

THE CHARACTERISTIC RELIGIOUS TERMS IN DEUTERONOMY
AND THEIR INTERCONNECTIONS

by

Christian Land

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Divinity
of the University of Edinburgh in partial
fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy
Department of Old Testament and Semitic Languages

1959



P R E F A C E

The first chapter defines the task and limits of the present research. However, the main object considered here may be stated briefly. The approach differs from that of the hitherto known ones to the study of the literature of the Old Testament. Deuteronomy has been studied mainly as a legal code in the light of biblical criticism. Although this aspect is given due consideration in the present work, it is to be conceived of as secondary to the prophetic message contained in Deuteronomy and it surpasses the actual code. This prophetic message is contained in the thirty Deuteronomic terms and their respective phrases; They are as follows:

לחיים, יד, פדה, שם, אהב, שבע, בחר, בלית, גוי, עם, היום
(הזה), שמע, הלך, ירא, עשה, צוה, סור, בער, זכר, הקים
(קום), ארץ (אדמה), ברך, לע, תעבה, קללה, שמד, אבד, שוב, לחם, חסד.

In this research an attempt is made to demonstrate that the Deuteronomist has invested the terms listed above with a new hitherto unknown meaning. Furthermore, besides expressing a new lexical meaning, he is also propounding a distinct teaching in each one of these terms and their respective phrases.

Effort is also made to show that these terms are inter-related with each other organically, historically and theologically, forming a unique literary composition and containing the quintessence of the Deuteronomic message. His-

torically they throw light on the religious, political and economic situation of the then decimated Israel (Judah) during which period (we assume) Deuteronomy to have taken shape. Theologically, we are not primarily concerned with the religious state of Israel existing during the Deuteronomist's lifetime, but rather with his faith, his conception of Yahveh, his main concern and his cause for the promulgation of the message.

In addition to the discussion of the intrinsic elements of the terms listed above, consideration is given to the various interconnections which link them into one whole, the message of Deuteronomy. Such a demonstration will show that the heart and core of the message and its distinctiveness in being Deuteronomic does not lie in its being a legal code but in the newly formed characteristic Deuteronomic phraseology.

It is hoped that the present work may redirect the prevailing general tendency on the part of the Bible student and find the true message of Deuteronomy by allowing its preacher to speak in the light of his own belief and according to the aim for which he promulgated his message.

The translation of the quoted Scripture verses is the writer's own rendering. The occasional translitera-

tion of Hebrew words corresponds to the actual Hebrew pronunciation as used in Israeli and may sometimes differ slightly from that found in English textbooks. It should be emphasized here that the 'Appendix' does not constitute a part of the actual research itself. It is intended to be more of a clarification of the present writer's position with regard to biblical criticism and an explanation as to why he has taken it.

The present research has been a humble attempt to demonstrate how both scholarship and faith can work together; how the Word of God can be studied reverently without losing sight of true scientific research. Reverence may be said to result from faith, and scholarship from scientific study. We should not sacrifice the one for the other, but we must always remember that faith, being primary, is preeminent over scholarship. For it is only in faith that we receive the Bible as God's Word. Without faith it may be a good manual for anthropology or a collection of ancient writings, but not a guide of faith and life for the Christian. This unity of scholarship and faith may help, it is hoped, to bring unity, so much desired, within theological circles.

The present work represents the fruit of many years if not decades of labour. Yet with these efforts, it

would not have come to full completion, except for the patient and kind advice of my professor and friend, Doctor Norman W. Porteous, for the past few years. This is acknowledged with much gratitude as a small token of deep appreciation.

Christian Land

Philadelphia

September, 1959

T A B L E O F C O N T E N T S

PREFACE 11

TABLE OF CONTENTS. vi

CHAPTER I

DEFINITION, SCOPE AND PURPOSE OF THESIS

Characteristic Religious Terms in
Deuteronomy 1

Definition of Interconnections 10

Scope of Thesis 13

Purpose of Thesis. 23

CHAPTER II

THE DEUTERONOMIC TERMS AND THEIR PHRASES

The Leading Thoughts of the Deuteronomic
Message 26

The Deuteronomic Terms and Their Phrases 32

A Summary Message of the Deuteronomic
Terminology 39

Genuine Prophetic Message 42

CHAPTER III

THE DEUTERONOMIC CONCEPTION OF YAHVEH

Delimitations 56

Yahveh the Only God 61

Negative Assertions and Limitations. 71

CHAPTER IV

ELECTION AND THE COVENANT

Anthropomorphisms and Their Functions 85

Historical Review of Election. 90

The Reason and Purpose of Israel's
Election 94

The Significance of the Election and
the Covenant. 96

The Terminology of Election and the
Covenant 98

The Meaning of the Covenant 109

CHAPTER V

YAHVEH'S SOVEREIGNTY OVER ISRAEL

Yahveh the Sovereign of the Land	119
Yahveh the Sovereign of the Individual Israelite	126
Yahveh the Sovereign of Israel.	134
The Purpose of the Deuteronomic Theocracy	143

CHAPTER VI

THE DEUTERONOMIC THEOLOGY OF HISTORY

Deuteronomic History	148
Yahveh the Lord of History	154
The Deuteronomic Theology of Moral Retribution	158
The Deuteronomic Eschatological Teaching	169

CHAPTER VII

THE INTERCONNECTIONS OF TERMS AND PHRASES

The Nature and Function of the Textual Interconnections.	176
The Nature and Functions of the Historical Interconnections.	181
The Theological Interconnections: Their Nature and Function.	186
The Interconnections between the Terms and the Deuteronomic Code	195
The Stylistic Interconnections and Their Function	200

APPENDIX

DEUTERONOMY A BIBLICO-CRITICAL STUDY

Preface	206
The 'Message' in Which God Speaks to Man	215
Revelation: Reality, Idea, or Interpretation	228
Authorship and Date of Deuteronomy	235
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	245

CHAPTER I

DEFINITION, SCOPE AND PURPOSE OF THESIS

Characteristic Religious Terms In Deuteronomy

A 'Characteristic Religious Term in Deuteronomy' may be defined as a word used within a particular phrase which expresses a definite thought or action, and pertains to the biblical history of Israel as a theocratic nation in her covenant relation with Yahveh.¹

In the present work only those are considered to be 'characteristic religious terms' which exhibit the following distinguishing marks:

1. Terms which, combined with at least one more word, form a phrase expressing a single and specific

-
1. Lists of Deuteronomic phrases may be found in S. R. Driver's Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, pp. 99, ff.; and in his ICC Deuteronomy, pp. lxxviii, ff.; A. H. McNeile, Deuteronomy, Its Place in Revelation, p. 90, ff.; G. von Rad, Gottesvolk im Deuteronomium, pp. 5, ff. (5-19). G. T. Manley's list of phrases in his The Book of the Law, is but a reiteration of the phrases listed in the above-mentioned works, viewed from a different perspective. While the above-listed works include phrases which may be found in other biblical books, the present work is limited to such phrases (with their particular combination of words) as appear exclusively in Deuteronomy. However, some of the phrases listed here are not to be found in any of the works mentioned above.

lexical and theological meaning. In the former, it characterizes an individual style and composition; in the latter, it expresses a distinctive religious idea which forms the basis of one of the major elements of the Deuteronomic theology. For example גוי גדול "a great nation,"¹ expresses a specific lexical and theological meaning. Outside Deuteronomy it conveys the simple connotation "a great nation", and may refer to any nation whether it appears in singular or plural form.² In Deuteronomy, however, the phrase גוי גדול when found in singular form, always refers to Israel alone and to no other nation. In addition to this specific lexical meaning, it conveys to us a distinct theological idea: that a people has become a great nation through the favor and grace of Yahveh. Her greatness is not to be understood numerically but in a spiritual sense. Israel's covenant relationship with Yahveh elevated her above any other nation in that she was Yahveh's peculiarly treasured inheritance.³

1. Dt. 4:6, 7, 8; 26:5.

2. Plural: Dt. 4:38; 9:1; 11:23; Jos. 2:9; Jer. 50:9. Singular: Jer. 50:41. All refer to Gentile nations. See following footnote for indirect references to Israel, i.e., as the posterity of the patriarchs.

3. Dt. 4:20; 7:6; 9:26, 29; 14:2; 26:18. Even in the covenantal references to the patriarchs (Gen. 12:2; 18:18; 46:3.) the expression "a great nation" is to be understood numerically as in Gen 17:20.

2. Terms which are employed exclusively by the author of Deuteronomy. It is this unique phraseology that characterizes it as a "singularly well-marked style";¹ or, as D. C. Simpson observes: "His [Deuteronomic] style is absolutely new in Hebrew literature; it carries the reader with it, and holds him enthralled."²

3. Terms which differ from their usual and primary connotation. As is well known, each Hebrew word has an intrinsic meaning derived from its root. But the Deuteronomist, by employing these words in his phraseology, gives them an entirely new meaning.³ Their connotation is not figurative as might be the case in any other language, but takes on a new, hitherto unknown meaning. For example, the word nm "name," may be used figuratively as "reputation,"⁴ but the Deuteronomist invested it

1. C. B. Gray, A Critical Introduction to the Old Testament, p. 32.

2. Pentateuchal Criticism, p. 113.

3. Gerhard von Rad says: "Eine weitere, laengst erkannte formale Eigentuemlichkeit des Dt. liegt in seiner ausgiebigen, den Leser mitunter ermuedenden Verwendung ganz bestimmter Phrasen, von denen die meisten als eine genuine dt. Schoepfung zu gelten haben, von denen viele -- und das ist das Wichtigere -- auch inhaltlich auf ganz bestimmte, eben in Dt. lebendige Gedanken Rueckschluesse gestatten. Hier bietet sich uns nun ein nicht unguenstiger Weg zum Verstaendnis der tieferen Eigenart des Dt. dar." Das Gottesvolk in Deuteronomium, p. 3.

4. "Name": Dt. 5:11; 6:13; 7:24; 9:14; 10:8, 20; 12:3; 18:5, 7, 19, 20, 22; 21:5; 25:6, 7, 10; 28:10, 58; 29:19. "Reputation": 22:14, 19; 26:19.

with a meaning hitherto unknown as expressed in his phrase, לשכן שמו דו "to make His Name to dwell there" (viz., in the sanctuary).¹ By "making His Name to dwell there" is meant that "He is there Himself and has made the temple His sanctuary ... in a particular way."² It means that the glorious Presence of Yahveh is there; or as O. Grether puts it, "the manifestation of the hypostatic Being of Yahveh."³

4. The terms considered here appear at least three times in Deuteronomy, chapters I - XXX⁴, and convey the same meaning. It is obvious that the frequency of usage does not make it a Deuteronomic phrase. It is rather the coinage of such a phrase that makes it distinctively Deuteronomic, as pointed out above. The frequency of usage,

-
1. Or, with its equivalent דו שמו Dt. 12:5, 11, 21; 14:23; 14:24; 16:6, 11; 26:2.
 2. Th. C. Vriezen, An Outline of Old Testament Theology, p. 248. Also compare Emil Brunner, The Christian Doctrine of God, p. 120, ff.
 3. Name und Wort Gottes Im Alten Testament, p. 179.
 4. It is generally agreed by critics that the four closing chapters of Deuteronomy form a lengthy appendix consisting of several biographical narratives and poetical compositions loosely connected. H. Breit, in Die Predigt des Deuteronomisten also excludes the last four chapters for the reasons stated above, retaining, however, 31:1-13 as belonging to I - XXX. After much consideration, the present writer has decided in favor of the general opinion accepted by the critics excluding 31:1-13 in spite of some stylistic similarities and the Deuteronomic phraseology, particularly in 31:11-13.

however, as observed by S. R. Driver, gives evidence that the entire work, i.e. chapters I - XXX, is Deuteronomic. Driver says that "particular words and phrases, consisting sometimes of entire clauses, recur with extraordinary frequency, giving a distinctive colouring to every part of the work."¹

It should be added that in certain phrases the Deuteronomist may change (perhaps for eloquence's sake) some of the additional words combined with the term, while the phrase retains its connotation. Examples may be cited: לשום שמו שם "to put his name there," and its equivalent לשכן שמו שם "to make his name to dwell there"² -- or the phrase ויבחר בזרעם אחריהם "and he chose their descendants"³ and its equivalent בך בחר יהוה אלהיך "Yahveh thy God chose thee,"⁴ or both combined ויבחר בזרעם אחריהם

בכם "And he chose their descendants after them, namely you."⁵

5. Terms which are grouped around the covenant as its center (directly or indirectly). One of the most essential and influential ideas of the Deuteronomic

1. ICC, Deuteronomy, p. lxxvii.

2. With the word לשום : Dt. 12:5, 21; 14:24; with the word לשכן : Dt. 12:11; 14:23; 16:6, 11; 26:2.

3. Dt. 4:37.

4. Dt. 7:6, 7; 14:2.

5. Dt. 10:15.

teaching is that of the covenant theology. It traces the history of Israel from the events of its progenitors¹ through those of the Hebrew nation.² The distinctive idea of the covenantal relationship with Israel penetrated deeply into the thought of every Israelite and brought out their unique character as a people in union with a holy God. In this consciousness of Israel's peculiar relation to Yahveh was rooted her past and her present welfare, and in it lay her hope of future realization of that covenant. H. H. Rowley calls our attention to a significant fact:

"Every member of the Covenant people was called to consecrate himself in a real sense to God ... The call for universal consecration is implicit in the statement that Israel was called to be a kingdom of priests. Ex. 19:6. ... Moreover the great Deuteronomic word which Judaism has always cherished, which calls on every Israelite to love the Lord with every fibre of his being (Dt. 6:5),³ demands the spirit of consecration from all men."

-
1. Regarding Yahveh's love of the patriarchs, resulting in the election of their posterity: Dt. 4:37; 10:15. Regarding the patriarchal covenant: Dt. 4:31; 7:8, 8:18. Regarding Yahveh's promises of the land to the patriarchs and their posterity: Dt. 1:8; 6:10, 23; 7:13; 8:1; 11:9; 11:21. These instances are exclusively Deuteronomic phrases, though there are many more instances where the Deuteronomist refers to the patriarchs.
 2. Regarding its election: Dt. 7:6, 7; 14:2. Regarding its redemption (ransom) from the Egyptian bondage: Dt. 5:6; 5:15; 6:12; 7:8; 8:14; 9:26; 13:6-11; 15:15; 16:12; 21:8; 24:18, 22. Regarding their covenant with Yahveh: Dt. 4:13, 4:23, 31; 5:2, 3; 7:9, 12; 8:18; 9:9, 11, 15; 10:8; 28:69 (twice); 29:8, 11, 13, 20, 24.
 3. The Faith of Israel, p. 135.

R. L. Ottley remarks about the transformation of Israel's faith brought about by the covenant, "It was then the moral requirements involved in the covenant which formed the basis and distinctive mark of Israel's religion."¹

Israel's whole sphere of life, both public and private, pointed to or was guided by the covenant. Israel's land, its priestly institutions, its sanctuary with "the ark of the covenant,"² containing "the tablets of the covenant;"³ its holy feasts, its administration of justice, its charity toward fellow men were, all in all, covenantal obligations. As well observed by J. Pedersen:

"The covenant is the creator of all rights and duties, therefore it is identical with right and duty; even of the least privilege or the least duty the Israelite can say that it is the covenant, for the covenant is present in it."⁴

It is for this reason that every important teaching propounded by the Deuteronomist is centered within the covenant.

6. The terms which have Yahveh or Israel as their subjects. Although, as well pointed out by Th. C. Vriezen⁵ and H. H. Rowley,⁶ the covenant originated with Yahveh alone and does not represent a voluntary agreement between two parties, Israel is a partner in the sense that she has to comply with obligations which the cove-

1. Aspects of the Old Testament, p. 213.

2. Dt. 10:8; 31:9, 25, 26.

3. Dt. 9:9, 11, 15.

4. Israel, Its Life and Culture, vol. I, p. 309.

5. An Outline of Old Testament Theology, pp. 141, f.

6. The Faith of Israel, pp. 68, ff.

nant lays upon her. Hence the core of the Deuteronomic message states the conditions of the union between the two partners and the manner in which they are to fulfil their mutual obligations. It is therefore obvious that these phrases would be related (directly or indirectly) to either of these parties, Yahveh or Israel.

7. Terms which are of vital importance to the Deuteronomic message. As has already been shown tentatively in the preceding paragraphs, they constitute the heart of the Deuteronomic message. In the following chapters an attempt is made to demonstrate how these phrases convey not only the most vital teaching of the Old Testament, but they also supersede the legal code which takes on a new and vigorous form in the newly moulded Deuteronomic phraseology.¹ Its spiritual and moral depth and its ethical principles go above and beyond the mere legal code which, in most cases, is but a restatement of the laws found in Exodus, Leviticus, and, occasionally, in Numbers.² Sir James Frazer also observes, "Even new laws are seldom or never complete innovations; they nearly always rest upon and presuppose a basis of ex-

1. Cf. D. C. Simpson, Pentateuchal Criticism, pp. 112, ff.

2. S. R. Driver, An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, p. 73, ff.; also cf. his ICC Deuteronomy, pp. iv, ff.; A. H. McNeile, Deuteronomy Its Place in Revelation, pp. 86-89; R. H. Pfeiffer, Introduction to The Old Testament, p. 216, ff.

isting custom and public opinion which harmonizes more or less with the new laws, and have long silently prepared for their reception in the minds of the people."¹

8. Terms interrelated with each other organically, historically and theologically, forming a unique literary composition and containing the quintessence of the Deuteronomic message. Each phrase, although propounding a distinct teaching in itself, is an indivisible and integral part of the whole structure of the Deuteronomic teaching with the covenant theology as its center. The unconditional love and infinite grace of Yahveh towards Israel would not be evident except as effected in the election of Israel and the Exodus event. The covenant can be fully understood only when viewed as a culmination of the election and the Exodus event. The covenantal obligations can be rightly comprehended only in the light of Yahveh's attributes, will and purpose revealed in His historical acts within the life of His chosen and ransomed people Israel. This channel of God's revelation to man was to become His legacy to mankind. Thus, as these phrases are linked together organically, they form a whole literary composition; historically, they present a sequence of events which are the reali-

1. Folklore in the Old Testament, p. 350, f.

zation of Yahveh's revelation through Israel; and theologically, they interpret the significance of these events.

The above paragraphs outline briefly the meaning of the 'Characteristic Religious Terms in Deuteronomy.' Their classification, nature and content will be fully discussed in the following chapters.

Definition of "Interconnections"

By 'Interconnections' of the 'Characteristic Religious Terms in Deuteronomy,' described above, are to be understood such qualities which:

1. Link the words within a particular phrase, affecting the connotation of the term and limiting its linguistic and theological connotation to a single meaning. This has been demonstrated above with the term שׁוֹמֵר in the phrase

$\text{שׁוֹמֵר שְׁמוֹ לַיהוָה}$. Thus שׁוֹמֵר the usual meaning of which is "name" (or, in figurative speech, "reputation") had assumed a new and hitherto unknown meaning, i.e. "the glorious Presence of Yahveh."

Another example: אהב while still retaining the meaning "love," is not "love" as commonly understood by human beings.¹ In his phrase $\text{כִּי אֲהַבְךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ}$ the Deuterono-

1. Th. C. Vriezen has termed God's love as "faithful and holy love". Cf. Die Erwählung Israels nach dem Alten Testament, p. 108.

mist has invested it with a deep spiritual and sacred meaning. Human love springs, generally speaking, from egoistic motives as a desire for self-gratification, finding its realization in reciprocity. But the divine love of Yahveh for Israel is not motivated by reciprocity. For Yahveh does not stop loving even a decadent, apostate Israel.¹ Moreover, unlike mere human love, it is not a passion or condition due to external causes. It is rather a pure spiritual love not conditioned by any physical elements. For Yahveh's love to Israel was neither motivated because she was the greatest nation numerically nor because of any inherent nobility.² Thus the Deuteronomist invested the word אהב "love" with a new meaning, limiting it in his phrase כי אהבך יהוה אלהיך to the spiritual, unconditional, unmerited and divine love of Yahveh.³

2. ~~Unite~~ ^{should be united} These phrases into groups according to their coherence logically, historically, and theologically. It is obvious that, were such a phrase as כי אהבך יהוה אלהיך isolated by itself from any other text, we could have never arrived at its linguistic meaning or

1. Dt. 4:31; 30:3, ff.

2. Dt. 7:7, 8; 9:4, 5. The prophet Hosea has best illustrated that love of Yahveh towards Israel in chapters III & XI.

3. Compare Norman H. Snaithe, The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament, chapter VI, particularly pp. 134, ff.

its theological interpretation presented above. Other phrases connected with **כִּי אֶהְיֶה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ** so complement and clarify that we may arrive at sound conclusions. Thus this phrase is linked with the terms, **בָּחַר**, **בְּרִית**, **שָׁבַע**, **גָּוַל**, **גָּוַל**, **גָּוַל** and their phrases. Together they form a group of Deuteronomic phrases which convey to us the theology of election and the covenant, having the love of Yahveh and the divine purpose of revelation as their supreme motive. Other groups of phrases are linked in the same manner, each conveying a single major element of the theology propounded by the Deuteronomic preacher¹ as demonstrated in the following chapter.

3. Interrelate these groups of phrases, linking them into a literary composition, containing the quintessence of the Deuteronomic message.

The Deuteronomic teaching about the divine love, election and the covenant is but a part of its message. It is the foundation upon which the author bases his conception of Yahveh as the faithful God of Israel, the Sovereign of Israel, and One who fashions Israel's his-

1. Compare H. Breit, Die Predigt des Deuteronomisten, p. 30. Breit states that Deuteronomy is the first sermon that we possess and that the Deuteronomist preaches a prophetic message to his people. See p. 225 particularly where he states that the Isaianic prophecy gave way to a new prophetic school of preachers whose messages combined the priestly and prophetic ideals.

phrases ← ?
 ?

tory. Their division into groups and the particular terms belonging to each group are presented in the following chapter. The interconnections which link the groups into a whole are discussed in Chapter VII.

Scope of Thesis

The present work is limited to such terms as are fully described in the above listed definitions and discussed in the following chapter. In discussing these terms the following aspects are taken into consideration:

1. Etymology: finding, whenever possible, the primary and original meaning of terms and their later derivatives. One should be fully aware of the fact that etymology does not always provide us with an answer. There are various difficulties. Some of these terms have a long and involved history which makes the etymological origin of the word uncertain. Furthermore, some of these words may have a dual etymology with two opposite meanings which may be traced only with the help of cognate languages to obtain satisfactory results.¹

1. See Norman H. Snaith's treatment of $\tau\omicron\mu\eta$, in The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament, pp. 94, ff. The word $\tau\omicron\mu\eta$ has a dual etymology with two opposite meanings. Also compare Dt. 5:10; 7:9, 12 as over against Lev. 20:7; Job 6:14. They are differenti-

There is also the danger of making etymology some kind of mechanical tool, resorting to lexical aid or to concordances in search for words with the same radicals. First of all, it is important to remember the generally accepted hypothesis that the Hebrew words were originally biconsonantal and not trilateral;¹ hence one of the radicals may be a later addition and so bear a different connotation. Secondly, as stated above, some words may have a dual etymology, and it would be an error to treat them as having one and the same root. Nonetheless, in spite of these difficulties and shortcomings, etymology has been and will remain the first step in finding the original meaning of words for the lexicographer and

ated in S. Mandelkern's Concordance, p. 412, as well as in the Oxford Hebrew Lexicon, pp. 338, ff. The latter gives several etymological possibilities for the two kinds of TOP. Cf. also H. Breit, Die Predigt des Deuteronomisten, p. 148, f. See especially an article by Robert Gordis entitled, "Studies in Hebrew Roots of Contrasted Meanings," The Jewish Quarterly Review, vol. XXVII, July 1936, No. 1, pp. 33-58.

1. J. Olshausen, in Beitraege zur hebraeischen Sprache, pp. 15, ff.; G. R. Driver in Problem of the Hebrew Verbal System, pp. 3-8, 25; W. Frankenberg, in Der Organismus der semitischen Wortbildung, pp. 94, ff., and 124 are among those who hold that the Hebrew words were originally biconsonantal. It may also be added that, with the exception of the verb, we still have many biconsonantal words in the Hebrew language. Even the verb with its Pe-Yoed and Pe-Yav classes (which sometimes appear without the middle radical) may serve as additional support in favor of the original bilateral root theory.

the biblical scholar. When an etymological answer is impossible, as may sometimes be the case, parallel texts or words provide another resource used as an aid complementary to etymology, though they belong more properly to exegesis.

2. Exegesis: Seeking to interpret the terms and their phrases with the aid of comparative Semitic philology and by the means of parallel study of phrases and contexts. In trying to ascertain the true meaning of a term or phrase objectively, we let the Scripture speak for itself without the influence of traditional interpretation. It becomes necessary to project oneself into the mind and feeling of the Deuteronomic preacher, and so visualize his times and circumstances as to receive and interpret his message consonant with his original motives and aims.¹

3. Textual criticism is taken into consideration only when other texts offer the terms and phrases considered here in a variation from their version in the Massoretic Text upon which the present research is based. Although the Massoretic Text is accepted as the most

1. Compare Th. C. Vreizen, An Outline of Old Testament Theology, pp. 106, ff.

trustworthy,¹ a comparative study is made of the Samaritan Pentateuch, the Septuagint, the Peshito and the Targum.

These variations are not always of great significance. They may be but a correction of a grammatical form due, perhaps, to scribal error.² But there are also variations which are of supreme importance, such as

כִּי יְהוָה הוּא הָאֱלֹהִים אִין עוֹד מַלְבֹּדוּ. The theological implication of the variation offered in the Septuagint differs considerably from the Massoretic Text. The latter should be accepted as correct, as is demonstrated in chapter III.

The English translations of the Hebrew text are the present writer's own rendering, based on a comparative study of the Authorized and American Standard Versions, James Moffatt's, E. J. Goodspeed's, and Isaac Leeser's

-
1. It is the opinion of modern scholarship today. Cf. H. H. Rowley, Editor, The Old Testament and Modern Study, pp. 238, ff. See particularly, p. 245. "The reputation of the Massoretic Text today stands deservedly high," says D. W. Thomas in his article, "The Language of the Old Testament" in The Bible Today, Eyre & Spottiswoode, London. Also in the same work see article by B. J. Roberts, "The Old Testament Hebrew Text," pp. 22-27.
 2. Dt. 4:37, the MT has the singular יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ while all other versions have correctly used the plural. Compare critical footnotes in Biblia Hebraica, R. Kittel, et al. p. 270, which notes that the same phrase is correctly stated in MT, in 10:15.
 3. Dt. 4:35, 39; 7:9.

(Hebrew Publishing Company) modern translations.

4. Archaeology, because of the nature of the present work, has a rather limited application here. It serves as a linguistic aid in offering some help in the comparative Semitic philology employed in the present work. Particular reference is made here to the Ras-Shamra tablets,¹ written in the Ugaritic language, a Canaanite dialect akin to the pre-Mosaic Hebrew and belonging to the north-west branch of Semitic languages.²

Also the latest discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls has helped many to take a more definite stand for the trustworthiness of the Massoretic Text. Even when the latter shows minor variations, the text on the whole is identical with that of the Dead Sea Scrolls' records.³

Likewise, some of the contents of the Elephantine papyri may serve as evidence that the Deuteronomist does not mean centralization, but purity of worship. S. R.

-
1. Cf. John Gray, The Legacy of Canaan, particularly ch. VI (pp. 189, ff.) where a comparative study is made of "the Ugaritic literature and the Old Testament in vocabulary, imagery, and literary style and form". (p. 189).
 2. W. F. Albright, From Stone Age to Christianity, p. 39. The tablets are also of some theological value as they throw light on the worship of the Canaanite people and their resemblance to that of the Israelite. This particular aspect is brought out by J. W. Jack, The Ras-Shamra Tablets, and C. H. Gordon, Ugaritic Literature.
 3. H. H. Rowley, Editor, The Old Testament and Modern Study, p. XXV, f.

Driver contends that "the Jews of Elephantine did not feel themselves bound by the law of a single sanctuary, so strongly insisted on by the writer of Deuteronomy and accepted as an unquestioned principle in the priestly sections of the Pentateuch."¹

It may be argued, however, that the temple mentioned in the Elephantine Papyri met the Deuteronomic requirement $\text{DW } \text{WDW } \text{D}^{\text{W}}\text{L}$ for it was "the Temple of God Yahu" (i.e. Yahveh). It may therefore be concluded that it was a proper place of worship, as long as the worship itself and the sacrifices were not syncretistic.

In fact, the present writer is inclined to think of the Elephantine Papyri as a monumental document witnessing to the worship of Yahveh in a Temple outside Palestine, hence attributing to Yahvism a true monotheistic conception as opposed to those religions of other nations whose worship was confined to gods of their own territories and localities.²

Of historical significance and especially relevant to the present research are the Annals of Sennacherib.³

-
1. Modern Research as Illustrating the Bible, p. 30.
 2. See M. Jastrow, Jr., The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria, p. 49. See also W. Robertson Smith, The Religion of the Semites, p. 35, f.
 3. D. Winton Thomas, Editor, Documents from Old Testament Times, p. 64, ff.

They throw light on the political and economical situation of the decimated Israel (Judah), during which period Deuteronomy took shape.

5. Theology: discussion of the theology of the Deuteronomist in his four major teachings:

a) We are not here primarily concerned with the religious state of Israel existing during the Deuteronomist's lifetime, but rather with the faith of the Deuteronomist or his conception of Yahveh. His message reveals to us his personal conviction and belief in Yahveh and rooted in it are the following three major elements of the Deuteronomic theology:

b) The theology of election and the covenant. He states the motives for the election of Israel and interprets the sequence of events preceding and leading to the covenant between Yahveh and Israel.

c) The sovereignty of Yahveh. Here the Deuteronomist states clearly the implications and the results of the covenantal relationship between Yahveh and Israel. The major part of his sermons is devoted to it.

d) The Deuteronomic theology of history. To the Deuteronomist all history is religious history. He did not arrive at this theology of history by philosophical speculations, but it has been intrinsic in the nature

of the Deuteronomist and of the Israelite in general to conceive of Yahveh as the One who fashions history and historical events as His planned acts.¹

6. Literary form: Discussion of the literary form of Deuteronomy, I - XXX, its structure, its unique style as expressed in the newly coined terms and phrases. Fullest consideration is also given to the interconnections between phrases and groups of phrases, by demonstrating how they are linked together as a literary composition and how they serve as an exposition of Deuteronomic theology.

7. Appendix. As may be observed, the present writer does not include in his research the aspect of Higher or Historical Criticism. Important as it may be, it could not be included here because this field constitutes an extensive branch of biblical research in itself, and is not directly related to the subject of the present work.

However, to eliminate any sense of incompleteness, the present writer clarifies his position with regard to authorship and date of Deuteronomy chapters I - XXX in

1. Compare B. W. Anderson, Understanding the Old Testament pp. 95 and 189, f. See also J. Strahan, God in History, pp. 14, ff. See also W. Eichrodt, Man in the Old Testament p. 24, ff. The most helpful book in this field is C. R. North's The Old Testament Interpretation of History, where the various periods and their several interpretations are considered concisely.

the form of an appendix. In expressing his opinion as to the possible date and authorship, the present writer has chosen a way of his own. The criteria used here are based mainly on internal evidence. They are the Deuteronomic language and style and a comparative study of parallel teachings of Hosea, Amos, Isaiah and Micah with those of the Deuteronomic preacher. The criterion of centralization of worship based on כִּי אֵין בְּמִקְוֹם אֶחָד (so much used by critics as a corner stone) may be abolished on purely scientific interpretation of the above quoted passage.¹ The supposed opposition between law and prophet, and prophet and priest, could be shown to be non-existent. The Law is the Word of God as much as that of the prophet, and, as A. B. Davidson says, "Prophetism is but a development of Mosaism on one side; but it is a distinct development and a literary development."² Or, as Th. C. Vriezen says, "Fundamentally prophecy is in complete agreement

-
1. Dt. 12:14. This has already been refuted by A. C. Welch, The Code of Deuteronomy, p. 48, f., and by T. Oestreicher, Das Deuteronomische Grundgesetz, p. 103, f. See also Keil & Delitzsch, Deuteronomy, at 12:14. It should be added that each of the above mentioned has an independent theory.
 2. The Theology of the Old Testament, p. 20. See also H. Breit, Die Predigt des Deuteronomisten, p. 30, f., and A. Westphal & C. duPontet, The Law and the Prophet, p. 306.

with the essence of Yahvism".¹ And the priests were no mere ritual slaughterers as some critics would have them to be; they were media of revelation, custodians of the sacred tradition, instructors of the Torah, appointed by Yahveh to give spiritual guidance to the people. It was only when the priest failed or was not influential enough that the prophet stepped in as Yahveh's mouthpiece.² The supposed antagonism of the eighth century prophets to the cult is discussed later, and it is shown that they were not against the cult per se, but first against apostasy, then against using the cult as a robe to cover their injustice and immorality, and further, against syncretism.³

The Deuteronomic message is thus no compromise but a true presentation of the Mosaic teachings, where both priest and prophet united together are complementary in their respective services to Yahveh.⁴ It is mainly for this reason that the Deuteronomist makes Moses to speak

-
1. An Outline of Old Testament Theology, p. 259.
 2. H. H. Rowley, The Faith of Israel, p. 37 & 138. See also H. H. Rowley, Editor, The Old Testament and Modern Study, p. XXV.
 3. J. M. P. Smith says: "A religion without ritual would have been practically inconceivable to the Hebrew mind, and the prophets never ceased to be Hebrews." Quoted by J. E. McFadyen, The Message of Israel, p. 153.
 4. Compare H. Breit, Die Predigt des Deuteronomisten, p. 223, ff.

in his addresses to the people.¹ As in the time of Moses as well "as this day"² they are Yahveh's appointed leaders of Israel chosen by Him³ to watch over Israel safeguarding their compliance with the covenantal obligations.⁴

Purpose of Thesis

1. As already stated in the subject title, it is the purpose of the present work to discuss the Deuteronomic terminology and phraseology from a linguistic and stylistic standpoint.

2. To discuss the intrinsic elements by which these various terms and phrases are interconnected.

-
1. Dt. 1:1, 3, 5; 4:44, 45; 5:1; 27:1, 9, 11; 28:69; 29:1.
 2. Dt. 2:30; 4:20, 28; 6:24; 10:15; 9:27. (with היום הזה) The Deuteronomist uses also the expression היום הזה on numerous other occasions to express the timelessness or the perpetuity of the covenant. He wants to impress upon the mind of the hearer its actuality today as in Moses' time. Perhaps a definite reference to the unity of spirit of both prophet and priest as guardians of Yahveh's covenant may be found in Dt. 27:9: "And Moses with the priests, the Levites, spoke unto all Israel, saying: Be attentive and hearken, O Israel! This day art thou become a people unto Yahveh thy God. Thou shalt therefore hearken to the voice of Yahveh thy God, and do his commandments and his statutes, which I command thee this day." Compare also v. 14. See also positions of authority as God's representatives held by both: Dt. 17:8-12; 18:14-19.
 3. Dt. 10:8; 18:5, 15, 18.
 4. Dt. 17:12; 18:18, 19. W. H. Bennett gives a good description of the functions of both priest and prophet in his The Books of Chronicles, pp. 221-269. Although this description is to represent the chronicler's viewpoint, they are worth our consideration.

3. To show that the Deuteronomic phrases are not only characteristic from a literary viewpoint, but that they also represent the major elements of the Deuteronomic theology.

4. To set forth evidence in favor of the opinion that Deuteronomy I - XXX is a single literary composition.

5. Not taking sides involved in either literary criticism or different schools of Old Testament theology, this work is to present, as much as possible, an objective view of the contents of the Deuteronomic message, the belief of its preacher and the urgency which called for its promulgation.

6. To demonstrate that the heart and core of the message and its distinctiveness of being Deuteronomic does not lie in its code but in the newly formed characteristic Deuteronomic phraseology.

7. To explain the uniqueness of Deuteronomy within the framework of biblical literature, both as a literary composition and as a religious message.

It is hoped that the present work may redirect the prevailing general attitude on the part of Bible students of putting all emphasis on Literary Criticism. Instead, the present work aims to encourage the student to find the true message of the Old Testament, the message of

Deuteronomy in particular, by allowing the Deuteronomic preacher to speak in the light of the Deuteronomist's own belief according to that aim which called for its promulgation.¹

-
1. "It is the object of the Bible to teach religion -- practical religion -- what is of primary importance is its value as a religious volume. The purely historical and literary problems should therefore be regarded as matters of secondary importance. These latter are valuable for the elucidation of the "human side" of the Bible and as such must not be ignored." R. Kittel, The Scientific Study of the Old Testament, p. 282, f. See also a very important statement by Th. C. Vriezen, An Outline of Old Testament Theology, p. 89. To Deuteronomy in the light of Historical Criticism, H. Breit has this to say: "Man suchte den literarischen Werdegang des Dt. zu rekonstruieren analog dem aeußeren Gang der Volksgeschichte. Eine Fuelle von Hypothesen bildete den Ansatzpunkt solcher Arbeiten, wobei keine endgueltig befriedigen konnte. Sie verbauten dem Forscher den Weg zum Verstaendnis des Inhalts." H. Breit, Die Predigt des Deuteronomisten, p. 15. Compare also Max Loehr, Das Deuteronomium, p. 46.

CHAPTER II

THE DEUTERONOMIC TERMS AND THEIR PHRASES

The Leading Thoughts of the Deuteronomic Message

While in its structure Deuteronomy, chapters I - XXX, may be loosely subdivided into three discourses: 1:1-4:49; 5:1-28:69; and 29:1-30:20, each beginning with וַיִּקְרָא מֹשֶׁה אֶל כָּל יִשְׂרָאֵל¹, a close analysis of its contents will reveal that such a division seems to be a superficial one. The simple reason for such a statement would be the fact that the Deuteronomist does not follow any particular chronological order or logical sequence in the presentation of his message. He is primarily a preacher² addressing an assembly of laymen,³ and has as his only aim to influence and to compel his audience to take the desired action.

The present writer finds it more correct to discuss the Deuteronomic message independent of chapter sequence.

-
1. "And Moses called all Israel." The first address has וַיִּקְרָא instead of וַיִּשְׁמָע.
 2. As already mentioned, H. Breit rightly calls the author of Deuteronomy a "preacher". Die Predigt des Deuteronomisten, p. 29, f. Compare also G. v. Rad, Studies in Deuteronomy, p. 1, ff. "It is law preached," says v. Rad, p. 16.
 3. Max Loehr, A History of Religion in the Old Testament, p. 111.

Thus all three verses quoted above contain the same phrase emphasizing the fact that Yahveh is not only God, but the only God.¹ This is the foremost teaching of the Deuteronomist and constitutes the foundation upon which the following three major teachings are based.

2. In his second major teaching the Deuteronomist describes the status of Israel in relation to Yahveh and upon what this is based. This theology is set forth in a twofold proposition and expressed in the following two phrases:

(א) כי אהב את אבותיך ויבחר בזרעם אחריהם
(ב) למען הקים אתך לו לעם והוא יהיה לך לאלהים

a) "And, therefore, because he loved thy fathers, he chose their descendants after them"

"But on account of Yahveh's love for you"

"Yet only upon your fathers set Yahveh his heart to love them; he chose, therefore, their descendants after them"

"Because Yahveh thy God loved thee."²

b) "Thou hast this day avowed Yahveh to be thy God ... and Yahveh avowed thee this day to be unto him a peculiarly-treasured people, as he hath spoken unto thee."

"Yahveh will constitute thee unto himself as a holy people, as he hath sworn unto thee...."

1. Further discussion of each of these major elements of the Deuteronomic theology is to be found in the respective chapters dealing with each of these major teachings and includes complementary terms and phrases which elucidate the position the Deuteronomist has taken.

2. Dt. 4:37; 7:8; 10:15; 23:6.

"In order to constitute thee this day unto himself for a people, and that he may be unto thee a God as he hath spoken unto thee...."¹

Here again we have slight variations, but the phrases retain the same meaning. The verses cited above contain first the motive upon which Israel's status in relation to Yahveh is founded, and secondly describe her position and her role in the family of nations, as affected by such relationship.

3. In his third major teaching, the Deuteronomist explains the conditions of the covenant relation to be fulfilled by Israel. Such obligations as are required of Israel are expressed in the phrase: וְאָהַבְתָּ אֱתֵי יְהוָה
אֱלֹהֶיךָ בְּכָל לִבְבְּךָ וּבְכָל נַפְשְׁךָ וּבְכָל מַאֲדְךָ The following verses contain that phrase with slight variations:

"And thou shalt love Yahveh thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might."

"And now, Israel, what doth Yahveh thy God require of thee but to fear Yahveh thy God, to walk in all his ways, and to love him, and to serve Yahveh thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul."

"...to love Yahveh thy God, and to serve him with all your heart and with all your soul."

"For Yahveh your God testeth you, to know whether you indeed love Yahveh your God with all your heart and with all your soul."

"...to love Yahveh thy God with all your heart and with all your soul, in order that thou mayest live."²

1. Dt. 26:17, 18; 28:9; 29:12.

2. Dt. 6:5; 10:12; 11:13; 13:14; 30:6.

Israel's main obligation lay in her reciprocation of Yahveh's love towards her. If love of heart, mind and soul be her motive, she will consequently do all to please Yahveh.

4. In his fourth major teaching, the Deuteronomist explains that Israel's existence and her wellbeing depend solely upon Yahveh; secondly, that Yahveh, who is the Author of their prosperity, is a faithful God, keeping His covenant, and exercising loving-kindness to both Israel and her ancestors. This twofold proposition is expressed in the following two characteristic phrases:

(א) שֶׁמֶר הַבְּרִית וְהַחֶסֶד

(ב) לִמְעַן הַקִּים אֶת בְּרִיתוֹ אֲשֶׁר נִשְׁבַּע לֵאבוֹתָיִךְ

Here again we have slight variations, but the phrase retains the same meaning. The verses cited below state first the fact that Israel's existence and wellbeing depends wholly on Yahveh. Secondly, they describe Yahveh as a faithful God, carrying out His promises given to the patriarchs as well as showing loving-kindness in all His acts on behalf of Israel.

- a) "Because he keepeth the oath which he swore to your fathers, hath Yahveh brought you out with a mighty hand, and redeemed you from the house of bond-men, from the hand of Pharaoh the king of Egypt."

"Know, then, that Yahveh thy God, he is the God the faithful God who keepeth the Covenant and

"exercises loving-kindness unto those who fear him and who keep his commandments for a thousand generations."

"Yahveh thy God will keep unto thee the covenant and exercise loving-kindness which he swore to thy fathers."¹

- b) "For a merciful God is Yahveh thy God, he will not forsake thee, nor destroy thee; and he will not forget the covenant of thy fathers which he hath sworn unto them."

"Remember thus Yahveh thy God: for it is he who giveth you the power of gaining wealth; in order that he might fulfil the covenant which he swore unto thy fathers."

"Not for thy righteousness, nor for the uprightness of thy heart, dost thou go in to possess their land; but for the wickedness of these nations doth Yahveh thy God drive them out from before thee, and in order that he may fulfil the word which Yahveh swore to thy fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob."²

As may be observed, some of these elements a) and b) are intermingled here. We also find some part of a phrase that does not exactly belong to this group propounding the Deuteronomic theology of history. However, it is very much the style of Deuteronomy and one of the ways by which the Deuteronomist interconnects these phrases which makes exclusion of such parts impossible. He has linked them organically into a literary composition containing the theological quintessence of the Deuteronomic message.

1. Dt. 7:8, 9, 12.

2. Dt. 4:31; 8:18; 9:5.

These four leading thoughts or major elements of the Deuteronomic theology represent the four divisions of his message, not according to chapter sequence but in accordance with the teachings contained in these terms and phrases.

The Deuteronomic Terms and Their Phrases

The phrases introduced above are only those which represent the leading thoughts of the Deuteronomist. Each of these major elements of the Deuteronomic theology is supported by a number of additional terms and phrases, forming four groups, each conveying a single, vital teaching of the Deuteronomic preacher. They are conveniently listed here under the following headings (titles):

1. The Deuteronomic Conception of Yahveh

their phrases:

the terms:

- 1) "That Yahveh He is the God, there is none else (besides Him)."¹

כי יהוה הוא האלהים אין עוד (מלבדו)

אלהים

- 2) "And Yahveh brought us out of Egypt with a mighty hand and with an outstretched arm, and with great terror, and with signs and with wonders."²

1. Dt. 4:35, 39; 7:9.

2. Dt. 4:34; (5:15); 7:19; (11:2); 26:8.

ויוצאנו יהוה אלהינו ממצרים ביד חזקה ובורע
 נטויה ובמארה גדול ובאתוח ובמפתים

3) "And He redeemed you out of the house
 of bond-men."¹
 ויפדך מבית עבדים (ממצרים) פדה

4) "To make (cause) His name to dwell
 there; to put His name there."²
 לשכן שמו שם; לשום שמו שם שם

2. The Deuteronomic Theology of Election and Covenant.

their phrases:

the terms:

- 5a) "for he loved your fathers";
 because Yahveh thy God loved
 thee.³
 כי אהב את אבותיך; כי אהבך יהוה אלהיך אהב
- 6) "The covenant of your fathers which
 he swore to them."⁴
 את בריית אבותיך אשר נשבע להם שבע
- 7) "And he chose their descendants
 after them." "Yahveh thy God chose
 thee."⁵
 ויבחר בזרעו אחריו (בזרעם אחריהם) בחר
 בך בחר יהוה אלהיך

1. Dt. 7:8; 9:26; 13:6; 24:18. This phrase is to be found only in Micah 6:4.
 2. Dt. 12:5, 21; 14:24; -- 12:11; 14:23; 16:2, 6, 11; 26:2.
 3. Dt. 4:37; 7:8; 10:15; 23:6.
 4. Dt. 4:31; 7:8; 8:18.
 5. Dt. 4:37; 7:6, 7; 10:15; 14:2.

3. Yahveh's Sovereignty over Israel.

their phrases:the terms;

- 5b) "And thou shalt love Yahveh thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul and with all thy might."¹

ואהבת את יהוה אלהיך בכל לבבך ובכל נפשך
ובכל מאדך

אהב

- 12) "And thou wilt listen to the voice of Yahveh thy God and observe to do."²

ושמעת בקול יהוה אלהיך לשמע ולעשות

שמע

- 13) "To walk in his ways to fear (to love) him (and to cling to him)."³

ללכת בדרכיו ליראה (לאהבה) אתו (ולדבקה בו)

הלך

- 14) "In order that thou mayest learn to fear Yahveh thy God (all the days)."⁴

למען תלמד ליראה את יהוה אלהיך (כל הימים)

ירא

"And all Israel shall listen and fear and shall not...."⁵

וכל ישראל ישמעו ויראו ואלא ...

-
1. Dt. 6:5; 10:12; 11:13; 13:14; 30:6.
2. Dt. 13:5, 19; 15:5; 26:14, 17; 27:10; 28:1, 2; 28:15, 45; 30:8, 10.
3. Dt. 8:6; 10:12; 11:22; 19:9; 30:16.
4. Dt. 4:10; 14:23; 17:19.
5. Dt. 13:12; 17:13; 19:20.

- 15) "And thou shalt do what is (good and) right in the eyes of Yahveh (thy God)."¹

ועשיה (הטוב ו-) הישר בעיני יהוה (אלהיך) עשה

- 16) "The commandment(s) the statutes, and the judgements which Javeh thy God commands thee."²

את המצוה (-ת) החקים והמשפטים אשר צוה יהוה אלהיך (-כם) צוה

- 17) "Thou shalt not turn aside from ...neither to the right nor to the left."³

לא תסור מן (מ-...) ימין ושמאל סור

- 18) "And thou shalt eradicate the evil from your midst (from Israel's midst)."⁴

ובעתה הרע מקרבך (מישראל) בער

- 19) "And thou shalt remember that thou wast a bond-man in the land of Egypt."⁵

וזכרת כי עבד היית בארץ מצרים זכר

4. The Deuteronomic Theology of History.

their phrases:

the terms:

-
1. Dt. 6:18; 12:25, 28; 13:19; 21:19. This phrase occurs also in Kings and Chronicles but without the combination of
 2. Dt. 4:40; 5:31; 6:1; 7:11; 8:11; 10:13; 28:15, 45; 30:16.
 3. Dt. 17:11, 20; 28:14.
 4. Dt. 13:6; 17:7, 12; 19:19; 21:21; 21:24; 24:7.
 5. Dt. 5:15; 15:15; 16:12; 24:18, 22.

- 20) "Who keeps the covenant and exercises loving-kindness (unto those who love him and keep his commandments) for a thousand generations."¹

חסד שמר (לא ישכח) הברית והחסד (לאהביו)
ולשמרי מצותיו) לאלף דור

- 21) "In order that he may fulfil his covenant (oath) which he swore unto thy fathers"²

הקים (קום) למען הקים את (השבעה) בריתו אשר נשבע
לאבתיך

- 22) "The land which he swore unto thy (our, their) fathers."³

ארץ (אדמה) את הארץ אשר נשבע לאבתיך (-נו, -כם)

- 23) "Yahveh thy God (will) bless (has blessed) thee in every work (acquisition) of thy hand."⁴

ברך יהוה אלהיך (י) ברכך בכל מעשה (יך) ידך
ובכל משלח ידך

- 24) "And you will do that which is evil in the eyes of Yahveh thy God to provoke his anger (to transgress the covenantal laws)."⁵

רע ועשיחם הרע בעיני יהוה אלהיך להכעיסו
(לעבר בריתו)

1. Dt. 7:8, 9, 12.

2. Dt. 4:31; 8:18; 9:5.

3. Dt. 1:8; 6:10, 23; 7:13; 8:1; 11:9, 21.

4. Dt. 2:7; 14:29; 15:10; 23:21; 24:10; 28:8, 12.

5. Dt. 4:25; 9:18; 17:2. We may find the phrase in other parts of Deuteronomic literature, but without the particular combination of לעבר בריתו or להכעיסו.

- 25) "It is an abomination to Yahveh thy God."¹
 חעבה יהוה (אלהיך) חעבה
- 26) "All these curses will come upon thee and overtake thee."²
 ובאו עליך כל הקללות האלה והשיגור קללה
- 27) "And Yahveh was angry with you to destroy you."³ "He will send (or cause otherwise to come) upon you until thou be destroyed."⁴
 ויחאנף (קצף, אפר, ישיש) יהוה להשמיד אהכם שמד
 ישלח (יתן, ישא, יעלם) עלך (בך) ... עד השמך
- 28) "I testify against you that you will surely perish."⁵
 העידתי בכם היום כי אבד האבדון אבד
- 29) "Then thou wilt return to Yahveh thy God and listen to his voice."⁶
 ושבת עד יהוה אלהיך ושמע בקולו שוב
- 30) "And he will have mercy upon thee... as he swore unto thy fathers."⁷
 ורחםך ... כאשר נשבע לאבותיך רחם

It should be said of the terms and phrases that such a division into four groups is only approximate. There are some phrases which would fit into two or more groups and a decision had to be made as to which group would be

1. Dt. 7:25; 17:1; 18:12; 22:5.
 2. Dt. 28:15, 45; 29:26.
 3. Dt. 9:8, 19, 25; 28:63.
 4. Dt. 28:20, 24, 45, 61.
 5. Dt. 4:26; 8:19; 30:18.
 6. Dt. 4:30; 30:2, 8, 10.
 7. Dt. (4:31); 13:18; 30:3.

most appropriate. In addition, the Deuteronomist often interconnects and links two or more phrases within one verse, a dominant and vital characteristic of his parenthesis, which makes it rather difficult to decide upon a definite grouping of such a term. However, for the sake of better orientation, a line had to be drawn somewhere, and the one presented here seems to be as nearly correct as possible.

Also all phrases are exclusively Deuteronomic unless otherwise stated in the footnotes. We may find similar phrases in other parts of Deuteronomic literature, but not with the combination of words listed here.

A Summary Message of the Deuteronomic Terminology

The terms and phrases listed above contain the heart and core of the Deuteronomic message. In fact, this is the part which is genuinely Deuteronomic for the legal code itself is, in most cases, a reiteration of the Laws found from Exodus to Numbers.¹

The Deuteronomic preacher communicated to his

1. It has already been mentioned in the first chapter. See S. R. Driver, An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, pp. 73, ff.; also by the same author, ICC Deuteronomy, pp. iv, ff. Also, G. B. Gray, A Critical Introduction to the Old Testament, p. 42, f.; A. H. McNeile, Deuteronomy Its Place in Revelation, pp. 86-89.

audience his knowledge of Yahveh. "Your God, Yahveh," he proclaims, "is the only God and there is none besides Him." His almighty power has given full proof of that. For He delivered Israel out of Egypt with a mighty hand and with His outstretched arm, with great terror, with signs and wonders.

Yahveh is also Israel's Redeemer for He redeemed her out of the house of bond-men. By redeeming Israel, He also proved to be a God of faithfulness in keeping his covenant made with her patriarchs and in exercising the loving-kindness promised to them.

Moreover, He loved the patriarchs and their descendants, Israel. He therefore elected Israel to be a great nation, a holy nation, and a peculiarly treasured people unto Him out of all peoples on the earth. Out of the same motive, i.e., divine love, He made an ever-restorable¹ covenant with Israel in order that He may

1. The covenant is ever-restorable through renewed obedience for the election of Israel is irrevocable. This is well summarised in Th. C. Vriezen's conclusive statement: "Die Verwerfung ist nie ein theologischer Ausdruck geworden; sie bleibt immer der Erwählung gaenzlich untergeordnet, wie der Zorn Gottes seiner heiligen Liebe. Und dies alles ist voellig in Uebereinstimmung mit dem Gottesglauben Israels, denn Jahwe ist ihm im Grunde nur bekannt geworden als der Gott der heiligen, treuen Liebe." (Die Erwählung Israels nach dem Alten Testaments, p. 108.) It would be correct to say that the covenant, although theoretically revocable was practically irrevocable.

constitute her as that great and holy nation, and that peculiarly treasured people; while at the same time and by the same covenant, Israel is to avow Yahveh as her only God. Such privileges bestowed upon Israel in elevating and honoring her above other nations also involved obligations. Israel was to reciprocate Yahveh's love by loving him with all her heart, soul, and might. She must listen to the voice of Yahveh and observe to do what is required of her and walk in His ways. She must also learn to reverence (fear) Yahveh and do what is right in His sight, by keeping His commandments, statutes and judgements and not to turn away (swerve) from them, either to the right or to the left. Not only is this an individual obligation, but Israel, being a corporate personality,¹ must also be sure in case of apostasy or any other evil deeds, to stand up for Yahveh and eradicate every evil from her midst. All this Israel must do out of gratitude to Yahveh, remembering that she was enslaved in the land of Egypt.

For complying with these covenantal obligations, Israel is given the land which Yahveh promised to her

1. H. W. Robinson, The Cross in the Old Testament, pp. 76, ff. H. H. Rowley, Editor, The Old Testament and Modern Study, pp. 307, 333, f. Also H. H. Rowley, The Faith of Israel, pp. 99, ff.

forefathers. He is also blessing her in every area of life and in all her undertakings. On the other hand, if Israel will do what is evil in the sight of Yahveh or what is an abomination unto Him, all the curses (Yahveh's) will come upon her and she will be destroyed until she utterly perishes for provoking Yahveh to anger. However, if Israel repents and turns wholeheartedly to Yahveh, He will have mercy upon her and reinstate her former privileged status in the family of nations.

The above synopsis is the genuine Deuteronomic message and is conveyed wholly in the characteristic thirty terms and phrases listed above.

The Deuteronomic writer, being primarily a prophetic preacher, did not narrowly confine himself to legal matters with which he links and interweaves his message. He is rather setting forth a proclamation of Israel's faith which includes both the acts of Yahveh and the requirements that are binding upon those whom He has chosen, redeemed and established as a people uniquely treasured by Him.

Genuine Prophetic Message

Some may indeed question whether these Deuteronomic phrases combined together in the above synopsis actually

constitute the heart of the Deuteronomic message. The first and most obvious objection would be that it does not represent the actual Deuteronomic code as contained in chapters XII - XXVI. This was considered by J. Wellhausen¹ and is still considered by many of his followers as the kernel of the Deuteronomic message and the original "Book of the Law" upon which the Josianic reform was based. It would, however, be correct to state that, in spite of the absence of the seventy-nine laws contained in chapters XII - XXVI and the several laws dispersedly placed in various chapters, the above formulated phrases contain something which far surpasses the actual Deuteronomic legislation.²

The Deuteronomist is not so much concerned with the letter of the law as with the spirit motivating compliance with the law: the attitude of the heart and the desire of the soul. He is emphasizing motives rather than deeds, trustful submission rather than stern obedience; love and mercy above legal justice. This has been well

-
1. Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel, p. 345. See also his Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der Historischen Buecher des Alten Testaments, p. 181. The erroneousness of J. Wellhausen in claiming the original Deuteronomy to have been "a pure law-book" is discussed later in the appendix.
 2. See especially D. C. Simpson's comments in Pentateuchal Criticism, pp. 112, 113.

stated by A. H. McNeile:

"The positive side of Deuteronomic religious thought is love to God and love to men who are either Israelites or under Israelite protection. These two duties are the warp and woof of the writer's ideal of character.... It gives to the writer's exhortations a tender and yearning force to which Hosea supplies the nearest parallel. Love to men is the moving principle of all ethical requirements of justice and mercy detailed earlier in the chapter. Deuteronomy foreshadows St. Luke's Gospel in its sympathy for the poor, St. John's in its insistence on love."¹

There is yet another vital element which penetrates almost every page of Deuteronomy. The Deuteronomist purports to bring comfort and assurance to a frustrated and despairing people. If one can entertain the possibility of Deuteronomy having taken shape shortly after 701 B. C., without entering at the moment into the problem of Higher Criticism, he will fully understand the task of the Deuteronomic message and the psychological effect which it was to bring about in the mind of a decimated people and country. The Israelite of that crucial period had been removed by centuries from the Exodus Event and from the Sinaitic Covenant. What he was experiencing shook his faith and generated doubt, a doubt which could ruin the very foundation of Israel's religion and her existence as a nation -- the doubt whether Israel

1. Deuteronomy Its Place in Revelation, p. 29, f.

was still Yahveh's covenant people.

What the Israelite of that period was a witness to is well summarized by H. P. Smith:

"The country was overrun by the Assyrians, forty-six walled towns suffered the horrors of siege and sack, over two hundred thousand people were carried into slavery, an enormous booty fell into the hands of the invader, Jerusalem itself was invested, though not regularly besieged. Hezekiah was obliged to pay a heavy fine and to send his daughters and concubines to Nineveh. Finally, his kingdom was reduced in size, a large part of his territory being taken away and added to adjoining states."¹

This was exactly the deplorable state of the tiny vassal kingdom of Judah after the annihilation of the Northern Kingdom. And the pious Israelite to whom the Temple was the sanctuary of Yahveh, where His Presence dwelled, the stronghold of Israel's hope and her pride as an architectural beauty, has seen the doors and the pillars of that same Temple being stripped of the precious metals to be sent as tribute to a heathen king!² And this was after both the Temple's and the royal treasuries had been emptied for the same reason. It was then that the Israelite questioned himself how all this could happen if Yahveh was still dwelling in His sanctuary marked by the most sacred Name of Yahveh. Are we still His chosen

1. Old Testament History, p. 243.

2. 2 Kings 18:14-16.

people who^{2m} He has redeemed from Egypt "with a mighty hand and with an outstretched arm, and with great terror, and with signs, and with wonders"?¹ If we are still His covenant people, where is His omnipotent power? Why were we decimated in numbers as a people, and in territory as a country, "the land He swore to our fathers"?²

To that the Deuteronomist has a twofold answer. As to the covenant, it is an ever-restorable covenant, through renewed obedience, and hence practically an irrevocable covenant.³ He uses the expression דִּינָה (this day, today) to emphasize the timelessness and the perpetuity of the covenant which, even when once broken, may be fully restored. "Thou hast this day avowed Yahveh to be thy God and that thou wilt walk in his ways and keep his statutes, and his commandments, and his ordinances and hearken unto his voice; and Yahveh avowed thee this day to be unto him a peculiarly treasured people, as he hath spoken unto thee."⁴

As to the numerous calamities which have beset Israel, the Deuteronomist points to his theology of

1. Dt. 7:8; 9:26; 13:6; 24:18.

2. Dt. 1:8; 6:10, 23; 7:13; 8:1; 11:9, 21.

3. See p. 40, ft. 1 and infra p. 49, f. for further comments.

4. Dt. 26:17, 18. Compare G. v. Rad, Studies in Deuteronomy, p. 70, f.

history: "Know, then, that Yahveh thy God, he is the God who keepeth the covenant and exercises loving-kindness unto those who fear him and who keep his commandments for a thousand generations."¹ The blame thus rests upon Israel herself which he declares clearly in the following statement:

"When thou begettest children, and children's children, and you shall have remained long in the land, and you become corrupt, and make a graven image, the likeness of anything, and do the evil in the eyes of Yahveh thy God, to provoke him to anger: I call this day the heaven and the earth to witness against you, that you shall soon perish from off the land whereto you go over the Jordan to possess it; you shall not remain many days upon it, but you shall surely be destroyed."²

The same prophetic preacher may have used the withdrawal of the Assyrian army forced by the devastating plague brought upon them, as one of these "signs and wonders" coming from the "mighty hand" of Yahveh. This must have been a shining ray in the dark hour of Israel's history which awakened their hope that Yahveh is still their God, and that she is still His people. Above all, Yahveh is still protecting the sacred place of His abode, even if He, because of Israel's sin, permitted it to be

1. Dt. 7:9, 12.

2. Dt. 4:25, 26. See further references of similar phrases in the fourth group of phrases, the Deuteronomic theology of history.

stripped of the gold and silver. And the very same victorious army which turned most of the Judean cities into a picture of horror and destruction, was stopped by the hand of Yahveh at the gates of Jerusalem, the seat of the holy Temple, by striking them with a devastating plague, "probably bubonic in nature."¹

Has not the prophet Isaiah assured Hezekiah that Yahveh would deliver Jerusalem miraculously from the Assyrian forces?² And Yahveh the faithful God kept His promise, for in spite of Israel's sinfulness, she is still Yahveh's people, for the covenant is an ever-restorable one through renewed obedience.

G. von Rad takes a similar position (excluding his dating of Deuteronomy) namely that the Deuteronomist has made it his task to bring comfort to Israel in assuring them that Yahveh is still their God, and that Israel is Yahveh's inheritance:

"It is this: this Israel has in actual fact no longer any points of comparison with the Israel which in the past stood at Horeb; it is separated from the events at Horeb by a very long and extremely incriminating history; in the later regal period its whole religious and political life had been called in question; is it then still Yahveh's people? The answer is clear and unambiguous; it is to this Israel, the people just as it was, that

1. R. K. Harrison, A History of Old Testament Times, p. 182.
 2. 2 Kings 19:6, 7, and 32, ff.

Deuteronomy proclaims Yahveh's election and promise of salvation."¹

This assurance that Yahveh is still Israel's God and the comfort brought to her by confirming that she is Yahveh's inheritance penetrates almost every page of Deuteronomy and constitutes one of the major tasks of the Deuteronomic message. The Deuteronomic preacher also uses it as a background for his message. He explains to his audience that Israel, in order to insure her remaining in that covenant relation, must remember the most vital of all teachings, namely that Yahveh is the only God, which he has phrased in Dt. 4:35, 39 and reiterated in the Shema (6:4, ff.). In between these phrases 4:32-40, he exhorts Israel to remember the greatness of Yahveh. Has there ever been a revelation of God such as Israel has had -- Yahveh Himself speaking out of the midst of fire, after He has demonstrated His omnipotence in delivering her from Egypt? And when Yahveh spoke at Horeb He not only spoke to your fathers, says the Deuteronomist, but also to you all living and present here today!² Yahveh's covenant is made with past, present and future generations: it is perpetual and ever-renewable, hence irre-

1. Studies in Deuteronomy, (transl. by D. Stalker) p. 70.
2. Dt. 5:2, ff.

vocable. This view is upheld by Th. C. Vriezen who states:

"The Covenant may, indeed, be broken by Israel, and in that case God punishes His headstrong and wilful people, but that does not mean that the Covenant, the circle, is broken by God. Even if God rejects the empirical Israel in its entirety for some time, that does not mean that Israel is rejected altogether. None of the prophets thought that the judgement of the people of their days implied the destruction of the people as such! Each of the prophets was a prophet of salvation as well as a prophet of evil, and proclaimed that God's Covenant, which had been brought into being by Him, would be restored by Him. Israel was never rejected absolutely, a conception which is found with the ancient Orientals, e.g. the Babylonians, who in their Creation-narratives suppose that the wrath of the gods had in view the complete destruction of mankind."¹

After he has brought comfort and assurance to his people, the Deuteronomic preacher proceeds with his full message which embodies the teachings of the four eighth-century prophets: Amos, Hosea, Isaiah and Micah.² He has combined their teachings with a singularly unique eloquence, as a master-orator who speaks with enthusiasm and warmth of emotion compelling the hearer to comply with his message since it presents issues of life-and-death urgency.

-
1. An Outline of Old Testament Theology, p. 142. Compare also Edmond Jacob, Theology of the Old Testament, p. 211, ff.; H. Breit, Die Predigt des Deuteronomisten, p. 149, f.
 2. Compare D. C. Simpson, Pentateuchal Criticism, pp. 160, ff., A. H. McNeile, Deuteronomy Its Place in Revelation, pp. 107, ff., and Th. C. Vriezen, An Outline of Old Testament Theology, p. 177.

The Deuteronomic theology of election and the covenant are both Hosea's¹ and Amos's teaching.² Again, the Deuteronomist has condensed the whole law into a single verse nearly identical with Micah's condensation of his teaching. Both Micah and the Deuteronomic preacher proclaim that obedience to Yahveh is not to be a legalistic religion, but a heart that delights in acts of love and in walking humbly with God.³

The Deuteronomist has also given his whole message the Gospel spirit of love, both on the part of Yahveh and Israel; this is an embodiment of Hosea's teaching of divine love.⁴ The prophetic preacher likewise reiterates in his own phraseology the Isaianic theology of holiness.⁵ Since Yahveh, Israel's Sovereign, is a holy God she must be a holy nation. Only then is a real union and fellowship possible between Yahveh and Israel.

Finally, there is the Deuteronomic theology of history. A similarity in the pronouncement of judgements in Hosea 7:1 - 11:7, and Amos 6:1 - 9:10, with those of

1. Hosea 11:1; 13:4.

2. Amos 3:2; compare H. Breit, Die Predigt des Deuteronomisten, p. 36.

3. Micah 6:8; Dt. 10:12.

4. Hosea 3:1; 9:15; 11:1, 4; 14:5.

5. Is. 1:4; 2:3; 5:19, 24; 6:3; 10:20; 12:6. Compare also G. v. Rad, Das Gottesvolk im Deuteronomium, pp. 83, ff.



Deuteronomy 28:15 - 69 is evident. Both the prophets and the prophetic preacher warn Israel of her utter destruction and doom in case of disobedience. For Yahveh, although a God of love, mercy and loving-kindness, is also a God of justice who metes out severe judgement to those who break the laws of the covenant. Since He is the only God, he is both the Lord of creation and history, controlling both Israel and other nations.¹ Events wherever and whenever they happen are Yahveh's planned acts.

This prophetic message of Deuteronomy, compared above with the teachings of the four eighth-century prophets is not contained in the laws of Deuteronomy as such. The code of Deuteronomy has not a single word to say about the election and the covenant which is the core and the foundation of the Deuteronomic message. They are found in the parenthesis. The legislation² contains nothing of "the Oneness of Yahveh and the Uniqueness of Israel"³, nor of the theology of history so characteristic of the Deuteronomist and found practically on every page and expressed in his uniquely phrased terminology. And it is the teach-

1. Amos 4:13; 5:8, 9; 7:7-9; 8:1-17; 9:1-10.

2. Particularly as confined by J. Wellhausen to his "Urdeuteronomium". (Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der Historischen Buecher des Alten Testaments, p. 181.)

3. A. H. McNeile, Deuteronomy Its Place in Revelation, p. 25, ff.

ing contained in this phraseology which has been the foundation of Israel's faith, worship and hope. Examples have been quoted earlier in this chapter, but we may conveniently restate them briefly here.

Israel's faith is summarized in the following phrase:

"Know, therefore, this day, and reflect in thy heart, that Yahveh is the God in the heavens above, and upon the earth beneath: there is none else."¹

Her worship is to take such forms as outlined in phrases like these:

"And thou shalt love Yahveh thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul, and with all thy might."

"And thou shalt go to the place which Yahveh thy God will choose to let his name to dwell there."

"And thou shalt do what is good and right in the eyes of Yahveh."²

Her hope is found in the message of salvation which breathes from such terms as אהב "love," בחר "election," ברית "covenant," נחלה "inheritance," finding its fullest realization of Yahveh's promise of salvation and pointing to Jesus Christ and His New Covenant.

For those who do not see a connective link between

1. Dt. 4:39. See also 4:35 and 7:9.

2. Dt. 6:5; 26:2; 6:18.

the Old and New Testaments¹ it may be said that the above statement is an objective one. For Christ confesses His indebtedness to Deuteronomy by His reliance on it in His temptation.² Secondly, He endorses its emphasis on the first and great commandment which is a characteristic Deuteronomic phrase: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul, and with all thy might."³

Thirdly, it is also possible that the Deuteronomic phrase "to walk in his way" including the verse, "Perfect shalt thou be with Yahveh thy God," may have been the nucleus and core of the crucial thought in the Sermon on the Mount: "Be ye therefore perfect as your heavenly Father is perfect."⁴

Fourthly, the most fundamental teaching of Christ about the Person of God is that of a loving heavenly Father which resembles that of the Deuteronomic teaching.⁵

1. Compare C. Procksh, Theologie des Alten Testaments, pp. 7-12, and Th. C. Vriezen, An Outline of Old Testament Theology, pp. 5, ff.

2. Dt. 6:13-16; 8:3; compare Mt. 4:4, 7, 10; Lk. 4:8, 12.

3. Dt. 6:5; compare Mt. 22:37, 38; Mk. 12:29-33; Lk. 10:27.

4. Dt. 18:13, and its equivalent in Mt. 5:48.

5. Dt. 1:31; 8:5; 14:1. Compare also W. Robertson Smith who says: "In Christianity, and already in the spiritual religion of the Hebrews, the idea of divine fatherhood is entirely dissociated from the physical basis of natural fatherhood." The Religion of the Semites, p. 41.

Finally there is the prospect of the kingdom of God in
 both Deuteronomy, -- ^{and the N.T.?} another most vital teaching of Christ.¹

Yahveh is the Sovereign of Israel and every Israelite is
 subject to Him alone,² as Lord and Master of his life.³ In
 both the kingdom of God is but a prospect, i.e. awaiting
 its realization. Its dimensions, however, are indeed dif-
 ferent.⁴

-
1. See Th. C. Vriezen, An Outline of Old Testament Theology, p. 91, f.
 2. Compare Martin Buber, Moses, pp. 105, ff.
 3. For further evidence in support of unity of Old and New Testament see Robert H. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament, p. 3, ff. and H. H. Rowley, The Unity of the Bible, pp. 90. ff.
 4. See A. Harnack, What is Christianity? pp. 53, ff. Also see especially H. H. Rowley, The Unity of the Bible, pp. 86, f.

CORRASABLE

BOND

U.S.A.

WESTSHIRE

CONTAIN FIBER CONTENT

CHAPTER III

THE DEUTERONOMIC CONCEPTION OF YAHVEH

Delimitations

Discussion of the origin and etymology of tetragrammation יהוה is omitted here because of the limits of the present work. Brief discussions of some of the existing hypotheses by a number of scholars may be found in the sources listed below.¹

Serious attempts have been made by scholars and theologians² to classify the pre-exilic religion of Israel, particularly that of the teaching of the eighth century prophets. That this has been no easy task is evidenced by the divided opinions that still exist. Some claim it

-
1. G. F. Oehler, Old Testament Theology (revised by George E. Day) pp. 92, ff.; H. Ewald, Old and New Testament Theology, p. 90, ff.; A. B. Davidson, The Theology of the Old Testament, pp. 45, ff.; S. R. Driver, Recent Theories on the Origin and Nature of the Tetragrammation (monograph); L. Koehler, Old Testament Theology, pp. 40, ff.; Wm. F. Albright, From the Stone Age to Christianity, pp. 258, ff.; H. H. Rowley, The Faith of Israel, pp. 53, ff.; C. Procksch, Theologie des Alten Testaments, p. 72, ff.; Th. C. Vriezen, An Outline of Old Testament Theology, pp. 170, ff.; E. Jacobs, Theology of the Old Testament contains the latest statement about several hypotheses, very succinctly phrased. Cf. pp. 48, ff.
 2. See particular references in the process of the discussion of the present chapter.

to have been monotheism; others, henotheism. Among those who claim it to have been monotheism, some limit it by the addition of some kind of adjective such as "absolute" "practical" "ethical" "implicit" "theoretical" and the like. Some, of whom W. F. Albright is a particular representative,¹ also classify Israel's religion as "pure" monotheism, even beginning with Moses.

The task is indeed a difficult one for several reasons. First, Israel's religion during its entire history under its various judges and kings was syncretistic. A majority of Israelites worshipped Yahveh by pagan means and at pagan altars.² Secondly, apostasy was a common, everyday occurrence in the life of Israel. While it is impossible to determine the exact number of apostates, we know from biblical records, particularly from the Books of Kings and Chronicles, that at times it involved practically the whole nation, including its kings and priests. Thirdly, and this is the greatest of all difficulties, it is impossible to obtain any results from a comparative study of the existing religions, since no other monotheistic religion existed to form a means of comparison.

1. From the Stone Age to Christianity, p. 271, f. See also his article, "Archaeology Confronts Biblical Criticism" in The American Scholar, vol. 7, Spring 1938, No. 2, p. 176-188.

2. Compare H. H. Rowley, The Faith of Israel, pp. 76, ff.

Israel's environment as a whole was polytheistic. It is true that Babylonia and Assyria had reached some resemblance of a theoretical "unity of God"¹ as had the religion of Egypt.² But as M. Jastrow observes, "We have nothing to warrant the existence of a genuine monotheistic tendency in the East outside of Israel before the sixth century B.C., and there can be no doubt that the belief in one God had been firmly established before that."³ On the other hand, there are some who consider the religion of Israel as taught by the prophets to be monotheistic. First, they state, it would be a gross mistake to consider the apostate idol worship which flourished for many periods in Israel's history as her established religion.⁴ As. H. H. Rowley well observes:

"Not until we come to Hosea, do we find any protest against the sacred bulls. Hos. 8:5, 10:5, 13:2. But that does not prove that bull images were legitimate in the worship of Yahveh, any more than the other things against which Hosea protested were or ever had been integral to Yahvism as such. It would rather seem that it was characteristic of Yahvism from its origin that it had no idol symbols of its

-
1. M. Jastrow, The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria, p. 133.
 2. W. F. Albright, From the Stone Age to Christianity, pp. 213, ff.
 3. The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria, p. 133. As supporting evidence M. Jastrow refers to E. Jeremis, Monotheistische Stroemungen Innerhalb der Babylonischen Religion.
 4. F. Baethgen, Beitraege zur Semitischen Religionsgeschichte, p. 214, f.

own, and that when idols were finally eliminated with the completeness and rigidity that marked later Judaism, we have a development that was in line with the essential spirit of the religion."¹

This very view is confirmed by Th. C. Vriezen who states:

"That the prophets should be the creators of monotheism, a view which is still maintained quite wrongly, is impossible. The writings of the prophets nowhere justify the conclusion that these men looked upon themselves as introducing a new doctrine. On the contrary, they always referred to things already known to the people; they only demanded that the people should adhere to Yahweh, whose will was already known to them.... There is, therefore, nothing to stand in the way of a recognition of a monotheistic Yahwism given by Moses, though not pursued by him to its ultimate consequences."²

Secondly, the gods of the Semitic pantheon worshipped by Israel's apostates were very few as compared with those of other nations.³ Thirdly, the theophoric names of the Israelites, which are often a reflection of the belief of any Semite, show no traces of polytheism.⁴ Finally, while the manner of worship of Yahveh, particularly the cult, shows external similarities to that of other Semitic nations,⁵ it was fundamentally different in essence.⁶

-
1. The Faith of Israel, p. 78.
 2. An Outline of Old Testament Theology, pp. 178, 179.
 3. J. Wellhausen, Reste Arabischen Heidentums, passim; F. Baethgen, Beitrage zur Semitischen Religionsgeschichte, passim.
 4. J. Nikel, Der Monotheismus Israel in der vorexilischen Zeit, pp. 33-36.
 5. W. Robertson Smith, The Religion of the Semites, pp. 213, ff. L. Koehler, who states, "Indeed, the cult is a bit of ethnic life. Israel takes it over from the heathen,"

In spite of the above positions taken by some scholars, M. Burrows, who speaks on behalf of the "most modern scholars,"¹ states that the subject of "when and how the Hebrews had become monotheists is still a moot question."²

Thus, while it may be difficult to decide which of these views is correct as to the whole of Israel, it may prove easier to determine the Deuteronomic conception of Yahveh, confining it solely to the Deuteronomic preacher. It will, however, be well to state at the outset that the above title, *The Deuteronomic Conception of Yahveh*, is not intended to limit the concept to a single author or person. The expression "the Deuteronomic preacher" is to be understood as meaning members of a prophetic school who pursued the teachings of the eighth century prophets.

In addition to the above delimitations, the present

Old Testament Theology, p. 181. Max Loehr says: "But the worship of Yahveh took over much from the previous forms of worship and usages of the allied tribes and clans." A History of the Religion of the Old Testament, p. 41. Cf. also John Gray, The Legacy of Canaan, p. 140, ff. Not only was the cult similar to that of Israel's neighbouring nation, but even many of the cultic terms are Canaanite loan-words as well observed by J. Gray who states: "There are undoubtedly many technical terms common to Hebrew and Ugaritic and we are prepared for this, especially as regards the more general terminology. Thus *dbh*, DBH, 'sacrifice', corresponds to 𐤁𐤁 , MTN, 'gift', to 𐤍𐤒 , NDR, 'vow', to 𐤒𐤒 , while, of the verbs, SQRB corresponds philologically to 𐤒'ק𐤒 , and in meaning to 𐤕'ל𐤒 , 'to bring up a victim to sacrifice'...." (Op. cit., p. 143).

6. Compare H. H. Rowley, Faith of Israel, p. 93.

1. An Outline of Biblical Theology, p. 57.

2. Op. cit., p. 54.

writer bases the Deuteronomic conception of Yahveh principally on the characteristic phrases listed in the previous chapter, although he compares some of these with the contents of Deuteronomy as a whole.

Yahveh the Only God

The most significant element in the Deuteronomic sermons is the constantly repeated warning against apostasy or syncretism. While the Deuteronomist propounds his prominent teachings in his singularly formed phrases, their repetition witnesses to the great urgency of his teachings. That apostasy and syncretism were the most burning problems is evidenced by the fact that more than half his message in Deuteronomy I - XXX, is devoted both to warnings and encouragements to yield undivided loyalty to Yahveh alone. Out of the 955 verses constituting the Book of Deuteronomy, nearly half are directly expounding this one commandment, either in the positive or negative form.¹ In addition there are many passages and even chapters which state this

1. In Dt., chs. IV - XIII, (with some intermissions) the Deuteronomist exhorts to worship and serve Yahveh alone. Then interspersedly in 14:1; 17:1-7; 18:9-22, and 20:16-18. Then again in chs. XXVI, XXVII emphasis is given to worshipping Yahveh out of gratitude. Finally chs. XXVII - XXX, are primarily predictions of Israel's doom in case of apostasy; and an assurance of her restoration after her return to Yahveh.

commandment implicitly.¹

As G. von Rad observes, the Deuteronomist is most severe and uses three synonyms with regard to extinction of polytheism; אבד, מחה שם, מחה את זכר². With like vigorous expression against the extermination of apostates or objects of apostasy, he urges absolute loyalty to Yahveh on three grounds. First, he demonstrates the nature of Yahveh who has revealed Himself through His deeds in history, particularly the Exodus and the Sinaitic covenant which give evidence of His choice of Israel and of His faithfulness and omnipotence. Secondly, he emphasizes the material benefits which Israel will derive from such undivided loyalty to Yahveh. Thirdly, he assures Israel of Yahveh's continuing presence and power which will bring her victory over her enemies. One may conclude, then, that apostasy and syncretism were the main problems of

-
1. One such example is the passage 16:18 - 18:22 which speaks of the office bearers of the theocracy. It has as its motive the preservation of pure worship and obedience to Yahveh, as it is well defined by O. Naumann: "...So bietet der Gesetzgeber zur Erreichung dieses erzieherischen Zweckes mit der Einsetzung der theokratischer Aemter das Mittel und in Amtstraegern die Mittelspersonen. Denn jeder Beamte in diesem theokratisch ausgestalteten Staatswesen ist ein Diener Yahves, als Hueter der staatlichen und kultischen Rechtsordnung." (Das Deuteronomium, p. 24.)
 2. Das Gottesvolk in Deuteronomium, p. 8, f.

Israel's religious life.¹

Against that background of Israel's apostasy and syncretism, the Deuteronomist's faith in Yahveh stands out boldly. His views of Yahveh must not be identified with those of the people. They are at opposite poles. On one side we have a prophetic preacher, and on the other Israel in need of a revival of the old Mosaic religion as contained in the teachings of the eighth century prophets, adapted to new conditions.²

The Deuteronomist's most profound credal phrase, which E. Jacob terms the "classic formula", is יהוה הוא יהוה (Yahveh he is the God; there is none else.) The above phrase clearly states that the Deuteronomist does not believe in the existence of other gods besides Yahveh. In this particular phrase, יהוה is used as a predicate preceded by the definite article -ה for emphasis, i.e. the God.

Before we enter a discussion as to what the Deuteronomist understood in the word יהוה, it would seem

-
1. Chapter XII is especially designed to stamp out syncretism, S. R. Driver, commenting on Dt. 12:4-7, states that these laws were designed that the Israelite should "not worship Him at every spot without distinction, and with idolatrous rites." Deuteronomy I.C.C., p. 140. See also Keil & Delitsch Deuteronomy, at ch. XII. Chapters XIII and XVII, however, would indicate a possibility of the inclination, among some Israelites at least, toward outright pagan worship.
 2. Compare G. von Rad, Das Gottesvolk in Deuteronomium, p. 62.
 3. Dt. 4:35, 39; 7:9.

proper to refute the hypothesis of some that chapter IV, where two of these profound phrases are to be found, is a misplaced later addition. For example, Andrew Harper, following Dillman, places chapter IV at the commencement of Moses' farewell address, i.e. chapters IV, XXIX, XXX.¹ H. Wheeler Robinson considers Deuteronomy 4:1-40 "an exilic second introduction."² E. Kautsch regards 1:1 - 4:40 as a later addition.³ J. Wellhausen holds that the original Deuteronomy found in the Temple contained only chapters XII-XXVI.⁴ S. R. Driver discusses this problem at length in his Introduction (Deuteronomy I.C.C., pp. lxxvii-lxxxvii) and includes chapter IV in the law-book of Josiah. So does Herbert Breit who regards Deuteronomy 1:1-31:13 as the original book.⁵

The present writer finds it important to emphasize at this point⁶ that chapter IV is a part of the original, for it contains the fundamental propositions of the entire Deuteronomic message, i.e. that Yahveh is the only God, a proposition which the Deuteronomist preacher discusses at

-
1. Deuteronomy, The Expositor's Bible, pp. 433, ff.
 2. The Old Testament, Its Making and Meaning, p. 189.
 3. Literature of the Old Testament, p. 232.
 4. Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel, p. 345;
Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Buecher des Alten Testaments, p. 181.
 5. Die Predigt des Deuteronomisten, p. 31.
 6. The order of placing narratives and their dates is discussed later in the Appendix.

length in the nine chapters following (with some exceptions). To say the least, it would seem sufficient to point out that the characteristic Deuteronomic phrases, identical with those used throughout the message are to be found with the same frequency throughout chapter IV. His method of teaching, his language, and his content in chapter IV are all in harmony with the entire Deuteronomic message. We may therefore assume that chapter IV is an integral part of the Deuteronomic message, promulgated by the same prophetic school.

Returning to the Deuteronomic "classic formula" יהוה

הוא האלהים אין עוד (Yahveh is the God; there is none else) we shall discuss the word האלהים and what its full meaning is from a Deuteronomic standpoint. It may be well to consider this word etymologically first. Scholarly opinion differs greatly on this point. In fact, M. H. Pope states that "As far as the word ILU, ¹EL is concerned, it gets us nowhere; the problem is philologically insoluble on the basis of the materials now at hand. The word ¹EL is simply a primitive noun and, as such, cannot be further analyzed."¹

Pope assumes that אלהים is the plural of אלה ²

1. El in The Ugaritic Texts, p. 19.

2. Ibid., p. 20.

This, however, seems wrong for, as S. R. Driver observes, אלה was not found in biblical writings earlier than the age of Jeremiah, while אלהים may be found in the oldest records. For the same reason it may be correct to consider אלה, an Aramaism or Arabism which came into use in Hebrew about the sixth century B.C.¹ As to אלהים it would be correct to assume it to be, as many scholars do, a plural of אלה. Most scholars agree that אלה belongs to the whole Semitic world and signifies "power" "strength" or "might."²

However, they vary in their derivations: some derive it from אלה or אלה meaning 'strength'; others from אלה 'ram', the strongest in the fold; or from אלה or אלה the 'oak', the strongest among the trees.³

-
1. See G. Kittel, Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament, Vol. III, p. 85, f.
 2. Oxford Hebrew Lexicon, p. 41, f.; S. Mandelkern, Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae, p. 85; G. Kittel, Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament, Vol. III, p. 82, f. See also A. B. Davidson, The Theology of the Old Testament, p. 39, ff.; Th. C. Vriezen, An Outline of Old Testament Theology, p. 196, f.; E. Jacob, Theology of the Old Testament, pp. 43, ff.; L. Koehler, Old Testament Theology (translated by A. S. Todd), p. 242.
 3. An addition to the meaning "strength" "power" or "might". There are a number of hypotheses, each conveying a different meaning or even derivation, such as "be in front" "to experience dread" "a flowing river" "to tie" "to shine" "bright" "refuge". For more details see the above listed sources.

Whatever its proper derivation may have been, the meaning "strength" "power" or "might" should be considered the most proper, and particularly so in the Deuteronomic message. That is, the true Deuteronomic conception of אלהים may be seen in the following two phrases:

ויוציאנו יהוה ממצרים ביד חזקה ובוזע נטויה ובמארה

גדול ובאחוז ובמפחים

"And Yahveh brought us out of Egypt with a mighty hand and with an outstretched arm, and with great terror and with signs and with wonders."¹ Yahveh is thus the omnipotent God who has proven to be almighty during the Exodus event.

The second phrase implicitly states the same:

ויפדך מביה עבדים (ממצרים) "And he redeemed you out of the house of bond-men."² Only Yahveh could do it for He is the source of all power, hence the Redeemer (in a physical sense) of Israel. In the same chapter³ and for the same reason, the Deuteronomist contrasts the omnipotent Yahveh who is the God with "other gods"⁴ (simple plural), which were only "the work of men's hands, wood and stone, which

1. Dt. 4:34 (5:15); 7:19; (11:2); 26:8.

2. Dt. 7:8; 9:26; 13:6; 24:18.

3. Dt. 4:28.

4. Every אלהים designating Yahveh or the true God is followed by a singular adjective, verb, etc. in 4:7 refers to heathen gods.

neither see nor hear, nor eat nor smell." In other words, the gods usually called by the Deuteronomist "other gods" are powerless, and have no reality.

Thus the Deuteronomist invested the word אֱלֹהִים with a new meaning perhaps hitherto unknown to the average Israelite. As outlined in the beginning of this chapter, Israel as a whole was either polytheistic or syncretistic in its worship. Some, no doubt, had a henotheistic conception of Yahveh, i.e., worshipping Yahveh but believing in the reality of the gods of the neighbouring peoples. Thus, the Deuteronomist comes with a very strict warning and a clear conception of Yahveh: He is the God. You must neither worship him with pagan means, nor divide your loyalty between Him and other gods. In so doing, Israel breaks the covenant. Only by undivided loyalty to Yahveh and a recognition of His sole existence as the God, is the Israelite worthy of being a member of this chosen community. Even the mere belief in the reality of other gods meant forfeiting Israel's covenantal obligation. The Deuteronomic preacher, therefore, warns Israel to take heed lest they forget the personal¹ experiences they had at Horeb. "For you saw no

1. The covenant is timeless and is binding both generations in the past, present and future. Cf. Dt. 26:16-18; 29:9-14.

similitude on the day that Yahveh spoke unto you at Horeb out of the midst of the fire."¹ The true God Yahveh has no material form, and any of the gods of the other nations which resemble likenesses of male or female, of beast or fowl are man-made idols, powerless dummies and detested things.²

In like manner, the terms יָד and כִּפְיוֹ in their respective phrases quoted above receive new connotation. יָד is a primitive biliteral word meaning hand.³ It is one of the anthropomorphisms of which the Deuteronomist makes frequent use in his message.⁴ One of its many metaphors is power. But in the phrase וַיֹּצִיאֵנוּ יְהוָה מֵאֲצָרִים בְּיַד חֲזָקָה as referring to Yahveh, it is always to be understood as His omnipotence.⁵ The verb כִּפְיוֹ means to ransom a person or animal from death, and it is often used in connection with Hebrew ritual.⁶ It is also used figuratively in representing deliverance from any trouble, danger, etc. But here כִּפְיוֹ has been invested with a new meaning by the Deuteronomist, i.e. Yahveh "reclaiming" his inheritance

1. Dt. 4:12.

2. Dt. 29:16.

3. Compare Oxford Hebrew Lexicon, p. 388.

4. See the beginning of ch. IV for the functions of anthropomorphisms in the Deuteronomic message.

5. Dt. 7:8; 9:26; 13:6; 24:18.

6. See S. R. Driver, Deuteronomy, I.C.C., p. 101.

and "revindicating" his chosen and peculiarly-treasured people, bringing them from Egyptian slavery to freedom and nationhood in order that it might be His holy nation. This idea of reclaiming Israel seems to have originated with Hosea and Micah who use נָתַן in this very sense. (Hosea 7:13, and Micah 6:4.) It was no doubt later adopted by Jeremiah (31:10) from the Deuteronomist who uses it often. Otherwise, it is never used in the sense of reclaiming Israel; like the other phrases, it is characteristically Deuteronomic.

Summarizing what the first three phrases convey to us of his concept of Yahveh, we state the following. Yahveh is the only God who proves His existence by revealing His omnipotence during the Exodus event and by being Israel's Redeemer in reclaiming her as His own possession and in making her a holy nation unto Him.

Because of that, Israel must worship Him alone, for other gods have no real existence. In order to worship Him properly Israel must not make any similitude, for He is an invisible, moral (righteous) reality, and they must free themselves from worshipping natural powers as Yahveh.¹ To the Deuteronomist, this conception of Yahveh was no abstract or metaphysical idea, nor did he derive it from

1. Dt. 4:19.

philosophical speculations, but from the experiences of God's power expressed in historical events.¹

Negative Assertions and Limitations

To evaluate the Deuteronomist's conception of God it is not sufficient to state only its positive content. It is nearly as important to evaluate its negative side and such limitations as may be found in the Deuteronomic message.

First, there may be those who claim the Septuagint as an authoritative source for investigation, and their first observation would be that the "classical formula" יהוה הוא

(מלכודו) האלהים אין עוד is not to be found in the Greek version: *Κύριος ὁ Θεός σου ὁ ὕψιστος Θεός ἔστι* (that the Lord thy God, he is God, and there is none else beside Him.) It is true that there is a great difference in the expression ὁ Θεός σου and יהוה האלהים which has the definite article. In the former, Yahveh is claimed to be a particularistic God, while the Hebrew expression makes Yahveh universal. Besides, the Septuagint, following the usual custom of substituting *Κύριος* for Yahveh, has created an altogether new phrase and loses

1. G. E. Wright makes a similar general statement in saying, "that Israelite monotheism was not derived from philosophical speculation concerning the one and the many but from a knowledge of God's power, expressed in powerful acts." The Old Testament Against Its Environment, p. 39.

all its emphasis upon the oneness of Yahveh and claims Him to be a particularistic God as those of other nations. A question then arises: which of these two phrases is correct? The problem is of even wider scope, for it involves the query: which of the two versions is more authentic?

Present-day scholarship considers the Massoretic Text as the most trustworthy, as has already been stated in the first chapter. In addition, attention is called to the fact that all other ancient versions have the identical phrase contained in the Massoretic Text. And, as M. Noth well observes, translation regardless of its age remains a translation and a source of inescapable mistakes.¹ Although the phrase in Dt. 7:9 unlike in Dt. 4:35, 39, has אלהים following יהוה, the force of the oneness of Yahveh is still preserved in the latter part of the phrase

1. "Fuer alle Textarbeit am Alten Testament ist der Ausgangspunkt grundsatzlich stets und ueberall der ueberlieferte massoretische Text; denn er ist der geradlinig weiterueberlieferte Text des Kanons in seiner Grundsprache. Alle Uebersetzungen, auch wenn sie sehr alt sind, stellen doch nur Abzweigungen dar, und jeder Uebersetzungsvorgang ist eine grosse Fehlerquelle, da keine Uebersetzung - von allen Missverstaendnissen und Fehlern des Uebersetzers noch ganz abgesehen - das Original mechanisch genau wiedergeben kann." (M. Noth, Die Welt Des Alten Testaments, p. 286.)

...הוא האלהים, האל...

Above all other evidence, the Shema in 6:4 is a definite confirmation of the correctness of the Massoretic phrase, and should be considered as the only authentic witness to the Deuteronomist's monotheistic belief.

But this is not the only difficulty. There are other difficulties which may seem to repudiate the monotheistic belief, or the universality of Yahveh which we ascribe to the Deuteronomist. The Deuteronomist limits Yahveh to Israel alone, a teaching found on practically every page of his message. The election and covenant theology fully confirms it. The covenantal obligations are binding upon Israel only. By confining Yahveh to Israel alone, the Deuteronomic preacher leaves other nations implicitly to other gods. In fact, this is even confirmed in Deut. 4:19; 29:25 where he clearly states that Yahveh has "assigned" other gods to other nations for worship. If the Deuteronomist thus believes that Yahveh is only Israel's God, any claim that the Deuteronomic conception of Yahveh is monotheistic would be incongruous.

Moreover, another characteristic phrase makes it even more difficult to consider the Deuteronomic conception of Yahveh as monotheistic. By the phrase לשון (לשכון) שמו שם the Deuteronomist seems to localize and confine the worship

of Yahveh in the same manner as the polytheistic gods were confined to communities or small nations, where a change of one's abode involved a change of cult.¹ How shall one interpret the common elements in the ritual institution to be found both in Deuteronomy and the surrounding heathenism? Did the Deuteronomic preacher have a definite purpose in mind in localizing the worship of Yahveh, or was it necessitated by special circumstances?

To answer these questions let us first study the Deuteronomic phrase $\square\omega$ $\square\omega$ ($\square\omega$) $\square\omega$. The term $\square\omega$ a primitive biliteral word, has no known etymology.² Similar to most biliteral Hebrew words, it is a part of the vocabulary of all Semitic languages conveying the same meaning: "name." Its secondary meaning is "reputation," usually with the addition of an adjective. But in this phrase, as in all characteristic phrases listed in chapter II, the Deuteronomist gives the term a completely new connotation. G. F. Oehler calls it "Divine glory"³ or as a means by "which God gives his people a direct ex-

-
1. The Religion of the Semites, p. 35, f.; 75, ff. and passim. See also M. Jastrow, Jr., Die Religion Baby- loniens und Assyriens, vol. I, p. 49.
 2. Compare Oxford Hebrew Lexicon, p. 1027.
 3. Theology of the Old Testament, Revised, with introduction by George E. Day, p. 125.

perience of Himself."¹ O. Grether,² O. Procksch,³ Th. C. Vriezen,⁴ and E. Jacob⁵ seem to agree that DW conveys to us the hypostatic Being of Yahveh. The Deuteronomist spiritualizes the hitherto known conception of God's revelation through visible means such as "fire" "angel" and replaces them by DW.⁶ However, it would be contrary to the teaching of the whole of Deuteronomy to think that the Deuteronomist confines the Presence of Yahveh to the Temple alone. Rather, as stated by E. Jacob,

"The theology of Deuteronomy is in the line of the preaching of the prophets, who admitted a particular association of Yahveh with the Temple, not in the sense of the deity's dwelling-place but in that of God's particular property. However, Deuteronomy makes a concession to popular religion since it retains the view of the Temple as a dwelling-place, but spiritualizes it through the concept of the name."⁷

While Jacob's statement would seem correct as to the Deuteronomist's conception of DW it does seem erroneous to think that "Deuteronomy makes a concession to popular religion." Only when one takes into consideration the

-
1. Theology of the Old Testament, Revised, with introduction by George E. Day, p. 125.
 2. Name und Wort Gottes im Alten Testament, p. 179.
 3. "So wohnte der Name im Temple als die Geistige Gegenwart Jahves." Theologie des Alten Testaments, p. 453.
 4. An Outline of Old Testament Theology, p. 248.
 5. Theology of the Old Testament, p. 82, ff.
 6. Compare O. Procksch, Theologie des Alten Testaments, p. 450, ff.
 7. Theology of the Old Testament, p. 83.

religious state of Israel in the time of the Deuteronomic preacher, can one fully appreciate the real cause and intent in limiting sacrifices to certain places where Yahveh's Presence is granted. This brings us to the long-discussed question of "centralization of worship" which has long been used as a determining criterion by biblical critics of the Graf-Wellhausen school. A. C. Welch and T. Oestreicher have endeavored to point out, on the basis of independent theories, the erroneousness of the passages 12:1-28 by that school. Welch points out, and rightly so, that the phrase בְּמָקוֹם אֶחָד (12:14) does not convey the idea that a single sanctuary is commanded.¹ The Deuteronomist's main emphasis is not on cult unity but on cult purity. "What it orders is that Israel's sacra are to be reserved rigidly for the services of the national God."² In addition to the correct observation by Welch, it could be added for clarification that the word אֶחָד in a construct phrase has no numerical value, but forms a genitive partitive equal to the English "some" "someone" "somebody."³ It should therefore be clear that the phrase בְּמָקוֹם אֶחָד

1. The Code of Deuteronomy, p. 48, f.

2. Op. cit., p. 51.

3. Compare S. Mandelkern, Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae, p. 27, who cites among others, 'aliquis', 'quidam'. For examples, see Dt. 15:7; 28:5.

is by no means a criterion for determining that the Deuteronomist intended to introduce the worship of a single sanctuary for, even when it may be used in a sense as a numeral, it does not confine it to one and only one place:

לְעֵינֵינוּ דְּמִלְכָּה 15:7; 23:17. T. Oestreicher, who takes the same position independently,¹ further refutes the supposition of those who support centralization of worship: that the slaughter of animals intended for food was freed from ritual because of centralization. He calls attention to the fact that such ritual-free slaughtering was practised by Israel throughout its history.²

The question that should be asked is not centralization or localization, but rather, how many legitimate sanctuaries did Israel have after Hezekiah's reform? There is only one possible solution to this question. It is to determine the need according to territory and population. Along with these two, the political and economic factors should be considered. In other words, what were the circumstances? Were they such as would require more than one sanctuary in order to meet the needs of the people, or would one sanctuary have been sufficient to dispatch the necessary sacrifices?

1. Das Deuteronomische Grundgesetz, p. 103, f.

2. Op. cit., p. 109, f.

The Northern Kingdom no longer existed, having been abolished and its population exiled by the Assyrians. Its capital, Samaria, fell after three years of siege on January 722, and its inhabitants were carried off to Assyria and Media. The ruined and depopulated towns were captured by Sargon who repopulated them with more loyal people from Babylonia.¹

Although still in existence, Judah was but a vassal state. This tiny country, which barely escaped the fate of its northern sister state, was no larger in territory than the average county of today. Furthermore, it represented a very pitiful state. Apart from Jerusalem, the few remaining towns were half ruined, others levelled to the ground, its population decimated by the cruel invader and impoverished by pillage and spoil. H. H. Rowley appraises the economic state of the surviving "little kingdom of Judah": "Many of her towns and villages had been occupied and plundered, a vast indemnity had been exacted from Jerusalem, and numbers of the citizens of Judah had been transferred to Philistine rule. The prosperity of

1. 2 Kings, ch. XVIII, Cyrus H. Gordon, Introduction to Old Testament Times, p. 224; Compare extra-biblical accounts of siege and capture of Samaria: I. Winton Thomas, Documents from Old Testament Times, p. 58, ff.

the recent years had gone, and only in the course of many years could the land recover from its disaster."¹ This is especially confirmed by Sennacherib's own account.²

It should be clear from the biblical and non-biblical accounts that Israel needed no more than one sanctuary to meet the requirements of her cultic ordinances. If one sanctuary was sufficient, there was no better sanctuary than the Temple in Jerusalem. The Deuteronomist, a prophetic preacher under the influence of the eighth century prophets (here particularly, Isaiah) had no need of pointing out the place or naming it; it was too obvious. For Isaiah's doctrines of the inviolability of Jerusalem greatly influenced his immediate generation.³ The Temple had been the scene of his inauguration as a prophet of Yahveh, and the miraculous deliverance of Jerusalem from the hands of the Assyrians may have convinced the prophet that Jerusalem was the city chosen of Yahveh and the Temple His dwelling place.⁴

-
1. Record and Revelation, H. Wheeler Robinson, Editor, p. 178, f.
 2. D. Winton Thomas, Editor, Documents from the Old Testament Times, p. 66, f. Compare same with 2 Kings chs. XVIII, XIX.
 3. See supra, p. 42, f.
 4. Compare Is. 2:3; 7:18; 18:7; 24:23; 27:13 and especially 29:1 on which C. J. Bredenkamp comments: "Wenn ferner Jerusalem 29:1 אר"ל genannt wird, so duerfte die Deutung: 'Herd Gottes' noch eben so haltbar sein als die: 'Loewe Gottes'. Dann aber hat Jesaia Jerusalem angesehen

We have thus attempted to interpret correctly the Deuteronomic phrases לשום (לשכן) שמו שם . The Deuteronomic preacher, under prophetic influence and through a call for pure worship recommends only places where purity of worship can be controlled. It may be true, as von Rad insists, that the Deuteronomist did not lay any particular emphasis on Jerusalem as the sanctuary¹ or that he shows no interest in the place of sanctuary (Kultort) as such; still the then prevailing circumstances made Jerusalem a must. For there the worship "could be minutely regulated by royal decree."² The most important and ruling factor, however, should be אשר יבחר יהוה לשום שמו שם i.e., a sanctuary associated only with Yahveh and where His indwelling Presence is both a confirmation of the same and a revelation of His glory in a spiritual sense.

The above discussion conveys to us clearly the two

als den grossen centralen Opferherd Israels, und Gottes Wohnung in Zion ist mit diesem Opferherd verbunden, wie des Menschen Wohnung mit seinem Herd." (Gesetz und Propheten, p. 98). Compare W. Robertson Smith, The Prophets of Israel, p. 206: "It is the teaching of Isaiah that forms the starting place of Deuteronomy...." See also O. Procksch, Jesaia I (commentary) p. 139, where he makes the following comment: "He [Isaiah] has, therefore, become the father of the Deuteronomic theology which claims the Temple on Zion as the only Divine abode in the royal Israel and the place of revelation."

1. Gerhard von Rad, Das Gottesvolk im Deuteronomium, p. 89.
2. D. C. Simpson, Pentateuchal Criticism, p. 163.

opposite motives for confining worship to a certain territory or clan -- that of the polytheist and that of the Deuteronomist. The polytheist confined the worship of a certain god to a place because, in accordance with the then generally accepted belief, the gods were assigned jurisdiction over a definite territory or clan where the heathen believed their power was exercised. The Deuteronomist, however, had but one motive: purity of worship. Such limitation warranted moral loyalty to Yahveh on the part of Israel, even if it were a forced one.

There still remains our vital question unanswered: If Yahveh is conceived by the Deuteronomist to be the only God, why does he confine Him to Israel, leaving all other nations to worship pagan gods? It is quite acceptable that the Deuteronomist makes a distinction between natural and revealed religion. Not that this was based on a philosophical distinction between natural and revealed theology. It was based upon practical observation. He recognizes the faith to be a historical one based on Yahveh's revelation in history. At the same time he recognizes the need of all mankind or, as S. R. Driver puts it, "the yearning of mankind after a power higher than themselves,"¹ and so have taken to worship the forces and phenomena of nature. He

1. Deuteronomy, I.C.C., p. 71.

therefore believes that Yahveh "assigned"¹ them to other nations for worship in the hope that in due time they will take cognizance of the true God, Yahveh. This would be one possible interpretation. The other possibility would be to recognize the fact that Israel's election eo ipso necessitated the confinement of Yahveh to her alone. As stated in verses 9:4, 5, the nations outside Israel were full of wickedness and evil and Israel was to be used first, as a channel of God's punishment upon them; and secondly as a witness to the true God, Yahveh.

In conclusion, we come back to our original task of classifying or evaluating the faith of the Mosaic teachings of the Deuteronomist about Yahveh. If we agree with W. F. Albright,² H. H. Rowley,³ Th. C. Vriezen,⁴ and E. Jacob⁵ that the religion of Moses was monotheistic in a limited sense, we ought to acknowledge the Deuteronomist's conception of Yahveh as monotheistic.⁶ However, it is a limited

1. Dt. 4:19; 29:25.

2. From the Stone Age to Christianity, p. 271, f.

3. Faith of Israel, pp. 71, ff.; Mose und der Monotheismus, ZAW, 69, Band, 1957, pp. 1-21.

4. An Outline of Old Testament Theology, p. 179.

5. Theology of the Old Testament, p. 65, ff.

6. It may also be of interest to note that O. Procksch sees already in Elijah "The first absolute monotheist" as demonstrated especially in the contest on Carmel. Theologie des Alten Testaments, p. 143. See also B. W. Anderson, Understanding the Old Testament, pp. 206-209.

monotheism for it was confined to Israel alone, and it would be well to term it, as A. C. Welch does, "Yahvism."¹

We may then conclude that the Deuteronomist's conception of Yahveh was not henotheism (monolatry). Although, assigning other gods to be worshipped by all other nations outside Israel, he did not, as he states, believe them to be real. His belief is a national monotheism, Yahvism. It was a national monotheism for two important reasons: first, Yahveh was the God of Israel. Over one hundred and twenty times we find the phrase יהוה אלהיך (Yahveh, your God), although in the singular, it refers to Israel as a corporate personality.² Second, it was a national monotheism because Yahvism included both religion and patriotism, both having their source in Yahveh, the Sovereign of Israel, unto whom they were bound by a covenant which was "more than a fixed, limited agreement."³ Through the covenant, "Yahveh unites himself with Israel into a political, theo-political unity."⁴ This was not only true about the covenant at Sinai to which M. Buber refers, but

1. The Code of Deuteronomy, p. 202.

2. H. Wheeler Robinson, The Cross in the Old Testament, p. 75, ff.; H. H. Rowley, Editor, The Old Testament and Modern Study, p. xxix, 203, 307.

3. Martin Buber, Moses, p. 115.

4. Ibid.

it is a predominant teaching of the prophets. "Hosea had pointed out that warlike effort and political combinations could not help Israel, which must seek its deliverance in repentance and reliance on Jehovah's sovereignty."¹ And Isaiah insists that "Jehovah is not simply the Holy One in an abstract sense; He is the Holy Being who reigns over Israel."² Yahveh, the covenant, and the land³ are integral elements of the Deuteronomist's religion and, the foundations of the Deuteronomic theology, a theology which has its retrospect in the patriarchal covenant and which has come down well into the era of Judaism. Yahvism is a unique monotheism, only once possible in the history of revelation, as the stepping stone for a universal monotheism.⁴

-
1. W. Robertson Smith, The Prophets of Israel, p. 209.
 2. Op. cit. Compare pp. 205, ff. with particular reference to pp. 209 and 227.
 3. How significant a role "the land" plays in the Deuteronomic theology can be shown in the fact that it is to be found on practically every page of the Deuteronomic message. Dt. 1:8 (twice), 21; 3:18, 20, 28; 4:1, 5, 14; 5:28, 30; 6:1, 10, 18, 23; 7:1; 8:1, 7-10; 9:4-6; 10:11; 11:8, 10, 12, 31; 12:1; 15:4, 7; 16:20; 17:14; 18:9; 19:8; 14; 23:21; 25:19; 26:1, 3, 9; 27:2, 3; 28:8; 31:7, 21, 23. The Deuteronomist uses the term ~~more~~ less frequently: 4:40; 5:16; 7:13; 11:9, 21; 25:15; 26:15; 28:11; 30:21; 31:13, 20; 32:47.
 4. "Ein Gott, der so handeln konnte, wo er wollte, der jedes beliebige Volk fuer sich erwählen konnte, neben dem andere Goetter nichts taugten, ein solcher Gott war kein Stammesoder Volksgott, und er war bestimmt nicht nur einer unter vielen Goettern.... Das Alter des Monotheismus darf also von der Zeit des Mose an datiert werden, wenn man nur anerkennt, dass es sich fuer jene Zeit nur um den Keim des Monotheismus handelt, als ein neuer Antrieb von unschaetzbarer Bedeutung fuer die Welt in die Religion hineinkam." (H. H. Rowley, Mose und der Monotheismus, ZAW, 69, Band, 1957, pp. 20, 21.)

CHAPTER IV

ELECTION AND THE COVENANT

Anthropomorphisms and Their Functions

Before we turn to discuss the characteristic phrases propounding the Deuteronomic theology of election and the covenant, it seems necessary to explain the terminology used by the Deuteronomist in describing the disposition of the Godhead towards a people. The Deuteronomic preacher makes full use of the anthropomorphic mode of biblical speech which expresses idioms dealing with the human race by using the language of human elections and covenants.

Anthropomorphisms, as already mentioned in the previous chapter, are to be found on nearly every page of the Deuteronomic message.¹ The author of Deuteronomy makes his message more appealing by using anthropomorphisms, i.e. ascribing to Yahveh the attributes and physical features of man. This serves several purposes.

First, it is illustrative, making the message easily understood by all, similar to the manner in which Christ used parables in teaching the multitudes.

Secondly, there is a much deeper meaning in the use

1. Compare Ludwig Hoehler, Old Testament Theology, p. 22, ff.

of anthropomorphisms. "Their intention," as L. Koehler states, "is not in the least to reduce God to a rank similar to that of man. To describe God in terms of human characteristics is not to humanize Him."¹ It has often been a stumbling block to the Bible student who may have rather underestimated the Deuteronomist's true conception of Yahveh. The Deuteronomist represents Yahveh as a person, for to him Yahveh was no abstract Idea, but rather a personal and living God,² One who has manifested Himself in the Exodus event, at Horeb, and One who defends Israel before its enemies and gives Israel "power to gather wealth."³ It is therefore most expedient for the Deuteronomist to use anthropomorphisms to illustrate this personal God, Yahveh, to his audience. As H. H. Rowley observes: "It is characteristic of the thought of the Old Testament that man may understand and do the will of God, may have fellowship with God and walk in His way."⁴ In order to have fellowship with Yahveh, Israel is "to walk in His ways"; "to listen to His voice," and not to

1. Ludwig Koehler, Old Testament Theology, p. 22, ff.

2. Dt. 5:23 אֱלֹהִים חַיִּים "a living God" an adjective he uses often in referring to Israel, Dt. 4:4; 4:10; 5:3; 12:1; 31:13.

3. Dt. 8:18.

4. The Faith of Israel, p. 79.

do "that which is evil in the eyes of Yahveh....to provoke his anger," for Israel is to be a holy nation unto Yahveh, "a people of His inheritance." These Characteristic Deuteronomic Phrases which are discussed at length later are cited here only for demonstration.

By using anthropomorphisms, he brings such a fellowship with a holy God nearer to the people. It bridges the vast gulf which separates Yahveh from Israel, bringing Him within reach of fellowship. These, briefly, are the functions of the anthropomorphisms used by the Deuteronomist in his theology of election and covenant.

Unlike human elections and covenants, Yahveh's covenant with Israel was not based on quantity or quality. "Not because you are more in number than all the nations did Yahveh desire you and make choice of you, for you are the fewest of all nations, but on account of Yahveh's love for you and because he keeps the oath which he has sworn to your fathers.... And thou shalt know that not for thy righteousness Yahveh thy God gives thee this good land to possess it, for thou art a stiff-necked people."¹ In the election of and in the covenant with Israel there was but one supreme purpose, that of divine grace.

1. Dt. 7:7, 8; 9:6.

Therefore, such phrases as **כִּי אָהַב אֶת אֲבֹתָיִךְ וַיִּבְחַר בְּזֶרְעִם** ; **אֲחֵרֵיהֶם** ; **יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ כָּרַח עִמָּנוּ בְּרִית** are to be understood as illustrating the character of Yahveh rather than His actions, as they would be comprehended in terms of human actions. For example, **בְּרִית** is neither a covenant nor an agreement as we understand from a human standpoint. There is a lack of equality among the parties Yahveh and Israel. Some have tried to explain (and thereby minimize) this disparity by comparing it with an agreement between a conqueror and a defeated people;¹ others, to a contract between a large company and a single employee. Such comparisons are analogies, perhaps making the biblical term more easily understood, but in reality they are fallacious. In the first instance, Yahveh who has chosen Israel out of love to her and her patriarchs, in no way takes the attitude of her conqueror. In the second instance, whether it be a conqueror or a large company, both parties are human beings which is not the case in Yahveh's covenant with Israel.

In addition, there are other elements which disqualify **בְּרִית** to be understood as "covenant", i.e. an agreement between two human parties, for the initiative is

1. Compare H. Wheeler Robinson, The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament, p. 167.

taken wholly and solely by Yahveh. Israel's choice was actually no free choice, for she was already a debtor to Yahveh. Furthermore, the covenant on the part of Israel meant obedience to God, but it does not require or even imply Yahveh's obedience to Israel.¹ The fulfilment of Yahveh's promises does not mean obedience. And finally, while any human contract or agreement has its limitation in time and may be dissolved any time the parties find it expedient to do so, Yahveh's covenant with Israel is practically irrevocable.² Israel's disobedience does not dissolve the covenant for, regardless of Israel's behaviour, the acts of Yahveh in regard to Israel's election and covenant remain unchangeable even by Israel's conditional rejection.³

From these and similar elements of disparity among the covenantal parties, one may conclude that the Deuteronomist uses anthropomorphisms. As stated above, there was no other way of expressing the dealings of the Godhead Yahveh with His people Israel. This is particularly true

-
1. Compare H. H. Rowley, The Faith of Israel, p. 60.
 2. Cf. Th. C. Vriezen, An Outline of Old Testament Theology, p. 142. As already discussed in chapter II, the covenant, although theoretically revocable, was practically irrevocable. It could be restored through renewed obedience. It may be worth noting here that other Deuteronomic literature (Jud. 2:1) and the Psalmist (105:8, 10; 111:5, 9) uses the phrase ברית עולם (an everlasting covenant) in describing both the patriarchal and Israel's covenant with God.
 3. "Israel was never rejected absolutely" says Th. C. Vriezen, (ib.)

of the Deuteronomic preacher who wanted to bring his message home to his people. He could not have used abstract ideas effectively, but a language which his fellow men could understand and obey. Besides, as indicated above, Yahveh is a personal and living God to the Deuteronomist.

Historical Review of Election

Historically and logically, the election preceded the covenant. As to when the consciousness of the election and covenant originated in the Hebrew mind (both as a nation and individually), opinions vary greatly.¹ Wellhausen and Stade assert that the idea of election took place and developed during and under the influence of the prophets.² K. Galling, denying any historical value to Genesis³ considers the beginning of the consciousness of the election in the mind of the people to have been concurrent with the Exodus event. In his opinion, and rightly so, Israel's "belief in election is a philosophy of history, or better, a theology of history, i.e., she

-
1. Compare Th. C. Vriezen, Die Erwaehlung Israels nach dem Alten Testament, p. 25, ff.
 2. Compare J. Wellhausen, Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel, p. 418, f.; R. Kraetzschmar, Die Bundesvorstellung im Alten Testament, p. 1; F. E. Koenig, The Religious History of Israel, p. 150.
 3. Die Erwaehlingstraditionen Israels, p. 64.

hears the word of God in history."¹ Galling shares Hempel's view.² Galling, however, does recognize a second tradition which goes back to the patriarchs. He holds this to be later than the Exodus tradition, both being then combined by the Deuteronomist. G. von Rad follows Galling's viewpoint that for the first time we find a complete theology of election in Deuteronomy.³ In fact, many scholars more or less favor Galling's thesis of traditions being combined into one or, as H. Wheeler Robinson understands it, a gradual development.⁴ Kraetzschmar, in his valuable work, has given an objective account of the progressive development of the idea of election in the Old Testament. He holds that בְּרִית in a historical sense (which would include the patriarchal covenant) "was coined at first during the seventh century."⁵ H. H. Rowley places the idea of election-consciousness at the time of the Exodus:

"Yet again, in the complex of events connected with the Exodus it is clearly brought out that God is an electing God. This was firmly held throughout the Old Testament, and indeed the thought of him as an

-
1. Die Erwählungstraditionen Israels, p. 64.
 2. "Dass das Alte Testament kein Wort fuer 'Geschichte' hat -- ebensowenig fuer 'Natur' --, erschwert den Einblick in die Sachlage. Sicher ist, dass in Sinne des Alten Testament von Geschichte nie anders gesprochen werden darf als so, dass das goettliche Handeln als der entscheidende Faktor sichtbar wird. 'Geschichte ist hier stets Gottesmanifestation im Raum und der Zeit.'" J. Hempel, Gott und Mensch im Alten Testament, p. 86.
 3. Das Gottesvolk im Deuteronomium, p. 27, f.
 4. Compare Religious Ideas of the Old Testament, p. 185, ff.
 5. R. Kraetzschmar, Die Bundesvorstellung im Alten Testament, p. 145.

electing God is vital to the teaching of both Testaments, though it has fallen into the background in much modern thought. God chose Israel for himself, and sent Moses to bring her out of Egypt in his name. He did not choose her because she was strong or cultured or good; but precisely because she was weak and helpless and downtrodden. Only so could he reveal those elements of his character which he purposed to reveal, and which we have seen to belong to the very texture of the revelation. There was thus nothing arbitrary in his election. It was the revelation of his character."¹

The present writer finds Vriezen's statement as correct:

"Der Glaubenssatz der Erwählung Israels steht in einem organischen Zusammenhang mit der Gesamtheit der israelitischen Glaubensvorstellungen, und gehoert als Abschluss, als Summa, zu der inneren geistigen Entwicklung, aus welcher er hervorgegangen ist. Also ist er, wenn auch ein neuer Gesichtspunkt, doch nicht etwas voellig Neues, denn er musste auf Grund der prophetischen Kritik an den israelitischen religioesen und voelkischen Vorstellungen aufkommen. Und gerade weil er so gaenzlich als ein lebendiges Element aus den tiefsten inneren Voraussetzungen der israelitischen Religion herausgewachsen ist, ist er auch nicht verloren gegangen. Er war wie jeder einmal fest gepraeagte Glaubenssatz wieder inneren Umdeutungen ausgesetzt (sodass er aus einem aktiven Begriffe der Erwählung Gottes zu einem passiven der Erwähltheit des Volkes wurde), aber er hat immer einen eigenen gesicherten Platz innegehabt."²

Indeed, Israel's idea of election is an integral part of her whole faith. With the development of her faith the idea of election has taken on a new form and wider horizons.

1. The Faith of Israel, p. 67.

2. Th. C. Vriezen, Die Erwählung Israels nach dem Alten Testament, p. 80.

He therefore rightly goes back to the patriarchal election and call of Abraham without analyzing, as Galling did, which of these traditions was the earlier and which the later. The development of a religious idea which has gone through the same stages as its nation both politically and religiously (election involved both) becomes too complicated to determine the exact dates of these various stages of development.

However, H. H. Rowley is correct in calling attention to the Exodus as the most decisive event in bringing the idea of election to the consciousness of Israel as a whole. The religious and ethnic origin of the Hebrew nation is to be found in Egypt. Each passing epoch: the redemption from Egypt, the Sinaitic covenant, the possession of the land, the monarchy, the spirit of the prophetic age, even its periods of crisis and exiles[?] deepened and widened the concept of being a people elected by Yahveh their God. Also "The subordination of the covenant to history explains the variations that the notion of the covenant has undergone in the course of the ages."¹

1. E. Jacob, Theology of the Old Testament, p. 214.

The Reason and Purpose of Israel's Election

The reason for choosing Israel is clearly stated in the Deuteronomic message *כי אהב את אבותיך; כי אהבך יהוה אלהיך*; Much has been written about the love of God for Israel and her patriarchs but, as A. B. Davidson has well stated:

"This love of Jehovah to Israel is entirely inexplicable.... Jehovah's love is free, and we cannot explain it. We can see, indeed, why He should love some one people, and enter into relations of redemption with them, and deposit His grace and truth among them; but we cannot see why one and not another. It helps us, however, somewhat if we perceive that His choice of one was only temporary, and for the purpose of extending His grace unto all."¹

Herbert Breit compares the love of Yahveh with that of Christ as an explanation.² Indeed, Norman H. Snaith, after a lengthy discussion on "The Election-Love of God," gives the reason for God's unmerited love to Israel in the words of Charles Wesley's hymn, "He hath loved, He hath loved us, because He would love."³ Any attempt to speculate upon a reason would be erroneous, except as A. B. Davidson explains, "It helps us, however, somewhat if we perceive that His choice of our nation was only temporary, and for the purpose of extending His grace unto all."⁴

-
1. The Theology of the Old Testament, p. 170, f.
 2. Die Predigt Des Deuteronomisten, p. 35.
 3. The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament, pp. 131-137.
 4. The Theology of the Old Testament, p. 171.

This brings us to the second part of our proposition, i.e., to the purpose of Israel's election. All agree that, from the viewpoint of Christian theology, Yahveh's purpose in choosing Israel was to use her for a universal blessing.¹ As E. Jacobs observes: "God loves his people in order to achieve his aim with them, that is to say the establishment of his kingship over the world."² This great privilege of being chosen of God involved great responsibilities. Israel was to be a holy nation that she might be a witness of God's revelation to her. Israel was to be a channel to disseminate the faith of Yahveh to the whole of mankind. Indeed, we have perhaps assumed too much, for the Deuteronomist nowhere states that Israel was chosen to be a blessing to mankind, or that Israel should be a witness to other nations. It would seem rather to be contradicted by such particularism as preached by the Deuteronomist and mingled with hatred against any idolatrous nation with whom Israel must have nothing to do except to exterminate them. Keil & Delitsch, in interpreting Dt. 7:1, ff. states that the Israelites were "exhorted to be aware of false tolerance."³ Verses 7:2, f. state clearly Israel's mission,

-
1. G. Ernest Wright, The Old Testament Against Its Environment, p. 51.
 2. Theology of the Old Testament, p. 111.
 3. Deuteronomy, at ch. 7:1, ff.

and it seems completely contradictory to the above statement of Israel's being a blessing to all nations. It pictures rather the ideal Israel as the terror and envy of other nations. In spite of all this, the message of the book has a universal meaning beyond its own conception. The answer is to be found in W. Robertson Smith's succinct statement:

"The Hebrew ideal of a divine kingship that must one day draw all men to do it homage offered better things than these, not in virtue of any feature that it possessed in common with the Semitic religions as a whole, but solely through the unique conception of Jehovah as a God whose love for His people was conditioned by a law of absolute righteousness. In other nations individual thinkers arose to lofty conceptions of a supreme deity, but in Israel, and in Israel alone, these conceptions were incorporated in the accepted worship of a national god. And so of all the gods of the nations Jehovah alone was fitted to become the God of the whole earth."¹

The Significance of the Election and the Covenant

The Covenant is the most central and fundamental teaching of the Old Testament,² a fact generally agreed upon by most scholars. We find, however, those who consider the covenant rather a hindrance to Israel's spiritual development. For example, Kraetzschmar, consistent

1. The Religion of the Semites, p. 81.

2. Compare H. H. Rowley, The Unity of the Bible, p. 112, ff.

with his theory, considers the covenant idea to be a "relapse" and sees in it "a compromise between the prophetic ideals and the power of comprehension of the masses."¹ Others may consider the covenant to be the result of God's irrational and arbitrary love,² yet R. Gallings, aware of the misconceptions that both the election and covenant may have brought with them, considers that both election and covenant elevated the Israelitic religion above all the nature religions of the earth, making it a historical religion, one which has its counterparts in historical events.³ Another very significant aspect is that the covenant points to the fact that Israel knew that Yahveh existed before she did, and perhaps considered Yahveh to be eternally existent. This fact further elevated Yahveh above any other gods of the East. The polytheists believed that the gods could not exist without a people and that their whole existence depended upon the people or clan which worshipped them; hence the belief that for their own sake these gods were compelled to save their worshippers in time of war. Norman H. Snaith has succinctly stated some points of significance about the

-
1. R. Kraetzschmar, Die Bundesvorstellung im Alten Testament, p. 146.
 2. Norman H. Snaith, Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament, p. 138.
 3. See K. Gallings, Die Erwaehlungstraditionen Israels, p. 92; Th. C. Vriezen, An Outline of Old Testament Theology, p. 140.

covenant:

"Out of these first distinctive ideas of the Covenant between Jehovah and Israel, four points of importance arise. Firstly, Jehovah existed before Israel. Secondly, if He once existed without them, He could do it again. Thirdly, if He chose them, He could also reject them. Fourthly, He was different from other gods in the demands He made upon His people as their part in the Covenant. These four points are of the utmost importance."¹

The Terminology of Election and Covenant

In our preliminaries it has already been said that in some cases the language used would be anthropomorphic. On the other hand, these anthropomorphisms also appear along with many concepts which purport to spiritualize Israel, such as גוי גדול or עם קדוש . We will follow a logical sequence in our discussion of the Deuteronomic terminology or phraseology.

A. B. Davidson observes that "it is difficult to say whether this choice follows God's love or is contemporaneous with it, or is but another way of expressing it."² For our present purpose we will consider love to be the cause and the election the effect. W. H. Snaith distinguishes between election-love אהבה and covenant-love חבה .³ Some derive חבה from אב (father) which

1. The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament, p. 108.
2. The Theology of the Old Testament, p. 171.
3. The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament, pp. 94-142.

would express fatherly love toward children. Others derive it from נתן (to give),¹ which may convey a sense of giving (out of love) both in a physical and spiritual way. Snaith suggests a root which conveys the idea "burn, kindle, be set on fire."² Perhaps the derivation from אב (father) is most plausible. First, it conveys a primitive idea of parental love. Secondly, it would seem fitting into the Deuteronomist's conception of Divine love as a fatherly love. Two analogies used by the Deuteronomist may confirm such an assumption. Yahveh carried Israel through the wilderness as a father would carry a little child in his arms, or as a man disciplines his child, so Yahveh thy God disciplines thee.³ Also the statement, "You are children unto Yahveh, your God" (14:1), makes the Deuteronomic conception of God's love to be that of a father's.⁴

As in all the characteristic phrases, the Deuteronomist has a high concept of divine love. It is a love for the sake of love. It is a pure, spiritual, unconditional, unmerited Divine love, with no motive whatsoever, and this is the primary reason for God's election of Israel. Be-

-
1. Compare S. Mandelkern, Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae, p. 17.
 2. The Distinctive Ideals of the Old Testament, p. 131.
 3. Dt. 1:31; 8:5; also compare L. Koehler, Old Testament Theology, p. 240.
 4. Compare also H. Breit, Die Predigt des Deuteronomisten, pp. 145-47.

cause of that love both to Israel and its patriarchs, Yahveh chose their descendants, namely Israel.

כי אהב את אבותיך ויבחר בזרעם אחריהם;

כי מאהבת יהוה אתכם ומשפרו את השבעה אשר נשבע לאבותיכם
The Deuteronomist gives another (secondary) reason,

namely, the patriarchal covenant to which Yahveh was bound by an oath. The term used here is שבעה . Both Gesenius and Mandelkern seem to be of the same opinion as to the etymology of שבעה (שבע) .² Seven was considered a sacred number. Whether basing it on an incident of Genesis 21:22 ff. (Mandelkern) or, as Gesenius thinks, the oath was seven times repeated, or one bound himself by seven things. Originally, שבעה may have been used in connection with covenant-making only, but later it was commonly used to express the making of an oath or a solemn promise. It is not quite certain whether all covenants were made in the presence of a seven-animal sacrifice. In the actual covenant between Yahveh and Abraham, described in Genesis chapter XV, Yahveh commands Abraham to prepare a sacrifice of three animals (although requested, the birds were not ^{divided} sacrificed). Nonetheless, we may assume our original view as the possible etymological interpretation. שבעה takes on a new meaning with the

1. Dt. 4:37; 7:6, 7; 10:15; 14:2.

2. Oxford Hebrew Lexicon, p. 989; Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae, p. 1144.

Deuteronomist in the phrase השבעה אשר נשבע לאבותיכם
 or its equivalent; אח ברית אבתיך אשר נשבע להם
 In this particular phrase, שבעה (or שבוע) means cove-
 nant or covenantal oath, (or the making of that, respec-
 tively) the very origin of Israel's covenant with God.
 In Yahveh's covenant with Abraham lies the genesis of
 Israel's covenant with Yahveh, Abraham being the person-
 ification of Israel.²

The next term is בחר (to elect). Yahveh, because
 of love toward the patriarchs and their posterity (pri-
 mary cause) and, because of the covenant concluded with
 them (secondary cause), elected Israel. The term בחר
 appears 32 times and conveys the meaning "to choose" "to
 select" or "elect." בחר may be used both in connection
 with sacred and secular things, but in Deuteronomy all
 but two³ signify divine choice. Rabbinical etymologies
 derive בחר from בחן (examine, test, try). Others sug-
 gest a mutation of the last radical from ב-ח to ב-ח-ר.⁴

It is true that, as J. Jocz observes, Israel's elec-

1. Dt. 4:31; 7:8; 8:18.

2. Compare B. W. Anderson, Understanding the Old Testa-
ment, p. 420.

3. Dt. 30:19; 23:17 refer to human choice; Dt. 4:37; 7:7;
 10:15 and 14:2 refer to the election of Israel. The
 remaining refer to the divine choice of priesthood,
 sanctuary or king.

4. See J. Fuerst, Concordance, under בחר.

tion brought upon her trials and persecutions;¹ but this is hardly an etymological explanation. There may be, though, some connection between קָרַב and בָּרַב . "To select" or "elect" is usually connected with "examination" as a preceding act, and it may well be that one is a derivative of the other.

However, we must remember that the divine choice of Israel was not based on any such examination but solely on divine grace. Let us then examine what that קָרַב involved on the part of Israel.

1. It means distinction. Israel, by being elected of Yahveh, is a great nation $\text{גִּבּוֹרֵי גָּוִים}$. The word originated from גָּבַח (or גָּבַח) meaning "the back, the center (main part of body)."² The suffix -וֹת signifies a plurality, therefore here a grouping of bodies, a community or nation. In biblical Hebrew it is applied mostly to non-Israelitic nations. The Deuteronomist, by adding the adjective גִּבּוֹרֵי , has made it to be a title of distinction, and when it appears in singular form it always refers to Israel alone and to no other nations. In addition to this specific lexical meaning, the Deuteronomist spiritualizes

1. Compare Jakob Jocz, A Theology of Election, p. 46, ff.

2. Cf. Oxford Hebrew Lexicon, p. 156; G. H. Dalman, Aramaeischneuhebraeisches Woerterbuch, p. 69; L. Mandelkern, Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae, p. 255.

the phrase and makes it convey a distinct theological idea: that a people has become a great nation through an act of divine grace, i.e., election. Her greatness is not to be understood numerically but spiritually. Her election sealed by the covenant brought her into relationship with a holy God. Israel's ideal was to be worthy of her calling and her elevated state above all other nations on the earth by obedience to His voice.

2. It meant separation. That Israel was set apart from all other nations is fully confirmed in the phrase

וְיִשְׂרָאֵל . It may be correct to state that יִשְׂרָאֵל (people) originated from the preposition יַחַד (with).¹ There may be two reasons why biblical Hebrew uses יַחַד and not אֶחָד when speaking of the Hebrew people as a "holy nation." First, the Hebrew people considered themselves related to each other by common descent and heritage. Secondly, they had a strong sense of corporate personality.² The adjective וְיִשְׂרָאֵל which is used six times as an epithet is derived

1. Compare Oxford Hebrew Lexicon, p. 766.

2. "God revealed Himself to Israel in a certain series of events which were interpreted to Israel by Moses.... The fact that the Hebrews had a strong sense of corporate personality made it easier for them to regard history as the supreme revelation of God, since, when God chose Israel in Egypt and dealt with it at Sinai, he was in effect dealing with the whole of Israel in all its succeeding generations." H. H. Rowley, Editor, The Old Testament and Modern Study, Ch. XI, pp. 333, 334.

from the verb שָׂדַף meaning "to set apart for a particular use." It conveys to us the idea of separation.¹ The root שָׂדַף is most probably a Canaanite one which the Hebrews had taken over with a number of other words pertaining to the cult.² Its etymological root is, no doubt,

שָׂדַף "separated", "cut off."³ Israel has been separated from all other nations, to serve Yahveh. Her being holy is not something of her own merit. Israel is a holy nation because the election and covenant made it possible for Yahveh's Presence to dwell in her midst. And that is the main reason why Israel is holy, not because of any inherent holiness of her own.⁴ It expresses a sense of belonging. Israel is Yahveh's inheritance or peculiarly-treasured people.

3. Israel is עַם נַחֲלָה and עַם סִגְלָה . Israel belongs to Yahveh not in a natural sense, but as subject to Yahveh, her Sovereign.

נַחֲלָה means "possession" "property" "inheritance", as Yahveh's possession or subject. Being the property of Yahveh implies undivided loyalty in worship, in keeping His laws, and in doing His will. She is obliged to obey, for disobedience may bring severe consequences upon her

1. See Oxford Hebrew Lexicon, p. 871.

2. G. Kittel, Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament, vol. I, p. 88.

3. Ibid.

4. Op. cit., p. 91.

since, being the property of Yahveh, He has the right to do as He sees just. These obligations, moreover, are not one-sided. Yahveh as her Sovereign will protect her from her enemies and bless every undertaking.

It seems as if the Deuteronomist may have wanted to exclude any idea of a master-slave relationship which the word נחלה might convey. He therefore uses עמ נחלה interchangeably with another phrase עמ גולה. The word גולה is derived from the verb ללו meaning "to acquire with a desire,"¹ such as the acquisition of a treasure, precious jewels, or a dear friend.² This is confirmed by the passage in Deuteronomy 7:6-8 where, in connection with the word גולה, the words בחר, (to elect) רשק, (to desire, to crave for) and אהב (to love) are used. גולה is a noun meaning "treasure,"³ but here it is used as a construct phrase with עמ גולה, the two together forming one idea: 'a people specially treasured (or prized) by Yahveh.'⁴ This would clarify the relationship between Yahveh and Israel as not being that of master-slave, but rather a relationship marked by love and esteem. For, as Th. C. Vriezen observes: "The Hebrew word berith (Covenant)

-
1. Cf. Oxford Hebrew Lexicon, p. 688; S. Mandelkern, Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae, p. 790.
 2. Compare S. R. Driver, Deuteronomy, I.C.C., p. 100.
 3. I Chr. 29:3; Eccl. 2:8.
 4. S. R. Driver, Deuteronomy, I.C.C., p. 100.

means something like 'bond of communion'; a covenant means as it were a circle enclosing both partners, not so much a 'limitation' (Buber) as a being brought together into an intimate relationship."¹

This brings us to the final phrase **יהוה אלהינו כרת עמנו ברית** concluding the covenant between Yahveh and Israel. Some derive the etymology of **ברית** from the Assyrian **BARU** or Hebrew **ברח** (to bind, to fetter).² S. Mandelkern derives **ברית** from **ברח** (meal); however, he interprets it as "to cut."³ The phrase **כרת ברית** makes our first etymological root rather to contradict its meaning. If accepted, it would then mean "to cut the bond" instead of "to unite in a bond." S. R. Driver has a valuable note on Dt. 4:13,⁴ where he calls attention to the cutting of an animal as an integral part of the covenant ceremony. In the covenant between Yahveh and Abraham two elements are mentioned: a sacrifice and a solemn promise.⁵ The sacrificial ritual involved the cutting of the animal into two pieces. The

1. An Outline of Old Testament Theology, p. 141.

2. Oxford Hebrew Lexicon, p. 136; R. Kraetzschmar, Die Bundesvorstellung im Alten Testament, p. 244, ff.

3. Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae, p. 234. Also compare Kittel, Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament, Vol. II, p. 121.

4. Deuteronomy, I.C.C., p. 67.

5. Gen. 15:9, 10, 13-16.

words used in connection with that ritual are **בָּחַר** (to cut into two pieces) and **בִּחְרָה** (a piece of a whole parted into two).¹ The ritual of cutting the sacrificial animal into two parts was to symbolize the unity of both partners or agreement in some particular action or engagement. The exchange of **בָּחַר** for **בָּרַח** is a common occurrence in Hebrew and affords no difficulties.² There is no absolute proof that this etymology is the only correct one, but it would seem a plausible solution for explaining the phrase, **כָּרַח בְּרִיחַ** "to cut a covenant" since the original covenant consisted, among other things, of cutting the animal into two parts.³ Perhaps an analysis of the use of **בְּרִיחַ** by the Deuteronomist will throw some light on its etymology.

1. 4:13, with the use of the verb, (נגד) הגיד "to

-
1. Gen. 15:10. Compare also Jer. 34:18.
 2. The exchange of radicals is very common in the Hebrew language without changing the meaning of the word with the exception of a few verbs which receive a related connotation. (**גָּזַר** Ps. 136:13; Is. 9:19; **גָּרוּז** Ps. 31:23; **כָּרַח** Ex. 29:39, 40, 41; **כָּשַׁב** Dt. 14:4; **שָׁמַלַח** Dt. 8:4; 10:18; **שָׁלַח** Dt. 24:13; 29:4; **רָעַץ** Ex. 15:6; Jud. 10:8; **עָרַץ** Dt. 1:29; 7:21.) It is worth noticing that the derivative nouns are formed like **בְּרִיחַ** from the verbs with exchanged radicals: **גְּרוּזָן**, **שְׁלִמְוֹן**;
 3. See Oesterley & Robinson for the meaning of the ritual: Hebrew Religion, p. 156, ff. Also R. Kraetzschmar, Die Bundesvorstellung im Alten Testament, p. 41, f.

tell."

2. 4:23, 31, with the use of the verb, שכח "to forget."

3. 5L2, 3; 29:13, contain the technical phrase כרת ברית explained above as the only proper expression for "making a covenant."

4. 7:9, 12; 29:8, with the use of the verb שמר "to keep."

5. 8:18, with the use of the verb הקים (קום) "to fulfil."

6. 9:9, 12, 15, as a part of a construct phrase לחות הברית "the tablets of the covenant."

7. 10:8; 31:9, 25, 26, as a part of a construct phrase, ארון ברית יהוה "the ark of the covenant," or "the ark of the covenant of Yahveh."

8. 17:2, with the use of the verb, עבר "to transgress."

9. 28:69; 29:8, as a part of a construct phrase דברי הברית "the words (commandments) of the covenant."

10. 29:11, with the use of the verb, עבר ב- "to enter."¹

1. Both 17:2 and 29:11 have the verb עבר . However, the first is the usual word for transgressing or violating, while the second forms a phrase with עבר בברית which is prefixed with the preposition.....ב . This, too,

11. 29:20, as a part of a construct phrase, אלוה
 הבריה "the curses (imprecations) of the covenant."¹

12. 29:24, with the use of the verb, עזב "to
 forsake."

13. 31:16, 20, with the use of the verb (פרר) הפר
 "to break."

The above analysis shows that the characteristic
 phrase כרת בריה is used nine times. The use of כרת
 is especially absent when בריה takes on the connotation
 of "decatalogue" "law" -- where the use of the verb צוה
 with בריה is justified. However, when the Deuteronomic
 message refers to the performance of the covenant it uses
 the characteristic phrase כרת בריה which, to some
 extent, may indicate בחר (ברת) as being derived from בריה

The Meaning of the Covenant

There are three covenants, or actually three stages
 of the same covenant. The Deuteronomist refers first to

is a technical phrase, taking its origin from the original
 ritual, where the covenanting party passed עבר through
 the pieces of the animal. (Gen. 15:17).

1. J. Hempel (Biblia Hebraica) reads it אלה הבריה which
 would be more in conformity with the singular הכתובה.
 On the other hand, the SM., LXX, Syr., Vg., Tg., Ar.
 have a plural verb. (S. Davidson, The Hebrew Text, Dt.)
 Luther's translation has a singular verb, probably re-
 ferring to בריה.

a covenant between Yahveh and Abraham (who personifies Israel). Abraham is not always mentioned by name, but by אַבְרָהָם (אֲבִרָם). The second mention is the Horeb (Sinai) covenant through the mediation of Moses. The third is a renewal of the second.¹ It is obvious that the covenant with Abraham must have meant something altogether different from what it meant to Israel facing the power of God at Horeb. Though in both cases we have fire and smoke symbolic of the presence of Yahveh,² to Abraham it meant prosperity, and he could hardly have understood thereby all the implications of the Sinai covenant.³ There are great differences between the two. In the patriarchal covenant, Yahveh makes a covenant with an individual; at Sinai with a people.⁴ God's covenant with Israel meant a revelation of Himself. For the covenantal obligations required of the Israelites were such as to imitate Yahveh.

First, the God of Israel is a holy God. Israel, therefore, in order to retain her epithet קְדוֹשׁ, גְּדוּלָהּ received by entering the covenant relation with Yahveh, must pursue holiness. Holiness demands purity. Therefore,

-
1. The Deuteronomist purports this to have taken place in Moab but consistent with our thesis we may assume the covenant to be permanent and renewed with each generation.
 2. Gen. 15:17; Dt. 5:5, 22.
 3. Compare L. Koehler, Old Testament Theology, p. 64.
 4. Compare op. cit., p. 65.

Israel as a corporate unity and individuality must be purified from any foreign elements and influences in every area of life. First of all, there must be purity of worship, followed by moral purity within the life of the community and the family.

Secondly, Yahveh is a God of justice. Hence, Israel must comply with such laws as are just in the eyes of Yahveh and Him alone.

Thirdly, Israel is to reciprocate Yahveh's love towards her and express her gratitude to God by maintaining an attitude of awe and reverence towards Him.

Fourthly, Yahveh is a God of faithfulness. He therefore requires of Israel an undivided loyalty in all her activities, whether they be on a national level, or individually.¹

When Israel proves that she has accomplished all these, then, and only then, her covenant with Yahveh will have become a reality. That reality would aim at the ideal theocracy which the Deuteronomic teachings purport to establish. In response to Israel's undivided loyalty, Yahveh was to be her Sovereign and Law-giver, her Judge, her Champion and Protector. Israel's triumphs over her

1. Herbert Breit, Die Predigt des Deuteronomisten, p. 137, ff. Breit takes a similar position in listing what the covenant involved, and so finds its true meaning.

enemies were His for He won them for her. Israel's prosperity and wellbeing was Yahveh's gift, for Israel's dwelling places and their labors are blessed by Yahveh's Presence in her midst. However, this ideal state of Yahveh's Kingship upon earth, was but a dream which has come true only in part. Biblical history confirms it. Therefore, ideal theocracy, or Yahveh's Kingship on earth may be looked upon more as a hope than a reality. The covenant only brought renewed hope to Israel within its various epochs of political and religious reconstruction. It was that hope that nourished Israel particularly in periods of crisis, during national calamities and exiles. Her hope was unfailling, that the same Yahveh Who redeemed her from Egypt and established her as a nation will once again redeem her as the same favorite and chosen people. Even in her being rejected she has clung to Yahveh's promise and assurance that He will not fail her, for "he will keep the covenant and mercy-love (חַסְדִּים). That assurance and her never-ceasing hope lies in the word חַסְדִּים .

The word חַסְדִּים , as well observed by N. Glueck,¹ is at times identical with the words חַסְדִּים and חַסְדִּים , and therefore are brought together in the characteristic phrase

1. Das Wort Hesed, p. 38, ff. Compare also N. H. Snaith, The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament, p. 99, ff.

שֶׁכֶּן הַבְּרִיחַ וְהַחֹסֵד.¹ Like בְּרִיחַ , חֹסֵד is an integral part of Israel's history, for only through Yahveh's חֹסֵד does she exist. Moreover, her very election is based on this חֹסֵד and not on Israel's inherent greatness or nobility.

Etymologically, according to Gesenius and Norman H. Snaith,³ the meaning of חֹסֵד is derived from an Arabic root conveying the connotation, 'ardent desire'. E. Jacobs thinks that its primitive meaning was 'strength'.⁴ The present writer, however, believes that חֹסֵד may have originated from חָסַד 'to have compassion' which was a bilateral word (חָסַד). It would be descriptive of Yahveh's love as a compassionate or mercy-love. Which of these etymological derivations may be correct is difficult to say, although the suggestion 'strength' seems to be the least possible.

To find the true meaning of חֹסֵד , it would be well to draw upon some of the concluding statements of N. Glueck, particularly those which fit into the Deuteronomic teaching.

1. Only those who stand in an ethical and religious

1. Dt. 7:(8), 9, 12.

2. Oxford Hebrew Lexicon, p. 338.

3. *Op. cit.*, p. 95, ff.

4. Theology of the Old Testament, p. 103.

relationship with Yahveh may await and are recipients of His חַסֵּד .

2. Yahveh's חַסֵּד corresponds to the requirements of faithfulness and justice and as such are included in it.

3. Yahveh's חַסֵּד stand close in its connotation to 'compassion'.

4. Yahveh's חַסֵּד , although it may not be identified with 'grace' or 'mercy' (Gnade), rests upon the foundations of His grace and mercy.¹

The above definitions show clearly where Israel's strength and hope lies. It lies in Yahveh's חַסֵּד , of which the nearest equivalent would be 'mercy-love', or as N. H. Snaith terms it, 'the covenant-love'.² This חַסֵּד has been Israel's stronghold throughout the ages, and of which E. Jacobs writes: "In the midst of the changes inherent in a revelation of God in history chesed represents the permanent element which allows Yahveh to be always faithful to himself. It is to this chesed that every member of the covenant can appeal when he wishes to see the covenant maintained and confirmed."³

It may be said in conclusion that the same חַסֵּד 'covenant love', characterizes any covenant spoken of in

1. Das Wort Hesed, p. 66, f.

2. The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament, p. 94, ff.

3. Theology of the Old Testament, p. 105.

the Old Testament, a fact observed by J. Pederson¹ who states: "The basis of all Israelite ethos is the common feeling, love, and according to the nature of the compact it must, in its innermost essence, be a family feeling."¹

Thus TOPI has its application both to God and to men. In Deuteronomy TOPI appears only in connection with Yahveh², but its references to men may be found in the prophetic literature.³ When TOPI appears in reference to men it takes on a partly new connotation which is well formulated by G. Ernest Wright:

"In Old Testament usage, however, this word [hesed] does not refer primarily to God's love or grace for man but rather to the behaviour which the covenant relationship or blood relationship requires. No member of the community can do as he pleases. He must be loyal to his covenant obligations; that is, he must exercise hesed, involving obedience to the Divine commandments which are the laws of the community, a proper reverence (fear) for God, and justice and kindness towards his fellow-men."⁴

1. Israel, Its Life and Culture, vol. I, p. 309.

2. Dt. 5:10, 7:9, 12.

3. Hosea 6:4, 6; Jer. 2:2. The latter refers to the wilderness experience and therefore is self-explanatory as to the connotation of TOPI when applied to men.

4. The Challenge of Israel's Faith, p. 90, f. Inasmuch as the above definition is correct as referring to men, the term TOPI is, in Deuteronomy, primarily a character-revealing word of Yahveh. It is worth noticing that A. R. Johnson suggests 'devotion' as the equivalent for TOPI . Cf. H. H. Rowley (Editor), Studies in Old Testament Prophecy, p. 151.

There is yet one more term which appears frequently in Deuteronomy (היום) . When (היום) is to be found in reference to the covenant and appears in its immediate context, it is of special significance. The Deuteronomist uses this term to emphasize the validity of the covenant, as a perpetual agreement between Yahveh and each generation. It adds an existential element to the validity of the covenant. Every Israelite must not think of the covenant as a great historical event which had once taken place in the life of his nation, but rather as an ever-recurrent contemporaneousness of that which has once taken place. Every generation becomes united with the first generation which stood at Sinai and with all those that have followed.

"Yahveh our God made a covenant with us in Horeb. Not with our fathers (only) did Yahveh make this covenant but with us, we who are here, all of us alive this day.""You are standing this day, all of you, before Yahveh your God: your heads of your tribes, your elders and your officers, all the men of Israel. Your little ones, your wives, and thy stranger who is in the midst of thy camp, from the hewer of thy wood unto the drawer of thy water: That thou shouldest enter into the covenant of Yahveh thy God, and into his oath of denunciation, which Yahveh thy God maketh with thee this day. In order to constitute (avow) thee unto himself for a people, and that he might be unto thee a God, as he hath spoken unto thee, and as he hath sworn unto thy fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac and to Jacob. And not with you alone do I make this covenant and this oath; But with him that is standing here with us this day before Yahveh our God, and

"with him who is not here with us this day."¹

H. H. Rowley's statement is well fitting as a commentary on the above biblical quotation:

"Nowhere is it supposed that each generation should decide *de novo* whether it desired the bond to continue. Rather was it taught that on every generation rested the moral obligation to renew the Covenant in its own life, since each generation inherited a blessing which imposed its claim upon it."²

The adverbial form of הַיּוֹם (today, this day) is derived from the word יוֹם (day). It is also often used to signify 'periods' or 'years'.³ The word יוֹם is common to all Semitic languages, and its etymology is not known. As a simple adverb הַיּוֹם (הוּזָה) means 'today' as it is commonly used in any language. However when it appears in the immediate context with the covenant (with the possible inclusion of כָּל) it takes on a new connotation: 'the ever-present moment'. The Deuteronomist invested the phrase הַיּוֹם (הוּזָה) with a new, dynamic meaning, an ever-recurrent contemporaneousness, an ever-present experience in the life of every Israelite.

This meaning is made evident from the contents of the Deuteronomic message itself. Even if one were to take literally the historical setting of Deuteronomy, the

1. Dt. 5:3, 4; 29:9-14.

2. The Faith of Israel, p. 69, f.

3. Cf. Oxford Hebrew Lexicon, p. 398, ff.

preacher could not have addressed his audience as having been at Sinai (or Horeb) and having experienced God's self-revelation there. The Deuteronomist himself states clearly that the generation which actually had that experience had died in the wilderness.¹ The generation, then, which he would be addressing would not be one born in the wilderness. It is thus made clear that היום (הזה) is not to be understood literally, but rather as a spiritual and personal experience of the individual Israelite, as if he himself were present at the making of the original covenant at Sinai. The covenant was to be a contemporaneous event with every generation which she was to cherish and esteem through submission and obedience to the will of Yahveh.

1. With the exception of the leaders of Joshua and Caleb. See Dt. 1:34, ff.; 2:14, ff.

CHAPTER V

YAHVEH'S SOVEREIGNTY OVER ISRAEL

Yahveh the Sovereign of the Land

It would seem correct to state that Old Testament scholars have overlooked one very vital aspect of Old Testament theology -- "the land". Palestine, as a biblical land, has been extensively studied and written upon in the sphere of geography and history as companion studies to the Old Testament. The purpose of these studies has been confined to elucidation of the text and historical events. They have also served as a handmaid for biblical criticism. Very few scholars have called attention to the fact that it is in itself a vital element of Old Testament theology.¹ It may be mainly due to the fact that our modern way of thinking places this aspect in the purely political sphere. Such a view is mistaken, not only because there is no such distinction between the political and the religious in the Old Testament; but also

1. G. v. Rad mentions this aspect only in passing. Das Gottesvolk im Deuteronomium, see particularly pp. 6, 43. Herbert Breit, although devoting more space to it in his work, Die Predigt des Deuteronomisten, has not sufficiently emphasized it as a major element of the Deuteronomic theology. See pp. 153, 183, ff.

because, as well observed by G. F. Oehler, "the whole theocracy is purely earthly, blessing and curse are confined to life on earth."¹

In the first instance, the God of Israel is not only Sovereign of the religious life of the nation, i.e. of the cult, but also Ruler and Administrator in what we to-day would call the sphere of politics. In the second instance, "the land" is an integral part of the covenant between Yahveh and Israel. The covenant relation makes Israel to be Yahveh's inheritance נחלה² and, by the enactment of the same covenant, "the land" is Israel's inheritance.³ Yahveh, Israel, and the land form a covenantal triangle, and that covenant is incomplete without the participation of all three. While Yahveh and Israel are active partners of that covenant, the land takes on a passive role in the hands of both Yahveh and Israel. Palestine, as H. Breit observes,⁴ is not just another land among many others. First of all, it is a promised

-
1. The Theology of the Old Testament, p. 195. Compare also G. v. Rad who states: "Jahwes Segen ist irdisch aber nicht weltlich." Das Gottesvolk im Deuteronomium, p. 41, f.
 2. Dt. 4:20; 7:6; 9:26, 29; 14:2; (26:18, 19).
 3. Dt. 4:21, 31; 12:9, 10; 25:4; 19:14; 15:19. Also with the use of the verb נחל , 1:38; 3:28; 19:3.
 4. Die Predigt des Deuteronomisten, p. 183.

land, which the Deuteronomist expresses in his characteristic phrase (נו, כם) .¹ Thus the election and the covenant are inseparable from the land. The patriarchal covenant includes the land; so does the covenant at Sinai and at Moab.

Secondly, as Israel is elevated by her covenant relationship above all other nations, the land, too, is qualitatively superior to any other land. It is "the good land" אח הארץ הטובה .² It is a land flowing with milk and honey.³ This superlative state of the land is, of course, conditional, as the possession of the land itself is conditional. This land is Israel's inheritance only when Israel, fulfilling her covenantal obligations is Yahveh's inheritance. Likewise, only when the covenant between Yahveh and Israel becomes a reality, the land will be a source of manifold blessings. If, however, Israel breaks that covenant relationship, then "the heavens that are over thy head shall be copper, and the earth that is under thee shall be iron. And Yahveh will give as the rain of the land powder and dust, from heaven shall it come down upon

1. Dt. 1:8; 6:10, 23; 7:13; 8:1; 11:9, 21.

2. Dt. 1:25, 35; 3:25; 4:21, 11; 6:18; 8:7, 10; 9:6; 11:17.

3. Dt. 6:3; 11:9; 26:9, 15; 27:3.

thee, until thou be destroyed."¹ In that sense Yahveh is the Sovereign of the land, for it is completely at His disposal even when once given to Israel as her inheritance. For Yahveh gives the land to Israel undeservedly, only in realization of His promise and as a covenantal love-gift. When the covenant is broken the land is withdrawn from their possession, through Israel's exile or their untimely death.² Israel cannot boast that she has conquered the land by her own power. Her victories are won by Yahveh. The same Yahveh who is Israel's Deliverer from Egypt is also the Warrior;³ He makes the inheritance of the land possible by His almighty power.⁴

Thirdly, the land, like Israel, has been set apart (not in a political sense, although in our modern view this cannot be excluded) for purely religious purposes. Because of Israel's heathen environment, she is to serve Yahveh in the land.⁵ The blessings which are to come

1. Dt. 28:23, 24. Compare also 11:16, 17.

2. Dt. 4:25, ff; 11:16, 17; 28:15, ff.

3. A title ascribed to Yahveh in the poetical literature of the O.T. (Ex. 15:3; Ps. 24:8). Isaiah, in his prophecy of the coming destruction of Babylon, describes Yahveh "mustering a battle array" (13:4). This title is to be found directly in Dt. 4:34.

4. Dt. 1:30, 38; 3:22, 28; 7:17, ff; 9:5; 11:23; 12:10, 29; 19:3; 20:4, 13.

5. Dt. 4:14; 5:28; 6:1; 12:1; 19:14; 20:16.

upon Israel as a reward for her obedience and loyalty to Yahveh are confined to the land.¹ In fact, the whole realization of Israel's covenantal life is to take place only in the land.² The whole teaching of the Deuteronomic theocracy with Yahveh as its Sovereign is inconceivable without the land.

This Deuteronomist's teaching about "the land" is conveyed in his characteristic terms and phrases which he invests with a new lexical and theological meaning. The term ארץ (sometimes also אדמה) is used by the Deuteronomist in forming two distinct and significant phrases. The first is ארץ אשר נשבע לאבותיך

(דכ- , 11-) "the land which he swore unto thy (our, their) fathers."³ The usual meaning of ארץ is "earth" "land" or "country", and may include any land or country. In the above phrase, however, and in any other phrase with the use of verbs נחל, נהן, and ירש, it becomes a Deuteronomic term and is lexically limited to Palestine only. Theologically, the above-quoted phrase conveys to us the fact that this land is a "promised land" which

-
1. Dt. 4:25; 5:30; 12:10; 15:4; 25:19; 28:1-13 with particular reference to v. 8; 29:26; 30:16.
 2. Compare G. v. Rad, Das Gottesvolk im Deuteronomium, p. 43; Herbert Breit, Die Predigt des Deuteronomisten, p. 184.
 3. Dt. 1:8; 6:10, 23; 7:13; 8:1; 11:9, 21.

Yahveh has assigned to Israel as an inheritance before her national existence and concurrently with her election. This land has, therefore, been separated from other lands for this specific purpose. Although the Deuteronomist does not attach the epithet "holy" (קדש) as he does to Israel, he states it indirectly on various occasions. For example, Israel is not to defile (נטו)¹ the land, and must also ban, detest, and destroy anything that might remain after the defeated heathen people.² Israel must make every effort to "eradicate the evil from her midst."³ Israel's realization of being a "holy people" and a "great nation" is possible only in the land which was set apart for that purpose.

The land has no specific geographic boundaries as such⁴ and the Deuteronomist often speaks of extensions and additions.⁵ The only mark of Israel's possession is her abode there. The boundaries, consequently, are where no Israelite lives. These unstable boundaries are at the same time the boundaries of Yahveh's sovereignty over

1. Dt. 21:23; 24:4.

2. Dt. 7:2, ff.; 7:24, ff.; 20:12, ff.

3. Dt. 13:6; 17:7, 12; 19:19; 21:21; 22:21, 24; 24:7.

4. The geographical outline found in Dt. 34:1-3 is not considered here as this research is confined to Deuteronomy I - XXX.

5. Dt. 12:20; 19:8; 20:10, ff.

Israel.

The second phrase contains another term in addition to ארץ . This term is נחלה .¹ Its usual connotation is "property" or "(family) inheritance." However, in the phrase הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ נָחַן לְךָ נַחֲלָה the term נחלה has been lexically limited to mean "a common inheritance of all Israel."² Thus, the inheritance is a secondary factor, a material expression of the primary factor of unity: Yahveh's covenantal relationship with her, making Israel a brotherhood under Yahveh.

Theologically, נחלה is not to be construed as an inheritance in the common sense of the word, but as a result of the election and covenant it is an undeserved gift of love.³ And like the covenant, the נחלה is ever-restorable.⁴ For the idea is not confined to the three historical covenants mentioned in Deuteronomy but is an ever-recurrent contemporaneousness with every

1. Dt. 4:21; 15:4; 19:10; 21:23; 24:4; 25:19; 26:1.

2. Compare G. v. Rad, Das Gottesvolk im Deuteronomium, p. 43.

3. See Herbert Breit, Die Predigt des Deuteronomisten, p. 183, f.

4. This statement should not be compared with the present purely political state of Israel nor is it a result of what it conveys. For further clarification, see Th. C. Vriezen's noteworthy explanation. (Die Erwählung Israel's nach dem Alten Testament, p. 112, ff.) Cf. also H. Breit, op. cit., p. 149, f.

generation. ארץ or נחלה which is an integral part of the covenant relationship is, therefore, as ever-restorable possession. With the Deuteronomist there is no distinction between history and the present. Both the past and the present are a manifestation of Yahveh's love toward Israel.¹

Yahveh the Sovereign of the Individual Israelite

A few explanatory statements regarding the limitations of the present chapter and a contrast between the Deuteronomist's specific view and our modern view about the spheres of legislature may prove helpful.

It should be stated at the outset that no specific laws proclaiming Yahveh's sovereignty over Israel are considered here. It is not intended, within the limits of the present work, either to dwell upon or to enumerate laws contained in Deuteronomy.² The present research is confined to such characteristic phrases which proclaim Yahveh's sovereignty, some of which actually supersede the requirements of the laws themselves.

-
1. See Herbert Breit, Die Predigt des Deuteronomisten, p. 135, f.; H. H. Rowley, The Faith of Israel, p. 69, f.; Th. C. Vriezen, An Outline of Old Testament Theology, p. 142.
 2. Such classifications may be found in the following works: S. R. Driver, An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, p. 73, f.; Deuteronomy, I.C.C., p. iv, f.; A. C. Welch, The Code of Deuteronomy, p. 24, ff.; G. T. Manley, The Book of the Law, p. 65, ff., as well as others referred to throughout this work.

Secondly, to the Deuteronomist there is no distinction between sacred and secular, religious and civil in legislation. All laws are divine laws.¹ Therefore such phrases as ושמעת בקול יהוה אלהיך לשמך ולעשות, ללכת בדרכיו ליראה (לאהבה) אהו, ועשיה הטוב והישר בעיני יהוה,

may refer both to sacred and secular, or to the religious and civil life of Israel. This is well stated by H. Schultz:

"Hence this people does not stand to its legal constitution in the same relation as do modern peoples.Everything is of a piece, from the most trifling commandment regarding outward cleanliness up to the fundamental thoughts of the moral law. Civic virtue is indissolubly linked to piety. Whoever violates the great fundamental principles of law and order, dishonours the national God as grievously as he who directly attacks His rights and sanctuaries."²

In like manner, a distinction between personal and national religious life would seem artificial. Because the individual Israelite, as explained later, is an indivisible unit of the whole nation, responsible for both the religious and material welfare of his fellow men, he is called אָח , "a brother,"³ not a citizen. In the

-
1. Compare A. C. Welch, The Code of Deuteronomy, p. 87, f.; O. Procksch, Theologie des Alten Testaments, p. 232.
 2. Old Testament Theology, Vol. I, p. 138.
 3. Cf. G. v. Rad, Das Gottesvolk im Deuteronomium, pp. 9, 43. Compare also H. Breit, Die Predigt des Deuteronomisten, p. 185, ff.

first place, it is a natural brotherhood, claiming the same patriarchs as their progenitors. Secondly, it is a brotherhood in a spiritual sense because of the covenant relationship to one and the same Yahveh. Thirdly, it is a confined brotherhood possessing a common inheritance, the land. While there is no distinction between personal and national religion, there are, however, some phrases which have a definite personal appeal. Hence our present division into two: Yahveh's sovereignty over the individual Israelite and over the whole nation. It is purely a matter of system and convenience and not a Deuteronomic idea.

There are four characteristic phrases which seem to have a personal appeal. They represent four consecutive steps which every individual Israelite is to take in order to fulfil the covenantal obligations. Only when he has complied with these requirements does he become worthy to be one of Yahveh's chosen people, a member of a 'great nation' גוי גדול and of a 'holy people'

עם קדוש .

The fundamental motivation of all obedience is expressed in the personal appeal phrased as follows :

ואהבת את יהוה אלהיך בכל לבבך ובכל נפשך ובכל מאודך

1. Dt. 6:5; 10:12; 11:13; 13:14; 30:6.

The Deuteronomist, in the above phrase, makes clear that Yahveh's Sovereignty over Israel on the individual level is not a master-slave relationship; rather, the first requisite is 'love.' The individual Israelite is "to love Yahveh with all his heart, soul and might." One is an Israelite only when he is one inwardly, which means the whole man: his entire personality, physical strength, desires, and aspirations--all are claimed for allegiance to Yahveh. Israel is to love Yahveh as her Sovereign because He proved to be her Redeemer who liberated her from Egyptian slavery, her Champion and Protector against all the nations whose land He has promised as her inheritance. In loving Yahveh, Israel is reciprocating Yahveh's love toward her.

The term אָהַב 'to love' has already been discussed in Chapter III. Both Yahveh's love to Israel and her love to Him are always to be understood as spiritual. There is, however, a difference between the love of God toward Israel and that of Israel toward Him. The first is an unmerited love and the latter a rightly deserved one.

As a result of that love, the individual Israelite is ללכת בדרכיו ליראה (לאהבה) אהו ולדבקה בו "to walk in His ways, to fear (reverence) Him and to cling to Him."¹

1. Dt. 8:6; 10:12; 11:22; 19:9; 30:16.

Here love and obedience are united as the greatest force in Israel's life. This is not obedience for its own sake, but rather a natural result of Israel's love for Yahveh.

Both הלך and יָרַד as they are used in the above phrase are characteristic of the Deuteronomic message.

The usual connotation of הלך is 'to go' 'to walk', but when it appears as a construct phrase ללכת בדרךיו it means to follow in obedience, fulfilling the covenantal obligations.

Of particular interest is יָרַד.¹ Whenever this construct phrase appears (sometimes also in singular with verbs יָרַד or יָרַד²) it has a moral application, and is to be understood as the total of divine laws to which Israel is to remain obedient.³ One could compare it with the New Testament ἡ ὁδός.⁴ יָרַד is to the Deuteronomist "the way of Yahveh" as ἡ ὁδός is to the evangelist "the way of Christ," each according to his period of revelation.

The term יָרַד is derived from the verb יָרַד 'to

-
1. Compare A. Kuenen, The Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch, p. 111; S. R. Driver, Deuteronomy, I.C.C., pp. lxxxii, 108.
 2. Dt. 11:28; 13:6.
 3. Compare S. Mandelkern, Veteris Testamenti Concordantiæ, who among others lists: Deum colendi ratio; præcepta, leges.
 4. Acts 19:9, 23; 24:22.

tread upon' 'to walk.'¹ Both the noun and the verb have many derivative or figurative meanings.² Out of the forty-seven times that קָוַל appears in Deuteronomy, only thirteen³ have a moral application.

The next step the individual Israelite is to take is expressed in the phrase ושמעת בקול יהוה אלהיך לשמך
 וילעשון.⁴ In this phrase both the verb שמע and the noun קול receive new connotations. The usual meaning of שמע is 'to hear' 'to listen.' Here it means 'to obey.' The term קול, 'voice' 'sound' takes on a new meaning, 'command.' The phrase should therefore read: "And thou shalt obey the command of Yahveh thy God to keep and to do it." Like דבר 'to speak,' when it has in its immediate context one of the divine names or one of the verbs צוה, שמע, שמך, it conveys God's command.⁵ It

-
1. J. Fuerst's Concordance under קָוַל and in its etymological section on p. 1241; Oxford Hebrew Lexicon, p. 202; S. Mandelkern, Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae, p. 301.
 2. Ibid.
 3. Dt. 5:30; 8:6; 9:12, 16; 10:12; 11:22, 28; 13:6; 19:9; 26:17; 28:9; 30:16; (31:29). The particular phraseology considered here appears only five times. See Footnote 1, p. 129. The characteristic Deuteronomic phrase ושמעת בקול יהוה אלהיך לשמך appears seven times; the meaning of the remaining six is easily determined on the basis of the verbs קוּל and צוה found in their immediate context.
 4. Dt. 13:3, 19; 15:5; 26:14, 17; 27:10; 28:1, 2, 15, 45.
 5. Compare O. Grether, Name und Wort Gottes im Alten Testament, p. 58, f.

means that when Yahveh speaks, it is the command of the Sovereign.

Although the preceding and the present phrase call for obedience, both in thought and action, the latter seems to have a special appeal. ללכת בדרכיו is a call for obedience to written divine laws, while ושמעה בקולו

יהוה in addition to the written laws, calls for obedience in matters where the "voice of Yahveh" would be the only guide as to what step the individual should take. The case of a false prophet may be cited¹ where this phrase appears. It is not always easy to determine, even with the instruction in the text, whether or not the prophet is a false one. In such cases the person should rely on God's guidance, "the voice of Yahveh." It characterizes an earnest seeker after Yahveh.²

The final phrase which seems to have a personal appeal is ויעשה (הטוב ו-) הישר בעיני יהוה (אלהיו)³ Every Israelite is "to do that which is good and right in the eyes of Yahveh." The individual who loves Yahveh with all the fibres of his being and walks in His ways

1. Dt. 13:2, ff.

2. Compare Keil and Delitzsch, Deuteronomy, at ch. IV, v. 30.

3. Dt. 6:18; 12:25, 28; 13:19; 21:9. This phrase occurs also in Kings and Chronicles, but without the combination of הטוב והישר.

will have a sensitive conscience to distinguish between good and evil in the light of Yahveh's teaching. Both לטב and נָכוֹן have a relative value, but when they are combined in the above phrase with (אלהיך) בעיני יהוה they represent positive teaching. Only what is "good and right in the eyes of Yahveh" should be considered as such; all other things are of an opposite quality.

The term לטב is both a verb and an adjective. It is a primitive, originally biliteral (still preserved in Aramic, Syriac and Palmyrene languages¹) Semitic word meaning 'good' or 'pleasing.' נָכוֹן is an adjective derived from the verb נָכוֹן meaning 'to be straight' 'to be right.' Hence נָכוֹן means one whose acts are right in a moral sense. Both adjectives לטב and נָכוֹן are used here in an ethical sense. The individual Israelite is "to do that which is both pleasing and right in the eyes of Yahveh."

These four phrases proclaim a personal religion. Without listing any specific laws, it not only includes them but supersedes them because of the motivation and the requirement of a religion that proceeds from the heart.

1. Cf. Oxford Hebrew Lexicon, p. 373; G. H. Dalman, Aramisch-Neuhebraeisches Woerterbuch, p. 156.

Yahveh the Sovereign of Israel

While the Deuteronomic addresses have a personal appeal¹ the preacher is aware of addressing an assembly. His purpose, then, is twofold. First, he appeals to the individual within that assembly to yield to Yahveh in undivided loyalty. Secondly, he calls attention to the fact that the individual cannot fulfil his covenantal obligations until he sees to it that the community in which he lives is a God-fearing and obedient one like himself. Every Israelite is "a brother"² to every other, and therefore as much responsible to Yahveh for the acts of others as for his own. The conduct of his community is relegated to his constant care and watchfulness.

The hortatory characteristic phrases addressed to the assembly take on a more legal form. All Israel³ is both to keep and teach others "the commandment(s), the statutes and the judgements" which Yahveh commands them,

אח המצוה (ח) החקים והמשפטים אשר צוה יהוה אלהיך (-כס) ⁴

-
1. Compare S. R. Driver, Deuteronomy, I.C.C., p. xxxiii, f.
 2. Dt. 1:16, 28; 3:18, 20; 10:9; 15:2, 3, 7, 9, 11, 12; 17:15, 20; 18:2, 15, 18; 19:18, 19; 20:8; 22:1, 2, 3, 4; 23:20, 21; 24:7, 14; 25:2, 11; 28:54. Cf. also H. Breit, Die Predigt des Deuteronomisten, p. 185, f.
 3. A characteristic phrase often used by the Deuteronomist: 1:1; 5:1; 11:6; 13:12; 18:6; 21:21; 21:9; 29:1.
 4. Dt. 4:40; 5:31; 6:1; 7:11; 8:11; 10:13; 28:15, 45; 30:16.

The Deuteronomist distinguishes between three kinds of divine laws. The first מצוה is derived from the verb צוה 'to give charge' 'to command' or 'to order.' therefore, means 'commandment' in a general sense and may include all the laws contained in Deuteronomy. As L. Koehler states: "All that God commands or forbids can be called מצוה."¹ It may be synonymous with משפט in the sense that Yahveh is Israel's only Judge,² and the שפט (human judge) is His representative which is the true conception of theocracy. The same may be said of חקים, 'statutes.'

However, they are distinguished in the Deuteronomic phraseology. The rabbinical interpreters distinguish between חקים and משפטים claiming that the first have no explanation for their decree, while in the latter the reason is either stated or understood in itself.³ While this may be true to a certain extent, the terminology has an explanation of a more intrinsic nature.

חק or חקה is a stationary, permanent and unchangeable law, and therefore correctly rendered "statute."

1. Old Testament Theology, p. 203.

2. See Dt. 1:17. Compare also G. Kittel, Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament, vol. III, p. 920, f.; H. Breit, op. cit., p. 178, f.

3. M. Maimonides, Moreh Nebuchim, III, 26; Rashi, Lev. 18:

4. See also J. Reider, Deuteronomy, at 4:1.

Etymologically, it is derived from קָטַן ¹ meaning 'to cut in (stone)', 'to inscribe' or 'to engrave.' They are therefore called קִטְוֹת i.e., "fixed by being engraven, or inscribed on some durable surface."² קִטְוֹת are also established institutions or hallowed conventions,³ referring mostly to cult and ritual, but may also include civil enactment if such are made fixed and permanent.⁴

פְּסוּקֵי is derived from the verb פָּסַד , and hence פְּסוּקֵי ⁵ means a pronouncement or verdict of a divinely appointed person פֶּסֶד . These פְּסוּקֵי or 'judgements' some of which have already been codified, are both in the spheres of cult and ritual as well as the purely civil. These are the valid explanations for the Deuteronomic distinction of the laws.⁶

In the light of history and archaeology, not all the laws are of Israelitic origin. Israel has adopted many from its Canaanite neighbours. According to A. Alt,⁷ the

1. S. R. Driver, Deuteronomy, I.C.C., p. 62; Oxford Hebrew Lexicon, p. 349.

2. S. R. Driver, ibid. Cf also L. Koehler, op. cit., p. 203, f.

3. A. Kuenen, The Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch, p. 178.

4. Compare Keil and Delitsch, Deuteronomy, at ch. IV, v. 1.

5. The noun is formed according to the well known rule of

קִטְוֹת פְּסוּקֵי.

6. Cf. L. Koehler, Old Testament Theology, p. 203, ff.

7. Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel, p. 295, ff.

form of the law is a factor in determining whether it is Israelitic or not. Alt distinguishes two forms in which the biblical laws are phrased: the casuistic and the apodictic. The casuistic are such laws as form a conditional phrase with the conjunction אם ¹ or כי .² An analysis of the casuistic laws found in Deuteronomy shows that most of them pertain to what we today would call civil legislature. It may be correct to state that, with a few exceptions, the casuistic form of law corresponds with $\text{דְּבָרֵי דִּיּוּרִים}$ or, 'judgements,' in Deuteronomy.

The apodictic laws are those which are stated clearly and concisely. They appear in the 'thou-style' followed by a negative command with either אֵל or לֹא . The Decalogue³ is the best example of apodictic law. Also, the curses in Deuteronomy 27:15-26 represent the biblical form of apodictic law.⁴ According to A. Alt, the casuistic form of law is characteristic of all Canaanite nations from whom the Hebrews have taken over both the laws and their form. However, the apodictic form of laws is exclusively of Hebrew origin.⁵

1. Dt. 20:11, 12; 21:14; 22:2, 20, 25; 24:1, 12; 25:2, 7.

2. Dt. 12:20, 21; 13:2, 7, 13; 14:7, 8; 15:7, 12, 16; 17:2, 8; 19:16; 20:10; 21:1, 10, 15, 18; 22:6, 8, 13, 22, 23, 28; 23:11, 22, 25, 26; 24:1, 5, 7, 10, 20, 21.

3. Dt. 5:7, ff.

4. A. Alt, Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel, Band, I, p. 302.

5. Op. cit., p. 323.

Returning to the characteristic phrases, the phrase which seems to follow logically would be (ד-) לֹא תִסָּוּר מִן

יְמִין וּשְׂמָאל "Thou shalt not turn aside from....

neither to the right nor to the left."¹ Once Israel has learned the laws (the commandments, statutes, and judgments) she must abide by them. They must be made her rule of life. The verb סָוַר is here used in a moral sense. The original meaning of סָוַר is 'to turn aside'; sometimes also 'to enter in' in the sense that the traveller turns aside from the road he has pursued to enter a house, shelter, etc.² Here it is confined to one lexical and theological meaning, i.e., to depart from Yahveh's way; to apostatize. It is the opposite of שָׁמַע בְּקוֹל . Apart from its frequent use in its original meaning, סָוַר appears thirteen times³ in connection with God's commandments.

As already mentioned, the responsibility of the people is not only to obey personally, but every Israelite is to safeguard obedience to the law in his community. This is expressed in the phrase וְבִעַרְתָּ הָרָע מִקִּרְבְּךָ (מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל)⁴, "And thou shalt eradicate the evil from your midst" (from Israel's midst). Although this phrase appears mostly in

1. Dt. 17:11, 20; 28:14.

2. Compare Oxford Hebrew Lexicon, p. 693.

3. Dt. 4:9; 5:29; 9:12, 16; 11:16, 28; 13:6; 17:11, 17, 20; 19:16; 28:14; (31:29).

4. Dt. 13:6; 17:7, 12; 19:19; 21:21; 22:21, 24; 24:7.

connection with idolatry or apostasy, it includes any and all "evil." This phrase shows that Israel's faith must be one of solidarity and must not lack in public testimony.

וַיִּבְרַח is the Pi'el form of בָּרַח, 'to burn' 'to consume.' The Pi'el form usually expresses the intensive action;¹ evil must be utterly destroyed, leaving no traces of it. There is a twofold purpose in that command.

In the first instance it is the punishment the apostate deserves and must be enacted upon him. Secondly, this action of the part of Yahveh's faithful would teach a lesson to the whole community. It is the Deuteronomist's desire that Israel should obey and serve Him out of love, but knowing human nature, he has another motive, "fear."

This kind of punishment characterized by extreme severity is in accordance with the whole covenantal plan. Sin, whether committed by the individual, community or the whole nation, breaks the covenant relationship with Yahveh. However, when the requirement is fulfilled as expressed in the phrase וְיָבִיחַ אֶת-עֲוֹנוֹתָם מִפְּנֵי יְהוָה (מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל) i.e., utter destruction and eradication of evil, whether it be apostasy or crime, the covenant relationship is restored.² This kind of corporate responsibility is not

1. Compare A. B. Davidson, An Introduction to Hebrew Grammar, p. 65.

2. Compare Dt. 13:7-19, with particular reference to v. 18.

limited to crime or evil committed publicly. The same obligation rests upon the individual as well as upon the community when any evil (of which there are traces of evidence) has been committed secretly. A perfect example is the ritual of removal of corporate guilt in the case of the secretly committed murder.¹ This ceremony does not remove the guilt from the murderer,² but only from the community which has the responsibility of exterminating every evil and crime from their midst.

The eradication of evil from Israel's midst has (as already mentioned above) two more reasons besides restoring the broken covenant relationship with Yahveh. First, to mete out the deserved punishment upon those who commit the evil and defile the land; secondly, it is to be a public warning to the remainder to deter them from doing the same. Thus the Deuteronomist added another motive to his primary motive of love -- fear. But it is only a secondary motive and born out of necessity. The Deuteronomist expresses this motive of fear in the following two phrases: (כל הימים) למען חלמך ליראה את יהוה אלהיך³
 "in order that thou mayest fear Yahveh thy God (all thy

1. Dt. 21:1-9.

2. Dt. 27:24.

3. Dt. 4:10; 14:23; 17:19.

days)."

.... וְכָל יִשְׂרָאֵל (הַעַם) יִשְׁמְעוּ וְיִרְאוּן וְלֹא יִ;¹

"and all Israel shall listen and fear and shall not...."

From the above phrases it may be seen that the author of Deuteronomy distinguishes between two kinds of fear. In the first phrase where God is the object of fear, it should be understood as awe and reverence. For to the Deuteronomist fear of punishment as expressed in the second phrase is purely material and physical, namely loss of property or life or both. It could come immediately after the discovery of the committed sin, or later by divine retribution when apostasy or crime was committed in secret. This latter is characteristically Deuteronomic.² Like the reward so the punishment in the theocracy under Yahveh is confined to life on earth. Hence such a distinction is logical; in the first place awe and reverence is required, in the second fear of consequences.

However, this motive of fear although frequently mentioned in Deuteronomy is only a forced one. The primary and fundamental motive for obedience, and in the true Deuteronomic sense^s, is love. This is made most evident in our final phrase discussed here.

1. Dt. 13:12; 17:13; 19:20.

2. See C. R. North, The Old Testament Interpretation of History, p. 90, f.

Israel's love toward Yahveh must be one of gratitude. וְזָכַרְתָּ כִּי עַבְדִּי הָיִיתָ בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם;¹ "and thou shalt remember that thou wast a bond-man in the land of Egypt." The Deuteronomist, an interpreter of Israel's history, saw in the Exodus Event a realization of God's promise to the patriarchs, the results of which were the election and deliverance from slavery. It was to him both a revelation of God's power as well as a manifestation of Yahveh's love to Israel. To the Deuteronomist, the Exodus Event was the cradle of Israel's nationhood and the cornerstone of his faith. What Christ's resurrection was to Paul the Exodus event was to the Deuteronomist.²

He therefore makes the Exodus Event his primary motive in calling for obedience out of love and gratitude. It was a twofold appeal as C. R. North well observes: "Love toward Yahveh, and lovingkindness toward man, are to be man's response to the love of Yahveh, who redeemed and by that act 'chose' (7:6, ff.) Israel."³

The Exodus Event is employed in the Deuteronomic parenthesis, first to urge the audience to obey Yahveh

1. Dt. 5:15; 15:15; 16:12; 24:18, 22.

2. Compare C. R. North, The Old Testament Interpretation of History, p. ix.

3. The Old Testament Interpretation of History, p. 90.

willingly and joyfully¹ prompted by the love towards Him. Secondly, an appeal for a truly humanitarian spirit, in which the Deuteronomic message is steeped, because of Yahveh's loving mercy in redeeming them from the Egyptian slavery.

The Purpose of the Deuteronomic Theocracy

The life of Israel under the Mosaic law was a life of restraint and obedience. The Deuteronomic preacher under the influence of the eighth century prophets saw both a deterioration of that covenant relationship as well as a laxity of obedience and a misconception of the nature of obedience. There was much conformity to outward ritual alongside immorality and injustice. In his message, therefore, he makes every effort to bring about and to maintain a true theocratic union (in the full sense of the word) between Yahveh and His people.

The Deuteronomist, in accomplishing his purpose, invested the Mosaic law with a true prophetic spirit. He has not discovered a new truth nor expanded new laws (in the main); but he accentuates the ethical character of

1. NDW is a characteristic Deuteronomic term. Compare G. v. Rad, Das Gottesvolk im Deuteronomium, p. 9. Biblical references are: 12:7, 12, 18; 14:22; 16:11, 14; 24:17, 19, 21; 26:12, 13; 27:19.

Yahveh's revelation and the need of corresponding conduct on the part of His people. His reaffirmation of the Mosaic teaching takes on a new spiritual breath, so that it practically seems to be a new revelation.¹ The Deuteronomic preacher did not gain this ethical view through a process of reflection on man's moral nature, but it was planted within him by the prophetic teaching of his age. Also a historian, he interprets Israel's history as divine acts by which Yahveh reveals both His power and His will. Because of that, history to him is not something past.² Historical events are characterized by an ever-recurrent contemporaneousness. His relationship with Yahveh, therefore, is a personal and intimate one, for he (the Deuteronomist) is one of the redeemed in the Exodus Event, he is one who stood at Sinai and has heard Yahveh speaking amidst fire and thunder, one whom God fed with manna in the wilderness.

He wants to share with his countrymen this view of Yahveh's revelation and his personal relationship with Yahveh. And this is the primary, if not the only, reason

-
1. Compare G. v. Rad, Das Gottesvolk im Deuteronomium, p. 63.
 2. Compare Herbert Breit, Die Predigt des Deuteronomisten, p. 135, f.

why he thought it necessary to place his message in a definite historical setting -- namely, in the mouth of Moses at the close of the wilderness wandering. He was not re-creating the past or re-living past events. To him it was a reality, a personal experience, the present.

"Not with your fathers did the Lord make this covenant, but with us, we who are here all of us alive this day. Face to face did Yahveh speak to you on the mount, out of the midst of the fire."

"You are standing this day, all of you, before Yahveh your God: your heads of your tribes, your elders and your officers, all the men of Israel. Your little ones, your wives, and thy stranger who is in the midst of thy camp, from the hewer of thy wood unto the drawer of thy water: That thou shouldest enter into the covenant of Yahveh thy God, and into his oath of denunciation, which Yahveh thy God maketh with thee this day. In order to constitute thee unto himself for a people and that he may be unto thee a God, as he hath spoken unto thee, and as he hath sworn unto thy fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob. And not with you alone do I make this covenant and this oath: But with him that is standing here with us this day before Yahveh our God, and with him that is not here with us this day."¹

Although the above quotations represent two covenants: the one at Sinai, the other at Moab, there is neither distinction in time or persons. The only important date is הַיּוֹם (הַזֶּה) , 'this day.' The only important factor in regard to persons is כְּלֶכֶם (וְ) , 'all of you

1. Dt. 5:3, 4; 29:9-14.

alive.' The Deuteronomist invested the phrase היום (הזוה) with a new, dynamic meaning. As mentioned in Chapter IV, the simple meaning of היום (הזוה) 'today' 'this day,' was transformed to mean 'the ever-present moment,' in the sense that it is an ever-recurrent experience. Israel's Sovereign, Yahveh, is eternal; hence His events are ever-alive. Every individual Israelite must feel himself redeemed from Egypt, and led by the same Redeemer to Sinai to enter into an ever-renewable covenant with Him.¹

Therefore, the phrase זוכרה כי עבד היית בארץ מצריים "And thou shalt remember that thou wast a bond-man in the land of Egypt," should not be considered past history but present fact, a personal experience of every Israelite; his appeal for obedience prompted by love and gratitude. The Deuteronomist is not so much concerned with the enforcement of the law as with the spirit behind the yielding to Yahveh's command. To him true theocracy was not mere legal obedience. One can only be a member of the theocratic community when his heart delights in walking humbly with God and in acts of lovingkindness towards his fellow men. These are the things in which Israel's

1. Christian theologians claimed both Augustine and Thomas Aquinas to have been existentialists. If this be true, the Deuteronomist may have been one as well.

Sovereign takes pleasure and brings Israel into a personal relationship with Him as being His covenant-people, chosen and elevated above any other nation.¹

1. Compare H. H. Rowley, The Faith of Israel, p. 59.

CHAPTER VI

THE DEUTERONOMIC THEOLOGY OF HISTORY

Deuteronomic History

In a sense all Old Testament History is Deuteronomic; i.e., either a reconstruction of the annals available or a revision of historical records by the Deuteronomic school. "A Deuteronomic version of Israel's history from the Conquest to the Exile is contained in Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings, the 'Former Prophets' of the Hebrew Canon."¹

It is not intended, however, within the limits of the present work, either to dwell upon or to outline the Deuteronomic history contained in such Old Testament books. Neither is it our intention to analyze the historical narrative in detail as contained in Deuteronomy itself.² Our main object is to discuss such characteristic Deuteronomic phrases as are found in Deuteronomy only and which convey to us the Deuteronomist's conception and interpretation of history.

-
1. C. R. North, The Old Testament Interpretation of History, p. 86, f.
 2. Such outlines may be found in S. R. Driver's, Deuteronomy, I.C.C., p. i, f.; C. R. North's, op. cit., p. 86, f.

In referring to such characteristic phrases, it is indispensable to deal with such significant events as the Deuteronomist selected. This selection of events is not dictated so much by a mere historical value or interest (significant as they may be historically), as by a sense of the important religious message they convey. This selection of events by the Deuteronomist shows his twofold purpose in presenting them to his assembly: first, to emphasize the exclusiveness of Yahveh's acts to one and only one people, Israel; secondly, that these events have been at the same time a self-revelation of Almighty God.

Indeed, according to the Deuteronomist, self-revelation was chiefly embodied in His action and made manifest in historical events. For that reason Deuteronomy contains nothing of mere abstract teaching or formal doctrine as to the nature of God and His attributes. The character of God and His relation to Israel and to the world as a whole are to be inferred from His action.

For that reason the Deuteronomist selected the major events in the history of Israel which he reproduces in the Book of Deuteronomy: the Exodus Event, the wilderness experience, the Sinai covenant, the (partial) conquest of the land and the covenant at Moab. All these are

great milestones in the history of Israel, but were not selected because of their historical significance alone. The Deuteronomist made these events the center of his message mainly to convince his audience that all of these events have taken place, "in order that he may fulfil the covenant which he hath sworn to thy fathers,"¹ למען הקיים

"And because Yahveh, the God of Israel, is a faithful God who keeps the covenant and mercy-love," שם הברית והחסד.² That Yahveh revealed Himself to Israel through the events of history to make known to man His nature and will is the one great principle stated repeatedly and explicitly in Deuteronomy. In the Deuteronomist's interpretation of history no event is contingent, but all are acts of Yahveh wrought by His providential hand in accordance with the design and realization of His purposeful plan.

The first phrase claims these events to be a realization of Yahveh's covenant with the patriarchs. The term used here is the Hiph'il form of קום . The verb קום means 'to stand up' 'to arise.' In its Hiph'il form it means 'to cause to arise, or to stand.' It is also sometimes interpreted as 'to raise up' 'to set up.'

1. Dt. (4:31); 8:18; 9:5.

2. Dt. 7:8, 9, 12.

Here it means 'to carry out' or 'to give effect' to the covenant.¹ In other words, it means a fulfilment or a realization of the covenant made with the patriarchs. Whether it be Israel's existence (4:31), her prosperity and success (8:18), or the inheritance of the land, they are all interpreted by the Deuteronomist as a realization of Yahveh's covenant with the patriarchs.

The second purpose of such an interpretation (His self-revelation) is inherent in the same phrase. Only a faithful God would accomplish all this for the sake of keeping His promise given to the patriarchs. In addition it is explicitly stated in the second phrase **שמר הברית** **ורחם**. One "who keeps the covenant and mercy-love."

Both terms **ברית** and **רחם** have been discussed at length in the previous chapters, and we need not dwell upon them here. The above quoted phrases state, in addition to Yahveh's faithfulness claimed in the first phrase, that He is also a God of mercy and love. Yahveh's omnipotence may be inferred from the same phrases² also. He is the source of all power and riches (18:18), and in 9:5 reference is made that only through Yahveh's omnipotence

1. Cf. Oxford Hebrew Lexicon, p. 877.

2. The Deuteronomist also uses the word **אמן**, 'faithful' as an epithet for Yahveh, Dt. 7:9.

is the inheritance of the land made possible.

The Deuteronomic interpretation of history has a twofold purpose. The first is didactic, as pointed out by S. R. Driver, who states:

"His references to it [history] have mostly a didactic aim: hence they are accompanied usually by parenthetic comments designed to bring home to the Israelite reader the theocratic significance of the history, and to arouse in him emotions of becoming gratitude towards the divine Leader and Benefactor of His nation."¹

C. R. North states the same even more emphatically:

"Never have historians been more didactic, or so concerned to point the moral to their contemporaries."²

The second purpose is inherent in the first. Consistently with what was said in previous chapters and more fully discussed in the Appendix, the Deuteronomic message is one of assurance and comfort. The Israel of the beginning of the seventh century B.C. (then only a decimated Judah) had need of such assurance and comfort. This assurance is fully expressed in the above quoted phrase: "For Yahveh thy God is a merciful God, he will not forsake thee nor destroy thee: and he will not forget the covenant of thy fathers which he hath sworn unto them."³ The same comfort-bringing message is contained

1. Deuteronomy, I.C.C., p. xvii.

2. The Old Testament Interpretation of History, p. 92.

3. Dt. 4:31.

in the phrases with the term רחם, 'to have mercy' 'to have compassion.' "And he will have mercy upon thee.... as he hath sworn to thy fathers," ורחםך ... כאשר נשבע

לאבותיך.¹ However, this assurance of Yahveh's mercy and compassion may be brought into effect only through Israel's repentance and returning to Yahveh their God. The term שׁוּב used here² is otherwise interpreted as 'to turn about' or 'to return (to or from)' and is always connected with space or distance. Here the Deuteronomist, *though not only the Deuteronomist*, invested it with a spiritual meaning, i.e., 'to be converted.' If Israel turns from her unbelief to faith in Yahveh, then He will have mercy upon her as He swore to her patriarchs. The phrase ושבתי עד יהוה אלהיך ושמעתי בקולו ושמעתי בקולו "Then thou wilt return to Yahveh thy God and obey his voice," is one of the most vital and characteristic didactic phrases in Deuteronomy, at the same time bringing a message of assurance and comfort: that, although her apostasy has brought Yahveh's punishment upon her, she is still Yahveh's 'inheritance' and He is her God.

1. Dt. 13:18; 30:3.

2. Dt. 4:30; 30:2, 8, 10. The etymology of שׁוּב is רחם 'womb', suggestive of mother's love or compassion. Others suggest נָךְ 'delicate', 'tender', hence (mutation of כ' to 'ח') 'to treat tenderly, with compassion.' (Cf. Oxford Hebrew Lexicon, p. 933.)

Yahveh the Lord of History

Some of the most important factors in the Deuteronomic history are the miraculous events which witness explicitly to Yahveh as being an omnipotent God and the Lord of history including the realm of nature. These miraculous events are not merely a demonstration of Yahveh's omnipotence for its own sake, but their taking place serves His definite purpose. The Exodus event may serve as an example. In describing miracles occurring during that event, the Deuteronomist uses the expression

וּמִפְעֻלֵי יָדֵי יְהוָה "the signs and wonders."¹ This expression constitutes a part of the phrase discussed in chapter III. The emphasis there was put on יָד , "the omnipotent hand of Yahveh" which has wrought these "signs and wonders."

The divine purpose in bringing about these signs and wonders was the liberation of Israel from Egyptian slavery and not to show the miracle per se. The same may be said of the wilderness experience,² where Yahveh's purpose was, as the Deuteronomist states:

"And thou shalt remember all the way which Yahveh thy God hath led thee these forty years, to make thee need him in time of af-

1. Dt. 4:34; 6:22; 7:19; 11:3; 26:8; 29:2.
2. Dt. 2:7; 8:3, 4; 29:5, 6.

"fliction, to test you, in order that he may know what is in thine heart, whether thou wouldst obey his commandments or not. So he made thee feel your need of him, he let thee hunger and then fed thee with manna which neither thou nor thy fathers had ever known; in order that he might make thee to know that man lives not only by bread (food) but by every thing that proceedeth out of the mouth of Yahveh thy God."¹

Likewise the Sinai experience², though a witness to Yahveh's omnipotence, has as its one great purpose the covenant. Thus every miracle presupposes a divine purpose behind it. Israel's faith in the miracles of Yahveh was born out of her experience in these major events narrated by the Deuteronomist. The Exodus event had generated the faith which helped them to conquer the land. The importance of that faith among the Israelites (as well as today) is excellently stated by H. H. Rowley:

"If miracle be defined as divine activity within the world, a belief in its possibility would seem to be fundamental to a belief in God. He cannot be excluded from the world he has made, or reduced to the position of a spectator of the interplay of forces which he had once set in motion. In the faith of Israel he was too real and personal to be reduced to impotence in his own world, or regarded as one who idly watched while men worked out their own destiny, and this faith is integral to any worth-while faith in God."³

1. Dt. 8:3, 4.

2. Dt. 4:32, 33; 5:4, 5, 19, 20, 21.

3. The Faith of Israel, p. 58.

It was that faith in Yahveh as the Lord of history which instilled new hope when they faced defeat or calamities. For as we shall see (in the following sub-chapter) the Deuteronomist interpreted defeat and calamity as a result of Israel's disloyalty to Yahveh and His covenant. All that was needed to avert the situation was Israel's repentance and renewed obedience to Yahveh who in turn as the Lord of history will change defeat into victory, calamity into prosperity, and misfortune into success.

There is another evidence that the Deuteronomist conceived of Yahveh as the Lord of history. In Deuteronomy 2:1-23, it is clearly stated that Yahveh has not only given Israel the promised land as their inheritance, but He has also given to other peoples their land as their possession. He should therefore be acknowledged in that sense as the Lord of history because His acts are not limited to the affairs of Israel alone but include other nations as well.¹

It would perhaps be noteworthy to mention that the Deuteronomist makes a distinction between the inheritance of Israel and that of other nations. Israel's promised land is called אֶרֶץ כְּנָעַן while that of other nations is

1. See Keil and Delitzsch, Deuteronomy, at 2:1-23.

called **ירשה**.¹ In the present writer's opinion, this distinction is not accidental, for the Deuteronomist never uses the term **ירשה** in reference to Israel's land.² This distinction may be due to the fact that the term **נהלה** forms an integral part of the covenant relationship. Also as discussed previously and at the close of this chapter, **נהלה** has definite spiritual connotation which could only be used in connection with Israel's theocracy.

Furthermore, the Deuteronomic theology of election requires for its foundation a monotheistic conception of God, a God who is not confined to any one particular territory or country. Therefore the covenant relation with the patriarchs presupposes that Yahveh was with them wherever they were; whether in Chaldea or in Egypt. Indeed Moses' mission in Egypt and Yahveh's power demonstrated in the liberation of Egypt proves beyond dispute that Yahveh is the Lord of history.³

Finally, the Deuteronomist speaks about the possibility that Yahveh would extend Israel's territory to include

1. Dt. 2:5, 9, 12, 19.

2. Dt. 3:20 refers to an individual possession **איש לירשתו** and not to the land, a common inheritance of all Israelites.

3. Compare C. R. North, The Old Testament Interpretation of History, p. 26.

4. Dt. 12:20, f.; 19:8, f.; 20:1, f.

such parts as may have been the possession of other people and hence the domain of another god. Ordinarily, if a man went outside his own country to live in another, he had no option but to transfer allegiance to the god in ~~whose territory~~ he settled. But not so with the Israelite, for the jurisdiction of Yahveh extended to embrace any provinces that the Israelite may have conquered and made their own. The Deuteronomist also speaks of exile in case of Israel's apostasy, which presupposes the existence of the Israelites in lands under the jurisdiction of other gods. Yet it is there that they were to seek Yahveh and to turn to Him in whole-hearted repentance¹ upon which He will respond with forgiveness and make their return to their homeland possible.

Thus Yahveh is the Lord of history and the Lord of the world, performing miraculous events through and against the forces of nature, not confined to territory or nation.

The Deuteronomic Theology of Moral Retribution

It is clear from the Deuteronomic interpretation of history that the Deuteronomist considers Yahveh's blessings upon Israel as immediate reward for her loyalty and

1. Dt. 4:30; 30:2, 8, 10.

obedience. Throughout the book the author emphasizes the central truth that Israel's vitality and wellbeing lies in a united and exclusive loyalty to Yahveh as requested by the covenant. Yahveh promises prosperity on condition of obedience to His revealed will.

In like manner, the Deuteronomist considers physical and natural calamities¹ as immediate punishment of God for sins committed.² They are also conceived by the Deuteronomist as being a disciplinary action designed to bring Israel back into the way of Yahveh in order that He might reinstate her to a restored covenantal relation.³

This Deuteronomic theology of retribution is expressed in several characteristic phrases: "And Yahveh thy God will bless thee in every work and all the (acquisition) of thy hand."⁴

Yahveh's blessings are all-inclusive and are related to every work or enterprise in Israel's acquisition. And as G. v. Rad well pointed out, "Yahveh's blessing is earthly but not worldly."⁵ It may sound paradoxical, but one has to place himself in the life and time of Israel's

-
1. Such as famine, drought, mildew, locust, pestilence, annihilation, and exile. For references see Footnote 2.
 2. Dt. 8:19, 20; 9:19, ff.; 11:5, 6; 27:15-26; 28:15, ff.
 3. Dt. 4:31, f; 8:5; 30:2, ff.
 4. Dt. 2:7; 14:29; 15:10; 16:15; 23:21; 24:10; 28:8, 12.
 5. Das Gottesvolk im Deuteronomium, p. 41, f.

theocracy to understand its full meaning. Firstly, as we know from Israel's history, she received these blessings undeservedly, for at no time was the nation as a whole truly given to her Sovereign Yahveh in undivided loyalty. Secondly, in a theocracy all blessings received from Yahveh's hand (even the purely material) are of a religious nature. In a theocracy nothing is secular or civil, but all is sacred and religious: its laws, its peace and wars, the land of the people and the home of the individual, the fruit of the land and the product of the craftsman, the very life itself -- all are God-given. They are all closely interconnected and supervised by Yahveh. The tithes of the products of the land and of cattle,¹ the year of release² or the Sabbatical year which brought freedom to slaves and release from debts is to witness that Yahveh is both Owner of the land and other possessions. The term בָּרַךְ, therefore, although confined to material blessings, has a religious application. The elements which make יהוה אלהיך (י) ברכך בכל

מעשה ידיך (מעשך) ובכל משלח ירך characteristically Deuteronomic are to be found in the phrase מעשה ירך and משלח ירך, "the work of thy hands or the acquisition of thy hands." The term משלח in the sense used here,

1. Dt. (12:6, 17); 14:22-29; 15:19-23.
2. Dt. 15:1-18.

is found nowhere else in the Old Testament. The use of the term in Isaiah 7:25; 11:14 has a different connotation. The term מְלָאכָה is derived from מָלַךְ, 'to send.' When in a construct phrase with עָמַל it means 'to stretch out (forth).' מְלָאכָה appears in Deuteronomy only in a construct form together with עָמַל, and its meaning is 'enterprise' 'business' 'affair', or 'acquisition.' Thus the proper interpretation of the phrase would be, "And Yahveh thy God will bless all thy work and all thy undertakings."

The Deuteronomist lays even more emphasis on retribution as Yahveh's punishment for disloyalty and disobedience. As C. R. North observes, "the curses he enumerates in chapter 28 are in length and severity almost in ratio of seven to one to the blessings...."¹

As previously mentioned, the Deuteronomist's primary motive for obedience is love. However, knowing the history of his nation and the repeated apostasy of his people in the past, he finds it necessary to picture divine retribution in such horrifying circumstances in order to generate a terrifying fear in the hearts of those who would not serve Yahveh out of love. Also the characteristic phrases are most radical. When Israel "will do that

1. The Old Testament Interpretation of History, p. 92.

which is evil in the eyes of Yahveh to provoke His anger"¹
(or "to transgress his covenant laws"²)

ועשיחם הרע בעיני יהוה אלהיך להכעיסו (לעור בריחו)
by doing that which is "an abomination to Yahveh";³

תעבת יהוה (אלהיך) "then all the curses will
come upon thee and overtake thee"⁴ (ישלח יחן, ישא, יעלם)
ועד השמך... עלך (בך) "and he will send⁵ upon thee,
until thou be destroyed."⁶ And he closes with the most
positive warning: "I testify against you that you will
surely perish,"⁷ (את השמים ואת הארץ) העידתי בכס היום
כי אתה תחבדון

We will now discuss these terms and their phrases
etymologically to gain a better understanding of these
Deuteronomic warnings which occupy a very prominent place
in the Deuteronomic message.

The term פל is a general expression for 'sin.' פל
is the opposite of טוב, and it means literally 'bad,'
both in a physical sense, i.e. bad fruit, bad blemish⁸

-
1. See footnotes 1 and 2 on p. 159 for specific list and references.
 2. Dt. 4:25; 9:18; 17:2. We may find this phrase in other parts of Deuteronomic literature, but without the particular combination of לעור בריחו or להכעיסו.
 3. Dt. 7:25; 17:1; 18:12; 22:5.
 4. Dt. 28:15, 45; 29:26.
 5. See Footnote 1 above.
 6. Dt. 28:20, 24, 25, 61.
 7. Dt. 4:26; 8:19; 30:18.
 8. Jer. 24:2; Dt. 15:21; 17:1.

and, in a moral sense, meaning 'evil.'¹ According to C. Ryder Smith, "the adjective [עַר] and its cognates occur about eight hundred times [in the O. T.]. They have some thirty English translations."² This is no doubt due to the fact that both 'good' and 'bad' have a wide range of meanings either in physical or moral sense.

The term עַר is derived from the verb עָרַע,³ 'to be evil' or 'to do evil.' The phrase וַעֲשִׂיתָ הַרַע בְּעֵינֵי יְהוָה

וַעֲשִׂיתָ הַטּוֹב וְהַיָּשָׁר יְהוָה forms a contrast phrase of The contrast brings out the full meaning of the phrase. In both phrases the clause "in the eyes of Yahveh" constitutes the standard according to which the Israelite is to decide whether he is doing 'good' or 'evil.'

The term תַּבְּוֹהַת rendered 'abomination,' like the preceding phrase is followed by the divine name Yahveh,⁴ for the same reason explained above. It also makes the phrase more emphatic. תַּבְּוֹהַת which appears twenty-one times in Deuteronomy generally refers to idolatry or to

-
1. In Deuteronomic phrases it is used with the verb עָרַע or עָרַע, and forms a noun. Otherwise it is an adjective or adverb.
 2. The Bible Doctrine of Sin, p. 15.
 3. The verb עָרַע has two etymological roots. The one considered here is of Hebrew origin; the second root meaning 'to break' 'to ruin' is of Aramic origin. Compare G. H. Dalman, Aramaeisch-Neuhebraeisches Woerterbuch, p. 387; Oxford Hebrew Lexicon, p. 947, ff.
 4. Only in the phrases discussed here. Otherwise it appears less often without

idolatrous rituals or customs.¹ Its etymology is uncertain. The verb צָרַח has no Kal form and in its Pi'el form it means 'to abhor' 'to detest' and is a denominative verb.² To the Deuteronomist, idolatry was the greatest of all crimes;³ hence it must be utterly detested. He rightly looked upon it as the source of all evil.

S. Mandelkern⁴ suggests several etymologies for the term קָלֵל . However, the most acceptable would be the one common to all Semitic languages, namely קָלַל , which originally meant 'to be light,' but later came to be used as 'to take lightly' 'to despise' 'to dishonour.' The Pi'el form of קָלַל means 'to curse' in the sense that it makes one contemptible. Thus קָלֵל 'a curse' is the action taken against a contemptible man. When the Deuteronomist is using the term קָלֵל , he is referring to the curses listed in chapters 27:15, ff; 28:15, ff.

-
1. Both as a noun, Dt. 7:25, 26; 12:31; 13:15; 14:3; 17:1, 4; 18:9, 12 (twice); 20:18; 21:13; 22:5; 23:19; 24:4; 25:16; 27:15; (32:16); and as verb, Dt. 7:26 (twice); 23:8, 9. All but four refer to idolatry. These four are of an ethical nature, referring to the non-Israelite people, 23:8, 9; to chastity, 24:4; and to ritual (unclean animals) 14:3.
 2. Compare Oxford Hebrew Lexicon, p. 1073.
 3. Cf. G. v. Rad, Studies in Deuteronomy, p. 70; C. R. North, Old Testament Interpretation of History, p. 91.
 4. Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae, p. 1030. So too, Oxford Hebrew Lexicon, p. 886.

These curses are a pronounced judgement or condemnation for sins committed, without specifying the time or the person, except to define him by the particular sin committed (mostly) secretly. It is therefore in a true sense divine retribution. The fixed formula of ritual imprecation commences with אָרַר (cursed be), followed by a statement of the transgression for which it is pronounced. The curse is then confirmed by the responsive אָמֵן uttered by the assembly as an expression of assent. In its contents קָלְלָהּ, constitutes a commandment enforced by a warning on one hand and a pronouncement of judgement following in punishment on the other. Therefore the phrase "then all the curses will come upon thee and overtake thee,"¹ וְבָאוּ עֲלֶיךָ כָּל הַקְּלָלוֹת הָאֵלֶּה וְהִשִּׁיגוּךָ conveys a grim warning that all the curses detailed in chapter 27:15, ff. and 28:15, ff. will be an actual punishment to the apostate, the criminal, and the disobedient. The result of such a punishment is stated in the phrase "I testify against you that you will surely perish,"

הָעֵדָתִי בְּכֶם הַיּוֹם (אֵת הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֵת הָאָרֶץ) כִּי אֲמַד הַחַבְדוֹן

אֲמַד means 'to perish' 'to cease to exist' 'to die.'

The frequent use of the absolute infinitive or simple duplication of noun, adjective and verb is to intensify

1. Dt. 28:15, 45; 29:26.

or ascertain its action. In English the first verb of the absolute infinitive would then take on the role of an adverb 'surely' or 'quickly.' J. Moffat uses, instead, a stronger expression, 'to wipe out,' and has no substitute for the first verb. Such emphatic expressions are a common occurrence in Deuteronomy.¹ It is to lay stress upon the action or to indicate its speediness. For example, in another instance, the Deuteronomist uses the adverb (ן) װ 'quickly,'² when the verb is not duplicated.

Of particular interest is the Aramic ending of the second verb ןװװװ. These Aramic endings are particularly frequent in Deuteronomy and appear fifty-six times.³ They are, however, not to be considered an archaism but rather a poetical ending to a phrase or verse which adds beauty to the Deuteronomic oratory.⁴

It would seem proper to raise here the question as to whether the Deuteronomist, in using the verb װװ (to do) in connection with both terms ף and װװ, meant that there is no sin except in act or whether he considers 'evil intention' to be a sin in thought. C. Ryder Smith is inclined to think that there is such a thing in the

1. Please see closing pages of chapter VII for examples.

2. Dt. 11:17; 28:20.

3. Cf. S. R. Driver, Deuteronomy, I.C.C., p. 18, f. and 106, f.

4. Ibid.

Old Testament as "inward sin."¹ In the present writer's opinion, the Deuteronomist definitely considers 'evil intention' as sin. It would be sufficient to refer to the Tenth Commandment where 'covetousness' requires no physical action, but is nonetheless, a cardinal sin. It is also clearly evident from the following verse: "That thither might flee the manslayer, who should kill his neighbour unawares, when he had not been an enemy to him in times past; and that he should flee unto one of these cities and live."² The above verse needs no comment. It is more than clear that with the Deuteronomist, who emphasizes motives rather than deeds, evil intention is 'sin.' To indicate such a sin in thought, the Deuteronomist uses the word לב (the heart)³ or עין (the eye)⁴ as the seats of both evil and good. Psychologically speaking, to the Hebrew, the heart and the eye were the centers of functions both of good and evil. Hence the importance of the curses and the divine retribution they teach, for 'sin in thought' may never have been discovered by those who were to see to it that "evil is eradicated from Israel's midst."

In concluding our discussion on the Deuteronomic the-

1. The Bible Doctrine of Sin, pp. 32, ff.

2. Dt. 4:42. Cf. also op. cit., p. 34.

3. Dt. 4:9; 8:2; 10:16; 11:16; 15:7, 10; 30:14, 17.

4. Dt. 13:9; 15:9, 18; 16:19; 19:13.

ology of divine retribution it would be well to state that the fundamental idea remains essential to faith in a living God. This has been well stated by H. Schultz:

"In what unbelief regards as chance, faith sees as an act of God. (Ex. xxi.13; Prov. xvi.33). This conviction is most directly expressed in the doctrine of retribution. The everlasting moral will of God makes its influence on human destiny felt in this way -- that every act of opposition to it brings its own punishment, every voluntary act in harmony with it its own encouragement and reward."¹

Even today, from a Christian standpoint, the Deuteronomic theology of retribution is true, but differs in time of enactment. The blessings and punishments of God are no less real to us today than they were to the Deuteronomist, in spite of its confinement to one people Israel and to life on earth. The difference has been pointed out by A. B. Davidson:

"Now the difference between our way of thinking and that prevalent for long at least in Israel, does not lie in any difference as to the belief in retribution. It lies here. We may relegate this retribution to a future world; Israel believed that it prevailed fully now and was seen in this world."²

Israel's Yahveh, the Lord of History has through Jesus Christ become the Lord of universal history to include the human race as a whole, in this, and in the future world.

-
1. Old Testament Theology, vol. II, p. 198.
 2. The Theology of the Old Testament, p. 409.

The Deuteronomic Eschatological Teaching

Eschatology, in the definition of H. Gressmann, means "a science of the last things (אַחֲרֵי מוֹתָוּת , τὰ ἔσχατα , de novissimis). Under this name are to be understood all views collectively concerning the end, whether of the individual, or of the whole world."¹ This as a general statement may be said to be true. However, a more specific, well-phrased explanation, one which fits the entire scope of Deuteronomic theology of history is that of A. B. Davidson:

"God was the real Maker of history God is the author of the events, and His mind, His will, or His purpose is in them. Hence when so broad a view as that of human life or history as a whole is taken, it is, so to speak, secondary. It is the reflection of the view taken of God, of His being, and as an inference from His being, of His purpose, and of what the issue will be when He realizes His purpose, or as we might say, when He realizes Himself in the history of mankind."²

The Deuteronomic theocracy has as its purpose Yahveh's realization in the history of mankind, in the sense that it hoped to see Yahveh's kingdom upon earth even when primarily limited to Israel. It proved to be only a hope, but that hope was never relinquished in the minds of Israel's prophets and God-fearing leaders. For the Deu-

1. Der Ursprung der israelitisch-juedischen Eschatologie, p. 1.

2. The Theology of the Old Testament, p. 401.

is true that the Deuteronomic preacher sets forth a theology of the remnant, taught very distinctly by Amos, Hosea, and more particularly by Isaiah.¹ It may also be correct to assume that the Deuteronomist was endeavoring to explain events contemporary with himself: the national disaster of both the Northern Kingdom and Judah. He might have been addressing a frightened and bewildered audience, the actual remnant, escapees from Israel and from the devastated cities of Judah along with the Jerusalemites whose last stronghold was in great danger. If this assumption is correct,² then the Deuteronomic teaching of the remnant is of great importance and conveys three leading thoughts:

1. The author endeavours to exalt the omnipotence of Yahveh and His faithfulness, transferring the entire cause of the national disaster to Israel itself, interpreting it as divine retribution for Israel's apostasy, immorality and injustice.

2. That Yahveh's punishment was of a disciplinary nature and that His intent was not to destroy them utterly. Divine punishment was intended to compel them to turn to

-
1. Amos 3:12; 5:2, f.; Hosea 9:11, 12, 16; Isaiah 6:11, ff.; 17:5, f.; 24:13, 17, ff. Cf. also H. Gressmann, Der Ursprung der israelitisch-juedischen Eschatologie, pp. 229, ff.
 2. Compare H. Wheeler Robinson, Editor, Record and Revelation, p. 64, ff.

Him and to obey His voice *וּשְׁמַעְתָּ בְּקוֹלֵי* , to walk in His ways *לֵלֶכְתָּ בְּדַרְכָיו* , and to do that which is good and right in the eyes of Yahveh, as evidenced in the Deuteronomic characteristic phrases.

3. To instil hope and to bring comfort to a frightened remnant which was doubting whether Yahveh was still their God.¹ The Deuteronomic preacher therefore assures them that the election is irrevocable and the covenant ever-restorable. Moreover, he assures them that Yahveh's compassion for Israel has not abated because Yahveh is both a God of compassion and One who keeps His covenant and mercy-love sworn to her patriarchs. This again is expressed in his characteristic phrases discussed at length in the previous chapters.

When one visualizes the deplorable state of Israel during the Deuteronomic age, religiously, politically and morally, one is able to understand the Deuteronomist's theology of the remnant and his eschatological teaching relevant to his own time.

Are there any contents in Deuteronomy which convey an eschatological message in the true sense, i.e., referring to the Messianic age, to Christ? An objective answer would be that Deuteronomy does not reveal any prophecies

1. Compare G. v. Rad, Studies in Deuteronomy, p. 70.

directly related to Christ. Nonetheless, Deuteronomy conveys an eschatological message in the sense that Israel was not to be an end in itself but the means to an end. For Israel is Yahveh's holy people only insofar as she fulfils a divine mission in the history of revelation.¹ For even the Isaianic teaching of the remnant is not to be understood as a continuation of a race and its culture, but rather a perpetuation of God's activities in the world.²

She is to be a living witness of God's love, of His election, בְּחֵרָה , and the covenant, בְּרִית , and of His inheritance נַחֲלָה . All of these are terms which convey an eschatological message in the sense that they are all fulfilled in Christ.³ Particularly, Israel is Yahveh's inheritance נַחֲלָה for her main object was to perpetuate the divine דְּבַר as revealing His will, whether in creation, command, or divine law,⁴ until it was fulfilled in Jesus Christ, the living דְּבַר . The Old Testament דְּבַר found its fullest realization in the New Testament λόγος

1. Cf. Norman W. Porteous, Volk und Gottesvolk im Alten Testament, p. 162, in the Theologische Aufsätze, Karl Barth 50. Geburtstag, Muenchen, 1936.

2. Op. cit. p. 161.

3. Compare Das Gottesvolk im Deuteronomium, p. 61; Studies in Deuteronomy, p. 73.

4. Cf. O. Grether, Name und Wort Gottes im Alten Testament, p. 181.

Jesus, the Christ. Likewise the Deuteronomic $\square W$, Yahveh's glorious Presence confined to Israel's sanctuaries,¹ was fulfilled in Christ as the fullest expression of Yahveh's Being, and whose glorious Presence was no longer confined but filled the whole earth. These are the interconnections between the Deuteronomic message and the New Testament Kerygma. Those whose theological views tend to separate the Old and the New Testaments as having no unity are missing the heart of the Old Testament message.²

Such a unity of the Old and New Testaments is not based on allegorical interpretation of Scripture, but on one of the major bases, i.e. on that of the Deuteronomic interpretation of history. Jesus Christ is the crowning event of all events recorded in the Deuteronomic literature. This eschatological vision and expectation of Yahveh's culminating event in history, although characteristically Hebrew³, if not Deuteronomic, became the universal event of mankind.

"The theologian must take the view seriously, that in Jesus Christ, the Old Covenant came to an end, and a New Covenant was founded, by which God created a community open to both Jew and Gentile, i.e. a Universal Church. But the Old Covenant--

-
1. O. Grether, Name und Wort Gottes im Alten Testament, p. 182.
 2. P. Tillich, Systematic Theology, I, p. 142, f.
 3. Th. C. Vriezen, An Outline of Old Testament Theology, p. 369.

"and in this paradoxical formula lies the crux of the matter -- was actually, i.e. according to the understanding and the will of God, also a universal Church."¹

It was natural for the early Church that it should turn to the Deuteronomic passage נביא מקרבך כמני 2 as a witness and a prediction of the coming of Jesus the Messiah.³ This interpretation is only correct, if it is accepted that this promise was fulfilled many times in Israel's prophets, but that its greatest and fullest manifestation was realized in Jesus Christ.

This promise should not be considered an exclusive and direct Messianic reference, but like many other indirect references and together with them form a cumulative testimony of the Old Testament to Jesus Christ.⁴

-
1. Norman W. Porteous, Volk und Gottesvolk im Alten Testament, (Theologische Aufsätze, Karl Barth zum 50. Geburtstag, Muenchen, 1936), p. 162.
 2. Dt. 18:15.
 3. Acts 3:22; 7:37.
 4. Compare Keil and Delitzsch, Deuteronomy, at 18:15; S. R. Driver, Deuteronomy, I.C.C., p. 227, ff.

CHAPTER VII

THE INTERCONNECTIONS OF TERMS AND PHRASES

The Nature and Function of the Textual Interconnections

The various aspects of the interconnections discussed in this chapter belong virtually to the field of exegesis or, more correctly, to hermeneutics. Although the method used here is a general one, i.e. may be applied to other parts of the Old Testament literature (particularly the textual interconnections), the relationship between the terms and phrases is, like the terms and phrases themselves, characteristically Deuteronomic.

The word 'interconnection' as used here may be defined as an interdependent relationship between two or more terms and phrases. When applied to terms within a specific and immediate context, it functions to bring out clarity of meaning or expression. Such an interconnection confines the meaning of a certain term to a single connotation.¹ Applied to a number of terms and phrases, the interconnections link them together and bring out the entirety of the message the Deuteronomic preacher purports to convey to his audience.

1. Examples are given later in the course of the discussion.

It has been shown in the previous chapters that the Deuteronomist has invested a number of terms with a new, *though not always entirely new*, hitherto-unknown-meaning. These specific connotations have been made clear by the use of interconnections with other words found in the text, hence they are named textual. The textual interconnections include both the interrelation of a specific term within a single phrase or an interrelation between a number of terms and their respective phrases which form the quintessence of the Deuteronomic message. Through the instrumentality of these interconnections we have formed internal evidence to support our claim that both the terms and their phrases, as well as the message they convey, are characteristically Deuteronomic. These interconnections form the internal evidence in the sense that they prove that the terms found in Deuteronomy assume a connotation *utterly* different from identical terms found within another context; for example, the term $\square\psi$ in the phrase $\square\psi$ $\square\psi$ (לשכן) לשום "to make his name to dwell there." The primary meaning of is 'name'¹ or, when used, figuratively, it means 'reputation.'² But here in this particular phrase the Deuteronomist confined $\square\psi$ to mean 'the glorious Presence of Yahveh.'³ The same may be said of the term γ . The

1. Dt. 5:11; 6:13; 7:24; 9:14; 10:8, 20; 12:3; 18:5, 7, 19, 20; 18:22; 21:5; 25:6, 7, 10; 28:10, 58; 29:19.

2. Dt. 22:14, 19; 26:19.

3. Dt. 12:5, 11, 21; 14:23, 24; 16:6, 11; 26:2.

term יד means 'hand.' One of its many metaphorical uses is 'power.'¹ But when יד appears in the phrase וּיִצְאֶךָ $\text{יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ בְּיַד חֹזֶק וּבְזֹרֵעַ נְטוּיָה}$ it is always to be understood as 'Yahveh's omnipotence.'² Another example is אַהֲבָה (ה) which, while still retaining the meaning 'love', was not a 'love' as commonly understood by human beings. $\text{אַהֲבָה אֶת אֲבוֹתָיךָ, אֲהַבְךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ, כִּי}$ in the phrase $\text{מֵאַהֲבָתָה יְהוָה אֲהַבְכֶם}$ ³ conveys to us the meaning of a spiritual, unconditional, unmerited and divine love of Yahveh towards Israel. While the first two connotations of שָׂם and of יד are a result of the interconnections within a single phrase, the immediate context in which it is found, the term אַהֲבָה needed a wider range of interconnections with other terms such as $\text{בְּרִית, בַּחֵר, שָׁבַע}$ and בְּחֻלָּה in order to arrive at the above-stated connotation. Without the instrumentality of these interconnections it would have been impossible to establish its true and correct meaning. Thus these terms interconnected with their respective phrases help us to establish and define Yahveh's love upon which both the election and the covenant are based. Together they form one of the major

1. Cf. Oxford Hebrew Lexicon, p. 389, f.
 2. Dt. 5:15; 6:21; 7:8; 9:26; 26:8.
 3. Dt. 4:37; 7:8; 10:15; 23:6.

elements of the Deuteronomic theology. The same is true of other terms and phrases and their respective groups as demonstrated in the previous chapters.

The textual interconnections also include an interrelation between groups of terms and phrases expressing a single and major element of the Deuteronomic theology. For the Deuteronomist's teaching about divine love, election and the covenant is but a part of his message. It is the foundation upon which the author bases his conception of Yahveh as the faithful and omnipotent God of Israel, the Sovereign of Israel, and the Lord of history.

These major Deuteronomic thoughts may be said to follow a logical sequence where the love and the faithfulness (to the patriarchal אֱלֹהֵינוּ) of Yahveh is the cause and all other teachings are the results and effects of these. This logical sequence is not to be understood as an orderly, chapterwise sequence in Deuteronomy, but rather is to be found in the message which these characteristic terms and their respective phrases convey to us.

Thus it was the love and the faithfulness of Yahveh which brought about the redemption (גְּדוּלָה) from Egypt by His omnipotent hand (יָד), the election (בְּחֵרָה) of

Israel and covenant (ברית) with her, to make her a great and holy nation (גוי גדול; עם קדוש). Even the very laws and commandments (המצוה(ת) החקים) to which Israel is subject have divine love as their motivation. For only through obedience to her Sovereign Yahveh is the covenant brought into effect by which she is to be elevated to be Yahveh's inheritance (חלה) and a peculiarly treasured people (עם סגולה) to Him. The Deuteronomist interprets even Yahveh's punishment upon Israel as motivated by (fatherly) love.¹ And even when Israel forsakes (יזב) or transgresses (עבר) the covenant, Yahveh will remain faithful to His mercy-love (חסד) towards Israel, waiting patiently until she returns to Him in wholehearted repentance. (שוב).

These are the functions of the textual interconnections. On the one hand they bring out clarity of expression; on the other, they bring to light the entirety of the message. That the terms and phrases are characteristically Deuteronomic has been shown at length in the previous chapters and need not be repeated here. That the interconnections themselves are characteristically Deuteronomic cannot be shown in the text itself, but in

1. Dt. 8:5; the motive is, of course, always a disciplinary one to bring Israel back into the covenant relationship as also mentioned in Dt. 4:30; 30:2, 8, 10.

the message it conveys. This is the task of the historical and theological interconnections discussed below.

The Nature and Functions of the Historical Interconnections

The textual interconnections are but one proof that, linguistically, these terms are characteristically Deuteronomic. The Deuteronomist was also a historian or, perhaps more properly, an interpreter of history. He idealizes past events in order to enforce the historic lessons they would teach. In so doing he has interconnected the past with the present, making the past a living present. The Deuteronomist, by the use of his characteristic term הַיּוֹם (today), has interconnected his entire message historically in threefold ways.

The first aspect is expressed in the Deuteronomic conception of history as the theatre of God's activity, as well observed by G. E. Wright: "In considering Biblical faith, it seems to me that the point is not with the history of its evolving ideas but with history in another sense. It is history as the arena of God's activity."¹ Yahveh is a God who acts in the life of the individual and the nation. It means viewing history from a divine rather than human standpoint. Hence these acts are ever-

1. God Who Acts, p. 38.

present as is Yahveh who wrought them.

Secondly, the Deuteronomist has depicted certain important events such as the Exodus event, the desert experience, the Sinai covenant, the (partial) conquest of the land, and the covenant at Moab and made them the focus of his message. It would seem that all these events are retrospective since they all refer to the past, but the Deuteronomist refers to these events primarily to establish the fact that the present event is but an extension and a further realization of the same. For example, in referring to the historical covenant between Yahveh and the patriarchs, he does not speak of it as having once taken place and then ceasing to exist. On the contrary, his main thesis is "because he loved your fathers"¹ and "because of the covenant of your fathers which he swore to them,"² "he chose their descendants after them."³ These historical interconnections between the patriarchs and the major historical events mentioned above are mainly and exclusively used to establish the fact that they are but a result, a realization and expansion of the patriarchal covenant which never ceased to exist.

These historical interconnections are the most

-
1. Dt. 4:37; 7:8; 10:15.
 2. Dt. 4:31; 7:8; 8:18.
 3. Dt. 4:37; 7:7, 8; 10:15.

vital element in the Deuteronomic message and are well distributed throughout the book of Deuteronomy.¹ They constitute the foundation upon which the author has built his entire message, his conception of Yahveh as the omnipotent and faithful God, his theology of election and the covenant, and his theology of the promised land. The following verses are an example of the use of the historical interconnections and a confirmation of the above statement:

"Not because you are more in number than all the nations, did Yahveh desire you and choose you; for you are the fewest of all the nations; but because of Yahveh's love for you and because he would keep the oath which he has sworn unto your fathers, has Yahveh brought you out with a mighty hand and redeemed you out of the house of bond-men, out of the land of Pharaoh, the king of Egypt."

"Not for thy righteousness, nor for the uprightness of thy heart, dost thou go in to possess their land; but for the wickedness of these nations does Yahveh thy God drive them out from before thee, and in order that he may fulfil the word which Yahveh has sworn unto your fathers, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob."²

The historical interconnections are so distributed

-
1. In addition to the above listed, such historical interconnections are to be found in Dt. 4:20, 34; 6:23; 7:12; 8:18; 9:5; 29:12. Also with reference to the promised land as a realization of the solemn promise given to the patriarchs: Dt. 1:8, 21; 6:10, 18; 7:13; 8:1, 10:11; 11:9, 21; 19:8; 26:3, 15; 28:11; 30:20.
 2. Dt. 7:7, 8; 9:5.

as to include the Deuteronomic legislation containing the covenantal obligations on the part of Israel. These interconnections in conjunction with the Deuteronomic laws constitute a vital part of the book, namely the parenesis, by which the preacher encourages and persuades Israel to obey Yahveh out of love and gratitude.¹

Thirdly, these historical interconnections link the historical events cited by the Deuteronomist with the Israel of his own day. Consistent with the present thesis, one can fully comprehend these interconnections when he visualizes the period in which Deuteronomy was written. Israel had been experiencing a serious political and economic situation combined with a religious reconstruction. The Northern Kingdom no longer existed. Judah itself feared her fall shortly. But Yahveh, the Lord of history, wrought an act which made the Exodus event relive in the memories of the people as a present reality. That act took place in the year 701 B.C., when Israel experienced again an 'Exodus,' a renewal of the old in different circumstances, an event which is well described by R. Kittel:

1. Dt. 5:6, 15; 6:12, 21; 9:12, 26; 10:19, ff.; 11:21; 13:6; 13:11; 15:12-15; 16:1, f., 12; 21:8; 24:18, 22; 26:5-10a; 29:24, f.

"During the great straits to which the town and the country of Judah were reduced by Sennacherib's invasion of Judah in the year 701 B.C., Isaiah placed all his hope on Zion. Jerusalem could not fall (this was his watchword), for here Yahweh himself had his dwelling-place. (Isa. xxxl. 8 f.; of Gesch., II3, p. 562.) Isaiah was in the right. Zion with its Temple as the dwelling-place of Yahweh stood the test. Yahweh himself had acknowledged them. Sennacherib's army had devastated the land of Judah, had burned the towns and with them the local sanctuaries on the high places, but the Temple remained untouched."¹

Israel, i.e. the decimated people of Judah including perhaps some refugees from the Northern Kingdom, needed a comforting and uplifting spirit, new hope and courage. The author thus effectively interconnected these current events with the past to inspire that sorely needed hope and comfort.

The same may be said of the other events selected by the Deuteronomist. While the delivered Jerusalem gives proof that Yahweh is still acting in history on behalf of Israel, it also proved implicitly that the covenant between Him and Israel is still in effect. The term היום וְהיום (הוזה) often used with the enactment of the covenant² makes it to be an ever-present reality. The Sinai covenant and the covenant at Moab are not only past but continue to exist between Yahweh and His chosen people, Israel.

1. The Religion of Israel, p. 167.

2. Dt. 5:3, 4; 8:18; 29:9-14.

Likewise the interconnections with the wilderness experience and the partial conquest of the land were used to bring the same effect. As the Deuteronomic preacher may behold the refugees from the Northern Kingdom and the homeless from the devastated towns and villages of Judah, he causes them to visualize the wilderness experience, "when he gave thee manna to eat... that he might make thee to know that man lives not only by bread (food) but by every thing that proceedeth out of the mouth of Yahveh thy God." He also provided you miraculously with clothes which "wore not away from off thee." All this was Yahveh's discipline, "as a man disciplines his son."¹ Their present experience is but another discipline, and Israel must take courage and have deep faith in Yahveh who still cares for Israel and "will enlarge thy border," i.e. Yahveh will once again intervene and fight for Israel² that she may regain the lost territories, for the land is His and He gave it to her for an inheritance,³ provided that Israel 'obeys His voice' and 'walks in His ways.' The wilderness experience should be viewed as one long experience of divine faithfulness and care for Israel. His discipline is not merely punitive; it is an expression of Fatherly

1. Dt. 8:3, ff.

2. Dt. 1:29-31; 3:21, 22; 7:17-21; 11:22-28; 20:1-4; 29:1, ff.

3. Dt. 4:21; 15:4; 19:1; 21:23; 24:4; 25:19; 26:1.

love. In it all the Deuteronomist was referring to the deplorable political situation of his own time, the violence and syncretistic worship, the injustice and immorality which gave rise to the prophetic message of the eighth-century prophets.

These are the historical interconnections and their function in Deuteronomy. They make past events a living present; they make the covenant an ever-recurrent experience; they bring comfort and encouragement on the one hand, and are a call and persuasion to obedience on the other.

The Theological Interconnections: Their Nature and Function

The meaning of history to the Deuteronomist is to be found in its totality only through faith in God. These events are seen and interpreted from the specific viewpoint of that faith.¹ Therefore, Deuteronomy does not contain history proper, but a theology of history based on faith in Yahveh.

While the historical interconnections reveal the interrelation between past events and the message conveyed, the theological interconnections give meaning to these events by explaining why they took place. In explaining

1. Cf. Arthur Weiser, Glaube und Geschichte im Alten Testament, pp. 44, ff. See particularly p. 51.

these events the present writer neither rationalizes nor allegorizes these events. It is a theology based solely on conclusions derived from these events which are conveyed in the Deuteronomic message. Deuteronomy lends itself to such an objective study, for the clarity of its oratory raises no difficulties and its message is distinct and unequivocal.

Yahveh, of his own free will, revealed Himself to the patriarchs, to Moses and to all Israel. The patriarchal tradition, it would seem, was deeply rooted in the history of Israel. The author of Deuteronomy, therefore, does not give an account of how and where Yahveh revealed Himself to the patriarchs except to mention them collectively as (אבות, יי-) אבות or sometimes individually by their names.¹ He refers repeatedly to their covenant with Yahveh, the results of which are:

1. The liberation from Egyptian bondage;
2. The election of Israel as a holy and especially treasured nation by Yahveh;
3. The Horeb (Sinai) covenant and the covenant at Moab;
4. The (partial) conquest of the land.

The account of Yahveh's revelation to Moses is a small

1. Dt. 1:8; 6:10; 9:5; 29:19; 30:20.

one as compared with other Pentateuchal books, but it is given more details. Nonetheless the Deuteronomic preacher makes him the mouthpiece of Yahveh. It may be due to the fact that Deuteronomy, being a prophetic message, prefers the proclamation of the code by Moses, the national prophet.¹ While this may be one reason, a more dominant factor may be cited. The characteristic message of Deuteronomy which, as mentioned in the previous chapter, in endeavoring to make the past a living present, has, therefore, made Moses the speaker.

The means by which Yahveh reveals Himself to Moses are two: supernatural phenomena² and His 'word,' the divine command.³ Whenever Yahveh is the Speaker, means 'to command.'⁴ It means that Yahveh reveals His will to man through the instrumentality of the prophet. These theological interconnections which interrelate Yahveh's command with the rest of the Deuteronomic message form its foundation. They convey the thought that Yahveh is a God of revelation and that He exists. The ontological proof which has taken such a prominent place in both

1. Cf. O. Procksch, *Theologie des Alten Testament*, p. 225.

2. Dt. 4:34; 6:22; 7:19; 11:3; 26:8; 29:1, 2.

3. Cf. O. Grether, *Name und Wort Gottes im Alten Testament*, p. 120, ff.

4. Dt. 1:6; 2:1; 4:12, 15, 33; 5:4, 19, 23, 24; 9:10; 10:4; 18:21. The phrase לְךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ is an exception. It appears in connection with the covenantal promise to the patriarchs: Dt. 1:21; 6:3, 21; 9:3; 11:25; 12:20; 15:6; 19:8; 26:18, 19; 27:3; 29:12.

theology and philosophy has no place in Deuteronomy. For to the Deuteronomist the historical events are more than a witness to His existence. In fact, it was not the existence of God that he was seeking to prove but rather His omnipotence and His faithfulness. For to the Deuteronomist, God's acts as they took place in various historical periods testify to His characteristics or attributes. The mighty acts of the Exodus event make it evident to all who experienced it that He is an omnipotent God. Likewise the same events testify that Yahveh is a God of faithfulness in keeping His covenantal obligations promised to the patriarchs which the Deuteronomist also states explicitly in verses 5:10 and 7:9. On the other hand, one rightly concludes that the same Yahveh who elected Israel to be a holy nation must be a God of holiness.¹

Yahveh is also a God of love, for out of love to the patriarchs and to Israel He elected her and chose her to be His inheritance. Further confirmation may be found in His command to love one's fellow man with particular emphasis upon the love of the stranger, widow and orphan.²

Also the fact that Yahveh is merciful even to the rebellious apostate³ makes us conclude that Yahveh must be a God

1. Cf. Dt. 26:15 for a more specific expression.

2. Dt. 10:19; 11:14; 14:29; 23:8; 24:19, 20, 21; 26:11, 13.

3. Dt. 4:31; 30:3.

of mercy deserving the epithet רַחוּם.¹ This is also confirmed by His commanding Israel to have mercy upon the poor and unfortunate, pleading their cause very explicitly.² Yahveh is also a God of justice which the Deuteronomist conveys to us fully in his teaching of divine retribution discussed at length in the previous chapter. Also the fact that He commands justice in the law courts and honesty in commerce³ confirms that He is a God of justice.

Some, no doubt, may question the correctness of such conclusions, particularly in recognizing Yahveh as the God of love, mercy, and justice. They may point to those Deuteronomic passages which command Israel to exterminate the Canaanite peoples.⁴ They may also point to the Deuteronomic code which discriminates between Israelites and non-Israelites.⁵

To give an objective answer one must call attention to the fact that if the Deuteronomic code is to be studied and judged only from the polemical standards of the twentieth century, then it is not easy to defend its ethics. However, one who has a broad view of revelation will remem-

1. Dt. 4:31.

2. Dt. 15:11-15; 24:10-15. See also Footnote 2, p. 189.

3. Dt. 1:16; 16:18-20; 24:17; 25:1, 15.

4. Dt. 7:1-4, 15, 16, 20-24; 9:3; 12:2, 3; 20:16-18.

5. Dt. 15:2-18; 23:20, 21.

ber that he must be able to visualize the period of Israel's moral education and the particular circumstances under which it took place. The Deuteronomic code contains needful adaptations and adjustments corresponding to the stage of Israel's growth during unusual and transient conditions, which have their proper place in the onward moral progress toward a genuine theocracy.

One should surely take cognizance of the religious, economic and political factors which were the causes of such a legislature. The religious factors are clearly stated by the author. Close association with heathenism would lead inevitably to heathen worship in Israel, and the Deuteronomic preacher, who has as his main aim the blotting out of apostasy and syncretism, sees no possibility of a compromise.¹ We also have a clearly stated reason in Deuteronomy 9:4 on which W. S. Bruce's comment is quite elucidating:

"The same forbearing God who was moved by Abraham's intercession to declare that He would spare degenerate Sodom if ten righteous men were found therein, gave four centuries to the Canaanites to repent of their evil deeds. But when, instead of repenting, they were found to have become thoroughly and hopelessly infamous, then it was clearly for the moral interests of the rest of mankind, that they should be swept off the face of the earth."²

-
1. Cf. H. Preserved Smith, The Religion of Israel, p. 189.
 2. The Ethics of the Old Testament, p. 261.

As to the discrimination between the Israelite and the non-Israelite, it could be said that, on the whole, it was not as drastic as the extermination. It only seems inconsistent with the rest of the Deuteronomic ethics and the humanitarian spirit in which it is steeped. It has, no doubt, the economic factor as its cause. The homelessness and poverty caused by the latest Syrian invasion made the claim that 'charity begins at home' a necessity. The political separatism is most probably rooted in the same cause. The decimated and impoverished Judah had been making every effort not to lose its national identity and existence, not an easy task amongst peoples of the same racial background and of the same language and culture. These no doubt are the contributing factors which brought the two moral difficulties into the Deuteronomic code.

On the other hand, the high ethical teachings, the humanitarian spirit, and the Gospel spirit of love found in Deuteronomy should not be overlooked because of these two difficulties. It is because of its message as a whole steeped in the teaching of the eighth-century prophets, that the above conclusions as to the attributes of Yahveh, as the God of revelation, faithfulness, holiness, love, mercy and justice are valid. These attributes of Yahveh explain why these events took place, and most of all the

covenantal relationship between Yahveh and Israel which, as G. v. Rad observes, is the main theme of Deuteronomy.¹ These theological interconnections link the acts of Yahveh with His attributes and give full meaning to the Deuteronomic message and its requirements. This has been observed by H. Preserved Smith, who states the following in commenting on the message of Deuteronomy:

"Obedience to the law now laid down is motivated not only by the greatness and power of Yahveh but also by his moral character. His leading attributes are justice and fidelity. He does not regard faces nor take bribes; he secures the rights of the orphan and the widow; he loves the client, giving him bread and clothing (10:17, f.) He keeps covenant and loving-kindness with them that love him and keep his commandments, to a thousand generations, but repays them that hate him by destroying them. (7:10, f.) He is merciful even to sinners if they repent."²

The theological interconnections reveal to us the heart and core of the Deuteronomic message. In the first place, such terms as אהב (ה-), בחר, פדה, ברית, רחם, חסד when interconnected together reveal to us the fulness of Yahveh's character, i.e. His attributes.

A God who seeks to enter into a covenant relationship ברית with man is indeed a God of revelation. He enters that covenant with Israel because He is a God of

1. Das Gottesvolk im Deuteronomium, p. 22, f.
2. The Religion of Israel, p. 185.

love (אהב-ה) . The term בּוֹרֵא implies that Yahveh is a God of holiness (עַם קְדוֹשׁ). The term פָּדָה gives proof that He is a God of omnipotence fully manifested in the redemption from Egypt. The term רַחֵם (רַחוּם) states clearly that He is a God of mercy. The unique term חַסֵּד is of great importance. When applied to Yahveh, it has a threefold meaning and describes Him as the God of mercy, love and faithfulness.

In the second place, there is the counterpart of the same terms in which they oblige Israel to imitate Yahveh,

ללכת בדרכיו by entering into that covenant בְּרִית with Yahveh. As well observed by A. H. McNeile, "Ethics and Monotheism are the obverse and reverse of theology."¹

Israel is to love אהב Yahveh with all her heart, soul and might. Since Yahveh chose her, she is to choose the way of life וּבַחֲרָה בַחַיִּים .² Also, Israel is to liberate חַפְּשׁוֹ³ her slaves in remembrance of Israel's own redemption פָּדָה from Egypt, and remain philanthropically minded when they are in her midst.⁴ Like Yahveh, Israel is to be merciful and to maintain a true humanitarian spirit toward man and every living creature.⁵ Although

1. Deuteronomy: Its Place in Revelation, p. 17.

2. Dt. 30:19.

3. Dt. 15:12, 13, 18. It does not form a characteristic term and its use here is only explanatory.

4. Dt. 5:14.

5. A characteristic example may be found in Dt. 22:6.

the word $\pi\omega\eta$ appears in Deuteronomy only in connection with Yahveh,¹ it may also be applied to man as found in the prophetic literature.² When $\pi\omega\eta$ appears in reference to man, it takes on a partly new connotation which has been discussed in chapter IV.

We have delimited the number of terms in the above demonstration to avoid repetition. But the remaining terms discussed in the present work have the same application and have the same theological interconnections. All together they contain the major theological teaching of the book of Deuteronomy.

The Interconnections between the Terms and
the Deuteronomic Code

An explanatory note may be proper regarding the use of the word 'Interconnections' in the following two subdivisions. The textual, historical and theological interconnections, discussed above, are interconnections in the proper sense of the word. However, the interconnections between the characteristic terms and the Deutero-

-
1. Dt. 5:10; 7:9, 12.
 2. Hosea 6:4, 6; Jer. 2:2. The latter refers to the wilderness experience and therefore is self-explanatory as to the connotation of $\pi\omega\eta$ when applied to man. A. R. Johnson suggests "devotion" as the equivalent for $\pi\omega\eta$. Cf. H. H. Rowley, (Editor) Studies in Old Testament Prophecy, p. 151.

onomic code, as well as, the stylistic ones, are to be understood more as influence and continuity respectively, rather than actual interconnections. This is emphasized here to clarify that its use in the two following subdivisions is merely to keep in uniformity with the title and contents of the present chapter.

The classification of chapters I - XXX of Deuteronomy presents a very difficult problem. Having been placed in the Old Testament canon as the fifth book of the Pentateuch, or the 'Law', one first attempts to classify it as 'the Book of the Law', so named since it was discovered during Josiah's reign.¹ But after a close study of the book one is inclined to dispense with such a title for the laws (including even some of the decalogue) are not codified but interpreted and preached. It may therefore be considered to be more an appeal for keeping the laws than a formulation of the same. In addition, these laws are interwoven with oratorical and hortatory material which

1. Scholars unanimously agree that the book found in the temple during Josiah's reign was Deuteronomy even when they disagree on its contents. Cf. S. R. Driver, Deuteronomy, p. xlv, f.; C. B. Gray, A Critical Introduction to the Old Testament, pp. 31, ff.; H. Wheeler Robinson, The Old Testament (Its Making and Meaning), p. 88, f.; H. H. Rowley, The Growth of the Old Testament, p. 29, f.; R. H. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament, pp. 51, ff.; and many others.

constitutes over one-third of the book. Furthermore, emphasis is laid more upon the consequences of obedience to the law than upon the law itself.

Moreover, although the aspect of divine worship has been given one of the most prominent places in Deuteronomy (i.e., the so-called law of localization of worship), we witness a complete omission of the ceremonial and ritual laws such as are contained in the books of Leviticus and Numbers.¹ All this would imply that Deuteronomy should perhaps be considered fundamentally only as a teaching of the requirements of Israel's covenant faith and the preaching of the will of Yahveh amongst His own whom He had chosen and redeemed.

A second possible attempt would be to classify it as history, for Deuteronomy contains an extensive retrospect going back to the patriarchs. Not only does it present a review of Israel's history, but also introduces its leader, Moses, in the third person. His sermons, which he is described as having delivered, very closely resemble the manner in which the chroniclers and compilers of the historical books of the Old Testament canon introduce their personages and place their speeches in their mouths.

Also, in no other book of the Old Testament has the

1. Cf. Max Loehr, A History of Religion in the Old Testament, p. 111, f.

'Historical Credo' been given such prominence as in Deuteronomy. Likewise historical narratives may be found interspersed throughout the whole book.

However, to classify it solely as history would be erroneous for the legislation it contains occupies an important place in Deuteronomy. Besides, the author employs the historical elements as reminiscences and not for the sake of history. He uses them rather as his parenthesis to add force to his speeches and to compel the hearer to obedience.

We, therefore, come to the conclusion that the book of Deuteronomy is singularly unique within the framework of biblical literature. It is unique in its contents because its author is primarily a preacher and orator. It is for this reason that law and history, discourse and exhortation, dialogue and narrative and "pictorial imagery"¹ are interconnected. The forces that link and unify the book of Deuteronomy in spite of its heterogeneous contents and bind them into one literary composition, are the characteristic Deuteronomic terms and their phrases.²

There is, however, a more important factor by which

-
1. G. T. Manley, The Book of the Law, p. 24, giving biblical references in support of that term.
 2. Cf. S. R. Driver, Deuteronomy, I.C.C., p. lxxxvii; D. C. Simpson, Pentateuchal Criticism, p. 113, ff.

Deuteronomy and, particularly, the code takes on a distinctive colouring, an ethical teaching, which unifies every part of its message. It is the prophetic teaching contained in these terms and phrases which spiritualize the code, making it an ethical and moral one. H. Preserved Smith, in commenting on how even the decalogue underwent an ethical transformation in Deuteronomy, makes the following statement:

"The idea of the decalogue as the basis of the covenant is as old as the Yahwist. But the covenant of the Yahwist is a plain case of bargain with the Divinity. Yahweh agrees to go with the people and give them possession of Canaan if they will agree to pay him the dues at the sanctuary; and the commands of this earlier decalogue are concerned with these dues -- the festivals, the firstlings, and the first-fruits (Ex. 34). An enormous advance is registered therefore by the Deuteronomist when he makes the Decalogue entirely ethical. God now commands nothing in the way of sacrifices, but he enjoins the duties which man owes his fellow man, along with such reference as is due to God himself. Even the desire of the heart is to be regulated in accordance with the law of right (Deut. 5:1-21). The supremacy of ethical above ritual requirements is indicated further by making this Decalogue the covenant proposed by Yahveh himself at Horeb and accepted by the people with fear and trembling. In thus distinguishing it, the author shows himself the heir of the best prophetic tradition."¹

Deuteronomy, as observed by E. Jacob, was to be a "new constitution."² The Deuteronomic age was the turning

1. The Religion of Israel, p. 187.

2. Theology of the Old Testament, p. 215.

point in Israel's religious development.¹ The prophetic revelation of the eighth-century prophets was to supersede the old religion of Israel, in teaching Israel the deeper values of God's revealed will. The Deuteronomic school, although prophetic in substance, thought it necessary, because of the conditions in which they lived, to codify "a complete rule of life for the Israelite."² But the prophetic message with its high ideals did not find immediate and wide recognition and, when it was finally accepted, it was stripped of much of its original character.³ Nonetheless, the value of Deuteronomy must not be underestimated. First, it is a book which has put the stamp upon subsequent generations "by which the religion of the prophets was transformed gradually into Judaism."⁴ Secondly, the New Testament witnesses to the great influence of Deuteronomy upon Christ and His apostles.⁵

The Stylistic Interconnections and Their Function

In closing it might be of significance to evaluate

-
1. Theology of the Old Testament, p. 214, f.
 2. H. Preserved Smith, The Religion of Israel, p. 192. He expresses the same opinion as S. R. Driver, Deuteronomy, I.C.C., p. lxvi, f.
 3. Cf. R. Kittel, The Religion of the People of Israel, p. 156. H. Wheeler Robinson, basing his observation upon S. R. Driver and K. Marti, states: "Deuteronomy does much to crystallize, and thereby partly strangles the free prophetic life, to which Israel so largely owed its existence." The Century Bible, Deuteronomy, p. 44.
 4. S. R. Driver, op. cit. lxv.
 5. H. Wheeler Robinson, op. cit. p. 50, f.

some elements in the book of Deuteronomy from a purely literary standpoint, particularly its style and vocabulary. It is of significance since Deuteronomy witnesses to a new, highly developed literary school along with religious, moral and ethical development. For this reason it will be well to mention briefly some of the purely literary features in addition to those discussed from a theological viewpoint. R. G. Moulton classifies the book of Deuteronomy as "spoken rhetoric."¹ "Read in any way," he states, "Deuteronomy reveals its rhetoric richness; read at a single sitting, it is seen to be oratory arranged to produce all the effect of Drama." There are two outstanding elements which produce these fine qualities spoken of above; they are the synonyms and antonyms used by the Deuteronomist in a masterly fashion. Both are, no doubt, of great exegetical value in aiding to clarify the meaning of certain terms and phrases. But presently our main concern is their stylistic value. The Deuteronomist uses, among others, the following synonyms which are a witness of great eloquence as a biblical orator:

; נבלה -- טרה	; משפט -- חק	; נחלה -- ארץ
; טרה -- טרה	; משפט -- אדק	; חשק -- אהב
; אבד -- שט	; חורה -- עדת	; חורה -- ברית

1. The Literary Study of the Bible, 268.
 2. Op. cit. p. 269.

; חסא -- (ע) רע	; עבד -- עשה	; מצוה -- דבר
; שבעה -- בריח	; סוד -- עבר	; שם -- יהוה
; חסא -- שחח	; חסא -- עבר	; עם -- ישראל
; שמר -- שמע	; שמר -- עשה	; טוב -- ישר
; ישר -- צדקה	; גוי -- עם	; צדק -- ישר

Some of the above listed synonyms are used by the Deuteronomist in the following phrases:

; לשמר את כל הקוחיו	--	; ללכת בדרכיו
; דברי התורה	--	; דברי הברית
; עם סגולה	--	; עם נחלה
; לשמר את כל דברי	--	; לשמר את מצות יהוה
; וכל העם ישמעו ויראו	--	; וכל ישראל ישמעו ויראון
; כאשר נשבע לך	--	; כאשר דבר לך
; נתן לך נחלה.	--	; נתן לך את הארץ

In addition to the above quoted, the Deuteronomist uses (quite frequently) three or more synonyms in a single verse.¹ These verses exhibit both oratorical beauty and a great power of persuasion.

In every art the law of contrast (otherwise called 'the unity of contrast'²) is an element which adds great force to artistic creation. In the Deuteronomic prose it adds a sense of poetical beauty. That unity of

1. Dt. 13:5, 9, 15; 20:3; 28:63 and passim.

2. Compare R. G. Moulton, The Literary Study of the Bible, p. 95.

contrast is expressed in the Deuteronomic antonyms. In addition to their exegetical value contained in the elucidation of each other's meaning by putting two terms of opposite properties side by side, as a literary device it makes the equality of the two very forcible in their respective properties. For example:

טוב -- רע ;	טהור -- טמא ;	ברך -- ארר ;
צדיק -- רשע ;	שמש -- עבר ;	קללה (אלה) -- ברכה ;
ישר -- רע ;	סור -- שטן ;	רשע -- צדק ;
צדק -- עול ;	ישר -- רשעה ;	שנא -- אהב ;

The Deuteronomist uses these antonyms very effect-

ively in phrases like these:

והצדיקו את הצדיק והרשיעו את הרשע (25:1) האהב את טובה ואהב
שנאה (21:15) תאכלנו הטמא והטהור יחדיו (12:15, 22; 15:22)
ברוך אתה בעיר וברוך אתה בשדה (28:3) ארר אתה בעיר וארר
אתה בשדה (28:16) לא ידעו היום טוב ורע (1:39; 30:15)
ובאו עליך כל הברכות (2:28) ובאו עליך כל הקללות (28:15)

There is another stylistic feature which the Deuteronomist uses to obtain the same emphatic effect. Instead of using synonyms or antonyms as demonstrated above, he uses the same term twice in a different grammatical form. By redoubling the noun or adjective (which has no inflection) and the verb (either in its absolute infinitive or simple reduplication) the author adds force to its expression. The following are examples of some of the uses of double

nouns, adjectives and verbs:

מעלה מעלה... מטה מטה (28:43) צדק צדק (16:20) שקר...
 שקר (19:18) בדרך בדרך (2:7) פתח הפתח (15:11)
 אבד האבדון (4:26; 8:19; 12:2; 30:18) השב השבים
 (22:1; 24:13) החרם החרם (מט) (7:2; 20:17) שום השים
 (17:15) שלח השלח (22:7) שקץ השקצנו (2:26) שמע השמע
 (-, -) (11:13; 15:5; 17:24; 28:1) בך יברכך (15:4)
 שמר השמרון (6:17; 11:22) השמר... ושמו (4:9) שכח השכח
 (8:19) וזעב הזעבנו (7:26) ירבה... ירבה (8:13)
 והחנפל... החנפלתי (9:25) נחון חתן (15:10) הכה חכה (13:16)

The above listed are a characteristic feature of the Hebrew language and have no equivalent in the Indo-European languages. In English the first verb would then take on the role of an adverb 'surely' or 'quickly.' Some translators like M. Luther and J. Moffatt use a stronger expression and omit the first verb altogether.

Another feature, which although not characteristically Deuteronomic, is used in Deuteronomy with pronounced frequency, is the Aramic ending of the verb (second and third person plural) which appears in Deuteronomy fifty-six times. It witnesses once more to the highly rhetorical style of Deuteronomy. In addition to those already quoted in connection with the doubling of the verb, it is also found otherwise,¹ "adapted to round off a sen-

1. Dt. 1:17 (twice), 18, 22, 29; 4:6, 10, 11, 26, 28 and throughout the book.

tence"¹ and so add poetical beauty to the discourse.

These are some of the stylistic interconnections which have a twofold purpose. First, from a purely literary standpoint, they aid in linking together the Deuteronomic discourses by forming a unity as a literary composition of exquisite beauty. They also demonstrate that next to the proclaiming of great divine truths, Deuteronomy is itself a literary composition of great value. Secondly, from the viewpoint of biblical criticism, their use throughout chapters I - XXX unites these discourses into a single document, witnessing to the same prophetic and literary school and age as its author.

1. S. R. Driver, Deuteronomy, I.C.C., p. 19. It should be noticed, however, that this is not always the case. It is demonstrated in v. 4:28 which has four verbs with Aramic endings, and only the last rounds off the sentence.

APPENDIX

DEUTERONOMY A BIBLICO-CRITICAL STUDY

Preface

The work of biblical criticism, in ascribing possible authorship and date to particular books of the Old Testament, is intellectually and religiously subjective. Intellectually it is relevant to the general philosophical trends and accumulated research of a certain epoch in the field of biblical literature, languages, and archaeology. Religiously it is subject to the faith of the person who critically analyses a book or books of the Bible. And this is one of the reasons why this final chapter is not included in the present research. It is intended to be more of a clarification of the position of the present writer with regard to biblical criticism and an explanation as to why he has undertaken it.

The general position of the biblical critics is well summarized by C. H. Dodd:

"You will observe that none of the books of the Old Testament (in its finished form) is of earlier date than the eighth century B.C. Before that time there existed traditions handed down by word of mouth, and various documentary records of composition, which were used by the later writers. But the books of the Old Testament, as we know them, were composed in the period starting with the great prophets Amos,

"Hosea, Micah, and Isaiah. And it was the work of these prophets which directly or indirectly determined the character of the Canon of Scripture."¹

These "various records of composition" are known to us as the Graf-Wellhausen theory and marked J, E, D, P. "The detection of those sources was the work of older scholars, but it was generally held that P was the oldest of the sources until the Graf-Wellhausen school put them in the order,"² given above. Although this school has many followers, the dating of these sources as well as the identification of the first two, is still debatable, and it seems as if it will remain a moot point. This is briefly the documentary theory which was followed by a 'development hypothesis,' i.e. a gradual development of Israel's distinctive ideas and institutions. References will be made later to 'form criticism' and to the tradition-historical method. But it is not our intention presently to outline in detail either of these theories. Further information may be found in the works listed below.³ In

1. The Bible Today, p. 33, f.

2. H. H. Rowley, The Growth of the Old Testament, p. 28.

3. Julius Wellhausen, Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel; Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Buecher des Alten Testaments; A. Kuenen, The Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch; S. R. Driver, An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament; T. K. Cheyne, Founders of Old Testament Criticism; G. B. Gray, A Critical Introduction to the Old Testament; D. C. Simpson, Pentateuchal Criticism;

addition to the works listed below, the book by Herbert F. Hahn¹ is highly recommended. Its clarity, conciseness, all-inclusiveness and objective evaluation make it, to the present writer's knowledge, the best among recent works on this subject.

Although this final chapter is not a part of the research itself, references are given and quotations made to substantiate statements and to show, as much as possible, the correctness of the present writer's conviction with regard to biblical criticism.

This chapter should be looked upon not as a plea for the abandonment of the critical study of the Old Testament, but purports to redirect the prevailing general attitude on the part of the Bible student of putting all emphasis on the search for the so-called sources or documents. Instead, the present writer hopes that the search for the

J. E. McFayden, An Introduction to the Old Testament; W. O. E. Oesterly and T. H. Robinson, An Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament; H. H. Rowley (Editor), The Old Testament and Modern Study, (see particularly ch. III, Pentateuchal Criticism). Also by the same author, The Growth of the Old Testament. R. H. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament. There are a few books by those who are opposed to biblical criticism but most of these are anything but convincing. However, James Orr's book, The Problem of the Old Testament, although a little outdated, has some noteworthy objections.

1. Old Testament in Modern Research, Muhlenberg Press, Philadelphia, 1954.

'message' as defined later will offer a more satisfactory method for 'biblical criticism.' We may prove to be on more stable ground than the transitory and debatable theory of the Graf-Wellhausen school and their followers.

The Subjectiveness of Biblical Criticism

Very few are willing to concede that theology as a whole and biblical criticism in particular, like any other of our views and opinions, are the results of our subjectivity. We are influenced by the age and its trends, by our environment and its education whose influence is so deeply rooted in our subconscious mind that it is utterly impossible to be objective in the fullest sense of the word. That this is true may be confirmed by the fact that both the evangelical and the liberal adherents make the same claim. To use two known representatives of both theological camps, it would be well to point out the statements made by Edward J. Young and Paul Tillich. Edward J. Young states:

"Were Julius Wellhausen living today he would doubtless modify his statements concerning Genesis. In defense of Wellhausen it might conceivably be said that he was simply a child of his times, that he had to work with the best information available to him."¹

Paul Tillich makes a similar statement with regard to

1. Carl F. H. Henry, (Editor), Contemporary Evangelical Thought, p. 19.

being "a child of his times," but he calls it "situation."

"Yet the 'situation' cannot be excluded from theological work. Luther was unprejudiced enough to use his own nominalist learning and Melanchthon's humanist education for the formulation of theological doctrines. But he was not conscious enough of the problem of the 'situation' to avoid sliding into orthodox attitudes, thus preparing the way for a period of Protestant orthodoxy. Barth's greatness is that he corrects himself again and again in the light of the 'situation' and that he strenuously tries not to be his own follower."¹

Although there is a difference in terminology, they both mean the same. Even when each of them represents an extreme opposite theological school, their opinion with regard to influence of age and environment is the same.

Another element in addition to the transitory influence of the trends of a particular age is the factor of faith, which may or may not suffer under such an influence. To use an example, two statements by the same two representatives would again be a helpful demonstration.

"It is true," says E. J. Young, "that truth does not change; it is true that there is an abiding message in the Bible.... Truth does not change. The purpose of Evangelical Old Testament scholarship is not at all to discover new things. If men ask what contribution can be made, the answer is that the greatest possible contribution of a Bible-believing scholarship is to expound the Scriptures, to bring forth new light from them, to illustrate them and to point out their trustworthiness."²

1. Systematic Theology, vol. I, p. 5.
2. Systematic Theology, p. 3.

A similar statement with regard to the "truth" and the "abiding message in the Bible" is to be found in Tillich's work. He calls it the "truth of the Christian message" or "the eternal truth." I do not mean to say that in both cases they are to be understood as identical. They nonetheless refer to the same "truth."

"A theological system is supposed to satisfy two basic needs: the statement of truth of the Christian message and the interpretation of this truth to every new generation. Theology moves back and forth between two poles, the eternal truth of its foundation and the temporal situation in which the eternal truth must be received."¹

The 'eternal and abiding truth' to which both seem to adhere, even if not identical in nature and substance, is no doubt based on or received in faith. We, therefore, have two factors: the 'situation' and 'faith,' which (whether we are aware of it or not) make us subjectively disposed to the biblical literature which contains that 'eternal and abiding truth' which we accept as our a priori. To use Tillich's phraseology, every theologian "enters the theological circle with a concrete commitment."²

The present writer once more emphasizes the fact that it is not his intention to show any unanimity on the part of the two representatives of the two opposing theological schools. It is nonetheless clear from the above state-

1. Systematic Theology, p. 10.

2. Op. cit. p. 10.

ments that both the 'situation' and 'faith' factors are the principles or the foundation upon which they base their extreme opposite views. Their diversity, no doubt, is to be found in the 'eternal truth' they both speak of, and by what each comprehends this 'eternal truth' to be.

Another very good example of man's subjectivity in the study of Old Testament literature is given in E. Jacob's historical review of the various currents in the Old Testament studies beginning with the Church fathers to the present day.¹ This survey shows clearly how each generation was moulded by the influence of the trends and education of its particular age and gave full expression to it in the single treatment of the Old Testament literature. The present-day biblical criticism is not any different in this respect, but is still a result of the prevailing trends. The reasons why the Graf-Wellhausen theory is "as cogent today as ever,"² is because we are still under the influence of Darwin's evolutionistic theory and the philosophy of Hegel, particularly those of his materialistic disciples on the one hand and the humanists on the other.

However, we have been witnessing a tremendous change,

1. Theology of the Old Testament, pp. 11-30.

2. H. H. Rowley, The Growth of the Old Testament, p. 28.

a new era taking place in theological thought. These prevailing trends which slowly but surely are ousting the above mentioned views are existentialism¹ and pragmatism (especially that of Henri Bergson). Both have extended far beyond their philosophical circle and their ideas are welcomed by many religious leaders and thinkers.

Although existentialism and pragmatism must not be identified, one can observe an affinity with regard to religion. To show that such an affinity exists in some respects between them, we quote two statements, one by Barth, the other by Bergson in which both express a similar view of God. Karl Barth states:

"I said that God is He who, according to Holy Scripture, exists, lives and acts, and makes Himself known. By this definition something fundamentally different is taking place from what would happen if I should try and set before you conceptually arranged ideas of the infinite, supreme Being. In such a case I would be speculating. But I am not inviting you to speculate. I maintain that this is a radically wrong road which can never lead to God, but a reality called so, only in a false sense. God is He who is to be found in the book of the Old and New Testaments, which speaks of Him. And the Christian definition of God consists simply in the statement, 'He is spoken of there, so let us listen to what is said of Him there,' He who is to be seen and heard there is God."²

-
1. Particularly that of Karl Barth, who claims no more to be an existentialist at present. However, his previous views have made wide inroads into theological thought.
 2. Dogmatics in Outline, p. 37.

Henri Bergson's statement, although it contains more of a philosophical phraseology, expresses nonetheless the same idea, i.e. that God is He who communicates with man. He says:

"No doubt you may construct the idea of an object or of a being, as the geometrician does for a geometrical figure; but experience alone will decide whether it actually exists outside the idea thus constructed. Now, you may assert that this is just the question, and that the problem precisely is to know whether a certain Being is not distinctive from all other beings in that He stands beyond the reach of our experience, and yet is as real as they are. Granted, for this once; although an assertion of this kind, with its attendant arguments, appears to me to imply a fundamental illusion. But then you must prove that the Being thus defined, thus demonstrated, is indeed God. You may argue that He is so by definition, and that one is at liberty to confer any meaning one likes on words, provided one defines them first. Granted again; but if you attribute to a word a radically different meaning from that which it usually bears, it will apply to a new object; it is therefore understood that you are speaking to us of something else. This is precisely what occurs in most cases when the philosopher speaks of God. So remote is this conception from the God most men have in mind that if, by some miracle, and contrary to the opinion of the philosophers, God as thus defined should step down into the field of experience, none would recognize Him. For religion, be it static or dynamic, regards Him, above all, as a Being who can hold communication with us: now this is just what the God of Aristotle, adopted with a few modifications by most of his successors, is incapable of doing."¹

One easily observes that with both Barth and Bergson only He is God who speaks to man, i.e. who reveals Himself in

1. The Two Sources of Morality and Religion, p. 241.

human experiences.

Those who are acquainted with Barth's crisis theology and Bergson's philosophy according to which morality and religion remain always in crisis, will know that the above statements are not isolated pronouncements but are indeed characteristic of both representatives. And it is this divine 'message' revealed to man when God speaks to him that the present writer has made his foundation upon which he bases his view of biblical criticism. The only proper and correct way of studying biblical literature critically is to look for this divine 'message' in which God speaks to man revealing His will.

The 'Message' in Which God Speaks to Man

The 'message' in which God speaks to man should be the only norm in the critical study of biblical literature. We will find easily distinguishable strata in the Old Testament which, while preserving the wholeness of the divine 'message,' reveals the difference first in the way of communicating this message to man, and secondly in the extent of the message itself. For example, the divine 'message' spoken to the patriarchs was different from that revealed to Moses. And yet different from both was the 'message' God spoke to Amos, Hosea, Isaiah and

Micah. God also speaks differently to the Psalmist and one can find God speaking in the wisdom literature in spite of the fact that, when compared with the rest of Old Testament literature, one is aware of its non-Israelitic contents, unconcealed by its modifications.

Contrary to this critical study, the division of the Old Testament literature by the Graf-Wellhausen school into J, E, D, P completely destroys the message. It makes the whole Bible to be a jig-saw puzzle, a cold geometrical mosaic of various bricks bearing the nomenclature of which it was supposed to have been built. It is beside our point to enter here into a discussion proving that the whole theory is based mostly on assumptions; to which even some critical scholars raised much objection.¹ Our sole task is to point out that this documentary theory has strangled and crippled the message of God speaking to man.

1. Cf. H. H. Rowley, Editor, The Old Testament in Modern Study, p. xxvii and pp. 56, ff.; M. H. Pope, El in the Ugaritic Texts; see particularly pp. 6, 15, 25, f. and 55; C. H. Gordon who says: "It is against the background of Ugarit that we must evaluate the multiplicity of God's names: El, Eloah, Elohim, Yahweh, Yah, El-Shadday, Adonay, etc. Per se, Elohim and Yahweh need not imply dual authorship in a chapter of the Bible any more than Baal and Hadad do in a Ugaritic myth." (Ugaritic Literature, p. 6, f.). See also H. F. Hahn, Old Testament in Modern Research, p. 15, ff.

It became utterly lost amongst the J's, E's and the like. The fact that the documentary theory mutilated the message is no new discovery. In addition to those listed below, attention is called to this significant statement:

"Modern Literary Criticism with its long and complicated process of D¹, D², D^R, D^t, and R's by which it endeavours to disclose the very minutest details, has practically lost sight of the old venerable kernel, namely the Mosaic BL/Buch der Lehre, a name he attaches to Deuteronomy."¹

Others although upholding the documentary in principle point to the fact that the fragmentary hypothesis lead to absurdities and disintegration of the theory.

In recent years there has been a sign of a reaction against the absurdities of the position to which this fragmentary hypothesis has led us. Dr. Edward Robertson remarks: "When you can subdivide your main documents into two, three, four or more 'hands' the disintegration of the theory comes perilously near."²

However our objective is here limited. We are presently interested in the message which the documentary theory mutilates and deforms. Many prominent scholars have stated it clearly in the past century which the following quotation confirms:

"The critical approach to the Old Testament had not made the literature meaningful in any real sense to the modern generation of readers, and the secularizing spirit of research into its background

-
1. Das Deuteronomium, p. 46. *author?*
 2. F. V. Winnett, The Mosaic Tradition, p. vii.

"had obscured the Old Testament's significance, not merely as a part of the literary heritage of mankind, but as an expression of religious aspiration. Gunkel's new approach to the Old Testament was meant to provide the means for re-emphasizing the greatness of its literature and for pointing out the religious values in it."¹

While the present writer welcomes H. Gunkel's work and his influence upon Old Testament scholarship, the proposed treatment of the 'message' here does not correspond to the method used by the school of 'Form Criticism' initiated by H. Gunkel. His followers, particularly S. Mowinckel, have been lost in debatable conjectures² and so have lost sight of the original intention of its founder. But even Gunkel himself, in his approach to the study of the Old Testament Scriptures, already implied a classification of the studied material according to its historical value, such as myth, legend, etc. Neither has the present approach anything in common with the Scandinavian traditio-historical school, who in some respects are followers of H. Gunkel, i.e. in the important part that oral tradition plays in their methods of study of Old Testament Scriptures. If the method of the Scandinavian school differs from that of the literary critics in general, their aim is the same, i.e. "namely

1. H. F. Hahn, Old Testament in Modern Research, p. 122.

2. Op. cit., p. 138, f.

a correct and true placing of the separate Old Testament texts."¹ This again destroys the 'message' in spite of their claim of reverence for tradition.²

It remains now to enlarge upon the thought expressed previously about the 'message' which God spoke in various epochs to man. Throughout the book of Genesis it is clearly stated that God has spoken to the patriarchs:

"And Yahveh said to Abram"; "After these things the word of Yahveh came to Abram in a vision, saying...."; "And behold the word of Yahveh came unto him, saying...."; "And Yahveh appeared to Abram and said"; "And Yahveh appeared to him (Isaac) the same night, and said...."; "And behold Yahveh stood above it, and said to Jacob"³

In all these instances Yahveh appeared to each of the patriarchs and spoke to them. God came to man with a 'message.' It was rather an indirect, occasional communication by means of visions, dreams, or through an inward voice,⁴ and mostly at night. The content of the message was a personal one, and in its farthest extent did not go beyond the family circle of the patriarchs and their immediate descendants. As we know now from the rest of the Old Testament literature, the message was indeed of a much wider scope, but it would be conjecture to claim

1. Eduard Nielson, Oral Tradition, p. 63.

2. Ibid.

3. Gen. 12:1; 15:1, 4; 17:1; 26:24; 28:13.

4. Compare S. R. Driver, The Book of Genesis, W.C., p. 144.

that the patriarchs understood it in its fulness.¹ Because of the method of communicating the message and the limitations otherwise, we will do well in calling ^{to speak of} the patriarchal age during which God's message was spoken to them in this ^{the patriarchs} particular way, ^{an age of} as tradition. But this does not make it void of historical value. Indeed, as Max Loehr observes, the patriarchal narrative contains true history:

"The tradition," says Loehr, "from which we gain our knowledge of the religion and worship of pre-Mosaic Israel is to be principally found in the book of Genesis The stories of the patriarchs are not only seen more and more true to life, but they have preserved a number of data reliable for both religious and secular history."²

It is not the task of the present approach to the 'message' to investigate how much is tradition and how much history and to classify them as such. This is left entirely to the individual inquirer. We have spoken here about two factors according to which our views and opinions are formed: the 'situation' and 'faith.' The 'situation' involves also the archaeological discoveries which are a part of that 'situation' in which we are living. Thus the situation and faith of the individual inquirer are the determining

-
1. We are not here questioning the historicity of the patriarchal narrative. We are mainly interested in God's message behind the story as well stated by C. F. Kent (See Origin and Permanent Value of the Old Testament, p. 26.) See also H. Wheeler Robinson, The Old Testament, Its Making and Meaning, p. 41, f.
 2. A History of Religion in the Old Testament, p. 19, f.

factors as to what is mere tradition and what is history. Faith or religion is a personal experience and cannot be handed down as mathematical formulae. Nonetheless, it should be emphasized at this point that the investigation as to what is tradition and what is history is secondary to the message, namely that God spoke to man. This is the abiding and eternal truth and is alone of primary significance.

Following the patriarchal age we enter the Mosaic one. Throughout the Pentateuchal books we have a record of God speaking to Moses. That communication, different from the patriarchal one, is marked by a pronounced frequency and clear mode of revelation or conveyance of the message. The biblical record states this clearly: "And Yahveh spoke unto Moses as a man speaketh to his friend."¹ The message is addressed to all Israel. Moses was to convey God's message to Israel as a nation and for the purpose he received it. He was to be the mediator of God's command to Israel. The Mosaic age is the age of the Law. Moses was to transmit to Israel the laws of the covenant. Yahveh had made His covenant with her at Sinai where she responded with the promise of obedience. The Exodus event initiated this period, and it fell into

1. Ex. 33:11.

obscurity with the death of Joshua.¹

The Mosaic message was not altogether abandoned after the death of Joshua, but like the history of Israel it had its ebb and flow. The recognition of Yahveh and His message depended very much upon the tide of history and hence that age may be rightly called 'history.'

During that period the communication of God's message takes on a much wider range.² God speaks to judges, priests, kings and, above all, to prophets. Also the extent of the message grows constantly along with Israel's history. Once limited to Israel alone, it gradually includes more and more non-Israelitic nations until Yahveh becomes the Lord of history and so the God of mankind.

In that period the prophetic literature is combined with the historical one to form an uninterrupted flow of God's message as He spoke to man on behalf of Israel or other nations. There are several reasons for the inclusion of the prophetic literature into the age of history.

1. The prophets, like the biblical historians, convey Yahveh's message on behalf of the nation Israel and other nations as related to Israel.

2. "The prophets, like the historians of Israel were religious teachers, and it is as teachers of religious truth that they are to be judged."³

1. The distinguishing mark is the covenant at Sinai (Horeb) and its renewal at Moab and Shechem.

2. Extensively and intensively.

3. H. H. Rowley, The Growth of the Old Testament, p. 83.

3. The prophetic oracles are history. "The single oracle is closely bound to the situation out of which it sprang; to the concrete sin against which it is directed; to the special danger which is threatened from this or that foe."¹

4. The prophets, like the biblical historians, looked upon events as divine activity. "Revelation," says Otto Eissfeldt, "is not the communication of a system of future events, or of a system of moral or religious requirements, but the making known of God's will which is to be performed in the particular and concrete situation, and of threats and promises of divine activity which also will be realized in the particular and concrete situation."²

These three epochs of Tradition, Law and History represent the message of God as He spoke to man and the end of that continuing flow of the message came with the beginning of Judaism. It is not to be understood that God ceased to speak to man, but rather that He was no more the Initiator. With Judaism He was the One whom man was seeking and in whom man found the assurance that he seeks from God. Judaism did not come with the exile and the dispersion. The Synagogue or the rise of the

1. H. Wheeler Robinson, Editor, Record and Revelation, p. 65.

2. Op. cit., p. 67.

Scribes does not mark its beginning. They were contributing factors but not the real mark of the beginning of Judaism. It came with the reverse of the hitherto known method of revelation. It was no more a revelation that began with God speaking to man, but rather with man seeking to have communion with God. It was exactly as the Deuteronomist states it:

"And it shall come to pass, when all these things are come upon thee, the blessing and the curse, which I have set before thee, and thou reflectest upon them in thy heart among all the nations, whither Yahveh thy God had driven thee; so that thou returnest unto Yahveh thy God and obeyest his voice according to all that I command thee this day, thou and thy children, with all thy heart, and with all thy soul."¹

It was Israel's true and earnest awakening to the message of God to which she had remained indifferent for all these centuries. In the literature of that period we see in this belated awakening of Israel a threefold reaction which expressed itself in three kinds of literature. In some respects they form a threefold response to the three periods outlined above.

The Psalmist represents the patriarchal tradition of close communion with God without the elaborate Temple ritual. Men learned to stand alone with God and to know

1. Dt. 30:1, 2.

Him as an unseen but loving Friend, like Abraham and the rest of the patriarchs did. The present writer is aware of the fact that some scholars have called the Psalms 'The Hymn Book of the Second Temple', hence the name would imply a definite connection with the cult. However, such a title seems to be a misnomer for the following three reasons:

1. Some of the Psalms were composed before there ever was a Temple and some were written in exile, far removed from Jerusalem, which is confirmed by H. Ewald who states:

"We possess in the present Psalter the flower of the lyrical poetry of the Hebrews most suitable for public edification and instruction, out of all centuries from David down to the latest times."¹

2. The Psalms represent such a wide variety and range that it is impossible to attach any exact descriptive title to the Psalter as a whole. This is observed by Prof. Davison who states:

"It would be a mistake to use any descriptive title for the Book which would narrow its breadth of its scope or the comprehensiveness of its range. It is didactic, lyric, elegaic, by turns; it is various as human life, and its main feature is the bringing of human history with all its joys and

1. Quoted by Prof. Davison in The Book of Psalms, (The Century Bible), vol. I, p. 4.

"sorrows, hopes and fears, struggles and achievements, into the presence of God and the light of religion."¹

3. The predominant group in the Book of Psalms are the so-called 'I' Psalms which according to H. Ewald, Th. Noedelke, H. Duhm and James Robertson represent (and rightly so) the individual Psalms.² And it is to this major group which represents over eighty Psalms, that the present writer refers. In them we see man seeking God and finding solace in, and communion with Him whether in joy or in sorrow, in hope or in fear, in victory or in defeat.

The Law has its counterpart in the wisdom literature which makes such claims as quoted below:

"My son, forget not my teaching, and let thy heart keep my commandments."

o/ "Honour Yahveh with thy wealth, and with the first-fruits of all thy products. So shall thy barns be filled with plenty, and with new wine shall thy presses overflow. The correction of Yahveh, my son, do not despise, and feel no loathing for his admonition; because whomsoever Yahveh loveth he admonisheth, and as a father who delighteth in (his) son."

"For the commandment is a lamp, and the law is light; and the way of life are the admonitions of corrections."

"Observe my commandments, and live: and my teaching as the apple of thy eyes. Bind them around thy fingers, write them upon the table of thy heart."³

-
1. The Book of Psalms, (The Century Bible), vol. I, p. 5.
 2. T. Witton Davies, The Psalms (The Century Bible), vol. II, p. 19, f.
 3. Prov. 3:1, 9, 10, 11, 12; 6:23; 7:2, 3.

These and similar sayings suggest that the wisdom literature was formed as if it were an enforcement of the Law through a deeper understanding of its purpose.

The age of history has its counterpart in the apocalyptic literature where emphasis is laid upon the Sovereignty of Yahveh who would eventually intervene, annihilate Israel's enemies, and set up His kingdom upon earth. This is best exemplified in the closing chapter of the book of Daniel.

The comparison between the literature of the three ages of the message in which God spoke to man and the literature of man's belated response to God's message is only suggestive. It is not meant to make it a law. It only illustrates the variety of the spiritual effect God's message may have upon man. One meditates as in the Psalms, the other reflects and contemplates as in the wisdom literature, and yet another finds solace in the visions of the final triumph of God's justice and the vindication of His saints.¹

J 1. C. H. Dodd first asserts that the wisdom literature (Job) "stands in the succession of the prophets as humane moralists." But in his concluding statement he remarks, "The 'wise' describe their own moral teaching as 'Torah' in the wide sense. Ben Sirach expressly identifies wisdom with Torah, and even with 'the book of the covenant of the Most High God, the Torah which Moses commanded us for a heritage.'"

Revelation: Reality, Idea, or Interpretation?

The above outline of Old Testament revelation was intended to give an account of the essence of God's message to man as He spoke through Israel's history, and of her final response to that message. It is not our present concern to trace the origins of Old Testament religion as they may be found in the ancient religions of the Near East.¹ Neither does it lie within our present interest to discuss the theory of religious evolution from animism to monotheism or the anti-evolutionist theory of the Uppsala School which maintains that the polytheistic pantheons have arisen from an original monotheism (Goetter-spaltung).²

All this is to be found outside the message and entirely foreign to it and to the writers of Old Testament

(The Authority of the Bible, p. 170). It could be further added that even Job (book) makes reference throughout to the law of moral retribution which is very characteristic of Deuteronomy.

1. There is ample literature dedicated specifically to that field: J. G. Frazer, The Golden Bough; also by the same author, Folklore of the Old Testament; Julius Wellhausen, Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel, and Reste Arabischen Heidentums; W. Robertson Smith, The Religion of the Semites; W. O. E. Oesterly and T. H. Robinson, Hebrew Religion, Its Origin and Development; H. Wheeler Robinson, Record and Revelation; H. H. Rowley, (Editor), The Old Testament and Modern Study, pp. 283, ff.
2. H. H. Rowley (Editor), op. cit., p. 287.

literature. We are not presently interested in 'Religionsgeschichte' but confine ourselves simply to God's revelation to man as He spoke through His message. Our division into Tradition, Law, History and Judaism is inevitably historical. Yahveh's revelation, as explained in previous chapters, is to be found in historical events whether that of an individual or the nation. Moreover, this division springs mainly from the character and content of the message which Yahveh spoke in a particular and concrete situation.

Our present concern, after the presentation of the above outline, is to define precisely what it contains. Does it represent the actual (real) revelation of God as He spoke to man, or does it represent an 'idea' or 'ideas' as the biblical authors conceived God's revelation to be? Or, does this outline represent the present writer's interpretation of the biblical record?

It may perhaps prove expedient to answer the last question first. The only part that the present writer can claim as his own is the method of approach and the classification of the content of the message.¹ The

1. The slightly similar division from a purely literary standpoint by H. Wheeler Robinson (The Old Testament, Its Making and Meaning, p. 19) and vague resemblance to R. Bultmann's approach to the New Testament message is purely accidental.

reasons for such a classification were also stated and may be confirmed in the words of H. Wheeler Robinson: "To say that the divine revelation was made through the life of Israel is necessarily to admit its progressive character."¹

As to whether the above outline represents actual (real) revelation or 'ideas' depends very much upon what the biblical record itself represents. For the present writer has tried faithfully in his outline to reproduce the message conveyed by the biblical authors.

Before attempting to answer the question raised here, it should be said at the outset that it is a purely philosophical one and foreign to biblical revelation. We should not forget that the biblical writer did not think in our present-day terms, nor gave himself to any mode of speculation. For his was not an idea but real revelation. God was real to the patriarchs; God was real to Moses and to those who beheld the wonders of the Exodus event. God was real to the judges and to the prophets to whom He revealed Himself through a supernatural event or through His 'Word' or command. God was no less real to

1. The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament, p. 218. Compare also C. F. Kent, The Origin and Permanent Value of the Old Testament, p. 29, f.

the Deuteronomic prophetic preacher whose discourses we read and are inspired by their beauty and by their message. He speaks from personal experience and reality, and not from speculation. This God who has entered into an ever-restorable covenant with Israel is indeed a "living God"¹ to the writer of the divine message as well as to those who entered that covenant, for they heard "the voice of the living God".²

On the other hand there is the possibility of considering the biblical revelation from a present-day viewpoint. Such a view may not be discarded for there are at least five valid reasons for accepting the biblical revelation (as outlined in the preceding subdivision) as the 'ideas' comprehended by the individual writer.

1. The Hebrews were realists, which means that if Israel was to know God it would be through a concrete and living experience rather than an abstract speculation. The individual interpretation of this living experience would inevitably form ideas of a particular revelation which might be recorded immediately or, if passed on by tradition, centuries later. It is almost unanimously agreed that the oral tradition in the East was the 'record'

1. Dt. 5:23.

2. Ibid.

preserved from generation to generation.

2. God's revelation has not been a one-time disclosure, but a continuous speaking to man throughout history. It would therefore be natural for man, who received that revelation, to interpret it according to a particular and concrete situation of his time. It is true that the post-Mosaic religion was to run its course in accordance with the fundamental principles set forth by the great law-giver; still it was inevitable that each generation should lay its stamp upon it, forming a distinct development.

"The idea of Him is never static in quality and is always being enriched. One form of this enrichment is the extension of the idea from the narrowly localized God of Sinai to the God of Zion and ultimately the God unto whom all men shall come (Ps. lxxv. 2).¹

3. Strictly in accordance with the internal evidence of the message itself (and it may be said to be a result of point two) is the variety of the use of anthropomorphisms, both in volume and frequency. Whether it be an anthropomorphism for the sake of making God more real and personal, capable of having communion with man, or whether it be the basis of prophetic consciousness as having "sympathy with God"², it witnesses to a varying

1. H. Wheeler Robinson, Record and Revelation, p. 307.

2. Ibid., p. 310.

emotional state of the individual, creating his own 'idea' of revelation.

4. Fourthly, the fact that man is able to know God only in part,¹ (and that 'part' varying with each individual) leads one to conclude that the revelation recorded would be marked by the limits of the particular writer.

5. As well observed by A. J. Heschel, the prophet's record was not a 'reproduction' of his personal experience with Yahveh. He was simply relating his experience to his fellow countrymen.

"The prophets themselves," Heschel states, "could only relate, but not reproduce, what happened to them. They endeavoured to vindicate their own reliability by forecast or persuasion; the act itself could not be displayed to others. However, the fact of our inability to share an experience does not deny its authenticity. Many of our own experiences, the most precious and singular, can hardly be shared by anybody else. Much of what a person goes through cannot be communicated, and what is not communicable is not sharable."²

Naturally some may object to any or all of these reasons but they should be taken into consideration. Moreover, the present-day viewpoint of an 'idea' versus real revelation, has raised a very serious question, namely, does such a view undermine the authority of the

1. Is. 55:8, 9; Job 26:14; Rom. 11:33, 34.

2. God in Search of Man, p. 220, f.

Scripture as the 'Word of God'? The fact that we consider biblical revelation as real puts this question outside our present concern, but it does not eliminate it. What possible answer could be given to one holding such a view?

First it could be said that one holding such a view cannot deny real revelation which to a certain extent is inherent in the 'idea'. Secondly, he cannot overlook the fact that, even if the biblical record be conceived as the 'word of man' in form, it is, nonetheless, the 'Word of God' in substance.¹ The biblical writer's only concern was the one remarkable event: God speaking to man. This truth does not change regardless of man's view, for the same God speaks to us today through the same Bible.²

Finally, the Bible is God's Word because in it (and through it today) man and God are brought face to face one with the Other. They are brought together by God's love and man's dependence upon Him. Also the covenant of God with man, of which the Bible is the only testimony, has broken every barrier between them by enduing man spiritually with Divine kinship, making such communion and fellowship between them possible. And finally, the

1. Compare Heschel's statement above (p. 233) particularly where he says: "The fact of our inability to share an experience does not deny its authenticity."

2. Karl Barth, The Word of God and the Word of Man, p. 242.

Bible is the Word of God because it is the revelation of His eternal purpose.

Authorship and Date of Deuteronomy

Although the third decade of our century witnessed a special interest in a critical study of Deuteronomy,¹ that interest has not abated in the subsequent decades nor has it come to a stand-still in our own day. This is no doubt due to the greatness of Deuteronomy described in the following words by J. E. McFadyen:

"Deuteronomy is one of the epoch-making books of the world. It not only profoundly affected much of the subsequent literature of the Hebrews, but it left a deep and abiding mark upon Hebrew religion, and through it upon Christianity."²

The Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis published a Symposium (referred to above) containing three articles by eminent scholars. They discuss the possibility of three datings: an early date of Deuteronomy (possibly during the existence of the Northern Kingdom); a post-exilic date, and "the currently accepted date of

-
1. In addition to the works listed throughout the present research, attention is called to the "Symposium" in the Journal of Biblical Literature, vol. XLVII, parts III and IV, 1928, pp. 305-379; also Adam C. Welch's reply to the first article of the foregoing published in the Journal of Biblical Literature, vol. XLVII, parts III and IV, 1929, pp. 291-306.
 2. An Introduction to the Old Testament, p. 51.

Deuteronomy".¹ Because of our present limitations, we cannot enter this threefold discussion in detail. Also in our present discussion we are to follow the message outlined with the intention of finding a possible date. On the surface one may not see any such relationship between the above outlined record of revelation and the date of Deuteronomy. This is, however, to be found inherent in the division of Old Testament revelation into strata.

In Deuteronomy chapters I - XXX, we have Tradition, Law and History mingled together. Chapters XXXI - XXXIV, witness to the age of Judaism. Since we have limited our present research to Deuteronomy I - XXX, we have confined its literature to the first three strata. In the present writer's opinion, chapters I - XXX was the "book of the Law" which initiated the Josianic reform.

It contains 'tradition' for throughout the book the author refers to the patriarchal covenant. The historical question, as already alluded to in the outline, is of very little importance to us. The patriarchal tradition was deeply rooted in the mind of the Israelite and we cannot understand its subsequent history without that tradition.

1. Journal of Biblical Literature, vol. LXVII, parts III and IV, 1928, pp. 359-379.

Deuteronomy contains 'law'. We have a body of laws dispersed through the various chapters. Again it is not the task of the present approach to investigate how many laws were truly Mosaic, how many laws were Canaanite customs or laws, how many were of Egyptian or Babylonian heritage and how many were of purely Israelitic nature. We accept them as Mosaic in spirit because of two important principles established by Moses: they were divine laws and a part of the covenantal obligations. Both of these principles are more than obvious in the book of Deuteronomy. The book is but an enlargement of the original covenant and a renewal of the same. That the laws are divine would follow from the fact that they are covenantal laws. In addition, one must never lose sight of the fact that the covenant meant to establish a theocracy in Israel. In the theocratic nation all laws are divinely sanctioned and hence divine, regardless of their nature or origin.

The book also contains 'history,' not only in the sense that Deuteronomy gives us a retrospect of Israel's history, but we also have history in a purely prophetic sense as defined above. We have oracles, the prophetic threats of doom, the prophetic eschatology and, above all, the prophetic teaching as contained in the charac-

teristic Deuteronomic phrases. This factor has been discussed in every chapter of the present work and need not be repeated here.

It would then be correct to conclude that the Deuteronomist should be identified first of all with one of the latest strata, namely that of history. He must have been a prophetic preacher who, incorporating tradition and law, added history in that interpretation as the prophets of his age saw it.

To give a more specific answer, we must employ arguments already discussed throughout the present research: (1) the religious argument, the teaching of the eighth-century prophets; (2) the historical argument, the miraculous deliverance of Jerusalem in 701 B.C. and Hezekiah's reform; and finally (3), the literary argument, the characteristic style and language of Deuteronomy as expressed in its phraseology and vocabulary.

Practically every scholarly work on Deuteronomy in general and every work referred to in the present research calls our attention to the fact that Deuteronomy contains the teaching of the eighth-century prophets. To confirm what was already stated, we quote George Dahl:

"In its religious ideas, Deuteronomy follows closely after the great social prophets of the eighth century. The social passion of Amos,

"the national devotion of Isaiah, and above all, Hosea's dramatic and touching plea for the recognition of love as the essence of religion -- all these find repeated expression in this remarkably human and warm-hearted program of reform. Love easily becomes the dominant note of the book."¹

To that should be added the Isaianic theology of holiness and his devotion to the Temple in Jerusalem which is evident in Deuteronomy. Also the Deuteronomist, like Micah, proclaims a religion of the heart by which man delights in acts of love and in walking humbly with God. They have also both condensed this conception of religion into a single verse, which might be said to contain the whole law.² All these show fresh and immediate influence as a result of their teaching. To include the influence of all four prophets one should suggest the beginning of the seventh century.

The historical argument is based upon two or three events. The remarkable deliverance of Jerusalem from Sennacherib in 701 and Hezekiah's reformation following

-
1. Journal of Biblical Literature, vol. XLVII, part III and IV, 1928, p. 373. (And in the footnote attached to it: "Deuteronomy contains none of Hosea's lyrical abandon. But no one who has caught the distinctive music of Hosea - silent in Amos, Isaiah and Micah - can miss it in the more precise and measured yet still unmistakably fervent devotion of Deuteronomy." Cf. Lofthouse, *op. cit.*, p. 73.)
 2. Micah 6:8; Dt. 10:12.

it¹ are events which could not pass without leaving deep religious impressions upon the faithful and the nation as a whole. This experience must have greatly enhanced the influence of Isaiah who predicted it, and his message found partial realization in the religious reform undertaken by Hezekiah. Even if there was some doubt as to the extent of this reform, the practical result of such laws as Hezekiah enacted and enforced to bring about this reformation was the introduction of a single sanctuary,² not as a law but as a necessity.³

The third event, although it did belong to the past and ^{might?} may have been forgotten had not the same danger been at Judah's door, was the fall of the Northern Kingdom. The massacre of its population, the exile and enslavement amongst foreign people were the ^{a?} constant fear and threat to Judah; she too might fall a victim of the same oppressor. That fear and threat on the one hand and the miraculous deliverance of Jerusalem predicted by Isaiah on the other resulted in Hezekiah's reformation. This reformation was, no doubt, under the influence of Isaiah

-
1. A number of scholars agree that the reformation took place after the experience in 701 B.C. Henry Preserved Smith, Old Testament History, p. 254; Cf. W. Robertson Smith, The Prophets of Israel, p. 359, f.; A. Westphal and C. DuPontet, The Law and the Prophets, p. 304, f.
 2. W. Robertson Smith, op. cit., p. 357.
 3. See discussion in chapter III of the present work.

and as a response to his preaching, if not directly under his leadership, for the relationship between king and prophet was congenial and co-operative. This makes Hezekiah the first Reformer of the Jewish Church, even if it was less successful than that of Josiah.

On the other hand, it is acceptable that Isaiah conceived the inviolability of Jerusalem only as a temporary event, and that in his prophetic insight he saw the complete destruction of Judah which he at times proclaimed equally as clearly as Micah did.¹ Would it not be possible that the prophet, prompted by that vision, asked his disciples to write a book to save Israel's faith at least, seeing that the destruction of Jerusalem was inevitable. Isaiah twice mentions such writing.² It may, no doubt, have referred to his own prophecy: "Bind up the testimony, seal the law among my disciples." (8:16). It poses a serious question: Had Isaiah used both תורה and תעודת for his prophetic instructions of which תורה at least usually refers to God's law? The word תעודת is to be found only once more in Ruth 4:7 in connection with a ceremonial law. We find both words again in the following verse: "Consult the Torah and the testimony! But that

1. Is. 6:9, ff.; 28:16, ff.; Micah 3:2, f.

2. Is. 8:16; 30:8.

will only be their cry when there is no dawn of hope any more."¹ One is indeed mindful of being cautious in such cases not to read more into words than they convey. We will therefore leave both quoted verses and look for evidence outside them. We find again הורה in Isaiah 1: 10; 2:3; 5:24; 24:5; 30:9 where, without a shadow of doubt, the word הורה refers definitely to God's law. Could we not entertain such a thought that Isaiah commanded to write down the Law of God including his oracles in which he warned them of the forthcoming doom? And his disciples, obedient to the command of the master, wrote both the law and his oracles and Deuteronomy contains both. Perhaps in support of that hypothesis it would be well to state that scholars have already considered this possibility, and the present writer shares that view whole-heartedly.²

-
1. Is. 8:20. Quoted in part from Moffatt's translation.
 2. "In Jesaia 8, 16-18 erhaelt der Prophet von Jahve den Auftrag (Jes. 8, 16: הורה :verschnuere (anders Proksch, Komm. z. St.), die ihm geoffenbarte Wahrheit nicht dem Volk, sondern einem Schueler-kreis anzuvertrauen. Hier waechst organisch die von Gott geschaffene Gemeinde. Die Frucht der Prophetie uebernimmt ein kleiner Kreis von Juengern, die im eigenen Volke missionieren (vgl. Jes. 8, 18) und eine geistliche Gemeinde bilden. Jesaia sieht nicht von Israel ab. Die von ihm gerufene Schar auf Gott harrender Menschen haben an ihrem Volk eine grosse Aufgabe zu erfuehlen. Jahve zeigt durch sie seine Groesse, wie er einst dem

Finally we come to the literary argument. Scholars unanimously agree that the Isaianic poetry is superb and excels in beauty both in form and substance. It witnesses to the golden age of literature. The same may be said of the oratory of Deuteronomy which was discussed at length and need not be repeated here. It remains only to say that it fits well into the Isaianic period.

Perhaps we may conclude by citing one more fact which in itself may constitute vital evidence in support of the fact that Deuteronomy took shape under the influence of Isaiah's prophetic message and during the reign of Hezekiah. The latter, as is well observed by S. R. Driver, in addition to being a godly man and a great administrator, was also "a patron of art and literature"

Pharao seine Macht kundgegeben hatte (Jes. 8, 18). Die Prophetie geht in die Predigt ueber. Damit tritt eine neue Form israelitischer Religion in die Geschichte ein: Die Predigt. Wenn wir die in Jes. 8, 16-18 angedeuteten Gedanken unter dem oben dargestellten Gesichtspunkt auslegen duerfen, liegt die Annahme nicht ganz ferne, unter den Schuelern (יְהוֹשֻׁעַ) Jesaias den Verfasser des Dt. zu vermuten." Herbert Breit, Die Predigt des Deuteronomisten, p. 225, f. Cf. Norman W. Porteous' remark on the above in H. H. Rowley (Editor) Studies in Old Testament Prophecy, p. 150. Cf. also p. 159 for listing of more scholars holding a similar view. However, the present writer does not share A. Westphal's (listed there) view that Hezekiah already used Deuteronomy as a guide for his reformation. (The Law and the Prophets, p. 304, ff.).

in ancient Judah. Driver states that:

"At his [Hezekiah's] court, moreover, literature flourished: a poem attributed to him is preserved in the Book of Isaiah (XXXVIII, 9-20); and in Prov. XXV, 1, allusion is made to the patronage bestowed by him upon literary undertakings. The 'men of Hezekiah,' who 'copied out' proverbs, were evidently employed in the collection and preservation of the literary remains of former ages; and we would gladly know whether their activity extended to other departments of literature besides 'proverbs'."¹

One seems justified in assuming Isaiah's disciples to be the authors of Deuteronomy and Hezekiah its promulgator. With their collaboration the oral tradition became written law. In the same sermonic form accessible to all Israelites it was probably preserved under the patronage of King Hezekiah. During the reign of his successor, Manasseh, the greatest of all apostates, the book sank into disrespect and forgetfulness. In order to protect it from destruction some pious person may have hidden it in the temple buildings (a custom preserved to this day by Jewish people) where it was discovered during the reign of Josiah (in 621 B.C.), a godly king who welcomed it and made it the centre of His reform.

1. Isaiah: His Life and Times, p. 46.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. PRIMARY SOURCES

Biblia Hebraica adjuvantibus W. Baumgartner, G. Beer, J. A. Bever, J. Begrich, F. Buhl, J. Hempel, F. Horst, M. Noth, O. Procksch, G. Quell, Th. H. Robinson, W. Rudolph, H. H. Schaefer - edidit Rud. Kittel - textum Massoreticum curavit P. Kahle - editionem tertiam denuo elaboratam ad finem perduxerunt A. Alt et O. Eissfeldt, Stuttgart Privileg. Wuertt. Bibelanstalt, 1950.

The Pentateuch with Onkelos Targum and Rashi Commentary published by The Hebrew Publishing Co., New York.

The Twenty-Four Books of the Bible, Hebrew and English. Carefully translated after the best Jewish authorities by Isaac Leeser, Hebrew Publishing Company, New York.

S S Biblia Polyglotta complectentia textus originales Hebraicum Pentat. Samaritano (Chaldaicum, Graecum) versionumque antiquarum, Samaritanae, Graecae, Chaldaicae, Syriacae...Londini, Thomas Roycroft, 1657.

The Old Testament in Greek according to the text of Codex Vaticanus supplemented from other uncial manuscripts, with critical apparatus containing the variants of the chief ancient authorities for the text of the Septuagint: edited by Alan England Brook and Norman McLean, vol. I, the Octateuch, Cambridge at the University Press, 1917.

II. SECONDARY SOURCES

Breit, Herbert: Die Predigt des Deuteronomisten, Christian Kaiser, Muenchen, 1935.

- Colenso, John W.: The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua, Part III, Deuteronomy, Longman, Green and Brothers, London, 1863.
- Dillmann, A.: Das Deuteronomium, Leipzig, 1886.
- Driver, S. R.: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy, I. C. C., T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1902.
- Harper, A.: (The Expositor's Bible) Deuteronomy, Hodder and Staughton, London, 1901.
- Keil, K. F. and Delitsch, F.: Commentary on the Old Testament, vol. III (Translated from the German by the Rev. James Martin) William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1956.
- Loehr, Max: Das Deuteronomium, Berlin, 1925.
- Manley, G. T.: The Book of the Law, The Tyndale Press, 1955.
- McNeile, A. H. Deuteronomy, Its Place in Revelation, London, 1912.
- Naumann, O.: Das Deuteronomium, Bertelsmann, Guetersloh, 1897.
- Oestreicher, T.: Das Deuteronomische Grundgesetz, Guetersloh, 1923.
- Rad, G., von: Das Gottesvolk im Deuteronomium, Verlag W. Kohlhammer, Stuttgart, 1929.
- Studies in Deuteronomy, S. C. M. Press, London, 1953.
- Reider, J.: Deuteronomy, Philadelphia, 1937.
- Robinson, H. Wheeler: Deuteronomy - Joshua (The Century Bible) The Caxton Publishing Co., Ltd., London.
- Steuernagel, C.: Die Entstehung des deuteronomischen Gesetzes, Halle a. S., 1876.

Welch, A. C.: The Code of Deuteronomy, James Clarke and Co., Ltd., London, 1924.

Deuteronomy, The Framework to the Code, Oxford, 1932.

III. HISTORICAL, CRITICAL, AND THEOLOGICAL SOURCES

Albright, W. F.: From the Stone Age to Christianity, Doubleday & Co., Inc., New York, 1957.

Alt, A.: Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel, Muenchen, C. H. Beck, 1953.

Anderson, B. W.: Understanding the Old Testament, Prentice-Hall, Inc., New Jersey, 1957.

Baethgen, F.: Beitrage zur Semitischen Religionsgeschichte, Berlin, Reuter, 1888.

Barth, Karl: Dogmatics in Outline, Philosophical Library, New York, 1947.

The Word of God and the Word of Man, Harper and Brothers Publishers, New York, 1957.

Bennett, W. H.: The Books of Chronicles, Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1894.

Bergson, Henri: The Two Sources of Morality and Religion, Doubleday and Co., Inc., New York, 1956.

Bredenkamp, C. J.: Gesetz und Propheten, Erlangen, 1881.

Bruce, W. S.: The Ethics of the Old Testament, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1895.

Brunner, Emil: The Christian Doctrine of God, The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1949.

- Buber, Martin: Moses, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1958.
- Burrows, Millar: An Outline of Biblical Theology, Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1946.
- Caiger, Stephen L.: Lives of the Prophets, S. P. C. K., London, 1958.
- Cheyne, T. K.: Founders of Old Testament Criticism, Methuen and Co., London, 1893.
- Cook, S. A.: The Religion of Ancient Palestine in the Light of Archaeology, Milford, London, 1930.
- Davidson, A. B.: The Theology of the Old Testament, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1955.
- Davidson, S.: The Hebrew Text, London (no date).
- Davies, T. Witton (The Century Bible), The Psalms, LXXII - CL, The Caxton Publishing Company, London.
- Davison, Prof.: The Book of Psalms, (The Century Bible), I - LXXII, The Caxton Printing Company, London.
- Delitzsch, Friedrich: Babel and Bible, Crown Theological Library, G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1903.
- Prolegomena (Hebraeisch Aramaeischen Woerterbuchs), Leipzig, 1886.
- Dodd, C. H.: The Bible Today, Cambridge, 1947.
- The Authority of the Bible, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1958.
- Driver, G. R.: Problems of the Hebrew Verbal System, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1936.
- Driver, S. R.: Recent Theories on the Origin and Nature of the Tetragrammaton, Clarendon Press, Oxford.

- An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, Meridian Books, New York, 1956.
- Modern Research as Illustrating the Bible, Oxford University Press, London, 1909.
- The Book of Genesis, Methuen and Co., London, 1920.
- Isaiah (His Life and Times), London, 1887.
- Eichrodt, W.: Man in the Old Testament, S. C. M. Press, London, 1956.
- Eissfeldt, O.: Geschichtshreibung im Alten Testament, Berlin, 1948.
- Ewald, Heinrich: Old and New Testament Theology, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1888
- Frankenberg, W.: Der Organismus der Semitischen Wortbildung, A. Toepelmann, Giessen, 1913.
- Frazer, J. G.: Folklore in the Old Testament, Tudor Publishing Company, New York, 1923.
- The Golden Bough, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1958.
- Galling, K.: Die Erwählungstraditionen Israels, Giessen, Toepelmann, 1928.
- Glueck, N.: Das Wort Hesed, Giessen, A. Toepelmann, 1927.
- Gordon, Cyrus H.: Introduction to the Old Testament Times, Venter Publishers, Inc., Venter, N. J., 1953.
- Ugaritic Literature, Roma, Pontificium, Institutum Biblicum, 1947.
- Grant, Elihu: The Haverford Symposium on Archaeology and the Bible, New Haven, Conn., 1938.

- Gray, G. B.: A Critical Introduction to the Old Testament, Duckworth and Co., London, 1913.
- Sacrifice in the Old Testament, Oxford, 1925.
- Hebrew Proper Names, Black, London, 1896.
- Gray, John: The Legacy of Canaan, E. J. Brill, Leiden, 1957.
- Gressmann, H.: Der Ursprung der Israelitisch-Juedischen Eschatologie, Goettlingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1905.
- Mose und seine Zeit, Goettlingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913.
- Grether, O.: Name und Wort Gottes im Alten Testament, Giessen, A. Toepelmann, 1934.
- Hahn, Herbert F.: The Old Testament in Modern Research, Muhlenberg Press, Philadelphia, 1954.
- Harnack, A.: What is Christianity? Williams and Norgate, London, 1904.
- Harrison, R. K.: A History of Old Testament Times, Marshall, Morgan and Scott, London, 1957.
- Hastings, J. (Editor): The Greater Men and Women of the Bible, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1913.
- Heinisch, P.: Theologie des Alten Testaments, P. Hanstein, Bonn, 1940.
- Henry, Carl F. H.: Contemporary Evangelical Thought, Channel Press, Great Neck, New York, 1957.
- Heschel, A. J.: God in Search of Man, Meridian Books, Inc., New York and The Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia, 1959.

- Jack, J. W.: The Ras Shamra Tablets, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1935.
- Jacob, E.: Theology of the Old Testament, Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1958.
- Jastrow, M., Jr.: The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria, Boston, Ginn and Company, 1898.
- The Study of Religion, Scott, London, 1901.
- Die Religion Babyloniens und Assyriens, volumes I and II, Alfred Toepelmann, Giessen, 1905-1912. (Revised and enlarged edition of the above listed)
- Jocz, Jacob: A Theology of Election, S. P. C. K., London, 1958.
- Karge, Paul: Geschichte des Bundesgedankens im Alten Testament, Verlag der Aschendorffischen Buchhandlung, Muenster i. W., 1910.
- Kautzsch, E.: Literature of the Old Testament, London, 1898.
- Kent, C. F.: The Origin and Permanent Value of the Old Testament, Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1906.
- Kerber, G.: Die Religionsgeschichtliche Bedeutung der Hebraeischen Eigennamen des Alten Testaments, Leipzig, 1897.
- Kittel, R.: The Scientific Study of the Old Testament, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh.
- The Religion of the People of Israel, London, 1925.
- Klostermann, A.: Geschichte des Volkes Israel, Muenchen, 1896.
- Koehler, L.: Old Testament Theology, The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1957.

- Koenig, F. E.: The Religious History of Israel, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1885.
- Syntax der Hebraeischen Sprache, Dietrich, Leipzig, 1900.
- Theologie des Alten Testaments, Chr. Belser, A. G., Stuttgart, 1923.
- Kraetzschmar, R.: Die Bundesvorstellung im Alten Testament, Elert, Marburg, 1896.
- Kuenen, A.: The Religion of Israel, volumes I, II, and III, (translated by A. H. May) Williams and Norgate, London, 1883.
- The Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch, London, 1886.
- Loehr, Max: A History of Religion in the Old Testament, I. Nicholson & Watson, Ltd., London, 1936.
- Maimonides, M.: Moreh Nebuchim, Om Publishing Co., New York, 1946.
- Marti, K.: The Religion of the Old Testament, London, 1907.
- McFayden, J. E.: The Interest of the Bible, Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1922.
- The Approach to the Old Testament, J. Clarke and Co., Ltd., London, 1926.
- The Message of Israel, J. Clarke and Co., Ltd., London, 1931.
- An Introduction to the Old Testament, Hodder and Stoughton, New York.
- Moulton, R. G.: The Literary Study of the Bible, Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons, Ltd., London, 1906.
- Nielsen, Eduard: Oral Tradition, S. C. M. Press, London, 1955.

- Nikel, J.: Der Monotheismus Israels in der vorexilischen Zeit, Paderborn, Schoeningen, 1893.
- North, C. R.: The Old Testament Interpretation of History, The Epworth Press, London, 1953.
- Noth, M.: Ueberlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuchs, Stuttgart, 1948.
- Die Welt des Alten Testaments, A. Toepelmann, Berlin, 1953.
- Oehler, G. F.: (Revised and with Introduction by G. E. Day), Theology of the Old Testament, Funk and Wagnalls, New York, 1883.
- Oesterley, W. O. E. and Robinson, Theodore, H.: Hebrew Religion Its Origin and Development, S. P. C. K., London, 1931.
- An Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament, S. P. C. K., London, 1958.
- Olshausen, J.: Lehrbuch der hebraeischen Sprache, Braunschweig, Vieweg, 1861.
- Orr, James: The Problem of the Old Testament, J. Nisbet and Co, Ltd., London, 1906.
- Ottley, R. L.: Aspects of the Old Testament, Longmans, Green and Co., London, 1898.
- The Religion of Israel (A Historical Sketch) Cambridge: at the University Press, 1905.
- Pace, E.: Ideas of God in Israel, London, 1924.
- Pedersen, J. P. E., Israel, Its Life and Culture, Oxford University Press, London, 1954.
- Pope, M. H.: El in the Ugaritic Texts, E. G. Brill, Leiden, 1955.
- Porteous, N. W.: Volk und Gottesvolk im Alten Testament, Theologische Aufsätze, Karl Barth zum 50. Geburtstag, Muenchen, 1936, pp. 146-163.

- Procksch, O.: Jesaia I, Deichert, Leipzig, 1930.
- Theologie des Alten Testaments, (Edited by G. v. Rad) Guetersloh, 1950.
- v. Rad, G.: Der Heilige Krieg im Alten Testament, Zuerich, 1951.
- Theologie des Alten Testaments (Bd. I., Die Theologie der Geschichtlichen Ueberlieferungen Israels), C. Kaiser, Muenchen, 1957.
- Robinson, H. Wheeler: The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament, Duckworth, London, 1947.
- Record and Revelation (Editor), Clarendon Press, London, 1951.
- The Old Testament Its Making and Meaning, Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1953.
- The Cross in the Old Testament, The Westminster Press, Philadelphia (A reprint of the S. C. M. Press, London, 1953).
- Rowley, H. H.: The Biblical Doctrine of Election, London, 1950.
- The Unity of the Bible, The Carey Kingsgate Press, Ltd., London, 1955.
- The Old Testament and Modern Study (Editor), The Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1956.
- The Growth of the Old Testament, Hutchinson's University Library, London, 1956.
- Studies in Old Testament Prophecy, (Editor), T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1957.
- The Faith of Israel, The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1958.
- Sayce, A. H.: The Times of Isaiah (As Illustrated from Contemporary Monuments), The Religious Tract Society, London, 1889.

- Schultz, H.: Old Testament Theology, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1895.
- Simpson, D. C.: Pentateuchal Criticism, Oxford University Press, London, 1924.
- Smith, C. Ryder: The Bible Doctrine of Sin, London, 1953.
- Smith, H. Preserved: Old Testament History, (International Theological Library), T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1911.
- The Religion of Israel, Charles Scribners Sons, New York, 1914.
- Smith, W. Robertson: The Religion of the Semites, Meridian Books, New York, 1956.
- The Prophets of Israel, Adam and Charles Black, London, 1897.
- The Old Testament in the Jewish Church, Adam and Charles Black, London, 1892.
- Strahan, J.: God in History, James Clarke and Co., Ltd., London.
- Thomas, D. W., Snaith, N. H. et al: The Bible Today, Eyre and Spottiswoode, London, 1955.
- Thomas, D. Winton: Documents from Old Testament Times, Thomas Nelson and Sons, New York, 1958.
- Tillich, P.: Systematic Theology, vol. I, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1951.
- Vriezen, Th. C.: An Outline of Old Testament Theology, Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1958.
- Die Erwählung Israels nach dem Alten Testament, Zwingli-Verlag, Zuerich, 1953.

Welch, A. C.: Kings and Prophets of Israel, London, 1952.

The Book of the Chronicler, London, 1939.

Weiser, D. Arthur: Glaube und Geschichte im Alten Testament, W. Kohlhammer, Stuttgart, 1931.

Wellhausen, J.: Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel, The Meridian Library, New York, 1957 (Reprint).

Reste Arabischen Heidentums, G. Reimer, Berlin.

Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der Historischen Buecher, G. Reimer, Berlin, 1899.

Westphal, A. and DuPontet, C.: The Law and the Prophets, Macmillan and Co., Ltd., London, 1910.

Winckler, H.: Die Geschichte Israels, Leipzig, 1895.

Keilenschriftliches Textbuch zum Alten Testament, Leipzig, 1892.

Alttestamentliche Untersuchungen, Leipzig, 1892.

Winnett, F. V.: The Mosaic Tradition, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, 1949.

Wright, G. E.: The Challenge of Israel's Faith, S. C. M. Press, London, 1946.

God Who Acts, S. C. M. Press, Ltd., 1952.

The Old Testament Against Its Environment, S. C. M. Press, London, 1957.

Yahuda, A. S.: Die Sprache des Pentateuch in ihren Beziehungen zum Aegyptischen, W. DeGruyter, Berlin, 1929.

IV. AUXILIARY SOURCES (Dictionaries, Concordances, etc.)

- Brown, F., Driver, S. R. and Briggs, C. A.: Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, Oxford, 1955.
- Browne, H.: Triglot Dictionary of Scriptural Representative Words in Hebrew, Greek and English, S. Bagster, and Sons, London, 1901.
- Cheyne, T. K. and J. Sutherland Black: Encyclopaedia Biblica, Adam and Charles Black, London, 1899-1903.
- Cross, F. L. (Editor): The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, Oxford University Press, London, 1958.
- Dalman, G. H.: Aramaeisch-Neuhebraeisches Woerterbuch, L. Kauffman, Frankfurt a. M., 1901.
- Fuerst, J.: Librorum Sacrorum Veteris Testamenti concordantiae Hebraicae atque Chaldaicae... additio lexico linguae sacrae Hebraicae atque Chaldaicae, Lipsiae, Tauchnitius, 1840.
- Wilhelm Gesenius' Hebraeisches und Aramaeisches Handwoerterbuch ueber das Alte Testament, bearbeitet von Dr. Frants Buhl, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1954.
- Girdlestone, R. B.: Synonyms of the Old Testament, London, 1871.
- Kittel, G.: Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament, Verlag W. Kohlhammer, Stuttgart, 1932.
- Richardson, Alan: A Theological Word Book of the Bible, S. C. M. Press, London.
- Mandelkern, S.: Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae, Hebraicae atque Chaldaicae, Sumptibus Schocken, Jerusalem, 1955.

Rabbiner, Zemach: Beitrage zur hebraeischen
Synonymik, Berlin, 1889.

Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge,
L. A. Loetscher, Editor in Chief, Baker
Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1955.

V. PERIODICALS¹

Albright, W. F.: Archeology Confronts Biblical
Criticism, A. S., vol. 7, Spring 1938, No.
2.

The Ancient Near East and the Religion of
Israel, J. B. L., June, 1940.

The Names Shaddai and Abram, J. B. L., vol.
LIV, Dec. 1935.

Bewer, J. W.: The Case for the Early Date of Deuter-
onomy, J. B. L., vol. XLVII, 1928.

Dahl, George: The Case for the Currently Accepted
Date of Deuteronomy, J. B. L., vol. XLVII,
1928.

Day, Edward: The Promulgation of Deuteronomy, J.
B. L., vol. XXI, part II, 1902.

Elliot-Binns, L. E.: Some Problems of the Holiness
Code, Z. A. W., Heft 1/2, 1955.

Goiten, S. D.: YHWH the Passionate. The Monotheistic
meaning and origin of the Name YHWH. V. T.,
Jan. 1956.

Gordis, R.: Studies in Hebrew Roots of Contrasted
Meanings, J. Q. R., vol. XXVII, July, 1936.

Gordon, C. H.: Elohim in Its reputed Meaning of
Rulers, Judges, J. B. L., vol. LIV,
September, 1935.

1. Explanation of the abbreviations used in this
section is given at the close of the bibliography.

- Kuyper, J. L.: The Book of Deuteronomy, Interpretation, July, 1952.
- Maag, V.: Erwägungen zur deuteronomischen Kultzentralisation, V. T., Jan. 1956.
- McCasland, S. V.: The Unity of the Scriptures, J. B. L., vol. LXXIII, March, 1954.
- Meek, T. J., Monotheism and the Religion of Israel, J. B. L., vol. LXI, March, 1942.
- Montgomery, J. A.: The Hebrew Divine Name and the Personal Pronoun HU, J. B. L., vol. LXII, June, 1944.
- Obermann, J.: The Divine Name YHWH in the Light of Recent Discoveries, J. B. L., Dec., 1939.
- H. H. Rowley, Moses und der Monotheismus, Z. A. W., 69. Band, 1957, pp. 1-21.
- Segal, M. W.: El, Elohim and YHWH in the Bible, J. Q. R., vol. XLVI, Oct. 1955.
- Wood, W. C.: The Religion of Canaan, J. B. L., vol. XXXV, 1916.
- Paton, L. B.: The Case for the Post-Exilic Origin of Deuteronomy, J. B. L., vol. XLVII, 1928.
- Welch, A. C.: The Problem of Deuteronomy, J. B. L., vol. XLVIII, 1929.

ABBREVIATIONS

- A. M. -- The American Scholar, published by the United Chapters Phi Beta Kappa, New York.
- J. B. L. -- Journal of Biblical Literature, published by the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, New Haven, Conn.

Z. A. W. -- Zeitschrift fuer die Alttestamentliche
Wissenschaft (formerly Giessen, now) Berlin.

J. Q. R. -- The Jewish Quarterly Review, Phila-
delphia.

Interpretation -- A Journal of Bible and Theology,
Richmond, Virginia.

V. T. -- Vetus Testamentum, International Organi-
zation of Old Testament Scholars, Leiden.