PEOPLE, COVENANT AND LAND

IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

By

SAMUEL HOSAIN

A
Dissertation
Submitted to the
Faculty of Divinity of
Glasgow University
In Complete Fulfilment of the
Requirments for the
Degree
of
Master of Theology

April 1991

ProQuest Number: 10992167

ProQuest 10992167

CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS

AFO	Archiv für Orientforschung
AJSL	American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures
AJTh	American Journal of Theology
ANET	J.B. Pritchard, Ancient Near East texts *relating* V to the Old Testament, 3rd edition with supplements, Princeton 1969
AOT	H. Gressmann, Altorientalische texte zum alten Testament, 2nd edition, Berlin and Leipzig 1929
BA	The Biblical Archaeologist
BJRL	Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, Manchester
BASOR	Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research
BKAT	Biblischer Kommentar: Altes Testament
BWANT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament
BWAT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten Testament
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift fur die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
CBQ	The Catholic Biblical Quarterly
CQR	Church Quarterly Review
DOTT	Documents from Old Testament Times (ed.Thomas)
ETR	Études Theologiques et Religieuses
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten and Neuen Testaments
HAT	Handbuch zum Alten Testament, ed by O. Eissfeldt
HDB	Hastings Dictionary of the Bible,
HTR	Harvard Theological Review, Cambridge, Mass.
IB	The Interpreter's Bible
IDB	The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible

ICC	The International Critical Commentary
JAOS	Journal of the American Oriental Soceity
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature
JBR	Journal of Bible and Religion
JCS	Journal of Cuneiform Studies
JSOT-SS	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament - Supplement Studies
JSS	Journal of Semitic Studies
JTS	Journal of Theological Studies
OTS	Oudtestamentische Studien
RGG	Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart
RHR	Revue de l'Histoire des Religions
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology
ST	Studia Theologica, Oslo
TGUOS	Transactions of the Glasgow University Oriental Society
Th.B	Theologische Bücherei, Munich
Th.LZ	Theologische Literatur zeitung
VT	Vetus Testamentum
VTS	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, Neukirchen - Vlunyn
ZAW	Zeitschrift fur die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, Giessen, Berlin
ZThK	Zeitschrift fur Theologie und Kirche

INTRODUCTION

Today not many would be aware of the important role that the Old Testament played in the Protestant Reformation. In fact, its discovery was so central to the Reformation that, according to one opinion, "it is doubtful whether Protestantism could have arisen without the knowledge of the Old Testament, it is certain that without it the Reformed Church could not have assumed the shape it took" (The Cambridge Modern History, Vol.11, N.Y. 1907, p.696). Its far reaching theological, social and political impact both in the continent of Europe and that of North America hardly any historian could ignore. But the most enduring is the theological impact.

Today as in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the term "Israel after the flesh" still conjures up for us a homogeneous group of people with a long and unbroken line reaching back to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. The Reform tradition with its emphasis on the covenant still stresses more the similarity than the difference, more the continuity than the discontinuity between the Old and the New Covenants (cf. Reformed Theology and the Jewish People, ed. by A.P.F. Sell, Geneva: World Alliance of the Reformed Churches, 1986). With the added eschatological dimension inherent in the New Testament and fully nourished by the Protestant millenarian schools for the last three centuries, the ancient ideology of the land and its alleged essential role in the dawning of a new age is rejuvenated even among some of the more liberal scholars today. (1)

The purpose of this dissertation is to reassess the origin of ancient Israel and its emergence upon the stage of the ancient world of Near East history as the people of Yahweh. The scope of our inquiry centres upon the

Old Testament literature as a source for historical information regarding Israel, its Covenant and gift of land. Unfortunately, apart from a very few references to Israel in certain extra-biblical sources, there are practically no primary documents or sources which are directly related to our subject outside the Old Testament. The topic of this work is developed in seven chapters: 1) Israel in history and legend; 2) Yahweh and Israel: A God-People relationship; 3) The Covenant concept in ancient Israel; 4) Covenant as a late theological idea; 5) The promise of land; 6) The Deuteronomic theology of people and land and 7) Conclusion: Restoration.

It is true that from the decline of "ancient Israel" there emerged the phenomenon usually known as "Judaism". It is equally true that from the womb of "Judaism" there sprang in the last four decades a new secular entity called "Israel" which established its homeland in Palestine under the auspices of the Zionist Movement. The romantic ideas by means of which Zionism has won over many Christians to its ideology (the Bible, Covenant, return to Zion, fulfilment of prophecy, etc.) have had a lasting impact. In the mind of many today there exists an equation between the present State of Israel and ancient Israel. The task of this dissertation is to demonstrate in an objective manner that such an equation is a misuse of the imagination, a strain upon credulity and a grave misconception of the history and religion of Old Testament Israel.

---

1. P.D. Miller, Jr., 'The Gift of God: The Deuteronomic Theology of land', Interpretation 23, 1963, pp.551-65; G.A.F. Knight, 'Israel, the Land and the Resurrection', in 'The Witness of the Jews to God', ed. D.W. Torrance, Handsel Press, Edinburgh 1982, pp.32-41; See also in the same book, T.F. Torrance's article 'The Divine Vocation and Destiny of Israel in World History', pp.85-104.

CHAPTER ONE

ISRAEL IN HISTORY AND LEGEND

The name "Israel" is found in abundance throughout the Bible. It is used in the Old Testament tradition as a collective name for the twelve tribes which had a separate history of their own. At first, the tradition tells us that the term "Israel" was originally given to Jacob, the father of the twelve ancestors (heroes eponymi) of the tribes (Gen.32:23ff). (1) This aetiological legend is meant to explain the peculiar situation of one and the same people having the name "Israel". Whether the name had a previous history, in the course of which certain changes of meaning led to this collective name, is the one thing which the tradition does not even hint at. Therefore, resorting to conjectures for which there is no concrete foundation, would certainly be labour in vain.

The earliest mention of the name "Israel" in any source outside the Old Testament is found in the famous Merneptah Stele dating about 1207 B.C. Even here the epigraphic occurrence of the name is of no help to us. In line 27 of this victory ode, the Egyptian Pharaoh Merneptah, rather exaggeratingly, claims to have destroyed Israel:

"Israel is laid waste and his seed is not". (2)

Unpronounced hieroglyphic signs known as determinatives are sometimes attached to words to indicate the category of the word to which it is attached. Now, when we examine this victory ode carefully, we find that the determinative for a 'city state' is attached to the words Ashkelon, Gezer and Yano'am. The determinative for a 'foreign land' is attached to

Canaan. By contrast, the determinative for a 'foreign people' is attached to the hieroglyphic signs for "Israel". The fact that "Israel" is listed as a people suggests that she was more of a recognizable group residing in Palestine than a settled nation. (3) However, in spite of the fact that much ink has been spilled interpreting the Merneptah Stele, it remains impossible to say with any degree of certainty what the "Israel" referred to here really was in Palestine in Merneptah's reign. We do not know whether it was the "Israel" of the twelve tribes in the form known in the Old Testament tradition, or some still older group which bore the name "Israel" and then for some obscure historical reason passed it on to the "Israel" that we know. (4)

Less than four centuries later we find a similarly exaggerated claim on the victory monument (or Moabite Stone, as it is called), set up by King Mesha of Moab:

"Israel is utterly perished for ever." (5)

This remarkable document at least gives us a clearer picture of what Israel meant in political terms in the ninth-century B.C., and the information it contains generally confirms the Biblical account in II Kings 3:1ff. However, to deal with the various uncertainties of our Biblical text in the light of the Moabite Stone lies entirely outside the scope of this paper. (6) Suffice it to say that although the above mentioned extra-Biblical sources are of value to us in so far as their reference to "Israel" is concerned, their central trend remains one of embellishment of personal and national ideology. But the Old Testament tradition was not entirely immune to this trend, which is evidenced by its approach to

Israel's name and origin.

I   THE OLD TESTAMENT ETYMOLOGY OF THE NAME "ISRAEL"

In the Old Testament, the etymology of a name or names is mostly presented in the form of a narrative. Intense interest in the origin and real meaning of names, which were believed to be closely related to things, demanded an explanation. (a) In many cases it was quite difficult to produce the correct explanation for names, either because they came down from races already extinct or from earlier stages of the national language. The old name was simply identified with a modern one, and a story was told explaining why this particular word was uttered under these circumstances and was adopted as the name. (7) Such etymological narratives or legends are numerous (Gen.17:15; 18:12; 21:28,31; 29:20,22; I Sam. 17:1 ff. etc.) (b) In a few cases, the old meaning of a name was well understood but deliberately re-interpreted in order to conceal what was regarded as an unwished for meaning, and a new import was put into it. This was intended either for polemical purposes or to heighten the value of the name. Thus, "Babel", was not allowed to have its proper religious significance, "Gate of God". It is no longer the spot where God visits the earth, where humans therefore ought to gather. On the contrary, it is the place of dispersion. (8)

As in the case of so many names, the Old Testament gives an etymology of the name "Israel" in Gen.32:23-33. The prophet Hosea also hints at it in 12:3ff.

1.   The primary intention of course is to explain the meaning of the name

4.

"Israel", and make clear the peculiar situation of one and the same people having the names "Jacob" and "Israel". The actual explanation of the name evidently deduces the first part of the word יִשְׂרָאֵל from a verb שָׂרָה which means "to fight, to battle". The name "Israel" is therefore made into a memorial of the battle of Jacob, the clan's ancestor, with a deity, before his return to Canaan. (9) Beaten and out of joint, Jacob refuses to let his antagonist go. He demands a blessing, ie, he seeks for himself the power of his adversary. This is given by the changing of Jacob's name to "Israel" (vv.27ff.). It should be noted at this stage that "Israel" does not mean "You have prevailed (or 'preserved')" (v.28). In fact, the meaning of the name is uncertain. God fights or rules, but God is the subject of the verb. The reference to "men" may not be out of place. It is a probable reference to Jacob's strife with Esau and Laban. (10) Theologically, the story may serve as an acted parable of Israel's life, the people of God, strong in the power of His blessing and victorious in the face of all odds.

2. The narrative in Gen.32:23-33 (J) also bears all the marks of a story designed to explain Israel's territorial ownership of Canaan. Certainly, as we previously indicated, there is little point in analysing grammatically the name "Israel" in order to understand the author's interpretation of it. Indeed, neither the translation "he fights", "God fights" nor "God's fighter" conveys an adequate expression of what the name "Israel" means according to Gen.32:23ff. Its full import is to be understood only against the background of the narrative as a whole. The main trend there is to verify the right of the Israelites to the land of Canaan. (11)

Many scholars agree that the narrative gives a clear and very significant picture of the Israelite ancestor as the man who won the right

to the country for himself and his offspring. But different views exist among them regarding the divine figure who fought Jacob. Th. C. Vriezen, for example, opines that behind Jacob's struggle with the deity, there probably lurks a piece of mythology in which the titulary gods of Jacob/Israel and Esau/Se'ir (cf.33:10) wage a battle over access of the country to the south of the Jabbok. (12) The Jabbok in certain periods was probably regarded as a boundary river (Num.21:24). J. Pedersen is of the opinion that the divine figure is certainly the god of the country, but not Yahweh. (13) This is possible only if one can penetrate behind the tradition as we know it. In its present context, the story of course points to Yahweh who revealed Himself to the patriarchs as El Shaddai (Ex.6:3). It was this God, who later, as in Jacob's case, unexpectedly attacked Moses (Ex.4:24), for He was after all characterised as "a man of war" (Ex.15:3). The narrative, therefore, clearly implies that at the Jabbok, Yahweh, the Lord of the land, sought to prevent Jacob's entry into the land. But through his tenacity and against all odds, Jacob manages to win the right to dwell in the land and become a recognised citizen of it. Thus, the main thrust of the narrative is to verify the right of the Israelites to the land of Canaan. Moreover, one cannot dismiss the fact that the author of this narrative presents us with an ideal picture which suits his nationalistic, ideological purpose. Indeed, some scholars even go as far as to suggest that apart from this nationalistic ideology the narrative is devoid of any theological implication. (14) Yet, it seems that the prophetic protest against this conquest did not go unheard. The Jacob of the prophet Hosea is not the victor as in Gen.32, but the humbled rebel, the vanquished who weeps and begs for favour (Hos.12:4).

Finally, there is strangely enough, another account of the giving of

the name in Gen.34:9-15 (P). The fact that the latter is separated from the narrative in Gen.32:23ff, suggests, a) that this story had proved ·itself to be divine teaching in the life of Israel in pre-exilic times and could not be discarded; but b) it did not lend itself to the more formal post-exilic theological perspective. (15)

II   ISRAEL'S ORIGIN IN THE GENESIS NARRATIVE

The men and women who appear in Gen.12-50 have for a long time been the subject of much scrutiny among scholars. To some they were real historical personalities, to others they are no more than mythical figures, the reflection of impersonal clan movements or the typological prefigurations of the later Israelites and their neighbours. (16) In any case, the individuals mentioned in Gen.12-50 remain historically inaccessible to us. The best that can be said is that they are eponyms, ie. persons (mythical or real) from whom the names of the later groups were derived.   Thus, Jacob, who is also called "Israel" (the name by which the nation was later known), and the twelve sons are the eponymous ancestors of the twelve tribes of Israel. (17)

1.   When we come to consider the narratives and genealogies of the various peoples of the author's own times, we find them portrayed from his own people's ideological perspective. For example, Israel's ancestors are delineated as ideal personalities. They are born under auspicious circumstances, whereas the ancestors of the Moabites and the Ammonites, "Moab" and "Ben-Ammi" are born of the incestuous union of Lot and his two daughters (Gen.19:30-38). Jacob, "Israel", is described as one who supplants his brother Esau, otherwise known as "Edom" and wins his

birthright (Gen.25:3034; 36:1ff.). Ishmael, the ancestor of the tribes that roamed the region between Palestine and Egypt, is the son of the Patriarch Abram and Sarai's Egyptian slave Hagar (Gen.16:1ff.). (18) It is extremely difficult to use this sort of material in an effort to establish a credible account of those nations' ancestral origins, including that of Israel. We can only say with some degree of confidence that our knowledge of Israel as it appears first on the stage of history cannot go back beyond the period of the exodus and settlement. And even at this early historical period we are confronted with an Israel of a mixed composition. (19)

2. There is a sense in which the above ethnological narratives (or legends) are of great value in considering the ethnic ideology and socio-political outlook of later Israel. These legends, as H. Gunkel put it: "have the first rudiments of a philosophy of history". They are based on the assumption that the tribal and national relations of that day were not due to chance, but that they were all the result of the primitive world, that they were in a way "predestined". And according to the author, Israel's predestination to occupy a unique position in history, was marked at first by the auspicious birth of its ancestors. The principle of exclusiveness which Israel had developed during the exilic and post-exilic periods, may, to a great extent, be attributed to this notion (Ezra 9:1ff; Neh.13:19ff.). Yet, it was the exilic prophet Ezekiel who saw fit to puncture this exclusiveness with the sharp words: "Your origin and your birth are of the land of the Canaanites; your father was an Amorite and your mother a Hittite." (Eze.16:3). (20)

NOTES ON CHAPTER ONE

(1)   M. Noth, "The History of Israel", London, 1960, p.3

(2)   AOT, pp.20.25; ANET, pp.376-8; DOTT, pp.137-41

(3)   J.A. Callaway, "The Settlement in Canaan: The Period of the
        Judges", in (Ancient Israel: A Short History from Abraham to the
        Roman Destruction of the Temple) ed. by Hershel Shanks, SPCK,
        1989, p.75f; G.E. Wright, "Introduction to Biblical Archaeology",
        London, 1960, p.44.

(4)   E.L. Stager, who made an extensive study of the Merneptah Stele
        goes as far as to suggest that Israel's strength may have been
        weakened by this defeat as well as by the incursions of the Sea
        Peoples into the region. But he does not suggest any more
        specific identification for Israel as referred to in the Stele.
        See his "Merneptah, Israel and the Sea Peoples", in Eretz Israel
        18 (Jerusalem: IES, 1985), p.60ff.

(5)   See translation and notes by E. Ullendorff in DOTT, p.195f; ANET
        320-21

(6)   For a historical assessment of the two accounts see G. Garbini,
        "History and Ideology in Ancient Israel", SCM. 1988, pp.33-7;
        J.H. Miller, and J.H. Hayes, "A History of Ancient Israel and
        Judah", SCM, 1986, pp.280-4.

(7).   H. Gunkel, "The Legends of Genesis: the Biblical Saga and
        History", N.Y. Schocken Books, 1964, pp.27-30

(8)   Ibid., pp.76-77; A.S. Yahuda sees Egyptian influence in the
        interpretation of names through assonant words, especially
        characteristic of Genesis and Exodus. He also asserts that the
        Hebrew narrator could be fully aware of the artificiality of his
        interpretation and of the real meaning of the name. See his
        "The Language of the Pentateuch in its Relation to the Egyptian",
        Oxford and London, 1933, p.231ff., p.260f.

(9)   G.A. Danell, "Studies in the name Israel in the Old Testament",
        Upsala 1946, p.17.

(10)   A.S. Herbert, sees the reference to "men" in (Gen.32:28) as being
        out of place, see his "Genesis 12-50: Abraham and his Heirs",
        SCM, 1967, p.108; J. Skinner thinks that it points to the
        existence of a fuller body of legend, in which Jacob is the hero
        of many combats, culminating in this successful struggle with
        deity, see International Critical Commentary on "Genesis",
        Edinburgh, 1910, pp.409-10.

(11)   G.A. Danell, "Studies in the Name Israel in the Old Testament",
        Upsala, 1946, p.18.

(12)   Th. C. Vriezen, "The Religion of Ancient Israel", London:
        Lutterworth, 1967, p.113.

13. J. Pedersen, "Israel", Oxford University Press, 1953, IV. p 503ff.;
    H. Ringgren, however, seems strongly inclined to identify the deity
    who fought Jacob with Yahweh, see his "Israelite Religion", London:
    SPCK, 1974, pp.44-5; O. Eissfeldt, "El and Yahwe", JSS, I(1952),
    25ff.; cf. F.M. Cross, "Yahweh and the God of the Patriarchs", HTR, LV
    (1962), PP.250ff.

14. G.E. Wright agrees with C.C. McCowan that the story in Gen.32:23ff.,
    "Can be regarded only as a piece of chauvinistic patriotism proving
    to the Israelite that eventually his nation would prevail over others
    in spite of the dark night through which they had to suffer". "The Old
    Testament Against Its Environment", London, SCM 1950, p.10; C.C.
    McCowan, "Exegetical Commentary on Genesis", London, N.Y.
    revised ed. 1925, p.411f.; Contrast S.R. Driver, "The Book of
    Genesis", London, N.Y. 1904, p.296f.; and even H. Gunkel, "Genesis",
    Göttingen, 1901, pp.328ff.

15. A.S. Herbert, "Genesis 12-50: Abraham and His Heirs", London, SCM
    1967, p.108.

16. J.Bright calls for a more sympathetic evaluation of the Patriarchal
    narratives, "A History of Israel", London, SCM 1972, p.91; Contrast
    M. Noth, "The History of Israel", London, Adam & Charles Black, 1960,
    pp.121-27; P.K. McCarter, "The Patriarchal Age: Abraham, Isaac &
    Jacob", in "Ancient Israel: A Short History from Abraham to the Roman
    Destruction of the Temple" ed. by Hershel Shanks, London, SPCK 1989,
    pp.16ff.; J.A. Soggin, "A History of Israel, from the beginnings to
    the Bar-Kochba Revolt AD 135", London, SCM 1985, pp.89-108.

17. The figure of Jacob as the ancestor of Israel may be compared to the
    great Sheikhs of the modern Bedowin Arabs. For a discussion on this
    point see H • Ringgren, "Israelite Religion", London, SPCK 1974,
    p.17f.

18. P.K. McCarter, "The Patriarchal Age", p.4. J. Bright, "A History of
    Israel", pp.130-33; Y. Kaufmann, "The Religion of Israel from its
    Beginnings to the Babylonian Exile", Schocken Books, N.Y. 1972,p.300f.

19. J. Bright, "A History of Israel", pp.130-33; Y. Kaufmann, "The
    Religion of Israel from its Beginnings to the Babylonian Exile",
    Schocken Books, N.Y. 1972, p.300f.

20. P. Ackroyd whilst not regarding Ez. 16:3 as factual, admits that it
    does indicate something of the mixture of groups which together formed
    the people of Israel. See his "The People of the Old Testament",
    London, 1963, p.3fl; R. De Vaux, "The Early History of Israel",
    London, 1978, pp.271f, 275-8.

CHAPTER TWO

YAHWEH AND ISRAEL: A GOD-PEOPLE RELATIONSHIP

We have dealt in some detail with the etymological legend concerning the name "Israel" in Gen.32:23ff. The legend does not provide a satisfactory etymology. Whether the author was acquainted with the science of philology, or simply the meaning of the name was beyond his reach is of no interest to us. What is interesting however is the fact that the author was able to take the name, weave a legend around it and finally present it fully clothed in the bright garb of national and territorial ideologies. When we turn to the narratives and genealogies of the origins of Israel and its neighbours, we are again faced with unsatisfactory bits of material. They may indeed throw some light on the ethnic ideology and socio-political outlook of later Israel, but hardly provide any basis which may be of use to us in an effort to construct the history of the ancestors of Israel and its neighbours.

The narrator (or narrators) might have been strongly motivated to establish the legitimacy of his own people, according to Mendenhall, (1) which is not an uncommon custom among individual tribes even today. Israel therefore must be able to trace its origin back to their patriarchal ancestors whom Yahweh chose and blessed. Both the (JE) and (P) sources make frequent reference to the theme of the patriarchal ancestors through whose merits Israel came to enjoy a privileged position. To some extent Deuteronomy maintains the same idea, but on the whole the patriarchs are subordinated to the Horeb covenant. No doubt, Deuteronomy does develop the traditions of both the patriarchal and the Sinaitic covenants, it relates them to each other in a way which shows the greater significance attached to the latter. (2) Both in the Deuteronomic, and to some extent the

Deuteronomistic corpus, the patriarchal ancestors play a very marginal role in Israel's relationship with Yahweh. Even the appeal to Yahweh's covenant with them represents but the minutest seed of hope (Deut.29:11f.). "Israel" is therefore perceived almost entirely in a theological and religious context. What constituted "Israel" was not race or language, but the historic moment when it became the people of God (Deut.27:1-10). To be Israel is not determined by blood descent but by the way that the first small exodus generation (Deut.4:28; 7:7,17) joined ranks with refugees whom Moses led out of Egypt, and with the dispossessed peoples of Canaan who allied themselves with the liberating army of Joshua and the early Judges (Josh.9:1ff.; 15:16-19; Judg. 1:16; 4:11; I Sam.15:6). All these found their unity in the worship of Yahweh and were constituted as "His people", "His own possession" (Deut.7:6; 14:2). Judging therefore from the Deuteronomic theological perspective, "Israel" as such did not exist, only a conglomerate group of dispossessed people, marred and confused by revolutions, wars and migrations. "Israel" was therefore a refugee from Egypt, a temporary sojourner in the desert oases and often a semi-nomad. Such was the situation when the main lines of Election and Covenant were struck. (3)

I   ELECTION IN PRE-EXILIC SOURCES

The subject of election does not seem to have excited the interest of many scholars. This is clear from the very meagre amount of literature so far produced on the subject. Yet, election is one of the central realities of the Old Testament. Although it is less frequently mentioned than the Covenant, it remains beyond all doubt the initial act by which Yahweh enters into relationship and fellowship with His people. (4)

The Hebrew verb בָּחַר "choose" is used in Deut.7:6ff.; 14:2; as an expression of divine election of Israel. In E. Jacob's view, this is expressed by a rich variety of images and terms in the Old Testament and shows the union of Yahweh with His people. Images such as "the marriage union" (Hos.3:1-2; Jer.2:2-2; 3:11-20), the Father-son relationship (Ex.4:22; Hos.11:1-2; Isa.63:16; 64:7), the clay and the potter (Jer.18:8; cf., Isa.29:16; 64:8) and the shepherd with his flock (Ps.68:52; Isa.63:11; Hos.11:4) are all expressive of Yahweh's election of Israel. Likewise titles such as עַם יְהוָה or עַם אֱלֹהִים "people of Yahweh" or "people of God" (II Sam.1:12; 14:13), עַם קָדוֹשׁ "holy people" or עַם סְגֻלָּה "people for His possession or treasure" (Ex.19:5, Deut.7:6; 14:2, Mal.3:17) were in some way designed to give Israel the consciousness of her election. Moreover, verbs like חָשַׁק "to be attached", אָהֵב "to love" and רִחַם "to have pity or mercy" are also said to be words belonging to the language of election. We must however be careful not to assume that the above mentioned images and terms are some sort of synonyms for divine election of Israel as a people. The best that can be said about them is that they are simply descriptive of Yahweh's relationship with His people. It is only when we come to Deuteronomy that we are faced with the clear fact that the divine election which instituted the Covenant is now for the first time described as an act of election. (5) It is here that Israel is explicitly said to be a chosen people. However, the idea of divine election does have a pre-Deuteronomic history, but with specific applications.

1.   In the pre-Deuteronomic period of Israel's history, the concept of divine election was explicitly current. But it was particularly used in relation to the Davidic kingship of Jerusalem. (6) The idea of course did not emerge de novo in the monarchy of ancient Israel. Indeed, as J.M.P.

Smith clearly shows, (7) throughout the ancient Near East, Kings were regarded as the chosen of the gods. As early as the beginning of the second millennium B.C., Gudea, the Sumerian ruler of Lagash, was said to be the "shepherd designed by Ningersu in his heart". The gods were said to have found Tiglathpileser I (745-727 B.C.) to be the design of their hearts, "whom in their faithful hearts they have chosen". (8) Nebonidus (555-539 B.C.) was "chosen" by Sin and Nergel "to reign when he was yet in his mother's womb". A more similar instance is Cyrus' declaration that Marduk "in all lands everywhere searched, he looked through them and sought a righteous prince, after his own heart, whom he took by the hand. Cyrus, King of Anshan, he called by name, to lordship over the whole world he appointed him." (9) The declaration of Cyrus finds a striking parallel in Isa.44:28; 45:1-4. The idea of the divine choice of kings was quite current in the ancient world of the Near East, and the dynastic covenant of II Sam.7:1ff., indicates the distinctive form which this belief in royal election took in Israel. (10) We can therefore conclude that the election of the Davidic throne was influenced by the current conceptions of kingship in the ancient world, and not simply an Israelite formulation based on the tradition of the older Abrahamic Covenant. We shall have occasion to return to the significance of the Abrahamic and Davidic Covenants later.

2. There is no reason to doubt that such an originally non-Israelite concept of a divinely chosen kingship could gain an easy entry into Israelite faith. In the sense of the henothiestic world of the pre-Deuteronomic historian (or the Deuteronomic historian for that matter) this constituted no problem whatever. If Marduk, Chemosh or any of the great host of Near East deities decided to chose a king, so could Yahweh. And in pre-Deuteronomic history it was indeed Yahweh who chose David and his

dynasty to reign in Zion. Here the idea of divine election is not applied to the people of Israel, but only to the king. Certain passages in the historical books of Samuel (cf.I Sam.16:18ff.; II Sam.6:21; 16:18) and the Psalms (Pss.78:7; 89:19) clearly presuppose the existence of a royal ideology connected with the Davidic dynasty which held that the king was the chosen of Yahweh. However, this act of Yahweh in choosing His king (I Kgs.8:16; 11:34), resulted in a relationship between Himself and the Davidic king which is clearly described as a covenant relationship (Ps.2:7; 89:26). True, this relationship which was deeply rooted in Yahweh's gracious act of election, did not exclude the element of obligation binding on the recipient of divine grace (II Sam.7:14-15; Pss.89:33ff.; 132:12). Thus, the monarchs of the Davidic line were subject to divine law and stood under the threat of divine punishment and retribution in the event of disobedience. (11) But the Jerusalem Court tradition makes it perfectly clear that though the king's disobedience may incur divine punishment, his election could not be nullified, for the divine choice of David and his dynasty is said to be "for ever" (Pss.45:6; 89:3-4, cf. I Kgs.8:16). There is a sense in which this was intended to make sure that the tragic failure of Saul to found a dynasty would not be repeated in David's family. (12)

3. The theme of election in the pre-Deuteronimic tradition of the Jerusalem Court was not only confined to the Davidic monarchy, but also to the divine dwelling upon Mount Zion, Yahweh's sanctuary in Jerusalem. Here Jerusalem was regarded as having a unique pre-eminence among all Israel's sanctuaries. It is described as "the city of God", "His holy mountain", "the city of the great King" (Ps.48:1ff.). It is said to be the city which Yahweh chose and "loves" (Ps.78:68), the city which He has "desired for His habitation" (Ps.132:13). Interestingly, the background of these ideas can

no doubt be found in the originally non-Israelite mythological motifs of the divine mountain, which at Ugarit appears in the belief in Mount Zaphon as the dwelling place of Baal. (13) This belief is associated with the god Elyon ("Most High") in Isa. 14:13f. who was worshipped in pre-Israelite Jerusalem (Gen.14:18ff.). It was through these Canaanite beliefs that the divine mountain theme gained entry into Israelite faith, and was further strengthened by the actions which David and Solomon took to make Jerusalem the political capital of the Kingdom as well as the religious centre, the site of the Temple and the home of the Ark of God (II Sam.6:1ff.; 1 Kgs.8:1ff). Consequently, such actions established a strong connection between the theme of the election of Zion and that of the election of David and his dynasty. This connection finds clear expression in Pss.2:6; 78:68ff.; 132:11f. (14)

It has, however, been suggested that the election of the Davidic monarchy and that of the Jerusalem sanctuary were not unrelated to the wider concept that Israel as a whole was chosen by God. (15) Prior to the Davidic monarchy, Israel's election was, in all probability, conceived to be covered by the divine election of Abraham. (16) During the monarchy, the royal rituals of the Jerusalem temple, no doubt, made reference to Abraham, but essentially the idea of election was now applied to the Davidic line and the Jerusalem temple. (17) This, as R.E. Clements strongly argues, was the theme which the pre-exilic prophets greatly emphasised. Israel's election was therefore regarded as mediated by, and dependent upon, the election of the Davidic monarchy and the temple which had been founded by this monarchy. (18)

4.. The belief that Yahweh had forever chosen Mount Zion as His permanent

abode, and had promised David a dynasty that would never end, was affirmed in the cult of the Jerusalem temple, and indeed became a central feature in the official theology of the monarchy in Judah. Notably among these are the so-called Royal Psalms. (20) But it should be noted that this belief did not go unchallenged. There were those in Judah who out of grave reservations or outright opposition to the idea, were ready to make their voices heard. Micah for instance completely rejected the concept that Yahweh's election of Mount Zion and His promise to the Davidic line guaranteed the Capital city protection. On the contrary, going beyond anything that Isaiah is recorded to have said, he declared that on account of the crimes of Zion's ruling classes, both Jerusalem and its temple would be reduced to ruins (3.9-12). Micah's theology allowed no place whatever for such complacency as the official theology may have tended to create in the people's minds. In this way, Micah's message, like that of Amos and Hosea, seems to be cast into the mould of the traditions of Israel's formative period and the stipulations of the Mosaic Law. It seems to presuppose an understanding of the God-people relationship like that observed in the Sinaitic Covenant that brought Israel into being as a people (6:6-9). (21) Surprisingly, even the author of Psalm 132 (22) manages to blunt the edge of the unconditional element which characterises all the other royal psalms. Here the continuance of the Davidic throne is contingent upon obedience to the stipulations of Yahweh's covenant (Ps.132:11-12). From the outset there existed a profound theological tension; a tension between two ways of viewing Israel's election, its relationship to Yahweh and its future under Him, which had always been held in a somewhat delicate balance. In time they were to give rise to two diametrically opposed ways of viewing the future of Israel as a nation. There were those who had no qualms that the nation could be destroyed if it

persisted in violating the terms of the Mosaic Law. And there were those who maintained as an article of faith that though the nation might be punished even severely for its sins, it could never be destroyed, for God had assured its continuance through His unconditional election of Mount Zion and His promises to David. (23) However, in view of such a theological tension, there were those who chose the third way, to whom the concept of "the remnant" could perfectly accommodate the notions of divine justice and divine grace (Zeph.3:11-12; cf. Isa.1:9; 10:20f.; Amos 5:4, 14-15 ect.).

II THE DEUTERONOMIC THEOLOGICAL IMPACT IN 622-21 B.C.

The corpus of the Hebrew Bible that stretches from the book of Deuteronomy to II Kings, is called the Deuteronomic history (see p.110). It was written under a unified plan and theological perspective in which the book fo Deuteronomy itself served as the introduction furnishing the theological viewpoint by which the history was written. The book of Deuteronomy is presented to us as a series of addresses given by Moses to Israel on the other side of the Jordan shortly before his death. We shall now confine ourselves to this significant book, which is generally regarded as the classic expression of the theology of the ancient Mosaic covenant. (24)

1.. In the year 622-21 B.C. while the temple of Jerusalem was under repair, a "book of the law" was discovered and brought to King Josiah (II Kgs.22:3-23,25). Unfortunately, however, no further details are given about this newly found "book of the law". It is generally agreed that this "book of the law" was some form of the book of Deuteronomy. The idea was first

suggested by certain of the Church fathers like Athanasius, Chrysostom, Jerome and Procopius, (25) and has in modern times become the widely accepted view. (26) For example, the ruling requiring the priests of the land to join the temple staff in Jerusalem in (II Kgs.23:9) corresponds clearly to (Deut.18:6-8). The centralisation of worship in the one sanctuary "which the Lord your God will choose" (Deut.12:5,11,14,18,21,26; 14:23-25; 15:20; 16:2,6,11,15; 17:8,10; 18:6; 26:2), was fully implemented by Josiah who first abolished the local shrines (II Kgs.23:8,10,13-15), and then reached the climax of his reform by celebrating the Passover in Jerusalem (vss.21-23) according to the regulations laid down in Deut.16:1-8. Before the Josian reform, the people observed the Passover at home on the night of the full moon, and then set out in the morning to celebrate the feast of Matzoth (unleavened bread) at the nearest favourite shrine. Thus, Josiah's action was to a great extent a response to the Deuteronomic call for the centralisation of worship. We can therefore assume with good reason that the "book of the law" found in the temple is to be equated with Deuteronomy. (27) However, we do not know precisely how much of Deuteronomy was available to Josiah, although some scholars like C. Kuhl and C. Steuernagel seem certain that he was acquainted with the central section (Deut. Chapter 12-26), the so-called Code of Deuteronomy, (28) and perhaps some of the threats or curses that follow it.

2. It is however incorrect to assume that the book of Deuteronomy instituted the reform. It is quite certain that Josiah did not get all his impulses for action from it. The rapid decline of the Assyrian Empire must have encouraged him to throw off feudal service and, accordingly free himself also from the worship of the Assyrian gods previously adopted by King Manasseh (II Kgs.23:11). In fact, the reform was already taking place

when the law-book was found (II Kgs.22:3f.). (29) G. von Rad is of the opinion that if Josiah was thinking of restoring the Kingdom of David, then a connection with Deuteronomy, which is so far removed from Jerusalem's sacral traditions of kingship, is even more remote. (30) On the other hand, Josiah's action against a number of Yahweh sanctuaries in the land, and against those of the Canaanite deities, cannot be explained by the political demands of this period (II Kgs.23:8,10,13-15), nor can the special celebration of the Passover (vss.21-23). However, a document like Deuteronomy could not be used exclusively as a programme for the reform of the cult by a King of Judah. In the measures he took, in some ways the king would go beyond Deuteronomy, in others fall short of it. The account of the reform mentions one case in which it was not practicable to carry out the regulations prescribed in Deuteronomy (see Deut.18:6-8; II Kgs.23:9)(31) But we can say that the newly found law-book gave the reform direction and a heightened sense of urgency, and imparted to it its distinctive character.

III THE DEUTERONOMIC CONCEPT OF ELECTION

The uniqueness of Deuteronomy lies in the fact that it is a homiletical collection of laws. They derived ultimately from the legal tradition which goes back to a very early period of Israel's life as a people. There is a widely held view, first suggested by C.F. Burney, (32) that the traditions upon which Deuteronomy was based arose in the Northern Kingdom of Israel. This of course does not mean that the book was actually composed in the North. There are great difficulties which surround such a notion. Firstly, the Northern Kingdom had been incorporated into the Assyrian Empire since its fall in 721 B.C., and

the cultic life had been severely disrupted. Secondly, there is much in Deuteronomy which points to a familiarity with, and concern for, the political and cultic traditions of Jerusalem. (33) The traditions underlying Deuteronomy were brought to Judah after the fall of Samaria, and there reformulated into a programme of reform. (34) However, the laws of Deuteronomy could not have been for the most part so very novel. What was novel was the stringent demands, demands that the official religion had either failed to stress or externalised, owing to the deeply rooted idea of Yahweh's irrevocable election of Zion and the Davidic dynasty. But the Deuteronomic concept of election was different from that of the Jerusalem Court tradition. Some even go as far as to suggest that "Deuteronomy undermines the Davidic Covenant altogether". (35)

1.   One of the most outstanding characteristics of Deuteronomy is its definition of the relationship between Yahweh and Israel in terms of election.   It is clear that Israel believed herself as standing in a unique relationship to Yahweh, as being, in fact, His peculiar people. In stressing this relationship between Yahweh and Israel with all the responsibilities and obligations entailed for Israel, Deuteronomy is therefore heir to a concept as old as Israel itself. What is new in Deuteronomy, however, is its distinctive use of the verb בָּחַר "choose" to define Yahweh's action in history on behalf of Israel.   Apart from Deuteronomy, none of the Old Testament sources refer to Yahweh's choosing a people. Yet, according to Biblical scholars, because the religion of Israel was from the beginning based on a unique and exclusive relationship between Yahweh and Israel, the implicit idea of election, therefore, cannot be ruled out. (36) But it is in Deuteronomy that the doctrine of Yahweh's election of Israel is for the first time clearly defined. As G. von Rad and

in Deut.9:7., is dependent on that of the golden calf in Exodus 32:1f., and that in their present form both are aimed against the actions of Jeroboam I (I Kgs.12:26f.). to whom the downfall of Samaria is attributed (II Kgs.176:21f.). M. de Tillesse is therefore right in suggesting that the Deuteronomist's insertion of the golden calf narrative into the Mosaic period was designed to prefigure the apostacy of the northern kingdom under Jeroboam I. (42) The intention of the Deuteronomic law, therefore, was not to exalt the King above his brothers, but rather to express negatively the idea that it is only the one chosen by Yahweh, and not any other, whom the Israelites may set over themselves as King. The divine election, which involved an individual special relationship with God, is "democratized" in Deuteronomy in order to emphasise the concept of the brotherhood of all believers. In the light of the background of the people's election theme, it must be considered highly probable, as A. D. Mayes argues, that the Deuteronomic view of the divine election of the people, is intended as an implicit rejection of the notion of divine election centered on one individual or dynasty. However, explicitly, Deuteronomy says nothing of this. (43) The Deuteronomist is specific in presenting the background of Israel's election as being twofold: (A) Yahweh's unmerited favour towards His people, and (B) The oath which he swore to the Fathers. Israel's election is based neither on the elect status of David's dynasty nor indeed on Israel's own greatness or goodness (Deut.7:7-8). Nevertheless, this election is by no means unconditional (vss.9-11), as we shall later discuss when we come to the subject of the covenant.

3. The theme of election in Deuteronomy is not confined only to the people of Israel, but it focuses on the one sanctuary at which the people may worship Yahweh. Probably, the centralisation law of worship in Deuteronomy refers to Jerusalem and has its origin within the context of the Jerusalem cult traditions. (44) As we mentioned before, these traditions, according to modern research, were based on two fundamental

theological principles, viz. Yahweh's choice of Mount Zion for His dwelling place, and His choice of the Davidic dynasty. (45) It was Jerusalem which claimed a unique and special relationship to Yahweh. But more significantly, it was in Jerusalem that the first attempt to centralise the worship was made. Apparently it was King Hezekiah who took such a step accordingly to the Chronicler (II Chron.29-31) (46) He may well have been religiously as well as politically motivated. It is possible that he aimed to re-establish the cultic centrality of Jerusalem, perhaps against the claims of Bethel as the first move towards regaining possession of the territory of the Northern Kingdom and establishing once again the "all Israel" state of the Davidic-Solomonic period. (47) In any case, it is significant that in formulating the centralisation law, the Deuteronomist employed a terminology, used in the Jerusalem tradition to describe Yahweh's choice of Mount Zion. (48) But this of course does not mean that the author accepted the traditional claims of Mount Zion in their entirety, or at all. Indeed, he gave no place to the notion that Yahweh Himself dwelt in the Sanctuary (Ps.132:13); but only His name dwelt there (Deut.12:5,11,21; 16:2,6,11). His sole purpose was to confine the sacrificial worship to a single sanctuary, which would be expressive of the unity and uniqueness of Yahweh (Deut.6:4). (49) A multiplicity of sanctuaries would lead to the existence of different conceptions of God and so pave the way to the assimilation of the worship of Yahweh with that of other gods. We conclude, therefore, that unlike the Jerusalem Court tradition, the Deuteronomic theology did not perceive Israel's election as being mediated by, and dependent upon, the election of the Davidic monarchy and temple. The latter are greatly modified and even subordinated to the election of Israel as a whole. (50) Nevertheless, this election, as G.E. Wright and H.H. Rowley have observed, was by no means unalterable; it could be annulled by Israel's own acts. (51) The method employed to express this particular combination of privilege, obligation and

brittleness of election was the use of a particular term, drawn from the realm of jurisprudence. This term was בְּרִית "covenant", to which we must turn our attention in the next chapter.

NOTES ON CHAPTER TWO

1. D. Senior & C. Stuhlmueller, "The Biblical Foundations for Mission".
    SCM London, 1983, p.86.

2. R.E. Clements, "God's Chosen People: A Theological Interpretation of
    the Book of Deuteronomy", SCM London, 1968, p.39.

3. D. Senior & C. Stuhlmueller, "The Biblical Foundations for Mission".
    p.93ff.; R.H. Pfeiffer, "Religion in the Old Testament", London,
    1961, p.50f.; J. Bright, "A History of Israel", pp.130-36;
    R. Polzin, "Moses and the Deuteronomist", N.Y. 1980, p.126f.

4. The best that so far has been published on the subject of election is
    "The Biblical Doctrine of Election", by H.H. Rowley, Luterworth Press
    London, 1961. See also Mendenhall, "Election", in IBD. pp.79ff.;
    Kohler, "Old Testament Theology", 1953, pp.81-82. To him the election
    of Israel is not that important.

5. E. Jacob, "Theology of the Old Testament", London, 1974, pp.201ff.;
    cf. Mendenhall, "Election", IBD Vol.2, pp.79ff.

6. A.D.H. Mayes, "Deuteronomy", Marshall, Morgam & Scott Publ., London,
    Rep. 1987, p.60; G.E. Wright, "The Old Testament Against its
    Environment", SCM London, 1950, pp.46-60.

7. A.D.H. Mayes, "Deuteronomy", p.60.

8. J.M.P. Smith, "The Chosen People", in American Journal of Semitic
    Languages, XLV, 1928-29, pp.73ff.

9. D.D. Luckenbill, "Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia", 1926,
    I. pp.72ff.

10. R.W. Rogers, "Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament", 1912, p.381;
    cf., H. Gressmann, "Altorientalische Texte Zum Alten Testament", 2nd
    ed. 1926, p.367.

11. R.E. Clements, "Abraham and David: Gen.15 amd Its Meaning for
    Israelite Tradition", SCM London, 1967, p.55; see now his "Prophecy
    and Temple", H. Frankfort, "Kingship and the Gods: A Study of
    Ancient and Near Eastern Religion as the Interpretation of Society
    and Nature", Chicago 1948, pp.238ff.; R. de Vaux, "Ancient Israel:
    Its Life and Institutions. , London, 1974, p.100f.

12. A.D.H. Mayes, "Deuteronomy", 1987, p.60.

13. R.E. Clements, "Abraham and David", p.54

14. For a fuller account of this point, see G.R. Driver, "Canaanite Myths
    and Legends", Edinburgh, 1956, pp.96ff.; 1967, pp.31ff. A.D.H. Mayes
    "Deuteronomy", p.62; cf. Widengren, "King and Covenant", JSS (1957),
    1ff.

15. H. Wildberger considers these two elections as separate. He views
    Israel's election in the context of Israel's salvation and the
    election of Jerusalem in the context of temple ritual. See "Die

15. Neuinterpretation des Erwählungsglauben Israels in der Krise der Exilszeit", in Wort-Gebot-Glaube (Walter Eichrodt Zum 80. Geburstag, hrsg Von H.J. Stoebe) (ATANT 59), Zurich, 1970, p.312f.); see also J. Bright, "Covenant and Promise", Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1976, pp.49ff.

16. R. Clements, "God's Chosen People", p.46.

17. J. Bright, "Covenant and Promise", p.26f.

18. R. Clements, "Abraham and David", p.62f.; see also his "Prophecy & Tradition." Oxford, 1975.

19. R. Clements, "God's Chosen People", p.46.

20. J.H. Eaton, "Psalms, Introduction and Commentary (Torah Bible Commentary) SCM press, 1967;"Kingship and the Psalms" (studies in Biblical Theology) SCM Press, 1976. Note Pss. 2; 18; 20; 21; 45; 72; 89; 101; 110; 132; 144. Not to mention others. These Psalms should be studied carefully. Cf. K.R. Crim, "The Royal Psalms", Richmond, John Knox Press, 1962, for an excellent introduction. The above Psalms (and others of the Royal Court tradition) cannot be dated with precision, but since all of them have the King as their central figure, they may confidently be regarded as belonging to the pre-exilic origin. See J. Bright, "Covenant and Promise", p.58.

21 Ibid, pp.55ff.

22. F.M. Cross is of the opinion that Psalm 132 belongs to the reign of David, "Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic", p.232, n.56; J. Bright maintains that "the reason for this conditionality" may well be that this Psalm in its original form stems from a very early stage in the development of the royal theology, before the later theology of kingship in its notion of an unconditional decree granting the Davidic house an eternal rule had taken hold, and while the idea of a conditional decree still prevailed. See "Covenant and Promise", p.64.

23. Ibid. p.118.

24. G.E. Wright and R. Fuller, "The Book of the Acts of God", Lutterworth, London, 1960, p.79f.; R. Polzin, "Moses and the Deuteronomist", N.Y. 1980, p.18f.

25. Athanasius (P.G. XXVII, 1887, Col.44); Chrysostom (P.G. LVII, 1882, Col.181, and LXI, 186w, Col.58); Jerome (P.L. XXXVIII, 1883, Col.227, and XXV, 1884, Col.17); and Procopius (P.G. LXXXVII, part 1, 1865, Col.915f).

26. E.W. Nicholson, "Deuteronomy and Tradition", Oxford, 1967, pp.1ff.; for the review of the discussion with bibliography see H.H. Rowley, "From Moses to Qumran", Lutterworth, London, 1963, pp.187-208.

27. For a complete list of parallels between Deuteronomy and II Kings 23 see L.B. Paton, "The Case for the Post-Exilic Dating of Deuteronomy", JBL, 47 (1928), pp.325ff.; cf. C. Kuhl, "The Old Testament, Its Origins and Composition", Oliver & Boyd, London, 1961, p.80f.; G.R. Berry is of the opinion that the law-book found in the temple was none

27. other than (Lev. Chs.17-26). But this opinion is far from accepted. See his "The Code Found in the Temple", JBL. 39(1920), pp.44-51.

28. C. Kuhl, "The Old Testament, Its Origins and Composition", p.81; C. Steuernagel, "Das Deuteronomium", Göttingen 1923, p.6, gives further bibliography.

29. G. von Rad, "Deuteronomy", in IBD. Vol.I, p.836; J. Bright, "Covenant and Promise", p.128f.

30. G. von Rad, "Deuteronomy, A Commentary", SCM. London, 1966, p.27f..; C.A. Simpson, "A Study in Deuteronomy 12-18", ATR (1952), pp.247ff.; A. Alt, "Die Ursprünge des Israelitischen Rechts", Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volks Israel (1953), I, pp.278ff.

31. G. von Rad, "Deuteronomy, A Commentary", p.27f.

32. C.F. Burney, "The Book of Judges", London, 1918, p.XLVI note. This view was supported in the works of A.C. Welch, "The Code of Deuteronomy. A New Theory of Its Origin", London, 1923; G. Von Rad, "Deuteronomy, A Commentary", SCM London, 1966, p.23f.; G.E. Wright, "Deuteronomy", IB, II 1953, pp.309-537.

33. R. Clements, "Deuteronomy and the Jerusalem Cult Tradition", VT.15, 1965, pp.300-12; Also his "God's Chosen People", p.20.

34. J. Bright, "Covenant and Promise", p.129; for an opposite view which argues that the book was composed in the North by Northern circles for the North, see A. Alt, "Die Heimat des Deuteronomiums", Kleine Schriften II, (1953) pp.250ff., and p.275. On the other hand, N. Lohfink argues that the law-book found in the temple was of a Judean origin, see his, "Die Bundesurkunde des Königs Josias", Biblica 44 (1963), pp.2610-88, 461-98. For a fuller discussion on this point see E.W. Nicholson, "Deuteronomy and Tradition", pp.58ff.

35. J. Bright, "Covenant and Promise", p.131f.

36. G. Mendenhall, "Election", in IBD, Vol.II, pp.76ff.

37. G. Von Rad, "Das Gottesvolk im Deuteronomium", BWANT III:2 (Stuttgart, 1929), p.27f.; R. Clements, VT. 15, 1965, pp.305ff. T.C. Vrie zen, "Die Erwählung Israels nach dem Alten Testament", (Zurich 1953), p.47; E.W. Nicholson, "Deuteronomy and Tradition", p.56f.

38. A.D.H. Mayes, "Deuteronomy", p.46; "Deuteronomy and the Jerusalem Court Tradition", V.T.15, (1965) pp.300-312.

39. Ibid p.46; cf. G. von Rad, "Old Testament Theology", Vol.I, pp.334ff.

40. A Caquot, "Remarques sur la 'Loi Royale' due Deuteronome (17,14-20)", Semitica 9, 1959, 21-33; The reference to the King's election by Yahweh is best taken as an independent element introduced at a secondary stage. See comment on Deut.17:15 by A.D.H. Mayes, "Deuteronomy", p.271f.

41. D.J. McCarthy, "Covenant in the Old Testament. The Present State of Inquiry", CBQ 27, (1965), P.220,P.235.

42. C.M. de Tillessé, "Sections 'tu' et Section 'vous' dans le Deuteronome", VT.12. (1962) p.60; R.S. Kennedy, "Golden Calf", in HBD (Edinburgh), 1898, Vol.I. p.341; S.R. Driver, Exodus (CBSC, Cambridge 1918, p.346; E. Nicholson, "Deuteronomy and Tradition", p.30f.

43. A.D.H. Mayes, "Deuteronomy", p.60f.; cf. J. Bright, "Covenant and Promise", p.131.

44. R.E. Clements, "Deuteronomy and the Jerusalem Cult Tradition", VT.15, (1965), pp.300-312; cf. E.W. Nicholson, "Deuteronomy and Tradition", p.95.

45. H.J. Kraus, "Die Königsherrschaft Gottes im Alten Testament", (Tübingen 1951) and "Worship in Israel", (Oxford, 1966), pp.179ff.

46. II Chron.14:1-4 and 17:6 claim that both Asa and Jehoshaphat before him abolished the local shrines. But these statements are totally unfounded on the basis that the chronicler himself contradicts them (20:33). See also (I Kgs.15:14; 22:43).

47. E.W. Nicholson, "Deuteronomy and Tradition", p.96: See also his "The Centralisation of the Cult in Deuteronomy", VT13 (1963), pp.380-389.

48. R. Clements, "Deuteronomy and the Cult Tradition", VT.15, (1965), pp.303-304; See also his, "God and His Temple", (Oxford, 1965), pp.48ff.; Evidently R. Clements and E.W. Nicholson follow K. Koch, "Zur Geschichte der Erwählungsvorstellung in Israel", ZAW 67 (1955). pp.205ff.

49. For a variety of possible translations of (Deut.6:4) see Driver, "Deuteronomy", (International Critical Commentary), Edinburgh, 1902, p.89f.: J.W. McKay, "Man's Love for God in Deuteronomy, and the Father/Teacher-Son/Pupil Relationship", VT.22, (1972), pp.426-35; A.D.H. Mayes, "Deuteronomy", p.176.

50. E.W. Nicholson, "Deuteronomy and Tradition", pp.83ff.

51. G.E. Wright, "The Old Testament Against Its Environment", p.54; H.H. Rowley, "The Biblical Doctrine of Election", p.99.

CHAPTER THREE

THE COVENANT CONCEPT IN ANCIENT ISRAEL

It was of paramount importance to discuss the subject of election prior to dealing with the concept of the Covenant in ancient Israel. We must agree with K. Galling and H.W. Robinson, that Covenant cannot be treated independently of election, because it merely puts into concrete terms, almost metaphorically, the meaning of the relationship involved in election. (1) And with this G.E. Wright is in total agreement that the doctrine of election finds its most concrete expression in the Old Testament language of the Covenant. (2)

In the Old Testament we encounter this divine-human bond that gave Israel its most distinctive religious belief, and provided the basis of its unique social interest and concern. Outside of the Old Testament we have no clear evidence of a covenant between a god and his people. (3) Covenant ideology therefore is one of the most notable features of the Old Testament, and has in recent decades played a lively role in Old Testament studies. Yet, it remains a highly intricate subject giving rise to a good number of questions. For example, what are we to understand by "Covenant ideology" in the Old Testament and how do we detect its presence? Do we find it confined only to passages where the word בְּרִית "berit" actually occurs or is there a wider semantic field which in certain circumstances may be taken to imply the ideas of Covenant even when the word "berit" itself does not occur? There are of course certain kinds of relationship that are implied by the word "berit", how are we to understand them when they occur in the context of ancient Israel's political life, institutions and social experience? In particular, what significance does

the word "berit" have when used in the context of Israel's religious and theological vocabulary? Turning to the religious use of "berit", is there a uniform Covenant ideology or doctrine, or do we encounter a complex of traditions which existed together both in tension and in harmony with each other? Is there a relationship between the Covenant traditions associated with Mount Sinai or Horeb (Ex.19-24; Deut.27:1-10) and those of a Covenant with Abraham (Gen.15,17) and with David (Ps.89, II Sam.7; Jer.33:19-23), and with the hope of a new Covenant (Jer.31:31-34)? When and why did these different Covenant traditions come into the life and thought of Ancient Israel? There are no doubt complex historical, literary and traditio-historical questions which confront us whenever we seek to answer such questions. (4)

I   THE LINGUISTIC SIGNIFICANCE OF THE COVENANT

Despite many attempts, no one has succeeded in providing a convincing etymology for the word "berit". But the door remains wide open. The following are the main views which have so far been advanced on this subject:

(A) "Berit" as a feminine noun is said to derive from the root word "baraḥ" to eat, from which come the nouns "biryah" and "barut" food. Thus, eating together was one form of symbolizing a relationship, and an example of this is to be found in Gen.26:28-30; 31:54; Ex.24:11. Among the recent scholars, this etymology is favoured by L. Köhler and F. Aver. (5)

(B) Some nineteenth-century scholars, and in recent times E. Kutsch (6) saw the term "berit" as derived from the homonym "barah" to see, to look at

with favour, hence to choose, or to decide. It refers to that which has been decided, chosen or acquired (Gen.22:8; I Sam.17:8) (7)

(C) The word was also linked with the Akkadian noun "birtu" to clasp or fetter. In this sense, "berit" denotes the binding together of two or more parties, hence binding agreement, and the like. This too was the view of some nineteenth century scholars like R. Kraetzschmar, and is accepted by recent scholars like M. Weinfeld and O. Loretz. (8)

(D) There are those like M. Noth who make the suggestion that the word derives from the preposition "berit" in Akkadian, which means "between". This derivation is based on a letter from Mari sent by one Ibal-ila to King Zimrilim in which he states the fact that he mediated an agreement "between" the Mana people and the people of Idamaraz by the slaying of a young ass. (9) As a substantive derived from this proposition, berit would have thus meant originally "a between", "a mediation" whence it became the usual term for "agreement". (10)

(E) There is, of course, a recent suggestion made by G. Gerleman, (11) which E.W. Nicholson terms as a novel one, that the word may be linked with an original biconsonantal stem "bar" meaning to separate. Thus it has to do with something special, set apart, distinguished, a special privilege or advantage. (12)

There is no shortage of scholarly works in which summaries and analyses of the etymological arguments regarding the word "berit" are to be found. (13) Yet, none of the etymologies so far suggested is fully convincing. Detailed linguistic studies have resulted in various

conclusions regarding the word "berit". J. Begrich, for example, argued that originally the word denoted not a bilateral arrangement between two parties but a relationship created by a stronger party who took to himself a weaker partner and made a commitment to him expressed by means of a solemn act. (14) Among the biblical passages he cites in support of his view is the Covenant scene described in Ex.24:1-2, 9-11. In this Covenant which was made by means of a meal, there is no hint of obligation imposed upon Israel. It is only later that the legal connotation came to be exemplified in the tradition in Ex.24:3-8 and Joshua 24:23-7. Here Yahweh's grace is made contingent upon obligations imposed upon Israel. "Berit" in these texts clearly designates a contract, an agreement or a treaty. A. Jepsen rejected Begrich's view as being based on too narrow a definition of "berit". He maintains that although in many passages those involved in covenant-making were not equals, in many others they were. In fact, however, whether the parties were equals or not did not belong to the essence of what "berit" meant. Jepsen argues that to make a "berit" meant to give a solemn pledge to another or to undertake an obligation towards another. (15) E. Kutsch goes slightly further and confirms L. Perlitt's view that "berit" originally meant obligation, duty and the like. According to him, the word does not primarily mean an agreement, but an obligation, either self-obligation or obligation imposed by one party upon another (Gen.15; I Kgs.5:26; II Chron.23:16; Hosea 2:20; Jer.34:8,10,18). (16)

With the variety of views that have so far been advanced regarding the word "berit", none of them is satisfactory. But it is generally agreed that "berit" in the Old Testament cannot be divorced from the concept of relationships. J. Pedersen was not far off the mark when, on the analogy of the Arabic word "عهد" 'ahd', argued that "berit" denotes a mutual

relationship of solidarity with all the rights and obligations which this relationship entailed for the parties involved. (17) And of this relationship we have quite a number of varieties in the Old Testament. The word "berit" may be used of a relationship which a stronger imposes upon a weaker party (Josh.9:15; I Sam.II:1f.; I Kgs.20:34). It is used in a situation where a superior makes certain promises to those under his authority (Jer.34:8); or a relationship between equals in which mutual obligations are involved (I Sam.23:16-18); or used as a mutual pledge by two parties to leave each other in peace and nothing more (Gen.21:27-32; 31:44f.). Moreover, the word may denote a political agreement or treaty between two nations (II Sam.3:13; I Kgs.5:2ß), a solemn pledge of friendship (I.Sam.20:8) or marriage contract (Mal.2:14). Such covenants or covenant-making were common in ancient Israel and its contemporary nations throughout the ancient Near East. But when we come to deal with the word "berit" in its religious context, our task becomes so crucial as to require an honest and careful study free from any influence of personal theological bias.

II TREATY AND COVENANT

A new period in the Covenant debate was initiated by G.E. Mendenhall in 1955. Five years earlier, E. Bickerman published an article in which he made passing reference to the treaties between Hittite Kings and their vassals as providing an analogy to the Covenant relationship between Yahweh and Israel. (18) That this was the prompting factor behind G.E. Mendenhall's thesis should not be overlooked.

1. Drawing upon Hittite treaty documents, published by V. Korosec in

in 1931, G.E. Mendenhall established that law, with its associated sanctions, and covenant were in Israel essentially religious in origin, and that there were remarkable similarities in form between these Hittite treaties of the late bronze age (1400-1000 B.C.) and the covenantal formulations of the Old Testament. (19) He then proceeds to isolate six basic elements in these suzerainty treaty texts:

1.   The treaty begins with the identification of the King the inaugurator of the treaty: "Thus (saith) so and so, the great King, King of the Hatti land, son of so and so......the valiant." The parallel to this preamble is found in early Covenant passages in the Old Testament in which God addresses Israel: "I am the Lord your God" (Ex.20:2.cf.; Josh.24:2).

2.   There follows the historical prologue which lays particular emphasis on the past deeds of kindness made by the great King on behalf of the vassal. This was designed to invoke the vassal's grateful response to the ensuing treaty obligations. The parallel to this in the Old Testament is summed up in a few words: "Who brought you out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage" (Ex.20:2). Or it may be a somewhat longer account such as is given in Josh.24:2-13.

3.   Then come the stipulations, among them the prohibition against the vassal's engaging in relations with foreign powers, which reminds us of the first commandment which forbids any relations with other deities: "You shall have no other gods before me". (Ex.20:3; cf. 34:13; Josh.24:14).

4.   There is the stipulation that the treaty documents should be deposited in the sanctuary of the vassal and publicly read at regular intervals. Similar provisions were found in Israel. Whilst no mention is made of these provisions in the decalogue, they are certainly to be found elsewhere in the Pentateuch, notably in Deuteronomy (Deut.10:10-5; 31:26; 31:9-13).

5.   Another point which characterises these suzerainty treaties is the invocation of the deities of the vassals concerned as witnesses to the treaty. Usually, the mountains, rivers, the heavens and the earth, the winds and clouds are also included as witnesses. A list of deities would have been out of place in the non-polytheistic setting of the decalogue. The nature of Israel's God clearly forbids this. But one should not overlook such texts as Deuteronomy 32:1 and Isaiah 1:2 (cf.Mic.6:1f.) in which "heaven and earth", "mountains" and "hills" are summoned as witnesses to Israel's relationship with Yahweh.

6.   Finally, the treaty concludes with a series of blessings and curses befalling the whole community as the result of its honouring, or failing to honour the terms of the treaty. It is argued that the parallel to this is to be found in the decalogue where Yahweh is said to be a "jealous God" punishing yet holding out rewards for obedience (Ex.20:5-6). However, what is certain is that in the Old Testament book of the Covenant, the Law Code in Deuteronomy, and the Holiness Code all conclude with such promises and threats (Ex.23:20f.; Deut. 27:15f.; 28:1ff.; Lev.26:3ff.).

2.   The thesis presented by Mendenhall excited much interest in the study
of Ancient Near East treaty documents. In addition to Hittite treaty texts
of the second millenium which were studied in great depth, increasing
attention came to be focused upon the Assyrian treaties, in which the
Assyrian Empire regulated relations with its subject peoples from the
thirteenth to the eight century B.C. These Assyrian treaty documents, such
as the Sefire treaties from Syria and the vassal treaties of Esarhaddon and
others, (20) came to be regarded as of particular significance since some
of them developed at length the curse element in a way which seemed to be
reflected in Deuteronomy 28. (21) Such ancient treaties were not only
regarded as constituting a genre which functioned sociologically in
regulating and protecting the structures of the Assyrian Empire within a
framework of divine sanctions, but the particular language employed in such
treaty texts is assumed to provide clues as to the distinctive use of
certain Hebrew words in Covenant contexts in the Old Testament.

(A) W.L. Moran argued that the term "tbt" found in the Sefire treaties is
a designation of "the amity established by treaty", and several other
scholars like McCarthy, D.R. Hillers and M. Fox have also emphasised its
similarity with the Old Testament word טוֹב or טוֹבָה i.e. good or
good things. (22) According to A. Malamat, the word טוֹבָה in II Sam.
7.28 is the terminological indication of Yahweh's Covenant with David's
line here. The same Covenantal connotation of this word and its variants is
found with reference to Yahweh's Covenant with Israel in passages like
Jer.33:9 and Hosea 3:5; 8:3. (23)

(B) Another term which is thought to carry a Covenantal connotation is אָהֵב
"love". Again W.L. Moran and others trace the concept of the love of God

in the Old Testament generally and Deut.6:4-5 in particular to a treaty background. (24) Particular emphasis is placed upon the nature of this love as one that can be "commanded", and most of all, a love which is expressed in loyalty and service, in an unqualified obedience to the law. This command to the subject to love his overlord is evidently found in the Ancient Near East texts from the early second millennium down to the first millennium B.C. for example, Esarhaddon commanded his vassals to love his successor Assurbanipal: "You will love as yourselves Assurbanipal." (25) Pointing to various other parallels between Assyrian treaty texts and Deuteronomy, Moran states that "Deuteronomic circles were familiar with Assyrian practice of demanding an oath of allegiance from their vassals expressed in terms of love." (26) According to him, it is to this source rather than to the prophet Hosea that the concept of the love of God in Deuteronomy is to be traced. (27) Moran's suggestion prompted McCarthy and F.C. Fensham to argue than even the "father-son" imagery used of Yahweh's Covenant relationship with Israel or the Davidic throne is to be understood against the background of the use of this same imagery treaty context from the second to the first millennium B.C. (28) They further maintain that the term "slave" עֶבֶד when used in a Covenant context, must also be seen against a treaty background. (29) Moreover, the word סְגֻלָּה "special possession or property" (Ex.19:5; Deut.7:6; 14:2; 26:18; Ps.135:4), is found very much at home in the treaty texts. However, the Urgaritic "sglt" is discovered to have been used to describe a special relationship of the Sovereign to one of his vassals. (30)

(C) Another word must be taken into consideration. The word is "to know". A treaty background for the meaning in certain contexts of the word יָדַע has been argued on the analogy of Hittite "sak" and Akkadian "idu", "know"

as signifying "mutual recognition" on the part of suzerain and vassal. This argument has been advanced by H.B. Huffmon and S.B. Parker. (31) The usage of the word יָדַע with reference to "Covenant recognition" of Israel by Yahweh has been proposed for Hosea 13:5 and Amos 3:2, with reference to Israel's recognition of Yahweh as its only God in Jeremiah 24:7; 31:34; Hosea 2:22; 4:1; 4:4; 8:2; 13:40. (32)

3.   In conclusion, apart from the intensive study of these ancient treaty documents and their distinctive language, attention has been drawn to statements, oral and otherwise, which intimate various types of union between different groups and individuals. In his detailed examination of such declaratory formulae in a wide range of secular covenants in the Old Testament in the light of other Ancient Near Eastern treaties, P. Kaluveetil has concluded that since covenants throughout the ancient world were mainly concerned with relationships and are designed to create unity or community in one form or another, words or statements referring to such relationships can in certain contexts indicate a covenant union, even when the term covenant itself is absent. (33) This argument tends to spread the net widely. R. Davidson has rightly observed that in spreading the net too widely, one "must question whether the mesh has not at times been so fine that what has been caught remains highly heterogeneous." Indeed, it is so heterogeneous that to gather it together and provide it with a Covenant label, particularly a treaty-covenant label, raises more questions than it answers. (34)

III THE TREATY COVENANT AND BIBLICAL SCHOLARSHIP

With a pair of articles, (35) G.E. Mendenhall was able to establish

the treaty-covenant model as part of Israel's experience since Moses's time. A new impetus was now given to the understanding of Israel's religious and sociological history. It seemed also at this stage as if J. Wellhausen's idea of the Covenant as being a post-exilic, post-prophetic theological concept was finally thrown to the wind. But since the last decade, Wellhausen's idea proved to be more of a boomerang than an old hat.

1. In his book Prolegomena, (36) Wellhausen devotes fewer than three pages to a discussion of the meaning and development of the term "berit" in the Old Testament. Here, Wellhausen argued that the use of "berit" to characterise the Yahweh/Israel relationship is something unknown to the pre-exilic prophets, including Hosea. (37) When it appeared later it was "an entirely new thing". According to him, the use of "berit" appeared only after Josiah had introduced the Deuteronomic law; and "it prevails" only in Deuteronomy, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Second Isaiah, Leviticus 17-26, and, of course, "in the book of the Four Covenants", which is one of his designations for Q or P. (38) R. Kraetzschmar and P. Valeton were to don Wellhausen's mantle, and their studies became those from the end of the nineteenth century to which most frequent reference was made on the subject of the Covenant. Neither scholar appeared to depart from Wellhausen's position. (39) However, Wellhausen's assessment of the Covenant was thoroughly rejected in the middle of the twentieth century by most scolars in favour of the centrality of the Covenant in Israel's religious and sociological history.

2. As early as 1927, N. Glueck published his dissertation (Hesed in the Bible), in which he stressed the mutuality implied in various uses of the term חֶסֶד "loyalty, devotion, steadfast love". For Glueck, this term

in the Old Testament is the very content of "berit" and can be translated "Covenant loyalty". (40) Six years later, W. Eichrodt published the first volume of his work (Theology of the Old Testament). In this volume, he argued that Covenant as a theological concept was early and definitive for Israel's understanding of God, man and the world. And he did not cease to defend this view against many of his critics. He was quite certain that, "the word Covenant...... is so to speak a covenient symbol for an assurance much wider in scope and controlling the formation of the national faith at its deepest level, without which Israel would not be Israel. As an epitome of the dealings of God in history, the Covenant is not a doctrinal concept.... but the characteristic <u>description of a living process</u> which was begun at a particular time and at a particular place". (41)   And for Eichrodt that time was the time of Moses and the place Mount Sinai. Despite much criticism, Eichrodt's idea of the role of the Covenant as an organising principle for Israelite religion found a wide response - i.e. the first to alter for a time the tradition of Old Testament scholarship. (42)   Moreover, the treaty-covenant model, following G.E. Mendenhall, seemed, at last, to confirm Eichrodt's centrality of the Covenant notion for the religion of Israel. A decade or so after, the publication of Mendenhall's articles witnessed the high point of this position.   J. Muilenburg, for example, could argue that "behind the promulgation of the Deuteronomic Code of 621 B.C. lies a long history of literary and cultic activity". He denies the presence of any Deuteronomic or Deuteronomistic editing in Ex.19:3-6. Rather, he sees this passage as the source of the many Covenantal periscopes found in the Old Testament. His conclusion therefore is that both Joshua 24 and I Samuel 12 rest upon old traditions which "formed the background against which the prophets (especially from the North) launched their invectives and threats". (43)

K. Baltzer virtually adopts the same arguments in favour of Covenant antiquity and centrality in Israel's religious and sociological history. He also shows strong leaning towards Webster's position. (44) With the treaty-Covenant form in mind, D.R. Hillers also contends that "Israel took a suzerainty treaty as a model for God's treaty with her". And like Eichrodt, he maintains that without such a treaty-Covenantal bond Israelite tribes could not have been held together prior to the emergence of the monarchy. In short, others like John Bright virtually re-echoed the same argument. (45)

3. The treaty-Covenant model, however, was not the only basis on which the antiquity and centrality of the Covenant in Israel could be argued. The study of the sociology of religion has also contributed greatly to the understanding of the role of the Covenant in ancient Israel. The most comprehensive attempt to understand ancient Israel in sociological terms was that made by Max Weber. (46) But we must bear in mind at this point that a sociological approach to demands in Israel's religion is by no means a novel idea. In 1889 W.R.Smith was able to describe the God of Israel as the God of a confederation, and religion in this connection, is characterised as "Covenant Religion". According to Weber, "Israel as a political Community was conceived as an oathbound confederation". The Covenant therefore became the means by which different and unstable tribal elements were united as one people, and united under Yahweh who was not only Israel's war god, "but the contractual partner of its law established by "berit" above all of its socio-legal orders". (47) R. Davidson observed that "into this context Martin Noth's thesis of pre-monarchical Israel being constituted as a twelve tribe amphictyony fitted neatly". (48) The memory of the central role which the Covenant played in instituting this

amphictyony, is preserved in Joshua 24. However, the portrait presented in this passage that all the groups which gathered to form the Israelite amphictyony had experienced the Exodus and Sinai events is quite misleading.

4. But the most radical attempt to provide a sociological analysis and explanation of early Israel is advanced by N. Gottwald in his voluminous book, The Tribes of Yahweh . Having rejected the idea of the suzerainty-treaty covenant model, including Noth's amphictyonic model and Mendenhall's religious idealism, he argued for the importance of the antiquity and centrality of the Covenant of early Israel, but only in so far as it fulfilled an essential socio-egalitarian function. He writes: "The novelty and threat of early Israel was not the introduction of new religious ideas and practices as such, but the conjunction of previously and contradictory social groups in a united and mutually supportive network of relationships". (49) Owing to the great social tensions and struggles that were taking place in the Canaan of the fourteenth and early thirteenth centuries B.C., when various groups such as the Apiru, transhumant pastoralists and peasants were struggling for survival with cohesion against ruling-class enemies, (50) Covenant served as "The bonding of decentralised social groups in a larger society of equals committed to co-operation without authoritarian leadership, and a way of symbolising the locus of Sovereignty in such a society of equals". (51) Thus, the Covenant is divested of what is claimed to be all false religious idealism and clothed with a form of Marxist ideological garb. Still it played an important role in the emergence of Israel from the very heart of Canaanite feudalism. However, despite the vast difference between J. Bright's theological understanding of the Covenant in his "Promise and Covenant", and N. Gottwald's

sociological approach, they are totally in agreement that the Covenant played an important role in the life of Israel prior to the birth of the monarchy.

Thus, the argument in favour of the pre-monarchical existence of the Covenant in Israel is obviously an attempt to explain how a people consisting of components of exceedingly diverse origin emerged on the stage of history as a united community identified as Israel. To use Mendenhall's words, "If, as Israelite tradition maintained, there were only descendants of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, in short a group bound together by blood-ties or clan, then it is not so likely that a covenant would have been necessary to bind them together as a religious group". (52) But why should the Covenant be the only factor which constituted the unity of such a diverse group of people to Yahweh at this early period? Such a notion does not even figure in Joshua 24:25, where the word "berit" denotes more precisely a solemn pledge or oath of loyalty to Yahweh than a "bond" with Him. (53) There is every indication that it was this pledge or oath which in fact played a cental role in uniting the Hebrew tribes together at this early stage. We encounter a similar situation in the early history of Islam. The unity of the many diverse Arabian tribes at the time of Mohammed was established solely through a solemn pledge of loyalty and commitment to the worship of Allah. The concept of Covenant, the equivalent of "berit" never occurred, and to this present time remains absent from Islamic theology.

IV.   THE TREATY-COVENANT MODEL RE-ASSESSED

In concluding this chapter, it is necessary to examine the claim that Covenant, modelled on the treaty form, played an important role in the formation of Israel religiously and sociologically. It has recently been argued that "though for a time research into the possible influence of suzerainty treaties upon Old Testament Covenantal texts seemed to offer striking results, in reality it has yielded little of permanent value".(54) In what sense has research into the influence of ancient treaty documents upon Old Testament Covenantal texts over-reached itself, as it has been suggested? This is the question to which we shall now address ourselves.

1.   In his comprehensive study, first published in 1963, (55) D.J. McCarthy presented the first detailed critique of Mendenhall's dependence upon the Hittite treaty model for the Sinai tradition. In this study, McCarthy agrees that aspects of the Sinai tradition were old, and that they contained covenant theology. But, he emphasised the extremely complex literary and traditio-historical problems involved in any analysis of Exodus 19-24 and argued that the Hittite treaty model is neither necessary nor indeed illuminating for our understanding of the tradition.(56) He found evidence of a gradual development from an older notion of covenant (Ex.24:1-11) centering on ritual to one in which a covenant made by verbal affirmation and pledge comes to the fore and which in turn was followed by a covenant understood and made after the manner of the suzerainty treaties, i.e. the Assyrian suzerainty treaty. According to McCarthy, the core of the Sinai Covenant was a matter of ritual. It was mainly through the ritual ceremony described in Ex.24:6-8 that the covenant was constituted between Yahweh and Israel. In this case therefore, the covenant is "more than a

matter of agreement, it is a question of adoptive kinship. Israel is not only the subject of Yahweh, but is His adopted family. And so the laws are not the terms of a treaty, but the conditions covering continued action in the family". He also viewed the eating of the common meal (Ex.24:9-11) as a ritual and so "an authentic gesture of covenant making". (57) Nothing therefore could be proved about the date and origin of the Sinai tradition by drawing attention to Hittite treaty parallels. The treaty form comes to full expression in the book of Deuteronomy which was the product of circles who were politically aware of the language of international treaties, particularly Assyrian treaty documents, and which were in vogue during the Hebrew monarchy. Following many commentators, McCarthy viewed Deuteronomy as having comprised substantially Chapters 4:44 - 26:19 plus Chapter 28. In this central section of Deuteronomy there are the following treaty-like elements: 1) The historical-parenetic prologue (Deut.4:44 - 11:1ff), 2) Stipulations (12:1 - 26:15), 3) Invocations-adjuration (26:16-19), (4) Blessings and curses (28:1-46). (58) He stresses that besides the structure of the treaties which this central part of Deuteronomuy displays, it also takes up many details from the treaty tradition, like for example, the command to love the Lord. And this to him is "a strange sort of thing to command but one at home in the treaties".(59)

2. McCarthy's conclusions on the treaty background of Deuteronomy had the support of M. Weinfeld, who added some further detailed comparisons.(60) According to Weinfeld, Deuteronomy emanates from the Wisdom tradition, from those circles whom he identified as having held public office under the Hebrew monarchy and who were familiar with the treaties of the day. At their disposal, they had a corpus of Deuteronomic religio-literary material which had already conjoined covenant and law. This material they enriched

"by introducing all the elements of the vassal treaties". (61) In doing this, the covenantal pattern is blurred as it is put into a homiletic setting. The long list of curses in Deut. 28 is said to have a perfect parallel in the treaty which Esarhaddon made with his eastern vassals regarding the coronation of his son Ashurbanipal in 672 B.C. (62) By following the pattern of Assyrian treaty documents, the Deuteronomists meant to emphasise the point that the pledge of loyalty to the Assyrian emperor had now been replaced by the pledge of loyalty to the divine King, Yahweh. The relevance of this particular point must also be seen against the background of Josiah's move to free himself from Assyrian domination in the seventh century B.C. Thus Weinfeld presents us with a portrait of a "historical and political milieu in which the appeal to the language of the treaty texts would be understandable, to identify the Wisdom and court circles which might reasonably make such an appeal, and to stress the theological underpinning of such an appeal". (63)

3. McCarthy's critique however, which seriously questioned Mendenhall's appeal to Hittite treaty texts, has itself been questioned in recent years. Can Deuteronomy best be explained in terms of a covenantal pattern, following the Assyrian treaty model, which has been (in Weinfeld's view) blurred by being put into a homiletic framework, or is it rather an extended oration in homiletic style which often alludes to, and makes use of, treaty language? (64) We are now in no doubt that most of the arguments regarding the link between Deuteronomy and Assyrian treaty texts are by no means convincing. The alleged formal relationship between Deut.28 and the Esarhaddon has been carefully examined by E.W. Nicholson in his recent book (God and His People: Covenant and Theology in the Old Testament). His conclusion is that Deuteronomy was never influenced in this particular

respect by the Esarhaddon treaty. He observed that the intensification of the curse element in Deuteronomy "Can be more readily explained by the historical circumstances in which the Chapter was developed, that is, the closing years of the Kingdom of Judah, when the threat of curse was seen to hover more and more ominously over the nation and fell catastrophically upon it in the event of 597 and 587 B.C.". (65) Moreover, it has been argued that in the framework to the legislation in Deut. 4:25-31 and 30:1-10, curse and blessing do not stand side by side as alternatives, as in the treaty documents, but occur in historical succession, with curse a present reality to be followed by blessing on condition of repentance; which suggests, in A.D.H. Mayes' view (not so widely different from that of E.W. Nicholson), that the curse of the law is that which Israel in exile is now experiencing, but there is blessing to follow. Israel in exile is encouraged with the promise of renewal and restoration . (66) The emphatic appeal to distinctive Deuteronomic language like "the command to love", as being necessarily indicative of the influence of treaty terminology, is strongly challenged on the basis that terms such as "Father", "Son", "treasured possession", "slave or servant", including "the command to love", "belonged in the first instance to familiar settings of every day life, and needed no treaties to mediate them or give them a special nuance". (67) For example, all references in the treaties to the "love" of suzerain for vassal and of vassal for suzerain, to the suzerain as "father" and the vassal as "son", such relationships were ever hardly like that. In reality, vassals did not "love" those who conquered and subjugated them. There is ample evidence for this in the history of ancient Israel and of the ancient Near East. Therefore, such a language of intimate and familial relationships in the treaties reflects anything but the reality of a loving relationship. On the contrary, it reflects the political, strategic,

and economically motivated endeavour of suzerains to maintain the subservience of those they had conquered and regarded as subjects. No Israelite could have envisaged that Yahweh "loves" His people just as a suzerain "loves" his vassals, and that Israel therefore ought to "love" Yahweh just as vassals "love" their suzerains. Such an idea would have seemed to him as totally absurd. There is, therefore, no need to believe that the Deuteronomists were dependent for such terminology on anything other than the familiar settings of their every day life. "Why should it be strange, as Moran and McCarthy contend, that love is "commanded""? The Israelite is not only commanded to love Yahweh, but also to love his neighbour (Lev.19:18) and the stranger (Lev.19:34; Deut.10:19); Hosea is commanded to love a woman (Hos.3:1); there is also the command to love Wisdom (Prov.4:6), the command to love peace and truth (Zech.8:19) and to love that which is good (Amos 5:15). (68) That the command to "love God" should be understood as a "strange sort of thing", explicable only when we know suzerainty treaty usage, is to say the least, a strange sort of argument.

Obviously, the attempt to relate the Old Testament Covenant to suzerainty treaties has in fact produced little that is of lasting value. And with this, the entire notion which perceived the Covenant as being old and central in forming the principle of unity and cohesion among the earliest Hebrew tribes has so far remained lacking in weight. The tide has now moved in favour of the argument that "the picture of Israel as a covenant community has to be seen as an ideal no earlier than the late monarchical period".   And in this regard we seem to have been brought back, like L. Perlitt, to almost the view of J. Wellhausen a century or so ago. (69)

NOTES ON CHAPTER III

1. K. Galling, "Die Erwählungstraditionen Israels", Gissen, 1928, p.37: H.W. Robinson, "Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament", p.153.

2. G.E. Wright, "The Old Testament Against its Environment", p.54.

3. F. Nötscher, BZ9, pp.186, 193, cf. R.E. Clements, "Abraham and David", p.83.

4. R. Davidson, "Covenant Ideology in Ancient Israel" in "The world of Ancient Israel", Cambridge, 1989, ed. by R.E. Clements, p.323f.

5. L. Köhler, "Problems in the Study of the Language of the Old Testament", JSS 1, 1956, pp.3-24 (esp.pp.3-7); F. Auer, "Das Alte Testament in der Sicht des Bundesgedankens", Lex tua Veritas, Festschrift fur H.J. Junker, ed. H. Cross and F. Mussner, Trier 1961, pp.1-15 (esp.pp.3f.).

6. E. Kutsch, "Verheissung und Gesetz, ch.2, Cf. L. Wachter, "Die Übertragung der beritvorstellung auf Jahwe", TLZ 99, 1974, Cols. 801-16.

7. E.W. Nicholson, "God and His People: Covenant and Theology in the Old Testament", Oxford, 1986, p.94f.

8. R. Kraetzschmar, "Die Bundesvorstellung in Alten Testament", pp.244ffr.; O. Loretz, "Berit "Band-Bund"", VT 16, 1966, pp.239-41.

9. M. Noth, "Old Testament Covenant-Making in the Light of a Text from Mari", The Laws of the Pentateuch and Other Studies, pp.108-17.

10. Cf. E.W. Nicholson, "God and His People", p.95.

11. G. Gerleman, "Die Besonderheit" Untersuchung zu berit in Alten Testament", Studien zur alttestamentlichen Theologie, Heidelberg, 1980. p.24-37.

12. E.W. Nicholson, "God and His People", p.96f.

13. Cf. M. Weinfeld, "Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School", Oxford, 1972, "Covenant", TDOT, II 1973, pp.253-79; J. Barr, "Some Semantic Notes on the Covenant", Beiträg zur alttestamentlichen Theologie, FS Z. Zimmerli 70. Geburtstag. eds. H. Donner, R. Hanhart, R. Smend, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Rupprecht, 23-33; E.W. Nicholson, "God and His People", pp.83ff.

14. J. Begrich, "Berit. Ein Beitrag zur Erfassung einer alttestamentlichen Denkform", ZAW 60, 1944, 1-11.

15. A. Alt, "The Origins of Israelite Law", Essays on O.T. History and Religion, Oxford 1966, p.96.

16. E. Kutsch, "Verheissung und Geretz. Untersuchungen zum sogenannten "Bund" im Alten Testament", BZAW 131, Berlin & New York, 1973; and particularly his "Berit Verpflichtung", Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament I, ed. E. Jenni and C. Westermann, Munich and Zurich 1971, pp.339-52.

17. J. Pedersen, "Der Eid bei den Semiten", Strasburg, 1914, p.33f. See also his "Israel" I-II Denmark 1953, pp.274ff.

18. E. Bickerman, "Couper une Alliance", Archives d'Histoire du Droit Oriental, 5, 1950-1, pp.133-56.

19. G.E. Mendenhall, "Covenant Forms in Israelite Tradition", B.A. 27 (Sept. 1954), no.3; Cf. G.E. Wright, "Biblical Archaeology" (1952), p.56f.

20. J.A. Fitzmyer, "The Aramaic Inscription of Sefire", Biblica et Orientalia 19, Roma, 1967; D.J. Wiseman, "The Vassal Treaties of Esarhaddon", London. 1958, pp.528ff. D.J. McCarthy, "Treaty and Covenant", pp.309-11.

21. R. Borger, ZA, 54 (1961), pp.181-2; for a striking parallel we may consider Assurbanipal's statement in his annals and Deut. 28:23; 29:23ff. in M. Streck, "Assurbanipal und die letzten Assyrischen Könige", 79:68-73, 78, 4; W.L. Moran, "The Ancient Near Eastern Background of the Love of God in Deuteronomy", CBQ 25 (1963), p.83f.

22. W.L. Moran, "A Note on the Treaty Terminology of the Sefire Stelas", JNES 22, 1963, pp.173-6; D.J. McCarthy, "Berit in the Old Testament History and Theology", Biblica 53, 1972, p.114; M. Fox, "TOB as Covenant-Terminology", BASOR 209, 1973, pp.41f.

23. A. Malamat, "Organs of Statecraft in the Israelite Monarchy", BA 28, 1965, p.64; M. Fox, p.41f.

24. W.L. Moran, "The Ancient Near Eastern Background of the Love of God in Deuteronomy", CBQ 24, 1963, pp.77-87.

25. D.J. Wiseman, "Iraq" 20 (1958), 49 Col.IV 26608; cf. also 43 Col.III 207; cf. For variant reading see R. Borger, ZA 54, (L96L) 181-2.

26. W.L. Moran, CBQ 25, (1963), p.80.

27. W.L. Moran, CBQ 25, (1963), p.77.

28. D.J. McCarthy, "Notes on the Love of God in Deuteronomy and Father-Son Relationship between Yahweh and Israel", CBQ 27, 1965, pp.144ff; F.C. Fensham, "Father and Son as Terminology for Treaty and Covenant", in Near Eastern Studies in Honour of W.F. Albright, ed. H. Goedicke, Baltimore and London, 1971, pp.121-35.

29. Fensham, pp.132-134; McCarthy, "Treaty and Covenant", p.161, note 5.

30. M. Weinfeld, "Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School", Oxford, 1972, p.226, note 2; McCarthy, "Treaty and Covenant", p.162, note 10.

31. H.B. Huffmon, "The Treaty Background of Hebrew Yada", BASOR, 184, 1966, PP.36F.

32. Huffmon, BASOR, pp.35ff.

33. P. Kaluveetil, "Declaration and Covenant", Analecta 88, Rome 1982, Biblical Institute.

34. R. Davidson, "Covenant Ideology in Ancient Israel", in "The World of Ancient Israel", Ed. by R.E. Clements, Cambridge University Press, 1989, p.326.

35. G.E. Mendenhall, "Ancient Oriental and Biblical Law", BA, 17 (1954), pp.26-46; Also "Covenant Form in Israelite Tradition", BA, 17 (1954), pp.50-76.

36. J. Wellhausen, "Prolegomena to the History of Israel", Edinburgh, 1985 See also Encyclopaedia Britannica, Vol.XIII. 1881.

37. For Wellhausen, Hosea 5:7 is no problem, since he finds here no real awareness of the use of "Berit" to characterise Yahweh's relationship with Israel. As for Hos.8:1, it is a secondary interpolation, (Prolegomena. 418).

38. Prolegomena, p.419.

39. R. Kraetzschmar, "Die Bundervorstellung im Alten Testament in ihrer Geschichtlichen Entwicklung (2nd Ed., Marburgt Elwert, 1996); P. Valeton, "Bedeutung und Stellung des Wortes bryt im Prister-Codex", ZAW 12 (1892, pp.1-22; or "Das Wort berit in den Jehovistischen und Deuteronomischen Stücken des Hexateuch", ZAW 12, 1892, pp.224-60.

40. N. Glueck, "Hesed in the Bible", Cincinnati: Hebrew Union, 1967, pp.74-77. For a recent and more comprehensive return to many of the issues raised by Glueck, see K.D. Sakenfeld, "The Meaning of Hesed in the Hebrew Bible: A New Inquiry", (HSM 17, Missoula, Mont.: Scholar's Press 1978, pp.3-13; G.R. Larue, "Recent Studies in Hesed", pp.1-32. Both Sakenfeld and Larue offer summaries of the studies of Hesed in the years following the appearance of Glueck's volume.

41. W. Eichrodt, "Theology of the Old Testament", Vol.I, 1961, p.14.

42. G.F. Hasel, "Old Testament Theology: Basic Issues in the Current Debate", (Grand Rapid: W. Eardmans, 1972, p.20.

43. J. Muilenburg, "The Form and Structure of the Covenantal Formulations" VT9 (1959) pp.347-65.

44. K. Baltzer, "The Covenantal Formulary", (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971, pp.19-38.

45. D.R. Hillers, "Covenant: The History of an Idea", J. Hopkins Univ. 1969, p.64; John Bright, "Covenant and Promise: The Future in the Preaching of the Pre-Exilic Prophets", Westminster Press, 1976, p.43.

46. M. Weber's Study of Ancient Israel first appeared as a series of articles in the 1917-19 issues of the Archiv fur Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialforschung. It was published in 1921 (posthumously) as the third Volume of his Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Religionssoziologie under the title Das Antike Judentum (E. trans. Ancient Judaism, London 1952)

47. Ancient Judaism, pp.75, 120, 135.

48. R. Davidson, "Covenant Ideology in Ancient Israel", in 'The World of
    Ancient Israel', ed. E. Clements, Cambridge University Press, 1989,
    p.328; Cf. E.W. Nicholson, "God and His People: Covenant and Theology
    in the Old Testament", Oxford, 1986, p.43.

49. N. Gottwald, "The Tribes of Yahweh: a Sociology of the Religion of
    Liberated Israel 1250-1050 B.C., London: SCM. 1979, p.645.

50. Robert Davidson, "Covenant Ideology in Ancient Israel", in "The World
    of Ancient Israel", ed. E. Clements, p.328f.

51. N. Gottwald, "The Tribes of Yahweh", p.692.

52. G.E. Mendenhall, "Covenant Forms in Israelite Tradition", BA, 26,
    1953, p.51.

53. L. Perlitt, "Bundestheologie im Alten Testament", p.260-70; E.W.
    Nicholson, "God and His People", p.153.

54. E.W. Nicholson, "God and His People", p.81.

55. D.J. McCarthy, "Treaty and Covenant", Analecta Biblica 21, Rome:
    Biblical Institute; 2nd ed. 1987.

56. R. Davidson, "Covenant Ideology in Ancient Israel", in "The World of
    Ancient Israel", ed. by R.E. Clements, 1989, p.332.

57. D.J. McCarthy, "Treaty and Covenant", 1978, pp.254, 295; "Covenant
    in the Old Testament: The Present State of Inquiry", CBQ, 27, 1965,
    p.217; E.W. Nicholson, "God and His People", pp.60, 126.

58. D.J. McCarthy, "Treaty and Covenant", p69.

59. Ibid, p.186.

60. M. Weinfeld, "Covenant", DOT II, p.157; cf. R. Davidson, "Covenant
    Ideology", p.333.

61. M. Weinfeld, "Traces of Treaty Formulae in Deuteronomy", Biblica 41,
    1965, pp.417-27; "Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School", Oxford
    1972, pp.116 ff.

62. R. Davidson, "Covenant Ideology in Ancient Israel", in "The World of
    Ancient Israel", p.333.

63. M. Weinfeld, "Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School", pp.157ff; R.
    Davidson, "Covenant Ideology in Ancient Israel" in "The World of
    Ancient Israel", ed. R.E. Clements, p.333; A.D.H. Mayes, "Deuteronomy"
    London, 1979, p.37.

64. E.W. Nicholson, "God and His People". pp.77, 109 ff.

65. A.D.H. Mayes, "Deuteronomy", p.45; see also E.W. Nicholson, "God and
    His People", p.77.

66. Ibid. 79; R. Davidson, "Covenant Ideology in Ancient Israel", p.335.

67. E.W. Nicholson, "God and His People", p.79f.

68. Ibid, p.79.

69. J. Wellhausen, "Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel", Mass: Peter Smith, 1973, pp.417-19; L. Perlitt, "Bundestheologie in Alten Testament", WMANT 36, 1969.

CHAPTER FOUR

COVENANT AS A LATE THEOLOGICAL IDEA

With the Hittite treaty model dismissed as unncessary for our understanding of the Sinai tradition, the Assyrian treaty model which is supposed to explain how the Covenant came to be conceived (or re-conceived according to McCarthy & Weinfeld) (1) in Israel has now suffered the same fate. Obviously, the entire argument in favour of the treaty-covenant model seems to fit in reasonably with the idea of a 'pact', 'agreement' and 'relationship' which "berit" is thought to contain. (2)

On the basis of his thorough investigation of the meaning of "berit", E. Kutsch argues that the word is nowhere employed in the sense of an agreement (Bund) between Yahweh and Israel, Yahweh and Abraham, etc. It is used only in two senses: (A) In the sense of Yahweh's self-obligation, i.e. His promise to another like Noah (Gen.9:8-17), Abraham (Gen.15:18), the three anscestors (Ex.2:24; 6:4-5; Lev.26:42, 45; Deut. 4:31; 7:12; 8:18; Ps.105:8, 10; Neh.9:8), David (II Sam.23:1-5; Jer.33:21; Ps.89) and the priesthood (Num.18:19; 25:12 f.; Jer.33:21; Mal.2:4 f.).   The word "berit" has the same meaning in other passages (e.g. Gen.6:18; Lev.26:9, 44f.; Deut.7:9; I Kings 8:23; Jer.14:21; Ezek.16:8; Pss.78:37;   106:45; 111:5, 9; Dan.9:4; Neh.1:5; 9:32). He points out that none of the above texts is early; even Gen.15 is no earlier that the late seventh century B.C. He suggests that it may be dated for the period 625-609 B.C.   Psalm 89 also comes from the late monarchical period, whereas II.Sam. 23:1-7 is from the middle of the sixth century B.C. (B) "Berit" is also used in the

sense of an obligation imposed by Yahweh upon Israel - and therefore of the law, whether in general or a particular law - he again finds it extensively attested.   He finds this especially in Deuteronomy/Deuteronomistic literature and in the Sinai narratives in the book of Exodus (19:3-8; 24:3-8; 34:27-28). He also finds it with this meaning in passages in P(Gen.17:9-14; 31:16); in the Holiness Code (Lev.26:15); in several prophetic books including that of Isaiah (24:5; 56:4,6); Jeremiah (11:1-17; 22:9; 31:31-34; 34:13, 18). Ezekiel (16:17,44), Hosea (8:1), as well as a number of Psalms (25:10, 14; 44:18; 50:16; 78:10; 103:18; 132:12) and also in Proverbs (2:17)   (3)   E. Kutsch goes on to argue that in style as well as in content, the use of "berit" in these texts generally, and in Exodus (19:3-8; 24:3-8; 34:27-28) in particular, displays the influence of the Deuteronomic/Deuteronomistic literature of this period. (4)

I.   DEUTERONOMIC/DEUTERONOMISTIC CORPUS: A COVENANT DOCUMENT

E. Kutsch's study of the term "berit" is regarded as undoubtedly the most thorough since Kraetzschmar's monograph in 1896. (5)   But L. Perlitt's book (Bundestheologie in Alten Testament) is the most detailed study yet of the view that the concept of "berit" became part of Israel's culture and religion only in the late period of its history. He first points out that it is in the book of Deuteronomy and in the Deuteronomistic literature of the seventh and sixth centry B.C. that the term "berit" is most expansively and intensively exployed. This corpus of literature with its intensive use of "berit" arose in response to various theological needs and crises in the life of ancient Israel. (6)

1.   After his thorough examination of other texts to determine whether

"berit" was used earlier in Israel's history, L. Perlitt's conclusion is similar to that of E. Kutsch and L. Wachter. They contend that in its theological context, the term "berit" was first applied to the divine promise of land to Abraham (Gen.15:18; 17:8). The historical background of this application was a period of national and territorial crises. Israel's continued occupation of the land was in grave doubt. In this context the strengthening of the divine promise would have reassured Israelites of the reality and certainty of their possession of the land. It is suggested that the reign of Hezekiah towards the end of the eighth century B.C. would be the suitable historical context, for Sennacherib's invasion of Judah in this period would have clearly shown the precarious nature of the Judean grip on its territory. The activities of the Deuteronomic circle in the seventh century B.C. which resulted in Deuteronomy and later in the Deuteronomistic historical work, are not far separated from this time. (7) It is also in the context of Deuteronomic theologizing that the word "berit" came to include the obligations laid upon Israel. This is evidenced by passages in Deuteronomy and Deuteronomistic history in which "berit" and "torah" are reciprocal, identical and interchangeable (Deut.29:20, 26; II Kings 23:2, 21). (8) We are now confronted with a situation in which Israel's possession of the land is strengthened by the application of the term "covenant", but at the same time this certainty is by no means a blank cheque. The flouting of the Covenant obligations does indeed result in the forfeiture of land, as in fact it did. It is therefore against the background of such national and territorial crises and disasters that Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic corpus must be understood. "By his understanding of "berit" and what it entails, the Deuteronomist was able to reinterpret the significance of the law: whereas in earlier Deuteronomic preaching the law was given for Israel's prosperity

(Deut.6:20ff.; 16:15), the Deuteronomistic generation experienced "the book of the law" in its power to bring curse, and the Deuteronomist's usage of "berit" served to highlight this. The curse of the law had been unleashed because the "berit" had been broken. For the Deuteronomist, blessing and curse were no longer alternative possibilities for Israel: blessing belonged to the past and curse to the present; it is only in late exilic additions such as Deuteronomy 30:1ff. that this calamitous situation is left behind". (9)

2.   Having traced "berit" back to an original meaning of duty or obligation, E. Kutsch denied that there was ever any theological use of the word earlier than the seventh century B.C. And with this view, L. Perlitt is in complete agreement. (10)   In fact, L. Perlitt goes further and suggests that originally the relationship between Yahweh and Israel was analogous to that between Chemosh and Moab (Judges 11:23f.), and it was prophetic opposition to this very nationalistic form of religion which led to the Deuteronomic view that Yahweh and Israel are related by Covenant. (11) Thus "berit" in its theological context was totally unknown in ancient Israel prior to Deuteronomy. Others, however, are of the opinion that the religious concept of the covenant had an earlier wide-spread currency.

Attention has been drawn to the fact that the term "berit" is absent in the writings of the prophets of the eighth century B.C., even in contexts where "berit" would seem to have been the natural word to use. (12) The exceptions are Hosea 6:7; 8:1. In response to this, W. Eichrodt argued that since the prophets were struggling "to eradicate all thought of an opus operatum, the covenant could not help them for....   the weakness inherent in it, which made it a potential danger to religious life, was

precisely its legal character, because of which it was liable to become the seed bed for parasitic "do ut des" religion". (13) This argument according to R. Davidson, has never been satisfactory "since it is not obvious that the best way to deal with a potentially misleading idea is to ignore it, particularly if the idea already has wide-spread religious currency". (14) J. Bright views this silence as stemming from the fact that "berit" had been hijacked by royal ideology, the Covenant with the Davidic dynasty, to which many prophets were opposed. (15) Others contend that the absence of the term "covenant" should not deflect us from the fact that the complex of ideas associated with such a covenant tradition was nevertheless present as "an invisible framework". Therefore, "without the prior fact of the Covenant, the prophets' words would be unintelligible to us...." (16) Moreover, attention has frequently been drawn to the "rib-form" in terms of which Yahweh brings charges against His people (Deut.32; Isa.1:1-2; Jer.2:4-13; Mic.6:1-8). Such passages frequently feature a summons to heaven and earth or to the mountains to act as witnesses in the case. Such appeals are particularly characteristic of treaty docments. Thus the label, "Covenant lawsuit", was commonly attached to such passages, with the God of the Covenant bringing charges against His rebellious people on the analogy of the imperial overlord bringing charges against his rebellious vassal-states. (17) Thus, like Moses, the prophets were acting as Covenant mediators, proclaiming the demands of the Covenant to the people which are reflected in the oracular words in such passages as (Pss.50:7-15; 81:6-14. They were also able to bring the "Covenant lawsuit" against a rebellious people and pronounced a threatening curse upon the disobedient. J. Muilenburg could describe the prophets as those "sent from the divine King (Yahweh), the suzerain of the treaties, to reprove and pronounce judgement upon Israel for breach of the Covenant.... We no longer speak of Moses

or the prophets, or the law and prophecy, but rather of Moses and the prophets". (18)

3.   The above-mentioned arguments which present us with the eighth century prophetic preaching as presupposing an already extant Covenant theology, have recently been strongly challenged by other scholars like L. Perlitt, W. McKane and A. Phillips. (19) The most prominent and continuingly influential challenge to this view is to be found in L. Perlitt's literary-critical study (Bundestheologie in Alten Testament). In this work, L. Perlitt argues that the prophets of the eighth century, including Hosea, never employed the term "berit" for Yahweh's relationship with Israel. Thus with L. Perlitt we are back to the position of J. Wellhausen. (20) All attempts, therefore, to find a covenantal background or basis for what they preached or elements of what they preached is in the face of this absence of the word itself. (21) For instance, Amos never mentions the themes of Sinai and Covenant. He does, however, refer to the forty years in the wilderness (5:25) which would have given him ample opportunity to mention "Covenant", but he does not. He dwells on Yahweh's ancient dealings on behalf of His people like the deliverance from Egypt, the gift of the land and His gracious turning to them (2:10; 3:2; 9:7ff). But, as H.W. Wolff observed, these were recalled by him "exclusively for the purpose of demonstrating guilt". (22) Amos spoke "neither of Yahweh's justice or His faithfulness, nor of His Covenant or His law. Amos nowhere "kindled any genuine hope", but announced the end of Israel; such a message afforded no room to a return and appeal to a Covenant". (23)

In the case of Micah and Isaiah we find no difference. The former nowhere employs the term "berit", and it is totally unacceptable to read

Micah 6:1-8 as a "Covenant lawsuit" between Yahweh and Israel, since Ver.8 does not say "that the people should live up to the Covenant obligations". (24) It rather refers to a general ethic addressed to "man". After all, we must bear in mind that the entire passage (6:1-8) is a secondary addition to the sayings of the prophet. When we come to Isaiah, we find the term "berit" used in 28:15, 48. Here the word is used simply in the sense of Israel's reliance upon the effectiveness of human treaties. The phrase "we have made a covenant with death" is the prophet's way of saying that in such reliance lies death, whilst in Yahweh alone is Israel's true security. (25) K. Galling goes too far in finding in this passage an implied contrast between this "Covenant with death" and a covenant with Yahweh which leads to life. (25) Isaiah 1:2f also cannot be taken as indicative of a "Covenant lawsuit", for the imagery here is that of a father and his rebellious sons and not of Yahweh as a covenant partner. To assume that all such images convey the expressions of a covenant relationship would certainly be at the cost of the rich and varied imagery employed in the Old Testament for Yahweh's relationship with Israel. (26)

In the book of Hosea, the term "berit" is to be found in 6:7; 8:1. (27) Obviously, 6:7 is quite enigmatic and has been amended to read, "at Adam they broke the berit; there they were treacherous against me". (28) This text does not refer to a breach of a covenant with Yahweh, but to the breaking of a treaty with some other group or nation at a place called Adam. That it is described in the second part of the text as treachery against Yahweh, is simply because such a treaty would have been made by an oath taken by Israel in Yahweh's name. It was therefore not only treachery against the other treaty partner, but also against Yahweh Himself. Hos.8:1.

does in fact present us with the explicit reference to Yahweh's Covenant with Israel, but this text is, in any case, a secondary, Deuteronomistic addition. (29)

4. Appeal has been made to the Sinai narratives in Exodus 19-24, 32 and 34 and finally to Joshua 24. J. Muilenburg, for example, considers Ex.19:3ff. as "the fons et origo of the many covenantal periscopes which appear throughout the Old Testament". (30) Yet, the recent scholarly research seems to challenge this assumption on the basis that this passage is "an amalgam of Deuteronomistic, priestly and prophetic elements which point either to the late exilic, or early post-exilic periods". (31) However, L. Perlitt finds striking similarities in structure and language between Exodus 19:3-8 and 24:3, 7, which, he argues, come from a Deuteronomistic hand. This was C.F. Whitley's position six years earlier. (32)

Exodus 24:1-2, 9-11 has also been widely regarded as representing the makings of a Covenant. In fact, this passage has no covenant connection but is concerned only with a remarkable visio dei which was granted to the elders of Israel on Mount Sinai. The "Community" between God and Israel was here established precisely through His gracious theophany. It is by no means a "Covenant relationship". The meal mentioned in the final statement of this passage, "they ate and drank", is not celebrated with God, but in His presence or before Him. "It is not the heart of the scene described, but rather presupposes what the centre of the scene, God's appearance, and is the expression of the joy of those who thus experienced this theophany". (33) Yet, one passage should not escape our attention: Exodus 24:8. It is argued that the phrase "the blood of the Covenant" in this text cannot be taken as an expression of Deuteronomic or Deuteronomistic belief. It is

therefore of a pre-Deuteronomic origin. (34)   In his intensive examination
of Ex.24:4-6, 8, L. Perlitt takes only the description of the offering of
sacrifices in vv. 4-5 as being an independent unit and of ancient   origin.
It begins with Moses building an altar and concludes with v.6. The entire
material in vv. 4-6 is a self-contained account of sacrificial offering, no
more no less, which requires no accompanying words whether delivered orally
or read. (35)   He further opines that the one half of the blood cast
against the altar was simply a cultic practice, the remainder being placed
in basins and disposed of. According to him, no one has been able to
associate these basins with a covenant ritual. Further, the other half of
the blood is no longer mentioned in v.8 which refers simply to the blood,
that is, all the blood. This text, Perlitt argues, is a secondary addition
construing the sacrificial offering in v.6 as a covenant rite.   Its
concluding phrase, "in accordance with these words", betrays its dependence
upon the terminology of vv.3 and 7, and with them v.8 too must belong to a
Deuteronomistic redactor of the post-exilic period. His aim was simply to
recast the Old Testament tradition in vv.4-6 to make it read as a covenant-
making. (36)   No doubt, one cannot ignore the strength of Perlitt's
argument despite his tendency to pedantry with regard to v.6. However, E.
Zenger avoids this difficulty and considers v.6 as belonging also to a
Deuteronomistic redactor.   According to him, what is described in v.6
simply paves the way for the ritual in v.8 which comes from the same
redactor. (37)

As for Exodus 32 and 34:10-28, they are relatively late and provide no
testimony to more ancient Covenant tradition. It is also argued that the
Deuteronomic hand is quite discernible in these passages. (38) Joshua 24
is obviously of exilic origin. It is a Deuteronomistic narrative

"concerned with the judgement that has deservedly fallen on Israel because of its faithlessness to the Covenant". (39)

II   JEREMIAH AND THE DEUTERONOMISTS

According to Jer.1:2; cf. 25:3, Jeremiah embarked upon his prophetic career in the thirteenth year of Josiah's reign (627 B.C.).(40) A few years later (621 B.C.), the King's reform was in full progress and the pagan legacy of Menasseh's reign was being violently dismantled. What Jeremiah thought of Josiah's reform and what his stance was in relation to what the Deuteronomists were attempting to do, is a question that has provoked the widest differences of opinion. In fact, it is a question to which the book of Jeremiah itself provides no clear answer. We certainly know that the reform took place at the initiative of King Josiah and in solemn covenant with the elders and notables of Judah (II Kings 23:1-3), and therefore hardly needed the evangelising activities of a young and relatively unknown prophet to ensure its nation-wide acceptance. Apart from this, we are almost entirely in the region of conjecture.

1. We may suppose, for instance, as does J. Bright, that Jermiah's preaching may well have helped to prepare the climate for reform, and when it came, he could not possibly have ignored it or, even worse, opposed it. Yet, others opine that this was unthinkable. Jeremiah could not have been in favour of the Deuteronomic reform because he was basically opposed to sacrifices and indeed to all forms of recognised worship. His conception of religion was inner and individual. (42)   This position is hardly convincing.   J. Skinner observed that "the disinclination to admit even a temporary co-operation of Jeremiah with the Deuteronomists rests less

on exegesis of particular texts than on the broad ground that his insight into the nature of religion makes it inconceivable that he could ever have had any sympathy with an attempt to convert the nation by forcible change in its form of worship. (43) It is therefore impossible to assume that Jeremiah should have disapproved of the reform. Indeed, to do this would be tantamount to assuming that he wished the pre-reformation conditions to continue. His early preaching was primarily directed vigorously against the pagan prectices which had filled the land, the very practices which the reform was now removing. Moreoever, his expressed admiration for King Josiah (Jer.22:15-16) would have been meaningless had he regarded that King's major official action as a deplorable error, if not a sin. We know also of more than one occasion on which the Deuteronomic sympathizers took the prophet's part and even were instrumental in saving his life (Jer.26:7ff.; 38:1ff.). This certainly tells us nothing directly of Jeremiah's attitude toward the reform, but it tells us something about the Deuteronomic sympathizers' attitude towards Jeremiah. Far from regarding him as an enemy, they had at least a degree of sympathy with what he had to say. Whatever his view of the reform and its results came in retrospect to be, he must initially have approved of its essential aims. (44) It is most likely that at one time he joined in the fervour with which the reform was enforced, which led to his family losing their shrine in Anathoth and thereby earned the hostility of his kinsfolk (Jer.11:18-19, 21; 12:6). (45) Later, he perceived the moral and spiritual redundancy of this reform and therefore condemned its insufficiency (Jer. 8:8).

2. In a neatly rationalized account, J. Skinner shows how Jeremiah at first went part of the way with the Deuteronomists (just as a woman may sometimes need to be engaged to a man to discover that she cannot marry

him), but eventually realised that his spirit was quite different from this. (46) Two important parties were keenly interested in the promotion of this particular reform: (A) The Temple Priesthood, which despite all its lapses from the pure service of Yahweh had been noted for their loyalty to the national religious institutions and had already been instrumental in implementing important measures of reform. This was demonstrated by the action of Hilkiah and his fellow-priests in giving publicity to the new law-book. (47) (B) The Prophetic Circle, which had kept the ideals of Isaiah alive, and had always longed to see Hezekiah's scheme of centralization come to fruition, also made its contribution. The support of the prophetic party may be deduced from the response of the prophetess Huldah to Josiah's anxious inquiry (II Kgs.22:15-20). But from the beginning this reform seems to have had the seed of dissolution in its bosom. The priesthood was interested mainly in the positive idea of centralization and soon came to emphasize the ritual element of the law, to the neglect of its moral and spiritual requirements. The prophetically minded dwelt more on the negative side, the abolition of the local shrines and could not acquiesce in any undue exaggeration of ceremonial. (48) The superficiality of the reform soon became apparent, and Jeremiah, as J. Skinner comments, "began to suspect the inherent impotence of the legal method of dealing with national sin. At a later time he detected a worse evil in the new-born spirit of self-reighteousness based on a formal acceptance of the covenant and an outward compliance with its demands." (49) On this basis, the prophet began to withdraw from involvement in the Deuteronomic movement.

3. J. Skinner has described Jeremiah's early relationship with the Deuteronomists in terms of a woman who needed to be engaged to a man to

discover that she cannot marry him. (50) But in retrospect, it seems that in this case the man has decided after all that come what may the marriage will take place. This is abundantly clear from the fact that the book of Jeremiah underwent heavy Deuteronomistic editing. Thus the Deuteronomists could claim continuity links between their ideology and theology and the preaching of Jeremiah. (51) Certain clues in the book of Jeremiah may induce us to believe that the characteristic feature of his prophecies during his troubled and tragic period was one of doom and destruction. The fall of Assyria evoked in him no sense of gratification, and Josiah's reform did not satisfy him in the end. (52) Moreover, the national tendency to rest on the formal fact of the Covenant transaction as a sufficient pledge of Yahweh's favour, to the neglect of its ethical content, may well have led him to oppose the whole idea of a covenant based on a written law.

However, some argue that Jeremiah must have advocated the acceptance of some covenant at some stage in his career (Jer.11:1ff). (53) This passage is in fact an undated prose in which Jeremiah is described as publicly endorsing a covenant, which has been regarded as referring either to the Josian reform (II Kgs.23.2f), or to the Sinai Covenant (Ex.19-24; Deut.5-9). (54) In any case, the passage in question is obviously a Deuteronomic/Deuteronomistic composition, (55) and it is not difficult to note the familiar Deuteronimic/Deuteronomistic phrases in Jeremiah 11:1ff: v.3 "The curse of the Covenant", Deut.27:26; v.4 "to command the Covenant", Deut.4:13; 6:7; v.5 "fulfil the oath which I swore to your fathers", Deut.7:12-13; v.8 "walk in the stubborness of his evil heart", Deut.29:19; v.4 "iron furnace", Deut.4:20; I Kgs.8:51.

Apparently, therefore, the Deuteronomists were strongly determined to represent Jeremiah as the standard-bearer and especially the spokesman of their Covenant thesis, travelling around the countryside preaching the terms of the obligation laid on his people. (56)

4. When we look at Jer.31:31-34, we are faced with a passage which stands firmly within the Sinai Covenant tradition. The Covenant in this particular passage is projected by way of continuity and contrast into an unspecified future, there to find fulfilment. (57) The God-Israel relationship is now to continue on the basis of a "new Covenant". Whatever the theological content of this "new Covenant" passage may be, it clearly confirms the bilateral nature of Yahweh's covenant with Israel. As it is in the nature of the Covenant that it could be annulled, so it has been annulled by Israel and rendered obsolete (v.32). (58) This is exactly how the writer to the Hebrews in the New Testament understood this passage (Heb.8:13). The Hebrew term employed in v.32 is הֵפֵרוּ. This term does not convey the idea that Israel transgressed the Covenant stipulations for which it would be punished and finally restored to fellowship with Yahweh, but rather Israel's transgressions have been such that the Covenant has been brought to nought, and with this Israel's standing as Yahweh's people. (59) The situation therefore demanded the creation of a "new Covenant" for the continuance of relationship between God and His people.

The authorship and significance of this passage have been a matter of much debate among Old Testament scholars. For example, scholars like Hyatt,

Rudolph and to some extent Bright, have argued that the passage is a genuine Jeremianic piece. The latter could write: "As regards its authenticity, it ought never to have been questioned. Although the passage may not represent the prophet's ipsissima verba it represents what might well be the high point of his theology. It is certainly one of the profoundest and most moving passages in the Bible." (60) On the other hand there are those like Böhmer, Nicholson, Carroll and Soggin who advocate a post-exilic date and even question the profundity of this passage. (61) And one suspects that this body of opinion is increasingly influential which views this passage as secondary and from a Deuteronomistic hand. ' It certainly remains a popular piece for analysis and exegesis. (62) It seems, however, that the weight of the argument in this debate is in favour of the view that the idea of the Covenant in Jeremiah's oracles generally, and in 31:31-34 in particular, comes from the pen of the Deuteronomistic redactor. (63) Moreoever, this particular passage is in fact the second of a series of three appendices to the book of Consolation (30:5-31:22) introduced by the phrase "Behold, the days are coming" (31:27, 31, 38). They are written in prose, have many elements alien to the Jeremianic core and include clear Deuteronomistic phrasings. (64) The term and concept of "berit" are very much at home in the Deuteronomistic literature and ideology. Jeremiah, therefore, is presented as a preacher of the Covenant because, for the Deuteronomistic school working during the exile, that is what he must have been, and indeed he is made to perform such a role. (65) In any case, the Deuteronomic/Deuteronomistic use of "berit" which always involves obligations between two parties, which can be either kept or broken, has now in Jer.31:31-34 been transformed into a metaphor for a Utopian society which does not, and cannot exist, but which provides fertile ground for new movements, which far transcend anything envisaged

in the Jeremianic tradition. (66)   It remains, therefore, extremely
doubtful if Jeremiah was ever keen on the idea of the Covenant which
obviously became, during his time, a potential danger to the religious life
of the Judean nation. Moreover, nowhere does he ever mention Abraham or
allude to a Covenant connection with him. Most of all, the whole complex
of ideas associated with the tradition of the election of Zion and the
Covenant with David seems to have been totally alien to him.   It plays
virtually no role in his thinking, save in a negative way. (67)   He
explicitly places the Mosaic law far above the election of Zion and the
Davidic Covenant.

III   THE ABRAHAM AND DAVIDIC COVENANT TRADITIONS.

It has widely been recognised that the tradition of the Abrahamic
Covenant has developed independently of, and reflects a different ethos
from that of the Sinai tradition. (68)   There are two narrative accounts of
Yahweh's covenant with Abraham. One is in Genesis 15 commonly assigned to
the J source, and the other in Genesis 17 assigned to the P source. The
covenant in these two accounts is presented as being unilateral, although
some like Kraetzschmar and Kutsch view the term "berit" in Genesis 17 as
being used in the sense of an obligation imposed by God upon Abraham and
his descendants. (69) But according to most scholars it is still God's
covenant, and its unilateral character is well attested by the phrase וַהֲקִמֹתִי
"I will 'establish' my covenant" (v.7), the description of the covenant as
"everlasting" and the promise that "kings shall come forth from you". (v.6)
This covenant is in essence "a binding promise – or better a promissory
oath – on the part of God". (70) Moreover, the Abrahamic covenant seems to
have clear links with that of Yahweh's covenant with the Davidic dynasty

(II Sam.7:8-16; Pss. 89:29, 30,37; 132:11-12). In this case the one must have influenced the other, depending on which came first.

1.   It appears that G.E. Mendenhall was the first to draw attention to the fact that in its essential features, the Davidic covenant follows the pattern of Yahweh's covenant with Abraham. (71) Other prominent scholars were soon to pursue this subject in some detail, prominent among them is R.E. Clements. (72) The latter put forward the argument that there was a two way relationship between the Abraham and Davidic covenant traditions. The form of the Davidic covenant, which he dates to no later than the Solomonic reign, was a piece of covenant theology which proved to be eminently successful in establishing the claim of the Davidic house over Israel, "and was influenced by the recollection in Jerusalem of the ancient covenant with Abraham". (73) He agrees with A. Caquot and R. Carlson that it is perfectly possible that the Yahwist's account of the covenant with Abraham in Gen.15 has itself been moulded by the form of Yahweh's covenant with David as part of a conscious attempt to relate the two. (74) But unlike Caquot, he does not venture to suggest that Gen.15 originated from the Jerusalem Court circle in the post-Davidic period. Without being specific, he simply states that "the earliest written account of the Abrahamic covenant stems from the post-Davidic age". (75) However, there is every indication to suggest a reciprocal influence of the two covenant traditions. If the ancient memory of the covenant with Abraham served to influence the theology of the Davidic covenant, there are also traces in Gen.15 of royal motifs which suggest that Gen.15 has been influenced by the Jerusalem Court theology.

The nucleus of the Abraham tradition is to be found in Gen.15:7-21.

This section, with the exception of the interpolation vs. 13-16 (76) and 18b, 20-21, is a unity and comes from the Yahwistic hand which Clements dates, along with the Yahwist's work as a whole, to the tenth century B.C. It describes Yahweh's promise to Abraham and his descendants of the land of "the Kenizzites and the Kadmonites" (v.19), which was clearly in Southern Canaan. A later editor, however, stretched this original promise of land to cover the frontiers of the Davidic empire (Gen.15:18b, 20-21; compare II Sam.8;3; I Kgs. 4:21; 8:65). Thus, the Yahwist presents us with a patriarchal promise that was simply foretelling the rise of the Israelite empire under David, or as Mendenhall puts it, "The covenant with Abraham was the 'prophecy' and that with David the 'fulfilment'". (78)

2. Another important point in the relationship between the Abraham and Davidic covenant traditions, was the close geographical link between David and Hebron (II Sam.5:1-3) and Abraham and the sanctuary of Mamre which was slightly north of Hebron (Gen.13:18; 23:19). (79) The fact that the shrine of Mamre was the focus of the tradition of the covenant with Abraham, provides therefore a basis for recognising that a link was seen in Israel between David adn the ancestral figure of Abraham. (80) It is also argued that this Abraham covenant tradition was part of the Caleb-Judah traditions. (81) However, the original deity involved in the Abrahamic covenant was probably the El of Mamre, and the covenant as a divine gift would initially have involved obligations on the part of Abraham. The obligation of Jacob was the offering of tithes to El-Bethel at Bethel (Gen.28:22), and Abraham himself felt obligated to offer tithes to El Elyon at Jerusalem (Gen.14:20). Apparently, "the Yahwist in his literary presentation of the Abraham covenant was concerned for reasons of his own to heighten the emphasis upon divine promise, so that it is

understandable that any reference to this obligation should have dropped out". Thus, "in referring this covenant to the political and religious situation of his own age, the Yahwist reinforced its promissory character by omitting any reference to the corresponding obligations which it involved. From being a local institution it was transformed into a promise of Israel's future greatness". (82) The Abram covenant tradition has, therefore, been skilfully squeezed into the mould of that of the Davidic tradition (II Sam. 7:8-16; Ps.89:1ff).

It has been suggested, moreover, that while Genesis 15, reflects the Yahwist theology, "its picture of the covenant with Abraham is influenced by covenant ideology already existing in Canaan and we may compare the reference to the temple of El-Berit at Shechem (Judges 9:4,46). (83) The problem with this argument is that it is not clear what the significance of the title Baal-Berit was, although his shrine at Shechem indicates certain associations with covenant theology. (84) Even if we accept the view of Kaufmann and De Vaux that Yahweh and El Berit (or Baal-Berit) were somehow regarded as identical in the pre-monarchical period, (85) it is not clear what the significance of the title El-Berit was. Does it mean that the deity was a party to the covenant, or just a witness to it? The latter is most likely the case, since in ancient Near East treaty documents, gods figure so frequently as witnesses who watched over the enforcement of the obligations contracted in covenants, and who punished offending parties. (86) In this case, the role of Baal-Berit, as R. Kraetschmar observed, was that of a witness to the treaty between Shechem and a number of other Canaanite city states. (87) Similarly, and indeed significantly, it was at Shechem that Joshua made a covenant with the Israelite tribes which was

witnessed by a stone, purporting to embody the divine presence (Jos.24:25-26). (88) Moreover, as L. Perlitt points out, (v.25a) consists only in Israel's oath of loyalty to serve Yahweh alone. The term "berit" here is not a bond "Bund" between two partners, Yahweh and Israel, but an obligation (Verpflichtung) placed upon Israel by Joshua. As for (v.25b), it is a later interpretative interpolation reflecting a time when the Deuteronomic preaching had already found expression in literature. (89) It is, therefore, difficult to see how the Abram covenant tradition in Gen.15 could have been influenced in any way by the covenant ideology which was associated with Shechem.

3.   Some scholars have argued that the Abram tradition was the source rather than the object of influence. On this basis, R.E. Clements was able to argue that this tradition directly influenced the development of the Davidic covenant, and that the Yahwist author saw in this ancient Abram tradition an expression of the divine providence which pointed forward to the emergence of the great Davidic empire. It has also been suggested that the description of the Abram covenant as "everlasting" and the promise that "kings shall come forth from you" in Gen.17:5-7 (P) have clear links with the tradition of the Davidic covenant. (90)   According to R.E. Clements, Gen.17 (P) is a later account and a revised form of Gen.15 (J). A careful comparison of the two accounts shows that Gen.17 (P) is not the result of an independent historical tradition, but is the result of theological reflection upon the earlier narrative. (91)   The complete collapse of the Davidic monarchy under the Babylonians had shattered the straightforward political interpretation of the terms of the Davidic covenant as an everlasting covenant, guaranteeing that David's dynasty would always provide the kings of Israel. From now on the continuing belief in Yahweh's

everlasting covenant with David would only be justified by the expectation of an eschatological Messiah, or by the radical reinterpretation of it in terms of the entire Jewish people (Isa.55:3). (92) There is little doubt therefore that the Priestly account of the Abrahamic covenant in Gen.17 was influenced by the tradition which viewed the Davidic covenant as having a permanent validity. The intention of the Priestly author now was to recast the earlier Abrahamic covenant in Gen.15 (J) and present it as no more than the covenant of Israel. This covenant is now described as "everlasting" (v.7). There is a further indication in v.6 (P) of the connection of the Abrahamic covenant with the Davidic monarchy, which points to the dependence of (P) upon (J). In Gen.15:5 Yahweh promises Abraham that he will be the father of a multitude of descendants. This promise is repeated in Gen.17:5-6a (P) and further elaborated by the assertion "and kings shall come forth from you" (v.6b). Obviously, the Priestly author was aware of a link between the Abrahamic and Davidic covenants, and was concerned only to root Israel's entire life, including its monarchy, in the divine promise made to Abraham. Thus, the Abrahamic account in Gen.17 (P) has a purely theological significance, and no longer an institutional one as in Gen.15 (J). (93.

4. The date and provenance of the Abrahamic covenant tradition have been widely discussed and the arguments have, to some extent, followed the pattern previously mentioned in our discussion of the Sinai traditions. (A) There are those, like W. Zimmerli, A. Alt, D. Hillers and J. Bright, who view Gen.15 (J) as preserving a ritual which originally belonged to the secular realm. This ritual (vs.9-10, 17) was adapted to refer to a covenant between God and Abraham, and this religious adaptation was certainly pre-Deuteronomic. (94) If this is so, then why were the pre-exilic prophets

as well and the pre-exilic cult (95) silent concerning the Abrahamic covenant? According to R.E. Clements, those pre-exilic prophets who made a strong appeal to the Davidic covenant as a basis for Israel's privileged position under Yahweh had no need to appeal behind this to the covenant with Abraham. The significance of the latter was implied by the existence of the former. It was only when "the continuance of the Davidic monarchy was placed in doubt through Judah's political misfortunes that the occasion arose for a renewed emphasis upon the divine promises made in the ancient covenant with Abraham". (96) But if the pre-exilic prophets were silent concerning the covenant with Abraham simply because they regarded the Davidic covenant of far greater importance, then one wonders why the Deuteronomist(s), for example, did not do the same, since the patriarchal covenant in their theology was subordinate to that of Horeb. Obviously, Deuteronomy developes the traditions of both the patriarchal and the Horeb covenants, it relates them to each other in a way which showed the greater significance attached to the latter. Yet the tradition of the covenant with Abraham is not ignored. (97) It is therefore hardly possible that this covenant tradition could have been ignored by the pre-exilic prophets and the pre-exilic cult, had it really been widely known in their time. (B) In recent years there has been a marked tendency to place the origins of the Abraham traditions in the exilic period, (98) a position well favoured by the advocates of the antiquity and primacy of the Davidic covenant, and which according to M. Noth and L. Perlitt was a late innovation. (99) However, the first to challenge Alt's view of the antiquity of the covenant in Genesis 15:7-21 was J. Hoftijzer. In his monograph published in 1956, Hoftijzer argued that the Abrahamic tradition in Gen.15 arose at a time when Israel felt that its occupation of the land was in jeopardy. This was in the late period of the monarchy or even during the exile. (100) At

first his views made virtually no impact, and it was not until more recent years that an increasing number of scholars have again begun to question the antiquity of Gen.15. (101) Prominent among these scholars is L. Perlitt who, not only agrees with Hoftijzer's dating of Gen.15 and the territorial crises it reflects, but views the entire covenant between God and Abraham in this chapter as being no more than a proto-Deuteronomic formula emanating from this period. (102)

15. J. Bright, "Covenant and Promise", 1977, p.79; R. Davidson, "Covenant Ideology in Ancient Israel", pp 329-30

16. D.R. Hillers, "Covenant: The History of a Biblical Idea", 1969, p.140; R.E. Clements, "Prophecy and Covenant", SBT 43, London, 1965, p.126.

17. H.B. Huffmon, "The Covenant Lawsuit in the Prophets", JBL 78, 1959, pp.285ff.; G.E. Wright, "The Lawsuit of God: A Forum-Critical Study of Deuteronomy 32", from "Israel's Prophetic Heritage", eds. B.W. Anderson and W. Harrelson, London: SCM, pp. 26-67, R. Davidson, "Covenant Ideology in Ancient Israel", p.330.

18. J. Muilenburg, "The Office of the Prophet in Ancient Israel", in "The Bible in Modern Scholarship", ed. J.P. Hyatt, Nashville: Abingdon, 1965, p.97; D.R. Hillers, "Treaty Curses and the Old Testament Prophets", Biblica et Orientalia 16, Rome: Biblical Institute, 1964, pp.43-79.

19. L. Perlitt, "Bundestheologie in Alten Testament"; W. McKane, "Prophecy and the Prophetic Literature", in "Tradition and Interpretation", ed. by G.W. Anderson, Oxford, Clarendon, 1979, pp.163-88; A. Phillips, "Prophecy and Law", in "Israel's Prophetic Traditions", eds. R.J. Coggins, M.A. Knibb and A. Phillips, Cambridge, CUP, 1982, pp.217-32.

20. J. Wellhausen, "Prolegomena", p.418; E. W. Nicholson, "God and His People", p.115.

21. Ibid, p. 115.

22. H.W. Wolff, "Amos", BKAT XIV/2, Neukirchen 1967, p.123; Et. trs. "Joel and Amos", Philadelphia, 1977, p.102.

23. L. Perlitt, "Bundestheologie", p.136, citing H.W. Wolff, p.101f.

24. L. Perlitt, p.137 in response against H.B. Huffmon, "The Covenantal Lawsuit in the Prophets", JBL 78, 1958, p.287.

25. K.Galling, "Die Erwählungstraditionen Israels", p.137, in response to this see E.W. Nicholson, "God and His People", p.115.

26. Ibid, p.115.

27. According to E.W. Nicholson, "berit" is used five times (2:20; 6:7, 8:1; 10:4; 12:2) but most of these refer to Yahweh's covenant relationship with Israel. See "God and His People", p.116.

28. L. Perlitt, "Bundestheologie", p.142, following J. Wellhausen, "Die Kleinen Propheten übersetzt und erklärt", Berlin, 1892, fourth edition 1963. Adam is probably to be identified with an area in the Jordan valley (Josh. 3:16), modern Tell ed-Damiye.

29. J. Wellhausen, "Prolegomena", p.418; L. Perlitt, "Bundestheologie", p.142; E.W. Nicholson, "God and His People", p.116.

30. J. Muilenburg, "The Form and Structure of the Covenantal Formulations", VT9 (1959) 347-65; R.A. Oden, "The Place of Covenant in the Religion of Israel", in "Ancient Israelite Religion", eds. P.D. Miller, P.D. Hanson and S.D. McBride, Philadelphia: Fortress 1987, p.234. K. Baltzer's study of Joshua 24, Exodus 19-34 suggests to him that the genre of the covenant formula was unknown in Israel prior to the emergence of Deuteronomy, see "The Covenant Formulary", Philadelphia: Fortress Press 1971, pp.13-38.

31. R. Davidson, "Covenant Ideology in Ancient Israel" in "The World of Ancient Israel", ed. R.E. Clements; cf. L. Perlitt, "Bundestheologie" pp.167ff.; E.W. Nicholson, "God and His People", pp.117, 167; C. Brekelmans, "Die sogenannten deuteronomischen elemente in Gen-Num", VTS 15, 1966, 90-6.See Auld's book on "Joshua, MOSES & THE LAND."

32. L. Perlitt, "Bundestheologie", p.192; E.W. Nicholson, "God and His People", p.167; C.F. Whitley also saw heavy Deuteronomistic editing or composition in these passages, thus concluding, "We may doubt if there was any notion of such a covenant before Deuteronomic times", see his "Covenant and Commandments in Israel", JNES 22 (1963), pp.37-48.

33. E.W. Nicholson, "God and His People", p.116-117; also his article "The Interpretation of Exodus XXIV 9-11, VT 24, 1974, pp.77-97; A.D.H. Mayes, "Deuteronomy", p.66.

34. A.D.H. Mayes, "Deuteronomy", p.67, R. Davidson, "Covenant Ideology in Ancient Israel", in "The World of Ancient Israel", ed. R.E. Clements, p.336.

35. L. Perlitt, "Bundestheologie", p.192.

36. Ibid, p.198f. E.W. Nicholson, "God and His People", pp.167f.

37. E. Zenger, "Die Sinaitheophanie:Untersuchungen zum jahwistischen und elohistischen Geschichtswerk", Forschung zur Bibel 2, Wurzburg 1971, pp.165ff.; for a response to E. Zenger's point of view see, E.W. Nicholson, "God and His People", p.170f.

38. Ibid. 117; R. Davidson, "Covenant Ideology in Ancient Israel", in "The World of Ancient Israel", ed. R.E. Clements, p. 336.

39. Ibid. 336; also "God and His People", p.161.

40. The vast majority of scholars accept this date as correct. Other scholars, e.g. J. P. Hyatt, IB, Vol.5, 1956, pp.779f; W.L. Holladay, "Jeremiah: Spokesman Out of Time", Philadelphia, 1974, pp.16ff.; J. Bright, "Covenant and Promise", p.143.

41. Ibid. p.143; R. Carroll, "From Chaos to Covenant", SCM 1981, p.97.

42. R.H. Kennett, "Deuteronomy and the Decalogue", 1920, pp.12-16; "The Church of Israel", 1933, pp.81-85, and also p.34; Against this view see F.C. Burkitt, "The Date of Deuteronomy", JTS 22, L92L, P.63.

43. J. Skinner, "Prophecy and Religion: Studies in the Life of Jeremiah", Cambridge, 1963, p.105.

44. J. Bright, "Covenant and Promise", p.143f.

45. R. Carroll, "From Chaos to Covenant", p.98; J. Skinner, "Prophecy and Religion", p.106, 109f.; Against this view see J.P. Hyatt, IB, Vol.5, 1956, pp.779-80; S.R. Hopper, IB. Vol.5, 1956, pp.911-13.

46. J. Skinner, "Prophecy and Religion", p.106; R. Carroll, "From Chaos to Covenant", p.97; H.H. Rowley, "Men of God", New York, 1963, p.165; cf. N.K. Gottwald, "A Light to the Nations", 1959, p.356.

47. H.H. Rowley, "From Moses to Qumran", p.195; J. Skinner, "Prophecy and Religion", p.95.

48. Ibid. p.106.

49. Ibid. 106, also pp.95-96.

50. Ibid, p.106.

51. R. Carroll, "From Chaos to Covenant", p.105.

52. Y. Kaufmann, "The Religion of Israel", p.410.

53. J.G.S. Thomson, (The New Bible Dictionary, ed. by J.D. Douglas, 1962, p.606) thinks that this passage may well refer to Jeremiah's advocacy of Josiah's reforms. For the view that it is simply editorial, see B. Duhm, "Das Buch Jeremia", 1901, pp.106-8; C. Cornill, "Das Buch Jeremia", 1905, pp.143-45.

54. For a discussion on this point see W. Rudolph, "Jeremia", HAT, 1968, pp.77-81, cf. R. Carroll, "From Chaos to Covenant", p.96.

55. J. Blenkinsopp, "A History of Prophecy in Israel", SPCK, 1984, p.161, For a discussion on this point see W. Thiel, "Die Deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia", 1-25, Neukirchen, 1973.

56. J.A. Soggin, "Introduction to the Old Testament", SCM. 1989, p.249f.; R. Carroll, "From Chaos to Covenant", p.105.

57. R. Davidson, "Covenant Ideology in Ancient Israel" in "The World of Ancient Israel", ed. R.E. Clements, p.p. 337-8.

58. E.W. Nicholson, "God and His People", p.211f.

59. Ibid. p.212; cf. R. Carroll, "From Chaos to Covenant", pp.217ff.

60. John Bright, "Jeremiah: Translation with an Introduction and Notes", Anchor Bible 21, 1965, p.287; also his "Covenant and Promise", p.194; cf. J.P. Hyatt, "Jeremiah: Prophet of Courage and Hope", N.Y. Nashville, 1958, pp.105ff.; W. Rudolph, "Jeremia", HAT, 1968, pp.77ff.

61. S. Bohmer, 'Heimkehr und neuer Bund: Studien zu Jeremia 30-31', Gottinger theologische Arbeiten 5, Gottingen 1976: E.W. Nicholson, 'Preaching to the Exiles: A Study of the Prose Tradition in the Book of Jeremiah', Oxford and N.Y., 1970, pp.82ff.; R. Carroll, 'From Chaos to Covenant', p.217f.; J.A. Soggin, 'Introduction to the Old Testament', p.250f.

62. See for example, J. Bright, 'An Exercise in Hermeneutics: Jeremiah 30:31-34', Interpr. 20, 1966, 188-210; P. Buis, 'La Louvelle Alliance' VT 18, 1968, 1-15; M. Weippert, 'Das Wort vom neuen Bund in Jeremia' XXXI 31-34, VT 29, 1979, 366-51; J. Swetnam, 'Why was Jeremiah's New Covenant New?', in Studies in Prophecy, VT 26, 1976, 111-5.

63. E.W. Nicholson, 'Preaching to the Exiles', pp.82ff.

64. R. Carroll, 'From Chaos to Covenant', pp.217ff.

65. Ibid, p.217; E.W. Nicholson, 'Preaching to the Exiles', pp.82ff.

66. R. Davidson, 'Covenant Ideology', p.338; R. Carroll, 'Jeremiah', O.T. Library, London, SCM, 1986, pp.609ff.

67. J. Bright, 'Covenant and Promise' p.144.

68. R. Davidson, 'Covenant Ideology in Ancient Israel' in 'The World of Ancient Israel', ed. R.E. Clements, p.338.

69. R. Kraetzchmar, 'Die Bundesvortellung im Alten Testament', Marburg 1896, pp.188, pp.192ff.; E. Kutsch, 'Verheissung und Gesetz', pp.71ff.; N.M. Sarna, 'Understanding Genesis', p.132; Cf. R. Davidson, 'The Old Testament', p.41; J. Skinner, 'Genesis', I.C.C. 1910, pp.293f.

70. J. Bright, 'Covenant and Promise', p.25; R.E. Clements, 'Abraham and David', p.73.

71. G.E. Mendenhall, 'Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East', pp.45ff.

72. R.E. Clements, 'Abraham and David', Ch.5; Cf.; F.M. Cross, 'Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic', Cambridge, Mass. and London 1973; Ch. IV:9 (esp pp.260-273); R.A. Carlson, 'David, the Chosen King: A Traditio-Historical Approach to the Second Book of Samuel', Uppsala, 1964, pp.115ff.; von Rad, 'The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays', p.72f.; J. Bright, 'Covenant and Promise', p.26, pp.70f.

73. R.E. Clements, 'Abraham and David', p.54; Cf.; G.E. Mendenhall, BA,17, p.72; D.N. Freedman, 'Interpretation', 18, p.427.

74. Ibid, p.55; A. Caquot, 'Semitica' 12, pp.62ff.; R.A. Carlson, 'David, the Chosen King: A Traditio-Historical Approach to the Second Book of Samuel', pp.115ff.; D.J. McCarthy, 'Covenant in the Old Testament: The Present State of Inquiry', CBQ, 27, 1965, p.236 note.

75. Ibid. p.55.

76. O. Kaiser argues that vs. 13-16 which link the promise of land with the sojourn in Egypt and the Exodus, are a later interpolation, see his 'Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung von Genesis 15', ZAW 70, 1958, pp.109, 118; J. Hoftijzer whilst accepting a late date for the chapter as a whole, regards them as belonging to the basic narrative, see his 'Die Verheissungen an die Drei Erzväter', Leiden, 1956, p.54.

77. R.E. Clements, 'Abraham and David', p.21; J. Bright, 'Covenant and Promise', p.70f.

78. R.E. Clements, 'Abraham and David', p.21, p.58; G.E. Mendenhall, 'Covenant Forms in Israelite Tradition', BA 17, 1954, P.72; D.N. Freedman, 'Divine Commitment and Human Obligation: The Covenant Theme', Interpretation 18, 1964, p.427, p.429; G. von Rad, 'The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays', p.72.

79. V.R. Gold, 'Hebron', IDB, I, 1962, pp.575ff.; K. Galling, 'Hebron (und Mamre)', BRL, Cols, pp.275ff.; A. Kuschke, 'Hebron', RGG, III Col. p.110.

80. R.E. Clements, 'Abraham and David', p.51.

81. Ibid, Ch. IV, pp.35ff.

82. Ibid, p.34

83. R. Davidson, 'Covenant Ideology', p.339. G. Schmitt sees a close connection between the covenant of Shechem and that of Baal-Berit, and argues that the idea of the covenant was derived by Israel from this Baal-Berit of Shechem, see his 'Der Landtag von Sichem', pp.88ff. G.A. Danell, 'Studies in the Name Israel in the Old Testament', p.41, contents that Yahweh was only identified with the God of Israel when the covenant was made at Shechem; C.A. Simpson, 'The Early Traditions of Israel', Oxford, 1948, p.648, maintains that the covenant idea was derived by Israel from the cult of Baal-Berit at Shechem; see also his 'Genesis', IB, I, 1952, p.603; In 'The Growth of the Hexateuch', IB, I, p.195, he clearly modifies his view by saying that Israel's idea of the covenant "was at least partly derived from the cult of Baal-Berit", Cf. E. Meyer, 'Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme', pp.542-61.

84. R. Davidson, 'Covenant Ideology in Ancient Israel', p.339.

85. Y. Kaufmann, 'The Religion of Israel', p.138, note.; R. de Vaux, 'Ancient Israel, Its Life and Institutions', p.294, both agree that it was only in later times that the Deuteronomistic redactor condemned the Israelites for "taking Baal-Berit as god", (Judges 8:33); Cf. H. Ringgren, 'Israelite Religion', p.157.

86. F. Notscher, 'Bundesformular und "Amtschimmel". Ein Kritischer Überblick"', BS9, 1965, pp.181-214; R.E. Clements, 'Abraham and David', p.157.

87. R. Kraetschmar, 'Die Bundesvortellung im Alten Testament in Ihrer Geschichtlichen Entwickelung', p.25 note.

88. J. Bright, 'Joshua', IB, II, 1952, p.671.

89. L. Perlitt, 'Bundestheologie im Alten Testament', pp.263-8; For a comprehensive discussion on Joshua 24:1ff.; see A.D. Mayes, 'The Story of Israel between Settlement and Exile', London, 1983, ppp.46-52.

90. R. Davidson, 'Covenant Ideology in Ancient Israel', p.339.

91. R.E. Clements, 'Abraham and David', p.10.

92. O. Eissfeldt, 'The Promises of Grace to David in Isa.55:1-5', in 'Israel's Prophetic Heritage', ed. B.W. Anderson and W. Harrelson, London, 1962, pp.196, pp.196; O. Kaiser, 'Der Königliche Knecht. Eine Traditionsgeschichtlich-Exegetische Studie über die Ebäd-Yahwe-Lieder bei Deuterojesaja', (FRLANT 70), Göttingen, 1959, pp.132ff.; Cf. R.E. Clements, 'Abraham and David', pp.71ff.

93. R.E. Clements, 'Abraham and David', pp.71-74.

94. W. Zimmerli, 'Old Testament Teology in Outline', p.57; A. Alt, 'The God of the Fathers', in 'Essays on Old Testament History and Religion', Eng. Tr. R.A. Wilson, Oxford: Blackwell, 1966, pp.1-77; D.R. Hillers, 'Covenant: The History of a Biblical Idea', p.103; J. Bright, 'Covenant and Promise', p.21.

95. Ps.105 is post-exilic and was in existence already when the author of I.Chron. was at work. Compare I.Chron. 16:8-22 and Ps.105:1-15. See A. Weiser, 'The Psalms', Westminster, Philadelphia 1962, p.673; W.S. McCullough, 'Psalms', IB, Vol.4, p.558; Cf.; M. Dahood, 'Psalms', III, New York, Doubleday, 1970, p.51, Ps.47:9, Cf. the interpretations of S. Mowinckel, 'The Psalms in Israel's Worship', I, Oxford, 1962, pp.121f. 171; J. Muilenburg, 'Psalm 47', JBL 63, 1944, pp.235ff. A. Caquot, 'Le Psamme 47 et la Royaut de Yahwe', RHPR 39, 1959, pp.311-37; H. Kraus, 'Psalmen' (BKAT), I Neukirchen, 1960, pp.349ff. The latter suggests, however, a possible dependence of this Psalm on Deutero-Isaiah.

96. R.E. Clements, 'Abraham and David', p.63.

97. R.E. Clements, 'God's Chosen People: A Theological Interpretation of the Book of Deuteronomy', pp.39f.

98. J. Van Seter, 'Abraham in History and Tradition', New Haven: Yale U.P. 1975, pp.263-78; T.L. Thompson, 'The Origin Traditions of Genesis and Exodus 1-23', JSOT (SS), 1987; also his 'A New Attempt to Date the Patriarchal Narratives', Journal of the American Oriental Society 98, 1978, p.76-84.

99. M. Noth, 'The Laws in the Pentateuch', in 'The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Essays', Edin. and London, 1966, pp.93; L. Perlitt, 'Bundestheologie im Alten Testament', pp.47ff.

100. J. Hoftijzer, 'Die Verheissung an die drei Erzväter', Leiden, 1956, pp.81ff.

101. E. Kutsch, 'Verheissung und Gesetz', (BZAW 131), 1972, pp.88ff.; L. Wächter, 'Die Übertragung der beritvorstellung auf Jahwe', (Th LZ 99), 1974, pp.801ff.; For a survey and extended bibliography see C. Westermann, 'Genesis (12-36)', BKAT I, Neukerchen 1981, pp.247-74.

102. L. Perlitt, 'Bundestheologie im Alten Testament', pp.60ff.; R. Davidson, 'Covenant Ideology in Ancient Israel', p.340.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE PROMISE OF LAND

The term "promise of land" or "promised land" is a theological
reference to the ancient land of Canaan (Ex.32:11-14; Lev.25:38; Deut.9:27-
29;19:8-10). Located as it was on the roads between the two most ancient
centres of culture in the world, the valleys of the Nile (Egypt) and of the
Tigris-Euphrates (Babylon), Canaan had been from time immemorial in the
main stream of civilization. (1)   Here civilizations began, as in Egypt
and Mesopotamia, with the coming of the Semites, who inaugurated the Bronze
Age, which modern scholars divide into three periods: Early Bronze (I, 3200
- 2900 B.C.; II, 2900 - 2600 B.C.; III, 2600 - 2300 B.C.; IV, 2300 - 2100
B.C.). Middle Bronze (I, 2100 - 1850 B.C.; II, 1850 - 1500 B.C.). Late
Bronze (I, 1500 - 1400 B.C.; II, 1400 - 1200 B.C.). The Early Iron Age
(1200 - 900 B.C.) witnessed the invasion of the Philistines ' from the
Mediterranean coast who were responsible for the introduction of the iron
industry into Canaan from Asia Minor. (2)   This period also witnessed the
invasion of· the Israelites from the east (Joseph) and the south (Judah),
which led to their conquest of the land and the establishment of the united
monarchy.

When the Israelites invaded Canaan about the twelfth century, the
Egyptian control of it had already been broken during the late Bronze Age.
At the same time the Hittite empire in Asia Minor had collapsed through the
invasion of the 'Sea Peoples' (including the Philistines) from the Aegean
provinces after the destruction of Troy c.1194 - 1184 B.C. (3)

The Arameans meanwhile were beginning their widespread migrations which consequently weakened both Assyria and Babylonia. Evidently Israel's invasion of Canaan and the glorious reign of David and Solomon about 1010 - 940 B.C. were made possible only by the fact that from 1200 to 700 B.C. no empire was capable of ruling over Palestine. A similar situation prevailed again only in the short period of Jewish independence under the Maccabeans in 141 - 63 B.C.

The arts of civilization were already ancient in Canaan when the Israelite invasion took place in the twelfth century B.C. The cultivation of the vine and the making of wine, which presumably originated in Asia Minor, were attributed to an ancient mythical husbandman called Noah, identified with the hero of the deluge (Gen.9:20-21). On the whole, agriculture (Gen.3:18-19; 4:2-3), gardening and shepherding (Gen.4:2-4), weaving tents (Gen.4:20), the production of musical instruments (Gen.4:21), metal work, pottery making, the building of cities (4:17,22), and other arts and crafts were so ancient in Canaan in 1200 B.C. that they were dated back to the earliest days of mankind. Contrary to the fact that, for many centuries, Canaan had been thickly inhabited and dotted with towns and villages, the authors of the patriarchal narratives in Genesis, portray Abraham as roaming about the country freely with his flocks, as if in an empty wilderness. The reference to Shechem, a very ancient city, in Gen.34 is much more in harmony with the facts. (4)

We can be certain, however, that Israel contributed nothing to the

progress of the arts and crafts in Canaan. Even in the glorious days of Solomon and Ahab, it was Phoenician architects and craftsmen who were employed in building palaces and temples. No advance attributable to the Israelites can be detected in the Old Testament or archaeological remains. Israel, however, did make lasting contributions to human culture only in two fields: literature and religion. And these are the materials which we must now utilize in our quest for Israel's understanding of Canaan as "the promised land".

I. THE DIVINE OWNERSHIP OF LAND

The Old Testament presents us with the concept of the land of Canaan as Yahweh's heritage נַחֲלָה (Jer.2:7; cf. II Sam.20:19; 21:3). The basic meaning of this word is that of "landed property apportioned to an individual". In the Hexateuch this land is invariably referred to as the "Land of Canaan" (Ex.16:35; Lev.14:34; Num.34:2; Jos.14:1), "the land of the Amorites" (Jos.24:8) and often the land of various groups of non-Israelite peoples (Gen.15:19; Ex.13:5). It is worth noting that the phrase "land of Israel" אֶרֶץ יִשְׂרָאֵל does not appear until I.Sam.13:19. As a matter of fact, the phrase seldom figures in the Old Testament, occurring only six times in all (I.Sam.13:19; I.Chron.22:2; II Chron.2:17; 34:7; Ezekiel 40:2). It is also mentioned in certain other places fives times (II Kgs.5:2,4; 6:23; II Chron.30:25; Ezekiel 27:17), where it refers only to North Israel. In the final analysis, this land according to the Old Testament, belongs neither to the Canaanites nor to the Amorites nor even

to the Israelites. It belongs to Yahweh.

1.   It is clearly stated that the land, commonly known today as Palestine,
was Yahweh's own land (Isa.14:2; Hos.9:3; cf. Jer.2:7; 16:18). It is the
land which He loaned to His people Israel and which, according to the 'P'
source, must "not be sold in perpetuity, for the land is mine" (Lev.25:23).
This passage is found within the context of ordinances concerning the Year
of Jubilee including some ritual enactments. (6)   The 'P'   source,
therefore, instructs that Yahweh commands that only a portion of what
rightfully belongs to Him should be consecrated to Him exclusively and thus
set aside from secular usage (Lev.7:14, 32; Num.15:19-21; 18:26-29).   This
הַתְּרוּמָה i.e. heave-offering or holy food, is a symbolic acknowledgement
that Yahweh is the owner of all (Ex.19:5; cf. Ps.24:1; 50:12; 89:11) and
illustrates the forces of the second great principle of 'P', namely
arbitrary law. Theoretically, therefore, everything belongs to God, but in
practice he is satisfied if He receives His dues. This is obviously very
different from the disposition of the heart that Yahweh required of His
worshippers, according to prophetic teachings. (7)

    The land in its entirety belongs to Yahweh just as today all land is
ultimately the property of the State. Private property is of course
recognised, but the State can come and repurchase at any time. Moreover,
the State also owns land that cannot be used for private purposes. The same
principle applies in the 'P' code. In theory Yahweh says, "the land is
mine; and you are strangers and sojourners with me" Lev.25:23), but in

practice He reserves a small section for sacred purposes and leaves the greater part in private hands so long as certain requirements are met. The individual, therefore, might utilise the land, providing he offered Yahweh the tithes and first fruits, left the field fallow on the Sabbatical Year (Lev.25:1 ff.; Ex.23:10; Deut.15:1 ff.), and returned the land to its former owner every fiftieth year (Jubilee Year). (8) The Sabbatical Year is "a Sabbath of solemn rest for the land, a Sabbath to the Lord" (Lev.25:4). (9) It is doubtful, however, if this law was ever kept in ancient Israel. But whether it was or not, this law should not be regarded as having emerged de novo in Israel. It has been suggested that this may well reflect the custom of propitiating the fertility powers of the soil, although here the practice is redefined in terms of Israel's faith. (10) The Jubilee Year , therefore, became a reminder that the land could "not be sold in perpetuity" because it belonged to Yahweh (Lev.25:23).

2. Lev.25:23 with its emphasis upon the fact that the land is Yahweh's own property, comes from the hand of a later redactor. But this does, not imply, however, that the idea that "Yahweh is the owner of the land", is late. The idea is certainly old, but must not induce us to believe that it was necessarily rooted in the concept of the universality of Yahweh. Passages like Ex.19:5 (JE); (11) Deut.10:14; Ps.24:1; 89:22 (12) are evidently late, and are the result of the development of the knowledge of Yahweh in the Old Testament. He was gradually perceived, not only as the God of the land of Canaan, but also as the God of heaven and earth, the God of the universe. (13) Universalism is the native element of Monotheism.

Monotheism to be monotheism must transcend national and territorial limitations; it must be supernational and universal. (14) It should be pointed out at this stage that the development of monotheism came through the personalities of the eighth and seventh century prophets, who were hardly regarded as the expression of the Israelite life of their time. With the prophets of this period, we begin to witness the emergence of an implicit monotheism that was becoming increasingly explicit (Amos 4:13; 5:8; Hos.2:1ff). (15) But it is only as we come to Deutero-Isaiah in the post-exilic period that the explicit formulation of monotheism stands out with undeniable clarity (Isa.44:6,8; 45:5-7; 18, 21-22). Prior to this, what we find in Israel was a prevailing henotheism which also characterised all its neighbouring states. Moab and Ammon are commonly said to have been henotheistic, the one holding Chemosh to be Moab's god and the other Milkom to be Ammon's. In fact, we have no evidence to suggest that Chemosh alone was worshipped in Moab and Milkom alone in Ammon. It may well be that while these deities were worshipped as the national gods, others stood beside them, just as in Israel through long periods Yahweh was regarded as the national God though other gods were popularly worshipped alongside Him. (16)

3. It is against this henotheistic background that the idea of Yahweh's ownership of land must be seen. If, as R.H. Pfeiffer points out, Deutero-Isaiah drew from monotheism its corollary of universalism, (17) then the concept of a national and territorial deity must unavoidably have been the corollary of henotheism. In Christianity and

Islam, for example, the concept of God as being national, ethnic or territorial is completely non-existent. The obvious reason for this is that the birth of these two faiths took place in situations where monotheism was either predominant or influential. (18) Essentially, the Mosaic faith of Ancient Israel, as S.R. Driver and R. Kittel argue, was henotheistic and hardly different in its theological perspectives from those of its neighbours. One of those perspectives characteristic of the henotheistic world of the ancient Near East, was the concept that particular lands or territories were the properties of particular gods. For instance, Assur is the name of a god and at the same time the name of his land, Assyria. (19) Ugaritic documents were found to speak about Mount Zaphon as the abode of Baal and his "heritage". (20) Similarly the old passage in the Moses hymn of Exodus 15 sings of Yahweh: "Thou wilt bring them (i.e. His people) in, and plant them on Thy own mountain, the place, O Lord, which Thou hast made for Thy abode, the Sanctuary, O Lord, which Thy hands have established" (V.17 does not refer to Zion and its temple, but to the mountains of Canaan). (21) The idea that a god owns all the land where his worshippers live is in fact an ancient Canaanite concept which pre-dates the Exodus. According to this belief, Baal or Baalim are the owners of all the landed properties, fields, vineyards, orchards, together with all the springs, trees, hills, and the like. They give rain and fertility to the land, and thus make possible the living of their worshippers. (22) Accordingly, the Baalim receive worship to ensure rainfall and fertility. With the Israelite invasion of Canaan, the first attempt was made by the newly settled tribes to relate their God, Yahweh from Sinai, to the new land

they had just occupied. But how could their religion of Yahweh from Mount Sinai or of the gods of their fathers (23) be related to a way of life on arable land? Viewed from a henotheistic world perspective, this constituted no problem. Yahweh, the desert Warrior God, was indeed now the owner of the land whose military prowess as "a man of war" (Ex.15:3; Ps.24:8) might be useful in any future threat to His territorial integrity (I.Sam.4:3ff). For the time being, however, there was no reason why they should not depend upon the services of the Canaanite fertility gods for their milk and honey. (24) Thus, the religion of Israel from the time of the conquest to the exile (except for the prophets) was neither exclusive nor universal, but merely national and territorial, and therefore as henotheistic as other ancient religions. It is against this background that the concept of Yahweh's ownership of land must be understood. The jurisdiction of Yahweh was acknowledged to be confined only to his own people and territory, just as other gods were acknowledged to have jurisdiction over their own respective nations and territories. For instance, Jephthah sent a message to the King of Ammon saying, "Will· you not possess what Chemosh your god gives you to possess?" (25) (Judges 11:24). It is obvious here that Jephthah did recognise the existence of another god outside Palestine with authority over his land and people. When David took refuge with the Philistines to escape the jealous persecution of Saul, he felt that he could not take Yahweh with him into their territory, but must there worship their gods (I.Sam.29:19). This belief remained prevalent down to the closing days of the pre-exilic period (Jer.16:13). Israel's neighbours shared the same concept. Ruth changed

her religion when she changed her land and nationality (Ruth 1:16), and Naaman brought Palestinian soil to Damascus so that on it he might worship Yahweh there (II Kings 5:17-18). (26)

4. By the 1st quarter of this century, J.H. Breasted could say that "Monotheism is but imperialism in religion". (27) It was not until the emergence of the eighth and seventh century prophets that a thoroughgoing monotheism was possible with the Hebrews. Imperialism was in the air. With the prophets of this period henotheism began to blossom into monotheism. (28) Moreover, according to H. Pfeiffer, there was another factor which also helped to pave the way to the final triumph of monotheism, i.e. the process of the amalgamation of the religions of Baals and Yahweh which seems to have taken place in this form: Yahweh absorbed the Baals, and the Canaanite form of worship was offered, · pratically unchanged to Yahweh. This final result was one of a possible three that can be conceived: (1) a pantheon, bringing together the gods of both nations, as in Babylon and Greece, where city-states were joined into one kingdom; (2) the prevalence of the Baals over Yahweh, (which Hosea feared), or one of the Baals over Yahweh (as Elijah feared Melkart would displace Him), (3) the triumph of Yahweh over the Baals (which actually took place). Why was no pantheon formed? Why did Yahweh absorb the Baals and not the other way round? The answer lies in the fact that the Baals were small local deities, Yahweh was the national God of Israel. They were peaceful patrons of agriculture, Yahweh was noted for His irresistible valour in battle and, until the time of David, wars were a necessity of

the Hebrews. Their wars were Yahweh's wars (Num.21:14; I.Sam.25:28). They were characterised by a strong national feeling, whereas the Canaanites were divided into many city-states. Yahweh, moreover, had a strong personality, a history, a name, while the Baals were pale, dull, indistinct deities whose records did not include heroic exploits and accomplishments. Yahweh was now a jealous God, becoming more and more intolerant of other gods, demanding with ever-greater insistence the exclusive worship of Israel (I. Kings 18:21). No doubt, times of peace furthered the practice of the cult of the Baals, but in times of war the national feeling was awakened and devotion to Yahweh was revived. Yahweh, God of battles and storms, (29) coming from Sinai (Judges 5:4f.; cf. Deut.33:2), was the aggressor against the Baals of fields and orchards, and in the long run they could not resist Him successfully.

Gradually, therefore, the Baals evaporated before the strong character of Yahweh or were absorbed by Him. He eventually took their place. This appears in a number of facts. Yahweh was called "Baal" in such names as Jerubbaal (Judges 8:35), Meribbaal (I.Chron.8:34), Ishbaal (I.Chron.9:39) and Bealiah (I.Chron.12:5) which means "Yahweh is Baal". However, Yahweh eventually came to be regarded as the giver of rain (I. Kings 18:1) and agricultural bounty instead of the Baals (Hos.2:8; cf. Num.24:6), the proprietor of the high places and the shrines of Baals (Eze.20:28) and finally the God of the land of Canaan (I.Sam.6:9; Hos.9:3; Isa.14:2; Jer.2:7; 16:18) which he has now given as a loan to Israel (Lev.25:23). When the Patriarchal narratives of Genesis were written, the process of

Yahweh's relationship with Israel and His gift of land to them, had already been completed. The patriarchs therefore were not initially involved in this relationship nor indeed were they the recipient of His gift of land until 'J' and 'P' included them (Gen.12:1-3; 15:18, 17:8). (30)

II. THE PATRIARCHS AND THE LAND

W. Zimmerli was perhaps not wide of the mark when he suggested that Lev. 25:23 was intended to call Israel back to the status of the Patriarchs who, while they waited patiently for the coming of the promise, lived as aliens in a foreign land. (31) But can we, with some measure of certainty, speak of the patriarchs as real historical figures, or of a period known as the patriarchal age? And if so, can we be equally certain that the idea of the promise of land occupied a central place in the life and time of the patriarchs? If, however, the answer to these questions is in the negative, then what was the underlying reason behind the claim of the promise of land to the patriarchs? These are the points to which we wish to address ourselves.

1. The middle of this century witnessed a new, apologetic development, in which scholars sought to demonstrate that the Biblical traditions about the proto-history of Israel have a credible historical background. In his works, the American archaeologist and explorer, Nelson Glueck, often refers to what he turns as "the astonishing historical memory of the Bible". (32) This view has been re-echoed by some American archaeologists and philologists, and particularly by the pupils of W.F. Albright. (33) The

school of Albright has also been the training ground for a new generation of Israeli archaeologists, philologists and historians, which would explain their often similar approach to problems. However, the securing of a historical background for the patriarchs in the second millennium B.C. through archaeology was thought to have dealt the final blow to the older criticism which, according to Albright, regarded "the patriarchal sagas of Genesis as though they were artificial creations of Israelite scribes of the Divided Monarchy". (34) Chief among the pioneers of this older criticism was J. Wellhausen who maintained that the patriarchal age reflected only the times of the later writers and not an older period in Israel's history. (35) But the triumph of the school of Albright was shortlived, for cracks began to appear in its edifice which indicated that the foundation may not be so secure after all. The dating of the patriarchal age ranged from the Middle Bronze I at the turn of the third to second millennium, (36) to the Middle Bronze II around the nineteenth to seventeenth centuries B.C., (37) to the late Bronze - Amarna Age. (38) The range of opinion, as van Seters observed, represents at least an eight-hundred-year spread. (39) In this case, if the dating of the patriarchal age could not be fixed more precisely than this, then it has scarcely been established at all. It is obvious that studies with apologetic slant, based on archaeological discoveries have, in J.A. Soggin's words, failed not only to resolve the problem of the patriarchs and their age, but even to smooth over the difficulties raised by the clash between the biblical account and modern historical research. (40)

2. In Germany, and to some extent in Brittian, the tendency is to speak only in general terms of an early patriarchal settlement period. M. Noth,

for instance, was ready to accept in broad outline that in the context of the patriarchal narratives, "there are real and manifest features, and, moreover, of such a specific kind that it is necessary to connect them with some historical elements". (41) The fundamental constituent of the patriarchal tradition, however, "lies in the divine promises regarding the possession of the land of Palestine and regarding their descendants". These promises were bestowed on these patriarchs in repeated divine revelations in certain holy places such as Shechem (Gen.12:6-7; 35:2-4), Hebron (Gen.13:18; 18:1ff) and Beer-Sheba (Gen.21:22ff; 26:23ff; 46:1ff). It was on the altars of these hallowed places that the descendants of these patriarchs used to sacrifice to "the God of their fathers". It follows that information about the patriarchs survived and was handed down in connection with the sacred objects established by them (מזבחות - altars) at the above-mentioned holy places, and that their names lived on in association with the deity ("God of Abraham, etc."). In brief, the origin of Israel, for Noth as well as Alt, remains historically based on the union of its tribes in the common worship of the God Yahweh and not on some biological or physical descent from the patriarchs. The claim to patriarchal ancestry assumed the central role only when the confederate tribes became firmly connected with the worship of the "El" of the patriarchs, i.e. "the God of the Fathers", whose memory survived at some of the sanctuaries in Palestine. (42) This "God of the Fathers" came to be identified with Yahweh. However, Noth's argument is not dissimilar to A. Alt's cultic-historical position by which he sought to recover the historicity of the patriarchs from the Genesis narratives. The basis of Alt's argument is that titles like "the God of Abraham" and "the God of Isaac" do reflect an ancient usage among the nomadic clans descended

from the patriarchs who were cult founders of a distinctive kind of nomadic religion associated with their unsettled way of life. Moreover, the patriarchs themselves did not really belong to the territory of Canaan but only to its vicinity. (43) Both H.G. May and K.T. Andersen have rather modified this view by concentrating their attention upon the title of "the God of my Father", which they contend was distinctive of the pre-Mosaic religion of the Hebrews. (44)R.E. Clements however, takes the position of O. Eissfeldt and argues that a historical individual like Abraham can be recovered from the Abraham traditions, and so he too describes the religion of Abraham in religio-historical terms. According to him, the primary content of the covenant of Genesis 15 is a divine oath which promises land to Abraham and his descendants (vv. 18-21), while the promise of a great posterity (vv. 4-5) is secondary. (45) The difference between Clements and Alt is not hard to find. Alt argues that the clans descended from the patriarchs brought into Canaan semi-nomadic cults named after their founder and attached them to Canaanite sanctuaries. Clements takes the ground that the religion of the patriarchs, Abraham, Issac and Jacob was primarily the worship of the local manifestations of El which were already established in the land which they occupied. This position was advocated by O. Eissfeldt, H. Gressman and R. Kittel, and was strongly supported in recent times by F.M. Cross. (46) According to Clements, the God of Abraham was the El of Mamre-Hebron, perhaps שַׁדַּי אֵל El-Shaddai (Gen.17:1), and this cult, having been appropriated by Abraham when he settled in the Hebron area in the fourteenth century B.C., was associated with the promise of land. (47) "God of Abraham" was simply a popular name for this El which was subsequently in use among Abraham's descendants and the same explanation holds for the other so-called "gods of the Fathers". (48)

3.   So far the argument from archaeology (49) has yielded hardly anything in support of the existence of the so-called "patriarchs" or "patriarchal age". The patriarchal narratives, as J.A. Soggin has carefully pointed out, "have remained in the limbo of conjecture, and the texts found in the Mesopotamian city-states of Mari on the Euphrates and Nuzi east of the Tigris have not so far provided material by which to verify them". (50) "The God of the Fathers" theory seemed for a while to be quite convincing. The sum and substance of this theory is that the deity or deities which the patriarchs worshipped (now identified with Yahweh on the basis of the concept of continuity), are given titles and designations indissolubly connected with the patriarchs who worshipped them. So these are authentic personal deities, in the sense that they are identified through the persons who were their followers (Gen.26:24; 31:56, 296, 53; 43:33; 46:1; 50:17; Ex.15:2). (51) But "the God of the Fathers" theory (whether argued from a historical position like that of Clements, or a cultic-historical position like that of Alt) (52) appears to rest on a very fragile foundation.   In 1929 Alt could produce only a few parallel texts from the Nabatean inscriptions of the first and second centuries A.D. in support of his argument. (53) His argument was strongly challenged by J. Lewy in 1934 who was able to provide a series of ancient Assyrian texts coming from Caesarea in Cappadocia, present day Kultepe. (54) Here we find not only references to the national deity, Ashur, but also to a deity called "the god of your father", often without any other designation or specification, although this is a deity who could intrinsically have borne a name. A few other examples were then discovered at Mari where Aplahanda, the ruler of Carchemish, writes to Ismah-Addu, the Viceroy of Mari saying, "If you have not sent me anything because of the god of my father, my heart will

be afflicted". (55)   The argument from the Biblical term "God of the Fathers" has hardly been sufficient to help us recover the historicity of the patriarchs or the patriarchal age.   Indeed, the term was also employed by the non-Israelites as we have just pointed out. Yet, as G. Garbini has clearly shown, "the existence of eponymous figures for populations is not attested among any other people of the ancient Near East outside Israel. Neither the Sumerians nor the Assyrians nor the Babylonians nor the Phoenicians nor any others have left anything of this kind". (56) Moreover, J. Hoftijzer has pointed out that in the Bible the mention of the "God of the Fathers" is not limited to the time before the revelation of the name of Yahweh (cf. Ex.18:4; I Chron.28:9; II Chron.17:4), so that it cannot serve to identify pre-Yahwistic religion. (57)   More recently, however, B. Diebner has argued polemically that after all, the excavations made at Mamre reveal that the sanctury did not yet exist in the pre-exilic period. (58)   J. Van Seters in his most recent study has argued that the references to sacred objects in Genesis like sacred trees, pillars and altars in connection with the patriarchs are more consistent with the religious practices of the exilic period than with the far distant period of the second millennium B.C. (59)

The narrative cycles relating to the patriarchs, as they appear in the Biblical text, seem, therefore, extremely complex in terms of literary redaction.   Consequently, the patriarchs remain for us as remote and as illusive as ever. The subdivisions of the individual narratives or parts of them between the traditional sources 'J', 'E' and 'P' is, in Garbini's words, "quite inadequate, and does not take account of what strikes any reader of the Hebrew text, namely the continual changes of names,

vocabulary and style which have to be attributed to more than a few and distinct ancient 'sources': one senses the superposition of many different hands, and especially many different ideas, which can be fitted much more easily into the later manifestations of Hebrew thought than into what the ancient ideology must have been". (60) In this sense we seem to have been brought back, like Garbini and to a great extent Soggin and others, to Wellhausen's view a century or so later. (61)

4. The scarcity of information and the stereotyping of themes which is a characteristic of the narratives, taken with the way in which different locations (Abraham in Hebron, Isaac in the Negeb, Jacob in Shechem), makes it, in Soggin's words, quite possible that the three figures all existed at the same time, or even, if one wants to be more critical, that they never existed at all". (62) The patriarchal narratives therefore are ideology, not history. They were composed for the purpose of making political and theological statements about Israel as a nation. It is not hard to pinpoint some political ideologies in the patriarchal narratives of Genesis. It is interesting, for example, that in Gen.12:1ff; 24:1ff, Abraham's homeland appears to be Harran and not Ur as in Gen.11:28, 31; 15:7. Apparently, the brief mention by 'J' of the migration from Ur was the product of a late exilic period, and seems to have been current in the post-exilic period (Neh.9:7). The specific description of Abraham as being originally a native of "Ur of the Chaldeans", indicates not only a late exilic notion, very likely in the reign of Nabonidus, (63) but also was particularly designed to convey a significant political overtone. Garbini has argued that by having Abraham as a native born of Ur, the Judean exiles declared themselves autochthonous to the land in which they found

themselves a conquered people, and by linking Abraham first with Ur and then with Harran, they intended to remind Nabonidus of the places most dear to him. (64)   J.A. Soggin on the other hand, takes the itinerary of Abraham and his family from "Ur of the Chaldeans" (Gen.11:28, 31; cf. Neh.9:7) to Harran as simply reflecting the itinerary of the exiles on their return to their homeland. (65)

On closer examination however, the element of nationalistic and territorial ideology in the patriarchal narratives appears to be much more pronounced than anything else. Indeed, in 1928 K.Galling was able to stress the fact that the patriarchal narratives are a "conscious creation", focused on the "pan-Israelite conception", and intended to anticipate the date of legal rights over Canaan. (66) Probably as early as the monarchical era and certainly in exilic and post-exilic times, Israel confessed that there was what might be called a "symbolic" relationship between itself and the land of Canaan. This land had been given freely by Yahweh to Israel to enjoy, though He continued to be its absolute owner. To lend more credence to this confession, the weight of patriarchal antiquity is brought to bear. The land was not only a direct gift from Yahweh to the Israelites (Lev.14:34; 20:24; 23:10, Num.10:29; 13:2; 14:8, Deut.32:49,52), but is also legally transferred to them by their eponymous ancestors, the patriarchs, who were the first recipients of it (Gen.12:7; 15:18; 24:7; 28:13; Num.14:23-24; 32:11,22). But when we come to consider the land in relation to the patriarchs some problems certainly arise. (A) The promise of land to the patriarchs within the Pentateuch has three different forms: 1 - In Gen.12:7; 15: 18; 24:7, the promise is directed to "your descendants" (לְזַרְעֲךָ); 2 - In Gen.13:15; 26:3; 28:13; 35:12,

it is directed "to you and your descendants" (לְךָ וּלְזַרְעֲךָ); and 3

- In Gen.13:17; 15:7, there is only the form "to you" (לְךָ).   (B) There

are also differences in the matter of the land thus promised. In Gen.15:7,

18; 24:7, we find the form "this land" (הָאָרֶץ הַזֹּאת); (67)

in Gen.13:15; 28:13; we find "all the land" (כָּל הָאָרֶץ); and in

Gen.26:3-4 we find the phrase "all these lands" (כָּל הָאֲרָצֹת הָאֵל).

It is, therefore, important to note the plural form (הָאֲרָצֹת).

which points to a smaller area than the whole country. Moreover, the

promise of land, particularly to Abraham in Gen.13:14-17, is in the legal

form of land grant. (68) It was later reaffirmed to Isaac and Jacob (26:3-

4; 28:13-15). Yet, the patriarchal narratives show that none of them ever

actually gained possession of the land. (69) The author of the epistle to

the Hebrews was aware of this problem. But for him, the problem is solved

once Canaan ceases to have a geographical expression and becomes a heavenly

place (Heb.11:13-17).

It is obvious that the patriarchal narratives cannot be approached, as

historiography in anything like the modern sense. To do so, would not only

lead us to a spurious prehistory of Israel, but would also prevent us from

gaining the authentic information which these narratives provide about a

later period. In a sense, what we have here is an ideological history, which

is history written in the way it should have happened rather than in the

way it did happen. The authors' aim had a far reaching effect. It created

in Israel the consciousness of a matchless and legitimizing racial and

national status, and its control of the land came to be seen in the context

of an ancient historic and legal right. (70) It is worth pointing out in

this connection that the promise of land in Genesis seems to have, as

C. Westermann discovered, a fairly constant formulation. So, when the promise is addressed to Abraham (as it is mostly the case), God says, "I will give this land to you and to your descendants (Gen.12:7; 13:15; 15:18; 17:8; 24:7; 28:13). There is a formula used here which is proper not to the context of promises but rather to the legal context of the actual transfer of ownership in the present. (71) Genesis 48:22 uses the same verb "give" which indicates that the legal context is one to which the formula is really appropriate. According to A.D.H. Mayes, if this is the case, "then those apparent promises of land to Abraham and his descendants in fact presuppose the situation of the descendants who actually possess the land as a result of settlement: they express a claim to the land which says in effect that this land belongs to us by virtue of the fact that ownership of it has been legally transferred to us. Thus, the tradition of the promise of land in no case preserves actual promises which go back to the patriarchal period". (72)

NOTES ON CHAPTER FIVE

1. W.F. Albright, "The Role of the Canaanites in the History of Civilization" in "The Bible and the Near East", ed. by G.E. Wright, N.Y. 1965, pp. 438-71.

2. F.E. Winnett, "Iron" DB. Vol.4, p.725 f.; J. Bright, "A History of Israel", p.180; Y. Yadin, "The Art of Warfare in Biblical Lands", (McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. 1963), Vol.II, pp.248-253, 354 f.; R. H. Pfeiffer, "Religion in the Old Testament", London, 1961, p.59.

3. H.D.F. Kitto, "The Greeks", A Pelican Book, Edinburgh, 1951, p.18.

4. R.H. Pfeiffer, "Religion in the Old Testament", p.60; G.E. Wright and R. Fuller, "The Book of the Acts of God", pp.50 ff.

5. G. von Rad, "The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays", N.Y. 1966 pp.90 ff.; E. Lipinski, "La Terre Promise, Héritage de Dieu", in E. Lipinski, "Essais sur La Révélation et La Bible" (Paris 1970), pp.115-132; Hans E. von Waldow, "Israel and Her Land: Some Theological Considerations", in "A Light Unto My Path", ed. H.N. Bream, R.D. Heim, C.A. Moore, Philadelphia, Temple University Press 1974, p.493-494.

6. J. Pedersen, "Israel: Its Life and Culture", Vol.III, IV, p.306 ; M. Buber, "Israel and Palestine", trans. S. Godman, London, 1952, pp. 3 ff.

7. R.H. Pfeiffer, "Religion in the Old Testament", p.187.

8. R. de Vaux, "Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions", pp.175 ff.; G. Harford-Battersby, "The Sabbatical Year" in "Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible", Vol.IV, pp.323 ff.; J. Morgenstern, "The Jubilee Year" in ID Vol.II, p.1001 f.

9. R.H. Pfeiffer, "Religion in the Old Testament", p.187; Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol. X, p.605.

10. The Oxford Annotated Bible, notes on Lev. 25:1-15, p.153.

11. E. Zenger, "Die Sinaitheophanie: Un ersuchungen zum jahwistischen und elohistichen Geschichtswerk", p.20-27 f.; E.W. Nicholson, "God and His People", pp.164 ff.

12. W.R. Taylor, "The Psalms", ID. Vol.4, pp.131 f., 260 f., 478.

13. H.H. Rowley, "From Moses to Qumran", p.42, "nowhere in the Pentateuch is Moses credited with the formal denial that any other gods exist, such as we find in Deutero-Isaiah save in passages such as Deut.4:35, 39; 32:39 which quite certainly did not issue from Moses".; See also "The Faith of Israel", SCM 1956, pp.71 f. For a full study on the development of the knowledge of Yahweh in Ancient Israel, See W.L. Wardle, "Zeitschrift fur die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft", II, 1925, p.192; Cf. W. Eichrodt, "Theology of the Old Testament", I.p.222 n. and p. 227; O. Rankin, "A Theological Word Book of the Bible", ed. A. Richardson, 1950, p.92. G. von Rad, "Old Testament Theology",Part I, 1962, p.211; H. Ringgren, "Israelite Religion", pp.66-67.

14. T.J. Meek, J.B.L. LXI, 1942, pp.36f.; H.G. May, 'J.B.K.' XVI, 1948, pp.100 ff. Cf. "Hebrew Origin", 1973, p.208; H.C. Creager, "The Lutheran Church Quarterly", Vol.VIII (1934), p.279.

15. H.H. Rowley, "From Moses to Qumran", p.62; See also his "The Rediscovery of the Old Testament", I. p.221; I.G. Mathews, "The Religious Pilgrimage of Israel", 1947, p.129; A. Causse, "Les Prophéts d'Israel et les Religions de L'Orient", 1913, p.62.

16. H.H. Rowley, "From Moses to Qumran", p.43; also his "The Faith of Israel", pp. 71f.; Driver and Kittel whilst acknowledging the common henotheism of Israel and its neighbours, maintain that the religion of Moses, which Israel adhered to, was an ethical henotheism, See S.R. Driver, "Exodus", 1911, p.413; R. Kittel, G.V.I. I, 6th edn. 1923, p.389; Y. Kaufmann, however, stresses that Israel's religion in pre-exilic times was wholly monotheistic, and defines monotheism as "the idea of a god who is the source of all being, not subject to cosmic order, and not emergent from a pre-existent realm; a god free of the limitation of magic and mythology". "The Religion of Israel", 1960, p.29.

17. R.H. Pfeiffer, 'J.B.L.' XL 11, 1947, pp.193 ff.

18. Whilst Christianity was born in a predominantly Judaic environment, the birth of Islam and its development owes much to the Jewish missionary activity in Arabia generally, and to the strongly influential Meccan Jewish community in particular. See Erwin I.J. Rosenthal, "Judaism and Islam", London, 1961, pp.4 ff.; S.D. Goitein, "Jews and Arabs: Their Contacts Through the Ages", New York, 1974, pp.46 ff.; Abraham, I. Katsh, "Judaism in Islam: Biblical and Talmudic Backgrounds of the Koran and its Commentaries", New York, 1980.

19. Hans-Ruedi Weber, "The Promise of the Land", Study Encounter 7, 1971, p.2.

20. Ibid. p.2; D.O.T.T. ed. W. Thomas; New York 1958, p.130, note 18; S.R. Driver, "Canaanite Myth", pp.96 ff.; A.R. Johnson, "Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel", pp.31 ff.

21. Hans-Ruedi Weber, "The Promise of the Land", p.2.

22. Ulf Oldenburg, "The Conflict Between El and Baal in Canaanite Religion", 1969, p.76.

23. R.H. Pfeiffer, "Religion in the Old Testament", pp.66-7.

24. For a discussion on this point see T.J. Meek, "Hebrew Origin", pp.216 ff.

25. In fact the god of Ammon is Milkom not Chemosh. The latter is the god of Moab. This is obviously a scribal error. See G.F. Moore. International Critical Commentary, 1908, pp.294 ff.

26. S. Zeitlin, "Studies in the Early History of Judaism", KTAV
     Publishing House, N.Y. 1975. Vol.III, pp. 3ff.; T.J.Meek, J.B.L.
     LXI, 1942, p.37; H.H. Rowley, "From Moses to Qumran", p.43;
     T.J. Meek, "Hebrew Origin", p.216; J. Pedersen, "Israel: Its Life
     and Culture", III-IV (1947), pp.650ff.

27. J.H. Breasted, "The Development of Religion and Thought in Ancient
     Egypt", (1912), p.315.

28. T.J. Meek, "Hebrew Origin", pp.217ff.; J.M.P. Smith, "The Effect of
     the Disruption on the Hebrew Thought of God", American Journal of
     Semitic languages, XXXII (1916), pp.261ff.

29. Like the storm-god Baal in Ras Shamra texts, Yahweh was known as "The
     Rider on the Clouds" (Ps.68:4; Isa.19:1), See J.H. Patton, "Canaanite
     Parallels in the Book of Psalms", (1944), p.12.

30. R.H. Pfeiffer, "Religion in the Old Testament", pp.67ff.; Th.C.
     Vriezen, "The Religion of Ancient Israel", p.274.

31. W. Zimmerli, "The Old Testament and the World", SPCK, 1976, p.77.

32. N. Glueck, "The River Jordan", N.Y., 1968, p.8f.

33. W.F. Albright, "The Israelite Conquest of Palestine in the Light of
     Archaeology", BASOR 74, 1939, pp.11-23; J. Bright, "Ancient Israel
     in Recent History Writing", SBTI, 19, London, 1956; G.E. Wright,
     "Modern Issues in Biblical Studies: History and the Patriarchs",
     Expt. 71, 1959-60, pp.242ff.

34. W.F. Albright, "The Biblical Period", Pittsburgh: The Biblical
     Colloquium, 1950, p.3.

35. J. Wellhausen, "Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel".

36. W.F. Albright, "Abram The Hebrew: A New Archaeological Inter-
     pretation", BASOR, 162 (Oct.1961), pp.36-54; N. Glueck, "The Age of
     Abraham in the Negeb", BA 18 (1955), pp.2-9.

37. G.E. Wright, "Biblical Archaeology", pp.40-52; J. Bright, "A History
     of Israel", PP.69-78.

38. C. Gordon, "Introduction to Old Testament Times", N.J. 1953, pp.100-
     119.

39. J. Van Seters, "Abraham in History and Tradition", p.9.

40. J.A. Soggin, "A History of Israel", p.98, this is in contrast to
     G.E. Wright's view in his "Biblical Archaeology", Philadelphia,
     Westminster Press 1957, p.40; See also J.A. Soggin, "Introduction to
     The Old Testament", SCM, 1989, p.58f.

41.   M. Noth, "Hat die Bibel doch Recht?", in Festschrift Gunther Dehn,
      Neukirchen, 1957, pp.7-22; "Der Beitrag der Archaeologie zur
      Geschichte Israels", SVT 7, 1960, pp.269ff.

42.   M. Noth, "The History of Israel", pp.121ff.

43.   A. Alt, "The God of the Fathers", in Essays on Old Testament History
      and Religion", Oxford 1966, pp.1-77cf; M. Noth, "The History of
      Israel", p.123; E. Clements, "Abraham and David",p.29.

44.   H.G. May, "The God of My Father: A Study of Patriarchal Religion",
      JBR 9, 1941, pp.155-8, 199-200; "The Patriarchal Idea of God", JBL60,
      1941, pp.113-28; K.T. Anderson, "Der Gott Meines Vaters", St. Tb 16,
      1962, pp.170-88.

45.   W. McKane, "Studies in the Patriarchal Narratives", p.205.

46.   R. Clements, "Abraham and David", p.33; O. Eissfeldt, IBD, II,
      p.379; H. Gressmann, "Mose und seine Zeit. Ein Kommentar zu den
      Mose-Sagen (FRLANT 18). Göttingen, 1913, pp.425ff. "Sage und
      Geschichte in den Patriarchenerzählungen", ZAW 30, 1910, p.28;
      R. Kittel, "Die Religion des Volkes Israel", Leipzig, 1921, pp.27ff.;
      F.M. Cross, "Yahweh and the God of the Patriarchs", HTR 55, 1962,
      pp.225-59.

47.   R. Clements, "Abraham and David", p.33.

48.   R. Clements, "Abraham", Theologisches Wörterbuch zum alten
      Testament", Lieferung I (1970), pp.58f.; W. Mckane, "Studies in the
      Patriarchal Narratives", p.206.

49. · For an excellent outline of the argument from archaeology, see, R.
      Davidson, "The Old Testament", in Biblical Criticism, "The Pelican
      Guide to Modern Theology", ed. R.P.C. Hanson, Penguin Books,
      Middlesex, 1972, pp.39-49.

50.   J.A. Soggin, "Introduction to the Old Testament", pp.58cf.; T.L.
      Thompson, "The Historicity of the Patriarchal Narratives", N.Y. 1974,
      pp.52-66.

51.   J.A. Soggin, "A History of Israel from the Beginnings to the Bar
      Kochba Revolt A.D. 135", pp.105f.

52.   A. Alt, "The God of the Fathers", (1929), in Essays on the Old
      Testament History and Religion, Oxford 1966, pp.3-77; also his "Zum
      Gott der Vater", PJB 36, 1940, pp.93-104; R.E. Clements, "Abraham",
      Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament, Leiferung I (1970),
      pp.58f; also his "Abraham and David", p.33; F.M. Cross, "Yahweh and
      God of the Patriarchs", HTR 55, 1962, pp.225-59; K.T. Andersen,
      "Der Gott Meines Vaters", ST 16, 1962, pp.170-88.

109.

53. A. Alt, "The God of the Fathers", pp.3-77; J. Van Seters, "Abraham in History and Tradition", pp.140f.; J.A. Soggin, "A History of Israel", p.107.

54. J. Lewy, "Les Textes Paleo-Assyriens et L'Ancien Testament", RHR 110, 1934, (26-65) pp.50-59; P. Garelli, "Les Assyriens en Cappadocie", Paris, 1963, here we have a recent and up-to-date treatment of these matters.

55. Archives Royales de Mari, V. Paris, 1952, No.20; J.A. Soggin, "A History of Israel", p.107.

56. G. Garbini, "History and Ideology in Ancient Israel", p.84; for an opposite but rather weak argument see, J.J. Finkelstein, "The Genealogy of the Hammurapy.", JCS 20, (1966), pp.97-98.

57. J. Hoftijzer, "Die Verheissungen an die drei Erzväter", Leiden 1956, pp.84-96; J.A. Soggin, "A History of Israel", p.107.

58. B. Diebner, "Die Gotten der Vater - eine Kritik der "Vatergott" - Hypothese", DBAT 9, 1975, pp.21-51; cf. N. Wyatt, "The Problem of the God of the Fathers", ZAW 90, 1978, pp.101-4.

59. J. Van Seters, "Religion of the Patriarchs in Genesis", Biblica 61, 1980, pp.220-233.

60. G. Garbini, "History and Ideology in Ancient Israel", p.76.

61. G. Garbini, " History and Ideology in Ancient Israel", p.78; A.J. Soggin, "A History of Israel", pp.59-108; P.K. McCarter, "The Patriarchal Age", in "Ancient Israel", ed. H. Shanks, 1959, p.17, McCarter, despite his argument in favour of the historicity of the Patriarchs and the patriarchal age, admits that the patriarchal narratives in Genesis do provide authentic information about a later period; J. Wellhausen, "Prolegomena", pp.318-19; H. Ringgren, "Israelite Religion", p.17.

62. J.A. Soggin, "A History of Israel", p.95.

63. J. Hoftijzer, "Die Verheissungen an die drei Erzväter", Leiden, 1956, pp. 5-30; J.A. Soggin, "A History of Israel", p.100; G. Garbini, "History and Ideology in Ancient Israel", p.79.

64. Ibid. p.78. This was an elegant way of declaring themselves "fellow-countrymen" of Nabonides. This was not an unusual practice. The Phoenicians during the period of the Achaemenides'domination circulated the claim that they came from the Persian Gulf,over which the original land of the Persians looked. For an excellent discussion on this point, see G. Garbini, "Paisa", La Parola del Passato 39, 1984, pp.39-41; also on the Phoenician claim, see Herodotus, "The Histories", 7, 89.

65. J.A. Soggin, "A History of Israel", pp.99f., cf. "Joshua - A
     Commentary", London and Philadelphia, 1972, pp.237ff.

66. K. Galling, "Die Erwählungstraditionen Israels", BZAW 48, Giessen,
     1928, pp.65ff.

67. The mention of "this land" in Gen.15:7,78; 24:7 seems to refer to
     the Mamre-Hebron Territory in the South of Canaan, see L.A. Snijders,
     "Genesis 15, The Covenant with Abram", OTS XII, Leiden, 1958,
     pp.161-79; R.E. Clements, "Abraham and David", pp.21,25, whilst in
     Gen.12:7 it probably refers to Shechem, located at the commercial
     crossroads of Canaan in the pass between mount Ebal and Mount
     Gerizim (v.6), see Oxford Annotated Bible, p.15.

68. M. Weinfeld, "The Covenant of Grant in the Old Testament and in the
     Ancient Near East", JAOS 90, 1970, pp.184-203; S.E. Loewenstamm,
     "The Divine Grant of Land to the Patriarchs", JAOS 91, 1971,
     pp.509ff.; W.M. Clark, "The Origin and Development of the Land
     Promise Theme in the Old Testament", Yale University 1964, pp.22-29.

69. J. Van Seters, "Abraham in History and Tradition", pp.276, 289.;
     von Rad understood Gen.23 as a pledge of the fulfilment of the
     promise of land to Abram, see "The Problem of the Hexateuch", p.90.

70. K. Galling, "Die Erwählungstraditionen", pp.65ff.

71. C. Westermann, "Die Verheissungen an die Väter", (FRLANT 116), 1976,
     pp.135f.

72. A.D.H. Mayes, "Deuteronomy", p.80.

CHAPTER SIX

THE DEUTERONOMIC THEOLOGY OF PEOPLE AND LAND

We previously made a brief mention of the corpus Deuteronomy - II Kings (see p.17). Our intention here is to go a little further and give a concise evaluation of this remarkable work before discussing in some detail its theological position regarding Israel and the land.

A. M. Noth was the first to argue that the section of the Hebrew Bible consisting of seven books: Deuteronomy - II Kings , should be treated as a single literary unit to be known as "The Deuteronomistic History". (1) This appellation reflects the dependence of the work on the book of Deuteronomy, both for its language and its theology. The overall unity of this work becomes abundantly clear when we consider its fixed interpretive discourses which look backward and forward. The single purpose of this work is to present to its contemporary generation a theological interpretation of the catastrophes of 721 B.C. and 586 B.C. It is designed to show that Israel's national and territorial calamity was the direct result of apostasy and constant infractions of Yahweh's covenant law (II Kgs. 17:7ff.). (2) Moreover, Noth argues that this work must be regarded as the product of one single author or redactor, who was responsible for the whole literary complex. (3) He further suggests that the work was composed entirely after the destruction of Jerusalem in 586 B.C. and during the exile, probably about 550 B.C. (4) Noth's view has been widely accepted.

B.   Another approach to the redactional history of this work was taken by

scholars like A. Jepsen, R. Smend and F. Cross, but with different

emphasis.   This is known as the theory of "The Double Redaction of the

Deuteronomistic History".   A. Jepsen and later J. Gray, argued that the

work was pre-exilic, but contained also post-exilic revision. (5)   This

argument was not widely accepted.   R. Smend attempted to trace the hand of

a law orientated Deuteronomist (DtrN) overlaying the work of the historian

(DtrG) in Joshua and Judges as a complete reworking of the material.   F.

Cross contended that the first edition of the Deuteronomist appeared in

Josiah's time (639-609 B.C.), but the King's material was updated about 560

B.C. by means of several editions which completely altered the theological

thrust of the original (Deut.4:19-20; Joshua 23:4, 7, 12-13; 24; Judges

1:1-2, 5; 6:7-10). The advocates of this theory argue that the pre-exilic

redactor had the concept of a total conquest of the land of Canaan

(Josh.11:23), which reflects the nationalistic optimism of his time.   But,

for the exilic redactor, the gift of land already contained the seeds of

Israel's eventual destruction, because the people did not adhere to the

stipulations of Yahweh's covenant (II Kgs.17:7ff.; 21:9). (6)

C.   The Deuteronomistic author, according to Noth, presents us with a work

formed on the basis of a uniform view of the theology of history. He had

at his disposal several sources: Deuteronomy - the law of the covenant; for

Joshua he had a collection of accounts of the conquest; for Judges a

collection of stories of individual deliverers; for Samuel a set of

traditions about Saul and David; and for Kings material from royal and

temple archives. (7) The main purpose of the Deuteronomist was not to

reconstruct the history of his people, but rather to compile a theological

history. (8) Here the fundamental position is that from the conquest and down through the centuries, Israel had continually violated the stipulations of Yahweh's covenant as revealed in the "law of Moses", i.e. Deuteronomy, until He finally rejected it, the northern Kingdom in 721 B.C. and the Southern in 586 B.C. In R. Polzin's words, "It is as though the Deuteronomist is telling us in Deuteronomy, "Here is what God has said concerning Israel", but in Joshua - II Kings, "This is how God's Word has been exactly fulfilled in Israel's history from the settlement to the destruction of Jerusalem and the exile". (9) The underlying factor running through the entire Deuteronomistic work is that Israel did not have a carte blanche. To the Deuteronomist(s), the notion of an unconditional covenant and gift of land was completely alien.

I. COVENANT-LAW AND LAND

One of the main themes which the Deuteronomist(s) emphasises so strongly is that of the divine grace which brought Israel into being, and bound it to Him by a covenant. Israel was therefore under a great debt to Yahweh. In His love, He has given to this people many gifts, chief among them was the land of Canaan which forms a major theme in the Deuteronomic work. Closely linked to this, however, was the theme of Israel's obligation. (10) Obedience to the terms of the Horeb-Sinai covenant was absolutely essential if Israel were to enjoy what Yahweh has given. Von Rad asks whether this conditional form paves the way for a declension from grace into law. The answer he gives is that "Deuteronomy reflects a substantially more advanced situation than that envisaged by the priestly writer, for whom the land remains a pure gift of God". (11)

In the Deuteronomic-Deuteronomistic literature, the acceptance of the covenant together with the land, automatically committed the covenant-people to obedience.

1.   There is a sense in which the Deuteronomic-Deuteronomistic corpus revolves around a triad of inter-related concepts: People, land and covenant.   This last concept, throughout this set of literature, has undergone a significant transformation.   In the Deuteronomic-Deuteronomistic theology the term בְּרִית "covenant" becomes synonymous with the commandments (Deut.5:2-3; 29:1, 9, 25; 31:20; Josh.7:11-15; Judges 2:20; I Kgs.19:10; II Kgs.17:7ff.). Indeed, the "tables of the covenant" are the tables on which the ten commandments stand written (Deut.9:9, 11, 15), and the "Ark of the covenant" receives its name from the tables of the commandments which were placed in it (Deut.10:8; 31:25-26; Josh.3:3; Judges 20:27; I Kgs.3:5). (12)   L. Perlitt credits the Deuteronomistic writer for having done much to highlight this particular sense of the בְּרִית According to him, the Detueronomistic redactor wrote against the background of the decline and fall of Israel in 721 B.C., as well as Judah in 586 B.C. and the ensuing exile. His task was to demonstrate theologically the ruin of the two kingdoms.   If at that time there were those who in their consternation appealed to "Abraham" and "David", he immediately responded with "Moses". For the Deuteronomist history now could only be written from the standpoint of the (unfulfilled) conditions upon which Yahweh's gifts had been bestowed. (13)   To this end he took up the word בְּרִית, already used in those parts of Deuteronomy (Deut.5-26, 28), for Yahweh's promissory oath to the patriarch (Deut.7:8, 12; 9:7 etc.) and for Israel's obligation (Deut.5:1 ff.; 29:1; 33:9 etc.) which he used almost exclusively in the latter sense and thus of Yahweh's law, here the codified "book of the law"

which he designated "the book of the covenant" (Deut..29:20, 26; II Kgs. 23:2,21). בְּרִית and תּוֹרָה fore that in many Deuteronomistic texts the terms בְּרִית and תּוֹרָה are reciprocal, identical and interchangeable. (14)   The task of the author to provide a theological explanation of why Israel was rejected by Yahweh becomes extremely easy. The disasters of 721 B.C. and 586 B.C. occurred because Israel had been unfaithful to Yahweh's covenant as revealed in the "law of Moses". Together with the promulgation of the law had come the stern warning of the curse which would befall the nation in the event of disobedience.   Writing as he did after the destruction of the nation, the Deuteronomist saw this curse to have been executed. (15)

2.   The realisation of this curse, as von Rad has pointed out, gave rise to one of the most notable features of the Deuteronomist's theology, namely that Yahweh had not allowed His Word to "fail" (Josh.21:45; 23:14; I Kgs.8:56; II Kgs.10:10) but had "established" it (I Kgs.2:4; 6:12; 8:20; 12:15). (16)   This can clearly be seen in the prophecy-fulfilment schema which pervades the entire work. This scheme consists of a series of prophetic predictions which are reported to have been fulfilled. A few examples from this work will suffice to demonstrate this point: Yahweh promised in the oracle of the prophet Nathan that David and his throne will be established by his successors (II Sam.7:12f.). In fulfilment of this promise, Solomon became King (I Kgs.8:20). Ahijah prophesied to Jeroboam that the kingdom of David would be divided (I Kgs.11:30f.).   Rehoboam's refusal to abolish the oppressive policies of his father resulted in the disruption of David's kingdom (I kgs.12:15f.) Then Ahijah predicted the fall of Jeroboam's own dynasty because he had outdone all his predecessors in wickedness (I Kgs.14:7f.).   This was fulfilled when Jeroboam's successor

Nadab was assassinated by Baasha who also exterminated the remaining members of the royal family (I Kgs.15:27-30). The prophet Jehu the son of Hanani, condemned Baasha for having followed in the wicked footsteps of Jeroboam and prophesied the fall of his household (I Kgs.16:1f.). This was fulfilled when Zimri assassinated Elah, Baasha's successor and exterminated his household (I Kgs.16:9ff.). Elijah predicted that Ahaziah, the son of Ahab, would die of his illness as a punishment for having sought healing from Baalzebub, the god of Ekron (II Kgs.1:16-16). Obviously if Ahaziah was the son of Jezebel, it is not surprising that he preferred Baal to Yahweh. In any case, Ahaziah died and so the prophetic word of Elijah was fulfilled (II Kgs.1:17).

It is therefore clear that by carefully recording this prophecy-fulfilment schema, the Deuteronomist wanted his readers to observe the direct connection which existed between the word of Yahweh as spoken by the prophets and the events of Israel's history. This has led some scholars such as von Rad to conclude that a prophetic circle was responsible for the Deuteronomic-Deuteronomistic work. (17) Be that as it may, it is however evident that the Deuteronomist saw and wished his readers to understand that the prophets were the mediators of the law (Deut.18:15f.), and that they exercised the functions which the book of the law (Deuteronomy) ascribed to Moses (II Kgs.18:13). It is therefore abundantly clear that in this, as E.W. Nicholson observed, "The Deuteronomist, like Deuteronomy itself, is associating the promulgation and teaching of the divine law to Israel with the prophets. What Moses did in Deuteronomy, so also did the prophets during the course of Israel's history". (18) His central purpose is to provide a theological lesson that Israel's rejection and expulsion from the land was the result of its infractions of Yahweh's

covenant-law which both Moses and the prophets proclaimed. From all this, we may confidently conclude that to the Deuteronomist(s), the idea of an unconditional covenant or an unconditional promise of land was totally inconceivable as we shall now discuss in some detail.

II.   COVENANT, LAND AND CONDITIONALITY

The Deuteronomistic corpus, which comprises Joshua - II Kings and also the narrative framework of Deuteronomy, traces the history of Israel from the time of Moses to the writer's own day. Although we speak of it as a history, its aim is not only to record historical events; rather it records events and preaches from them. It seeks to demonstrate that at every step of the way history itself has shown the theology of the covenant, as presented in Deuteronomy, to be true. (19) And it calls the reader's attention to the fact that Yahweh was not committed irrevocably to Israel's well-being or defence through this covenant with David. It offers Israel no unconditional promises of whatever sort.

1.   The book of Deuteronomy having been found in the Jerusalem Temple where it had been deposited by its authors was then adopted and cherished by another and different circle, and eventually used in writing what is known as the Deuteronomistic work. However, the Deuteronomistic circle was not only greatly influenced by Deuteronomy itself, both theologically and linguistically, but also by the specifically Jerusalem traditions regarding Yahweh's choice of Mount Zion as His sacred abode and the house of David to be His anointed kings over Israel (see pp.11-17). (20) It is generally agreed that in this work there is a fusion of two originally different blocks of traditions, the Sinai - Mosaic traditions and the Mount

Zion - Davidic traditions. Von Rad is of the opinion that the author belonged neither exclusively to one nor the other of these two traditions. He stood mid-way between them deriving his theological standpoint from certain aspects of both of them. (21) But the fact is, as E.W. Nicholson and R.E. Clements (22) have argued, whilst the Deuteronomistic circle have undoubtedly been greatly influenced by the Jerusalem traditions, there is a more direct relationship between it and the circle responsible for the book of Deuteronomy. It seems that both of these circles belong ultimately to the same basic stream of tradition. Both are united in stressing the importance and indeed the primacy of the Horeb-Sinai covenant tradition, and both place the nation's very existence and the existence of its Davidic monarchy firmly under the stipulations of this covenant.

It is beyond doubt that by placing the Davidic monarchy under the terms of the Horeb-Sinai covenant, the Deuteronomist renders its position insecure. This of course does not imply that he is hostile to it or actively participating in its downfall. But it does indicate that he had a degree of reservation towards it. He does not seem to have regarded the monarchy as a necessary institution, but rather an optional one, one that represents, as we might say, a concession on Yahweh's part and one that exists through divine sufferance, subject to divinely imposed conditions. This view is made abundantly clear in Deuteronomy 17:14-20, (23) and is fully shared by the circle responsible for the Deuteronomistic work (I.Sam 8:10-22). The ruling dynasty of David therefore is by no means rejected, but at the same time its continuance is conditionally guaranteed.

Obviously, what we have here can best be described as a re-interpretation

of the Davidic covenant. This covenant seems originally to have been unconditional, as is clear from Nathan's oracle to David (II.Sam.7:8ff.). (24) But according to the Deuteronomist this is no longer the case. The continuance of the Davidic line is now made contingent upon obedience to the laws of Deuteronomy. That is to say, the covenant between Yahweh and David is conditional. (25) This is clear from the last charge which David gave to Solomon (I.Kgs.2:2-4). We also find the note of conditionality in the word that Solomon received during the building of the temple (I.Kgs 6:12-13), and also after its completion and dedication (I.Kgs.9:4-5). At the same time, whilst depicting the Davidic kings as appealing to the old traditions about Yahweh's election of Israel in the exodus from Egypt and the gift of the promised land (I.Kgs.8:16,20f., 34, 36), (26) the Deuteronomist does not forget to remind his reader that the very existence of the Davidic monarchy, the Jerusalem cult and the land depends entirely upon obedience to the terms of the Mosaic covenant (I.Kgs.9:6-9). It is worth noting that the term "if" is mentioned in each of these charges. It is a small word, but it introduces a considerable difference: the promises are not flatly and unconditionally assured. They can only be guaranteed through absolute commitment to the observance of covenant law. J. Bright was not wide of the mark when he called this "the victory of the Mosaic covenant over the Davidic". (27)

2. In the Jerusalem court tradition Yahweh's election of the Davidic household and His election of the Jerusalem sanctuary were signs of His relationship to Israel, and testified to His authority over the entire nation. They are thus related to the belief in the Davidic covenant with

its promises which are said to be "for ever" (Pss.89:28,34; 78:69; 132:14).
(28) In this Jerusalem court tradition the election of Israel as a nation
was mediated by, and completely dependent upon, the election of the Davidic
monarchy and Mount Zion (see pp.15ff.). (29)   The Deuteronomic-
Deuteronomistic circle was by no means ignorant of this belief in the
divine election of Israel's kings (Deut.17:15; II.Sam.7:8ff.) and Yahweh's
sanctuary (Deut.12:5, 11, 14; 16:11, 16; I Kgs.8:16, 44, 48; 11:13, 32,
36).   What we find now in the Deuteronomic-Deuteronomistic literature is
the explicit application of the term "election" to cover the entire
Israelite nation. This act of election is no longer connected with David,
but with the Horeb-Sinai covenant and its tables of the commandments. (30)
And it is by this alone that Israel along with its king and temple must now
be assessed (I.Sam.12:14-15; 1.Kgs.9:6-9). No doubt influenced by the
traditions of the northern kingdom and the knowledge of its catastrophe in
721 B.C., the Deuteronomists presented Israel's election in relation to
Horeb-Sinai covenant and its law. (31) The reader therefore is left under
no illusion that the Israelite monarchy, and the Jerusalem sanctuary which
it had founded, were consequences, but not guarantees, of this election,
(32) and this election will remain valid as long as Israel remains obedient
to the terms of this covenant. For the Deuteronomic-Deuteronomistic circle
the fundamental essence of the covenant is that it is Israel's response to
its stipulations and only those who are heirs of this response could
therefore be heirs of the covenant. (33) The book of Deuteronomy describes
Moses as saying to Israel: "Not with our fathers did the Lord our God make
this covenant, but with us, who are all of us here alive this day"
(Deut.5:3).   It is here implied that the covenant with the patriarchs of
old was not valid for the generation of the Exodus, but that only the
covenant into which they themselves entered could have validity and meaning

for them. And by the same token their covenant could not have automatic validity for the generation that followed. (34) The bilateral nature of the Horeb-Sinai covenant is the common thread that runs through the entire Deuteronomic-Deuteronomistic literature. Again and again, with absolute clarity, it places before Israel the threat that disobedience to the terms of the covenant brings in its wake the inevitable forfeiture of God's protection and expulsion from His land.

3. Undoubtedly, the land plays a central role in the "sermon" of the Deuteronomistic historian. He fully agrees with Deuteronomy that Israel's history began with the occupation of the land through military conquest which Yahweh Himself had led (Deut.1-3; 7:1-2; 9:1-3), and he emphasises the events of the military campaigns during the initial period of that occupation (Joshua and Judges). (35) The completeness of this conquest from the Deuteronomistic perspective is indicated by the summary remarks in Joshua 21:43-44. Moreover, we must not overlook the fact that what we find in the Deuteronomistic work is a "theology about the delicate, complex relation between people and the land". (36) For this reason the author was able to incorporate the book of Deuteronomy into his work and take from it clues for the purpose of evaluating the history of Israel's conquest and loss of its land. And there are certain important implications which the author wants the (exilic and post-exilic) community to know.

A. With the theology of land in Deuteronomy in mind, the Deuteronomistic historian explains that Israel's loss of land was due to its breach of Yahweh's covenant. The author points out that the tragedies of 721 B.C. and 586 B.C. were not unexpected. From the beginning Israel's entry into the land was made contingent upon obedience to the terms of the covenant

(Deut. 1:41-45; 6:16-19; 8:1,6-7; 11:8f., 18-25; 16:20; Josh.7:1ff.), and even after the settlement, Israel's continued residence and prosperity in the land is dependent entirely upon its faithfulness to the demands of this covenant (Deut.4:25-29; 7:1-11; Josh.23:14f.; 24:20). (37) That complacency and disobedience can result in the loss of the promised land is clearly manifest in the general pattern of the book of Judges. When the Israelites turn away from Yahweh they begin to lose the land, when they turn to Him the land is restored to them, yet not by their own power (cf.Jgs. 7:1ff). Doubtless, the characteristic features of the Deuteronomist's outlook upon the conquest is a cultic as well as theological view of the Israelite community as a people destined to occupy the land of Canaan. Not only is the worship of Yahweh related to the promised land, but so is the entire law. In order to be a nation, Israel needs a land, for there can be no nation without land. Likewise, to be the people of Yahweh, Israel needs the law of Yahweh (Deut.4:5f). There can be no people of Yahweh, in the land of Yahweh, without the law of Yahweh (II Kgs.17:7-23; 24:3, 18-20). (38) Expulsion from the land, according to the Deuteronomist, meant the termination of the relationship between Yahweh and Israel, it signified the death of the nation (Deut.4:26) (39) Obedience, therefore is the sine qua non for continuing existence in the land, for Israel's life.

B. For the Deuteronomic-Deuteronomistic circle the land was the badge of Israel's nationhood. The idea that there was a mystical bond uniting Israel to the land (conceived by today's Gush-Emunim settlers of the occupied territories) (40) was wholly alien to the Deuteronomists of the exilic and post-exilic period. For them the claim that Israel possessed a national right to Canaan had no place in their theology. Such a notion was

brushed aside by the assertion that Israel had come into possession of the land because of the gross wickedness of its former inhabitants whom Yahweh had expelled (Deut.9:4-5a; 18:12; I Kgs.14:24; 21:26; II Kgs.16:3, etc.), and also because God wanted to fulfil His promise to the patriarchs (Deut.9:5b; Josh.1:6; Jdg.2:1). Indeed, even the fulfilment of this patriarchal promise appears to hinge entirely upon Israel's faithful compliance with the terms of the covenant law (Deut.7:8-11; 8:18-19). This is not surprising since the Deuteronomic theology clearly views the patriarchal covenant as subordinate to the Horeb covenant. (41)

C. The land was simply conceived by the Deuternomists as a sacred trust, given to Israel on condition that it remained faithful to the laws of Yahweh who had given it. (42) Israel, therefore, was to do everything necessary to keep and maintain this gift and not to lose it. Disobedience affects not only the relationship between Yahweh and Israel, but also the relationship between Israel and its land, the latter is illustrated by the idea that in some cases disobedience of the covenant law brings defilement or guilt upon the land itself (Deut.21:23; 24:4). This idea is further elaborated in the rather archaic-looking passage of Lev.18:24-25. Here we are told that when the land was defiled, it incurred the divine punishment for "its iniquity", and the land vomited out its inhabitants (Lev.20:22). The basic idea behind this passage seems to be a very old one. It belonged to the world of natural religion and mythology. A natural relation was believed to exist between people and the land on which they live. If they violate the order of nature, they defile both themselves and the land. The land therefore reacts by spewing out its transgressors. H.E. von Waldow suggests that the land is spoken of here as a mythological entity with its

own power. The thought of the Israelite author differs. He suppresses the mythological power of the land, and introduces Yahweh as the one who casts out the transgressors and punishes them. (43) The concept that the land brings defilement and guilt upon itself, and that Israel's responsibility for it brings in its wake the fate of the nations already expelled is quite evident in Deuteronomy (8:19-20; 21:23; 24:4). (44) For the Deuteronomistic historian Israel finally suffered that fate in 721 B.C. and 586 B.C. (II Kgs.17:7-23).

D. In Deuteronomy Israel is addressed as if it stood perpetually antecedent to the giving of the land, as if the promise of land, long ago fulfilled, was yet an open question and subject to conditions. (45) The author wanted his readers to know that Yahweh's law was addressed to each generation of Israelites, as if each of them had stood with their ancestors at Horeb-Sinai and had personally bound themselves to the terms of the covenant (see for example Deut.5:1f.; 6:10-15; 8:1ff.; 11:26-28; 28:1ff.; 30:15-20). The position of the Deuteronomistic historian is that each generation of Israelites failed to obey the covenant law as revealed in Deuteronomy. Israel's sin consequently caused rejection by Yahweh. (46)

The question of whether or not Yahweh's rejection and expulsion of Israel from the land was final has been a point of dispute among scholars. Pointing to II Kgs.25:27-30, G. von Rad argues that the Deuteronomistic historian could not have possibly conceded that Yahweh's promise to David had now failed. For him this promise is still valid and therefore Israel still has a future under this promise. (47) According to M. Noth, the Deuteronomistic historian has no concern for Israel's future. For him such

a future does not exist. (48)   The passage in II Kings simply points to an act of amnesty, a friendly and personal gesture. It does not imply a restoration of the Davidic royal perogatives. (49)   We cannot rule out the possibility that Jehoiachin's release might have raised many hopes among the Israelites remaining in Palestine and among the exiles in Babylon.   But in the end Jehoiachin died in exile as the Deuteronomist indicates (vv.27-30), without any of the hopes that had been placed in him having been fulfilled. (50)   It seems that even among the ancient writers, a good story must always have a happy ending. The pleasant report about Jehoiachin in II Kgs.25:27-30, is just another way of saying "and they lived happily ever after".   (51)

NOTES ON CHAPTER SIX

1. M. Noth, "Überlieferungsgschiechtliche Studien", I. Halle, 1943;
    Tübingen, 1957, pp. 3-110; cf. "Deuteronomistic History", JSOT,
    Supplement Series 15, Sheffield 1981.

2. E.W. Nicholson, "Deuteronomy and Tradition", p.25; cf. Zahi Nassir,
    "The Israelite Conquest of Palestine, and Theological Implications of
    Claiming a Land", 1987, pp.43f. Unpublished dissertation submitted to
    the Faculty of the Baptist Seminary of Switzerland.

3. Noth's view of a single redactor who composed the entire work was
    strongly defended by G. Minette de Tillesse, "Section "tu" et Section
    "vous" dans le Deuteronome", VT12, 1962, pp.29-87.

4. M. Noth, "Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien", I, 1957, pp.91ff.

5. A. Jepsen, "Die Quellen des Königsbuches", (Halle, 1953); cf. J. Gray,
    "I and II Kings", (London, 1964), pp.13f.

6. For a comprehensive discussion on the theory of "Double Redaction",
    see R.D. Nelson, "The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History"
    JSOT, Supplement Series 18, Sheffield, 1981.

7. Oxford Annotated Bible, "Introduction to the Book of I Kings", p.413;
    O. Kaiser, "Introduction to the Old Testament", Oxford rep.1984, p.169

8. P.R. Ackroyd, "Exile and Restoration", SCM 1968, p.62; H.W. Wolff,
    "Des Kerygma des Deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk$", ZAW 73 (1961),
    pp.171-86.

9. R. Polzin, "Moses and the Deuteronomist", p.19.

10. R. Clements, "God's Chosen People", p.50

11. G. von Rad, "The Promised Land and Yahweh's Land in the Hexateuch",
    in "The Problem of the Hexateuch and other Essays", (Edinburgh and
    London 1966), p.91.

12. G. von Rad, "Old Testament Theology", Vol.II, p.131;   "Deuteronomy",
    p.78.

13. E.W. Nicholson, "God and His People", pp.109f.

14. Ibid. p.110;   L. Perlitt, "Bundestheologie in Alten Testament",
    pp.46ff.

15. E.W. Nicholson, "Deuteronomy and Tradition", p.115; also his "God and
    His People", p.110; cf.   L. Perlitt, "Bundestheologie im Alten
    Testament", p.46.

16. G. von Rad, "Old Testament Theology", Vol.I, pp.339f.; also his
    "Studies in Deuteronomy", pp.78ff.

17. G. von Rad, "Old Testament Theology", Vol.I. pp.339f.; also his
    "Studies in Deuteronomy", pp.78ff.

18. Ibid.

19. G. von Rad, "Old Testament Theology", Vol.I. pp.334ff.; H.W. Wolff,
     "The Kerygma of the Deuteronomic Historical Work", Eng.tr, in
     W. Brueggemann and H.W. Wolff, "The Vitality of the Old Testament
     Traditions", Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1975, pp.83-100; F.M. Cross,
     "The Structure of the Deuteronjmic History", (Perspectives in Jewish
     Learning, III, pp.9-24); John Bright, "Covenant and Promise", p.132.

20. G. von Rad, "Old Testament Theology", pp.334ff.

21. Ibid., p.336, footnote 5.

22. E.W. Nicholson, "Deuteronomy and Tradition", pp.107ff,; R.E. Clements,
     "God's Chosen People", pp.30ff.

23. J. Bright, "Covenant and Promise", pp.129ff.

24. E.W. Nicholson, "Deuteronomy and Tradition", p.111; *Apparently the
     term 'berit' is not found anywhere in this passage despite the fact
     that the majority of scholars take it for granted that the idea of
     'covenant' is strongly implied here. See M. Noth, "David and Israel
     in II Samuel VII", in "The Laws in the Pentateuch and other Studies",
     Eng.tr., Fortress Press 1967, pp.250-259; However, L. Perlitt is
     emphatic that the Deuteronomist knew of no 'berit' with David. See
     E.W. Nicholson, "God and His People", p.111; L. Perlitt,
     "Bundestheologie", pp.46ff.

25. The complete collapse of the Davidic dynasty and the Israelite state
     made it necessary that the official theology be corrected and re-
     interpreted. See J. Bright, "Covenant and Promise", p.134; F.M.
     Cross, "The Structure of the Deuteronomic History", pp.18f.

26. G. von Rad, "Old Testament Theology", Vol.I. pp.338f.

27. J. Bright, "Covenant and Promise", p.135.

28. R.E. Clements, "God's Chosen People", pp.45f.

29. Ibid. p.46; cf. L. Rost, "Davidsbund und Sinaibund", ThLZ, 72, 1947,
     cols 129-34; A.H.J. Gunneweg, "Sinaibund und Davidsbund", VT, 10,
     1960, pp.334-344.

30. R. Clements, "God's Chosen People", pp.46f.

31. E.W. Nicholson is of the opinion that the corpus Deuteronomy - II
     Kings derived from some of the prophetic circle who fled to Jerusalem
     after 721 B.C. See "Deuteronomy and Tradition", pp.102ff.; cf. G.
     von Rad, "Studies in Deuteronomy", G.E. Wright, IB, Vol.II, pp.311-
     329; A. Alt, "Die Heimat des Deuteronomiums" (Kleine Schriften zur
     Geschichte des Volkes Israel), Vol.II, 1953, pp.250-275.

32. R.E. Clements, "God's Chosen People", p.47.

33. H.H. Rowley, "The Biblical Doctrine of Election", p.48.

34. Ibid. p.48; R.E. Clements, "God's Chosen People", p.39; also his "Abraham and David", p.66.

35. Hans -Ruedi Weber, "The Promise of the Land", study 7, (1971), p.5; R.E. Clements, "God's Chosen People", p.54.

36. W. Brueggemann, "The Kerygma of the Deuteronomistic Historian: Gospel of the Exiles", Interpretation LXXIX/4 (1968), p.394.

37. P.D. Miller, Jr. "The Gift of God: The Deuteronomic Theology of the Land", Interpretation, 23, (1963), p.459.

38. H.E. von Waldow, "Israel and Her Land: Some Theological Considerations", in "A Light Unto My Path", ed. H.N. Bream, R.D. Heim, C.A. Moore, Philadelphia, Temple University Press 1974, pp.505f.; A.D.H. Mayes, "Deuteronomy", pp.78f.

39. G. von Rad, "Old Testament Theology", p.126; E.W. Nicholson, "God and His People", p.210.

40. P.D. Miller, "The Gift of God: The Deuteronomic Theology of the Land", Interpretation, 23, (1963), p.459.

41. I.S. Lustick, "For the Land and the Lord: Jewish Fundamentalism in Israel", N.Y. 1988, pp.30-34.

42. R.E. Clements, "God's Chosen People", pp.39f.

43. Ibid. p.51; P.D. Miller, "The Gift of God", pp.459f.

44. H.E. Von Waldow, "Israel and Her Land", p.503.

45. S.R. Driver, "Deuteronomy", Edinburgh, 1902, p.272; G. von Rad, "Deuteronomy", p.150.

46. J. Bright, "Covenant and Promise", p.129; cf. H.H. Schmid, ZThK, 64, (1967), p.13; W. Zimmerli, "Man and His Hope in the Old Testament", London: SCM Press, 1968, p.76.

47. J. A. Montgomery, "The Book of Kings", ed. H.S. Gehman, I.C.C. 1951, pp.468-471.

48. G. von Rad, "Studies in Deuteronomy", pp.89-91; also his "Old Testament Theology", p.343; cf. W. Zimmerli, "The Old Testament and the World", p.124; P.R. Ackroyd, "Exile and Restoration", pp.79f.; T.H. Robinson, "Decline and Fall of the Hebrew Kingdoms", Oxford 1963, p.104.

49. M. Noth, "The Deuteronomistic History", p.79; L. Perlitt, "Bundestheologie in Alten Testament", pp.46ff.; E.W. Nicholson, "God and His People", p.112.

50. M. Noth, "The History of Israel", pp.283, 290.

51. ANET, 308, DOTT. ed. D.W. Thomas, N.Y. 1961, pp.84-6. This indicates that there was at least an imperial provision for Jehoiakin. (II Kgs. 25; Jr 52).

CHAPTER SEVEN

CONCLUSION: RESTORATION

In this concluding chapter, we should briefly recapitulate certain points previously made, before we focus our attention on the subject of restoration as viewed from the exilic and post-exilic perspective.

We have noted that the origin of the people known as "Israel" is as obscure as the name itself. (1)   What constituted Israel, however, was not race or language.   The Bible offers evidence that Israel was formed by a complex process and included components of diverse origin (Ex.12:38; Lev.24:10; Num.11:4; 10:27-32; Josh.14:13f.; 15:16-19; Jdg.1:10-20).   The only bond between these mixed groups was the worship of Yahweh: Yahweh is the God of Israel, Israel is the people of Yahweh. This relationship, however, was not established through a covenant at the early stage of Israel's history. The concept that Israel was bound by a covenant with Yahweh was apparently late.   Originally, the relationship between Yahweh and Israel was analogous to that which existed between Chemosh and the people of Moab (Jdg.11:23f.). It was the prophetic opposition to this very nationalistic form of faith which led to the Deuteronomic view that Yahweh and Israel are related to each other by covenant. (3)   Moreover, this Deuteronomic concept had a double purpose:

A)   It undermined the Davidic covenant which was becoming a potential danger to the moral and religious life of the nation. As the sure promises of Yahweh to David were reaffirmed in the cult of the temple, we may assume

that the stringent moral obligations that the Mosaic faith laid upon the people tended to be thrust into the background. This is what Isaiah and Micah seem to have witnessed in the course of their ministry (Isa.1:15; 5:20; Micah 3:9-12). According to the Deuteronomist, the Davidic king is no longer the sole recipient and mediator of the covenant. He now stands on equal level with all his Israelite brethren, and as such he is firmly placed under the terms of the Horeb covenant. (4) The ruling Davidic dynasty is by no means rejected; but its continuance is not unconditionally guaranteed. Indeed the Deuteronomistic historian goes even as far as to suggest that the continuance of the institution of kingship in Israel would depend upon the obedience of the nation as a whole to the terms of the covenant (I Sam.12:13-15).

B) It is most probable, as E.W. Nicholson suggests, that the theological concept of the covenant was closely linked with Israel's demythologised world-view of the nations of its time, which was grounded in what might be termed as a "theology of creation". (5) Among the nations of Israel's environment, the "right order" of the social world was seen as a reflection of the cosmic order created by the gods. This sacred order extended from the world of the gods to the world of mankind, embracing all in a unity. The entire religious, social and political structures and institutions of society were thus believed to be rooted in the sacred order of the cosmos and accordingly regarded as being divinely legitimated. (6) In common with the religions of its environment, Israel's religion contained a "state ideological" component. Israel saw its social order and institutions as being established by Yahweh and legitimated by Him as permanent. His established order and His actions on behalf of his people were viewed as a manifestation of His unchangeable righteousness. It was

therefore inconceivable to assume that the demands of Yahweh's righteousness could constitute any ultimate threat to Israel. When Israel sinned and incurred Yahweh's displeasure, the organs of the cult (lament, sacrifice, etc.) were there to restore His favour. Yahweh's victory over the forces of chaos whether cosmic (Ps.104:6-9; Job.9:13; 26:12; Isa.51:1) or human (Pss.74:13f.; 89:10f.; Isa.27:1), is always guaranteed. (7)   As in the surrounding kingdoms, the Israelite king is Yahweh's son (8) on whose behalf Yahweh defeats the enemies (Pss.2:1ff.; 89:1ff.; 100:1ff), and as His viceregent he guards and maintains Yahweh's righteousness among the people, and associated with the king in this respect is the very prosperity of the people and the fertility of the land (Ps.72). (9)   Thus Israel's well-being was fully and permanently guaranteed by Yahweh. Indeed, Israel viewed its well-being and Yahweh's will as being closely identified: "Is not Yahweh in the midst of us? No evil shall come upon us" (Micah 3:11; cf. 2:6). (10)   There seems to be an air of iron determinism about this entire concept. However, a controversy within Israel on this issue did not come until the prophets of the eighth century who turned Yahweh's righteousness against Israel, making it central and strongly repudiating the notion that His will and Israel's well-being were identical. It was the eighth century prophets who were the first to polarise Yahweh's righteousness and Israel's transgressions against it "to such an extent as to announce that Yahweh had rejected Israel (Isa.7:18; Amos 3:2; 8:2; cf. 5:2; Hos.1:9; 4:6-7; Mic.3:11f.). The natural bond between Yahweh and Israel was broken, and "the relationship was henceforth viewed as conditional.... The ethical element destroyed the national character of the old religion." (11)   As a result of this decisive change there arose "the substance of the notion of covenant or treaty." (12)   Therefore, the concept of a covenant between Yahweh and Israel is, "in terms of cash value, the concept that religion is

based, not on a natural or ontological equivalence between the divine realm

and the human, but on choice: God's choice of His people and their choice

of Him, that is their free decision to be obedient and faithful to Him."

(13)   On the other hand, Israel's choice to be otherwise would result in

its rejection and exile.

I   RESTORATION IN THE DEUTERONOMISTIC WRITINGS AND THE PROPHETS

There is little doubt that in the concluding chapters of II Kings the

Deuteronomistic historian is trying to come to terms with the awful

calamity of the two kingdoms and to find its cause in his own beliefs. So

far as he is concerned, Yahweh's righteousness is beyond question: it is

now and for all time an unshakeable certainty. Israel throughout its

history had chosen the path of sin and disobedience, of defection and

unfaithfulness to Yahweh's covenant. (14) The decisive sin for the

northern kingdom was that of Jeroboam I in which all the subsequent kings

are reported to have walked. Consequently, Yahweh's judgment was

pronounced over Israel. The delay in the fulfilment of this judgment for

another two centuries can be explained by the fact that particular kings

like Ahab (I Kgs.21:9), Jehu (II Kgs.10:30) and Jeroboam II (II

Kgs.14:26f.) were in many respects pleasing to Yahweh. The choice of the

southern kingdom to tread the path of disobedience was not different from

that of the northern kingdom. There was, however, one thing in its favour:

the memory of the ideal King David (the God-fearing, God-serving ruler),

had to be rewarded by Yahweh's longsuffering and patience with the Judean

kingdom (I Kgs.11:13, 33, 38; II Kgs.20:6). Strangely enough, David is not

always over-favourably judged in this account, especially in the history of

the succession (I Kgs.15:3-5). But this is not the Deuteronomist's own

verdict, it is apparently the judgment of the sources which he used in their original state in the books of Samuel. (15) In any case, for the Deuteronomist, Yahweh's judgment over Judah could not be averted even "for David's sake". But what of the promise to David, so prominent in the Deuteronomistic history and expressed specifically as Yahweh's 'berit' with the Davidic house in II Sam.23:1-7? Does not this major theme in this corpus point, as G. von Rad argues, to the presence of 'gospel' alongside 'law' in the purpose of the Deuteronomist? (16) This argument was sharply attacked by both Wolff and Cross. (17) The most recent criticism comes from Perlitt. The latter contests von Rad's view and argues that neither the pre-Dts. tradition nor the Dts. writer himself speaks of a 'covenant' with David. He speaks only of a promise which stood over against, and had only the effect of retarding, the judgment which breach of Yahweh's covenant with Israel had now finally brought. The Davidic promise could have been 'gospel' but since the Judean monarchs forsook the law and with it the way of obedient David, the promise itself collapsed. Even the report of Jehoiachin's release in II Kgs.25:27-30 is no sufficient revocation of Yahweh's total rejection of Judah. (18) Such a rejection carried with it no hope of any future restoration which was a characteristic feature both of the Deuteronomist's theology and the pre-exilic prophecy.

1. The theological material of the original Deuteronomist contains hardly anything which may pass for a national or territorial restoration. Such a notion is found only in a late passage in Deut.30:1-10 which may be regarded as having a common link with Deut.4:29-31. (19) The Hebrew verb שוב is determinative for 30:1-10, and is employed six times: 'return' v.2; 'restored' v.3; 'again', vv.3, 8, 9; 'turn' v.10. (20) It is worth

noting that the expression of these verses does not refer to "the bringing back of the exiles", but is commonly used with reference to the returning of Israel to Yahweh and Yahweh to Israel. It points to a decisive change in the people's fortune. (21) Here, as also in Jer.29:14; 30:3; Ez.29:14, the return from captivity is mentioned separately afterwards. The reference to the return from the Babylonian exile is found in vv.3-5 where specific Hebrew verbs are employed קָבֵּץ 'to gather', vv.3-4, לָקַח 'to fetch', v.4, הֵבִיא 'to bring', v.5.

However, the entire chapter of Deut.30 becomes more significant when seen against the exilic setting. Here the last verses reiterate the theme of blessing and cursing, obedience and disobedience. Above all, they set the choice before the people of "life and good, death and evil" (v.15), and clearly indicate the consequences of both. The final appeal is a moving and heartfelt cry for obedience (V.19). Interestingly, the passage also sets out the concept of 'two ways', to be found in Jer.21:8 and Ps.1. This theme was later developed in the Wisdom literature, particularly in the opening chapters of Proverbs and was further carried into the writings of the Qumran community which speak of the "ways of the sons of light" and the "ways of the sons of darkness". The influence of this theme upon the New Testament writings is quite significant (Mt.7:13ff.). (22) But most prominent of all in this passage is the theme of 'return' which obviously comes from a late Deuteronomistic hand. (23)

The late Deuteronomistic authorship of this passage is obvious not only by its close affinities with other such Deuteronomistic passages as Deut.4:29-31; 29:28-29, but also with Jer.29:14; 30:3, 8; 31:23, 31; 32:39ff; and no doubt by its content in which the exilic period is presupposed. The theme

of 'return' is, as H.W. Wolff has clearly shown, (24) a significant one in the Deuteronomistic work. This becomes abundantly clear when we compare Deut.30:1-10 and I Kgs.8:46ff. In these passages the theme of return is obviously the work of a late Deuteronomistic interpolator. (25) The notion of a decisive turn in Israel's fortune and its national and territorial restoration is one that belongs within the confines of the exilic/post-exilic editorial work. The original Deuteronomist(s) might have looked at the day of doom approaching, but certainly not beyond it.

2. The pre-exilic prophets did certainly envisage the approaching day of doom, and evidently had no hesitation in threatening the nation with it.(26) The question is, did they look beyond that day and anticipate a national restoration? Or did they see it as the end? It seems that even prior to the great catastrophes of 721 B.C. and 586 B.C. and the subsequent exiles, such questions arose in the prophets' minds, and they found the answer at first in the 'doctrine of the remnant'. It seemed to them quite inconceivable that Yahweh's judgment would mean the utter annihilation of Israel, least of all, religious annihilation. (27) Had they believed that the doom was final, they would have seen no need to denounce their nation. Instead they would have counselled Israel to resign itself to that fatal day, and, to use R.H. Pfeiffer's words, "they might even have administered anaesthetics to the patients and offered some comfort!" (28)

The prophet Amos for example had the 'remnant' in mind, but not without a deep sense of pessimism about it (3:12). In answer to the question whether the destruction will be complete or some at any rate will be spared, Amos in this passage provides us with a bitter irony. According to him, so much will be saved as the shepherd saves when he gathers up the remnants of the

sheep that the lion has done with, a couple of leg bones or a bit of an ear, remnants that have their value only as proof to the owner that the animal has actually been slain. (29) Hosea at first looked forward to Israel's reconciliation with Yahweh after the punishment (2:14-15, 19-20). However, when repentance in time of trouble proved to him as short-lived as the morning dew (5:15-6:4), Hosea concluded that Yahweh's love had turned into hatred (9:15), and His tender compassion would inevitably give way to His fury (11:8-9; 13:14-15). The hope which he cherished earlier regarding a national conversion has now evaporated, and he is left with the certainty that Yahweh, notwithstanding His abiding love, would have no choice but to execute the death sentence against His people. (30) Some have argued that even in these passages the future salvation and restoration of Israel are clearly implied. Yahweh had to be cruel to be kind. (31) Others, like Wellhausen, Marti and Batten have denied these and all the salvation sayings found in his book. (32)

3. Before 721 B.C. when the Northern Kingdom became an Assyrian province, the prophets had absolutely nothing to say about a restoration. They were neither optimistic forecasters nor indeed fortune-tellers, but they were preachers of righteousness. (33) According to R.H. Pfeiffer, Isaiah was the first of the prophets who had occasion to impart some comfort to his prostrate people with the theme of the 'remnant' which the name of his son, Shear-jashub symbolised (7:3). (34) This interpretation has been disputed by Wildberger and Clements who view this particular passage as pointing to the Syro-Ephaimite army that marched against Jerusalem, but was defeated and reduced to a remnant by the Assyrians in 734 B.C. (35) For Soggin, the entire Ch.7 contains a narrative of past events, written in the late exilic or post-exilic period, with marked Deuteronomistic elements, or

elements which recall this school. This chapter was written a long time after the events as evidenced by 7:1, a text which simply copies II Kgs.16:5. (36) However, S. Mowinckel following J. Wellhausen and his school argues that Isa.7:3 and 37:32 are genuine remnant passages. (37) He obviously revives J. Meinhold's theory without mentioning him by name that the Hebrew concept of remnant first appears in Isaiah of Jerusalem, who was at first a prophet of doom and only later became a prophet of salvation. (38) But the overwhelming majority of scholars regard these passages as coming from the hand of a late editor(s). Attention can also be drawn to another remnant passage in Isaiah 4:2-6. Despite G.F. Hasel's strenuous attempt to prove its Isaianic genuineness, virtually all modern commentators contend that these verses belong to a later post-exilic redactor of the book whose main purpose was to show that the threat to Jerusalem had passed. (39) Some are of the opinion that this later post-exilic redactor may well have belonged to the late Persian period, or even, the third or early second century B.C. (40) It seems therefore highly unlikely that the prophet Isaiah had occasion to comfort his people with the 'remnant' theme. Nor indeed was he a preacher of repentance and deliverance one day, and the next day a proclaimer of his nation's ruin. But rather, as O. Kaiser points out, he consistently announced the coming disaster as an unbearable act of punishment by Yahweh (cf. e.g. 5:1ff. with 22:1-4, 12-14). The picture of a preacher of repentance and deliverance goes back only to an editor of the words of the prophet at work in the exilic or post-exilic period, to whom we owe at least 1:2-9 in its present form as an introduction and 3:8, 9-17 as the original closing saying. (41) It is hard to know whether he had before him a written tradition of Isaiah or whether he drew on oral tradition. The 'hardening of the heart' theology in Ch.6, "derives from a post-exilic reflection, which presupposed

the image of the prophet in the Isaiah tradition that has already been sketched out, and attempted to answer the question why the hortatory preaching of the prophet did not find faith, and why the nation rushed on into disaster". (42)

4.   Jeremiah seems to have anticipated the fall of Jerusalem long before he witnessed it.   Prior to the siege he must have toyed with the possibility of a national conversion - only so can we understand the energy of his call to repentance - although he spoke of the inevitable doom because conversion was impossible (13:10, 23; cf. 5:1-9). This may sound contradictory.   But we must not overlook the fact that both denunciation and exhortation, threats and promises belong to the task of the preacher even to this day. (43) Jeremiah was therefore no exception. Older commentators like J. Skinner and more recently S. Herrmann(44) have noted the unusual way in which threats and promises are formulated in both an absolute absolute and conditional form (cf.7:3-7, 8-15).   Having said this, it remains totally impossible to determine what the prophet Jeremiah actually said about Israel's deliverance from the imminent doom, or its restoration if that doom occurred. We cannot however deny the existence of these two themes in the book of Jeremiah, but at the same time they can by no means be regarded as genuinely Jeremianic. (45)

A.   DELIVERANCE THEME

Our attention must be drawn to the temple sermon in Ch.7, which if taken at face value leaves the impression of being a single connected discourse of Jeremiah. It is a simple and straightforward message to the Judeans of the pre-exilic period: if the people were to amend their sinful lives they will

be allowed to live in the land (vv.5-7) and thus be saved from the impending religious and national devastation (vv.8-15). (46) But the case is not as simple as that. As a matter of fact, the whole of Ch.7 consists of separate units (e.g. 7:1-2a, 2b-15, 16-20, 21-26, 27-28, 29-34) which have been worked together in such a way that the whole gives the impression of being a single connected discourse. (47)

When we come to consider the so called temple sermon in 7:1-15, we find that it contains four elements: a first admonition (vv.2-4), a second admonition (vv.5-7), invective (vv.9-11), and threat (12-15). (48) The most important feature of the temple sermon in the Jeremiah tradition is that there is a parallel account in Ch.26 which sets out the sermon and its aftermath. (49) It concentrates mainly on the threat to the city (26:2, 6b, 9b, 12-13, 15, 18a, 20), the temple element appears only briefly (vv.6a, 9a, 12, 18b). In 7:1-15 the focus is on the temple (vv.4-14a), the territory is mentioned just briefly (vv.3,7,14b-15). Moreover, attention must be drawn to the fact that 7:8-15 conveys an absolute prediction of the fall of the sanctuary of Shiloh. The absolute element is ignored in the summary sermon in 26:4-6. However, R. Carroll suggests that "the absolute element in 7:8-15 should be interpreted in the light of the prefatory conditional element in vv.3-7 and read as contingent in accordance with the version given in 26:4-6". (51) It is interesting to note that both chapters, with hardly any contradiction, echo the theme of a possible deliverance from the coming disaster if the people mend their ways. But it must not be assumed that the so called temple sermon in 7:1-15 (and for that matter the sermon in Ch.26) (52) contains the authentic words of the prophet Jeremiah.

There are indications to suggest that the style and content of the temple sermon belong to a Deuteronomistic writer. For example, the use of the phrase "other gods that you have not known" (v.9) clearly points to the Deuteronomistic fingerprints (Deut.11:28, 13:2, 6; 28:64; 29:25-26). The same Deuteronomistic fingerprints are to be found in Jer.19:4; 44:3. The reference to the temple as "this house, which is called by my name" (vv. 10,11,14) reflects Deuteronomistic usage (cf.Deut.12:11; 14:23; 16:2,6,11; 26:2; I Kgs.8:43). We may also note the occurrence of the sanctuary place name Shiloh in vv.12, 14. Here the prophetic speech is linked with the tradition about Shiloh associated with Samuel the prophet in the Deuteronomistic history (I.Sam.1-4). (53) The type of preaching in the temple sermon and elsewhere in the book of Jeremiah is quite at home in the Deuteronomistic circles (Cf. 7:1-15; 22:1-5; 17:19-27; I.Kgs.8:25; 9:4-7). We conclude, therefore, that in the so called temple sermon, we are dealing not with Jeremiah's words to the pre-exilic Judeans, but with the Deuteronomistic editor(s)' message to the exilic community. This message had a two-fold purpose: 1) To present the prophet Jeremiah to his readers as an ardent preacher of Torah; (55) and, 2) By presenting the absolute prediction of the fall of the Shiloh sanctuary and the rejection of the nation (8-15), he meant to explain why destruction had befallen temple and state in 587 B.C. The call to amendment of life (3-7) is directed to his contemporaries and the subsequent generations, that to live according to the terms of the covenant-law would always ensure Yahweh's saving presence and blessing. (56)

B.   RESTORATION THEME

In the book of Jeremiah, numerous passages are similar in style and thought to Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic historical books - Joshua through II

Kings.   This similarity led John W. Colenso in the nineteenth century, to the extreme theory that Jeremiah was the author of Deuteronomy and editor of the historical books of the Old Testament. (56) We now know, thanks to recent Old Testament studies, that the book of Jeremiah underwent much Deuteronomistic editing in the exilic and post-exilic times. (57) In his edition of Jeremiah, the Deuteronomist "shares a special predilection for composing long sermons and prayers, a characteristic that may be observed in other works from the Deuteronomic school". (58)   The Deuteronomists's main theme in Jeremiah is that history is under Yahweh's control. He led Israel out of Egypt into Canaan, but there they fell into idolatry. Despite repeated calls to repentance through many prophets (including Jeremiah), Israel persisted in sin. Consequently, Yahweh gave them into the hands of the Babylonians. Yet, Yahweh's ultimate plans for Israel are good rather than evil, and He will finally restore them to their land. (59) A brief treatment of this last point will show how the Jeremiah tradition has been developed to present the prophet as a preacher of future restoration.

Jer.3:14b-18.   An editorial passage , probably late Deuteronomistic, expressing ideas that are frequently found in exilic and post-exilic apocalyptic passages (Isa.2:2-4; Micah 4:1-3; Zech.19:16-19). (60)   The editor appears to have misunderstood the meaning of 'Return' in the preceding Jeremianic verses 12-14a, which refer to the return to God in true repentance.   He understood it as a call to Northern Israelites to return from exile (14b).

Jer.24:4-7 is editorial and may be dated to the period after 587 B.C.   (61) The Deuteronomistic phraseology is noticeable in v.v.6-7, 9-10. (62)   The

vision is a literary product and does not represent Jeremiah's own thought. Indeed, the view expressed in vv. 4-10 contradicts Jeremiah's ideas and actions expressed on other occasions: a) In Ch.5 all groups and classes in Jerusalem are sinful; b) The exiles are severely condemned for their impatience ch.29; c) For Jeremiah, Yahweh had rejected Jehoiachin 22:24-30; d) He regarded Zedekiah as weak rather than evil chs.37-38; e) He decided to stay in Palestine rather than go to Babylon 39:13-14; 40:1-6. For Jeremiah, Yahweh's favour did not depend on whether or not a man had been in exile, but on his repentance and obedience. (64) To ' some, the view expressed in vv.4-7 resembles that of those Judeans who regarded the exiled Jehoiachin as the legitimate King and opposed Zedekiah's claims to the throne (Ezek.17:22). This view lasted well into the post-exilic period (Hag.2:21ff.; Zech.3:8; 4:6ff.). (65) More likely, the insertion of vv. 4-7 was intended to "boost the identity and confidence of the exiles in Babylon", and thus shift the focus from Palestine to Babylon. The focus of the Jeremiah tradition is on Jerusalem, and despite this propaganda on behalf of the exiles in Babylon, the social and political centre of the Judean life remained Palestine. (66)

Jer.29:4-14 consists of two parts: 1. The Jeremianic oracle vv.4-9 which agrees with ch.28 that the exile would be permanent. The injunction in vv. 5-7 reminds the exiled community to behave as peaceable subjects, and to realise that their well-being is linked with the well-being of Babylon. 2. The editorial addition vv.10-14 seems to be a counterbalance to what preceded it. (68) Moreover, the Deuteronomistic phraseology is particularly evident in v.v. 13-14 (cf.v.13 with Deut.4:29; I Kgs.8:46-53; cf. v.14 with Deut.30:3,5). (69) The passage contains the promise of restoration (v.10), "a promise for which there is no basis given in the

tradition but which has arisen out of this redaction of Jeremiah (applying the early oracles of restoration for Israel to the exiles in Babylon)." There are also two distinctive views of future restoration. The view that restoration precedes the turning to Yahweh (vv.10-11), and the view that restoration follows when the exiles turn to Him (v.v.13-14). (71) Most interesting is the mention of seventy years as the limit of the exile (v.10). The seventy-year motif is also mentioned in an Esarhaddon inscription as the period in which Babylon shall lie desolate. (72) Weinfeld and Luckenbill detect the influence of this inscription upon the editors of v.10 and other similar Biblical texts (eg 25:11f.; Isa.23:15-17; Dan.9:2; Zech.1:12; 7:5; II Chron.36:21). (73) For many fundamentalist Christian sects this figure has been a source of eschatological speculations. It is generally agreed that in the ancient Near East seventy years was simply a conventional figure for a period of divine punishment. However, the prediction gives hardly any hope of return to those who were in exile at the time the letter was written. Nor is the seemingly additional passage of Jeremiah's purchase of a field in Anathoth (32:1-15) indicative of the restoration of land to those who would soon be exiles. In fact, as R. Carroll has clearly shown, the passage is so beset with difficulties that it is impossible to take the story of the purchase of family land as a literal act of Jeremiah's. It should therefore be read "as one more presentation of Jeremiah the prophet behaving in a paradigmatic manner with reference to the community's future". (75) Quite often, such a future hope of territorial restoration is placed in eschatological and apocalyptic contexts (3:15-18; 12:14-17; 16:14-15 - comparable to Isa.51:9-11; 16:19-21; 23:1-8; 30:10-11; 31:4-14; 35-37). This concept was foreign to Jeremiah (as to the pre-exilic prophets), whose sole concern was the moral and spiritual restoration of the nation. (77)

II   RESTORATION IN THE LATER PROPHETS

The theme of Israel's new and happy future in Palestine after the catastrophe is one of the characteristic features of the later prophets. The pre-exilic prophets had no interest in the curious inquiry as to the way Israel's future would be shaped. For them the nation was doomed to destruction and the state was bound for desolation. Yahweh was neither bound ·to Israel nor to Palestine. The concept of a future territorial restoration is the addition of a later age which, as K. Marti opines, may have intended to revert "more or less to the assumption of a national connection between Yahweh and Israel", (78) which the prophets themselves combated so fiercely in their days (see above pp.121f.). Naturally, too, the pre-exilic prophets did not have in mind the apocalyptic picture of the end of the world when they spoke of the impending doom of the people. They simply described the judgment which Israel will suffer. It was only the later editors who read into their statements an eschatology of the end of a corrupt world and the beginning of a better one. In reality, they preached the end of the sinful ways of Israel and other nations while the rest of the world went its way. (79) Their message proclaimed a spiritual rather than territorial and political restoration. Even if we regard the prophecies of Assyria's destruction in Isa.14:24-27; 30:27-33; 31:4-9 (80) as authentic - which apparently they are not - the overthrow of Assyria in 605 B.C. had no relation to Judah's restoration. Interestingly, however, later redactors who read into certain prophetic oracles the idea of a territorial restoration were careful to divest it of any possible independent political autonomy without a righteous Messianic king descended from David (e.g. Isa.9:2-7; 11:1-9; Jer.23:5; 30:8-9; 33:14-17). (81)

This, most likely, reflects the conditions of the post-exilic period in which the Judeans, though under the religious leadership of the high priest, were under the Persian and Greek flags consecutively (538-143 B.C.). (82) Even the seventy-one year political independence under the Hasmoneans (142-63 B.C.) did not pass unopposed. At first, the Hasidim militarily supported Mathathias and his son, Judah Maccabeus, in the struggle against the Seleucids (I Mac.2:42; II Mac.14:6). When religious freedom was recovered, they climbed off the Maccabean nationalist bandwagon and were anxious to secure peace with their Seleucid colonial masters (I Mac.7:14-14). They opposed Jonathan, the brother of Judah Maccabeus, "because he strove to make Judea a free state and also because he claimed the high priesthood." (83) Later they opposed the election of his brother Simon for the same reason.

However, in the later prophets restoration is an important theme, and there is no reason to doubt the genuineness of some of the prophetic oracles on this subject. Nevertheless, such restoration oracles appear to include some new dimensions.

1. Our attention at this point must be drawn to the book of Ezekiel. It has been suggested that "the throne-chariot" vision in Eze.1-3 ; 8-11 (84) may possibly be original and also part of the vision of the restored temple in Chs.40-48. (85) These nine chapters constitute the fourth section of the book, and are denied to the prophet Ezekiel altogether by some scholars, while others are prepared to allow that they contain a substantial Ezekielian element. (86) As we said previously, the oracles of promise scattered through the pre-exilic prophets are later additions.

The same is true of the oracles which look forward to the return in Chs.1-39 of Ezekiel, with the exception perhaps of the vision of dry bones in 37:1-14. (87) The Davidic king idea mentioned in 29:21; 34:23-24; 37:24-25 is also untypical of Ezekiel and belongs to the editor's messianic eschatology. Within Chs.40-48 mention is made of a "price" נָשִׂיא as the secular head of the restored community, who is totally different from the Davidic prince of the future new age in Chs.29, 34 and 37. The term נָשִׂיא suggests a parallel to the modern 'sheik', and this is probably the sense in which it is used in Chs.40-48. (88)

However, the vision of the temple in Chs.40-48 most probably contains some Ezekielian element, especially when we remember that he was a priest and a member of the family of Zadok. Having lived among the exiles for some thirteen years, Ezekiel might well have desired to direct their minds towards a return to Palestine. The bulk of the exiles seemingly centred their hopes around Jehoiachin and looked for the restoration of the political regime in Palestine very much as it had been (Eze.17:22f.; Jer.22:24-30). Ezekiel vehemently opposed this attitude and visualised a theocratic community centred around the temple, a kingdom of God. (89) He seems to have done his utmost to prevent the tendency of his fellow-exiles to be swallowed up in the Babylonian empire, and thus keep the people together for the coming restoration. As a prophet he warned them against sin and comforted them in their discouragements. But as a priest he planned the restoration of the temple services as an essential part of the territorial restoration (Chs.40-48). Indeed, his "concrete presentation proved more influential than the mysticism of Jeremiah, and his plan was realised to some extent in the Priestly Code". (90) In Ezekiel's thought

the temple as Yahweh's dwelling place, which marked His presence among His people, is absolutely central to the restoration and to the renewed life of Israel. (91) Here an ancient motif of temple ideology is quite discernible (esp. Eze.47:1ff.; cf. Ps.36:8-10; 65:5). (92) There is also a great element of truth in the argument that what is said particularly in Ch.47 concerning the glorious temple fountain demonstrates that Ezekiel was speaking of the final age. (93) In any case, it seems that for Ezekiel a restoration was unthinkable without the temple, the two are inextricably linked. Even if his concept of the prince in 44:3; 45:7-16; 46:2, 4, 8, 10; 48:21-22 meant a scion of David, as Ackroyd, Baltzer and Caquot seem to suggest (which apparently he is not), the theocratic rule here clearly subordinates him to the priesthood. (94)

2. In spite of the impact which Ezekiel's concept might have made on his hearers and their successors, the idea of an essential link between a territorial political independence and a Messianic king descended from David never died. The widespread insurrections which Darius I, King of Persia (521-485 B.C.), had to overcome in his early reign did not leave Judea untouched. During this period both Haggai and Zechariah were moved to announce that Yahweh was shaking up the kingdoms of the world not only to bring their wealth to Jerusalem (Hag.2:6-9; Zech.2:8-9), but also to restore the kingdom of David under his descendant Zerubbabel (Hag.2:23; Zech.3:8). In fact, Zechariah actually crowned Zerubbabel as the Messiah (6:9-15). (95) We may, however, conjecture that despite all secrecy the Persian authorities heard of this coronation and promptly removed Zerubbabel from circulation and warned Zechariah against any future involvement in such political plots. (96)

3.   Following the spiritual restoration of Isaiah and Jeremiah and the
ritual restoration of Ezekiel, but before the dreams of political
independence of Haggai and Zechariah, the great author of Isaiah 40-55
commonly known as the second Isaiah (about 540 B.C.) had elevated the
restoration to the level of an event of world-wide significance.   It is
outside the scope of this essay to deal with all the varying theological
elements of Isa.40-55. We wish to focus our attention mainly on the theme
of the "Servant" because of the relevance it has for the subject of this
essay.

It is significant to note that in Deutero-Isaiah nothing is said about a
Davidic Messiah.   Yahweh simply accomplishes His redemptive purpose through
Cyrus of Persia, whom he calls 'Messiah' and 'Yahweh's beloved'
(44:28-45:1-7; 48:14) and also through his Servant, Israel. (97)   The
Servant idea, however, is a fundamental element in the theology of Deutero-
Isaiah and is contained in Chs.42:1-4; 49:1-6; 50:4-9; 52:13; 53:12 .
Since the work of Duhm these passages have been recognised by a number of
scholars as forming a distinct group within the book and belong to a later
author. (98) Others regard the 'songs' as an integral part of the rest of
the work. (99) In any case, the question of the identify of the 'Servant'
has often been asked and variously answered. J. Muilenburg argues that in
one series of passages the 'Servant' is clearly identified with Israel
(41:8ff.; 43:8-13; 43:14-44; 1-5; 44:6-8; 21-23; 44:24-45; 4; 48:1, 7, 10-
12, 17); in a second series (42:1-4; 49:1-6; 50:4-9; 52:13-53; 12) there is
only one reference to Israel (49:3), and this is usually expunged by those
who maintain that the 'Servant' is these passages refers to an individual. (100)
Some scholars like A.R. Johnson and I. Engnell have even found in the

'Servant' the features of the divine Davidic king as he appears in the
royal Psalms and elsewhere (e.g. II Sam.21:17; Sam.4:20; Ps.2). (101 Also
the fact that individual and corporate traits intersect, has led a number
of scholars like Rowley, North, von Rad and Westermann, to see in the
'Servant' the coming Messiah or some other future mediator. (102)
However, most of those who find in the 'Servant' an individual figure
identify him with some historical figure either contemporary with the
author or before his time. He has been identified with Jeremiah, with
Zerubbabel, with Jeholachin, with Moses, with some unknown contemporary of
the prophet, with the prophet himself; but none of these seems to fit all
the conditions of the case. (103) But there continue to be many
representatives of the collective interpretation, which can appeal to 49:3,
where the 'Servant' is identified with Israel, as well to mentions of the
'Servant' in context, when he is clearly identified with Israel. This view
was defended by Budde, Giesebrecht and Marti, (104) and has later been
supported by scholars like de Boer, Eissfeldt, Rignell, Snaith, Baltzer and
Kapelrud. (105) A vast amount of literature has been written on this
subject, and it is probably too much to hope that there will ever be any
generally agreed solution to the problem. It seems that the writer himself
would have found difficulty in defining precisely what was in his own mind
when he spoke of the 'Servant'. But we can say with some degree of
confidence that what the writer appears to have meant by the 'Servant' was
the chosen and appointed agent of the divine will. In any case, the door
remains wide open. Interestingly, however, for the first time the election
of the 'Servant' (41:8; 42:1; 43:10) is defined in terms of mission and
service (106) (42:6; 49:6; 43:1ff.) rather than privilege or favouritism.
This must be seen against the backdrop of Monotheism and its corollary

universalism which are the hallmark of Deutero-Isaiah.

4.   With Deutero-Isaiah the idea of mission reaches its high-water mark
and is based on two concepts that are an essential part of the author's
thought: monotheism and universalism. This is the first Hebrew author to
declare strongly and unequivocally that Yahweh is alone, and there is no
god beside Him (44:6, 8: 45: 6,21; cf. 41:26-27). He is the controller of
history (41:4) and the one creator of the world (40:12ff.). His
sovereignty over the world is such that He forms light and creates
darkness, makes weal and creates woe (45:7) and nothing is outside His
authority. Other gods are but dead and useless idols (41:23-24; 43:12-13;
48:5), less worthy of respect than those who make them (44:9-20; 45:16-17).
Above all, He is eternal (41:4; 44:6). (108) Such a concept entailed
corollaries. The creator of all must be the God of all, and as such must
desire the worship not only of Israel but of all mankind. In Rowley's
words, "If He has revealed Himself peculiarly to Israel, then His purpose
must be that Israel should be the medium of this revelation unto all men,
and in this divinely appointed destiny lies Israel's supreme glory and
distinction". (109)

We cannot, however, pretend that this view has gone undisputed. Exegetes
such as Snaith, de Boch and recently Whybray have questioned Deutero-
Isaiah's universalism. Snaith particularly sees the author as "essentially
nationalistic in attitude. He is actually responsible for the narrow and
exclusive attitude of post-exilic days. The so-called universalism of
Deutero-Isaiah needs considerable qualification". (110) R. Martin-Achard
seizes on this argument and goes further to contend that "monotheism does

not hold the central place in Deutero-Isaiah's proclamation, but is only one aspect of it", indeed, it "is only a secondary element" in his preaching. Therefore, he cautions against exaggerating Deutero-Isaiah's universalism. The prophet's chief concern is not the salvation of the Gentiles but the liberation of the Judean exiles and their triumphant return to their land. Far from offering a lecture on monotheism or a treatise on dogmatics, the prophet was simply giving an answer to the plight of his fellow exiles. He was not confronting them with a doctrine but with the message of deliverance. "Just as Ezekiel struggled with his hearers' disbelief so Deutero-Isaiah had to contend with the doubts of his contemporaries. He had to repeat his declarations, argue with his interlocutors, and answer their objections". Moreover, he re-echoes Zimmerli's argument that for Deutero-Isaiah as well as Ezekiel, Yahweh's honour is inextricably and indeed exclusively linked with Israel. "The sole purpose of the divine intervention on behalf of Israel was the glorification of His name" (40:23; 42:10ff.; 43:7ff.; Eze.36:22ff.; 39:25ff.). (111) Despite his assertion of the prophet's exclusive nationalism, he is inevitably forced to explain those passages which portray Israel, in the divine scheme, as a shining witness and missionary agent to the nations. He ignores Snaith's view that "the Servant will be a light to guide every Israelite wanderer home", (112) and adopts the position of de Boer and Ploeg which perceives Israel's role in the world as purely passive. (113) This is tantamount to saying that at restoration Israel should be transformed into a museum of saints for universal inspection and admiration. Martin Archard's argument in favour of Deutero-Isaiah's exclusive nationalism is not entirely convincing.

We cannot ignore the fact that the Servant Songs do exhibit a new way of envisaging the relationship between Israel and the Gentiles. It is also hard to dismiss the body of opinion which views the Songs as being the product of the universalistic vision which possessed the authors of the books of Ruth and Jonah. (114)   But what of the particularist passages which we certainly encounter in Deutero-Isaiah such as 43:3f.; 45:14, 24; 49:23, 26?   The authenticity of these and other similar nationalistic passages has been seriously questioned, and E. Jacob seems quite certain that "the prophet's book itself underwent some retouching of a nationalist kind". (115)   Many scholars tend to see an interlinking of three major points in Deutero-Isaiah: monotheism from which derives universalism and from the two together derives the concept of mission. (116)   The message is that the 'Servant', Israel, must establish the religion of Yahweh to the end of the earth.   J. Wellhausen summed up Deutero-Isaiah's message in the formula: "There is no God but Yahweh, and Israel is His prophet". (117)

THE SERVANT: A FAR REACHING THEOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE

In the four songs, the Servant, as J. W. Miller has carefully shown, may be identified with Israel as a corporate body (42:1-4), with Israel and the prophet (49:1-6), with the prophet and his suffering (50:4-9) and finally with the prophet and his martyrdom (53:1ff.). (118)   The fact remains, however, that the songs differ completely in kind, their link being a subject in common, 'God's Servant'.   One thing at least is clear: their language reveals and conceals the Servant at the same time.   It may well be that there was a fluidity in the writer's thought that makes all our efforts to pin him down to a single identification doomed to failure. (119)

Perhaps owing to such a fluidity of thought some modern scholars have been able to apply the 'Servant' idea not only to Israel, but "to an ideal community within it, and also to an individual arising from that community". (120) With this last point we are back to the Targum which equates the 'Servant' in Ch.53 with the Messiah. (121)

It is, extremely hard to know exactly what Deutero-Isaiah had in mind when he spoke of the 'Servant'. But "this much, however, is certain: the Servant has a task imposed on him by God and embraces the Gentiles as well as Israel. It is also certain that his function is that of proclaiming God's word, and to this extent it very closely approximates to a prophet's". (122) There are two more points worth knowing about the 'Servant' in Deutero-Isaiah: (1) The manner in which he is designated in 42:1-4 may recall that of a king. (123) (2) In 50:4-9,; 52:1ff we have a description of his office which involves him in suffering and which 53:1ff explains as vicarious, for 'the many'. (124) The Servant is portrayed as having a place in the history of the office of mediator, which begins with Moses, who is designated as "the Servant of God" (Ex.14:31; Num.12:7; Deut.34:5). By virtue of "the positive value attributed to the Servant's vicarious suffering, and since in his hands the office of mediator was expanded to take in the Gentiles - the Servant is destined to be a light to the nations - the songs point forward to a new era in the history of that office". (125) One may venture to add that the Songs of the 'Servant' often leave the reader with the strong impression of a sublime personality (if the term personality is allowed) that transcends Israel itself, its nationalism and its territory. It is hard to ignore the role that the songs of the Servant played in the emergence of the "New Israel movement"

(Gal.6:16; Phil.3:3), which far transcended anything envisaged in the Old Testament and which assigned to itself alone the sole right of being "a light to the nations" (John 8:1; cf. 1:7-9; Acts 13:47; 26:23).(126)

NOTES ON CHAPTER SEVEN

1. G. Garbini points out that "the Hebrews liked to call themselves 'sons of Jacob' but were even fonder of calling themselves 'sons of Israel', and we know absolutely nothing about this Israel, the eponymous ancestor of the northern kingdom - in other words, the Bible is completely silent about this figure, who was only identified with Jacob at a late stage and almost incidentally". "History and Ideology in Ancient Israel", p.80; cf. M. Noth, "The History of Israel", p.3; D.N. Freedman and D.F. Graf (eds.), "Palestine in Transition: The Emergence of Ancient Israel", Sheffield 1983.

2. See translation and notes by E. Ullendorff in DOTT, pp.195ff; W. Beyerlin, "Near Eastern Religious Texts Relating to the Old Testament", SCM Press 1978, pp.237-240.

3. L. Perlitt, "Bundestheologie im Alten Testament", p.114; for a recent perceptive discussion on this see. W. McKane, "Prophet and Institution", ZAW 94, 1982, PP.251-66.

4. J. Bright, "Covenant and Promise", pp.65, 73, 131; A.D.H. Mayes, "Deuteronomy", pp.55.

5. E.W. Nicholson, "God and His People", pp.193-201.

6. Ibid. p.194; H.H. Schmid, "Altorientalische Welt in der alttestamentlichen Theologie", Zurich, 1974, Ch.I; P. Berger, "The Social Reality of Religion", London, 1969, esp. Chs. 1-2.

7. F. Stolz, "Strukturen und Figuren im Kult von Jerusalem", BZAW 118, Berlin, 1970, pp.12-101; Cf. J. Day, "God's Conflict with the Dragon and the Sea", Cambridge, 1985, Ch.3; E.W. Nicholson, "God and His people", p.199f.

8. See W. Beyerlin, "Near Eastern Religious Texts Relating to the Old Testament", pp.19, 29, 113.

9. E.W. Nicholson, "God and His People", p.199.

10. S.W. Bewer, "Micah - Zeph - Nah - Hab - Obe and Jonah", The International Critical Commentary, 1912, p.80; D.R. Hillers, "Micah" (Hermeneia Commentaries), Fortress Press, 1983; See also J. Blenkinsopp, "A History of Prophecy in Israel", p.123; A.S. van der Woude, "Micah in Dispute with the Pseudo-Prophets", VT19, 1969, pp.144-6. This author attempts to reconstruct elements of the mainline Israelite religion through quotations attributed to "the false prophets".

11. J. Wellhausen, "Israel", 9th edition of Encyclopaedia Britannica, Vol.XIII 1881, pp.473f.

12. J. Wellhausen, "Prolegomena", pp.417f.; R.H. Pfeiffer, "Religion in the Old Testament", pp.173f.

13. E.W. Nicholson, "God and His People", pp.215,; R. Davidson, "Covenant Ideology in Ancient Israel", p.337.

14. G.H. Jones, "I & II Kings", N.C.B.C. pp.70ff.

15. C. Kuhl, "The Old Testament: Its Origins and Composition", p.152

16. G. von Rad, "The Deuteronomistic Theology of History in the Book of Kings", Studies in Deuteronomy, London, 1953, ch.7

17. H.W. Wolff, "Das Kerygma des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerkes", ZAW 73, 1961, pp.171-86; F.M. Cross, "The Themes of the Book of Kings and the Structure of the Deuteronomistic History" in "Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic", Cambridge, Mass. 1973, pp.274-89

18. For L. Perlitt, passages such as II Sam. 7 and 23, Pss.89 and 132, which speak of an 'eternal covenant' and a 'dynasty for ever' must be assigned to a late, post-exilic period. See his "Bundestheologie in Alten Testament", pp.47ff.; B.S. Childs, "Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture", Fortress Press, Philadelphia, pp.292f. gives a guarded support to von Rad's view; E.W. Nicholson on the other hand tends to support Perlitt's argument. See his "God and His People", pp.109ff.

19. S.R. Driver, 'Deuteronomy', p.328; A.D.H. Mayes, 'Deuteronomy', pp.367f.

20. W.L. Holladay, 'The Root SUBH in the Old Testament', Leiden 1958

21. S.R. Driver, 'Deuteronomy', p.329, especially his note on U.3; A.D.H. Mayes, 'Deuteronomy', p.369; cf. W.L. Holladay, 'The Root SUBH in the Old Testament', 110ff.

22. J. Muilenburg, 'The Way of Israel', London, 1962, p.67; P.R. Ackroyd, 'Israel under Babylon and Persia', Oxford 1970, pp.146f.

23. N. Lohfink, 'Höre Israel. Auslegung von Texten aus dem Buch Deuteronomium', Dusseldorf, 1965, pp.119f; A.D.H. Mayes, 'Deuteronomy', p.368.

24. H.W. Wolff, 'Das Kerygma des deuteronomistischen Geschicht - Werks', in Gesammelte Studien Zum Alten Testament (Theologische Bücherei 22), München, 1964, pp.371f.

25. A.D.H. Mayes, 'Deuteronomy' pp.41ff, 368f.

26. T.H. Robinson, 'Prophecy and the Prophets in Ancient Israel', London, 1967, pp.46f.; O. Kaiser, 'Introduction to the Old Testament', Oxford 1984, p.215.

27. R.H. Pfeiffer, 'Religion in the Old Testament', p.155; T. Kittel, 'Great Men and Movements in Israel', London, 1926, p.233.

28. Ibid. p.155.

29. H.E.W. Fosbroke, 'Amos', IB, Vol 6, p.798; J. Marsh, 'Amos and Micah' SCM. 1967, p.45; E.D. Harper, 'Amos and Hosea', ICC. T.T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1936, p.81; Wolff urges that we must see in the book of Amos a basic core going back to Amos himself in the book of visions (7:1-8, 8:1-2 and 9:1-4, and also perhaps in the collections of sayings (1:3-2:16 and 3:1-6, 14). The passages (1:1; 6:2; 7:9-17; 8:3-14 and 9:7, 8a, 9-10) belong to ancient 'school of Amos' which which was active in Judea about 760-730 B.C. This school was also responsible for the oracles about the destruction of the Bethel sanctuary in Josiah's time (1:2; 3:14; 4:6-12; 5:5-6), and also for the Doxologies, which form a three-strophe hymn, (4:13; 5:8; 9:5f.). There is also the Deuteronomistic redaction (1:1; the sayings against Tyre, Edom and Judah, 1:9-12; 2:4f; and also 2:10-12; 3:16, 7 and 5:25f.). Finally, there is also a post-exilic salvation – eschatology redaction (9:8b, 11-15). See H.W. Wolff, 'Dodekapropheten, II Joel und Amos, BKAT 14, 2nd edition, Neukirchen 1975, pp.120 and 201, E. trs. Joel and Amos, Philadelphia 1977.

30. J.A. Soggin, 'Introduction to the Old Testament', p.296, M.J. Buss, 'The Prophetic Word of Hosea', BZAW 111, 1969; A. Loisy, 'The Religion of Israel', London 1910, pp.127f.

31. O. Kaiser, 'Introduction to the Old Testament', p.220; H.H. Rowley, "The Marriage of Hosea" in 'Men of God', London 1963, pp.66ff., esp. pp.94f.; E. Sellin, 'Einleitung in das Alten Testament', 7th Edn., 1935, p.105.

32. J. Wellhausen, 'Die kleinen Propheten übersetzt und erklärt', Berlin 1898, p.128; K Marti, 'Das Dodekapropheton (K.H.G.) 1904, P.90; L.W. Batten, J.B.L. 48, 1929, PP.258, 264F.; O Kaiser has urged that "With Fohrer we must regard as secondary, besides Hosea 1:7, at least 1:10-2:1; 2:4-8, 10, 12; 4:15; 5:5; 7:13bf.; 11:11-12; 14:9", Cf. 'Introduction to the Old Testament', p.220; G. Fohrer, "Umkehr und Erlosung beim Propheten Hosea", (1955), in 'Studien zur altestamentlichen Prophetie', BZAW 99, 1967, pp.222ff.

33. R.H. Pfeiffer, 'Religion in the Old Testament', p.155; for a comprehensive discussion on the character and function of the Old Testament prophet, see T.H. Robinson, 'Prophecy and the Prophets in Ancient Israel', pp.28-49.

34. R.H. Pfeiffer, 'Religion in the Old Testament', p.155; An immense variety of possible interpretations have been canvassed for the understanding of the name 'Shear-Jashuv', See H. Wildberger, 'Jesaja 1-12 (Biblische Kommentar), Neukerchen-Huyn, 1965-72.

35. H. Wildberger, Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament, ed. by E. Jenni and C. Westermann, Vol.II, Zurich/Munich, 1971-6, pp.844ff.; R.E. CLements, 'Isaiah 1-39', London 1982, p.83.

36. J.A. Soggin, 'Introduction to the Old Testament', pp.247f.

37. S. Mowinckel, 'Psalmenstudien II. Das Thronbesteigungsfest Jahwäs und der Ursprung der Eschatologie. 2nd Ed. Amsterdam, 1961, p.265; cf. G.F. Hasel, 'The Remnant: The History and Theology of the Remnant Idea From Genesis to Isaiah', Andrews University Press, 1980, p.12.

38. S. Mowinckel, Psalmenstudien II, pp.279, 281f.; J. Meinhold, Studien zur israelitschen Religionsgeschichte. Band I: Der heilige Rest. Teil I: Elias Amos Hosea Jesaja. Bom, 1903.

39. W. Eichrodt, Der Heilige in Israel. Jesaja 1-12 (Die Botschaft des Alten Testament), Stuttgart, 1960; O. Kaiser, 'Isaiah 1-12' SCM 1974; A. Schoors, Jesaja (De Boeken Van het Oud Testament) Roermond 1972, G. Fohrer, Das Buch Jesaja (Zürcher Biblekommentare), 2nd. ed, Zurich/Stuttgart, Bd.I, chs.1-23, 1966; H. Wildberger, Jesaja 1-12; R.E. Clements, 'Isaiah 1-39', pp.53f.

40. See H. Wildberger, Jesaja 1-12, pp.153f.; O. Kaiser, 'Isaiah 1-12, p.54'; also his 'Isaiah 13-39', p.395.

41. Ibid. Isa.13-39, pp.234f. cf.

42. O. Kaiser, 'Introduction to the Old Testament', p.223.

43. R.H. Pfeiffer, 'Religion in the Old Testament', p.156. R. Smend calls this kind of contradiction "a hypothetical prediction". According to him this "hypothetical prediction is a contradiction in terms, as if one should speak of "wooden iron"", cf. 'Lehrbuch der Alttestamentlichen Religionsgeschichte', 2nd. ed., 1899, p.191.

44. J. Skinner, 'Prophecy and Religion', pp.74ff.; 170ff.; S. Herrmann, 'Die prophetischen Heilserwartungen in Alten Testament', BWANT, V.5 (85), 1965, pp.159ff.; R. Carroll, 'From Chaos to Covenant', pp.85ff.

45. For a full and extensive treatment of this point see W. Thiel, 'Die deuteromonistische Redaktion von Jeremia 1-25, WMANT, 1973; H.G. von Reventlow, 'Gattung und Uberlieferung in der "Tempelrede Jeremia"', ZAW 81, 1969, pp.315ff.; W.E. Nicholson, 'Preaching to the Exiles: A Study of the Prose Tradition in the Book of Jeremiah', Oxford 1970; W. Rudolph, Jeremia, HAT 12, 1968; S. Mowinckel, 'Zur Komposition des Buches Jeremia', Videnskapsselskapets Skrifter II, 1913, 5, Kristiania 1914; J.P. Hyatt, 'Jeremiah and Deuteronomy', JNES I, 1942, pp.156ff. P. Volz, 'Studien zum Text des Jeremia', BWAT 25, 1920; J. Skinner, 'Prophecy and Religion'.

46. J. Skinner, 'Prophecy and Religion', p.170.

47. J. Bright, 'Jeremiah', pp.57ff.

48. R. Carroll, 'Jeremiah: A Commentary', SCM 1986, pp.207ff.; G. Fohrer, 'Jeremias Tempelwort (Jeremia 7:1-15)'; 'Prophetie und Magie', Studien zur alttestamentlichen Prophetie (1949-1965), BZAW 99 Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1967, pp.190-203.

49. R. Carroll, 'From Chaos to Covenant', p.85; G. Fohrer, 'Jeremia Tempelwort', pp.190-203; H.G. Reventlow, 'Gattung und Überlieferung in der "Tempelrede Jeremias", Jer.7 und 26', ZAW 81, 1969, pp.315-52; J.A. Wilcoxen, 'The Political Background of Jeremiah's Temple Sermon' in 'Scripture in History and Theology: Essays in Honour of J. Coert Rylaarsdam', ed. A.L. Merrill and T.W. Overholt, Pittsburgh, 1977, pp.151-66; J. Skinner, 'Prophecy and Religion', p.170.

50. R. Carroll, 'Jeremiah', p.207; see also his 'From Chaos to Covenant', p.86; W. McKane, 'Jeremiah', ICC, Edin. 1986, pp.158-68.

51. R. Carroll, 'From Chaos to Covenant', p.86.

52. H.G.Reventlow, 'Gattung und Überlieferung in der "Tempelrede Jeremias" Jer. 7 und 26', ZAW 81, 1969, pp.315-62; cf.; W. Thiel, 'Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 26-46', Neukirchen 1981, pp.3-4; E.W. Nicholson, 'Preaching to the Exiles: A Study of the Prose Tradition in the Book of Jeremiah', pp.52ff.; R. Carroll, 'Jeremiah', pp.512-22.

53. Some scholars are of the view that the Shiloh sanctuary fell during the Assyrian destruction of the Northern Kingdom in the late eighth century; see J. van Rossum, 'Wanneer is Silo verwoest?', Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift 24, Wangenningen 1970, pp.321-32; R.A. Pearce 'Shiloh and Jer. 7:12,14, 15', VT 23, 1973, pp.105-08. Against this view see J. Day, 'The Destruction of the Shiloh Sanctuary and Jer. 7:12, 14' in Studies in the Historical Books of the Old Testament, ed. J.A. Emerton. VTS 30, 1979, pp.87-94.

54. R. Carroll, 'From Chaos to Covenant', p.87, see also p.302, note 3.; W. Thiel, 'Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremias 1-25' WMANT 41, 1973, pp.290-5.

55. R. Carroll, 'From Chaos to Covenant', p.87; H.G. Reventlow, ZAW 81, 334-41.

56. J W Colenso, 'The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua Critically Examined', London, 1879, VII, 12, pp.225-27, 259-69 and Appendix 149.

57. See R.E. Friedman, 'Who Wrote the Bible?' (1987); R. Carroll, 'Jeremiah', p.211; J. Skinner, 'Prophecy and Religion', p.170f.; E.W. Nicholson, 'Preaching to the Exiles', p.71.

58. J P Hyatt, 'The Deuteronomic Edition of Jeremiah', Vanderbilt Studies in the Humanities I, ed. R C Beatty, J P Hyatt and M K Spears, Vanderbilt University Press (1951), pp.71-95 (Perdue and Kovacs, pp.247-67; cf. S. Mowinckel, 'Zur Komposition des Buches Jeremia' (Kristiania: J Dybwad 1914).

59. J P Hyatt, 'The Book of Jeremiah: Introduction and Exegesis', IB 5, 1956, pp.788f.

60. Ibid. p.789.

61. W McKane, 'Jeremiah', pp.72ff.; J P Hyatt, 'The Deuteronomic Edition of Jeremiah' in 'A Prophet to the Nations', ed. L G Perdue and B W Kovacs, p.254; see also J P Hyatt, 'The Book of Jeremiah: Introduction and Exegesis', IB.5, pp.827f.; A S Peake, 'Jeremiah and Lamentations: I Jeremiah I-XXIV', the Century Bible, ed. T C and E C Jack, 1910; R Carroll, 'Jeremiah', pp 148ff.

62. For a detailed study of this point see M Weinfeld, 'Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School', pp.327, 334-5, 347-49, 354, 357, J P Hyatt, 'The Book of Jeremiah: Introduction and Exegesis', IB.5, p.998.

63. B Duhm, 'Das Buch Jeremia', Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament VI, J C B Mohr (Paul Siebeck) 1901; H G May, 'Towards an Objective Approach to the Book of Jeremiah: The Biographer', JBL 61, pp.148-49.

64. J P Hyatt, 'The Book of Jeremiah: Introduction and Exegesis', p.997.

65. Ibid, pp.985f; W F Albright, 'Seal of Eliakim and Latest Pre-Exilic History of Judah', JBL 51, (1932), pp.92-103.

66. R Carroll, 'From Chaos to Covenant', p.22; M Noth, 'The History of Israel', p.292; S Herrmann, 'A History of Israel in Old Testament Times', ET, rev.ed., London & Philadelphia, 1981, pp.259-97; E Janssen, 'Juda in der Exilszeit: Ein Beitrag zur Frage der Entstehung des Judentums', FRLANT 69, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1956; P R Ackroyd, 'Exile and Restoration', p.56; A Loisy, 'The Religion of Israel', London 1910, p.194

67. R Carroll, 'Jeremiah', pp.555, 557f.; P R Ackroyd, 'Exile and Restoration', p.56.

68. For a discussion on this point see R Carroll, 'Jeremiah', pp.557f.; W Rudolph, 'Jeremia' Handbuch zum Alten Testament I, 12, J C B Mohr (Paul Siebeck) 1968.

69. R Carroll, 'From Chaos to Covenant', pp.202f.; J P Hyatt, 'The Deuteronomic Edition of Jeremiah', p.260.

70. Eg.Jer.31:2-6, see R Carroll, 'From Chaos to Covenant', pp.203-3, 308.

71. These two distinctive views are also found in Ezek.36:22-32, 33-36. G I Emmerson provides an excellent analysis of these two distinctive stands as they affect the editing of the Book of Hosea. See her 'Hosea: An Israelite Prophet in Judean Perspective', JSOT (SS) 28, JSOT Press, 1984, pp.9-55; R Carroll, 'Jeremiah', pp.559f.

72. R Berger, 'Die Inschriften Asarhaddon', AFO Beiheft 9, 1956, Epis.10, p.15.

73. M Weinfeld, 'Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School', pp.144f.; D D Luckenbill, 'The Black Stone of Esarhaddon', AJSL 42 (1924-5), p.167.

74. P R Ackroyd, 'Two Old Testatment Historical Problems of the Early Persian Period', JNES 17 (1958), pp.23ff.; R Berger, 'Additional Remark on P R Ackroyd', JNES 18 (1959), p.74; For a concise and comprehensive discussion of this motif, see R Carroll, 'From Chaos to Covenant', pp.203-4; R H Pfeiffer, 'Religion in the Old Testament', pp.156f.

75. R Carroll, 'Jeremiah', pp.620ff.

76. J.P. Hyatt, 'The Book of Jeremiah: Introduction and Exegesis', IB 5, P.118.

77. R H Pfeiffer, 'Religion in the Old Testament', p.157.

78. K. Marti, 'Religion of the Old Testament', p.179.

79. Ibid. p.179; G. Fohrer, 'History of Israelite Religion', p.328.

80. R.H. Pfeiffer, 'Religion in the Old Testament', p.155; K. Marti, 'Das Buch Jesaja (Kurzer Hand-Kommentar zum Alten Testament), Tübingen, 1900; R.E. Clements, 'Isaiah and the Deliverance of Jerusalem', Ch.5; also his 'Isaiah 1-39', (New Century Bible Commentary) 1982.

81. R.H. Pleiffer is of the view that Isa.9:2-7; 11:1f. "could only have been penned after 586 B.C. when the Davidic dynasty lost its throne", 'Introduction to the Old Testament', p437; cf. S. Mowinckel, 'He that Cometh', pp.102 ff.; G. Fohrer, 'Das Buch Jesaja' (Zürcher Bibelkommentare), 2nd ed., Zurich/Stuttgart, Bd.I, Chs.1-23, 1967; see also his 'History of the Israelite Religion', pp.283f.; For discussions on Jer.23:5; 30:8-9; 33:14-17, see J.P. Hyatt, 'The Deuteronomic Edition of Jeremiah', in 'A Prophet to the Nations', ed. L.G. Perdue, pp. 258ff.; R.E. Clements, 'Isaish 1-39', pp.191f., 246, 268f.

82. S. Zeitlin, 'Studies in the Early History of Judaism', KTAV. N.Y. 1973, pp.81f.

83. S. Zeitlin, 'The Rise and Fall of the Judean State', JPS 1968, Vol I. p.189; P. Sigal, 'The Emergence of Contemporary Judaism', Pittsburgh 1980, Vol.I, pp.161-164; W.S. McCullough, 'The History and Literature of the Palestinian Jews From Cyrus to Herod (550-4 B.C.), Toronto 1975, p.131. Perhaps the equivalent of these 2nd century B.C. Hasideans are the anti-Zionist Neturei Karta and Satmar Hasidim of our times. They are opposed to any Jewish political independence in Palestine according to Talmud Ket.111a.

84. A. Bartholet regards Chs.1-3 as belonging to separate authors. Cf. 'Das Buch Hesekiel' (Kurzer Handkommtar zum Alten Testament 12), Freiburg. As for Chs.11:1-11:25, the fingerprint of the editor may be seen particularly in expansions in Ch.10. He is also responsible for the oracle of restoration in 11:14-21, cf. H.G. May, 'Ezekiel: Introduction and Exegesis', IB Vol.6. p.105; N. Messel, 'Ezechielfragen' (Oslo II, 1945-1) pp.12708.

85. H.G. May, 'Ezekiel: Introduction and Exegesis', IB Vol.6, p.53.

86. H.H. Rowley discusses with references to many scholars the modern theories on the book of Ezekiel. Cf. B.J.R.L., XXXVI, 1953-4, pp. 146ff.; J.W.Wevers allows that the original vision is to be found in 40:1-37, 48-41:4 adn 42:15-20. Cf. 'Ezekiel' (New Century Bible), 1969, pp.206ff.

87. J.W. Wevers is inclined to assign this chapter to the school of Ezekiel rather than to Ezekiel himself, cf. pp.196f., while A. Bartholet thinks that there is a link between it and 3:24a as a part of the oracle of the valley, cf. 'Das Buch Hezekiel'.

88. G. Holscher, 'Hezekiel, der Dichter und das Buch', Gressen 1924, C.V. Wolf, 'Prince', ID, Vol.3, p.891.

89. H.G. May, 'Ezekiel: Introduction and Exegesis', IB, Vol.6, p.53.

90. R.H. Pfeiffer, 'Religion in the Old Testament', p.157; K. Marti, 'Religion of the Old Testament', pp. 204ff.; G. Forher, 'Ezekiel', mit einem Beitrag v. K. Galling (Handbuch zum Alten Testament I, 13), Tübingen 1955, pp.228ff.; P.R. Ackroyd, 'Exile and Restoration', pp.112f.

91. M. Schmidt, 'Prophet und Tempel', (1948), pp.129-71; see esp. pp.166-71 for a proper stress on the relationship of God to His temple and to the renewed life of Israel. Cf. R.G. Hammerton-Kelly, VT 20 (1970), pp.1-15; R.E. Clements, 'God and the Temple: The Idea of the Divine Presence in Ancient Israel', (Oxford 1965), pp.102ff.

92. R.E. Clements, 'Temple and Land', TGUOS 19(1963), pp.16-28; see also his 'God and Temple', (1965), pp.10ff.; P.R. Ackroyd, 'Exile and Restoration', p.112.

93. W. Zimmerli, 'Gottes Offenbarung (Th.B 19, 1963), p.117; ZAW 66 (1964), p.26; T. Chary, 'Les Prophètes et le Culte a partir de L'Exil', (Tournai 1955), pp.17f.; C. Westermann, 'Handbook to the Old Testament', p.177.

94. P.R. Ackroyd, 'Exile and Restoration', pp.113f.; K. Baltzer, 'Das Ende des Staates Juda und die Messias-Frage', (Neukirchen 1961), p.39; A. Caquot, 'Le Messianisme d'Ezekiel', Semitica 14, (1964), pp.5-23.

95. In v.11 Zerubbabel should be read instead of Joshua. Cf. R.H. Pfeiffer, 'Introduction to the Old Testament', pp.605f.

96. S.A. Cook, 'The Age of Zerubbabel', in 'Studies in Old Testament Prophecy', ed. H.H. Rowley, Edin.. T.T. Clark, 1950, pp.19-36; P.R. Ackroyd, 'Exile and Restoration', pp.138-217; J.M. Myers, 'The World of Restoration', Prentice-Hall 1968, pp.82-102; J.H. Hayes and J.M. Miller, 'Israelite and Judean History', SCM 1990, pp.516-23; R.H. Pfeiffer, 'Religion in the Old Testament', p.157.

97. Ibid. p.158. For a discussion on a sufficient number of passages showing the relevance of the prophecies of Deutero-Isaiah to the events related to Cyrus' conquests and the fall of Babylon, see Sydney Smith, 'Isaiah Chs. XL-LV', Schweich Lecture, 1944, pp.49-75, 183-193.

98. B. Duhm, 'Das Buch Jesaia', (1922), pp.XVIII, 284ff., 365ff.; C.R. North, 'The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah', (London:Oxford University Press 1948), pp.156-188; A.S. Peake, 'The Servant of Yahweh', (Manchester University Press 1931), pp.1-74; H.H. Rowley, 'The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays on the Old Testament', (Lutherworth Press 1952), pp.5ff.; More recently J.A. Soggin, 'Introduction to the Old Testament', pp.368ff.; C. Westermann, 'Handbook to the Old Testament', p.149.

99. R.N. Whybray, 'Isaiah 40-66', (N.C. B 1975), pp.70f.; P.E. Bonnard,
     'Le Seconde Esaie, son Disciple et leur Editeur, Esaie 40-66 (Paris
     1972); also his 'Relire Esaie 40-66', ETR 50, 1975, pp.341-9; T.N.D.
     Mettinger, 'A Farewell to the Servant Songs', (Lund 1983); R.
     Rendtorff, 'The Old Testament: AnIntroduction', (ET. London &
     Philadelphia 1985), pp.195f.; H.H. Rowley, 'Israel's Mission to the
     World', SCM 1939, p.10.

100. J. Muilenburg, 'Isaiah 40-66: Introduction and Exegesis', IB V, 1956,
     pp.406f.; for a concise and comprehensive discussion on this see H.H.
     Rowley, 'Israel's Mission to the World', pp.10-25.

101. A.R. Johnson, 'The Role of the King in the Jerusalem Cultus', in 'The
     Labyrinth', ed. S.H. Hooke (S.P.C.K. 1935), pp.100f; I. Engnell, 'The
     Ebed Yahweh Songs and the Suffering Messiah', BJRL, XXXI, 1948, pp.3,
     100;   G. Ostborn, 'Tora in the Old Testament', 1945, pp.56ff.; J.
     Coppins, 'Pro Regno pro Sanctuario', (Van der Lieuw Festschrift 1950),
     pp.116f.; also M. Buber, 'Pro Regno pro Santuario', 1950, p.73.

102. H.H. Rowley, 'The Servant of the Lord in the Light of Three Decades of
     Criticism', in 'The Servant of the Lord', Oxford 1965, pp & ff.; C.R.
     North, 'The Former Things', and the 'New Things' in Deutero-Isaiah, in
     'Studies in the Old Testament Prophecy', Festschrift. T.H. Robinson,
     Edin, 1950, pp.111ff.; J. von Rad, 'Old Testament Theology', Vol.II,
     pp.250ff., 273ff.; C. Westermann, 'Das Heilswort bei Deuterojesaja',
     EV. Th24 (1964), pp.355ff.; 'Sporache und Struktur der Prophetie
     Deuterojesajas', in Forschung am Alten Testament, ThB 24 (1964),
     pp.92ff.; 'Jesaja 48 und die "Bezeugung gegen Israel"', in Studia
     biblica et Semitica Th. Ch. Vriezen dedicata Wageningen 1966,
     pp.356ff.; S. Mowinckel, 'Die Komposition des Deuterojesajanischen
     Buches', ZAW 49 (1931), pp.87ff., 142ff.

103. H.H. Rowley, 'Israel's Mission to the World', p.11.

104. F. Giesebrecht, 'Beiträge zur Jesajakritik', Göttingen 1890; K.
     Budde, 'Jesaja's Erleben'. Eine gemeinverstandliche Auslegung der
     Denkschrift des Propheten, Gotha 1928; see also his 'The So-called
     "Ebed-Yahweh Songs"....in Isaiah', AJTh., 3, 1899, pp.499ff.; K.
     Marti, 'Das Buch Jesaja', 1902, pp.344f., 360f.

105. P.A.H. de Boer, 'Second-Isaiah's Message', OTS 11, 1956;   O.
     Eissfeldt, 'The Promises of Grace to David in Isaiah 55: 1-5' in
     Israel's Prophetic Heritage', Festschrift J. Muilenburg, ed. B.W.
     Anderson and W. Harrelson, 1962, pp.196ff.; L.G. Rignell, 'A Study of
     Isaiah Ch.40-55', LUA NF1, 25, 5, 1956; N.H. Snaith, 'Studies on the
     Second Part of the Book of Isaiah; SVT 14, 1967; K. Baltzer, 'Zur
     Formgeschichtlichen Bestimmung der Texte vom Gottes-Knecht im
     Deuterojesaja-Buch', in Probleme Biblischer Theologie, Festschrift G.
     von Rad, Munich 1971; A.S. Kapelrud, 'Second Isaiah and the Suffering
     Servant', in 'Hommages a' A Dupont Sommer, Paris 1971, pp.297ff.

106. The line "a light to the nations" is lacking in some manuscrips of the
     LXX.   Cf. M.J. Lagrange, 'Le Judaisme avant Jesus Christ', 1931,
     p.369;   C.R. North, 'The Old Testament Interpretation of History',
     1946, p.177n; P. Volz, 'Jesaja II', Komm. A.T., VOL IX, Leipzig 1932,
     p.169.

107. H.H. Rowley, 'The Biblical Doctrine of Election', pp.45ff.

108. R.N. Whybray says that in such phrases as "first" and "last" or "with the last" Deutero-Isaiah "came as near to the concept of eternity as was possible within the limit of his theological world thought", see his 'Isaiah 40-66', p.37.

109. H.H.Rowley, 'Israel's Mission to the World', pp.7f.; A. Lods, 'The Prophets and the Rise of Judaism', London 1937, pp.236ff.

110. N.H. Snaith, 'The Servant of the Lord in Deutero-Isaiah', in 'Studies in the Old Testament Prophecy', ed. H.H. Rowley, Edinburgh, 1950, pp.186-200, esp. p.191; P.A.H. de Boer, 'Second Isaiah's Message' in Oudtestamentische, XI, 1956; R.N. Whybray, 'Isaiah 40-66', pp.31f.; J.D. Senarclens, 'Le Mystere de l'histoire', Geneva 1949, p.191.

111. R. Martin-Achard, 'A Light to the Nations: A Study of the Old Testament Conception of Israel's Mission to the World', London 1962, pp.8ff.; W. Zimmerli, 'Erkenntis Gottes nach dem Buche Ezekiel', Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments No.27, Zurich 1954; P.R. Ackroyd, 'Exile and Restoration', pp.135f.

112. N.H. Snaith, 'Studies in the Old Testament Prophecy', p.198.

113. R. Martin-Achard, 'A Light to the Nations', pp.18-31; P.A.H. de Boer, 'Second Isaiah's Message', p.92; J.S. van der Ploeg, 'Les Chants du Serviteur de Yahve', Paris 1936, p.43.

114. J. Bright, 'A History of Israel', pp.447f.; A. Lods, 'Histoire de la Literature Hebraique et Juive', Paris 1950, pp.517ff. N.H. Baynes, 'Israel Among the Nations', London 1927, pp.131f.; esp. H.H. Rowley, 'The Faith of Israel', pp186f.

115. E. Jacob, 'Theology of the Old Testament', p.220.

116. H.H. Rowley, 'The Faith of Israel', p.185; cf. 'Israel's Mission to the World', pp.7f.; A. Lods, 'The Prophets and the Rise of Judaism', pp.243f., 248; P. Volz, 'Jesaja II', Kommentar zum Alten Testament, Vol. IX, Leipzig 1932, p.169; Th.C. Vriezen, 'An Outline of Old Testament Theology', Netherlands 1970, pp.450ff.; K. Koch, 'The Prophets', Vol. II. SCM 1983, p.144.

117. J. Wellhausen, 'Sketch of the History of Israel and Juday', London 1891, p.126.

118. J.W. Miller, 'Meet the Prophets: A Beginner's Guide to the Books of the Biblical Prophets', Paulist Press, N.Y. 1987, pp.220ff.

119. H.H. Rowley, 'Israel's Mission to the World', p.12; C. Westermann, 'Isaiah 40-66', SCM 1969, p.20.

120. C.F. Whitley, 'The Exilic Age', Longmans London 1957, p.149; O.C. Whitehouse, 'Isaiah 40-66 (Century Bible) Vol. II, 1905, pp.18ff.; C.F. Burney, C.Q.R., LXXV, 1912-13, p.121.

165.

121. L. Gillet, 'Communion in the Messiah: Studies in the Relationship
     Between Judaism and Christianity', Lutterworth Press 1942, p.94;
     Neubauer and Driver, 'The Fifty Third Chapter of Isaiah According to
     the Jewish Interpreters', Vol. II, Oxford 1977; W. Manson, 'Jesus the
     Messiah', 1943, pp.168ff.; C.R. North, ' The Suffering Servant in
     Deutero-Isaiah', 1948, pp.11f.

122. C. Westermann, 'Isaiah 40-66', p.21.

123. Ibid. p.21; N.H. Snaith thinks that the Servant here "is primarily
     Jehoiachin and the exiles of 597 B.C., but then extended to include
     the exiles of 586 B.C. See his 'Studies in Old Testament Prophecy',
     p.191.

124. C. Westermann, 'Isaiah 40-66', p.21; C.F. Whitley, 'The Exilic Age',
     pp.150f.

125. C. Westermann, 'Isaiah 40-66', p.21

126. H.B. Huffmon, 'The Israel of God', Interpretation, Vol.23, 1969,
     pp.66-77.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ackroyd, P.R.   'Two Old Testament Historical Problems of the Early
                       Persian Period', JNES 17, 1958, pp.23ff.
                       ——'The People of the Old Testament', London 1963
                       ——'Exile and Restoration', SCM 1968
                       ——'Israel Under Babylon and Persia'. Oxford, 1970

Albright, W.F.   'The Israelite Conquest in the Light of Archaeology',
                       BASOR 74, 1939, pp.11-23.
                       ——'The Biblical Period', Pittsburgh: Biblical Colloquium
                       1950.
                       ——'Abraham the Hebrew: A New Archaeological
                       Interpretation', BASOR 162, 1961, pp.35-54.
                       ——'The Role of the Canaanites in the History of
                       Civilization', The Bible and the Near East, ed. by G.E.
                       Wright, N.Y. 1965.
                       ——'Seal of Eliakim and Latest Pre-Exilic History of
                       Judah', JBL 51, 1932, pp.92-103.

Alt, A.   'Der Gott der Väter', BWANT III: 12, Stuttgart 1929,
                       reprinted in Klein Schrift I, Munich 1953, pp.1-79.
                       E.Trs. 'The God of the Fathers', Essays on Old
                       Testament History and Religion, Oxford 1966, pp.1-77.
                       ——'Die Ürsprunge der israelitischen Recht', Leipzig 1934,
                       reprinted in KS II, pp.278-332. E.trs. 'The Origins of
                       Israelite Law', Essays on Old Testament History and
                       Religion', pp.79-132.

Anderson, G.W.   'The History and Religion of Israel', Oxford University
                       Press 1966.

Baltzer, K.   'Das Bundesformular', WMANT 4, Neukirchen-Vluyn 1964.
                       E.Trs. 'The Covenant Formulary', Oxford 1971.

Barr, J.   'Some Semantic Notes on the Covenant', Beiträge zur
                       Alttestamentlischen Theologie, Festschrift für W.
                       Zimmerli zum 70. Geburststag, ed. H. Donner, R.
                       Hanhart, R. Smend, Göttingen 1977, pp.23-38.

Barton, J.   'Natural Law and Poetic Justice in the Old Testament',
                       JTS 30, 1979, pp.1-14.

Berger, P.   'The Social Reality of Religion', London 1969.

Berry, G.R.   'The Code Found in the Temple', JBL 39 (1920), pp.44-
                       51.

Bewer, S.W.   'Micah-Zeph-Nah-Hab-Obe and Jonah', ICC, T.T. Clarke,
                       Eding. 1912.

de Boer, P.A.H.   'Second-Isaiah's Message', OTS 21, 1956.

Bayne, N.H.   'Israel Among the Nations', London 1927.

Beyerlin, W.   'Near Eastern Religious Texts Relating to the Old Testament', SCM 1978.

Blenkinsopp, J.   'A History of Prophecy in Israel', SPCK 1984.

Breasted, J.H.   'The Development of Religion and Thought in Ancient Egypt', 1912.

Bright, J.   'Early Israel in Recent History Writing', SBT I, 19, 1959.
            ——— 'A History of Israel', SCM Press, 1972.
            ——— 'Covenant and Promise: The Prophetic Understanding of the Future in Pre-Exilic Israel', The Westminster Press, Philadelphia 1976.
            ——— 'Jeremiah: Translation with an Introduction and Notes', Anchor Bible 21, 1965.
            ——— 'Joshua: Introduction and Exegesis', IB, II, 1953.

Brueggemann, W.   'The Kerygma of the Deuteronomistic Historian: A Gospel of the Exiles', Interpretation LXXIX/4 (1968).
            ——— 'The Land', Fortress Press, Philadelphia 1977.
            ——— 'The Vitality of the Old Testament Traditions', Atlanta 1975.

Buber, M.   'Israel and Palestine', London 1952.

Burkitt, F.C.   'The Date of Deuteronomy', JTS 22, 1921, pp.61-65.

Burney, C.F.   'The Book of Judges', London 1918.

Buss, M.J.   'The Prophetic Word of Hosea', BZAW 111, 1969.

Calloway, J.A.   'The Settlement in Canaan: The Period of the Judges', Ancient Israel: A Short History from Abraham to the Roman Destruction of the Temple, ed. by H. Shanks, SPCK 1989.

Carlson, R.A.   'David the Chosen King: A Tradition-Historical Approach to the Second Book of Samuel', Uppsala 1964.

Carroll, R.   'From Chaos to Covenant: Uses of Prophecy in the Book of Jeremiah', SCM Press, London 1981.
            ——— 'Jeremiah: A Commentary', Westminster Press, Philadelphia 1986.

Childs, B.S.   'Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture', Fortress Press, Philadelphia 1979.

Clark, W.M.   'The Origin and Development of the Land Promise Theme in the Old Testament', Yale University 1964.

Clements, R.E.   'Temple and Land: A Significant Aspect of Israel's Worship', TGUOS 19, 1963, pp.16-28.
—————'Prophecy and Covenant', London 1965.
—————'Deuteronomy and the Jerusalem Cult Tradition', VT 15, 1965.
—————'Abraham and David: Gen.15 and its Meaning for Israelite Tradition', London 1967.
—————'God's Chosen People: A Theological Interpretation of the Book of Deuteronomy', SCM, London 1968.
—————'Abraham', Theologisches Wörterbuch zum alten Testament, Lieferung I (1970), pp.58ff.
—————'Isaiah 1-39', N.C.B. London 1982.

Colenso J.W.   'The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua Critically Examined', London 1879.

Cook, S.A.   'The Age of Zerubbabel', Studies in Old Testament Prophecy, ed. H.H. Rowley, T.T. Clarke, Edinburgh 1950, pp.19-36.

Crim, K.R.   'The Royal Psalms', John Knox Press, Richmond 1962.

Cross, F.M.   'Yahweh and the God of the Patriarchs', HTR, LV 1962, PP.250FF.
—————'Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel', Cambridge, Mass. 1973.
—————'The Themes of the Book of Kings and the Structure of the Deuteronomistic History', in "Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic", 1973.

Dahood, M.   'Psalms', III, New York 1970.

Danell, G.A.   'Studies in the Name Israel in the Old Testament', Uppsala 1946.

Davidson, R.   'The Old Testament', London 1964.
—————'The Old Testament', Biblical Criticism, The Pelican Guide to Modern Theology, ed. R.P.C. Hanson, Penguin Book, Middlesex 1972.
—————'Covenant Ideology in Ancient Israel', The World of Ancient Israel, ed R.E. Clement, Cambridge, 1989, pp.323-344.

Day, J.   'The Destruction of Shiloh Sanctuary and Jer.7:12,14', Studies in the Historical Books of the Old Testament, ed. J.A. Emerton, VTS 30, 1979, pp.87-94.
—————'God's Conflict with the Dragon and the Sea', Cambridge, 1985.

Driver, S.R.   'Deuteronomy', ICC, Edinburgh, 1902.
—————'The Book of Exodus' Cambridge, 1911.
—————'Canaanite Myths and Legends', Edinburgh, 1956.

Eaton, J.H.   'Psalms', Introduction and Commentary (Torch Bible Commentary), SCM, 1967.

Emmerson, G.I.   'Hosea: An Israelite Prophet in Judean Perspective', JSOT (SS) 28, JSOT Press, 1984.

Eichrodt, W.   'Theology of the Old Testament', Vol.I, 1967.

Eissfeldt, O.   'El and Yahwe', JSS, I, 1952, pp.25ff.
————'Promises of Grace to David in Isa.55:1-5', Israel's Prophetic Heritage, ed. B.W. Anderson and W. Harrelson, London, 1962.

Fensham F.C.   'Malediction and Benediction in Ancient Near Eastern Vassal-Treaties and the Old Testament', ZAW 74, 1962, pp.1-9.
————'Father and Son Terminology for Treaty and Covenant', Near Eastern Studies in Honour of W.F. Albright, ed. H. Goedicke, Baltimore and London 1971, pp.121-35.

Fitzmyer, J.A.   'The Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefire', Biblica et Orientalia 19, Roma 1967.

Fohrer, G.   'History of Israelite Religion', trs. by D.E. Green, SPCK, London, 1981.

Fosbroke, H.E.W.   'Amos: Introduction and Exegesis', IB, Vol.6, pp.763-76.

Frankfort, H.   'Kingship and the Gods: A Study of Ancient and Near Eastern Religion as the Interpretation of Society and Nature', Chicago 1948.

Frankena, R.   'The Vassal-Treaties of Essarhaddon and the Dating of Deuteronomy', OTS 14, 1964, pp.123-54.

Freedman, D.N.   'Divine Commitment and Human Obligation: The Covenant Theme', Interpretation 18, 1964, pp.419-31.

Freedman, D.N. and Graf, D.F. (eds.)   'Palestine in Transition: The Emergence of Ancient Israel', Sheffield 1983.

Garbini, G.   'History and Ideology in Ancient Israel', SCM, 1988.

Gillet, L.   'Communion in the Messiah: Studies in the Relationship between Judaism and Christianity', London 1942.

Glueck, N.   'Hesed in the Bible', Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati 1967

Goitein, S.D.   'Jews and Arabs: Their Contacts Through the Ages', N.Y. 1974.

Gordon, C.   'Introduction to Old Testament Times', N.J. 1953.

Gottwald, N.K.   'The Tribes of Yahweh: A Sociology of the Religion of Liberated Israel, 1250-1050 B.C.E', London 1979.
————'A Light to the Nations', N.Y. 1959.

Gunkel, H.   'The Legends of Genesis: The Biblical Saga and History', Schocken Books, N.Y. 1964.

Harford-
   Battersby, G.   'The Sabbatical Year', Hastings Dictionary of the Bible, Vol.4, pp.322ff.

Harper, G.D.   'Amos and Hosea', ICC, Edinburgh 1936.

Hasel, G.F.   'Old Testament Theology: Basic Issues in the Current Debate', Grand Rapids, Eerdmans 1972.
————'The Remnant: The History and Theology of the Remnant Idea from Genesis to Isaiah', (Andrews University Press), Michigan 1974.

Hayes, J.H. and   'Israelite and Judean History', SCM, London 1990.
Miller, J.M.

Herbert, A.S.   'Genesis 12-50: Abraham and His Heirs', SCM, London 1967.

Herrmann, S.   'A History of Israel in Old Testament Times', ET, London, Philadelphia 1981, pp.259-47.

Hillers, D.R.   'Treaty Curses and the Old Testament Prophets', Biblica et Orientalia 16, Rome 1964.
————'Covenant: The History of a Biblical Idea', Baltimore 1969.
————'Micah', (Hermeneia Commentaries), Fortress Press, 1983.

Holladay, W.L.   'The Root SUBH in the Old Testament', Leiden 1958.
————'Jeremiah: Spokesman Out of Time', Philadelphia, 1974.

Huffmon, H.B.   'Treaty Background of Hebrew YADA', BASOR 181, 1966, pp.31-7.
————'A Further Note on the Treaty Background of Hebrew YADA', (with A.S. Parker) BASOR 184, 1966, pp.36-8.
————'The Covenant Lawsuit in the Prophets', JBL 78, 1959, pp.285-95.

Hyatt, J.P.   'Jeremiah and Deuteronomy', JNES I, 1942., pp.156ff.
————'Jeremiah: Introduction and Exegesis', IB, Vol.5, 1956, pp.777-91.
————'Jeremiah: Prophet of Courage and Hope', N.Y. 1958.
————'The Deuteronomic Edition of Jeremiah', A Prophet to the Nations: Essays in Jeremiah Studies, eds. L.G. Perdue and B.W. Kovacs, Indiana, 1984, pp.247-267.

Jacob, E.   'Theology of the Old Testament', London, 1974.

Johnson, A.R.   'The Role of the King in the Jerusalem Cultus', Labyrinth, ed. S.H. Hooke, London, 1935, pp.71-111.
————'Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel', University of Wales Press, 1967.

Jones, G.H.   'I and II Kings', New Century Bible Commentary, London
                     1984.

Kaiser, O.   'Isaiah 1-12', SCM, London 1974.
                ——— 'Introduction to the Old Testament', Oxford, rep. 1984.

Kaluveetil, P.   'Declaration and Covenant', Analecta 88, Rome 1982.

Kapelrud, A.S.   The Main Concern of Second-Isaiah', VT 32, 1982, pp.50-
                     8.
                ——— 'Second-Isaiah and the Suffering Servant', in Hommage a
                     A. Dupont, Sommer, Paris 1971.

Katsh, A.I.   'Judaism in Islam: Biblical and Talmudic Backgrounds of
                     the Koran and its Commentaries', N.Y. 1980.

Kaufmann, Y.   'The Religion of Israel: From its Beginnings to the
                     Babylonian Exile', N.Y. 1972.

Kennedy, R.S.   'Golden Calf', HDB, Vol.I, 1898, pp.341ff.

Kennett, R.H.   'The Date of Deuteronomy', JTS 6, 1905, pp.481-500.
                ——— 'Deuteronomy and the Decalogue', Cambridge 1920.
                ——— 'The Church of Israel', London 1933.

Kittel, T.   'Great Men and Movements in Israel', London 1926.

Kitto, H.D.F.   'The Greeks', A Pelican Book, Edinburgh 1951.

Koch, K.   'The Prophets', Vol.I, SCM, London, 1982.

Köhler, L.   'Problems in the Study of Old Testament Language', JSS
                     1, 1956, pp.3-24.

Kuhl, C.   'The Old Testament: Its Origins and Compositions',
                     E.trs. G.T.M. Herriot, Edinburgh and London, 1961.

Loewenstamm, S.E.   'The Divine Grant of Land to the Patriarchs', JAOS 91,
                     1971, pp.509ff.

Loisy, A.   'The Religion of Israel', London 1910.

Luckenbill, D.D.   'Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia', London
                     1926.
                ——— 'The Black Stone of Es arhaddon', AJSL 42, 1924-5,
                     pp.165ff.

Lustick, I.S.   'For the Land and the Lord: Jewish Fundamentalism in
                     Israel', N.Y. 1988.

Lots, A.   'The Prophets and the Rise of Judaism', London 1937.

Malamat, A.   'Organs of Statecraft in the Israelite Monarchy', BA
                     28, 1965, pp.35-65.

Manson. W.   'Jesus the Messiah'. London 1943.

Marsh, J.   'Amos and Micah', SCM, London 1969.

Marti, K.   'Religion of the Old Testament: Its Place Among the Religions of the Near East', London 1907.

Martin-Achard, R.   'A Light to the Nations: A Study of the Old Testament Concept of Israel's Mission to the World', London 1962.

Matthews, I.G.   'The Relgious Pilgrimage of Israel', 1947

May, H.G.   'The   God of My Father: A Study of   Patriarchal Religion', JBR 9, 1941, pp.155-8.
            ———'The Patriarchal Idea of God', JBL 60, 1941, pp.113-28.
            ———'Ezekiel: Introduction and Exegesis', IB, Vol.6, 1956, pp.41-64.

Mayes, A.D.H.   'Deuteronomy', (New Century Bible), London 1979.
            ———'The Story of Israel between Settlement and Exile', London 1983.

Meek, T.J.   'Hebrew Origins', Gloucester, Mass. 1973.

Mendenhall, G.E.   'Covenant Forms in Israelite Tradition', BA 17, 1954, pp.50-76.
            ———'Ancient   Oriental and Biblical Law', BA 17, 1954, pp.26-46.
            ———'Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East', Pittsburgh, 1955.
            ———'Covenant', ID, Vol.1, 1962, pp.714-23.
            ———'Election', ID, Vol.2, 1962, pp.76-82.

Miller, J.M. and   'A History of Ancient Israel and Judah', SCM. London,
Hayes, J.H.   1986.

Miller, J.W.   'Meet the Prophets: A Beginner's Guide to the Books of the Biblical Prophets', N.Y. 1987.

Miller, P.D.   'The Gift of God: The Deuteronomic Theology of the Land', Interpretation 23, 1963, pp.451-65.

Montgomery, J.A.   'The Book of Kings', ed. by H.S. Gehman, ICC, Edinburgh 1951.

Moore, G.F.   'Judges', ICC, Edinburgh 1908.

Moran, W.L.   'The Ancient Near Eastern Background of the Love of God In Deuteronomy', CBQ 24, 1963, pp.77-87.
            ——— 'Notes on the Treaty Terminology of the Sefire Stelas', JNES 22, 1963, pp.173-6.

Morgenstern, J.   'The Jubilee Year', ID, Vol.2, 1962, pp.1001f.

Mowinckel, S.   'He that Cometh', Oxford, 1959.
—— 'The Psalms in Israel's Worship', Vol.1, Oxford, 1962.

Muilenburg, J.   'Psalm 47', JBL 63, 1944, pp.235ff.
—— 'Isaiah 40–66: Introduction and Exegesis', IB, Vol.5. 1956, pp.382-415.
—— 'The Form and Structure of the Covenantal Formulations', VT 9, 1959, pp.345-65.
—— 'The Way of Israel', London 1962.

Myers J.M.   'The World of Restoration', Prentice-Hall, 1968.

McCarter, R.K.   'The Patriarchal Age: Abraham, Isaac and Jacob', Ancient Israel: A Short History from Abraham to the Roman Destruction of the Temple, ed. by H. Shanks, SPCK, London 1989.

McCarthy, D.J.   'Treaty and Covenant', Analecta Biblica 21, Rome, 2nd Ed. 1978.
—— 'Notes on the Love of God in Deuteronomy and Father-Son Relationship between Yahweh and Israel', CBQ 27, 1965, pp.144-7.
—— 'Covenant in the Old Testament: The Present State of Inquiry', CBQ 27, 1965, pp.217-240.
—— 'Berit in the Old Testament Theology', Biblica 53, 1972.

McCullough, W.S.   'The History and Literature of the Palentinian Jews from Cyrus to Herod (550-4 B.C.)', Toronto, 1975.

McKane, W.   'Studies in the Patriarchal Narratives', Edinburgh, 1977.
—— 'Prophecy and Prophetic Literature', Tradition and Interpretation, ed. G.N. Anderson.
—— 'Jeremiah' ICC, Edinburgh 1986.
—— 'Prophet and Institution', ZAW 94, 1982, pp.251-66.

Nassir, Z.   'The Israelite Conquest of Palestine and Theological Implications of Claiming a Land', (Unpublished dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Baptist Seminary of Switzerland 1987).

Neubauer, A. and Driver, S.   'The Fifty-Third Chapter of Isaiah according to Jewish Interpreation', KTAV. N.Y. 1968.

Nicholson, E.W.   'Deuteronomy and Tradition', Oxford 1967.
—— 'Preaching to the Exiles: A Study of Prose Tradition in the Book of Jeremiah', Oxford and N.Y. 1970.
—— 'God and His People: Covenant and Theology in the Old Testament', Oxford 1986.

North, C.R.   'The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah: A Historical and Critical Study', Oxford 1950.
———'Isaiah 40-55: Introduction and Commentary', Torch Bible Commentaries, N.Y. 1952.
———'The Old Testament Interpretation of History', 1946.
———'The "Former Things and the "New Things" in Deutero-Isaiah', Studies in the Old Testament Prophecy, ed. T.H. Robinson, Edinburgh 1950.

Noth, M.   'The History of Israel', London 1960.
———'The Old Testament World', London 1966.
Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament', pp.142-54, E.trs. 'Old Testament Covenant-making in the Light of a Text from Mari', The Laws of the Pentateuch and Other Essays, Edinburgh and London, 1966, pp.108-17.
———'The Laws in the Pentateuch', The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Essays, 1966, pp.1-107.
———'Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien', Tübingen 1943, E.trs. 'The Deuteronomistic History', JSOT (SS) 15, Sheffield 1981.

Oden, R.A.   'The Place of Covenant in the Religion of Israel', Ancient Israelite Religion, eds. P.O. Miller, P.D. Hanson and S.D. McBride, Philadelphia, Fortress, 1987, pp.429-47.

Oldenburg, U.   'The Conflict Between El and Baal in Canaanite Religion', Leiden, 1969.

Ostborn, G.   'Tora in the Old Testament'.

Paton, L.B.   'The Case for the Post-Exilic Dating of Deuteronomy', JBL 47, 1928, pp.325ff.

Patton, J.H.   'Canaanite Parallels in the Book of Psalms', Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1943.

Pearce, R.A.   'Shiloh and Jer.7:12, 14-15', VT 23, 1973, pp.105-8.

Pedersen, J.   'Israel: Its Life and Culture', III-IV, Copenhagen, 1940.

Pfeiffer, R.H.   'Introduction to the Old Testament', London, 1953.
———'Religion in the Old Testament', London 1961.

Phillips, A.   'Prophecy and Law', Israel's Prophetic Tradition, eds. R.J. Coggins, M.A. Knibb and A. Phillips, Cambridge 1982, pp.217-32.

Polzin, R.   'Moses and the Deuteronomist', N.Y. 1980.

Rad, von Rad   'Deuteronomium - Studien, FRLANT 58, 2nd edition, Gottingen 1948, E.trs. 'Studies in Deuteronomy', London 1953.
————'Deuteronomy', IDB Vol.I, 1962, pp.831-8.
————'Old Testament Theology', Vols.I-II, SCM, London 1965.
————'The Promised Land and Yahweh's Land in the Hexateuch', The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays, Edinburgh and London, 1966, pp.87-100.
————'Genesis: A Commentary', Westminster, Philadelphia 1962

Rankin, O.S.   'God, God's', A Theological Word Book of the Bible, ed. A. Richardson, London 1955, pp.89f.

Rendtorff, R.   'The Old Testament: An Introduction', London and Philadelphia, 1985.

Rignell, L.G.   'The Ebed Yahweh Songs and the Suffering Messiah', BJRL XXXI, 1948, pp.3-100.
————'A Study of Isaiah 40-44', Lund 1956.

Ringgren, H.   'Israelite Religion', SPCK, London 1974.

Robinson, H.W.   'Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament', Oxford 1946.

Robinson, T.H.   'Decline and Fall of the Hebrew Kingdom', Oxford 1963.
————'Prophecy and Prophets in Ancient Israel', London 1967.

Rogers, R.W.   'Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament', 1912.

Rosenthal, I.J.   'Judaism and Islam', London 1961.

Rowley, H.H.   'Israel's Mission to the World', London 1939.
————'The Servant of the Lord', London 1952.
————'The Faith of Israel', London 1956.
————'The Biblical Doctrine of Election', London 1961.
————'Men of God', London 1963
————'From Moses to Qumran', London 1964.

Sarna, N.M.   'Understanding Genesis: The Heritage of Biblical Israel', N.Y. 1970.

Senior, D and   'The Biblical Foundation for Mission', SCM London 1983.
Stuhlmueller, C.

Sigal, P.   'The Emergence of Contemporary Judaism', Vols.I-II, Pittsburg, Penn. 1980.

Simpson, C.A.   'The Early Traditions of Israel', Oxford 1948.

Skinner, J.   'Genesis', ICC. Edinburgh, 1910.
————'Prophecy and Religion: Studies in the Life of Jeremiah', Cambridge 1963.

Smith, J.M.P.   'The Chosen People', AJSL 55, 1928-9, pp.73ff.
                     ——'The Effect of the Disruption on the Hebrew Thought of
                     God', AJSL 32, 1916, pp.25=61ff.

Smith, S.   'Isaiah 40-55', Schweich Lecture, London 1944.

Snaith, N.M.   'The Servant of the Lord in Deutero-Isaiah', Studies in
                     the Old Testament Prophecy, ed. H.H. Rowley, Edinburgh
                     1950, pp.186-200.

Soggin, J.A.   'Judges: A Commentary', Westminster Press, Philadelphia
                     1981.
                     ——'A History of Israel: From the Beginnings to the Bar-
                     Kochba Revolt, AD 135', SCM, London 1984.

Stager, G.L.   'Merneptah, Israel and the Sea Peoples', Jerusalem
                     1985.

Swetman, J.   'Why was Jeremiah's New Covenant New?', Studies in
                     Prophecy, VT 26, 1976, pp.111-5.

Taylor, W.R.   'The Psalms', IB, Vol.4, 1955, pp.131ff., 260ff.

Thompson, T.L.   'A New Attempt to Date the Patriarchal Narratives',
                     JAOS 98, 1978, pp.76-84.
                     ——'The Origin Traditions of Genesis and Exodus 1-23',
                     JSOT (SS), Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987.

Van der Woude, A.S. 'Micah in Dispute with the Pseudo-Prophets', VT 19,
                     1969, pp.244-60.

Van Seters, J.   'Abraham in History and Tradition', New Haven, 1975.
                     ——'Religion of the Patriarchs in Genesis', Biblica 61,
                     1980.

Vriezen, Th. C.   'Religion of Ancient Israel', London 1967.
                     ——'An Outline of Old Testament Theology', Netherlands
                     1970.

Vaux, R. de   'Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions', London
                     1961.
                     ——'The Early History of Israel: From the Entry into
                     Canaan to the Period of the Judges', London 1978.

Waldow, H.E. Von   Israel and Her Land: Some Theological Considerations',
                     in 'A Light Unto My Path', eds. H.N. Bream, R.D. Heim
                     and C.A. Moore, Philadelphia, Temple University Press,
                     1974, pp.493-507.

Wevers, J.W.   'Ezekiel' (New Century Bible), London 1969.

Weber, H-R.   'The Promise of Land: Biblical Interpretation and the
                     Present Situation in the Middle East', Study Encounter
                     7, 1971, pp.1-16.

Weber, R.   'Das antike Judentum, Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Religionssoziologie, III. Tübingen 1921, E.trs. 'Ancient Judaism', London 1952.

Weinfeld, M.   'Traces of Treaty Formulae in Deuteronomy', Biblica 41, 1965.
————'The Covenant of Grant in the Old Testament and in the Ancient Near East', JAOS 90, 1970, pp.184-203.
————'Covenant', Encyclopaedia Judaica, Jerusalem 1971, Cols.1012-22.
————'Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School', Oxford 1972.
————'Berit-Covenant vs Obligation', Biblica 56, 1975.

Weiser, A.   'The Psalms: A Commentary', Westminster, Philadelphia 1962.

Wellhausen, J.   'Prolegomena to the History of Israel', Edinburgh 1885.
————'History of Israel and Judah', London and Edinburgh 1891.

Westermann, C.   'Isaiah 40-66', SCM London 1969.
————'Handbook to the Old Testament', Minnesota 1976.

Whitehouse, O.C. 'Isaiah 40-66', (Century Bible), Vol.II, 1905.

Whitley, C.F.   'The Exilic Period', London 1957.

Whybray, R.N.   'Isaiah 40-66', (New Century Bible), London 1975.

Wilcoxen, J.A.   'The Political Battleground of Jeremiah's Temple Sermon', Scripture In History and Theology: Essays in Honour of J. Coert Rylaarsdam, eds. A.L. Merrill and T.W. Buerholt, Pittsburg, 1977, pp.151-66.

Winnett, F.E.   'Iron', IDB, Vol.5, 1962, pp.725f.

Wiseman, D.J.   'The Vassal Treaties of Esarhaddon', London 1958.

Wolf, C.U.   'Prince', IDB, Vol.3, 1962, p.891.

Wolff, H.W.   'Amos', BKAT XIV/2, Neukirchen 1967, E.trs. 'Joel and Amos', Philadelphia 1977.

Wright, E.G.   'The Old Testament Against its Environment', SCM, London 1950.
————'Introduction to Biblical Archaeology', London 1960.
————'The Lawsuit of God: A Forum-Critical Study of Deuteronomy 32', Israel's Prophetic Heritage, eds. G.W. Anderson and W. Harrelson, SCM, London 1962.

Yahuda, A.S.   'The Language of the Pentateuch in its Relation to the Egyptian', Oxford and London 1933.

Zeitlin, S.   'The Rise and Fall of the Judean State', Vol.I. JPS,
                 N.Y. 1968.
                 'Studies in the Early History of Judaism', KTAV, N.Y.
                 1973.

Zimmerli, W.   'Man and His Hope in the Old Testament', SCM, London
                 1968.
                 'The Old Testament and the World', SPCK, London 1976.
                 'Old Testament Theology in Outline', Atlanta: John Knox
                 Press, 1978.