teacher with humility. Being an active link in the chain of culture is a great responsibility, underscored by the privilege of helping others to become new links and transmitters. This is a sacred task. Students are the soul-root of cultural continuity; and their voice is the modality of its sustenance and spiritual vigor. My teachers exemplified the ideal of knowledge as service. They received it from their teachers and passed it on to me. It has been my ideal as well—held and given in trust. Teachers and students are interlinked by shared responsibility and purpose: to receive, interpret, and transmit the archive of tradition, each in their own way, through individual or shared sensibilities.

How does one begin? We begin with the great mystery of how language creates meaning. Sharing that wonder is the beginning of true learning—and our grave hermeneutical responsibility. A teacher can inaugurate students into the wonder of making meaning: the way sense is forged by words, expressed in voices, and formulated in texts—deriving, first and foremost, from responses to the mystery of existence itself; but also in response to all the challenges and stimulations of historical existence. Texts are records of primary experience, cultural form, and the bounty of expression. Teachers have the pivotal privilege of mediating the responsible reception of these documents, exemplifying the patience and care required for their explication by later generations of scholars, who engage the world with a different mentality or mind-set. For that reason, the mysteries of language must be joined to the sober sophistication of philology. The original horizon of our texts has long receded, and when we face them again in our lived present, even with the tools of linguistic competence, we easily meld their meanings with our own. The struggle for responsible exegesis is ongoing, and may be exemplified in the classroom, where possibilities and their implications can be analyzed, and the moral duty of scholarship (to give voice to a text on its own terms, as much as possible) is actualized. I have tried to serve this spiritual goal, and, in the process, to help students find their own unique voice as interpreters, conscious of the implications of reading and the inviolable otherness of the text.

Study begins with finding a generative question, and then entering the circle of interpretation with an exegetical assertiveness tempered by humility in the face of textual resistance. It continues with the creative capacity of recalibrating new questions, guided by the perceived intentions of a text, despite its ambiguities and gaps—the speedbumps that slow the unimpeded imagination. The meaning of our questions becomes clear in the process of interpretation; for at the outset they are mere stimulants and of often inchoate value. Hearing the shaping power of a question, and then being able to utilize its force, is a learned skill conveyed by a teacher who is reciprocally influenced by a student's queries. One of my teachers once conveyed the traditional adage that we have two hands—to keep the finger of one on the text, and that of the other on a commentary. I would add, in the light of the preceding observation, that we also have two eyes—so that both the text and one's students can be kept in view, simultaneously. A teacher must therefore be bifocal, and in the process is a living bond between the generations. This is central to the spiritual vocation of the teacher. If I have served this ideal, my students have found their voice, their questions, and their place in the continuity of culture. Scholarly responsibility is ethical and much more: it is ultimately soul-shaping, for giver and receiver alike.

I would like to underscore this last assertion. A teacher truly becomes a teacher through the receptivity and response of students—and a student may be profoundly impacted in turn. In the process, a teacher assesses and generates new questions, shaped by the context and presence of those being addressed, alert to their spirit and temperament. Slowly new meanings are formed. Writing these words, my memory carries me back to two decisive occasions—one, when I had fallen into silence after a personal loss, and one dear teacher brought me back to a reengagement with the material studied through a focused dialogical back and forth; the second occurred when I too eagerly asserted my knowledge and failed to perceive the deeper issues of a text, and therefore required the prodding voice of another dear teacher for corrective guidance. Both learning moments are indelible.

We thus become persons and scholars interactively—teacher and student together; and our souls are conjointly cultivated through the silent and voiced relationships we have with the shared words of a text, through attentive conversation and question and answer.

The class setting is a sacred site. It embodies the purposes of culture long before scholarship takes on its diverse forms, precisely because the classroom facilitates the dialogical and ethical dimension of making meaning through proper regard for the otherness of fellow students and a text, and of commitments to a common task. Helping others to realize this ideal of shared study has been a central goal of my life as a teacher. It involves both giving and letting go. Having given what I could over these many years, I have watched with quiet joy as students have found their singular path as scholars and teachers—each one in their own way, each one with their unique proclivities and gifts. Letting go means knowing when to pull aside so that there is space for each person to nurture their own talents, in their own special and distinctive way.

I have been a teacher for a half-century, beginning when I was still a student under the tutelage of my own teachers. I, too, had to find my voice and my purpose; and over the years you, my students, each so dear to me for all the conversations shared in class and private study (not to mention all the exchanges brimming with the aims of education and life), have shaped my vision of what I wanted and needed to do to realize the ideal of knowledge as service. Your questions and concerns have explicitly and implicitly influenced the choice of the subjects I taught, the methods cultivated, and the values to be actualized. And so I thank you, each and all—most especially for the blessing of your engaged presence over these years, and for the gifts of your lifework, symbolized by your contribution to this volume, which has grown out of our scholarly venture together. The editorial initiative of this book, by my beloved

sons, Eitan and Elisha, is another great blessing that has come to me. As my first and devoted students, they have repeatedly helped shape my voice and activity as a teacher. It has been a loving and lifelong enterprise. You, dear students, have further cultivated this process, and for all this and more I am deeply grateful. Together, we now share a living nexus of past, present, and future.

—Michael Fishbane

BIBLE AND HISTORY OF INTERPRETATION

2

Monotheism and Anthropopathism in Hosea 11: Divine Personhood vs. Immutability in Biblical Theology

Benjamin D. Sommer

"יקר וגדולה למרדכי"

Biblical authors confront a basic problem as they attempt to describe their God. The inescapable humanity of their language and experience limits their ability to portray or imagine a nonhuman being. Yet they emphasize the uniqueness, and consequently the otherness, of YHWH. As a result, biblical authors—and their successors in the monotheistic traditions of the West—describe God in ways that disclose similarities between humans and God even as they stress differences between them. These authors attribute human emotions and commitments to God, but they insist nevertheless that God is really not like a human at all.[1]

The tension inherent in this project becomes acute in a passage that asserts God's uniqueness, Hosea 11, and in the traditions of exegesis based on that passage. But the meaning and form of the passage are challenging. It will be worthwhile, then, to examine the passage within the context of Hosea's thought,

1 For a deft summary of this "root tension in the nature of YHWH," see Yochanan Muffs, *The Personhood of God: Biblical Theology, Human Faith and the Divine Image* (Woodstock, VT: Jewish Lights, 2005), 55. On interaction between the finitude of our language and experience and our aspiration to approach the infinite, see Michael Fishbane, *Sacred Attunement: A Jewish Theology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008), 201–6.

and then to assay the passage's approach to divine attributes—in particular, anger, love, and mutability.

As in much of Hosea, the text of our chapter is difficult. It may have been written in a northern Israelite dialect we understand imperfectly, and—perhaps for that reason—it may have become garbled in transmission. But it has suffered even more at the hands of scholars quick to emend to a Hebrew that seems more familiar, often on the basis of the Septuagint. In fact, a careful examination suggests that little emendation is necessary, especially in the consonantal text. In what follows, I do not present a text-critical study of the chapter, but in the footnotes I explain reasoning behind important aspects of my construals, especially those not found in standard commentaries and philological works. I present the text in Hebrew and my translation, inserting vocalization wherever the text I propose differs from the Masoretic Text (MT), and inserting a blank space where we can detect a break between stanzas.

(1) כי נער ישראל ואהבהו — וממצרים קראתי לבני
(2) כְּקָרְאִי להם — כן הלכו מפָנָי
הֵם לבעלים יזבחו — ולפסילים יקטרון
(3) ואנכי תרגלתי לאפרים — וָאֶקָּחֵם על זרועָתָי
ולא ידעו — כי רפאתים
(4) בחבלי אדם אמשכם — בעבתות אהבה
ואהיה להם — כמרימי על על לחיהם
וָאֵט אליו — אוכיל (5) לוֹ

ישוב אל ארץ מצרים — ואשור הוא מלכו — כי מאנו לשוב
(6) וחלה חרב בעריו — וכלתה בדיו — ואכְלה ממעצותיהם
(7) ועמי תלואים למשובתי — ואל עֹל יקראהו יחד — לא ירוֹמָם

(8) איך אתנך אפרים — אמגנך ישראל
איך אתנך כאדמה — אשימך כצבאים
נהפך עלי לבי — יחד נכמרו נחומי
(9) לא אעשה חרון אפי — לא אשוב לשחת אפרים
כי א–ל אנכי — ולא איש
בקרבך קדוש — ולא אבוא בעיר
(10) אחרי ה' ילכו — כאריה ישאג
כי הוא ישאג — ויחרדו בנים מים
(11) יחרדו כצפור ממצרים — וכיונה מארץ אשור — והושבתים על בתיהם

נאם ה'

[1] When Israel was young, I loved him,
And from Egypt I called for My son.
[2] The more I called them,
The more they went away from Me.
They sacrificed to baal-gods,
And burned offerings to idols.
[3] Yet it was I who guided Ephraim,
Taking them in My arms.
But they failed to understand
That I remitted the punishment they deserved.
[4] I led them with humane ropes,
With cords of love.
And I seemed to them
Like those who put a yoke on their cheek,
Even though I turned to him
And gave [5] him food.

He will return to the land of Egypt,
And Assyria will be his king.
For they refused to return.
[6] And a sword will whirl in his cities,
And destroy his gates,
And consume because of his schemes.
[7] And My people will be devastated for turning away from Me,
And together they will call him to the yoke;
He will not rise up.

[8] How could I give you up, O Ephraim,
Or surrender you, O Israel?
How could I destroy you like Admah,
Or make you like Zeboiim?
My heart is overturned against Me,
Even as regret overwhelms Me!
[9] I shall not perform My fiery anger,
I shall not destroy Ephraim again.
For I am a god
And not a man,
A Holy One in your midst,
And I shall not come in anger.

[10] They will follow YHWH,
Who will roar like a lion.
When He roars,
[His] children will tremble in the west,
[11] They will come trembling from Egypt,
And like a dove from Assyria,
And I shall allow them to dwell in their houses.
A pronouncement of YHWH.

The first stanza of this poem consists entirely of two-part lines; the second, of three-part lines; the third, of two-part lines, with a final three-part line that signals the end of the poem.[2] As we move through the poem, YHWH describes disappointment and anger at Israel's failure to acknowledge His beneficence to them. The tone is surprising; God displays not righteous fury but a very human distress over rejection by a loved one to whom He had given so much and for whom He still retains, beneath the anger, a wounded love.[3]

Hosea is concerned here not only with his own era but also with Israel's "youth"—the time of the exodus and the travels through the Sinai wilderness.[4] Hosea's God remembers that youth with mixed emotions. He loved Israel when Israel was young,[5] but the nation failed to return that love. Even when they should have been punished, God remitted the punishment (v. 3).[6] Yet they continued to abandon Him. Israel's past behavior serves, alas, as a model for

2 Robert Gordis, "Psalm 9–10: A Textual and Exegetical Study," *Jewish Quarterly Review* 48 (1957): 119 n. 32, notes that three-part lines often close a poem or stanza that otherwise consists of two-part lines. Cf. Wilfred G. E. Watson, *Classical Hebrew Poetry: A Guide to Its Techniques* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1984), 168–74, who makes the same claim about the role of what he calls the orphan line—which is identical to what I call the third part of a three-part line.

3 Israel's inability to recognize God's succor is a favorite theme of Hosea's. See 2:10, 6:4, 13:4–6.

4 Hans Walter Wolff, *Hosea*, trans. G. Stansell (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974), 199, denies that this passage is concerned with the period of wandering in the wilderness, but several motifs allude to this theme. Verse 2 recalls the sins committed in the desert, which Hosea mentions in 9:10. That Hosea links the exodus and wandering themes is clear from 13:4–6. There, as in this passage, the prophet stresses that God fed Israel in the desert; there, as here, Israel grew haughty and abandoned God. On Hosea's familiarity with exodus typology, see Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, Clarendon, 1985), 360–61.

5 On the connection of the verb אהב to the exodus-wandering tradition, see Walter Brueggemann, *Theology of the Old Testament: Testimony, Advocacy, Dispute* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1997), 415.

6 On my translation of רפאתיו there as "remitted the punishment they deserved," see Shawn Zelig Aster and Abraham Jacob Berkovitz, "Akkadian *Bulluṭu* and Hebrew רפא: Pardon and Loyalty in Hosea and in Neo-Assyrian Political Texts," *Hebrew Studies* 59 (2018): 149–71.

present conduct. Therefore, the tropes of tenderness at the beginning of the unit, where Israel is compared to a child, give way to negative figures in verse 4: Israel, like a dumb animal, needs to be led, though even then God turns[7] to Israel to feed it.[8] The underlying motif of the exodus, however, continues: Israel as child was called out of Egypt by its divine parent;[9] Israel as animal was fed by God in the desert.

In the second stanza, God's love-cum-sadness gives way to anger, and God describes the fate awaiting the ungrateful people. Like the first stanza, the second stanza alludes to the exodus and desert wanderings, this time to describe the future rather than the past. Shortly after the Israelites went out of slavery, they wanted to return to Egypt (see Ex. 14:11–12, Num. 14:1–4). Our passage announces that now they will see this wish fulfilled, when they go back to Egypt as prisoners or refugees. Israel refused to return (שוב) to God (v. 5) and instead committed apostasy (משובה, v. 7); now the nation will return (שוב) to Egypt and the slavery it coveted (v. 5).[10] God seemed to Israel like those who put him

---

7 Instead of MT's וָאֵט, I read וָאַט, a first-person *waw*-consecutive *qal* from נט"ה. Understanding the letters אט as conveying a verb rather than the adverb אַט preserves a pattern found throughout the stanza: each part of the two-part lines has its own verb and constitutes a distinct clause.

8 The word אוכיל is first-person *hiphil* prefix indicating repeated action in the past; God turned to Israel at the exodus and fed them in the desert and thereafter.

9 Interpreters generally speak of Hosea 11 as portraying YHWH as Israel's father; see, for example, Gerhard von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, 2 vols.; trans. D. M. G. Stalker (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1962–65), 2:181; Brueggemann, *Theology*, 246–48; most recently, Yisca Zimran, "The Prevalence and Purpose of the 'Assyria-Egypt' Motif in the Book of Hosea," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 46 (2021): 14. But the roles in Hosea 11 are not gender-specific, and it is possible that some of them, such as feeding, were more frequently maternal than paternal. Helen Schüngel-Straumann, "Gott als Mutter in Hos 11," *Theologische Quartalschrift* 166 (1987): 119–34, argues that the chapter portrays God as mother. Schüngel-Straumann maintains (128–131) that 9bα denies not God's human-ness but God's male-ness, and that God's decision in the chapter to prioritize a relationship over divine pride or prerogatives are typically feminine. At the very least, Schüngel-Straumann's analysis shows that the presentation of God in this text need not be read as exclusively paternal.

10 I read the beginning of the line as ישוב אל ארץ מצרים ואשור הוא מלכו; the word written as לא (to be read לו) belongs to the end of the previous statement, "I turned toward him and I fed him." Thus, the new stanza that begins with this poetic line describes punishment. One might object that verse 5, unlike most pericopes prophesying punishment, does not begin with על כן or a similar rhetorical marker. But the next verse is unquestionably a description of the doom, and it is not introduced by any form critical marker either. Either way, then, this poem contains a prediction of punishment without any of the usual markers. Such markers are less common in Hosea than they are in other prophets. The beginning of this line resembles Hosea in 9:3; see also 8:13. Cf. Ephraim's desire to rely on Assyria and Egypt (7:11, 12:2); that desire is ironically fulfilled in our verse, in 9:3, and in 8:13.

under a yoke,[11] though in fact God was feeding Israel (v. 4). Having rejected God to accept unreliable Egyptian and Assyrian aid, the nation will lose God's protection; it will experience invasion, followed by exile in Egypt and Assyria (vv. 5–6). The nation will wear a real yoke rather than a mistakenly imagined one, as verse 7 makes clear in its description of Israel's subjugation to the foreign empires.[12] In this stanza God experiences the most human of emotions: love which has turned to bitter disappointment and then to anger.

But as in Jeremiah 2:2, God cannot forget the love He felt when Israel was young. As we enter the third stanza, God asks Himself how He could destroy His people. He then announces that He will not in fact destroy Israel in spite of

---

11 The words ואהיה להם כמרימי על לחיהם must mean that the Israelites perceive God as hurting them. The phrase הרים על appears only here, making it difficult to be sure whether it means to take a yoke off (as Radak and Gustav Dalmann, *Arbeit und Sitte in Pal*ästina, 4 vols. [Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1928–42], 2:99–100, understand it) or to put one on. However, נשא על (Lam. 3:27) means to put one on, and על עלה עליה (Num. 19:2) describes an animal upon which a yoke has been put. Both phrases, like this passage's phrase, הרים על, refer to upward movement, which makes it probable that all three describe putting a yoke on. The words סור, פרק, and שבר are the Hebrew verbs for taking a yoke off. Here as elsewhere in Hosea God complains that the people perceived Him negatively when they should have recognized His kindness. Cf. 5:12–4.

12 MT reads וְאֶל־עַל יִקְרָאֻהוּ יַחַד לֹא יְרוֹמֵם. These few words are riddled with difficulties. עַל is not a noun and should not be the object of a preposition; the meaning of יחד in this context requires elucidation; and ירוֹמֵם, which should mean, "he will exalt," is problematic, because neither the subject nor the object of this transitive verb is specified. There are several ways of dealing with the first problem. Ibn Ezra and Radak maintain that עַל is equivalent to עליון and thus an epithet of YHWH. They suggest that various prophets (whom they found in verse 2) are the unnamed subject of the verb here. But no such epithet is known, and recourse to unidentified prophets as the verb's subject is unlikely. Francis Andersen and David Noel Freedman, *Hosea: A New Translation with Introduction, Notes, and Commentary* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1980), 586–87, suggests that עַל may be the name of another god, otherwise unattested in Israelite or ancient Near Eastern literature, to whom the people are called, which would mesh well with verse 2 if there were in fact a god with this name. Wolff suggests reading ואל בעל יקראו הוא יחד לא יְרִימֵם—"They call to Ba'al, but he will not raise them up." This is a very attractive understanding, since it fits well with verses 2–3. But what is the sense of יחד here? A further possibility is to vocalize עַל as עֹל, as do Targum, Aquila, Symmachus, and Vulgate (as well as Arnold Ehrlich, *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel* [Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1908–14], *ad loc.*, whose far-reaching emendation of whole the line is unlikely). If we read the *pôlāl* ירוּמָם ("to be lifted, to get up") rather than the MT's *pôlēl* ("to lift up, to exalt"), we may translate, "And together (יחד) they will call him to the yoke, and he will not get up." The word "they" refers to Egypt and Assyria, who enslave the Israelites exiled to those lands. This understanding finds support in Deuteronomy 28, which has many points of contact with Hosea 11 (see vv. 48, 66). The inability to get up is a frequent prophetic trope in descriptions of punishment (see Am. 5:2, Jer. 25: 27, and so forth). This reading leaves the consonantal text untouched, allows us to retain a normal meaning for יחד, and does not require us to import into this verse gods or epithets whose existence is dubious.