



University
of Glasgow

<https://theses.gla.ac.uk/>

Theses Digitisation:

<https://www.gla.ac.uk/myglasgow/research/enlighten/theses/digitisation/>

This is a digitised version of the original print thesis.

Copyright and moral rights for this work are retained by the author

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study,
without prior permission or charge

This work cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first
obtaining permission in writing from the author

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any
format or medium without the formal permission of the author

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author,
title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given

Enlighten: Theses

<https://theses.gla.ac.uk/>
research-enlighten@glasgow.ac.uk

LITERARY AND HISTORICAL PROBLEMS IN THE

BOOK OF DEUTERONOMY

by

E.W.Nicholson

SUMMARY

The main problem dealt with in this thesis is the twofold problem of the provenance of Deuteronomy and the date of its composition. But any attempt to decide the answer to this question of necessity involves the study of several problems of both a literary and historical nature. We have first of all to decide what we mean by Deuteronomy for it is almost unanimously agreed by Old Testament scholars that the present book is the final product of a long growth beginning with the so-called Urdeuteronomium and developing into the book in its present dimensions. Our first chapter is therefore concerned with the problem of determining what sections of the present book belonged to the original book, Ur-Deuteronomy, and which parts are later additions. We conclude that the book of Deuteronomy in its original form consisted of substantially chapters v-xxvi and xxviii of the present book. In the second chapter we proceed to examine the relationship between Ur-Deuteronomy and the law book which, according to 2 Kings xxii, was discovered in the Jerusalem Temple in the eighteenth year of Josiah (621 B.C.). In this chapter we survey the scholarly debate to which this problem has given rise during the past generation or so and we conclude that in spite of the vigorous opposition of such scholars as Hölischer, Kennett, Horst and Pedersen, the conventional theory, first formulated by W.M.L.DeWette in 1805, which equates Ur-Deuteronomy with Josiah's law book is the most reasonable solution to this problem. This conclusion is of great significance in dating the composition of Ur-Deuteronomy since it fixes the

ProQuest Number: 10662282

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10662282

Published by ProQuest LLC (2017). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

the terminus ad quem for this in the year 621 B.C. when the book was discovered in Jerusalem. The third chapter attempts to fix the terminus a quo for the composition of the book. Here we conclude that the legislation in Deuteronomy belongs to a more advanced period in Israel's history than that in the Book of the Covenant (ca. 800 B.C.). In particular we argue that the doctrine of the centralisation of the cult has its origin in the reign of Hezekiah and that it is therefore reasonable to infer that the Deuteronomic demand for centralisation is later than the reign of that king, that is, after about 700 B.C. On the basis of our investigation thus far we conclude that Ur-Deuteronomy was written sometime between 700 B.C. and 621 B.C. and we suggest, following the opinion of many Old Testament scholars, that the reign of Manasseh is the likely period of its composition.

The second part of the thesis, chapters IV-VI, is concerned with the problem of the authorship and origin of Deuteronomy. In chapter IV we outline the nature of Deuteronomy and the traditions upon which it is based. Following the work of many recent scholars, we decide that Deuteronomy is based upon the old amphictyonic sacral traditions of early Israel. In chapter V we survey the currently favoured theory which holds that Deuteronomy originated in Northern Israel where, it is maintained, these old traditions were preserved and transmitted down through the centuries. We agree with the advocates of this theory that there are strong connections between Deuteronomy and north Israelite traditions, particularly the E document of the Pentateuch and Hosea. But we argue that the old traditions underlying Deuteronomy were also preserved in Judah and in chapter VI we attempt to show that Deuteronomy originated in a circle composed of both northern and southern prophets who combined and worked in Judah in the 7th

century B.C. and who composed Deuteronomy as a programme of reform and revival during the dark days of Manasseh's reign when the pure Yahwistic faith was all but eclipsed by the paganism so widespread in those days.

In the course of our investigation several other problems are raised which are of incidental importance in the discussion of the problems on hand. With these I have dealt in additional notes. The first, after chapter II, deals briefly with the problem of the Deuteronomistic sections in Jeremiah. The second, appended to chapter III, deals with the problem of Sennacherib's invasion of Judah in 701 B.C. This is of some importance in our discussion of the origin of the centralisation of the cult. The third additional note, after chapter IV, is concerned with the important question of the relationship between the Exodus-conquest traditions of the Hexateuch and the Sinai traditions and their cultic Sitz im Leben in early Israel. The fourth note, after chapter V, deals with the recent trend in Old Testament studies which seeks to find the origin of so much of the literature of the Old Testament in cultic liturgies. Finally, we have appended to chapter VI a long additional note on the problem of the $\{ \gamma \delta \eta \zeta \}$ which is of importance in Gerhard von Rad's currently popular theory of the origin of Deuteronomy.

LITERARY AND HISTORICAL PROBLEMS IN
THE BOOK OF DEUTERONOMY

by

E.W.Nicholson

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the University
of Glasgow 1964

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abbreviations		
Introduction		1-4
Chapter I	The Structure and Unity of Deuteronomy	5-28
Chapter II	Deuteronomy and Josiah's Reformation	29-63
Additional Note	The Deuteronomistic sections of Jeremiah	64-66
Chapter III	The Date of the Composition of Deuteronomy	67-91
Additional Note	Sennacherib's Invasion of Judah	92-96
Chapter IV	The Origin of Deuteronomy - I	97-111
Additional Note	The Festival of the Renewal of the Covenant	112-119
Chapter V	The Origin of Deuteronomy - II	120-139
Additional Note	The early Israelite Cult and the formation of the traditions of the Hexateuch	140-142
Chapter VI	The Origin of Deuteronomy - III	143-164
Additional Note	The meaning of the expression לעם יהוה in the Old Testament	165-176
Bibliography		177-188

Abbreviations

AASOR	Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research.
AJSL	American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures.
ANET	Ancient Near Eastern Texts relating to the Old Testament (Edit. J.B.Pritchard, London 1950).
AOr	Archiv Orientalni.
ATD	Das Alte Testament Deutsch (edit. V.Hertrich and A.Weiser, Göttingen).
BA	The Biblical Archaeologist.
BASOR	Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research.
BJRL	Bulletin of the John Rylands Library.
BWAT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten Testament.
BWANT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament.
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.
CAH	Cambridge Ancient History (edit. J.B.Bury, S.A.Cook and F.E.Adcock, Cambridge 1923-39).
CBSC	The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges.
ET	Expository Times.
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literature des Alten und Neuen Testaments.
HAT	Handbuch zum Alten Testament (edit. O.Eissfeldt).
IB	The Interpreter's Bible (edit. G.A.Buttrick).
ICC	The International Critical Commentary.
IEJ	Israel Exploration Journal.
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature.
JNES	Journal of Near Eastern Studies.
JQR	Jewish Quarterly Review.
JR	The Journal of Religion.
JSS	Journal of Semitic Studies.
JTS	Journal of Theological Studies.
KS	Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel by A.Alt (2 vols., Munich 1953).
LXX	The Septuagint.

MT	Massortie Text.
NKZ	Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift.
OLZ	Orientalistische Literaturzeitung.
OTMS	The Old Testament and Modern Study (edit.H.H.Rowley, Oxford 1951).
OTS	Oudtestamentische Studien.
RB	Revue Biblique Internationale.
RHR	Revue de l'histoire des religions.
RSc.R	Recherches de science religieuse.
TBC	The Torch Bible Commentary.
TGUOS	Transactions of the Glasgow University Oriental Society.
TLZ	Theologische Literaturzeitung.
Th.R.	Theologische Rundschau.
VT	Vetus Testamentum.
ZA	Zeitschrift für Assyriologie.
ZAW	Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.
ZDMG	Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft.
ZDPV	Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins.
ZTK	Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche.

INTRODUCTION

No book in the Old Testament has given rise to more debate than the book of Deuteronomy. The problems involved are many and could be the basis of countless theses. In this work I have limited myself to only a few of the more important questions which arise in the study of the book.

The main problem tackled is the twofold problem of the provenance of Deuteronomy and the date of its composition. But any attempt to decide the answer to this question of necessity involves the study of several problems of both a literary and historical nature. We have first of all to decide what we mean by Deuteronomy for it is almost unanimously agreed by Old Testament scholars that the present book is the final result of a long growth beginning with the so-called Urdeuteronomium and developing into the book in its present dimensions. Our first chapter and study is therefore concerned with the problem of determining what sections of the present book belonged to the original book, Ur-Deuteronomy. Having attempted to determine the extent of the original book, we proceed in the second study to a discussion of the relationship between it and Josiah's reformation and law book. In this chapter we conclude that the conventional equation of Ur-Deuteronomy with Josiah's law book is still the most reasonable solution to this problem. This conclusion is of great significance in dating the composition of Ur-Deuteronomy since it fixes the terminus ad quem for this in the year 621 B.C. when the book was discovered in the Temple in Jerusalem. The third chapter attempts to fix the terminus a quo for the composition of the book. Here we conclude that the legislation in Deuteronomy belongs to a more advanced period in Israel's history than that in the Book of the Covenant (ca. 800 B.C.). Of more significance, however,

is our argument that the doctrine of the centralisation of the cult has its origins in the reign of Hezekiah and that it is therefore reasonable to infer that the Deuteronomic demand for centralisation is later than the reign of that king, that is, after about 700 B.C. On the basis of our arguments thus far we conclude that Ur-Deuteronomy was written sometime between 700 B.C. and 621 B.C. and we suggest that the reign of Manasseh is the likely period of its composition.

The second three chapters in the thesis are concerned mainly with the authorship and provenance of Deuteronomy. In the first study in this second part of the work, chapter four, we set the stage by outlining the nature of Deuteronomy and the traditions upon which it is based. Following the work of many recent scholars, we decide that Deuteronomy is based upon the old amphictyonic sacral traditions of early Israel. The problem of the provenance and authorship of Deuteronomy then becomes largely that of determining who preserved these old sacral traditions down through the centuries until they were formulated as a book in the 7th century B.C. In the fifth and sixth chapters we deal with this problem. In the fifth chapter we survey the currently favoured theory of the north Israelite origin of Deuteronomy and we conclude that there are definite connections between Deuteronomy and north Israelite traditions, particularly the E document of the Pentateuch and Hosea. But we argue that any theory of a purely northern origin of the book raises several difficult problems for we believe that there are strong Judaeans as well as northern elements in Deuteronomy. In the sixth chapter we take up this suggestion and attempt to show that Deuteronomy originated in a circle composed of both northern and southern prophets who combined and worked in Judah in the 7th century B.C. and who composed Deuteronomy as a programme of reform and revival during the dark days of Manasseh's reign when the pure Yahwistic faith was all but eclipsed

by the paganism so widespread and deep-rooted in those days.

In the course of our investigation several other problems are raised which are of incidental importance and interest in the discussion of the problems on hand. With these I have dealt in additional notes. The first, after chapter II, deals briefly with the problem of the Deuteronomistic sections in Jeremiah. The second note, appended to chapter III, deals with the problem of Sennacherib's invasion of Judah in 701 B.C. This is of some importance in our discussion of the origin of the centralisation of the cult. The third additional note is concerned with the important question of the relationship between the Exodus-conquest traditions of the Hexateuch and the Sinai traditions and their cultic Sitz im Leben in early Israel. The fourth note, after chapter V, deals with the recent trend in Old Testament studies which seeks to find the origin of so much of the literature of the Old Testament in cultic liturgies. And finally we have appended to chapter VI a long additional note on the problem of the $\{ \text{ר} \text{א} \text{ד} \text{ו} \text{ל} \text{א} \}$ which is of importance in von Rad's currently popular theory of the origin of Deuteronomy.

It is not easy to be original in dealing with problems such as those involved in the study of Deuteronomy about which so much has been written down through the years. There are, however, parts of this thesis where I have arrived at some independent conclusions which I am putting forward for consideration. Chapter II will be seen to contain some original thoughts on the problem of Josiah's reformation and Deuteronomy. In particular there is in this chapter a small but, I believe, important textual emendation on 2 Kings xxii 18.¹ The substance of this chapter was read as a paper before

1. Published as a short article under the title "II Kings xxii 18 -- A Simple Restoration" in Hermathena vol.xcvi (1963) pp.96-98.

the Glasgow University Oriental Society in September 1963.² Chapter III formed the basis of an article published recently in Vetus Testamentum³ in which I offered for consideration a new suggestion as to the motives behind Hezekiah's centralisation of public worship to Jerusalem. Chapter VI contains some of my own thoughts on the problem of the provenance and authorship of Deuteronomy in the light of recent study. In it I have attempted to modify the currently favoured theory of ~~s~~northern Israelite origin of Deuteronomy by arguing that the book also contains strong Judaeac elements and that it originated in a circle composed of both northern and southern prophets. As to authorship, I have contended that Deuteronomy was composed by prophetic circles. I have maintained this view in opposition to G. von Rad's theory, recently accepted by many critics, of a priestly origin of the book.⁴ The additional note to chapter III appeared as part of the article in Vetus Testamentum referred to above and the additional note to chapter IV on the problem of the $\{78\pi \square \vee$ is to be published in the Journal of Semitic Studies in 1965.

In preparing this dissertation I have, to the best of my knowledge, consulted almost everything of importance which has been written on the problem of Deuteronomy during the past half century or so. In doing so I have come to appreciate deeply the great gifts of scholarship which former generations of Old Testament scholars have left us. I have drunk deeply from the well of their labours and researches and although at times I have dared challenge what they thought and wrote it is always, I trust, in a humble and reverent manner.

2. To be published in the Society's Transactions in 1965.

3. "The Centralisation of the Cult in Deuteronomy" VT xiii (1963) 380-389.

4. Cf. G. von Rad Studies in Deuteronomy (London 1953).

CHAPTER ITHE STRUCTURE AND UNITY OF DEUTERONOMY

Deuteronomy purports to be a series of sermons delivered by Moses to the Israelites on the eve of their entrance into the promised land. The book falls naturally into the following divisions:

After a brief introduction (i 1-5) specifying the place and time at which the sermons were delivered we have:

A Chs. i 6-iv 40 Moses' first discourse which comprises two parts: (a) a historical retrospect of the journey from Horeb to the present location (i 6-iii 29) and (b) a hortatory section appealing to the nation to be loyal to the God who has brought them thus far (iv 1-40).

There follows a short passage which narrates in the 3rd person Moses' legislation concerning Asylum cities on the other side of Jordan (iv 41-43).

B Moses' second discourse follows in chapters v-xi with a short introduction in iv 44-49. This second address includes the decalogue (v 1-21) and the Shema^c (vi 4-5) as summaries of the Law, with further hortatory material and a short historical section (ix 7b-x 11).

C These two introductory discourses are followed by the code of laws (xii-xxvi) which contains laws and legal material of very varied age and origin interspersed for the most part with parenetic or sermon-like material. This code of laws finds its epilogue in chapter xxviii which is connected closely with chapter xxvi 19 and which proclaims the blessings and curses which will befall Israel according as it observes, or neglects, the laws which have just been laid down in the code. Between the code and the epilogue

stands chapter xxvii which interrupts Moses' discourse and is composed in the 3rd person. It makes provision for a ceremony to take place at Shechem between Mts. Ebal and Gerizim when the Jordan is crossed. This ceremony is carried out in Joshua viii 30-35.

D Moses' third address in chapters xxix-xxx insists afresh upon faithfulness to Yahweh and comprises: (a) an appeal to Israel to accept the terms of the covenant, with a further warning of the disastrous consequences of apostasy (xxix 1-28); (b) a promise that even after the punishment threatened in xxviii the nation could be saved if it repented and turned to God; and (c) the well known statement about the nature of the choice before Israel as being one of life or death (xxx 11-20).

E This last section (xxi-xxiv) contains a number of appendixes to the book as follows:

- (a) Moses' last words of encouragement (xxxi 1-8);
- (b) the delivery of the law book to the Levites with instructions for a ceremony of renewal of the covenant every seven years (xxi 9-13);
- (c) the commissioning of Joshua as Moses' successor (xxi 14-15, 23);
- (d) the song of Moses (xxxii 1-47) with reasons for it (xxxi 16-22, 24-30);
- (e) final commendation of the whole book to Israel (xxxii 45-47);
- (f) conclusion of the book containing the blessing of Moses (xxxiii) and narrating the death of Moses (xxxiv).

Scholars have generally agreed that the book of Deuteronomy is the final product of a long growth beginning with the so-called Ur-Deuteronomy and developing into the book as we now have it. But on the question of what parts of the present book constituted this Ur-Deuteronomy and of how it assumed its present form there has been no unanimity of opinion.

The attempt to sift Ur-Deuteronomy from the present book has been, broadly speaking, carried out along two main lines of research.

1. Many scholars, especially in the earlier stages of the discussion, viewed the problem as one of deciding which of the main sections outlined above belonged to the original book. The debate revolved around the problem of the plurality of introductory and concluding speeches: which of them, together with the central law code in chapters xii-xxvi, constituted Ur-Deuteronomy ?
2. Whilst many scholars see the problem as being the same to-day, there has nevertheless been another attempt at the literary analysis of Deuteronomy along quite different lines. It seeks to find Ur-Deuteronomy not in a combination of one of the introductory and concluding speeches with the law code but scattered throughout the book. In other words the advocates of this theory deal not with the main divisions of the book as outlined above but with divisions which they believe to run through the whole book - "cross divisions".¹ They question the unity of the main sections.

1.

Of the main divisions, A and B raise a difficult problem. They both seem to be independent introductions to the code in xii-xxvi; neither one seems to require the other. Why two introductions ? The problem is made more acute by the fact that both sections are written in the same style and are pervaded with the same spirit.² In the earlier stage of the discussion on these sections several solutions to this problem were offered. A number of scholars detected differences in style and standpoint between the two discourses, and, emphasising these, argued that the first section was a later

1. G.A.Smith Deuteronomy (CBSC, Cambridge 1918) p.lxii f.

2. For an excellent treatment of this see G.A.Smith op.cit. pp.lii-lviii.

addition to the original book to which the second discourse (v-xi) was the introduction proper.³ On the other hand an equal number of scholars argued that the stylistic and other differences between the two discourses are insignificant and not sufficient to warrant belief in different authorship.⁴

Other commentators faced with the striking uniformity in language and spirit in the discourses suggested that they were originally separate introductions to two separate editions to the code in xii-xxvi.⁵ Recently, however, fresh research into this problem has yielded a more satisfactory solution. In his monumental work on the Pentateuch and Former Prophets,⁶ Martin Noth has argued that the first discourse, chapters i-iv, in Deuteronomy is not an introduction to that book but rather to the Deuteronomistic history of Israel from Moses to the Exile which begins in Deuteronomy chapter i and runs through to 2 Kings.⁷ Noth's suggestion is certainly the most attractive solution to the problem so far offered and has been enthusiastically received by majority of scholars.⁸

3. So, for example, W.E. Addis The Documents of the Hexateuch I (London 1892) p.lxv; J.E. Carpenter and G. Harford The Composition of the Hexateuch (London 1902) in a long footnote on pp.155-158. See further G.A. Smith op.cit. p.lix footnote 2.

4. So notably S.R. Driver Deuteronomy (ICC, 3rd edit., Edinburgh 1902) p.lxxii.

5. So, for example, J. Wellhausen Die Composition des Hexateuchs (Berlin 1899) p.192; G.A. Smith op.cit. p.xci; O. Eissfeldt Einleitung in das Alte Testament (Tübingen 1934) p.266.

6. M. Noth Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien I (2nd edit., Tübingen 1957).

7. *Ibid.* p.14.

8. To quote but a few: A. Bentzen Introduction to the Old Testament (4th edit. Copenhagen 1958) vol.11 pp.237-40; G.A. Danell Studies in the Name Israel in the Old Testament (Uppsala 1946) p.51; G.E. Wright Deuteronomy (IB vol.11 1953) p.316; B.W. Anderson The Living World of the Old Testament (London 1958) p.310f.; G.W. Anderson A Critical Introduction to the Old Testament (London 1959) pp.44, 53.

With regard to the central section, the so-called law code, virtually all scholars agree that it or part of it belonged to Ur-Deuteronomy.⁹ We shall return to this when we deal with the unity of the individual sections below.

It is very widely agreed that chapter xxvii is a later insertion into the original book. The chapter is composed in the 3rd person, interrupts the speech of Moses, and breaks the connection that seems to exist between xxvi 19 and xxviii 1. It is possible, however, that xxvii 9-10 was the original link between xxvi and xxviii.¹⁰

Section D (xxix-xxx) is of the nature of a supplement to the central section of the book. It has generally been regarded as a later addition to the original book. There has been much debate as to whether xxviii 69 (LXX and EVV xxix 1) is a superscription to the discourse in xxix-xxx or a subscription to the preceding discourse in xii-xxvi, xxviii. Those who argue in favour of the latter do so on the grounds that "words of the covenant" refers to the laws and exposition of the covenant in the main (preceding) section of the book rather than to the general exhortations in xxix-xxx.¹¹ Those

9. J.Cullen The Book of the Covenant in Moab (Glasgow 1903) in contrast to the majority of scholars finds Ur-Deuteronomy not in the law code but in the discourses and takes the law code to be the deposit of Josiah's reformation. For a treatment of this view see G.A.Smith op.cit. pp.xcvi-xcviii.

10. Cf. S.R.Driver op.cit. pp.297-298; W.E.Addis op.cit. p.lxxv; A.Bertholet Deuteronomium (Leipzig 1899) p.84; recently G.Henton Davies in Peake's Commentary (London 1962) p.281.

11. So, for example, S.R.Driver op.cit. p.319; R.H.Pfeiffer Introduction to the Old Testament (revised edit. New York 1948) p.187; O.Eissfeldt op.cit. p.265; A.Bentzen op.cit. p.41; H.Cazelles Le Deutéronome (Paris 1958) p.117; R.De Vaux Ancient Israel (London 1961) p.147.

who regard the verse as a superscription to xxix-xxx argue that there are no other subscriptions in Deuteronomy and that the verse is the introduction to the notion of the covenant in Moab which is dominant in the ensuing discourse.¹² That is to say, the relationship between xxviii 69 and xxix 1 is the same as that between iv 45 and v 1.¹³ Either view would seem to be possible although the latter has been recently preferred; the verse is now regarded by some as an editorial note identifying the beginning of Moses' third address.¹⁴

In the earlier stage of the discussion of chapters xxix-xxx they were regarded as composite and no part of the original Deuteronomy, though there was a willingness to allot at least xxx 15-20¹⁵ and/or perhaps one or two other passages to Ur-Deuteronomy.¹⁶ Recently, however, this third discourse of Moses has been viewed in another light. It is now suggested that these chapters on account of their marked liturgical interest and form -- the recitation of the saving acts of God (xxix 1-7), the solemn charge to accept the terms of the covenant (8-14), the stern warning of the consequences of apostasy and breach of covenant (15-28), and the promise of God's favour and mercy upon the nation if it truly repents and returns to him when it breaks the covenant (xxx 1-10), and finally the solemn appeal to the people to choose the way of life by entering into covenant with the God who has so revealed himself to them (xxx 11-14, 15-20) -- may be based upon an actual covenant ceremony

12. Cf. K.Steuernagel Die Entstehung des Deuteronomische Gesetz (Leipzig 1895); J.Cullen op.cit. p. A.Bertholet op.cit. pp.88-89.

13. Cf. A.Bertholet op.cit. p 89.

14. Cf. G.E.Wright op.cit. p.502; G.Henton Davies Deuteronomy (Peake's Commentary on the Bible, London 1962) p.201 in loc.

15. So S.R.Driver op.cit. p.lxxvi (xxx 11-20); A.Bertholet op.cit. p.91 (xxx 15-20); G.A.Smith op.cit. p.329 (xxx 15-20 but with reservations); E.Sellin Einleitung in das Alte Testament (8th edit. by L.Rost, Heidelberg 1950) p.62 (xxx 15-20).

16. S.R.Driver further allows xxix 1-3 and Carpenter and Harford xxx 1-10.

(cf. xxx 9-13) which perhaps employed the original Deuteronomy as containing the covenant "words" or divine stipulations.¹⁷ The liturgical pattern of these two chapters is demonstrable in other parts of the Pentateuch including Deuteronomy itself and in the light of this the more recent suggestion noted above is to be preferred.¹⁸

That section E (xxxi-xxxiv) was not part of the original book but contains rather a series of appendixes to it has been widely accepted among Old Testament scholars.¹⁹ These chapters have been considered as belonging less to the book of Deuteronomy proper than to the Pentateuch as a whole.²⁰ Parts of them have been viewed as forming the link between the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua.²¹ This latter view has been strongly advocated recently by M.Noeth who sees in parts of these chapters (ch. xxxi 1-13, 24-26a; xxxiv) as in chapters i-iii the work of the Deuteronomistic historian.²²

Thus we may conclude that a considerable number of scholars confine Ur-Deuteronomy to chapters v-xxvi and xxviii of the present book of Deuteronomy. This leads us immediately to a second question: are there any passages within these chapters which are secondary?

17. Cf. G.E.Wright op.cit. pp.317,502; G.Henton Davies op.cit. pp.281-282.

18. Cf. G.von Rad Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuchs (Gesammelte Studien, Munich 1958); idem Studies in Deuteronomy (ET London 1953 by D.M.G. Stalker) p.14f.

19. Earlier scholars were, however, willing to allot some fragments of these chapters to Ur-Deuteronomy. S.R.Driver allowed xxxi 1-13, 24-27 and xxxii 45-47 to the original book. Part of the difficulty for earlier scholars lay in the close similarity in style and standpoint between parts of these chapters and chapters i-iii (cf.Driver op.cit. p.333; G.A.Smith op.cit. pp.332-333). Noeth's theory noted below offers an attractive solution to this problem.

20. Cf. G.A.Smith op.cit. p.xii; W.E.Addis op.cit. p.lxv

21. Cf. G.A.Smith op.cit. p 332.

22. M.Noeth op.cit. pp.39-40

The question of the unity of the individual sections noted above leads us immediately to a discussion of the second approach to the problem of determining Ur-Deuteronomy — that which seeks to find the original book scattered throughout the present book rather than in a combination of one of the introductory and concluding speeches with the central law code in chapters xxi-xxvi. The main criterion used by the advocates of this theory for isolating Ur-Deuteronomy is the frequent transition from the singular to the plural form of address in Deuteronomy. It is alleged that this transition is accompanied by other changes in the narrative.

It was not until the last decade of the 19th century that this distinction in the form of address in Deuteronomy was carefully scrutinized. In 1891 C.H. Cornill regarded some laws as secondary on account of their use of the plural.²³ A few years later, in 1894, W. Stärk²⁴ and K. Steuernagel²⁵ working independently published detailed analyses of Deuteronomy based on the changing forms of address. Since then this criterion has been adopted by a large number of scholars and is currently favoured by many.²⁶

23. C.F. Cornill Einleitung in das Alte Testament (Tübingen 1891).

24. W. Stärk Das Deuteronomium: sein Inhalt und seine literarische Form (Leipzig 1894).

25. K. Steuernagel Der Rahmen des Deuteronomiums (1894). Cf. further his Die Entstehung des deuteronomischen Gesetz (1896) and Deuteronomium und Josua (1st edit. 1898).

26. To note a few: H.G. Mitchell "The Use of the Second Person in Deuteronomy" JBL xviii (1899) pp. 61-109; J. Hempel Die Schichten des Deuteronomiums (Leipzig 1914); G.A. Smith op.cit. pp. lxxiii ff.; G. Hölscher "Komposition und Ursprung des Deuteronomiums" ZAW xi (1922) pp. 161-255; O. Eissfeldt op.cit. pp. 188-195, 251-268; M. Noth op.cit. p. 16f.; J.H. Hospers De numeruswisseling in het boek Deuteronomium (1947) (not consulted); G. von Rad Studies in Deuteronomy p. 11; and very recently G. Minette de Tillesse "Sections 'tu' et sections 'vous' dans le Deutéronome" VT xii (1962) pp. 29-87.

Within the ranks of those who champion the use of this linguistic criterion there have been, broadly speaking, two theories concerning the literary growth of Deuteronomy. The first one, which was more characteristic of the earlier stages of the debate, sees in the present book of Deuteronomy the result of a combination of two or more originally separate editions (Sonderausgaben) of Ur-Deuteronomy.²⁷ The second theory explains the development of Deuteronomy by way of a supplementary hypothesis whereby the original book was amplified by additions and expansions which attached themselves to Ur-Deuteronomy (Ergänzungen hypothesis).²⁸

Of these two theories the first, the Sonderausgaben theory, would find few supporters to-day. In the first place the attempts to isolate the separate editions of Ur-Deuteronomy within the present book were unsuccessful.²⁹ Furthermore the problem of the plurality of introductory and concluding addresses from which this theory took its starting point is now more satisfactorily accommodated by Noth's theory noted above.

More popular to-day is the Ergänzungen theory. The most recent detailed study along these lines comes from G.Minette de Tillesse.³⁰ Before considering his suggestions we must note some general objections which have been raised against the use of this linguistic criterion in the study of Deuteronomy.

27. So for example K.Steuernagel in the works cited in note 25 above; W.Stärk op.cit.; J.Hempel op.cit.; O.Eissfeldt op.cit.

28. Cf. G.Hölscher op.cit.; G.Minette de Tillesse op.cit.

29. Cf. S.Mowinckel Le Décalogue (Paris 1927) p.11; A.Weiser Introduction to the Old Testament (ET London 1961 by D.M.Barton from 4th German edit.) p.130.

30. G.Minette de Tillesse op.cit.

31. Cf. W.E.Addis The Documents of the Hexateuch vol.ii (London 1898) pp.10-19; A.Bertholet op.cit. p.xxi; J.W.Carpenter and G.Harford op.cit. p.165f. J.Cullen op.cit. pp.2-4; E.König Das Deuteronomium (1917); J.Sperber "Der Personenwechsel in der Bibel" ZA xxxii (1913) pp.23-33; B.D.Eerdmans "Deuteronomy" in Old Testament Essays (edit. J.C.Simpson, London 1927) pp. 77-84.

Right from the beginning it has met with strong opposition from a large number of Old Testament scholars.³¹ Broadly speaking three main objections have been levelled against it.

(1) The divergencies between the readings in the MT and the other versions, particularly the Samaritan version and the LXX, render the criterion hazardous. Thus in chapter i 21 the MT has the singular in an otherwise plural passage whilst the LXX has the plural throughout. In iv 3 the MT is in the plural except for the last two words. The LXX and Peshitto have the plural throughout. Similarly in verse 10 of the same chapter the LXX is in the plural whilst the MT is a mixture of both singular and plural. Similarly in iv 29 the LXX has singular throughout whilst the MT has the first word in the plural. In vi 3 the MT, followed by the LXX, has one word in the plural in an otherwise singular text but the Samaritan, Vulgate and Peshitto have the singular throughout. In vi 17 the MT is mostly plural with only the last word in the singular. The LXX has the singular throughout. In viii 1 the LXX has plural whilst the MT has one word in the singular. In x 15 the LXX is plural but the MT is in the singular except for one word. In xi 10 the MT is predominantly singular with only one word in the plural. The LXX however has plural in the first half of the verse and the singular in the second half. Some versions, however, have the singular throughout. In xi 13 the MT is in the plural whilst the LXX is singular except for one word לִשְׁמִי . In verse 14 of the same chapter the MT has the first half in the plural and the second in the singular. The LXX is singular throughout. Verse 20 in the MT is singular but the LXX is plural.

If this comparison is carried further the results are the same. It

(contd)
 31. S.Mowinckel op.cit. p.14; H.M.Wiener "Zur Deuteronomiumsfrage" in Monatschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums n.f. xxxvi (1928) pp.24-48; H. Breit Die Predigt des Deuteronomisten (Munich 1933); A.Lentzen op.cit. p.41; G.E.Wright op.cit. pp.362,393f.

has been argued against this objection that the differences between the LXX and MT readings may be due to a "harmonizing" process carried out by LXX translators.³² But the evidence does not seem to point to this. There are many instances where the LXX follows the MT where one would expect harmonizing. Thus for example in chapter i 31 the MT has the first half of the verse in the singular and the second half in the plural: "And in the wilderness, where thou hast seen (וְאַתָּה רָאִיתָ) how that the Lord thy God (יְיָ אֱלֹהֶיךָ) bore thee (וְיָרָא), as a man doth bear his son, in all the way that ye went (בְּכָל הַדֶּרֶךְ) until ye came (וְעַד) unto this place". The LXX, far from harmonizing, has וְאַתָּה רָאִיתָ for וְאַתָּה רָאִיתָ and otherwise follows the MT. Similarly in chapter ii 24 the LXX follows the MT which begins in the plural and changes to the singular. In vi 3 the MT and LXX have the singular throughout except for one word (וְיָרָא) in the plural. In vii 4 a very mixed MT is followed by the LXX. In verse 25 of the same chapter the MT is followed by the LXX in having one plural word (וְיָרָא) in an otherwise entirely singular passage. And there are many more examples of this throughout the book.

In addition to this there are copious examples of where the LXX has preserved a passage with both singular and plural in it as against a MT reading which is consistently either singular or plural. For example, in chapter vi 18 the MT has the singular throughout: "And thou shalt do (וְעָשִׂיתָ) that which is right and good in the sight of the Lord; that it may be well with thee (וְיָרָא) and that thou mayest go in (וְיָרָא) and possess (וְיָרָא) the good land which the Lord swore unto thy fathers (וְיָרָא)". The LXX, however, adds the plural "your God" after "the Lord" and reads "your fathers" (וְיָרָא) for the MT וְיָרָא . Similarly in ix 1 the MT is singular throughout whilst

32. So, for example, A.F.Puukko Das Deuteronomium (Leipzig 1910) p.105f; J.Hempel op.cit. pp. 7-15.

the LXX has one word in the plural — reading $\square \zeta \eta$ for MT $\overline{\eta} \eta \eta$

In chapter xvi 3 the LXX and the Samaritan between them preserve a plural reading in a passage which is otherwise in the singular both in these versions and in the MT. And there are many more similar occurrences throughout the book.

The most reasonable explanation of all this is that the LXX has behind it a different textual tradition from the MT. This is further supported by the fact that in for example chapters v-vii there are more than thirty variations in person and number between the MT and the LXX. Accordingly the divergencies between the MT and the other versions at once raise serious difficulties and obstacles for those who would use this linguistic criterion for the literary analysis of Deuteronomy.

(2) Another objection to this theory is the fact that such variations in form of address occur in other parts of the Old Testament where there can be no question of a plurality of authors. For example, Exodus xxii 21-23 reads:

"(21) Ye shall not afflict ($\overline{\eta} \eta \eta$) any widow or orphan.
 (22) If thou dost afflict ($\overline{\eta} \eta \eta$) them³³ and they cry³³
 unto me, I will surely hear their³³ cry; (23) and my wrath
 will burn, and I will kill you ($\square \zeta \eta$) with the sword,
 and your wives ($\square \zeta \eta$) will become widows and your
 children ($\square \zeta \eta$) fatherless."

The unity of these three verses can hardly be denied. Similarly Exodus xxiii 13, 25, 31 are mixed.

There are several examples of variations in form of address in the book of Jeremiah. In chapter iii verses 12 and 13 contain both singular and plural. In chapter iv verses 5-8 are in the plural with the exception of verse 7 which is singular. A similar mixture of singular and plural is to be found

33. Reading plural with the LXX against the MT singular.

in such passages as chapter v 15, xi 13, xv 14 (cf. xvii 3-4), xxi 13-14.

Careful examination would probably reveal many more examples of such changes in address not only from 2nd person singular to 2nd person plural but of other changes in person and number within a passage. These few examples will suffice to demonstrate that such changes do not necessarily indicate diversity of authorship.

(3) That the criterion of the variation in form of address is an unsatisfactory method in the literary analysis of Deuteronomy is further demonstrated by the great diversity of results among those who have applied this common criterion. An examination of the work of Steuernagel, Stärk, Mitchell, Hempel, Puukko, Hölscher, etc. along these lines will reveal that no two of them agree in their results. This proves that the change in address cannot in itself be an adequate criterion. The arguments based on the change of address must be accompanied by other evidence from the text. C. Minnette de Tillesse has lately attempted an analysis of Deuteronomy from this standpoint.³⁴ We must now turn to an examination of his views.

De Tillesse takes his starting point from K. Noth's theory noted above that the corpus Deuteronomy-2 Kings represents the work of a Deuteronomistic author who wrote the history of Israel from Moses down to the release of Jehoiachin in exile about 562 B.C. Noth, as we have already noted, regards Deuteronomy i-iv as the prologue not to the book of Deuteronomy itself but to this great history work. Similarly parts of the last four chapters of Deuteronomy (xxxi-xxxiv) are taken by him to be the link between Deuteronomy and Joshua. For the rest Noth believes that Deuteronomy iv 40-xxx lay before the Deuteronomistic historian more or less as we now have it. But he believes that the

34. C. Minnette de Tillesse "Sections 'tu' et sections 'vous' dans le Deutéronome" VT xii (1962) pp. 29-87.

original book consisted of the singular portions of this block and that this original book was surcharged with the plural passages now in iv 40-xxx 20.³⁵ De Tillesse now goes further than Noth and attempts to demonstrate that in fact the "vous" sections within this block are also the work of the Deuteronomistic historian. But the reasons adduced by him for regarding the plural passages in Deuteronomy as secondary are unconvincing as careful examination will show.

De Tillesse begins with chapter v 1-vi 1 of which verses 1-5 and 22-vi 1 are in the plural whilst v 6-21 containing the decalogue are in the singular. According to De Tillesse this section forms a historical unity and narrates an event which is ignored completely in the singular passages throughout the book.³⁶ I find it difficult to see how this section can possibly be regarded as secondary. In the first place the plural passage forms an indispensable introduction and framework to the decalogue and the decalogue cannot reasonably be regarded as secondary. If it is regarded as secondary then the remainder of chapters vi-xi lose their significance since they are essentially a development of the first commandment.³⁷ De Tillesse suggests that an original singular context of the decalogue has been lost.³⁸ But such a suggestion does not carry conviction. In the second place there is, in spite of De Tillesse's argument, a clear reference in a later singular section (xviii 15f.) to the narrative in chapter v:-

35. M.Noth Überlieferungsgeschichtliche-Studien I (2nd edition, Tübingen 1957) p. 16f.

36. De Tillesse op.cit. p. 35

37. Cf. S.R.Driver Deuteronomy p.82; G.E.Wright op.cit. pp. 314-315.

38. Op.cit. p35

Deut.v 5

"I stood between the Lord and you at that time, to declare to you the word of the Lord; for you were afraid because of the fire, and you did not go up into the mountain".

Deut. xviii 15f.

"The Lord thy God will raise up for thee a prophet like me from the midst of thee, of thy brethren: unto him shall you hearken according to all that thou didst desire of the Lord thy God in Horeb in the day of the assembly saying: let me not hear again the voice of the Lord my God, neither let me see this great fire any more, that I die not".

We may add that De Tillesse's argument runs into further difficulty since in chapter vi verse 2, in the singular, is clearly the continuation of verse 1 (plural) and cannot be dispensed with. In an attempt to circumvent this problem it has been argued that vi 2 is a secondary development of verse 1.³⁹ This seems to me to be yet another attempt to smooth out the difficulties which inevitably arise in the application of this linguistic criterion to the study of the composition of Deuteronomy.

In chapter vi verses 14,16,-17a are plural in an otherwise singular context. According to De Tillesse verse 14 interrupts the connection between 13 and 15; he argues that 15 follows logically after verse 13 and explains why Israel is to "fear" Yahweh.⁴⁰ It seems to me, however, that verse 14 is entirely in context in this passage. In this passage, vv.10-15, the preacher is warning Israel of the temptations she will face when she has entered the promised land with all that it will offer and exhorts them not to let this material well-being lead them to forget their God and to go after other gods.

39. So J.H.Hospers De numeruswisseling in het Boek Deuteronomium p.19 cited in De Tillesse op.cit. p.35

40. Op.cit. p.36

Furthermore, verse 15 with its threat of the destruction which will come from Israel's "jealous" God follows better after verse 14 with its talk of other gods. The theme that increasing prosperity can lead to idolatry is further developed in chapter viii where in verse 19 there is a similar warning against "going after other gods".

It may be that verse 16 with its reference to Massah is an intrusion. Verse 17 is an appropriate continuation of verse 15; it is not to be rejected on account of its use of the plural which in any case gives way to the singular in the last part of the verse.⁴¹

In chapter vii verses 4,5,7-8a, 12a, 25a are plural in an otherwise singular passage. Verse 4 is actually mainly singular with only the plural "against you" (confirmed by the versions) in the second half of the verse. De Tillesse maintains that it can be removed without damage to the text.⁴² But once more there is no need to excise it; the verse makes good sense as it stands. De Tillesse considers verse 5 as secondary on the grounds that verses 1-4 deal with matters military and matrimonial whilst it deals with the cult.⁴³ This is not a very strong argument. More convincing is the argument which

41. It has been suggested that the singular at the end of the verse is due to "attraction" of the singular in verse 18. (so G.A.Smith op.cit. p.102.) But if we were to use the argument of "attraction" it would surely be in cases where a passage begins in, say, a singular because it is immediately preceded by a singular passage. That is, we can understand a copyist accidentally continuing to use the singular at the beginning of a plural passage which is immediately preceded by the singular. It is difficult to see however how a copyist could accidentally anticipate the use of the singular or plural. In other words the argument of "attraction" can only work one way -- in cases where the beginning of a section has been accidentally influenced by the preceding passage.

42. De Tillesse op.cit. p.36

43. Ibid. p. 36.

would excise the verse on the grounds that it does not direct the destruction of the persons of the heathen, which would have been relevant to the preceding verses, but only of their altars, etc.⁴⁴ On the other hand the verse does deal with the danger of idolatry and as such fits in well with the preceding verses.

De Tillesse considers verses 7-8a as a secondary explanatory gloss aimed at elaborating on the theme of verse 6. He suggests that the original reading was:

"..... the Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people unto himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth and hath redeemed thee from the house of bondmen"⁴⁵

It has been argued by others too that verses 7-8a are a gloss occasioned by the mention of election in verse 6.⁴⁶ But on the other hand the notion that Israel's election was due solely to God's grace is common in Deuteronomy. Chapter vii deals largely with God's election of Israel and the response which that election demands from Israel. It is noteworthy too that much of the chapter is based on the notions of the Holy War in which it is Yahweh and not Israel's might that conquers her enemies (cf. verses 1-2, 16ff.) Verses 7-8a which emphasise Israel's numerical insignificance must be seen against the background of Yahweh's election love and his might to carry through his purposes of election.

Chapter vii 12 has the plural in the first half of the verse and the singular in the second half. According to Tillesse 12a interrupts the flow between 11 and 12b.⁴⁷ To eliminate 12a on the grounds that it repeats 11 is surely hypercritical. We must see verse 11 as the conclusion of one section and 12 as the beginning of another in which the benefits of loyalty and obedience

44. Cf. G.A. Smith op.cit. p.107; A.C. Welch Deuteronomy: the Framework to the Code (1932) p.70.

45. De Tillesse op.cit. p.36. Cf. G.A. Smith op.cit. p.111.

46. A.C. Welch Deuteronomy: the Framework p.71. 47. De Tillesse op.cit. p.36

to the covenant are set forth. If 12a is a gloss we may well ask what purpose it serves? What reason could an editor have had for inserting it?

De Tillesse would eliminate verse 25a because of its use of the plural and because he considers 25b to be a suitable continuation of 24.⁴⁸ It seems to me however that verse 25 is a unity; the second half forbids the taking of the gold or silver plate which overlaid the heathen idols mentioned in the first half. Furthermore verse 26 is a continuation of the prohibition mentioned in 25.

Chapter viii 1 is considered as interrupting the connection between vii 26 and viii 2.⁴⁹ Against this, however, it may be argued that the appeal to obey the commandments etc. in this verse is but one example of the same oft-recurring appeal. It occurs again in verses 6 and 11 and is nothing more than a rhetorical device aimed, like similar examples throughout the book, at inculcating the lessons upon the hearts of the people addressed.⁵⁰

Chapter viii 19b-20 with its use of the plural raises a formidable difficulty for the advocates of the criterion of the changing forms of address for it is clear that without 19b-20 19a would be meaningless:

"And it shall be, if thou do at all forget the Lord thy
God, and walk after other gdds, and serve them, and worship
them, I testify against you this day that ye shall surely perish;
"As the nations which the Lord destroyed before your face, so
shall ye perish: because ye would not obey the voice of the
Lord your God".

The argument that these verses with their threat of destruction are a late gloss reflecting the events of 586 B.C. carries no weight for two reasons.

First of all the verses could well reflect the catastrophe of the fall of the northern kingdom in 721 B.C. Secondly the threat in these verses is substan-

48. Ibid. p.36

49. Cf. De Tillesse op.cit. p.36

50. It may be noted that in this instance the LXX has the plural throughout the verse.

tially the same as what the prophets had been uttering since the eighth century!⁵¹

In chapters ix-x we have yet another plural section, ix 7b-x 11. This section has been taken by many as an editorial expansion by the author of chapters i-iii occasioned by 7a: "Remember and forget not how thou provokedst the Lord thy God to wrath in the wilderness".⁵² The fact is that chapters ix-x form a unity of which this plural section is an integral part. Following the words "for thou art a stiffnecked people" (v.6) the author proceeds to demonstrate Israel's rebellion against Yahweh even since the day he led them forth from Egypt, since he first knew them.⁵³ The historical retrospect recalls the incident of the making of the golden calf and one or two other acts of rebellion during the wilderness period. The episode of the golden calf has been carefully chosen in this respect: even at Horeb God's grace in granting Israel the covenant was the scene of Israel's greatest failure. Similarly the allusion to the disobedience of Kadesh is very pointed: the divine goodness in giving the promised land was met by lack of faith and disobedience on Israel's part. Except for Moses' intercession and God's forbearance Israel would have been destroyed and rejected by God there and then.⁵⁴ These incidents rigorously drive home the lesson of how rebellious Israel has been. Chapter x 1-11 completes the historical narrative begun in ix 8 and emphasises further God's guidance of Israel in the wilderness. Finally in x 12ff. we have the preacher's conclusions which he draws from the events just quoted. In verses 12-13, in language reminiscent of Micah vi 8, the total demand of God from his people is

51. Cf. the remarks in this respect in G.E.Wright op.cit. p.351

52. Cf. G.Minnette de Tillesse op.cit. p.37. G.A.Smith op.cit. pp. 126-127.

53. Reading $\overline{\text{JN}}\overline{\text{Y}}\overline{\text{T}}$ with LXX for the MT $\overline{\text{JN}}\overline{\text{N}}\overline{\text{T}}$ in verse 24.

summed up: Israel must walk in his ways, love him and serve him with their whole being for he is the God of gods, and Lord of lords to whom belongs the heaven of heavens, the earth and all therein. Here in this section the first and second commandments and the demands of the shema^c are pressed home upon the ears of the readers.

Viewed from this point of view these two chapters form a literary and theological unity. The reason for the change in address may be that in this section the author moves away from exhortation to historical narrative.⁵⁵ It may be too that the author is quoting freely from another source⁵⁶ but there are strong reasons for believing that chapters ix-x are the work of the author of Ur-Deuteronomy. The plural section ix 7b-x 11 serves such a necessary purpose here that there are no reasonable grounds for claiming that it is a later addition to the remainder of chapters ix-x.⁵⁷

Implicit in what we have said is the rejection of the view which would further eliminate verses 15c-19 of chapter x on the grounds that they too are plural and interrupt the connection between 15ab and 20. To attempt to disassociate 15ab from 15c is again being hypercritical. Further, verse 16 follows naturally after 15:

15 "Only the Lord thy God had a delight in thy fathers
to love them, and he chose their seed after them,
even you above all peoples as at this day.

16 "Circumcise therefore the foreskin of your heart and
be no more stiffnecked".⁵⁸

Similarly verses 17f. follow logically upon verse 16.

Chapter xi is largely in the plural but contains singular sections: verse 1,12,15,20,29 are singular whilst verses 8,10,11,14,26 are mixed in their

55. Cf. G.E.Wright op.cit. p. 394.

56. Cf. Wright op.cit. p. 93. G.Henton Davies op.cit. p.275

57. S.R.Driver, G.E.Wright, G.Henton Davies and others accepted the unity and authenticity of these two chapters. 58. Cf. verse 6 in chapter ix.

usage. Furthermore in this chapter the LXX in various places used the plural where the MT has singular and vice versa. In view of the uncertainty in the text it seems hazardous to attempt to analyse this chapter on the basis of the varying forms of address. Furthermore in both MT and LXX the occurrences of the singular are so sparse that it is difficult to see how a coherent unity can be made out of attempting to link them up.

In chapter xi we have another homily which re-emphasizes in a different way what has already been dealt with in vi-x. In view of this the chapter may be in the nature of a peroration to chapters vi-x. G. E. Wright suggests that the author has arranged the material into the following sections: an introduction in chapter v: chapters vi-vii the main point of the discussion: chapters viii-x mainly historical illustration with concluding exhortation in x 12-22: and then chapter xi peroration.⁵⁹

The reasons adduced for excising the plural sections from chapters vi-xi do not therefore carry conviction. The complete section with only the possible exception of chapter xi can reasonably be accepted as forming a unity and as having been part of the original book of Deuteronomy.⁶⁰

The question of the unity of the central section xii-xxvi, the so-called law code, raises serious difficulties. The most serious difficulty is the fact that the material does not seem to follow any orderly arrangement. This is particularly true of chapters xxi-xxv which contain a miscellany of legal matter:

59. Cf. G.E. Wright op.cit. 402.

60. S.R. Driver Deuteronomy accepted vi-xi as a unity: so too G.E. Wright op.cit. and G. Henton Davies op.cit.

Ch.xxi 1-9 the case of an unsolved murder.

10-14 the treatment of captive women.

15-17 the rights of inheritance.

18-21 the case of a rebellious son.

22-23 law governing the body of a hanged criminal.

Ch.xxii 1-4 laws governing the return of lost property.

5 an old law forbidding women to wear men's clothing and vice versa.

6-7 law concerning a bird's nest which has been found.

8 command to build balustrades on house tops.

9-10 old cultic laws forbidding "mixtures" of seed in vineyard, animals for ploughing, or material for garments.

12 law commanding fringes to be made on every garment.

13-30 laws dealing with sexual purity.

Ch.xxiii 1-8 laws governing admission to the Qahal.

9-14 old Holy War laws concerning cleanliness in the camp.

xxiii 15-xxv 19 a conglomeration of widely differing laws.

Chapters xii-xvi 17 and xvi 18-xviii 22 are less mixed mixed. The first section, xii-xvi 17, deals largely with laws pertaining to correct worship and idolatry and the second section, xvi 18-xviii 22, with laws concerning various officials. It has been held by some that chapters xii-xviii constitute the original code and that xix-xxvi are later miscellaneous additions to it. Against this, however, it may be argued that even chapters xii-xviii are not entirely free from incongruities in content. Thus for example in chapter xiv 3-21 we have food lists and in xv 1-18 laws concerning the release. In the section on officials ^{xvi 18-20, xvii 8f} chapter xvi 21-xvii 7 introduces once more the subject of the cult and idolatry.

This lack of order in Deuteronomy xii-xxvi has so far defied solution. It may be true that some "doublets" are later additions. It has been suggested xii 1-12 is a secondary addition to xii 13-28⁶¹ or that several hands have been at work in chapter xii.⁶² Two tests of false prophets are offered in xiii 1-5 and xviii 21-22. But the criterion which is disallowed in xiii 2 (the actual verification of a prediction) is made the basis of discrimination in xviii 22. It has also been noted that from chapter xx onwards the amount of parenthesis decreases and it has been suggested that parts at least of these chapters may on this account be later additions.⁶³ But against the elimination of chapters xx-xxv it may be pointed out that they contain many laws concerning war which have at their basis old norms concerning the Holy War. Von Rad has demonstrated how largely the ideology of the Holy War figures in Deuteronomy,⁶⁴ and in view of this these laws must be considered as original. On the other hand perhaps parts of chapters xx-xxv are later additions. It may be that as in the case of for example chapters xxix-xxx the central law code too received additions at the periodic ceremony of the renewal of the covenant.

The truth is, however, that the literary analysis of this section is highly precarious if not impossible. The book of Deuteronomy as we have it is

61. Cf. J.E.Carpenter and G.Harford op.cit. p.159f.

62. Cf. F.Horst Das Privilegrecht Jahwes (FRLANT N.F. xxviii (1930) now in his Gesammelte Studien (Munich 1961) p.21ff.

63. See G.von Rad Studies in Deuteronomy p.22.

64. Ibid. pp.45-59. Cf. his Der Heilige Krieg im Alten Israel (Göttingen 1958) pp.68ff.

certainly the final product of a long literary history but few to-day would attempt to trace that history in all its details. (Modern scholarship in contradistinction to that of former generations has abandoned the quest for exactitude in documentary investigation.) Attempts to reconstruct Ur-Deuteronomy down to verse and half verse is now a thing of the past.

What then can we safely say of the original book of Deuteronomy ? In the first place Noth has shown us that chapters i-iv 43 together with parts of xxxi-xxxiv are the work of the Deuteronomistic historian. Secondly, the rest of chapters xxxi-xxxiv can reasonably be taken as belonging not so much to the book of Deuteronomy as to the Pentateuch. We have seen too that chapters xxix-xxx are now generally accepted as later additions and that xxvii too is a late insertion. And this is as far as most modern scholars will go. That is, the original book of Deuteronomy can reasonably be said to have consisted of substantially chapters v-xxvi and xxviii of the present book.⁶⁵

It is with this Ur-Deuteronomy that we are concerned in this dissertation and we propose investigating two problems involved in its study:

1. When was it written ?
2. Who wrote it and where did it originate ?

65. Cf. for example G.E.Wright op.cit. p.317; B.W.Anderson The Living World of the Old Testament p.310; G.W.Anderson A Critical Introduction to the Old Testament p.44; H.H.Rowley The Growth of the Old Testament (London 1950); and many others.

CHAPTER IIDEUTERONOMY AND JOSIAH'S REFORMATION (2 Kings xxii-xxiii; 2 Chron. xxxiv-xxxv).

Beginning with Athanasius, Chrysostom and Jerome in the 4th century A.D. the law book which, according to 2 Kings xxii-xxiii, was found in the Temple in Jerusalem in the eighteenth year of Josiah (621 B.C.) and became the basis of a reformation carried out by him, has been identified with the whole or part of the book of Deuteronomy. Since W.M.L.DeWette's Dissertatio Critica¹ in 1805 this equation of Deuteronomy with Josiah's law book has become virtually the corner-stone of Pentateuchal criticism.² In spite of the dissent of a number of scholars,³ the majority of critics accepted the

1. His doctorate thesis published in his Opuscula (Berlin 1833). See further his A Critical Introduction to the Canonical Scriptures of the O.T. (Eng. trans. by T.Parker, Boston 1843).

2. The majority of scholars argued that Ur-Deuteronomy and not all of the present book was Josiah's law book. For this see Chapter I.

3. Quite a number of scholars argued in favour of the traditional Mosaic authorship. Not a few 19th century scholars favoured an exilic or post-exilic origin of Deuteronomy: C.F.W.Gramberg Kritisch Geschichte der Religionsideen des A.T. (1829-30) vol.I p.153f. and 305f.; L.Seinecke Geschichte des Volkes Israel (1876-84) vol.I p.386, vol.II pp.1-20; E.Havet Le Christianisme et ses Origines (1878) vol.III p.8; G.d'Eichthal Critique Biblique (1886) p.6ff.; M.Vernes Une Nouvelle Hypothèse sur la Composition du Deutéronome (1887); L.Horst "Etudes sur le Deutéronome" in Revue de l'Histoire des Religions vol.xvii (1888) and vol.xxvii (1893); and at the beginning of this century E.Day "The Promulgation of Deuteronomy" JBL xxi (1902). Other scholars dated Deuteronomy much earlier than the 7th century B.C.: Naumann Das Deuteronomium (1897); Hummelauer Commentarius in Deuteronomium (1901); Sternberg Die Ethik des Deuteronomiums (1908) (none of these consulted); and A.Klostermann Der Pentateuch (N.F. 1907) p.154ff.

theory that Deuteronomy was written during the 7th century B.C., whether under Hezekiah or Manasseh or Josiah they were not agreed, and that it was placed in the Temple in Jerusalem by its authors until a favourable moment would arise in which to promulgate it.⁴ This conventional theory is so well known that it need not be repeated in detail. Here we offer only a short résumé of it.⁵

In 2 Kings xxii-xxiii⁶ we are told that in the eighteenth year of king Josiah (621 B.C.) some repairs were being carried out in the Temple (xxii 3f.) and the king sent the scribe Shaphan to Hilkiah, the high priest, with directions concerning the financing of the repair work. Hilkiah gave Shaphan a law book which he had found in the Temple. The scribe read it and in his turn delivered it to the king (xxii 8f.). On hearing its contents, the king was alarmed and sent a deputation to the prophetess Huldah to enquire the will of Yahweh concerning it (xxii 10f.). Huldah replies pronouncing doom upon the nation and land (xxii 15-17) but promising Josiah himself a peaceful death on account of his personal piety (xxii 18-20). The king immediately convokes an assembly of the people before whom the book is read (xxiii 1-2). A formal covenant to observe the commands of the book is made (xxiii 3) and thereafter a sweeping reformation is inaugurated to implement them in the Temple "as it is written in this book of the covenant" (xxiii 21-23).

When the reform measures carried through by Josiah on the basis of the newly discovered book are examined, it will be observed that there are

4. For a complete bibliography see A.R.Siebens L'Origine du Code Deutéronomique (Paris 1929) pp.23-24.

5. The classical statement of this theory can be found in such works as S.R.Driver's Introduction to the Literature of the O.T. (9th edit. Edinburgh 1913); A.R.Siebens op.cit.; R.H.Pfeiffer Introduction to the O.T. (Revised edit. New York 1948).

striking parallels between them and the laws in Deuteronomy. The king's enactments can be explained for the most part by Deuteronomy and some of them only by it. This can readily be appreciated from the following table:

2 Kings xxiii	Deuteronomy
Abolition of Asherah/Asherim vv.4,6,7,14	xii 3; xvi 21.
The host of heaven vv.4,5	xvii 3.
Heathen high places v.13	xii.
Sun and moon worship vv.5,11	xvii 3.
Sacred prostitution v.7	xxiii 18.
Abolition of Yahweh high places (with consequent centralisation of worship) v.8	xii, etc.
Child sacrifice v.10	xii 31; xviii 10.
Foreign gods etc. v.13	xii; xiii.
Passover celebrated in Jerusalem, i.e. centralised Passover vv.21-23	xvi 1-8.
Wizards etc. v.24	xviii 11.

These striking parallels between Josiah's enactments and Deuteronomy, especially the abolition of the Yahweh high places and the centralisation of worship, have been interpreted by the majority of scholars as indicating that Josiah's law book was in fact Ur-Deuteronomy. This is the conventional theory in nuce.

This theory is obviously of cardinal importance since, if it can be upheld, then the terminus ad quem for the composition of Ur-Deuteronomy will be the year 621 B.C. During the past forty years or so, however, this theory has encountered heavy weather. This has come chiefly from a group of scholars who date the composition of Deuteronomy in the exilic or post-exilic

6. The Chronicler's account (2 Chron. xxxiv-xxxv) is quite different from that in Kings and will be dealt with below pp. 41f., 46ff.

period and in so doing deny that it could have been Josiah's law book.⁷ On the other hand, more recent research has endorsed the main conclusion of this conventional theory, viz. that Josiah's law book was Deuteronomy, but has considerably modified it in other respects.⁸ In what follows therefore we propose examining this theory in the light of recent research with a view to determining anew whether it is acceptable or not. This can best be done under two headings:

1. The views of those who challenge the theory.
2. The currently accepted theory of the relationship between Josiah's law book and Deuteronomy.

7. G.Hölscher "Komposition und Ursprung des Deuteronomiums" ZAW xl (1922) pp.161-255; idem Geschichte der jüdischen und israelitischen Religions (1922) pp.130-134; idem "Das Buch der Könige: seine Quellen und seine Redaktion" in the Gunkel Eucharisterion in Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur xviii (1923) pp.153-213; R.H.Kennett Deuteronomy and the Decalogue (Cambridge 1920) preceded by "The Origin of the Aaronite Priesthood" JTS vi (1905) pp.161-186 and "The Date of Deuteronomy" JTS vii (1906) pp.481-500; F.Horst "Die Anfänge des Propheten Jeremias" ZAW (1923) pp.94-153; idem "Die Kultusreform des Königs Josia" ZDMG lxxvii (1923) pp.220-238; W.Spiegelberg "Zur Datierung des Deuteronomiums" OLZ xxvi (1923) pp.481-482; F.C.Burkitt, in a review of Kennett's work, in JTS xxii (1921) pp.61-65; idem note in JBL xl (1921) p.167; S.A.Cook "Some recent tendencies in O.T. criticism" JTS xxvi (1925) pp.156ff.; idem C.A.H. vol.iii (1925) p.406f. and 481-486; Johs.Pedersen Israel: Its Life and Culture III-IV (1940) pp.569-592; J.N.Schofield "The Significance of the Prophets for the dating of Deuteronomy" in Studies in History and Religion (ed. A.E.Payne, 1942); G.R.Berry "The Date of Deuteronomy" JBL lix (1940) pp.133-139 preceded by "The Code found in the Temple" JBL xxxix (1920) pp.44-51.

8. See below pp.46ff.

1.

We noted above that the main challenge to the view that Josiah's law book was Deuteronomy has come from the advocates of the exilic or post-exilic origin of the latter. These scholars freely acknowledge that the narrative in 2 Kings xxii-xxiii does suggest that Josiah's law book was Deuteronomy but argue that this is due to the work of a Deuteronomistic⁹ redactor who edited the original account of Josiah's reign in order to create this impression.¹⁰

R.H.Kennett defined his point of view in the following passage:

"Arguing from the account contained in II Kings xxii and xxiii many people have concluded that it was the book of Deuteronomy itself which was read before Josiah. It may indeed be conceded that the writer (or writers) of these chapters was acquainted with Deuteronomy and that he supposed Josiah to have been familiar with it also; but even the most trustworthy chapters of the book of Kings are not to be treated as though they were taken from a file of some Jerusalem newspaper. It is quite evident that the account which we possess was not written when all Judah was seething with excitement over Josiah's enactments and the historian himself looked back (xxiii 25) not only to Josiah's successors on the throne, but also to the captivity. If therefore his statements are not those of an eye-witness, but of one

9. We employ the term Deuteronomistic when referring to the work of the writer of the history of Israel contained in the corpus Deuteronomy-2 Kings (cf. M.Noth Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien I). When referring specifically to the book of Deuteronomy we employ the term Deuteronomic.

10. Thus Hölscher (ZAW xl 1922, p.231) says: "From the point of view of the Old Testament science of the 19th century the proof of this theory seemed quite obvious. The reforms of Josiah can be explained for the most part by the laws of Deuteronomy; and part of them can be explained only by Deuteronomy, particularly the laws commanding the destruction of the high places (Dt.xii; 2 Kings xxiii 8,16)". Similarly F.Horst in ZDMG lxxvii (1923) p.221.

who lived at least thirty-five years after 621 B.C. and quite possibly considerably later, there is no difficulty in supposing that this account of Josiah's reign, although based on a sound tradition, has been coloured by the belief that Josiah as a pious king must have acted in accordance with the Deuteronomic law".¹¹

Kennett proceeds to argue that Josiah had jurisdiction over Judah only; the story that Josiah desecrated Bethel (2 Kings xxiii 4,15-20) is "clearly a late interpolation, for it is at variance with the rest of the account (see esp. verses 5-8) in which it is clearly stated that Josiah's reformation was limited to Judah, 'Geba to Beersheba'".¹²

The most obvious weakness in Kennett's argument is the lack of internal evidence advanced by him in support of his thesis. We are told that the writer of the narrative concerning Josiah's reign was too far removed in time from the events which he described to be a reliable witness; he was dependent only on "a sound tradition". But if we are to accept Kennett's analysis of what occurred during Josiah's reign then this "sound tradition" amounts to very little for, according to him, the real motive behind Josiah's reformation was antagonism towards the religious prostitution so vehemently denounced by Hosea and Jeremiah and not the discovery of a law book.¹³ As for the book found in the Temple, Kennett suggests that it may have been a collection of prophetic sayings containing a denunciation of sacrifice such as we find in either Amos, Hosea, Isaiah or Micah.¹⁴ But if all this be so then it is a far cry from legislation, albeit drastic legislation, against

11. Deuteronomy and the Decalogue pp.2-3.

12. Ibid. p.4. Cf. also W.O.E.Oesterley and T.H.Robinson History of Israel (Oxford 1932) vol.I p.421 footnote 3; R.H.Pfeiffer op.cit. p.402 regards the narrative in 2 Kings xxiii 15-20 as "historically absurd".

13. Kennett Deuteronomy and the Decalogue p.10.

14. Cf. R.H.Kennett "Israel" in The Church of Israel (ed.S.A.Cook, Cambridge 1933) pp.35-36.

religious prostitution on the basis of some prophetic oracles to the narrative of the law book and the far reaching cultic reformation carried out by Josiah. If the "sound tradition" which the writer of these chapters in 2 Kings had before him was what Kennett believed it to have been, then far from being "coloured (sic) by the belief that Josiah.....must have acted in accordance with the Deuteronomic law" this "sound tradition" has been altered to the extent of being no longer history at all, since the only thing in common between it and the present narrative in Kings is a king called Josiah, a book of some sort and a reformation of some sort! All the rest is the addition of the author of the narrative.

Of his rejection of the narrative of Josiah's desecration of Bethel as being unhistorical only this need be said. It is now being generally accepted that Josiah did indeed aspire to gain control of the Northern provinces in an attempt to re-unite all Israel as it had been before the disruption.¹⁵ With this we shall be dealing more fully later in our investigation.

G.Hölscher offers a much more detailed treatment of the narrative concerning Josiah's reformation than does Kennett.¹⁶ According to Hölscher the sources used in the compilation of the book of Kings were J and E up to the disruption of the monarchy and thereafter, up to the fall of Jerusalem, exclusively E. Both sources have however, continues Hölscher, been worked

15. See for example G.von Rad Old Testament Theology vol.I (Eng.trans. by D.M.G.Stalker, London 1962) pp.75-77; J.Bright A History of Israel (First British edition, London 1960) pp.295-298; M.Noth The History of Israel (First British edition, London 1958) pp.272-273; H.G.May "History of Israel" in Peake's Commentary on the Bible (London 1962) pp.124-125.

16. G.Hölscher "Das Buch der Könige, seine Quellen und seine Redaktion" in Eucharisterion für Gunkel in FRIANT xviii (1923) pp.206-213.

over by a Deuteronomistic redactor. Whilst acknowledging the difficulty of determining the Deuteronomistic material, Hölscher believes that the key to it, as far as the account of Josiah's reign is concerned, lies in verses 8a and 9 of chapter xxiii. These verses, he argues, interrupt an otherwise coherent account of the purification of the Temple in Jerusalem contained in verses 6-11; they deal not with Jerusalem and its immediate vicinity but go far beyond it. Moreover, in these two verses, continues Hölscher, the use of waw with the perfect as against the imperfect in the rest of the narrative is further proof that they are interpolations. He concluded that these two verses are without historical value, inserted by a redactor and no part of the original E narrative. This being so, the real reason for equating the law book of Josiah with Deuteronomy falls away. The original E account, concludes Hölscher, knew nothing of the removal of the high places in all Judah by Josiah; the statements which portray him as having done so are the work of a Deuteronomistic redactor of Kings; the real reformation was limited to the purification of the Temple.

Hölscher's arguments based upon chapter xxiii 8a, 9 are not at all convincing. It is true that 8a is in an awkward position but this, as H.Schmidt has suggested,¹⁷ may be due to nothing more than a copyist's error which caused 8a to be written immediately after 7 on account of the similar beginning of 7 and 8b; 8a perhaps originally stood after 8b. As to the argument based on the use of the waw with the perfect as indicative of later

17. H.Schmidt in a review of Holscher's theory, in TLZ xlviii (1923) col.290. Followed by W.Nowack "Deuteronomium und Regum" in Festschrift für Marti in BZAW xli (1925) p.223; L.B.Paton "The Case for the Post-exilic Dating of Deuteronomy" JBL xlvii (1928) p.330; H.Gressmann "Josia und das Deuteronomium" ZAW xlii (1924) p.328; and others.

interpolation, it has been correctly pointed out that in fact the use of way with the perfect actually stands in 8b and not in 8a.¹⁸ Quite apart from this however, the use of this grammatical construction as a criterion for isolating possible sources within a Biblical passage is extremely hazardous, and certainly no basis on which to build a theory of the sources, if any, used by the author of such a passage.¹⁹

F.Horst adopts a different analysis of the narrative in 2 Kings xxii-xxiii.²⁰ According to him there are two sources present in this narrative and he identifies them with two sources, A and B, which he believes to have been used in the compilation of the book of Jeremiah.²¹ In both Jeremiah and Kings source A is the original material whilst source B is the work of a later Deuteronomistic editor and is historically untrustworthy.

Horst isolates source A on the basis of a number of doublets present in the narrative. Thus in chapter xxii, verse 5a is repeated in 5b;

18. Cf. A.R.Siebens op.cit. p.52.

19. It seems evident that Hölscher has been inconsistent in this whole matter. According to his analysis of 2 Kings xxii-xxiii ("Das Buch der Könige") verses 8a and 9 are the work of a Deuteronomistic redactor and are of no historical value. But in his article on Deuteronomy itself (ZAW xl 1922 pp.202f.) he seems to regard these two verses as historical evidence that Josiah's law book was not Deuteronomy for, he argues, whereas the latter does not demand that the levites are to be brought up to Jerusalem, we are told that Josiah, acting upon the basis of the newly found law book, did bring them up. The obvious question is that if 8a and 9 are the work of a Deuteronomistic redactor then why did he not report exact obedience to Deuteronomy in this matter? Hölscher is clearly arguing in a circle.

20. F.Horst "Die Kultusreform des Königs Josia" ZDMG lxxvii (1923) pp.220-238.

21. Idem "Die Anfänge des Propheten Jeremia" ZAW xli (1923) pp.94-153.

Hilkiah is referred to simply as "the priest" in verses 10,12,14 whilst in verses 4,8a (cf.xxiii 4) he is referred to as "the high priest"; the book found in the Temple is referred to as "the book" in verses 8b,10,13,16 and as "the book of the law" in verses 8a,11; in verses 10f. the book is read to the king by Shaphan, whilst in verse 16 he is said to have read it himself.²²

According to Horst, source A narrated that in the days of Josiah, Hilkiah the priest and Shaphan were in the Temple when repairs were being made to the building. On this occasion Hilkiah gave Shaphan a book which he had found. Shaphan brought the book to the king who, when he read it, was so moved by its contents that he sent to Huldah the prophetess to consult the oracle of Yahweh. The prophetess warned the king of impending doom for the land and people but promised him personal deliverance from this disaster if he obeyed the words of the newly found book. Horst concludes:

"From this recension no one can hit upon the idea that the book found was a law code.....In accordance with the entire character of the prophetic writer A, one can think of nothing else than a prophetic book that came into the hands of the king, and made a tremendous impression upon him.....The king then went with the inhabitants of Jerusalem into the Temple. There he made a covenant before Yahweh, to walk after Yahweh and to keep his commandments.....This covenant is certainly never regarded by this source as a code of legally fixed enactments. The content of the covenant made by Josiah is described as 'to walk after Yahweh and to keep his commandments'. If that was the content of Josiah's covenant, then we are not at all surprised to find that in the account of the king's reformation of the cult that follows immediately in the text nothing more can be claimed with

22. "Die Kultusreform" p.231.

certainly linguistically for A. Only a primitive construction of verse 4 (ch.xxiii) may be assigned to it: 'the king commanded the priest (sic) Hilkiah and the second (!) priest to bring forth out of the Temple the objects that were made for Baal and the Asherah, and to burn them in the valley of Kidron'. If anyone wishes to call that a cult reformation of Josiah, he is welcome to do so. In my opinion this older source tells us nothing more about it."²³

The evidence adduced by Horst in favour of his theory is completely unconvincing.²⁴ The linguistic evidence advanced in support of the view that two sources, A and B, underlie both Jeremiah and 2 Kings xxi-xxiix consists for the most part of such "neutral" words as כי "because", לְעֵלֶּה "in order to", לְהַקְטִיב "to burn incense", מִקְוֵה "place".²⁵ His criterion for separating the supposed two sources in the narrative in Kings is untenable. Gressmann illustrated this aptly by pointing out that if we are to use the different expressions used to describe the book found in the Temple as such a criterion, then we must conclude that there are three sources present in the narrative, for as well as being called "the book" and "the book of the Torah" it is also referred to as "the book of the covenant"!^{26.27}

23. "Die Kultusreform" pp.235-236.

24. For the problem of the Deuteronomistic sections in Jeremiah see additional note at the end of this section.

25. Cf. H.Gressmann "Josia und das Deuteronomium" ZAW xlii (1924) p.317.

26. Cf. H.Gressmann op.cit. p.320.

27. A.Bentzen (Die josianische Reform und ihre Voraussetzungen Copenhagen 1926), though he dates Deuteronomy in the pre-exilic period, yet presents an analysis of the narrative of Josiah's reign somewhat similar to Horst's noted above in the text. Bentzen (p.19) believed that Horst was arguing in the right direction. He too finds two sources, A and B, but, unlike Horst, he limits his division to chapter xxiii (pp.20-23) arguing that the separation of A from B in chapter xxi is too difficult. Bentzen (p.23) further contends (against Horst) that both

Kennett, Hölischer and Horst were followed and supported in their views by S.A.Cook who argued that the narrative of Josiah's reign in its present form is the work of an exilic or post-exilic editor who wished to describe the promulgation of the teaching under which his generation lived.²⁸ Similarly, Johs.Pedersen contended that a Deuteronomistic redactor of Kings enlarged the original account of Josiah's reformation and gave it wider scope than it originally had.²⁹ More recently this view has been re-asserted though, as far as I am aware, not argued in detail by some Scandinavian scholars. E.Nielsen, for example, has expressed the opinion, noted above,³⁰ that the narrative was written by a Deuteronomistic historian who deliberately intended to create the impression that the law book of Josiah was Deuteronomy.³¹

These attempts to dissociate Deuteronomy from Josiah's reformation cannot be considered successful. They entail, as we have seen, far too drastic a handling of the narrative of Josiah's reign in 2 Kings and the evidence advanced is for the most part very weak. But they do raise one crucial problem: to what extent has the Deuteronomistic historian of 2 Kings altered, schematised or added to the original account of Josiah's reign? It may be conceded at the sources are historically trustworthy. Bentzen takes the use of $\square' \eta \eta \eta$ in xxiii 5 and of $\square' \eta \eta \eta$ in xxiii 8 as indicative of two sources in the narrative on the grounds that both these words refer to the same class of people (p.20). But this is not probable; nowhere in the O.T. is $\eta \eta \eta$ (which occurs only three times: 2 Kings xxiii 5, Hosea x 5, Zeph.i 4) synonymous with $\eta \eta \eta$. For this cf. R.deVaux Ancient Israel p.345; W.F.Albright From Stone Age to Christianity (2nd edit.Baltimore 1946) p.178 and notes.

28. S.A.Cook C.A.H. vol.iii (1925) p.472.

29. Johs.Pedersen Israel: Its Life and Culture (1940) p.587.

30. See above p.33f.

31. E.Nielsen Oral Tradition (London 1954) p.79.

outset that it is antecedently possible that the Deuteronomist has "doctored" the facts to some extent at least. But the demonstration of this is more than difficult. In this respect it is hazardous to attempt to isolate the Deuteronomist's contribution to the narrative on internal grounds alone; it was on this rock that Hölcher and Horst perished. Sounder methodology demands some external data; that is to say, data from sources other than the narrative in 2 Kings. It is here that recent study in this problem has done right in drawing attention to the Chronicler's account of Josiah's reign (2 Chron.xxxiv-xxxv). The scholars whose work we discussed above failed totally to deal adequately with the Chronicler's account vis-à-vis the account in Kings. Like the majority of scholars during the earlier decades of this century, they assumed that the Chronicler was in no way to be trusted. Recently, however, he has been treated with more respect and it is now widely accepted that he may often preserve records derived from otherwise lost sources.³² In what follows we shall see how this new respect for the Chronicler has been very fruitful in dealing with the problem on hand.

The currently accepted view of the relationship between Deuteronomy and Josiah's reformation has its roots in the work on this subject by Theodor Oestreicher during the 1920's.³³ Accordingly we shall begin this aspect of our investigation with an examination of his thesis.

32. Cf. E.Sellin Einleitung in das Alte Testament (8th edition, revised by L.Rost, Heidelberg 1950) p.177; A.Bentzen Introduction to the O.T. (3rd edition, Copenhagen 1957) vol.ii p.214; H.H.Rowley "Hezekiah's Reform and Rebellion" BJRL vol.44, no.2,(1962) p.404; A.S.Herbert Peake's Commentary (1962) p.357.

33. Th.Oestreicher Das Deuteronomische Grundgesetz (Gutersloh 1923).

Oestreicher, like the scholars dealt with above, proposes yet another analysis of 2 Kings xxii-xxiii. Apart from the introductory and concluding verses which form the framework of the account of Josiah's reign (xxii 1-2 and xxiii 25-30), the narrative can, according to Oestreicher, be divided into three sections: (a) xxii 3-xxiii 3 which is different in style from (b) xxiii 4-14. Section (c) xxiii 15-24 is a mixture of both. Section (a) is written in a broad narrative style (breite Erzählungsweise): all the details of the events are carefully set down in a series of vivid pictures.³⁴ In marked contrast, he continues, is the style of section (b) which consists of short terse sentences. Here there is not that painting of individual scenes characteristic of chapter xxii, but instead only a summary enumeration (Aufzählung) of the events.³⁵ "Evidently we have here", concludes Oestreicher, "an account of the purification of worship in Judah which has been subsequently added by the author of Kings to the quite different passage concerning the finding of the book of the law."³⁶

Oestreicher proceeds to argue that the account of Josiah's reign in 2 Kings has been schematised so as to make it appear that the motive behind the reformation was the discovery of the law book and the necessity of carrying out its demands. In actual fact the reformation, he argues, began some six years before the finding of the law book and was motivated by political reasons. In this respect the account of Josiah's reign in 2 Chronicles xxxiv-xxxv is more reliable and historically trustworthy than that in 2 Kings, he contends, for the former states that Josiah began to reform in his twelfth year on the

34. Ibid. p.14.

35. Ibid. p.14.

36. Ibid. p.14.

throne - six years before the discovery of the law book. The motive given by the Chronicler for the reformation was the young king's personal piety. Oestreicher contends, however, that it was political and was occasioned by Josiah's desire to gain independence within his own land whilst remaining in closest co-operation with Assyria in foreign affairs.³⁷ That Josiah in spite of his anti-Assyrian policy at home nevertheless supported Assyria in external affairs is evidenced, argues Oestreicher, by Josiah's ill-fated attempt to intercept the advance of Necho's troops on Assyria in 609 B.C.³⁸

Josiah's first opportunity to regain independence came, continues Oestreicher, in his twelfth year (following Chronicles) and was occasioned by Assur-ban-apal's death which he dates in 627 B.C.³⁹ In this year the young king rejected the Assyrian cult, which had been instituted in the Temple in Jerusalem by the suzerain power, and by rejecting it rejected also Assyrian rule in Judah. Six years later further disturbances in Nineveh gave Josiah the opportunity to continue his reformation.⁴⁰ It was during this year (Josiah's eighteenth) that the law book was found and this, continues Oestreicher, supplied further incentive to the king to complete the abolition of the Assyrian cult.⁴¹ Thus, according to this hypothesis, the reformation was progressive and its two most important phases were separated by a space of six years; the real motive behind the reformation was political; the law book found in the Temple was of only incidental significance.⁴²

37. Ibid. p.39.

38. Ibid. p.39.

39. Ibid. p.64.

40. Ibid. p.69.

41. Ibid. p.65.

42. Ibid. p.40: "Die Auffindung des Thorahbuches.....hatte in Wirklichkeit gar nicht die entscheidende Bedeutung, die ihr heute zugeschrieben wird."

As far as the law book itself is concerned, Oestreicher held that it was wider in content than either the so-called Ur-Deuteronomy or Deuteronomy. He agreed that part at least of Deuteronomy was present in the book but "it would be a gross error", he says, "to conclude that only the Deuteronomic code (Grundgesetz) or Ur-Deuteronomy lay before Josiah. The expression 'Torah book' is as general as possible and is of much wider extent than the Deuteronomic Code".⁴³ He further argues that the book is also known as "the book of the Covenant" and that nowhere does Deuteronomy claim to be such.⁴⁴ As further proof that the newly found book contained more than Deuteronomy, Oestreicher drew attention to 2 Kings xxiii 8b where Josiah is reported as having removed the $\square \text{ } \gamma \text{ } \psi$ -cult.⁴⁵ Such a cult, he points out, is nowhere forbidden explicitly in Deuteronomy but is forbidden in Leviticus xvii 7. Consequently, he argues, the law book must have contained all or part of the Holiness Code of Leviticus xvii-xxvi.⁴⁶ He concludes therefore that Josiah's law book was not limited to Deuteronomy but contained also a "book of the covenant" in which or besides which stood the Holiness Code.⁴⁷

Most of what Oestreicher has proposed is quite unacceptable. His analysis of 2 Kings xxii-xxiii is not at all convincing. There is to be sure

43. Ibid. p.22.

44. Ibid. pp.22-23.

45. In actual fact the MT reads $\square \text{ } \gamma \text{ } \psi$ "gates". But the suggestion that we should read $\square \text{ } \gamma \text{ } \psi$ "satyrs" in place of "gates" with a change of two pointings in the MT has been very widely accepted. Cf. Montgomery and Gehman Kings in ICC (Edinburgh 1951) p.532.

46. Oestreicher op.cit. pp.22-23.

47. Ibid. p.24.

a difference in style between chapter xxii 3-xxiii 3 (Oestreicher's section (a)) and chapter xxiii 4-14 (his (b)), but this is readily explained. Chapter xxii 3-xxiii 3 is describing the events which led to the finding of the law book, its effect upon the king, the consultation of the prophetess, and the making of the covenant. Chapter xxiii 4-14, on the other hand, enumerates the reforms which were carried out as a result of the discovery of the book. As such this section is of a very different nature than chapter xxii 3-xxiii 3; a comparison of their respective styles is pointless.

With regard to the $\square\gamma\psi$ -cult, it is true that Leviticus alone forbids it, but it must be borne in mind that Josiah aimed at the destruction of all high places (in accordance with the demands of the law book) and the high places of the $\square\gamma\psi$ were naturally included in this whether there was a specific law dealing with them or not in his law book.

In the matter of the names given to the law book one cannot avoid the feeling that Oestreicher is being hypercritical. Both expressions are used interchangeably of the same book. To say that the "Torah book" contained the "book of the covenant" is to disregard the plain fact that the "Torah book" is "the book of the covenant". Furthermore, as Oestreicher himself agrees,⁴⁸ Deuteronomy claims to be a "Torah book". If this is so, then to say that the expression "Torah book" is of wider interpretation than a book such as Deuteronomy is hardly in keeping with the facts!

But in spite of these weaknesses Oestreicher has made a major contribution to the study of this problem. His insistence that the chronology

48. Ibid. pp.21-22.

of the events of Josiah's reign as recorded by the Chronicler is of cardinal importance in the discussion of this problem has been taken up and advocated anew by scholars in recent years and the view that Josiah carried out reforms before the finding of the law book is being increasingly accepted by scholars to-day. It is to this later stage of the discussion that we now move.

The beginnings of Josiah's reformation.

According to the book of Kings, Josiah in his eighteenth year on the throne carried out a reformation based on the demands of a law book which Hilkiah the high priest had found in the Temple during that same year (621 B.C.). The narrative in Kings implies that the reformation was due solely to this newly discovered book and began only after its discovery. The motive behind the reformation was the king's desire to implement the demands of the law book; no movements towards reform were carried out prior to Josiah's eighteenth year as king.

Contrary to this sequence of events, the account in 2 Chronicles xxxiv-xxxv records that Josiah had been carrying out reform measures in his twelfth year, that is, six years before the discovery of the law book. In this year the king, according to the Chronicler, "began to purge Judah and Jerusalem from the high places, and the Asherim, and the carved images and the molten images" (xxxiv 3). We are further told in this narrative that Josiah carried this purge "to the cities of Manasseh and Ephraim and Simeon even unto Naphtali" (xxxiv 6). The account in Chronicles goes on to corroborate the narrative in Kings telling of the discovery of the law book in the eighteenth year of Josiah's reign, the king's dismay when he read it,

and the subsequent consulting of the oracle of Yahweh through Huldah the prophetess (xxxiv 8ff.). But in the matter of the ensuing reformation recorded in Kings the Chronicler differs. Whereas Kings records Josiah as having carried out a reformation which abolished the high places in Judah and Samaria and destroyed the shrine at Bethel, Chronicles, having dated these enactments of the king in the twelfth year of his reign, narrates that only the making of a covenant (2 Chron.xxxiv 29-32; cf. 2 Kings xxiii 1-3) and the celebration of the Passover (2 Chron.xxxv 1-19; cf. 2 Kings xxiii 21-23) followed the discovery of the book; there is no mention of reforms after the finding of the book.⁴⁹ The differences between the two can be seen more clearly from the following table:

<u>Chronicles</u>	<u>Kings</u>
<u>8th year:</u> Josiah "began to seek after the God of his father David."	_____
<u>12th year:</u> cleansing of Judah and Jerusalem; destruction of high places, asherim, images, molten images, altars of Baalism and their images. This purge extended to Manasseh, Ephraim, Simeon.	_____
<u>18th year:</u> law book found; Huldah consulted; covenant made; Passover.	Law book found; Huldah consulted; covenant made. Reformation: purification of Temple; cultic emblems of Baal and the worship of the host of heaven destroyed; idolatrous priest ($\square \text{ } \gamma \text{ } \eta \text{ } \zeta$) put down; asherim destroyed; priests in Judah brought up to Jerusalem; high places

49. Having already recorded a widespread reformation at an earlier date the Chronicler can now only record the extension of the reformation to the northern provinces. Apparently nothing more needed to be done at home!

from Geba to Beersheba abolished; sun worship abolished; altar at Bethel destroyed and high places in Samaria defiled, their priests killed; Passover; wizards etc. destroyed.

These two accounts are obviously at variance with one another. In the first place, as we have already noted, the chronology of events is different in the two accounts. In the second place, the law book is of much more significance in the Kings account than in Chronicles. Indeed, if only the account in Chronicles were extant then the evidence for equating Josiah's law book with Deuteronomy would be very slight.

We have already seen that Oestreicher believed that as far as the beginning of the reformation is concerned the account in Chronicles is historically trustworthy. This view has been supported in recent years by the majority of scholars.⁵⁰ Their argument is briefly as follows.

The years after the death of Assur-ban-apal's death witnessed the increasing weakening of the Assyrian empire until its collapse in about 612 B.C. The date of Assur-ban-apal's death can now be fixed within narrow limits. He reigned for not less than thirty-six years (669-633 B.C.). The majority of

50. See F.M.Cross and D.N.Freedman "Josiah's revolt against Assyria" JNES xii (1953) pp.56-58; J.Bright A History of Israel p.293f.; M.Noth The History of Israel p.272f.; B.W.Anderson Living World of the O.T. p.305; R.DeVaux Ancient Israel p.337; G.von Rad Old Testament Theology p.75f.; H.H.Rowley "The Prophet Jeremiah and the Book of Deuteronomy" in Studies in O.T. Prophecy (edit.H.H.Rowley, New York 1950) p.164.

scholars fix the absolute limit for his death as the year 631 B.C.⁵¹ The commonly accepted chronology of the kings of Assyria during the last half of the 7th century is now:⁵²

Assur-ban-apal.....669-633 B.C.

Assur-etel-ilani.....633-629 B.C.

Sin-sum-lisir.....629 B.C.

Sin-sar-iskun.....629-612 B.C.

On the basis of this chronology it is argued that the account of Josiah's reform movements as related in the second book of Chronicles is supported by external evidence. Thus it is suggested that the annexation of the Assyrian provinces in northern Israel (2 Chron. xxiv 6) may have been occasioned by the death of Assur-etel-ilani in 629 B.C. and the subsequent disorders in Assyria and Babylon.⁵³ It is also suggested that the note in 2 Chronicles xxxiv 3 which states that in the eighth year of his reign (632 B.C.) Josiah "began to seek after the God of David his father" may indicate that he had repudiated the gods of the Assyrian suzerain immediately following the death of Assur-ban-apal in 633 B.C.⁵⁴ Finally, the events following the discovery of the law book in 621 B.C. are said to "coincide precisely with the end of the last vestige of Assyrian control in Babylonia.....By 623 B.C. recognition of Sin-sar-iskun had ceased even in Nippur, probably the last foothold of Assyria in Babylonia."⁵⁵ At this time Nabopolassar had thoroughly consolidated his power in the south and

51. W.H.Dubberstein "Assyrian-Babylonian Chronology" JNES iii (1944) pp.38-42; Cross and Freedman op.cit.; J.Bright op.cit. p.296 follows the latter; Noth op.cit. p.269; D.J.Wiseman in Documents from O.T. Times (edit.D.Winton Thomas, London 1958) p.75.

52. See Cross and Freedman op.cit. p.58.

53. Ibid. p.57.

54. Ibid. p.57.

55. Cf. Dubberstein op.cit. pp.41-42.

was poised to invade Assyria itself."⁵⁶ It is therefore concluded that the dates given by the Chronicler - 632, 628, 622 B.C. - "admirably correlate with the major shifts in the Assyro-Babylonian political situation."⁵⁷

The present writer finds himself in agreement with the main feature of the argument outlined above, viz. that conditions lent themselves to revolt by Josiah some years before 621 B.C. and that the Chronicler's record of revolt before this year is historically trustworthy. But it is not necessary, nor is it wise, to attempt to correlate the dates given by the Chronicler with the "major shifts" in the fortunes of the Assyrian empire. Such a correlation demands a precision in our dating of the Assyrian monarchs which we do not possess. For example, we cannot be sure at all that Assur-ban-apal died in 633 B.C. In very recent work on the problem a date of 629 B.C. and 627/26 B.C. has been given by A.L.Oppenheim and H.W.F.Saggs respectively.⁵⁸ The fact that such experts disagree illustrates the uncertainty with which we are faced in this matter. Accordingly it is wiser to avoid basing conclusions upon precise but hazardous dates and to limit ourselves to more general and trustworthy statements concerning the events in the years before 621 B.C. In doing so we are on very safe grounds. We can be fairly certain that the last years of Assur-ban-apal's reign and the years immediately following his death were very troublesome for the Assyrians⁵⁹ and this would

56. Cross and Freedman op.cit. p.57. They further suggest that Josiah may have made common cause with the Babylonian rebel on the analogy of what Hezekiah did one hundred years before in allying himself with Merodach-Baladan.

57. Cross and Freedman op.cit. p.58.

58. A.L.Oppenheim in The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible (New York 1962) p.257. H.W.F.Saggs The Greatness that was Babylon (London 1962) p.126ff.

59. Cf. H.W.F.Saggs op.cit. p.127f., 134f.

have been conducive to revolt in the subject countries. This weighs heavily in favour of the suggestion that Josiah began his religious reform well before his eighteenth year (621 B.C.), as the Chronicler testifies, and that this reform was an aspect of his assertion of sovereignty against the decaying Assyrian hegemony. Thus whilst not being tied by the Chronicler's exact dating of the events we can accept with confidence his chronology in so far as it places reforms before the finding of the law book.

It may be noted that there is some evidence in the narrative in 2 Kings in support of all this. It has been pointed out that the fact that repairs were being carried out in the Temple before the law book was found may be an indication that the Jerusalem authorities were removing Assyrian cult emblems from it.⁶⁰ And there is yet another important consideration to which we must draw attention. The account in Kings implies that if Hilkiah had not found the law book there would have been no reformation. This is difficult to believe however. It is very probable that Amon's assassination (2 Kings xxi 19-26) was the work of an extreme anti-Assyrian party in Jerusalem, for according to both Chronicles and Kings Amon was as pro-Assyrian as his father Manasseh had been.⁶¹ It is reasonable to infer therefore that there was a revolutionary party in the state which awaited a favourable opportunity to throw off the Assyrian yoke. Such an opportunity presented itself, as we have noted, in the years immediately before and after Assur-ban-apal's death and

60. Cf. H.H.Rowley "The Prophet Jeremiah and the book of Deuteronomy" p.164; J.Bright op.cit. p.296.

61. See A.Malamat "The Historical Background to the Assassination of Amon, King of Judah" IEJ iii (1953) pp.26-29. This position is followed by J.Bright op.cit. pp.294-295 and M.Noth op.cit. pp.271-272 (with reservations). Cf. B.W.Anderson The Living World of the O.T. p.298; J.Mauchline "I and II Kings" in Peake's Commentary (1962) p.355.

we can be sure that the anti-Assyrian elements in Judah would not have let it pass by unexploited.⁶²

If then Josiah began to reform before the finding of the law book several problems immediately arise. On the one hand the Chronicler records the reformation measures as having been carried out prior to the finding of the law book. On the other hand the writer of Kings narrates that they were carried out after the discovery of the law book and as a consequence of it.⁶³ The question therefore is: what did the law book actually contribute to the reform movement of Josiah? Or, to put it another way: which reforms took place before the discovery of the law book and therefore independent of it, and which reforms, if any, followed it and were a direct result of it?

The progress of the reformation.

A.Jepsen has proposed the following solution to this problem.⁶⁴

He accords historicity to the account of Josiah's reign in Chronicles in so far as it suggests that the king carried out reform measures before the

62. Those responsible for Amon's death were themselves executed (2 Kings xxi 24). It has been suggested that this was because their policy was too hazardous at that particular time (c.640 B.C.) and that wiser elements in the country were anxious to pursue a more prudent policy until a more favourable opportunity arose. (Malamat op.cit. p.27; Bright op.cit. p.295.)

63. J.Pedersen Israel: Its Life and Culture III-IV p.579 notes that "it is not expressly stated that the law book caused the reform". But it was surely intended by the author of Kings that this was the case. See the remarks of Hölischer noted above on page 33.

64. A.Jepsen "Die Reform des Josias" in Baumgärtel Festschrift (edit. J.Herrmann 1959) pp.97-109.

discovery of the law book. But he believes that the Chronicler is guilty of an inconsistency.⁶⁵ 2 Chronicles xxxiv 22-28 narrates Huldah's oracle in which the prophetess pronounces doom on the nation because of its apostasy; only the king is to be spared. The obvious question, states Jepsen, is: if Josiah had been carrying out reform measures prior to the discovery of the law book and the consultation of Huldah, then how could the prophetess have condemned the nation? The prophetess could only have uttered such words, continues Jepsen, if the reforms already carried out were not radical enough and if the newly found law book demanded more thorough-going enactments. Jepsen accordingly suggests that the Chronicler too, like the writer of Kings, has telescoped the account of the reformation. He suggests that the reformation was carried through in three stages thus:

1. The removal of Canaanite and Assyrian heathenism.
2. The abolition of the Yahweh high places.
3. The destruction of the high place of Jeroboam in Bethel.

Jepsen dates the first stage in the twelfth year of Josiah's reign and the second and third after the discovery of the law book.⁶⁶

Such a reconstruction of the events as this one proposed by Jepsen certainly offers an attractive solution to the problem. It satisfies the requirement of dating some reform measures before the discovery of the law book whilst at the same time placing significant measures after its discovery thus according more significance to the law book than the writer of Chronicles does. Whilst however accepting his conclusions in their broad outline, it has to be asked if the inconsistency which Jepsen believes the Chronicler to

65. Ibid. pp.105-106.

66. Ibid. pp.107-108.

be guilty of is really such. It seems to the present writer that the prophetess could well have spoken such an oracle of doom even if, with Chronicles, we believe that there was a sweeping reform before the finding of the law book for it must be borne in mind (against Jepsen) that the fact that a reformation was carried through does not mean that with it the people suddenly (or even gradually!) became loyal Yahwists and thereafter walked unswervingly after their God. On the contrary, there is an abundance of evidence in the Old Testament to prove that in spite of Josiah's reformation idolatry and apostasy persisted.⁶⁷ In the light of such evidence Huldah's oracle against the people of Judah was only to be expected. There is however something striking about Huldah's oracle to which we must draw attention. Before doing so we must examine the oracle.

Huldah's oracle is composed of two addresses.⁶⁸ The first (2 Kings xxii 15-17) is addressed to "the man who hath sent you" and condemns both land and people because of their idolatry and apostasy. The second is addressed to "the king of Judah" and whilst endorsing what the first address has already stated concerning imminent doom, promises the king that he shall be buried in peace and shall not see the coming destruction of his land and subjects.

Now it is commonly considered that the first of these two addresses

67. E.g. Zeph.i 4-6; Jer.i 16, ii 28, iii 8, v 1-2, etc. Note the striking similarity between Jer.i 16 and Huldah's words in 2 Kings xxii 17. Jeremiah reads: ".....who have forsaken me, and have burned incense to other gods, and worshipped the works of their hands". Kings reads: "because they have forsaken me, and have burned incense unto other gods, that they may provoke me to anger with all the works of their hands".

68. As the account in Chronicles is substantially the same as that in Kings references here are to the Kings account only.

(vv.15-17) is a vaticinium post eventum written after the catastrophe of 586 B.C.⁶⁹ The reason given for this is that if Huldah had pronounced such doom then Josiah would have had no incentive to carry out the reformation since it would have been to no avail.⁷⁰ Accordingly it is argued that only the second address (to the king) is the original oracle. Against this however it has been pointed out that the second address (vv.18-20) also predicts doom upon land and people and is thus no improvement upon the first.⁷¹ Several attempts to circumvent this difficulty have been made. Thus, for example, Horst sought to find the original words of the prophetess not in either one of the two addresses but scattered through both of them. According to him, the original oracle (his source A) must have read as follows:

15. And she (Huldah) spake unto them.....Tell the man who sent you to me:
 16. Thus saith Yahweh: Behold I bring evil upon this land and its inhabitants, even all the words of the book which the king of Judah has read, 17b. for mine anger is kindled unquenchably against this land. 19a But it shall come to pass, if you listen to that which has been spoken against this land and its inhabitants, that they should become a desolation and a curse, 20a then thine eyes shall not see all the evil which I shall bring upon this land.
 The rest of the material in verses 15-20 is assigned by Horst to his later and unhistorical source B.⁷²

On the other hand, Gressmann, for example, attempts to overcome the difficulty by re-arranging and adding to the second address; the first address

69. Cf. for example R.H.Pfeiffer Introduction to the O.T. (Revised edit. New York 1948) p.402; A.F.Puukko Das Deuteronomium (Leipzig 1910) p.4.

70. Puukko op.cit. p.4; H.Gressmann "Josia und das Deuteronomium" ZAW xlii (1924) pp.318-319.

71. Cf. F.Horst "Die Kultusreform des Königs Josia" ZDMG lxxvii (1923) p.229.

72. Horst op.cit. p.231.

is considered secondary.⁷³ He maintains that something which a later editor found objectionable or anachronistic has been excised from the original oracle of Huldah. He argues that the original words of the prophetess must have promised the people safety too, since, in the first place, they would naturally have had their part in the reformation; and, in the second place, the difference between the fate of the king and the people in the oracle as it now stands would have been impossible to the ancient Hebrew concept of the collective community consciousness (primitiv-kollektivischen Gemeinschaftsgefühl).⁷⁴ Gressmann suggests that something originally stood immediately after verse 18. His reconstruction of the oracle is as follows:

"The words which thou has heard (concerning this place and its inhabitants, that they should become a desolation and a curse), (do I revoke), because thy heart was tender and because thou hast humbled thyself before me. Because thou hast hearkened to that which I commanded and hast rent thy clothes and hast wept before me, therefore will I hear thee, saith Yahweh. Therefore behold I will gather thee to thy fathers in peace."⁷⁵

These arguments against the unity and authenticity of Huldah's oracle are singularly unconvincing. First of all, the argument which states that the first address of Huldah (15-17) cannot have been the original utterance of the prophetess since, if they were, then Josiah would have had no incentive to reform is based upon a completely mistaken concept of the nature of Old Testament prophecy. Such an argument assumes that if Huldah did utter such words then the only reaction expected of the king would have been one of

73. Gressmann op.cit. p.319f.

74. Ibid. p.319.

75. Ibid. p.319.

total resignation to the unavoidable disaster predicted. Why would he have bothered reforming? After all, the prophetess had promised him personally a peaceful end and, besides, nothing that he could do could avert the oncoming disaster! But such an assumption is simply nonsense.⁷⁶ It is implied that the nation had no longer any choice in its future. But this is not so. It belongs to the very essence of Old Testament prophecy that even though disaster is predicted as judgement upon men's sins, nevertheless repentance can still make possible an escape from that disaster. The idea implicit in such an argument as this is of a fixed scheme of prediction and fulfilment and, to quote a recent writer, "such a fixed scheme of prediction and fulfilment belongs together with a static conception of history in which from the beginning God has determined all events, a conception totally alien to the dynamic character of the prophetic faith in which history consists of a succession of situations in which the nation is called upon to choose between the way of life and the way of death."⁷⁷ Accordingly, Huldah's words of doom, far from destroying all incentive to reform, would actually have accentuated the need for reform. There is no sound reason for regarding them as post eventum.

As to the second address, verses 18-20, we have noted that Gressmann and others regard it as original. It has to be said however that reconstructions such as those offered by Horst and Gressmann are bound to be too subjective. It is just too easy for a scholar to rearrange texts in this arbitrary fashion

76. The corollary of such an argument is that Josiah, having heard Huldah's words, was free to do what he wished, even if it meant disobedience to the law book, since whatever he did he was assured of a peaceful death!

77. Cf. James D. Smart The Interpretation of Scripture (First Brit. edition, London 1961) p.104. Cf. J.Lindblom Prophecy in Ancient Israel (Oxford 1962) pp.199-200 and 300f.

to suit his own preconceived notion of events. To be sure it may be admitted that Gressmann is probably correct in his contention that something is missing from verse 18.⁷⁸ But this difficulty can be removed in a much simpler manner than that proposed by him. There is no need to assume that something has been omitted after "the words which thou hast heard" in this verse. The difficulty is removed by the addition of זֶה or זֶל immediately before וַיִּבְרַח . The זֶה or זֶל could easily have been omitted due to haplography after זֶה ; that is, the copyist's eye mistook it for the last syllable of זֶה and passed over it to write וַיִּבְרַח . If this simple restoration is accepted then the text will read: "Thus saith Yahweh God of Israel concerning the words which thou hast heard".

It is difficult to see how this second address of Huldah's oracle could possibly be the work of a later editor. The fact that Josiah's death was by no means peaceful is surely evidence that this address is not ex eventu.⁷⁹

It will be recalled that Jepsen believes the Chronicler to be guilty of an inconsistency in recording the bulk of Josiah's reformation before the

78. Note however that Montgomery and Gehman Kings (ICC, Edinburgh 1951) in loc may well be correct in regarding the text as being all right as it stands. They point to chapter xxiii 17 for a similar break after the word וַיִּבְרַח . It may be added that we do not know all the ramifications of the word זֶה . or again, have we here in xxii 18 nothing more than dialectic usage?

79. In this respect Horst is surely wrong in attributing verse 20a to his later source B which he dates ca. 500 B.C. The obvious objection to this is that in the late 6th century everyone knew that Josiah did not have a peaceful death (cf. 2 Chron. xxxv 25). Cf. A.R.Siebens op.cit. p.56. R.H.Pfeiffer regards the oracle as it now stands as having been heavily worked over by an editor. He holds that the words which promise Josiah a peaceful death are due to a "strange slip" of an editor's pen!

finding of the law book and then narrating Huldah's words of doom which, he argues, presuppose that the nation had not reformed. It will further be recalled that we rejected this argument whilst at the same time acknowledging that there is something striking about the oracle. We may put this in the form of a question: if Josiah had been carrying out reforms, such as we read of in Chronicles, before the finding of the law book, then why did Huldah not stipulate these actions as those which guarantee Josiah safety from the coming doom instead of promising him deliverance simply because he had humbled himself and rent his garments when he read the book of the law? Here we must answer, with Jepsen, that although Josiah did indeed implement reforms before the discovery of the law book these reforms were inadequate when compared with the demands of the newly found law book. It is in this respect that the Chronicler has been inconsistent since in his account the law book contributes very little to the reform work of Josiah.

The fact probably is that the account of Josiah's reformation in both Kings and Chronicles has been telescoped. It seems that the Deuteronomistic author of Kings has (not unnaturally) placed all the reforms of Josiah's reign after the finding of the law book so as to augment the significance of the book for his generation. In this respect those scholars, like Kennett,⁸⁰ Cook⁸¹ and Nielsen,⁸² who emphasise the Deuteronomist's contribution to the narrative are correct. On the other hand the Chronicler in placing them for the most part before the discovery of the book is laying more stress on the young king's piety. It must also be borne in mind that by the Chronicler's day the law book - which was no doubt interpreted as being the whole Pentateuch -

80. See above p.33f.

81. See above p. 40.

82. See above p.40.

was canonical and there was consequently not the same necessity to stress the importance of the law book in the reformation.

This now leads us back to the question of the progress of the reform measures carried out by Josiah. We have already concluded that some measures were implemented before 621 B.C. In this respect we have further noted that during Josiah's reign there was a strong movement towards national liberation from Assyrian dominion and that the opportunity for such liberation came in the years immediately before and following Assur-ban-apal's death.⁸³ We now suggest that the early (i.e. pre-law book) reforms of Josiah were derived from his desire to throw off the Assyrian yoke. They would therefore have been predominantly a repudiation of the Assyrian cults in Jerusalem and throughout Judah (2 Kings xxiii 4-5, 11-12). It is also possible that other foreign cults were destroyed during this wave of resurgent nationalism (2 Kings xxiii 13).

Part of Josiah's political ambitions seems to have been the conquest of North Israel now deprived of its king and organised into provinces by Assyria. Indeed it is not unlikely that Josiah had the "master picture of David's empire" before his eyes.⁸⁴ As to when he moved to take possession of the northern provinces we cannot be sure. It is possible that the opportunity for doing so came before 621 B.C.⁸⁵ But much of Josiah's time before 621 B.C. must have been spent in consolidating his own country and if he did essay to expand northwards it can only have been very shortly before that year. Very probably, however, it was after this year when his position in Judah was secure

83. See above p. 46f.

84. See G.von Rad Theology of the O.T. (London 1962) vol.I p.76.

85. So, for example, J.Bright op.cit. p.295; Cross and Freedman op.cit. p.57; B.W.Anderson op.cit. p.305.

and the Assyrian empire was already crumbling.⁸⁶

The second stage of the reformation followed the discovery of and was based upon the demands of the law book. Josiah now abolished the Yahweh high places throughout Judah and brought their priests up to Jerusalem (2 Kings xxiii 8a). It was probably also after the discovery of the book that measures were taken to abolish the practice of human sacrifice (xxiii 10). The destruction of the Bethel high place must also have occurred at this time (xxiii 15). It is also to this second phase of the reformation that we must trace the measures taken against wizards etc. (xxiii 24). Finally the celebration of the new-style Passover was also due to the law book (2 Kings xxiii 21-23) as also was the making of the solemn covenant "to confirm the words that were written in this book" (xxiii 1-3).

On the basis of our conclusions we offer the following schema of the events of Josiah's reign:

	<u>2 Kings</u>	<u>2 Chron.</u>
<u>639 B.C.</u> Josiah's first year on the throne.		
<u>ca. 630-621 B.C.</u> Removal of Assyrian and other foreign cults.	xxiii 4-5, 11-12, 13.	xxxiv 4.
<u>621 B.C. onwards:</u> Discovery of law book and consultation of Huldah.	xxii.	xxxiv 8-28.
Abolition of Yahweh high places.	xxiii 8.	xxxiv 3.
rural priests brought to Jerusalem.	xxiii 8.	---
Legislation against wizards etc.	xxiii 24.	---
Making of Covenant.	xxiii 1-3.	xxxiv 29-32.
Passover celebrated in Jerusalem.	xxiii 21-23	xxxv 1-19.
Extension of territory into northern Israel; destruction of Bethel high place.	xxiii 15f.	cf. xxxiv 6.

86. For this period see Saggs op.cit. p.134ff., p.140f.

(Drawing up of boundary list of Judah under
Josiah, Joshua xv (?))⁸⁷

609 B.C. Josiah killed at Megiddo.

xxiii 29

xxv 23-24.

We must now attempt to sum up our conclusions. In the first place we have found the attempts to dissociate Deuteronomy from Josiah's reformation unconvincing. At the same time we have attempted to demonstrate that Josiah's reformation was not due solely to the discovery of a law book (Kings) but that part of it was carried out before the finding of the book and independent of it (Chronicles). In this respect we are modifying the conventional theory which based its arguments on a detailed comparison of all Josiah's reform measures, as recorded in Kings, with the laws of Deuteronomy⁸⁸ and rejected the Chronicler's account in so far as it places reform measures before Josiah's eighteenth year on the throne (621 B.C.). On the other hand we can confidently endorse the conventional identification of Josiah's law book with the original Deuteronomy (Ur-Deuteronomy).

If these conclusions are accepted then the terminus ad quem for the composition of Deuteronomy will be the year 621 B.C. We must now attempt to determine how long before this year the book was drawn up - the terminus a quo.

87. So Jepsen op.cit. p.108; M.Noth op.cit. pp.272-273; both scholars following A.Alt "Judas Gaue unter Josia" Kleine Schriften II pp.276-288. For a different view however see F.M.Cross and G.E.Wright "The Boundary Lists of the Kingdom of Judah" JBL lxxv (1956) pp.202-226. Cross and Wright prefer a 9th century date for these lists. So too now R. de Vaux op.cit. pp.136-137.

88. Cf. for example, L.B.Paton "The Case for the Post-Exilic Origin of Deuteronomy" JBL xlvii (1928) pp.325-326.

Additional Note to Chapter IIThe Deuteronomistic sections of Jeremiah

It has long been recognised that there are marked similarities in style and vocabulary between Deuteronomy and parts of Jeremiah. Opinions have varied greatly as to how this phenomenon came about. Old critics held that Jeremiah was influenced by Deuteronomy. Thus S.R.Driver wrote: "Jeremiah is the earliest prophet who can be demonstrated to have been acquainted with Deuteronomy".¹ On the other hand, those scholars who argued that Deuteronomy originated in the exilic or post-exilic period contended that the great prophet influenced the compilers of Deuteronomy. R.H.Kennett, for example, attempted to show that the author of Deuteronomy drew many phrases from Jeremiah.² Holscher and Horst who, as we have seen, argued that Deuteronomy was drawn up after Jeremiah's life, believed that the prophet's original oracles were edited by a Deuteronomist who wished to create the impression that the great prophet supported and endorsed the claims of Deuteronomy.³ More recently E.Nielsen has also expressed the opinion that the original book of Jeremiah has been consciously revised by a Deuteronomist.⁴ A.Bentzen argued along similar lines claiming that Jeremiah's book fell into the hands of "Deuteronomistic zealots" who "used him in their propaganda".⁵ R.H.Pfeiffer suggested

1. S.R.Driver Deuteronomy (ICC, Edinburgh, 2nd edit. 1902) p.lxiii.

2. R.H.Kennett "The Date of Deuteronomy" JTS vii (1906) pp.481-486. Cf. J.N.Schofield "The Significance of the Prophets for the Dating of Deuteronomy" in Studies in History and Religion (ed. A.E.Payne, 1942) pp.44-60; G.R. Berry "The Code found in the Temple" JBL xxxix (1920) pp.46-48.

3. Cf. G.Hölscher "Komposition und Ursprung des Deuteronomiums" pp.233-239; F. Horst "Die Anfänge des Propheten Jeremia" ZAW xli (1923) pp.94-153.

4. E.Nielsen Oral Tradition (London 1954) pp.78,79.

5. A.Bentzen Introduction to the Old Testament vol.II p.118.

that Baruch revised many of the prophet's sayings in his own Deuteronomistic style.⁶ Oesterley and Robinson argued that parts of Jeremiah savour of Deuteronomy simply because both books were written in the same rhetorical prose style of the period to which they both belong.⁷ Y.Kaufmann takes the view that Deuteronomy must have been an element in Jeremiah's education.⁸

More recent trends in Old Testament studies would reject any suggestion that the so-called Deuteronomistic sections in Jeremiah are the work of a Deuteronomistic "redactor" of Jeremiah or are due to the use of a Deuteronomistic source by the compiler of the prophet's oracles. Mowinckel suggested that these sections in Jeremiah are the work of a circle of the prophet's disciples by whom some of the prophet's sayings were preserved and transformed according to Deuteronomistic ideas and forms of style which prevailed in that circle.⁹ Recently J.Lindblom has supported this view.¹⁰ Another recent view comes from J.W.Miller who argues that the Deuteronomistic language in some sections of Jeremiah is explained when it is remembered that Jeremiah himself was influenced by the terminology of the cultic teaching of the Temple on which, he claims, Deuteronomy itself is based.¹¹ A.Weiser has offered a similar

6. R.H.Pfeiffer Introduction to the Old Testament p.505.

7. W.O.E.Oesterley and T.H.Robinson Introduction to the Books of the O.T. (London 1934) p.304.

8. Y.Kaufmann The Religion of Israel (Translated and abridged by M.Greenberg London 1961) pp.416-417.

9. S. Mowinckel Prophecy and Tradition (Oslo 1946) p.62f.

10. J.Lindblom Prophecy in Ancient Israel (Oxford 1962) pp.237-238, 425-426.

11. J.W.Miller Das Verhältnis Jeremias und Hesekiels sprachlich und theologisch untersucht mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Prosareden Jeremias (Assen 1955).

suggestion.¹²

Recent investigation into the manner in which the prophetic books came to us lends weight to Mowinkel's suggestion.¹³ On the other hand it is very possible that after its discovery in the Temple in 621 B.C. Deuteronomy was used in ceremonies of covenant renewal and if this is allowed then the views of either Miller or Oesterley and Robinson would carry weight.

12. A.Weiser Introduction to the Old Testament pp.217-218.

13. For this see O.Eissfeldt "The Prophetic Literature" in OTMS (edit. H.H.Rowley, Oxford 1951) p.126-134.

CHAPTER III

THE DATE OF COMPOSITION OF DEUTERONOMY -- Terminus a quo

In the previous chapter we arrived at the conclusion that the terminus ad quem for the composition of Deuteronomy is the year 621 B.C. In this chapter we shall attempt to fix the terminus a quo. We may divide our treatment of this problem into two sections:

1. A comparison of the legal material in Deuteronomy with that in the Book of the Covenant will reveal that Deuteronomy belongs to a more advanced age than it.
2. The dogma of the centralisation of public worship to one sanctuary supplies a vital clue to the terminus a quo since, in our opinion, its evolution can be dated within narrow limits.

1.

A comparison of some of the laws in the Book of the Covenant in Exodus xx 22-xxiii 33 with similar laws in Deuteronomy suggests that the legislation in the latter is more developed and belongs to a later age than the Exodus laws.¹

The law of the לִפְנֵי יְהוָה is found in both Exodus (xxi 2-11) and Deuteronomy (xv 12-18). There are however several significant differences between the two laws. In Exodus the law of release is

1. Cf. M. Noth Exodus (London 1962, trans. by J. S. Bowden from Das zweite Buch Mose (ATD series) Göttingen 1959); H. Cazelles Études sur le Code de L'Alliance (Paris 1946) pp. 104ff.

applied to male slaves only (verse 2); female slaves are not to go free as the males do (verse 7). Furthermore, in Exodus the slave is to go free with whatever possessions he entered his master's service; his master is not obliged to give him any aid to rehabilitation. In Deuteronomy on the other hand the law is more humane. The release is extended to the female slave (verse 12). Moreover, Deuteronomy's interpretation of 'שִׁפְחָה is much more liberal than that in Exodus. According to Deuteronomy a slave of either sex on leaving his master's service is to be provided for by his master from the flock, the threshing floor and the winepress (xv 13-14). The 'שִׁפְחָה of Exodus (xxi 3,4) has disappeared.³ The Deuteronomic law represents a sociological and moral advancement upon the Exodus law.

Another example of where the Deuteronomic laws exhibit an advancement on the Exodus laws is to be found in the matter of pledges (Exod.xxii 25-27; Deut. xxiv 10-13). The legislation in Exodus demands that if a man's garment is taken in pledge then it is to be returned to him before night (vv.26-27). Deuteronomy endorses this law (v.13) and adds a prohibition against taking the mill or upper millstone to pledge (v.6). There is however yet another stipulation in Deuteronomy; verses 10-11 legislate that a creditor is not permitted to enter a borrower's house to receive the pledge; he is to wait outside. This law is evidently aimed at preventing the arbitrary choice of pledge.⁴

3. Cf. Cazelles op.cit. p.104.

4. Cf. G.Henton Davies Peake's Commentary (London 1962) p.279 ;
 Cf.S.R.Driver Deuteronomy pp.275-276.

A further indication that Deuteronomy is later than the book of the Covenant is to be found in the law of the sabbatical year for the land (Exod.xxiii 10-11; Deut. xv 1ff.) The old norm which lies behind the law of release is the demand for a fallow year (cf. the Exodus law). In Deuteronomy however the law is extended to include the sphere of debt. Here too we have a sociological advancement upon the Exodus law which preserves the law in its more ancient form which applied to the land only.⁵ We may also note that the Exodus law uses the verb $\text{פָּדַתְּ אֶת־אֶדְמָתְךָ}$ -- "thou shalt make a release", whereas Deuteronomy uses the noun פְּדוּת -- "release". It is possible that by the time of Deuteronomy this word had already become a terminus technicus.⁶

5. See G.von Rad Studies in Deuteronomy pp.15-16; cf.Henton Davies op.cit. p.277.

6. See Cazelles op.cit. p.106. Cazelles points to what he believes to be another indication of Deuteronomy's later dating. He refers to Exodus xxi 14 and the use there of בְּחָיִל "with guile". He points to the similar law in Deut. xix 11 where the word בְּחָיִל is used and suggests that by the time of Deuteronomy the word בְּחָיִל was already acquiring the meaning which it had in the later writings in the Old Testament, that is, "prudence" in a good sense -- cf. Prov. i 4; viii 5,12; Job v 13. The suggestion is worth noting but since in fact Deuteronomy does not anywhere actually employ the word בְּחָיִל it is not wise to place too much significance on the use of בְּחָיִל as against פְּדוּת .

These few examples suffice to demonstrate that the book of Deuteronomy belongs to a later period than the Elohistic strand in which the Book of the Covenant now stands.⁷ The E strand is generally dated about 800 B.C.⁸ Deuteronomy must therefore come from a period subsequent to this year. In the following section we shall give reasons for coming down to yet a lower date than this.

2.

It has long been recognised that one of the fundamental demands made by the book of Deuteronomy is that all acts of a religious nature are to be carried out "at the place which Yahweh shall choose". Sacrifices and tithes are to be offered there (xii 4, 11, 14, 18; xiv 22f.; xv 19f.); the Passover is to be observed only at "the place" (xvi 2, 5-6); this also applies to the feast of Weeks (xvi 11) and Tabernacles (xvi 15); all vows must be offered there (xxvi 2; xv 19-23); the judicial system is to have its "arbitration" centre at the central shrine (xvii 8). The book demands the destruction of all places of worship other than this place (xii 8-14). Scholars have generally agreed that "the place which Yahweh shall choose" is to be interpreted as referring to Jerusalem.

7. See A. Weiser Introduction to the O.T. (London 1961) p.121ff.; G.W. Anderson A Critical Introduction to the O.T. (London 1959) pp.37-8 (following Weiser).

8. Cf. Weiser op.cit. p.124; Anderson op.cit. p.38.

Recently however both these interpretations have been challenged on several counts. On the one hand some scholars have argued that Deuteronomy does not in fact demand centralisation.⁹ On the other hand there has been an attempt to remove by literary critical means the demand for centralisation from the book.¹⁰ Again a number of scholars have contended that "the place which Yahweh shall choose" refers not to Jerusalem but to Shechem¹¹ or perhaps Bethel.¹²

9. Th. Oestreicher Das Deuteronomische Grundgesetz (Gutersloh 1923); idem "Dtn.xii 16f. im Licht von Dtn.xxiii 16f." ZAW xliii (1925) pp.246-249; W. Staerk Das Problem des Deuteronomiums (Gutersloh 1924) (follows Oestreicher); A.C. Welch The Code of Deuteronomy: a new theory of its origin (1924); idem "The two descriptions of the sanctuary in Deut." ET xxxvi (1925) pp.442-444; idem "The two descriptions of the sanctuary in Deut." ET xxxvii (1926) pp.215-219; idem "The Problem of Deuteronomy" JBL xlvi (1929) pp.291-306. More recently M.H. Segal "The Composition of the Pentateuch -- A Fresh Examination" in Scripta Hierosolymitana vol. viii (1961) p.111.

10. A.C. Welch The Code of Deuteronomy pp.57-61, 193f.; idem Deuteronomy: the framework to the Code (1932) p.205; idem "When was the worship of Israel centralised at the Temple?" ZAW xliii (1925) pp.250-255. For Welch's views on this see below. Cf. also G. von Rad Studies in Deuteronomy (London 1953) p.67; V. Maag "Erwägungen zur deuteronomischen Kultzentralisation" VT vi (1956) p.10.

11. Cf. W.F. Albright From Stone Age to Christianity (1940) p.241; G.A. Danell Studies in the Name Israel in the O.T. (Upsala 1946) p.56; B.W. Anderson The Living World of the O.T. (1958) p.309; A. Alt "Die Heimat des Deuteronomiums" in Kleine Schriften vol. II p.274 note 1.

12. Cf. F. Dumermuth "Zur deuteronomischen Kulttheologie" ZAW lxx (1958) p.79ff.; it was proposed some years ago by Oesterley and Robinson Introduction to the Books of the O.T. (1934) p.50. Although the question of where "the place" referred to belongs properly to a discussion of the provenance of Deuteronomy, it is inevitably linked up with the problem of centralisation as a whole and will therefore be dealt with in this chapter.

In view of these recent trends it is necessary to re-examine the law of the centralisation of worship. Our ultimate concern in this matter is to demonstrate that the doctrine of the centralisation of the cult provides most important data for the dating of the composition of the book of Deuteronomy. We can best approach the problem under three sub-titles:

a. Does Deuteronomy centralise public worship to one sanctuary?

b. If so, is the demand for centralisation easily removed from the point of view of literary criticism?

c. When did the doctrine of the central shrine come into existence?

a. During the past generation a group of scholars have contended vigorously that Deuteronomy does not centralise worship. Th. Oestreicher and A. Welch argued that the book recognises the validity of a multiplicity of Yahweh shrines and that it demands that Israel worship only at these shrines. Such a theory was not absolutely new in their day, for it had been postulated in one form or another by scholars such as van Hoonacker,¹³ Poels,¹⁴ Klostermann¹⁵ and Fries.¹⁶ Van Hoonacker, for example, held that there were two types of sanctuaries in Judah, private and public, and that Deuteronomy abolished only the public ones. That is, the centralisation of the cult demanded by Deuteronomy was not absolute but relative.¹⁷ Poels held a view similar to this.¹⁸ Fries also

13. A. van Hoonacker "Le Lieu du culte dans la Legislation rituelle des Hebreus" in Le Muséon xiii (1894) p.195f.

14. A. Poels Examen critique de l'histoire du sanctuaire de l'arche (Louvain 1897).

15. A. Klostermann Der Pentateuch (Neue Folge, Leipzig 1907) pp.154ff.

16. S.A. Fries Die Gesetzschrift des Königs Josias

17. Van Hoonacker op.cit. p.533

18. Poels op.cit. p.75.

followed this opinion but with reservations.¹⁹ According to Klostermann the clause "the place which Yahweh shall choose" designated several places which changed from time to time. The choice of where it was to be at a given time was determined by the people by means of lot or oracle.²⁰

But the main attack came from Welch and Oestreicher during the 1920's. Their opinions are based on a novel interpretation of the phrase "the place which Yahweh shall choose".

Oestreicher argued that the law concerning the place of worship in Deuteronomy adds nothing to the old altar-law in Exodus xx 24. Deuteronomy xii 13 reads: "take heed to thyself that thou offer not thy burnt offering in every place that thou seest". Exodus xx 24b reads: "In every place where I record my name I will come unto thee and I will bless thee". The meaning of both these passages, argues Oestreicher, is that the faithful are not to offer their sacrifices in just any place but only in places sanctioned by Yahweh.²¹ He interprets Deuteronomy xii 14 $\text{בְּמִקְוֵי יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר יִבְרַךְ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ בְּכָל מְדִינָה}$ as follows: "but in every place which Yahweh shall choose in any of thy tribes".²² He obtains this translation by giving the definite article in בְּכָל מְדִינָה a distributive interpretation and the indefinite article in בְּכָל מְדִינָה a general meaning. He attempts to justify his translation by drawing attention to the analogous use of the same words in the passage concerning the fugitive slave in Deut. xxiii 17. Here it is

19. Fries op.cit. p.13.

20. Klostermann op.cit. p.426.

21. Oestreicher Das Deuteronomische Grundgesetz pp.103-104.

22. Ibid. p.106.

legislated that a slave who escapes from his master is not to be

returned to him but is to be permitted to dwell בְּמִקְוֹם אֲשֶׁר

יְבַחֵר יְיָ בְּאַחַד שְׁבֵטֵי . Now it is obvious, argues Oestreicher,

that in all essential points this verse and בְּמִקְוֹם אֲשֶׁר יְבַחֵר

יְיָ בְּאַחַד שְׁבֵטֵי are the same. But the translation of the former (Deut. xxiii 17), he continues, is clearly: "he (the slave)

shall dwell with thee in any (jedem) place which he shall choose

within any one (an irgend einer) of thy gates".²³ On the basis of

this he concludes that the phrase בְּמִקְוֹם אֲשֶׁר יְבַחֵר יְיָ

יְבַחֵר יְיָ בְּאַחַד שְׁבֵטֵי is to be translated: "in every (jedem) place which Yahweh shall choose in any one (an irgend einer) of your tribes".

In pointing to the parallels between Deut. xxiii 17 and xii 14 however, Oestreicher has overlooked one important difference, for whereas the subject of xxiii 17 is "he", in xii 14 it is "Yahweh". That is, in xii 14 it is a definite subject and the action is limited to Yahweh, whilst in xxiii 17 the "he" is general and refers to any one of a class of people.²⁴ Accordingly the phrase "he (the slave) shall dwell thee in the place which he shall choose in one of thy gates" is to be interpreted (but not translated!) as indicating that fugitive slaves

23. Ibid. p.105.

24. For this argument see: E.König "Der Generelle Artikel im Hebräischen" ZAW xliv (1926) p.173; idem "Stimmen Exod. xx 24 und Dtn. xii 13f. zusammen?" ZAW xlii (1924) p.337f.; idem "Deuteronomische Hauptfragen" ZAW xlviii (1930) pp.43-66, esp.44-54. Cf. also A.R.Siebens L'Origine du Code Deutéronomique (Paris 1929) pp.108-109.

may reside in any town or village in Israel. But the phrase "in the place which Yahweh shall choose in one of thy gates" is referring to the action of one specific subject and cannot be interpreted after the analogy of xxiii 17.

Oestreicher further failed to deal with one text which even Welch,²⁵ who otherwise holds the same views, admits leaves no

ambiguity on the matter. Chapter xii 5 reads: כִּי אֶם-אֶל-הַמָּקוֹם

אֲשֶׁר-יבְחַר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ מִכָּל-שְׂבִיטֶיךָ לְשׂוֹם

אֶת-שְׁמוֹ "....but unto the place which Yahweh your God shall choose

out of all your tribes to place his name there....."

The words מִכָּל-שְׂבִיטֶיךָ leave no doubt as to what the author had in mind — one central place for public worship.

We must conclude therefore that the book of Deuteronomy as it now stands demands that Israel's worship is to be carried out at one central sanctuary. But is the demand for centralisation an integral part of the book or can it be moved by literary critical means? it is to this question that we must now turn.

b. Welch agreed that chapter xii 5 "definitely and uncompromisingly" demands centralisation.²⁶ To surmount this difficulty to his thesis, however, he contended that this whole section, xii 1-7, is a late interpolation into the book and was probably added just before Josiah's

25. A.C. Welch The Code of Deuteronomy p.58, cf. p.193.

26. Ibid p.58, cf. p.193

reformation.²⁷ He suggests that this section is possibly "an addition to the original code, inserted with the intention of laying down a general caveat as to the principle in the light of which all the rest must be read".²⁸ His reasons are:

(i) The section has its own historical attitude which is radically different from that of all the rest.²⁹ In demanding the absolute destruction of every heathen sanctuary and altar together with their emblems and instruments, the author of this passage, argues Welch, takes the attitude of the last revision of the book of Joshua, according to which Palestine was overrun and conquered by a united Israel in one or two campaigns after which the country was distributed by lot among the tribes.³⁰

(ii) As the passage has its own historical attitude, continues Welch, so also it has its own religious demand: "definitely and uncompromisingly it orders the centralisation of the cult". This too is different from the rest of the code where, he argues, the centralisation of the cult is not clearly commanded.³¹

(iii) The third argument adduced by Welch is that the section is a self contained unit with no connection with what follows. Whilst acknowledging that it forms an excellent introduction to the code, he argues that it is not so integrally bound up with what precedes or follows as to produce any break if it were removed.³²

27. Cf. Deuteronomy: the framework to the code (1932) p.205

28. Cf. The Code of Deuteronomy p.194.

29. Ibid. pp.57-58.

30. Ibid. p.58.

31. Ibid. p.195.

32. Ibid. pp.193-194.

(iv) The legislator betrays by two significant omissions, continues Welch, that he does not occupy exactly the position of the other laws in the code. Firstly, when the law enunciated in xii 1-7 demands that the worshipper is to come to the central shrine, he is mentioned only with his "house": nothing is said which is exactly parallel to the sons and daughters, the male and female slaves of the other laws.³³ Secondly, the section omits to deal with the position of the Levite. This too is at variance with the other laws in the code, argues Welch, where the needs of the clergy are carefully ordered.³⁴

Against Welch's arguments it must first of all be noted that the historical attitude of the section in question is not peculiar to these verses. A similar attitude is found in such passages as xii 29-30, xviii 9-14, xix 1. If then chapter xii 1-7 is to be dismissed as secondary then these passages must also be eliminated. Indeed we can go further. We shall see later that one of the pressing problems which faced the author of Deuteronomy was Israel's survival among the nations. This is why there is so much of the ideology of the Holy War in Deuteronomy.³⁵ Not only are the heathen nations to be wiped out, but even Israelites who adopt their religious customs or beliefs are to be exterminated (cf. chapter xiii).

Welch's other arguments against the originality of these verses are equally unconvincing. His contention that chapter xii 1-7 contains a different religious demand in commanding the centralisation of the cult does not hold water since neither he nor Oestreicher has demonstrated

33. Ibid. pp.60-61.

34. Ibid. p.61

35. See G.von Rad Studies in Deuteronomy pp.45-59: idem Der Heilige Krieg im Alten Israel (Göttingen 1958) pp.68-78.

convincingly that the other references to "the place which Yahweh shall choose" do not make the same demand. With regard to his arguments based upon the use of "household" in verse 7 as against "sons and daughters, etc." in verse 12 it is obvious that "household" is nothing more than a comprehensive term for a man's family and other members of his home. But furthermore, if the use of the word "household" is indicative of different authorship, then presumably the use of this word in xiv 26, xv 20 and xxvi 11 implies that these verses derive from a different author from v 14, vi 2, xvi 11, 14 where we have "sons and daughters, etc."? But this obviously cannot be the case. It is manifestly impossible to use this difference in terminology as a criterion for different authorship.

In recent years other scholars have argued that the demand for centralisation can easily be removed from Deuteronomy from the point of view of literary criticism. G. von Rad for example states roundly that the demand for centralisation "rests on a narrow basis only, and is, from the point of view of literary criticism, comparatively easy to remove as a late and final adaptation of many layers of material".³⁶ With this opinion we strongly disagree. The demand for centralisation occurs again and again in the course of the book.³⁷ Not only however is there this insistence on centralisation; there are in Deuteronomy various provisions which are the direct result of the centralisation of the cult. Thus, since the slaughtering of animals for domestic use

36. G. von Rad Studies in Deuteronomy p.67; cf. V. Maag "Erwägungen zur deuteronomischen Kultzentralisation" VT vi (1956) p.10.

37. Deut. xii, 5, 11, 14, 18, 21, 26; xiv 23, 24, 25; xv 20; xvi 2, 6, 7, 11, 15; xvii 8, 10; xviii 6; xxvi 2.

has thitherto been a sacrificial act carried out at the local altars, the difficulty arose as to how this was to be performed if all these local altars were abolished. Hence the law in chapter xii 20-25 (cf. xiv 22-26) which permits the "profane" slaughter of animals for domestic use. Again, since the abolition of the local shrines will deprive the priests at those shrines of their livelihood, it is legislated that they are to be permitted to minister at the central sanctuary if they so desire (xviii 6-8). It is also probable that the abolition of the local altars with its consequences for their priests is the reason for the constant commendation of their needs to the people (Deut. xii 12,18,19; xiv 27,29; xvi 11,14; xxvi 11,12,13).³⁸ Furthermore the centralisation of the cult led to a corresponding centralisation of the juridical rights of the priesthood (cf. xvii 8f.).³⁹ All this is surely sufficient evidence that the demand for centralisation by no means "stands on a narrow basis only". In fact, far from being easily removed from the point of view of literary criticism, it would require nothing less than violent surgery of the text to remove the centralisation demand with all its associated laws.

Quite apart from these arguments it must be emphasised how integral the demand for centralisation is to the whole character of the book of Deuteronomy. Von Rad has done more than any other scholar to demonstrate the unifying tendencies of Deuteronomy and in view of this it is all the more surprising to find him minimising the significance

38. In Deuteronomy alone the Levite is classed among the needy classes in society.

39. Did the local lay courts now assume wider responsibilities? Cf. A.Bentzen Introduction to the O.T. vol. II p.44.

of the centralisation law. The total demand which Deuteronomy makes has been summed up in the neat German phrase: ein Gott, ein Volk, ein Kult.⁴⁰ And the demand for Kultuseinheit is wholly in keeping with the demand that Israel as ein Volk should worship ein Gott.⁴¹ On both literary critical and theological grounds the demand for centralisation must be considered an integral part of Deuteronomy.

c. If this be granted then we must attempt to determine at just what period in Israel's history this radical break in cult practice came into existence. If we succeed then we shall have an important landmark for dating the composition of Deuteronomy.

There has been little unanimity of opinion on the question of the origin of the doctrine of the centralisation of public worship to one sanctuary. It has been considered by some as nothing more than the impracticable ideal of a group of priests living in exile and divorced from the realities of life in Palestine.⁴² Others believe that the centralisation of worship was the means chosen by Josiah to abolish sacred prostitution which had its breeding grounds at the local high places.⁴³ Some scholars see in it the practical outcome of the teaching of the 8th century prophets and their condemnation of the high places.⁴⁴

40. Cf. G.W.Anderson op.cit. p.40.

41. See the apposite remarks on this by Bentzen op.cit. p.42.

42. So G.Hölscher "Komposition und Ursprung des Deuteronomiums" ZAW xl (1922) p.183f. and Geschichte der israelitischen und jüdischen Religion (Giessen 1922) p.132.

43. So R.H.Kennett Deuteronomy and the Decalogue (Cambridge 1920) pp.12-15.

44. So for example S.R.Driver Deuteronomy (I.C.C., Edinburgh 1902) p.xliv footnote and pp.xlix-1; A.R.Siebens op.cit. pp.119-138; R.Kittel Geschichte des Volkes Israel (7th edition, Stuttgart 1925) vol.II, p.374.

Another theory sees in it the final outcome of a long process in which the larger and more important sanctuaries monopolised so much of the offerings of the people that the smaller local shrines suffered an ever increasing loss in revenue until finally the priests at these smaller sanctuaries legislated that worship should be centralised at one of the major shrines with a view to integrating themselves into the ministry there.⁴⁵ These rural priests have been considered as the originators of the doctrine of the centralisation of worship for another reason viz. that by the 7th century they had outgrown their cultic sphere proper and were now exercising more of a teaching ministry.⁴⁶ Some scholars have argued that the centralisation of worship (to Jerusalem) was the result of the miraculous deliverance of the city from Sennacherib in 701 B.C.⁴⁷ whilst others argue that Hezekiah centralised worship in Jerusalem in order to concentrate national feeling on the preservation of the capital in the struggle for independence from Assyria; that is, the centralisation of worship has its origin in a political or largely political necessity rather than in a religious one.⁴⁸ More recently it has been suggested that the Deutero-

45. Cf. A. Bentzen Die josianische Reform und ihre Voraussetzungen (Copenhagen 1926) pp. 68-72; idem Introduction to the O.T. vol. II p. 44. Cf. R. de Vaux Ancient Israel p. 364.

46. G. von Rad Studies in Deuteronomy pp. 60-69. Both von Rad and Bentzen trace the origin of Deuteronomy itself to circles of country Levites.

47. Cf. recently V. Maag op.cit. p. 12f. Cf. G. A. Smith Jerusalem vol. I (London 1908) pp. 175-177.

48. So T. H. Robinson and W. O. E. Oesterley A History of Israel vol. I (Oxford 1932) pp. 392-393.

nomic dogma of the central shrine has its origin in the central shrine of the so-called amphietyonic period.⁴⁹

Most of the theories outlined above do not carry conviction. The view that the centralisation of the cult is but the impracticable ideal of exiled priests can hardly be accepted if only for the simple reason that in the post-exilic period and as late as New Testament times the law of the one central sanctuary was accepted without question.⁵⁰ But further, as we have seen, there are no sound reasons for rejecting as unhistorical the narrative of Josiah's reign. The same can be said of the narrative of Hezekiah's reign (2 Kings xviii-xx).⁵¹ Both of these kings attempted to centralise public worship and to abolish the local high places. Against the view that the centralisation of the cult was the practical outcome of the teaching of the 8th century prophets it must be pointed out that nowhere do these prophets militate against the high places in themselves but against the kind of religion practised at them. It is true, as we shall see, that for some of them Jerusalem, or Zion, was of paramount significance. But nowhere do they explicitly

49. So M.Noth The History of Israel (First English edit., A. & C. Black, London 1958) p.275; J.Bright A History of Israel (London 1960) p.265; cf. F.Dumermuth "Zur deuteronomischen Kulttheologie" ZAW lxx (1958) p.62.

50. See for example John iv 20; ii 13; xi 55; Luke ii 22f., 41, cf. 44. Cf. C.R.North "Pentateuchal Criticism" in O.T.M.S. (edit. H.H.Rowley, Oxford 1951) p.50; W.C.Graham "The Modern Controversy about Deuteronomy" JR vii (1927) p.416; K.Budde "Das Deuteronomium und die Reform König Josias" ZAW xliiv (1926) p.179.

51. Cf. H.H.Rowley "Hezekiah's Reform and Rebellion" BJRL vol.44 no.2, 1962 p.425; G.W.Anderson Introduction p.44.

demand the destruction of the high places per se or the centralisation of the cult to Jerusalem.⁵² There are several serious weaknesses in the view that rural priests were the originators of the demand for centralisation. Firstly, whilst it may be true that the larger sanctuaries such as Jerusalem and Bethel would have attracted many pilgrims from all over the land, there is no evidence whatsoever that this had adverse effects on the revenues or status of the rural shrines. Indeed the fact that Deuteronomy militates so strongly against them and that in spite of Hezekiah's and Josiah's attempt to destroy them they persistently sprang up again would seem to suggest that they were far from being robbed of their popularity among the people or that they were suffering any grave loss in income.⁵³ Secondly, the fact that Deuteronomy over and over again insists on charity towards the country Levites who were now to be deprived of their altars by its legislation is surely evidence that these altars had hitherto provided the means of livelihood for these priests. Of the theory that the centralisation of the cult was the result of the miraculous deliverance of Jerusalem from Sennacherib only this need be said: according to 2 Kings xviii

52. See J.E.Carpenter and G.Harford The Composition of the Hexateuch (London 1902) p.144, cf.140; more recently Y.Kaufmann The Religion of Israel (Trans. and abridged by M.Greenberg, London 1961) pp.161-162.

A.Bentzen also argued against this in his Studier over det zadokidiske praesteskabs historie (Copenhagen 1931) (Not consulted but see his Introduction to the O.T. vol. II p.44, footnote 1.)

53. Was Josiah's action in bringing the rural priests to Jerusalem (2 Kings xxiii 8) motivated by the memory that Hezekiah's attempt to centralise worship had failed largely on account of the non-co-operation of the country priests?

Hezekiah centralised worship before Sennacherib's sudden withdrawal from the city (cf. verse 22). It is no doubt true that this deliverance was for many the visible sign of Yahweh's choice of Jerusalem as his dwelling place but it was not in itself the cause of the centralisation of the cultus.⁵⁴ The suggestion that Hezekiah centralised worship in order to concentrate national feeling on the preservation of the capital in the struggle for independence is certainly very attractive. As it stands the argument is, however, inadequate and requires some evidence to substantiate it. We shall return to this below. Finally, the suggestion that the Deuteronomic dogma of the central place of worship has its origin in the central shrine of the amphictyonic period cannot carry conviction. It fails to distinguish sufficiently between the amphictyonic shrine as the main shrine among many and the Deuteronomic demand for one and only one sanctuary for all Israel.⁵⁵ The latter has an origin of its own.

Whilst however none of the theories outlined above is in itself a satisfactory solution to the problem on hand, it is our opinion that those which connect the actual origin of the dogma of the central shrine with Hezekiah's reign are standing on firmer ground than those which seek to find its origin in other periods of Israel's history, for it must be emphasised that as far as the Old Testament documents

54. Cf. R. De Vaux op.cit. p.327.

55. Noth himself acknowledges this. Cf. his History of Israel p.275.

are concerned Hezekiah was the first ever to abolish the high places and to concentrate public worship at one sanctuary. No one before him, as far as we know, attempted such an innovation.^{55a} It is therefore to Hezekiah's reign that we must look for the origin of the centralisation of the cult.⁵⁶

When Hezekiah came to the throne⁵⁷ the Northern kingdom had already been swept away by the Assyrians. Its monarchy no longer existed, its Israelite population was decimated by the deportation of the better elements in its society and its territory was now infiltrated by foreigners who had been imported by the Assyrians from other parts of the empire. Judah, though by no means in the same plight as the north, was nevertheless subject to Assyria.

55a. The Chronicler's record that both Asa (2 Chron. xiv 1-4) and Jehoshaphat (xvii 6) abolished the high places is an exception to this. But the Chronicler cannot here be historically trustworthy. Both statements are contradicted by the Chronicler himself (cf. 2 Chron. xv 17 and xx 33) and by the author of Kings (cf. 1 Kings xv 14 and xxi 44).

56. There was a time when the historicity of Hezekiah's reformation was doubted. (cf. for example, J. Wellhausen Prolegomena (1885) p.25; G. Hölcher Die Propheten (1914) p.165 and Geschichte der israelitischen und jüdischen Religion; A. Bentzen Die josianische Reform und ihre Voraussetzungen p.34.) Recently however it has been accepted as historically trustworthy by the majority of scholars. (Cf. especially H.H. Rowley "Hezekiah's Reform and Rebellion" BJRL vol.44, no.2 (1962) p.425f.)

57. The chronology adopted here is that proposed by W.F. Albright "The Chronology of the Divided Monarchy of Israel" BASOR 100 (1945) pp.16-22. Cf. J. Bright History p.261; B.W. Anderson op.cit. p.275; J. Gray "Chronology of the old Testament" Peake's Commentary (London 1962) p.72.

These events must have had far-reaching effects in Judah. There was naturally the desire for freedom from Assyrian dominion. But the tragedy which had befallen the Northern kingdom would have provoked much heart searching in Judah for it must have seemed to many that the fate of the northern people was nothing less than Yahweh's judgement upon their apostasy and idolatry. The high places had been largely responsible for this and since in Judah also the high places were a constant source of idolatry and apostasy, there must have been from now onwards an ever increasing demand to reform them drastically or perhaps even to abolish them altogether. It seems however that there was yet another effect of the downfall of the northern kingdom upon Judah. There were evidently those in Judah who saw in the destruction of the northern kingdom Judah's opportunity to extend its borders and to re-establish the kingdom of Israel as it had been in David's day.⁵⁸ But centuries of division and enmity between the two states made this task extremely difficult. Not least among the difficulties was the fact that Jeroboam I in erecting Bethel and Dan as rival sanctuaries to Jerusalem (1 Kings xii 26f.) seems to have been successful, as far as the northern tribes were concerned, in eclipsing the religious significance of Jerusalem for the twelve tribes by reason of its possession of the sacred Ark brought there by David. Bethel certainly

58. Cf. 2 Chron. xxx 1-2. Opinion is divided on the question of the historicity of this passage. W. Rudolph rejects it (Chronikbücher in HAT Tübingen 1955, pp. 299-301). But it is very probable that sound tradition stands behind this narrative. The time was certainly ripe for such a policy. (Cf. J. Bright op.cit. p. 266.)

seems to have been of signal significance for the north.⁵⁹ Accordingly it is reasonable to infer that those who aimed at the re-unification of all Israel under the Judaean monarchy would have realised the necessity of re-constituting Jerusalem as the religious centre of the nation as a whole. That is to say, the work of Jeroboam I had to be undone. This in itself would have been the source of centralising tendencies in Judah, and, needless to say, particularly in Jerusalem.

We suggest therefore that after the fall of the Northern kingdom in 721 B.C. there arose in Judah a religio-political movement in which there were already centralising tendencies. The final cause of the centralisation of the cult arose, we suggest, out of the conditions brought about by Sennacherib's first invasion of Judah in 701 B.C.⁶⁰

The movement for independence had its first opportunity in 705 B.C. when Sargon died and his successor Sennacherib was met on his accession to the Assyrian throne by widespread rebellion throughout his empire.⁶¹ Hezekiah seems to have been a ringleader of the revolt in the west. By 701 B.C., however, Sennacherib had regained the upper hand. He

59. It is significant that later Josiah singled out Bethel in his reform and territorial expansion (2 Kings xxiii 15). It may also be true that in sending a Yahweh priest to Bethel (2 Kings xvii 27) the Assyrians were endeavouring to ensure that the north would not look to Jerusalem for the future of their country. (Cf. J.Bright op.cit. p.266)

60. Since the theory of two campaigns against Judah by Sennacherib is of importance for our suggestions we deal with it briefly in the additional note after this chapter.

61. Cf. H.W.F.Saggs The Greatness that was Babylon (London 1962) p.118f.; J.Bright op.cit. p.276.

marched on Judah and Hezekiah surrendered but not before Judah had suffered heavily at the hands of the invader.⁶² Sennacherib records that he took forty-six walled cities and innumerable small townships as well as 200,150 captives. Even allowing for some exaggeration on the victor's part it still remains true that Judah paid heavily for her part in the rebellion.⁶³ At least a considerable portion of Judah if not the whole of the country except Jerusalem was handed over by the Assyrians to the loyal Philistine kings of Ekron, Gaza and Ashdod, and heavy tribute was exacted from Hezekiah. Furthermore, it is more than a probability that Sennacherib carried out the customary Assyrian policy of replacing those whom he took captive by importing into Judah foreigners from other parts of the empire.⁶⁴ At any rate it is not without significance that from this time onwards all sorts of foreign cults gained a footing in Judah.⁶⁵ As a result of these events the country was politically and religiously in danger.

62. For Sennacherib's account of the campaign see Ancient Near Eastern Texts edit. J.B.Pritchard (2nd edition 1955) pp.287-288.

63. Isai. i 5-9 probably belongs here.

64. Is it possible that 2 Chron.xxix 8-9 preserves a memory of this captivity under Sennacherib?

65. Cf. Zeph. i 4-6,8,9; 2 Kings xxiii 4ff.; Jer. iii.

It was in these circumstances, we suggest, that Hezekiah was forced to abolish the high places and to concentrate worship in Jerusalem. His motive for doing so is clear. In the decade which followed 701 B.C. the Assyrians were increasingly troubled by uprisings in Babylon.⁶⁶ During this decade hope no doubt arose once more in Judah. It is perhaps to this period that Hezekiah's war with the Philistines belongs (2 Kings xviii 8). This would have been the first move in the renewed attempt at national self-assertion. But if the struggle for independence from Assyria was to succeed the support of the nation as a whole was necessary and the nation was at this stage in grave danger of being weakened by the presence of foreign cults in the land. There must have been a tendency towards widespread syncretism and a dampening of the nationalistic fervour so characteristic of the earlier years of Hezekiah's reign. Hezekiah therefore, determined to curb such a tendency among his people, broke with ancient practice and abolished the high places where, we may presume, these foreign cults were gaining ground. It was largely a political move though it would be unfair to attribute Hezekiah's action solely to political motives. As we noted above, there was probably in Judah at this time a strong desire among loyal Yahwists to reform drastically the local high places.

We argued above that the 8th century prophets nowhere demanded the destruction of the local high places. It is true however that they helped to prepare the way for the centralisation of worship to Jerusalem. For Amos Jerusalem is the place from which Yahweh roars (i 2); for Isaiah Zion is where Yahweh dwells (viii 18) and where he has his "fire" and his "furnace" (xxxi 9). Micah pronounces doom upon "the mountain of the house" (iii 12). According to Isaiah ii 2f(=Micah iv 1f.) Zion

66. See H.W.F.Saggs op.cit. p.120ff.; J.Bright op.cit. p.270.

shall be "the mountain of the house of Yahweh" to which "all nations shall flow" to be taught Yahweh's ways "for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of Yahweh from Jerusalem".

When eventually the Assyrians once more invaded Judah (ca.688 B.C.) Jerusalem survived. This was the occasion of the miraculous deliverance of the city.⁶⁷ This must surely have been taken by many as the visible sign of Yahweh's choice of Jerusalem.⁶⁸ It is true of course that Hezekiah's innovation was not entirely successful; the high places flourished once more under Manasseh. But we can be sure that there was some group in Judah who saw in the deliverance of Jerusalem from the Assyrian host Yahweh's will to preserve the city and to be worshipped only there. The words of the 8th century prophets concerning Zion would now have taken on a deeper significance and Hezekiah's actions would have seemed to many to have been justified. And is it not more than plausible to infer that it is to this group that we owe the formulation of the law of the centralisation of public worship and that Josiah's law book owed its origin to this group? For such a group the heathen reaction which set in when Manasseh came to the throne must have accentuated the need for the abolition of the high places even more. And by the same token it is surely most reasonable to interpret "the place which Yahweh shall choose" as referring to Jerusalem. The bulk of the evidence in the Old Testament is certainly in favour of this interpretation.

As far then as the date of Deuteronomy is concerned we can conclude with confidence that it was composed sometime after ca.688 B.C.

67. Cf. J.Bright op.cit. p.287.

68. Cf. R. De Vaux Ancient Israel (London 1961) p.327.

If we allow some time for the heathen reaction to set in after Hezekiah's death then we are carried well into Manasseh's reign. This coincides with the resurgence of Assyrian power under Assur-ban-apal (668-626?) and the swan song, for the meantime, of Judah's aspirations to freedom. Sometime during Manasseh's reign with its dark days for loyal Yahwists Josiah's law book was drawn together.⁶⁹

69. Manasseh's reign is preferred by H.H.Rowley The Growth of the O.T. (London 1950) p.31; S.R.Driver Deuteronomy pp.l-lii.

Additional Note to Chapter IIISennacherib's Invasion of Judah

Since the theory of two invasions of Judah by Sennacherib is presupposed in the suggestions noted above in chapter III concerning the centralisation of the cult, we must say a brief word in defence of it. It is obviously not our task to enter into a detailed discussion of the problem of Sennacherib's campaigns against Judah.¹ Here we shall confine ourselves to a re-statement of the case for the two-campaign theory and attempt to deal with some objections recently raised against it.²

The case for the two-campaign theory may be briefly stated as follows. The narrative of Hezekiah's submission and surrender to Sennacherib in 2 Kings xviii 13-16 is paralleled by Sennacherib's own account of the events. They both relate that the Assyrians in suppressing the revolt in the west invaded and ravaged Judah, forced Hezekiah to surrender and imposed heavy tribute upon him. Another account in Assyrian adds that Hezekiah was deprived of his army and war materials.³ When we add to this the fact that Hezekiah's partners in the rebellion had been subdued, that the main military force behind the revolt, Egypt, had been routed at Eltekeh, and that most if not all of Judah was now in the hands of foreigners, then it is highly improbable that Hezekiah could have recovered sufficiently to rebel again within, say, a few months. That he did rebel again seems evident from the words of the Rabshakeh in 2 Kings

1. For an excellent bibliography of the whole problem see H.H.Rowley "Hezekiah's Reform and Rebellion" in BJRL vol.44 no.2, March 1962.

2. For a thorough treatment of the two-campaign theory see J.Bright A History of Israel pp.267-271 and 282-287.

3. Cf. D.D.Luckenbill The Annals of Sennacherib (Chicago 1924) cited in H.H.Rowley op.cit. p.418.

xviii 20. But such a rebellion must have taken place at a time when Assyria was once more losing its grip, when the Egyptians had recovered sufficiently from their losses at Eltekeh in order to support such a rebellion,⁴ and when Hezekiah himself had recovered from the invasion and impoverishment of his country. We know that the decade immediately following 701 B.C. was one of constant trouble for the Assyrians in Babylon.⁵ The news of the Assyrian setbacks there must have led to a revival of hope in the west. It was just at this time too that the vigorous young Tirhakah became ruler of Egypt. Since we now know that Tirhakah was a mere nine or ten years old in 701 B.C.⁶ the narrative in 2 Kings xix which records that he led an army against Assyria must be referring to a military conflict well after 701 B.C. On the basis of all this it is suggested that there were two campaigns against Judah by Sennacherib: one in 701 B.C. when Hezekiah was defeated, the other in c.688 B.C., following fresh revolt, in which Tirhakah was involved and when Jerusalem was delivered from the Assyrian army.

The most recent challenge to this theory comes from H.H.Rowley who advocates anew that the two encounters between Hezekiah and Sennacherib both belong to the year 701 B.C.⁷ According to Rowley, Sennacherib moved against Judah in 701 B.C. as a result of a rebellion which had broken out in 703 B.C. which Rowley takes as Hezekiah's twenty-fourth year on the throne.⁸ It is accepted that the Assyrians ravaged Judah forcing Hezekiah

4. That Egypt was involved seems evident from 2 Kings xviii 21.

5. Cf. H.W.F.Saggs op.cit. p.120; J.Bright op.cit. p.270.

6. Cf. W.F.Albright "New Light from Egypt on the Chronology and History of Israel and Judah" BASOR 130 (April 1953) pp.8-11.

7. H.H.Rowley op.cit.

8. Ibid. pp.410-411.

to surrender and imposing heavy tribute upon him. But it is suggested that the Egyptian forces defeated at Eltekeh "may have been a relatively small advance force to stiffen the resistance of the Philistine cities".⁹ Rowley then suggests that shortly after Sennacherib subdued Jerusalem he learnt that a powerful Egyptian army was approaching, regretted not having occupied Jerusalem and forthwith despatched a small force to do so in the belief that it might be strategically important to hold the city in the encounter with Egypt.¹⁰ When however the Rabshakeh and his troops arrived at Jerusalem, Hezekiah, encouraged by Isaiah, shut the city gates and refused to admit them on the grounds that the occupation of the city had been no part of the original surrender terms.¹¹ This was the occasion of the miraculous deliverance of the city.

There are, however, several weaknesses in this theory to which we must draw attention. Firstly, as was noted above, the words of the Rabshakeh seem to be addressed to one who had already rebelled. It is of course arguable that by closing the city gates Hezekiah was in fact rebelling. But there seems to have been more to the rebellion than this. It had evidently been planned in advance, for the Rabshakeh in his address to the people of Jerusalem ridicules Hezekiah's reliance upon Egypt and his belief that Yahweh would defend the city. He further states that he has come up against Jerusalem to destroy it (2 Kings xviii 25). Here, we suggest, we are dealing with Assyrian reaction to a full scale revolt and not to the stubborn decision of a king to refuse to admit into his city a few troops of an enemy who, on Rowley's hypothesis, had utterly devastated the country but a few months before. It does not at all sound as though

9. Ibid. pp.420-421

10. Ibid. p.421.

11. Ibid. pp.422-423.

Hezekiah simply shut the gates and rebelled just when the Assyrian troops arrived. On the contrary, the words of Rabshakeh in 2 Kings xviii 25 imply that Hezekiah was boldly making a stand against an enemy which had come up to his capital not just to occupy it but to destroy it. This is further supported by the fact that the Rabshakeh threatens deportation (2 Kings xviii 32). Secondly, there is no evidence that the Egyptian army destroyed at Eltekeh was a small token force. But even if this be granted, can we really believe that the Egyptians in the knowledge that the whole of Syria-Palestine was once more under Assyrian control, that their allies had all been utterly subdued and their lands occupied, would so soon have attempted to face the hosts of Sennacherib again? It is possible but unlikely. But further, if the Egyptian army destroyed at Eltekeh was "a relatively small advance force" then surely it is reasonable to suppose that Sennacherib would have been aware before he subdued Jerusalem that the main Egyptian force was yet to be reckoned with and would consequently have occupied Jerusalem then, if indeed he thought it important to do so? If however it is accepted that the defeat of the Egyptians at Eltekeh was nothing less than the humiliation of the Egyptian army, we can understand not only why Sennacherib would not have occupied Jerusalem but also why Hezekiah was permitted to remain on his throne. The reason for this, we suggest, is that by the time Sennacherib got round to dealing with Hezekiah the rebellion had been thoroughly suppressed and there was consequently nothing more to fear from the small city of Jerusalem. The Assyrians were content to deprive Hezekiah of his war potential - an obvious precautionary measure - and to impose heavy tribute upon him.

For these reasons therefore we find Rowley's arguments unconvincing. At the same time it is readily admitted that the two-campaign theory has its weaknesses. It requires that Hezekiah ruled until 687 B.C. and this, as Rowley points out, raises a chronological problem since Manasseh, Amon and Josiah between them ruled eighty-eight years before Jehoiakim came to power in 608 B.C. But, as Rowley himself acknowledges, there has to be an anachronism somewhere.¹² He, for example, is forced to emend the Hebrew text of 2 Kings xviii 13 to read twenty-four instead of fourteen and to eliminate the mention of Tirhakah in 2 Kings xix 9 as an anachronism.¹³ Accordingly, whilst future archaeological discoveries may clarify this matter, we believe that for the present the balance of probability lies with the two-campaign theory.

12. Rowley op.cit. p.425

13. Ibid. pp.410-411 and 425.

CHAPTER IV

THE ORIGIN OF DEUTERONOMY -- IThe Nature of Deuteronomy and its place within the traditions of Israel

The problem of the provenance and authorship of Deuteronomy is amongst the most complex in Old Testament studies. As to authorship, it has at one time or another been attributed to Moses,¹ Samuel,² levitical priests,³ the Jerusalem priesthood,⁴ or prophetic circles.⁵ Conventionally the origin of the book was associated with Jerusalem on account of the demand for centralisation. During the past generation, however, the opinion that Deuteronomy is to be associated primarily with north Israel has gained favour and is to-day advocated by the majority of scholars.⁶

1. This traditional view is still not without its supporters and has been advocated lately by M.H.Segal "The Composition of the Pentateuch: a fresh examination" in Scripta Hierosolymitana vol.viii (Jerusalem 1961) pp.68-114.

2. Cf. for example E.Robertson The Old Testament Problem (Manchester 1950).

3. Cf. F.Dornseiff "Antikes zum Alten Testament: 4. Die Abfassungszeit des Pentateuch und die Deuteronomiumsfrage" ZAW lvi (1938) pp.64-85; A.Bentzen Die josianische Reform und ihre Voraussetzungen (Copenhagen 1926); more recently G.von Rad Studies in Deuteronomy (London 1953).

4. Cf. R.H.Pfeiffer Introduction to the O.T. pp.179-180.

5. So for example K.Budde "Das Deuteronomium und die Reform König Josias" ZAW xliv (1926) pp.177-224; A.Weiser Introduction to the O.T. (London 1961) p.132.

6. The chief advocates of this view are: A.C.Welch The Code of Deuteronomy: a new theory of its origin (London 1924) and several other works; C.F.Burney The Book of Judges (London 1918) p.xlvi footnote; W.F.Albright From Stone Age to Christianity (2nd edit. O.U.P. 1946) p.241; G.A.Danell Studies in the Name Israel in the O.T. (Upsala 1946) p.53f.; A.Weiser op.cit. p.132; A.Alt "Die Heimat des Deuteronomiums" in Kleine Schriften

Our investigation into the date of the composition of Deuteronomy led us to conclude that the book in its present form is to be identified with the law book which was discovered in the Jerusalem temple in the reign of Josiah and which became the basis of a far reaching religious reformation carried out by that king. On the basis of all this it was conventionally believed that Deuteronomy was composed by circles in Judah who formulated it as a programme of reform probably during the dark days of Manasseh's reign and placed it in the temple in Jerusalem until a favourable opportunity would arise in which to promulgate it. But it has become increasingly clear during the past generation that there are strong connections between Deuteronomy and the traditions of northern Israel. We are therefore faced with several problems. Did Deuteronomy originate in northern Israel? If so, then how did it come to be in the Jerusalem temple in 621 B.C.? Or is it possible, as some have recently argued,⁷ that the book is in fact the work of Judean circles? Or again, is it possible that to account for the connections between Deuteronomy and northern Israel and its discovery and implementation in Judah we must see it as the work of a circle comprised of both northerners and southerners?

6. (cont'd.) vol.II (1953) pp.250-275; G.E.Wright "Deuteronomy" in Interpreter's Bible vol.II (1953) pp.311-330; J.Bowman "Ezekiel and the Zadokite Priesthood" in Transactions of Glasgow University Oriental Society xvi (1955-56) pp.1-14; idem "The Samaritans and the Book of Deuteronomy" Ibid. vol.xvii (1957-58) pp.9-18; F.Dumermuth "Zur deuteronomischen Kulttheologie und ihre Voraussetzungen" ZAW lxx (1958) pp.59-98; J.Bright A History of Israel pp.299-300; G.Henton Davies in Peake's Commentary (London 1962) p.269.

7. Cf. G.von Rad Studies in Deuteronomy (London 1953).

In what follows we shall be dealing with these problems and the various solutions offered to them recently. Before proceeding to a discussion of these problems, however, we must first of all survey briefly the nature of Deuteronomy and its place within the traditions of Israel.

A. The influence of the cult upon the form and contents of Deuteronomy.

The book of Deuteronomy takes the form of a sermon of Moses to the children of Israel on the eve of their entry into the promised land: "These are the words which Moses spake to all Israel on the other side of Jordan" (i 1; cf. i 5). Now this sermon assumes a definite form. There is first of all the hortatory introduction (v-xi) in which Israel is reminded of Yahweh's gracious acts on her behalf in the past together with repeated exhortations to obey his commandments and to serve him. There follows the presentation of the divine laws which are to be observed by Israel (xii-xxvi 15). An actual ceremony of covenant making seems to be presupposed by xxvi 16-19. This is followed by a setting forth of the blessings and curses which will befall Israel according as it observes or neglects the divine laws which have just been proclaimed (xxviii).

What we have here in fact is the pattern of the old ceremony of the renewal of the covenant. Deuteronomy purports to be a renewal on the plains of Moab of the covenant made between Yahweh and Israel on the sacred mountain Horeb (cf. v 2f.; ^{xxviii}~~xxiii~~ 69). In other words the situation which Israel occupies in Deuteronomy is a cultic one.

That there was in Israel a periodical festival of the renewal of the covenant is widely acknowledged to-day. Deuteronomy itself provides for such a festival (xxxi 9-13) and Joshua xxiv is based upon such a

festival (cf. verse 25). At a much later period yet the prophet Samuel officiates at such a festival at Gilgal (1 Samuel xii).⁸ It is also probable that the so-called minor-judges (Jud. x 1-5; xii 7-15) exercised a similar function at the central shrine of the amphictyony. At least they were apparently responsible for the maintenance and administration of covenant law.⁹

The reconstruction of this festival of covenant renewal has been the subject of not a little controversy.¹⁰ But an increasing number of scholars now accept that it followed a pattern somewhat as follows:

1. Parenesis and exhortation followed by a historical retrospect of God's saving acts on Israel's behalf (Heilsgeschichte theme).
2. The promulgation of the divine law (Sinai theme).
3. The making of a solemn covenant.
4. The promise of blessings or curses.

This pattern is observable in the Book of the Covenant. More important for our purposes here is the manner in which Deuteronomy in its broad outline follows this pattern:

1. Parenesis and historical retrospect: chs.v-xi.
2. The giving of the law: chs.xii-xxvi 15.
3. The binding by covenant: ch.xxvi 16-19.
4. The blessings and curses: ch.xxviii.

8. Cf. J.Muilenburg "The form and structure of the covenantal formulations" VT ix (1959) pp.347-365.

9. Cf. M.Noth "Das Amt des Richters Israels" in Festschrift für Bertholet (Tbingen 1950) pp.404-417; G.von Rad Old Testament Theology vol.I pp.32-33.

10. See additional note on this problem after this chapter.

Accordingly we may conclude that the form in which Deuteronomy is cast derives from the cult and follows the liturgical pattern of the festival of the renewal of the covenant. But there is even more striking evidence of the influence of the cult upon Deuteronomy. The repeated use of the phrase "to-day", the frequent challenge and exhortation to obey and serve Yahweh "to-day", becomes more meaningful if we see it as originating in the covenant renewal festival:¹¹

- Deut. v 2-3: "The Lord our God made a covenant with us in Horeb. The Lord made not this covenant with our fathers, but with us, even us, who are all of us here alive this day."
- Deut. viii 18: "But thou shalt remember the Lord thy God, for it is he that giveth thee power to get wealth; that he may establish his covenant which he swore unto thy fathers as at this day."
- Deut. xi 26: "Behold I set before you this day a blessing and a curse ..."
- Deut. xi 32: "And ye shall observe to do all the statutes and the judgements which I set before you this day."
- Deut. xxvi 17: "To-day thou hast acknowledged the Lord to be thy God, and that thou shouldest walk in his ways, and keep his statutes and his commandments"
- Deut. xxvii 9: "..... keep silence and hearken, O Israel! This day thou art become the people of the Lord thy God."

And this urgent appeal, this demand for a decision hinc et nunc, is characteristic of the entire book (cf. iv 40; v 1; vi 6; vii 11; viii 1; ix 3; x 15; xi 2,8,13; xiii 18; xxvi 13; xxviii 1; xxix 10f.).

11. G.von Rad "Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuchs" now in his Gesammelte Studien (Munich 1958) p.35f.

This brings us finally to a consideration of the peculiar homiletic style of Deuteronomy. This appealing and urgent sermon-like style permeates the book through and through and gives it its most characteristic stamp. The introduction in chapters v-xi is comprised of a series of exhortatory compositions which call in a general way for faithfulness and obedience to the "ordinances and the statutes which I set before you this day". What is more remarkable is the manner in which the legal section of the book, chapters xii-xxvi, is presented in the same parenetic style. The legal material in Deuteronomy is not set out in codified form, such as we find in the Book of the Covenant, but is presented in a parenetic form in which words of admonition, of exhortation, of warning and of promise are employed to drive the commandments home very personally on the conscience of the reader.¹² Such a presentation of the material in Deuteronomy displays a preaching technique which points for its origin to a cultic milieu; it was, as von Rad has put it, only after such a technique was worked out in actual practice that it became literature in Deuteronomy.¹³ In other words the very style in which Deuteronomy is written derives ultimately from the cult.

Accordingly we may conclude that the cult has exercised an extraordinary influence upon the form and contents of Deuteronomy. Whoever composed it evidently stood within the cultic traditions of the festival of the renewal of the covenant and was steeped in a preaching technique which he inherited from the cult and of which he was perhaps the best exponent.

12. Cf. G.von Rad Studies in Deuteronomy p.15ff.

13. Cf. G.von Rad Old Testament Theology p.72.

B. Deuteronomy and the traditions of early Israel.

The vexed problem of the origin of Deuteronomy has been greatly illuminated in recent years by the complete transformation which has come about in our knowledge of the life and institutions of Israel in the pre-monarchical period. In striking contrast to scholars of a previous generation who saw this period as one of natural, unrestricted, free religion,¹⁴ modern scholars for the most part see it as the first real creative period in Israel's history.

In America a school of thought, closely associated with the name of W.F.Albright,¹⁵ utilizing the vast amount of information brought to light by the archaeologist's spade, argues that the peculiar and particular evolution of the Biblical faith was made possible by a something, a mutation, which was inherent in Israel's faith from the beginning.¹⁶ It is argued that the basic elements of her faith must have been firmly established in the morning time of Israel's history -- with the towering figure of Moses and the momentous historical experiences of Exodus, Sinai and Conquest.¹⁷

More directly significant for our task here, however, is the work of a group of German scholars closely associated with the name of Albrecht Alt. For this school of thought the period of the Judges was the great formative period in Israel's history. For Alt and his disciples this was the period when the disparate traditions of the various clans

14. For the classical statement of this older theory see J.Weillhausen Prolegomena to the History of Israel (ET W.Robertson Smith, Edinburgh 1895).

15. Cf. W.F.Albright From Stone Age to Christianity (2nd edit. O.U.P.1946). Albright's views are followed by such scholars as G.E.Wright The Old Testament against its Environment (London 1950) and God who Acts (London 1952); J.Bright A History of Israel (1st Brit.edit.London 1960).

16. G.E.Wright The O.T. against its Environment p.14f. 17.Ibid.p.29

who, they believe, went to make up Israel, were welded together and given their "all Israel" orientation.¹⁸ For Alt and his students the traditions of an "all Israel" surviving from the pre-monarchical period is explicable only by the assumption of some sort of political and cultic organisation by which the disparate traditions of the clans were united and made into the national epic.

Martin Noth has done most to fill in our picture of the organisation of Israel during the period of the Judges.¹⁹ Noth points out that when we first meet Israel it is as a confederation of twelve tribes on the soil of Palestine. Now this system of twelve tribes is not the result of the artificial splitting up of a greater whole but represents a form of tribal organisation which is witnessed to amongst other people and at other times.²⁰ The Greeks called such a confederation of tribes an "amphictyony".

The bond which united the tribes was a religious one and was expressed in terms of a covenant between them and Yahweh. Primarily therefore it was a theocratic community as indicated by the very name of the confederation, "Israel", which can be translated "may God rule". The name "Israel" in fact properly designates this twelve tribe league and its later use to designate northern Israel as distinct from Judah or Judah as distinct from northern Israel is purely secondary. The focal point of the amphictyony was a central shrine where from time to time the tribes

18. For the process whereby the various traditions were welded into the national "epic" see M.Noth Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuchs (Stuttgart 1948).

19. M.Noth Das System der zwölf Stämme Israels (Stuttgart 1930); idem The History of Israel pp.85-108.

20. Noth History p.88.

would assemble to worship and to discuss matters of mutual interest.

It was at this central shrine that the festival of the renewal of the covenant of which we have already spoken must have taken place and at

which the laws governing the relationship between Yahweh and the tribes and between the members of the covenant society were laid down and

developed.²² In the event of a breach of covenant law the tribes acted

swiftly to punish the wrong-doer.²³ The tribes were also united in the face of a common enemy threatening the life of the amphictyony. There was no standing army but in military crises the clans rallied and those

men capable of carrying arms went forth to battle. It was part of the

covenant obligations that the clans should so rally for what was being

fought was Yahweh's Holy War.²⁴ Those who did not respond to the call

to arms were roundly cursed (cf. Jud. v 23; 1 Sam. xi 7). Characteristic

of the institution of the Holy War was the charismatic leadership; the

tribes were led into battle by one upon whom "the spirit of Yahweh

rushed" (Jud. iii 10; xiv 6; etc.). This notion of charismatic leadership,

of leadership by divine choice, was to play a vital part in Israel's

life right down through the centuries.

Now a glance at the contents of Deuteronomy will reveal that the book stands within the traditions of this old Israelite amphictyony of the pre-monarchical period. It was here that the festival of the renewal of the covenant which has had such a remarkable influence upon Deuteronomy

22. Cf. M.Noth History p.103; J.Bright History p.149f.

23. See M.Noth History p.104f. The sexual offence against the wife of the levite recorded in Judges xix provides a good example of such action.

24. Cf. G.von Rad Der Heilige Krieg im Alten Israel (Göttingen 1958); idem Studies in Deuteronomy p.45ff.

had its origin. It was celebrated periodically at the central shrine of the tribal league. One cannot avoid the feeling that this central shrine of the amphictyony is the prototype, so to speak, of the later Deuteronomic demand for the centralisation of worship. The central shrine of the amphictyony was, like the Deuteronomic "place which Yahweh shall choose", the focal point of Israel's life. Nevertheless it must always be borne in mind that Deuteronomy demands something much more radical by its law of the central shrine. This more extreme demand for only one place of worship for all Israel had its origin, as we have seen, in Hezekiah's days.²⁵

The covenant which Deuteronomy seeks to renew is the covenant made between Yahweh and Israel on Horeb/Sinai and is based upon God's saving acts on Israel's behalf in the events of Exodus, Wandering and Conquest. These are the sacral traditions upon which the covenant life of amphictyonic Israel was established. There is no hint in Deuteronomy of later developments such as those centering around the covenant between Yahweh and the Davidic house in Judah. Indeed the law on kingship in Deut. xvii 14-20 makes it quite clear that the author(s) of Deuteronomy regarded the institution of monarchy negatively. The "like the nations that are round about me" of verse 14 is itself polemical (cf. 1 Sam. viii 5-9, 19-20). For Deuteronomy kingship is an institution of foreign importation to be regarded theologically as Yahweh's concession to Israel's demand. In this respect this law in Deuteronomy occupies the same standpoint as the anti-monarchical narratives in 1 Samuel viii, xii 6-25 which are now widely accepted as being based on old traditions

25. See above p.84f.

rather than on later post-exilic retrospection. As monarchy is Yahweh's concession to Israel's desire, however, certain uncompromising conditions accompany it. The king must be chosen by God (15). At the basis of this demand one can discern the principle of charismatic designation to which we have already referred. Verses 16,17,20 seem to indicate that the author has had long experience with the perils of kingship. It is possible that verses 16-17 may be based upon the bitter experience of Solomon's activities whilst verse 20 could reflect the high-handed actions of an Ahab or a Manasseh.

But perhaps the strongest link between Deuteronomy and the traditions of the old tribal league of pre-monarchical Israel is to be found in the amount of material in Deuteronomy dealing with the institutions of the Holy War.²⁶ To begin with there are several laws dealing specifically with war:

Deut. xx 1-9: general laws concerning warfare;

Deut. xx 10-18,19-20: laws concerning the besieging of cities;

Deut. xxi 10-14: laws concerning female prisoners of war;

Deut. xxiii 10-14: rules concerning the camp;

Deut. xxiv 5: exemption from military service for newly-married men;

Deut. xxv 17-19: Remember Amalek!

But there are in addition to these laws several speeches in the book which are saturated with the ideology of the Holy War:

Deut. vii 16-26:

"And thou shalt destroy all the peoples that the Lord thy God will deliver unto thee; thine eye shall not pity them; neither shalt thou serve their gods If thou shalt say in thine heart: these nations are more than I; how can I dispossess them?

26. Cf. G.von Rad Studies in Deuteronomy p.45ff.

"Thou shalt not be afraid of them: thou shalt well remember what the Lord thy God did unto Pharaoh, and unto all Egypt; the great trials which thine eyes saw and the signs and the wonders and the mighty hand and the stretched out arm whereby the Lord thy God brought thee out. So shall the Lord thy God do unto all the peoples of whom thou art afraid. Moreover the Lord thy God will send a disheartening^{26a} among them until they that are left and hide themselves perish from before thee. Thou shalt not be afraid of them for the Lord thy God is in the midst of thee a great and terrible God. And the Lord thy God will cast out these nations before thee little by little But the Lord thy God shall deliver them up before thee, and shall discomfit them with a great discomfiture until they be destroyed. And he shall deliver their kings into thine hand and thou shalt make their name to perish from under the heavens: there shall no man be able to stand before thee, until thou hast destroyed them; the graven images of their gods ye shall burn with fire; thou shalt not covet the silver or the gold that is on them nor take it unto thee for it is an abomination to the Lord thy God and thou shalt not bring an abomination into thine house and become a devoted thing like unto it; thou shalt utterly detest it and thou shalt utterly abhor it for it is a devoted thing ($\square \gamma \pi$)."

Underlying this speech are the basic principles of the Holy War: do not fear the hosts of the enemy for Yahweh is with you; he will fight for you, sending his panic upon the enemy; but be careful not to take in booty anything under the sacred ban.²⁷ Other war speeches are: Deut. ix 1f.

"Hear O Israel: thou art to pass over Jordan this day to go in to possess nations greater and mightier than thyself, cities great and fenced up to heaven; a people great and tall, the sons of the Anakim whom thou knowest not and of whom thou hast heard say: who can stand

26a. On this rather than the traditional "hornet" see L.Köhler ZAW xliv (1936), p.291

27. Ibid. pp.54-55. Cf. G. von Rad op.cit pp.54-55.

"before the sons of Anak? Know therefore this day that the Lord thy God is he which goeth over before thee as a devouring flame; he shall destroy them and shall bring them down before thee: so shalt thou drive them out, and make them to perish quickly as the Lord hath spoken unto thee "

Deut. xi 23:

"..... the Lord will drive out all these nations from before you, and ye shall possess nations greater and mightier than yourselves."

Deut. xxxi 3f.:

"The Lord thy God he will go over before thee; he will destroy these nations from before thee And the Lord will do unto them as he did unto Sihon and to Og, the kings of the Amorites, and unto their land, whom he destroyed. And the Lord shall deliver them up before you and ye shall do unto them according unto all the commandment which I have commanded you "

When, however, the laws and speeches concerning war have been examined there still remains to be demonstrated the much broader basis of the ideology of the Holy War in Deuteronomy. The entire corpus is permeated through and through with this war-like atmosphere and possesses on that account a striking militant and aggressive spirit:²⁸

Deut. vi 18f.:

"And thou shalt do that which is right and good in the sight of the Lord that it may be well with thee and that thou mayest go in and possess the good land which the Lord promised to give unto thy fathers to thrust out all thine enemies from before thee, as the Lord hath spoken."

Deut. vii 1f.:

"When the Lord thy God shall bring thee into the land whither thou goest to possess it, and shall cast out many nations before thee, the Hittite, and the Girgashite, and the Amorite, and the Canaanite and the Perizzite, and the Hivite, and the Jebusite, seven nations greater and mightier than thou; and when the Lord thy God shall

"deliver them up before thee and thou shalt smite them; then thou shalt utterly destroy them; thou shalt make no covenant with them nor shew them mercy "

Deut. xii 29:

"When the Lord thy God shall cut off nations from before thee whither thou goest in to possess them, and thou possessest them and dwellest in their land "

Deut. xix 1:

"When the Lord thy God cutteth off the peoples, whose land the Lord thy God will give thee, and thou overcomest them "

Deut. xx 16f.:

"But in the cities of these peoples that the Lord thy God giveth thee for an inheritance, thou shalt save alive nothing that breatheth but thou shalt utterly destroy them: the Hittites and the Amorites, the Canaanites and the Perizzites, the Hivites and the Jebusites "

In view of all this it may be concluded that Deuteronomy is firmly rooted in the traditions of the old Yahweh amphictyony of pre-monarchical Israel. That is not to say, however, that we have in Deuteronomy any direct deposit of these old traditions. Deuteronomy is, as we have already concluded, a fairly late book and as a result the old traditions with which it works have been modified and changed to suit the needs of a more advanced age in Israel's history. Thus for example, the "Israel" to whom Deuteronomy is addressed is already so much of a unity that the older notion of individual tribes has almost entirely faded. That is to say, the "Israel" of Deuteronomy presupposes the formation of the state.²⁹ Even in the matter of the Holy War where, as

29. Cf. G.von Rad Old Testament Theology (London 1962) p.224.

we have seen, Deuteronomy has its strongest links with the old traditions there have been considerable changes and modifications. In Deuteronomy the holy wars presuppose the functioning of military officers (שָׂרִים) which came into being in Israel only after the establishment of the monarchy and the coming of a standing army.³⁰ Furthermore, Deuteronomy in contrast to the older period conceives the holy wars as offensive rather than defensive.³¹ Again, the status of the central shrine in Deuteronomy is much more radically defined than in the amphictyonic period.³² We have noted too that much of the legislation in Deuteronomy has been formulated to deal with the needs of a relatively late period in Israel's history.

If all this be granted then part of the problem of the provenance of Deuteronomy will be the question of where and by whom these old traditions were preserved and transmitted down through the centuries until their adaptation by the author of Deuteronomy. It is to this question that we must now turn.

30. Cf. G.von Rad Der Heilige Krieg in Alten Israel, p.71 note 120.

31. Ibid. pp.32,70.

32. Cf. M.Noth History p.275.

Additional Note to Chapter IVThe Festival of the Renewal of the Covenant

It is the German scholar Gerhard von Rad who has done most to attempt to reconstruct the form of this old festival.¹ For von Rad there were two main festivals in early Israel. The one centred around the Sinai covenant events and was a festival of the renewal of the covenant, whilst the other celebrated the Exodus-Conquest events.

Von Rad takes his starting point from the concise historical credos which now appear in later contexts in the Old Testament but which had their original Sitz im Leben in the cult of the Judges period.² The theme of these little credal confessions is a Heilsgeschichte -- a summary of God's great acts on Israel's behalf. Deuteronomy xxvi 5b-9 is such a creed:

"A wandering Aramaean was my father; and he went down into Egypt and sojourned there, few in number; and there he became a nation, great, mighty, and populous. And the Egyptians treated us harshly, and afflicted us, and laid upon us hard bondage. Then we cried to the Lord the God of our fathers and the Lord heard our voice, and saw our affliction, our toil, and our oppression; and the Lord brought us out of Egypt with a mighty hand and an outstretched arm, with great terror, with signs and wonders; and he brought us into this place and gave us this land, a land flowing with milk and honey."

A similar confession is to be found in Deuteronomy vi 20-24:

"When your son asks you in time to come: 'What is the meaning of the testimonies and the statutes and the ordinances which the Lord our God has commanded you?' then you shall say to your son: 'We were Pharaoh's slaves in Egypt; and the Lord brought us forth out

1. Cf. especially his Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuch now in his Gesammelte Studien (Munich 1958).

2. Ibid. p.11f.

"of Egypt with a mighty hand; and the Lord showed signs and wonders, great and terrible, against the Egyptians and against Pharaoh and all his household, before our eyes; and he brought us out from there, that he might bring us in and give us the land which he swore to our fathers. And the the Lord commanded us to do all these statutes, to fear the Lord our God, for our good always that he might preserve us alive, as at this day."

We may add to this the speech of Joshua before the assembly at Shechem,

Joshua xxiv 2b-13:

"Thus says the Lord, the God of Israel: 'Your fathers lived of old beyond the Euphrates, Terah, the father of Abraham and of Nahor; and they served other gods. Then I took your father Abraham from beyond the River and I led him through all the land of Canaan, and made his offspring many. I gave him Isaac; and to Isaac I gave Jacob and Esau. And I gave Esau the hill country of Seir to possess, but Jacob and his children went down to Egypt. And I sent Moses and Aaron, and I plagued Egypt with what I did in the midst of it; and afterwards I brought you out. Then I brought your fathers out of Egypt, and you came to the sea; and the Egyptians pursued your fathers with chariots and horsemen to the Red sea. And when they cried to the Lord, he put darkness between you and the Egyptians and made the sea come upon them and cover them; and your eyes saw what I did to Egypt; and you lived in the wilderness a long time. Then I brought you to the land of the Amorites, who lived on the other side of Jordan; they fought with you, and I gave them into your hand, and you took possession of their land, and I destroyed them before you. Then Balak the son of Zippor, king of Moab, arose and fought against Israel; and he sent and invited Balaam the son of Beor to curse you, but I would not listen to Balaam; therefore he blessed you; so I delivered you out of his hand. And you went over Jordan and came to Jericho, and the men of Jericho fought against you, and also the Amorites, the Perizzites, the Canaanites, the Hittites, the Girgashites, the

"Hivites, and the Jebusites; and I gave them into your hand.
And I sent disheartening³ before you which drove them out before
you, the two kings of the Amorites; it was not by your sword
or by your bow. I gave you a land which you had not laboured,
and cities which you had not built, and you dwell therein;
you eat the fruit of vineyards and olive yards which you did
not plant."

Although the details vary, a fixed scheme underlies all three passages --
God called Israel's fathers and promised them the land, delivered them
from Egyptian bondage by terrible acts and, after their lengthy wandering
in the wilderness during which they encountered again and again his
gracious goodness, gave them the land of promise. This credo-form appears
repeatedly in cult lyrics, in prayers, and in recitation (e.g. 1 Sam. xii 8;
Pss. lxxviii, cv, cxxxv, cxxxvi). Now the remarkable thing is that never
in these credos is there any mention of the Sinai covenant event. Von Rad
concludes from this that the two themes, the Exodus-Conquest and the Sinai,
had separate liturgical histories and were joined together only at a
relatively late date.⁴

Originally the Sinai events were the subject of a separate festival,
according to von Rad. In the Sinai pericope of Exodus xix-xxiv he disting-
uishes four parts of an ancient covenant renewal ceremony:⁵
1. Parenesis (xix 4-6) and the historical presentation of the Sinai
events (xixf.).

3. On this rather than the traditional "hornet" see L.Kohler ZAW xliv (1936).

4. Von Rad argues that the Yahwist first joined the two traditions together
(Das formgeschichtliche Problem p.60f.). M.Nothe believes that the traditions
were already united in G which he believes underlies the work of both J and
E (Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuchs p.40f.).

5. G. von Rad Das formgeschichtliche Problem p.34

2. The recitation of the Law (Decalogue and Book of the Covenant).
3. Promise of blessing (xxiii 20ff.).
4. Making of a solemn covenant (xxiv).

According to von Rad the renewal of the covenant festival had its Haftpunkt at the old tree snactuary of Shechem (cf. Deut. xxvii; Josh. viii 30f.; xxiv),⁶ whilst the Exodus-Conquest celebrations (the credo theme) were held at Gilgal in Benjamin territory.⁷

It has to be asked, however, whether von Rad's radical separation of the Sinai and Exodus-Conquest traditions is justified. In this respect a growing body of opinion now questions whether his assessment of the Sitz im Leben of the credo theme is correct.

It may be questioned at the outset whether von Rad is correct in isolating Joshua xxiv 2-13 from its sequel in 14-26. Here surely the two sets of tradition -- the salvation history in 2-13 and the challenge to the people to commit themselves to God in 14-26 -- are closely combined and supplement each other.⁸ The Heilsgeschichte is given as the prolegomena to the exhortation (verses 14-15) to serve Yahweh and this in turn is followed by the pledge to serve Yahweh (16f.) and then: "So Joshua cut a covenant with the people that day, and made statutes and ordinances for them in that day" (25). In other words we have already here a renewal of the covenant ceremony which included the credo theme as the initiating part of the ceremony. In the Sinai pericope in Exodus xix-xxiv we discover the same thing in the preamble to the Decalogue: "I am the Lord thy God who brought thee out of the land of Egypt" (Exod. xx 2).⁹

6. Ibid. p.41.

7. Ibid. p.48.

8. Cf. A.Weiser Introduction to the Old Testament p.87f.

9. Cf. J.Bright Early Israel in Recent History Writing (London 1956) p.105f.

This brings us to an examination of a second line of research which has been carried out in America and which concerns covenant formulations in the ancient near east. As we shall see, this line of investigation substantiates what we have just said in criticism of von Rad's separation of the Sinai theme from the Exodus-Conquest traditions.¹⁰ It has also shed considerable light on the renewal of the covenant festival in which we are particularly interested.

G.E.Mendenhall has established that there are striking similarities in form between certain international treaties of Western Asia during the 2nd millenium and the covenant forms in the Old Testament.¹¹ He classifies these treaties into two types: the parity treaty made between equals and the suzerainty treaty between a great king and a vassal. It is with the latter that we are concerned. According to Mendenhall there are six basic elements in these suzerainty treaties.

1. The treaty begins with the identification of the Great King who is offering the treaty: "Thus saith AB, the Great King" This is clearly closely paralleled in early covenant passages in the Old Testament in which God addresses the people: "I am the Lord" (e.g. Exod. xx 1-2) and "Thus saith the Lord, the God of Israel" (Josh. xxiv 2). It should be noted too that the suzerain was no mere king but is characterised by such titles as "the Great King", the "King of kings" and "Lord of lords". This too is paralleled by such early Biblical phrases as "Lord of lords" for Yahweh.

10. G.E.Mendenhall "Ancient Oriental and Biblical Law" BA xvii (1954) pp. 26-46 and more especially "Covenant Forms in Israelite Tradition" BA xvii (1954) pp.50-76. For an excellent summary see G.E.Wright Biblical Archaeology (London 1957) p.98ff.

11. Cf. Mendenhall "Covenant Forms in Israelite Tradition" p.61ff.

2. There follows a historical retrospect which lays particular emphasis on the past deeds of kindness wrought by the suzerain on behalf of his vassals. This was no doubt aimed at invoking the vassal's gratitude and affection so that he will accept the ensuing treaty obligations. This is clearly paralleled in the Old Testament where preceding the giving of the Law there is a historical sketch of what God has done for his people. It may be a short summary statement such as we find in the preamble to the Decalogue in Exodus xx 2: "I am the Lord thy God who brought thee forth from the land of Egypt, from the house of bondage". Or it may be a somewhat more detailed account of God's gracious deeds on behalf of Israel. Such an account is found in Joshua xxiv 2-13.

3. The first two sections are the prolegomena to the central section, the presentation of the laws laid down by the suzerain. Typical of the Hittite suzerain treaties is the law forbidding the vassal from entering into relationship with any foreign powers. This too is strikingly reminiscent of the first of the Ten Commandments (Exodus xx 3) and of the demand made by Joshua at Shechem: "Put away the gods which your fathers served beyond the River and in Egypt, and serve the Lord" (Josh. xxiv 14).

4. The treaties stipulated that the document should be publicly read now and again (the time was not always specified). A similar stipulation is found in several places in the Old Testament. In Deuteronomy x 5 we read that the tables of stone upon which the commandments were inscribed were placed in the Ark of the Covenant which was almost certainly a portable sanctuary (cf. also Exod. xx 20). Similarly, in Deuteronomy xxxi 9-13 Moses is said to have written "this law" and to have given it to the priests in

charge of the Ark with instructions that it should be read "at the end of every seven years when all Israel is come to appear before the Lord thy God".

5. A fifth characteristic of these suzerainty treaties was the invocation of the deities of the vassals concerned as witnesses to the treaty. They usually ended by specifying the mountains and the rivers, the heaven and the earth, the winds and the clouds as witnesses "to this treaty and this oath". In Israel the covenant was between Yahweh and Israel and needless to say no "gods" are invoked as witnesses. Nevertheless it is interesting to note that now and again the prophets in inveighing against Israel's violation of the covenant call upon the heavens and the earth as God's witnesses (cf. Isai. i 2; Hos. ii 21-22; Mic. vi 2). In Joshua xxiv 22 Joshua says: "Ye are witnesses against yourselves that ye have chosen you the Lord, to serve him".

6. Finally, the treaty concludes with a series of blessings and curses which will befall those who keep or violate the treaty. In the Old Testament the Book of the Covenant, the Holiness Code and the Deuteronomic law code all conclude with such promises of blessings or curses (Exod. xxiii 20-33; Levit. xxvi; Deut. xxvii, xxviii).

The point which must be stressed here is that in this treaty form the historical retrospect -- the Old Testament credo theme -- is an integral part of the covenant ceremony. The point is that von Rad's cultic credo has its original Sitz im Leben precisely within the renewal of the covenant festival from which he attempts to dissociate it altogether. This means that the Exodus-Conquest and Sinai themes could not have been separate originally. The present separation of the two themes in cult

lyric etc. cannot therefore be explained in the manner suggested by von Rad. It has recently been suggested that after the formation of the Davidic state the Sinai covenant tradition fell into the background, being virtually replaced by the Davidic covenant, and that this brought about a "great dislocation" of the Sinai and Exodus themes.¹² Alternatively, the explanation of their present separation may be due, as Weiser has long advocated, to the fact that although they were both integral parts of the one festival they were separate parts of it.¹³ But whatever the explanation be, the two themes must, in the light of the evidence presented above, be seen as component parts of the one festival; liturgically they belonged together.

12. Cf. G.E.Wright "Cult and History" Interpretation xvi (Jan. 1962) pp.3-20.

13. A.Weiser Introduction to the Old Testament p.85ff.

CHAPTER V

THE ORIGIN OF DEUTERONOMY - IIThe Case for the North Israelite Provenance of Deuteronomy

In recent years an increasing number of scholars have accepted and supported the theory that Deuteronomy derives either directly or ultimately from northern Israel where, it is argued, the old amphictyonic traditions upon which it is based were preserved and transmitted down through the centuries.¹ The conventional theory that Deuteronomy with its centralisation demand was drawn up in the interests of Jerusalem and therefore probably by a pro-Jerusalem circle if not the Jerusalem priesthood itself has been almost totally rejected. The most extreme presentation of the theory of the northern origin of Deuteronomy comes from A.Alt who sees in it a restoration programme drawn up in northern Israel sometime after the catastrophe of 721 B.C.² For Alt Judæan circles had nothing whatsoever to do with it; how it got into the Temple in Jerusalem is a mystery which we shall never solve.³ Others take a less radical position in the matter. A.Weiser, for example, agrees with Alt that Deuteronomy is a restoration programme drawn up in the north but suggests that circles of Judæan cultic prophets cherished and preserved it after the destruction of the northern kingdom.⁴ Others, like J.Bright, whilst agreeing that the traditions in Deuteronomy are northern, argue that they were brought south sometime after 721 B.C. and there reformulated and made into a programme of reform.⁵

1. See above p.97 footnote 6.

2. A.Alt "Die Heimat des Deuteronomiums" KS II (1953) pp.250-275.

3. Ibid. p.275

4. A.Weiser Introduction to the O.T. (London 1961) p.132.

5. J.Bright A History of Israel pp.299-300.

Recently however G.von Rad has presented the view that Deuteronomy owes its origin to a circle of Levites who lived in the countryside of Judah and who formulated Deuteronomy as a programme of national political and religious revival during the 7th century B.C.⁶

In this chapter a brief survey of the arguments adduced recently in favour of the northern provenance of Deuteronomy is offered together with some observations on this theory. In the next and final chapter we shall examine the case for the Judaeian origin of the book.

The currently accepted theory of the provenance of Deuteronomy has its beginnings in the work of A.C.Welch in the 1920's.⁷ In a series of publications on the matter Welch broke radically with the dominant theory of that period concerning the problem of Deuteronomy. In the first place he argued that the book was composed in the 10th century and not in the 7th.⁸ In the second place he contended that except for the law formulated in ch. xii 1-7, regarded by him as secondary, the original book nowhere commands the centralisation of public worship.⁹ And thirdly he argued that the book originated in northern Israel.¹⁰

Of these three points neither of the first two has carried conviction. The majority of scholars still accept a 7th century date for the composition

6. G.von Rad Studies in Deuteronomy (London 1953).

7. See the works cited above on p.71 footnote 9.

8. Cf. A.C.Welch The Code of Deuteronomy: a new theory of its origin p.206ff.

9. Ibid. p.46f.

10. Ibid. pp.38f.; 74f.; 113.; 128f.

of the book whilst at the same time acknowledging that it contains a great deal of material derived from a much earlier period. The argument that the law code does not demand centralisation of public worship has been almost totally rejected.¹¹ Welch's third suggestion, however, viz. that the book of Deuteronomy originated in northern Israel, has been widely supported in recent years.

Welch saw evidence of the northern origin of the book at several points. Like other scholars before and after him, he emphasised the connections between Deuteronomy and Hosea but argued at the same time that the former influenced the latter and not, as conventionally held, the latter the former.¹² He believed too that the kingship law in Deuteronomy xvii 14f. is northern in its attitude towards the monarchy and again found resemblances between it and Hosea's attitude.¹³ Again like other scholars he points to the resemblances between Deuteronomy and the Elohist document in the Pentateuch.¹⁴ He contended also that the Passover law in Deuteronomy xvi 1-8 belongs to the same (northern) stream of traditions from which the later Samaritan practice sprang.¹⁵ Finally Welch suggested that the law of the tithe which occurs frequently in Deuteronomy (xii 6,11,17; xiv 22,23,28; xxvi 12) may have originated at the sanctuary of Bethel.¹⁶

11. See above pp.72-75.

12. Cf. A.C.Welch The Code of Deuteronomy p.32f.; cf. A.Alt op.cit. p.266f.

13. Cf. Welch The Code of Deuteronomy p.117ff.; Alt op.cit. p.271f.

14. Cf. Welch The Code of Deuteronomy p.113f.

15. Ibid. p.74f. Cf. A.C. Welch "On the method of celebrating Passover" ZAW xlv (1927) pp.24-29; J.Bowman "The Samaritans and the Book of Deuteronomy" Transactions of Glasgow University Oriental Society XVII (1957-58) pp.9-18.

16. Cf. Welch The Code of Deuteronomy p.38f.

The arguments adduced more recently for the northern origin of Deuteronomy are in part the same as those advanced by Welch and in part quite different. The differences are due for the most part to the new understanding which has come about concerning the broad traditional basis upon which Deuteronomy stands - the traditions of the old Yahweh amphictyony - as well as the new insights into the important role played by the cult in the formation of the literature of the Old Testament.¹⁷ We have already observed the influence of the old festival of the renewal of the covenant upon both the form and contents of Deuteronomy and it is here that we may begin our survey of the modern view of the origin of Deuteronomy.

During the period of the Judges the real home of the traditions seems to have been the central shrine of the confederation of tribes where, we may presume, the great festival of the renewal of the covenant was celebrated. In the earliest period this seems to have been at Shechem.¹⁸ The Deuteronomic literature associates the first great festival of the renewal of the covenant with Shechem (Josh. xxiv). It is probable that the central shrine was located for a time also at Bethel¹⁹ and Gilgal²⁰ so that the old traditions would have also attached themselves to these sanctuaries.

But for most of the period of the amphictyony the central shrine was located at Shiloh and it was there when the confederation broke up under

17. See additional note on this at the end of this chapter.

18. Cf. M. Noth The History of Israel p.91f. This has been challenged by Bright A History of Israel p.147.

19. Cf. Noth History p.94. Again this is challenged by Bright op.cit. p.147.

20. Cf. Noth History pp.94-95; Bright History p.147.

the pressure of the Philistines (I Sam. iv-v). And in the case of Shiloh we have some evidence that there was here also a festival of the renewal of the covenant held annually in the autumn. We read that Elkanah the father of Samuel went up to Shiloh annually "to worship and to sacrifice unto the Lord of hosts" (I Sam. i 3).²¹ Samuel's close connections with Shiloh also point in this direction since, as we shall see, he represented strongly the amphictyonic traditions.

It may be concluded therefore that for the period of the Judges the traditions had their home in the central shrine of the amphictyony where the tribes gathered periodically to renew the covenant with Yahweh their God. It is also probable that even after the Ark had been moved to Shiloh, thus constituting it as the central shrine, the traditions associated with it were still nurtured and preserved at the previous central shrines of Shechem, Bethel and Gilgal.²²

But the question immediately arises as to where the traditions were preserved after the destruction of the amphictyony. Shiloh was destroyed about 1050 B.C. and seems to have fallen into the background altogether (cf. I Sam. iv; Jerem. vii 12,14, xxvi 6,9). Samuel seems to have moved away from it and although there may have been an attempt later to re-establish it by Ahijah²³ it seems to have ceased to have any real significance for Israel. On the other hand Gilgal seems to have continued as a centre (I Sam. vii 16, x 8, xi 14,15, xv 21) and figures prominently in the activities of Samuel.

21. Cf. M.Noth History p.97f.; W.McKane I & II Samuel (S.C.M. London 1963) p.35.

22. Cf. M.Noth History p.92.

23. For this interesting suggestion see J.Bright History p.218.

Gilgal indeed was probably the scene of a covenant ceremony which marked the end of the old order and the beginning of the new (1 Sam. xi 14-xii).²⁴

Bethel too seems to have been of significance (1 Sam. vii 16, x 3). Both Gilgal and Bethel were included in Samuel's judicial itinerancy and we may presume that at these important shrines he administered covenant law after the analogy of the older so-called "minor judges" (Judges x 1-5, xii 7-15) in whose succession he evidently stood.²⁵ As for Shechem archaeological researches have revealed that the temple of "ba'al berith" was destroyed in the early 11th century.²⁶ In spite of this, however, it evidently retained some importance even as late as the time of the disruption (1 Kings xii) although thereafter it is little mentioned.

It is quite possible therefore that in spite of the destruction of the amphictyony the old traditions were kept alive at these old tribal centres. But before long both Bethel and Gilgal are the object of prophetic wrath. Amos ridicules both Bethel and Gilgal in language which makes it clear that the old pure Yahwism had ceased to exist at them (Amos iv 4-5; v 4f.). According to the testimony of Amos there is no longer any religious value in going on pilgrimages to such shrines. And Hosea endorses this. He too condemns the pilgrimages to Gilgal and Bethel (Bethaven!) (Hosea iv 15). As for Shechem, according to Hosea a pilgrim to this shrine ran the risk of being robbed by priests before he even arrived there (Hos. vi 9)!

If then these old shrines ceased to be the bearers of the old

24. Cf. the interesting article on this by J. Muilenburg "The form and structure of the covenantal formulations" VT ix (1959) p.347-365.

25. Cf. W. McKane op.cit. p.63f.; J. Bright History p.166.

26. For recent excavations at Shechem see BA vol. xxiii (1960) no.4 and vol. xxvi (1963) no.1.

amphictyonic traditions where or to whom are we to look for the preservers of these traditions? This at once faces us with the familiar problem of continuity.²⁷

The evidence suggests that it is above all to the prophetic party that we are to look for the preservers of the old traditions. After the destruction of the amphictyony it was to the figure of Samuel and the associated prophetic guilds that the old traditions owed their survival. From the beginning of his life Samuel had been closely associated with the amphictyonic shrine of Shiloh and, as we have seen, he probably stood in the succession of the amphictyonic judges. We may be sure that he was steeped in the old traditions and strove to keep them alive during the dark days of the Philistine oppression when amphictyonic life had broken down and the faith was struggling for its survival. Samuel's loyalty to the old traditions is perhaps best seen in his clash with the new monarchical order as represented by Saul. It is very probable that Samuel was suspicious of the new order right from the beginning. It is being increasingly recognised that the narrative in 1 Samuel viii, x 17f., xii which records Samuel as having been unfavourable to the institution of monarchy is not a later "retrojection" but quite possibly reflects the reaction of the representatives of the older order to an institution which they regarded as foreign and as constituting a definite threat to the old traditions and practices.²⁸ Samuel

27. On this see most recently N.W.Porteous "The Prophets and the Problem of Continuity" in Israel's Prophetic Heritage (ed. B.W.Anderson and W.Harrelson, London 1962. Muilenberg Festschrift) pp.11-25.

28. Cf. J.Bright History p.167; W.McKane op.cit. p.67f.; J.Pedersen Israel: Its Life and Culture III-IV (1940) p.99.

himself was quick to condemn any attempt of the new order to violate any of the old amphictyonic traditions or laws. Thus for example in 1 Samuel xiii 4b-15 Samuel accuses Saul of attempting to usurp the functions of the amphictyonic priesthood and in chapter xv Saul is condemned for having violated the Holy War laws of $\square \gamma \Pi$. If it was prophetic designation that made Saul king it was also prophetic opposition that led to his rejection.

This concern of the prophetic circles for the old traditions continued down through the centuries. Northern Israel seems to have been the scene of their most vigorous activity. There were probably several reasons for this. The challenge of the Canaanite religion was stronger in the north where the nature of the country lent itself to the agricultural pursuits with which much of the Canaanite religion was associated. The south, by contrast, was for the most part more suited to the ancestral shepherd life and was less exposed to the danger of syncretism. Furthermore the north was altogether more cosmopolitan than the south. The main concentration of population was in the north and the country was, unlike Judah, more open to both the religious and the cultural influence of foreign peoples, particularly Phoenicia and Syria. It must be remembered too that the old amphictyony had had its focal points in northern shrines (Shechem, Gilgal, Bethel, Shiloh); it was not, as we shall see, until the time of David that Judah began to play a prominent role. To what extent the old traditions were kept alive in the south will be considered later.²⁹

The tenacity of the old traditions in the north is perhaps best

29. We shall be dealing with this in the next chapter.

seen in the clash between the prophetic circles there and the monarchy. We have already noted Samuel's resentment of Saul's violation of amphictyonic traditions and practices. Samuel's successors continued to keep a watchful eye on the activities of the monarchy.

The disruption can be explained as being for the most part the reaction of those loyal to the old traditions to Solomon's oppressive measures and the state's encroachments upon the ancient prerogatives of tribal life. It is significant that it was a prophet, Ahijah, who led the revolt and designated Jeroboam as king of the breakaway tribes (1 Kings xi 29f.). It is probable too that Ahijah and his followers resented the state's appropriation of the amphictyonic shrine and its consequent control over it.³⁰ This resentment of the state's annexation of the central shrine was undoubtedly augmented by the pagan influence brought to Jerusalem by Solomon's marriage-alliances with foreign powers (1 Kings xi 1ff.). We must also see in Ahijah's designation of Jeroboam as king the refusal of the representatives of the old order to accept the principle of dynastic succession and their belief in the charismatic leadership so characteristic of the amphictyonic period.

The tenacity of this charismatic tradition is further evidenced by the fact that the north never succeeded in maintaining a stable dynasty. Jeroboam I himself raised to the throne by a prophet was rejected by that same prophet (1 Kings xiv 7f.). Similarly Baasha who exterminated the house of Jeroboam (1 Kings xv 27f.) was also apparently raised to power by prophetic designation and rejected by the prophets (1 Kings xvi 1-7).

30. Cf. J. Bright History p.211. Bright makes the interesting suggestion that Ahijah from Shiloh may have desired a restoration of the amphictyonic cult at that place (op.cit. p.218).

The prophets too were responsible for the revolution which raised Jehu to the throne (2 Kings ix 1-10) and brought the house of Omri to its long-remembered bloody end (2 Kings ix 30-x 11; cf. Hosea i 4). During the reign of Ahab the conflict between the old order and the new order reached its bitterest stage. The marriage of Ahab to Jezebel which sealed the alliance between Israel and Tyre brought with it a twofold challenge. On the one hand Jezebel brought with her her native religion, the worship of Ba'al Melqart and Asherah, and before long attempted to constitute it as the official religion of Israel. The prophets of Ba'al enjoyed official status (1 Kings xviii 19) and the court and ruling classes evidently supported Jezebel (1 Kings xxi 8ff.). On the national level there seems to have been widespread apostasy (1 Kings xix 10) and the majority of the people seem to have been strongly attracted by the pagan cults (1 Kings xviii 21). Persecution of those loyal to Yahwism ensued and the prophets of Yahweh, evidently the back-bone of the resistance, became the special object of Jezebel's wrath (1 Kings xviii 4). It is quite probable that under the pressure of the persecution many prophets hitherto loyal to Yahwism yielded and henceforth were willing to compromise with paganism. From this time forward the danger of false prophets must have been greatly increased (cf. 1 Kings xxii; Hos. ix 8; Amos vii 14; Micah iii 5-6; Isai. ix 14; Zeph. iii 4) and it is possible that the laws in Deuteronomy dealing with the dangers of false prophets (xii 1-6; xviii 20-22) had their origin at this time.

Besides this challenge on the religious level there was also at this time an alarming growth of social injustice. Jezebel had evidently no

difficulty in having the stubborn Naboth removed (1 Kings xxi 7f.). And there must have been many more incidents of this nature. There is evidence of the exploitation of the poor by the richer elements in the community: the former were compelled in hard times to borrow from the latter at outrageous interest charges which forced them to pledge their land and even their own persons as security (2 Kings iv 1). The whole structure of Israelite society was threatened by this harsh system. It has been plausibly suggested that the practices denounced a century later by Amos (Amos ii 6-8, iii 10, iv 1, v 11) had their beginnings at this time.³¹ Under the house of Omri there were many in Israel for whom covenant law mattered little.

But these were the days of Elijah and Elisha who together with the vigorous prophetic guilds with whom they co-operated declared Holy War upon the Omrides and were instrumental in bringing about their violent downfall. Elijah on Mount Carmel championed the cause of Yahwism against the worship of the Tyrian Ba'al (1 Kings xviii 17-40) and took up the sword against Jezebel's prophets. He it was too who faced Ahab and Jezebel and roundly cursed them for their treachery with Naboth (1 Kings xxi 17-24) and it is hinted that he may have conspired with Hazael of Damascus to overthrow Ahab (1 Kings xix 15-17).³² Elijah's struggle with the Omrides was carried forward by his disciple Elisha in whose days Elijah's dreadful curse upon Ahab and Jezebel was violently realised (2 Kings ix 30-x 11).

We observed in the previous chapter how prominent a role the

31. Cf. J. Bright History p.225.

32. For this suggestion see J. Bright History p.227. For a different view see M. Noth History p.229 who with others argues that this was connected only secondarily with Elijah.

ideology of the Holy War plays in Deuteronomy. The grand period of the Holy War was the period of the Judges and we have already noted how the notion of charismatic leadership so characteristic of this institution asserted itself down through the centuries. But the ideology of the Holy War itself was also preserved and transmitted by the prophetic groups of whom we have been speaking.

We have noted already how Saul incurred Samuel's wrath for failing to carry out the sacred ban on the Amalekites (1 Sam. xiii 4-15). Almost two centuries later Ahab is charged for similarly failing to destroy Ben Hadad (1 Kings xx 35f.). In Ahab's case the rebuke came from one of the

בְּנֵי-יִשְׂרָאֵל of whom we hear so much at that time. These groups of ecstatic prophets first make their appearance in Samuel's time; what their history was before that period we cannot tell. It is significant that they make their appearance at the height of the Philistine threat. Intensely patriotic they seem to have been most active in times of military crises when the nation was threatened by a foreign power and Yahweh's Holy War had to be fought. They appear often in the battle field beside the armies of Israel advising the king and demanding that the wars be carried out according to the principles of the Holy War (cf. 1 Kings xx 13-14, 22, 28, 35f.; 2 Kings iii 11f.; xiii 15f.). It is not without significance that Elijah and Elisha are referred to as "the chariots of Israel and its horsemen" (2 Kings ii 12; xiii 14.).

If we summarise our discussion so far then the case for the northern provenance of Deuteronomy is seen in the close relationship between it and

the teaching of the prophetic party in north Israel. They both stand upon the traditions of the old Yahweh amphictyony - their concern for the observance of covenant law, their adherence to the ideology of the Holy War, their belief in charismatic leadership and their constant criticism of the monarchy. The attitude of Deuteronomy towards the monarchy has been taken by many as being one of the strongest arguments in favour of the northern origin of the book. It is argued that the law of the king in Deuteronomy xvii 14f. reflects the antagonistic attitude of the northern prophets of whom we have been speaking towards the monarchy.³³ It is argued that such an attitude did not exist in Judah where monarchy seems to have met with signal success.

Further evidence of the northern origin of Deuteronomy is adduced from the close relationship between it and the Elohist strata in the Pentateuch. This relationship is apparent in phraseology and substance:

(1) "the Lord the God of thy (our/your/their) fathers": Deut. i 11,21; iv 1; vi 3; xii 1; xxvi 7; xxvii 3; xxix 25. Cf. Exod.iii 15-16; iv 5.

(2) "to go after (or to serve) other gods": Deut. vi 14; vii 4; viii 19; xi 28; xii 20; xiii 2,6; xvii 3; xxviii 14; xxix 18,26; xxxi 16. Cf. Exod. xx 3; xxiii 13,24,32; xxxiv 15,16; Num. xxv 2 (JE); cf. Hos. iii 1. It has been suggested that this polemic against worshipping other gods belongs particularly to a stream of literature stemming from northern Israel.³⁴

(3) "to hearken (or to obey) the voice of the Lord": Deut. xiii 18; xv 5; xxvi 14,17; xxx 10; xiii 4. Cf. Exod. xv 26; xix 5; xxiii 21-22; Num. xiv

33. Cf. A.Alt "Die Heimat des Deuteronomiums" KS vol.II (1953) p.250ff.; G.E.Wright Interpreter's Bible p.325,441.

34. Cf. G.E.Wright Interpreter's Bible vol.II p.318.

(all probably E passages).³⁵

(4) Both Deuteronomy and E refer to the mountain of God as Horeb: Deut. i 2,6,19; iv 10,15; v 2; ix 8; xviii 16; xxviii 69 (EVV xxix 1). Cf. Exod. iii 1; xvii 6; xxxiii 6.

(5) They both refer to the inhabitants of the hill country of Canaan as the "Amorites": Deut. i 4,7,etc.; ii 24; vii 1,etc.; xx 17. Cf. Exod. iii 8,17; xiii 5; xxxiv 11; Num. xiii 29; xxi.

(6) "to do that which is right in the sight of the Lord": Deut. vi 18; xii 28,etc. Cf. Exod. xv 26.

(7) The command to destroy pagan objects of worship: Deut. xii. Cf. Exod. xxiii 24,32-33.

(8) It is only in E and D that the word $\pi\gamma\gamma$ ("depression") occurs:³⁶ Deut. vii 20; Josh. xxiv 12. Cf. Exod. xxiii 28.

(9) Both E and D use the word "prove" or "tempt" with God as both subject and object: Deut. vi 16; viii 2,16; xiii 3. Cf. Gen. xxii 1; Exod. xv 25; xvii 7; Num. xiv 22.

(10) Both Deuteronomy and E offer the same explanation of why God will not drive out completely the enemies from the land: Deut. vii 22; Exod. xxiii 29-30.

(11) There are close similarities between the law concerning the release of the Hebrew slave in Deuteronomy xv 12f. and the corresponding law in Exodus xxi 2f. The same is true also of Deuteronomy xxiv 10-13 and Exodus xxii 25-27 (pledges) whilst it has been suggested that the regulations about the

35. Ibid. p.318.

36. See above p. 108 note 26a.

cities of refuge in Deuteronomy xix 1-13 may be an expansion and modernisation of the older and shorter legislation in Exodus xxi 22f.³⁷

Beside these relationships in phraseology and substance between the E document and Deuteronomy there is a common spirit pervading them both. This is particularly observable in their common desperate concern about the dangers of apostasy and idolatry. In this respect they both reflect the battle between Yahwism and the religion of Canaan which was carried out chiefly in the north. We have noted already³⁸ how Deuteronomy takes some of the laws of the Book of the Covenant and brings them up to date and into line with the requirements of a later generation. On the basis of this it has been suggested that Deuteronomy was in fact conceived^{of} as a sort of substitute for the Book of the Covenant.³⁹

It has long been recognised that there are close relationships between Deuteronomy and the teaching of the northern prophet Hosea. Indeed it has been said that the author of Deuteronomy was the spiritual heir of that great prophet.⁴⁰ Hosea, like Deuteronomy, stood upon the traditions of the old Yahweh^h amphictyony. He calls to remembrance Yahweh's saving acts on Israel's behalf in the past (xi 1ff.) and inveighs against an Israel that has been unfaithful to the covenant obligations (iv 1f.; v 3f.; vi 7f.; etc.). Like his prophetic predecessors of whom we have already spoken Hosea waged war against the Canaanite religions and the apostasy which was rife in his days (iv 12f.; viii 5f.) and the widespread violation of covenant law

37. Cf. A.Weiser Introduction to the O.T. p.131.

38. See above pp.67-70.

39. So O.Eissfeldt Einleitung in das A.T. p.251ff.

40. Cf. S.R.Driver Deuteronomy p.xxviii.

(iv 1ff.; vi 7f.). His attitude towards the monarchy (viii 4) also coincides with the negative point of view of Deuteronomy (xvii 14f.).⁴¹ But it is in the fundamental principle of both books, viz. Yahweh's election love for Israel and the obligations which this places upon Israel, that Hosea and Deuteronomy stand closest together.⁴² For both of them Israel's election was the free, unmerited and gracious act of Yahweh. "When Israel was a child, I loved him" says Hosea on Yahweh's behalf (xi 1f.). And for Deuteronomy Yahweh chose Israel simply and solely because He loved her and not because she merited it morally or otherwise (vii 7-8; x 15; xxiii 5). Yahweh's election love for Israel demanded a response from Israel in terms of love and obedience; Israel was to love Him because He first loved her. Thus it is that right at the beginning of Deuteronomy are the words: "thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy might" (Deut. vi 5; cf. x 12,18,19; xi 1,13,22; xix 9; etc.). And it was because Israel had not loved Yahweh but had been unfaithful to him (Hos. i 2; ii 1f.; vii 13; etc.) that Hosea saw that she was doomed.

This then is the case for the northern origin of Deuteronomy. This survey suggests that the old traditions underlying Deuteronomy were preserved and transmitted down through the centuries by prophetic circles in northern Israel. But when all this has been said we are still left with two crucial questions:

1. If Deuteronomy originated in northern Israel then how did it come to be in the Jerusalem temple in 621 BC. ?

41. Cf. A. Alt op.cit. p.266f.

42. Ibid. p.271f.

2. How too did it become the basis of a sweeping religious reformation carried out by a Judaeen king and supported by the Jerusalem priesthood ?

These are questions which demand an answer if the problem of Deuteronomy is to be satisfactorily dealt with. What both of them really amount to is this: is it possible that although Deuteronomy has strong connections with the traditions of northern Israel it may also have been strongly influenced by Judaeen traditions ? Is it possible that both north and south contributed to the authorship of Deuteronomy ?

The answer given to this question by A. Alt is a firm No.⁴³ Alt argued that the book of Deuteronomy was the reformation programme of a revival movement in northern Israel following the fall of Samaria in 721 B.C.⁴⁴ According to Alt the authors of this revival movement in the northern provinces may have had the whole of the former kingdom of Israel in mind or just that part of it which was still inhabited by Israelites, or perhaps one of the Assyrian provinces. If this last suggestion is correct then, continues Alt, the province may have been Samaria. This, he suggests, would fit in well with Deuteronomy's noticeable interest in Shechem and Alt argues that "the place" in the mind of those who formulated the centralisation law may have been Shechem itself.⁴⁵

There are, however, some serious weaknesses in Alt's theory. First of all he draws attention to the rather narrow estimation of the institution of monarchy in Deuteronomy.⁴⁶ Arguing that such a view of monarchy could

43. A. Alt "Die Heimat des Deuteronomiums" KS vol. II (1953) pp.250-275.

44. Ibid. p.273f.

45. Ibid. p.274 and footnote on the same page.

46. Ibid. pp.263-268.

hardly be Judaeen where ideas of sacral kingship were held, Alt sees in them a specifically northern attitude. As he sees it, the Deuteronomist whilst disapproving of the monarchy was nevertheless forced to tolerate it but with severe reservations.⁴⁷ But it is just here that Alt raises a difficulty in his own thesis. If, as he argues, Deuteronomy is the product of a revival movement in the north after the fall of the northern kingdom then what possible need could there have been for the authors of such a movement to consider the monarchy at all? With the destruction of the state had come the destruction of the monarchy. Why then did not the authors of Deuteronomy, if they were northerners writing after 721 B.C., simply condemn outright the monarchy as one of those factors which had led to the catastrophe and make no allowances for it at all in their reform and revival programme? One cannot avoid the feeling that when the author of Deuteronomy formulated the laws concerning the monarchy he was dealing with an existing institution which, whatever his own wishes, had to be reckoned with as a part of the life of the people among whom he lived.

Another serious weakness in Alt's thesis is his failure to deal with the question of how this alleged northern reform programme came to be in Jerusalem. If, as Alt holds, Deuteronomy was drawn up as a reformation programme in and exclusively for the north then why did the Israelites up there not adopt and support it? According to Alt there was a strong enough Israelite population to do so!⁴⁸

A more positive criticism of Alt's suggestions is the fact that according to our sources any revival movements amongst Israelites during

47. Ibid. p.264.

48. Ibid. p.273.

the century between the fall of the northern kingdom and Josiah's reign came from Judah. It was Hezekiah and then Josiah who attempted to reform and revive. What is more, it seems that the northerners did nothing but attempt to thwart their efforts!

F.Dumermuth has at least avoided some of the difficulties into which Alt ran by dating the composition of Deuteronomy and the revival movement which produced it before the fall of Samaria.⁴⁹ He argues that the central shrine intended by Deuteronomy was Bethel. But Dumermuth too has failed to explain how Deuteronomy turned up in Jerusalem. He argues in fact that even after the fall of the northern kingdom the Deuteronomic programme was carried out at Bethel.⁵⁰

A more satisfactory answer to this problem has been offered by those scholars who suggest that the northern traditions underlying Deuteronomy were brought south to Judah after the destruction of the northern kingdom in 721 BC. and there reformulated into a programme of reform.⁵¹

But even this suggestion does not go far enough. The second question which we posed above still remains to be answered, viz. if Deuteronomy is entirely a product of north Israelite circles and if it stands upon northern traditions then how did it become the basis of a far-reaching reformation in Jerusalem and Judah? Had not the Judaeans their own traditions upon which to base reformations?

We have already concluded that the centralisation of worship

49. F.Dumermuth "Zur deuteronomischen Kulttheologie und ihre Voraussetzungen" ZAW lxx (1958) pp.59-98.

50. Ibid. p.96f.

51. Cf. for example J.Bright History p.299f.; A.Weiser Introduction p.132.

demand by Deuteronomy is best understood in terms of Jerusalem where such a demand was first formulated during Hezekiah's reign. We have also seen that the south was the scene of a revival movement after the fall of the northern kingdom in 721 B.C. These and other considerations to which we shall turn in our next chapter strongly suggest that Deuteronomy has more definite connections with Judah than most modern scholars are willing to allow. Is it possible that the basic traditions underlying Deuteronomy were common to a greater or lesser degree to both north and south ? Did the old traditions of the Yahweh amphictyony completely die out in Judah under the impact of the royal theology of the Davidic house with its peculiar traditions ? Is it possible that Deuteronomy was the work of a group comprising both northern and southern circles ? It is to these questions that we must now turn.

Additional Note to Chapter VThe early Israelite cult and the formation of the traditions of the Hexateuch

During the past generation Old Testament scholarship has laid increasing emphasis upon the cult as a major force in both shaping and preserving the traditions of Israel. The results of this approach have been very rewarding. To-day, however, one senses a feeling among Old Testament scholars, at least outside Germany, that this line of research has been and is being overworked.¹ It is with the question of to what extent Israel's national epic was the product of the cultus that this short note is concerned.²

We have already noted the emphasis laid by Martin Noth on the cult at the central shrine of the Israelite amphictyony in welding together the disparate traditions of the clans. What Noth is saying in fact is that the Israelite national epic was the product of the cultus.

Two other German scholars, G.von Rad and H.-J.Kraus, have made very thorough attempts to reconstruct the cultic life of early Israel.³ We have already noted von Rad's theory of two major festivals in early Israel, the festival of the renewal of the covenant held every seven years or perhaps annually at Shechem,⁴ and the annual celebrations at Gilgal of the events of Exodus and Conquest (the Heilsgeschichte theme).⁵

1. On the problem of the cult and continuity see P.R.Ackroyd Continuity: A Study in the Old Testament Religious Tradition (London 1961); N.W.Porteous "The Prophets and the Problem of Continuity" in Israel's Prophetic Heritage (ed. B.W.Anderson and W.Harrelson, London 1962) pp.11-25.

2. For the substance of this note see G.E.Wright "Cult and History" Interpretation vol.xvi (January 1962) pp.3-20.

3. Cf. G.von Rad Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuch; H.-J.Kraus Gottesdienst in Israel (Munich 1962, 2nd edition).

4. G.von Rad op.cit. p.41ff.

5. Ibid. p.48ff.

H.-J. Kraus follows von Rad as far as he goes but suggests yet another early Israelite festival. Kraus believes that in addition to the two festivals dealt with by von Rad there was a Tent festival celebrated annually at the central shrine of the amphictyony in the autumn.⁶

According to von Rad and Kraus there were therefore three major festivals in amphictyonic Israel:

(1) The covenant renewal festival held every year or seven years in the autumn (Tabernacles). It is argued that Joshua xxiv, the Sinai pericope in Exodus xix-xxiv, and much of the material in Deuteronomy derive from the liturgy of this festival.⁷

(2) A Tent festival (Kraus) celebrated at the central shrine annually in the autumn (Tabernacles). According to Kraus it was from the liturgy of this festival that the writers of Israel's history derived the traditions about the wandering, the Tent of Meeting, the details of the camp, the traditions of the pillars of cloud and fire.⁸

(3) An annual festival at Gilgal in the Jordan valley at Pentecost (von Rad) or perhaps in spring (Kraus) when the Exodus-Conquest traditions were commemorated.⁹ According to both von Rad and Kraus this Gilgal festival supplied the material for Joshua i-v.¹⁰

These views of Noth, von Rad and Kraus then raise the question of the extent to which Israel's national epic was the product of the cultus. We may add to these the extreme position of Weiser for whom the cult seems

6. Kraus op.cit. p.152f.

7. G. von Rad Das formgeschichtliche Problem pp.20-48. 8. Kraus op.cit. p.152f.

9. Cf. von Rad op.cit. p.48f.; Kraus op.cit. p.179ff. and his "Gilgal, Ein Beitrag zur Kulturgeschichte Israels" VT i (1951) pp.181-199.

10. Cf. von Rad op.cit. p.52f.; Kraus Gottesdienst p.181f.

to be the fons et origo of so much of the Old Testament,¹¹ and the views of Pedersen who sees Exodus i-xv as the cult legend of the Passover festival,¹² and who understands the Patriarchal traditions of Genesis xii-1 and the Sinai covenant traditions in Exodus in a similar manner, viz. as cult legends and not as literary products.¹³ All this merely sharpens the issue.

The impression gained from the views of these scholars is that the authors of the various Pentateuchal strands derived their material for the most part from old liturgies. But is such a view really acceptable ? The case for Deuteronomy is the strongest. We have already observed its very marked liturgical nature both in form and content. But it is surely a gross exaggeration to view Genesis xii-1, Exodus i-xv, Exodus xix, and Joshua i-v as deriving from liturgies. "They contain", as G.E.Wright has put it, "too many details of great interest to the teller of stories and scarcely practical for the liturgist".¹⁴

This is not to go to the other extreme and deny any cultic influence upon the literature. There are examples of liturgical elements on all sides, for example the hymn in Exodus xv, credos such as we find in Deuteronomy xxvi 15-19, Joshua xxiv, old series of apodeictic laws such as we find scattered throughout Deuteronomy and the Holiness Code,¹⁵ etc. But the view that the bulk of the traditions in the Hexateuch were derived from the cult does not carry conviction.¹⁶

11. Cf. A.Weiser Introduction to the Old Testament p.81ff.

12. J.Pedersen "Passahfest und Passahlegende" ZAW lxi (1934) p.161ff.; idem Israel: Its Life and Culture III-IV (1940) p.726ff.

13. J.Pedersen Israel III-IV p.726f.

14. G.E.Wright "Cult and History" p.14.

15. For this see G.von Rad Studies in Deuteronomy chapters 1 and 2.

16. This whole problem would be very interesting and rewarding to investigate. A detailed and up-to-date assessment of the problem is a desideratum.

THE ORIGIN OF DEUTERONOMY -- IIIThe Case for the Judaeen Provenance of Deuteronomy

In the previous chapter we examined the evidence for the north Israelite origin of Deuteronomy and we concluded that there are strong links between the traditions underlying Deuteronomy and the teaching of north Israelite prophetic circles and between Deuteronomy and the E document in the Pentateuch. We argued however that any theory of a northern origin of Deuteronomy raises a twofold question the answer to which is vital if the problem is to be fully resolved. The question was this: if Deuteronomy originated in northern Israel then how did it come to be in the Jerusalem Temple in 621 B.C. and, more important still, how did it become the basis of a sweeping reformation carried out by a Judaeen king and supported by the Jerusalem priesthood? This question itself immediately raises the question of the possible Judaeen provenance of Deuteronomy and it is to this that we now turn.

1.

Gerhard von Rad has proposed a theory which in contrast to the views outlined in the previous chapter finds the provenance of Deuteronomy amongst circles of Judaeen Levites.¹ On the basis of a form-critical analysis of the book von Rad concludes that it has a twofold nature. On the one hand, he says, it contains a great deal of old cultic material, series of apodeictic commandments and priestly toroth all of which have been worked over and presented homiletically.² On the other hand he sees Deuteronomy as being impregnated with the ideology of the old sacral institution of the Holy War which has imparted to the book a decidedly martial nature.³

1. G.von Rad Studies in Deuteronomy (London 1953).

2. Ibid. chapter 1.

3. Ibid. chapter 4.

The many laws dealing with the institution of the Holy War and the cultic form⁴ in which Deuteronomy is cast together with many other old cultic norms point, in von Rad's opinion, to the old Yahweh amphictyony for their origin.⁵ Thus, for von Rad, the authors of Deuteronomy were the bearers of a priestly and cultic tradition, stemming ultimately from the old amphictyony, together with a national and martial spirit. And he believes that any answer to the question of the origin of Deuteronomy must satisfy this peculiar double form, this "Janus-like" quality of the book.

For von Rad the bearers of this cultic and priestly tradition can only have been Levites. Only priests, he maintains, could have had access to such a wide range of cultic material and, even more significant, only priests could have had the authority to expound and re-interpret these old traditions and laws in the free manner with which the author(s) of Deuteronomy has treated them.⁶ The marked homiletic style in which Deuteronomy is written points for its origin to a preaching activity⁷ and this activity was carried out, according to von Rad, by a body of Levites living in the country areas of Judah who were the bearers of the old patriarchal traditions in Deuteronomy and who were the representatives of a revival movement in Judah in the 7th century B.C.⁸ That the Levites engaged in such preaching activity is evidenced by such texts as Nehemiah viii 7f., 2 Chronicles xxxv 3 which, though post-exilic, no doubt reflect, according to von Rad, much earlier practice going back to pre-exilic times.⁹

4. For this see Ibid. p.14f. and Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuch (Gesammelte Studien) p.33ff.

5. Studies in Deut. p.40.

6. Ibid. p.24.

7. Cf. G.von Rad Old Testament Theology p.72.

8. Studies in Deut. p.66f.

9. Ibid. p.13f. Cf. Old Testament Theology p.72f.

If these arguments concerning the activity of Levites satisfy the cultic side of Deuteronomy, what about the other side, the martial and nationalistic side? Von Rad answers this by claiming that these Levites were the spokesmen of a movement for national revival and independence amongst the $\{ \text{לְאֵוִי} \}$ whom von Rad, following E.Würthwein,¹⁰ believes to have been the body of free, property-owning, full (male) citizens of Judah.¹¹ Von Rad, following E.Junge,¹² believes that this body came to power after 701 B.C. when Sennacherib's destruction of Judah's regular mercenary army necessitated the revival of the old militia which was drawn from the ranks of this body of "landed gentry".¹³ According to von Rad, this body aimed at national independence and at the same time inner religious renewal: "the old patriarchal traditions of the strict Yahweh faith had long remained alive amongst the free peasant population, and given rise to an opposition to the capital which expressed itself in strong impulses towards revival in both cult and politics".¹⁴ The movement must not therefore be viewed as having its centre in Jerusalem, according to von Rad, and this is further evidenced, he continues, by the very insignificant role accorded the king in Deuteronomy -- a role which clearly cannot reflect the sacral concepts of kingship which were characteristic of Jerusalem.¹⁵ Von Rad concludes therefore that Deuteronomy owes its origin to this body of Levites amongst whom the old amphictyonic traditions had remained alive and who in the 7th century formulated their traditions into a programme of national political and religious revival.

10. E.Würthwein Der 'amm ha' arez im A.T. BWANT iv: 17 (1936).

11. Studies in Deut. p.63ff.

12. E.Junge Der Wiederaufbau des Heerwesens des Reiches Juda unter Josia BWANT IV:23 (1937).

13. Studies in Deut. p.60ff.

14. Ibid. p.66.

15. Ibid. p.62.

Several serious objections can however be raised against this theory. The first, with which we have already dealt,¹⁶ is the question of centralisation. Why would the country Levites have abolished their own shrines and thus, as von Rad himself puts it, have "sawn off the branch upon which they sat". Von Rad's reply to this is far from satisfactory. In the first place he argues that "it is being increasingly recognised that the demand for centralisation in Deuteronomy rests upon a very narrow basis only and is, from the point of view of literary criticism, comparatively easy to remove as a late and final adaptation of many layers of material".¹⁷ But we have seen already,¹⁸ and von Rad in other places seems to agree with our conclusions,¹⁹ that it is precisely this "late and final adaptation" with its demand for centralisation which constituted Ur-Deuteronomy. Von Rad's statement quoted above seems to imply that the Levites were not responsible for this "late and final adaptation" and, if that is so, then they cannot be considered as being the real authors of Deuteronomy; at best they were the sources from which the author responsible for the book obtained much of his material. But von Rad himself does not accept any such theory. In spite of this rather misleading statement, he believes that the country Levites were the authors of Deuteronomy in the form in which it lay before Josiah.²⁰ This is clear from his second point in reply to the

16. See above pp.78-80.

17. Studies in Deut. p.67.

18. See above pp.

19. Cf. for example his Old Testament Theology pp.226-227.

20. See Studies in Deut. pp.66-67.

question of centralisation, viz. that by the 7th century B.C. the Levites who wrote Deuteronomy had outgrown their cultic sphere proper and therefore stood to lose nothing by centralising sacrificial worship to one major shrine.²¹

Such a suggestion however runs into several serious difficulties. There is no evidence that the country Levites in the 7th century had given up their cultic functions. Indeed there is much to indicate that it was a time of very vigorous cultic activity. That the Yahweh high places were thriving is surely clear from the fact that Josiah had to attempt to abolish them in spite of Hezekiah's measures less than a century before. But further, Deuteronomy itself by its provision for these country Levites (xviii) and its recurring commendation of their needs to the people surely implies that hitherto they had gained their livelihood at their local altars now to be abolished. Accordingly a strong question mark at least must be placed against von Rad's suggestion that Levites living in the Judaeen countryside wrote Deuteronomy.

What then of von Rad's suggestion concerning the לויים ביהודה ? Let it be said at the very outset that the present writer feels that far too much has been read into this expression and that those theories which regard it as a terminus technicus designating a fixed social or political group within Judah's population are going beyond the evidence.²² But quite apart from this, any idea of a connection between these people and Deuteronomy must be rejected for several reasons. There is, for example, an abundance of evidence to show that the Judaeen countryside was rife with

21. Cf. Studies in Deut. pp.67-68.

22. See additional note on this after this chapter.

all sorts of pagan cults during the 7th century B.C. One obvious indication of this are the cults which Josiah had to get rid of (2 Kings xxiii) as well as the fact that in spite of his attempts his death was followed by a resurgence of idolatry perhaps on a worse scale than before (cf. Jerem. vii 16-18, xi 9-13, etc. Ezek. viii). If the $\{ \gamma \delta \pi \square \vee$ were, as von Rad believes, a powerful military group seeking national independence and inner religious renewal, then surely there would have been a drastic reduction of all this paganism? On the contrary however - and von Rad has evidently overlooked this - such texts as Jeremiah xxxiv 19, xxxvii 2, xlii 21 make it quite clear that the $\{ \gamma \delta \pi \square \vee$ contributed in no small way to the sorry state of the nation and the depths to which religion had sunk!

Accordingly we may conclude that von Rad's theory raises too many difficulties to be acceptable. There is also one further question mark which may be placed against von Rad's work. Without going into the problem just yet, it may be asked whether he has not underestimated the prophetic influence upon Deuteronomy?²³ We shall have to examine this presently.

2.

If then von Rad's suggestion that Judaeans Levites wrote Deuteronomy is not acceptable, who else in the southern kingdom could have been responsible or partly responsible for its composition? The problem involved here is fundamentally this: to what extent and by whom were the old amphictyonic traditions underlying Deuteronomy preserved in Judah?

23. See von Rad Studies in Deut. p.69. For von Rad the "prophetic element" (sic) in Deuteronomy is "no more than a sign of the time in which Deuteronomy is speaking" (ibid.)

It is widely agreed that in establishing his throne David made two masterly moves. The first was his choice of the Jebusite stronghold of Jerusalem for his capital. Until its conquest by David this city had remained outside the territory of the twelve tribes. It thus lay on neutral ground and in constituting it as the seat of his power David undoubtedly avoided the bitter jealousy which would have resulted between the northern and southern tribes had he remained in Hebron or moved up to say Shechem.²⁴ Having moved to Jerusalem David made his second masterly move. He rescued the Ark of the covenant which had evidently lain neglected at Kirjath-jearim since the collapse of the amphictyony under the Philistines and brought it to Jerusalem. In doing this David attempted to constitute Jerusalem as the successor of the central shrine of the old tribal confederation and the preserver of its sacral traditions.²⁵ In other words he sought to establish Jerusalem as the religious as well as the political capital and to win for it a significance which would gain the loyalty and support of the tribes.

Accordingly, it is generally agreed that Jerusalem under David became heir of the sacral traditions of the twelve tribes and that the old amphictyonic traditions moved there with the sacred Ark. There has, however, been not a little debate as to the history of the amphictyonic traditions in Jerusalem. It is very widely accepted that there developed in Judah, perhaps even in the time of David himself, a theology of kingship centering upon the Davidic throne.²⁶ Basic to this royal theology was the

24. Cf. M.Noth The History of Israel p.189; J.Bright A History of Israel pp.178-179.

25. Cf. Noth ibid. p.190; Bright ibid. p.179f.

26. Cf. A.R.Johnson Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel (Cardiff 1955)

notion of a covenant between Yahweh and the house of David.²⁷ Many scholars believe that these covenantal traditions which grew up round the Davidic king in Jerusalem displaced the older amphictyonic traditions of the covenant at Sinai.²⁸ According to these scholars the appearance of Deuteronomy in Jerusalem in the 7th century was nothing less than the rediscovery of the old traditions which had been all but eclipsed by the later traditions surrounding the Davidic throne. On the other hand, several scholars have consistently held the view that the older traditions were preserved in Jerusalem right down through the period of the monarchy.²⁹ What evidence is there that the old historical and legal traditions of the twelve tribe league were preserved and transmitted in Judah during this period?

A.Weiser has long held the view that the old traditions were kept alive in the great autumnal festival of the renewal of the covenant which he believes to have been celebrated annually in the Jerusalem Temple all through the period of the monarchy.³⁰ According to Weiser the majority of Psalms had their origin within the context of this festival; that is to say, they are "fragments" of the liturgy of this festival.³¹ According to Weiser the component parts of this festival were (1) the recitation of Yahweh's acts of salvation (the Heilsgeschichte) as the manifestation of his nature on the one hand and (2) the theophany (Sinai) tradition with

27. For this see G.E.Mendenhall Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East (The Biblical Colloquium, Chicago 1955, reprinted from BA xvii, 1954, pp.26-46, 49-76); J.Bright op.cit. p.203f.; B.W.Anderson The Living World of the O.T. p.289f.

28. So Mendenhall op.cit.; Bright op.cit. p.300; Anderson op.cit. p.290.

29. M.Noeth and A.Weiser have both, in their own ways, maintained this position. Cf. Noth History of Israel p.290; idem "Jerusalem und die israelitische Tradition" (OS viii, 1950, pp.28-46 now in GS pp.172-187) idem "Die Gesetz im Pentateuch" GS p.42f. For Weiser see below.

the manifestation of God's will (the laws) and the making of the covenant on the other hand.³² In the pre-monarchic period the saving acts were those of exodus and conquest but this tradition, argues Weiser, was later enlarged as a result of David's cultic policy to include the traditions of the election of the Davidic house and of the Temple in Jerusalem as Yahweh's dwelling place.³³ In other words, Weiser maintains that both sets of traditions -- the old amphictyonic Sinai traditions and the later Davidic covenant traditions -- were preserved together in Jerusalem and were the substance of the great autumnal festival of the renewal of the covenant.

Whether or not we accept Weiser's theory of a long-surviving amphictyonic festival in Jerusalem, he has certainly demonstrated impressively that the old historical and legal traditions of the Israelite amphictyony underlie many of the Psalms which are generally accepted as having derived from the cultus of the Jerusalem Temple. Thus the memory of Yahweh's acts of salvation is preserved in such Psalms as xliv, lxvi, lxxv, lxxviii, lxxxi, xcvi, cv, cvi, cxxxv, cxxxvi, etc.³⁴ Weiser finds evidence of the cultic proclamation of Yahweh's will (the setting forth of the divine stipulations) at several points. He points, for example, to Psalm lxxxi 10 which is reminiscent of the opening words of the Decalogue and to verse 9 of the same Psalm which contains an example of apodeictic law.³⁵

30. A. Weiser The Psalms (ET by H. Hartwell, London 1962).

31. Ibid. p. 35.

32. A. Weiser Introduction to the O.T. p. 89f.

33. Weiser The Psalms p. 45. He cites Ps. lxxviii in this connection.

34. Ibid. p. 42f.

35. Ibid. pp. 45, 554.

He points to several instances where the aim of the recitation of the Heilsgeschichte is to exhort the people to obey the laws and statutes (e.g. Pss. cv 45, cxi 10, lxxviii 7f., lxxxix 13, cvi, cvii 35f.).³⁶ He further argues that the idea of judgement recurrent in the Psalms has at its background the divine laws.³⁷

That the old legal traditions of the amphictyony were kept alive in Jerusalem has been concluded along quite different lines by A.R.Johnson.³⁸ In contradistinction to Weiser, Johnson sees the autumn festival in Jerusalem as having been essentially a festival of the enthronement of Yahweh in which the Davidic king played a vital role.³⁹ Following the work of Mowinkel, Johnson has attempted to reconstruct this festival from evidence adduced from the Psalms. For our purposes here the most significant part of Johnson's theory is his suggestion that in the royal psalms can be discerned the fusion of the old amphictyonic law with the Davidic covenant. According to Johnson it was the Davidic king's solemn function to ensure the prosperity of his people by remaining faithful to Yahweh and administering justly His laws to which the tribal brotherhood of Israel was pledged under the terms of the Sinaitic covenant.⁴⁰ If this view is granted then here again we have evidence that the old amphictyonic legal tradition was fostered and kept alive in Jerusalem.⁴¹

36. Weiser The Psalms p.45.

37. Ibid. p.45f.

38. A.R.Johnson op.cit.

39. Ibid. p.93ff.

40. Ibid. pp.127-128.

41. Johnson's views are quoted with approval by N.W.Porteous "The Prophets and the Problem of Continuity" in Israel's Prophetic Heritage (ed. B.W.Anderson and W.Harrelson) p.22f.

Here then from both Weiser and Johnson comes the suggestion that the old legal and historical traditions of the Israelite amphictyony were kept alive during the period of the monarchy in the southern kingdom. Further evidence in support of this suggestion comes from one of Weiser's students, Walter Beyerlin, in a most stimulating study of Micah.⁴² Arguing along similar lines to those of Weiser noted above, Beyerlin believes that Micah's prophecies are to be understood against the background of the autumnal covenant renewal festival in Jerusalem. Thus he argues that Micah i 3-4

"For behold, the Lord is coming forth out of his place
and will come down and treat upon the high places of
the earth. And the mountains will melt under him and
the valleys will be cleft, like wax before the fire,
like waters poured down a steep place"

derives from the theophany which Weiser believes to have been a central part of that festival.⁴³ That Micah was familiar with the old historical traditions of exodus and conquest is evidenced by vi 3-5:⁴⁴

"O my people, what have I done to you? In what have I
weariied you? Answer me! For I brought you up from the
land of Egypt, and redeemed you from the house of
bondage; and I sent before you Moses, Aaron, and Miriam.
O my people, remember what Balak king of Moab devised,
and what Balaam the son of Be'or answered him, and what
happened from Shittim to Gilgal, that you may know the
saving acts of the Lord."

As for covenant law, Beyerlin points to chapters ii 1f.; iii 1f., 9f.; v 11-13; vi 8; vii 2f. for evidence of Micah's concern for it.⁴⁵ In addition

42. W.Beyerlin Die Kulttraditionen Israels in der Verkündigung des Propheten Micah (FRLANT n.f. liv, 1959).

43. Ibid. p.30ff. Cf. A.Weiser Micha (ATD 24, Göttingen 1949) in loc.

44. Beyerlin op.cit. p.69f.

45. Ibid. pp.42-64.

Beyerlin has demonstrated that Micah employs the name "Israel" in its old sacral sense, that is, as the name of the sacral union of the twelve tribes, though he also uses it in its later usage to designate either the northern or southern kingdom.⁴⁶ Beyerlin contends that all this material in Micah evidences the existence of a living amphictyonic tradition in the prophet's days and, following Weiser, he believes this tradition to have been preserved in the cultus of the Jerusalem Temple.

What Beyerlin has said of Micah would seem to hold good also in the case of his contemporary Judaeen prophet Amos.⁴⁷ Like Micah i 3-4, Amos i 2 seems to derive from a theophany:

"The Lord roars from Zion, and utters his voice from
Jerusalem;
the pastures of the shepherds mourn, and the top of
Carmel withers."

That he was familiar with Yahweh's acts of salvation on Israel's behalf seems evident from such passages as ii 9f.; iii 1f.; iv 10; ix 7:

"Yet I destroyed the Amorite before them, whose height
was like the height of the cedars, and who was as strong
as the oaks..... Also I brought you up out of the
land of Egypt, and led you forty years in the wilderness,
to possess the land of the Amorite." (Amos ii 9-10)

Is it possible that Amos and Micah both participated in festivals in Jerusalem?⁴⁸ Whatever answer be given to this question it is clear that both prophets were steeped in the old amphictyonic traditions of Israel. There is certainly a considerable amount of evidence to support the view that the old traditions were kept alive in the cultus in Jerusalem.

46. Cf. Beyerlin op.cit. pp.11-28

47. For this suggestion see N.W.Porteous op.cit. pp.18-19.

48. Cf. Porteous op.cit. p.19.

Since however the cultus in Jerusalem was attimes anything but pure, it is probable, as Porteous has suggested, that we are to look to the prophetic circles in Judah for those who kept alive the old traditions.⁴⁹ We have already seen how the prophetic circles in the northern kingdom preserved the traditions when the cultic transmission broke down. Amos and Micah in the South were certainly not lone figures; they must have had their disciples. And there were no doubt many others. During such periods of widespread apostasy and cultic laxity such as the reigns of Ahaz and Manassch it must have been these circles who preserved the memory of Yahweh's saving acts and of Israel's high moral code. It was the voice of Micah, Isaiah, Zephaniah and Jeremiah which was raised in protest against the unfaithfulness of their fellow countrymen.

The mention of Isaiah serves to introduce yet further evidence that the old amphictyonic traditions were preserved in Judah. Underlying Isaiah's bitter polemic against the religiously and socially decadent society in which he lived (chs. i 21-23; iii 15f.; v 8f.; etc.) can be discerned the tradition of the Sinaitic covenantal obligations whilst x 24-27 evidences his awareness of the traditions of exodus and conquest. But the most significant factor in Isaiah's oracles from our point of view is the extent to which his teaching was influenced by the ideology of the Holy War which we have already seen to have been one of the old amphictyonic sacral institutions. When Ephraim and Damascus threatened Jerusalem Isaiah predicted their doom and exhorted Ahaz to have faith in Yahweh (vii 3-9). When the hosts of Assyria were marching on Jerusalem

49. Cf. Porteous op.cit. pp.21,23f.

Isaiah assured the people that Yahweh would defend the city (xxxvii 33f.).

He inveighed against those who put their confidence in military alliances:

"Woe to those who go down to Egypt for help and rely
on horses, who trust in chariots because they are many
and in horsemen because they are strong, but do not
look to the Holy One of Israel, or consult the Lord!" (xxxi 1f.)

Military preparations he condemned (xxii 9f.); Israel's strength was Yahweh Sabaoth who "would come down to fight on mount Zion and upon its hill" (xxxi 4). Yahweh would come against Egypt "riding on a swift cloud..... and the idols of Egypt will tremble at his presence, and the heart of the Egyptians will melt within them" (xix 1f.).⁵⁰ Here in Isaiah we have all the basic concepts of the old sacral institution of the Holy War: the certainty of victory, the necessity for faith in Yahweh who alone brings victory, the terror that he unleashes on the enemy. And all this reinforces what we have been attempting to maintain in these pages, viz. that the old amphictyonic traditions of Israel were preserved in Judah as well as in the northern kingdom.

It may therefore be concluded that the old amphictyonic traditions of Israel were preserved and transmitted in both the northern and southern kingdoms during the period of the monarchy. It also seems probable that it was primarily the prophetic party which was responsible for the continuity of the traditions. The question which interests us here is this: is it possible that Deuteronomy originated in a circle comprised of both northern and southern prophets? Before this question can be answered it must first of all be established that Deuteronomy could have been the work of prophets and it is to this that we now turn.

50. Some have dated this oracle to a later period than Isaiah. Recently, however, its authenticity has been vigorously defended by J. Mauchline Isaiah 1-39 (TBS, London 1962) in loc.

We have already seen that in both form and content Deuteronomy bears the stamp of the old festival of the renewal of the covenant. Now it is important to note in this connection the role of Moses in Deuteronomy. His function may be described as that of covenant mediator.⁵¹ It has been plausibly suggested that Exodus xx 18-21 and Deuteronomy xviii 16-18 may contain the aetiology for the office of covenant mediator.⁵²

Exod. xx 18-21

Now when all the people perceived the thunderings and the lightnings and the sound of the trumpet and the mountain smoking, the people were afraid and trembled; and they stood afar off and said to Moses: You speak to us and we will hear; but let not God speak to us lest we die. And Moses said to the people: Do not fear; for God has come to prove you and that the fear of him may be before your eyes, that you may not sin. And the people stood afar off while Moses drew near to the thick darkness where God was.

Deut. xviii 15-18

The Lord your God will raise up for you a prophet like me from among you, from your brethren -- him shall you heed -- just as you desired of the Lord your God at Horeb on the day of the assembly, when you said: Let me not hear again the voice of the Lord my God or see this great fire any more lest I die. And the Lord said unto me: They have rightly said all that they have spoken. I will raise up for them a prophet like you from among their brethren and I will put my words in his mouth and he shall speak to them all that I command him.

From both Exodus and Deuteronomy it may be deduced that the role performed by the covenant mediator was:

1. To speak for and in the name of Yahweh to the people (Exod.xx 1-2a; Deut. v 6).
2. To recollect Yahweh's acts of salvation (Exod.xx 2, xix 3-6; Deut. v 6, etc.).
3. To proclaim the divine laws binding upon the covenant community (Exod. xx 3ff.; Deut. v 7f.; xii-xxvi).

51. For much of what follows see M. Newman "The Prophetic Call of Samuel" in Israel's Prophetic Heritage p.86ff.

It seems clear that this was the function which Joshua performed in Joshua xxiv. The scene is a festival of covenant making at Shechem: the people "presented themselves before God" וַיִּתְּצוּ אֶת־אֲבֵרָתָם לִפְנֵי יְהוָה (verse 1). In verses 2-13 Joshua proclaims Yahweh's saving acts. In verses 14-15,23 he exhorts the people to be faithful to Yahweh alone and in verses 16-18,21 the people in response to this promise to serve Yahweh. Finally in verse 23 we are told that Joshua "made a covenant with the people that day, and made statutes and ordinances for them at Shechem".

Now the significant factor from our point of view is this: the important function of covenant mediator is assigned in Deuteronomy to the prophet and not to the priest: "I will raise up for them a prophet like you (Moses) from among their brethren " (Deut. xviii 18). In other words the function exercised by Moses in Deuteronomy is that of prophet covenant mediator (cf. Deut. v 5). What other evidence is there to suggest that the prophets performed such a role?

We have already seen how Samuel was the bearer of the old amphietyonic traditions in the dark days of Philistine oppression. That Samuel was covenant mediator is evidenced by the role played by him in the narrative in 1 Samuel xii.⁵³ The scene is apparently Gilgal (cf. ch.xi 15) and the issue at stake is the demand for a king. As in Joshua xxiv, the people have "presented themselves" (וַיִּתְּצוּ אֶת־אֲבֵרָתָם לִפְנֵי יְהוָה) before Yahweh (verse 7).

52. Cf. H.-J.Kraus Gottesdienst in Israel p.129ff.; M.Newman op.cit.p.87f.

53. For this see J.Muilenburg "The form and structure of the covenantal formulations" Vt ix (1959) pp.360-365.

In verses 1-6 Samuel reminds the people of his faithfulness to the covenant demands. In verses 7-13 Samuel recites Yahweh's acts of salvation and this section concludes with Yahweh's granting Israel's request for a king (verse 13). There follows the covenantal order of the kingdom; Samuel exhorts both people and monarch to be faithful to Yahweh's laws and this exhortation is accompanied by the promise of blessing or curse (verses 14-15). In verses 16-18 Samuel invokes Yahweh to send thunder and rain as a sign of his displeasure with the people's demand for a king. The people ask Samuel to intercede for them with Yahweh and he, as covenant mediator, accedes to their request once more exhorting them to be faithful to Yahweh (verses 19-25).

Here then is evidence that the prophet Samuel carried out the function of covenant mediator. He is Yahweh's spokesman to the people and intercedes on their behalf (xii 23), he recites the saving acts of Yahweh on Israel's behalf (verses 7-11), and proclaims Yahweh's covenantal demands (14-15).⁵⁴

We have already seen that Samuel stood at the beginning of a long line of prophets in the northern kingdom who preserved tenaciously the old amphictyonic traditions of Israel down through the centuries. Elijah was certainly his successor and it is not surprising therefore that we have some evidence that this prophet, like his great predecessor, is portrayed in one place at least as covenant mediator. Elijah's battle with the prophets of Baal is certainly very reminiscent of the covenant assembly as depicted

54. In a very fascinating short study Murray Newman has suggested that the story of Samuel's call in 1 Samuel i-iii is an aetiological legend which seeks to explain the emergence of the prophet in Israel as the successor in covenant mediation to the earlier priesthood as represented by Eli and his sons. Cf. M. Newman "The Prophetic Call of Samuel" in Israel's Prophetic Heritage pp.86-97.

in Joshua xxiv and 2 Samuel xii to which reference has already been made.⁵⁵ As at Shechem (cf. Josh. xxiv 1) "all the people of Israel", the covenant assembly, have gathered at Carmel (1 Kings xviii 17). Here too Elijah, like Joshua (cf. Josh. xxiv 14-15), exhorts the people to obedience to Yahweh the covenant God (1 Kings xviii 21). As at Shechem (Josh. xxiv 16-18), so here the people respond to Elijah's appeal by acclaiming Yahweh as their God (1 Kings xviii 39). It is significant that Elijah built a stone altar upon which to sacrifice just as Joshua had done at Shechem (Joshua xxiv 26; cf. viii 39).

Accordingly it may be concluded that there is strong evidence in support of the view that the function of covenant mediator was exercised by the prophets. And is this not of great significance in the discussion of the authorship of Deuteronomy? We have seen that it was primarily the prophets in both northern and southern kingdoms who kept alive the old amphictyonic traditions which underlie Deuteronomy. The evidence for this is abundant. When we add to this the fact that the very role exercised by Moses in Deuteronomy is prophetic (cf. Deut. xviii 15f.) then it is difficult to escape the conclusion that Deuteronomy originated in prophetic rather than in priestly circles. This is further supported by the strongly ethical nature of the book which older scholars attributed to the prophets.⁵⁶

55. For what follows I am indebted to the article by Murray Newman cited above.

56. Cf. for example S.R.Driver Deuteronomy (ICC, Edinburgh 3rd edition 1902) p.xxvff.

We have concluded thus far that the old amphictyonic traditions underlying Deuteronomy were kept alive down through the centuries by the prophetic party in both northern Israel and Judah and in the light of this and other evidence we have argued that the book owes its origin to prophetic rather than priestly circles. We have seen too that there are strong connections between Deuteronomy and north Israelite traditions, particularly the Pentateuchal document E and Hosea. But we have argued that any theory of a purely northern origin of the book, such as that advanced by Alt,⁵⁷ encounters several difficulties and we maintain that allowance must be made for a Judean element in the book.⁵⁸ The evidence for a southern contribution to Deuteronomy is impressive. Deuteronomy is a programme of national revival and religious renewal. In this respect it has long been observed that there are striking similarities between its demands and Hezekiah's reformation.⁵⁹ Hezekiah attempted to re-unite Israel and to concentrate the national cult in Jerusalem. Deuteronomy too aims at binding together the "people of Yahweh" and uncompromisingly demands the centralisation of worship to one sanctuary. Hezekiah's struggle for independence and the nationalistic movement in 7th century Judah are more

57. See above pp.136f.

58. In what I am saying here I have taken up the suggestion of G. A. Anderson that Deuteronomy reflects "conditions in 7th-century Judah". (Cf. his Introduction p.44 Cf. A. Weiser Introduction p.132).

59. In the 3rd edition of his Einleitung E. Sellin indeed argued that Hezekiah already had Ur-Deuteronomy before him and based his reform on it. He later rejected this view, however, in the 8th edition of his book (edit. L. Rost, Heidelberg 1949). But for a recent re-statement of this view see J. Junker "Die Entstehungszeit des Ps. 78 und das Deuteronomium" Biblica xxxiv (1953) pp.487-500.

than echoed in Deuteronomy's concern for Israel's existence over against other people, a concern which is manifested chiefly in the marked martial spirit which pervades the book through and through and to which von Rad has rightly drawn attention.⁶⁰ Furthermore the idea of centralising the cult exclusively to one sanctuary is a Judaeen development and was, as we have suggested, first conceived of in Hezekiah's day. Older critics were almost unanimously agreed that there was a connection between Hezekiah's centralisation of the cult and the similar demand of Deuteronomy and that the Jerusalem Temple stands behind the demand for centralisation in Deuteronomy. In my opinion no strong evidence has been adduced by more recent research to refute their belief.

If what we have argued is acceptable, then a plausible solution to the problem of the authorship of Deuteronomy is to trace it to a circle composed of both northern and southern prophets. By what means and when could such a circle have come into existence?

There are strong grounds for believing that after the fall of Samaria in 721 B.C. and the destruction of the northern kingdom a great deal of literary material was brought down to the southern kingdom, presumably by fugitives.⁶¹ It was no doubt at this time that E was worked into J.⁶² (Does this combination of JE itself point to the combination of northern and southern circles?) It is commonly agreed too that Hosea's oracles were worked over subsequently by a Judaeen editor.⁶³ It is also very probably that at this time the traditions of Elijah and Elisha and

60. Cf. G.von Rad Studies in Deuteronomy pp.58,60.

61. For what follows see G. von Rad Old Testament Theology p.71.

62. Cf. G.W.Anderson op.cit. p.37f.

63. Cf. G.W.Anderson op.cit. p.145; A.Weiser Introduction p.236.

and other northern traditions together with the court annals of the northern kings were brought south, there to be used eventually by the Deuteronomistic historian.

It is against this background that we can visualise the origin of the circle responsible for Deuteronomy. In the light of this it is reasonable to infer that after the destruction of the northern kingdom circles of prophets fled to Judah and there joined the ranks of southern prophetic circles with whom, as we have seen, they would have had much in common. And such a combination would offer an explanation of how Deuteronomy has strong connections with both the north and the south.

The main impulse which drove northerners south after 721 B.C. was very probably the belief that the future of Israel lay with Judah. At any rate it is surely striking that shortly after 721 B.C. there developed in Judah, as we have seen, a movement which aimed at both political independence and religious revival.

It was under Hezekiah that this movement was first able to assert itself. But this first attempt to reform was short lived. Hezekiah's successor Manasseh broke radically with his father's policy and under him there seems to have been a violent reaction against the reformation. Under Manasseh the high places flourished once again and pagan cults together with fertility rites seem to have been carried out in the Temple itself (2 Kings xxi 7; xxiii 4-7; Zeph. i 4). The Assyrian cults were reinstated in the Temple (2 Kings xxi 3,5) and human sacrifice seems to have been practised (2 Kings xxi 6). Assyrian practices such as divination and magic gained popularity in Jerusalem (2 Kings xxi 6). We are told too that Manasseh "shed very much innocent blood" (2 Kings xxi 16). Tradition has it

that the prophets were prosecuted during his reign and in the light of 2 Kings xxi 16 that tradition is probably well founded. Once again it seems to have been the prophets who raised their voice in the protest (2 Kings xxi 10f.).⁶⁴

Under Manasseh, therefore, the movement for reform and revival was subdued. But the hope lived on that one day the opportunity would arise once more. The prophetic party who would have been to the fore in such a movement was evidently driven underground and it was probably during these dark days under Manasseh, we suggest, that they formulated their ideas into a programme of revival and placed it in the Temple until a favourable opportunity would arise in which to promulgate it. It is not surprising therefore to find Deuteronomy so bitter in its polemic against paganism and apostasy; it was against a background of such paganism and widespread apostasy that it was formulated.

The dawn broke when Josiah came to the throne and the Assyrian power began to wane. Once more Judah attempted to assert her independence and, as we have suggested, it was in the course of this attempt that the book was discovered in the Temple. Was its discovery purely accidental? There is no proof that it was. What can be said with confidence, however, is that it made its appearance in Israel's history at precisely the right moment -- in the fullness of time.

64. This passage is strongly Deuteronomistic in flavour but may nevertheless preserve a kernel of sound history.

Additional Note to Chapter VIThe Meaning of the Expression $\{ \text{רִאשׁוֹן וְאַחֲרֵי} \}$ in the Old Testament

The expression $\{ \text{רִאשׁוֹן וְאַחֲרֵי} \}$ occurs between sixty and seventy times in the Old Testament and very frequently in post-Biblical writings. In Rabbinic literature it is a term of contempt for the religiously illiterate. Its meaning in the Old Testament has been variously interpreted. It has been taken as designating the rural population of a country as against the urban population.¹ It has been suggested that the $\{ \text{רִאשׁוֹן וְאַחֲרֵי} \}$ was nothing less than an ancient Hebrew parliament complete with both upper and lower houses.² The phrase has been interpreted as referring to the entire population of a country as opposed to the ruling classes.³ Some have taken the expression as designating the landed nobility⁴ whilst others, in contrast to such a view, interpret it as referring to the lowest and poorest layers in society.⁵

Currently favoured is the view advanced some years ago by E. Würthwein who sees in the $\{ \text{רִאשׁוֹן וְאַחֲרֵי} \}$ the body of free, property-owning, full (male) citizens of a country who played a vital political, economic and military role

1. Cf. R. Gordis "Sectional Rivalry in the Kingdom of Judah" JQR XXV (1934-35) pp. 237-259.

2. So M. Sulzberger The Am Ha-aretz: the ancient Hebrew Parliament (1909); idem "The Polity of the Ancient Hebrews" JQR iii (1912-13) pp. 1-81; cf. N. Sloush "Representative Government among the Hebrews and Phoenicians" JQR iv (1913) pp. 303-310.

3. So E. Klamroth Die jüdischen Exulanten in Babylonien BWAT x (1912) p. 99f.

4. Cf. S. Daiches "The meaning of 'am ha-aretz in the Old Testament" JTS xxx (1929) pp. 245-249.

5. Cf. A. Menes Die vorexilischen Gesetz Israels im Zusammenhang seiner kulturgeschichtlichen Entwicklung BZAW vol. L (1928) p. 70f.

in the affairs of that country.⁶ According to this view the word $\{ \text{אֶרֶץ} \}$ in the expression can be replaced by the actual name of the country to which it refers. Thus, for example, the term when applied to Judah is the same as the expression יְהוּדָה אֶרֶץ (2 Kings xiv 21).⁷ It is further argued that since the word אֶרֶץ in the expression designates the responsible male citizenry of a country it may be replaced by the word אֲשֵׁר so that the $\{ \text{אֶרֶץ אֶרֶץ} \}$ of Judah, the אֶרֶץ יְהוּדָה , is parallel in meaning to אֲשֵׁר יְהוּדָה (2 Sam. ii 4, etc.).⁸ On the basis of all this it is argued that every country had its אֶרֶץ .⁹ Thus the אֶרֶץ of Hebron is mentioned in Genesis xxiii 7,12-13, the Egyptian אֶרֶץ in Genesis xlii 6, that of the Canaanites in Numbers xiv 19¹⁰ whilst the אֲשֵׁר יִבְשִׁי mentioned in 2 Samuel ii 4 are believed to be the אֶרֶץ of Jabesh.¹¹

Würthwein's theory is based mainly on arguments adduced from a consideration of the occurrences of the expression $\{ \text{אֶרֶץ אֶרֶץ} \}$ as applied to Judah during the period of the monarchy. It is argued that the political role of the Judaeans $\{ \text{אֶרֶץ אֶרֶץ} \}$ is evidenced by their part in the overthrow of Athaliah and the enthronement of Joash (2 Kings xi)¹² and in their enthronement of Josiah (2 Kings xxi 24; 2 Chron. xxxiii 25)¹³ and his successor Jehoahaz (2 Kings xxiii 30; 2 Chron. xxxvi 1),¹⁴ whilst their role in the

6. E. Würthwein Der 'amm ha' arez im Alten Testament BWANT IV:17 (1936); cf. E. Gillischewski "Der Ausdruck $\{ \text{אֶרֶץ אֶרֶץ} \}$ im A.T." ZAW xl (1922) pp.137-142; M.H. Pope "'Am Ha' arez" in the Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible (Edit. G.A. Buttrick, New York 1962) vol.i pp.106-107.

7. E. Würthwein op.cit. p.15.

8. Ibid. p.15.

9. Ibid. p.14.

10. Ibid. p.14 footnote 8.

11. Ibid. p.15.

12. Ibid. pp.8,22f.

13. Ibid. pp.8-9,30f.

14. Ibid. p.33f.

country's economy is adduced from 2 Kings xxiii 35 where they are said to have been taxed in order to raise the tribute imposed by Necho.¹⁵ The reference in 2 Kings xxv 19 (cf. Jerem. lxx 25) to the official "who mustered the people of the land" is taken as evidence of their military role.¹⁶ Finally, the frequent mention of the $\{ \text{רָאֵם הָאֶרֶץ} \}$ alongside the king, the priesthood and the nobility (cf. Jerem. i 18; xxxiv 19; xxxvii 2; xlv 21) is taken as further indication of their high position in Judah.¹⁷

Common to the various interpretations which have been advanced is their insistence that the expression is a terminus technicus designating a fixed and specific social or political class or group within the population of a country. The contention of this short paper is that the expression is no such technical term but that it is used in a very general manner varying in meaning from context to context.

In Genesis xxiii 7,12-13 we are told that Abraham "bowed himself before the people of the land". Throughout the chapter (cf. especially v.7) the term $\{ \text{רָאֵם הָאֶרֶץ} \}$ is parallel in meaning to בְּנֵי חֵת . Both expressions are used of the inhabitants of Hebron in contradistinction to the foreigner Abraham. No one would suggest of course that the entire population of Hebron turned out to witness the purchase of the cave by the Patriarch; obviously only the particular group of men involved in the business would have been present. But to argue that the expression $\{ \text{רָאֵם הָאֶרֶץ} \}$ is a technical term for that group of men is to ignore the fact that they are also referred to as the בְּנֵי חֵת and it would be absurd to claim that the phrase בְּנֵי חֵת

15. Ibid. p.34f.

16. Ibid. p.10.

17. Ibid. pp.9f., 41f.

was limited in its application to a specific social or political group in Hebron. The group of men involved in the business with Abraham are referred to representatively as the **בְּרֵי חֵת** or **עַם הָאֲרָץ**.

In Genesis xlii 6 we read that Joseph sold corn to "all the people of the land". The plain meaning of this text is surely that Joseph was responsible for supplying corn to any Egyptian who might wish to buy it. The expression cannot here be referring to a specific class, social or otherwise, within the population of Egypt.

The use of the phrase in Exodus v 5 raises a problem. The MT reads: **וַיֹּאמֶר פַּרְעֹה הֵן רַבִּים עִתָּה עַם הָאֲרָץ**. Taken as it stands, this would mean that the Hebrews were the **עַם הָאֲרָץ** as distinct from the Egyptian population. Possibly, however, the Samaritan text has preserved the correct reading in **וַיֹּאמֶר פַּרְעֹה** - "And Pharaoh said: they (the Hebrews) are more numerous than the people of the land" (cf. the parallel statement in i 9). In this case the **עַם הָאֲרָץ** would obviously refer to the Egyptian population as a whole.

Leviticus iv sets out the sin offerings which have to be offered in the case of the high priest (v.3), the religious community as a whole (v.13), a civic ruler (**שֹׂרֵק** v.22) and finally for anyone of "the people of the land" (v.27). Some would link the section dealing with the **עַם הָאֲרָץ** (vv.27-35) with chapter v 7 and would interpret the expression as designating the poorest members of the community who could not afford an expensive offering.¹⁸ But perhaps the simplest interpretation is to take the **עַם הָאֲרָץ** here as referring to the ordinary members of the community as distinct from the priesthood and the civic rulers who have already been catered for.¹⁹

18. Cf. for example Würthwein op.cit. p.48.

19. Cf. N. Micklem "Leviticus" in Interpreter's Bible vol.ii (1953) p.24;

Leviticus xx 1-6 stipulates the punishment for anyone who participates in the Molech-cult. Offenders are to be stoned by the עַם הָאֶרֶץ . Here again there is no need to take the expression as anything other than a purely general term. Naturally such executions would have been carried out by the men of the area involved (cf. Deut. xxi 18-21, xxii 21, etc.). As in the example quoted above from Genesis xxiii the group of men involved in the execution are referred to representatively as the עַם הָאֶרֶץ .

In Numbers xiv 9 Joshua and Caleb having just returned with the other spies from the land of Canaan exhort the Israelites not to fear the עַם הָאֶרֶץ . Here the expression clearly means the indigenous population of the promised land and is parallel to the "people who dwell in the land" of chapter xiii 28 (cf. Neh. ix 24). The expression is also parallel to the יֹשְׁבֵי הָאֶרֶץ in such texts as Joshua ii 9,24; vii 9; viii 24; ix 24; etc. Once again the term עַם הָאֶרֶץ or its parallel יֹשְׁבֵי הָאֶרֶץ is used in a purely general sense.

This brings us to a consideration of the expression as it is applied to Judah. The part played by the עַם הָאֶרֶץ in the overthrow of Athaliah and the enthronement of the young Joash (2 Kings xi) has been taken as evidence that the עַם הָאֶרֶץ was a powerful political body within the population of Judah who played a vital role in the affairs of the state. It is argued that this view is supported by the part played by the עַם הָאֶרֶץ in the enthronement of Josiah (2 Kings xxi 24) and of his successor Jehoahaz (2 Kings xxiii 30). The עַם יְהוּדָה who raised Azariah to the throne (2 Kings xiv 21) are identified with the Judean עַם הָאֶרֶץ . But the use of

19 (cont'd.)

N.H.Snaith "Leviticus" in Peake's Commentary (London 1962) in loc.

the term $\{ \text{רָאִתָּם} \}$ in these instances can be interpreted along quite different lines. The overthrow of Athaliah and the enthronement of the legitimate Davidic king Joash must be seen as a national revolution. The coup was organised by the high priest Jehoiada, who evidently had the backing of the army, and was supported by the nation at large. To be sure verse 20 seems to contrast the $\{ \text{רָאִתָּם} \}$ with the עִיר but this, as De Vaux has suggested,²⁰ may be nothing more than a distinction between the city as the seat of the regime which had just been overthrown and the rest of the country which had remained loyal to the Davidic house. And in the case of Azariah, Josiah and Jehoahaz the expression is to be interpreted in a similar manner. That is to say, these kings were raised to power by popular acclamation.

In 2 Kings xv 5 we read that Jotham "was over the house, judging the people of the land". This text has been interpreted as meaning that the $\{ \text{רָאִתָּם} \}$ were a privileged group who had direct access to the king in judicial matters and who were not subject to the royal officials who might otherwise deal with such matters.²¹ But such an interpretation is surely too forced. The most natural interpretation of the text is that Jotham in the absence of his leprosy-stricken father was responsible, either personally or through the agency of his officials, for such legal matters as any of his subjects, irrespective of class or rank, might bring before him.

2 Kings xvi 15 reads:

"And king Ahaz commanded Uriah the priest saying: Upon the great altar burn the morning burnt offering and the evening meal offering, and the

20. R. De Vaux Ancient Israel (London 1961) p.71.

21. Cf. Würthwein op.cit. p.29.

king's burnt offering and his meal offering, and the burnt offering of all the people of the land....."

This text, like the previous one, has been interpreted as meaning that the

סוֹד הַמֶּלֶךְ was a special body of men in Judah who stood in a privileged relationship to the king since, it is argued, their offerings are classed with those of the king whilst the offerings of other groups, for example the Jerusalem people, are not mentioned.²² But again such an interpretation is very strained. Here again the most natural interpretation of the text is that Ahaz demanded that all sacrifices including his own and those of any of his subjects who might come up to the Temple to worship were to be offered upon the newly erected altar.

Two texts which have been deemed particularly significant in the discussion of the meaning of the expression are 2 Kings xxiii 35 and xxv 19. In the former it is narrated that Jehoiakim in order to raise the tribute imposed upon Judah by Necho, the victor of Megiddo, "taxed the land" and "exacted the silver and gold from the people of the land, each one according to his rating". This has been taken as evidence of the economic role played by this alleged special group of Judaeans men.²³ But here again there is no need to take the expression as referring to anything other than the Judaeans population in general. In this verse the "land" in the first half is synonymous with "the people of the land" in the second half. In other words a universal taxation was imposed upon the country and each family was taxed according to its means. We may contrast this universal levy imposed by Jehoiakim with that imposed by Menahem (2 Kings xv 20) upon the wealthy

22. Ibid. pp.8,30.

23. Cf. Würthwein op.cit. p.34f.

גבורי החיל only.²⁴ The second text, 2 Kings xxv 19 (cf. Jerem. lli 25) reads:²⁵

"And he took from the city an officer who was in command of the men of war; and five men of those who saw the king's face, who were found in the city; and the secretary of the commander of the host, who mustered the people of the land; and sixty men of the people of the land who were found in the city."

Those who contend that the גבורי החיל was a specific class of men within Judah take this text as evidence of the military role played by them in the country's affairs.²⁶ Now it is obvious that only the adult male population of the country would have been liable for military service but here again they are referred to loosely as the גבורי החיל. We may compare the use of the term here with the analogous use of יהודה in such texts as Judges i 10, 2 Samuel xx 5, 2 Kings xiv 12 and of ישראל in such texts as 2 Samuel v 2, x 15,17, etc. In these instances both "Judah" and "Israel" actually refer to the fighting men but it would be absurd to imagine that only the militia bore the name Judah or Israel.

2 Kings xxiv 14 reads:²⁷

"And he carried away all Jerusalem and all the captains and all the trained men of the army - a deportation - and all the artisans and smiths; there was none left except the poor of the people of the land."

In the parallel text in Jeremiah lli¹⁶ the word נ is omitted. It is also omitted in 2 Kings xxv 12. The LXX reads: ὁ πτωχὸς τῆς γῆς. It has

24. For this class see W. McKane "The Gibbôr Hayil in the Israelite Community" in Glasgow University Oriental Society Transactions xvii (1959) pp.28-37.

25. For this verse see J.A. Montgomery and H.S. Gehman Kings (ICC, Edinburgh 1951) in loc.

26. Cf. Würthwein op.cit. pp.10,44.

27. Cf. Montgomery and Gehman op.cit. in loc.

been argued on the basis of this that the word $\square \vee$ in the MT is a gloss and that therefore this text is of no value in the discussion of the meaning of $\vee \square \square \square \square$.²⁸ But if the contention of this article is correct, viz. that the expression is purely general in meaning, then the text in 2 Kings xxiv 14 with or without the word $\square \vee$ means the same thing - only the poorest elements in the Judaeen population were left in the land.

It is difficult to see how 2 Kings xxv 3 (cf. Jerem. lii 6) can be used in support of any theory which holds that the $\vee \square \square \square \square$ was a particular social or political group within Judah's population. The text contains a note which reads:²⁹

וַיְחֻזַּק הָרָעָב בְּעִיר וּלְאָ הָיָה לֶחֶם לְעַם הָאָרֶץ

There are two possible interpretations of this verse. It is possible to take the note to mean that in both city ($\vee \square$) and countryside ($\square \square \square \square$) there was famine:

"And the famine was sore in the city; neither was there any bread for the people of the land."

Alternatively, it is possible that the second half of the verse stands in apposition to the first half so that both halves refer to the same location:

"And the famine was sore in the city so that there was no bread for the people of the land."

In view of the fact that the whole context of this note is dealing with events in Jerusalem this second interpretation is to be preferred. But whether the first or second is preferred can we seriously accept the view that the $\vee \square \square \square \square$ refers to only a particular class or group in the city or countryside? The most natural interpretation of the text is that because of

28. So Würthwein op.cit. p.43.

29. Possibly an interpolation. Cf. Montgomery and Gehman op.cit. in loc.

the seige of Jerusalem the inhabitants of the city, both men, women and children, were threatened with starvation.

In four texts in Jeremiah (i 18, xxxiv 19, xxxvii 2, xlv 21) the $\{ \gamma \delta \pi \square \nu$ are mentioned together with the kings, nobility and the priesthood. Those who argue that the $\{ \gamma \delta \pi \square \nu$ was a special political or social group within Judah's population take these texts as evidence of the high position of that group classed as it is with the highest officials and social classes in the country.³⁰ Here again, however, the expression can be interpreted in a purely general sense. For example, Jeremiah i 18 reads:

"For behold I have made thee this day a fenced city and an iron pillar and as walls of bronze against the whole land, against the kings of Judah, against the princes thereof and the priests thereof and the people of the land."

Here the expression $\{ \gamma \delta \pi \square \nu$ is most easily interpreted as referring to any of the Judaeen population who together with the ruling classes and the priesthood might attempt to persecute the prophet. Such an interpretation is much more in accordance with the first half of the verse with its promise of protection for the prophet "against the whole land". And the meaning of the expression in the other texts (xxxiv 19, xxxvii 2, xlv 21) is best understood in this same general sense, viz. as a comprehensive term for the rest of the population apart from the royal house or the ruling classes and the priesthood. The use of the expression in Ezekiel vii 27, xxi 29 and Daniel ix 6 is to be understood in the same manner.

Apart from the two texts just cited the expression $\{ \gamma \delta \pi \square \nu$ occurs elsewhere in Ezekiel in xii 19, xxxiii 2, xxxix 13, xlv 22,³¹ xlv 3, 9.

30. Cf. Würthwein op.cit. p.9f.; p.36f.

31. Ezekiel xlv 16 reads $\{ \gamma \delta \pi \square \nu \pi$. Since the LXX omits $\square \nu \pi$ it is probable that it is a gloss in the MT. Cf. Würthwein op.cit. p.47.

In xii 19 the **עַם הָאֶרֶץ** is parallel to the "inhabitants of Jerusalem" and the "land of Israel". Similarly in xxxix 13 the **כָּל עַם הָאֶרֶץ** is clearly synonymous with the **בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל** in verse 12. In Ezekiel xxxiii 2 the expression is again used in a purely general sense of the inhabitants of a country. In Ezekiel xlv 22, xlvi 3,9, the **עַם הָאֶרֶץ** can only be taken as designating the Jewish community as distinct from the **נָשִׂים**. This is evidenced by the fact that in xlv 19 and xlv 3 respectively the **עַם** and the **עַם הָאֶרֶץ** are clearly used of one and the same class, viz. the ordinary worshippers who were to worship in the outer court.³²

In Haggai ii 4 the prophet exhorts Zerubbabel, the high priest and the people of the land to work for the rebuilding of the Temple. Here **עַם הָאֶרֶץ** is obviously parallel in meaning to the **שְׂאֵרֵת הָעָם** of verse 2 and is just as general in meaning.³³ In Zechariah vii 5 once more the **עַם הָאֶרֶץ** must be taken as nothing more than a general reference to the population as a whole.

In Ezra iv 4 the **עַם הָאֶרֶץ** is contrasted with **עַם יְהוּדָה** and is clearly a general term designating those elements in the population of the country who attempted to frustrate the efforts of the returned exiles to rebuild the Temple. The **עַמֵּי הָאֲרָצוֹת** of Ezra ix 1,2,11 (cf. 2 Chron. xii 9) and the **עַמֵּי הָאֶרֶץ** of Ezra x 2,11 and Nehemiah x 31,32 are synonymous and both clearly designate the heathen population of Palestine amongst whom the Jews who had returned had to live - "Canaanites, Hittites,

32. Cf. Würthwein op.cit. p.47f.

33. Würthwein op.cit. p.53 (following Rothstein and Sellin) would change **עַם הָאֶרֶץ** here to **כָּל שְׂאֵרֵת הָעָם** which is very frequent in Haggai. But such a change has no support from the versions and must be considered arbitrary. (cf. G.A.Danell Studies in the name Israel in the O.T. (Upsala 1946) p.266 footnote 81.)

Perizzites, Jebusites, Ammonites, Moabites, Egyptians and Amorites" (cf. Ezra ix 1). It is quite possible that the later Rabbinical use of the expression as a term of contempt for the religiously illiterate had its roots in the situation in Judah in the post-exilic period to which these texts refer. Finally the יְרֵאָתָם in Esther viii 17 is most naturally interpreted as referring to the general population of the country amongst whom the heroine Esther lived. Again the view that the expression is here referring to a specific social or political class is unwarranted.

It may be concluded from this brief survey that the expression יְרֵאָתָם in the Old Testament has no fixed and rigid meaning but is used rather in a fluid and general sense varying in meaning from context to context. To argue that it is a technical term is, in my opinion to go beyond the evidence.

Works consulted in the Preparation of this Thesis.

- Ackroyd P.R. Continuity: a study in the Old Testament religious tradition. (London, 1962).
- Addis W.E. The Documents of the Hexateuch vol.I (London 1892), vol.II (1898).
- Albright W.F.
 "King Jehoiachin in exile" BA vol.v no.4 (1942).
 "The Chronology of the divided monarchy of Israel" BASOR 100 (Dec.1945) pp.16-22.
From Stone Age to Christianity (2nd edit. Baltimore 1946).
Archaeology and the Religion of Israel (3rd edit. Baltimore 1953).
 "New Light from Egypt on the Chronology and History of Israel and Judah" BASOR 130 (1953) pp.4-11.
- Alt A.
 "Judas Gaue unter Josia" KS II pp.276-288.
 "Die Staatenbildung der Israeliten in Palästina" KS II pp.1-65.
 "Die Ursprünge des Israelitischen Rechts" KS I pp.278-332.
 "Die Heimat des Deuteronomiums" KS II pp.250-275.
- Amussin I.D.
 "The People of the Land" in Russian in Vestnik Drevnej Istorii vol.ii (1955) pp.14-36. A German summary in Bibliotheca Classica Orientalis (Berlin) vol.i (1956) pp.73-75.
- Anderson B.W. The Living World of the Old Testament (London 1958).
- Anderson B.W. and W.Harrelson (edit.) Israel's Prophetic Heritage (Essays in honour of James Muilenburg, London 1962).
- Anderson G.W. A Critical Introduction to the Old Testament (London 1959).
- Battersby-Harford J. Since Wellhausen (Compiled from a series of articles published in the Expositor, July-December 1925).
- Baumgartner W.
 "Der Kampf um das Deuteronomium" TR (1929) p.7ff.
 "Wellhausen und der heutige Stand der Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft" TR (1930).
- Bentzen A. Die josianische Reform und ihre Voraussetzungen (Copenhagen 1926).

- Bentzen A. "The Cultic use of the Story of the Ark in Samuel" JBL lxvii (1948) pp.37-53.
Introduction to the Old Testament (4th edit. 2 vols. in one, Copenhagen 1958).
- Berry G.R. "The Code found in the Temple" JBL xxxix (1920) pp.44-51.
 "The Date of Deuteronomy" JBL lix (1940) pp.133-139.
- Bertholet A. Das Deuteronomium (Leipzig 1899).
- Bewer J.A. with L.B.Patton and G.Dahl "A Symposium on the Problem of Deuteronomy" JBL xlvii (1928) pp.305-379.
- Beyerlin W. Die Kulttradition Israels in der Verkündigung des Propheten Micha FRLANT liv (1959).
- Bič M. "Bet'el: Le Sanctuaire du Roi" AOr xvii (1949) pp.46-63.
- Binns E. Jeremiah (Westminster commentary, London 1919).
- Bowman J. "Ezekiel and the Zadokite Priesthood" TGUOS vol. xvi (1956) pp.1-14.
 "The Samaritans and the Book of Deuteronomy" TGUOS xvii (1958) pp.9-18.
- Breit H. Die Predigt des Deuteronomisten (Munich 1933).
- Bright J. Early Israel in Recent History Writing (London 1956).
A History of Israel (1st British edit. London 1960).
- Brinker R. The Influence of Sanctuaries in Early Israel (Manchester 1946)
- Budde K. "Das Deuteronomium und die Reform Josias" ZAW xliv (1926) pp.177-224.
- Burkitt F.C. A review of Kennett's Deuteronomy and the Decalogue in JTS xxii (1921) pp.61-65.
 A Note in JBL xl (1921) p.167.
- Burney C.F. The Book of Judges (London 1918).
- Campbell E.F. "Excavation at Shechem 1960" BA vol.xxiii no.4 (1960).
- Campbell E.F. with Ross J.F. "The Excavation of Shechem and the Biblical Tradition" BA vol. xxvi no.1 (1963).
- Carpenter J.E. and Harford G. The Composition of the Hexateuch (London 1902).
- Caspari W. "Weltreichbegebenheiten bei dem Deuteronomisten?" OLZ xxvii (1924) cols.8-10.
- Cazelles H. Études sur le Code de L'alliance (Paris 1946).
 "Jérémie et le Deutéronome" RScR xxxviii (1951) pp.5-36.
Le Deutéronome (Paris 1958).

- Cook S.A. "Some recent tendencies in Old Testament Criticism" JTS xxvi (1925) p.156ff.
Cambridge Ancient History vol.III (1925) p.406f. and pp.481-486.
- Cornill C.H. Einleitung in das Alte Testament (Tübingen 1891)
- Cross F.M. and D.N.Freedman "Josiah's Revolt against Assyria" JNES xii (1953) pp.56-58.
- Cross F.M. and G.E.Wright "The Boundary Lists of the Kingdom of Judah" JBL lxxv (1956) pp.202-226.
- Cullen J. The Book of the Covenant in Moab (Glasgow 1903)
- Daiches S. "The Meaning of am ha-aretz in the Old Testament" JTS xxx (1929) pp.245-249.
- Danell G.A. Studies in the Name Israel in the Old Testament (Upsala 1946)
- Davies G.Henton Deuteronomy in Peake's Commentary (edit. H.H.Rowley and M.Black, London 1962).
- Day E. "The Promulgation of Deuteronomy" JBL xxi (1902).
- Dornseiff F. "Antikes zum Alten Testament: 4. Die Abfassungszeit des Pentateuchs und die Deuteronomiumsfrage" ZAW lvi (1938) pp.64-85.
- Driver S.R. Deuteronomy (ICC 2nd edit. Edinburgh 1902).
Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament (9th edit. Edinburgh 1913).
- Dubberstein W.H. "Assyrian-Babylonian Chronology" JNES iiii (1944) pp.38-46.
- Dumérout F. "Zur deuteronomischen Kulttheologie und ihre Voraussetzungen" ZAW lxx (1958) pp.59-98.
- Eerdmans B.D. "Deuteronomy" in Old Testament Essays (edit.D.C.Simpson, London 1927) pp.77-84.
- Eichrodt W. "Bahnt sich eine neue Lösung der Deuteronomischen Frage an?"
Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift xxxii (1921) pp.41-78.
- d'Eichthal G. Critique Biblique (1886).
- Eissfeldt O. Einleitung in das Alte Testament (Tübingen 1934).
"Stierbild und Lade" ZAW lviii (1940-41) pp.190-215.
"Silo und Jerusalem" in Supplement to Vetus Testamentum (Leiden 1958) pp.138-147.
Review of F.Horst in TLZ xlix (1924) col.224f.

- Elhorst H.J. "Die deuteronomischen Jahresfeste" ZAW xlii (1924) pp.136-145.
- Emerton J.A. "Priests and Levites in Deuteronomy" VT xii (1962) pp.129-138.
- Freed A. "The Code spoken of in II Kings xxii-xxiii" JBL xl (1921) pp.76-80.
- Fries S.A. Die Gesetzschrift des Königs Josia
- Galling K. "Königliche und nichtkönigliche Stifter beim Temple von Jerusalem" ZDPV lxiii (1946-51) pp.134-142.
- Gillischewski E. "Der Ausdruck Am Ha'arec im AT" ZAW xl (1922) pp.137-142.
- Gordis R. "Sectional rivalry in the Kingdom of Judah" JQR xxv (1934-35) pp.237-259.
- Gordon E.T. "Jeremiah's Beginnings" ET xliv (1932-33) pp.562-565.
- Graham W.L. "The Modern Controversy about Deuteronomy" JR vii (1927) pp.396-418.
- Gramberg C.P.W. Kritische Geschichte der Religionsideen des AT (1829-30) Vol.I.
- Gressman H. "Josia und das Deuteronomium" ZAW xlii (1924) pp.313-337.
"Vorläufer des Dtns." OLZ xxix (1926) pp.779-782.
- Hahn H. The Old Testament and Modern Research (London 1956).
- Harford J.B. "Altars and Sanctuaries in the Old Testament (Deut. 12-28)" ET xl (March 1929).
- Harrelson W. See under Anderson B.C. above.
- Hastings J. Dictionary of the Bible (2nd revised edit. H.H.Rowley, Edinburgh 1963).
- Havet E. Le Christianisme et ses Origines (Paris 1878) vol.III.
- Hempel J. Die Schichten des Deuteronomiums (Leipzig 1914).
- Herbert A.S. I and II Chronicles in Peake's Commentary (London 1962).
- Hülscher G. Die Propheten. Untersuchungen zur Religionsgeschichte Israels (Leipzig 1914).
"Komposition und Ursprung des Deuteronomiums" ZAW xl(1922) pp.161-255.
Geschichte der israelitischen und jüdischen Religions (Giessen 1922).
"Das Buch der Könige: seine Quellen und seine Redaktion" in Eucharisterion für Gunkel in FRLANT n.f, xviii-xx (1923) pp.158-213.

- Hooke S.H. (Edit.) Myth, Ritual and Kingship (Oxford 1958).
- Hoonacker A. van "Le lieu du culte dans la législation rituelle des Hebreus" Le Muséon xiii (1894) p.195f.
- Horst F. "Die Kultusreform des Königs Josia" ZDMG lxxvii (1923) pp.220-238.
 "Die Anfänge des Propheten Jeremia" ZAW xli (1923) pp.94-153.
 "Das Privilegrecht Jahwes" FRLANT n.f. xxviii (1930) now in his Gesammelte Studien (Munich 1961) pp.17-154.
- Horst L. "Etudes sur le Deutéronome" RHR xvii (1888) and xxvii (1893).
- Hyatt J.P. "Jeremiah and Deuteronomy" JNES i (1942) pp.156-173.
- James Flemming Personalities of the Old Testament (London 1939).
- Jepsen A. "Die Reform des Josias" Baumgärtel-Festschrift (edit. J.Herrmann, Erlangen 1959) pp.97-108.
- Johnson A.R. Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel (Cardiff 1955).
- Junge E. "Der Wiederaufbau des Heerwesens des Reiches Juda unter Josia" BWANT iv; 23, 1937.
- Junker H. "Die Entstehungszeit des Ps. 78 und das Deuteronomium" Biblica xxxiv (1953) pp.487-500.
- Irwin W.A. "An objective criterion for the dating of Deuteronomy" AJSL lvi (1939) pp.337-349.
- Kaufmann Y. The Religion of Israel (Trans. and abridged by M.Greenberg, London 1961).
- Kegel M. "Wo opferte Israel seinem Gott?" NKZ xxxv (1924) pp.239-280 and 483-516.
- Kennett R.H. "The Origin of the Aaronite Priesthood" JTS vi (1905) pp.161-186.
 "The Date of Deuteronomy" JTS vii (1906) pp.481-500.
Deuteronomy and the Decalogue (Cambridge 1920) reprinted in The Church of Israel (edit. S.A.Cook 1933) pp.73-98
Old Testament Essays (Cambridge 1928).
- Kittel R. Geschichte des Volkes Israel vol.II (7th edit.Stuttgart 1925)
- Klamroth E. "Die jüdischen Exulanten in Babylonien" BWAT x (1912).
- Klostermann A. Der Pentateuch (n.f. 1907).
- Kühler L. Note on $\overline{\pi} \overline{\gamma} \overline{\gamma} \overline{\gamma}$ in ZAW liv (1936) p.291.

- König E. Das Deuteronomium (Leipzig 1917).
 "Stimmen Exod. xx 24 und Deut. xii 13f. zusammen?" ZAW xlii (1924) pp.337-346.
 "Der Generelle Artikel im Hebräischen" ZAW xliv (1926) p.173f.
 "Deuteronomische Hauptfragen" ZAW xlviii (1930) pp.43-66.
- Kraus H.-J. "Gilgal: ein Beitrag zur Kulturgeschichte Israels" VF i (1951) pp.181-199.
Gottesdienst in Israel (2nd edit. Munich 1962).
- Lemaire P. "Crise et effondrement de la monarchie Davidique" RB xlv (1936) pp.161-183.
- Levy I. The Growth of the Pentateuch (1955).
- Lindblom J. Prophecy in Ancient Israel (Oxford) 1962)
- M.Lühr Das Deuteronomium: Untersuchung zum Hexateuch-Problem (Berlin 1925).
- Loisy A. Religion D'Israel (3rd edit. Paris 1933).
- Luckenbill D.D. The Annals of Sennacherib (Chicago 1924).
- Maag V. "Erdgungen zur deuteronomischen Kultzentralisation" VF vi (1956) pp.10-18.
- Malamat A. "The Historical Background to the Assassination of Amon King of Judah" IEJ iii (1953) pp.26-29.
- Manson T.W.(edit.) A Companion to the Bible (Edinburgh 1939).
A Companion to the Bible (2nd edit. by H.H.Rowley Edinburgh 1963).
- Narti K. Deuteronomium (HSAK 4th edit. Tübingen 1922).
- Nauchline J. I and II Kings In Peake's Commentary (London 1962) pp.338-356; Isaiah (TBC, London 1962).
- Nazar B. "Jerusalem -- King's Chapel and Royal City" in Judah and Jerusalem (Jerusalem 1957) pp.25-32 (in Hebrew but with a summary in English).
- McKane W. I and II Samuel (TBC, London 1963).
 "The Gibbor Hayil in the Israelite Community" TGUOS xvii (1959) pp.28-37.
- Meinhold J. "Zur Frage der Kultuszentralisation" Wellhausen-Festschrift (Giessen 1914), pp.301-315.

- Mendenhall G.E. "Ancient Oriental and Biblical Law" BA xvii (1954) pp.26-46.
 "Covenant Forms in Israelite Tradition" BA xvii (1954) pp.50-76.
- Menes A. "Die vorexilische Gesetz Israels in Zusammenhang seiner kulturgeschichtlichen Entwicklung" BZAW vol. I (1928).
- Nickerson N. Leviticus IB vol.II (1953).
- Nibler J.W. Das Verhältnis Jeremias und Hesekiels sprachlich und theologisch untersucht mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Prosareden Jeremias (Assen 1955).
- Minette G.Tillesse de "Les sections 'tu' et les sections 'vous' dans le Deutéronome" VI xii (1962) pp.29-87.
- Mitchell H.G. "The Use of the Second Person in Deuteronomy" JBL xviii (1899) pp.61-109.
- Montgomery J.A. and Gehman H.S. Kings (ICC, Edinburgh 1951).
- Mowinckel S. Le Décalogue (Paris 1927).
Prophecy and Tradition (Oslo 1946).
- Muilenburg J. "The form and structure of the covenantal formulations" VI ix (1959) pp.347-365.
- Newman M. "The Prophetic Call of Samuel" in Israel's Prophetic Heritage (edit. B.W.Anderson and W.Harrelson, London 1962) pp.86-97.
- Nielsen E. Oral Tradition (London 1954).
- North C.R. "Pentateuchal Criticism" OTMS pp.48-83.
- Noth M. "Das System der zwölf Stämme Israels" BWANT IV 1 (1930).
Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuchs (Stuttgart 1948).
 "Jerusalem und die israelitische Tradition" OTS now in his Gesammelte Studien (Munich 1960) pp.172-187.
 "Gott, König, Volk im Alten Testament" ZPK xlvii (1950) pp.157-191 now in Gesammelte Studien pp.188-229.
 "Die Gesetz im Pentateuch" Gesammelte Studien pp.9-141.
 "Das Amt des Richters Israels" Bertholet-Festschrift (Tübingen 1950) pp.404-417.
Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien I (2nd edit.Tübingen 1957).
The History of Israel (ET S.Godman, London 1958).
Exodus (ET by J.S.Boden from Das Zweite Buch Mose in ATD Göttingen 1959, London 1962).

- Nowack W. "Deuteronomium und Regum" Marti-Festschrift BZAW xli (1925) pp.221-231.
- Oesterley W.O.E. and Robinson T.H. A History of Israel vols. I and II (Oxford 1932).
Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament (London 1934).
- Oestreicher Th. Das Deuteronomische Grundgesetz (Gutersloh 1923).
"Dtn. xii 13f. im Licht von Dtn. xxiii 16f." ZAW xliii (1925) pp.246-249.
Reichstempel und Ortsheiligtümer in Israel (Gutersloh 1930).
- Oppenheim A.A. Article on Assyria in The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible (general editor G.A.Buttrick, New York 1962).
- Orr J. The Problem of the Old Testament (New York 1906).
- Paton L.B. See above under Bewer J.A.
- Peake A.S. "Some recent developments in Old Testament criticism" BJRL xiii (1928).
- Pedersen Johs. Israel: its Life and Culture III-IV (London 1940).
"Passahfest und Passahlegende" ZAW lii (1934) p.161ff.
- Pfeiffer R.H. Introduction to the Old Testament (1st British edit. London 1952).
- Poebel A. "The Assyrian King List from Khorsabad" JNES ii (1943) pp.56-90.
- Poels A. Examen Critique de l'Histoire du Sanctuaire de l'Arche (Louvain 1897).
- Pope M.H. Article on Am-ha'arez in The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible (edit. G.A.Buttrick, New York 1962).
- Porteous N.W. "The Prophets and the Problem of Continuity" Israel's Prophetic Heritage (edit. Anderson and Harrelson, London 1962) pp.11-25.
- Porter J.R. "The Interpretation of II Samuel vi and Psalm cxxxii" JTJ v (1954) pp.161-173.
- Pritchard J.B. Ancient Near Ancient Texts Relating to the Old Testament (2nd edit. London 1955).
- Procksch O. "König Josia" in Festschrift für Zahn (1928) p.19ff.
- Puukko A.F. Das Deuteronomium (Leipzig 1910).

- Rad G. von "Das Gottesvolk in Deuteronomium" BWAT (1929)
 "Zelt und Lade" NKZ xlii (1931) pp.476-498 now in his
Gesammelte Studien pp.109-129.
 "Das Formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuchs" BWANT
 (1938) now in Gesammelte Studien (Göttingen 1958) pp.9-86,
Studies in Deuteronomy (ET by D.M.G.Stalker from Deutero-
nomium-Studien Göttingen 1948, London 1953).
 "Die Stadt auf dem Berge" Evangelische Theologie viii
 (1948-49) pp.439-447 now in Gesammelte Studien pp.214-224.
Der Heilige Krieg im Alten Israel (Göttingen 1958).
Old Testament Theology vol.I (ET by D.M.G.Stalker from
Theologie des A.T. Göttingen 1958, London 1962).
 Robertson E. The Old Testament Problem (Manchester 1950).
 Rost L. "Die Bezeichnungen für Land und Volk im A.T." in
Procksch-Festschrift (Leipzig 1934) pp.125-148.
 Rowley H.H. "Zadok and Nehustan" JBL lviii (1939) pp.113-141.
 "Melchizedek and Zadok" Bertholet-Festschrift (Tübingen
 1950) pp.461-474.
 "The Prophet Jeremiah and the Book of Deuteronomy" in
Studies in Old Testament Prophecy (edit. H.H.Rowley
 London 1950).
The Growth of the Old Testament (London 1950).
 "Hezekiah's Reform and Rebellion" BJRL xlv (1962)
 pp.395-431.
 Rowley H.H. and Black M. Peake's Commentary (2nd edition completely
 revised, London 1962).
 Rudolph W. Chronikbücher HAT (edit. O.Eissfeldt, Tübingen 1955).
 Saggs H.W.F. The Greatness that was Babylon (London 1962).
 Sanda A. Moses und der Pentateuch
 Schmidt H. Review of Hölscher's works cited above. Th. Blatter ii
 (1923) p.223f. and TLZ xlvi (1923) cols. 289-292.
 "Jahwe und die Kulttradition von Jerusalem" ZAW lxvii
 (1955) pp.147-197.

- Schofield J.N. "The significance of the prophets for the dating of Deuteronomy" in Studies in History and Religion (edit. A.E.Payne, London 1942) pp.44-60.
- Segal M.H. "The Composition of the Pentateuch -- A Fresh Examination" in Scripta Hierosolymitana viii (Jerusalem 1961) pp.68-114.
- Sellin E. Introduction to the Old Testament (ET by J.A.Montgomery from 3rd edit. of his Einleitung in das Alte Testament, London 1923).
Einleitung in das Alte Testament (8th edit. by L.Rost Heidelberg 1950).
Geschichte des jüdisch-israelitischen Volkes (Leipzig 1924).
- Siebens A.R. L'Origine du Code Deutéronomique (Paris 1929).
- Simpson C. Pentateuchal Criticism (London 1914).
- Sloush N. "Representative government among the Hebrews and Phoenicians" JQR iv (1913) pp.303-310.
- Smart J.D. The Interpretation of Scripture (1st British edit. London 1962).
- Smith G.A. Jerusalem vol.II (London 1908).
Deuteronomy (CBSC, Cambridge 1918).
- Smith J.F.P. "The Recent History of Old Testament Interpretation" JR vi (1926) pp.403-424.
- Snaith N.H. Leviticus in Peake's Commentary (London 1962), pp.241-253.
- Sperber J. "Der Personenwechsel in der Bibel" ZA xxx (1918) pp.23-33.
- Spiegelberg W. "Zur Datierung des Deuteronomiums" OLZ xxvi (1923) pp.481-482.
- Stärk W. Das Deuteronomium: sein Inhalt und seine literarische Form (Leipzig, 1894).
Das Problem des Deuteronomiums (Gutersloh 1924).
"Noch einmal das Problem des Deuteronomiums" Sellin-Festschrift (Leipzig 1927) pp.139-150.
- Steuernagel K. Der Rahmen des Deuteronomiums (Halle 1894).
Die Entstehung des Deuteronomischen Gesetz (Leipzig 1895).

- Sulzberger M. The Am Ha-aretz: the ancient Hebrew Parliament (Chicago 1909).
- Thadmor H. "The Chronology of the last kings of Judah" JNES xv (1956) pp.226-230.
- Thomas D.Winton (edit.) Documents from Old Testament Times (London 1958)
- Vaux R. de "Le schisme religieux de Jéroboam Ier" Angelicum xx 1943 = Biblica et Orientalia (1943) pp.77-91.
Ancient Israel (ET from Les Institutions de l'ancien Israel vol. I (Paris 1958) and vol.II (Paris 1960) by J.McHugh, London 1961).
- Vermes M. Une Nouvelle Hypothèse sur la Composition du Deutéronome (1887)
- Vincent L.H. "Abraham à Jerusalem" RB lviii (1951) pp.360-371.
- Vriezen Th.C. An Outline of Old Testament Theology (Oxford 1958).
- Weiser A. Introduction to the Old Testament (ET by D.M.Barton from 4th German edition of his Einleitung, London 1962).
The Psalms (ET by H.Hartwell, London 1962).
- Welch A.C. The Code of Deuteronomy: a new theory of its origin (London 1924).
"The two descriptions of the sanctuary in Deuteronomy" ET xxxvi (1924-25) pp.442-444.
"When was the worship of Israel centralised at the Temple?" ZAW xliii (1925) pp.250-255.
"The Death of Josiah" ZAW xliii (1925).
"The two descriptions of the sanctuary in Deuteronomy" ET xxxvii (1925-26) pp.215-219.
"On the method of celebrating Passover" ZAW xlv (1927) pp.24-29.
"The Problem of Deuteronomy" JBL xliii (1929).
Deuteronomy: the framework to the code (London 1932).
The Work of the Chronicler (Schweich Lectures 1938).
- Wellhausen J. Prolegomena to the History of Israel (ET by Robertson Smith, Edinburgh 1895).
Die Composition des Hexateuchs (Berlin 1899).

- Wette W.M.L.de A Critical Introduction to the Canonical Scriptures of the Old Testament (ET by T.Parker, Boston 1843).
- Whitley C.F. The Exilic Age (London 1957).
- Wiseman D.J. Article on Assyrian inscriptions in Documents from Old Testament Times (see above).
- Wright G.E. The Old Testament against its background (London 1950).
God Who Acts (London 1952).
Deuteronomy in IB vol.ii (1953) pp.331-535.
 "The Levites in Deuteronomy" VT iv (1954) pp.325-330.
Biblical Archaeology (1st edit. London 1957).
 "Cult and History" in Interpretation xvi (January 1962). pp.3-20.
- Würthwein E. "Der 'am ha' arez im Alten Testament" BWANT iv:17 (1936).
- Zeitlin S. "The Am Ha'arez" JQR xxiii (1932-33) pp.45-61.