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ABSTRACT

In the first chapter it is argued that Deuteronomism was not an active force in Judah before or during the time of Jehoash. While it is impossible to determine precisely the degree to which religious and political factors combined to influence Hezekiah's reformation, this king's centralization of sacrificial worship at Jerusalem reflects the crystallization of opinion which is associated with the Deuteronomic circle and is the first historical indication of the presence and activity of the Deuteronomic movement in the Southern Kingdom.

In the second chapter, the major opinions concerning Deuteronomy are examined and it is argued that Urdeuteronomium provided the principal motivation for Josiah's reformation. While the book is to be assigned to the seventh century, it should be recognized as the final deposit of a long period of growth and development.

In the final chapter, the view that the Deuteronomic demand for cultic centralization had its origin in the Jerusalem cult traditions and the claims of the Jerusalem temple to a position of primacy is examined and rejected. This Deuteronomic demand is to be interpreted in the light of the Deuteronomic theology with its insistence upon one God, one nation, and one cult, all defined and interpreted through one torah, which Deuteronomy claims to be. Deuteronomy declared to Israel the will of Yahweh expressed in the Sinai covenant and just as the prototype of Deuteronomy as a covenant document was the Decalogue, so the prototype of the Deuteronomic central sanctuary was Mount Sinai, where Israel originated. Noth's theory of an Israelite amphictyony is then examined and rejected. Israel's constitutive factor was its faith and the unity of Israel as the people of Yahweh originated at the establishment of the Sinai covenant. The thesis ends with a brief examination of the consequences of Josiah's implementation of cultic centralization.
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Introduction (incorporating a definition of terms used, a clarification of the principal issues to be discussed, an indication of the limits of and problems inherent in such a study, a brief survey of some of the major suggestions which have been offered as to the background and motivation of the demand for cultic centralization, and a brief exposition of the methods and procedures to be employed in the presentation of the material).

"The basic meaning of Israelite worship", writes W.J. Harrelson, (1) "is to be found in the quality of the relationship which it both affirmed and established between God and man." In a broad sense, "worship" may be defined as the recognition and acknowledgment of the absolute worth of God. (2) However, it can also be understood to refer specifically to those acts and words of man in response to God who reveals Himself to man. Worship in this sense must include the performance of recognized public acts and the utterance of familiar words by the members of the community, through which they can make their approach to God. As Herbert rightly points out, in ancient Israel, the words and acts of worship constituted the meeting point of God, as He had revealed Himself to Israel, and His people Israel, as they knew themselves in the light of this revelation. (3) The performance of these ritual acts and the utterance of these words both expressed Israel's desire to obtain communion with God and constituted the effective media


through which the relationship between God and Israel was maintained or restored.\(^4\) There can be little doubt that the cult represented for the bulk of the people of ancient Israel the specifically religious aspect of life. For the greater part of the populace, Yahweh's activity was especially manifest in the cultus.\(^5\)

One of the most universal of ritual activities and certainly the most regular and normal cultic act in ancient Israel was sacrifice.\(^6\) The Old Testament ascribes an antiquity to animal sacrifice as great as that of the human race (Gen. iv:3ff).\(^7\) For the patriarchs, who do not appear to have participated in an established cultus, sacrificial offerings were both the vehicle of their personal worship and the expression of their individual veneration for the deity.\(^8\) The older Israelite codes and the pre-exilic history provide only meagre information about the details of sacrifice, but they do take it for granted.\(^9\) There is little reason to doubt that the practice of sacrifice continued through the pre-Settlement period\(^10\) and there is certainly abundant evidence to show that it was prevalent in the so-called period of the Judges and during the time of the monarchy.

4. Ibid.


6. Cf. Herbert, op.cit., p.15. See, too, note (41), below (pp.17ff.), McKenzie, op.cit., p.45, makes the point that not only is sacrifice an almost universal religious phenomenon but inevitably similarities will exist between sacrificial rituals "simply because of the limited possibilities of symbolism."


8. Ibid., p.24.

9. Ibid., p.113.

10. Ibid., p.116.
Deuteronomy xii contains a law which prescribes that the sacrificial cult of Yahweh shall be carried on only at the sanctuary which He has chosen. (11) The centralization of sacrificial worship in Jerusalem is the obsession of the Deuteronomistic historian who uses this law as the criterion by which to judge each king. (12) According to the Old Testament records, efforts were twice made on royal initiative to take this step: first under Hezekiah (2 Kings xviii:4, 22; 2 Chr. xxxi:1; Isa. xxxvi:7), then under Josiah (2 Kgs. xxiii:5, 8f., 15-20). According to numerous allusions in the books of Kings, the people of Judah worshipped at the "high places" before these reforms and in the intervening years. What prompted "the drastic step" (13) of complete centralization of sacrificial worship to a single sanctuary?

The main purpose of this thesis is to study the book of Deuteronomy and the accounts of the reforms of Hezekiah and Josiah with a view to determining the causes and natures of these reformation and, above all, to try to discover the motivating forces behind the demand for cultic centralization. It will be seen that while the factors which motivated this demand were manifold, one of the principal concerns of those who legislated for it was to define the nature and location of the divine presence on earth. The need to resolve the tension between the transcendent and immanent aspects in Yahweh's nature is apparent at the very beginning of Israel's sacred history and it continues like a leitmotiv throughout the entire Old Testament period, which ends

12. Ibid., p.28.
without a full reconciliation of the multiplicity of ideas on the subject together with a sense of tension between what had been promised and what had actually been fulfilled. (14) The theme of cultic centralization is intimately interwoven with the development of the conception of the nature and mode of God's presence on earth. Hence, another important aspect of this thesis will be to examine the interrelationship of these two themes and to assess the effect cultic centralization had on the theological concepts which were employed to give expression to the idea of Yahweh's dwelling in the midst of Israel.

In the past there was a tendency among commentators on the religion of Israel and theology of the Old Testament to ignore the cultus. Many regarded the sacrifices of the Old Testament as being of little or no importance for the understanding of the New Testament. (15) Furthermore, it was generally held that the Old Testament classical prophets were anti-cultic and that the emphasis placed on the cultus in the post-exilic period was a retrograde step in the development of Israelite religion. (16) In recent years, however, such views have been vigorously


15. Cf., for example, as recent a work as M. Burrows, An Outline of Biblical Theology, Philadelphia, 1946, p.5.

16. Cf., for example, B. Duhm, Der Theologie der Propheten, Bonn, 1875; idem, Israels Propheten, Tübingen, 1916, p.8, who says that prophecy represented the beginning of the spiritual history of the world and that the period following the two centuries when prophecy flourished represented a decline. J. Wellhausen, Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel with a reprint of the article 'Israel' from the Encyclopaedia Britannica, Meridian Books, Cleveland and New York, 1965, p.474; (Wellhausen's Geschichte Israels, I, was published at Marburg in 1878. The second edition, Prolegomena
challenged and much attention has been focused on the cult of both
the post-exilic and the pre-exilic periods which has resulted in a
better balanced understanding of the cultus and a fairer estimate of
the importance of its role in the life of Israel.\(^{(17)}\) It is now
widely accepted that earlier interpreters seriously underestimated
the importance of cultic worship in the formation of both Israelite
belief and Israelite literature.\(^{(18)}\) Nowadays, it is generally
agreed that the cult, particularly in its most elaborate expression in
the Jerusalem temple, was a most powerful unifying influence within the
Israelite nation. Nevertheless, study in this field has been hampered
by the fact that there is no uniformity of definition of the word "cult".
As Kapelrud\(^{(19)}\) points out, many differences of opinion on controversial
matters relating to cult can be attributed to confusion arising out of
interpretation of the term "cult" rather than factual disagreement.

16. Continued. zur Geschichte Israels was published in 1883 and an
English translation of this work by J.S. Black and A. Menzies
appeared in 1885 with the title Prolegomena to the History of
Israel), makes the claim that the prophets were the first
ethical monotheists. More recently J. Jocz, The Spiritual History
Achievement, London, 1963 have made equally exaggerated claims
about the prophetic influence on the Old Testament. However, as
ident, 'Interpreting the Prophets', A Century of Old Testament Study,
Guildford and London, 1976, pp.51-75, ref. pp.51ff., well observes,
such exaggerated claims raise prophecy out of its context in
Israel's religious tradition, do the prophets a disservice by
claiming too much for them, and create a false picture of them as
theologians rather than the messengers of Yahweh. Cf., too,
Rowley, op.cit., pp.1ff, 144ff. and the literature cited there.

17. For a review of some of the most important schools of thought on
the Israelite cult since Wellhausen, see G.E. Wright, 'Cult and
History: A Study of a Current Problem in Old Testament
Interpretation', Interpretation,xvi, No. 1, January,1962, pp.3-20.

18. Cf., for example, J.L. McKenzie, op.cit., p.63.

19. A.S. Kapelrud, 'The Role of the Cult in Old Israel', The Bible
in Modern Scholarship, edited by J. Philip Hyatt, London, 1966,
p.45. Cf., too, J. Lindblom, Prophecy in Ancient Israel, Oxford,
1967, p.351, who points out that "cult is never homogeneous;
there are many different elements in the cult, which can be
judged of in different ways."
Such confusion has led to a certain amount of exasperation among scholars. Thus, for instance, Westermann (20) condemns the expression "the cult" as being confused and vague. Preferring to think only in terms of worship, which underwent a gradual process of development in the course of Israel's history and which varied accordingly in form, time, place, and personnel, Westermann argues that no such thing as "the cult" ever existed in the Old Testament period.

In order to avoid confusion, therefore, it is imperative at the outset to try to establish what is here meant by "cult" and "cultic centralization". Obviously it is most important to bear in mind constantly the fact that there were at least four major stages in Israel's constitutional history and, hence, at least four distinct stages in the development of the cultus: that of the pre-settlement period, that of the so-called period of the Judges, that of the monarchy, and that of the post-exilic period. Moreover, not only does the Old Testament material present literary activity of a thousand years or more, but that material has been constantly added to, rewritten, and re-edited. Thus, for instance, the process by which the material in Genesis - Numbers reached its present form from the first literary strand in, or shortly after, the time of Solomon to the completion of the Priestly editorial framework of the Tetratauchen after the exile, is a complex and controversial subject. (21)

The constant process of


reinterpretation of the Old Testament material was the result of the recognition that the word of God is never static but, rather, essentially active and, therefore, to be adapted and to be made real and actual for each generation. (22) Consequently, it is essential to attempt to identify the principal contributors to the formation of the text and to examine the distinctive developments which


took place in the interpretation of the material caused by the different theological perspectives of the various writers and editors.\(^{23}\)

23. As J. Barr, Old and New in Interpretation: A Study of the Two Testaments, London, 1966, pp.201-206; idem, The Bible in the Modern World, London, 1973, pp.168ff.; idem, Fundamentalism, London, 1977, rightly points out, the importance attached by fundamentalists to the defensive process of applying harmonizing apologetics all over the Old Testament, in order to paper over the cracks left by the diversity of the sources, greatly damages the theological sensitivity of their biblical interpretation. Fundamentalism is surely one of the most serious enemies of the Church today. Yet, it is disturbing to note that much of the Christianity which flourishes best today has 'conservative' or 'fundamentalist' characteristics. Attempting to improve and correct the general understanding of the way in which biblical conservatism works, Barr draws attention to the fact that the real point of conflict between fundamentalists and those who have no allegiance to this highly self-enclosing ideology, is not over literality but over inerrancy. The insistence of the fundamentalist "is not that the Bible must be interpreted literally but that it must be so interpreted as not to admit that it contains error. In order to avoid imputing error to the Bible, fundamentalists twist and turn back and forward between literal and non-literal (symbolic, metaphorical, transferred) exegesis." (Barr, The Bible in the Modern World, p.168).

The unthinking and uncritical attitudes of the fundamentalist position are both damaging and dangerous. In his penetrating study, Fundamentalism, Barr argues convincingly that fundamentalism is not only incoherent as a scholarly position but thoroughly in contradiction, theologically, with the central logic of Christian faith. He goes on to say that the hostility of fundamentalists towards non-conservative thinking is based on both the religious and the intellectual levels. It is based on the religious level "because non-evangelical religion seems to offer a quite different religious solution, which if valid would damage the exclusiveness claimed for the evangelical path to God" (Barr, Fundamentalism, p.342). It is based on the intellectual level "because modern theology and biblical criticism offer a different organization of the biblical material...and... modern theology and biblical criticism, if valid, would break the intellectual link with the Bible which for fundamentalists provides them with the final assurance that their religious faith is true" (Ibid). The fundamentalist approach has not only thinned down and diluted the theological understanding of the Bible but has also been largely responsible for the yawning gulf which all too frequently exists between the average minister and the average individual in the pew on the one hand, and the theologians and scholars on the other (cf. R.P.C. Hanson, 'Introduction to Volume 3', in R. Davidson and A.R.C. Leaney, The Pelican Guide to Modern Theology, vol. 3: Biblical Criticism, pp.9-21, ref. p.14). Perhaps the most severe self-indictment of fundamentalism is the fact that it has produced no really interesting discussion of biblical interpretation. Fundamentalist students often single out von Rad and Noth as irreligious nihilists, but, although many details in the researches
To illustrate the necessity of this task, one need only point to the calamitous experience of the exile, when the twin pillars of Judah's religious life - the belief in an everlasting covenant between Yahweh and the house of David, and the special position of Jerusalem as Yahweh's chosen dwelling-place - had both fallen. This event, which constituted the most cataclysmic crisis in the history of ancient Israel, not only signified the end of Israel's national existence with all its institutions together with the suspension of the state cult, but it also, and more importantly, questioned her continued existence as God's chosen people. (24) It is the theological reaction to this climax

23. Continued. of these two scholars are certainly open to debate, Knight, The Traditions of Israel, p.97, rightly says: "their uniqueness was their ability for perspicacious analysis of the materials, as well as an originality of thought and method which allowed them to go beyond the previous trends in Old Testament work and to become occupied in depth with problems which few prior to them had even recognized as existing." Cf. J. Coert Rylaarsdam, 'Editor's Foreword', in N. Habel, Literary Criticism of the Old Testament, Philadelphia, 1975, pp.3-i-x, ref. p.viii. As Barr, Fundamentalism, p.344, concludes: "We do not have to be liberals: but we have to recognize that the liberal quest is in principle a fully legitimate form of Christian obedience within the church, and one that has deep roots within the older Christian theological tradition and even within the Bible itself."

of God's judgement on Israel, as it had been proclaimed by the prophets, which dominates the Old Testament. Hence, it is imperative to attempt to distinguish between pre-exilic and post-exilic material. Since, in certain major aspects, pre-exilic theology is as markedly different from post-exilic theology as chalk is from cheese. Moreover, within both pre-exilic theology and post-exilic theology there is a kaleidoscopic compendium of traditions, ideas, and theological standpoints. It is essential, therefore, that one should attempt to

25. Cf., recently, A. Phillips, God B.C., pp.xiiff., et passim. Thus, for example, the Deuteronomistic historian (the term may be used in the singular for convenience since, although evidence may be adduced to indicate more than one editorial hand, the work is one in both plan and conception. See G.W. Anderson, A Critical Introduction to the Old Testament, p.94, note 1. Cf. O. Eissfeldt, The Old Testament: An Introduction, p.284, note 18; E.W. Nicholson, Deuteronony and Tradition, Oxford, 1967, p.107, note 2. See also, however, the important observations of R.E. Clements, Prophecy and Tradition, Oxford, 1975, p.12, n.9. Cf. also note (69) below), has selected and arranged the material at his disposal in order to apply the religious lessons of history. The Deuteronomist's record is selective for he was not concerned simply to record facts as a modern scientific historian. Rather, he was concerned to explain why the catastrophes of 721 B.C. and 586 B.C. had befallen Israel. In his task of making evident God's purpose and highlighting the errors of Israel, the Deuteronomist's criterion for including, excluding, or fabricating a piece of material was purely whether or not it would be theologically edifying. Above all, the Deuteronomist applied the principles of Deuteronomy to the history of Israel. The kings of Israel and Judah are judged according to whether or not they centralized sacrificial worship to the single sanctuary. Thus, for instance, the extraordinary story in 1 Kings xiii clearly presupposes the reform of Josiah in 621 B.C. and the almost total obsession with cultic centralization is most evident throughout this chapter. That the Deuteronomist singled out only those facts which he considered relevant to his purpose is obvious from the lacunae in his material (cf. for instance, his treatment of the Omri dynasty with his account of Hezekiah's boil). Cf., for example, P.R. Ackroyd, Exile and Restoration, pp.62ff.; idem, Israel under Babylon and Persia, pp.141ff.; G.W. Anderson, A Critical Introduction to the Old Testament, pp.93ff.; idem, The History and Religion of Israel, p.49; R.E. Clements, God and Temple, pp.79-99; E.W. Heaton, The Hebrew Kingdoms, OUP, 1968, pp.60ff.; O. Kaiser, Introduction to the Old Testament, pp.169ff.; E.W. Nicholson, Deuteronony and Tradition, Oxford, 1967, pp.28ff., 107ff.; M. Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien I, second edition, Tübingen, 1957; G. von Rad, Studies in Deuteronony, translated by D. Stalker, SBT, No. 9, London, 1956, pp.74ff.;
set each section of the text which is being studied into its particular context in order to understand it properly. (26)

25. Continued. *idem, 'The Deuteronomic Theology of History in I and II Kings', The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays,* pp.205-221; *idem, Old Testament Theology,* vol. I, translated by D.M.C. Stalker, Edinburgh, 1968, pp.334ff.; H.H. Rowley, *The Growth of the Old Testament,* pp.49ff.; J.A. Soggin, *Introduction to the Old Testament,* pp.161ff. One of the most important contributions to the study of the Old Testament is the thesis that the corpus Deuteronomy - 2 Kings did not evolve out of a process of literary redaction and expansion of an original work or number of works but, rather, is the product of an author who was attempting to write the history of Israel from Moses to the exile and to provide a theological interpretation of that history. This thesis is usually associated with Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien I* (originally published in 1943). However, it is worth remembering that W.M.L. de Wette in his doctoral thesis, *Dissertatio critico-exegetica, qua Deuteronomium a prioribus Pentateuchi libris diversum, alius cuiusdam recentioris auctoris opus esse monstratur,* Jena, 1805 (reprinted in his *Opuscula Theologica,* Berlin, 1830), claimed that the deuteronomic style could be traced through Joshua as far as Kings. Robert North, *op.cit.,* p.118a, describes this as "a clairvoyant anticipation of Martin Noth's post-Wellhausen dominance".

26. By employing Textual Criticism, Literary Criticism, Form Criticism, Tradition History and Redaction Criticism. As J. Coert Rylaarsdam, 'Editor's Foreword' in N. Habel, *Literary Criticism of the Old Testament,* Philadelphia, 1975, pp.iii-ix, rightly says, these are, or rather should be, clearly distinguishable methods of study and each is really a discipline in its own right, having its own specific techniques and analytical procedures which are appropriate to the phenomena on which it focuses attention. At the same time, however, all the disciplines are interrelated. Their interrelationship is organic and logical since they all want to contribute to the understanding of the text. None of them on its own is capable of dealing with all the questions concerning a particular text, but each addresses itself to those questions which have baffled the others. Textual Criticism seeks to untangle those difficulties which have arisen in the text because of mistakes or changes made by the copyists. Literary criticism employs an analytical method in its attempt to identify such individual characteristics as provide clues to the author(s) or editor(s) of a particular piece of literature. Form Criticism, which assumes that the literature of an ancient community reflects the life of that community in its entirety, seeks to isolate separate units of material within that literature, to classify them according to type, and then to trace each type back to its *Sitz im Leben.* Tradition History is concerned to indicate the process by which these individual units, isolated by Form Criticism and traced back to their original *Sitz im Leben,* have been transmitted, largely in oral form, within the community and to illustrate how, in the process, they have been shaped and reshaped until they eventually acquired the form which they now
Nevertheless, while bearing all these points in mind, it is yet possible to make some general observations on the meaning of the term "cult" with particular reference to the cult of ancient Israel.

Most dictionaries understand the word "cult" as referring both to worship and to the rites and ceremonies connected with worship. (27)

A similarly wide definition is offered by Tillich who says that "all religious acting is cultic acting" with offerings being "the central, cultic symbol". (28)


A more precise definition of cult is put forward by Mowinckel. He points out that religion has been said to appear in three main aspects, as cult, as myth, and as ethos, or, using other terms, as worship, as doctrine, and as behaviour (morals). This is not to say that religion can be divided into three separate parts. Rather, the three words signify "forms of expression and manifestations, aspects of religion". Both doctrine and morals are expressed in the cult and both "draw power and new life from the cult". Cult is an essential and constitutive feature of a religion and while it may take many forms, it exhibits the same main features in all religions. Mowinckel defines cult by saying: "Cult or ritual may be defined as the socially established and regulated holy acts and words in which the encounter and communion of the Deity with the congregation is established, developed, and brought to its ultimate goal. In other words: a relation in which a religion becomes a vitalizing function as a communion of God and congregation, and of the members of the congregation amongst themselves". Cult, according to Mowinckel, is "the visible and audible expression of the relation between the congregation and the deity".

---

30. Ibid.
31. Ibid.
32. Ibid.
33. Ibid., p.16. For Mowinckel's thoughts on the cult in general, see his book, Religion und Kultus, Göttingen, 1953, pp.10ff. and The Psalms in Israel's Worship, pp.16ff. In Religion und Kultus, pp.73-80, Mowinckel argues that ancient cult was always realistic in that it was not simply subjective in its effect, but was regarded as objectively efficacious. This view is echoed by R.C. Dentan op.cit., p.86, who writes: "The ancient worshiper did not approach the cultus primarily to feed his intellect or stimulate an act of mental recollection; his purpose was to achieve actual participation in the events portrayed and existential involvement in the blessings proclaimed."
Kapelrud, in his definition of the term, says that "cult is religious life in certain regulated forms, expressing the relationship between God and man and intended for use in a society". A similar definition is offered by J.L. McKenzie, who sees the essential nature of cult "as the rites by which the believing community recognizes and professes its identity and proclaims what it believes about the deity it worships and the relations between the deity and the worshipers."

Along similar lines, de Vaux says: "By 'cult' we mean all those acts by which communities or individuals give outward expression to their religious life, by which they seek and achieve contact with God".

Perhaps the most penetrating insight into the nature of the cult has been offered by Clements. Clements says it is clear from the ideas and psychological presuppositions of ancient ritual that the cult was intended to actualize the divine activity on earth and that "essentially the cult sought to secure the reality of the divine blessing upon all the land and people of Israel".

Of the cult which was enacted upon Mount Zion, Clements says that the worship of the temple was centred upon the belief that during its ceremonies Yahweh himself was present "and the presence of

34. Kapelrud, _op.cit._, p.45.
38. _Ibid._
Yahweh on his holy mountain was thought to be a firm assurance that his goodness and kindness would continue to be with Israel". (39)

Most significant of all for the purpose of this study is what Clements has to say about the ideology of the Jerusalem temple: "The entire ideology of the Jerusalem temple centred in the belief that, as his chosen dwelling-place, Yahweh's presence was to be found in it, and that from there he revealed his will and poured out his blessing upon his people. When we press to find out how this presence was conceived, we find that it was dominated by the idea of Yahweh as the God of the exodus and Mount Sinai". (40)

As was the case with other peoples of the ancient Near East, sacrifice was the principal act in Israel's cult and the expression "cultic centralization" refers primarily to the limitation of all sacrificial worship to a central and/or sole sanctuary. (41)

Prior to


40. Ibid.

substituts royaux en Assyrie au temps des Sargonides', RA, xl, 1945-1946, pp.123-142; M.J. Lagrange, Études sur les religions sémitiques, Paris, 1903; G. van der Leeuw, Religion in Essence and Manifestation, A Study in Phenomenology, translated by J.E. Turner, London, 1938, pp.350ff.; A. Loisy, Essai historique sur le sacrifice, Paris, 1920; S. Lyonnard and L. Sabourin, Sin, Redemption and Sacrifice, Rome, 1970; C. Ryckmans, 'Le sacrifice dans les inscriptions safaitiques', HUCA, xxii, 1, 1950-1951, pp.431-438; H. Savyerr, 'Sacrifice', Biblical Revelation and African Beliefs, edited by K.A. Dickson and P. Ellingworth, London, 1969; W. Robertson Smith, Lectures on the Religion of the Semites, new revised edition, London, 1914; E.B. Tylor, Primitive Culture, fifth edition, London, 1929, pp.375ff.; D.M.L. Urie, 'Sacrifice among the West Semites', PEQ, 1949, pp.67-82. R. Will, Le Culte, Étude d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses, Strasbourg and Paris, 1925. There is much sacrificial terminology in the Old Testament, but, as Herbert, op.cit., p.15, points out, the precise significance of the language is often extremely difficult to determine. Moreover, as Pedersen, Israel III-IV, pp.299ff. and Rowley, 'The Meaning of Sacrifice in the Old Testament', From Moses to Qumran, London, 1964, pp.67-107; idem, Worship in Ancient Israel, pp.111ff., both rightly emphasize, sacrifice was designed to serve such a variety of purposes that it is impossible to interpret Israelite sacrifice in terms of one idea. Rowley is concerned to show that sacrifice carries a two-way traffic since it is not simply man's approach to God but also God's approach to the offerer who displays the appropriate spirit of humility and submission. Cf. Rowley, From Moses to Qumran, pp.106ff.; idem, Worship in Ancient Israel, p.143, et passim. Cf. G. Nagel, 'Sacrifices. O. T.' in J.J. von Allmen, Vocabulary of the Bible, translated from the second French edition by P.J. Allcock and others, London, 1958, pp.375b-380b, ref. p.380a, who writes: "No right conscience could be satisfied with sacrifices alone, for they always remain disproportionate to the gravity of the offence committed. In order to find peace one must obtain, over and above sacrifice, the grace of God, and one must bring to God true repentance and the fervent desire to make amendment of life. The external and internal action do not by any means exclude each other, and the second should always accompany the first, and bestow upon it its true value. With the most pious souls the rite eventually takes second place. The sacrifice was allowed to function normally but the soul committed itself entirely to the grace of God." Cf. de Vaux, Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions, translated by J. McHugh, second edition, London, 1968, p.451 who says that sacrifice "is a prayer which is acted, a symbolic action which expresses both the interior feelings of the person offering it, and God's response to this prayer." F.L. Moriarty, writing in The Way, v, London, 1965, p.97 says: "In the Old Testament we are confronted with a very elaborate system of sacrifices; but it is impossible to find anything like a unified or coherent theory of sacrifice". Similarly, T.H. Gaster, 'Sacrifices and offerings, O.T.', IDB, iv, pp.147b-159a, ref. p.147b, says: "The practices in question were diverse and varied not only in form but also in motivation and significance .... Accordingly, they cannot be derived from any one single principle, and, in respect of them, all monogenetic theories of the origin of sacrifice may be safely discountenanced from the start." These words are echoed by de Vaux, op.cit., p.451, when
Hezekiah, the slaughter of animals for sacrifice was carried out at all sanctuaries throughout the land of Israel. However, it would appear from 2 Kings xvi: 3f. and 2 Kings xvi: 22 that Hezekiah carried out a programme of cultic purification by which he attempted to abolish pagan practices, to suppress the high places, and to centralize the cult to the temple at Jerusalem. According to the Old Testament, Hezekiah's reform was short-lived, his policy being reversed by his son and successor, Manasseh, and almost a century elapsed before another attempt, this time by Josiah, was made to centralize the cult at Jerusalem. With Josiah's reform the high places were again suppressed and the Jerusalem temple was made, once more, the sole legitimate sanctuary where sacrificial worship could take place. 2 Kings xxii-xxiii and 2 Chronicles xxxiv-xxxv describe the important religious reforms which were introduced by Josiah and both narratives relate the discovery of a "book of the law". However, while 2 Chronicles speaks of a reform in the twelfth year of Josiah's reign followed, in the eighteenth year, by the finding of the law book, the account of 2 Kings clearly implies that it was the discovery of the law book which motivated Josiah's reform and that it was on hearing this book's contents that Josiah resolved to inaugurate a reformation in order to implement the demands of its laws. At any rate, the "book of the law" clearly played an important role in Josiah's reform.

It has long been recognised that the measures adopted by Josiah correspond closely to some of the leading provisions found in Deut. xii-xxvi. Particularly striking is the fact that both Deut. xii-xxvi and the Josianic reform share the same two dominant themes of purification of the cult and the limitation of sacrificial worship to a central sanctuary. Although some of the early fathers of the fourth century A.D., notably Athanasius, Jerome, Chrysostom, and Procopius of Gaza, to be followed later by Hobbes and Lessing, had already suggested that the "book of the law" found in the Jerusalem temple in Josiah's reign was substantially the book of Deuteronomy, (42) it was not until W.M.L. de Wette's doctoral thesis of 1805 (43) that this view was scientifically propounded. Since the publication of de Wette's study, a vast amount of literature has been written, from many different angles, on the book of Deuteronomy and the reforms of Hezekiah and Josiah. The most diverse opinions have been expressed because scholars differ in their evaluation of the narratives of 2 Kings and 2 Chronicles, in their identification of Josiah's "book of the law", in their analysis and understanding of the book of Deuteronomy, and in their assessment of the influence Assyrian dominance had on the religion of Israel.

As to the background of the demand for cultic centralization, again, there are many different theories. A brief survey of some of the main ones is sufficient to illustrate the wide diversity of opinion.


Some scholars, notably J.G. Vaihinger, A. Westphal, E. Sellin, C. Steuernagel, E. König, G.A. Smith, and H. Junker, feel that the main influence on Hezekiah and Josiah to centralize the cult was the demand of Deuteronomism.\(^{44}\) On the other hand, there are those who argue that Deuteronomy does not, in fact, demand cultic centralization. Thus, for example, T. Oestreicher, A.C. Welch, W. Staerk, R. Brinker, M.H. Segal, and R.K. Harrison maintain that Deuteronomy demands only cultic purity, the law of the sanctuary in Deuteronomy being no different from that found in Exod. \(^{45}\) xx: 24 which simply demands that only those sanctuaries approved by Yahweh are to be used by Israel for public worship.\(^{45}\) According to G. von Rad and V. Maag, the demand for cultic centralization in Deuteronomy "rests upon a very narrow basis only'.\(^{46}\) and can be removed easily on literary critical grounds.


as belonging to a later stratum of tradition in the book's complicated process of growth. Arguing against the view that Deuteronomy demands the centralization of sacrificial worship at Jerusalem, J.N.M. Wijngaards maintains that what is envisaged in Deuteronomy is a series of sanctuaries serving in turn as the amphictyonic shrine. (47)

C.W.P. Cramberg, W. Vatke, L. Seinecke, E. Havet, G. d'Eichthal, M. Vernes, L. Horst, E. Day, S.A. Fries, R.H. Kennett, G.R. Berry, F.C. Burkitt, G. Hölscher, W. Spiegelberg, F. Horst, S.A. Cook, A. Loisy, J. Pedersen, J.N. Schofield, E. Nielsen, and S. Mowinckel all argue that Deuteronomism cannot have been the main influence on Judah's reformers because Deuteronomy can only have originated at an exilic or post-exilic date. (48)


There is even doubt whether either king really attempted to carry out a programme of cultic centralization. Wellhausen, B. Stade, T.K. Cheyne, G. Hölscher, and A. Lods doubt the story of Hezekiah's reform altogether.\(^{49}\) It is commonly allowed that the account of the destruction of the Bronze Serpent is authentic, while the rest of the reform measures are merely a reading back from the reform of Josiah to the reign of Hezekiah. On the other hand, the account of Josiah's reform has been denied historicity by E. Havet, L. Horst, M. Vernes, G. Hölscher, F. Horst, and A. Loisy on the ground that it was too unpractical to have been possible or that it is the fictitious ascription to Josiah of the programme of Deuteronomy.\(^{50}\)

From a different angle, R.H. Kennett\(^{51}\) maintains that Josiah chose to centralize the cult as a means of wiping out sacred prostitution.

---


which had been rife at the provincial shrines. Along somewhat similar lines, R. Kittel, S.R. Driver, and A.R. Siebens argue that the roots of the demand for cultic centralization can be traced back to the teaching of the eighth century prophets and their condemnation of the high places. (52) A. Bentzen, on the other hand, considers that the originators of the doctrine of cultic centralization were the rural priests. (53) According to Bentzen, the larger and more important sanctuaries were monopolizing so much of the people's offerings that the deprived priests of the smaller local shrines decided to legislate for centralization of the cult at one of the major shrines in the hope that they could integrate themselves into the ministry there and thus obtain a fair share of the revenue.

A. Cody suggests that centralization of sacrificial worship to a single sanctuary may have been motivated by a reaction against the divisiveness created by the rivalry between the Northern and Southern royal sanctuaries or by "the chronic influence of Canaan and even of Assyria on the country sanctuaries." (54) Fohrer expresses a similar sentiment, but with deeper insight, when he writes: "the unique cultic center...is a consequence of the uniqueness of God and is intended to combat the tendency toward a pluralistic concept of God brought about by a multiplicity of sanctuaries." (55) This more positive evaluation


53. A. Bentzen, Die Josianische Reform und ihre Voraussetzungen, Copenhagen, 1926, pp.68-72.


of the demand for cultic centralization is echoed by G.W. Anderson and R.E. Clements who both maintain that cultic centralization was more than a practical expedient designed to effect cultic correctness, in that it was also an expression of "the theological principle of the unity of Yahweh's being (Dt. 6:4)". (56)

In their search for the principal stimulus for the demand of cultic centralization some scholars focus attention on the city of Jerusalem. Thus, for instance, A. Bentzen, J. Pedersen, and E. Robertson maintain that centralization of the cult is the logical outcome of David's political centralization in Jerusalem, (57) while V. Maag argues that the tendency toward cultic centralization received a considerable impetus from the miraculous deliverance of the city in 701 B.C. (58)

R.E. Clements traces the background to the demand for an absolute cult monopoly in Jerusalem to the unique form of Israelite state religion which had developed in Jerusalem after Solomon erected the Temple. (59)


Some scholars, notably T. Oestreicher, W.O.E. Oesterley, T.H. Robinson, E.W. Nicholson, and M. Weinfeld, lay more stress on political than religious reasons as constituting the prime motivation for cultic centralization. These scholars maintain that Hezekiah centralized the cult primarily as an act of political necessity, in an attempt to focus national attention on the preservation of the capital during the struggle for independence from Assyrian suzerainty. Thus, for example, Weinfeld, although admitting that the act of cultic centralization could not have been executed purely on a political basis and recognizing that there was an interplay of political and religious motives, argues that Hezekiah's destruction of the high places was largely a consequence of political circumstances. Weinfeld parallels Hezekiah's attempt to centralize the cult with the action of Nabonidus, the last king of Babylon, who withdrew all the gods from the provincial Babylonian cities and transferred them to the metropolis. According to Weinfeld, Nabonidus did this in order to make the inhabitants of the provincial cities religiously dependent on the capital, which would, in turn, bring them into closer political identification with the ruling city, thereby strengthening their resolve to defend it. Weinfeld argues that just


as Nabonidus tried to elevate the Esagila temple in the capital to the status of an exclusive politico-religious centre in order to strengthen the ties between the population of the provincial cities and that of the royal city, so too, Hezekiah, by abolishing the high places and centralizing the cult in Jerusalem, hoped to increase the dependence of the provincial population on the central sanctuary in Jerusalem and thereby to prevent both their political and religious surrender to Assyria. However, a totally different view is expressed by J. McKay. He contests that Hezekiah and Josiah were motivated far more by religious than political reasons and he attempts to support this view by trying to show that religion in Judah under Assyrian suzerainty was not dominated, as is usually assumed, by an obligation to venerate Assyrian deities. (61)

A large number of scholars, most notably M. Noth, G. von Rad, G.E. Wright, F. Dumermuth, and J. Bright, have sought to trace the roots of the demand for cultic centralization to the amphictyonic ideal of a central sanctuary. (62) The theory of an Israelite amphictyony, as propounded in its classic form by Noth, (63) is one of the most persuasive and stimulating theories in the study of the history of

61. J.W. McKay, Josiah's Reformation, its antecedents, nature and significance, a dissertation submitted in 1969 to the University of Cambridge for the degree of Ph.D.; idem, Religion in Judah under the Assyrians, London, 1973. The view that both religious and political motives led to the centralization of sacrificial worship at Jerusalem has been put forward most recently by Phillips, God B.C., p.27.


Israel. According to Noth, Israel, in the early days after the settlement, was organized as an amphictyony—a term borrowed from Greek usage and denoting an association of communities or tribes centring in an ancient sanctuary which served as a focal point for periodic gatherings. This theory has gained such a wide acceptance among scholars of all nationalities that a separate section will be devoted to it. It has been argued that the demand for the limitation of all sacrificial worship to one, sole, sanctuary, as prescribed by Deuteronomy and attempted by Hezekiah and Josiah, cannot have had its origin in an amphictyonic central shrine since the latter would simply have been the main sanctuary among many others. Moreover, Noth did not maintain that sacrificial worship was offered solely at a central sanctuary. However, since one of the principal concerns of this thesis is to trace the ultimate background to the demand for cultic centralization, then, if the case for the existence of an Israelite amphictyony were able to stand up to close inspection, there


65. Cf. Noth, Das System der zwölf Stämme Israels, BWANT, IV, i, 1930, pp.97f.; idem, The History of Israel, pp.97f., where he states that the demand in Exodus xxiii:17; xxxiv:23, "Three times in the year shall all your males appear before the Lord God" can only refer to the annual agricultural festivals celebrated at the local shrines since "it would have been impracticable to carry it out at the central shrine" (The History of Israel, p.98).
would be every reason to see in the sanctuary of this amphictyony the prototype, so to speak, of the later demand for only one place of sacrificial worship. (66)

66. Cf. E.W. Nicholson, Deuteronomy and Tradition, Oxford, 1967, p.49. S. Asami, The Central Sanctuary in Israel in the Ninth Century B.C., a thesis presented in 1964 to the Committee on Higher Degrees in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Theology in the subject of Old Testament at Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, argues that the concept of the central sanctuary "was an ideal in the normative faith of Israel" (p.ii). He attempts to trace the history of the ideal of a single sanctuary for all Israel and maintains that this ideal was held by the prophets of Northern Israel in the ninth century B.C. Asami maintains that both the direct and indirect evidences produced by Noth in support of his theory of the existence of an Israelite amphictyony "seem to be sufficient to support his basic thesis", and the pivot of Asami's thesis is his belief that "the existence of the central sanctuary in premonarchical Israel may be said to be an established fact"(ibid., pp.6f.). Cf., too, ibid., p.15: "Thus today we may safely assert against the classic scholarship that both in law and practice the central sanctuary was essential for the institutional structure of the premonarchical religion of Israel." Cf., also, W.F. Albright, Archaeology and the Religion of Israel, Baltimore, 1956, pp.102-105; B.W. Anderson, Understanding the Old Testament, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1957, pp.84-91; R. de Vaux, Ancient Israel, pp.92f.; M.L. Newman, The People of the Covenant: A Study of Israel from Moses to the Monarchy, New York and Nashville, 1962, pp.102-126; N.W. Porteous, 'The Prophets and the Problem of Continuity', Living the Mystery, pp.113-125, ref. pp.119f. Cf., too, Noth, 'The Jerusalem Catastrophe of 587 B.C., and its significance for Israel', The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Essays, pp.260-280, ref. p.262: "The Ark...had (as the last traditional tribal sanctuary) handed on its central importance for the whole of Israel to the Temple in Jerusalem." In spite of the fact that the hypothesis of an amphictyony has been subjected to very sharp and searching criticism, (in addition to the works cited in footnote 64 above, cf. G. Fohrer, 'Altes Testament - 'Amphiktyonie' und 'Bund'?' ThLZ, xci, 1966, cols. 801-816, 893-904; H.M. Orlinsky, 'The Tribal System of Israel and Related Groups in the Period of the Judges', Studies and Essays in Honor of Abraham A. Neuman, 1962, pp.375ff.; R. de Vaux 'La Thèse de 1' 'Amphïctyonie Israëlië', HTR, 1xiv, 1971, pp.415-436; G. Buccellati, Cities and Nations of Ancient Syria, Rome, 1967, pp.114-116. Cf., too, L. Perlitt, Bundestheologie im Alten Testament, WMANT, xxxvi, 1969, and E. Kutsch, Verheissung und Gesetz: Untersuchungen zum sogenannten "Bund" im Alten Testament, BZAW, cxxxi, 1973, who both argue that the covenant concept was of relatively minor importance in Israel until the days of the Deuteronomistic writers in the seventh century), some scholars maintain that no "convincing alternative explanation of that very same phenomenon" has so far been offered. See J. Bright, Covenant and Promise: The Future in the Preaching of the Pre-exilic Prophets, London, 1977, p.33. Cf., too, R.E. Clements in his notice of Mayes' book in Society for Old Testament Study Book List, 1975, pp.31f.; idem, 'Interpreting the Historical Books', A Century of Old Testament Study, pp.31-50, ref. p.43. Some scholars who previously held that there was an Israelite amphictyony in the period of the judges have been sufficiently
What reasons motivated the demand for cultic centralization?

Does Deuteronomy actually call for it? If Deuteronomy does demand it, then who was responsible for the compilation of the book and why is it so concerned to give a theological interpretation to Israel's cult? Did Hezekiah and Josiah both attempt to carry it out? What relation, if any, does Deuteronomy, in its present form or in its antecedents, have to the reforms of Hezekiah and Josiah?

Was cultic centralization, as apparently prescribed by Deuteronomy and attempted by Hezekiah and Josiah, "a sweeping innovation in the history of the Israelite cultus"(67) or "an old ideal presented in a

66. Continued. persuaded by the criticisms levelled against the theory to reject it. Cf., for example, the comments of R.E. Clements, Prophecy and Tradition, pp.9ff., with his earlier statements in Prophecy and Covenant, pp.18ff., 72f., 89 91, et passim. Cf., too, the remarks made by E.W. Nicholson, Exodus and Sinai in History and Tradition, Oxford, 1973, p.27, with his earlier comments in Deuteronomy and Tradition, pp.48ff., et passim. However, J. Bright exhibits a disturbing ambivalence to criticism of the theory. In Early Israel in Recent History Writing, London, 1956, p.84, ('The School of Alt and Noth: A Critical Evaluation' was re-published in Old Testament Issues, edited by S. Sandmel, London, 1969, pp.156-193, ref. p.163), he asserted confidently: "That the Israelite amphictyony with its Yahwistic faith was a going concern in the period of the Judges is, of course, beyond criticism." In the light of the vigorous criticism of the theory, Bright, A History of Israel, second edition, London, 1972, p.158, n.45, said of the amphictyony hypothesis: "But, though admittedly hypothetical and subject to correction, it is, in my opinion, one that best accounts for the evidence and affords the only satisfactory explanation of the phenomenon of early Israel as we see it in the Bible." Bright even used the words "Israelite amphictyony" on p.159. However, in footnote 48 of the same page he wrote: "But perhaps one would do well as far as possible to avoid use of the work "amphictyony" in speaking of early Israel, since the parallels, while illuminating, are not exact." Cf., too, his Covenant and Promise, p.33 and n.30.

new way"? Why was the temple at Jerusalem, which had been founded by Solomon to be one among many and to be the royal shrine of the kingdom, chosen to be the only legitimate sanctuary where sacrificial worship could take place? What consequences did cultic centralization have on the evolution of the religious faith of Israel? These are the principal issues with which this thesis will be concerned.

As regards methodology, the thesis will begin with an examination of Hezekiah's reform and its antecedents. The second chapter will focus attention on the reformation of Josiah and a large section will be devoted to a study of the book of Deuteronomy. Chapter three will be concerned with the ultimate background to the demand for cultic centralization. Firstly, Jerusalem's claim to pre-eminence will be discussed with special reference to the development of the belief in the inviolability of Mount Zion and the notion that the temple was Yahweh's earthly dwelling place. Secondly, the theory of an Israelite amphictyony in the so-called period of the Judges will be examined, with special reference to the possibility of the existence of a central sanctuary. Thirdly, an endeavour will be made to determine the formative period of the people of Israel and to show why, in their formulation of the demand for centralization of the cultus, the Deuteronomic authors were able to make such an enormous concession to the pre-eminence of Jerusalem, in spite of the fact that this city owed its pre-eminence very largely to that very Canaanite-mythological aspect of the Jerusalem

68. G.W. Anderson, The History and Religion of Israel, p.126. Cf. S.R. Driver, Deuteronomy, p.xliv, note: "The law of Dt. remains an innovation; but it is an innovation for which the soil had long been preparing". Cf., too, R.H. Pfeiffer, Religion in the Old Testament. The History of a Spiritual Triumph, edited by C.C. Forman, London, 1961, p.166: "The single sanctuary and other measures were in a sense a return to the worship of the time of Moses". Cf., also, E.W. Heaton, The Hebrew Kingdoms, p.65, who says of the Deuteronomist's attitude to the demand for cultic centralization: "For the deuteronomist, the law of the single sanctuary was the law of Moses (cf. 2 Kgs. 18:12, 21:8, 23:25) and, so far from being an innovation, was an attempt to restore the purity of primitive Yahwism".

69. Throughout this study, the term 'Deuteronomist' will be used when referring to the author of the corpus Deuteronomy - 2 Kings, while the word 'Deuteronomic' will be employed when referring to the author(s) of Deuteronomy itself, or, at least, of Urdeuteronomium. Cf. Nicholson, Deuteronomy and Tradition, p.4, n.6; idem, Preaching to the Exiles, p.21, n.1.
cult tradition which was so utterly abhorrent to them. An endeavour will be made to show that in order to communicate to the people of Israel the meaning of the central sanctuary in a way which would be acceptable to themselves, the Deuteronomic authors not only replaced mythology with theology, by re-interpreting the central sanctuary and abolishing the old Jebusite ideas and symbolism, but they also linked the memory of Sinai to the tradition of Zion as the mountain of God in such a way that Jerusalem became the new Sinai.

The traditional views about the meaning of the temple were severely challenged when the building was destroyed in 586 B.C. This led ultimately to great changes in the Jewish understanding of the divine presence, and Jerusalem, together with the religious ideas associated with it, became increasingly part of an eschatological hope. In the final chapter, the consequences of the destruction of the temple and the reactions of those who were deported to the impossibility of continuing sacrificial worship at Jerusalem will also be examined. Attention will be focused on the re-interpretation of the cult and other interesting developments in exilic and post-exilic circles which were necessitated by the crisis of the exile. It is hoped to show

70. Cf. R.E. Clements, God and Temple, pp.94ff., et passim.

71. R. de Vaux, 'Jerusalem and the Prophets', (the Goldenson Lecture of 1965), Interpreting the Prophetic Tradition, p.297 refers in passing to the linking of the memory of Sinai to the tradition of Zion as the mountain of God in connection with Is. ii:2-4 (cf. Micah iv:1-3) and Ps. lxviii:15-17. However, to the best of my knowledge, de Vaux has not developed this idea in connection with Deuteronomy, not even in his article entitled "Le lieu que Yahvé a choisi pour y établir son nom", Rost Festschrift, pp.219-228, where he seeks to show how ancient is the idea of the sanctuary as the possession of Yahweh. As examples he refers to Exod. xvii:i-18, particularly verse 17, and Ps. lxxviii:53 which speaks of Zion as the holy territory of Yahweh. Of this idea of the sanctuary as the possession of Yahweh, de Vaux says:"La nouveauté du Deutéronome est d'avoir intégré cette idée dans sa théologie de l'Élection". Cf., too, R.J. Clifford, The Cosmic Mountain in Canaan and the Old Testament, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1972, pp.113f., 120, 154f., 157. However, as far as I am aware, neither de Vaux nor Clifford mentions the link between the memory of Sinai and the tradition of Zion as the mountain of God in connection with the book of Deuteronomy. In the course of his examination of the place of Sinai in the liturgical understanding of the Deuteronomic and Deuteronomistic writers, K.H. Walkenhorst, Der Sinai im liturgischen Verständnis der Deuteronomistischen und Priesterlichen Tradition, BBB, 1969, examines the relationship between the Sinai event and the Deuteronomic idea of the mágóm which Yahweh chooses...
that after the fall of Jerusalem, certain circles began to use the place name "Zion" to address the body of God's people (72) and there developed the concept of a new temple. This concept, which became a central idea of Old Testament eschatology, explains the priestly legislation and interpretation of history, many of the great exilic and post-exilic prophecies, and the disappointment and enervation which the programme formulated by Ezra and Nehemiah was designed to overcome, as well as providing an important key to help interpret the meaning of apocalyptic. (73)

In this final chapter an attempt will also be made to show that the idea of a new temple was also the common theme of widely differing intertestamental writings and constituted a bond which united both Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaism and orthodox and sectarian Judaism. As McKelvey writes: "The essence of biblical and post-biblical thinking on the eschatological age is the conviction that God will graciously condescend to dwell in the midst of his people in a new and unparalleled way and never again leave them." (74) The thesis will conclude with a very brief look at the way in which the New Testament writers declare that God has fulfilled His promise made to the prophets by establishing a new and more glorious temple. Here, the tension between God's immanence and His transcendence was finally resolved, for Jesus Christ was the only true and adequate temple in which the fullness of God could dwell on earth. The Christian doctrine of the Trinity proclaims that


74. Ibid.
the need for a material temple has been superseded since God has not
only taken human nature and dwelt among men by means of the Incarnation
but He continues to indwell human life through the Holy Spirit given
through Christ. (75) It will also be seen that, for some centuries
now, Christians throughout the world have been using hymns during
their worship in which Zion no longer refers to an earthly place but
is depicted as the abode of the saints in heaven.

Substance, Oxford, 1977, who reviews the concept of substance
as developed by the ancient Greek philosophers and then considers
how, when, and to what extent this concept affected the doctrine
of God which was developed in the first four centuries A.D.
by Christian writers, with special reference to the Trinitarian
concept of one God in three Persons. Cf., too, G.W.H. Lampe,
carries out an examination and radical reappraisal of the
concepts of 'God the Son' and 'the Holy Spirit'. Lampe objects
to the tendency of classical Christologies which are based on
the identification of Jesus with a pre-existent, personally
subsisting, 'Logos' or 'Son', to reduce the Incarnation to a
union which is not wholly personal. He points out that the
insoluble metaphysical problems for patristic and scholastic
theology and certain weaknesses which are apparent in contemporary
charismatic movements have arisen because of the traditional
reference of the concept of 'Holy Spirit' to a third divine
'person'. Lampe argues that the notion of the Holy Spirit
should not be understood as a third 'person' but, rather, as God
himself in personal relationship with man, inspiring and
informing the spirit of man. Lampe shows how the model of
'God as Spirit' serves to interpret the immanent creativity of
God in the developing process of creation and salvation and
serves also to interpret the deity of Christ as the central and
most decisive action in the continuum of divine activity.
Viewed this way, the Incarnation is the union of God with man in
which a human personality fully embodied characteristic qualities
of divine action without it detracting from his human freedom.
Cf., too, the essays by M. Wiles, F. Young, M. Goulder,
L. Houlden, D. Cupitt, J. Hick, and D. Nineham, in The Myth of
study the nature of the language of Christian doctrine in order
to examine the meaning of the words used in Christian creeds and
language of worship, and they also raise the question of the
relationship of Christianity to the other major world religions.
CHAPTER ONE
HEZEKIAH'S REFORM AND ITS ANTECEDENTS

One of the most widely accepted and convincing of theories in the study of the literature of the Old Testament is Martin Noth's thesis that the corpus Deuteronomy - 2 Kings is not the end result of a long process of literary redaction and expansion of an original work or number of works, but is the product of a single theological writer, the Deuteronomistic historian. Noth maintains that Genesis-Numbers was originally a Tetratarch which was distinct from Deuteronomy - 2 Kings, the Deuteronomistic history. According to Noth, there are very few traces

1. M. Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien I: die sammelnden und bearbeitenden Geschichtswerke im Alten Testament, second edition, Tübingen, 1957, pp.3-110, 211-216. Cf., too, idem, Das Buch Josua, HAT, Tübingen, 1938. Noth developed the hypothesis of the Deuteronomistic history on the basis of his analysis of the book of Joshua. A. Jepsen, Die Quellen des Königsbuches, Halle, 1953, also argues for the existence of a Deuteronomistic history extending from Deuteronomy-2 Kings xxv. It is claimed that Jepsen came to this conclusion working independently of Noth but that his work was published ten years after Noth's because of the circumstances of the time. The differences which exist between Jepsen's conception and that of Noth are due to the prehistory which Jepsen assumes for the Book of Kings. Jepsen maintains that the basis of the Book of Kings is a synchronistic Chronicle of the kings which was expanded by a priest after 587 B.C. to form a continuous history from the rise of David to the end of the period of the kings. It was then further expanded by the Deuteronomist with the whole of Deuteronomy, the Benjaminites conquest narratives in the Book of Joshua, the stories of the Judges, traditions about Samuel, the Succession Narrative and traditions about prophets. I. Engnell, Gamla Testamentet. En traditionshistorisk inledning, I, Stockholm, 1945, works with two major blocks of tradition which, he argues, were originally independent of each other. The one he terms the P work, Genesis-Numbers, and the other he calls the D work, which runs from Deuteronomy-2 Kings. Engnell, op.cit., pp.210f., n.3, says that he first became acquainted with Noth's book of 1943 long after his own position became clear (cf., too, 'The Pentateuch', Critical Essays on the Old Testament, London, 1970, pp.50-67, ref. p.58, n.13). Perhaps the most important difference between Engnell's work and that of Noth is the former's particularly sharp and relentless opposition to literary criticism. For a detailed review of Engnell's views on this subject, cf. C.W. Anderson, 'Some aspects of the Uppsala School of Old Testament Study', HTR, xliii, No. 4, October, 1950, pp.239-256, exp. pp.253-256; D.A. Knight, Rediscovering the Traditions of Israel, pp.268ff. In this context, it is sufficient to focus attention on the theory of the Deuteronomistic history as propounded by Noth.
of D in the Tetrateuch: the JE material was fitted into the framework of P and none of these sources was interwoven with D. Arguing against the view that J, E, and P are continued in the historical books where they are combined with Deuteronomic material, Noth insists that, apart from some verses at the end of Deuteronomy and some insignificant traces in the later books, J, E, and P do not proceed beyond Numbers, 

2. The hypothesis, recently revived by H. Schulte, Die Entstehung der Geschichtsschreibung im Alten Israel, BZAW, cxxviii, 1972, pp.201ff., of a Yahwistic history which stretches from the Creation up to the division of the kingdom, is unconvincing. However, many commentators argue for the continuation of the sources in the book of Joshua along different lines. They maintain that since both the J strand (cf. Gen. xii) and the E strand (cf. Gen. xv) look forward to the gift of the land as the fulfillment of the promise to the Patriarchs, an original JE narrative, which formed the climax of this record of Yahweh's election of Israel and His gift of the land, now underlies Josh. i-xi. Cf., for example, Ackroyd, Exile and Restoration, pp.63ff., n.3. See, further, J. Bright, 'The Book of Joshua: Introduction and Exegesis', IB, ii, New York and Nashville, 1953, pp.541ff.; E.W. Nicholson, Deuteronomy and Tradition, p.25, n.2. Noth's arguments are convincing but G. Fohrer, Introduction to the Old Testament, p.197, refers to "Noth's oversimplified analysis" in connection with his treatment of the history of the book of Joshua's development. Fohrer argues that "the source strata of the Pentateuch continue through Judg. 2:5". Those who maintain the theory of the existence of a Hexateuch ask how Deuteronomy could ever have been detached from the Deuteronomistic history work if it had formed its beginning. However, as Soggin, op.cit., p.162, rightly points out: "The last question can, however, also be turned against those who raise it: however could Joshua have been detached from the Pentateuch if it had formed its conclusion?" On the question of the presence of J material in Joshua, see S. Mowinckel, Tetrateuch-Pentateuch-Hexateuch, BZAW, xc, 1964, pp.17ff., 33ff. For Noth's analysis of the Pentateuch, see his book A History of Pentateuchal Traditions, pp.17-19, 28-32, 35-36. The major points where scholars deviate from Noth's analysis are indicated by B.W. Anderson in his 'Translator's Supplement: Analytical Outline of the Pentateuch', ibid., pp.261-276. Noth does not admit the existence of J, E and P beyond Num. xxxvi. P had no narrative of the occupation of the land and J and E lost theirs when they were slotted into the framework of P, thereby creating a "truncated Pentateuch" (cf. C.R. North, 'Pentateuchal Criticism', The Old Testament and Modern Study, edited by H.H. Rowley, pp.48-83, ref. p.72). As regards Josh. 1-12, Noth (who elaborated on suggestions made by Alt in a lecture on Joshua which he delivered to the Old Testament conference in Göttingen in 1936, 'Joshua', Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel, I, München, 1953, pp.176-192) argues that the basic material in Josh. 1-12 consisted of a series of aetiological
sagas and some hero tales. (Two examples will suffice to illustrate. Noth, Das Buch Joshua, pp.5f., argues that Josh. v:2-9, the story of the circumcision of Israel at Gilgal, is an aetiological story, the express function of which is to explain the later practice of the rite of circumcision at that sanctuary. Again, Noth, op.cit., pp.3, 17-19; idem, 'Grundsätzliche zur geschichtlichen Deutung archäologischer Befunde auf dem Boden Palästinas', PJ, xxxiv, 1938, pp.14-16; idem, 'Hat die Bibel doch recht?', Festchrift für Günther Dehn, Neukirchen, 1957, pp.13f.; idem, 'Der Beitrag der Archäologie zur Geschichte Israels', SVT, vii, 1960, pp.274f., offers a completely aetiological exposition of the tradition of the fall of Jericho in Josh. vi). Originally these stories had no connection either with one another or with Joshua, who was an Ephraimite tribal hero later magnified into the leader of all Israel. Around 900 B.C. these stories were incorporated into the continuous narrative which now constitutes the bulk of Josh. ii-xi and Joshua was made the overall Israelite leader of a unified military conquest of the land which resulted in complete occupation of Palestine. This narrative, which is unrelated to J and E, was then incorporated by the Deuteronomistic historian into his history, expanded, and given an introduction (chapter i) and conclusion (xi:21-xii:24). Noth also argues that Josh. xiii-xxii: xxiv and Judg. i:i-ii:5 were later insertions into the Deuteronomistic history. Again dependent to a large extent on Alt, 'Judas Gaue unter Josia' (originally written in 1925), Kleine Schriften, II, München, 1959, pp.276-288; idem, 'Das System der Stammesgrenzen im Buche Josua' (originally written in 1927), Kleine Schriften, I, pp.193-202, (cf., too, idem, 'Bemerkungen zu einigen jüdischen Ortslisten des alten Testaments', Kleine Schriften, II, pp.289-305), Noth, 'Studien zu den historisch-geographischen Dokumenten des Josuabuches', ZDPV, Iviii, 1935, pp.185-255; Das Buch Josua, pp.ixf., 47ff., argues that the bulk of Josh. xiii-xxi consists of tribal boundary and city lists. In their original form, the boundary lists date from before the rise of the monarchy while the city lists originally dealt with the division of the kingdom of Judah into administrative districts under Josiah. These lists were later incorporated into a single document with an introduction (xiv:la) and conclusion (xix:49a) in order to provide a survey of the tribal holdings. Josh. xiii:15-31 which relates the Trans-Jordan holdings allotted by Moses, with no mention of Joshua, constitutes an appendix to this document. It was an editor of the Deuteronomistic school, whose work begins in xiii:1,7 and ends in xxi:43-xxii:6, who shaped the section, inserted the name of Joshua, and arranged the tribes in their present order. This Deuteronomistic document together with Josh. xxiv:1-28 and Judg. ii:i-5 were soon incorporated into the Deuteronomistic history, while Judg. i was added at a later date. The methods employed by Alt and Noth are criticised strongly, if not entirely convincingly, by Bright, Early Israel in Recent History Writing, London, 1956, pp.34-55, 79-110 (= Old Testament Issues, edited by S. Sandmel, London, 1969, pp.157-193). A masterly presentation of the major hypotheses since 1925 concerning the Israelite settlement is provided by M. Weippert, The Settlement of the Israelite Tribes in Palestine, London, 1971. Weippert rightly concludes that, in its main features, the picture, created by Alt and those who have developed some of his suggestions, of the occupation of Palestine by those elements who later formed the Israelite tribes has "stood the test of the far-reaching criticism both of its general features and of specific details by the 'American Archaeological School'". (ibid., p.145).
and that Deut. i-iii(iv)\(^{(3)}\) is the beginning of the Deuteronomistic history,\(^{(4)}\) into which has been incorporated the hortatory and legal material which follows Deut. iv.

The Deuteronomistic historian\(^{(5)}\) attempted to record and interpret from a theological standpoint the history of Israel from Moses to the


4. Earlier scholars had observed that there were differences in both style and standpoint between chapters i-iv and v-xi. Some of these earlier commentators argued that chapters v-xi constituted the introduction proper to the book, while chapters i-iv were added at a later stage. See W.E. Addis, The Documents of the Hexateuch, I, London, 1892, p.1xxv and J.E. Carpenter and G. Harford, The Composition of the Hexateuch, London, 1902, pp.155-158, footnote a. On the other hand, S.R. Driver, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy, third edition, Edinburgh, 1965, p.1xxii, while acknowledging slight stylistic differences between the two sections argued that these were insufficient grounds for maintaining different authorship: "To the present writer there appears to be no conclusive reason why c.1-3 should not be by the same hand as c.5ff.; and the only reason of any weight for doubting whether 4:1-40 is by the same hand also, seems to him to be one which after all may not be conclusive either...." Cf., idem, Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, seventh edition, Edinburgh, 1907, p.94. See further, G.A. Smith, Deuteronomy, CBSC, 1918, p.1xi, n.1.

Yet another opinion was expressed by J. Wellhausen in a footnote on p.192 of his work Die Composition des Hexateuchs, Berlin, 1899, where he argued that chapters i-iv and v-xi were originally two separate prefaces to two separate editions of the Deuteronomistic legislation in chapters xii-xxvi.

5. Noth regards this continuous history of Israel from Moses to the fall of Jerusalem as the work of a single author/compiler and not a group, as is widely held. However, there is an increasing tendency among scholars to distinguish different hands within the Deuteronomistic history. Thus, for example, W. Dietrich, Prophetie und Geschichte. Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk, FRLANT, cviii, 1972, distinguishes three different hands within the Deuteronomistic history, that of the author of the history proper (Dtr G), that of a deuteronomistically oriented prophetic theologian of history (Dtr P), and that of a legalistic redactor who assesses the history of Israel by the law of Deuteronomy. Nevertheless, as mentioned in n.25 on p.12, above, throughout this thesis the term Deuteronomistic historian, in the singular, will be used when referring to the author/compiler of the corpus Deuteronomy - 2 Kings since, although evidence may be found of
exile in such a way as to explain why Israel suffered the catastrophes of 721 B.C. and 586 B.C. He collected, edited and wove together a vast amount of material from many different sources and periods in Israel's history (6) and created a structural unity by means of a rigid editorial framework which is frequently interspersed at crucial

5. continued. more than one hand, the work is obviously one in both plan and conception. Noth's assumption that the activity of the Deuteronomist was the middle of the sixth century in Palestine, has also been challenged. Noth thought that the work was composed in the same year as, or shortly after, the event described in 2 Kgs. xxv:27ff. (561 B.C.). He also maintained that the sources used by the Deuteronomist would have been most readily available to him in Palestine. E. Janssen, Juda in der Exilszeit: Ein Beitrag zur Frage der Entstehung des Judentums, FRLANT, lxix, 1956, pp.17f., puts forward further arguments in support of a Palestinian localization. Janssen argues that the warnings against apostasy to Canaanite deities, the understanding of the temple as a place of prayer (cf. 1 Kgs. viii:33ff.), and the fact that there is little real interest in the exiles, are indications that the work originated in Palestine. Cf., too, H.W. Wolff, 'Das Kerygma des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks', ZAW, lxxxiii, 1961, pp.171-186, ref. p.172. On the other hand, J.A. Soggin, 'Deuteronomistische Geschichtsauslegung während des babylonischen Exils', Oikononia. Festschrift O. Cullmann, Hamburg, 1967, pp.11-17; idem, Joshua, London, 1972, pp.218ff.; idem, Introduction to the Old Testament, p.164, and Nicholson, Preaching to the Exiles, Oxford, 1970, pp.117ff., (contra his earlier opinion expressed in Deuteronomy and Tradition, p.113), argue that the work originated among the exiles. Ackroyd, Exile and Restoration, pp.65ff., 68; idem, Israel under Babylon and Persia, p.143, regards the arguments as inconclusive and thinks that there is no means of knowing for certain whether the author was writing in Palestine or Babylonia. As regards the date of the work, Ackroyd maintains that the terminus ante quem is 520 B.C. on the grounds that there is no direct reference either to the rebuilding of the temple or to the existence of the Persian empire.

6. Cf., e.g., Ackroyd, Israel under Babylon and Persia, p.144. Underlying Deuteronomy there is a great legal tradition which is linked with earlier theological movements both in the old northern kingdom and in Jerusalem. Behind the narratives of the books from Joshua to 2 Kings there are large presentations of material such as the story of the kingdom of David and the succession narrative (mainly 2 Sam. ix-xx; 1 Kgs. i-ii) which provides a unified reflection on the meaning of this highly significant moment in the history of Israel. Heaton, The Hebrew Kingdoms, pp.60ff., is able to distinguish eight sources in 1 and 2 Kings: 'the Book of the Acts of Solomon' (1 Kgs. xi:41); 'the Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Israel' (1 Kgs. xiv:19); 'the Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah' (1 Kgs. xiv:29); a northern historical source underlying the appreciative account of the wars undertaken by Ahab against Damascus in 1 Kgs. xx and xxii; a cycle of stories about Elijah, which were originally independent and circulated orally among his disciples in the northern kingdom, which the Deuteronomist has drawn on for 1 Kgs. xvii-xix, xxi, and 2 Kgs. i:2-17; a separate cycle of stories about Elisha which is found
points in the narrative with his own distinctive theological
interpretative comments and reflections, often in the form of speeches.\(7\)
Among this material was the Deuteronomic Code (Deut. iv: 44-xxx:20)
which constitutes the key-note of the entire corpus, for the Deuteronomistic
historian applied the principles of Deuteronomy to the history of Israel.

In the Deuteronomist's presentation, Israel's history is divided
into five periods:\(8\) the Mosaic period which is covered by the book
of Deuteronomy; the period of the Israelite conquest under the
leadership of Joshua; the period of the Judges (Judg. - I Sam.
vii); the period from the rise of the monarchy under Saul to the
dedication prayer of Solomon on the completion of the Jerusalem

6. continued. in 2 Kgs. ii-xiii; material about Isaiah in 2 Kgs.
 xvi:13-xx:19 which differs from the biographical sections of the
prophetic book in that it is so much more popular in character;
finally, traditions about the prophet Ahijah which are to be found
in I Kgs. xi:29-39; xii:15; xiv:1-18; xv:29. The Deuteronomist
has brought all this diverse material under control by means of
his editorial framework and he has built upon it, interpreting it
in the light of the fact that the judgements of the prophets had
been vindicated. It was the task of the Deuteronomist to interpret
this material in such a way as to help Israel learn, in the situation
of the exile, what her place was to be in the purpose of Yahweh.

7. See, for example, Joshua's address in Josh. xxiv, Samuel's address
in I Sam. xii, Solomon's prayer at the dedication of the temple
in I Kgs. viii, and the comment on the fall of Samaria in 2 Kgs.
xviii. For further details, cf., for example, O. Plöger, 'Reden
und Gebet im deuteronomistischen und chronistischen Geschichtswerk',
in Festschrift G. Dehn, Neukirchen, 1957, pp.35ff. The Deuteronomist's
interpolation of these comments and reflections are clear indication
that the aim of this 'historian' was not to record the bare facts
of history but, rather, to give a theological explanation for the
fall of the two kingdoms. Cf. L. Perlitt, Bundestheologie im
1962, p.230, describes the Deuteronomistic history as "a religious
philosophy of Hebrew history". The Deuteronomist "was a teacher
of religion, who used history as his object lesson" and "the
history of about seven centuries was viewed in the light of one
great religious principle." The Deuteronomic principle of cultic
centralization, however,"was only one aspect of the larger idea
of wholehearted loyalty to Yahweh and exclusive worship of Him.
And this larger idea became the master key that unlocked the true
meaning of history" (ibid., n.2). Soggin, Introduction to the
Old Testament, pp.205f., prefers to call the Deuteronomistic work
"a theology of history, even if at this time theology and philosophy
coincided...Given a situation that was so overbearing in every
field it is not surprising that it was easy to interpret the
history of the people in terms like that of divine recompense."
Cf., also, J.F.A. Sawyer, From Moses to Patmos. New Perspectives in

temple (I Sam. viii - I Kgs. viii); and, finally, the remaining
period under the monarchy in both kingdoms when Israel sank deeper
and deeper into apostasy and disobedience. (9) As Noth has shown,

9. The latest event recorded by the Deuteronomist is the release
of Jehoiachin. Many commentators have wrestled with the problem
whether the Deuteronomist included this piece of information as
a sign of the divine favour and hope for the future, or as a
denial of a misplaced hope of revival. Noth, who thinks that
the Deuteronomist stops short of the moment of promise,
Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien, pp.107ff.; idem, The
History of Israel, p.290; (cf., too, idem, 'For all who rely on
works of the law are under a curse', The Laws in the Pentateuch
and Other Essays, pp.118-131), interprets this record as being a
denial of a forlorn hope of revival under a renewed Davidic
kingship through Jehoiachin which was shared by both the Israelites
remaining in Palestine and the scattered exiles. Noth thinks
that 'all the days of his life' in 2 Kgs. xxv:30 is an indication
that Jehoiachin is now dead and that the Deuteronomist specifically
reports this at the end of his work in order to show that none of
the hopes that had been placed upon him had been fulfilled.
See idem, 'Zur Geschichtsauffassung des Deuteronomisten',
Proc. XXII. Contress of Orientalists Istanbul, 1951, ii, Leiden,
1957, pp.558-566. Noth has been criticised for this gloomy
interpretation by, among others, H.W. Wolff, 'Das Kerygma des
deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks', ZAW, lxxxiii, 1961, pp.171-
186, ref. pp.172f. Von Rad, Old Testament Theology, vol. i,
pp.342ff., emphasises that there is an implicit link with the
promises of an eternal covenant with David. He says that the
Deuteronomist "could never concede that the saying about the
lamp which was always to remain for David had now in fact 'failed'.
As to any goal to which this saving word was coming he had nothing
to say: the one thing he could do was just, in this direction, not
to close the door of history, but to leave it open" (ibid., p.343,
n.22). Although Wolff, op.cit., p.174 rightly argues that there
is no direct allusion to the Nathan promise, Ackroyd, Exile and
Restoration, p.79, n.78, correctly points out that "the hope
though hesitant is none the less a real one". Wolff and Gray,
I and II Kings, second, fully revised edition, London, 1970,
pp.42f., argue that the note on the release of Jehoiachin from
close confinement, although far from signalling a messianic hope,
"may be adduced to encourage the people of God that security with
honour was still possible and that fidelity to ancestral principles
of the people of God's election might still raise Israel, even in
political obscurity, above the ruck of peoples, as Jehoiachin was
given preference above his fellows in captivity" (Gray, op.cit.,
pp.42f.). K.D. Fricke in his introduction to J. Fichtner, Das erste
Buch von den Königen, (Die Botschaft des Alten Testaments), edited
by Fricke, Stuttgart, 1964, p.31, views the item of Jehoiachin's
release as having been inserted as a ray of hope. H. Timm, 'Die
Ladeerzählung (I Sam. iv-vi; II Sam. vi) und das Kerygma des
deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerkes', EvTh, xxvi, 1966, pp.509-
526 draws a parallel between the situation of Israel after the
loss of the ark and Israel's situation in the exile. Just as
on the former, so, too, on the latter occasion, hope rested in
Yahweh alone. Ackroyd, op.cit., pp.78ff., adduces four main
reasons for thinking that the Deuteronomist holds out the promise
of a change of divine favour. Firstly, while the renewed life
Continued. of Israel as God's people is contingent, "it
depends upon the one thing which Israel has reason to believe is
sure, namely the absolute rightness and justice and assuredness
of divine action" (ibid., p.78). Secondly, the same type of
concern as that of the Deuteronomist may be seen in the question
raised by the poet in Lamentations v:20, "Why dost thou forget us
for ever?". The poet is firmly convinced that Yahweh is in
control (v.19) and his assured hope is that God will help his
people, but the poet's distress is that Yahweh is delaying his
Thirdly, the phrase "all the days of his life" in 2 Kgs. xxv:30
need not be interpreted so narrowly as to mean that Jehoiachin
is now dead. Rather the phrase should be taken as indicating
that the legitimate descendant of David is restored to favour
in perpetuity. Fourthly, there are overtones of promise
throughout the entire work (cf., e.g., Deut. iv:30ff.; I Kgs.
viii:46-50). Above all, Ackroyd, Israel under Babylon and Persia,
p.145, thinks that the picture of Israel poised at the entry to
the promised land would have been highly significant for the people
in the exilic age who in a sense had lost their land and who
would probably have identified themselves with their ancestors:
"There is no statement of what will happen, only the implication
which cannot be missed that the God who brought his people out
of Egypt and into the promised land, who gave them the law and
the dynasty of David, who time and again delivered them from
disaster and when they were disobedient relaxed the severity of
judgement right up to the final moment (cf. 2 Kgs. 14:27, 17:19ff.,
22:16ff.), could not just repudiate everything that he was"
(ibid). Thus, Ackroyd argues cogently for the view that the last
words of the Deuteronomist concerning the release of Jehoiachin
from prison are hopeful. The Davidic king, even after years
of imprisonment, still remains the symbol of Yahweh's enduring
love and eternal goodness. Although there is no blueprint
for the future in the Deuteronomistic history, "the hope for the
future lies in the assurance of the mercy of God, and of the
supremacy of the one who cannot be allowed to have been defeated
any more than he has been defeated in his former contests" for
"in the contest... with the alien powers which have for the
moment overrun his people at his behest, he is still supreme,
and in his willingness to show favour there is hope" (idem,
Exile and Restoration, p.81). A. Phillips, God B.C., pp.35f.,
thinks that it was probably the release of Jehoiachin from
prison which inspired the publication of the Deuteronomistic
History: "Undoubtedly the king's release caused a wave of
excitement to pass throughout Judaism both in Babylon and Palestine.
Was this the prelude to another mighty act of Israel's God
whereby he would deliver his people from the oppressor so that
they might enjoy their unique relationship with him in the land
he had chosen for them?" (ibid.). Phillips thus rejects the
view that no hope is held out in the Deuteronomistic history:
"in spite of the undoubted justice of God's judgment upon Israel,
the Deuteronomists could not bring themselves to believe that it
could be final. Against their own threat theology, they yet
envisaged the hope that the gracious God might again lead his
people back across the Jordan to the promised land: there might yet
be a second exodus.... if defeated and exiled Israel remained
the Deuteronomist incorporated the original book of Deuteronomy as the law of Yahweh mediated through Moses and attempted to show that Israel's downfall was the direct result of having continually refused to remain faithful to the covenant obligations contained in 'the law of Moses', that is, Deuteronomy, until Yahweh had no option but to reject his people, the northern kingdom in 721 B.C. and the southern in 586 B.C. The Deuteronomist tried to show that the disasters which had befallen Israel were not caused by misfortune but were, rather, the will of Yahweh as judgement on his people for their failure to obey the law given by God through Moses and set out and expounded in Deuteronomy. (10)

9. Continued. "loyal to her God" (ibid., p.35). According to Phillips "the Deuteronomists...place any hope there might be in an illogical act of divine mercy" (ibid., p.36). Focusing attention on the people in their time of alienation, E.W. Heaton, The Hebrew Kingdoms, p.67, points out that the Deuteronomist was concerned to teach the Israelites that it was they and not Yahweh who had failed and that 'the proper response was not cynicism or despair but repentance - a new and whole-hearted 'turning' to Yahweh, in the confidence that he was compassionate and would forgive, (1 Kgs. 8:33, 34, 46-53; cf. 2 Kgs. 17:13; Deut. 4:25-31)." A similar view that hope was not abandoned by the Deuteronomist is well expressed by Nicholson, op.cit., p.124: "The Deuteronomistic history was no mere academic exercise. Nor was it intended solely as further rebuke to those who had suffered Yahweh's rejection, for in seeking to show how this had come about it was holding forth the hope that even now the broken relationship with God could be healed if only Israel returned to him in penitence." Cf. idem, Preaching to the Exiles, pp.75ff., 118. Cf., too, J.M. Myers, I Chronicles, New York, 1965, p.xx.

10. Von Rad, Studies in Deuteronomy, pp.78ff.,(cf., too, Nicholson, op.cit., pp.28, 115ff.), points out that part of the Deuteronomist's technique is his employment of a prophecy - fulfilment schema to show the interrelationship between Yahweh's words and history. By virtue of the power which is inherent in it, Yahweh's word, once uttered, finds certain fulfilment under all circumstances in history. The two most significant instances of the fulfilment of earlier prophetic predictions are the downfall of the northern kingdom referred to in 2 Kgs. xvii:23 as the fulfilment of a prophetic prediction recorded in 2 Kgs. xvii:13, and the destruction of Judah reported in 2 Kgs. xxiv:2f. as the fulfilment of prophetic predictions made in the reign of Manasseh and recorded in 2 Kgs. xxi:10f.(although cf. Heaton, op.cit., p.66, who points out that the end of the southern kingdom could equally
There is a twofold basis for the Deuteronomist's judgement of the past and for his interpretation of the contemporary situation. On the one hand, there is 'the law of Moses' which provides the standard of obedience by which Israel is judged. Repeatedly in Deuteronomy, but particularly in Deut. xxx:15-20, it is stressed that the real intention of the law was to enable Israel to enjoy a long and blessed life in the land which Yahweh had given to his people. Thus, the law was both the litmus-test of Israel's obedience and, simultaneously, the vehicle of the divine promise. It was because of continual apostasy and disobedience that Israel lost Yahweh's gift of the land. The Deuteronomist was concerned to show that just as Israel had enjoyed prosperity as the reward of faithfulness, so, too, she must suffer affliction as the punishment for disloyalty to Yahweh. On the other hand, the Deuteronomist expressed the judgement upon the kingdoms as judgement upon the failure of the kings to conform to the Deuteronomic standards. Yahweh had not only

10. Continued. well be seen as the fulfilment of the curse of the law on the disobedience of Israel, cf. Deut. xxvii:11-26; xxviii:16-19. But Heaton agrees that prophecy, although of a rather limited kind, clearly constituted a major element of the historian's theology. Quite apart from the considerable number of prophets who bear witness to Yahweh's active intervention in the decline and fall of both kingdoms, Heaton points out that "in line with the book of Deuteronomy, which regards the fulfilment of prophecy as one of the criteria of its genuineness, Deut.18:22, 1 and 2 Kings is criss-crossed by prophetic predictions and their carefully noted fulfilment in historical event". Nicholson, op.cit., pp.28f., links this type of prophetic predictions with the repeated threats of exile which occur in various passages throughout the Deuteronomistic corpus: Deut. iv:26f.; vi:15; vii:4; viii:19-20; xi:17; xxviii:36f., 63f.; xxix:27f.; xxx:18-19; Josh. xxiii:13, 16; 1 Kgs. ix:6f.; 2 Kgs. xvii:13; xxi:10f. Cf., also, Weinfeld, Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School, pp.15ff.

11. Cf., e.g., Ackroyd, Israel under Babylon and Persia, pp.143f.

given his people the Davidic kingship, but he had also established a covenant with that royal line (cf. 2 Sam.vii) and it was the express responsibility of the king to ensure that the law was upheld (13) (cf. Deut. xvii:14-20). The Deuteronomistic historian condemns all monarchs of both kingdoms who actively, encouraged or who passively tolerated any non-Yahwistic religious practices. However, because the Deuteronomistic ideal specified not merely the purification of the cult but also its centralization at the one legitimate sanctuary, which, although unnamed, was probably Jerusalem, the Deuteronomist measures the kings above all else by the criterion of worship at the high places outside Jerusalem. Thus, failure to suppress the local shrines earns condemnation even for kings who are otherwise commended for their religious policy.

The Deuteronomist introduces and concludes the reign of each of the kings by means of a standard formula. (14) The formula introducing the reigns of the kings of Judah is well illustrated by 2 Kgs. xiv:1-3, although, of course, Joash receives qualified praise unlike the majority of kings for whom the Deuteronomist substitutes

The formula introducing the kings of the northern kingdom is similar but the age of the new king and his mother's name are omitted, as is illustrated by 2 Kgs. xiv:23f.:


The formula which concludes each reign is well illustrated by 1 Kgs. xxii:39f.:

One of the most frequently recurring stereotyped theological formulas used by the Deuteronomist is, of course, the judgement which is passed upon virtually all the monarchs of the northern kingdom. (16)

15. As Heaton, op.cit., p.62, points out, the synchronizing device used by the Deuteronomist in the introductory formula whereby he refers first to the date of the king's accession in terms of the regnal year of the monarch of the other kingdom and then to the duration of the king's reign, is an ingenious system which may have been copied from Assyrian historians. Cf., too, J. Gray, I and II Kings, second, fully revised edition, London, 1970, p.347. Nevertheless, discrepancies exist and there remain many unsolved chronological problems. Heaton also draws attention to another convention adopted by the Deuteronomist in his two-fold determination to preserve each king's reign as a unit and to co-ordinate the two kingdoms historically. Having written, for example, his account of a king of Judah, the Deuteronomist then proceeds to report on the reigns of all the kings of the northern kingdom who came to the throne during the reign of that Judaean king. Then, having completed the reign of the last northern king of the period, he reverts to the history of Judah and focuses attention on the Judaean king who had by that time succeeded to the throne. The obvious disadvantage of this method is that the Deuteronomist is occasionally forced to mention a king in relation to his contemporary opposite number before he has announced the king's accession to the throne (e.g. the case of Jehoshaphat, cf. I Kgs. xxii:2 with I Kgs. xxii:41).

16. Of the nineteen kings of Northern Israel only two, Shallum and Hoshea, escape outright condemnation by the Deuteronomistic historian. In the case of Shallum, no judgement at all is passed. However, although he reigned for only one month (2 Kgs. xv:13-16), it seems more likely that he escaped the usual damnatory formula because of an oversight on the part of the Deuteronomistic historian, than that his reign was considered to be of too short a duration for it to be appropriate to pass judgement. After all, judgement was passed on Zimri even though he is said to have reigned for a mere week (I Kgs. xvi:15-20). In the case of Hoshea (2 Kgs. xvii:2), the Deuteronomistic historian says נַעַמְתָּאּיֶשׁ אִשָּׁאִיֵּבָה נַעַמְתָּאִיֵּבָה, but then adds רֹעְשֶׁה רֹעְשֶׁה אֲלוֹ נַעַמְתָּאִיֵּבָה. It is difficult to explain why this 'excepting'
16. Continued. clause was added. The Deuteronomistic historian had to condemn all the Northern kings for the obvious reason that none of them centred the cult on Jerusalem. Lucian's recension of the Septuagint renders παρὰ κανὰς τοὺς γενομένους εἰμισθεὶς αὐτοῦ but, although such a judgement would be expected of the last king of Israel, this version is not acceptable, since it is an obvious alteration in the light of the events of 722 B.C. Furthermore, the fact that only one version offers this reading would suggest that the MT is authentic, and the clause would still have to be assigned to the Deuteronomistic historian because it comprises an accepted Deuteronomistic formula which was used in the judgement of Hezekiah (2 Kgs. xviii:5) and Josiah (2 Kgs. xxiii:25), the two kings who receive most approval and adversely in the judgement of one of the worst of the Northern apostates, Ahab (1 Kgs. xvi:33). J.A. Montgomery, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Kings, ICC, Edinburgh, 1967, (edited by H.S. Gehman), p.465, thinks that the clause might have been added as a "sympathetic expression for this last and valiant king", while J. Gray, I and II Kings, p.641, thinks that political involvements left Hoshea no time for religious matters and that "his comparative virtue according to Deuteronomistic principles was a virtue of necessity". However, neither of these explanations is convincing because, as McKay, Josiah's Reformation, pp.372f., points out, they both "fail to take account of the fact that the judgements are Deuteronomistic, and in the case of the Northern kings their measure is the assessment of the monarch's attitudes to the cults of Bethel and Jerusalem" (cf. I Kgs. xii:25-32). Montgomery, loc.cit., draws attention to a Jewish tradition which appears in Rashi and Kimchi to the effect that Hoshea removed the guards who had been positioned to prevent northern Israelites from travelling to worship at Jerusalem. However, McKay, op.cit., p.373, rightly says that this tradition "appears fanciful and appeals to the unknown and even the improbable". N.H. Snaith, writing in IB, iii, New York-Nashville, 1954, pp.1-338, ref. p.278, suggests that it may have been Hoshea's anti-Assyrian policy which earned him a comparatively favourable judgement. McKay, op.cit., pp.375f. (see, too, ibid., pp.125, 148-157), also thinks it possible that Hoshea's rebellion against Assyria would probably have pleased the Deuteronomistic historian since it implied the restitution of Yahweh to the status of sole overlord in Israel, but he rightly adds that an act of rebellion in itself would not have warranted the excepting clause because Pekah had also defied Assyria and Hoshea himself had at first submitted when he acceded to the throne. (On the problem of 2 Kgs. xvii:3-6 which suggests that before Samaria was captured Hoshea had twice revolted against Shalmaneser and had twice been subjected, the second time being taken prisoner, see McKay, op.cit., pp.373f. and the literature cited there). There is, however, another, much more interesting explanation offered by McKay as to why this 'excepting' clause was added. He thinks, op.cit., p.376, that the Deuteronomistic historian may possibly "have preserved a memory that the last king of Israel was sympathetic to the principles of Deuteronomism in some way which can no longer be specified owing to the scarcity of material available." This suggestion implies that Deuteronomism was already an active force in the latter days of the Northern Kingdom. F. Dumermuth, 'Zur deuteronomischen Kulttheologie und
This formula may be illustrated by I Kgs. xxii:53 (EVV52):

The Deuteronomist regarded Jeroboam's repudiation of the temple sanctuary in Jerusalem by setting up the golden calves at Bethel and Dan (I Kgs. xii:26ff.) as the sin par excellence of the northern kingdom. (17) Not

16. Continued. "ihre Voraussetzungen", ZAN, 1xx, 1958, pp.59-98, ref. pp.59f., and J. Bowman, 'The Samaritans and the Book of Deuteronomy', TGUOS, xvii, 1958, pp.9-18, ref. pp.17f., have both suggested this date for the original composition of Deuteronomy, Bowman even suggesting the reign of Hoshea. This is surely too early a date for the appearance of the book. Nevertheless, McKay, op.cit., pp.376f., rightly considers it possible that Deuteronomism became an active force in the second half of the eighth century, before the collapse of the Northern Kingdom, "and that in this period its propagators began to reformulate the old Yahwistic traditions which go back to the antiquity of Israel's origins as a covenant community, traditions which had been preserved by Levites, prophets and the humble obedient of the land". McKay adds that after the fall of the Northern Kingdom in 722 B.C. the Deuteronomists came to Judah with the hope that "Israel" might yet be delivered from extermination, "and it was in Judah in the century before Josiah's reformation that the traditions underwent the significant changes which were to determine the appearance of the Book of Deuteronomy" (McKay, op.cit., p.377).

17. Cf. Nicholson, op.cit., p.30. For some considerable time commentators had observed that the narrative in Deuteronomy ix:7ff. is dependent upon Exodus xxxii (S.R. Driver, Deuteronomy, pp.112ff., lists the parallels between the two narratives), and that both narratives in their present form are directed against Jeroboam I's action of setting up the golden calves at Bethel and Dan (cf. A.R.S. Kennedy and N.H. Snaith, 'Calf, Golden', HDB, p.119; S.R. Driver, Exodus, CBS, 1918, p.346; D.M.G. Stalker, 'Exodus', PC, pp.208-240, ref. p.238; M. Noth, Exodus, London, 1962, p.246; J.P. Hyatt, Exodus, London, 1971, p.305; E.W. Nicholson, op.cit., pp.30ff. Minette de Tillesse, 'Sections "tu" et sections "vous" dans le Deutéronome', VT, xii, 1962, pp.29-87, ref. p.60, suggests that the Deuteronomist deliberately projected back aetiologically the narrative of the golden calf into the Mosaic period in order to prefigure the apostasy of the northern state. Many commentators now treat Exod. xxxii as having been composed by the Deuteronomist and interpolated into the pentateuchal narrative as a polemic against Jeroboam's policy. The golden calf episode has attracted a considerable amount of attention from scholars, including the following: J. Hofbauer, 'Die literarische Komposition von Ex. 19-24 und 32-34', ZKTh, lvi, 1932, pp.476-529; O. Eissfeldt, 'Lade und Stierbild', ZAW, lvi, 1940/1, pp.190-215; idem, Die Komposition der Sinai-Erzählung Exodus 19-34, Berlin, 1966;
J. Lewy, 'The Story of the Golden Calf Reanalysed', VT, ix, 1959, pp.318-322; M. Noth, 'Zur Anfertigung des goldenen Kalbes', VT, ix, 1959, pp.419-422; S. Lehming, 'Versuch zu Ex. xxxii', VT, x, 1960, pp.16-50, who argues that Exod. xxxii:2-4a is a late insertion which supplanted an older version of the tradition in which a wooden calf was referred to, a view which is criticized by W. Beyerlin, Origins and History of the Oldest Sinaic Traditions, (translated by S. Rudman from Herkunft und Geschichte der Ältesten Sinaitraditionen, Tübingen, 1961), Oxford, 1965, p.18, n.119 and p.131, n.551 (cf., also, Noth, Exodus, p.249); J.J. Petuchowski, 'Nochmals "Zur Anfertigung des goldenen Kalbes"', VT, x, 1960, p.74; S.E. Loewenstamm, 'The Making and Destruction of the Golden Calf', Biblica, xlvi, 1967, pp.481-490; M. Aberbach and L. Smolar, 'Aaron, Jeroboam, and the Golden Calves', JBL, lxxxvi, 1967, pp.129-140; L.R. Bailey, 'The Golden Calf', HUCA, xlii, 1971, pp.97-115. Perhaps the most interesting line of argument, in this context, is that taken by Eissfeldt who argues, on archaeological grounds, for the possibility that Israel had a calf image in the pre-settlement period. This is significant in view of the fact that H. Junker, 'Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung über die Erzählung von der Anbetung des goldenen Kalbes (Ex. xxxii)\textsuperscript{7}', TrThZ, 1x, vol. 5-8, 1951, pp.232-242, ref. p.240, argues for the genuine antiquity of Exod. xxxii and claims that it is a reliable tradition which, in all its details, faithfully reflects the historical situation of Israel in the Mosaic period. More recently, G. Henton Davies, Exodus, London, 1967, p.231, has expressed the opinion that 'the suggestion that there never was a golden calf incident at Sinai...is difficult to sustain'. B.S. Childs, Exodus, London, 1974, pp.558ff., while acknowledging that a strong connection does exist between I Kgs. xii and Exod. xxxii, thinks it unlikely that the Deuteronomistic editor of I Kgs. xii actually created de novo the golden calf episode in Exodus in the light of the action taken by Jeroboam. Childs argues, not very convincingly, that the evidence supports the view that the Deuteronomistic editor of Kings was dependent on an existing story which he adapted in order to make it suit his later polemic against Jeroboam. According to Childs, there was an independent oral tradition underlying the story which, even in the oral stage, was linked with other traditions - the murmuring tradition, for example. It was probably in the J source that it passed into a literary form, before being incorporated by a pre-Deuteronomistic redactor into his larger narrative of chapters 32-34. M. Newman, The People of the Covenant: A Study of Israel from Moses to the Monarchy, New York and Nashville, 1962, p.182, thinks it is possible that when Jeroboam set up the calf at Bethel as "the northern counterpart to the ark" (ibid.; cf. Beyerlin, op.cit., p.129, n.556, but see, too, Eissfeldt, 'Lade und Stierbild', ZAW, lvi, 1940/1, pp.200ff. who offers a different explanation of the description of the bull as a leader-symbol), a tradition, originally favourable to the calf, emerged which attempted to relate the calf to the Mosaic period. The view that the tradition relating the calf at Bethel to the Mosaic period was originally favourable to the cult of the calf-image was expressed a little earlier and in much greater detail by Beyerlin, op.cit., pp.126ff. Beyerlin argues that the connection between Exod. xxxii and I Kgs. xii:25-33 is not due to the fact that one narrative is dependent on the other. Rather, the connection
only is each king condemned for having "walked in the sins of Jeroboam the son of Nebat", but the downfall of the northern kingdom is also ultimately attributed to this action by Jeroboam,

(2 Kgs. xvii:21ff.):

In similar vein, the Deuteronomist condemns the overwhelming majority of the kings of Judah for having permitted worship at sanctuaries other than the Jerusalem temple:

Although the majority of the kings were obviously ignorant of a law which,

17. Continued. probably exists because both refer to the same cult of the calf-image at Bethel (and Dan). Beyerlin maintains that there is little or no polemical emphasis in Exod. xxxii if one takes vv.1-6 by themselves. At most ḫašēk in v.6 may contain a polemical note, but, "since the peripheral ḫašēk may...be attributed to later editing, it follows that the original tradition of the verses referred to the cult of the calf-image at Bethel in a thoroughly positive sense "(ibid., p.127). To support this line of argument, Beyerlin (ibid., n.531) refers to 2 Kgs. x:28 (cf. 2 Kgs. x:16) where even avowed worshippers of Yahweh did not regard the calf-image cult as being incompatible with true worship of Yahweh. Beyerlin thinks the tradition underlying Exod. xxxii:1-6 is best interpreted as a cultic aetiology which seeks to explain the construction and cultic veneration of the calf-image at Bethel. The tradition revised in Exod. xxxii:1-6 probably owes its origin to the priesthood at Bethel who wished to give an account of the origins of the cult of the calf-image which was in existence there under Jeroboam I at the latest (Beyerlin thinks it possible, in view of the probability that the cultic image at Dan in the pre-monarchic period was a bull, that Jeroboam was not the first to introduce the cult of the calf-image at Bethel). Having concluded that an old aetiological narrative underlies Exod. xxxii:1-6 which reflects the cult of the calf-image at Bethel and which seeks to base it on what transpired at the Exodus and Sinai, Beyerlin adds: "The question whether this derivation is pure fiction or whether it corresponds to an actual historical situation may be left undecided in the present context" (ibid., p.130).

as will be seen later, was probably promulgated circa 621 B.C.,
they were guilty of disobedience because during their reigns the
alien cults at the local sanctuaries were allowed to flourish and
apostasy from Yahwism could not be tolerated. It is interesting
that just as the Deuteronomist stressed the Mosaic origin of Israel’s
distinctive faith, so, too, he regards the law of the single sanctuary
not as an innovation, but, rather, as the very law of Moses (cf.
2 Kgs. xviii:12; xxi:8; xxiii:25). (19)

According to the Deuteronomistic historian, of all the kings of
Israel and Judah only Hezekiah and Josiah deserve unconditional
praise for having fully obeyed the demands of Deuteronomy because
only they abolished the high places and centralized sacrificial
worship to Jerusalem. Asa, Jehoshaphat, Jehoash (of Judah),
Amaziah, Uzziah, and Jotham are also honoured by the Deuteronomistic
historian, but to a much lesser degree. In each of these cases the
formula used is the same: the Deuteronomistic historian praises
the king for having done "what was right in the eyes of Yahweh",
but laments the fact that (20) Two of these
kings - Asa and Jehoash - are attributed with having carried out
certain reforms. I Kgs. xv:12-15 contains a brief description
of the reforms undertaken by Asa, king of Judah 913-873, while the
reforms which were carried out by Jehoash, king of Judah 837-800,
and the chief priest Jehoiada, are recounted in 2 Kgs. xi-xii.
The Chronicler’s work must also be considered, particularly
with regard to Asa and Jehoshaphat, since he credits both these
kings not only with having carried out important religious reforms,

but also with having attempted cultic centralization. Hence, in this chapter, attention will be focused on the recorded reformations of Asa, Jehoshaphat, Jehoash, and Hezekiah.

1. The Reformation of Asa

In I Kgs. xv:12-15 the following reforms are attributed to Asa:

(a) The expulsion of the male cult prostitutes: (v.12).

(b) The removal of all the idols which his fathers had made: (v.12).

(c) The deposition of his mother, Maacah: (v.13).

(d) The destruction of an "abominable image" which Maacah had had made for Asherah: (v.13).

(e) The endowment of the temple with his votive gifts and those of his father, consisting of silver, gold, and vessels: (v.15).

What is immediately striking about this list of Asa's reforms is the fact that at least three of these measures - the expulsion of the , the removal of the , and the destruction of the - were carried out later by Josiah. According to A.T. Olmstead, many people, especially the peasants and the country priests, would have resented the reformation of Josiah because it would have robbed them of their religion: "To many a thinking and pious Hebrew, the 'reform' of Josiah must have seemed the utter negation of all that was best in the nation's past!"

22. Ibid., p.568.
23. Ibid., p.569.
this were the case, then the Deuteronomistic historian may well have included mention of these measures taken by Asa, one of Judah's best kings, in order to furnish precedents for Josiah's purges. (24) Indeed, McKay suggests that the account of Asa's reforms in I Kgs. xv:12-15, as it now stands, may well give more information about the reforms of Josiah than those of Asa. (25) The expulsion of the בִּשְׁפַּר(26)
The word בִּשְׁפַּר first appears in Gen. xxxviii:21f., the story of Judah and Tamar. Hos. iv:14 witnesses to the presence of בִּשְׁפַּר in the Northern Kingdom, while in Job xxxvi:14 Elihu speaks of the "godless in heart" dying בִּשְׁפַּר. However, it is Deut. xxiii:18f. which specifically legislates against the בִּשְׁפַּר and the מִשְׁפְּר and reference to the בִּשְׁפַּר in the Old Testament is largely restricted to the Deuteronomistic history.

Altogether, there are four references to these cult prostitutes in the Deuteronomistic history. I Kgs. xiv:21ff. gives a short account of the reign of Rehoboam and, in verse 24, part of a section where judgement is passed on the religious situation in Judah at that time, there occurs the phrase בִּשְׁפַּר. This phrase, introduced by בֵּין and followed by the asyndetic בִּשְׁפַּר, was probably inserted as a preface to the reforms of Asa. (27) Then, in I Kgs. xxii:47 there is a

25. Ibid., p.392.
note that Jehoshaphat exterminated מִדְּרָקֶן אֲשֶׁר נִטְשָׁר מִן אֶפֶן אֲשֶׁר, a comment which appears to have been added as an afterthought since it comes after the formula which concludes Jehoshaphat’s reign. (28) The remaining two references to מִדְּרָקֶן are, of course, in I Kgs. xv:12, in the account of Asa’s reforms, and in 2 Kgs. xxiii:7, in the account of Josiah’s reforms.

The removal of the מִדְּרָקֶן

Deut. xxix:16 condemns מִדְּרָקֶן as foreign cult images. (29) There are many occurrences of מִדְּרָקֶן in the book of Ezekiel. Otherwise, however, apart from two isolated references – one in Lev. xxvi:30, the other in Jer. 1:2 – interest in the מִדְּרָקֶן is restricted to the Deuteronomistic history.

In the Deuteronomistic history, apart from I Kgs. xxi:26, which attests the presence of מִדְּרָקֶן in the Northern Kingdom during the reign of Ahab, and 2 Kgs. xvii:12, which lists the worship of these idols as one of the reasons for the fall of Samaria and the exile to Assyria, the מִדְּרָקֶן are mentioned only in connection with the reforms of Asa and Josiah. I Kgs. xv:12 states that Asa’s fathers had served מִדְּרָקֶן and the account of Josiah’s removal of these idols is prefixed by two references – one in 2 Kgs. xxi:11 which refers to Manasseh and the other in 2 Kgs. xxi:21 which refers to Amon – indicating that מִדְּרָקֶן had figured prominently in the cultic paraphernalia of Josiah’s fathers.


29. It has been suggested that these מִדְּרָקֶן were the idols of an Egyptian Osiris cult, but, while this may indeed have been the case (cf. A.S. Yahuda, ‘The Osiris Cult and the Designation of Osiris Idols’, JNES, iii, 1944, pp.194-197), the term is used as a general expression for idols. See Burney, op.cit., pp.196f.; Montgomery, op.cit., p.275; Gray, op.cit., p.349. Cf., too, W.F. Albright, op.cit., p.158.
The destruction of Maacah's [nuvi] (30)

The planting of any tree as an [nuvi] is expressly forbidden by Deut. xvi:21. There are quite a few references to [nuvi] and [nuvi] in the Old Testament. The feminine plural form [nuvi] only occurs in 2 Chron. xix:3; xxxiii:3 and in Judg. iii:7, where, however, it is probably an error for [nuvi].

The fate of Maacah's idol to Asherah is described in the second half of I Kgs. xv:3: [nuvi] [nuvi]. The verb [nuvi] is often used in connection with the destruction of the [nuvi]. The noun [nuvi] occurs only in this verse and in the parallel in 2 Chron. xv:16. However, the most interesting part of I Kgs. xv:13 is [nuvi] [nuvi] because this phrase occurs in only two other contexts in the Old Testament – in 2 Chron. xxix:16; xxx:14 where it is used in the account of Hezekiah's reforms, and in 2 Kgs. xxiii:6, in the account of Josiah's reforms. Particularly striking is the use of the phrase in 2 Kgs. xxiii:6 because the context is the same as that in I Kgs. xv:13, namely, the destruction of the [nuvi].

Of the two remaining features of Asa's reform – the deposition of his mother Maacah and the endowment of the temple with precious gifts – McKay speculates that these may also have been recorded because they prefigured similar measures carried out by Josiah. (31) It is clear from 2 Kgs. xxii:4-7, 9 that Josiah, like Asa, patronised the temple and, in view of the considerable authority commanded by the [nuvi], (32)

McKay could well be correct in thinking that Josiah, too, may have restricted his mother's power, since she would have been in favour of the syncretistic policies of her husband and her father-in-law. (33) Certainly there is nothing improbable in this suggestion. 2 Kgs. xi:4-16 recounts how, when Jehoash was proclaimed king, the chief priest Jehoiada ordered the execution of the queen-mother and 2 Kgs. ix:30ff. relates how Jezebel was assassinated at the command of Jehu. McKay thinks that the Deuteronomistic historian may have been reluctant, for diplomatic reasons, to record a similar move by Josiah, but that he would have recorded Asa's removal of his mother in order to show the precedent set by one of Judah's best kings.

It is certainly possible that the Deuteronomistic historian may have selected from an original account (34) certain elements of Asa's reformation in order to furnish precedents for Josiah's reform. However, although it is impossible to define the exact content of Asa's reformation, it is virtually certain that he made no attempt to centralize the cult.

The Chronicler's account of Asa's Reforms

The Chronicler has freely rewritten and expanded the Kings' account of Asa's reign both by his own additions and material from sources which were not used by the Deuteronomist. However, it would appear that he had no other record of Asa's reforms than that of 1 Kgs. xv. This seems to be borne out by the fact that there is an apparent contradiction between 2 Chron. xiv:2, 4 (EVV xiv: 3, 5), where it is stated that Asa removed the foreign altars and the high places, and 2 Chron.


which reports that the high places were not taken away.

Unconvincing attempts have been made to resolve this difficulty by taking the words "out of Israel" in 2 Chron. xv:17 to mean exclusively the Northern Kingdom, since 2 Chron. xiv:2, 4 refers to Judah. Another explanation that has been put forward is that in 2 Chron. xiv:2 should be construed with as well as : the meaning then would be that Asa removed those high places which could make no legitimate claim to existence. However, in spite of these explanations, it is most unlikely that Asa removed any of the high places. If he had removed even some of them, for whatever reasons, then the Deuteronomistic historian would surely have been the first to acclaim such an action.


37. It is possible that the Chronicler has preserved accurate history in setting Asa's reformation in the context of a victory celebration, cf. McKay, op.cit., p.392, n.2. 2 Chron. xv: 8-15 describes a victory celebration after Asa's defeat of Zerah the Ethiopian at the battle of Mareshah. Before the actual celebration Asa carried out a purge of idols and restored the temple altar. Then followed the celebrations which took the form of a sacrifice from the spoils of war and the renewal of the covenant with Yahweh. To this account the Chronicler added I Kgs. xv:13-15 (2 Chron. xv:16-18) as if it were part of the same victory celebration. Originally this battle, which is not mentioned in Kings, was probably a very limited affair. Gray, op.cit., p.356, thinks that it might have been a repulse of an Egyptian force of Ethiopian mercenaries. In view of the fact that the engagement is placed south-west of Jerusalem at Mareshah, one of the Judaean fortresses (cf. 2 Chron. xi:8), and the pursuit does not continue beyond Gerar, south of Gaza, P.R. Ackroyd, I and II Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, London, 1973, pp.136f., thinks that the origin of the story might be in some tale of raids into Judaean territory by bedouin from these outlying areas. However, as Ackroyd rightly points out, nothing of value can be gained from a search for an historical base for this narrative. The Chronicler has clearly magnified the nature of the threat to
The Motivation behind Asa's Reforms

Asa's reforms were most probably motivated by both political and religious considerations. He would have perceived that religious unity could be relied upon to promote a political unity. There can be little doubt that he would also have been strongly influenced to carry out some measure of cultic reform by the constant reminder of the prophets that the support of Yahweh was conditioned by the response of the people to the moral demands made upon them by their God. Yahweh had always been encountered as unlimited personal energy and activity, in terms of "a moral power carrying out a purpose and summoning men to serve him", (38) by keeping his commandments, his

37. Continued. Asa in order to underline the faith expressed in his prayer in verse 11. The response of Yahweh to such trust is seen in the total overthrow of the enemy. A significant part of this story is 2 Chron. xv:1ff. which relates how a prophet, Azariah the son of Obed, was inspired to deliver a short sermon to Asa, after the defeat of Zerah, in which he drove home the appropriate lesson, מִבְלָיָ rhet (2 Chron. xv:2).

It was on hearing "the prophecy of Azariah the son of Obed" (verse 8, following Syr. and Vg.) that Asa felt prompted to carry out the purge of idols, the restoration of the temple altar and to conduct the great sacrifice which was accompanied by the covenant renewal. According to the Chronicler, therefore, it was these words of prophecy which led to Asa's religious reform. Azariah's sermon has been described as an excellent illustration of the Chronicler's use of contemporary Levitical preaching, see von Rad, 'The Levitical Sermon in I and II Chronicles', The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays, pp.267-280, ref. pp.270f.; W. Rudolph, Chronikbücher, HAT,1:21, Tübingen, 1955, p.245; J.M. Myers, II Chronicles, New York, 1965, p.88; Ackroyd, op.cit., pp.137f. One of the most striking features in the work of the Chronicler is the prominent position he has given to prophecy in relation to the kingdom. Throughout his narrative, the Chronicler has introduced a series of prophets who appear before the successive kings either to warn them of the policy which they ought to follow, or to chastise them for their failure to fulfil the divine will. According to the Chronicler, it was prophecy which had made the kingdom possible, which had accompanied this institution throughout its existence, and which in the end condemned it. Whereas the Deuteronomistic historian judged the successive kings by whether they suppressed or maintained the high places, the Chronicler introduced a different standard, and measured their allegiance to Yahweh according to their response to the divine will as revealed through the prophets. Cf. A.C. Welch, The Work of the Chronicler: its purpose and its Date, London, 1939, pp.7, 42ff

statutes and his ordinances. The price of disobedience to the will of Yahweh was to break the covenant relationship, to encounter Yahweh's wrath, and to forfeit his protection and his active support in delivering his people from hostile forces.

2. The Chronicler's account of the reformation of Jehoshaphat: fact or fiction?

Asa's son and successor, Jehoshaphat, earns qualified praise from the Deuteronomistic historian. Jehoshaphat is said to have "walked in all the way of Asa his father... doing what was right in the sight of Yahweh" (I Kgs. xxii:43), but the next verse (EVV 43) adds the standard lament: However, in contrast to the very meagre information of I Kgs. xv:24; xxii:41-51 and the assessment of Jehoshaphat found there, the Chronicler devotes four chapters to this king (2 Chron. xvii-xx) and attributes him with having carried out religious and political reforms. In particular, Jehoshaphat is said to have removed the high places and the Asherim out of Judah (2 Chron. xvii:6). The Chronicler has made use of all the narrative on Jehoshaphat's reign given in I Kings (I Kgs. xv:24b; xxii: 1-35a, 41-51). A small portion of this he has rewritten (cf. 2 Chron. xviii:1-3; xx:35-37) and he has supplemented the whole with a large amount of new material (2 Chron. xvii:1b-19; xix:1-xx:30) in which the reign of Jehoshaphat is depicted as one of unusual religious activity. (39) Jehoshaphat was clearly one of the Chronicler's favourite kings, along with Hezekiah.

and Josiah. (40) According to the Chronicler, his successful reign was the result of his loyalty to the tradition of his father in his devotion to Yahweh and his consequent rejection of Baal. By following Yahweh and continuing the reformation instituted by Asa, he won wealth and respect.

There is, however, much debate about the sources of the Chronicler's extra material. Indeed, as will be shown below, the origin and use of the compiler's sources is one of the most difficult problems in the study of the literary composition of Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah. Pfeiffer goes so far as to say that the Chronicler drew approximately fifty per cent of his material from earlier biblical books, while most of the remaining half is, more or less, historical fiction. (41) Clearly, the Chronicler's use of his sources "is closely related to his purpose, his theology and general point of view, which in turn depend on one's interpretation." (42)

D.N. Freedman describes the state of studies on the Chronicler's work as bordering on chaos: "The scope, purpose, date, and historical value of this work are all subject to violent debate on the part of scholars who affirm exactly opposite conclusions in the strongest possible language. Between extremes - represented for example by Torrey and Welch - there are numerous mediating positions, which

42. Myers, I Chronicles, p.XLIX; idem, II Chronicles, p. XXIV.

nevertheless differ sharply among themselves".(43) According to E.L. Curtis, "it is clear that the Books of Chronicles are a tendency writing of little historical value."(44) W.F. Stinespring says that the Chronicler was "a historian, but much more a theologian", a "thoroughly heilsgeschichtlich writer".(45) I. Benzinger describes the Chronicler as "not a historian but a Midrashist". Benzinger stresses that it was not the purpose of the Chronicler to write history in the modern sense of the term: the Chronicler was interested in relating not bare facts but what could serve as a vehicle for edification. Benzinger's description of the Chronicler is similar to C.C. Torrey's

43. D.N. Freedman, 'The Chronicler's Purpose', CBQ, xxiii, 1961, pp.436-442, ref. p.436. In what follows, the problem of the literary structure of the Chronicler's work will not be examined. As for the identity of the Chronicler and the period in which his activity should be set, it is impossible to demonstrate who the author was, but he was unquestionably motivated by a specific purpose and he probably wrote during the Persian period ca. 538-333 B.C. As Myers, I Chronicles, p.LXXXVI, writes: "The Chronicler was a man with a consuming desire to justify and maintain the hard-won victory over the forces of opposition, disintegration, and despair that bedeviled the Jewish community in Judah" from the moment the returning exiles set foot in Palestine "until his own time, when the issue was, in some measure, resolved." A man of vision, insight and determination, the Chronicler "was one steeped in the history of Israel, a persistent student of her religious traditions...a capable organizer...above all else a churchman of the highest order...an ecclesiastical official of knowledge, insight, wisdom, courage, organizing ability, and determination to put through his plan. He was in essence a reformer whose success may be judged by the fact that the Jewish community ever afterward - with a brief interlude - remained basically a religious community" (ibid., p.LXXXVII).


46. I. Benzinger, Die Bücher der Chronik, KHC, Tübingen und Leipzig, 1901, p.x. Welch, op.cit., p.4, rightly says:"the Chronicler was not specially interested in history qua history, but was using that form of writing in order to convey his judgement on a period...he recast some of the incidents in a way which suited his purpose". Cf., too, W.R. Smith, The Old Testament in the Jewish Church, second revised and much enlarged edition, London, 1902, p.145, who writes of the general tendency of the Chronicler and of later Judaism "to sacrifice all interest in the veritable facts of sacred history to a mechanical conception of God's government of the world at large, and of Israel in particular."
estimation and has been echoed more recently by several scholars. However, as Welch points out, the term "Midrashist" may be used of the Chronicler only in the sense of one who interprets history. As Myers rightly emphasizes, the Chronicler was a Midrashist only in the sense that he may have had a biased view of history and added or omitted material when it suited his purpose: the designation does not necessarily mean that the Chronicler was a purveyor of fiction. The Chronicler's history is neither to be accepted as a faithful narrative of the history of Judah nor to be dismissed as a fanciful recreation of that history. His work can best be described as "a lesson for the people of his time and situation drawn from the history of his people". 


48. Cf. A.C. Welch, The Work of the Chronicler, p.54; B.S. Childs, Isaiah and the Assyrian Crisis, London, 1967, p.107; McKay, Josiah's Reformation, p.121; idem, Religion in Judah under the Assyrians, p.15. This description of the Chronicler as a Midrashist may have derived originally from the occurrence of the following phrase in 2 Chron. xxiv:27. See Eissfeldt, The Old Testament: An Introduction, pp.533ff.

49. Loc.cit.

50. Myers, 1 Chronicles, p.XVIII; idem, II Chronicles, p.XX. Myers, 1 Chronicles, p.XXX, argues that although the Chronicler had more in mind than a straightforward recounting of the history of Israel and Judah, "he did not deliberately distort history to fit his purpose" and, indeed, "at numerous points, he manifestly relied on sources sometimes more accurate than those used by the Deuteronomist." Cf., too, Soggin, op.cit., p.416, who writes: "Recently...it has been recognized that in Chronicles we have a series of notes from a reliable source, perhaps even at first hand, which complement what we know only partially from the books of Samuel and Kings." See also, Ackroyd, 'Historians and Prophets', SEA, xxxii, 1968, pp.18-54, ref. p.23: "the Chronicler's history does contain a considerable amount of material, not in the books of Samuel and Kings, which rests upon sound and older sources."

51. Myers, 1 Chronicles, p.XVIII; idem, II Chronicles, p.XX. Cf. von Rad, 'The Levitical Sermon in I and II Chronicles', The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays, pp.267-280; idem, Das Geschichtsbild des Chronistischen Werkes, BZAW, Stuttgart, 1930, pp.133f. Cf., too, the important observations made by Ackroyd, I and II Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, pp.21ff.: "The possibility - a real one, though much exaggerated in recent years - that the work of the Chronicler preserves some otherwise unknown but reliable historical material does not alter the fact that the whole presentation offered here is...a theology couched in the form of narrative and sermon, prayer and comment, list and genealogy. The almost obsessive concern with history which has become so much a part of our theological make-up
The contrast between the Chronicler's work and the Deuteronomistic history is striking. Whereas the Deuteronomistic history appears more in line with the methods of modern historiography, the Chronicler's work contains genealogies, lists, exaggerated statistics, and lengthy and detailed descriptions of religious forms and institutions. The Chronicler's method of presentation is homiletical to the extent that he made everything subservient to his purpose. Although all the great historical writings of the Old Testament are theological works which were composed for "religious purposes", the Chronicler was the author who was faced with the most difficult and complex situation since he had to cope with the grave religious problems of the post-exilic period. The Deuteronomistic historian's purpose had been to exhibit the effectiveness of Yahweh's word in Israel's history, both as judgement and salvation, and to stir king and people to heed the lessons of the past, in order to arouse the hope of a revitalization of the promise to David (2 Sam. vii:8-16) in a period when Assyrian power was on the decline. However, although much of what the Deuteronomistic historian had written of the history of Judah had validity for future

51. Continued. has meant that the work of the Chronicler has been used most often to fill supposed gaps; this is a misunderstanding which can be traced as far back as the title given to the books of Chronicles in the Greek translation: ta paraleipomena". Ackroyd points out that "two hundred years or so" separates the Deuteronomistic history from the Chronicler's history and that "the Chronicler's overall viewpoint is by no means identical with that of his predecessors, however much he may owe to the influence of their profound assessment of their people's life and condition" (ibid., p.22). Cf., Soggin, op.cit., p.417, who writes: "In Dtr the theological interpretation served as an interpretative key for explaining the events which were reported; they were considered...as 'proof texts' for certain theories, for a particular theology of history. The texts did not emerge substantially transformed, but were simply cited outside their original context. Paradoxically, in Chronicles we may say that the theological theory existed first and that the facts came second and were often forcibly made to fit it." While stressing that it would be wrong to disregard "the utter good faith of the author", Soggin says: "instead of selecting examples for his preaching from history, like Dtr, the Chronicler adapts history to his preaching, taking to absurd lengths doctrines like that of reward and punishment, well-known to the prophets and the Deuteronomistic writers, not to mention wisdom" (ibid., p.418).

52. Myers, I Chronicles, p.XIX.

generations, his appeal and programme had failed to save the nation. Thus, although Yahweh's promises remained valid, a new situation had developed which demanded even more heroic efforts than had earlier been required. (54) According to the Deuteronomistic historian, Yahweh had promised that the throne of David's kingdom would be established for ever (2 Sam. vii:13). The Chronicler, faced with the fact that the political aspect of the Davidic line had come to an end, attempted to show that hope for Israel lay in the fortification of the religious institutions that had survived the events of 587 B.C. and the long years of the Exile. The Chronicler's intention was to show that the true successors of the Judah governed by the Davidic dynasty were those who returned from the Exile, since the true Israel was the one perpetuated in Judah from the reign of David to the time of Ezra. In order for the community to survive the diverse attacks which were being made upon it, it was imperative to preserve the purity and orthodoxy of its members and to ensure their strict allegiance and devotion to the ideals of its founders. (55)

54. Cf. Myers, op.cit., p.XX. The majority of commentators place the Chronicler's activity in the Greek period, after 333 B.C. Cf., for example, Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien, 2 pp.150-155, who places it in the Ptolemaic age, 300-200 B.C. However, a third-century date is difficult to maintain in view of the presence of fragments of Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah among the materials discovered in cave four at Qumran. There are sound arguments (most of which are listed by W.F. Albright, 'The Date and Personality of the Chronicler', JBL, xI, 1921, pp.104-124 and Myers, op.cit., pp.LXXXVIIIff.) for placing the Chronicler's activity in the Persian period, ca. 538-333 B.C.

55. Cf. Myers, op.cit., p.XL. Myers, ibid., p.XXXVI, says: "the Chronicler sees Jerusalem as the authentic place of worship, the returnees as the legitimate successors of the people of Judah and the cult personnel, and the community established by them as the true Israel. The Exile was but an interlude in the ongoing history of Judah and Jerusalem, though the organization and governing powers were a bit different." Myers, op.cit., p.XXXIX, also writes: "Strict cult orthodoxy, exclusivism and the support of a more broadly based cult personnel were of the utmost importance if the community was to succeed in its efforts." Cf., too, Rudolph, op.cit., p.xxiii, who says that the Chronicler's intention was to portray the realization of the theocracy upon the land of Israel, a realization which was based upon the 'isolation' of Israel and the election of Jerusalem and Judah. Cf., also, Kaiser, Introduction to the Old Testament, pp.185f. Cf., too, Curtis, op.cit., pp.16f. Curtis describes the picture which the
As for the vexed problem of the Chronicler's sources, it seems probable that he had at his disposal the priestly redaction of the Tetrateuch and the Deuteronomistic historical work, which he often followed exactly if it represented his own point of view. On the other hand, he would omit much material if he felt it would not contribute to his purpose, and he would include material supplementary to that of the Deuteronomist, in order to support his main thesis in a particular situation. (56) The Chronicler probably also possessed copies of official documents and memoirs, along with copies of various types of official lists which he may have supplemented partly from oral tradition and partly from his own studies and collections. (57) If, as seems quite likely, independent prophetic materials were also available to the Chronicler, then he may have used these as well. There is also the probability that the Chronicler utilized sources of information drawn from the temple archives which, although not found elsewhere, have been shown to be authentic by archaeological excavations and topographical studies. (58) It is difficult to assess the extent of recensions. That there was wholesale revision or major rewriting of the original work is unlikely. Indeed, the work is probably little

55. Continued. Books of Chronicles gives of the past as "a distorted picture in the interest of the later institutions of post-exilic Judaism" (ibid., p.14). In his commentary, The Minor Prophets, Edinburgh and London, 1906, S.R. Driver writes: "The course of events since the restoration had made the Temple, with its high-priest and its sacrificial system, a centre for the community much more than it had been before: but this very fact had a providential significance in view of the future. It was essential for Israel's preservation as the people of God that the ceremonial obligations laid upon it should be strictly observed, and that it should hold itself aloof socially from its heathen neighbours." Some of these views have recently been challenged by H.C.M. Williamson, Israel in the Books of Chronicles, Cambridge, 1977. Williamson argues that the books of Ezra and Nehemiah should not be ascribed to the Chronicler, that the books of Chronicles were not composed as a polemic against the Samaritans, and that the Chronicler's outlook is less exclusive than many have thought.

56. Cf. Myers, I Chronicles, pp.LXIII.; idem, II Chronicles, p.XXI.

57. Myers, I Chronicles, p.LXIII; idem, II Chronicles, pp.XXXIf.

changed from when it left the Chronicler's hands, apart from the additions which may have been inserted to bring it up to date or to make it applicable to a slightly later period. (59) However, later additions were no doubt made to some stories and it is possible that whole stories were compiled and inserted.

Nevertheless, in spite of the fact that he selected those phases of history which were suitable to his purpose and arbitrarily added, omitted, and interpreted, there has been an increasing tendency among scholars to accept the basic faithfulness of the Chronicler's use of literary sources "through the comparison of his work with his 'sources', over which we have inner Biblical control". (60) Thus, for instance, Myers, whilst conceding that the Chronicler grossly exaggerates where numbers are concerned, a fact which perhaps more than any other has made scholars sceptical of his work, and acknowledging that the Chronicler's method of presentation is homiletical, stresses that his work, "within the limits of its purpose", (61) is accurate wherever it can be checked.

While this opinion basically commends itself, the difficulties for the exegete lie primarily in those passages which cannot be checked against other sources. What, then, of the Chronicler's claim that Jehoshaphat not only carried out extensive religious and political reforms but also removed the high places? Albright (62) and Myers (63)

61. Myers, I Chronicles, p.LXIII; idem, II Chronicles, p.XXXII.
63. Myers, I Chronicles, p.LVIII; idem, II Chronicles, pp.XXVII, 108.
think that the judicial reform is factual. Myers says that the judicial reform proceeded along two lines: the teaching mission (2 Chron. xix:4; cf. xvii:7-9) and the reorganization of the judiciary, and "both were really two aspects of the same movement of whose general historicity there can hardly be any doubt". He thinks that the inception of this judiciary reform may have been partly due to Jehoshaphat's desire to strengthen the Southern Kingdom in view of the internal corruption and deterioration of the Northern Kingdom. He accounts for the fact that the Deuteronomistic historian has so little to say about the internal affairs of Judah in the reign of Jehoshaphat by saying that this author was too preoccupied with his main interests in Elijah and Elisha who were deeply involved in the activities of Ahab. Myers feels that the Chronicler's story is given additional weight by the fact that both Ahab (I Kgs. xxii) and Jehoram (2 Kgs. iii) sought the assistance of Jehoshaphat, and by the respect which Elisha is said to have had for this king (2 Kgs. iii:14).

While conceding that there is nothing inherently improbable in a king of this period attempting to improve the organization of justice, Ackroyd thinks that much of what the Chronicler says about the judicial reform "is of a general, somewhat homiletic kind" and that there is "no real basis for ascribing historicity to the present account." In view of the fact that the language of 2 Chron. xix:4-11 is strongly reminiscent of Deuteronomy, Ackroyd considers this passage

64. II Chronicles, p.108.
65. Ibid.
as representing "at least very largely a projection back into an earlier period of the practice or the desired practice of a later age." (68) He thinks it is probably best interpreted as an attempt to apply in a new situation the sort of requirements most clearly represented by Deuteronomy. (69) Curtis, too, thinks that the judiciary described as having been established by Jehoshaphat corresponds very closely with that referred to in Deut. xvi:18-20 and xvii:8 "and might well have been derived from that source", but, unlike Ackroyd, Curtis thinks that a tradition of historic value might underlie 2 Chron. xvii:1-9 and xix:4-11. (70)

68. Ibid.

69. Ackroyd, op.cit., p.146, continues: "In the light of the general impression which the Chronicler's work creates, this would most naturally be a reflection of the needs of his own time, an expression of his own hopes and ideals as well as of the realities of the contemporary situation." Ackroyd focuses attention on 2 Chron. xix:11 and, in particular, on רְשָׁעֵי וּרְשָׁעִים , and פָּדָא הָאָדָם . He points out that פָּדָא הָאָדָם, which appears in the Deuteronomistic literature and in the work of the Chronicler, is very similar to פָּדַּא הַנָּוֶת , which occurs in many different writings but significantly in Haggai and Zechariah, and in Neh. iii:1, 20. Ackroyd thinks that פָּדַּא הַנָּוֶת "could therefore perfectly well refer to the post-exilic high priest as having something already of that authority which may be seen in the Greek and Roman periods" (ibid., p.147). As for פָּדַּא הַנָּוֶת , although this is not the usual term in the post-exilic writings, the division of authority is so similar to that found in Haggai and Zechariah that it, too, probably reflects the later situation. Finally, Ackroyd thinks that although פָּדָּא הָאָדָם could denote practically anything, it could, in the period of Persian rule, refer to those matters governed by the demands of the Persian king. If this suggestion were correct, then the Chronicler may here be impressing on his contemporaries the necessity of paying due respect to the demands of the foreign authority, "to recognize the division between the requirements of that authority which must be accepted and the proper carrying out of the laws which govern the life of the religious community" (ibid.). Cf. Wellhausen, Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel, p.191: "Probably it is the organization of justice as existing in his own day that he carries back to Jehoshaphat." Cf., too, Curtis, op.cit., p.402, who says that "the Chronicler and those of his school...ascribed to him the foundation of a system of courts corresponding perhaps to those of their day...when in all probability a central sanhedrin existed at Jerusalem and local ones in other cities." However, Curtis continues: "Yet the judiciary given as established by Jehoshaphat corresponds very closely with that mentioned in Dt. 16:18-20; 17:8 and might well have been derived from that source" (ibid.).

70. Curtis, op.cit., p.402.
Weinfeld suggests that, if one were to accept the authenticity of 2 Chron. xvii:7-9, then this passage would indicate the involvement of royal officials in 'Torah' instruction before the reforms of Hezekiah and Josiah, a procedure which may be analogous to the custom practised in Assyria whereby the people were instructed by the king's officers in matters relating to worship and loyalty to the king. (71) In the light of this possible and other more certain examples of royal intervention in religious matters, particularly in its public aspects, prior to the Josianic period, Weinfeld thinks "it is plausible to assume that the kernel of the deuteronomic code stems from the earlier reforms, which may have been consolidated in the form of books like the book of Jehoshaphat." (72)

It is difficult to know what is meant in 2 Chron. xvii:9 by the intriguing reference to הַיָּדָה הָיָה. Curtis says that "the book of the law of Yahweh" is a reflection of Deuteronomy. (73) Ackroyd, as already mentioned, finds the language of 2 Chron. xix:4-11 very reminiscent of Deuteronomy, but considers the commission of the lay princes, levites and priests to go on circuit in order to ensure complete obedience to the law as "a projection back of the work of Ezra, whose commission (Ezra 7) demanded the acceptance of the law as the mark of the true member of the community." (74)

71. Weinfeld, Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School, p.163.
72. Ibid., pp.163f.
73. Curtis, op.cit., p.393. He writes:"Already, also at the time of the Chronicler, must have begun the study, exposition, and teaching of the law by members of the laity who were later reckoned among the Scribes."
74. Ackroyd, op.cit., p.143.
While the Chronicler normally refers to the priestly work of the Pentateuch when he uses this phrase, he can hardly be referring to it here. (75) Myers thinks it is plausible that this book of the law may have been a royal code of law similar to the Hammurabi Code and other royal edicts. (76) He thinks it is unlikely to have been the Book of the Covenant, since much of it would have been outmoded and inapplicable for the purposes of the monarchy. The phrase is more likely to refer, in this instance, not to a biblical source but, rather, to one of the lost law codes. (77)

Is there any real basis for ascribing historicity to the Chronicler's account of Jehoshaphat's reforms in general and to 2 Chron. xvii:6 in particular? Myers thinks that there is a historical basis to this description of a reformation carried out by Jehoshaphat and that "it is hard to believe that the reformers of the seventh century...were the first to institute a movement against the high places. There must have been movements in the direction of centralizing worship from the time of David on, sporadic efforts made to clean out the high places by the kings mentioned, if only for practical rather than doctrinaire reasons. Deuteronomy formulated in absolute terms a policy of long standing, generally observed in the breach."(78)

However, this line of argument is unconvincing. As will be shown later, Jerusalem certainly had a claim to precedence over other sanctuaries from the time of David, but, if any king prior to the time

76. Ibid.
77. Myers, op.cit., p.100.
of Hezekiah had attempted to centralize sacrificial worship to this city, for whatever reason, then the Deuteronomist would surely have been the first to have reported it. Although the book of Deuteronomy was held in the highest esteem by the Deuteronomist and influenced his entire work, the fact that he records an attempt to centralize the cult on the part of Hezekiah, with no mention of "the book of the law", is clear indication that the Deuteronomist was not solely concerned with glorifying the role played by Deuteronomy in effecting cultic centralization. Moreover, the fact that there is such tremendous diversity among commentators with regard to the motivation of the reformations of Hezekiah and Josiah makes it idle to imply that the Deuteronomist may not have recorded previous attempts to centralize sacrificial worship because they were motivated by practical rather than doctrinaire reasons.

In the case of Jehoshaphat, it certainly seems to be the case that this king was responsible for undertaking some kind of reform of a judicial and religious nature. This is borne out by a comparison with 1 Kgs. xxii:43, and v.47: However, there are two facts which indicate the unlikelihood of Jehoshaphat having attempted cultic centralization. Firstly, in spite of the fact that 2 Chron. xvii:6 confidently asserts, 2 Chron. xx:33 laments the fact that if Jehoshaphat had made any attempt at cultic centralization, then the Deuteronomist would have been bound to have acknowledged such a move and would have accorded him the same honour and praise earned by Hezekiah and Josiah for precisely this action.
Why, then, does the Chronicler attribute to Jehoshaphat religious reforms of a more impressive nature than those listed by the Deuteronomist? Wellhausen argues that the Chronicler's account of Jehoshaphat's activity with regard to the administration of justice may have been inspired by the meaning of the name Ṣהו, (79) Indeed, Wellhausen speaks in terms of "the free flight of the Chronicler's law-crazed fancy". (80) Ackroyd is also of the opinion that the king's name provided the Chronicler with the basis for homiletic development: "Jehoshaphat...suggests a twofold line of thought; to judge is to deliver, a theme adumbrated in ch. 17 but more fully developed in ch. 20. It also suggests the teaching mission and the judicial reform which appear in chs. 17 and 19. In these two ways, the nature of God himself is traced within the narrative material." (81) It seems reasonable to suggest that Jehoshaphat's name and the very fact that this king is accorded praise by the Deuteronomist appealed strongly to the Chronicler and caused him to exaggerate the extent of this king's reform measures in exactly the same way as he exaggerated the reforms of Asa making


80. Ibid., p.195.

81. Ackroyd, op.cit., p.142. Cf., too, the cautious statement made by Curtis, op.cit., p.402: "one cannot escape the force of Wellhausen's view that the story of Jehoshaphat's activity concerning the administration of justice may be due to the meaning of his name." Ackroyd, op.cit., pp.141f., thinks that Asa's name may also have inspired the Chronicler to homiletic development in 2 Chron. xvi:12. "The failure of Asa to appeal to God for help might have been suggested to the Chronicler in part by the interpretation of his name; a fuller form of his name might be 'Asa-el', which could be understood as 'God heals'" (ibid., p.141).
the latter another Josiah. (82) Referring to the fact that the Chronicler, having stated that Asa (2 Chron. xiv:2, 4) (83) and Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. xvii:3, 6; xix:3) abolished the high places, then contradicts himself in 2 Chron. xv:17 and 2 Chron. xx:33, Wellhausen remarks: "To the author it seems on the one hand an impossibility that the worship of the high places, which in spite of xxxiii:17 is to him fundamentally idolatry, should not have been repressed even by pious, i.e., law-observing kings, and yet on the other hand he mechanically transcribes his copy." (84)

82. Cf. Wellhausen, op.cit., p.193. The difficulties of the additional material supplied by the Chronicler are not, of course, limited to Jehoshaphat's reform measures. Thus, for instance, 2 Chron. xx:1-30, which describes how Jehoshaphat was miraculously delivered from a coalition of Moabites, Ammonites, and Arabs, is described by Benzinger, Die Bücher der Chronik, KHC, Tübingen und Leipzig, 1901, p.107, as a beautiful example of an historical midrash. Eissfeldt, The Old Testament: An Introduction, p.536, thinks that this story gives clear expression to "the Chronicler's conception of history with its ignoring of realities." Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien,2 pp.142f., n.3; idem, 'Eine palästinische Lokalüberlieferung in 2 Chr. xx', ZDPV, lxvii, 1945, pp.45-71, thinks that this story rests not on an old historical source but on a local tradition. Myers, II Chronicles, pp.114f., while acknowledging that certain features have been exaggerated, argues for a true kernel which revolves around an invasion of Judah from the south. Myers maintains that while much of 2 Chron. xx:1-30 is couched in terms drawn from the Chronicler's own period, the essence of the story must not be dismissed as pure fabrication. Although he argues that the story has a historical nucleus, Myers concedes that "it is difficult to get at the precise facts. As usual the story is shot through with Levitical themes of the Chronicler - the piety of Jehoshaphat, the message of the Levitical prophet (xx:14), the Levitical praises (19f.), singers appointed to praise Yahweh (21) and the valley of Beracah." (idem, Myers, I Chronicles, p.LVIII; idem, II Chronicles, p.XXVII).

83. EVV, 2 Chron. xiv:3, 5.

84. Wellhausen, op.cit., p.193. Cf. W.R. Smith, The Old Testament in the Jewish Church, p.142, who points out that "the Chronicler, writing at a time when everyone was agreed in rejecting high places as idolatrous, was unable to conceive that good kings could have tolerated them." Cf. Nicholson, Deuteronomy and Tradition, p.96, n.2, who writes: "2 Chron. xiv:1-4 and xvii:6 both claim that Asa and Jehoshaphat respectively abolished the high places. That these statements are historically untrustworthy is clear from the fact that the Chronicler himself contradicts them (cf. 2 Chron. xvi:17 and xx:33) as also does the author of Kings (1 Kings xv:14 and xxii:43)." Cf. W.R. Smith, op.cit., n.l.
3. Jehoash's Reformation

When Jehoram (849-842) became king on the death of his father Jehoshaphat, he was influenced by his wife Athaliah, the daughter of Ahab and Jezebel, to establish the Baal cult in Judah (2 Kgs. viii:18). Jehoram's son and successor, Ahaziah, reigned for only a year (842) and when he was killed in Jehu's revolt, Athaliah seized power and executed all the members of the royal family except Ahaziah's infant son Jehoash, or Joash, who was rescued and concealed for six years in the temple precincts by his aunt Jehosheba, the wife of the chief priest Jehoiada (2 Kgs. xi:1-3). In the seventh year a swift and successful coup d'état was effected by Jehoiada with the support of the priesthood, the professional soldiers in Jerusalem, and also popular support. Athaliah was killed and Jehoash was enthroned (2 Kgs. xi:4-20). Jehoash (837-800) earns qualified praise from the Deuteronomistic historian:

(2 Kgs. xii:3). The familiar indictment follows in verse 4:

2 Kgs. xi recounts the actions of Jehoiada who was responsible for having Jehoash made king, having Athaliah executed (vv.4-16), making two, possibly three (85) covenants (v.17), organizing the

85. Cf., for example, Gray, op.cit., pp.579f. On the other hand, cf. Skinner, I and II Kings, p.341; Montgomery, op.cit., p.416. S. Herrmann, A History of Israel in Old Testament Times, London, 1975, pp.224f., writes of 2 Kings xi:17: "The very general form of the text, the predominance of the idea of the people of God after the fashion of Deuteronomistic theology, the isolated position of the verse and not least the remarkable tradition of such an act in the context of an enthronement scene do not encourage us to see the text as a reflection of a covenant formula firmly rooted in the royal ritual of Judah. Rather, it is a piece of later theological reflection." Herrmann argues that this is the Deuteronomistic interpretation of events in which "Yahweh, king and people form an inseparable unity on the basis of the covenant which has proved itself in action against the alien cult" (ibid., p.225).
destruction of the house of Baal, Baal altars and images, arranging the execution of Mattan the priest of Baal (v.18), and, finally, posting watchmen over the temple of Yahweh (v.18). The bulk of 2 Kgs. xii is concerned with relating the fiscal arrangements organized by Jehoash for the maintenance of the temple fabric.

It is immediately apparent that there are some points of contact between the description of Jehoash's enthronement ceremony in 2 Kgs. xi and the account of Josiah's covenant ceremony in 2 Kgs. xxiii:1-3, as well as striking linguistic parallels between the account of Jehoash's temple repairs in 2 Kgs. xii:10-17 (EVV 9-16) and the description of Josiah's temple repairs in 2 Kgs. xxii:3-7, 9.

The points of contact between 2 Kgs. xi and 2 Kgs. xxiii:1-3

The covenant in which Jehoash was involved at his accession was the only explicit precedent for Josiah's covenant, in spite of the fact that Josiah's covenant was not concerned with a coronation ceremony. According to 2 Kgs. xi:14, Jehoash stood ἐπὶ τοῦ στύλου and 2 Kgs. xxiii:3 says the same of Josiah. ἐπὶ τοῦ στύλου is generally translated in both passages as "the pillar", but the renderings ἐπὶ τοῦ στύλου in 2 Chron. xxiii:13 and ἐπὶ τοῦ στύλου in 2 Chron. xxxiv:31 may indicate, as McKay suggests, that the στύλου was a structure reserved for the king's own use. In 2 Kgs. xi:14 the Septuagint reads ἐπὶ τοῦ στύλου while the Vulgate renders super tribunal. In 2 Chron. xxiii:13 the Septuagint reads ἐπὶ τῆς στάσεως αὐτοῦ and the Vulgate has super gradum. In 2 Kgs. xxiii:3 the Septuagint has πρὸς τὸν στύλου and the Vulgate renders in tribunali suo. It is interesting that Josephus was of the opinion that Jehoash stood ἐπὶ τῆς σχαρῆς (Ant. Jud. ix.151) and Josiah ἐπὶ τοῦ Βήματος (Ant. Jud. x.63), because 2 Chron. vi:13

86. Cf. McKay, op.cit., pp.73f.
reports that Solomon stood on a כַּלַמְלָן when he was about to deliver his dedication prayer, and Neh. viii:4 recounts that Ezra read the law from a כְּרָמְלִים . Although there is quite a large time gap separating Josephus, Nehemiah and Chronicles from both Jehoash and Josiah, it would appear that on such important occasions it was customary for the king to adopt a position which was elevated above the people, possibly on a dais as Widengren suggests, (87) from which he proclaimed the law. (88)

In 2 Kgs. xxiii:1-3 Josiah is said to have read aloud "all the words of the book of the covenant" before making the covenant. In 2 Kgs. xi there is no record of any reading of the law at the coronation of Jehoash, but, in verse 12, it is recorded that Jehoash was given כְּרָמְלִים . There has been much controversy over the statement made in verse 12: כְּרָמְלִים קֶרֶם וְלֵבָע . Both Noth (89) and de Vaux (90) draw attention to the fact that the כְּרָמְלִים worn by the king (cf. 2 Sam. i:10; Ps. lxxxix:40) was an ornament identical with the כְּרָמְלִים , the symbol of dedication worn by the high priest on his headdress, just above the forehead (Exod. xxxix:30; Lev.viii:9). The fact that the royal insignia of Saul described in 2 Sam. i:10 consisted of a כְּרָמְלִים and a כְּרָמְלִים (91) suggests to Wellhausen (92) that כְּרָמְלִים.

89. Noth, Exodus, pp.225ff.
90. de Vaux, Ancient Israel2, p.465.
91. Taking the כְּרָמְלִים of כְּרָמְלִים as כְּרָמְלִים.
92. Wellhausen, Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments, third edition, 1899, p.292, n.2, followed by W.R. Smith, op.cit., p.311f. (who calls Wellhausen's emendation a "certain correction" because the implication of the MT that the testimony was part of the royal insignia "is absurd"); Burney, op.cit., p.311; Skinner, op.cit., p.340; Curtis, op.cit., p.428. See, further, the works cited by A.R. Johnson, Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel, second edition, Cardiff, 1967, pp.23ff., n.4.
should be emended, since, he alleges, the phrase is not suitable to the object. However, as Gray rightly points out, Wellhausen's objection is not valid because even if the phrase does not refer to a written document being placed momentarily on the king's person, in much the same way that phylacteries are attached by orthodox Jews on their foreheads, it could still signify that a responsibility was imposed on the king. Klostermann's emendation which is accepted by G.R. Driver, must also be rejected since the MT is supported unanimously by the versions. Widengren and de Vaux think that was the Mosaic law. On the other hand, von Rad, Johnson, Fohrer, and Gray maintain that was some statement of the Davidic covenant.

That המָשַׂח was not only a feature of the coronation ritual but was also specifically connected with Yahweh's covenant with the Davidic king is supported by the fact that in Ps. cxxxii:12, which deals with Yahweh's covenant with the house of David, המָשַׂח is found in parallelism with המָשַׂח and המָשַׂח, in turn, is associated with המָשַׂח in another royal psalm, lxxxix:40 (EVW 39). It is plain from Nathan's oracle in 2 Sam. vii:12-16 that this covenant contained both the promise of divine grace and obligations which were laid upon the king and, as Gray for one points out, (99) it seems obvious from the phrase המָשַׂח in Ps. cxxxii:12 that המָשַׂח or המָשַׂח signified specifically the obligations laid upon the king in the covenant. It would appear, therefore, that המָשַׂח indicates that some declaration of divine will formed the basis of Jehoash's covenant.

The parallels between 2 Kgs. xii:10-17 (EVV 9-16) and 2 Kgs. xxii:3-7, 9

There are striking parallels between 2 Kgs. xii:10-17 (EVV 9-16), the account of Jehoash's temple repairs, and the description of Josiah's temple repairs in 2 Kgs. xxii:3-7, 9. The parallels between these two passages are perhaps best illustrated by being set out in the form of a table: (100)

99. Gray, op.cit., pp.573f. Cf., too, A.R. Johnson, Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel, p.24 and n.2. Contra von Rad, op.cit., pp.225ff.; Mowinckel, The Psalms in Israel's Worship, vol. I, pp.62ff.; Fohrer, op.cit.; Kraus, Psalmen, BK, xv, 2 vols, Neukirchen, 1959-1960, ref. II, pp.886f., who all stress the element of divine promise. Thus, for example, Fohrer, leaning to a certain extent on Ps. ii:7-cf., also, Ps. cv:10- maintains that המָשַׂח refers not to the conditions which the king agrees to observe, but to the promises which Yahweh undertakes to keep in fulfilment of the covenant. However, a stronger case can be made for the view that המָשַׂח refers to those obligations which the king agrees to fulfil, Cf. A.R. Johnson, op.cit., p.24, n.2.

100. Cf. McKay, op.cit., p.54.
(a) 2 Kgs. xii:6
2 Kgs. xxii:5

(b) 2 Kgs. xii:10
2 Kgs. xxii:4

(c) 2 Kgs. xii:11
2 Kgs. xxii:3-4
2 Kgs. xxii:9

(d) 2 Kgs. xii:12
2 Kgs. xxii:5
2 Kgs. xxii:9

(e) 2 Kgs. xii:12-13
2 Kgs. xxii:6

(f) 2 Kgs. xii:16
2 Kgs. xxii:7

Are both these accounts of repairs carried out to the temple historically accurate or is one a literary fiction which has been modelled on the original? The account of Jehoash's temple repairs in 2 Kgs. xii:10-17 contains some extra items of information which are not mentioned in 2 Kgs. xxii:3-9, concerning the construction of a collection chest (v.10), the inability to make vessels for the temple owing to the fact that all the silver and gold had been used to pay
the workmen's wages (vv.14f.), and the money derived from guilt and sin offerings (v.17). However, apart from these additional pieces of information in the account of Jehoash's temple repairs, 2 Kgs. xxii:3-7, 9 contains the same details in the same sequence as 2 Kgs. xii:10-17, although in abbreviated form. This fact has led B. Štade, J.A. Montgomery and J. Gray to regard 2 Kgs. xxii:4b-7 as redactional, while A. Šanda eliminates 2 Kgs. xxii:5b-7 as secondary. McKay, however, points out that these commentators retain verse 9 which, he argues, is every bit as much dependent on 2 Kgs. xii:10-17 as verses 4-7. McKay maintains that verses 4b-7 and verse 9 are either both to be excised or both to be retained. Both Kittel and McKay are of the opinion that to excise them as additions would be to mutilate the narrative. Responding to Stade's criticism that the words of verses 4b-7 seem strange emanating as they do from Josiah, McKay points out that many speeches in ancient writing - for example, 1 Sam. x:1-8; 2 Kgs. xi:5-8; Keret I. i.38-iii.49; Odyssey xiii.392-427 - include detailed instructions and appear equally strange to the modern reader. McKay maintains that verses 4b-7 together with verse 9 constitute an original part of the text and concludes with Benzinger that "the editor 'did not get the whole account from his written sources, but told it himself'."

101. Cf., for example, McKay, op.cit.
105. R. Kittel, Die Bücher der Könige, HKAT, i.5, Göttingen, 1900, p.297; McKay, op.cit., p.55.
107. Ibid., n.4.
The fact that the account in 2 Kgs. xii:5-17 is fuller than that of 2 Kgs. xxii:3-7, 9 suggests that the material about the temple repairs in 2 Kgs. xii is the original and the account in 2 Kgs. xxii is secondary. Hence, it seems reasonable to conclude that the Deuteronomistic historian has used the account of Jehoash's temple repairs in 2 Kgs. xii:5-17 for his description of the temple repairs undertaken by Josiah in 2 Kgs. xxii:3-7, 9. This is not to deny that Josiah had begun to carry out improvements to the temple before the discovery of the book of the law, but it does make it difficult, if not impossible, to assess whether 2 Kgs. xxii:3-7, 9 preserves historically reliable details about the repairs carried out by Josiah.


The Motivation for the reforms of Jehoash

It is important to remember that this Yahwistic rising in Judah was engineered by the priest Jehoiada, (110) and, since Jehoash clearly began his reign under the wing of the priesthood, (111) it seems likely that the repairs and purification of the temple were instigated by Jehoiada who may well have acted as regent during the king's minority. (112) Most commentators agree that these measures would have been a necessary step after the abominations perpetrated by Athaliah.

110. Cf., for example, Skinner, I and II Kings, p.336. Cf., also, G.W. Anderson, The History and Religion of Israel, p.97, who points out that this was one of three differences between the rising in Judah and the revolution in the northern kingdom. The other two were the absence of a general massacre of Baal worshippers in Judah and the restoration, rather than the destruction, of the Judaean royal line.

111. Cf., e.g., Heaton, op.cit., p.96.


113. Cf., for example, Bright, op.cit., p.252; Myers, II Chronicles, pp.131f.
However, there is debate about which elements of the population supported the revolution and religious reformation and much attention has been focused on 2 Kgs. xi:4-20. It has long been argued that verses 13-18a constitute an interpolation in the original text, since the death of Athaliah is mentioned twice, and that in the interpolation the religious motive is stressed over the political aspect which is emphasized in verses 4-12, 18b-20.\(^{(114)}\) In view of the fact that in verses 4-12 and 18b-20 the temple priests take the initiative with the aid of לְפָרְשָׁהוּ לַלֵּדֵי בָּדָּהו, while in verses 13-18a the people play a leading role, it is argued that verses 1-12, 18b-20 derive from a priestly source, whereas the section verses 13-18a is a popular source. Although this view has been challenged by Rudolph\(^{(115)}\) who drastically reduces the references to בְּרִית in verses 13-18a because of lack of support from the Versions, most commentators adhere to the hypothesis of a priestly source in verses 4-12, 18b-20, which is interested in the political aspect of the revolution, and a popular one in verses 13-18a, which represents the revolution in its religious aspect. However, Gray rightly points out that the two accounts are generally complementary rather than divergent, since the second makes explicit what is implicit in the first with regard to the popular support for the priests' coup d'état and the details of Athaliah's execution.\(^{(116)}\)


\(^{116}\) Gray, op.cit., p.567. Gray points out that the priests "were simply the leaders of public opinion".
In both style and viewpoint, 2 Kgs. xi:1-12, 18b-20 is similar to ch.xii and Gray follows Wellhausen in postulating a priestly source which revolved around the history of the temple, its cult, and its priesthood.\(^{(117)}\) The fact that 2 Kgs. xii:6ff. refers to the inefficiency and laxity of the priests with regard to maintaining the temple fabric is explained by Gray as "reflecting the sober and self-critical mood of the priests in and after the Deuteronomic reformation."\(^{(118)}\)

Gray thinks that the two sources may have been combined at the time of Josiah's reformation since this"was as much a constitutional as a religious reformation",\(^{(119)}\) and verses 13-18a, a fragment of the popular source, may have been inserted in order to praise the role of "the people of the land" who also figure in a similar way in Josiah's reformation. Skinner, on the other hand, says that "there seems really no need to look for any other source than the book of the chronicles of Judah."\(^{(120)}\)

A detailed analysis of the text would be out of place in this context. Of much more importance for this study is the reference to הָּרָעְיָד. This expression, which occurs between sixty and seventy times in the Old Testament, has been variously interpreted.\(^{(121)}\)

R. Gordis thinks that it refers to the rural as distinct from the urban population of a country.\(^{(122)}\) Montgomery reckons that the term

\(^{117}\) Ibid.

\(^{118}\) Ibid.

\(^{119}\) Ibid.

\(^{120}\) Skinner, op.cit., p.343.


has an original political import, and M. Sulzberger is of the opinion that it refers to an ancient Israelite bicameral parliament. W.E. Barnes and E. Klamroth understand the term as referring to the entire population of a country as distinct from the elite ruling classes. A. Menes thinks that the term designates the lowest, most deprived class of society while S. Daiches interprets the expression as referring to the landed nobility.

However, by far the most interesting view concerning is that put forward by E. Würthwein. Würthwein argues that the expression refers to the property-owning, full (male) citizens of a country who exercised considerable influence in the economic, military and political spheres. He takes the fact that are frequently mentioned in connection with the king, the priesthood and the nobility (cf. Jer. i:18; xxxiv:19; xxxvii:2; xliv:21), as clear indication that they held a position of considerable influence in Judah. Their role in the country's economy is reflected in

125. Barnes, *op.cit.*, p.239.
127. A. Menes, *Die vorexilischen Gesetze Israels im Zusammenhang seiner kulturgeschichtlichen Entwicklung*, BZAW, 1, 1928, pp.70f.
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2 Kgs. xxiii:35 which states that Jehoiakim exacted the silver and
gold of the people of the land in order to raise the requisite tribute
for Necho. (131) Their role in the military sphere is adduced from
2 Kgs. xxv:19f. (cf. Jer. lii:25) where there is a reference to
(132) Most significant of all, however,
is Würthwein's argument that ṭḥn ṭḥn played a key role in political
affairs. In support of this argument, he points to the intervention
of ṭḥn ṭḥn at crisis points in the Davidic monarchy, as evidenced
in their part in the overthrow of Athaliah and the enthronement of
Jehoash, the enthronement of Josiah (2 Kgs. xxi:24; 2 Chron. xxxiii:25),
and the enthronement of Jehoahaz (2 Kgs. xxiii:30; 2 Chron. xxxvi:1). (133)

Soggin (134) also draws attention to the fact that of the limited
number of Judaean kings commended by the Deuteronomist, Jehoash,
Amaziah, Uzziah, and Josiah were supported by ṭḥn ṭḥn in opposition
to the royal 'servants' in the crown-possession of Jerusalem whose
allegiance had been won by those wishing to support rival claimants
to the throne. Soggin also points to the preference of Asa and
Jehoshaphat to rely on the support of the general military levy
(2 Chron. xiv:7; xvii:13ff.) as further evidence of the same cleavage
between Judah at large and the feudal retainers in Jerusalem.

Soggin concludes that ṭḥn ṭḥn is a technical term designating the
representatives of the sacral community faithful to the Yahwistic
tradition expressed in the covenant-sacrament. (135)

131. Ibid., p.34.
132. Ibid., p.10.
133. Ibid., pp.8f., 22f., 30f., 33f.
134. J.A. Soggin, 'Der jüdische ʿam-hāʾāreṣ und das Königtum in
Both Wörthwein and Soggin maintain that the activity of יְלֶר-027 during the reforms of Jehoash indicates the presence of a Deuteronomistic influence in Judah about a century before the fall of the northern kingdom.

However, E.W. Nicholson (136) challenges the assumption that is a terminus technicus which designates a definite social or political class or group within a country's population. After a brief examination of the occurrences of the expression in the Old Testament, Nicholson rightly concludes that it is no such technical term with a fixed and rigid meaning. Rather, it is used in a very general and fluid manner and its meaning varies from context to context. (137)

A similarly sound but fuller discussion of יְלֶר-027 is that of McKay whose analysis of the relevant passages and whose conclusions about the term are similar to those of Nicholson, but with a further qualification. McKay's discussion of the term is particularly significant in this context since he underlines the necessity of taking into consideration the activities of "the citizens of Judah" in any study of Deuteronomism, and he ably demonstrates that, while their arguments may require modification, the view of Soggin and von Rad that יְלֶר-027 were the bearers of the Deuteronomic traditions is valid. (138)

McKay discusses יְלֶר-027 in relation to the Deuteronomists and Josiah. (139)


138. For von Rad's discussion of יְלֶר-027, see his Studies in Deuteronomy, pp.63ff. For Soggin's discussion of the term, see above, n.134.

139. McKay, op.cit., pp.400-421, et passim; idem, Religion in Judah under the Assyrians, pp.107f., n.110. McKay uses the term 'Deuteronomists' when speaking of those who belonged to the Deuteronomistic movement and who were responsible for drafting Urdeuteronomium.
His thesis is that although Josiah's reformation was facilitated by the climate of opinion at that time, it was primarily motivated by the religious zeal and single-minded dedication of those "who stood behind the law-book, namely the Deuteronomists", (140) a mixed group of people who had fled from the North after 722 B.C. and who lived and worked among 'the people of the land', "making converts among its more influential figures". (141) The fact that these refugees, who constituted the original nucleus of the movement which was ultimately responsible for the book of Deuteronomy, were well received by influential Judaeans who supported their message was, thus, a much more important reason for the speed with which the movement gained influence and authority than the threat of Assyria. (142)

As regards the writings which deal with the period of the monarchy, McKay concurs with Nicholson's conclusion that is a comprehensive term denoting those elements of the population distinct from the royal house, the ruling classes, and the priesthood, (143) but adds the further qualification that [without] constituted the monarch's Judaean subjects amongst whom there was an influential

140. McKay, Religion in Judah under the Assyrians, p.107, n.110.
141. Ibid., pp.107f., n.110. McKay rightly argues that Deuteronomism was unknown in Judah before the fall of the Northern Kingdom. Cf., idem, Josiah's Reformation, p.399.
142. McKay, Josiah's Reformation, p.400.
143. Ibid., p.406. Cf. Nicholson, op.cit., p.65. In the JE narratives (Gen. xxiii:7, 12, 13; xlii:6; Exod. v:5; Num. xiv:9) the term simply refers to the inhabitants of the land. It has the same meaning in Hag. ii:4 but its use in Ezra iv:4, where it designates those elements who tried to disrupt the rebuilding of the temple, marks the first stage of the later rabbinical use of the term as a term of contempt signifying either simple people or provincials as distinct from the intellectual and spiritual leaders of Judaism. Cf., too, Gray, op.cit., p.577.
circle of loyal supporters of the Davidic dynasty and the state religion. Focusing attention on 2 Kgs. xi:13-20 which mentions מִרְדָּשׁ four times, McKay observes that there is no indication from the Versions that the term should be omitted or altered in any instance, while the two major theories about the text - Rudolph wishes to remove it from vv. 14, 19 and Stade from v. 19 - do not remove the term either from one source or from the text entirely. Beginning with the two occurrences of the term which are least helpful in defining מִרְדָּשׁ - מִרְדָּשׁ (v.14) and מִרְדָּשׁ (v.19) - McKay favours Rudolph's view with regard to v.14 that the trumpets were probably played by the trumpeters rather than by מִרְדָּשׁ, while he considers it possible that the term is an addition in v.19. From the notices that מִרְדָּשׁ were responsible for the destruction of the temple, altars and images of Baal, and the execution of Mattan the priest of Baal (v.18), that they processed with the king to his enthronement (v.19), and that they rejoiced (vv. 14, 20), McKay infers that מִרְדָּשׁ were loyal to the Davidic dynasty and violently opposed to foreign paganism, and that they were prepared to use violence in revolution as a legitimate means for obtaining their goals. Moreover, in view of the fact that מִרְדָּשׁ (v.20) appears to distinguish between מִרְדָּשׁ and מִרְדָּשׁ, McKay thinks it possible that

144. Editio Lagardiana mentions the term five times, the extra instance being inserted between v.11 and v.12: קָנָא הַנַּחַל הַנַּחַל מִרְדָּשׁ וּמִרְדָּשׁ מִרְדָּשׁ מִרְדָּשׁ מִרְדָּשׁ מִרְדָּשׁ. Cf. McKay, op.cit., p.402, n.3.

145. Ibid., p.402.

146. Ibid., pp.402f. Cf. Gray, op.cit., p.576, n.6, who also thinks it "unlikely that 'the people of the land' should have been equipped with trumpets."

147. This seems a little odd in view of the fact that McKay goes on to include v.19 as one of the instances of the term from which he draws a number of inferences, unless, of course, he understands מִרְדָּשׁ of v.18 as one of the subjects of מִרְדָּשׁ and מִרְדָּשׁ in v.19.

rito-ov denotes "representatives of the Judaean population which Alt and Gordis found to be so active in upholding the Davidic succession." (149)

In support of these conclusions, McKay points to 2 Kgs. xiv:21 which does not mention ירָה נַבִּיִּים but which does contain one of the rare occurrences of the term ירָה נַבִּיִּים. (150) According to 2 Kgs. xii:21, Jehoash, who had been made king by ירָה נַבִּיִּים, was assassinated by his Jerusalemite courtiers: ירָה נַבִּיֵּי יִשְׂרָאֵל יְהֹוָה יָרְדֵּנַי. McKay argues that since it was ירָה נַבִּיֵּי who ensured the succession of his son rather than the statesmen, ירָה נַבִּיֵּי (2 Kgs. xii:21), "it seems probable that the ירָה נַבִּיִּים represented the same pro-Davidic, Yahwistic group as the ירָה נַבִּיֵּי who raised up Jehoash, namely the faithful subjects of God and King in the land of Judah." (151) The fact that Azariah was the grandson, not the son, of Jehoash does not really damage the force of McKay's argument here, especially since 2 Kgs. xiv:19 relates that Azariah's father suffered the same fate as Jehoash, also at the hands of those who lived in Jerusalem: יֹשֵׂה יְהֹוָה בָּרָא הָאָנָם לָלֹא דְּשֵׁה אֱלֹהִים יָדִיל יְהוֹ. McKay seeks confirmation for this opinion from 2 Kgs. xvi:5 which states that Jotham was יָדִיל יְהוֹ, which term the Syro-hexaplar interprets as יָדִיל, and from 2 Kgs. xvi:15 where Ahaz refers to all his subjects as יָדִיל interpreted by the Syro-hexaplar, Codex Vaticanus and Editio Lagardiana as יָדִיל. (152)

149. Ibid. Alt, 'The Monarchy in the Kingdoms of Israel and Judah', Essays on Old Testament History and Religion, translated by R.A. Wilson, Oxford, 1966, pp.239-259 and R. Gordis, op.cit., argue that the people of Judah, as distinct from the inhabitants of Jerusalem, played a special role in the political affairs of Judah. Cf. de Vaux Ancient Israel 2, p.71, who suggests that the contrast between יָדִיל and יָדִיל may be nothing more than a distinction between the city as the control centre of the regime which had just been overthrown and the rest of the population of Judah which had remained faithful to the Davidic house. Cf., too, Nicholson, op.cit., p.62.


151. Ibid.

McKay points to 2 Kgs. xxi:24 and 2 Kgs. xxiii:30 as providing confirmation of the loyalty of the king's Judaean subjects. 2 Kgs. xxi:24 relates how, after Amon had been assassinated by his own Jerusalemite officials, Josiah was elevated to the throne by these same officials. (2 Kgs. xxi:23), Josiah was elevated to the throne by these same officials.

(153) 2 Kgs. xxiii:30 relates how, after Josiah had been killed at Megiddo, he assumed responsibility for the succession of his son, Jehoahaz, although on this occasion there was no hostility between

McKay points out that while יָדָיָם and יָדְתָה are identical terms referring to the Judaean subjects of the king, the term "Judaean" does not refer exclusively to the rural population (155) and 2 Kgs. xxv:3, 19 indicate that the term included dwellers in Jerusalem. (156) 2 Kgs. xxv:3 contains the note: "רָעָה עֶבֶר בֵּית רָעָה לֵאמִים לֵאמִים", which can be interpreted either that there was sore famine in both city and countryside, or that there was severe famine in the city "so that there was no bread for the people of the land", taking the second half of the verse as standing in apposition to the first half, so that both halves refer to

153. Ibid. A. Malamat, 'The Historical Background to the Assassination of Amon, King of Judah', IEJ, iii, 1953, pp.26-29, followed by Bright, op.cit., p.315; Nicholson, Deuteronomy and Tradition, p.11, thinks that Amon's assassination was very probably the work of an extreme anti-Assyrian party in Jerusalem who wished for a change in the national policy. Cf., too, B.W. Anderson, The Living World of the Old Testament 2, p.301, who says that Amon continued his father's pro-Assyrian policy and was murdered "during a patriotic revolt", and J. Mauchline, 'I and II Kings', Peake's Commentary 2, 1964, pp.338-356, ref. p.355, who thinks that Amon "was assassinated by some of his supporters, probably not in religious protest, but in political intrigue which may have been intended as a gesture of independence against Assyria."

154. Ibid.

155. Ibid., pp.405f.

156. Ibid., p.405.
the same location. (157) As Nicholson rightly points out, the second interpretation is to be preferred since the whole context of this note is concerned with events in Jerusalem. (158) 2 Kgs. xxv:19 (159) not only shows that the term נִצְרָה-מָפוֹן embraced those dwelling in Jerusalem but also differentiates between נִצְרָה-מָפוֹן and the statesmen of Jerusalem:

Gray also notes this distinction between נִצְרָה-מָפוֹן, "indicating the people in general, the heirs of the sacral community", and the "official class in the feudal system in the army or the civil bureaucracy in Jerusalem, which held its status from the king." (160) Nicholson and McKay point to four texts in Jeremiah (i:18; xxxiv:19; xxxvii:2; xlv:21) where נִצְרָה-מָמוֹן are mentioned together with the king, the nobility, and the priesthood and where the term is used to designate the rest of the population apart from the royal house, the ruling classes and the priesthood. (161)

In his attempt to illuminate the meaning of the expression נִצְרָה-מָפוֹן, McKay acknowledges his indebtedness to Alt's distinction between the state of Judah and the city of Jerusalem, but he emphasises that while Alt was probably correct in distinguishing Judah and Jerusalem politically, it is doubtful whether the distinction is also geographical. (162) The Old Testament distinction between "Judah" and "Jerusalem" was not based upon a consideration of the city walls as a boundary but, rather, served to contrast the nation and the royal

158. Ibid., pp.64f.
160. Gray, op.cit.
162. Ibid., pp.406ff.
Convincing support for this argument is adduced from the fact that the ruler of the Southern Kingdom is always addressed as מִלְכַּת, and, while he reigned in Jerusalem, he is never referred to as "king of Jerusalem", a title which was used in the pre-Israelite city-state (cf. Gen. xiv:18; Josh. x:1, 3) in much the same way as Hiram was "king of Tyre" (cf. 2 Sam. v:11; I Kgs. v:15, etc.).

Examining the formula מִלְכַּת (Jer. iv:4; xi:2, 9; xvii:25; xviii:11; xxxii:32; xxxv:13; xxxvi:31; 2 Kgs. xxiii:2), the modified versions of this phrase - as in מִלְכַּת מִלְכַּת (Jer. iv:3); מִלְכַּת מִלְכַּת (Jer. xi:12); מִלְכַּת מִלְכַּת (Jer. xxxv:17) and a variant of the phrase - in מִלְכַּת מִלְכַּת (Jer. xxv:2) - McKay concludes that "the only citizenship is of Judah, and a Jerusalemite, while a Judaean citizen, is only a 'resident' in the city." (165) Judaeans, "men of Judah", were the subjects of "the king of Judah" and, hence, the same as מִלְכַּת. They were distinct "from the royal entourage, the Jerusalemite government machine, the מִלְכַּת whose life and work centred in the state capital. The מִלְכַּת were the Judaean royal subjects and included in their numbers were the rural population, the landed nobility, property-owning full (male) citizens and the poorest layers of society." (166) Within this Judaean population there was a circle of faithful Yahwists, steeped in the ancient traditions of Yahwism and intensely loyal to the House of David, who exercised considerable power and authority. The role played by מִלְכַּת at the enthronement of Jehoash is clear indication that they were "people amongst whom militant anti-paganism

164. Ibid., p.406f.
165. Ibid., p.407.
166. Ibid., pp.407f.
had survived the syncretistic policies of several monarchs." (167) McKay argues persuasively that those true Yahwists who fled to Judah after the fall of the Northern Kingdom and who were founder members of the Deuteronomic movement, would have been welcomed by יִשְׂרָאֵל who were disgusted by the syncretistic temple cultus, and would eventually have gained the support of the more influential elements in יִשְׂרָאֵל who had authority at the court. (168) McKay thinks that the Deuteronomic movement had gained sufficient authority, through the assistance of the influential elements of יִשְׂרָאֵל, to influence the king and his court when Hezekiah came to the throne in 715 B.C.: (169) "Hezekiah's attempt to centralize the cult may be the first historical indication of Deuteronomism in Judah." (170) Manasseh reversed his father's policy and during his reign, when polytheism stifled true Yahwism in Jerusalem, the message and traditions of the movement were kept alive amongst יִשְׂרָאֵל. (171) McKay seeks to illustrate to what extent יִשְׂרָאֵל were the bearers of the Deuteronomic traditions by pointing out that on three of four known occasions when they intervened to ensure the Davidic succession, the three monarchs they elevated to the throne were all young, Jehoash being seven, Azariah sixteen, and Josiah eight, all were crowned after there had been palace intrigue and a bloody revolution, and all pursued a policy which, to a greater or lesser degree, met with the approval of

167. Ibid., p.409.
168. Ibid.
169. Ibid.
170. Ibid., p.399.
171. Ibid., p.409.
the Deuteronomic movement. (172) As McKay suggests, it is probably no coincidence that each king was young when crowned since advisers and even regents would have been indispensable and these may well have come from the ranks of, or, at least, worked in collaboration with נתי. In the case of Jehoash, it has already been mentioned that the power behind the throne was the priest Jehoiada and he had the trust and support of at least a section of the Judaean community. McKay argues convincingly that just as Jehoiada was not the sole instigator and executor of the coup d'état but had the substantial support of the Judaean citizens, so, too, he was probably not the sole administrator of the new government, but worked in co-operation with the nominees of נתי who may have been elected as court officials after the

172. Ibid., pp.412ff. There has been some debate about the age of Josiah when he became king. According to 2 Kgs. xxii:1, Josiah reigned for thirty-one years and, hence, would have died at the age of about thirty-eight. 2 Kgs. xxiii:31 states that Jehoahaz was twenty-three when he became king, and 2 Kgs. xxiii:36 relates that Jehoiakim was twenty-five at his coronation, figures which suggest that Josiah was a father at the age of thirteen or fourteen. Two manuscripts of the LXX make Josiah eighteen when he was enthroned. Stade, The Books of Kings in Hebrew, p.290 and Sanda, Die Bücher der Könige, II, pp.327f., suggests altering the MT to יוחנן, but Montgomery, op.cit., p.523, rightly argues that early paternity is not sufficient ground for emending the MT. Gray, op.cit., pp.720f., also thinks there is no need to emend the number to eighteen, pointing out that "the first duty of a Semite is to perpetuate his name in posterity, the more so if he is of the royal line" (ibid., p.721). McKay, op.cit., p.416, n.1, is also of the opinion that the emendation of the MT does not carry conviction since "it requires the further alteration of Amon's age at his death (twenty-four, cf. 21.19) without support from the Versions." Moreover, Gray, op.cit., p.720, note a, may well be correct in thinking that the reading of the two MSS of LXX was "probably prompted by grammatical preciosity." Although the numerals from two to ten generally take the noun in the plural, Gray rightly points out that there are certain exceptions to this rule including כ, כ, כ, כ, etc., which are almost invariably found in the singular after numerals from two to ten. See, too, Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar as edited and enlarged by the late E. Kautzsch, second English edition, revised in accordance with the twenty-eighth German edition of 1909, by A.E. Cowley, Oxford, 1966, § 134 e and f.
administration of Athaliah had been overthrown. (173) At any rate, after Jehoiada's death, there was a change of policy which probably explains the reserved nature of the Deuteronomist's praise for Jehoash.

McKay thinks it probable that a similar form of government operated in the reign of Azariah, which may be the significance of the note in 2 Kgs. xv:5 concerning the co-regent - although this, as has been indicated already, can be interpreted in a more general way. (174) Moreover, McKay thinks that the bureaucracy may well have been under Judaean control from the elevation of Jehoash to the throne to the death of Jotham. Regarding the situation pertaining in the reign of Amaziah, the father of Azariah, no details are supplied about how he deposed the assassins of his father Jehoash and his accession to the throne, but the fact that the Chronicler states that he reorganized the Judaean army (2 Chron. xxv:5) suggests to McKay that he, too, enjoyed the backing of the people of Judah and that they, in turn, were probably represented in his administration. (175)

Between the death of Jotham and the coronation of Josiah, the Judaeans reappeared as a powerful and active political force, taking vengeance on those who had assassinated Amon, raising the Davidic king's son, Josiah, to the throne, and instructing the boy-king in the principles and faith of Deuteronomism. Once again, the result of these events was a significant change in policy and this time the policy pursued was wholly in accord with Deuteronomism. (176)

173. Ibid., pp.414f.
174. Ibid., p.415. See above, p.90.
175. Ibid.
176. Ibid., p.416. The fact that and collaborated in 609 B.C. suggests to McKay that controlled the bureaucracy during Josiah's reign (ibid., n.2).
It has been mentioned that on three of four known occasions when רְפִּיאוּה intervened to ensure the Davidic succession the new monarch was a youth, he was crowned in the wake of a bloody revolution, and, above all, he pursued a policy which, to a greater or lesser degree, met with Deuteronomistic approval. McKay argues that "the exception in the case of Jehoahaz seems to prove the rule."(177) Unlike Jehoash, Azariah, and Josiah, Jehoahaz was crowned when an adult (at the age of twenty-three), his elevation to the throne does not appear to have been preceded by any sort of revolt, and according to the Deuteronomistic historian: יְדוּחָה חַשְׁרוּת הַשָּׁנִים יָרֵאָה כָּלָהו גְּדוֹלָהו (2 Kgs. xxiii:32). McKay argues, quite plausibly, that when רְפִּיאוּה selected Jehoahaz to be king they probably hoped that he would execute their policies, but, either his reign was of insufficient duration for him to implement any of the policies advocated by his advisers, or, because of his relative maturity, he was not subject to advisers for political decisions and chose to follow an independent line.(178)

At any rate, during the reign of Manasseh, the doctrines of Deuteronomism were reformulated and developed and committed to writing, although Urdeuteronomium may not have been drafted as the constitutional document of the reformed הַגִּיסָה until some time in the first eighteen years of Josiah's reign.(179) The first public reading of the book - at the New Year Festival of 622 B.C. - was the climax of the reformation, for it drew together the reforms which had previously been implemented into coherent unity and it was the foundation charter of the restored community, in that it embodied the standards and demands made by the covenant.(180)

177. Ibid., p.413.
178. Ibid., pp.413f.
179. Ibid., p.417.
180. Ibid.
Conscious of the fact that "the laws of centralization raise problems for any theory of Deuteronomy" and that one objection to his reconstruction "could be that it has not solved these problems", McKay directs his attention to the problem which has long perplexed exegetes and which, McKay argues, also raised serious problems for the Deuteronomic writers. If are to be distinguished from the royal bureaucracy, then the latter must have included the temple priesthood within its ranks, which raises the question why those who formulated Urdeuteronomium, who lived and worked amongst , legislated for the removal of their own local shrines, thereby depriving their priests of their livelihood.

McKay rightly concludes that the problem of the motivation for centralization is much more complex than appears at first sight. Centralization may appear to be an act of favouritism towards the Jerusalemite priesthood but, in fact, concern is only shown for the Levites in Deuteronomy. Not only are the Levites mentioned virtually exclusively in the centralization laws - the exceptions are Deut. xvii: 18-20; xxi:5; xxiv:8f. - but they feature in seven of the ten centralization laws. Moreover, Deut. xviii:6-8 serves to strengthen the impression that, while depriving them of their shrines, Deuteronomy was concerned to preserve the rightful status of the Levites.

Furthermore, Deuteronomy does not recognize orders of priests. Not only is the priesthood at the central shrine regarded as Levitical (Deut. xviii:7) but so, too, is the royal chaplaincy (Deut. xvii:18).
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A priest's colleagues are simply designated לְפִילְחַוּ (Deut. xviii:7) and the Zadokites are not distinguished as a separate order either within or apart from the Levitical priesthood. However, following Bartlett, McKay thinks it possible that the distinction of the Zadokites is post-exilic and that during the pre-exilic period the temple priesthood was regarded as Levitical anyway. (184)

Sketching the history of the Levites, McKay reckons that Gen. xlix:5-7 and Gen. xxxiv account for the fact that the tribe of Levi became scattered and landless, while Judg. xvii-xviii indicate that the Levitical priesthood was held in high esteem at an early stage of Israel's history. Both Exod. xxxii:25-29 and Deut. xxxiii:8-11 preserve a tradition that the Levitical priesthood dates from the Kadesh period. A distinction is made in priestly ranks in later traditions in which the Levites have a subordinate status to the altar priests who, in P, are Aaronites and, in Ezekiel, Zadokites. Although it is unlikely that all Levites were apostate and perfectly clear that the following judgments are biased when compared with the account of temple idolatry in Ezek. viii and the history of the temple in the reigns of Ahaz and Manasseh, Ezek. xlvii:10-16, which gives a reason for the distinction in priestly ranks, preserves a memory that, prior to Josiah, paganism had been fostered amongst the Levites, "a paganism as bad as that in the Temple or as that condemned by Deuteronomy": (186)

185. Ibid., pp.419f.
186. Ibid., p.420.
To those responsible for drafting Urdeuteronomium, both the Levites and the Zadokites had gone astray and the local sanctuaries and high-places, together with the Jerusalem temple, were centres of pagan influence. Total reform was the only answer and, since both rural and temple priests had been guilty of apostasy, distinctions in priestly ranks were unnecessary, for, just as the whole cult had to be unified under close supervision, so, too, the whole priesthood had to be taken into the same scheme of reform in order to ensure uniformity of Yahwism. (187) While McKay writes that "it is not at all clear that the earliest Deuteronomists demanded centralization", he thinks that "the demand to centralize the cult in Jerusalem may have originated with Hezekiah's own interpretation of Deuteronomism or with his adoption of some 'temporary expedient' which was found acceptable to the Deuteronomists. By the time the Deuteronomists had edited the Cultic Decalogue centralization was certainly accepted Deuteronomic policy, and it was probably during the reign of Manasseh that its full implications were worked out and formulated as corollaries to a
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primary demand for one shrine only."(188) However, McKay later leaves his options open by concluding that "the Deuteronomists must have reasoned that the precedent set in the reforms of Hezekiah offered the most logical solution to the problem of paganism, if they had not been advocating the same policy earlier."(189)

This rather lengthy examination of McKay's views on יֵדֵוֹן has been necessary because his discussion of the term remains well-balanced while giving full consideration to the strong possibility that יֵדֵוֹן were the king's Judaean subjects amongst whom there was an influential group of loyal supporters of the Davidic dynasty and the state religion who were prepared not only to hear and receive the message, but also to hand-on and propagate the traditions of those northern refugees who fled to the South after 722 B.C. and who were founder-members of the Deuteronomic movement. It seems most likely that the northern refugees lived and worked among יֵדֵוֹן making converts of people from all walks of life and different levels of society and that, having gained leaders of status, this reforming movement used the opportunity presented to them at the accession of Josiah by a period of regency to put their reform programme into operation.

In view of the fact that the revolution which led to the elevation of Jehoash had the full confidence and support of at least a

188. Ibid., pp.411f. When he refers to the possibility of Hezekiah having adopted a 'temporary expedient', McKay is thinking in terms of Weinfeld's thesis that Hezekiah's destruction of local gods and sanctuaries parallels the action taken by Nabonidus who brought regional gods to Babylon. However, McKay, op.cit., p.412, n.1, rightly says that there is a vast difference between these two events and that Weinfeld's comparison "does not carry conviction".
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section of the Judaean community, and the probability that the policy-
changes which were subsequently pursued were the result of pressure
exerted from the same quarter, it seems reasonable to conclude that
Jehoash's reformation was motivated by the desire of יְהוָה to
eradicate all vestiges of the Baal cult introduced under Athaliah,
and to repair and purify the temple to enable the proper carrying out
of Yahweh worship. The revolution which led to Jehoash being made
king seems to have been caused by the intervention of יְהוָה to ensure
the succession of a Davidic king who would be sufficiently young to be
subject to advisers for religious and political decisions and Jehoiada,
who took a leading role in the instigation and execution of the
revolution and was responsible for the reforms recounted in 2 Kgs. xi,
probably worked in collaboration with the nominees of יְהוָה.

Although the Deuteronomist praises Jehoash, he seems to have been
in no doubt about the identity of the real power behind the throne:

שֶׁחָס הָאָדָם הַנַּחַר בֵּעָשׁוֹר הָעֵת לֶאָסְיָא אַשְׁרinea יִשְׁרָאֵל הַנְּדוּ וְהָנָּה (2 Kgs. xii:3). There has
been some debate about the interpretation of יִשְׁרָאֵל הַנְּדוּ וְהָנָּה. Both the Septuagint (τὰ τέλος τῶν ἡμερῶν του) and the Vulgate (cunctis diebus
quibus) make יִשְׁרָאֵל H qualify יִשְׁרָאֵל. Many commentators seem to prefer to
translate יִשְׁרָאֵל with a causal force "forasmuch as, in that, since" (190).

Barnes thinks that MT is better rendered "all his days, because
Jehoiada...taught him" than "all his days wherein Jehoiada...instructed
him", but, because the former rendering cannot be reconciled with
2 Chron. xxiv:17-22, which relates that Jehoash permitted the practice
of idolatry after Jehoiada's death, he concludes that "the correct

190. F. Brown, S.R. Driver and C.A. Briggs, A Hebrew and English Lexicon
of the Old Testament, Oxford, 1968, p.83, n.8c. Cf., too, RSV; Gray, op.cit., p.583, note b; On יִשְׁרָאֵל as a causal conjunction, see
too, GK, p.492, § 158b; W.L. Holladay, A Concise Hebrew and
reading of the Hebrew may be *all the days that Jehoiada instructed him*, since this translation removes the discrepancy with the passage in Chronicles and the difference only "lies in one Heb. consonant." (191)

However, Gray, observing that Lucian's recension of the Septuagint renders שֵׁנֵן for MT |וָן, "obviously thinking of...II Chron. 24.15-22", follows Ewald's defence of the soundness of MT and, pointing to 2 Kgs. xiv:3, where, he says, Jehoash is held up as exemplary, argues that the Deuteronomistic redaction of Kings knew nothing of Jehoash's declension from his early standards of conduct. (192) Burney is of the opinion that "the antecedent of הֶשְׂנֵן is found in [a Hebrew word]; lit. 'he who Jehoiada instructed'", (193) although he thinks it possible that שֵׁנֵן "may be an early marginal note intended to qualify the absolute שֶׁנֶּ֫בְתַּי, in accordance with the narrative of Chr.'", a supposition which has in its favour:זָרָתַי (2 Chron. xxiv:2) "which looks like a limited explanation of שֶׁנֶ֫בְתַּי simply." (194)

Although it is impossible to draw any definite conclusions from this brief and difficult clause, the phrase does seem to be a restricting qualification regardless of which interpretation is followed. (195) The rendering of the Septuagint and Vulgate restricts

---

191. Barnes, op.cit., p.240. Strictly speaking, this translation would involve the addition of the definite article as well as the alteration of ק to ק.

192. Gray, op.cit. See, too, the discussion by Montgomery, op.cit., p.427.

193. Burney, op.cit., p.312. Burney rightly points out that the weakness of the translation of A.V., R.V. and Kittel, following LXX, Lucian, and Vulgate, "all his days wherein Jehoiada the priest instructed him", is the fact that the normal way of expressing such a sense is קֵ֫בָה מַזָּק (as, for example, in 1 Sam. i:28) and קֵ֫בָה is elsewhere always used absolutely, without further definition, in the sense "all his life long" (ibid., pp.312f.). Moreover, in agreement with Ewald (and Gray), Burney thinks that the Deuteronomist seems to have been unacquainted with any narrative of the king's defection (ibid., p.313).

194. Ibid., p.313.

Jehoash's right conduct to the period of his tutelage. Both the interpretation of כְֹכֹּל as a causal conjunction and Burney's suggestion that כְֹכֹּל refers back to כְֹכֹּל, also admit a restriction or limitation of the Deuteronomist's praise of Jehoash. Even if one were to accept Burney's second suggestion that the whole phrase was a gloss inserted in the light of 2 Chron. xxiv, this interpretation does not detract from the fact that it is still a restricting qualification. The balance of probability seems to lie with the view that the Deuteronomist is reserved in his praise for Jehoash because of a change of policy after Jehoiada's death. (196)

An examination of the Chronicler's account of Jehoash's elevation to the throne, his reign and the reformation does not suggest any alteration of the conclusions arrived at on the basis of the discussion of 2 Kgs. xi-xii. Of the Chronicler's account of Jehoash's reform, Curtis remarks that, while the account is, in the main, a simple reproduction of 2 Kgs. xi:4-xii:21, there is, in places, such marked revision and amplification that "nowhere else does the Chronicler's method of interpreting history and introducing notions of his own time as controlling factors in the earlier history more clearly appear."(197) Ackroyd, too, is of the opinion that some of the differences of treatment between the account in Kings and the Chronicler's record "are due very largely to the Chronicler's particular emphases,"(198) and Myers refers to the Chronicler's "augmented theological interpretation of the reign of Joash"(199) and to

"significant additions and omissions" in the Chronicler's account "in harmony with the author's religious views" and his stress on the temple and David, together with his emphasis on the cult personnel. (200) What is of interest in this context is 2 Chron. xxiv:15-22, which relates that the king's conduct deteriorated after the death of Jehoiada. According to Curtis, this account of the apostasy of Jehoash was introduced by the Chronicler "since some such apostasy was necessary from his point of view to explain the disasters of the Syrian invasion." (201) Even if one were not to regard the materials referred to by the Chronicler (for example, מַחְרֶשׁ אָמַרְךָ of 2 Chron. xxiv:27) as largely fictitious and fabricated but were to accept that he had at his disposal extensive sources in addition to canonical Samuel and Kings, it is impossible to determine the reliability of his additions to the account of Jehoash's reign. Nevertheless, it should be possible to indicate where the balance of probability lies by assessing the extent to which the Chronicler's interests may have influenced his account, although this, of course, is by no means foolproof, since it obviously depends on one's interpretation of where the Chronicler's interests lie and of his purpose for writing. At any rate, in this instance, 2 Chron. xxiv:15-22 may well contain a genuine piece of information concerning infidelity on the part of the king, which seems to be reflected in the Deuteronomist's qualification of Jehoash's praise. (202)
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202. Both 2 Kgs. xii:21f. and 2 Chron.xxiv:25 report that Jehoash was assassinated. The report in Kings takes no account of motives, but, Gray, op.cit., p.590, thinks that 2 Chron. xxiv:25, which states that Jehoash suffered because he had antagonized the priests, particularly by having ordered the stoning to death of Jehoiada's son, Zechariah, "is probably a genuine tradition." However, while 2 Chron. xxiv:16ff. gives the reason for the
Jehoiada's revolution and purge were most probably motivated by both political and religious reasons which overlap to a large extent. McKay's unconvincing attempt to distinguish sharply between Jehoiada's purge and that of Josiah on the grounds that 2 Kgs. xi describes the events of a revolution whereas 2 Kgs. xxii-xxiii deal with a reformation of religious policy, is motivated by his desire to show that "Josiah's reformation, however much its execution was aided by anti-Assyrian sentiment, was not instigated in the first instance by a political movement towards independence."(203)

Arguing against the widespread view that religion in Judah was dominated by an obligation to venerate Assyrian deities in Jerusalem, McKay's unconvincing attempt to distinguish sharply between Jehoiada's purge and that of Josiah on the grounds that 2 Kgs. xi describes the events of a revolution whereas 2 Kgs. xxii-xxiii deal with a reformation of religious policy, is motivated by his desire to show that "Josiah's reformation, however much its execution was aided by anti-Assyrian sentiment, was not instigated in the first instance by a political movement towards independence."(203)

Arguing against the widespread view that religion in Judah was dominated by an obligation to venerate Assyrian deities in Jerusalem,

202. contd. king's drastic action as the outspoken criticism of the king's apostasy to the fertility-cult, Gray thinks it more likely that a rift opened between palace and temple when Jehoash imposed stringent financial control over the priests (2 Kgs. xii:5-17). Gray suggests that Zechariah may have used Jehoash's observance of seasonal festivals and rituals related to the agricultural year to incite opinion against the king, and, on the basis of 2 Chron. xxiv:24ff., he thinks that the priestly faction might have exploited Jehoash's humiliation by Aram to indicate that the had passed from him. Indeed, Gray considers it possible that Jehoash "may have been obliged to appoint Amaziah as co-regent as the price of his use of the Temple treasure to buy off the Aramaeans" (ibid., p.604). Although there is uncertainty about the status of the 'servants' or retainers, Gray, op.cit., p.590, thinks that they may have belonged to the palace staff, "but were more probably professional soldiers." Cf., too, the discussion by McKay, op.cit., p.394, who, however, while agreeing that Jehoash's activities, in burdening the people with the cost of the upkeep of the royal chapel and compelling them to pay heavy tribute to Hazael of Damascus, probably aroused antagonism against him which led to his assassination, argues that the Deuteronomist was aware of infidelity on the part of the king.

203. McKay, op.cit., p.422.

204. M. Cogan, Imperialism and Religion: Assyria, Judah and Israel in the Eighth Century B.C.E., SBL Monograph Series, xix, 1974, also argues that there is no convincing evidence that the Assyrians demanded that vassal states should worship their deities. Cf., too, A. Rofé, 'The Strata of the Law about the Centralization of Worship in Deuteronomy and the History of the Deuteronomistic Movement', SVT, xxii, Congress Volume Uppsala, Leiden, 1972, pp.221-226, ref. p.221, n.1, who agrees with the view that the study of the religious policy of the Assyrian Empire does not support the understanding of Josiah's reform as part of his revolt against Assyria.
McKay insists that motivation for the Josianic purges was not primarily political, but religious, and that "the reformation, however much aided by the revolt against Assyria, was not per se an act of rebellion," (205) but "was primarily motivated by the religious zeal and determination of the people who stood behind the law-book." (206)

As will be shown later, Josiah's reformation was indeed very largely motivated by the drive of those who prepared the draft of Urdeuteronomium, but, in laying so much emphasis on the religious motivation, to the virtual exclusion of the political aspect of the reformation, McKay, although he does not find the argument convincing, (207) is guilty of separating politics and religion in a way which would have been completely foreign to an ancient Semite. McKay concedes that politics and religion were intimately connected, but he argues that "the religio-political ideal of the ancient Semites was not therefore identical to that of the later Greeks and Romans who did try to impose or encourage the worship of their gods throughout their empires." (208)

However, as he does admit, "if the Assyrians did commonly impose such religious sanctions on defeated peoples, the likelihood is that Judah also was under obligation to worship the Assyrian gods, whether the Old Testament makes explicit statement to that effect or not." (209)

Although McKay can find no clear evidence that the Assyrians did as a

205. Idem, Religion in Judah under the Assyrians, pp.43f.
206. Ibid., p.107, n.110.
207. McKay, Religion in Judah under the Assyrians, p.74.
208. Ibid.
209. Ibid., p.60.
rule impose such obligations, he concedes that the goal of Assyria's expansionist policy was the subjection of the world to Ashur which meant "as a result, all defeated gods and nations were subject and vassal to the overlordship of Ashur." (210) Moreover, McKay also says "it cannot be denied that Assyrian religion often followed in the wake of the Assyrian armies and that it was at times adopted officially by a vassal state." (211) It therefore seems that he is walking on very thin ice when he questions "whether it is legitimate to go one step further and infer that the Assyrians required their vassals to introduce the cult of Ashur to their state sanctuaries." (212)

Anyhow, even if one were to accept McKay's view that the Assyrians did not commonly impose an obligation on a defeated people to introduce the cult of Assyrian gods, vassals, as Bright rightly points out, were obliged "to take their oath of loyalty by the overlord's gods, and thus acknowledge their supremacy, and it would certainly have been politic of them to show these gods respect." (213) This, together with the fact that a general loss of confidence in the power of Yahweh would

210. Ibid.

211. Ibid., p.65.

212. Ibid., p.60. McKay, op.cit., p.65, (cf., too, ibid., p.74), complains that "whilst the gods of Moab and the Syro-Phoenician states were war-lords as was Ashur, the God of Israel made claims that were in many respects similar to the imperial claims of the Assyrian god, but it has not been suggested that Moab, the Syro-Phoenician states, or Israel tried to impose the worship of their gods on defeated nations." However, while other peoples of the ancient Orient may, to a certain degree, have regarded their own principal deity in a manner similar to the Assyrian attitude to Ashur, none of these peoples had imperial aspirations on the scale of the Assyrians, the aim of whose expansionist policy was nothing less than the subjection of the world to Ashur.

213. Bright, Covenant and Promise, p.81, n.2.
have ensued from the defeat of Israel, "may go far to explain why
periods of subservience, such as the reigns of Ahaz and Manasseh,
should have been characterized by the infiltration of pagan cults, both
native and foreign."(214) Thus, even if it were the case that the
Assyrians did not impose worship of their gods on a defeated people,
it is more than probable that many of the vassal people would have
worshipped the victor's gods since, in the popular mind at least,
military defeat was the result of one nation's deity(ies) having
vanquished the god(s) of its opponent. In other words, political
subservience inevitably meant religious subservience, to a greater or
lesser extent, and, when Josiah carried out his purge, the reformation
was, by its very nature, as much a political act of rebellion against
Assyria as it was a manifestation of the religious zeal and determination
of the people who stood behind Urdeuteronomium.

A second, threefold, argument which can be put forward against
McKay's thesis is that it must be more than mere coincidence that the
rebel kings were the ones who attempted to reform the cult, that
unbroken apostasy marked the reigns of the subservient kings, and
that it was only during the period of Assyrian domination that the
Host of Heaven was worshipped. McKay attempts to counter this
argument, which he acknowledges to be a good one,(215) by saying that
the upsurge of the cult of the Host of Heaven and other kinds of
paganism may have come about at a time when Yahweh had been shown to
be weak, that it is only to be expected that reforming fervour should
rise to the surface when people longed for future liberation, and that
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"no imperial edict is needed to govern such movements in a people's religion".\(^{(216)}\) However, as shown in the preceding paragraph, McKay's first two arguments can just as easily be turned against him and seem only to strengthen the case against his thesis while his third line of argument does not carry conviction since, quite apart from the fact that he is again attempting to separate politics and religion in a way which would have been alien to an ancient Semite, all the kings who are recorded as having attempted to reform the cult in any way issued edicts to ensure that their wishes were carried out.

A third argument which can be levelled against McKay's thesis concerns the probability that Josiah carried through reformation measures before 621 B.C. As will be shown later, it is difficult to determine precisely the contribution of the law book to the reformation. However, without detracting from the significance of the law book, it would appear that the Chronicler's record of reformation before 621 B.C. is historically trustworthy, that Josiah began his reformation well before his eighteenth year on the throne (621 B.C.), and that the reformation measures carried through by Josiah before 621 B.C. may well have been motivated to a large extent by the desire to gain independence from Assyria.\(^{(217)}\) McKay admits that "political factors were, of course, very important" and that "as in the days of Hezekiah, the hope for independence began to rise again, and no doubt the rebirth of nationalistic expectation did much to promote the demand for a strong, purified and united national cult."\(^{(218)}\) If those reformation measures

\(^{216}\) Ibid., p.75.

\(^{217}\) Cf., for example, Nicholson, *Deuteronomy and Tradition*, pp.8ff.

\(^{218}\) McKay, *Religion in Judah under the Assyrians*, p.43.
carried through before 621 B.C. were geared towards removing Assyrian cult emblems and practices from the Jerusalem temple where - regardless of whether or not the Assyrians had demanded the presence of their deities there - they were a sign of Assyrian suzerainty, then Josiah's reformation was primarily motivated, in the first instance, by a wave of resurgent nationalism. The fact that 2 Kgs. xxiii:13 - לַעֲבֹד בַּאֲרוֹן, שָׁאִוֹת יַעֲבֹד בַּאֲרוֹן, מְקוֹם לְשֵׁה הַמִּשְׁמָרָה לְשֵׁה הַמִּשְׁמָרָה לְשֵׁה הַמִּשְׁמָרָה לְשֵׁה הַמִּשְׁמָרָה לְשֵׁה הַמִּשְׁמָרָה לְשֵׁה הַמִּשְׁמָרָה לְשֵׁה הַמִּשְׁמָרָה לְשֵׁה הַמִּשְׁמָרָה לְשֵׁה הַמִּשְׁמָרָה לְשֵׁה הַמִּשְׁמָרָה לְשֵׁה הַמִּשְׁמָרָה לְשֵׁה הַמִּשְׁמָרָה לְשֵׁה הַמִּשְׁמָרָה לְשֵׁה הַמִּשְׁמָרָה לְשֵׁה הַמִּשְׁמָרָה לְשֵׁה הַמִּשְׁמָרָה לְשֵׁה הַמִּשְׁמָרָה לְשֵׁה הַמִּשְׁמָרָה לְשֵׁה הַמִּשְׁמָרָה לְשֵׁה הַמִּשְׁמָרָה לְשֵׁה הַמִּשְׁמָרָה לְשֵׁה הַמִּשְׁמָרָה לְשֵׁה הַמִּשְׁמָרָה לְשֵׁה הַמִּשְׁמָרָה לְשֵׁה הַמִּשְׁמָרָה לְשֵׁה הַמִּשְׁמָרָה לְשֵׁה הַמִּשְׁמָרָה לְשֵׁה הַמִּשְׁמָרָה לְשֵׁה הַמִּשְׁמָרָה לְשֵׁה הַמִּשְׁמָרָה לְשֵׁה הַמִּשְׁמָרָה - refers specifically to the abolition of the Sidonian and Moabite cults does not strengthen McKay's argument that "the very fact that the Assyrian gods were not considered worthy of special mention in the account of the reforms suggests that they neither enjoyed a privileged status in the Judaean cult, nor formed a peculiar focus for the reformation."(219) Leaving aside the debate about the interpretation of some of the terms used by the Deuteronomist and the extent to which they can be understood to reflect Assyrian influence, the possibility that the Deuteronimistic historian does not refer specifically to the Assyrian deities may simply be due to his presupposing that the reader would be perfectly well aware of the identity of the objects mentioned, whereas he may have felt obliged to identify other comparatively less conspicuous objects of foreign paganism which were also rooted out. Although it may be granted that one's arguments tend to be circular depending on one's presuppositions, it may nevertheless be said that, in the mind of the present writer at any rate, the balance of probability would appear to lie with the view that the cult of Assyrian gods was introduced into the temple at Jerusalem and in the Judaean countryside, that, regardless of whether or not they had been introduced under compulsion, they would have been, in effect, symbols of vassal status every bit as much as treaty-

219. Ibid.
documents and Ahaz’s altar, that many Judaeans worshipped Assyrian deities, and that reformation of the cult was by its nature an act of rebellion. McKay’s conclusion that "in the accounts of the purges of Hezekiah and Josiah no element of anti-Assyrian polemic has been found and it seems logical to infer that Assyrian cults played no significant part in the politics or the religion of Judah", (220) does not carry conviction.

A fourth argument which may be raised against McKay’s thesis concerns the conclusions he arrives at with regard to יִהוָּיעַד. Unless the present writer has not followed his discussion of יִהוָּיעַד, which has been referred to with approval, with sufficient care, it would appear that McKay contradicts himself when he argues that the events recorded in 2 Kgs. xi should be distinguished from the events related in 2 Kgs. xxii-xxiii on the grounds that Jehoiada’s purge was first and foremost a revolution, whereas Josiah’s purge was a reformation of religious policy. McKay even goes so far as to imply that the House of Baal was destroyed by "Jehoiada’s revolutionaries" simply because it was a symbol of Athaliah’s regime and that Mattan, the Baal-priest, was executed just because he was a functionary of the same regime. (221) Once again, it would appear that in wishing to support his main thesis concerning Josiah’s reformation, McKay has overstepped the mark for, in this instance, he has laid too much emphasis on the political aspect of Jehoiada’s purge, to the virtual exclusion of the religious motivation.

In his discussion of יִהוָּיעַד, McKay refers to the case of Jehoash as "perhaps the most instructive", (222) for illustrating his view that
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221. McKay, Josiah’s Reformation, pp.395f.
222. Ibid., p.414.
included in their ranks "an element of considerable power and authority which was devoted to the House of David and to Yahweh", (223) "an influential body of faithful supporters of the Davidic dynasty and the religion of the state", (224) a group "faithful to the Davidic dynasty" who "were intolerant of foreign paganism and...were prepared to use revolutionary methods to obtain their objectives", (225) and he even writes: "The ʾam-hāʾāres ʾāʾ, as the part they played at the enthronement of Jehoash reveals...were also people amongst whom militant anti-paganism had survived the syncretistic policies of several monarchs." (226) Surely their objectives included both the elevation of the particular Davidic king they selected and the removal of all vestiges of paganism, not simply as a political gesture of independence, but for the express purpose of restoring Yahweh worship? When McKay writes of the "subsequent policy-changes" which "must, to some extent, have resulted from Judaean pressure", surely he must have in mind political and religious policies? Moreover, McKay is surely inconsistent when he argues that Jehoiada's revolution necessitated the removal of pagan religious influences because of their political connotations for does not this, in itself, suggest that religion and politics were perhaps more intimately connected than he would like to believe?

What can legitimately be said to distinguish Jehoiada's purge from Josiah's reformation is the fact that Jehoiada's religious reforms were not in full accord with the demands of Deuteronomism

223. Ibid., p.408 (italics mine).
224. Ibid., p.406 (italics mine).
225. Ibid., p.403 (italics mine).
226. McKay, Religion in Judah under the Assyrians, pp.17f.
since (2 Kgs. xii:4). From this study of the accounts of the reforms of Asa, Jehoshaphat, and Jehoash, it may be concluded with McKay that "Deuteronomism was not an active force in Judah before or during the time of Jehoash"(227) since none of these kings attempted to centralize the cult. It would appear, therefore, that Deuteronomism was unknown in Judah before the fall of the Northern Kingdom and that Hezekiah's attempt to enforce cultic centralization may be the first historical indication of the presence and activity of the Deuteronomic movement in the Southern Kingdom.

4. **Hezekiah's Reformation**

Of the kings before Josiah, Hezekiah alone is praised unconditionally by the Deuteronomistic historian for having fully obeyed the demands of Deuteronomy, especially the abolition of the high places and the centralization of sacrificial worship:

(2 Kgs. xviii:5-7). According to Heaton, "the biblical record of Hezekiah's reign raises some of the most complicated problems of Old Testament history".(228) Chronological difficulties abound and Rowley(229) draws attention to Honor's dissertation(230) on the subject of Sennacherib's invasion, in which the author was able to show that at least six different reconstructions of the course of Hezekiah's rebellion had been put forward. The political activities of Hezekiah


are difficult to determine in detail, the main problem stemming from
the fact that the record in 2 Kgs. xviii:13-xix:37 of the king's
relations with Assyria, seems to derive from three sources. (231) Many
attempts have been made to reconcile and harmonise the Deuteronomistic
historian's account, the Chronicler's account, the narrative of Is.
xxxvi-xxxvii, and the account of Sennacherib, but to carry out a detailed
analysis of the chronological difficulties of Hezekiah's revolt in relation
to the campaigns of Sennacherib would be to cover a wider field than is
germane to the present study. Attention, therefore, will be focused
primarily on the reformation.

Although the account in 2 Kings of the final phase of the history of
Judah is fuller and more detailed than the sections dealing with previous
reigns and three chapters are devoted to the reign of Hezekiah, the
commentator has only two verses by which to gauge the nature, extent and
purpose of this king's reformation. The reformation is recorded in a
single sentence in 2 Kgs. xviii:4 -

- and reference is made in part of the Rabshakeh's first speech to

231. On this problem, see e.g., T.H. Robinson, A History of Israel, vol. i,
Oxford, 1951, pp. 385ff.; Noth, The History of Israel, pp. 264ff.;
Bright, A History of Israel, pp. 277ff.; Herrmann, A History of
B.W. Anderson, The Living World of the Old Testament, pp. 280ff.;
C.W. Anderson, The History and Religion of Israel, pp. 103ff.;
B.S. Childs, Isaiah and the Assyrian Crisis, London, 1967,
pp. 69ff.; Beebe, The Old Testament, pp. 251ff.; Skinner, op.cit.,
See, too, A.K. Jenkins, Hezekiah's Fourteenth Year. A new
interpretation of 2 Kings xviii:13-xix:37, VT, xxvi, 1976,
pp. 284-298. Jenkins, who says that "there can be no date as
tantalising to the Old Testament historian" (ibid., p. 284) and who
refers to this whole area as "one of the most difficult problems
of Old Testament history and interpretation" (ibid.), attempts
to reconstruct the events of Hezekiah's fourteenth year in the
light of Child's findings concerning the nature of the material in
2 Kgs. xviii:13-xix:37. He concludes that this tradition of the
deliverance of Jerusalem from the king of Assyria originated
during the suppression of the revolt led by Ashdod (714-712 B.C.)
by the forces of Sargon II, and that it was later re-interpreted
in the light of the humiliation inflicted on Hezekiah by
Sennacherib and the narrow escape of Jerusalem in 701 B.C.
Hezekiah's abolition of the high places and altars and his attempt to centralize sacrificial worship in Jerusalem - (2 Kgs. xviii:22 and cf. Is. xxxvi:7). The Chronicler's record of Hezekiah's reign in 2 Chron. xxix-xxxii and his account of the reformation must also be considered since it is much more expansive than, and widely different from, that of the Deuteronomistic historian.

The Deuteronomistic historian's account of Hezekiah's Reformation

Although some have doubted the story of Hezekiah's reform, the vast majority of commentators, including many who maintain that there are unhistorical elements in the rest of the account, would accept that, whatever its nature or origin, the bronze serpent was in the temple in the time of Hezekiah and that he destroyed it because it was treated as an idol. It is generally acknowledged that the cult of the bronze serpent was ancient and the aetiological story of its role as a prophylactic against serpents in Num. xxi:6-9 may reflect its antiquity, although it could also be interpreted as an attempt to legitimize it.

Rowley, followed by Montgomery and Snaith, is of the opinion that, originally, it was a cult symbol of the Zadokites and he writes:

"we are justified in regarding Zadok as the Jebusite priest of Jerusalem before the capture of the city of David, and Nehushtan as the divine symbol in the sanctuary he guarded." (232) According to A. Lods, the

232. Rowley, 'Zadok and Nehushtan', JBL, lvi, 1939, pp.113-141, ref. p.141. (On the identity of Zadok, see C.E. Hauer, Jr., 'Who was Zadok?', JBL, lxxii, 1963, pp.89-94.) Cf. too, Montgomery, op.cit., p.481; Snaith, 'The First and Second Books of Kings: Introduction and Exegesis', IB, iii, p.290. Because of the similarity between נֹעַ and נֶהוֹשְׁתָן, Snaith suggests that the implication of Hezekiah calling the bronze serpent this punning name Nehushtan was in order to ridicule it. T.H. Robinson, op.cit., p.393, n.1, considers it probable that serpent-worship in Jerusalem was also a form of Yahweh cult.
serpent represented some Canaanite god or spirit of healing which the Israelites adopted when they settled in Palestine and, similarly, Gray suggests that the serpent symbolised the power of healing and was related to the god Horon.\textsuperscript{233} At any rate, Joines, Gray and McKay point out that the figure of a serpent was a characteristic feature of the Canaanite fertility cult and was often depicted with the mother-goddess in Canaanite art.\textsuperscript{234} That the wilderness origin of Nehushtan is not impossible is indicated by the discovery in situ in the Holy of Holies in the Midianite shrine at Timna in the Sinai Peninsula of a copper snake with a gilded head as the sole votive offering.\textsuperscript{235} However, although the tradition of the wilderness origin of Nehushtan receives support from the fact that the Midianites, with whom Israel is closely linked in the wilderness tradition, venerated a bronze serpent at their Timna shrine, "it seems fairly clear that Nehushtan also belonged to the cultural context of the indigenous cults."\textsuperscript{236}

However, the claim that Hezekiah destroyed the high places and centralized sacrificial worship in Jerusalem is regarded with suspicion by, among others, Wellhausen, Stade, Cheyne, Hölscher, and Lods.\textsuperscript{237}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{234} K.R. Joines, 'The Bronze Serpent in the Israelite Cult', JBL, lxxvii, 1968, pp.245-256; Gray, I and II Kings, pp.670f.; McKay, Josiah's Reformation, pp.119, 187, 189; idem, Religion in Judah under the Assyrians, pp.14, 85 (n.9).
\item \textsuperscript{236} McKay, op.cit., p.14.
\item \textsuperscript{237} See above, p.24, n.49.
\end{itemize}
It is argued that, in its double aim of cultic purification and centralization, Hezekiah's reform so closely resembles Josiah's reformation that it must be simply a reading back of Josiah's reform. On the other hand, T.H. Robinson, Noth, Bright, G.W. Anderson, Rowley, Childs, Fohrer, Heaton, Phillips, and Beebe, for example, share the opinion that a reform was inevitable since Assyrian monarchs demanded that kings who were tributary to them should acknowledge that their gods were inferior and subordinate to the Assyrian deities and, consequently any king who rebelled against Assyria would have been bound to repudiate the gods of Assyria. (238) Thus Robinson says that "patriotism and religious loyalty naturally went hand in hand in ancient Israel" (239) while, according to Beebe, Hezekiah's Yahwism "guaranteed his nationalism." (240) Anderson states that "the elimination of Assyrian religious influence implied the repudiation of Assyrian political authority", (241) while Childs says that "the removal of Assyrian altars was an overt sign of rebellion." (242) Bright asserts that "political subservience normally involved recognition of the overlord's gods" (243) and that "repudiation of the


239. Robinson, op.cit., p.393.


Assyrian gods amounted virtually to an announcement of rebellion."(244) Noth maintains that "when Hezekiah abandoned his dependence on Assyria...he quite consistently abolished...Assyrian religion" since "so long as Judah was a tribute-paying Assyrian vassal...the official Assyrian religion had a place alongside the traditional worship of Yahweh in the state sanctuary in Jerusalem."(245) Rowley declares that "it was out of the question to revolt against Assyria without purging the religion of Assyrian elements; on the other hand, it was equally out of the question to do away with those Assyrian elements without revolting against Assyria."(246)

Much of the debate about whether or not Hezekiah carried out a religious reformation has centred on 2 Kgs. xviii:4.(247) Robinson points out the "serious syntactical difficulties" of this passage "which can be solved only in one of two ways, either (a) by radical emendation of the text, or (b) by assuming that the verse is a very late insertion, dating from a time when the characteristic grammatical features of classical Hebrew had begun to break down."(248) According to Gray, the verse "reads like an excerpt from an annalistic source".(249) On the other hand, Wellhausen, Stade, and Hölscher support their argument that only the record of the destruction of

244. Ibid., p.280.
245. Noth, op.cit., p.266.
247. For much of what follows on this verse, see McKay, Josiah's Reformation, pp.11ff.; idem, Religion in Judah under the Assyrians, pp.84f., n.5.
Nehushtan is original, by maintaining that v. 4a is an editorial expansion, possibly a reading back of Josiah's reform. (250) Stade argues that ωαw with the perfect in narrative is a certain sign of glossation because it is confined to late Hebrew literature (251) and although Stade's proposals have been criticized, his view regarding this phenomenon has influenced Benzinger, Kittel, Puukko, Šanda, Montgomery, and Gray. (252) However, different views on ωαw with the perfect in narrative have also been expressed. S.R. Driver (253) considers that in later literature the phenomenon indicated Aramaic influence but that its occurrence in earlier literature presents "an insoluble enigma." (254) According to Burney, "the use of the perfect with weak 1 is a mark of decadence in style." (255) E. König suggests that sometimes the form was used to imply discontinuity and should be...

250. Wellhausen, Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel, pp.46f., 480ff.; Stade, Geschichte des Volkes Israel I, p.607; Hülscher, Geschichte der Israelitischen und jüdischen Religion, pp.98ff. Of course, some exegetes would agree that v. 4a is an editorial expansion without necessarily suggesting that the editor was reading back Josiah's reform measures. Cf., for example, E.W. Todd, 'The Reforms of Hezekiah and Josiah', SJTh, ix, 1956, pp.288-293, ref. p.290, n.2.


254. Ibid., p.161.

translated "he also did such-and-such". (256) While acknowledging that in some cases the text may be corrupt, while in others the phenomenon may have arisen under the influence of the Aramaic construction of the perfect with 1 (e.g. 2 Kgs. xxiii:4), suggests that in some instances "a longer or constant continuance in a past state is perhaps represented by the perfect with 1". (258) Jepsen suggests that the construction was used to express simultaneity and should be translated "and at the same time he did such-and-such" (259) while Oestreicher maintains that it implies delay and has some sort of meaning as "and after a period of time he did such-and-such". (260) A.R. Siebens is of the opinion that the construction arose as an error in transcription, and, along similar lines, A. Rubinstein suggests that it may have arisen as a result of errors in the process of copying during a period when Aramaic influence was strong. (262) According to K. Budde, the origin


258. Ibid., p.339.


260. T.Oestreicher, Das deuteronomische Grundgesetz, Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie 27.4, Gütersloh, 1923, p.42.


of the construction can be traced back to the incorporation into the

text of marginal notes or parallel accounts "die abgerissen mit einem

Perfektum ohne | begannen." (263) G. Bergsträsser has maintained that

the construction could be ancient (264) and both F.R. Blake (265) and

R. Meyer (266) have cited evidence to support this conclusion. On the

grounds that Hebrew has no consecutio temporum, A. Sperber (267) seeks
to account for the construction by formulating a new rule of sequence.

Finally, McKay, rightly pointing out that wāw with the perfect may have

been used in a variety of ways and that each occurrence of the form

should be explained with regard to the context in which it appears, (268)

confines himself primarily to an examination of the use of the

construction in the narratives in the Deuteronomistic history and

concludes that most of these occurrences can be explained without

transgressing the accepted rules of Hebrew grammar. Often the

construction is employed in a continuous or frequentative sense and

this is probably how its usage is to be understood in 2 Kgs. xviii:4a, (269)

while "in many of the remaining instances suspicion is cast on the
text by variant readings." (270) Only occasionally does the construction

present the grammarian with "an insoluble enigma", and McKay classifies

263. K. Budde, 'Das Deuteronomium und die Reform König Josias', ZAW,
xliv, 1926, pp.177-244, ref. p.194.

264. G. Bergsträsser, Wilhelm Gesenius' Hebräische Grammatik, 29

Leipzig, 1929, II. § 9n.

265. F.R. Blake, A Resurvey of Hebrew Tenses, Scripta Pontificii

Instituti Biblici, Rome, 1951, §§ 34, 37.

266. R. Meyer, 'Auffallender Erzählungsstil in einem angeblichen

Auszug aus der "Chronik der Könige von Juda", Baumgärtel Festschrift,
pp.114-123.

267. A. Sperber, A Historical Grammar of Biblical Hebrew. A Presentation

of Problems with Suggestions to their Solution, Leiden, 1966, pp.70-72.

268. McKay, Josiah's Reformation, p.14; idem, Religion in Judah Under

the Assyrians, p.85, n.5.

269. McKay, Religion in Judah Under the Assyrians, p.85, n.5.

2 Kgs. xviii:4b as one of those occasions when the phenomenon "is inexplicable within the limits of traditional grammar." (271) In this instance, McKay favours the solution proposed by Budde that the editor has incorporated paratactically material from an additional source. (272)

It would be foolhardy to make dogmatic assertions about the use of wāw with the perfect in 2 Kgs. xviii:4. Moreover, even if one were persuaded to accept the view that the use of this grammatical construction separates v.4a as editorial from v.4b as annalistic, this would not be sufficient reason to reject as unhistorical the Deuteronomist's statement that Hezekiah removed the high places and centralized sacrificial worship at Jerusalem since "historical conclusions cannot depend on a literary consideration." (273) Bright, who maintains that Hezekiah's reform was "exceedingly thoroughgoing" (274) says that "there is no reason to doubt that Hezekiah attempted "cultic centralization" (275) and the same opinion is expressed by Gray who, however, thinks that "we should emphasize the limited scope of Hezekiah's reformation compared with that of Josiah." (276)

There is no good reason to deny Hezekiah the credit of the reformation described in 2 Kgs. xviii:4. Regardless of the paucity of details in the book of Isaiah concerning Hezekiah's reformation, "there is" writes Gray, "no reason to suppose that the nationalist policy of Hezekiah did not have as its religious aspect the centralization of the cult." (277)

274. Bright, A History of Israel 2, p.280.
275. Ibid., p.281.
277. Ibid. Cf., too, Nicholson, Deuteronomy and Tradition, p.94.
Rowley, 'Hezekiah's Reform and Rebellion', Men of God, p.129, writes: "There is no necessary reason to doubt that in reviving the national religion and in cleansing the Temple Hezekiah could go on to close the 'high places' where the infiltration of ancient
This view is supported by the fact that the mention of cultic centralization in the first speech of the Rabshakeh -

(2 Kgs. xviii:22. Cf. Is. xxxvi:7) - probably belongs to the original, historical core of the speech. It lies outside the scope of this study to enter into the debate about the text critical problems of the relationship between 2 Kgs. xviii-xix and Is. xxxvi-xxxvii or to attempt to reconstruct the historical events of Hezekiah's rebellion. Suffice it to say, in this context, that, quite apart from the standard argument that Hezekiah's reform had strong political, as well as religious, overtones and that it was virtually inevitable that he would abolish the Assyrian altars, there are three principal features of the Rabshakeh's speech which accord favourably with a genuine historical setting. The first concerns the absence of one consistent line of argument together with "the fluctuation in style between questions, imperatives, and conditionals" which one would expect in a disputation. The second

277. contd. Canaanite practice had always been strong. So far back as the time of Gideon we find that the first thing that leader did to revive national feeling and national strength was to break down the local Baal altar" (Judg. vi:25ff.). Cf., too, Asami, The Central Sanctuary in Israel in the Ninth Century B.C., p.115, n.3. Cf., also, McKay, Josiah's Reformation, p.397, who says that although few details of Hezekiah's reformation are known and while, too, the Deuteronomist's inordinate praise of Hezekiah in 2 Kgs. xviii: 3-7a "may result partly from the Deuteronomist's desire to offer apologetic precedents for Josiah's reforms....the summary statement of its content seem to be of good historical value, as the Rabshakeh's speech and the notice that Hezekiah restored the Temple gates both attest, while the recent excavations of the Yahweh temple at Tel Arad show that the altar there was removed in Statum VII, that is in Hezekiah's time." Cf., also, idem, Religion in Judah under the Assyrians, p.17. On the excavations here referred to, see Y. Aharoni, 'Arad: Its Inscriptions and Temple', BA, xxxi, 1968, pp.1-32.

278. Cf., e.g., B.S. Childs, Isaiah and the Assyrian Crisis, pp.82-85. Cf., too, McKay, Josiah's Reformation, p.119.

feature concerns the peculiar mixture of an intimate knowledge of Hezekiah's cultic reforms and a pagan attitude towards them, for "only someone completely removed from the Hebrew religion could have interpreted Hezekiah's reform as an insult to Israel's deity." (280) Thirdly, the link between entreating the deity for help and offering cultic sacrifice does not have the appearance of a later tendentious theological contrivance and is "easier to understand as genuinely historical...particularly since this is a unique element within the Dtr. history." (281)

The Chronicler's Account and the Motivation of Hezekiah's Reformation

The Chronicler, who departs widely from the presentation of Hezekiah's reign in 2 Kings, devotes three chapters to the king's reforming activities and one to other matters which are partly of a political nature. In 2 Chron. xxix-xxxii, the Chronicler depicts Hezekiah as a good and virtuous king, a model of faith in Yahweh, who is able to repulse the Assyrian army through a prophet's prayer. 2 Chron. xxix describes preliminary repairs to the temple and the orderly establishment of all the service of Yahweh's temple. Chapter xxx describes how Hezekiah sent to Israel and Judah and wrote letters to Ephraim and Manasseh, inviting them to send representatives to Jerusalem to participate in a solemn observance of the Passover which was authorized by a royal decree proclaimed throughout all Israel from Dan to Beersheba. Hezekiah's couriers generally met with scorn and derision, but a few men of Asher, Manasseh and Zebulun humbled themselves and came to Jerusalem for the Passover which was celebrated after there had been a purge of altars. 2 Chron. xxxi relates that there was an extension of this iconoclastic zeal to the cities throughout all Judah and Benjamin and Ephraim and Manasseh.

280. Ibid.
281. Ibid., p.83.
Elmslie maintains that the Deuteronomist's superlative eulogy of Hezekiah "provided full reason for the Chronicler to expati ate in praise of Hezekiah, to depict him indeed as a second 'Saint David'". (282) While Curtis is of the opinion that "the whole narrative is largely, if not entirely, imaginary." (283) Curtis argues that Hezekiah "became a fruitful subject for the Chronicler" and that the account of Hezekiah's reopening the temple (c.29), celebration of Passover (c.30), and appointment of the temple servitors (c.31) "are treated from the point of view of the Chronicler's own time and without the evidence of the use of historical records." (284) Kittel, while acknowledging the historical and theological significance of Hezekiah's reform, does not take the Chronicler's account into consideration in his discussion. (285) Rudolph accepts that 2 Chron. xxix:2 and xxxi:1 are based on the Deuteronomistic history and therefore reliable, with the exception of the northern city names in xxxi:1b. (286) De Vaux accepts the Deuteronomist's account of Hezekiah's reform, but describes the Chronicler's record as "a product of the Chronicler's imagination" based on the pattern of Josiah's reformation. (287) However, Childs, in his study of that part of the Chronicler's narrative which deals with Sennacherib, while employing the term 'midrash' for the Chronicler's account, stresses that "the term midrash is basically...


284. Ibid., p.462.


286. Rudolph, Chronikbücher, pp.293-305.

287. R. de Vaux, Ancient Israel, 2 p.487.
misunderstood when it is employed in a derogatory fashion to designate a literature which is very loosely related in a tendentious manner to an historical account", (288) and McKay, who also classifies the Chronicler's account as midrash, is equally emphatic that "his witness to the reformation may not for this reason be dismissed as lacking the evidence of historical records." (289) Myers, who points out that only eighteen verses of Kings are reflected in the Chronicler's account and that the other material, approximately one hundred verses, is his own, thinks that "there is nothing improbable in the Chronicler's outline of Hezekiah's reforming and missionary activity." (290) Although he considers it possible that "the circumstances of Josiah's death may have led the Chronicler to shift some of the glory of Josiah to Hezekiah", (291) Myers concludes that "the Chronicler has made a great deal of this religious activity of Hezekiah and there is certainly much in what he says; he did not conjure up the whole idea." (292) Myers stresses that 2 Chron. xxix-xxxii must be evaluated in the light of the Chronicler's theology and he rightly says that "the real question is the degree to which the Chronicler may be more correct in his portrait of Hezekiah than the author of Kings, who was also biased, though in a different direction." (293) It is precisely this question, however, which is so difficult to answer for the Chronicler severely restricts historico-political details and his presentation of the historical data bearing on the religious situation is homiletic because his primary concern was for his own time and how best to overcome its problems, and his principal aim was "predominantly to present the religious situation with a view toward the orientation of the nation in his own day." (294)

289. McKay, Josiah's Reformation, p.121; idem, Religion in Judah Under the Assyrians, p.15.
290. Myers, I Chronicles, p.LXI; idem, II Chronicles, pp.XXIXf.
291. Myers, II Chronicles, p.XXIII.
292. Ibid., p.XXI.
293. Myers, II Chronicles, p.169.
2 Chron. xxxi:1 parallels 2 Kgs. xviii:4 but the Chronicler's account of the abolition of the high places, while it lacks any mention about the destruction of the bronze serpent, is an expansion of 2 Kgs. xviii:4 in that it asserts that the purge was extended to the Northern Kingdom:

(2 Chron. xxxi:1)

Is the Chronicler's record of the extension of the reformation to the Northern Kingdom based on historical fact or has his "obvious bias for Hezekiah"(295) unduly influenced his account? According to Rowley,(296) it cannot be ruled out that Hezekiah's reform was carried into the north, since the revival of the national religion would have accompanied the revival of national aspirations in the north no less than in the south, but he expresses doubt about the historicity of the Chronicler's record in this regard, firstly, because the Deuteronomist fails to mention it, and, secondly, because "where it is recorded by the Chronicler it is in the setting of an account in which the characteristic interests of the Chronicler figure, and where it is impossible to suppose that the whole is strictly historical."(297) Curtis is sceptical about both the Chronicler's account of the celebration of the Passover, which he describes as "probably a purely imaginary occurrence, suggested by the Passover

295. Myers, II Chronicles, p.184. According to Myers, the reformation "probably pertained to Judah", although he thinks that "there may have been some such activities in local situations conducted by those who had participated in the Jerusalem festivities". Ackroyd, I and II Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, p.187, thinks that the Chronicler may well be alluding to his contemporary situation and that there may be a particular reference here to the division between the Jerusalem and Samaritan communities.


297. Ibid., p.131.
under Josiah (2 K.23:21)",(298) and the reference to the king's attempt to extend his reform northwards: "It is very difficult, if not impossible... to conceive of Hezekiah as having historically sent such an invitation to the inhabitants of the semi-hostile N. kingdom at the commencement of his reign before the fall of Samaria."(299)

A different point of view is expressed by Todd, who, while acknowledging that the Chronicler's additional record is an exaggeration, argues that "it is an exaggeration of something which did actually take place."(300) Todd argues for the historicity of the extension of the reform to the Northern Kingdom on the ground that Sargon may have transferred some northern districts to Hezekiah as a reward for his refusal to rebel at the time of the fall of the Northern Kingdom.

Albright complains that "owing to unwarranted depreciation of the data preserved for us by the Chronicler, most recent historians have failed fully to understand the religious situation under Hezekiah".(301) Moriarty agrees with Albright and maintains that while the source of the material peculiar to the Chronicler is not indicated, "there are few today who would find it exclusively in the imagination of the Chronicler....It is no longer fashionable to write off the historical validity of the Chronicler's narrative even when one takes into account that it reflects his own special interests and purpose."(302) Although
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he offers a different solution to explain the hitherto obscure action of Hezekiah in permitting the Passover to be celebrated at Jerusalem in the second month, Moriarty follows S. Talmon(303) in defending the basic historicity of the Passover celebration, including the reference to the participation in it by elements from Northern Israel whom Hezekiah invited to Jerusalem to keep the feast in the second instead of the first month. Moriarty considers it most unlikely that the Chronicler, who was a "severely orthodox writer", would have concocted a Passover feast in Hezekiah's time simply on the basis of the "Second Passover" law in Num. ix:2-14.(304) He thinks it is a great deal more probable that "the Chronicler was faced with an unusual and unorthodox historical event which he attempted to explain by explicit reference (30,3) to the law of the Second Passover", (305) and he reckons that "the irregularities and the makeshifts appear to be good arguments for the authenticity of Hezekiah's Passover."(306) Moriarty interprets 2 Chron. xxx:26 to mean that Hezekiah's Passover was the first unified pilgrimage feast celebrated at a central sanctuary since the break-up of the United Kingdom, while he understands 2 Chron. xxxv:18 and 2 Kgs.xxiii:22 to refer to the fact that Josiah's Passover was the first of its kind since the important annual feasts of the amphictyonic celebrations. Moriarty concludes by suggesting that the Deuteronomist may have omitted all reference to Hezekiah's Passover "because it did not have those amphictyonic characteristics which made the Josianic celebration an ideal one."(307)

304. Moriarty, op.cit., p.405.
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However, Asami's defence of the general reliability of the Chronicler's account of Hezekiah's reform is, perhaps, the most significant in this context. (308) Asami acknowledges the doubtful nature of the number of animals which were Hezekiah's gifts to the people in xxx:24, the difficulty of attempting to determine how many of the ritual details of xxix:30-33 can be ascribed to Hezekiah's time and how many belong to the Chronicler's period, or of trying to decide how much of Hezekiah's letter in xxx:6-10 may be original and how much is the exposition of the Chronicler's theology. (309) He is also sceptical about Hezekiah's address to the Levites in xxix:5ff. and doubtful about the authenticity of xxix:10 which mentions Hezekiah's intention "to make a covenant with Yahweh". Asami expresses equal concern about the Chronicler's omissions, particularly the absence of any reference to the destruction of the bronze serpent "which was perhaps not compatible with the Chr's respect for Jerusalem, David's city, or with Moses' authority." (310) He also thinks "it is incredible that the cleansing of the Temple, a grand sacrificial ceremony, the psh and the following demolition of the local high places should all have taken place within the first two months of the first year of Hezekiah." (311) However, "in spite of all this and still other minor incredibilities", Asami seeks to demonstrate "the substantial reliability of the Chr's account regarding Hezekiah's reform, which involved Israel as well as Judah." (312) Asami argues that when one considers the significant peculiarities in the Chronicler's account of Hezekiah's
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Passover in contrast to that of Josiah — in Hezekiah's time the date of the festival had to be changed, the response from the north was very poor, the people were confused about the ritual preparation for eating the *psh*, and, finally, the festival was extended for another week — then "the burden of proof is on those who deny the substantial historicity of Hezekiah's reform including the *psh* celebration."(314) In fact, he argues, there are "a number of historical and other evidences" which indicate the substantial authenticity of the Chronicler's account of Hezekiah's reform.(315)

Asami maintains that, since Hezekiah's accession (715) "took place in all probability several years after the fall of Samaria" (722/1), then "the argument that his reform including the northern territory, and especially the joint celebration of the *psh*, cannot be historically true—is no longer a convincing one."(316) Not only would it have been recognized that religious unity would have promoted political union and that to rebel against Assyria would have necessitated the repudiation of the Assyrian cults, (317) but prophetic influence would also have motivated Hezekiah to carry out a religious reform since Isaiah, who had been so critical of the situation existing during the reign of Ahaz, was close to the king, encouraging and advising him,(318) and Jer. xxvi:16-19 testifies that Micah's warning concerning the fate of Jerusalem was heard and heeded by Hezekiah: יְהֹוָה יֶבַע לֵבֶן יְהוֹיָחֵד וּלְעָשָׂרֵי הָעָם וּלְעָשָׂרֵי אֲשֶׁרֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשָּׂרֵאֵל לְעָשָׂרֵי יִשָּׂרָאֵל. (Jer. xxvi:19) Asami suggests that when Jeremiah says that Hezekiah was influenced by Micah's prophecy, he might well be implying that Hezekiah undertook a religious reform to fulfil an oracle of Micah which is preserved in
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The obvious difficulty with the argument that the Chronicler's account of the reform is substantially authentic is the fact that the Deuteronomist fails to mention the celebration of the Passover or the attempt to extend the reform to the northern districts. The solution provided by Asami is that "the Dtr's omission of further details of the reform may be explained by his special idealization of Josiah," and the fact that Hezekiah's reform was not comparable with Josiah's, either in its comprehensiveness or in its abiding significance. (320) 2 Chron. xxxi:11 indicates the limited response of those invited to attend the festival and Asami thinks that Rudolph's suggestion that יָשָׁבוּ in 2 Chron. xxxi:1 is secondary, may be correct. (321) Moreover, "these 'few' northerners must not have been able to take such a violent measure as to destroy all the high places and altars, since the majority of their brethren were far from being enthusiastic for Hezekiah's venture" and this may be indicated by the fact that Ephraim, in which territory Bethel stood, is omitted, possibly deliberately, in 2 Chron. xxxi:11. (322) The success of the reform was also limited in time, as 2 Kgs. xxi:3 indicates:
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Nevertheless, while acknowledging that the reform's success was only partial, Asami insists that during Hezekiah's reformation "the first all-Israel celebration of the psh since the disruption of the monarchy was carried out." (323) In his attempt to explain why Hezekiah's policy of cultic centralization took the form of a joint celebration of the psh festival, Asami puts forward the view that Hezekiah deliberately took up the psh as the focus of his unifying policy and his appeal to the north in the name of Yahweh. Asami's thesis is that there must have been some kind of religious authority or authoritative tradition behind the reform which stimulated Hezekiah and to which he could appeal. (324)

Asami dismisses the possible references in 2 Chron. xxix:15, 25; xxx:5, 12, 16, 18 to some definite authorities on which Hezekiah's reform was dependent on the grounds that some may be secondary additions to the original work of the Chronicler (325) and "even if some are not, the question arises as to whether they are to be trusted as referring to the authorities which existed in written form in the time of Hezekiah and not to those of the Chr's own time." (326) However, despite the lack of any clear indication in these references that the written code of Urdeuteronomium was available for Hezekiah's reform, there can be "no doubt that the Dtc law is the only known prescription about the psh which is particularly motivated by the concern for the centralization
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Asami argues that it would have been impossible for Hezekiah to have ventured such a reform and to have succeeded in it, even to a limited extent, unless there had existed, prior to the reform, some kind of authoritative traditions which were well known in both north and south. He thinks that these traditions "must go back ultimately to the idea and/or practice either in the united monarchy or even earlier, because only then was Israel one people, able to carry on unified cultic activities, including the pšḥ ceremony."(328)

Asami, who accepts the northern provenance of the Deuteronomic tradition, argues that there are similarities between Hezekiah's pšḥ and the Deuteronomic law which indicate that, ideally, it was the king's intention to follow the Deuteronomic commandment concerning the pšḥ. (329) On the basis of the affinities of Hezekiah's pšḥ with the Deuteronomic tradition together with the lack of explicit insistence on roasting the sacrifices, Asami deduces "that in Hezekiah's pšḥ the Dtc-northern method of 'boiling' was as acceptable as the Jerusalemite method of 'roasting', because it was the very purpose of Hezekiah to encourage as many northerners as possible to participate in the joint festival."(330)

Further evidence of the influence of the northern Yahwists, represented by the Deuteronomic school, on Hezekiah's reform is adduced by Asami from the fact that the Levites played an equally conspicuous role in this reform as in Josiah's. (331) Asami considers
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it quite probable that the references to Levites in 2 Chron. xxx:17, 21, 25, 27 included northern Levites who had close ties with their southern brethren and who responded to Hezekiah's reform movement by coming to Jerusalem and contributing their service to the joint psh ceremony, which, of course, fits in very well with Deut. xviii:6f.\(^{332}\)

Finally, Asami thinks it is possible that pressure from the northern Yahwistic group may have prompted the "radical action" of demolishing the Bronze Serpent which had long been a venerated cult object in Jerusalem.\(^{333}\)

Asami concludes that both Hezekiah's idea of cult centralization and the joint celebration of the long-neglected psh were inspired by Deuteronomistic tradition "though perhaps not in the written form we now know."\(^{334}\) The Deuteronomist is silent about Hezekiah's psh because "for the Dtr only a real all-Israel celebration of the psh was important."\(^{335}\) Asami completes his discussion by stating that "already in the time of Hezekiah the northern-Dtr. tradition exerted considerable influence in Jerusalem."\(^{336}\)

Asami's conclusion is similar to that of S.D. McBride who says that "the Deuteronomic program must be seen as fully present in the Southern Kingdom by the time of Hezekiah", that this "program, whether in written or oral form became the basis of Hezekiah's unsuccessful attempt to re-establish the Davidic Empire", and that "the same program...was available at the beginning of Josiah's reign and served as the foundation"
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of his reform. (337) The difference between McBride's conclusion and
that of Asami, lies in the fact that McBride "was forced to eliminate
from this 'Deuteronomic' continuity between Hezekiah and Josiah the
observance of the spring festival as the central sanctuary festival" (338)
whereas Asami insists that this spring festival "is (besides the motif of
the cult purge) in fact the only major common factor in Hezekiah's reform,
Josiah's reform, and the Dt tradition." (339) McBride thinks that
the combined psh and mswt was a Jerusalemite tradition which had not
been celebrated since the time of Solomon but which was rescued from
oblivion by Hezekiah, whereas the tradition of the psh alone was "a
more normative (i.e. amphictyonic) celebration of the Passover" to which
the Northern Kingdom had returned "with the beginning of the Divided
Monarchy and the rejection of the Davidic covenant." (340) Psh, according
to McBride, was the only element common to both north and south and
"while both pesah and mas\textsuperscript{c}ot are celebrated under Hezekiah, his appeal
to the northern tribes is to keep the feast of Passover (alone)." (341)
McBride concludes that "there existed a tension between the Dt's emphasis
on pesah and the celebration of both pesah and mas\textsuperscript{c}ot by Hezekiah", that
this may have been one of the reasons why so few northerners accepted
Hezekiah's invitation, and, finally, that under Josiah "the amphictyonic
ideal which formed the basis of his passover celebration won over the
Jerusalemite combination of both pesah and mas\textsuperscript{c}ot. (342) According to
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McBride, therefore, under Hezekiah there was re-instituted the Jerusalemite custom of celebrating both pesah and massōt, whereas under Josiah the purer tradition of pesah alone was finally restored for the first time since the age of Samuel. Asami, on the other hand, maintains that the mswt element "was never absent from Josiah's psh" and, consequently, the hypothesis "that a tension existed between the psh-mswt combination (south) and the psh alone (north) is...entirely unwarranted."(343) It is "precisely in the mswt section of the entire festival of Hezekiah that we read": "(2 Chron. xxx:21). Acknowledging the fact that "the northern-Dtc tradition seems to have become much more dominant in Josiah's reform than in Hezekiah's", Asami maintains that "such a change can and should be explained not in terms of an imaginary scheme of the movement from the psh-mswt to the psh alone but in terms of the degree to which the Sinaitic-amphictyonic covenant tradition was re-introduced into the Jerusalem-Davidic covenant theology, as is eloquently illustrated in Josiah's covenant ceremony which resulted from the discovery of the BL."(344) Thus, according to Asami, "the 'common tradition' to which Hezekiah appealed in his invitation to the northern tribes was that of the archaic psh-mswt festival as a whole."(345) and he also argues that "there exists no conscious and meaningful difference between Hezekiah's and Josiah's festivals in terms of the names...which might suggest the different character or historical
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backgrounds of the two festivals." (346) The Chronicler's comment that there had been nothing like Hezekiah's psh since the time of Solomon refers primarily to the fact that this was the first time since Solomon that psh was celebrated on such an elaborate scale in Jerusalem in terms of the number of participants and of sacrifices offered, but above all in terms of services performed by the priests and, in particular, by the Levites. (347) In Josiah's time, the quality of the participants was the new feature and, since this was "the first time since the days of the twelve-tribe league" (348) that the real all-Israel celebration of the psh was achieved, the Chronicler emphasises the qualitative completeness of the participants in Josiah's psh (2 Chron. xxxv:18).

This concludes Asami's case for the substantial historicity of the Chronicler's account of Hezekiah's reform and it now remains to evaluate the strength of this position. It seems very probable that in the time of Hezekiah the Deuteronomistic circle exerted considerable influence in Jerusalem and that this circle brought pressure to bear on Hezekiah, particularly with regard to centralizing sacrificial worship at Jerusalem. However, the arguments put forward to support the claim that the Chronicler's account of the celebration of Passover and the extension of the reform to include the northern districts, do not carry conviction. Not only is there no solid evidence to support the historicity of either the Passover celebration or the Northern reform, but the fact that neither event is

346. Ibid., p.140. Contra Kraus, 'Zur Geschichte des Passah-Massot- Festes im Alten Testament', EvTh, xviii, 1958, pp.47-67, ref. pp.64f., who argues that in Hezekiah's period the psh festival was called hg hmσrw, which Kraus thinks was the customary name of the spring festival in Solomon's time, whereas, in the case of Josiah, the festival was called psh, which Kraus maintains was its name in the days of the amphictyony. Asami, op.cit., pp.139ff., is of the opinion that the designation mswt occurs where reference is to the ritual calendar (cf. Exod. xxiii:15; xxxiv:8; Deut.xvi:16), whereas psh is employed when special emphasis or explanation is given to that part of the spring festival for heilsgeschichtlichen (cf. Exod. xii; Josh. iii-v; Deut. xvi:1-8) or ritual (cf. Lev. xxxiii:5; Num. xxviii:16) reasons.
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recorded in 2 Kings militates against the Chronicler's account, for the Deuteronomistic historian would undoubtedly have recorded both events with particular relish if they had taken place. (349) Asami's argument that the Deuteronomistic historian's omission of these details "may be explained by his special idealization of Josiah" is unconvincing, especially in view of the fact that the Deuteronomist's tribute to Hezekiah: הַדּוּרְכֵּה אֶלֶּ֣הַיָּ֔הָ הָעָ֖שָׁה בּוֹקց֑רַת לְגֵהֶ֨ה הָעָ֖שָׁה מִלְיֹֽהֶהּ בַּמּוֹדֶ֖ה הַמֶּֽשֶׁרֶךְ הַלְּכָֽהֶה (2 Kgs. xviii:5) is virtually identical to the epitaph composed for Josiah: יָֽמָהּ לְאֵ֣לֶּ֔הַיָּהָ הָעָ֖שָׁה בּוֹקց֑רַת לְגֵהֶ֨הַיָּ֖ה הָעָ֖שָׁה מִלְיֹֽהֶהּ בַּמּוֹדֶ֖ה (2 Kgs. xxiii:25). Moreover, if the Deuteronomist had in fact wished to tone down Hezekiah's reformation then it would seem very odd that he should have accorded Hezekiah with having attempted cultic centralization, which is the criterion by which all kings are assessed and for which very act Josiah, too, is praised unconditionally, and yet have omitted the comparatively much less important details about the celebration of the Passover and the attempt to extend the reform northwards.

Some support for the argument against the historicity of the Chronicler's 'extra' details about Hezekiah's reform may be adduced from the fact that the Chronicler is inconsistent with regard to Hezekiah's invitation, which, in 2 Chron. xxx:4 ranges from Beersheba to Dan while, in v.10, the invitation is extended only as far as Zebulun, although "Beersheba to Dan" may be simply an expression meaning "throughout all Israel." More important, however, is the fact that, as Welch rightly points out, a study of the Chronicler's

method in his account of Hezekiah's reform not only sheds light on the aims which guided him but "illustrates...the extent to which he was prepared to modify the facts of history in order to adapt them to his purpose." (350) For example, because the Chronicler was concerned to show that the marvellous deliverance of Jerusalem was directly due to Hezekiah's piety, he omitted any reference to the date of Sennacherib's campaign and, more significantly, he deleted from the message of the Assyrian king any reference to Judah's desire to obtain Egyptian aid (cf. 2 Kgs. xviii:21, 24). Whereas the Deuteronomistic historian relates that the king was largely motivated to prayer by fear, the Chronicler makes Hezekiah have recourse to God in faith (2 Chron. xxxii:6-8).

In order to emphasize complete trust of the people in God and the absence of any panic in the city, the Chronicler omitted the request of the royal officers that the Rabshakeh should refrain from speaking to the inhabitants of Jerusalem in their own language, and, to heighten the marvellous and complete character of the divine deliverance, he failed to mention the fact that the Assyrians captured the provincial towns and carried many of their inhabitants into captivity. The Chronicler's motive for reporting the letter of the Assyrian king is to show that the series of insults which it contained against the God of Israel and the pious Hezekiah constituted another reason for Sennacherib's complete and ignominious withdrawal, but no mention is made about the humiliating demands it contained, or about the extent to which Hezekiah complied with them. Finally, in his report of Hezekiah's illness, the resultant miracle, and the embassy from Babylonia, the Chronicler, "without entirely omitting these events, slurred them over" (351)


in order to preserve a relatively serene picture of the king's absolute faith in Yahweh and its reward. (352)

The Chronicler obviously wished to present Hezekiah as a faithful and pious king who, giving special attention to the temple and its cult, restored the religion of Yahweh after the lapse under Ahaz and who relied implicitly "on the power of religion to give character to a nation, and even to maintain its independence." (353) As to the amount of confidence which can be placed in the Chronicler's account as an historical record of events, Welch, examining the thesis that Josiah was the first who, in the interests of cultic centralization, transferred passover to the sanctuary, and that Deuteronomy was the book of the law on which the reform was based, expresses the opinion that the Chronicler's record must be taken seriously. More attention should be given to the fact that the Chronicler, "a responsible writer, whose book has found its way into the Jewish Canon, had no hesitation in dating the first tentative movement for centralization, and the change of locus for passover in the time of Hezekiah, and...by doing this, he made it impossible to connect either movement with the discovery of the book of the law." (354) In response to this statement, it may be said that the fact that the Chronicler's work has been included in the Jewish Canon has no bearing whatsoever on the question of the historicity or otherwise of the Chronicler's account of Hezekiah's reform. Secondly, the designation "responsible writer" seems to be singularly inapt in view of the extent to which the Chronicler "was prepared to modify the facts of history in order to
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adapt them to his purpose." (355) Finally, even if one were to accept the Chronicler's account, this would in no way lessen the possibility that both Hezekiah and Josiah were strongly influenced by Deuteronomism in their desire to implement cultic centralization and to transfer Passover to the sanctuary.

It would appear that the Chronicler has shifted some of the glory of Josiah to Hezekiah. The Chronicler was concerned to stress that the Davidic line was the true one and to emphasize not only the legitimacy of the Jerusalem sanctuary, but also its uniqueness as the sole legitimate shrine for sacrificial worship of Yahweh. (356) The Chronicler's account of Hezekiah's Passover was probably created in order to emphasize the position of Jerusalem as the cult centre of the nation and to reinforce the writer's belief that all rites performed anywhere other than the official cult place were invalid. (357) That the Chronicler virtually recast the work of the Deuteronomistic historian by making the reform dominate the reign, and relegating the defeat of Sennacherib and the deliverance of Jerusalem into a relatively inferior position, need occasion no surprise when one bears in mind that, although religion and politics were inextricably linked, this writer accentuated religion, because, as Myers rightly points out, "it remained the one possibility for meeting the situation prevalent in his time." (358) In trying to overcome the threat to the religious

355. Welch, op.cit., p.97. Cf. ibid., p.121, where Welch concludes that aside from 2 Chron. xxxi, which is in a "confused condition", the narrative "whatever may be its historical value...represents his attitude and reflects his point of view".
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unity of his people, the Chronicler was impelled to lay great emphasis
upon the Jerusalem cultus with its history and precedents. This
writer firmly maintained that the united congregation of God's people
were lineal descendants of those whom David invested to perform the
service of the sanctuary at Jerusalem, which was the sole legitimate
cult place of Yahweh. Although the Chronicler regarded the Northern
Kingdom as having been "conceived in sin, born in iniquity, and
nurtured in adultery", (359) he always envisaged the possibility of
northerners participating in the Jerusalem cultus provided that they
were suitably humble and accepted "the historic tradition with its
stipulations and requirements." (360)

The Chronicler's treatment of the past as a lesson for the present
was motivated by his pragmatic, theological purpose, which provided him
with a licence to select and emphasize those traditions in his sources
which he considered to be edifying. However, the Chronicler not only
omitted from the sources at his disposal whatever he considered
irrelevant or unsuitable, but he also had a much stronger tendency than
the Deuteronomistic historian to fabricate material in order to fortify
his convictions. Moriarty's opinion that "the Chronicler...sought a
clue to the meaning and direction of Israel's history but not at the
expense of falsifying that history" (361) must be rejected in favour of
the view that the Chronicler modified the facts of history to suit his
purpose and that he was prepared to falsify history to the extent of
fabricating events to bolster his thesis or to teach a particular lesson.
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Consequently, Bright's confident assertion that "in spite of the Chronicler's characteristic handling of the material...there is no reason whatever to question the historicity" of Hezekiah's invitation to the people of the northern state and their participation in the reform programme and the Passover celebration in Jerusalem, does not carry conviction. The Chronicler's account of Hezekiah's Passover and extension of the reform to the northern territory seems to have been shaped by the events recorded of Josiah in 2 Kgs. xxiii and prompted by the writer's desire to highlight the uniqueness of Jerusalem as Yahweh's sanctuary and his special concern with the unity of all Israel.

364. Even Moriarty, op.cit., p.403, agrees that the Chronicler's theological perspective was "dominated by the vision of a united Israel with its capital and cult center at Jerusalem." It has been widely held that it was probably the Samaritan problem of his own time that motivated the Chronicler's special concern with the unity of 'all Israel'. (Thus, for example, H.J. Kraus, Worship in Israel, pp.51ff., who is sceptical whether any historical basis underlies the Chronicler's account of Hezekiah's activity in the northern territory, suggests that the Chronicler's 'additions' here reflect cultic controversies which existed between the Jerusalem community and the Samaritans in the third century B.C. Cf., too, Elmslie 'The First and Second Books of Chronicles: Introduction and Exegesis', IB, iii, pp.344f.). McKay, Religion in Judah under the Assyrians, p.87, n.32, argues that this conclusion "must be balanced by the consideration that the Chronicler is also intent on preserving purity and exclusiveness in the community." However, this view has been challenged by R.J. Coggins, 'The Old Testament and Samaritan Origins', ASTI, vi, 1967-8, pp.35-48, ref. p.46; idem, Samaritans and Jews, pp.19ff., 71ff., who argues that "there is no reference to the Samaritans in the Hebrew Old Testament" and that "some of the allusions in the work of the Chronicler may point to a situation which would later develop into Judaeo-Samaritan hostility, but that is the most that can be said" (ibid., p.163). Concerning the account of Hezekiah, Coggins writes: "Whether a specifically Samaritan interpretation is correct seems doubtful" (ibid., p.21). On the question of the historicity of the Chronicler's account, Coggins displays a certain ambivalence, for while he suggests with regard to Hezekiah's Passover, that "the historical element here may be less than elsewhere in the account of Hezekiah" (ibid.), he concludes that "we may regard it as likely that Hezekiah did indeed show
The problem of the historicity of the Chronicler's account is a storm centre of debate in the study of the extent and motivation of Hezekiah's reformation, but equally problematic is the question of the extent to which the king was influenced by religious and political factors. It may be granted that "Hezekiah's policy was one in which nationalism and Yahwistic zeal to a large degree converged." (365) Difficulty is encountered, however, in attempting to determine the degree to which religious and political factors combined to influence Hezekiah to reform the cult and, in particular, to centralize sacrificial worship at Jerusalem. Commentators have always found it difficult to keep the religious and political influences in balance. Thus, for example, Noth lays too much emphasis on the political aspect. He refers to those measures described as having been carried out by Hezekiah in 2 Kgs. xviii:4 and for which Hezekiah was praised unreservedly by the Deuteronomist in 2 Kgs. xviii:3, as "the so-called religious reforms of king Hezekiah." (366) Robinson supports his stress on the political aspect of the reformation by pointing to the fact that "nowhere have we the slightest reference to this reform in the extant work of Isaiah, and it is hardly credible that it should have passed entirely without notice if the prophet had seen that it was based on purely religious motives." (367) The problem is raised even more acutely with regard to cultic centralization by the opinion expressed by Snaith who says that "if the reform of

364. contd. an interest in the territory of the northern kingdom, possibly with a view to restoring the borders of his territory to those of David, at a time of hoped-for Assyrian weakness; that religious reform may well have been associated with this, though the terms in which it is described are to a considerable extent a reading back from the norms of a later period" (ibid., pp.21f.)


Hezekiah was primarily a reaction against Assyrian cults, the reference to the abolition of the local shrines may be due to an editor who read into Hezekiah's time policies which belonged to a later generation.”(368)

To what extent it is possible to concur with Fohrer that "we are dealing here with political measures, one element in the renunciation of foreign sovereignty and the striving for independence"?(369) On the other hand, how legitimate is McKay's opinion that "it may also be argued that the reforming influence on Hezekiah himself was more religious than political, and possibly even Deuteronomic"?(370)

In the mind of the present writer, McKay's argument that there was Deuteronomic influence on Hezekiah is perfectly valid, although it will be argued here, as above, that McKay's conclusion that neither the evidence of the Deuteronomist nor that of the Chronicler lends support to the thesis that Hezekiah's reformation was motivated by a political desire to rid the land of regnant Assyrian deities, (371) not only does not carry conviction but also indicates that, in the case of McKay, the pendulum has swung too far the other way for he is guilty of over-emphasizing the religious aspect of the reformation. A much more serious weakness in McKay's work on the subject is the fact that he fails to account satisfactorily for the motivation of Hezekiah's attempt to centralize the cult and for the presence of the law of cultic centralization in the book of Deuteronomy. Nevertheless, both Gray and McKay are right to suggest that Hezekiah's reform "may reflect the crystallization of opinion which is associated with the Deuteronomic circle." (372)
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problem, however, lies in trying to determine the extent to which the Deuteronomic principles had crystallized by the time Hezekiah attempted to reform the cult, particularly with regard to the demand for cultic centralization, but, if Deuteronomic influence did play a part in the reformation of Hezekiah, then is it not more reasonable to conclude that the king was motivated to centralize sacrificial worship at Jerusalem under the influence of Deuteronomism, than to deduce, with Nicholson and McKay, that the demand for cultic centralization was not a principle of those circles among whom Deuteronomy originated and that the Deuteronomic movement only decided to adopt Hezekiah's innovation in the interests of cultic purity and as a means of countering the widespread syncretism of the rural shrines? (373)

The whole problem of the tension between political and religious factors in the debate about Hezekiah's reform and the motivation of the demand for cultic centralization may be highlighted by examining what is generally regarded to be one of the best balanced treatments - that of E.W. Nicholson - of the relationship between the reformation of Hezekiah, Josiah's reform, and the book of Deuteronomy. (374) Nicholson's thesis is that Deuteronomy had its origins among prophetic circles of the Northern Kingdom who preserved and transmitted the sacral and cultic traditions of the old Israelite amphictyony during the period of the monarchy (375) and that the circle which was responsible for Deuteronomy, while originating in northern Israel, had fled

---

373. Nicholson, Deuteronomy and Tradition, Oxford, 1967, pp.79, 83, 97, 100, et passim; McKay, Josiah's Reformation, pp.411ff., 421. Cf., too, Myers, II Chronicles, p.177, who writes: "Deuteronomy's legislation may have been based, in part, on a Hezekian precedent, in which case the D code may have been formulated in connection with Hezekiah's attempt to unify the nation in the worship of Jerusalem."


375. Nicholson, Deuteronomy and Tradition, pp.83, 106, et passim. But, cf. more recently, idem, Exodus and Sinai in History and Tradition, p.27, where he observes that recent research has shown that the theory of an early Israelite amphictyony "is highly questionable."
south to Judah after 721 B.C. and there formulated their programme of reform and revival, with Jerusalem as its political and cultic centre. (376) However, like so many exegetes, Nicholson seems to find Hezekiah's religious reform, particularly the demand for cultic centralization, something of an embarrassment. The weakness which the present writer detects in Nicholson's thesis is the fact that, while he argues that the collapse and destruction of the northern kingdom in 721 B.C. prompted a movement for cultic and religious reformation as the complement of the political desire of the Judaean authorities to take the opportunity to extend the borders of the southern kingdom to include the northern provinces and to re-unite the people into an all-Israel state, he does not appear to identify the movement pressing for cultic and religious reformation in the time of Hezekiah with Deuteronomism. (377) Nicholson rightly says that the "movement for cultic and religious reformation...no doubt originated among Yahwistic circles who saw the calamity which had befallen the northern people as Yahweh's judgment upon their apostasy and idolatry and who wished to avoid a similar fate for Judah." (378) However, the lack of any reference here to that circle of northerners amongst whom Deuteronomy had its origins, seems to imply that, according to Nicholson, these northern refugees are not to be understood as belonging to that movement which "arose in Judah in the late eighth century...which aimed at both political and religious renewal" and which "stands behind the reformation and rebellion of Hezekiah in whose reign the first opportunity for

377. Ibid., pp.98ff.
378. Ibid., pp.98f.
realizing its aims arose." (379) In an article written in 1963, Nicholson maintained that since, according to the Old Testament documents, "Hezekiah was the first ever to abolish the high places and to concentrate public worship at one sanctuary....therefore...it is to Hezekiah's reign that we must seek for the origin of the centralisation of the cult." (380) In this article, Nicholson rejected the suggestion that the Deuteronomic demand for a central place of sacrificial worship had its origin in the central shrine of the amphictyonic period on the ground that "it fails to distinguish sufficiently enough between the amphictyonic shrine as the main shrine among many and the Deuteronomic demand for one and only one shrine for all Israel." (381) In his more recent work, Nicholson argues that Deuteronomy "stands within the traditions of this old Israelite amphictyony of the pre-monarchical period" to such an extent that "one cannot avoid the feeling that this central shrine is the prototype, so to speak, of the Deuteronomic demand for the centralization of worship." (382) However, the contradiction here is more apparent than real for Nicholson goes on to say that Deuteronomy's "more extreme demand for only one place of cultic worship for all Israel had its origin...at a much later time than the period of the tribal league", (383) and, later in the book, he repeats his assertion that the suggestion that the demand for cultic centralization has its origin in the amphictyonic central shrine is unsatisfactory

379. Ibid., p.99.
381. Ibid. Cf., too, Clements, God's Chosen People, p.76; idem, God and Temple, p.93, and see above, p.29, n.64.
383. Ibid.
since "it fails to distinguish between the amphictyonic shrine as the main cultic centre among a multiplicity of local sanctuaries and the Deuteronomic demand for one and only one place of worship for all Israel." (384) Following Clements, (385) Nicholson thinks it best to interpret Deuteronomy's law of centralization "as referring to Jerusalem and as having its origin within the context of the Jerusalem cult traditions", (386) and he concludes that Deuteronomy's demand for cultic centralization probably had as its background "the claims of the Jerusalem Temple to a position of primacy and, by the time of Hezekiah, to absolute and exclusive cultic centrality." (387)

Nicholson maintains that while Hezekiah's centralization of the cult and the other cultic innovations described in 2 Kgs. xviii:4f. did give expression to the desire for religious renewal and reform at that time, these reforms may have been motivated to a certain extent by political aims. (388) There would probably have been an ever increasing pressure to reform the high places drastically or even to abolish them completely since they had been largely responsible for the tragedy which had befallen the Northern Kingdom - which was nothing less than Yahweh's judgment on apostasy and idolatry - and because they

384. Ibid., p.95.
386. Nicholson, op.cit., p.95. Cf., too, ibid., p.83, where Nicholson says that the demand for cultic centralization "as far as we know, was never advocated by any northern circle whether priestly or prophetic."
387. Ibid., p.121. Cf., too, ibid., p.96, where he writes: "the most reasonable conclusion is that in their law of the sanctuary the authors of Deuteronomy were giving expression to the traditional primacy of Jerusalem and lending support and indeed in their book claiming Mosaic authority for the innovation made by Hezekiah."
were a constant source of idolatry in Judah as well. However another powerful source of centralizing tendencies in Judah and especially in Jerusalem would have been the realization by those who wished to take the opportunity of the destruction of the Northern Kingdom to extend the borders of Judah and to re-establish the kingdom of Israel as it had been in David's day, of "the necessity of re-constituting Jerusalem as the religious centre of the nation as a whole." (389) But while there was in Judah after the fall of the Northern Kingdom in 721 B.C. a religio-political movement with centralising tendencies, Nicholson suggests that the final cause of Hezekiah's act of cultic centralization "arose...out of conditions brought about by Sennacherib's first invasion of Judah in 701 B.C." (390) When Sennacherib acceded to the throne of Assyria on the death of his predecessor Sargon in 705 B.C., there was widespread rebellion throughout the Assyrian empire. (391) Hezekiah seized this opportunity to reject Assyrian suzerainty of Judah and indeed seems to have been a ringleader of the revolt in the west. When, by 701 B.C., Sennacherib had regained the upper hand, he marched on Judah in retaliation to subdue the rebels and to re-establish the Assyrian hegemony and, even allowing for some exaggeration in the Taylor Prism, Judah suffered heavily for her part in the rebellion before Hezekiah surrendered. (392) Quite apart from the heavy tribute


390. Ibid.


extracted from Hezekiah, a large portion of Judah, perhaps even the entire country except Jerusalem, was given by the Assyrians to the faithful Philistine kings of Ekron, Gaza, and Ashdod. Moreover, Nicholson considers it more than probable that Sennacherib followed the customary Assyrian policy of importing foreigners from other parts of the empire in order to replace those whom he had taken captive, and he suggests that 2 Chron. xxix:8f. may preserve the memory of the captivity under Sennacherib. (393) Thus, not only were the Assyrian cult emblems and practices re-introduced into the Jerusalem temple, "where they would have been placed as a sign of Assyrian suzerainty", (394) but, with the importation of foreigners into Judah, all sorts of other foreign cults were also introduced. Nicholson's thesis is that "it was in these circumstances...that Hezekiah was forced to abolish the high places and to concentrate worship in Jerusalem." (395) Hezekiah's principal motive for cultic centralization was the desire to counteract the cancer of syncretism caused by the presence of foreign cults in the land and to arrest the concomitant decline in nationalistic fervour in order to ensure the success of the struggle for independence from Assyria, at a time when the Assyrians were being increasingly troubled by uprisings in Babylon in the decade which followed 701 B.C. However, while Hezekiah's action "was largely a political move", Nicholson acknowledges the fact that it cannot have been entirely due to political motives since "there was probably in Judah at this time a strong desire among loyal Yahwists to reform drastically the local high places." (396)

396. Ibid., p.386.
Nicholson does not take into consideration the possibility that the Deuteronomic movement might have exerted influence on Hezekiah to centralize the cult. What he envisages is "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" and he concludes that "it is more than a plausible inference that it is within this group that we must seek for the author(s) of Deuteronomy in which the centralisation of worship became 'the law of Yahweh by the hand of Moses'." (397) Herein lies the weakness of Nicholson's thesis for this conclusion does not carry conviction.

Nicholson's threefold thesis that the major events of Hezekiah's reform took place between 701 and 688, namely, between Sennacherib's two campaigns, that the Deuteronomic law of exclusive cult centralization had its "origin" in the unifying policy of king Hezekiah, and that it was only after the miraculous deliverance of Jerusalem from the Assyrian siege in 688 B.C. that this Deuteronomic demand first took the form of the Mosaic law among "some group in Judah", has been severely criticized by Asami, for three reasons. (398) Firstly, Asami scathingly refers to Nicholson's distribution of the major events of Hezekiah's reform between 701 and 688 as being "based mostly on his own imaginative reasoning." (399) Asami argues that according to both the Deuteronomistic

397. Ibid.


399. Ibid., p.109, n.1. W.R. Smith, The Prophets of Israel, second edition, London, 1895, pp.359ff., places the reform in the midst of Sennacherib's campaign, which, as Rowley, 'Hezekiah's Reform and Rebellion', Men of God, p.131, n.2, rightly argues, is improbable. Rowley, following Noth, The History of Israel, p.266, places the reform "at some time between 705 and 701 B.C." and thinks this is a safer period to date the reform than 705 B.C., which is the date advocated by Snaith, IE, iii, p.289.
historian and the Chronicler, Hezekiah's reform, including the abolition of the local high places and the joint celebration of the nōm, took place prior not only to the second but also to the first campaign of Sennacherib. Asami accuses Nicholson of reconstructing "a different, imaginary history" from that presented by the biblical narrative and he asserts that "there is no reason whatsoever to doubt the OT accounts that the reform started quite early in Hezekiah's reign and many reform measures had been taken during the fourteen years between his accession and Sennacherib's first campaign (cf. II Kg 18: 13)."(400) Asami agrees with Nicholson that Hezekiah's revolt "was inseparable from his (and Judah's) desire to restore the united kingdom of David"(401) when Assyrian control over North Israel seemed to have weakened, and he also concurs with Nicholson's opinion that the religious unity of all Israel was a most desirable precondition for this political union.(402) However, Asami maintains that such a religious move could have been started prior to the decisive political rebellion since Assyrian power was on the decline to such an extent that "after 721 Sargon conducted no major campaign in Palestine"(403) and "under such circumstances, the reform could be advanced without becoming too offensive to the Assyrian ruler all at once."(404) Asami follows Bright in arguing that, although repudiation of the Assyrian gods would hardly have happened long before the final break in 705, since such an

400. Ibid.
401. Ibid., p.107.
402. Ibid., p.108.
act was virtually tantamount to a declaration of rebellion, reforming measures were almost certainly taken long before that as Hezekiah's policy was at first put into action cautiously and then intensified and broadened as the risk of possible Assyrian reaction was guaged to be lessening and the independence movement gained momentum. (405)

While it is possible to have some degree of sympathy with Asami's protest that there is an historical difficulty in Nicholson's argument, little of real value would be gained for the purpose of this study by entering into a detailed discussion of all the problems involved in attempting to determine the date of each of Hezekiah's reform measures and their chronological order. The same holds true for the debate about the question whether the non-Assyrian accounts of Sennacherib's siege of Jerusalem refer to one or two campaigns by this Assyrian king in the West, of which the first was his third campaign in 701 B.C., Hezekiah's fourteenth year, and the second between 689 and 686 B.C., following Assyrian operations against Arabia. Although it is clear that Hezekiah was the focus of the anti-Assyrian forces in the West and that Jerusalem experienced an eleventh hour reprieve from the assault by Sennacherib's besieging armies, which served to entrench more firmly than ever the traditional belief that the city was inviolate because Yahweh was in its midst thereby guaranteeing its protection, (406) Sennacherib's own account of the siege of Jerusalem "has given rise to one of the most debated historical problems of the O.T." (407)

Without wishing to side-step any issue of importance it seems to the

405. Ibid., pp.108f., following Bright, A History of Israel, ² p.280.
407. Wiseman, op.cit., p.64.
present writer that this issue really lies outside the scope of this study and that no useful purpose would be served by re-stating the case for the two-campaign theory and those objections which have been raised against it. (408)

Asami's second contention with Nicholson's view is that "Hezekiah's reform was not the kind of reform which could be carried out without any preceding tradition" (409) and his third objection is that "Nicholson's argument completely disregards the problem of the northern tie of the Dtc tradition." (410) Not only may it be said that these two criticisms of Nicholson's thesis are valid, but it is also possible to agree with Asami that the central sanctuary "was an ideal in the normative faith of Israel" (411) while, at the same time, rejecting Asami's presupposition concerning the existence of an Israelite amphictyony in the period of the Judges. (412) In fairness to Nicholson, it must be said that it was three years after Asami's thesis was written that Nicholson published his book on Deuteronomy in which he attempts to show that the amphictyonic shrine may well have been the 'prototype' of the Deuteronomic law for cultic centralization (413) and that the northern tie of the Deuteronomic tradition is to be explained by the fact that Deuteronomy had its origins among prophetic circles of the Northern Kingdom who had fled south to Judah after
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413. Nicholson, Deuteronomy and Tradition, p.49.
721 B.C. Nevertheless, while he deals adequately with the question of Deuteronomy's link with the Northern Kingdom, the fact remains that Nicholson has failed to account satisfactorily for Hezekiah's motive for centralizing the cult, and he has not provided a convincing explanation of the origin of the demand for a sole central sanctuary in the book of Deuteronomy. Nicholson rightly points out that, while the demand for only one place of cultic worship for all Israel which is formulated in the plural form of address in Deut. xii:5 was probably inserted by the Deuteronomist, whose constant preoccupation was the polemic against the paraphernalia of the Canaanite cult and whose obsession was the centralization of sacrificial worship in Jerusalem and the consequent abolition of the high places, the same law which is formulated in the singular in Deut. xii:14 was an original part of the book. Not only does Deut. xii:8-14 demand the destruction of all Yahweh sanctuaries other than the central shrine, a distinct advancement upon the altar law in the Book of the Covenant in Exodus xx:24 but, far from being easy to remove from the point of view of literary criticism, "it would require nothing less than violent surgery of the text to remove the centralization demand with all its consequences and associated laws from the book." One must concur wholeheartedly with Nicholson when he says that the demand is integral to the very character of Deuteronomy and that "it belongs without any doubt to the original
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composition of the book...and must therefore be seen as having been an essential part of the author's theology."(417) However, Nicholson's twofold conclusion that "Deuteronomy stands within the sacral traditions of the old Israelite amphictyony"(418) and that the demand for cultic centralization was not originally a principle of the Deuteronomic circle but "must certainly have originated at a relatively late period in Israel's history",(419) must be rejected.

Nicholson is undoubtedly right when he argues that because Hezekiah was the first king to attempt cult centralization "it is hardly a coincidence that at a slightly later period a book made its appearance in Jerusalem which contained a formulation of a law demanding precisely what Hezekiah had attempted to do in the cultic sphere."(420) However, although Nicholson deduces that the members of the Deuteronomic circle were impressed by Hezekiah's innovation and decided to adopt cultic centralization "simply in the interests of cultic purity and as a means of countering the widespread syncretism which had pervaded the rural shrines",(421) it is a great deal more probable, as will be shown later, that the demand for cultic centralization not only constituted part of the original composition of the book of Deuteronomy, but had always been an ideal in the minds of those northern refugees who fled to Judah after 721 B.C. and there began to formulate those principles of reform which they wished to have implemented in order to save the Southern Kingdom from a fate similar to that suffered by northern Israel. It seems much more probable that Hezekiah was

417. Ibid.
418. Ibid, p.57, et passim.
420. Ibid., p.96.
421. Ibid., p.97.
influenced to centralize the cult by pressure brought to bear on him by the Deuteronomic circle, than that this circle only adopted the concept of cultic centralization when they embodied some of the basic principles of Hezekiah's reformation while drawing up their programme of reform during the subsequent reign of Manasseh.

Nicholson fails to keep the political and religious factors operating in Hezekiah's reform in as fine a balance as he manages to do in the case of Josiah's reformation. He is guilty of overstressing the political aspect of the reform and is led to derive the demand for cultic centralization from the political necessities of Hezekiah's reign. (422) That Nicholson is not wholly persuaded by his own reasoning in this regard may be reflected in two statements which, although not exactly contradictory, do seem to be in tension. On the one hand, he says that, while Hezekiah's motives for centralizing the cult are not clearly known to us, "it is possible that they were largely political and sprang from his desire to re-establish the political and cultic centrality of Jerusalem, perhaps particularly against the claims of Bethel, in his attempt to regain possession of the territory of the northern kingdom and to establish once again the 'all Israel' state of the Davidic-Solomonic period". (423) On the other hand, he maintains that while cultic centralization and the abolition of the Assyrian cultic emblems from the temple precincts "may have been motivated to some degree by political aims...it can hardly be doubted that with the other cultic innovations and changes noted in 2 Kgs. xviii:4f. they also gave expression to the desire for religious...

renewal and reform abroad at the time."(424) However, while Nicholson does envisage a certain amount of pressure from religious quarters, the fact remains that he overemphasizes the political motivation for Hezekiah's reform to the extent that he has overlooked the distinct possibility that Hezekiah was influenced by the Deuteronomistic movement particularly with regard to the implementation of cultic centralization.

Clements, while conceding that the political necessities of Hezekiah's reign may have partly influenced the demand for cultic centralization,(425) rightly maintains that the motives for centralizing sacrificial worship to a single sanctuary were manifold and that the demand cannot have derived either from the memory of the amphictyony or simply as a political manoeuvre designed to further Hezekiah's rebellion against the Assyrians.(426) He expresses the opinion that "overall the aim was undoubtedly to remove the menace of the Canaanite high-places, with their crude nature worship, by restricting the cult to a shrine over which control could be exercised, and where the covenant tradition was maintained."(427) Deuteronomy is "intensely concerned for a pure cult, divested of any influence from Canaanite religion" and "the demand for centralization must be in accord with this overall aim."(428) Clearly, the religious motive must be emphasized and Clements is certainly right to stress the concern to maintain the closest vigilance over the operation of the cult in order to ensure its orthodoxy as a powerful motivating force behind the
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demand for cultic centralization. With regard to the relationship between Hezekiah's reform and Deuteronomism, Clements thinks that the circles responsible for formulating Deuteronomy were northern Levites, many of whom had been dispossessed of their means of livelihood after 721 B.C., and he maintains that it was "within circles drawn from the Levitical cult-personnel" that there arose a feeling of dissatisfaction and desire for reform. (429) These circles, who nursed this desire for reform "over a considerable period", "were responsible for a far-reaching reform in the days of Josiah". (430) Hezekiah, of course, had already made "some attempt at cultic reform...in Jerusalem" but "neither in this instance, nor the more significant attempt in Josiah's day, does the main stimulus appear to have come from the Jerusalem cult-officials, but from provincial Levitical groups, whose background lay in the shrines of northern Israel." (431)


430. Clements, God and Temple, p.87.

431. Ibid., pp.87f. Cf., too, Moriarty, 'The Chronicler's Account of Hezekiah's Reform', CBQ, xxvii, 1965, p.402, n.7, who writes: "Shortly after the fall of Samaria in 721 Levites who had been active at northern sanctuaries fled south bringing with them the nucleus of Deuteronomic law which probably had some influence on Hezekiah's reform." M. Weinfeld, Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School, Oxford, 1972, argues that the origin of the Deuteronomic school is to be found in scribal circles of the second half of the seventh century B.C. and "though we first hear of the literary activity of the scribes - wise men - in the reign of Josiah, it or its predecessors had doubtlessly already begun almost a century before, in the Hezekian period" (ibid., p.161). In the light of the precedents set by Asa and Jehoshaphat, he thinks "it is plausible to assume that the kernel of the deuteronomic code stems from the earlier reforms, which may have been consolidated in the form of books like the book of Jehoshaphat" (ibid., p.164). While "its literary form, its canonization in a public ceremony, and its consequent acceptance
While his conclusion that it was within Levitical circles that Deuteronomy originated is questionable and while, too, he may be criticized for failing to elaborate on the reforms of Hezekiah and this king's relationship with these Levitical circles, Clements is certainly correct in suggesting, as Gray and McKay have done, that Hezekiah's reform received its principal stimulus from the Deuteronomic circle. The political aspect of Hezekiah's reform must not be underestimated. (432)

Just as Ahaz's command concerning the construction of a copy of the Assyrian altar at Damascus and the removal or, at least, rearrangement of some of the Temple structures after he had offered his submission

431. contd. as the nation's written constitution were undoubtedly the outcome of the Josianic reform, Weinfeld thinks that "the main kernel of the book presumably antedated Josiah and may have been crystallized in the time of Hezekiah" (ibid.) The scribes "gave full expression to the religious national aims of Hezekiah and Josiah in the laws dealing with cult centralization and the extirpation of the foreign cult" (ibid., p. 166) but while "the formation of these laws was apparently begun in the Hezekian period", they were "crystallized finally only in Josianic times" (ibid., n. 5). It is interesting that Weinfeld regards the literary compositions of D and P as concurrent rather than successive documents and he thinks that P "may have been put in a fixed written form at the time of Hezekiah - Josiah by a conservative priestly circle whose aim was the collection of the sacral tradition of Israel regardless of its relevance to the royal policy of their time" (ibid., p. 180, n. 1). On this, cf., too, R. Abba, 'Priests and Levites', IBD, iii, pp. 876b-889b. See, also, idem, 'Priests and Levites in Deuteronomy', VT, xxvii, 1977, pp. 257-267; idem, 'Priests and Levites in Ezekiel', VT, xxviii, January, 1978, No. I, pp. 1-9. Cf., too, C.E. Wright, 'The Levites in Deuteronomy', VT, iv, 1954, pp. 325-330, who says that "the difference between P and D with regard to the Levites has been exaggerated" (ibid., p. 330). In defence of the claim that Deuteronomy recognizes the right of Levites to act as priests, see J.A. Emerton, 'Priests and Levites in Deuteronomy', VT, xii, 1962, pp. 129-138.

to Tiglath-pileser symbolized Judah's policy of appeasement, so Hezekiah's purification of Yahweh worship and removal of Assyrian cult objects was virtually a declaration of independence from Assyrian domination. The extent to which nationalism and Yahwistic zeal converged in Hezekiah's reform is reflected in the Deuteronomistic historian's evaluation of Hezekiah's life in 2 Kgs. xviii:6f.

Moreover, as mentioned above, prophetic influence may well have been

exerted on Hezekiah since the prose editor of the book of Jeremiah relates that Micah’s oracle(s) made a firm impression on the king (Jer. xxvi:18f.) and Isaiah seems to have held a particularly authoritative position in the royal court (2 Kgs. xix-xx; Isa. xxxvii-xxxviii). (434) The prophetic criticism of the cult, which focused ultimately in a condemnation of the Jerusalem temple, was that Israel's worship was no longer serving the true interests of the covenant with the result that instead of proclaiming the demands of the covenant law, "the cult obscured it by promising a false security which knew nothing of the moral conditions of fellowship between Israel and Yahweh." (435) However, while the eighth century prophets were violently opposed to the kind of religion which was being practised at the high places, the fact that they do not appear to have militated against the sanctuaries in themselves, since they nowhere demand either their abolition or the centralization of sacrificial worship to a single sanctuary, does not lend support to

434. Cf., e.g., Wellhausen, Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel, p.480; R. Kittel, A History of the Hebrews, II, London, 1909, pp.355ff.; A. Lods, The Prophets and the Rise of Judaism, London, 1950, pp.114ff.; Bright, A History of Israel², p.282; Moriarty, op.cit., p.402; McKay, Religion in Judah under the Assyrians, p.17; Asami, op.cit., pp.109ff., et passim. Cf., too, Weinfeld, Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School, Oxford, 1972, pp.366ff., who discusses the affinities between Hosea and Deuteronomy. According to T.H. Robinson, A History of Israel, I, p.393, the fact that "nowhere have we the slightest reference to this reform in the extant work of Isaiah" is very significant since "it is hardly credible that it should have passed entirely without notice if the prophet had seen that it was based on purely religious motives." On the other hand, B.W. Anderson, op.cit., p.280, thinks that Hezekiah's reform "in all probability...was one of the factors that led the prophet to break his long silence and to reappear in public." In his biased study, J. Hoschander, The Priests and Prophets, New York, 1938, who argues that the prophets were idealists and the priests realists, has to admit the influence of Isaiah on Hezekiah, but arbitrarily asserts that "Hezekiah's conversion in his early years was...due to the priests" (ibid.,pp.65f.

435. Clements, God and Temple, p.87. Cf., too, idem, Prophecy and Covenant, pp.86ff., et passim; Bright, Covenant and Promise, pp.84f., 162-164.
the view that cultic centralization was the practical outcome of the teaching of these prophets. (436)

It is most probable that there was some kind of religious authority and/or authoritative tradition behind Hezekiah's reform measures, since it is unlikely that the king could have ventured such a reformation, let alone have succeeded in it even to a limited degree, unless he had had such support. (437) Hence, it seems natural to assume that Hezekiah's reformation, with its attempt to centralize sacrificial worship to Jerusalem, was inspired by the Deuteronomic circle. Vaihinger, Steuernagel, Sellin, Westphal, König, G.A. Smith and Junker have suggested that the book of Deuteronomy was completed by the time of Hezekiah and that the king based his reform upon it. (438)


437. Cf., too, Asami, op.cit., pp.118, 121, 127ff., 143f. et passim. While some of the major arguments put forward by Asami must be rejected, he rightly concludes that "the influence of the northern traditions, including - above all - the Dtc one, on Hezekiah's reform can no more be denied" (ibid., p.128).

438. See above, p.22, n.44. Sellin expressed this view in his book Introduction to the Old Testament, English translation of the third German edition by W. Montgomery, London, 1923, pp.73ff., but he later withdrew this opinion and suggested instead that Deuteronomy had been written expressly for Josiah's reform, (see idem, Einleitung in das Alte Testament, seventh edition, Leipzig, 1933, pp.47ff.).
However, as Rowley correctly points out, "nothing is said...of any law book, and it is gratuitous to assume one." (439) If Urdeuteronomium had been written by the time of Hezekiah, then the Deuteronomistic historian would certainly have recorded its presence and influence. Rowley is representative of one of the most widely accepted interpretations of the origin of Deuteronomy when he says that the book was probably written early in Manasseh's reign "and emanated from a small group of reformers who wished to embody the lessons of Hezekiah's reform in a plan for the next occasion that should offer." (440) However, while it is unlikely that Deuteronomy had been drafted at this time, it is eminently probable that Hezekiah's reformation was the first manifestation of the principles advocated by a circle of true Yahwists, many of whom were northern refugees who had fled to Judah after 721 B.C., who were the forbears of those who formulated the first draft of Urdeuteronomium and whose urgent message activated a growing movement for religious reform amongst . The year 622 B.C. is merely the date when the Deuteronomistic circle "emerged articulate and effective" and it is highly improbable that the movement itself was newly born in this year. (441) It has been established that there are no grounds for doubting that Hezekiah attempted to centralize the cult or for questioning the


441. Cf. Gray, I and II Kings 2, p.33. Gray thinks it possible that "the lengthy, but still not detailed, account of the reigns of Hezekiah (II K. 18-20), Manasseh and Amon (ch. 21), and Josiah (chs. 22-23.35), where the Deuteronomistic passages are long and continuous, e.g. 18.1-8, 12: 21.1-22, is a matter of personal reminiscence and interest within the Dueteronomic circle, and even to the compiler himself" (ibid., p.34). While McKay, Josiah's Reformation, pp.398f., 409f., 411f.; idem, Religion in Judah under the Assyrians, pp.17ff., also argues that the religious demands of Deuteronomism were probably in some way amongst the causes of Hezekiah's reformation, the weakness in his argument is his indecision about the influence which motivated cultic centralization. As mentioned already, on the one hand McKay thinks that "Hezekiah's attempt to centralize the cult may be the first historical indication
Deuteronomist's judgment that the reforms acceded with the principles of Deuteronomism. It must be concluded, with Asami, that "the Dtc principle of cult centralization was not the result of Hezekiah's reform but rather the already existing stimulus for this reform," although probably not in written form. (443)

441. contd. of Deuteronomism in Judah" (idem, Josiah's Reformation, p.399), while, on the other, he prevaricates by saying that "it is not at all clear that the earliest Deuteronomists demanded centralization" (ibid., p.411) and he concludes that "the demand to centralize the cult in Jerusalem may have originated with Hezekiah's own interpretation of Deuteronomism or with his adoption of some 'temporary expedient' which was found acceptable to the Deuteronomists" (ibid., pp.411f.). Cf., too, idem, Religion in Judah under the Assyrians, p.18, where, having argued for the possibility that Hezekiah's reform was influenced by Deuteronomism, he adds the qualification "even if several other features influenced the act of centralization itself".

442. Asami, op.cit., p.129.

443. There is no reason to suppose that Hezekiah merely desired partial cultic centralization. Contra Phillips, Ancient Israel's Criminal Law, pp.167ff., who, arguing against the once common view that Exod. xxxiv:14ff. is to be described as 'the ritual Decalogue' and ascribed to J, while Exod. xx:3ff. contains 'the ethical Decalogue' and is the work of E, maintains that "the nature of Hezekiah's reform has in fact been summarized in Exod. 34:10ff., which has been created as the climax to the pre-priestly Sinai material by the JE redactor writing in Judah in the light of that reform" (ibid., p.168). It is Phillips' contention that the author of Exod.xxxiv:10ff., which "cannot be understood in isolation from...the story of the golden calf" (ibid., p.172), brought the traditions of the northern kingdom to the south after the fall of Samaria and sought there to re-write the Sinai pericope in the light of Hezekiah's reform (ibid., p.173). In the figure of Moses "the reader is intended to recognize Hezekiah who through Judah's syncretism with Canaan is himself threatened with punishment, but can yet save his people through his reform (Exod. 32:30ff.)" (ibid.) Having rewritten the Sinai narrative, the JE redactor transferred the Book of the Covenant from Josh.xxiv to its current position after the Decalogue, rearranging Exod. xx:18ff. in the process, added a preface to the Book of the Covenant specifically designed to reflect Hezekiah's reform, concluded the Book of the Covenant with a suitable sermonic epilogue (Exod. xxiii:20ff.), and was probably also responsible for Exod. xxiii:13 (ibid., p.174). Phillips argues that "in view of Josiah's more extensive reform the Deuteronomists have deliberately suppressed Hezekiah's partial centralization of worship" (ibid., p.177), that the Chronicler, who knew independently that Hezekiah had centralized the Passover at Jerusalem, was misled by the Deuteronomistic historian's account and "probably imagined that in fact Hezekiah had instituted the same type of reform as Josiah" (ibid., p.178), and that "it is in the legislation of Exod. 34:10ff. that the true nature and extent of Hezekiah's reform can be recovered" (ibid.). The fact that the JE redactor used Exod. xx:24ff., which implies a plurality of shrines, in his preface to the re-positioned Book of the Covenant, "confirms that Hezekiah did not intend to abolish all sanctuaries" but "appears to have envisaged a return to the conditions of the amphictyony in which Jerusalem was to replace Shechem as the amphictyonic centre" (ibid., p.177).
CHAPTER TWO

JOSIAH'S REFORM AND THE BOOK OF DEUTERONOMY

There has been a great deal of debate about the relationship between Josiah's reformation and the book of Deuteronomy. This question has produced a vast amount of literature since it is so closely interwoven with the problematic and controversial issues of the evaluation of the historical sources, the assessment of the contemporary political scene, the identification of Josiah's 'book of the law', the debate about the literary sources of the 'Pentateuch', and the question of the origin, extent, structure, nature, purpose and significance of Urdeuteronomium. Thus, for example, with regard to Deuteronomy, Nicholson writes that "the book...raises a multiplicity of problems" while he classifies the problem of the origin of the book and the circles responsible for its composition as "among the most controversial in Old Testament studies." Rowley refers to the problem of the date of Deuteronomy as "one of the most debated questions in the field of Old Testament scholarship". Pfeiffer, writing about the arrangement of the laws in Deuteronomy, says that "the disorder is so extreme that one would almost call it deliberate", while Carmichael is of the opinion that "no problem


3. Ibid., p.xi.


in biblical studies has proved more perplexing".\(^{(6)}\) Most significant of all, McKay points to "the centralization laws, which have caused so much trouble to exegetes"\(^{(7)}\) and which "raise problems for any theory of Deuteronomy".\(^{(8)}\)

In what follows, attention will be focused on the course of Josiah's reformation—with particular reference to the conflicting chronologies of the Deuteronomistic historian and the Chronicler and the motivation, nature, extent and significance of the Josianic reforms—and on the book of Deuteronomy.

**Josiah's Reformation**

2 Kgs. xxii-xxiii and 2 Chron. xxxiv-xxxv deal with Josiah's cultic activity and the discovery of 'the book of the law' in the temple. According to 2 Kgs. xxii-xxiii, Josiah sent the scribe Shaphan to Hilkiah, the high priest, with certain instructions regarding the financing of some repairs which were being undertaken in the temple in the eighteenth year of the king's reign (2 Kgs. xxii:3ff.). Hilkiah informed Shaphan that he had discovered 'the book of the law' in the temple and, having read it for himself, the scribe brought the book to Josiah and read it before him. Josiah, greatly alarmed at the contents of the book, sent a deputation to Huldah the prophetess to consult the oracle of Yahweh "concerning the words of this book" (2 Kgs. xxii:13), and received the reply that all the doom threatened by the book would befall "this place and...its inhabitants" (2 Kgs. xxii:16f.), but that Josiah himself would be spared the coming disaster.

---


because he had exhibited marked penitence and humility when the book had been read to him (2 Kgs. xxii:18-20). The king then assembled the people and "all the men of Judah and all the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and the priests and the prophets, all the people, both small and great" accompanied him to the temple where Josiah read "all the words of the book of the covenant which had been found in the house of Yahweh" (2 Kgs. xxiii:2) and "stood by the pillar and made a covenant before Yahweh, to walk after Yahweh and to keep his commandments and his testimonies and his statutes, with all his heart and all his soul, to perform the words of this covenant that were written in this book; and all the people joined in the covenant" (2 Kgs. xxiii:3).

According to Pedersen, "it is not expressly stated that the law book caused the reform", (9) but, as Nicholson and Weinfeld rightly point out, the clear implication of the narrative is that the law book motivated the reformation which followed the making of the covenant (2 Kgs. xxiii:4ff.). (10) It was on the basis of this law book that the king is said to have "instituted a radical and massive religious reform" (11) which has been described as "one of the major turning points in the religious history of the southern kingdom of Judah." (12)


12. Ibid. As will be shown later, however, Weingreen thinks that "this reform cannot be said to have aimed at making Jerusalem the only place where the people could engage in communal worship and thus commune with God" (ibid.).
2 Kgs. xxiii records that the following measures were enforced:

(i) The removal and destruction by fire in the Kidron valley of all the cultic vessels dedicated to Baal, Asherah, and "all the host of heaven" (v.4).

(ii) The deposition of the idolatrous priests of the high places and those "who burned incense to Baal, to the sun, and the moon, and the constellations, and all the host of the heavens" (v.5).

(iii) The removal and destruction by fire at the brook Kidron of the Asherah which had been in the temple (v.6).

(iv) The destruction of the houses of the male cult prostitutes (v.7).

(v) The transference of "all the priests out of the cities of Judah" and the defilement of the high places (v.8a).

(vi) The destruction of the high places of the gates or satyrs (13) in Jerusalem (v.8b).

(vii) The defilement of Topheth "which is in the valley of the sons of Hinnom" (v.10).

(viii) The removal of "the horses that the kings of Judah had dedicated to the sun, at the entrance to the house of Yahweh" and the destruction by fire of "the chariots of the sun" (v.11).

13. The reading 'demon' or 'satyr', emending MT שְׂדָרִים to שְׂדָרִים, is favoured by many commentators. Cf., e.g., G. Hoffmann, 'Kleinigkeiten', ZAW, ii, 1882, p.175. Cf., too, Montgomery, Kings, pp.532, 539, who refers to the MT as "a most puzzling statement" (ibid., p.532). Preferring the above emendation, Montgomery thinks that "it might best be expressed in English with 'hobgoblins'....The term is to be interpreted as a scoffing allusion to the debased ancient deities" (ibid.). Cf., also, Nicholson, Deuteronomy and Tradition, p.3, n.1; McKay, Josiah's Reformation, pp.6, 176f.; idem, Religion in Judah under the Assyrians, pp.90, 104f. (n.90). Gray, I and II Kings, 2 p.730, note j, writes: "we personally prefer the reading שְׂדָרִים ('gate-keepers'). Perhaps the allusion is to the bull-colossi which represent the guardian genii of the entrance in Assyrian palaces." McKay, Religion in Judah under the Assyrians, p.39, rightly points out that "this suggestion is difficult to assess, since it is based on unsupported textual emendation."
The removal of "the altars on the roof of the upper chamber of Ahaz" and the destruction of "the altars which Manasseh had made in the two courts of the house of Yahweh" (v.12).

The demolition of "the high places that were east of Jerusalem, to the south of the mount of corruption [or "the mount of the Destroyer"], which Solomon the king of Israel had built for Ashtoreth the abomination of the Sidonians, and for Chemosh the abomination of Moab, and for Milcom the abomination of the Ammonites" (v.13).

The removal of and and the defilement of their cult places (v.14).

The demolition of the high place erected by Jeroboam, the defilement of the place where the altar had been situated, and the destruction by fire of the Asherah (vv.15f.).

The removal of "the high places that were in the cities of Samaria" and the extermination of their priests (vv.19f.).

The institution of a centralized Passover celebrated at Jerusalem (vv.21ff.).

The removal of people and objects connected with necromancy (v.24).

The three principal problems with this account which have given rise to a great deal of debate are closely related. Firstly, there is a lack of order in this account of the purges which focuses first on the temple (v.4), then passes to the high places (v.5), reverts to the temple (vv.6f.), switches back to the high places (vv.8-10), passes again to the temple (vv.11f.), reverts to the high places (v.13), and concludes with a general summary (v.14). The account appears more confused and unsystematic because of the lack of a coherent sequence of theme, since vv.4f. relate the purge of the astral cults from the
temple and the high places while vv.11f. revert to describing their removal from the temple. It is also thought that v.8a originally belonged with v.9 and that v.8b is a carelessly inserted addition which interrupts the narrative about the priests. (15) Many divergent views have been expressed on the problem of the extent to which the Deuteronomistic editor or author of the narrative of Josiah's reign has altered or schematized the original account of what took place.

The second area of debate, which is closely related to the first, concerns the fact that there are obvious parallels between the reform measures described in 2 Kgs. xxiii and the demands of the book of Deuteronomy, including the following: (16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 Kgs. xxiii</th>
<th>Deuteronomy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) The abolition of the Asherim (vv.4, 6, 7, 14)</td>
<td>vii:5; xii:3; xvi:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) The removal of cultic objects dedicated to the host of heaven and the deposition of priests engaged in the worship of this astral cult (vv.4f.)</td>
<td>xvii:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) The shattering of 'the pillars' (v.14)</td>
<td>vii:5; xii:3; et passim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) The defilement of the heathen high places (v.13)</td>
<td>vii:5; xii:2f.; et passim</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Cf., e.g., McKay, op.cit.
(v) The deposition of priests xvii:3 ordained to burn incense to the sun and the moon and the removal of objects dedicated to the sun (vv.5, 11)
(vi) The destruction of buildings xxiii:18 (EVV 17) used for sacred prostitution (v.7)
(vii) The defilement of Topheth xii:31; xviii:10 which was associated with the Molech cult (v.10)
(viii) The defilement of the high places which had been dedicated to the worship of foreign deities (v.13)
(ix) The removal of mediums and wizards and all objects associated with necromancy (v.24)
(x) The celebration of centralized Passover

In view of these striking parallels between the reform measures related in 2 Kgs. xxiii and the demands of Deuteronomy, it has been argued that most of Josiah's enactments can be explained by reference to Deuteronomy and that some of them, particularly the abolition of the Yahwistic high places and cultic centralization, can only be explained by this book. Does Deuteronomy demand cultic centralization? Is Josiah's law book to be identified with Urdeuteronomium? When, where, and under what circumstances did this book originate?
The third area of controversy is related to the fact that, in contrast to the narrative in 2 Kings, 2 Chron. xxxiv-xxxv places significant reform measures before the year in which the book was discovered. According to 2 Kings, the demands of the law book found by Hilkiah in the temple in 621 B.C. stimulated Josiah to carry out his reformation in the same year, his eighteenth year on the throne. No reform measures had been undertaken prior to 621 B.C. and the sole motive behind the reformation was Josiah's desire to implement the demands of the newly discovered book. The Chronicler, however, records that reform measures had been enforced in the king's twelfth year on the throne, that is, six years before the book of the law was found. According to 2 Chron. xxxiv:3-5, it was in this year that Josiah began to purge Judah and Jerusalem of the high places, the Asherim, and the graven and the molten images, breaking down the altars of the Baals, hewing down the incense altars, smashing the cultic paraphernalia associated with their worship and burning the bones of their priests on their altars. 2 Chron. xxxiv:6-7 relate the extension of the reform to the cities of Manasseh, Ephraim, Simeon, "and as far as Naphtali", where Josiah "broke down the altars, and beat the Asherim and the images into powder, and hewed down all the incense altars throughout all the land of Israel." 2 Chron. xxxiv:8ff. corroborates the narrative in 2 Kings about the discovery of the book of the law in Josiah's eighteenth regnal year, the king's alarm at the book's contents and the deputation which he sent to consult the prophetess Huldah. However, at this point, the Chronicler differs radically from the account in 2 Kings, for, having dated Josiah's abolition of the high places and the removal of pagan cults and practices from Judah and northern Israel in the twelfth year of Josiah's reign, the Chronicler relates that the influence of the law book was
limited to the making of a covenant (2 Chron. xxxiv:29-32) and the celebration of the Passover (2 Chron. xxxv:1-19). The only hint that the book may have played a more important role in the reformation is "the purely general statement": (17) "... the book of the law (2 Chron. xxxiv:33). At any rate, there is a marked contrast between the account in 2 Kings and the Chronicler's record and they differ both in the chronology of the events of the reformation and in their estimation of the significance of the influence of the book of the law. Did Josiah's reformation receive its sole stimulus from the discovery of the law book, as suggested by 2 Kings, or had certain reform measures already been implemented before the book was found, and thus independently of it, as suggested by 2 Chron. xxxiv:xxxv? To what extent is it legitimate to use the Chronicler's record in an assessment of the relationship between Josiah's reformation and the law book?

It is something of an understatement to say that "the whole question is very complicated". (18) Since Deuteronomy is at the very centre of the debate, it seems prudent to compare, contrast and evaluate the major opinions which have been expressed concerning the origin, structure and date of Deuteronomy before attempting to determine the relationship of the book to Josiah's reforms or to evaluate the sources at our disposal for this king's reformation. (19)

Almost every period in Israel's history from Moses to the post-exilic period has been advocated, at one time or another, as the date for the composition of Deuteronomy. Opinions concerning the authorship of the book are equally diverse, ranging from individuals (Moses and Samuel are usually suggested) to circles of priests or prophets or scribes. The earliest Jewish discussions of Deuteronomy were primarily concerned with the question of how much of the book should be ascribed to Moses. Philo (De Vita Mosis II, 290f.) and Josephus (Antiquitates IV, 326) argued that Moses was responsible for the entire book except chapter 34. However, according to the Babylonian Talmud (Baba Bathra 14b), Joshua may have been responsible for the last eight verses of Deuteronomy, while 4 Ezra 14 relates that the twenty-four canonical books of the Old Testament together with seventy apocryphal books were rewritten by Ezra, under divine inspiration. Since the Christian fathers adopted most of the Jewish traditions concerning the origin of the Old Testament, they assumed Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.

In his commentary on the Pentateuch written in 1152-1153, Abraham ben Meir Ibn Ezra raised doubts about Moses' immediate responsibility for the entirety of Genesis-Deuteronomy. With regard to Deuteronomy, he considered Deut. i:1; iii:11; xxxi:9 as post-Mosaic. Unfortunately, however, Ibn Ezra was concerned not to give offence to more conservative rabbis and the intentional obscurity of his comments has given rise to different interpretations. Spinoza (20) claimed that Ibn Ezra meant that the Pentateuch was written after the death of Moses, but Wenham's opinion that Ibn Ezra was illustrating the complex structure of the Pentateuch and suggesting that these

---
passages were later insertions is equally valid.\(^{(21)}\) Out of respect for tradition and the dominance of allegorical methods of exegesis, critical questions were largely ignored by the mediaeval church, although bishop Alfonso Tostatus (d.1455) is said to have shown an interest in pentateuchal criticism.\(^{(22)}\)

During the reformation, when traditional dogmas of the church and the allegorical methods of exegesis were questioned, the issue of the authenticity of scripture, which was the norm and source of faith, received much more attention, although few fresh opinions were expressed in pentateuchal research because the traditional view of the inspiration of scripture dictated that the Bible be expounded harmonistically. There were some, however, who voiced their own opinion. A.B. von Carlstadt\(^{(23)}\) argued that, since the style of Deut. xxxiv is identical with the rest of the book, Moses could not have written Deuteronomy. Andreas Masius\(^{(24)}\) and Bento Pereira\(^{(25)}\) also expressed doubt about ascribing the Pentateuch in its entirety to Moses. Nevertheless, the majority of reformation writers ascribed the bulk of the Pentateuch to Moses, although many, including Calvin, conceded that Deut. xxxiv


24. Masius, Josuae imperatoris historia illustrata atque explicata, Antwerp, 1574.

25. Pereira, Tomus I-IV commentariorum et disputationum in Genesim, Lyon, 1594-1600.
was post-Mosaic. (26) As Wenham writes: "there soon developed in the lands of the reformation an orthodoxy as strict as mediaeval catholicism which effectively hindered the development of biblical criticism for about a century." (27)

In the seventeenth century, Cornelius a Lapide, (28) the Jesuit Jacques Bonfrère, (29) the English philosopher Thomas Hobbes, (30) Isaak de la Peyrère, (31) the Jewish philosopher Benedict de Spinoza, (32) and the French Roman Catholic priest of the congregation of the Oratory, Richard Simon (33) attempted to prove that the Pentateuch in its present form could not have been written by Moses. Hobbes' Leviathan, which was first published in 1651, opened up the question of the relationship between the canon of scripture and inspiration. Hobbes put forward the principle that the date of origin of any biblical book must be derived from the evidence of the book itself and

26. J. Calvin, Commentaries on the Last Four Books of Moses, IV, Edinburgh, 1855, p.404, suggested that Joshua or Eleazar may have composed this chapter.

27. Wenham, op.cit., p.10.


29. J. Bonfrère, Pentateuchus Moysis commentario illustratus, Antwerp, 1625.


31. I. de la Peyrère, Systema Theologicum, ex Praeadamitarum Hypothesi, Pars Prima, 1655.

32. B. de Spinoza, op.cit., chapters 7 and 8.

Hobbes argued that many of the historical books were written a great deal later than the period suggested by their titles and that the presence of post-Mosaica in the Pentateuch clearly indicates that the books Genesis–Deuteronomy were written after Moses' death. With regard to Deuteronomy, Hobbes maintained that only chapters xi–xxvii were Mosaic, implying that the rest of Deuteronomy was written later. It was Hobbes' opinion that Deut. xi–xxvii was "that Law which God commanded, that their Kings (when they should have established that form of Government) should take a copy of from the Priests and Levites; and which Moses commanded the Priests and Levites to lay in the side of the Arke; and the same which having been lost, was long time after found again by Hilkiah, and sent to King Josias, who causing it to be read to the People, renewed the Covenant between God and them."(35)

In his Tractatus theologico-politicus, first published in 1670, Spinoza, who was influenced by Hobbes in both his political thinking and in his ideas on biblical criticism, argued that while a few passages explicitly ascribed to Moses are from his hand, the presence of post-Mosaica(36) in the Pentateuch is clear indication that the Pentateuch was written long after the time of Moses.(37) Spinoza maintained that since there is no trace in the present Old Testament of the document referred to in Deut. i:5; xxix:14; and xxxi:9 which contained a second exposition of the law and renewal of the covenant,

37. Ibid., p.124.
this document, which was so short it could be read at a single sitting (Deut. xxxi:9ff.) (38) must be lost. (39) He also argued that Ezra was responsible for the present form of Deuteronomy and for editing Genesis to Kings to provide Israelites with a coherent picture of their history stretching from the creation to the exile. (40)

The most important suggestions which were put forward in this period were undoubtedly those of Simon who has been described by Knight as "the pioneer of historico-critical biblical research and... the precursor of the tradition-historical investigation of the Old Testament... despite the fact that many of his ideas and theories had already been propounded prior to him." (41) Simon's most significant work, Histoire critique du Vieux Testament, is divided into three parts and deals with the history of the text, the versions, and Old Testament interpretation. In this book, Simon, who wished to disassociate the idea of the divine inspiration of biblical books from the question of their authenticity, (42) argued that the entire Pentateuch could not be the work of only Moses. (43) This idea had

38. Ibid., p.126.
39. Ibid., p.125.
40. Ibid., pp.129ff.
42. Cf. Steinmann, op.cit., pp.100-102; Knight, op.cit., p.46.
43. The title of the fifth chapter of the first section of his work is: "Moïse ne peut être l'Auteur de tout ce qui est dans les Livres qui lui sont attribués."
already been proposed by, among others, Ibn Ezra, Carlstadt, Masius, Pereira, a Lapide, Bonfrère, Hobbes, Peyrère and Spinoza. The new contribution made by Simon was that he constructed the criticisms of others and his own ideas into a reasonable whole.\(^\text{(44)}\) He put forward four general groups of facts to prove that Moses could not have written the entire Pentateuch - passages which reflect a different historical background from that of Moses,\(^\text{(45)}\) repetitions,\(^\text{(46)}\) cases of poor order,\(^\text{(47)}\) and different literary styles.\(^\text{(48)}\) Simon developed the theory of public scribes\(^\text{(49)}\) who, under the direction of Moses and filled with the prophetic spirit, recorded the important facts and events of Israel's history and deposited their records in public registries or archives. The institution of scribes continued their task long after Moses' death and later writers used the public registries as their sources for composing collections or summaries of the historical facts. Ezra was responsible for the final compilation.\(^\text{(50)}\)

Although Simon was convinced of the full inspiration of scripture, his work seemed to threaten the traditional beliefs in the divinely inspired authorship of the biblical books\(^\text{(51)}\) and it was largely for this reason that his work aroused the anger of both Protestants and

\(^{44}\) Cf. Knight, op.cit., pp.46f.


\(^{46}\) Ibid., p.33.

\(^{47}\) Ibid., p.35.

\(^{48}\) Ibid., p.39.

\(^{49}\) Ibid., pp.3f., 15-40, et passim.

\(^{50}\) Ibid., p.50.

\(^{51}\) Knight, op.cit., pp.50f.; Wenham, op.cit., p.11.
conservative Roman Catholics, especially Bossuet, the book being officially listed in the Roman Catholic Index librorum prohibitorum in 1683.

Thus, on the one hand, Spinoza assumed the unity of Deuteronomy, but denied its Mosaic authorship, while, on the other, Hobbes and Simon accepted a Mosaic nucleus, but maintained that the book had undergone a subsequent expansion. However, while these views on the structure, date and origin of Deuteronomy are interesting, they amount to little more than speculation. It was in Germany that detailed discussion on these matters first took place.

Although some of the early fathers, notably Athanasius, Jerome, Chrysostom and Procopius of Gaza, and, later, Hobbes and Lessing, had already suggested that Deuteronomy was the book of the law discovered by Hilkiah in the reign of Josiah, W.M.L. de Wette's 1805 doctoral thesis, Dissertatio critico-exegetica, qua Deuteronomium a prioribus Pentateuchi libris diversum, alius cuiusdam recentioris auctoris opus esse monstratur, was the first scientific attempt to demonstrate that Deuteronomy had been written in the time of Josiah. De Wette's methods and conclusions have formed the basis for the bulk of subsequent research on Deuteronomy and the equation of Urdeuteronomium with Josiah's law book "has become virtually the cornerstone of Pentateuchal criticism." De Wette was influenced by J.G. Herder while at the gymnasium at Weimar and by J.J. Griesbach, J.P. Gabler and H.E.C. Paulus when he studied at Jena University. In what is really a thinly


disguised autobiography, de Wette records that at Jena, particularly under the influence of Griesbach's teaching, his former opinions about the origin of Christianity were shaken. However, while he later reacted to some degree against the rationalism of Jena, turning at this time to Herder, Schelling, and Schleiermacher, de Wette always retained the sceptical attitude towards the historicity of the biblical narratives which he had imbibed at Jena. Of his early works which were published between 1805 and 1811, Wenham writes: "de Wette's thought is basically a cross between rationalism and Herder." Smend describes de Wette's research as an attempt to overcome Herder with rationalism and to overcome rationalism with Herder. Barth refers to de Wette as a man with the mind of a rationalist but with the heart of a mystic or a pietist. Herder, who wanted the Bible to be read as a human yet deeply religious book, had quite a conservative attitude towards the historicity of the biblical narratives which he thought bore the marks of authenticity. The rationalists, on the other hand, wished to extract the factual history of Israel from the mythical narratives in which it was embedded, and do not appear to have been particularly interested in the religious value of the Old Testament.

55. De Wette, Theodore: or, the Sceptic's Conversion, (ET of Theodor, oder, Des Zweiflers Weihe, 1828), Boston, 1841, p.13.


De Wette, who was profoundly concerned with inculcating a true appreciation of the religious value of the scriptures, wished "to smash the historicity of the OT" because he thought that to regard the Old Testament as historical obscured its religious value and he did not want its readers to be distracted by the question whether events really happened as the Bible describes. (60) With regard to the Pentateuch,

60. Cf. Wenham, op.cit., p.25. In passing it may be mentioned that one of the major reasons for the downgrading of the Old Testament in both pulpit and academic institution seems to be the fact that the majority of the members of a congregation and of incoming Divinity students have never enjoyed the benefit of a well-balanced approach to the Old Testament such as is exemplified by, for example, S. Herrmann, Israel in Egypt, SBT, Second Series, xxvii, London, 1973. Herrmann seeks to build up as reliable a picture as possible of the historical context in which Israel's sojourn in Egypt belonged and to show "what ultimately small, local events they were which had such far-reaching effects" (ibid., p.x). Skilfully, Herrmann demonstrates that an Old Testament historical narrative is not reporting in the modern sense but is, rather, a pragmatic presentation of history which has the intention of both leading the reader along a chain of events and also of making the pattern of those events comprehensible to him. "This means a selection and ordering of the tradition: always in close contact with what has been, but none the less under the guidance of overriding points of view; with emphases designed to promote the understanding of the past, but primarily concerned to show the individual's own present as being the final result of a purposeful development. History is not related for its own sake, but in order to justify a sense of continuity from which the people of Israel has drawn its greatest strength from time immemorial" (ibid., pp.2f.). Herrmann demonstrates that the testimony of highly differing sources which derive from different periods and areas of early Israelite history have been used by "the concept which both ordered historical events in the interests of Israel's gradually developing history of faith and formed them into a single thread of salvation history" (ibid., p.3). The value of this approach is obvious for it shows how, in the formation and the processing of tradition, event and interpretation were inextricably entwined and events became "deepened and saturated with thought" (ibid., p.54) as they were bound up with the confession of faith in the God of Israel. Using this approach, many more people than at present would come to respect and comprehend the real nature of the Old Testament as they would learn that "it is not events themselves and their often insignificant radius of action that are capable of releasing far-reaching consequences; it is the depth of experience of the man who experiences those events" (ibid., p.66).
de Wette regarded Genesis–Deuteronomy in entirety as mythical (61) and he sought to demonstrate in detail the mythical character of every part of these books.

In his Dissertatio, de Wette seeks to demonstrate that Deuteronomy was written after Genesis–Numbers and by a separate author on the grounds of the different form and style of Deuteronomy, its peculiar theological outlook and legal content, and the contradictions between this book and the earlier books. Firstly, de Wette argues that the history of Moses seems to be complete with Num. xxvii, which relates how Moses had commissioned Joshua to take over, and that Moses is virtually resurrected in Deuteronomy where, in chapter xxxi he again names Joshua his successor. (62) Moreover, Num. xxxvi:13 states

and yet Deuteronomy contains many commandments and laws in addition to those in the book of Numbers. (63) Secondly, the writer of Deuteronomy seems to have assumed that the readers of his book were ignorant of the way in which Numbers ended, for, although both books depict the law-giving in the plains of Moab, the author of Deuteronomy repeats much of the earlier material and describes in intimate detail the time, place and situation in Deut. i:1–5, which he would hardly have done if Deuteronomy had been designed as an appendix to Genesis–Numbers. (64)

Thirdly, although in some respects there is a great similarity of style between Deuteronomy and the earlier books, this similarity seems to have resulted from the author of Deuteronomy deliberately copying the style

61. Cf., e.g., de Wette, Beiträge zur Einleitung in das AT, II, Halle, 1807, p.iv.
62. de Wette, Dissertatio, p.4.
63. Ibid.
64. Ibid., p.5.
of the earlier books. (65) In most parts of Deuteronomy, the author has an ornate and rhetorical style, a distinctive vocabulary with certain favourite words recurring regularly, a love of synonyms, a tendency to use quite different phrases from those used in the other books of the Pentateuch, even where the same object is referred to or the same idea is expressed, a tendency to use certain unusual grammatical elements including paragogic nūn and hé and he has greatly expanded on many passages in Exodus and some in Leviticus. (66)

Fourthly, de Wette argues that Deuteronomy's theological outlook differs from that of the earlier books in that theological dogmatism has replaced simple mythology, an almost mystical approach to God has replaced simple directions about worship, and the author, whom de Wette likens unto a preacher or instructor in morals, is concerned with an observance of the law from the heart, in contrast with the earlier books which stress the external observance of the Mosaic ritual and demand simple and strict obedience. (67) Fifthly, de Wette maintains that there are clear differences between the laws of Deuteronomy and the legal content of the rest of the Pentateuch and a completely new and different situation in the state and religion seems to be envisaged by Deuteronomy which introduces new laws and which adds new clauses to the older laws. (68) By far the most significant new law in the book is the demand for one cult place where it is alone permissible to offer sacrificial worship and first-fruits, to celebrate the Passover, the Feast of Weeks and Tabernacles, and to consult the priests about

65. Ibid., p.10.
66. Ibid., pp.6-10. On Deuteronomic phraseology, see also, Weinfeld, Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School, pp.320-365.
67. Ibid., pp.10-12.
68. Ibid., pp.12f.
controversial matters. The earlier books know nothing of one cult place and de Wette thinks that the law in Lev. xvii which demands that all sacrifices must be brought to the door of the tabernacle must be post-Mosaic since it contradicts Exod. xx:24. Deuteronomy was probably the book of the law found by Hilkiah which prompted Josiah to carry out cultic centralization. (69) De Wette also points to Deuteronomy's concern about the welfare of the Levites, the king law, which seems to represent a protest against the tyranny of kingship, and the divorce law, which seems to reflect the corrupt morals of a later age. (70) He hints that Deuteronomy was written by priests to enhance their power and privileges. (71) Sixthly, and finally, de Wette points out that Deuteronomy occasionally differs from the earlier books on historical points. (72)

Only slight modification of these views is to be found in de Wette's Beiträge (1806-1807). (73) In view of Vater's Fragmentary Hypothesis, de Wette concedes that Genesis-Numbers may have been produced from a number of short essays, but, while Deuteronomy may also have been produced in the same way, the critic must give primary consideration to the final redactional stage in the book's production and de Wette maintains that Deuteronomy everywhere bears the marks of the unifying activity of a single mind. (74) The second and much more significant point where de Wette has developed his thinking on Deuteronomy concerns

69. Ibid., footnote on pp.13f.
70. Ibid., pp.14-16.
71. Ibid., p.16. Wenham, op.cit., p.42, n.4, reckons that de Wette simply assumed an anti-clerical view of history which was prevalent in the Enlightenment and among Deists.
72. Ibid., p.15.
74. de Wette, Beiträge, I, pp.265f.
the laws which the book contains. The law on cult prostitutes in Deut. xxiii:18f. is later than Rehoboam's reign since this was when the problem first arose and, on similar grounds, the prohibition of sun worship can only be later than the reign of Manasseh. (75) Above all, however, is the fact that cultic centralization now dominates de Wette's discussion and "becomes the keystone in his criticism." (76) In the first volume of his Beiträge, de Wette is principally concerned to show that Chronicles is later than and dependent on Samuel-Kings, that one must adopt a sceptical attitude towards the Chronicler's description of the cult, and that Judges, Samuel and Kings clearly indicate that, prior to the Josianic period, sacrificial worship was performed wherever men liked.

While de Wette can be criticized for some of the criteria he employs for determining the historical reliability of a source, (77) these questionable criteria are used extensively in the Beiträge where he is dealing with Chronicles and the Pentateuch, but they hardly ever appear in his discussion of Deuteronomy. However, as de Wette himself acknowledges, several of his arguments, while compatible with the later composition of Deuteronomy, do not by themselves necessitate a late date for the book. (78) The duplication by Deuteronomy of material in Genesis-Numbers, the contradictions, the variation in style between Deuteronomy and the rest of the Pentateuch, and the different theological atmosphere of Deuteronomy can and have been used to date Deuteronomy in many different periods. Moreover, as Wenham correctly

75. Ibid., pp.280f.
76. Wenham, op. cit., p.38.
77. See Wenham, op. cit., p.41.
points out, (79) it could be argued that the contradictions between Deuteronomy and Genesis-Numbers, which de Wette uses to maintain different authorship, constitute a stumbling-block to his argument that the author of Deuteronomy had an intimate knowledge of the earlier books and was making his own copy. (80) On the positive side, de Wette's major contribution to the study of Deuteronomy was his recognition of the significance of the laws demanding cultic centralization and his connection of Deuteronomy with Josiah's law-book. However, the major weakness in de Wette's research on Deuteronomy is one shared by the vast majority of subsequent exegetes and that is his failure to provide a sufficient treatment of the relationship between Deuteronomy and Hezekiah's reformation which must be considered in any treatment of the book, for, as shown in the preceding chapter, there is no need to question the historicity of 2 Kgs. xviii:3f. which records that Hezekiah carried through a programme of cultic purification and centralization. (81)

De Wette's theory did not go unchallenged. Several nineteenth-century scholars dated the composition of Deuteronomy in the exilic or post-exilic period. (82) Thus, for example, C.P.W. Gramberg (83) argued that in Deuteronomy there are curses which presuppose the exile and passages which indicate familiarity with prophets, while the fact that Deut. xiii:13-19, which demands the execution of idolators, could never have been accepted by Josiah as state law is clear indication that Deuteronomy was not Josiah's

79. Wenham, op.cit., p.42.
80. de Wette, Dissertatio, p.10.
82. See above, pp.23f., n.48.
book of the law. (84) A little less 'radical' was the opinion expressed by W. Vatke (85) who argued that Deuteronomy was written after Josiah's reform and completed during the exile. G.L. Bauer and L. Bertholdt held a much more conservative view, for, while accepting that the present form of the Pentateuch is post-Mosaic, they argued that it must have been finally redacted before the division of the monarchy in view of the fact that the Samaritans accept the Torah as sacred scripture. (86) The traditional Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy and the rest of the Pentateuch was still vigorously and ingeniously defended by a number of commentators of whom E.W. Hengstenberg is probably the most significant.

Hengstenberg defended the Mosaic authorship of the vast bulk of the Pentateuch in a work on Old Testament criticism which bore the same title as de Wette's book, *Beiträge zur Einleitung ins AT.* (87) Hengstenberg maintains that it is incumbent on the Christian to follow Christ and the apostles in believing in the verbal inspiration of the Old Testament and the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and he insists that the Christian must accept and submit to the Bible, since it is the Word of God, and pray for guidance from the Holy Spirit when wishing to interpret scripture. (88) Under the influence of Vater's Fragmentary


87. This work was published in Berlin 1831–1839, and an English translation, *Dissertations on the Genuineness of the Pentateuch*, was published in Edinburgh in 1847.

88. On the life and thought of Hengstenberg, cf., e.g. Wenham, *op.cit.*, pp.44ff.
Hypothesis, Hengstenberg sought to determine the extent of Moses' contribution to Deuteronomy and concluded that Moses wrote Deut. i-xxviii, then xxix:1-xxxi:13, and finally xxxi:14-23, while a redactor who used Mosaic materials was responsible for the rest of the book. (89)

In his attempt to refute the arguments of de Wette and other writers for rejecting Mosaic authorship, Hengstenberg dismisses the assumption that stylistic differences between Deuteronomy and the rest of the Pentateuch indicate different authorship. To illustrate that this is a dubious criterion, he cites several examples in extra-biblical literature where differences of style are more convincingly explained on internal grounds than by positing different authorship and he argues that it is much easier to explain the stylistic differences between Deuteronomy and the rest of the Pentateuch from internal reasons. (90)

Thus, for example, the fact that Deuteronomy employs the name Horeb instead of Sinai is to be explained by seeing that Sinai is one of the peaks in the mountainous region of Horeb. (91) In the case of historical matters where Deuteronomy contradicts the earlier books, Hengstenberg resorts to harmonization. De Wette had pointed out that whereas Num. xx:20 reports that Israel was denied passage through the land of Edom, Deut. ii:29 states that Edom allowed Israel to pass. (92) Hengstenberg harmonizes the two accounts by maintaining that Israel's first attempt to pass through the land was stymied but on the second occasion the land was traversed by selecting a less fortified route. (93)

89. Hengstenberg, Dissertations, II, pp.126ff.
90. Ibid., I, p.20.
91. Ibid., II, pp.325ff.
92. de Wette, Dissertatio, p.15.
Whereas de Wette had argued that Deuteronomy must be late fiction because there is no evidence to suggest that its laws were implemented in the period of the Judges, Hengstenberg maintains that Israel was perfectly well aware of the Deuteronomic laws in this era, although they may well have been honoured more in the breach than in the observance. Firstly, Judg. iv-v and xix-xxi reflect Israel's sense of national unity. Hengstenberg also sees references to Deut. xxxii in the Song of Deborah and, in silhouette, ideas of covenant, apostasy, repentance and deliverance, while Judg. xix-xxi indicate the enforcement of the hērem demanded by Deut. xiii, and Judg. xxi, which records the desire to preserve the name of the tribe, reflects the same spirit as Deut. xxv:6. The tabernacle was always situated in Shiloh and the book of Judges, Ps. lxxviii and Jer. vii:12 presuppose that Shiloh was the only sanctuary prior to Jerusalem, while 1 Sam. ii:14 records that all Israel journeyed to Shiloh. Although the book of Judges records several instances of sacrifice being offered elsewhere, only the occasion mentioned in Judg. xvii-xviii can be described as theologically illegitimate. Normally in Judges, sacrifice is permitted only before the ark where God was present, but Judg. ii:5 and vi:19ff. indicate that, if God chose to appear at a different place, then it was legitimate for a man to offer sacrifice at that spot, and altars constructed for such occasions, although retained as memorials, were only used once. Moreover, that the Levites held a special

94. Ibid., p.96.
95. Ibid., pp.74ff., 85ff.
96. Ibid., pp.33ff.
97. Ibid., p.46.
98. Ibid., p.74.
99. Ibid., pp.33f.
religious status in Israel in this period is indicated by Micah's remark in Judg. xvii:13 and by chapter xix.(100)

Hengstenberg also regards as invalid the argument that the king law in Deut. xvii and the threats of exile in Deut. xxviii prove a late date for Deuteronomy. The vices referred to in Deut. xvii were common among oriental monarchs and cannot be said to presuppose experience of Solomon's reign, while Samuel's opposition to the people's request for a king was not due to ignorance of Deut. xvii but was based on the motive behind the request, for, in expressing dissatisfaction with Samuel, who had been commissioned by God, the people were displaying lack of confidence in God.(101) The threats of exile contained in Deut. xxviii do not require a late date for the book since throughout Deuteronomy it is stressed that the land is a God-given gift and that possession of the land is contingent on obedience. That Moses could have envisaged Israel being exiled on account of disloyalty to the covenant is clear from the fact that he attributed Aaron's and his own exclusion from Canaan to their unbelief.(102)

Having rejected a seventh century date for Deuteronomy, Hengstenberg seeks evidence to support Mosaic authorship. He dismisses the argument of Bauer and Bertholdt concerning the existence of the Samaritan Pentateuch as evidence of Deuteronomy's early composition,(103) because the history of the sect is obscure, while the fact that there is ample evidence from Northern sources that the Pentateuch was known in the Northern Kingdom makes this argument

100. Ibid., pp.52ff.
101. Ibid., pp.201ff.
102. Ibid., pp.271ff.
103. Hengstenberg, Dissertations, I, pp.69ff.
redundant anyway, since the book was probably composed before the division of the monarchy. Hengstenberg maintains that certain events recorded in Kings, particularly the records concerning Elijah and Elisha, (104) presuppose the existence of Pentateuchal law and custom in the Northern Kingdom. Finally, he argues that in the book of Hosea there are seventy allusions to or quotations from the Pentateuch, principally from Deuteronomy, while he also finds several striking parallels between Deuteronomy and Amos. (105) Thus, for example, he argues that in Hos. viii:11, the prophet's condemnation of the multiplicity of altars presupposes the audience's knowledge of Deut. xii, (106) while Hos. viii:12 implies that the prophet was basing his preaching on a written law.

Whereas de Wette had sought to disprove the historicity of the scriptures because he thought it was impossible to attain a religious appreciation of the Bible by reading it as an historical document, Hengstenberg argued vigorously for the authenticity of the biblical record because he believed the religious value of the Bible was dependent on its historicity.

There are a number of weaknesses in Hengstenberg's arguments. Firstly, Hengstenberg is inconsistent (107) for, while he does not think that the stylistic differences between Deuteronomy and the rest of the Pentateuch are sufficient to prove different authorship, his criterion for distinguishing between the work of Moses and that of the final editor of Deuteronomy is that the editor describes Moses as and . (108) Secondly, as will be shown in the next chapter,  

104. Ibid., pp.170ff. Cf., also, Wenham, op.cit., p.58, and n.6.  
105. Ibid., pp.136ff.  
106. Ibid., pp.107ff.  
it is most unlikely that there existed in the period of the judges the consciousness of national unity, practice of holy war and central sanctuary, which Hengstenberg argues for. Finally, although he makes a good case for the connection between Hosea and Deuteronomy, verbal parallels merely indicate a relation between the two but do not demonstrate that Hosea is dependent on Deuteronomy, as Hengstenberg believes, or that Deuteronomy is dependent on Hosea, as Wellhausen maintains, or that both are dependent on a common covenant tradition, possibly of Northern provenance, as Wenham suggests. (109)

J. Wellhausen (110) regarded Deuteronomy as the bridge between the old Israel of the JE traditions and the late Judaism of the Priestly Code, but, while Deuteronomy was crucial to his discussion of ancient Israelite history, he devoted very little time to a detailed discussion of the book. His principal contribution to Deuteronomic studies is to be found in his modification of de Wette's position with regard to the structure of the book.

Although de Wette had been the first to argue that Deuteronomy demanded the centralization of sacrificial worship to a single sanctuary and therefore must have been written in connection with Josiah's reform, he had devoted relatively little attention to this line of argument. In Wellhausen's work, everything hinges on interpreting Deuteronomy in terms of cultic centralization and the association of the book with Josiah's act of centralizing sacrificial worship to Jerusalem is the foundation stone of his reconstruction of the history of Israel.

Comparing the major Pentateuchal traditions with one another and


arguing that JE must have been written first, D second, and P last, he relies on the connection between Deuteronomy and the account in 2 Kgs. xxii to fix an absolute date for the Priestly Code. By drawing out a series of contrasts between the religious practices of JE, D, and P and by correlating them with the accounts of the historical books, Wellhausen demonstrates that JE sanctions a multiplicity of altars (Ex. xx:24), D demands centralization of sacrificial worship (Deut. xii), and the Priestly Code presupposes cultic centralization and transfers it, by means of the Tabernacle, to primitive times. Cultic centralization changed the character of sacrifice for it ruptured the bond between life and worship. In JE sacrifice was a joyful communal meal and harvest festivals were spontaneous affairs, but Deuteronomy and Josiah's reform marked the end of this natural unfettered worship, and the dawn of the age of the law-bound cultus of Judaism.

Few of Wellhausen's arguments concerning the date of Deuteronomy were original but his skill as a linguist and his literary sensitivity enabled him to present them with unparalleled lucidity. Where he differed from the majority of his predecessors was in his view that Deuteronomy was incomplete in the reign of Josiah, the material in the book being amalgamated over more than a century. His argument that a considerable proportion of the book was not in Josiah's book of the law is presented in his Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des alten Testaments.

Wellhausen argues that Deut. xxix and xxx could not have been written before the exile since the hope for blessing and conversion in

111. Wellhausen, Prolegomena to the History of Israel, p.13. Cf., too, ibid., p.368.

the succeeding era presupposes that the curse has had its effect (113) and, in view of the fact that the Judaeans did not fully identify themselves with their Northern brethren, the curse cannot have been the exile of the Northern Kingdom. Deuteronomy is to be identified with Josiah's book of the law, but, since Deuteronomy could not have existed in its present form before 621 B.C., what, then, constituted Urdeuteronomium? Rejecting Graf's view that it consisted of Deut. iv:45-xxviii:69, (114) Wellhausen supports Vater's suggestion that Deut. xii-xxvi was the original 'book of the law.' (115) If Urdeuteronomium did consist of chapters xii-xxvi, then it is similar to the other codes of law which also begin with sanctuary laws. (116) Urdeuteronomium dates from Josiah's reign, while i:3 (117) and xxxii:48-52, (118) which are P passages, were inserted at the time of Ezra, and the rest of the book was incorporated during the intervening years. Chapters xxviii-xxx presuppose a written law (cf. xxviii:58, 61; xxx:10). The fact that xxxi:9 then describes how Moses wrote it, indicates to Wellhausen that chapter xxxi must have been written and inserted at an even later stage by the editor who incorporated Deuteronomy in the Pentateuhal history. (119)  

113. Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des alten Testaments*², pp.190f.  
118. Ibid., p.208.  
119. Ibid., p.192.
Chapter xxvii must also be a secondary addition, since the narrative 'Now Moses...' begins in xxvii:1, but this chapter was originally independent of xxviii-xxx, for, while chapters xxvii and xxviii-xxx refer to 'this law', xxvii does not include itself in this description, whereas xxviii-xxx do. The phrase 'this law' also occurs in chapters i-iv, referring to the material after iv:44, (120) but iv:45-xxvi:19 clearly divides into two main sections since chapters v-xi were obviously composed simply as an introduction to the laws contained in chapters xii-xxvi.

Expansions have also been made to some of the laws in Urdeuteronomium as is clear from the king law, (Deut. xvii:14-20), for example, which presupposes that Deuteronomy has been written out. Editorial expansions were inserted by the author of chapters v-xi when he edited chapters xii-xxvi. (121)

After Urdeuteronomium had been written, two independently expanded editions (i-iv, xii-xxvi, xxvii and v-xi, xii-xxvi, xxviii-xxx) were made which were later amalgamated, the unification of the two editions being achieved by means of chapter xxxi, and then incorporated into the Hexateuchal law-book, which consisted only of the JE traditions and laws, not those assigned to P. This explains why Deuteronomy refers virtually exclusively to the JE traditions and those passages of the book which do refer to something only found in P are either insertions by the P editor or they belonged to the original form of the JE traditions before these were modified by being slotted into the framework of P. (122)

Wellhausen's original contribution to the critical source analysis was his argument that the great collections of cultic and ceremonial laws were late and that P, in which they were set, was the latest of the

120. Ibid., p.193.
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Hexateuchal sources. It was this argument which enabled him to provide a coherent and well-founded chronology of the development of the Hexateuch as a basis for a well-balanced understanding of the whole literary history of the Old Testament. Wellhausen's examination of the history of Israel's religious institutions of priesthood, temple, and sacrifice was thorough and meticulous and provided skilful and convincing substantiation of Graf's hypothesis. In spite of the fact that he tended to neglect Israel's political and cultural history, his work, as an interpretation of the growth of ancient Israelite religious history, was outstanding, and many of the principles which he enunciated with such cogency are firmly accepted by the majority of biblical scholars. Wellhausen rightly saw that the interpretation of the Hexateuch provided the key to understanding the origin and the development of Israel's religion and the growth of her literature. Only after the Hexateuchal documents have been analysed, classified historically with respect to their origins, compositional principles, theological orientations, and authenticity, is it possible to draw up the history of Israel and of its religion.

On the negative side, one of the most serious weaknesses in Wellhausen's work is the fact that he treats the development of Israelite religion as a purely internal and virtually insular process. He was also wrong to assume that the literary sources were consistent wholes which were to be dated close to the time of the latest developments which could be discerned within them. Wellhausen's reconstruction of the development of the religion of Israel seriously underestimated the spiritual and moral potentialities of the primitive cultus, with the

124. Cf., e.g., Knight, Rediscovering the Traditions of Israel, p.67.
125. Cf., e.g., Clements, op.cit., p.145.
result that he placed certain areas of the Old Testament literature much too late in the scheme of religious and literary development. (126) Wellhausen may be criticized for arguing that even the earliest of the Hexateuchal sources could tell us nothing about the nature of the earliest form of Israelite religion since they merely reflected the situation which had developed by the time of their composition. By concentrating almost exclusively on the developments of the text at the literary level, he thereby neglected the precompositional stage of tradition growth and agglomeration. (127) As well as underestimating the extent to which the tradition could have developed at the precompositional stage, Wellhausen was also guilty of devaluating the worth of these earlier forms for the exegete. (128) Moreover, Wellhausen failed to question the unilinear course of successive historical events and was unable to grasp that the historical picture presented in the 'Hexateuch' was formed with the development of tradition and was based on a theological conception of the Heilsgeschichte. (129) Another weakness in Wellhausen's work was his rather negative assessment of Judaism, which he saw in terms of a religion of people who had lost their national consciousness and sense of unity, which tended, to a certain extent, to create the impression that Old Testament criticism was inclined to be anti-Jewish. (130)

As regards Deuteronomic criticism, Wellhausen's work brought sharply into focus the problem of the structure of the book and illustrated that the question of the date of Deuteronomy is inextricably
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linked with the problem of its structure.\(^{131}\) Because he maintained that Deuteronomy was written to centralize sacrificial worship to Jerusalem for the purposes of Josiah's reformation, Wellhausen was forced to argue that certain parts were later additions to the book. Thus, for example, although he excluded chapter xxvii from Urdeuteronomium partly for literary critical reasons, he acknowledged that he was really obliged to excise this chapter in view of the fact that it gives directions for the erection of an altar and for the offering of sacrifices on Mount Ebal. Wellhausen argued that whoever upholds the unity of the book cannot maintain that Deuteronomy was composed during the reign of Josiah.\(^{132}\)

The weaknesses and inconsistencies in Wellhausen's views on Deuteronomy have been highlighted by those who, while accepting his position as their starting-point, have attempted to make it more consistent.\(^{133}\)

There were two significant developments in Deuteronomic criticism between 1878 and 1922.\(^{134}\) The first development took place in 1894, when W. Staerk\(^{135}\) and C. Steuernagel\(^{136}\) independently suggested that Deuteronomy should be analysed, and subsequent expansions of Urdeuteronomium isolated, by utilizing the criterion of the variation between the second person singular and second person 131. Cf., too, Wenham, op.cit., p.80.
136. Steuernagel, Der Rahmen des Deuteronomiums, Halle, 1894. Cf., too, idem, Die Entstehung des deuteronomischen Gesetzes kritisch und biblisch-theologisch untersucht, Halle, 1896, pp.8ff.; idem, Deuteronomium und Josua, Göttingen, 1900, pp.iiff. C.H. Cornill, Einleitung in das A.T., Tübingen, 1891 (English translation, entitled Introduction to the Canonical Books of the Old Testament, London, 1907, by G.H. Box from the fifth edition), seems to have been the first to scrutinize the distinction in the form of address when he argued for the secondary nature of some laws on account of their being couched in the second person plural form of address, instead of the usual singular.
plural forms of address. The second important development was the
tendency to postulate a late date for parts or all of Deuteronomy.
Thus, for example, Staerk maintained that several of the laws in the
book are so idealistic and impracticable that they can only be assigned
to the same period as the Priestly Code, while, from a different angle,
G. d'Eichthal, M. Vernes, and L. Horst argued for a late date for the
composition of Deuteronomy on the grounds that the description of Josiah's
reform and the explanation of Deuteronomy's origin provided by 2 Kgs.
xxiif. could not be trusted, because these chapters were a deuteronomistic
composition. (137)

In an attempt to make Wellhausen's views more consistent, Gustav
Hölscher, who fully accepted Wellhausen's literary-critical methods and
historical presuppositions, carried out an extensive analysis of the
structure of Deuteronomy and put forward radical conclusions about the
date of the book's composition. Hölscher accepts Wellhausen's
analysis and relative dating of the Pentateuchal sources and concurs
with Wellhausen's view that the post-exilic period was the era of
legalistic scribes who were out of touch with reality. In an article
on Deuteronomy published in ZAW, xl, (1922), (138) Hölscher argues that
literary criticism and historical criticism must be kept apart and that,
even if the identification of Urdeuteronomium with Josiah's law-book
were correct, it is methodologically incorrect to try to determine the
contents of Deuteronomy in its original form by comparing Deuteronomy
with 2 Kgs. xxii-xxiii. Even if it were the case that Deuteronomy
in its original form were Josiah's law, this would neither prove that

81ff.; M. Vernes, G. d'Eichthal et ses travaux sur l'AT, Paris,
1887, pp.50ff.; idem, Une Nouvelle Hypothèse sur la Composition
du D teachéronome, Paris, 1887; idem, Précís d'Histoire Juive, Paris,
1889, pp.468ff.; L. Horst, 'Études sur le D techronome', RHR,
xvi, 1887, pp.28-65; xvii, 1888, pp.1-22; xviii, 1888,

138. Hölscher, 'Komposition und Ursprung des Deuteronomiums', ZAW,
all the subjects dealt with belonged to Urdeuteronomium, nor that
Urdeuteronomium did not contain much more material than is mentioned
in 2 Kgs. xxii-xxiii. It is only when Urdeuteronomium has been
delimited by purely literary methods, without reference to 2 Kgs. xxiiif.,
that its relationship to 2 Kgs. xxiiif. can be worked out. (139)

Hölscher argues that the only two useful criteria for reconstructing
the content of Urdeuteronomium are the inner lack of contradiction and,
more positively, usage and style, (140) and, like Steuernagel, he thinks
the alternation between the plural and singular forms of address is a
valuable means of distinguishing different editions. Hölscher
acknowledges that these strict criteria have to be modified in view of
the fact that if the author of Urdeuteronomium incorporated older laws,
then these may well be devoid of deuteronomic vocabulary. (141)

After a painstakingly thorough analysis of Deuteronomy, Hölscher,
while acknowledging that purely literary arguments do not always give a
neat result and that it is only partly possible to segregate primary and
secondary material, concludes that Urdeuteronomium consisted of the
majority of the passages couched in the second person singular form of
address in chapters vi-x, xii-xxvi, and xxviii. (142) Arguing that there
is no stylistic difference which would warrant excising them, Hölscher
refuses to classify as later additions those laws, including the law
on apostate towns (xiii), the king law (xvii), and the regulations
concerning war (xx), which many previous commentators had maintained would
have been impracticable in the time of Josiah. Subsequent expansions of
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Urdeuteronomium include the introductory speeches in chapters i–iv and v together with the closing speeches in chapters xxix–xxx, and Hölscher thinks it is possible to discern the different phases in the expansion of these chapters.

As for the date of the book, Hölscher maintains that since it is thoroughly idealistic and impracticable and since, too, there is no evidence that it existed before 500 B.C., Deuteronomy must be post-exilic. He thinks it was written by priests about 500 B.C. and that the final editing of Genesis–2 Kings was completed around 300 B.C.

The centralization laws are impracticable since it would have been impossible to eat the whole tithe in one week and out of the question for every member of every family to go up to Jerusalem three times each year, leaving livestock unsupervised. Estimating the pre-exilic population of Judah to have been one hundred and twenty thousand, Hölscher argues that it is very difficult to envisage such a huge number of people simultaneously holding sacrificial meals in Jerusalem.

Moreover, the vague allusion in xii:13 to worship at the high places indicates that worship there had long been regarded as faulty, while the mild tone of xii:13ff. is not what one would have expected from an author who was introducing the centralization law for the first time. Hölscher also thinks it
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most unlikely that a writer of Josiah's period would have referred to the state of Judah as יַעֲקֹבּ (xii:14). (150) While the Deuteronomic lawgiver has not invented the laws, he has attempted to transfer old local customs to Jerusalem and in the process of making them apply to Jerusalem he has rendered them impracticable and unrealistic. (151)

In the rest of the laws, too, Hölscher discerns the same idealism and impracticality. The laws in chapter xiii demanding the destruction of those towns which have committed apostasy must be later than Josiah's time, since, if they had been taken literally, they would have necessitated the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple. (152) The naive idealism of the lawgiver is vividly demonstrated by the law in Deut. xv demanding the remission of debts, for this law was only strictly enforced by the determined efforts of Nehemiah (Neh. v). (153) The king law in Deut. xvii, which cannot be excised on grounds of style or context, is another clear indication of the impossibility of dating the book in the monarchical period. (154) This law and the laws in chapters xiii and xv suggest that Deuteronomy was designed as a programme for the future. Hölscher thinks that the late priestly school of authors responsible for the book sought the restoration of the ideal Davidic kingdom, in the same way that Zerubbabel's contemporaries did, and that the king law was the vehicle they used for expressing the Messianic hope. (155)

Hölscher draws further support for the view that Urdeuteronomium was the wishful thinking of unrealistic dreamers from the fact that the
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rest of the book reflects the same mentality as Ezek. xlvii:13ff. and the Priestly Code. Thus, for example, i:7 (cf. Ezek. xlvii:13ff.) describes imaginary divisions of the land which would have been unthinkable in the pre-exilic period. (156) In Deut. vii:3, a later addition, there is a ban on mixed marriages which is a commandment from the time of Nehemiah. (157) Hölscher thinks that Deut. ix calls to mind the exile's awareness of sin, because it emphasises that Israel inherits the land not because of her righteousness, but by grace alone. (158) Other pointers to a period after the exile are the exaggerations about the fruitfulness of Palestine, the great authority of the appeal court run by the priests (Deut. xvi:8-13), (159) and the command to exterminate the Canaanites, which would have been pointless in Josiah's reign, when there had been no Canaanites for a considerable period, but which fits in well with the intense hatred of the Jews towards foreigners after the experiences of the exile. (160)

To support his view that there is no evidence that Deuteronomy existed before 500 B.C., Hölscher argues that only the poems and visions of Ezekiel can be ascribed to the prophet, which means that all the clues which the book of Ezekiel previously seemed to offer for the dating of Deuteronomy, disappear. (161) Moreover, though it was the Deuteronomistic editor's opinion that Deuteronomy was Josiah's law-book, it is clear that
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in the oldest passages underlying the Deuteronomistic revision in 2 Kgs. xxiiif. which derive from the E source, written after 562 B.C., no mention is made of an attempt to abolish the high places. Hölscher puts forward four points to show that Josiah was not concerned to centralize sacrificial worship but only to purify it. Firstly, it is clear from Jeremiah's later oracles (e.g. Jer. xiii:27; xvii:1-4; xix:5) that worship continued to be conducted at the high places. Secondly, it is most unlikely that Jeremiah would have said (Jer. viii:8) if he had been referring to Deuteronomy. Thirdly, Jerusalem appears on an equal footing with Samaria in Ezekiel's oracles and the prophet seems to be unaware of the exclusive legitimacy of Jerusalem. Fourthly, the fact that the Elephantine Jews not only worshipped Yahweh in a temple in Egypt circa 410 B.C. but appealed to the Jerusalem authorities for financial support to rebuild their temple makes it most improbable that Deuteronomy was promulgated as state law in 621 B.C. (163)

Concluding that Urdeuteronomium was written circa 500 B.C., before Nehemiah's arrival in Jerusalem, as the private programme of Jerusalemite levitical priests, who were later bitter opponents of Nehemiah, Hölscher points out that the Elohistic history, which was written before D, was only completed after 586 B.C. (165)
does not appear to have much contact with Haggai and Zechariah i-viii, there are many references to Deuteronomy in Malachi, (166) and that Nehemiah's actions seem to reflect a later stage of religious development than Deuteronomy. (167)

With Hölscher's discussion of Deuteronomy, it is again apparent that the problem of the structure of the book is inextricably linked to the question of its date. (168) Hölscher maintained that since some of those laws which he classified as idealistic constituted part of Urdeuteronomium, then Urdeuteronomium could not have been Josiah's law-book.

Although he insisted that historical criticism should be kept separate from literary criticism, Hölscher seems to have deviated from this ideal in his analysis of Deut. xxvii:1-8, (169) where, with no more justification than a reference to Josh. iv, he declared that the plural verses 1, 2aA, and 4aB are more original than the other verses which are in the singular. (170)

As for the evidence cited by Hölscher to support his position, Wenham rightly points out that while, given Wellhausen's view of Israelite history and his methods of biblical criticism, Hölscher put forward a strong case for the late date of Deuteronomy, none of the evidence adduced by him is really decisive, since most of it is ambiguous and patient of other explanations. (171)
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In Germany, there was little response to Hölscher's arguments, largely because Theodor Oestreicher published a work on Deuteronomy claiming that the book was written much earlier than the time of Josiah and the majority of commentators seem to have felt that "truth and safety lay in the middle way, long pioneered by de Wette." As will be shown later, the German form critical 'school' of Alt, which put forward a different view of Israelite history and new methods of biblical criticism, had no fault to find with Hölscher's reasoning, but questioned his premises and rejected his conclusions.

Oestreicher, who proposes a tenth-century date for Deuteronomy, argues that Urdeuteronomium did not demand an absolute centralization of sacrificial worship but only a relative centralization at the larger sanctuaries. Oestreicher maintains that Deuteronomy xii:14 demands nothing more than the altar law in Exod. xx:24 which simply prohibits worship at shrines other than those specifically sanctioned by Yahweh. Oestreicher translates Deut. xii:14 as "Take heed that you do not offer your burnt offerings at every place that you see, but in any place which the Lord will choose in any of your tribes", (176)
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giving the definite article in לְפִנָּו a distributive interpretation and the indefinite article in לְפִנָּו a general meaning. This interpretation is said to be justified by the analogous use of the same words in Deut. xxiii:17 (EVV 16) which legislates that the slave who escapes from his master is to be permitted to dwell לְפִנָּו. This phrase is best translated "he [the slave] shall dwell with you in any place which he shall choose within any of your gates", (177) and, by the same token, the phrase about the sanctuary in Deut. xii:14 לְפִנָּו is to be translated "in every place which Yahweh shall choose in any of your tribes."

As regards Josiah's reformation, Oestreich argues that the story of the reform in 2 Kgs. xxiiif. is not interested in cultic centralization but, rather, in cultic purification from all heathen and particularly Assyrian elements, both in Jerusalem and elsewhere. Oestreich maintains that Josiah's reform was aimed at Kultreinheit, not Kulteinheit, that Josiah had commenced his reformation on his own initiative several years before the 'law-book', which was basically Deuteronomy, was discovered, and that the real motive behind the reformation was Josiah's desire to gain independence from the century-old Assyrian suzerainty. (178)


178. Oestreich, Das deuteronomische Grundgesetz, p.39. However, because he thought that Josiah was killed attempting to intercept the advance of Necho's army on Assyria in 609 B.C. (cf. 2 Kgs. xxiii:9), Oestreich maintained that Josiah remained loyal to Assyria in external affairs. In fact, Necho was marching to support Assyria against the Babylonians and Josiah met his death while attempting to prevent the Egyptian troops from reaching Assyria. On this, cf. D.J. Wiseman, Documents from Old Testament Times, ed. D. Winton Thomas, London, 1958, pp.75f.; E.W. Nicholson, Deuteronomy and Tradition, p.9, n.2.
Oestreicher maintains that, since in the ancient world religion and politics were linked to such an extent that any religious event must also have been political, 2 Kgs. xvi-xxiii should be read in the context of world history. (179) Living under Assyrian suzerainty, the Jerusalem cult had become virtually Assyrian ever since Ahaz had replaced the old altar of Yahweh with a new altar dedicated to Ashur of Nineveh. (180) Hezekiah's revolt had been unsuccessful, but, when Ashurbanipal died in, according to Oestreicher's chronology, 627 B.C., the twelfth year of Josiah's reign, the Judaean king rebelled and began to purge Jerusalem of the Assyrian cult. (181) Thus, according to Oestreicher, the Chronicler is more accurate than the narrator in Kings in recording that Josiah implemented his reforms in this year (2 Chron. xxxiv:3-7). Six years later, in 621 B.C., Nineveh was rocked by further disturbances which afforded Josiah an opportunity to continue the purge throughout Judah, (182) and it was during this year that the law-book was found which provided additional impetus to the king to complete the reformation. Thus, according to Oestreicher, Josiah's reformation was carried out in two distinct stages separated by six years and the principal motivation was political. The law-book was discovered only after the inauguration of the reforms and its significance was purely incidental, (183) although the account in 2 Kgs. xxiiif. has been schematized in such a way as to make it appear that it
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was the law-book which provided the real impulse for the reformation. The reformers began cautiously, removing the least important cultic items first.\(^{184}\) The cultic vessels were the first to be taken away (2 Kgs. xxiii:4),\(^{185}\) then followed the abolition of the astral cults with their Assyrian priesthood (v.5),\(^{186}\) the removal of the cult of Ishtar (vv.6f.),\(^{187}\) the desecration of the local sanctuaries in Judah and around Jerusalem (vv.8-10) and the transference of the priests into the city so as to foil any Assyrian attempt to use these cult places in order to gain control over the god of the land and manipulate him to fight against Judah.\(^{188}\) The culmination of the rebellion was the removal of the Shamash/Ashur cult which had been practised in sacred buildings in the temple precincts (v.11),\(^{189}\) the abolition of the last remaining altars in the temple (v.12), and the desecration of the last few cult places in the land (vv.13f.).\(^{190}\)

Quite apart from the tenth-century date which he proposes for Deuteronomy, Oestreicher's narrow estimation of the significance of the law-book in Josiah's reformation and his interpretation of Deut. xii:14 do not carry conviction. Firstly, while it may be granted that the Chronicler's account is probably historically trustworthy when it records reform activity before the discovery of the law-book, it seems more than probable that his schema, which has reduced the role of the
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law-book in the reformation to a minimum, is faulty. Secondly, Oestreicher's translation of the law in Deut. xxiii:17 (EVV.16) concerning the runaway slave, is illegitimate. The correct translation can only be: "he shall dwell with you in the place which he shall choose in one of your gates," although, since the subject of this law clearly designates a class of people, the meaning is that fugitive slaves are to be granted asylum in any Israelite town or village. (191)

In Deut. xii:14, the sanctuary has Yahweh for its subject and the only legitimate translation is "in the place which Yahweh shall choose in one of your tribes," (192) and, anyway, if the author had envisaged a multiplicity of Yahweh shrines to be legitimate places of worship, then he would probably have said simply: "but in the places (ヶ月ות) which Yahweh shall choose in your tribes (ヶ月ות)." (193)

A tenth-century date for Deuteronomy was also proposed by A.C. Welch, in 1924, but, whereas Oestreicher had used the tools of literary and historical criticism, Welch applied form-critical methods, not in the closely reasoned manner of the Germans, but in his own individual and creative style. (194) Instead of beginning with an attempt to identify the different authors who have contributed to the composition of Deuteronomy, Welch, applying form-critical principles, first examines


each pericope in turn, seeking to understand its content, then tries to reconstruct its Sitz im Leben, and then puts forward a possible date for its composition.

As early as 1912, Welch had arrived at the conclusion that cultic centralization was not very important in Deuteronomy. (195) In The Code of Deuteronomy: A New Theory of its Origin, 1924, he concurs wholeheartedly with Hölscher that, if one were to interpret Deuteronomy in the traditional way, then the centralization of sacrificial worship at a single sanctuary is completely impracticable. However, Welch rejects Hölscher's view that the book is to be ascribed to unrealistic post-exilic dreamers. Welch asks if Deuteronomy really does demand cultic centralization and concludes that the only passage which unequivocally orders the centralization of sacrificial worship to a single sanctuary is Deut. xii:1-7, which is an addition inserted into the book by the Josianic reformers to make it serve the purpose of centralization. Welch deduces that the law is late, not from the character of the law itself, but from the legislator's quite unhistorical attitude towards the conquest, which he regards as complete and absolute. (196)

In an article published in 1925, Welch argues that Deut. xii:1-7 together with similar passages in Kings identifying the place with Jerusalem, are to be ascribed to the Deuteronomistic editor of Kings. (197)

Examining the laws on first-fruits, tithes, sacrifice, and festivals, Welch first selects Deut. xxvi:1-11, the offering of first-fruits
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to Yahweh, where Yahweh's name is reiterated fourteen times. He deduces that this is a Yahweh liturgy which emphasizes that Israel owes everything to God and which insists that the Israelite must make his offering to Yahweh and not to Baal. The priest's role is simply to ensure that the correct form is used in worshipping Yahweh. Here, Welch maintains, "what interests the legislators is the character, not the unity, of the place of worship". (198) Deuteronomy, he continues, "does not, any more than the Book of the Covenant, demand a solitary place of sacrifice". (199) Welch concludes by saying: "The sanctuary where Yahweh elects to locate His name need not mean only one sanctuary: it must mean a shrine reserved to His honour. Since then the latter sense is the one which agrees with the whole tenor of the law, it is what the lawgivers meant." (200) The very early date of this law of first-fruits is indicated by the imprecision with regard to the size of the offering and the law should probably be assigned to the early monarchy or the period of the judges. (201)

As regards the tithing rule in Deut. xiv:22-27, which belongs to a later date, but is earlier than the time of Amos, there is no need to suppose that cultic centralization is demanded or that the possibility of turning the tithe into cash is a concession which was introduced because of centralization. Welch thinks that if cultic centralization had been presupposed by this law then it is difficult to believe that the priesthood at Jerusalem would have "passed a regulation which entirely ignored their own claim to any share in the tithes." (202)
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However, "difficulties arise, not from the law itself, but from the way in which it has been understood." (203) This law immediately becomes practicable when it is interpreted to mean that the tithe was to be consumed at the local Yahweh sanctuary.

Arguing that Deut. xii is not a unity, because vv. 1-12 are mainly in the second person plural form of address while vv. 13-28 are mainly in the singular, Welch first focuses attention on vv. 13-28, which he divides into two sections, vv. 13-19 and vv. 20-28. (204) Verses 13-19 presuppose a time when there were many Canaanite shrines throughout the country and, here, according to Welch, the Israelite is simply ordered to worship at a Yahweh shrine and not in a Baal sanctuary. On the analogy of Deut. xxiii:17, where he translates "in any of thy gates," Welch argues that קֶשֶׁת יִתְנָה in Deut. xii:14 is to be translated "in any of thy tribes" and "all that is commanded in our verse is that the Israelite must reserve his burnt offerings to a Yahweh sanctuary, not that he must reserve them to a single shrine." (205) Whereas this law is to be assigned to a very early period, when Israel was still living among the Canaanites, vv. 20-28 belong to a later time, and this section also "says nothing about centralisation." (206)

Welch argues that the legislation concerning the festivals is also entirely untouched by the idea of cultic centralization, since the regulations could only have been carried out if the legislators had intended the festivals to be celebrated at the local sanctuaries. It would have been completely unrealistic to have expected people to
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travel to Jerusalem just for the Passover sacrifice and then to return to their homes the next morning. Arguing that the celebration of the Passover as depicted in Deuteronomy is similar to the manner in which the Samaritans still celebrate it, Welch suggests that both Deuteronomy and the Samaritans retain the rites practised at the Northern sanctuaries. This Passover law "is another evidence of the connection between our code and the ideals and practices of Northern Israel" and "may even reproduce the 'use' of some Ephraimite sanctuary." (207) The fact that Deuteronomy gives no specific date for the Feast of Weeks, but simply says it is to be celebrated seven weeks after the beginning of harvest, is further indication of the realism of the legislators and their unconcern about cultic centralization, since harvest time would not have been the same throughout the country: "Because the sanctuary was local, and because no exact period was determined for the beginning or the end of the festival, the law was as practicable as it was beautiful." (208)

Examining those passages which deal with the priesthood, Welch concludes that, while "the idea of centralisation may be imported from the outside, because of a preconceived view of what the Deuteronomist code must contain," (209) none of the remarks made about the priesthood or the cities of refuge "implies in itself, and none of them needs for its clear interpretation, the centralisation of the cult." (210) However, when these passages are read without any reference to the Josianic reform, "they reproduce certain conditions which prevailed in the life of the nation during the period immediately preceding and following the rise of the kingdom." (211)
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Deuteronomy's laws on the prophets and the king are similar to the comments made by Amos and Hosea on the same subjects and Welch concludes that "the connection between prophet and lawgiver is unmistakable; and again it turns the eyes of the student of the Deuteronomic code to Ephraim as the place where some of its peculiar legislation had its origin."(212)

Turning his attention to miscellaneous laws which do not deal directly with the cult, but which touch intimately the social and religious practices of the nation, Welch maintains that these laws are not only capable of explanation, but much clearer in their terms, without importing cultic centralization, which only leads "to arbitrary and uncertain excision as glosses of what are integral elements in the laws, and so to failure to recognise their original purpose."(213)

Examining the framework of the code, Welch thinks it is highly significant that there is no mention of cultic centralization in the introductory chapters, "for, if the aim of the code had been to insist on this feature of the centralisation of worship, or if the intention of the reformers in issuing it had been to introduce precisely this change in the practice of their people, it would have been natural for them to lead up to it in their slight historical account of the way in which Moses led the nation from Egypt to the edge of Palestine."(214)

If the purpose of the code had been to demand cultic centralization, then "the introduction can only be called a complete failure."(215)
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Furthermore, the author of Deut. xxvii:1-8, "the very remarkable section" (216) which was included in, or added to, the Deuteronomic code as part of its conclusion and which "bristles with difficulties, textual, critical, historical" (217) did not believe in the centralization of the cult. (218) In spite of the alternation between the second person singular and the second person plural forms of address, which indicates that the verses may not be homogeneous, and the other difficulties of this section, "the recognition of the crowding ambiguities in the narrative only brings out more clearly where it is not ambiguous." (219) If this section describing how Moses commanded Joshua to erect an altar on Mount Ebal, to sacrifice on it and to celebrate a Yahwistic festival, were a late insertion to the Deuteronomic law "then the narrative with its offence against the centralisation of the cult has been deliberately inserted at the close of a code which is supposed to have been carefully revised in order to set forth exactly this fundamental principle of all worship in Israel." (220) However, if the Deuteronomic code "does not concern itself with centralisation, but, in connection with the cult, is content to demand that Israel shall reserve its worship for such sanctuaries as Yahweh shall elect, the narrative is not only in full agreement with all that precedes, but forms an admirable conclusion to the whole." (221)
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Welch concludes by saying that the code of Deuteronomy "cannot have been prepared and issued by a central authority which was legislating for the needs of a whole people" (222) but seems rather to be "a collection of laws which were never issued together, but which may have been promulgated at different times, even from different centres and by different authorities." (223) The Deuteronomic code not only betrays acquaintance with the conditions in Northern Israel, but repeatedly "shows affinities with the thought and practice of Israel proper" (224) and Welch thinks it possible that whereas Leviticus, or a nucleus in Leviticus, represents the 'use' which grew up round the Jerusalem temple, "Deuteronomy, on the other hand, may be the 'use' of Bethel, or of one of the larger sanctuaries in Ephraim." (225) As for those responsible for the Deuteronomic code, Welch maintains that it is "the outcome and one expression of that religious and national movement which rose in Benjamin and Ephraim, and which in its beginning is associated with the personality of Samuel", a movement which "sprang up after the people had made good their footing in Palestine." (226) The only part of the book which specifically demands cultic centralization, Deut. xii:1–7, is the only part which can be definitely assigned to the time of Josiah. (227)
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In Deuteronomy: The Framework to the Code, 1932, Welch employs the same form-critical principles as he had used in his earlier book, but, in this work, he devotes his attention to the origin and date of the material in Deut. i-xi and xxvii-xxxiv, examining each chapter in turn and then searching for its possible Sitz-im Leben. Again, Welch concludes that, while there has been relatively little editorial work, Deuteronomy is not the work of a single mind but is, rather, a collection of laws, liturgies and speeches from different periods, and is the product of a centuries-long religious movement in the Northern Kingdom. Of particular significance in this context is the fact that Welch considers that his analysis of Deut. xxvii:1ff. "bears out the conclusion I already stated in the Code of Deuteronomy, pp.179ff., viz. that it glaringly contradicts the current view that the book was carefully revised throughout in the interests of the Josianic reform." (228)

Welch thinks that this pericope must precede the date of the Josianic reform "for it not only records the building of a local sanctuary, it glorifies the shrine, since it makes this the earliest Yahweh sanctuary in Palestine, derives it from no less authority than that of Moses, and locates it in Samaria where Josiah is said to have destroyed all the houses of the high places, 2 Kings 23:19". (229)

Comparing and contrasting the attitudes of the editors of Judges and Kings respectively, Welch deduces that "the editor of Kings was writing from the point of view of the Josianic Reform; the editor of Judges from the point of view of the Deuteronomic Code." (230)

Similarly significant differences can also be detected between the Northern and Southern law codes. Ascribing the Book of the Covenant
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in its final form to the period of the united kingdom, Welch, while he considers it impossible to say how much of the book belonged to the period of the settlement at Kadesh, thinks "that some of its regulations, such as that of the field-altar, must date before the conquest seems clear." (231) Both the later law-books, the Deuteronomic Code and the Law of Holiness, are based upon the Book of the Covenant. The division of the two kingdoms "serves to explain why there were two accounts of the Origins of Israel, J and E" and "it equally serves to explain why there are now two law-books, the Law of Holiness and the Deuteronomic Code, which, with all their divergence, have a common aim and show signs of owing much to a common original." (232) The common aim of both codes of law was to maintain the people in absolute allegiance to Yahweh. Examining the differences between these two law codes, Welch points out "the linguistic peculiarities of the book of Deuteronomy" which "show so close a resemblance to those of E, so great a dissimilarity to J and the Law of Holiness", (233) and draws attention to the fact that the material added to the Deuteronomic Code shows "an intimate acquaintance with and a dependence on the E traditions in Exodus and Numbers and on the book of Judges." (234) The most significant difference is the fact that in its moral and social demands and in its religious teaching, the Deuteronomic Code, in marked contrast to the Law of Holiness, "is impregnated, as no other law in Israel, with the ideals of prophecy." (235) According to Welch, "the most remarkable
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divergence between the two law-books is in their attitude to the cult", for, whereas the Law of Holiness "is saturated with the idea of ceremonial cleanness", (236) the idea of ceremonial purity, while not entirely banished, has been thrust into the background in the Deuteronomic Code where "the conception of moral purity is dominant." (237)

Welch thinks that the bringing of the religious literature of the Northern Kingdom to Jerusalem and its recognition by the entire nation is to be ascribed to the period of the Josianic reform. In certain cases parallel documents were combined into a new form. Thus, the two accounts of the nation's origins were combined to form the material known as JE, the separate histories of the two kingdoms were interwoven to form the present books of Kings, and several northern psalms were incorporated into the official Psalter alongside the litanies which had been used at the temple. (238) However, the same method could not be followed in the case of the two law codes since the two had widely diverged and were so different in character. The Deuteronomic Code, therefore, "was recognized in N. Israel, but was carefully countersigned with the principle of the Josianic reform by the addition of the opening vv. 1-7 in chap. 12" and "everything in the following law was to be construed in the light of the fundamental law of the centralization of sacrificial worship at Jerusalem." (239)

Welch thinks it probable that the revision of the opening historical chapters is to be assigned to this period as the attempt was made to bring them into agreement with
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the prevailing view in Judah that the entry into the land of Canaan had proceeded by way of Jericho. (240) After the exile, those who returned renewed and reconsecrated the altar and deposed the levites and "with the deposition of the levites went naturally the rejection of their law-book." (241) Deuteronomy "was deprived of all authority" and "the men took up their own law, the Law of Holiness, and made it the basis for a new Code, which was needed to meet the new conditions of their life." (242) Thus, after the exile, the history of Israel was rewritten by the Judaeans and Deuteronomy was replaced by the Priestly Code as the law-code of Judah.

Thus, Welch differs in three respects from his predecessors in maintaining that Deuteronomy is not a unified composition, but a collection of laws and speeches, that it has a northern provenance, and that most of the material is much earlier than Josiah's reform. He puts forward four principal arguments to support these conclusions. Firstly, vv. 1-7 of chapter xii, "the only law in the code which unquestionably demands the centralisation of the cult," are a late insertion which "form a little unity which is entirely unconnected with what precedes and with what follows", (243) while the phrase לְפִילֹת בִּבְלָקָה בְּקַמְרֵי יָהִי יְרוּשָׁלָיִם in Deut. xii:14, which is usually interpreted as demanding cultic centralization, need not refer to one sanctuary, let alone Jerusalem. Secondly, the laws on worship and festivals are practicable and "singularly free from glosses, explanations and additions", (244) when they are read without thought of
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the centralization of the cult. Thirdly, chapter xxvii is difficult to reconcile with Josiah's reform. Fourthly, chapter xxvii and, more especially, the affinities of Deuteronomy with Amos and Hosea and the book's dependence on E, suggest a northern provenance.

Welch's work on Deuteronomy is full of fresh insights and imaginative and thought-provoking ideas. He deserves commendation for being the first to apply form-critical principles to the study of Deuteronomy, in spite of the fact that he was not very successful in relating form criticism to literary criticism. As Wenham rightly says: "It is hardly fair to expect a pioneer of new form-critical methods to have been able to relate the two disciplines coherently." The most obvious inconsistencies in his work are the fact that he sometimes uses the criterion of the change from singular to plural to indicate a change of author, but not always. Most significant of all, however, in this context is his treatment of Deut. xiii:1-7, which he declares to be a late gloss simply because it conflicts with his interpretation of the rest of the book. Moreover, Welch's interpretation of כומס השם; הביא, which had been put forward a year earlier by Oestreicher, is untenable. Both Oestreicher and Welch used Deut. xxiii:17 to elucidate Deut. xii:14. Thus Oestreicher, in response to the criticism of König, who said he had never heard of such a thing as a generalizing use of the
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definite article, and of Gressmann (250) who accused Oestreichers of wrestling the Hebrew language, maintained that the use of the generalizing article followed by the relative clause is common in Hebrew and, again referring to the law of the fugitive slave, concluded: "Es bleibt also dabei, hier liegt der, wahrlich nicht erst von mir erfundene, generelle Artikel in bammakôm vor; der individualisierende Artikel ist absolut ausgeschlossen. Da Dtn 12:14 den gleichen Wortlaut bietet, ist auch dort der Artikel von bammakôm generell und das Zahlwort 'תנ DISTRIBUTIV zu fassen" (251). Welch drew attention to the fact that 'תנ can and does mean "any" in other passages in Deuteronomy, including xiii:13; xvii:2; xviii:6; xix:5, 11. (252)

Wenham thinks that Oestreichers and Welch "definitely showed" that syntactically the passages in Deut. xii:14ff. do not require only one sanctuary. (253) König (254) argued that just as one fugitive slave could only choose one town, so Yahweh's choice must have been limited to a single place, and that the phrase 'making his name to dwell there' is most naturally interpreted as referring to one sanctuary.

Unconvinced, Wenham retorts by saying that "starting from de Wette's and Wellhausen's position, these arguments of König are worthless." (255)

Wenham disapproves of the way in which König, who believed that a
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central sanctuary existed from the earliest times, "could only defend a seventh-century date for Dt by denying the premise on which de Wette and Wellhausen depended, namely that centralization was an innovation of Josiah."(256) Budde(257) puts forward the argument that the phrases,"to make his name dwell there" and "to put his name there", in which Yahweh's name is hypostatized, must not be interpreted with reference to Exod. xx:24, but in the light of similar phrases in Kings, referring to the temple. Budde maintains that while God may reveal himself and be called on at many different places, he can only make his dwelling in one place, and the ark, which was first located at Shiloh and then at Jerusalem (cf. Isa. xviii:7; Jer. vii:12), was the dwelling place of Yahweh's name. Wenham considers Budde's argument that there is a qualitative difference between the central sanctuary and the subsidiary high places, a difference which can be traced back to the period of the judges, a stronger and better argument in defence of the idea that Deuteronomy intends cultic centralization than that put forward by König. However he says that, in so arguing, Budde "has deserted the ground on which de Wette based his main reason for supposing Dt to have been written in the time of Josiah."(258) Thus, Wenham considers that Welch's work on Deuteronomy presented Old Testament commentators with a dilemma for "either there was no central sanctuary before Josiah's time, in which case there is no good reason to suppose Dt requires centralization, or there was a central sanctuary at a much earlier date at which Dt intends all Israel to worship."(259)
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Moreover, Welch had thought that Deut. xii:1-7 "definitely and uncompromisingly...orders the centralisation of the cult", since in these verses "the place to which Israel must bring all their offerings is no longer the sanctuary where Yahweh elects to locate His name, nor is it the sanctuary Yahweh elects in any of the tribes: it is now the sanctuary which Yahweh your God elects from among all your tribes to set His name there." (260) Wenham, on the other hand, thinks that Welch is here "straining at a gnat" since "if everywhere else in Dt worship is permitted at Yahweh shrines, it is hard to see why מֵקֵּל שְׁמֶךָ, from all your tribes, should not be interpreted in the same way." (261) Wenham is reviving the view of Brinker who referred approvingly to Welch's argument that Deuteronomy was not originally geared to cultic centralization but who found Welch's contention that Deut. xii:5 belongs to a different category from the rest of similar passages in that it demands the centralization of sacrificial worship to a single sanctuary, unconvincing: "The addition of מֵקֵּל שְׁמֶךָ to the usual formula does, in our opinion, not affect the interpretation given by us to the significance of this phrase, 'From amongst all the tribes' would be in apposition to the first part of the sentence." (262)

Wenham is enthusiastic about Welch's reasons for supposing that Deut. xxvii:1-8 must be an early rather than a late insertion although he criticizes Welch for having failed to "account for why the redactor, who he believes inserted 12:1-7 to make Dt conform to the purposes of Josiah's reform, left Dt 27:1-8 untouched." (263) Wenham argues that
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Deut. i-xxx is an example of the Old Testament covenant form, which, although similar in several respects to the ancient Near Eastern treaty and 'law-code' forms, is distinct from both these forms. Deut. xxxi-xxxiv, which does not constitute part of the covenant form, has been appended to this material because it contains closely related matter. Attempting to determine the date of the final redaction of Deuteronomy in the light of its covenant structure, Wenham rejects the view that Deuteronomy was written to centralize sacrificial worship on the grounds that "it is by no means certain that Josiah's action in this direction was motivated by the law-book that was discovered in his reign" and "Dt 27 is integral to the covenant form of the book, and therefore Deuteronomy cannot be said to limit all worship to Jerusalem." (264)

In response to Wenham's arguments, it may be said, firstly, that to argue that if there were no central sanctuary before Josiah's time, then there would be no good reason to suppose Deuteronomy requires centralization, is really a non-sequitur. Secondly, as regards Oestreicher and Welch's translation of Deut. xii:14 and Brinker, Segal and Wenham's interpretation of Deut. xii:5, it is eminently more probable syntactically that both מָכַּעַר עָמֵּדָה (Deut. xii:14) and מִסְתֹּכֵל מֵעָנָה (Deut. xii:5) refer to a single sanctuary. Thirdly, as Nicholson correctly points out, not only does the insistence on cultic centralization occur over and over again in the course of the book, but there are various provisions in Deuteronomy "which are the direct result of the abolition of the local sanctuaries." (265)


Thus, for example, Deut. xii:20-25 (cf. xiv:22-26), permitting the secular slaughter of animals for domestic use, has been introduced because hitherto such slaughtering for domestic purposes had been a sacrificial act which was performed at the local altars. Again, Deut. xviii:6-8, legislating that the priestly personnel at the provincial sanctuaries are to be allowed to minister at the central sanctuary if they should so wish, has been formulated to give some compensatory concession to those priests who have been deprived of their livelihood through the abolition of the local shrines. Moreover, Deut. xvii:8f., legislating for the centralization of the juridical rights of the priesthood, is further evidence that "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 centralization demand with all its consequences and associated laws from the book." The demand for cultic centralization was almost certainly an integral part of Urdeuteronomium and clearly fits in perfectly with the character of the book and the author's theology. The total demand which the book makes has been neatly summarized in the German phrase, ein Gott, ein Volk, ein Kult, since "the demand for Kultuseinheit is wholly in keeping with the demand that Israel as ein Volk should worship ein Gott." Thus, on both literary and theological grounds the demand for cultic centralization must be
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considered a basic feature of Urdeuteronomium. Fourthly, Deut. xxvii clearly disrupts the connection between xxvi:19 and xxviii and its secondary nature is further evidenced by the fact that it is couched in the third person and not in the second person form of address which is characteristic of Deuteronomy as the direct speech of Moses. (270)

It is significant that Joshua viii:30-35 records the execution of the provision in xxvii:1-8 for a ceremony to be conducted at Shechem between Mounts Ebal and Gerizim after the Jordan has been crossed involving the erection of stones, on which the law is to be inscribed, together with an altar for sacrificial worship. At any rate, one may conclude with S.R. Driver that it seems "hardly possible that the chapter can form part of the original Dt" and "it seems that a Deuteronomistic nucleus has been expanded by the addition of later elements, and placed here, in an unsuitable context, by a later hand." (271)

One of the most creative minds in Old Testament scholarship was Gerhard von Rad who devoted several studies to the book of Deuteronomy and whose ideas are still the starting point for most modern discussions of the book. Von Rad was influenced by the researches of, among others, Gunkel, Horst, Alt, and Noth. With the progressive application to the Pentateuch of the methods which had been inaugurated by Gunkel, the book of Deuteronomy began to be analysed less and less in narrowly literary terms and increasingly in terms of the history of the traditions and material which it contained and their Sitze im Leben. (272)

270. Cf. Driver, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy, 3 p.294; Nicholson, op.cit., p.34.
272. Cf., e.g., Soggin, Introduction to the Old Testament, p.119.
Observing the varied terminology adopted by Deuteronomy for the laws which it contains, Horst (273) sought to assemble those laws classified as מֲנֹּסֶר - sacral law as distinct from מַנְעֵר which were the norms of everyday life - in a decalogue of five pairs of laws since, he argued, this decalogue would have constituted the nucleus from which Deut. xii-xxviii emerged. Horst traced its origin to northern levitical circles, pointing to Deut. xxvii which describes how it was promulgated at Shechem, and maintained that these norms passed to the south after the fall of the Northern Kingdom. In view of the fact that "worship and everyday life were an integral and indivisible part of the same reality, and the violation of a ritual regulation was considered by the same standards as that of a secular regulation", (274) Horst may be criticized for making too neat a distinction between sacral and secular law in a society which did not recognize distinctions of this kind. Alt, who was conscious of the limitations of any literary critical approach to the various codes of law within the 'Hexateuch' maintained: "The methods of literary criticism alone do not suffice to lead us directly to the oldest forms, for they can only show us older literary versions of the laws, and the oldest written forms which we can isolate with any degree of probability seem bound in any case to be secondary productions, quite distinct from the first promulgation of the laws." (275) Alt argued that, particularly in the case of Israel, "the making of law is basically not a literary process at all, but part of the life of a community". (276) Insisting that full consideration
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should be given "to the possibility that the very oldest written compilations of laws are separated from the real origins of the law by a considerable period in which the law was developed and handed down orally."(277) Alt maintained that "the progress of further research clearly depends on the discovery of reliable methods leading back to the pre-literary stages, thus bringing us much closer to the origins."(278) Alt was able to detect tensions at work in the formulation of Israelite law which were reflected in the fixed forms it had already received in the oral stage. He maintained that two of these forms are clearly distinguishable: casuistic law and apodeictic law. The basic form of casuistic law, in which the main case is introduced by ו and subsidiary cases by דחא, is almost always cast in the third person singular form of address. Casuistic law was not invented by the Israelites but was the normal form of secular jurisdiction throughout the Ancient Near East. The principal peculiarity of this form of law is a negative one for the casuistic formulation is never used in legislation connected with the cult or with ethics and casuistic laws are therefore neutral with regard to the sphere of religion. Alt thought that Israel took over this form of law in the process of settling in Canaan in the twelfth and eleventh centuries B.C. In contrast to casuistic law, apodeictic law is terse in form, and contains no provision for mitigations or special situations. However, the fundamental difference between the two forms of law lies in the contrast "between the implacable will of the national god, and an almost complete divorce of law from religion."(279) To illustrate
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the sharp contrast between the two forms, he selected his first example of apodeictic law from the Book of the Covenant which contains in the main casuistic law. This example is הֶעָרֵבָה הַשָּׁמָּא (Exod. xxii:12), a wholly unconditional terse rhythmic five-word single clause in which both the definition of the case and its legal consequences are compressed into the shortest possible space.\(^\text{(280)}\) Alt thought that closely related in type to such laws and "the best preserved of all"\(^\text{(281)}\) is the list of crimes laid under a curse in Deut. xxvii:15-26 where all the curses are connected with crimes which have been committed secretly and where each crime has the same penalty, viz. a curse laid upon the perpetrator banning him from the religious community. A third list of apodeictic laws marked by the same feature of constant repetition of the same wording in each clause, but restricted to only one of the themes found in the other two lists, is a series of at least eleven clauses, heavily interpolated, which is contained in the Holiness Code.\(^\text{(282)}\) The classic example of apodeictic law is the Decalogue (Exod. xx:2-17; Deut. v:6-18) in its original form\(^\text{(283)}\) which, when divested of the large number of interpolations with which it is overlaid, has a formal similarity to the other lists of apodeictic laws. Each of its commands was probably brief and the regulations concerning keeping the Sabbath holy and honouring parents "were originally not positively phrased, but like the other eight clauses were categorical prohibitions of work on the sabbath and the cursing of parents."\(^\text{(284)}\) Thus, the
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original form of apodeictic law was "always a short series of simple clauses, all similarly worded as far as possible", (285) always expressing a categorical prohibition, always passionately intense, and for the most part dealing with matters with which casuistic law was never concerned. As for the origin of apodeictic law as a whole, Alt maintained that everything in these laws "is related exclusively to the Israelite nation and the religion of Yahweh even where their terse wording does not refer directly to either" (286) and neither in the attitudes they reveal nor in the cultural background they presuppose is there the slightest indication of a Canaanite origin. Distinctively Israelite in character, apodeictic law emanated from the formative period of Israel's life, prior to settlement in Canaan. Moreover, both the intensity of expression and the internal construction of the lists of apodeictic laws seem to imply "that they were created and maintained in use in a part of Israelite life distinct from that of a single community administering secular justice." (287) The imperative tone towards individuals on whom were imposed the absolute prohibitions, or threats of curse or death suggests that the Sitz im Leben of this type of law was cultic and this is clearly indicated by the setting of the curses in Deut. xxvii. This list of curses is presented as being delivered orally by the levitical priests to the entire people assembled in the Shechem valley "in the great natural amphitheatre between Ebal and Gerizim" and as each curse is proclaimed to them, the people accept it with the response "Amen". Alt concludes that "the apodeictic law provides the central text for a sacral action
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involving the whole nation, and those who proclaim it are the mouthpiece of Yahweh, the levitical priests, whose task in the assembly of the whole nation was by no means only to conduct the worship of Yahweh, but who also carried out the function, at least equally important, of making his demands known to Israel" (cf. Deut. xxxiii:10). (288)

Apodeictic law was intended to be recited before the assembly of the whole people at the Feast of Tabernacles every seventh year and it had a precise and relevant purpose which was to signify "the recalling of the people to the ideals on which its existence is based, a renewed pledging of every member of the nation to the will of Yahweh, without which the welding of the tribes into a national unity could not have come about, nor could endure." (289) Thus, the origin of the proclamation of the apodeictic law which placed an obligation on the entire nation at the Feast of Tabernacles "is a regular renewal of the covenant between Yahweh and Israel of which they were conscious as the very source of their national life." (290)

There have been several major criticisms and developments of Alt's theory on Israelite law (291) but what is of importance here is that
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291. Cf. G.E. Mendenhall, 'Ancient Oriental and Biblical Law', BA, xvii, 1954, pp.26-46; idem, 'Covenant Forms in Israelite Tradition', BA, xvii, 1954, pp.50-76, who raised doubts about Alt's distinction by arguing that it is impossible to relate Israelite law framed in casuistic terms to Canaanite law and pointing to the discovery of laws formulated apodeictically among other peoples in the ancient Near East. E. Gerstenberger, Wesen und Herkunft des 'apodiktischen Rechts', WMANT, xx, Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1965 (cf. also idem, 'Covenant and Commandment', JBL, lxxxiv, 1965, pp.38-51), argues that the origin of apodeictic law can be traced back to clan life, where the chief, or father, instructed the younger members of the clan. Pointing especially to the example of the sons of Jonadab-ben-Rechab in Jer. xxxv:6-10, Gerstenberger maintains that the original authority presupposed by such commandments was that
in this study particularly, Alt brilliantly illustrated the method and techniques of form criticism by attempting to go behind the literary tradition, to classify the material on the basis of form, and to suggest a specific Sitz im Leben for each form. (292) In connection with the study of Deuteronomy, it is interesting to note six principal suggestions put forward by Alt in various works, some of which influenced von Rad. Firstly, Alt stressed the role of the Levites. (293) Secondly, he maintained that Judah proper was to be differentiated from Jerusalem. Alt argued that since Judah proper was the country from Bethlehem to a little north of Hebron, as distinct from Jerusalem which was the crown property of the house of David, Josiah's abolition of local sanctuaries in the former

291. (contd.) of the clan, voiced by the clan leader, and this authority was only secondarily subsumed into the wider religious authority of the cult. Cf. W. Richter, Recht und Ethos, Munich, 1966. Cf., too, H. Schulz, Das Todesrecht im Alten Testament, BZAW, cxiv, 1969 (who investigates new ways of interpreting the material previously classified as apodeictic); V. Wagner, Rechtssätze in gebundener Sprache und Rechtssatzreihen im israelitischen Recht, BZAW, cxxvii, 1972 (who proposes that Alt's classifications should be abandoned); G. Fohrer, Theologische Grundstrukturen des Alten Testaments, Berlin, 1972, pp.166ff. (who denies the legal character of norms formulated apodeictically); M. Weinfeld, 'The Origin of the Apodictic Law', VT, xxiii, 1973, pp.63-75 (who supports Alt's theory and makes comparisons with other, previously uncited, legal material from the ancient Near East); S.M. Paul, Studies in the Book of the Covenant in the Light of Cuneiform and Biblical Law, SVT, xviii, 1970, pp.112-124 (who gives an admirable survey of the debate about the classification of laws according to their Gattungen and Sitze im Leben. Paul thinks that Alt's form analysis of biblical law is correct, but, following F.C. Fensham, 'The Possibility of the Presence of Casuistic Legal Material at the Making of the Covenant at Sinai', PEQ, xciii, 1961, pp.143-146 and de Vaux, Ancient Israel, 2 p.146, he does not share Alt's view concerning the historical development of the casuistic material).


territory would have amounted to a violation of local liberties. (294) In a study devoted to the examination of administrative districts under Josiah, Alt maintained that the topographical list in Josh. xv:21-62 really represents the administrative division of the realm of Josiah, which was reorganized on the same traditional principles, and that Judah proper was confined to the districts of Bethlehem and Bethsur. (295) Thirdly, Alt argued that it is impossible to view Josiah's drastic abolition of provincial sanctuaries and centralization of the cult in Jerusalem as a natural political measure. This action can be understood only in the light of the religious sanction of the law of Deuteronomy. Fourthly, Alt put forward the thesis that Deuteronomy collects together traditions of the northern state of Israel, that it was composed there as an ideal programme, possibly after the fall of Samaria, and that it was somehow secreted in the

294. Alt, 'Bemerkungen zu einigen judäischen Ortslisten des Alten Testaments', Kleine Schriften, II, pp.289-305, ref. pp.291ff. In his examination of local administration during various phases of the settlement of the area, especially under Babylonian and Persian domination, Alt concluded that new administrative divisions invariably respected traditional territorial limits. Cf., too, idem, 'The Settlement of the Israelites in Palestine', Essays on Old Testament History and Religion, pp.133-169, where Alt maintains that while the circumstances of people's lives are easily liable to change, the territorial divisions of a country are a much more constant factor for they are hardly ever altered. Arguing for the necessity of investigating the history of Palestine's territorial divisions in order to shed further light on the settlement of the Israelite tribes, Alt says that "throughout history territorial divisions, ultimately dependent on the lie of the land, are extremely persistent; even changes of population hardly ever overthrow them completely, but bring about at most, minor alterations" (ibid., p.136).

Jerusalem temple. (296) Fifthly, it was Alt's opinion that the reason why Josiah was able to take the step of cultic centralization was the fact that Sennacherib's conquest and the provincial reorganization in 701 B.C. had severed the bond between the king and Judah outside the city-state of Jerusalem. (297) Finally, in 1929, (298) Alt endorsed the idea put forward on sociological grounds by Max Weber in 1921 that Israel was the name of an amphictyony, a league of tribes which were bound together in a covenant relationship. (299) This theory, as propounded by Noth who gave it a broad biblical basis, (300) had a profound influence on von Rad.

In Das Gottesvolk im Deuteronomium, 1929, von Rad seems to accept that Hölscher and Oestreicher had put forward strong arguments against the traditional reasons for dating Deuteronomy in Josiah's reign, for he maintains that 2 Kgs. xxii. cannot decide the date of the book, since Josiah may have been influenced by many other factors, and that the individual features within Deuteronomy do not enable its date of composition to be established with any certainty. (301) Attempting to approach the book from a different angle, von Rad maintains that Deuteronomy must be understood as an entirety and then dated by
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reference to the development of Israel's theology. Observing the preoccupation of the book with the unity and corporate responsibility of the whole people of God, von Rad maintains that the emphasis on national unity distinguishes Deuteronomy from the prophets and he suggests that the book was written to oppose Isaiah's doctrine of the remnant since the book not only has no doctrine of a remnant, but ignores the possibility of such. (302) This work marked an important step in the inquiry into the traditions enshrined in Deuteronomy and the particular historical setting presupposed by the book as a whole.

In 1938, von Rad published a study entitled Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuchs, (303) a pioneer work in which he seeks to break the stalemate reached in the study of the Hexateuch caused by the apparent exhaustion of the literary critical analysis of source documents. Von Rad enquires after the faith enshrined in the books from Genesis to Joshua and then seeks to trace the development of the different forms in which this faith is expressed. Since the Hexateuch is the final elaboration of Israel's creed, von Rad isolates what he considers to be the most ancient confessional beliefs found in the Old Testament and then attempts to use these to explain the compositional form of the Hexateuch as a whole by tracing the course of its development from originally separate traditions to their final form in their present context. In his investigation of the oral, literary, and

302. Von Rad, Das Gottesvolk im Deuteronomium, p.89. The embryonic doctrine of a remnant which appears in Deut. iv:27-31 is usually regarded as an exilic, or even post-exilic, expansion of the original book. Cf., e.g., Clements, God's Chosen People, p.37, n.12.

theological prehistory of the component parts of the Hexateuch, von Rad accords central significance to the role of the cult in the preservation of Israel's traditions.

Kraus and Knight highlight four major points about von Rad's approach. (304) Firstly, von Rad maintains that the Old Testament contains creeds or 'faith-statements' summarizing the principal events of God's redemptive activity through which He chose Israel and led her to the promised land. Secondly, he maintains that the Hexateuch did not develop through a long process of sedimentation whereby old traditions were gradually heaped upon some firm basis, viz. the credo. If this had been the case, then it would have been possible to mark a division between the ancient bed-rock and the later accretions. On the contrary, however, "a large quantity of detached materials...have been fused into a single whole according to the pattern of one ancient tradition" and "the various materials all lie as it were in the same stratum." (305) Thus, one plan alone governs the whole and von Rad argues that the credenda functioned as the major organizing principle for the entire agglomeration of multifarious materials and traditions which were incorporated into Genesis-Joshua. Thirdly, while many different types and sections of material within these books have been subjected to form-critical investigation, von Rad maintains that the Hexateuch as a whole must be examined form-critically and the Sitz im Leben of its earliest beginnings determined. Fourthly, von Rad emphasizes the necessity of examining carefully the


early periods when the traditions were circulating, developing, and being collected, if one wishes to acquire a well-balanced understanding of the Hexateuch as the end-term of a lengthy process. While he emphasizes the key role of the Yahwist, who has set his stamp on the whole body of Hebrew tradition, von Rad stresses that innumerable people working at widely different times have contributed to this colossal work which contains so many traditions and theologies. Only by examining it with an awareness of its dimensional depth, "recognising that its pages speak of the revelations and religious experiences of many different periods", can one hope to understand the Hexateuch.

Von Rad argues that Deut. xxvi:5b-9 contains the credo in probably its oldest form. It is much older, both in form and content, than its literary context and must have attained a canonical form through its repeated use by members of the cult who recited those vitally significant events of Israel's Heilsgeschichte. The one striking fact which von Rad observes about Deut. xxvi:5b-9 and similar credal statements in Deut. vi:20-24, Josh. xxiv:2b-13 and in numerous free poetic embellishments of such creeds in, for example, Exod. xv, I Sam. xii:8, Pss. lxxviii, cxxxv, cxxxvi, is the complete lack of any reference to the Sinai covenant story which is such a prominent feature of the narrative sections of Exodus. In fact, Sinai is first included in the Heilsgeschichte in the exilic Ps. cvi and Neh. ix. From the omission of Sinai in the credenda, von Rad concludes that there originally existed two distinct complexes of traditions in ancient
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Israel which were completely independent from each other, with entirely dissimilar subject matter, different histories, and rooted in quite separate cultic celebrations. The one complex, which he designates the 'Settlement tradition', dealt with the events of the exodus from Egypt and the settlement of the Israelite tribes in Palestine while the other complex dealt with everything that took place at Sinai.

The 'Settlement tradition', which is considerably older than the 'Sinai tradition' centres on the oldest form of the Israelite credo, that contained in Deut. xxvi:5b-9. This credo and the rest of the tradition complex, which in time accumulated around it, had a legitimizing function enabling the Israelites to appropriate a Canaanite agricultural festival in a period before the incoming Hebrews had taken over full control of the land from the indigenous population. The original Sitz im Leben of this tradition was the Feast of Weeks which was celebrated annually at the sanctuary of Gilgal, where Joshua was said to have divided the land among the tribes. At the centre of the Sinai tradition, on the other hand, is the narrative of the theophany and the covenant making ceremony which was probably originally a separate, closed tradition, but a number of different, smaller, originally independent traditions, many of which were cultic aetiologies, accumulated around it in the course of time. The main pericope of this tradition is Exod. xix-xxiv but it is also reflected in free poetic variations, for example in Deut. xxxiii, Judg. v, Hab. iii, and it is most fully developed in the body of the book of Deuteronomy. The Sinai tradition was also closely related to the cult and was celebrated by the
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Yahweh amphictyon in the covenant-renewal ceremony which took place at the sanctuary of Shechem (Deut. xxvii; Josh. xxiv) every seventh year at the Feast of Booths (Deut.xxxi:10f.).

Finally, von Rad argues that it was the Yahwist who was responsible for joining these two traditions, by grafting the 'Sinai tradition' on to the 'Settlement tradition' which was the basis of his work, developing the theological relationship between the stories of the Patriarchs journeying to Canaan and the post-Exodus settlement of the tribes in Canaan in terms of promise and fulfilment, relating the patriarchal covenant to the Sinai covenant, similarly conceived as promise and fulfilment, and prefixing to the whole the primeval traditions of Gen. i-xi in order to weld together Israel's history of redemption to God's purposes for 'all the races on earth.'

Examining Deuteronomy, von Rad argues that the book is, in form, an organic whole and that while it is possible to distinguish many different strata and accretions by literary criteria, "in the matter of form the various constituents form an indivisible unity." Stressing the necessity of examining Deuteronomy as a whole, von Rad argues that the book falls structurally into four sections: Deut. i-xi, which gives an historical presentation of the events at Sinai and which contains paraenetic material connected with these events; Deut. xii-xxvi:15, which describes the reading of the law; Deut. xxvi:16-19, which portrays the sealing of the covenant; and Deut. xxviii ff.,
which contains blessings and curses. Von Rad wishes to leave aside all literary considerations for while the exhortations consist of a whole group of paraenetic sermons and material from several different strata can be discerned in the sealing of the covenant and the pronouncement of the curses and blessings, "these findings do not preclude the view that in terms of form criticism the main elements of Deuteronomy make up a single whole." (315) In response to the question of the origin and purpose of the present form of the book, von Rad recognizes in the four major sections of Deuteronomy the basic features of a former cultic ceremony, "manifestly associated with the same festival which is reflected in the Sinai traditions known to J and E (Exod. xixff.)" (316) The four main elements of the tradition on which the Exodus version of the Sinai narrative rests are: the exhortation (Exod. xix:4-6) and the historical recital of the events which took place at Sinai (Exod. xixff.); the reading of the law (the Decalogue and the Book of the Covenant); the promise of blessing (Exod. xxxiii:20ff.); and the sealing of the covenant (Exod. xxiv). Although Deuteronomy has probably preserved the formal pattern of the cultic rite as a whole better than the book of Exodus, it is undoubtedly later in date and less close to the actual cultic situation. (317) However, the book's stress on the contemporaneity of its message (e.g. Deut. ix:1; xv:15; xxvi:17; xxvii:9; xxx:15, 19) is a striking feature which recurs constantly throughout Deuteronomy, indicating clearly that its provisions were formerly intimately bound up with the cultus and "reminding us that this is a vivid reconstruction
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of the events of the redemption story such as only the cultus can furnish." (318) Deuteronomy's "emphatic 'contemporaneity' for all succeeding generations of what occurred at Sinai" highlights the fact that within the framework of the cultus "past, present, and future acts of God coalesce in the one tremendous actuality of the faith." (319)

Observing the juxtaposition of historical and paraenetic introductory speeches in Deuteronomy and the similar intertwining of the historical events of Sinai and the hortatory allocution in Exod. xix, von Rad asks which of the two— the allocution or the strictly historical narration— is the closer to the form of the ancient tradition, and concludes that "it is the more primitive form which has been preserved in Deuteronomy, and...its transformation into an objective recital of historical events is a relatively late development, subsequent to the ancient cultic tradition." (320)

While the book is the outcome of a very long process of literary crystallization and contains an agglomeration of cultic materials, the material in Deuteronomy has an amazing inherent cohesion and the book owes its monumental unity of structure to the fact that the material reflects throughout one and the same cultic occasion and has been constructed on the same plan, in accordance with the same principles of the cultic pattern, as the book as a whole. (321)

Although the book, in its massive final form, bursts all cultic bounds, it still preserves the pattern of hortatory allocution, reading of the law, sealing of the covenant, blessings and curses, which
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indicates a cultic setting. Relying on Deut. xxxi:10b-11 and pointing to the many references in Deuteronomy to Shechem and the parallels in form and content between Deuteronomy and Jos. xxiv, which describes a covenant renewal ceremony at Shechem, von Rad concludes that the cultic Sitz im Leben of the Sinai tradition, and Deuteronomy in particular, was the ancient covenant festival celebrated in the Feast of Booths at Shechem. Further support for his view that Deuteronomy was a document for the renewal of the amphictyonic covenant is adduced by von Rad from the book’s insistence that Israel is a holy nation.

As Wenham rightly points out,(322) there is a tension in 'The Form-Critical Problem of the Hexateuch' between von Rad’s argument that, in form and content, Deuteronomy betrays its origin in the amphictyonic covenant renewal ceremony at Shechem and his unargued belief that, as literature, the book really dates from the seventh century B.C. In his Deuteronomium-Studien,(323) 1947, von Rad seeks to overcome this problem by arguing that the Josianic reformation was part of a movement which sought to revive the traditions and institutions of the amphictyony. Von Rad begins by pointing out that Deuteronomy is unique among the law books of the Old Testament in that it is composed as a speech of Moses to the people whereas the Book of the Covenant and the Holiness Code, as well as the laws of the Priestly Code, purport to be utterances of God to Moses. Following Klostermann,(324) who declared that Deut. xiiif. was not a law book, but a collection of material which was used for the public
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proclamation of the law, von Rad argues that "Deuteronomy is not
divine law in codified form, but preaching about the commandments -
at least, the commandments appear in a form where they are very much
interspersed with parenesis." (325) Seeking the derivation of
Deuteronomy, a question which he considers "possibly the most difficult
in the history of the Old Testament traditions," (326) von Rad catalogues
the most outstanding characteristics of the book. Firstly, he
observes the Deuteronomic concept of the name of Yahweh which he will
put, or cause to dwell, at the place which he shall choose. The
idea of Yahweh revealing himself through his name is not in itself
anything new "but what is decidedly new is the assumption of a constant
and almost material presence of the name at the shrine" and in
Deuteronomy the conception "verges closely upon a hypostasis." (327)
Replacing the old crude idea that Yahweh dwelt at the shrine with a
theologically sublimated concept, Deuteronomy, with its theologumenon
of the name of Yahweh is putting forward "a theological corrective." (328)
In the pre-deuteronomic period, Yahweh's presence was linked to the ark
and the ark was regarded as the throne of the invisibly present God
(Num. x:35f.; I Sam. iv:4ff.; 2 Kgs. xix:14f.; Jer. iii:16f.).
Deuteronomy knows this tradition but demythologizes the ark by making
it simply a receptacle for the tables of the law. But this
reinterpretation shows how closely bound Deuteronomy was to the
tradition of the ark which was the sacral centre of the old Israelite
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amphictyony. (329) Von Rad reaffirms his earlier conclusion that "Deuteronomy stands in the tradition of the old Jahweh amphictyony of Shechem" but qualifies this now by saying: "Or rather, it proposes to re-introduce this old cultic tradition in its own advanced period and to set it forth as the form obligatory upon Israel for its life before Jahweh." (330) The second principal characteristic of Deuteronomy which von Rad observes is the fact that it is the one corpus in the Old Testament which contains numerous regulations about war (Deut.xx:1-9, 10-18, 19f.; xxi:10-14; xxiii:10-14; xxiv:5; xxv:17-19), which are not the composition of the author of Deuteronomy, and "it is of as great import that the whole parenetic diction is sustained in the strongest possible way by an ideology inspired by war." (331) Von Rad thinks it significant that while these laws on war, which all presuppose the settlement in Canaan, contain ancient material, this has all been re-interpreted and brought up to date by being permeated with the characteristic conceptions of Deuteronomy which "gives the impression that, in all these ordinances which Deuteronomy re-introduced, there is at work a strong tendency towards the re-institution of what obtained in the past." (332) The Deuteronomic parenetic speeches (Deut. vii:16-26; ix:1-6; xx:1-9; xxxi:3-8) express the holy war ideology in the kind of language which von Rad thinks would actually have been used in a period whose principal aim it was to re-introduce sacral regulations of much earlier periods. (333)
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Moreover, von Rad points out that Deuteronomy's atmosphere of war is not limited to the so-called laws concerning war and the speeches about war for "it permeates the whole corpus as an unmistakable adjunct and gives it a very specific impress" (e.g. Deut. vi:18; vii:1f.; xi:23ff. - EVW 22ff.; xii:29; xiii:1; xx:16f.).

In view of the form-critical principle that brevity is the sign of antiquity, von Rad, observing that both the cultic and the military laws in Deuteronomy have been reinterpreted and adapted for later circumstances, (334) seeks to determine who would have had sufficient authority to reinterpret cultic laws and such an interest in the institution of holy war. Von Rad follows E. Junge (335) who maintained that after 701 B.C., when the disciplined mercenary troops were surrendered to the king of Assyria, the army of Judah was depleted but, since the state lacked the financial resources to build up a new military force, the only course of action left open to the authorities was to build up from what the country itself offered, by re-introducing the recruiting system of the amphictyony, the tribal levy. Since the programme of holy war in Deuteronomy fits in so well with the revival of the old tribal militia, von Rad is convinced that "we have to look within Judah's revived militia for the representatives of the religious ideas expressed in Deuteronomy." (336) Deuteronomy is unquestionably the product of a revival movement and its determination to reconstruct "moved wholly within the ambit of the traditions of the old Jahweh amphictyony." (337) That the book
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was the product of a revival movement and not of the amphictyony itself is clear for some really important elements of the old institution - charismatic leadership, for instance - were not resurrected, while many later features, notably kingship and prophecy, have asserted themselves in the book. That Deuteronomy aimed at a revival of amphictyonic, rather than Davidic, ideals is clear from the extremely insignificant position occupied by the king, the complete lack of reference to the Davidic covenant with its attendant Messianic consequences, and the book's noticeable silence with regard to the king's political functions. While these features of the book indicate that it "originated in circles where sacral conceptions of the 'anointed of Jahweh' had perhaps never really gained a footing," there is "positive proof of Deuteronomy's provenance from the amphictyonic traditions in its form and content." Thus, for example, the book makes a comprehensive attempt to gather Israel, whose life had become drastically disrupted and disintegrated, into new unity by designating her the people of God, which term was used in the older period to designate the amphictyonic militia, "and that in connection with the militia in the field" (Judg. v:11; xx:2; 2 Sam. i:12).

Next, von Rad points to the accounts of what took place at the removal of Athaliah and the elevation of Jehoash to the throne and the events which led to Josiah being raised to the throne when actively intervened in politics. Von Rad follows Würthwein in arguing that were the free, property-owning, full citizens
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of Judah who were the proper people liable for military service and "who in the event of war made their appearance in the levy of the militia."(341) יִשְׂרָאֵל, who had preserved a pure Yahwism and who took a stand against the syncretism prevailing in the capital, actively intervening on several occasions, notably at the accessions of Jehoash and Josiah, supported the revival movement of which Deuteronomy was a product because they sought the reformation of the cultus and the promotion of a policy of national independence. The actual spokesmen of the movement were the country Levites and "the authors of Deuteronomy are to be sought amongst those Levites",(342) whom the book describes as living in the country towns (Deut. xii:12, 18f.; xiv:27, 29; xvi:11, 14; xxvi:12). Only these men would have had access to a copious sacral literature and possessed the authority to reinterpret the cultic laws which Deuteronomy contains. Moreover, following up a suggestion he had made in an earlier work,(343) von Rad argues that when Ezra explained the law to the people, he was continuing a traditional function of the Levites. (344) That these Levites could have been "representatives of a passionate movement for national and military rehabilitation" is supported by the fact that 2 Sam. xv:24 indicates that the Levites had a special responsibility for the ark, which "was plainly the Palladium of the Holy War", and von Rad goes as far as to suggest that the picture of the priestly preacher of the Holy War in Deut. xx may have been a self-portrait by one of these Levites.(345)
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Attempting to counter the obvious objection that the country Levites would hardly have put forward a programme to eliminate their own sanctuaries thereby "sawing off the branch upon which they sat,"(346) von Rad puts forward two arguments. Firstly, he maintains 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."(347) Secondly, he argues that "it is increasingly a question whether the country Levites, whom Deuteronomy presumes everywhere as living in the country towns, were before this time purely cult-personnel and therefore chiefly interested in the cult."(348) Behind the whole spiritual atmosphere of Deuteronomy which "was not something of the present and the immediate past", stands, as its representatives, "a body of Levites, perhaps turned proletarian, which had evidently long outgrown the cultic sphere proper and was busying itself with the scholarly preservation and transmission of the old traditions."(349) Finally, von Rad argues that Deuteronomy is probably based on North Israelite traditions, which would account for the striking connections between this book and Hosea,(350) and, drawing attention to the Shechem traditions in chapter xxvii which are clearly at odds with the demand
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for cultic centralization, he concludes: "By this token, the separation of the centralising laws proper from the older traditions, which are only to be interpreted secondarily in the light of this demand, has in general proved itself a very fruitful principle for the analysis of Deuteronomy."(351)

In his commentary, Das fünfte Buch Mose: Deuteronomium, 1964,(352) von Rad presents a fuller discussion of the literary problems and puts forward additional arguments to support the view that Deuteronomy was written in the time of Josiah. As far as literary criticism is concerned, von Rad thinks that while there are passages cast in the second person plural form of address which are "quite clearly recognizable as secondary expansions" (Deut. ix:7b-10; xiii:3b-4; xx:2-4; xxix:1-29), "there are others about which it is doubtful whether such a distinction can rightly be made."(353) Following Noth, (354) von Rad considers that Deut. iv:44-xxx:20 originally formed a book in itself, and that i:1-iv:43 and xxxi-xxxiv were probably incorporated when Deuteronomy was included in the Deuteronomistic historical work.(355)

Comparing and contrasting the legal material in Deuteronomy with the laws contained in the Book of the Covenant, with special reference to the legislation on slaves and the year of release, von Rad concludes that "if the Book of the Covenant is to be placed in the period
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between the entry into Canaan and the formation of the State, then this involves bringing the date of Deuteronomy certainly down to the time of the monarchy." (356) Examining the material peculiar to Deuteronomy, von Rad argues that Deuteronomy must have been written later than the amphictyonic period since the prophets did not have a leading position in the people's life until after the time of Samuel, the technique of siegecraft in Deut. xx:20 is too advanced to date from the amphictyonic era, and the law which aims to restrict the power and function of the king suggests that the model used for the negative picture of the kingly office was probably the Deuteronomistic picture of king Solomon. (357)

Referring to Baltzer's Das Bundesformular, 1960, (358) von Rad mentions the fact that work has been done relating the treaty pattern to the form of Deuteronomy. Acknowledging that the treaty pattern was transferred from the political sphere and applied to the relationship of Yahweh to Israel, von Rad points out that it is unknown how and when Israel came to use the form of these early Near Eastern vassal treaties to express its relationship to God, and he himself makes little use of the treaty form to elucidate the structure of Deuteronomy. He argues that the Sitz im Leben of the pattern in which the book is arranged can only have been a cultic celebration, possibly a feast of covenant renewal, which is supported by the insertion of a formal covenant-making (Deut. xxvi:16-19). However, the cultic setting in which the form of the book was originally

356. Ibid., pp.14f.
357. Ibid., pp.15f.
rooted has been abandoned in the present Deuteronomy "because its contents now appear in the form of a homiletic instruction for the laity." (359)

Examining the origin and purpose of the book, von Rad asks:
"On whom devolved this practice of preaching which, from the first sentence to the last, gave to Deuteronomy this distinctive stamp?" (360)

Who were these men who had access to the whole sacral and the legal material, who had the authority to interpret this ancient material as they wished, who concerned themselves with the arrangement of the feasts, the institution of monarchy, the maintenance of the priests, the rules about the holy war, marriage and family law, and who were anxious to make the old cultic and legal traditions relevant for their time? Arguing that these men must have been holders of a religious office and pointing to Neh. viii:1ff. and the militant piety which pervades Deuteronomy, von Rad concludes that the preaching Levites of the seventh century were the sponsors of Deuteronomy. When Josiah wished to regain political independence from Assyria, he was obliged to return to the old-fashioned form of military organization, the levy of the free peasants, because, around 701 B.C., Sennacherib had taken Judah's mercenaries and specialized fighting charioteers and the State coffers were empty. Since Deuteronomy was connected with the events under Josiah, von Rad links the warlike spirit of the book with this reorganization and argues that "we must assume that the Levites in particular were responsible for this warlike movement of renewal." (361)
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Referring with approval to the work of Welch and Alt, von Rad lists the indications which point to an origin in the Northern Kingdom, and says: "If these considerations are well grounded, then we shall suppose one of the sanctuaries of Northern Israel (Shechem or Bethel?) to be Deuteronomy's place of origin, and the century before 621 must be its date." (362)

Von Rad again maintains that the laws concerning cultic centralization occupy a special position in Deuteronomy. Not all parts of the book "express, or even assume, this demand which was revolutionary for its time" and "there are not a few laws in Deuteronomy which do not seem to know anything about this demand for centralization." (363)

Von Rad argues that only six large units have been promulgated with cultic centralization explicitly in mind: Deut. xii, the altar law; xiv:22-29, the tithing law; xv:19-23, the law of the firstlings; xvi:1-17, the law dealing with the feasts; xvii:8-13, the law about the tribunal in Jerusalem; xviii:1-8, the law concerning the priests. He adds to these xix:1-13, the law dealing with cities of refuge, which was introduced to adjust the system of asylum after the abolition of the plurality of sanctuaries. (364) These ordinances "belong closely together and are perhaps to be described as a special, somewhat later stratum of tradition in the book's complicated process of growth, unless we wish to separate them even more definitely from the main mass of earlier material and to assign them directly to a process of revision." (365)
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Of the three ordinances of the altar law (xii:1-7, 8-12, 13-19 [20-28]), each of which independently includes the demand for cultic centralization, von Rad thinks that the third, which is the only one worded in the singular, is probably the earliest. (366) Questioning whether cultic centralization was really completely new in Israel's history, von Rad argues that "the interpretation of the centralizing formula was by no means restricted to Jerusalem", although he acknowledges that the question where a cult-theology with such a programme arose, and who fostered it "is still wide open." (367)

While conceding that Deuteronomy demands centralization in an extreme form, von Rad thinks it likely "that at least the centralizing formula in Deut. 12 does nevertheless in the last resort go back to one of the shrines in the kingdom of Israel (perhaps Shechem or Bethel)" (368) during the period of the Judges, when Israel was a sacral tribal union. (369)

Finally, von Rad argues that it would be wrong to seek to understand the demand for cultic centralization "merely as a tactical measure in cultic politics" for the demand is, rather, to be understood as a direct deduction from the basic conception of Yahweh's 'oneness'. (370) Not only had Israel's cult become completely lacking in unity, but the cult celebrated in many of the former Canaanite shrines was probably intended for Baal rather than Yahweh. The centralizing laws in Deuteronomy are to be understood "as a fresh interpretation, even if
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perhaps a harsh one, of the old cultic system, an interpretation which had become necessary owing on the one hand to abuses introduced in the meantime and on the other to quite new perceptions of Yahweh and his relationship to Israel."(371) Von Rad thinks that "this last consideration, namely a fresh theological basic conception of Israel's relationship to Yahweh, is probably the decisive factor."(372)

The importance of von Rad's work on the 'Hexateuch' is very considerable. Whereas Wellhausen had been concerned with the question of how much historical weight should be attached to each of the sources, von Rad was concerned with the more profound question as to why the sources had been written and what specific religious or political situations were being served by their composition. (373) However, von Rad has been rightly criticized for his view of the date and original setting of the brief summaries of Israel's past and God's redemptive activity. Rost (374) puts forward quite a different picture of Deut. xxvi:5-10 from that of von Rad. Disagreeing with von Rad that this credo is very old, Rost differentiates between the
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old "Darbringungsformel" in Deut. xxvi:5 α, 10 and the "deuteronomisches Credo" in xxvi:6-9 and argues that the credo is the creation of an individual author in the Josianic period. James Barr questions whether Deut. xxvi is really a short historical creed at all and thinks that "for a passage to which so much appeal has been made, it seems to be stuck away in a rather odd corner of the Pentateuch."(375) Anyway, Barr thinks that the occurrence of such a brief and summary confession statement, with a condensed concentration on God's redemptive acts, "does not entitle us to take it as the typical basic form of expression."(376) Weiser, Brekelmans, Vriezen, Fohrer, Hyatt, Lohfink, Clements, and Nicholson have also put forward strong criticisms of von Rad's treatment of these
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confession statements and it would seem that those passages
designated by von Rad as ancient historical credos are not so
ancient, but belong to a later date than that of J and presuppose
the outline of events which J had established. Moreover, von Rad
may be criticized for his separation of the Exodus and Sinai traditions,
for, as will be shown in the next chapter, the omission of the Sinai
tradition from the "historical Credos" does not prove that the Sinai
tradition developed in isolation from the other traditions, and
indeed there are cogent arguments to support the view that it
developed along with those traditions.

As regards his research on Deuteronomy, von Rad's argument that
Deuteronomy preserves and reworks the traditions of the old Israelite
amphictyony and that the whole book is dominated by amphictyonic
institutions and concepts, sometimes in modified form, does not carry
conviction since, as will be shown in the following chapter, "the
existence of an amphictyony in ancient Israel is a theory which is
supported neither by the most important and basic evidence which has
been brought forward...nor by the less important evidence."(385)
Moreover, his argument that the writing of Deuteronomy is to be
connected with a revival movement run by seventh-century Levites
suffers from several inconsistencies and lacks evidence to support
it.(386) Having largely based his argument that the Levites were
responsible for Deuteronomy on the repeated demand to 'remember the
Levite within your gates', von Rad counters the objection that the
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Levites would have been depriving themselves of their livelihood by preaching cultic centralization, by maintaining that the centralization passages can be easily excised as late additions to the book. However, the first difficulty here concerns the fact that von Rad regards Urdeuteronomium as consisting of the singular passages in Deuteronomy, because Deut. xii:14, which unquestionably demands cultic centralization, is cast in the second person singular form of address. The second difficulty with von Rad's line of argument is the fact that on more than one occasion the command to remember the Levites occurs together with the demand to worship at the central sanctuary. (387)

As argued above, the demand for cultic centralization undoubtedly belonged to the original composition of the book and must be viewed as having been an integral part of the author's theology. (388) In a further attempt to extricate himself from the dilemma posed by Levitical authorship, von Rad argues for the possibility that the Levites were not cult personnel at all. However, while they are not actually depicted offering sacrifice, the Levites are said to be the recipients of tithes and parts of the sacrificial offerings (Deut. xiv:29; xviii:8) while Deut. x:9 and xviii:2 declare that Yahweh is their inheritance. (389)

Finally, von Rad may be criticized for his argument that consisted solely of the more prosperous landowning class in Judah and his view that there was a fundamental change of military policy after 701 when the tribal levies were resuscitated, for which there is no evidence in Kings. (390)

Perhaps the most positive contribution of von Rad to Deuteronomic criticism has been his suggestion that the decisive factor in the formulation of the centralization laws was probably "a fresh theological basic conception of Israel's relationship to Yahweh,"(391) for the demand for cultic centralization in Deuteronomy is certainly inextricably linked with the Deuteronomic concept of the nature of Yahweh's dwelling among his people.(392)

A much more conservative approach to the historicity of the early books of the Old Testament than that of Alt, Noth, and von Rad, is taken by a number of American scholars, mostly pupils of W.F. Albright. It is characteristic of these American scholars that they follow very closely the course of events presented in the Biblical narratives and, on the basis of archaeology and a comparison of ancient Israelite customs and laws with those of her Near Eastern neighbours, they maintain that the Biblical narratives are much more reliable than their late date of composition might suggest.(393)

There has been some tension between the Alt-Noth-von Rad'school' and the Albright 'school'. Thus, for example, over the matter of the contribution of archaeology to the reconstruction of Israel's history, which is "one of the greatest bones of contention among the representatives

391. Von Rad, Deuteronomy, p.91.


of these two approaches", the Germans have been accused of 'nihilism' and the Americans have been charged with having an uncritical acceptance and application of archaeological results.

M.G. Kline, who owes much to the 'school' of Albright, has attempted to relate Deuteronomy to the Ancient Near Eastern treaties and his work again illustrates that the question of the structure of the book is inextricably linked to the question of its date. Kline noticed the relevance of Mendenhall's work, relating Old Testament law and covenants to the Near Eastern treaties, to the study of Deuteronomy. Mendenhall had argued that the account of the Sinai covenant must be older than literary critics had previously suspected since the form of the Sinai covenant in Exod. 19f., which is renewed in Josh. xxiv, does not parallel the form of first millennium treaties, but does correspond to the form of Hittite suzerainty treaties of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries B.C.

Kline argues that Deuteronomy has the form of a second millennium suzerainty treaty, that the contents of the book correspond to such treaties - when due allowance is made for the inevitable alterations which took place when the international treaty form was adopted to express the covenant relationship between Yahweh and his people - and that Deuteronomy, therefore, must be of Mosaic origin.

394. Mayes, op.cit.


Kline discerns the five principal sections of the full treaty form in Deuteronomy: i:1-5 contains the preamble which introduces the suzerain who is imposing the treaty; i:6-iv:49 is the historical prologue which traces the previous relations between the two parties; v-xxvi contains the stipulations; xxvii-xxx contains curses and blessings or covenant ratification; xxxi-xxxiv discusses the necessary arrangements for ensuring covenant continuity, witnesses, treaty document, and so forth.\(^{(398)}\) Kline maintains that not only has the treaty form determined the overall shape of Deuteronomy, but many of the distinctive features of the form are contained in certain sections of the book, notably chapter iv and chapters xxix-xxx. With regard to the stipulations, Kline thinks that the basic stipulation of allegiance to Yahweh is contained in Deut. v-xi and that this section should be distinguished from the ancillary stipulations contained in Deut. xii-xxvi. In extra-biblical treaties there is the same sequence whereby the auxiliary commandments follow the fundamental demands.\(^{(399)}\) Against Noth, Kline argues that chapters i-iv and xxxi-xxxiv are not later additions to an original core but, rather, constitute parts of the treaty form of the book. In view of the fact that Deut. xxviii seems to follow xxvi without a break, Kline thinks that chapter xxvii may have been inserted in the book after the death of Moses, together with Deut. x:6-9 and chapter xxxiv.\(^{(400)}\) With regard to style and content, he points out some parallels between Deuteronomy and the treaties and, following J. Harvey,\(^{(401)}\) he argues that Deut. xxxii is based on the pattern of a covenant lawsuit, which was a customary indictment incurred


\(^{399.}\) Ibid., p.6.

\(^{400.}\) Kline, Treaty of the Great King, p.121.

by a vassal's breach of a treaty in the second millennium.\textsuperscript{(402)}

Pointing to the fact that treaties were frequently concerned with the question of dynastic succession and vassals were often made to vow that after the suzerain's death they would give their allegiance to the chosen successor, Kline argues that the purpose of Deuteronomy was to ensure that Joshua would be Moses' successor as covenant mediator. Kline thinks that just as the Esarhaddon treaty, which is solely concerned with ensuring that Ashurbanipal would succeed Esarhaddon after the latter's death, was first made four years before the death of Esarhaddon and then renewed after Ashurbanipal's accession, so, too, a two-stage covenant renewal process is envisaged in Deuteronomy. Having mediated a covenant between Israel and Yahweh and appointed Joshua as his successor Moses then ordered that the people were to renew this covenant and reaffirm the appointment of Joshua as leader in a ceremony on Mounts Ebal and Gerizim (Deut. xxvii), once they entered the land of Canaan.\textsuperscript{(403)}

Finally, Kline argues that while there is a great similarity among all the treaties, Deuteronomy shows its affinity with the second millennium Hittite treaties in its introductory words - "These are the words of" - which are found in second, but not in first, millennium treaties, in its historical prologue, Deut. i-iv, which is a feature only of Hittite treaties, and in its blessings, which are usually absent from the later treaties.\textsuperscript{(404)} Believing it unlikely that Deuteronomy would have the form of a second millennium treaty if the

\textsuperscript{402} Kline, Treaty of the Great King, pp.35, 138ff.
\textsuperscript{403} Kline, 'Dynastic Covenant', WThJ, xxiii, 1960-1961, pp.11f.
\textsuperscript{404} Kline, Treaty of the Great King, p.42.
book were the end result of a process of continual accretion until the seventh century, Kline argues that its form confirms the prima facie case for the Mosaic origin of the book. (405) Since treaty documents were considered inviolable, alteration of the document being tantamount to breach of the treaty (cf. Deut. iv:2), Kline considers it improbable that Deuteronomy was subjected to a protracted process of expansion and development. (406)

Not only is there vigorous debate about whether or not there is any appreciable difference in form between first and second millennium treaties, but even if it were accepted that the early treaties were different and that the form of Deuteronomy corresponds to them, it would not necessarily follow that Deuteronomy is early since, as Wenham rightly points out, "the treaty form of Dt is not unambiguous evidence for its date of composition". (407) Moreover, both Eissfeldt and Wenham have rightly criticized Kline for his failure to deal with the historical arguments which have been put forward to support the view that Deuteronomy is from the seventh century. (408)

Since Korošec's work on Hittite treaties in 1931, (409) which was not concerned with possible biblical parallels, a vast amount of literature has been published on the form of ancient Near East treaties and the relationship of this form to the structure of the book of

405. Ibid., p.43.
406. Ibid., p.44.
407. Wenham, op.cit., p.140. Thus, for example, P. Buis, 'Les formulaires d'alliance', VT, xvi, 1966, pp.396-411, ref. p.409, suggests that someone rewrote the sermons of the Levites in the form of an old Hittite treaty.
409. V. Korošec, Hethitische Staatsverträge, Leipzig, 1931.
Deuteronomy. Baltzer argues that the Old Testament texts most closely resemble the highly developed formulary of the Hittite treaties. (410)

Since the majority of the Assyrian texts do not contain any Vorgeschichte, and the curse elements are greatly expanded at the expense of the blessing, Baltzer prefers to call these texts decrees rather than treaties. The Hittite treaties are composed according to a definite schema (411):

(i) Preamble
(ii) Vorgeschichte
(iii) Statement of substance concerning the future relationship of the partners to the treaty
(iv) Specific stipulations
(v) Invocation of the gods as witnesses. (In Deut. iv:26; xxx:19; xxxi:28 "heaven and earth" are invoked as "witnesses against you").
(vi) Curses and Blessings.

Both the Old Testament texts and the Hittite treaties include a Vorgeschichte and also a statement of the mutual treaty relationship. As regards the date when Israel adopted this literary type, Baltzer considers the early period of Israel's history likely since "the literary form and the conception of a covenant between God and people, with all its variations, are so intimately related that separate development is hardly conceivable." (412) Reviewing the Old Testament


412. Ibid., pp.xiif.
texts, Baltzer concludes that the covenant formulary, as a literary type, was familiar in Israel (413) but that a comparison between the vassal treaties and the formulae which govern the relationship between Yahweh and Israel in the Old Testament reveals that "the Israelite covenant is as far removed in content from the international treaties as it is closely related in form." (414) Observing that, in spite of the complexity of its structure, the present form of Deuteronomy represents a unified whole, Baltzer argues that Deuteronomy provides a very good illustration of the literary form of the covenant formulary (415) and that Deuteronomy and the literature which is dependent on this book make predominant use of it. Finally, Baltzer argues that "the rôle played by covenant terminology in the so-called Deuteronomistic tradition, especially if the Deuteronomistic tradition is associated with the period of Josiah, seems more a revival than an innovation." (416)

Thus, on the one hand, Mendenhall, followed especially by Beyerlin, (417) who traces the influence of the pattern of the Hittite treaties in all strands of the Old Testament covenant tradition, finds striking similarities in form between the Hittite treaties and the Old Testament formulations of the Sinai covenant, and Baltzer and Kline, stress that the form of Deuteronomy is remarkably similar to the

413. Ibid., p.38.
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structure of the Hittite treaties. Mendenhall and Beyerlin argue that the Sinai covenant must be roughly contemporary with the Hittite treaties (1500-1200 B.C.) and is to be assigned to the Mosaic era, while Kline maintains that the fact that the book of Deuteronomy corresponds in form to the Hittite treaties of the second millennium proves the Mosaic origin of the book.

On the other hand, McKay, referring with approval to the conclusions drawn by Hillers, (418) Weinfeld (419) and Frankena (420) on the basis of their comparisons of Deuteronomy with the vassal treaties of Esarhaddon, argues that "the Deuteronomist...shows no familiarity with the Hittite treaties" but was "deeply influenced by the Assyrian treaties, and those features of the Syrian treaties that may be traced in Deuteronomy could have been known to the Deuteronomist from an Assyrian-Palestinian treaty." (421) Thus, McKay is led to search for the background to Deuteronomy's treaty traditions to the period of Assyrian domination before 622 B.C.

D.J. McCarthy seeks to demonstrate the universality of the general treaty form in Hatti, Syria, and Mesopotamia from possibly as early as the third millennium until as late as the sixth century B.C. (422) He distinguishes, within this general form, the second millennium Hittite

421. McKay, Josiah's Reformation, p.236.
treaties, which contain an historical prologue and very brief curses, from the first millennium Assyrian and Syrian treaties, which lack an historical prologue but which contain lengthy curses and a substitution rite. (423) McCarthy dismisses the comparison of the Sinai covenant with the treaty pattern as being of little value because the Sinai covenant in Exod. xix-xxiv and Exod. xxxiv does not correspond with any known treaty pattern since it lacks an historical prologue (unlike the treaty prologues which are history in retrospect, Exod. xix is the history of what transpired at Sinai), lacks an acceptance by the subjects of the stipulations, and has no blessings and curses (Exod. xxiii:20-33 does contain blessings and curses but this section demands obedience to the guardian angel leading Israel, and not to the law). Deuteronomy, on the other hand, does compare well with the form of the treaties since Deut.iv:44-xix corresponds to the historical prologue, Deut. xii-xxvi:15 contains stipulations, Deut. xxvi:16-19 describes sanctioning rites, and Deut. xxviii contains a list of blessings and curses. (424) Moreover, some of the introductory sermons, including Deut. v; vi:4-19; vii:1-15; viii; xi:18-25, have been constructed on the treaty pattern. (425) Aside from Deuteronomy, McCarthy discerns traces of the treaty pattern only in I Sam. xii and Josh. xxiv (426) and, since these passages are usually assigned to E, he suggests that the "parentage" of the Deuteronomic form is Elohistic. (427)
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What contribution can a comparison of the form of Deuteronomy with the form of ancient Near Eastern treaties make to the study of the book of Deuteronomy? It seems to this writer that while such research has been worthwhile and illuminating, there is a tendency to over-emphasize the parallels. In the first place, it has been questioned whether Deuteronomy does have an historical prologue which is comparable to that of the Hittite treaties and some commentators think a more apt description of Deut. iv:44-xi is 'hortatory prologue.' (428)

Secondly, Plöger (429) argues that the history of the series of blessings and curses in Deut. xxvii and xxviii is very complex and, rejecting the notion of a composition at one specific point in time, he maintains that this pattern is to be attributed to the redactional phase rather than to the original formulation. Thirdly, McCarthy rightly points out that "covenant" is not conterminous with "treaty" and, having argued that "there was in fact one treaty form which was used for international agreements throughout most of the history of the pre-Hellenic Near East", he rightly insists that "the occurrence of the form does not by itself offer an adequate criterion for dating a document or an event." (430) Even if one were to accept that those responsible for the composition of the book of Deuteronomy did employ the form of the Hittite treaty, this could be interpreted as a deliberately archaizing stylistic feature. On the other hand, if one wished to see in Deuteronomy the influence of the Assyrian treaty form, then it could be argued that those writing the book deliberately adopted the Assyrian treaty pattern in order to show as forcibly as possible that Israel's,

428. Cf., e.g. McKay, Josiah's Reformation, p.222.


lord was not the Assyrian monarch but Yahweh, the one, the true, the living God. Finally, just as there is much diversity of opinion about the precise forms of the Hittite and Assyrian treaties, so, too, there is much debate about the origin and history of the covenant tradition in ancient Israel. (431)

Reference has been made to Assyrian treaties in a recent work

431. For example, Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament, vol. I, (translated by J. Baker from the German Theologie des Alten Testaments, Teil I, sixth edition, Stuttgart, 1959), London, 1964, p.36, writes: "The concept in which Israelite thought gave definitive expression to the binding of the people to God and by means of which they established firmly from the start the particularity of their knowledge of him was the covenant." Cf., however, Nicholson, Exodus and Sinai in History and Tradition, p.76, who writes: "It seems to me, however, that the time has come to re-open the whole question of the origin of the covenant, for I have found myself increasingly uneasy about the way in which the covenant 'ideology' has been regarded more and more as permeating almost every book of the Old Testament." Fohrer, 'Prophetie und Geschichte', TLZ, lxxxix, 1964, pp.481-500 and F. Mötscher, 'Bundesformular und "Amtschimmel"', EZ, ix, 1965, pp.182-214, criticize the theory of a relationship between Deuteronomy and the 'covenant formulary'. L. Perlitt, Bundestheologie im Alten Testament, WMANT, xxxvi, 1969, denies the antiquity of the concept and argues that it was a theological creation of Deuteronomy or possibly of the period immediately preceding. Perlitt has been criticized by Soggin Introduction to the Old Testament, pp.130f., for post-dating some crucial passages which were considered pre-Deuteronomic on an essentially literary basis, neglecting the whole tradition-historical approach to the question. Soggin concludes by saying: "Notwithstanding Perlitt's acute analysis, it is impossible to demonstrate that there is no evidence at all for the term Beth in the period before Deuteronomy." Soggin reckons that the use of the term is rare in the period before the book was composed and that it only came to represent a central concept because, like the holy war, "it is one of those concepts...which Deuteronomy wished to revalue and to restore" (ibid., p.131). Perlitt has also been criticized by Vriezen, 'The Exegesis of Exodus xxiv 9-11', OTS, xvii, 1972, pp.100-133, ref. p.117, n.4, who argues that Perlitt's definition of covenant is much too restricted, possibly because he commenced his study of the covenant with the representation of it in the Deuteronomic theology, which has its own particular idea of the covenant, so that he dismisses as sub-standard the many older and different forms. On the debate about Old Testament covenant, see, for example, McCarthy, 'Covenant in the O.T.: The Present State of Inquiry', CBQ, xxvii, 1965, pp.217-240; idem, Old Testament Covenant: A Survey of Current Opinions, (first published in German as Der Gottesbund im Alten Testament, Stuttgart, 1967), Oxford, 1972.
on Deuteronomy by Moshe Weinfeld. Weinfeld(432) puts forward the thesis that the origin of the 'Deuteronomic school', which marks a turning point in Israelite literature, is to be found in scribal circles connected with the court which "began to be active during the Hezekian-Josianic reign"(433) and he attempts to demonstrate this by an analysis of the literary form employed, with special reference to parallels in seventh-century Assyrian treaties, by investigating the religious ideology of the authors of the book, and by an examination of their didactic aims and the affinities which their work has with wisdom literature. Weinfeld does not discuss, here, the problem of Josiah's reform because although crucial from the historical point of view, it does not further the understanding of the book of Deuteronomy per se. (434)

Weinfeld rejects von Rad's theory that the Levites were responsible for the composition of Deuteronomy on the grounds that it is inconceivable that the Levites would have deprived themselves of their office by demanding cultic centralization — "centralization serves as the guiding principle for chs. 12-19, the nucleus of the code, and

---
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therefore cannot be simply discounted" (435) — and it is most unlikely that "so insignificant a provincial class as the Levites could possibly have preserved or have at its disposal such a rich variety of material." (436) Weinfeld suggests that it is more reasonable to see in the composers of Deuteronomy a neutral circle which had access to material of both cultic and national-political institutions. Moreover, in view of the strong resemblance that exists between the covenant in Deuteronomy and the political treaties prevalent in the surrounding area, it is unnecessary to assume a cultic ceremony for understanding the structure of the book. Since the structure of the covenant in the book is a literary imitation and not the reflection of a cultic ceremony, then it is reasonable to conclude that a literary circle which was familiar with treaty writing composed the book of Deuteronomy.

Weinfeld argues that only Deuteronomy has preserved the classic structure of the political treaty since the formal elements "which alone give the treaty its binding, judicial validity" — the blessings and curses, invocation of witnesses, oath-imprecation, deposit, periodic readings, duplicates and copies — are completely lacking in the covenants in Exodus and Joshua xxiv. (437) Although all the elements of the Deuteronomic covenant are found in the Hittite treaty, the fact that Deuteronomy, like the Assyrian treaties and the Sefire steles, contains a series of elaborate curses, while the Hittite treaty only has very short and generalized curse formulae, indicates to Weinfeld that the book was modelled on the later neo-Assyrian and Aramean treaty

435. Ibid., p.55. Weinfeld rightly points out that "the laws about sacrifices, tithes, firstlings, holidays, and the cities of refuge, incorporated in this collection, are based on the principle of centralization and reflect clearly the change these institutions underwent following the reform" (ibid., n.3).
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pattern. (438) Although Deuteronomy does include the 'historical prologue', which is lacking in the first millennium treaties, Weinfeld considers that this does not prove that the book belongs to a pattern different from that of the Assyrio-Aramean treaty type. Firstly, "the lack of the historical prologue in the Assyrio-Aramean treaties may be simply due to a gap in our documentary evidence"(439) and, secondly, in view of the fact that Assyrian kings used the literary pattern called 'historical prologue' in the neo-Assyrian royal grants, the reason for the absence of the historical prologue in the treaties "is not that it was unknown to the Assyrians, but, more likely, a matter of principle,"(440) in that the Assyrian king regarded himself as king of the world and may have felt it both unnecessary and humiliating to justify his demand for loyalty by referring to his gracious acts on the vassal's behalf. (441) Weinfeld finds plausible Frankena's suggestion (442) that Josiah's covenant with God was considered as a substitute for the former treaty with the King of Assyria and that its purpose was to express Israel's vassalship to Yahweh instead of vassalship to the Assyrian monarch. (443)

438. Ibid., p.67.
439. Ibid.
440. Ibid., p.68.
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In both structure and content Deuteronomy reflects the influence of treaty literature, but, unlike the treaties, the book does not present the judicial and stylistic elements in a fixed order as befits a legal document. (444) The most important deviation of Deuteronomy from the treaty form lies in the fact that its central section is devoted to civil, cultic, and criminal law which is very different in substance from the functionally equivalent stipulatory section of a treaty. (445) Examining the convergence of treaty and law-code forms, "one of the crucial problems not only in understanding the pattern of the deuteronomic covenant but also in comprehending the covenant between God and Israel as presented in Exodus", (446) Weinfeld concludes that "the Israelite covenant and especially the deuteronomic version combined two patterns which originally had nothing to do with each other." (447) Covenant and law had been combined in pre-deuteronomic times and the author of Deuteronomy adopted this mixed pattern from his sources but "enriched the covenant theme by introducing all the elements of the vassal treaty, while he blurred the covenantal pattern by putting it into a homiletic setting." (448) Deuteronomy, unlike the treaty, is not a legal document but an oration and while the structure of the speech follows a legal pattern, it has a sermonic style.
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Emphasizing the scribal role in the crystallization of Deuteronomy, Weinfeld points to Jepsen's suggestion (449) that Shaphan's scribal family was involved in the Deuteronomistic history, and, referring to Mowinckel's allusion to the scribes as being the circle from which the Deuteronomistic school arose and in which law and Torah tradition were composed, (450) he thinks it probable that the Deuteronomistic sermons in the book of Jeremiah, which Mowinckel designated as source C, were composed by this circle, with which Jeremiah was closely connected. (451) The supposition that the scribes of the Shaphan family were the leading exponents of the Deuteronomistic school is strengthened by the fact that of all the prophetic books, the Deuteronomistic school chose to redact the book of Jeremiah alone. (452) Jeremiah "fully identified himself with the religious ideology of the book of Deuteronomy and also appears to have supported the Josianic reforms (Jer. 11:1-8)." (453) Weinfeld


450. S. Mowinckel, Prophecy and Tradition, Oslo, 1946.


452. Ibid., p.160.

453. Ibid. That Jeremiah identified himself with the religious ideology of Deuteronomy was earlier suggested by C.H. Cazelles, 'Jérémie et le Deutéronome', Recherches de Science Religieuse, xxxix, 1951, pp.5-36; A. Gelin, Jérémie, Bible de Jérusalem, 1951, pp.47f. That Jeremiah appears to have supported Josiah's reforms has been argued by P. Volz, Jeremia, second edition, KAT, Leipzig, 1928, pp.xxviiiff.; W. Rudolph, Jeremiah, second edition, HAT, Tubingen, 1958, pp.73f.; G.W. Anderson, A Critical Introduction to the Old Testament, p.128. For a survey of the major views on the relationship of Jeremiah to the book of Deuteronomy, see Rowley, 'The Prophet Jeremiah and the Book of Deuteronomy', From Moses to Qumran, pp.185-208. Rowley himself argues that Josiah's law-book was Deuteronomy and that Jeremiah, who had some knowledge of its contents and style, at first advocated the Deuteronomistic reform, "but later perceived its spiritual failure and therefore condemned its insufficiency" (Ibid., p.208). See, also, Nicholson, Preaching to the Exiles, Oxford, 1970, who examines the prose material in the book of Jeremiah and, concluding that the narratives cannot be regarded as biographical writing but that their principal purpose is
argues that during the Hezekian-Josianic period there was a general literary renaissance throughout the entire ancient Near East. Although the literary activity of the scribes is first mentioned in connection with Josiah's reign, it must have already begun in the Hezekian period and indeed Weinfeld thinks that "Hezekiah may be considered the historically true patron of wisdom literature,"(454) since wise men do not appear as a class or profession before the Hezekian period.(455) The scribal circles of the Hezekian period and afterwards "differed essentially from their predecessors in that they saw the didactic importance of setting compositions down in writing" and, furthermore, "the sanctification and publication of the 'book of the Torah' in the time of Josiah...gave rise to scribes with the ability and competence to handle the scripture."(456) Pointing to the fact that the roots of Torah teaching by the wise and the scribes can be traced back to the time of Josiah and referring to the royal intervention in matters of religion by Asa, Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah and Josiah, Weinfeld argues that while the literary form, canonization in a public ceremony, and consequent acceptance of Deuteronomy as the nation's written constitution were unquestionably the outcome of Josiah's reform, the main kernel of the book may have been crystallized in the

453. (contd). theological, argues that they owe their composition not to Baruch but to the Deuteronomists who were also responsible for developing the sermons and discourses, largely on the basis of original sayings of Jeremiah. Nicholson contends that the prose material as a whole is the deposit of the Deuteronomists' preaching and teaching activity in Babylon during the exile and that they developed the Jeremiah tradition in order to meet the urgent needs of the community in exile.
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time of Hezekiah and "it is plausible to assume that the kernel of
the deuteronomistic code stems from the earlier reforms, which may have
been consolidated in the form of books like the book of Jehoshaphat."(457)

Referring to Deut. xxvii, Weinfeld argues that while there is a
connection between vv. 1-8 and Josh. iv, concerning the erection of
stones by Joshua and the people, the difference lies in the fact that
whereas in Josh. iv:7 the stones were set up "as a memorial to the
children of Israel", in Deuteronomy they are erected so that the law
may be inscribed upon them. (458) Moreover, while the Deuteronomist
writer inserted verbatim part of an Elohist Shechem tradition
relating the erection of an altar and the offering of sacrifices
(vv. 5-7), "he set it within a framework which converted the ritual
ceremony into an educational one."(459) On the basis of the Elohist's
description of the Sinai covenant scene (Exod. xxiv:3-8), which
mentions the erection of twelve stone pillars, and the description
of a Shechem covenant scene, where a large stone is set up (Josh.
xxiv:6), Weinfeld assumes that in the Mt. Gerizim ceremony the stones
served an important sacral function but "the author of Deuteronomy,
who expressly prohibits the erection of pillars, transformed the
stones into a law document which was to serve the Israelites as a
guide upon their entry into the promised land", (460) thereby divesting
the ceremony of its original character and the stones and the document
of all ritual significance. Weinfeld acknowledges that the passage
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in which the altar is referred to disrupts the continuity between verses 4 and 8, but he thinks that the passage has been inserted in complete disregard of the context because the author seems to have wished at all costs to preserve the ancient Shechem tradition "less from a desire to resuscitate 'amphictyonic' traditions than from a desire for a rapprochement with the northern tribes and their traditions (which accords with the Hezekian and Josianic policies)." (461) It was the Deuteronomistic editor of Josh. viii who, treating the entire section as an organic literary unit, "found it necessary to remove the friction between the two traditions by describing the stones upon which the law was inscribed as those from which the altar was constructed." (462)

Weinfeld thinks that the hand of the scribes who committed the book of the Torah to writing and presented its demands in the temper of the age is particularly evident in the laws connected with cultic centralization, the organization of executive and judicial institutions, and military affairs. In the laws relating to the centralization of the cult, "the scribes gave full expression to the religious national aims of Hezekiah and Josiah." (463) The book of Deuteronomy seems to have the character of an ideal national constitution which represents all the official state institutions - the monarchy, judiciary, priesthood, and prophecy - and this is due to the fact that the scribes have incorporated the traditions of all the national-spiritual currents in order to achieve their aim of "a national regime which incorporated all the normative, spiritual, and religious circles of the period." (464) Having examined the rhetorical technique of
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the authors of the book, Weinfeld concludes the first major part of his work by saying that "the authors of Deuteronomy and the deuteronomic school must be sought for, then, among circles which held public office, among persons who had at their command a vast reservoir of literary material, who had developed and were capable of developing a literary technique of their own, those experienced in literary composition, and skilled with the pen and the book: these authors must consequently have been the sôferím-ḥakamím."(465)

In the introduction to the second and third parts of his book, Weinfeld refers with approval to the work of Kaufmann(466) who, he writes, "has convincingly called into question the hypothesis of P's lateness and its dependence on D",(467) and he seeks to demonstrate that D and P, which he ascribes to priests of the central sanctuary in Jerusalem,(468) were concurrent rather than successive documents, that there are no significant ideological or linguistic ties between these two literary compositions, and that it was the Deuteronomic school which incorporated and redacted Priestly tradition. The ideological realm of P has a religious-theocentric orientation, since the roots of the Priestly authors lay in the temple and they drew their inspiration from the divine sphere, while the deuteronomic world has a religious-anthropocentric orientation, because the Deuteronomic authors were rooted in court reality and drew their inspiration from the political-national sphere.(469)
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In the second and third sections of his book, Weinfeld deals with the community of thought of the scribes who were the authors of Deuteronomy and Deuteronomic composition and he seeks to demonstrate that the humanistic vein in Deuteronomy, the distinctly eudaemonistic doctrine of reward, which is the Déuteronomic rationale for the observance of the Torah, and the book's concept of education all derive from the ideology of the sapiential scribes who were responsible for teaching and education. He seeks to strengthen his case by showing that, apart from these affinities, Deuteronomy and Deuteronomic literature contain wisdom substrata.

Weinfeld begins the second part of his book by emphasizing that the Josianic reform revolutionized all aspects of Israelite religion. The centralization of the cult was "a sweeping innovation in the history of the Israelite cultus, but its consequences were...decisively more revolutionary in nature, in that they involved the collapse of an entire system of concepts which for centuries had been regarded as sacrosanct."(470) The Deuteronomic conception of the cult represents a turning-point in the evolution of the religious faith of Israel and when the provincial cultus was eliminated religious life was wrested from the cult and the control of priest and temple and "transformed into an abstract religion which did not necessarily require any external expression."(471) Whereas the concept of God and the divine abode in the Priestly source and in the sources antedating it "is patently an anthropomorphic one"(472) which derives from early
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sacral conceptions, the theological conceptions of Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic school are abstract ones. (473) Following von Rad, Weinfeld argues that the Deuteronomic name theology is a theological corrective designed to counter the popular belief that the Deity actually dwelled in the sanctuary. Although the phrase "to cause his name to dwell" is very ancient and was used in the Jerusalem letters from Tel El Amarna, it originally had nothing to do with an abstract notion of God and it was the Deuteronomic school which endowed it with a specific theological meaning and which used it, along with a whole set of 'name phrases', to express the new theology. (474) Weinfeld rejects de Vaux's view (475) that it was the Deuteronomist who endowed the phrase 'establishing the name' with a new, more abstract meaning, there being no notion of a 'name theology' in Deuteronomy, where the phrase simply means 'to claim ownership'. Weinfeld rightly points out that there is no difference in meaning between Deuteronomy's phrase 'the place where I put My name' and the Deuteronomist's phrase 'the place where My name shall be'. (476) Arguing that the underlying imagery of the concept of God's Glory embedded in the Priestly tradition and in the book of Ezekiel, "whose ideology is grounded on Priestly doctrine", (477) is drawn in corporeal and not in abstract terms, Weinfeld concludes that it was the Deuteronomic school which initiated the polemic against the anthropomorphic and corporeal conceptions of the Deity and that
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this polemic was later taken up by Jeremiah and Deutero-Isaiah.\(^{(478)}\) In Deuteronomy, the terms glory and greatness do not denote the being and substantiality of God but refer, instead, to his splendour and greatness, thus denoting abstract and not corporeal qualities.\(^{(479)}\) Deuteronomy's attempt to eliminate the inherent corporeality of the traditional imagery also finds expression in the book's conception of the ark which is given the exclusive function of simply housing the tables of the covenant.\(^{(480)}\)

Examining sacral and festal observances in Deuteronomy, Weinfeld argues that sacrifice is not practised for its own sake and "the author's view seems to be that spiritual purification and repentance - consisting of confession and prayer - and not sacrificial offerings expiate sin."\(^{(481)}\) The book's special attitude towards sacrifice is well reflected in the sole instance where Deuteronomy does mention a rite analogous in character to the sin and guilt offering, the law of unsolved murder (Deut. xxii:1-9), for here there is no sacrificial offering complete with ceremonial slaughter and blood sprinkling but simply the symbolic act of breaking the heifer's neck and the cleansing of the elders' hands as a purificatory expression of their innocence.\(^{(482)}\) The fact that Deuteronomic sacrifice consists primarily of offerings which are consumed by the offerer at the sanctuary and shared with indigent persons, suggests to Weinfeld that the principal purpose of the offering is to provide nutriment for the destitute elements of Israelite society.\(^{(483)}\) He thinks it "remarkable that the very book

\[\begin{align*}
\text{478. } & \text{Ibid., p.198. } \\
\text{479. } & \text{Ibid., p.206. } \\
\text{480. } & \text{Ibid., p.208. } \\
\text{481. } & \text{Ibid., p.210. } \\
\text{482. } & \text{Ibid., pp.210f. } \\
\text{483. } & \text{Ibid., pp.211f. }
\end{align*}\]
which promulgates the law of centralized worship at the 'chosen place' has not so much as a word to say about the presentation of communal sacrifices (the daily and seasonal offerings) which constituted the principal mode of worship at this exclusive sanctuary." (484) In Deuteronomy, sacrifice is not an institutional practice but a personal one with the humanitarian object of providing nutriment to the poor and the private object of fulfilling a religious obligation and expressing gratitude to the Deity by means of votive offerings (Deut. xii:6, 11, 17, 26; xxiii:22-24). (485) For the author of Deuteronomy, ritual detail was unimportant and he seems to have deliberately ignored it because it did not accord with his view that sacrifice alone cannot expiate sin, the sincere intentions of the worshipper being the essential requisite for atonement. (486) Wherein in P the rituals are conducted in complete silence, the cultic ceremonies described in Deuteronomy are always accompanied by prayers. (487) In Deuteronomy, all laws pertaining to cult and ritual are conceived more rationally than in the earlier sources and the laws contained in xii-xix, which are a direct consequence of the implementation of cultic centralization and constitute the legal basis of the religious reformation, "clearly mirror the change in religious beliefs and attitudes which occurred in the wake of the reform." (488) Thus, (in Deut. xii:15, 16, 20-24) non-sacrificial slaughter is permitted (repudiating the hallowed Israelite dogma which ascribed a sacramental
quality to the blood), the tithe may be secularized and used for profane purposes (Deut. xiv:22-27), the firstlings of animals are to be consecrated (Deut. xvi:19) and owners have the alternative of redemption if they find it too difficult to bring them to Jerusalem (Deut. xiv:23ff.), and the paschal offering is stripped of its magical prescriptions being converted into a communal sacrifice offered up at the central sanctuary like all the other sacrifices, while the animal may be selected from cattle as well as sheep and goats (Deut. xvi:2) and cooked like any other ordinary sacrifice (v.7).

Moreover, all the festivals have been altered and freed of their ties to the ancient sacral ceremonies. While preserving the festivals themselves and their prescribed times of celebration, the author of Deuteronomy has stripped them of their original sacral content and, ignoring all those rituals "whose very implementation predicates the existence of provincial sanctuaries", he has re-established the festivals "on the exclusive basis of ceremonial rejoicing and votive offerings."(489)

Accompanying "this metamorphosis of the Israelite festivals" was a change in the manner in which the poorer layers of society were to participate, for in Deuteronomy the law which prescribes gifts for the poor is linked with the ordinances dealing with the feast of weeks and the feast of booths. (490) Furthermore, unlike Lev. xxiii, in Deuteronomy each celebrant at the harvest festival may bring whatever offering his means allow (xvi:10, 17). By severing the previous connection between the law of the firstfruits and the harvest festival, Deuteronomy has converted this law "into an expression of thanksgiving
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whose composition and time of execution is left entirely to the discretion of the farmer (26:1-11)". (491)

Deuteronomy also replaces the mythological rationale of P concerning the Sabbath with a social one (Deut. v:14), thus shifting the stress from cause to purpose, and whereas in P the Sabbath commemorates a sacral occurrence, in Deuteronomy it recalls an historical one. (492) Whereas the author of P selected the specifically sacral reason for Sabbath observance and developed it in his own way, the author of Deuteronomy selected the social motivation and formulated it humanistically. Moreover, whereas in P the sabbatical year is a taboo year in which agricultural work must cease, in Deuteronomy it has only a social significance and the book speaks of the 'release of debts' rather than the 'release of land', 'so that there be not among you a poor man' (xv:4). (493)

Examining the Deuteronomic conception of holiness, Weinfeld says that, whereas in P holiness is a condition that can be secured only by constant physical purification and sanctification, in Deuteronomy holiness "is the effect of a unique act of God - the divine election of Israel - and thus devolves automatically upon every Israelite, who consequently must not profane it by defilement." (494) Whereas in P the priests are regarded as possessing a greater degree of holiness than the lay Israelites because of their proximity to the tangible sanctity of the Deity, Deuteronomy regards all the people of Israel
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as holy by virtue of their election by God. In JE and P the concept of a holy people is completely absent and when these sources speak of holy men or of being holy they mostly refer to a state of holiness which is achieved by observing purity. In Deuteronomy, however, the concept of a holy people predominates and purity is not the prerequisite of holiness but rather an obligation which holiness imposes upon all Israelites because of their divine election. (495)

In contrast to the Priestly concept of the holiness of the land, Deuteronomy promulgates the concept of the holiness of the people. Whereas in P the resident alien and the native Israelite both draw their sustenance from a common sacral source and are both required to observe the regulations of the code of holiness, in Deuteronomy the laws of the Torah apply only to those who are true Israelites by blood and race while the resident alien, although accorded full protection and political and economic rights, is not required to observe the special sacral obligations which are imposed upon the holy people. (496)

However, against the view that in P the resident alien has a similar status to the one held by proselytes during the post-exilic period, Weinfeld argues that since in P the fundamental Israelite precepts as Sabbath, circumcision, paschal sacrifice, and sukkoth celebrations do not apply to the ger, those regulations which are imposed on him are not to be taken as indicating his complete assimilation into the congregation of Israel. (497) The difference between the Priestly and the Deuteronomic attitudes toward the resident alien is not the
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result of historical development but has arisen because the author of P had to ensure that the ger would not profane the sanctity and purity of the congregation inhabiting the holy land, whereas the author of Deuteronomy was not encumbered with such sacral conceptions and hence did not impose the obligation of holiness on those who were not members of the people of God. (498)

Since prior to Josiah's reform the provincial sanctuaries also performed judicial functions, Weinfeld examines the judicial reforms which followed in the wake of the centralization of sacrificial worship to one exclusive sanctuary and concludes that there are numerous regulations in the book of Deuteronomy which have been made completely secular by being divested of all sacral features (e.g. the slave law in Deut. xv:17 where the author of Deuteronomy, who predicates the existence of one exclusive sanctuary, deletes the detail of bringing the slave to God, which is found in Exod. xxi:6). Whereas in pre-Deuteronomic sources, major disputes were brought before God for final decision (cf. Exod. xviii:19), the Deuteronomic code refers all cases requiring a clear-cut verdict to the adjudication of the magistrates. Although the institution of appointed magistrates and clerical officers must have existed prior to Josiah's reformation, "it came into full operative force only as a result of those reforms" and is alluded to particularly in Deuteronomy and in the historical works inspired by this book. (499) When the provincial magistrate was unable to render a decisive verdict, then the litigation was submitted to the adjudication of the central tribunal in Jerusalem (Deut. xvii:8-13) and the interesting feature of this tribunal is that the sacral judicial institution (the
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sanctuary), presided over by the priests, and the civil judiciary (the city gate), in which the elders and judges officiated, were combined after the Josianic reform so that the two previously distinct judicial circles together constituted a supreme tribunal. (500)

The provision for the appointment of secular magistrates to deal with matters previously regarded as lying within sacral jurisdiction, is further indication that the Israelite judiciary has undergone a process of secularization.

Deuteronomy also removes the institution of asylum from sacerdotal jurisdiction in that the assignment of cities of refuge no longer depends on sacral factors (temple cities = Levitical cities) but is decided instead by rational and geographic considerations. (501)

Moreover, the asylum is not where the fugitive manslayer receives his punishment, but serves as a place of protection from the vengeance of the blood redeemer (Deut. xix:6) and he may remain there until the avenger's rage has subsided.

Comparing and contrasting the Deuteronomic and Priestly regulations about warfare, Weinfeld concludes that while the book of Deuteronomy contains countless regulations about war, these lack all the sacral features which are discernible in P. (502)

Referring to the distinctly sacral cast of "the ancient Israelite apodictic legal code", (503) which finds expression in the Book of the Covenant and in the Priestly Code, Weinfeld seeks to demonstrate that
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the concept of sin and punishment has also been transferred from the divine to the secular sphere. Deuteronomy "not only lacks the ancient proclamations but also fails to provide any regulations dealing with violations of sacral law". (504) On the other hand, the book lists some capital offences which are not found in any other of the law-codes and which illustrate the metamorphosis that the judicial conception underwent in the book of Deuteronomy. The secular character of the judicial conception of Deuteronomy is also apparent in the absence of certain grave sacro-cultic offences which, in P, incur the penalty of kareth. Whereas in P the offender is to 'bear his iniquity' or 'be cut off from his people', in Deuteronomy there is a much more rational view, for the onus is put on the people themselves to 'purge the evil from among you' so that the malefactor 'will never again commit such evil' and 'will not act presumptuously again' (cf. Deut. xiii:12; xvii:13). (505)

Weinfeld devotes the third part of his book to an examination of the wisdom substrata in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic literature. Whereas Exod. xviii demands that a magistrate must have capability, integrity, and fear of God, and Num. xi requires that a leader must have charismatic qualities, Deut. i demands that magistrates and leaders must possess the intellectual qualities of wisdom, understanding, and knowledge, "traits which characterize the leader and magistrate in wisdom literature also" (cf. Prov. viii:15f.). (506) Weinfeld draws a whole series of parallels between Deuteronomic passages and the wisdom literature of the Old Testament, Egypt and Babylon and
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draws a number of conclusions. Firstly, "the author of Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomist conceive wisdom in an entirely novel manner". (507) Secondly, the two previously separate and autonomous disciplines of Law and Wisdom were amalgamated in Deuteronomy and the laws of the Torah identified with wisdom, (508) a development which "led to an ideological conflict which has left traces in wisdom literature and the book of Deuteronomy". (509) Thirdly, the book of Deuteronomy does not antedate the book of Proverbs but was itself influenced by the ancient sapiential ideology which found expression in Proverbs and the wisdom literature of the ancient Near East. (510) Fourthly, the true explanation of Deuteronomy's unique humanism and the book's numerous affinities with sapiential literature "is that Deuteronomy had taken its material directly from, or was directly influenced by, the sapiential school." (511) Fifthly, the book of Deuteronomy possesses a strong didactic temper (cf., e.g., iv:9f.; vi:2, 7, 20-25; xi:19; xxxi:10-13) and in this respect greatly resembles both wisdom literature, the central concern of which was education, and ancient Near Eastern treaties so that "it seems that in order to strengthen the Israelite loyalty to the covenant the author of Deuteronomy not only relied on covenant typology but also employed modes of expression and imagery taken from the sapiential sphere." (512)
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The contribution to Deuteronomistic criticism of studies relating Deuteronomy to the form(s) of ancient Near Eastern treaties has already been evaluated and, while such a comparison was thought to be illuminating, it was stressed that the parallels between Deuteronomy and the structure of Hittite and/or Assyrian treaties ought not to be pressed too far since there is uncertainty about the precise form(s) of these treaties and an ever present danger of assigning 'the form' of Deuteronomy to a particular period and then insisting that the contents of the book must have originated in the era when this form was prevalent. Leaving aside his examination of the affinities between Deuteronomy and the ancient Near Eastern treaty formulae, Weinfeld may be criticized for his views regarding the relationship between the Priestly Writing and Deuteronomy, for his confident assertion that the Deuteronomic Code rests "on a distinctly secular foundation,"(513) for his argument that with the elimination of the provincial cultus Israelite religious life "was freed from its ties to the cult and...transformed into an abstract religion", (514) and for his treatment of the concept of God in the book of Ezekiel and in P. The arguments put forward by Weinfeld to support his view that D and P were concurrent rather than successive documents, and that it was the Deuteronomic school that incorporated and redacted Priestly tradition, do not carry conviction and the evidence which he adduces is patient of other explanations. While any document incorporating legal material of the nature and scope which is contained in P includes material of varying antiquity and reflects the
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usage of many generations, the balance of probability lies with the view that the process of codification by which the material in P was assembled and given its present character took place in the period after the Exile. In Deuteronomy, priests and Levites are identified but in Ezekiel xl-xlvi, which cannot be earlier than the sixth century B.C., the priesthood is limited to the family of Zadok (Ezek. xl:46; xlii:19; xlv:15). This seems to have been an attempt to limit the priesthood more narrowly than the authors of Deuteronomy had done but it was unsuccessful for it was the Aaronid priesthood which was established in post-exilic Israel, and this arrangement is in accord with P. The writer of Ezek. xlv was unaware of the provisions of P and this chapter provides an intermediate stage of the development of the law from D to P. (515) Moreover, the Priestly Writing (Lev. xxiii: 36) differs from Deuteronomy (Deut. xvi:13) with regard to the Feast of Tabernacles but accords with Neh. viii:18 which states that this festival lasted for eight days. Furthermore, Neh. x:32 refers to a temple tax of a third of a shekel and the only reference to a temple tax in the Pentateuch is to be found in P (Exod. xxx:13, where the amount is half a shekel). Weinfeld argues that it is strange that while the Priestly editor incorporated his own traditions in the earlier JE material, "the Priestly strand shows no contact whatever with the deuteronomistic school", (516) whereas "the book of Deuteronomy and deuteronomistic historiography show traces here and there...of Priestly views and phraseology". (517) This argument is two-edged for it could
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be maintained that the very fact that the Priestly Writing does not bear a specific Deuteronomic impress, whereas Deuteronomy and the books dependent on it contain Priestly views and phraseology, indicates that Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic history have been edited, to some extent, by the compilers of P. The fact that the legal sections of D show a knowledge of the Book of the Covenant, but no knowledge of P, could, of course, be used to support the thesis that D and P originated in different, but concurrent, circles. However, at the risk of appearing to be unduly influenced by that "sensitivity to chronological order that dominated the thought of the Wellhausenian school and its precursors", (518) it seems eminently more probable to this writer that the Priestly Writing was compiled after the Exile and that whereas Deuteronomy sought to eliminate the multiplicity of shrines and to centralize sacrificial worship to one sanctuary, P sought, among other things, to regulate the ritual of that sanctuary and to ensure that all permitted practices accorded with the purest worship of Yahweh and were "purged of every taint of the things that Deuteronomy had denounced." (519) The impression that the Priestly Writing comes from a period after the Exile seems to be confirmed by an examination of the theological emphases in the work. Thus, for example, the Abrahamic covenant (Gen. xvii) has been developed and reinterpreted and constitutes the bedrock upon which all subsequent history rests. Comparing and contrasting the account of the Abrahamic covenant in Gen. xv(J+) with the P account in Gen. xvii, Clements (520) argues that
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the Priestly account differs significantly from the earlier narrative as the result of theological reflection. Against Alt who locates Gen. xv outside Canaan and who maintains that the significance of the Abrahamic covenant in Gen. xv as a cult-aetiological legend was that it described the revelation of a nomadic deity, (521) Clements argues that the significance of the Abrahamic covenant lay in the fact that it provided divine sanction for the settlement of a Hebrew clan under Abraham in the region of Hebron-Mamre. The tradition of a covenant between Abraham and the god of Mamre was then taken up by the Yahwist whose entire epic is constructed around a tria of promises made by God to Abraham which are fundamental to his view of Israel's origins. Seeking to use the ancient historical traditions of his people in order to interpret the divine significance of his own age and to make plain the hidden purpose of God, the Yahwist, whose epic history was composed"early in Solomon's reign", (522) related the rise of Israel directly to the promise of God to the people's ancestors in such a was as "to show the divine providence which brought into being the Davidic Kingdom, by which Israel became a nation, and took possession of the land of Canaan." (523) In Deuteronomy, which attempts to provide Israel with a coherent, unified, and unifying doctrine of the covenant, obviating the earlier political friction between the Jerusalem tradition of the Davidic covenant and the pre-monarchic emphasis on the Sinai covenant, absolute priority is given to the Sinai covenant, the institution of the kingship being completely subsumed within it and the patriarchal covenant serving as a providential
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preparation for it. (524) In the exilic period, "a radical new importance" (525) was attached to the figure of Abraham and the tradition of the covenant made by God with him and in Judah it provided the basis for a hope and belief in a future national recovery and restoration (cf. Ezek. xxxiii:25-29) because it was believed to guarantee Israel's existence and its possession of the land. In the Priestly document, the major motif of the whole work is, as in the Yahwist's history four hundred years previously, the divine promise, but in P's account the third promise represents "a significant departure from the basic promise tradition of the Yahwist's history." (526) In Gen. xii:3 the third promise was that "by you all the families of the earth shall bless themselves/be blessed" but Gen. xvii:7 asserts that El-Shaddai, who establishes the covenant, and who is identified with Yahweh in Exod. vi:1ff., will be the God of Abraham's descendants and the second significant new feature in the Priestly account is that God makes with Abraham an everlasting covenant, thereby "asserting its permanent validity and its unconditional character." (527) Clements thinks it is reasonable to conclude that P's account of the Abrahamic covenant has been influenced by the tradition of the permanent validity of the Davidic covenant. When the last of the Davidic kings was removed from the throne of Jerusalem, the straightforward political interpretation of the terms of the Davidic covenant as being an everlasting guarantee of the stability of the Davidic dynasty was
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shattered. The Priestly writers may well have adopted the feature of permanent validity from the tradition of the Davidic covenant in order to show that the Abrahamic covenant was the basic and unalterable covenant made by God with Israel. P attempts to provide a unified doctrine of the covenant by according primacy to the Abrahamic covenant which is interpreted as a covenant of election in which Israel's future unique relationship is foretold and eternally guaranteed. The Sinai revelation and the institution of kingship are regarded as outworkings of this. (528) Clements argues that one of the principal reasons for the marked differences between the Deuteronomic and Priestly interpretations of Israel's covenant basis "is undoubtedly to be found in the fact that the experience of the exile intervened between their appearance." (529) Without necessarily accepting all the details of Clements' thesis, one may support his conclusion that the Priestly interpretation represents the latest and most elaborate of the covenant theologies in the Old Testament and that it was probably written in "the immediate post-exilic period", (530) by pointing to another major feature which the Priestly writers introduced into their version of the Abrahamic covenant, viz. its connection with circumcision, which is interpreted
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as the sign of its institution and validity (Gen. xvii:9-14). (531)

This rite of circumcision which, even though Jewish leaders of a later age may have regarded it differently, was originally intended to be a sign and not a restrictive condition of the Abrahamic covenant, may be taken as fair indication of the date of P. It is very probable that circumcision, which was originally a puberty rite, (532) was transferred to infancy during the exilic period when circumcision assumed a new importance for the Israelites in Babylon and became a badge of their religious and cultural distinctiveness as they strove to preserve and make evident their unity and distinctiveness while being forced to live amongst an alien population which did not practise this rite. (533) The fact that the Priestly creation story leads up
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533. Cf. Clements, op.cit., pp.73f.; Noth, The History of Israel2, pp.297ff.; C.W. Anderson, The History and Religion of Israel, p.143; Ackroyd, Israel under Babylon and Persia, Oxford, 1970, pp.29ff. Noth, A History of Pentateuchal Traditions, pp.230f., argues that "the post-Deuteronomic composition of P remains firmly established" (ibid., p.230) since, in addition to the usual reasons, "the importance P attached to the noncultic ritual observances of the sabbath rest and of circumcision (Gen. 2:2ff.; 17:10ff.) seems to presuppose a situation when these regulations came into prominence, specifically among the exiles deported to Babylon in the first half of the sixth century B.C." (ibid., pp.230f.). However, Noth points out that while this provides a terminus a quo, "the question remains open as to whether and how far one has to go below this terminus a quo into the subsequent period" since "sure clues for answering this question are completely lacking" (ibid., p.231). Noth maintains that "there can be no doubt that P was written in Judean circles" but "whether we are to think of P as being composed in the Judean homeland or perhaps in the circle of the Babylonian diaspora again remains in doubt owing to the lack of definite clues" (ibid., p.231). Noth also argues that the author of P, which constitutes the literary framework of the Tetrateuch, "set new limits for the narrative by omitting the theme 'guidance into the arable land' as manifestly of no importance for his concern" (ibid., p.234). Noth argues that the theological
to the institution of the Sabbath serves to confirm the impression that P was written after the Exile, for the custom of Sabbath rest on every seventh day was another very old custom which became in the exilic period an expression of the old faith and a mark of separation from the foreign environment.

The Priestly document, then, has the appearance of having been designed in the immediate post-exilic period to provide Israel with a renewed theological basis for its existence and for the entire work of reconstructing its life and worship by rewriting the history of the people's origins. (534)

Weinfeld also argues that "we may safely assume...that the subject-matter of the literature composed by priests and by scribes was 533.

essentially different" in that "Priestly composition was grounded entirely on religion and belief in the supernatural in which all is subordinate to the divine factor, while scribal composition, on the other hand, was grounded on secular reality." However, he presses his thesis too far when he draws the conclusion that "the Israelite Priestly school, whose roots lay in the temple, drew its inspiration from the divine sphere, while the deuteronomistic school which was rooted in court reality drew its inspiration from the political-national sphere." (535) Proposing the theory that P is an essentially historiographical work, Noth rightly maintains that while the customary designation "Priestly Writing" has a certain justification, "this should not mislead us into regarding P as a distinctly priestly work" for although the author of P may have been a priest, "the spirit of his literary work is not unconditionally priestly." (536) Clements points out that it was the extensive regulations dealing with Israel's faith and cult, inserted at various points in the narrative, which prompted earlier critics to designate P the Priestly Code but he rightly argues that "such a nomenclature obscures the genuinely historical nature of the work." (537) The Priestly Writing, then, is best described as an historical work with a didactic aim. Its clear outline of the history and life of the people of God from creation until the eve of the entry into the land of Palestine "has made it the 'backbone' of the present pentateuch, into which it has been woven." (538) Moreover, to say
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538. Ibid. However, cf.Soggin, Introduction to the Old Testament, pp.141ff., who examines the nature and scope of P's historiography and, following closely the analysis of K. Elliger, 'Sinn und Ursprung der priesterlichen Geschichtserzählung', ZTK, xlix, 1952, pp.121-143 (who distinguishes between a PÆ' basic document,
that Deuteronomy "rests on a distinctly secular foundation" seems to be in direct contradiction to what appears to be the central purpose of the book, viz. to provide an interpretation of Israel's religion, to show why certain rites should be performed and why Israel enjoyed a special relationship with God, and, above all, to show the nature and character of God and the best ways in which Israelites could enjoy communion with Him. (539) Deuteronomy, which has a "strenuous concern to give a theological interpretation to Israel's cult", (540) seems to have been designed to reawaken the religious sensitivities of Israelites, to provide them with a firmer grasp of the true nature of their religion, and to reform religion by a programme of religious education in which every Israelite individual including the king was to be involved. (541)

The style of the book, which has been compared with "the passionate preaching of religious ministers," (542) certainly fits in well with the general character of Deuteronomy as a work intended for religious instruction as well as education. As Clements rightly maintains:

"By recounting history, by reiterating ancient laws, and by exhorting Israel to a right way of thinking and acting, Deuteronomy strives after a maximum theological grasp of its faith, and an effective deepening of Israel's religious understanding." (543) In fact, Deuteronomy is

538. (contd.) and P°, later supplements), argues that, regardless of the intentions of those who compiled it, the Sinai pericope which "indubitably forms the climax of P" (op.cit., p.140), "cannot now be considered historical" (ibid., p.143). Soggin approves of Elliger's view that the primary interest is in the 'truth of faith'. However, the fact that P is saturated with theological thought does not detract from the genuinely historical nature of the work.


540. Ibid., p.106.

541. Ibid., p.13.


"one of the most consistently theological writings of the whole Old Testament". While the book questioned and reinterpreted established cultic as well as political institutions in its desire to search out the sources of spiritual life, the authors did this because they regarded these institutions as of primary importance and wished to reform and use them in the interests of a national reawakening of faith and obedience to God. Thus, the Deuteronomic writers "were fully aware that Israel's communion with God was mediated through a central sanctuary to which sacrificial gifts were brought, and where priests officiated." Although these writers gave a markedly new interpretation of the temple, they recognized the importance of this institution as the cultic centre of the covenant between Yahweh and Israel. By demanding cultic centralization, Deuteronomy was not so much giving "full expression to the religious national aims of Hezekiah and Josiah" as endeavouring to attain "a uniformity in religious practice which it regarded as a necessity born out of the unity of Israel as Yahweh's people, and the uniqueness of Yahweh as Israel's God." Thus, it may be concluded with Clements that Deuteronomy "is the textbook of a programme of religious education which sought to guide Israel through the political and religious crises of the seventh century B.C." by providing Israelites with "a maximum theological comprehension of historical tradition and cultic observance."
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Finally, Weinfeld may be criticized for his view that the concept of God and the divine abode in Israelite Priestly theology "is patently an anthropomorphic one" (549) for, while it is true that with the theologoumenon of the Name the anthropomorphic element in the conception of the deity was wholly excluded, the קָבֹד does not necessarily imply human features, in spite of the fact that it was a mode of appearance visible to human eyes. (550) In the Priestly Writing, the קָבֹד, in the likeness of a mass of fire veiled in cloud, is understood as a special form in which God manifests his presence to men which makes it "possible for priestly thought to speak of a real entry of the transcendent God into the realm of the visible without, however, thereby prejudicing his transcendence." (551) The glory in P is "very much a theological concept, and has not the same personal form as...in Ezekiel." (552) While traces may be found in P of a view presupposing Yahweh as present and dwelling at the shrine, many of these "are cases where older views have had a view derived from theological reflection, which now claims to be standard, superimposed upon them." (553) Anthropomorphisms are, on the whole, avoided in P. (554) Furthermore, P toned down the conception of the sanctuary as a physical dwelling place

551. Ibid., p.32. Eichrodt rightly points out that what Ezekiel sees - a lavishly proportioned and gleaming throne on which sits the Lord of the Universe - "ought to be described rather as a reflection of the heavenly glory of Yahweh than as that glory itself" (ibid., pp.32f.).
554. Cf., e.g. G.W. Anderson, A Critical Introduction to the Old Testament, p.47.
"in his own way and in a different manner than Dt and Dtr"(555) and it is eminently probable that his designation of the sanctuary as (cf. Exod. xxv:9) and his portrayal of the sanctuary as a great and complicated were prompted by a desire "to supplement and correct the views of the Jerusalem priests about the dwelling and the presence of God in the temple, views which had been heavily imprinted with ancient Canaanite traditions."(556)

The principal value of Weinfeld's study is his examination of Deut. xii-xix in which he demonstrates how the laws in this section, which formed the legal basis of the religious reformation, "are a direct consequence of the implementation of cult centralization."(557)

The work is also valuable for the way in which the author demonstrates the affinities of Deuteronomy with the thought of wisdom. However, the fact that an investigation of the style, literary methods, theology and didactic aims of Deuteronomy shows that the authors had access to and made use of a vast reservoir of literary material has prompted a number of theories about the identity of the circles responsible for the composition of the book and there is much debate about whether Deuteronomy originated in levitical, prophetic or sapiential circles.

Before evaluating the major arguments which have been put forward about the circles responsible for the book, it is necessary to bring this survey of the principal contributions made to Deuteronomic criticism to a close and to make some attempt at a summary and synthesis, but there is one more work on Deuteronomy which remains to be examined.

556. Ibid., p.246. Cf. also Clements, God and Temple, pp.113ff.
557. Weinfeld, op.cit., p.213.
J. Weingreen has put forward the thesis that the methods used by the rabbis whose interpretations are preserved in the Mishna and the Talmuds can be traced back to the age of the written Law itself and that Deuteronomy can be recognized as a Mishna on Israel's earliest law-code. (558) Weingreen identifies Deuteronomy as "an original 'oral Tora' or 'proto-Mishna', in that it deals with, and occasionally modifies or extends, literary and legal materials which are found in the three preceding books - Genesis being ignored." (559) Weingreen considers Deuteronomy to be "a work designed and intended originally to be external to the then existing sacred writings of which it was the authoritative exposition engendered by contemporary social and religious needs." (560) The Deuteronomic compiler took earlier enacted laws which were no longer applicable in his day and, using methods very similar to those employed by the Rabbis centuries later, "he worked over these laws and produced new versions of them to serve the needs of his day." (561) Weingreen thinks it very significant that the Deuteronomic compiler attributes the new laws to Moses and he argues that while the Deuteronomic legislation is represented as documents which purport to be of Mosaic, and therefore divine, origin, "they were originally external to the then existing sacred texts." (562)

558. Weingreen, From Bible to Mishna: The Continuity of Tradition, Manchester University Press, 1976. Cf. E. Robertson, The Old Testament Problem, Manchester University Press, 1950, who regarded the various bodies of law in the Pentateuch as 'hedges' which grew up around Israel's earliest law code at various centres and argued that the law code itself was a midrash to the Ten Commandments.
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Pointing to 2 Chron. xvii:7-9 which describes the educational activity inaugurated by Jehoshaphat in sending out teams of authorised educators to teach the Tora throughout the land of Judah, Weingreen argues that this record "must carry the implication that the teaching involved official exposition." (563) Even if this record were taken as reflecting the situation existing in the Chronicler's period, "this project was not necessarily an innovation but, rather, the organising of an activity which had earlier been rather haphazard and unorganised." (564) Moreover, the public reading and exposition of the Tora which Neh. viii:8 attributes to Ezra "was not a novel experiment but rather the popularising of a practice which had been restricted in its scope of operation in earlier times." (565) Weingreen argues that a comparison between the Exodus (Exod. xx:2-14) and Deuteronomic (Deut. v:6-18) presentations of the Decalogue in the massoretic tradition "points to the fuller use of exposition in Deuteronomy" and he thinks that this is very significant for determining the true character of this book. (566) Examining the origin of the synagogue, Weingreen refers to Josiah's reformation as "one of the major turning points in the religious history of the southern kingdom of Judah." (567) He rightly argues that while Josiah "is represented as having instituted a radical and massive religious reform", the reformation "cannot be said to have aimed at making Jerusalem the only place where the people could engage in communal worship and thus commune with God." (568) The people living

---
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in the provincial towns and villages were deprived of their right to offer sacrifice at their local shrines but "this new order by no means implied that the provincial communities outside Jerusalem were to be stripped of all forms of religious worship in their routine lives."(569)

Thus, while a change was certainly brought about in their religious life, there was not a cessation of regular communion with God for while Josiah banned the practice of sacrifice in the provincial areas and transferred the country priests to Jerusalem in his attempt to make this city the centre of religious authority and influence, he must have permitted the continuance of religious services conducted in the areas outside Jerusalem, but now without sacrifices. Although prescribed sacrifices may have been the central feature of public worship at local shrines in pre-Josianic times, the people also engaged in congregational prayer and songs of praise on such solemn occasions and "there were also other opportunities for congregational worship which did not involve offerings on the altar."(570)

After the enforcement of Josiah's religious reformation, sacrificial worship ceased for a period at the provincial shrines but the people in the country districts continued their communal worship with congregational prayer, the reading of sacred texts, the recital of psalm-like praises and the expository sermon, which are all the ingredients of the synagogue.(571)

In the penultimate chapter of his book, Weingreen seeks to demonstrate that the Deuteronomic legislator was "a proto-rabbinic type"(572).
and that the antecedents of rabbinic legislative machinery can be traced back to the activity of the Deuteronomistic legislator. When faced with the law relating to the הַכְּלַיִל in Exod. xxv, which he had to understand as referring to an Israelite, and the contradictory law in Lev. xxv prohibiting the enslavement of Israelites, the Deuteronomic legislator used a rabbinic-type exposition in order to harmonise them and make them complementary (Deut. xv): "It is a well-known device in rabbinic disputation that, when faced with the problem of dealing with two contradictory scriptural passages, a third must be found to harmonise them." (573)

By his application in certain instances of rabbinic modes of legal exposition to existing biblical laws, thereby producing extensions and modifications of the basic laws which altered their intent and made them relevant to the needs of his time, the Deuteronomic legislator may be described as being a proto-rabbinic type. Weingreen argues that Deuteronomy was originally an extra-biblical work like the Mishna and that the alteration of laws by the Deuteronomic legislator "was originally achieved by means of external exposition of the laws in the then written texts... without effecting any changes in these texts." (574) The authority of the Deuteronomic law-book, which was originally transmitted orally, became paramount when its contents were circulated in writing, and this led to its status as inspired Scripture.

The final chapter of Weingreen's book is devoted to an attempt to "demonstrate that the book of Deuteronomy was originally designed and meant to serve as an oral Tora or proto-Mishna, presenting the

573. Ibid., p.139.
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authoritative exposition of selected items of law and history which are now found in...Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers." (575) Weingreen argues that at one time משמאל denoted the authorised exposition of the Tora and that "just as the Mishna in later times was the authorised law book — and not the Pentateuch proper — so it may be argued that it was the proto-Mishna of Deuteronomy which represented the true presentation of Tora—law." (576) The conclusion that an 'authoritative' presentation of Tora in the form of a proto-Mishna was in operation presupposes "the existence and activity of a body of religious jurists which claimed authority to interpret basic laws in terms of contemporary needs" but Weingreen considers that it matters little to his main thesis "whether this body was priestly, levitical or lay or a combination of experts from all three strata of Israelite society." (577) Weingreen argues that originally there was only one written formulation of the law but, with changing circumstances, it was found necessary to modify, extend and, in some cases, alter the terms of that law. (578) Since the original law in the inspired law code could not be erased or ignored, established rules of exposition were applied which produced the required modifications, leaving the text of the original law unaltered. The derived law was part of an oral Tora or proto-Mishna which circulated outside the then existing Tora code. Laws which occur only in Deuteronomy had been developed independently of the then existing Tora law code and, together with those laws
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which were derived from existing laws, they constituted part of the corpus of the oral Tora. Subsequently, because of its overriding authority, Deuteronomy was attached to Genesis - Numbers. While the oral Tora was transmitted and circulated orally, written records of fresh legal material were constantly being made and these were not copied or circulated but were kept in the academies and thus preserved privately. Weingreen suggests that the fact that the Tora book had been placed in the Temple (2 Kgs. xxii:8) "may be explained simply as being an early example of what became the regular practice in mishnaic times." (579) Weingreen argues that "the so-called reformation which was carried out by Josiah to implement the dictates of the discovered Tora book must be redefined and he maintains that the reformation was not the introduction of startlingly new concepts and attitudes but, rather, "the restoration and implementation of the developed authoritative Tora, the laws of which had been progressively refined and modified over the preceding generations by the official guardians of the Tora." (580) In short, "the discovered Tora book represented the proto-mishnaic interpretation of laws preserved in the earlier books and it was this proto-rabbinic presentation of the Tora which had been suppressed and driven underground by Josiah's predecessor Manasseh. It was this authoritative presentation of Tora which Josiah restored and implemented." (581) Finally, Weingreen says that rather than think in terms of literary sources of the Pentateuch arranged "in neat, horizontal, chronological strata in a literary tell", the possibility should be recognized that there were "areas of religious, cultural and sociological growth which
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flourished and developed side by side in a continuing process" and he postulates that the activities of the schools of experts in these fields are probably to be placed during the monarchy when an organized society was consolidated. (582)

Weingreen's study is very interesting for the insights it provides into the methods of rabbinic exposition and he presents an attractive case for the view that some of the rabbinic literary and legal processes of exposition can be detected in rudimentary form in the Old Testament. However, the weakness of the book lies in the fact that Weingreen has not followed through the implications of his thesis regarding Deuteronomy by relating his findings to the views of contemporary scholars with regard to the nature and history of the book. While he argues that "by cataloguing points of agreement and disagreement" between the conclusions he has reached and those of contemporary scholars he "would have risked deflecting the attention of the reader from the real issue of this work on to a series of dialogues", (583) some such attempt, even on a limited scale, would not only have been well worth the risk, but would have rendered his work more valuable to the present study. The case he makes for his view that Deuteronomy was a proto-Mishna is rather like a torso. The case he builds is truncated, for, while he acknowledges that "the thesis presented in this book cannot remain an isolated hypothesis confined to examples of its operation and unrelated to contemporary patterns of Old Testament literary criticism", (584) the force of his argument is much weakened by his failure to enter into the debate about
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the nature and history of Deuteronomy and the circles responsible for its composition.

This survey of the principal contributions which have been made to the debate about the origin, structure, nature, and purpose of the book of Deuteronomy has highlighted the major problems involved and indicated the extent to which "different theological outlooks and pre-understandings of the development of Israel's history largely determine the view taken of... Deuteronomy." (585) Current views about the date and authorship of the book may be classified into four principal categories. (586) In the first group are those scholars, including J. Reider, G.T. Manley, Kline, E.J. Young, R.K. Harrison, and M.H. Segal, who argue for an essentially

592. M.H. Segal, 'The Composition of the Pentateuch: A Fresh Examination', Scripta Hierosolymitana, viii, Jerusalem, 1961, pp.68-114. Cf. Thompson, op.cit. Thompson's examination typifies the modern conservative but not wholly inflexible approach, for, while he says that "it is the strong opinion of the present commentator that the hand of Moses should be discerned throughout the book" (ibid., p.8) and that "the book is based firmly on the historical figure of Moses and in some way or other enshrines words which he spoke to Israel in Moab" (ibid., p.68) he concedes that "on the other hand editorial processes have brought the book to its present form" (ibid.). Thompson thinks that the book "may have assumed somewhat of its present
(contd.) form in the general period of the United Monarchy", which "would give a date of the eleventh to tenth century B.C., some two to three centuries after Moses" (ibid.). This date is also put forward by Wenham, op.cit., pp.253ff.; idem, 'Deuteronomy and the Central Sanctuary', TB, xxii, 1971, pp.116-118, who, arguing that it is "false to regard Dt as the programme for Josiah's reformation" (The Structure and Date of Deuteronomy, p.254) in view of the presence of chapter xxvii, suggests that Deuteronomy would have been a suitable document to be used by Rehoboam when, after Solomon's death, he went to Shechem to be made king (I Kgs. xii:1), in which case "it seems possible that Dt may date from the period of the united monarchy" (The Structure and Date of Deuteronomy, p.257). Cf., too, P.C. Craigie, The Book of Deuteronomy, NICOT, Grand Rapids, 1976, who also treats the book from a conservative perspective and argues that the covenant or treaty form which controls the entire book indicates that it is essentially a unity (ibid., p.24), even bringing chapters 33-34 into this structure. However, disapproving of "the radical doubt of the authenticity of Deuteronomy in its early setting" (ibid., p.22), Craigie rejects the argument of Frankena and Weinfeld dating the book to the seventh century B.C. on the basis of just this covenant structure and its links with Neo-Assyrian treaties, and, arguing that the treaty pattern underlying the book corresponds more closely to Hittite treaties of the second millennium, he maintains that Deuteronomy is a product of the period which it describes, that critical period after the death of Moses and the transference of leadership to Joshua in immediate anticipation of the entry into the promised land. He discerns traces in the book of the ceremony which marked the event of the Sinai covenant which would have been renewed at this time. While maintaining that the book is "essentially Mosaic" (ibid., p.53), Craigie does not insist that Moses actually wrote it; "These are the words that Moses spoke..." (Deut. i:1) refer to the substance of the book, not to its literary fixation. The book, which has a West-Palestinian perspective, was first written down by a person or persons unknown shortly after the death of Moses, and was handed down among the tribes and probably used in covenant renewal ceremonies at Shechem (Josh. viii:30-35; xxiv). The book, a covenant document, was preserved in the ark (Deut. xxxi:9) and eventually brought to Jerusalem by David. With the death of Solomon and the schism of the monarchy, it either remained in Jerusalem while another copy existed in the north, or it was taken to the north where its influence may be seen in the oracles of Hosea. Later, it was returned to Jerusalem, if a copy had not been there all the time, and its influence in Judah was probably minimal until it was rediscovered in the reign of Josiah, when it effected a renewal of the covenant and strongly influenced Jeremiah and his circle. Craigie explains the fact that the book is written in seventh century Hebrew by maintaining that, since, like all languages, the Hebrew language changed through the centuries, Deuteronomy had to be revised and up-dated to make it communicate more effectively. While the approach of both Thompson and Craigie is to be welcomed in that, while treating the book from a conservative perspective, they remain courteous and irenic (cf. J.G. Gammie's review of Thompson's book in CBQ, xxxviii:1, January, 1976, pp.132f., ref. p.132 and J. Bright's review of Craigie's book in Interpretation, xxxi:No. 1, January, 1978, pp.86ff., ref. p.86), those who do not share their conservative perspective will find their arguments strained and unconvincing.
Mosaic date and authorship. Five principal arguments are put forward to support this position. Firstly, there are several references to Moses speaking (e.g. Deut. i:6, 9; vi:1; xxvii:1, 9; xxix:2; xxxi:1, 30; xxxiii:1) and at least two to his writing (Deut. xxxi:9, 24). Particular emphasis is placed on "And Moses wrote this law" (Deut. xxxi:9) and "When Moses had finished writing the words of this law in a book, to the very end" (Deut. xxxi:24). Although opinions vary, it is widely held that the phrase "this law" refers to the legislation contained in chapters xii-xxvi and that the discourses and closing chapters were recorded and added later, shortly after the death of Moses. Against this argument, it may be said that the term 'law' in these references is ambiguous, since the exact content of the law is undefined, and these references may be explained as reflecting the tradition of Mosaic authorship and the writer's desire to give the book the character of authenticity.

Secondly, Jesus, Paul and the writer to the Hebrews seem to have accepted Mosaic authorship. The fact that in Matthew xix:8 Jesus referred to the law on divorce as something that Moses had allowed, is taken as indication that Jesus attributed Deut. xxiv:1-4 to Moses. Reference is also made to the fact that in His post-resurrection ministry Jesus interpreted in all the scriptures "beginning with Moses and all the prophets" (Luke xxiv:27 and cf., also, v.44) the things concerning Himself. Paul quotes Deut. xxv:4 in I Cor. ix:9 as being a law of Moses and the writer to the Hebrews (x:28) alludes to the law in Deut. xvii:2-6 in connection with violation of "the law of

593. Cf., e.g., Manley, 'Book of Deuteronomy', The New Bible Dictionary, p.308b
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Moses." Against this argument is the fact that the precise meaning of the term "Moses" is unclear and, since the Pentateuch as a single roll was referred to as "Moses" in the same way that "Prophets" designated Joshua to Kings together with all the prophets apart from Daniel and "Writings" designated all the other books of the Old Testament, the use of the term "Moses" may simply refer to the Pentateuch rather than specifically to Mosaic authorship. (595) Again, these references to "the law of Moses" may be explained as reflecting the tradition of Mosaic authorship.

Thirdly, it is argued that the laws of Deuteronomy fit best into the background of history and cultic practice at the close of the Mosaic age. The demand for cultic centralization was designed to ensure the destruction of all the Canaanite shrines and the eradication of pagan fertility practices and symbols when the Israelites occupied the promised land. Once Israel entered the land, there was to be a central sanctuary at Shechem. Jerusalem is never mentioned and, although the nature of kingship was well understood from observation of this institution in other nations, Israel had no king (xvii:14-17). Moreover, many of the laws in Deuteronomy which would have been strange anachronisms in a later society, fit in perfectly with the Mosaic period and shortly afterwards. (596) Much of the 'evidence' adduced in this connection is patient of alternative explanation. For example, the author of Deuteronomy could not mention Jerusalem since the book purports to be the words of Moses prior to occupation of Palestine.

The stance adopted by the writer with regard to kingship may be

596. Cf. Manley, The Book of the Law, p.109: "We look in vain for anything to connect them with the conditions in seventh-century Judah....But they fall naturally into their place if set before the children of Israel as they were about to enter the land of promise."
explained by arguing that he was writing with hindsight and was anxious to correct the earlier Jerusalem court tradition, which had regarded the king himself as a source of torah, and to place the monarch in submission to the law. The fact that there are so many striking parallels between the reform measures carried out by Josiah and the demands of Deuteronomy indicates how well the legal material fits into the background of the seventh century B.C. Finally, the view that Deuteronomy contains much ancient material is not incompatible with the theory that it was put into its present form in the seventh-century B.C. (597)

Fourthly, emphasizing the structural unity and integrity of the book, it is argued that Deuteronomy as a whole exhibits the complete range of elements, including the historical prologue, of the second millennium Hittite treaties, which makes any attempt to assign the book to the seventh century B.C. "nothing more than a vestigial hypothesis, no longer performing a significant function in Old Testament criticism." (598) Against this view it may be reiterated that the absence of an historical prologue in the Assyrian and Aramaic treaties does not prove that this element was lacking since it may have been stated orally or have been assumed. (599) Moreover, a seventh-century B.C. treaty has been found which does have an historical prologue (600) and it has been suggested that the absence


598. Kline, Treaty of the Great King, p.44.


of an historical prologue in the Sefer Aramaic documents may be due
to the fact that they are broken at the top. (601) Furthermore, the
author of Deuteronomy may have cast the book in the shape of an ancient
treaty in order to give it the appearance of authenticity. (602)

The fifth major argument used by contenders for a Mosaic origin is
the fact that there are passages in the prophetic books which are
reminiscent of Deuteronomy, (603) which is taken as indication that
the eighth-century prophets were acquainted with the book. However,
firstly, this is a double-edged argument, since it could be argued
just as easily that Deuteronomy was based on the prophets, and, secondly,
it is possible that the similarities are due to the dependence of both
Deuteronomy and the prophets on religious traditions which had been
perpetuated over many centuries. (604)

The second major view regarding the date and authorship of
Deuteronomy is that while it contains a great deal of material which
goes back to the time of Moses, the book was compiled at a post-
Mosaic, but pre-seventh century date. In this category, two principal
proposals have been put forward. On the one hand, Oestreicher and
Welch argue that the book was composed in the tenth century and, on
the other, Robertson and Brinker maintain that its date of composition
was the eleventh century. Oestreicher argues that Josiah's reform
was concerned with Kultreinheit and not Kulteinheit, that Josiah began

602. Cf. Thompson, op. cit.
603. The similarities include the triennial payment of the tithe
(cf. Deut. xiv:28 with Amos iv:4), the need for a standard
measure (cf. Deut. xxv:13ff. with Amos viii:5 and Mic. vi:10f.),
the authority of the priest (cf. Deut. xviii:12; xxiv:6 with
Hos. iv:4ff.), and the law of the landmark (cf. Deut. xix:14
with Hos. v:10).
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the reformation on his own initiative (2 Chron. xxxiv:3) several years before the discovery of the law book, which was basically Deuteronomy, and that Urdeuteronomium did not demand an absolute centralization of the cult but only a relative one at the larger sanctuaries, Deut. xii:13f. being just another way of expressing Exod. xx:24. Welch maintains that the only passage in Deuteronomy which demands cultic centralization is xii:1-7 which is a later addition to the book deliberately inserted at the beginning of the legal section proper in order to ensure that the whole law should be read in its light, and that the emphasis of Deut. xii:13f. and the rest of the book was not on the number of places but on the character of the sanctuaries, Deut. xii:14 being interpreted as referring to any legitimate Yahweh sanctuary. Deuteronomy is basically the product of the religious movement in Benjamin and Ephraim which originated with Samuel and centred on Shiloh, although the final editing of the materials was much later than the time of Samuel, some parts of the book (e.g. the curses of chapter xxviii) reflecting the period of the Assyrian domination. Against the proposals of Oestreicher and Welch it may be reiterated that their translations of Deut. xii:13f. are illegitimate and their interpretations of the rest of the book with regard to cultic centralization do not carry conviction. Oestreicher's suggestion that Josiah's reform was not concerned with Kulteineheit cannot be accepted, but Welch's conclusion that Deuteronomy had connections with Northern Israel is attractive.

Robertson (605) maintained that Deuteronomy was largely the work of Samuel who, having yielded to the pressure of the people and established the monarchy, undertook a codification of ancient divine

law and also prepared new legislation of a civil nature in order to facilitate the re-orientation of national life brought about by the movement away from priestly control towards the civil power. This accounts for the fact that it is in Deuteronomy that the king appears for the first time, while the high priest disappears. Centralization of worship was the natural sequel to the political union of the tribes under one king. Solomon provided the central sanctuary which the code required but his policy caused the schism. In 621 B.C. the rediscovery of the book coincided aptly with the hope of the reunification of all Israel. Arguing that the legislation formulated in Deuteronomy is basically Mosaic but that it was supplemented by decisions made by priests and judges at different sanctuaries, Brinker maintains that this formulation was undertaken by a council of priests, supervised by Samuel, as an expansion of the Mosaic Book of the Covenant. (606)

The value of this view lies in the importance which it attaches to sanctuaries in the formation of the sources and its recognition that some inconsistencies may reflect the usage of different places rather than different periods. (607) Against this view, it may be said that there is no hint of any such gathering of priests and scribes in the books of Samuel, the word תּוֹרָה is absent from 1 and 2 Samuel, the leader appointed by Samuel, according to 1 Sam. ix:16; x:1; xiii:14; xxv:30; 2 Sam. vi:21; vii:8, was a נָגִיל and not the king, as in Deut. xvii:14ff., (608) and, finally, it leaves unanswered the question why D shows knowledge of E, but not of the distinctive legislation


of P and why P takes D's law of cultic centralization for granted.\(^{(609)}\)

The principal weakness in the views of Oestreicher, Welch, Brinker, and Robertson is the fact that, to a greater or lesser degree, they maintain that the guiding principle of the book of Deuteronomy was not cultic centralization but the safeguarding of Israel from contamination through contact with Canaanite idolatry at a time of national crisis.

The third major view is that Deuteronomy was written during the Hezekiah-Josiah period. The early form of this view, which dates back in its essentials to de Wette's dissertation and which was developed by Wellhausen, is based on six basic presuppositions.\(^{(610)}\) Firstly, Deuteronomy in whole or in part was compiled sometime in the seventh century before the Josianic reformation in 621 B.C.\(^{(611)}\) Secondly, the book provided the impetus for Josiah's reforms and the king based his reformation on it. Thirdly, Deuteronomy was essentially a prophetic, and not a priestly, work. Fourthly, the book was designed as an ideal programme and not as a formal legal code, as is evidenced by the absence of penalties in some areas, for example, for failure to attend feasts. Fifthly, the centralization of sacrificial worship at a sole sanctuary was the principal formal demand of the authors of the book. Sixthly, although the book was compiled in the seventh

---


611. As noted already, Wellhausen regarded Deut. xii-xxvi as constituting Urdeuteronomium. S.R. Driver and G.A. Smith both followed closely the classical line but Driver, \textit{A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy}, p.lxxii, limited the original book to Deut. i-iii, v-xxvi, and xxviii whereas Smith, \textit{The Book of Deuteronomy}, CBSC, Cambridge, 1918, pp.xxivff., thought that Urdeuteronomium consisted of Deut. xii-xxvi, together with some form of the discourses now in i-xi and xxviii-xxx. Opinions varied widely, and still do, as to the precise extent of the original book.
century, it contains some ancient material, including laws which go back to the Book of the Covenant and beyond, which has been inserted alongside later additions, some of which may have been included after Josiah's time and even after 586 B.C.

In support of these propositions it was argued, from a literary point of view, that although it reflects a more advanced and complicated state of society, Deuteronomy is closely related to the Book of the Covenant, while it has few parallels with the Holiness Code and still less affinities with the Priestly Writing. The order JE, D, H, P based on a comparison of the legal material was found to be confirmed by the fact that the historical sections of D show a dependency on JE. Moreover, it was argued that whereas the eighth-century prophets show no trace of Deuteronomistic influence, apparent references to Deuteronomistic thinking in these books being classified as later additions, there is a close connection between Deuteronomy and Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Joshua-Kings were regarded as the product of Deuteronomistic redaction of earlier historical material. Moreover, the style and vocabulary of Deuteronomy were regarded as fitting in well with other seventh-century writings.

From a religious point of view, the book was said to contain religious thought far in advance of the primitive concepts of the period of the early monarchy and the monolatry of Elijah, while, at the same time, it was clearly influenced by the social passion of Amos, Hosea's emphasis on love, and the national devotion of Isaiah. Furthermore, the false religions referred to in the book were thought to be those of the reign of Manasseh (2 Kgs. xxii:1ff.).

From an historical point of view, it was argued that of all the bodies of law in the Old Testament, only Deuteronomy corresponds closely, point for point, with the measures enforced by Josiah on the
basis of the law book found in the temple of Jerusalem (2 Kgs. xxii; xxiii).

While the majority of scholars assign the final composition of Deuteronomy to the seventh-century, recent advocates of this date have considerably modified the arguments advanced by the early proponents of this view. Von Rad argues that Deuteronomy has a unified structure which is based on the pattern of a covenant renewal ceremony of the amphictyony at Shechem, that the book had its origin in the Northern Kingdom where the Levites preserved ancient covenant traditions and laws, and that Deuteronomy is the product of a movement which sought the revival of the traditions and institutions of the amphictyony, as is evidenced by, for example, the many references to the Holy War in Deuteronomy which point to the revival of the old Israelite militia in Judah. This movement was backed by יִשְׂרָאֵל who had preserved a pure Yahwism and, appalled by the syncretism of Jerusalem, sought to reform the cultus there and to promote a policy of national independence, but it was the Levites who acted as the spokesmen for this movement and were the real authors of Deuteronomy, taking up the old amphictyonic traditions which had been preserved in Levitical circles for centuries and re-interpreting and adapting these ancient laws for later circumstances. In order to avoid supposing that the Levites deprived themselves of their own livelihood by demanding cultic centralization, von Rad argues that the centralization passages can be easily excised as late additions and, as an alternative escape from the dilemma which Levitical authorship poses, he suggests that the Levites were not cult personnel at all. Against von Rad's thesis, it may be reiterated that it is most unlikely that there was an Israelite amphictyony in the period of the Judges, that there is strong
evidence to suggest that the Levites were cult personnel (cf. Deut. x:9; xiv:29; xviii:2, 8) and that the demand for cultic centralization undoubtedly belonged to the original composition of the book, firstly, because it fits in perfectly with the theological character of the rest of the book and, secondly, because there are many provisions in the book which are the direct result of the abolition of the local sanctuaries.

G.E. Wright, (612) who also holds a modified form of the seventh-century date for Deuteronomy, argues that "though it cannot be proved, it is nevertheless not improbable that the book rests on the tradition of an actual address of Moses before his death" and he maintains that "Deuteronomy must be considered as an exposition of the Mosaic faith by those who were vitally concerned in seeing its revival as the normative faith of the state."(613) Although "we have to reckon in Deuteronomy with a long interpretative tradition, one which has especial affiliations with north Israel", (614) Wright points to the fact that Deuteronomy must have arisen "at a time when the battle against the importation of foreign cultic practices into Yahwism was at its height and when the issue of law and obedience over against tolerant compromise had been made into a slogan for radical reform."(615) Thinking in terms of the period between the time of Elijah and the time of Josiah, Wright thinks that the references to the worship of "the host of heaven" (Deut. iv:19; xvii:3) seem to indicate the period of Assyrian domination, since this was the time when such worship was first introduced on a wide scale (cf. 2 Kgs. xxi:3-5; xxiii:12), and
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he concludes that the present core of the book - "consisting of the bulk of the material in chs. 5-30" - was compiled and edited in approximately 740-640 B.C. (616) Although he considers that Oestreicher and Welch have failed in their attempt to explain 'the place which Yahweh shall choose', Wright thinks that they are probably correct in the essential part of their thesis in that "it is true that the unity of the sanctuary is not the chief concern of Deuteronomy, and it is quite probable that the core of the book is indeed an old north Israelite document which was revised subsequently with the unity of the sanctuary in view." (617) Wright maintains that in the period of the judges Shiloh was the central shrine of the tribal amphictyony, to which annual pilgrimages were made (cf. Judg. xxii:19; I Sam. i:3), and that 'the place which Yahweh shall choose' is not a new invention of the author of Deut. xii-xxvi since "it refers to the central shrine or tabernacle where the ark was kept." (618) Arguing that "Deut. 13-26 actually contains no more about the centralization of worship at a single sanctuary than does the Book of the Covenant", (619) Wright agrees with Welch that Deut. xii is "the one place in the book where a definite revision of old custom is contained" but, in contrast to Welch, he considers the chapter a unity permitting the slaughter of domestic animals at home, which is no longer considered to be a sacrificial rite. (620) Comparing and contrasting Deuteronomy with the Holiness
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Code, which in Lev. xvii "preserves the original law of the tabernacle period, that all killing of 'clean' animals was sacrificial", Wright considers that the disagreements between D and H are readily solved "if it is assumed that the two documents represent parallel developments out of the earlier law of the tabernacle, Deuteronomy representing Levitical practices and tendencies in north Israel and H and P those of the Jerusalem priesthood."(621) Wright thinks that the law in Lev. xvii "presumably...was the law which continued to be fostered by the Jerusalem priesthood as part of the program for the small postexilic community centering in Jerusalem"(622) while "the centralization of all worship at one sanctuary was not only an attempt to revive the original situation pertaining to the Mosaic tabernacle, but in the eighth and seventh centuries it had a powerful political impetus as well."(623) Wright refers approvingly to von Rad's view that the ultimate bearers of the Deuteronomic traditions were Levitical circles in north Israel and in support of the northern provenance of the book he points to "the relationship existing between Deuteronomy, Hosea, and the Elohist document, and also...the prominent place which Shechem has in Deuteronomic tradition (11:26-32; 27; Josh. 8:30-35)". (624)

While this does not mean that Shechem was the original central shrine of Israel in Palestine, it "can safely be deduced...that the Deuteronomic tradition stems ultimately from the Shechem sanctuary where it was preserved and developed in special ceremonies for the renewal of the covenant, of which chs. 27-30 (cf. also 31:9-13) preserve the memory and perhaps a portion of the liturgy."(625)
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R.E. Clements (626) also argues for a seventh-century date. He maintains that Deuteronomy was composed by descendants of Levitical groups from the Northern Kingdom. These heirs of the Northern traditions of Israel's religion had come south after the fall of Samaria in 721 B.C. and, using old Northern material, they composed Deuteronomy in Jerusalem intending it to lead to a reform of the Jerusalem cult tradition. Of the features of the Jerusalem cult tradition which they sought to reform and reinterpret, the most important was the claim that Yahweh had made an eternal and unconditional covenant with Israel through his election of the Davidic dynasty and his choice of Mount Zion for his dwelling-place. The belief that Yahweh had chosen Mount Zion as his dwelling-place and David and his sons to be rulers over Israel were the two foundation pillars of the Jerusalem cult tradition. (627) The first piece of evidence adduced by Clements to support his view concerns the Deuteronomic interpretation of the ark. (628) The 'Jerusalem interpretation' was that Yahweh dwelled in the sanctuary on Mount Zion and that the ark was the mysterious symbol of the divine presence, associated with the notion of the heavenly king seated on his cherubim-throne. In Deuteronomy, the ark was


simply a box containing the tablets of the law, the Ten Words, and there is no mention whatsoever of it being the cherubim-throne of Yahweh or of symbolizing or representing in any way his presence.(629) The second piece of evidence which Clements puts forward concerns the Deuteronomistic innovation of the claim to uniqueness of the sanctuary which God will choose to set his name there. Clements accepts the claim of Koch (630) and Mendenhall (631) that the terminology of election was used in connection with both the Davidic dynasty and the Mount Zion sanctuary in the pre-Deuteronomistic period (cf. Pss. lxxviii:67-72; cxxxii:11-18). (632) Jerusalem had a special position of pre-eminence over other sanctuaries because of its close association with the Davidic dynasty and its claim to rule over the whole land and people. Those who produced Deuteronomy conceded and even extended Jerusalem's old claim to a position of primacy, but they made two major alterations of its religious ideas. Firstly, they introduced the theological concept of Yahweh's name which was made the vehicle of his presence, thereby denying that Mount Zion was Yahweh's chosen dwelling-place,(633) and, secondly, they severed the connection of the uniqueness of the sanctuary of Yahweh with the political claims of the monarchy, accepting the uniqueness of Jerusalem "solely in the interests of the purity of the Yahwistic cult."(634) The most important of all the innovations introduced by the authors of Deuteronomy into Israelite

631. G.E. Mendenhall, 'Election', IDB, ii, pp.78a, 80a.
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purity of the Yahwistic cult."(634) The most important of all the innovations introduced by the authors of Deuteronomy into Israelite theology "was to use the terminology of election in defining the relationship between Yahweh and his people"(635) and this stress on the election of Israel rather than on the election of David was another way in which the authors of Deuteronomy attempted to counterbalance the claims of the Jerusalem kingship ideology. Observing that the Deuteronomic writers were the first to describe Yahweh's action towards Israel in terms of his election of them from among all nations to be his people,(636) Clements thinks that there was a very thoroughgoing doctrine of election in the ideology of the Davidic kingship of Jerusalem and that while the authors of Deuteronomy did not derive their doctrine of election from this kingship ideology, "they minted their own very original and distinctive doctrine with a consciousness of the ideas and terminology used of the Jerusalem kingship."(637) Deuteronomy "was interested in the institution of the monarchy and was concerned to cut it down to size" and the Deuteronomic writers probably "applied the idea of election to all Israel as a deliberate counterbalance to


635. Ibid., p.305.


the excessive claims of the Jerusalem monarchy, "(638) as a "counter to the political theology current in the Southern Kingdom. (639)

Finally, the authors of Deuteronomy, who believed that "Israel's relationship to Yahweh was not something permanently rooted in the natural order, but rather an ethical and spiritual relationship grounded in a covenant of grace", (640) sought to oppose the Jerusalem cult tradition concerning Yahweh's relationship to the land of Canaan. The Deuteronomic writers stressed that Israel's settlement of Canaan was a consequence of the gracious purpose of God (cf. Deut.iv:26; v:16, 33; vi:1ff.; viii:1ff.; xi:8ff.) and that the continued privilege of dwelling in the land was morally conditioned. (641)

Clements discerns a strong polemical note in Deuteronomy's doctrine of the land, (642) and he thinks that it was deliberately opposing the idea that Mount Zion was especially the symbol of Yahweh's holy land, (643) which it regarded as a false doctrine. (644)
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Clements' work is very valuable with regard to the theological interpretation of the book of Deuteronomy. However, he has been criticized by Nicholson for his view that the authors of the book "had such a relatively narrow intention" as to reform the Jerusalem cult tradition. (645) Nicholson, who also adheres to the seventh-century date, questions whether the polemical attitude in Deuteronomy is as pronounced or deliberate as Clements' theory suggests. Nicholson argues that while the passages which refer to the ark (Deut. xv:1-5; xxxi:9, 25f.) do present "a non-Jerusalem concept of the Ark", (646) they are probably later additions inserted by the Deuteronomistic historian, (647) that while the law of kingship (Deut. xvi:14f.) does contain a polemical element, this attitude was probably not directed specifically against the Davidic monarchy but against monarchy in general, (648) and that the authors of Deuteronomy had a much more pressing urgency on their minds than the reformation of the Jerusalem cult tradition. Nicholson rightly argues that the Deuteronomic writers were concerned with the very survival of their people, for "the northern kingdom had been swept away and the southern state had reached its lowest point from both a political and religious point of view." (649) In the face of political and religious disintegration they sought to formulate a programme to revive the nation and preserve Israel's existence as Yahweh's covenant people at a time when this "was threatened with nothing less than extinction." (650)
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Referring with approval to the work of Noth (651) and, particularly, de Tillesse (652) on the structure of the book, Nicholson thinks that, while the history of the literary growth of the book is extremely complex and impossible to trace with any certainty in all its stages, (653) it seems likely that Urdeuteronomium consisted for the most part of the singular passages in chapters v-xxvi together with some of chapter xxviii. (654) Chapter xxviii was subsequently expanded after 586 B.C. and chapter xxx was added to it. Then, following Noth, Nicholson thinks that this book was incorporated by the Deuteronomistic historian into his history and provided with a framework in chapters i-iii (iv), xxxi:1-13, 24-26a, and xxxiv. Following de Tillesse, Nicholson thinks that the Deuteronomist also surcharged the original singular passages in v-xxvi with the majority of the plural passages which are now in this section. The Deuteronomist probably also

651. Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien, I, 1957, pp.39ff., whose thesis is that the corpus Deuteronomy-2 Kings is the work of one man who wished to present to his generation a theological interpretation of the catastrophes of 721 B.C. and 586 B.C., argues that Deut. i-iii (iv), xxxi:1-13, 24-26a, and xxxiv are the work of the Deuteronomistic historian (Deut. i-iii (iv) serving as the prologue to the history and the other passages in the last four chapters of the book constituting a link between Deuteronomy and Joshua) and that Deut. iv:44-xxx:20 lay before the Deuteronomistic historian in more or less its present form. Noth, op.cit., p.16, considers that Urdeuteronomium consisted of the singular portions of Deut. iv:44-xxx:20.

652. C. Minette de Tillesse, 'Sections "tu" et sections "vous" dans le Deutéronome', VT, xii, 1962, pp.29-87, accepts Noth's theory but goes further and attempts to demonstrate that the plural passages in Deut. iv:44-xxx:20 are also the work of the Deuteronomist. Confining his discussion for the most part to Deut. iv:44-xxvi, de Tillesse seeks to show, firstly, that most of the plural passages in chapters v-xxvi can be excised without detracting from the coherence of the (singular) text, secondly, that there are close literary parallels between these plural passages in the book and other passages throughout Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings which are the work of the Deuteronomistic historian, and, thirdly, that the theology of the plural passages in Deuteronomy matches that of the Deuteronomist.


654. See Deuteronomy and Tradition, p.36, for Nicholson's "tentative suggestion" (ibid., p.35) as to the development of the book.
added chapters xxvii and xxix. Finally, this block of material was expanded further at a later stage with the addition of chapter xxxi together with chapters xxxii and xxxiii, which may have been added when Deuteronomy was linked with Genesis-Numbers to form the Pentateuch.

Examining the nature of Deuteronomy and the traditions on which the book stands, (655) Nicholson maintains that the book has a cultic background and that it has been deeply influenced in both form and presentation by the old festival of the renewal of the covenant. In its broad basis, the book stands within the sacral traditions of the old Israelite amphictyony, which is evidenced notably by the amount of material which is based on the Holy War ideology. However, Deuteronomy contains no direct deposit of the old amphictyonic institutions and the material in the book has been modified and developed in a period much in advance of the period of the Judges, as is evidenced in the case of the material concerning the Holy War, Deuteronomy's spiritually exalted name-theology, its distinctive definition of the doctrine of election, and its demand for cultic centralization which "must certainly have originated at a relatively late period in Israel's history."(656)

Nicholson then seeks to determine where and by whom these traditions and principles were preserved in the centuries preceding their appearance in the book of Deuteronomy. (657) He maintains that after the collapse of the amphictyony the old amphictyonic shrines probably continued to preserve and transmit the covenant traditions
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but, after the collapse of the cultic transmission of the covenant faith at these sanctuaries, the prophetic party became the custodians of the old traditions and they took over from the priesthood the task of preserving and promulgating Israel's covenant faith. The prophetic party's concern for the old traditions continued down through the centuries and "Northern Israel was evidently the scene of their most vigorous activity." (658)

Having argued that Deuteronomy owes its origin to prophetic circles in northern Israel, Nicholson then seeks to determine the reason for the Deuteronomic demand for cultic centralization, which "was never, as far as we know, a principle of these prophetic circles", (659) to account for the presence of a book, which had derived from northern circles, in the Jerusalem Temple in 621 B.C., and to explain why this book became the basis of a reformation implemented by the Judaean monarch and supported by the Jerusalem priesthood. (660) Nicholson rejects Alt's view (661) that Deuteronomy was the reformation programme of a revival movement in northern Israel after 721 B.C. with exclusively the north in mind, largely because there is no evidence that such a reformation programme was ever adopted and put into operation in the north after the fall of Samaria. Alt's theory seems to be in direct contradiction to the fact that any revival movements between the fall of Samaria and the destruction of Jerusalem in 586 B.C. came from Judah and not the north. (662) Nicholson also
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rej ects F. Dumermuth's view that Deuteronomy was the programme of a revival movement in the Northern Kingdom before 721 B.C. and that Bethel was the centre of the reformation circle, largely because it is evident from Amos iv:4f. and Hos. iv:15 that Bethel had become corrupt with pagan practices and it is hardly conceivable that Hosea could have referred to Bethel as Bethaven if this sanctuary had been the centre of a revival and reformation movement in the period before the fall of Samaria. On the other hand, Nicholson finds von Rad's theory, that the provenance of the book is to be found among circles of levites in the Judaean countryside in the seventh century B.C., unconvincing and he also rejects Bächli's theory that Deuteronomy originated amongst Judaean circles. Nicholson rejects von Rad's view on the grounds that the demand for cultic centralization was an integral part of Urdeuteronomium and it is most improbable that the country levites would have abolished their local shrines thereby depriving themselves of their livelihood. Moreover, von Rad's view that the country levites had possibly outgrown the cultic sphere proper is untenable since there is absolutely no evidence to suggest that they were no longer ministering at the local shrines while there is abundant evidence to indicate that there was vigorous cultic activity in Judah in the seventh century. Finally, von Rad's treatment of 'the people of the
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land' as a terminus technicus is going beyond the evidence (668) and, anyhow, if 'the people of the land' had been a powerful political and military group aiming for national independence and inner religious renewal, then it seems strange that they had to deposit their programme in the temple in the hope that it would be discovered and its demands implemented. It is also strange that there was not a drastic reduction of the paganism referred to in, for example, 2 Kgs. xxiii, Jer. vii:17f.; xi:9-13, Ezek. viii, and even more odd that "such texts as Jeremiah xxxiv.19, xxxvii.2, xliv.21 make it abundantly clear that the 'people of the land' contributed in no small measure to the sorry state of the nation's cultic life and the depths to which it had sunk at this time."(669)

Bächli argues that while there is a direct relationship between Deuteronomy and Josiah's reformation, the book was composed after the reformation and was the deposit of it. (670) It was the tragic death of Josiah at Megiddo and the reaction against his reformation which prompted those who had been involved in Josiah's cultic and political aims to formulate them into the Deuteronomic programme in an attempt to revive the nation in both cult and politics and thus avert the possible catastrophe with which the nation was confronted. Whoever wrote the book was concerned with every aspect of Israel's life - sacred, secular, political, and military - and, isolating the parenetic, legal, cultic, and politico-military types of material, Bächli seeks to determine who was responsible for each of them and for bringing them all together. He concludes that the preaching activity underlying the homiletic
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style in which the book is written is to be interpreted in the light of Deut. xvii:14-20 which charges the king with the responsibility of reading and interpreting the law at public assemblies, (671) that the king, as the juridical head of the nation, was ultimately responsible for the administration of law, (672) that the king was the supreme authority in cultic matters in Israel, (673) and that the king is also the figure who stands behind the pronounced political and military atmosphere of Deuteronomy. (674) Bächli thinks that one of the clearest indications that the book originated among circles in Jerusalem is the fusion of two sets of traditions, (675) for, while the book promulgates the Sinai/Mosaic covenant traditions, it is anchored to the Davidic/Jerusalem traditions, as is evidenced in its prefiguring Moses as performing the ideal functions of the Judaean monarchy. (676) The fusion of these two traditions originated in Jerusalem where both were united in the person of the Davidic king. When Deuteronomy was formulated after Josiah's death it was dissociated from the monarchy, largely because of the reactionary policies of Jehoahaz and Jehoiakim, and it was founded on the authority of Moses. (677)

Against Bächli's theory, Nicholson rightly argues that if it be accepted that the book discovered in the temple stimulated Josiah's
enactments, then the most reasonable position to adopt is that, as indicated by 2 Kings, this book was Deuteronomy and that the demands of Deuteronomy stand in a large measure behind the reformation, particularly in its cultic aspects. (678) Secondly, Nicholson argues that Deuteronomy's polemical attitude towards kingship and the severe limitations which it places on the monarchy clearly indicate that the book's origin is not to be found among Jerusalem circles. (679) Moreover, Nicholson is of the opinion that the stipulation regarding the king's duty towards the book of the law in Deut. xvii:18f. may be the work of the Deuteronomistic historian who laid upon the king the solemn obligation to adhere to all the demands of the law of Moses. (680)

Arguing that any theory of a purely northern origin of the book fails to account for the presence of a northern reformation programme in Jerusalem and its acceptance by the Judaean authorities, while theories of a specifically Judaean provenance do not explain the book's striking affinities with north Israelite traditions and literature, Nicholson advances the thesis that Deuteronomy originated among prophetic circles of the Northern Kingdom who fled south to Judah after 721 B.C. and there formulated their old traditions into a programme of reform and revival with Jerusalem as its political and cultic centre, making certain concessions to the Jerusalem cult traditions, notably in demanding the centralization of the cult. (681) The book was probably composed during Manasseh's reign and the Deuteronomistic circle sought to integrate their own reformation and
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revival plans into those which had been attempted by Hezekiah, by embodying some of the fundamental principles of Hezekiah's reformation and orientating them towards their own particular theological traditions. (682) By adopting Hezekiah's idea of cultic centralization, the Deuteronomic circle were giving expression to the traditional primacy of Jerusalem and, at the same time, attempting to achieve cultic purity by rooting out the widespread syncretism which had pervaded the rural shrines. (683) Once Deuteronomy was accorded a place in Judah, the Deuteronomic circle sprang to life again and the Deuteronomistic history represents the work of the direct descendants of the authors of the book of Deuteronomy. (684) The interest shown by the Deuteronomist in prophecy and the role which he accords the prophets as the mediators of Yahweh's will to Israel is taken as further indication that the Deuteronomic-Deuteronomistic circle was a prophetic circle.

Nicholson's thesis is well argued but he may be criticized for his view regarding the origin of the demand for cultic centralization and for his suggestion that the origin of the book is to be sought among a prophetic group, for this idea "is speculative and merely shifts the problem of origin from the Levites to a prophetic group - for neither of which is there unambiguous evidence." (685)

Moshe Weinfeld, who also adheres to a seventh-century date, argues that Deuteronomy originated among a literary circle of scribes
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working in the courts of Hezekiah and Josiah who achieved a religio-national ideology inspired by a new emphasis on wisdom themes. This circle was familiar with ancient treaty forms and when formulating Deuteronomy they reworked the motifs of the old covenant tradition and adapted them to the covenant type prevalent in the eighth and seventh centuries B.C. Weinfeld's thesis may be criticized at several points not the least of which is his attempt to shift the problem of the origin of Deuteronomy from levitical and prophetic groups to a scribal circle.

Another writer who favours a seventh-century date for Deuteronomy is N. Lohfink, (686) who argues that the book of the covenant referred to in 2 Kgs. xxiii:2, 21 was probably the old covenant document of the Jerusalem temple, since it was recognized as genuine (2 Kgs. xxii:13; xxiii:21) and old, and it contained stipulations forbidding worship of other gods (xxii:16f.), it was binding on the fathers (xxii:13), it contained curses (xxii:13, 17), and it referred to the passover, which can be traced back at least to the period of the judges (xxiii:21f.). The narrative in 2 Kings, which may have been composited at the king's request and placed in the royal archives, is

686. N. Lohfink, 'Die Bundesurkunde des Königs Josias', Biblica, xliiv, 1963, pp.261-288, 461-498. In his Das Hauptgebot: eine Untersuchung literarischer Einleitungsfragen zu Dtn. 5-11 Analecta Biblica, xx, 1963, Lohfink begins with a survey of the most important work of earlier scholars and then conducts an investigation of words and literary forms in Deut. v-xi followed by an examination of the text and an attempted reconstruction of its literary history. Lohfink defends the unity and common authorship of chapters v and vi. He rejects the view that the alternation between the singular and plural forms of address indicates composite authorship unless this is supported by other evidence. Finally, he argues that behind chapters v-xi lie the covenantal cult and the preaching of the law. The 'Verfasser' combined various traditions in v:1-vi:25, ix:9-19, 21, 25-29, x:1-5, 10-18, 20-22, xi:1-17 and to these the 'Veberarbeiter' added vii:1-24 (and possibly 25f.), viii:1-20, ix:1-8, 22-24, xi:18-25. At one of these stages, or possibly later, this material was joined to xii-xxviii, and xi:26-32 was inserted to serve as a link.
not primarily concerned with the law book but, rather, with a king who was devoted to the covenant and the chief interest of the narrator lies in his description of a covenant renewal ceremony in which the king, on hearing the law, is greatly distressed, repents and is forgiven (xxii:3-20), renews the covenant (xxiii:1-3) and celebrates the passover (xxiii:21-23). Lohfink is of the opinion that Josiah's book was approximately Deut. v-xxviii and that the composition of the book is to be understood in the light of the efforts made by the kings of Judah, particularly David, to incorporate the old amphictyonic institutions into the Jerusalem royal cult. There was a line of legal continuity between the original covenant document, which can be traced right back to Shiloh, and the Deuteronomy of the time of Josiah. The principal weakness of Lohfink's thesis is his presupposition that an amphictyony existed in the period of the Judges. (687)

The last writer to be considered in this category of scholars who accept a seventh-century date for Deuteronomy is J.W. McKay. (688) McKay argues that the author of Deuteronomy was deeply influenced by the Assyrian treaties and that the background to the book's treaty conditions is the period of Assyrian domination before 622 B.C. (689) McKay then finds an overlap of wisdom and treaty materials in the code of Deuteronomy. Observing striking parallels between Deuteronomy and wisdom literature, McKay seeks to demonstrate that the author of the Deuteronomic code employed wisdom ideas and language to revise old

687. Thompson, op. cit., p. 66 (cf. ibid., p. 19), seeks to extend Lohfink's view by arguing that if the document found in Josiah's day were a covenant document then it would have comprised Deut. i-xxx since the complete covenant form would require a historical introduction (i-iii), a document clause (xxvii) and a recapitulation section (xxix and xxx).


689. Ibid., p. 236, et passim.
laws, drew up fresh legislation of wisdom concern, formulated a law from material found in the vassal treaties by employing familiar wisdom outlines and ideas, transformed wisdom sayings into laws and depicted judges as being acquainted with the standards of wisdom, preserved the principles of wisdom's humanitarianism, and saturated the Deuteronomic traditions with the wisdom doctrines of retribution and reward. \(690\) In short, the author of the code of Deuteronomy "was a man who was thoroughly at home in the wisdom traditions." \(691\)

McKay detects occasional traces of wisdom influence in Deut. xxviii where the treaty material has been followed in greater detail than elsewhere but he considers such contacts with wisdom to be possibly coincidental. \(692\) He finds many wisdom features in the prologue to the code, Deut. iv:44-xi:32, in both the singular and plural passages. \(693\) In fact, whereas the curses of chapter xxviii are primarily dependent on the Assyrian treaties and make little use of wisdom material, the prologue is heavily influenced by wisdom and shows little point of contact with the treaties. While the Deuteronomic prologue differs from the wisdom prologue in that its concern is with the traditions of Israel, which were based in history, and its law, and not simply the general, international wisdom of the ancient world, nevertheless, the Deuteronomic prologue "is 'hortatory' rather than 'historical', more akin to the Assyrian than to the Hittite treaty prologue, and its shape and content were largely determined by the Deuteronomist's familiarity with the wisdom traditions." \(694\)

690. Ibid., p.281, et passim.

691. Ibid., pp.280f.

692. Ibid., pp.281-283.

693. Ibid., pp.283-304.

694. Ibid., p.304.
McKay points out that wisdom teaching, both in Israel and in the ancient Near East, used the same kind of parenesis as Deuteronomy. Arguing that the book's parenesis is derived from the teaching methods of the wise and that it represents an advanced state of development, McKay traces the history of its growth in the Deuteronomic re-editing of the earlier law collections, the Decalogue, the Covenant Code, and the Cultic Decalogue where similar parenetic forms occur which "in many instances... can be shown to be secondary additions, probably from the pen of a Deuteronomistic redactor." Deuteronomism "was born at least one century before the appearance of Urdeuteronomium, and Deuteronomic redactors of ancient laws could have been active during a considerable period before, as well as after 622 B.C." At any rate, "it is obvious from the use made of the Decalogue and the Covenant Code in the Book of Deuteronomy that the Deuteronomists had a prior interest in these collections and doubtless in the early stages of their teaching they had used and adapted these old legal corpora", and their expansions in the extant documents "must therefore represent, at least in part, the teaching of the Deuteronomists before 622 B.C." McKay thinks that the Book of the Covenant may represent, in part at least, an early attempt by the Deuteronomic movement to achieve religious

695. Ibid., pp.305-322.
696. Ibid., pp.309ff.
697. Ibid., p.311.
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700. Ibid., pp.321f.
reformation and that it may be considered a precursor of the D-code belonging to the seventh century. (701) In the Cultic Decalogue, Exod. xxxiv:24 may be a Deuteronomistic addition inserted in the light of cultic centralization, but McKay considers it equally possible that it could point to a demand for centralization which pre-dates Deuteronomy. (702)

Thus McKay argues that the Assyrian treaties and the wisdom literature govern, to a large extent, the form of Deuteronomy, the author's style and his selection of laws and parenesis and provide an indication of the date and the methods of the compiler of the first edition of Deuteronomy.

Turning his attention to the origins and growth of Deuteronomism and the identity and aims of the members of this movement, McKay considers that, while some of the arguments used in the past may require some modification, there seems to be a good case for the view that many of the traditions in Deuteronomy are ancient and that they were preserved in the Northern Kingdom. (703) Behind the revival and reassertion of these ancient traditions there was a reformatory purpose and many of the traditions have been modified and reformulated and new doctrines have been introduced which seem to have been composed at a late time with the purpose of reforming the Jerusalem cult. (704) McKay concludes that the book constitutes the deposit of a Judaean reforming movement of Northern extraction and that the date of the final compilation of Urdeuteronomium was probably the reign of Manasseh or later. However, the book was but the final deposit of a

---

702. McKay, _op.cit._, p.320.
703. Ibid., p.333.
704. Ibid., pp.333ff.
period of growth and development experienced by the movement behind Deuteronomy and the stages of the movement's growth may be traced in the Covenant Code and the Cultic Decalogue in their present forms.

Finally, McKay rightly argues that the Deuteronomic circle should not be so narrowly defined that any important element of the tradition is passed over. The ancient Yahwistic traditions in Deuteronomy with their concern for 'all Israel' can hardly have been the monopoly of a single group who jealously guarded the privilege of being their traditors. (705) While there is both a distinctly priestly and a definite prophetic interest in Deuteronomy it is very probable that the book was composed by a very wide group which included both Levites and prophets "and which may be more generally defined as the humble, obedient Yahwists of the land." (706)

Having established that the basic traditions which are contained in Deuteronomy had been preserved mainly in the Northern Kingdom but that Urdeuteronomium had derived in seventh century Judah and its editors were familiar with wisdom and treaty traditions, McKay then turns his attention to the identification of these editors. He first

705. Ibid., p.348.

706. Ibid., p.349. McKay, op.cit., p.347, refers approvingly to the plausible suggestion made by N.W. Porteous, 'The Prophets and the Problem of Continuity', (originally published in Israel's Prophetic Heritage. Essays in honour of James Muilenburg, ed. B.W. Anderson and G. Harrelson, London, 1962, pp.11-25), Living the Mystery, pp.113-125, ref. p.124, who, while generally arguing in favour of a possible prophetic tradition, suggests that the people who probably preserved the covenant traditions under the united monarchy and in the divided kingdoms were the humble of the land, whose spokesmen were the prophets. In his 'Actualization and the Prophetic Criticism of the Cult', (originally published in Tradition und Situation. Studien zum alttestamentlichen Prophetie. Artur Weiser zum 70. Geburtstag, ed. E. Würthwein and O. Kaiser, Göttingen, 1963, pp.93-105), Living the Mystery, pp.127-141, suggests that the Levites may have been involved in the true tradition of Yahwism when it had to a considerable extent gone underground and "it may be as the result of the faithful activities of Levites living at the economic level of the poor in the land and doubtless in contact with men like Hosea who represented the true prophetic line" (ibid., p.135).
examines the theory that the editors of Deuteronomy were Levites and points out that there is no uniform definition of the Levites. For example, whereas Wright finds a distinction in Deuteronomy between altar priests and other Levites who were simply teachers and expositors.

707. H.W. Wolff, 'Hoseas geistige Heimat', Gesammelte Studien, Munich, 1964, pp.232-250, argues that Deuteronomy owes its origin to circles of Levites living in northern Israel who were the bearers of the old sacral traditions of early Israel and who had a marked concern for the true and ideal function of cultic worship. A circle of Levites who faithfully preserved the old cultic and sacral traditions and who were in active opposition to the popular and corrupt practices of their time may have originated among those Levites who, according to 1 Kgs. xii:31f., were expelled by Jeroboam I from Bethel and Dan. The centre of this Levitical group may have been Shechem. Wolff thinks that it may have been from this group that Hosea acquired his knowledge of Israel's sacral traditions and his lofty concept of the true function of cult. Finally, he suggests that eventually the teaching of this Levitical circle may have found expression in the book of Deuteronomy. Cf. idem, "Wissen um Gott" bei Hoseas als Ursprung von Theologie", Gesammelte Studien, pp.182-205. J. Lindblom, Erwägungen zur Herkunft der Josianischen Tempelurkunde, (Scripta Minora: Regiae Societatis Humaniorum Litterarum Lundensis, 1970-1971:3), Lund, 1971, argues that the Levites are a major interest in Deuteronomy. Among the Levites, he distinguishes four groups all descended from Levi, without land but with the right to function as priests. The first group consisted of those who were scattered throughout Palestine, impoverished with no connection with any shrine and in need of charity and protection. The second group consisted of the priests at the provincial shrines. The third group comprised the Temple priests. The fourth group consisted of descendants of Levi who earlier had been cultically unattached but who obtained priestly functions when they joined the Jerusalem staff. According to Lindblom, it was this group, together perhaps with Levites from the north, who wrote the Josianic lawbook during the first decade of the reign of Manasseh and then concealed it in the temple. Deuteronomy is an expanded version of the Josianic lawbook. A great many fragments were added to the original book at many different times and places. Some additions were inserted by the authors of the Josianic lawbook but the majority of additions were inserted by those responsible for the Deuteronomistic historical work during exilic and post-exilic times. A. Bentzen, Die Josianische Reform und ihre Voraussetzungen, Copenhagen, 1926, also puts forward the thesis that Deuteronomy derived from the circles of the country Levites.
of the law, (708) Emerton (709) prefers the more general definition put forward by S.R. Driver: "in Dt. they are a fluctuating minority, viz. those members of the tribe who are officiating for the time at the central sanctuary." (710) Granted that the Levites in Deuteronomy "were most certainly priests", (711) Pfeiffer's suggestion that the author of the book was a Jerusalem priest (712) must be rejected since it is improbable that a Temple priest would have formulated a law according rural Levites an equal status with himself and his colleagues at the central shrine (Deut. xviii:6-8). At the same time, it is equally improbable that a priest at a local sanctuary would have inserted a law demanding cultic centralization which would have closed down his sanctuary and those of his fellows. Moreover, the Deuteronomic polemic directed against the doctrines of the Jerusalem cult indicate that the author of the book was not a cultic priest but, rather, a rationalist theologian. (713)

With the alternative solution which is usually put forward, viz. that the authors of Deuteronomy were prophets, the problem of definition again arises. (714) While recognizing the high status accorded to the

714. Ibid., pp.352f.
prophet in Deuteronomy. McKay does not think that the Deuteronomic editors are to be sought amongst the prophets for the reason that the prophets had a method of presenting their message different from the style of presentation of the traditions which is employed in Deuteronomy. 

Examining Weinfeld's suggestion that the Deuteronomic editors were statesmen and McKane's conclusion that 'the wise' were pre-eminently statesmen and that Deuteronomy represents the reinterpretation of wisdom in terms of law, McKay concludes that while these suggestions at first appear plausible in the light of the book's use of the wisdom and treaty traditions, they raise problems. Not only is it difficult to reconcile the book's exalted view of prophecy with the fact that there was constant conflict between prophets and statesmen, but whereas statesmen are predominantly interested in state affairs and state law, Deuteronomy was the law of the religious community 'Israel' and "the absence of interest in constitutional  


719. Ibid. McKane himself, op.cit., pp.65ff., describes the constant friction between the two groups. 

matters of the state, in political affairs of the nation, in international law, in court procedure, etc. militates against deriving Deuteronomy from a circle of statesmen as editors."(721)

McKay concludes that while the Deuteronomic editors cannot be satisfactorily limited to Levitical or prophetic or scribal circles, the book undoubtedly does have certain associations with each of these circles, probably because the Deuteronomic editors "comprised a wider diversity of persons than scholars have been willing to admit."(722)

McKay stresses that the editors were first and foremost members of the Deuteronomic movement which probably included priests, prophets, and statesmen. The Deuteronomic editors' complete familiarity with wisdom teaching, the freedom with which they employed it, and the deep influence it had on their style and on the form and content of the book, (723) all "point only to an educated element in the movement and not to any particular limited circle."(724) These men may not have been priests or Levites but they had a lively interest in the priesthood, the Temple and the Levites. They may not have been prophets, yet they showed the utmost respect for them. They may not have been statesmen, yet they showed some concern for civil administration, accorded the elders considerable authority in the execution of justice, and demanded fair judgment in the law-court. Perhaps the best description of the editors of Deuteronomy is "theologians".(725) At any rate their first loyalty was to the Deuteronomic reforming movement and hence, in their attempt to reconstitute the community of
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Yahweh, they were able to view the circles of priests, prophets, and statesmen with impartiality. (726)

As for the birth of Deuteronomism, (727) McKay thinks that Deuteronomy is the deposit of a movement in Judah which derived from or was, at least deeply influenced by immigrant Northern elements. In view of the fact that the scope of an original Northern Deuteronomy is impossible to determine, McKay confines himself to drawing inferences from records outside the book of Deuteronomy. He concludes that it must have been in the last twenty-four years after the death of Jeroboam II, when the inner malaise of the Northern Kingdom erupted into open anarchy, that Deuteronomism took root, "especially after the events in the reign of Menahem who was compelled to become tributary to Tiglath-pileser." (728) McKay finds support for this opinion in 2 Kgs. xvii:2 where the Deuteronomist says of Hoshea: "And he did what was evil in the sight of Yahweh, yet not as the kings of Israel who were before him." Although little is recorded of this last king of Israel, "and what is recorded is difficult to interpret" (729) McKay thinks it may be highly significant that while the Deuteronomist was forced to condemn every king of the North for the obvious reason that he had not centred the cult in Jerusalem, he modified Hoshea's condemnation "by the use of a formula which...was used only in the judgment of one of the worst of the Northern apostates and of the two kings most approved by the Deuteronomist." (730) While Hoshea's

726. Ibid., p.365.
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rebellion against Assyria would certainly have pleased the Deuteronomic writers, "since it implied the restitution of Yahweh to the status of sole overlord in Israel", (731) an act of rebellion in itself would not have been regarded as sufficient justification for the excepting clause "for Pekah had also defied Assyria and Hoshea himself had at first submitted on accession". (732) However, it is possible that 2 Kgs. xvii:2 preserves a memory that Hoshea was in some way sympathetic to the principles of Deuteronomism and this, in turn, suggests that Deuteronomism became an active force bent on religious reform in the second half of the eighth century, before the fall of the Northern Kingdom "and that in this period its propagators began to reformulate the old Yahwistic traditions which go back to the antiquity of Israel's origins as a covenant community, traditions which had been preserved by Levites, prophets and the humble obedient of the land". (733) Although the movement appeared too late to influence the Northern Kingdom, they fled south to Judah after 722 B.C. with the hope that the community of "Israel" might yet be saved from extermination "and it was in Judah in the century before Josiah's reformation that the traditions underwent the significant changes which were to determine the appearance of the Book of Deuteronomy." (734) Deuteronomism was unknown in Judah before the fall of Samaria and Hezekiah's attempt to centralise the cult "may be the first historical

731. Ibid., p.376.
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indication of Deuteronomism in Judah." (735) While the form and style of Deuteronomy indicate that the Deuteronomic editors were men of high social standing who had received a state education and could speak with authority, "the discovery of similar traits in the Covenant Code and in the Cultic Decalogue" (736) suggests the presence of this well-educated stratum in Deuteronomism at an early stage of its Judaean history. While the urgency of the message proclaimed by the movement would have been one reason for the fact that it attained influence and authority so quickly, "a much more important reason seems to have been that the Deuteronomists found influential friends in Judah who were prepared to hear and receive their message." (737) When the true Yahwists of the North arrived in Judah with an urgent message authenticated by the catastrophe of 722 B.C., they would have been warmly received by 𐤄𐤊𐤆𐤄𐤇𐤅𐤃 who were violently opposed to the syncretistic policies of several of the Judaean monarchs. The movement had gained the support of the more influential elements in 𐤄𐤊𐤆𐤄𐤇𐤅𐤃 and sufficient authority to influence the king and his court by the time Hezekiah became king in 715 B.C. It must have been towards the end of Ahaz's reign that Deuteronomism "won to its support men of education and high standing in society, whose influence is reflected in those wisdom features discernible in the Covenant Code." (738) After the failure of Hezekiah's reforms, the miraculous deliverance of Jerusalem at the time of Sennacherib's invasion in 701 B.C. (2 Kgs. xix:35-37) probably played a major part in ensuring that the message and traditions of

735. McKay, Josiah's Reformation, p.399.
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Deuteronomism were preserved amongst יִשְׂרָאֵל during the reign of Manasseh. Although the official policy of polytheism stifled true Yahwism in Jerusalem, this was a time of literary activity on the part of Yahwists (739) and it was probably at this time that the Deuteronomic movement developed an interest in the treaties and transformed, modified, or embellished many of the old doctrines of the Northern Kingdom. One doctrine which shows development is the demand for cultic centralization. The law of the altar in the Covenant Code only demands that sanctuaries be limited to recognized cult places and it was probably during Manasseh's reign that the full implications of the demand for cultic centralization, which "may have originated with Hezekiah's own interpretation of Deuteronomism or with his adoption of some 'temporary expedient','(740) were worked out "and formulated as corollaries to a primary demand for one shrine only",(741) as the most logical solution to the problem of paganism.

The law of kingship fits perfectly into the scheme of cultic centralization for the Deuteronomic plan was not merely to centralize the cult but also to supervise it and, since the state cult was always subject to the king's pleasure, it was imperative to exert considerable influence over him, which explains why Deut. xvii:18-20 demands that the king should acquaint himself with the law's demands by regular study.

Not all of McKay's arguments carry equal conviction and he may be criticized for his failure to account satisfactorily for the presence of the demand for cultic centralization in Deuteronomy and


741. Ibid., p.412.
for his neglect of the political and economic factors which must have influenced Josiah's reforms to a considerable extent. On the positive side, however, McKay's work is very valuable for highlighting the folly of associating Deuteronomy with any one ministry of Israel's religion, either priestly, prophetic, or that of a circle of the wise since "aspects of the ideas, outlook, and speech-forms appropriate to all three areas appear to be present, suggesting that the Deuteronomic movement may have drawn elements from all three." Thus, in the light of the evidence, it is wrong to attribute the provenance and

742. Cf., e.g., Gray, I and II Kings, p.568, who thinks that "the Josianic reformation was as much a constitutional as a religious reformation." Von Rad, Old Testament Theology, vol. I, Edinburgh, 1968, p.76, maintains that "in his efforts for political expansion, Josiah had the master-picture of David's empire before his eyes - it is possible that he regarded himself as the second David promised by Yahweh." Cf., too, O. Procksch, 'König Josia', in Festgabe für Theodor Zahn, Leipzig, 1928, pp.19-53, ref. p.48; Noth, The History of Israel, pp.273f.; H.B. MacLean, 'Josiah', IDB, ii, pp.996b-999a, ref. p.997b ("His goal was a reunited Israel, the restoration of the old Davidic empire"); Montgomery, Kings, p.549 ("In modern terms, while religiously sincere, Josiah as king was a nationalist, a veritable King Arthur"); Myers, I Chronicles, p.LXXIII (Josiah... had definite ambitions of becoming a second David"); R.J. Coggins, Samaritans and Jews, pp.24f. E.W. Heaton, The Hebrew Kingdoms, pp.118ff.., is almost certainly correct when he writes: "Josiah was the chief hero of the deuteronomistic historian, but in concentrating so exclusively on his religious reformation he has seriously misrepresented the king's aim and achievement. It is left, therefore, to the modern historian to place these chapters in their proper political context and uncover the overall design with which he was working" (ibid., p.118). Heaton thinks that "Josiah dreamed dreams of restoring the dual kingdom of David with its capital at Jerusalem" (ibid., p.118) and that his religious reformation, therefore, "must be interpreted as an essential part of his bid for Judah's independence by rebellion against Assyria" (ibid., p.119). At the same time, however, a balance must be struck for as Heaton rightly adds: "Equally, his political ambitions were shaped by an authentic quest for a national religious revival; otherwise, it is inconceivable that he would ever have received the unqualified approval of Jeremiah (22:15, 16)" (ibid., p.119).

and composition of Deuteronomy exclusively to circles of priests, or prophets, or the wise, and "we should...understand the Deuteronomistic circle to have been a comprehensive movement of reform in which people of varying traditions, prophetic, priestly and wisdom, were actively engaged."(744) Moreover, McKay, Brekelmans,(745) and Gray,(746) are undoubtedly correct in arguing that Deuteronomy must have been the end-product of a long period of development. Finally, McKay deserves praise for the strong case he makes for the view that the northern Yahwists lived and worked among 'the people of the land', making converts among its more influential figures, and that during the reign of Manasseh the traditions of Deuteronomism were preserved and propagated by מַעְלָהָם.

The fourth and final current view about the date and authorship of Deuteronomy is that the book was a post-exilic work. Various dates have been proposed, from the time of Haggai and Zechariah up to circa 400 B.C. Hölscher(747) argues that Josiah was concerned to purify, and not to centralize the cult, and he quotes many examples from all areas of Deuteronomy to demonstrate that the law of the single sanctuary and many other laws in the book would have been impracticable in the time of Josiah. Far from being a seventh-century programme for reform, Deuteronomy must date about 500 B.C. and it represents the wishful thinking of unrealistic post-exilic dreamers. He arrives at this date on the grounds that the book is idealistic

746. Gray, I and II Kings², p.33.
in character and was written at a time when the Judaean kingdom was no longer in existence and the people were subservient to a foreign power. Moreover, while the book shows little contact with Haggai and Zechariah i-viii, there are many references to Deuteronomy in Malachi (i:2, 6, 8; ii:1, 2f., 4, 5, 8; iii:1, 3) and the language of Neh. xiii:25-27 is also Deuteronomic. Finally, Hölscher argues that Deuteronomy is fundamentally priestly and that the book was written as a private document for Levitical priests in Jerusalem.

Two years before Hölscher's work was published, R.H. Kennett(748) had also maintained that Deuteronomy must be later than the time of Josiah. He argued that the book was compiled by priestly circles in Palestine in the sixth century B.C., during the period of the exile, and that it mainly reflected the interests of the Levites. He suggested that it was brought to Jerusalem by priests from Bethel.

Against Hölscher's view that the law demanding cultic centralization would have been impracticable in the time of Josiah, it may be reiterated that the law continued to apply in later times, when the Jewish community in Palestine was not only larger but also more widely dispersed. (749) Moreover, as Anderson rightly comments, "Hölscher's view forms part of a complex of theories, in support of which he has had to subject some of the Biblical documents to drastic handling, a fact which tells against the theories." (750) Against Kennett's view that the book was compiled by priests in Palestine during the exilic period, it may be said that there is no evidence for the presence of such influential priestly groups in Judah during the period of the exile. (751)

750. Ibid.
Having examined the major views in the debate about Deuteronomy, a number of conclusions may be drawn. Firstly, the book is to be assigned to the seventh century and recognized as the final deposit of a long period of growth and development. Secondly, the Deuteronomic movement may well have come into existence in the last days of the Northern Kingdom. Thirdly, after the fall of Israel, the members, or, at least, the precursors of this movement, who belonged to all walks of life, fled to Judah. Fourthly, in Judah, they were well received by יְהֹוָה, who were the Judaean royal subjects comprising the rural population, the landed nobility, property-owning full (male) citizens, and the poorest layers of society. Amongst יְהֹוָה there was a group of men of considerable power and authority who were faithful supporters of the Davidic dynasty and the Yahwistic religion and who were prepared to use revolutionary methods to obtain their objectives. Fifthly, it was in Judah in the century before Josiah's reformation that the traditions brought by the northern Yahwistic refugees underwent transformation, modification or embellishment in the process of formulating Urdeuteronomium, which was a programme of reform designed to save the religious community "Israel" from extermination. Sixthly, the demand for the centralization of the cult was an integral part of Urdeuteronomium. (752) Sevently, while Urdeuteronomium may

752. There are two writers, not previously discussed, whose views regarding Urdeuteronomium and the demand for cultic centralization should be mentioned. H. Graf Reventlow, 'Gebotskern und Entfaltungstufen im Deuteronomium 12', Gottes Wort und Gottes Land. H.-W. Hertzberg zum 70. Geburtstag, ed. H. Graf Reventlow, Göttingen, 1965, pp.174-185, argues that the original kernel of the centralization law in Deut. xii may have been no more than a command to destroy pagan shrines. Y. Kaufmann, The Biblical Account of the Conquest of Palestine, Jerusalem, 1953, argues that the seventh-century edition of Deuteronomy added only the legislation dealing with the unification of the cult, all the rest of the book being older, and, noting that there is no mention of cultic centralization in the framework of Deuteronomy (i-xi; xxvii-xxxiv), he concludes that the whole historical philosophy of the book has no original connection with, and is older than, the idea of cultic unification. For criticism of this argument, see Bright, Early Israel in Recent History Writing, p.68 who rightly describes it as a non sequitur.
not have been written until Manasseh's reign, it is very probable that by the time Hezekiah came to the throne in 715 B.C. the Deuteronomic movement, having made converts of the most influential and learned members of "the people of the land", had gained sufficient authority to exert influence at court, so that Hezekiah's attempt to centralize the cult may well be the first historical indication of Deuteronomism in Judah. Eighthly, Urdeuteronomium was the book found in the Jerusalem temple in the reign of Josiah and, while it would be wrong to underestimate the political and economic factors which must have influenced Josiah, it was this book which was by far the most important motivating force behind the reform measures implemented by the king, of which the most significant was cultic centralization. At the accession of Josiah, the members of the Deuteronomic movement used the opportunity offered by a period of regency to have their reform programme implemented. In this context, having concluded that Urdeuteronomium contained the demand for cultic centralization, the problem of the structure of this book is not an issue of crucial importance requiring detailed examination and it may suffice to say that undoubtedly it would have consisted of the legislative kernel in Deut. xii-xxvi together, almost certainly, with v-xi, with which it is so closely linked, and possibly some of chapter xxviii.

Finally, attention must be focused on the question whether Josiah's reformation received its sole stimulus from the finding of the law book, as suggested by 2 Kings, or whether some of the reforms at least had been implemented before the book was discovered and thus independently of it, as suggested by 2 Chron. xxxiv-xxxv. The Kings narrative differs from that in Chronicles with regard to the chronology of the events and the significance of the law book. To what extent is it possible to determine exactly the contribution of
the law book to the Josianic reformation? It has been mentioned already that whereas many older commentators virtually ignored the Chronicler's record as being of little or no historical value, there is an increasing tendency to accept that the Chronicler may often preserve historically reliable information from otherwise lost sources. (753) W.R. Smith suggested that the Chronicler, knowing that Josiah was a good king, "felt that there must be a mistake in the account which made him wield an independent sceptre for many years before he touched the idolatrous abuses of his land", (754) but failed to be struck by the inconsistency that, by making the reformation begin in Josiah's twelfth year, he put the solemn repentance and covenant of reformation ten years after the reformation itself. Smith thinks that this is a good example to illustrate that the Chronicler "is no authority in any point that touches difference of usage between his own time and that of the old monarchy." (755) This interpretation presupposes that the sole motivation for Josiah's reformation was religious. On the other hand, Oestreicher argued that since it was Josiah's desire to gain independence from Assyrian suzerainty which was the real motive behind the reformation (756) and since, too, the death of Asshur-ban-apal (which he dates in 627 B.C., Josiah's twelfth year on the throne) provided the first opportunity for severing connections with Assyria, (757) 2 Chron. xxxiv:3-7 is more accurate than 2 Kings when it records that Josiah carried out reforms in this year. According to Oestreicher, Josiah purged Jerusalem of the

753. Cf., e.g., Nicholson, Deuteronomy and Tradition, p.7.
755. Ibid., p.144.
757. Ibid., p.64.
Assyrian cult in 627 B.C. and in 621 B.C. further disruptions in Nineveh provided him with the opportunity of continuing the purge throughout Judah. (758) It was also in 621 B.C. that the law book was found but, while this book did give further incentive to Josiah to complete the reformation, it was really of incidental significance only. (759) The motivation for the reformation, which was implemented in two distinct phases separated by six years, was politics and the narrative in 2 Kgs. xxii-xxiii is not as reliable as the Chronicler's record because it has been schematized in such a way as to make it appear that the law book provided the real impulse for the reform measures and that no movements towards reform were carried out before Josiah's eighteenth regnal year.

Basing their suggestions on W.H. Dubberstein's chronology of the Assyrian kings during the seventh century, (760) Cross and Freedman (761) argue that the account of Josiah's reformation in 2 Chron. xxxiv is supported by external evidence and that the dates supplied by the Chronicler (632, 628, 622 B.C.) correlate precisely with the major upheavals in the Assyrian empire during the last years of its history. Thus, 2 Chron. xxxiv:3, which records that, in the eighth year of his reign (632 B.C.), Josiah "began to seek the God of David his father", may indicate that it was in this year that he repudiated

758. Ibid., p.69.
759. Ibid., p.40.
Assyrian deities, which fits in well with the death of Asshur-ban-apal in 633 B.C. (762) According to 2 Chron. xxxiv:6, Josiah annexed the Assyrian provinces in northern Israel in the twelfth year of his reign (628 B.C.) and this action may have been occasioned by the death of Asshur-etel-ilani in 629 B.C. and the subsequent disturbances in Assyria and Babylonia. (763) Finally, Cross and Freedman argue that the events which followed the discovery of the law book in 621 B.C. coincide exactly with the termination of Assyrian control in Babylonia. (764)

Nicholson (765) rightly points out that while it is very probable that conditions were conducive for revolt before 621 B.C. and that the Chronicler's record of reformation prior to this date is historically trustworthy, it is unwise to try to correlate the dates given by the Chronicler with the principal changes in the fortunes of Assyria at that time since "such a correlation demands an accuracy in our dating of the Assyrian monarchs which we do not possess." (766)

Rather than base conclusions on "precise but hazardous dates", it is much more prudent "to limit ourselves to more general and trustworthy statements concerning the events in the years before 621 B.C." (767)

762. Ibid., p.57.
763. Ibid.
764. Ibid., p.56.
766. Ibid., p.11. For example, whereas Dubberstein suggested that Asshur-ban-apal died in 633 B.C., A.L. Oppenheim, 'Ashurbanipal', IDB, i, pp.256b-257b, ref. p.257b, tentatively suggests 629, while H.W.F. Saggs, The Greatness that was Babylon, London, 1962, suggests 627/6 B.C.
There are three facts which favour the suggestion that Josiah began his reformation well before his eighteenth regnal year (621 B.C.). Firstly, the last years of Asshur-ban-apal's reign and the years following his death were very unsettled for the Assyrians so that conditions lent themselves to revolt before 621 B.C. Secondly, 2 Kings itself states that repairs were being carried out in the Temple prior to the discovery of the law book, and this seems to be an indirect hint of pre-law book reforms. Thirdly, as has been indicated already, Amon was probably assassinated because of his pro-Assyrian policy and this event may well indicate that an anti-Assyrian, pro-Yahwistic 'revolutionary' group took advantage of the opportunity provided by the unsettled period immediately before and after the death of Asshur-ban-apal to throw off the Assyrian yoke.

On the other hand, the Chronicler's schema has reduced the law book's contribution to the reformation to a minimum for according to his record the most significant reform measures had been implemented before the book was found. Thus, while it may be conceded that the Chronicler's account is historically trustworthy in recording reform

768. Cf., e.g., Rowley, 'The Prophet Jeremiah and the Book of Deuteronomy', pp.185-208, ref. p.196, who argues that there is no reason to deny the substantial historicity of the Chronicler's record that the reform began before the discovery of the law book since the reform had its origin in the political situation with which it was associated ("without the law-book there was bound to be reform", ibid.) and the repair of the Temple "could well have been associated with its cleansing of Assyrian and other worship, which had thus begun already" (ibid.). While Rowley thinks it unlikely that Josiah would have begun his reformation as early as his twelfth regnal year, he does feel that the Chronicler's record is substantially correct, supplementing rather than contradicting the Kings narrative, and that the opportune discovery of the law book brought new authority and gave direction to a reform which was primarily motivated by political considerations.

769. Cf., e.g., Nicholson, op.cit., p.11.
activity before the discovery of the book, the Chronicler has certainly moved too far from the standpoint of the author of the narrative in 2 Kings, so that a balance must be struck between the two accounts. Nicholson's suggestion that those reform measures implemented by Josiah before 621 B.C. were probably largely motivated by the desire to gain independence from Assyria, is plausible. (770) The Deuteronomist probably telescoped the reforms of Josiah's reign and concentrated them in the period following the discovery of the law book in 621 B.C. in order to highlight the significance of this book which, for him, was all important. The apparent disorder of the Deuteronomist's narrative is probably best explained, as Nicholson suggests, by supposing that 2 Kgs. xxiii:4-14 is a conflation of two originally separate short lists, possibly from the Judaean court annals, of the pre-621 B.C. reforms and those reforms carried through after the discovery of the law book. (771) Nicholson suggests that the removal of the Assyrian and other foreign cults from Jerusalem and Judah referred to in 2 Kgs. xxiii:4f., 11-13 may be a description of the first stage of the reformation (circa 630-621 B.C.) which was the outcome of a wave of resurgent nationalism when foreign cults were destroyed, and Assyrian cult emblems and practices in particular, as signs of Assyrian suzerainty, were abolished. Nicholson reckons that

770. Ibid., p.12. Herrmann, A History of Israel in Old Testament Times, p.269, argues that "Josiah's efforts at emancipation from the Assyrians and the Deuteronomic reform work were surely two concerns which should be distinguished." At the same time, however, it is extremely difficult to distinguish precisely between measures implemented for political reasons and those carried out for religious purposes in"a state in which religion was an official national activity" (G.W. Anderson, The History and Religion of Israel, p.74.).

771. Ibid., pp.13f.
the second stage of the reformation which followed the discovery of the law book is probably described in 2 Kgs. xxii; xxiii:1-3, 8a, 9, 10, 15. The central aim of this phase of the reformation, which would have begun with a ceremony of the renewal of the covenant on the basis of the 'book of the law' (2 Kgs. xxiii:1-3), would have been the purification of the Yahweh cult. On the basis of the book's demands, Josiah carried out cultic centralization, transferred the priests of the abolished shrines to Jerusalem (2 Kgs. xxiii:8a, 9), and rooted out all kinds of idolatrous cults and cultic practices (2 Kgs. xxiii:7, 8b, 10). It may also have been after 621 B.C. that Josiah attempted to extend the boundaries of the Judaean kingdom to include the territory of the old northern state and to introduce the reformation to this territory (2 Kgs. xxiii:15). (772)

W. Rudolph (773) raises a twofold objection to the theory that Josiah implemented some reform measures before the law book was discovered. Firstly, it seems most peculiar that Huldah should have condemned and threatened the nation for its idolatry and apostasy (2 Kgs. xxii:15ff.) if the reformation had already been inaugurated and, secondly, it seems equally odd that the prophetess did not


stipulate Josiah's alleged reform measures as the reason for his guarantee of safety from the approaching disaster, instead of assuring him of deliverance for having showed humility and repentance when he learned of the contents of the book of the law (2 Kgs. xxii:18f.).

In response to this objection, Nicholson rightly points out the impossibility of defining precisely the original oracle uttered by Huldah since the Deuteronomistic historian has almost certainly worked over the prophetess' original words. The first address (2 Kgs. xxii:15-17), which is directed to 'the man who sent you to me' (v.15) and which castigates the nation for its apostasy and idolatry, contains some Deuteronomistic words and phrases and, since it seems to reflect the destruction of Judah which is recorded in 2 Kgs. xxiii:26f.,

774. Nicholson, op.cit., pp.14f. Cf., too, Gray, I and II Kings, p.727. F. Horst, 'Die Kultusreform des Königs Josia', ZDMG, lxvii, 1923, pp.220-238, ref. p.231, argues that underlying the narrative of Josiah's reign are two sources, one of which is the original and the other a later unhistorical Deuteronomistic addition. In his attempt to isolate and reconstruct Huldah's oracle, Horst thinks that the original words of the prophetess are scattered throughout both of these sources. H. Gressmann, 'Josia und das Deuteronomium', ZAW, xlii, 1924, pp.313-337, ref. p.319, regards the first address in vv. 15-17 as secondary, so he devotes his attention to rearranging and adding to the second address in vv. 18-20 in his attempt to determine the original oracle. Arguing that an editor excised something which he considered anachronistic in the original oracle, Gressmann suggests that the original oracle may have begun with: 'Thus saith Yahweh, the God of Israel: "The words which thou hast heard (concerning this place and its inhabitants, that they should become a desolation and a curse), do I revoke..."'. However, Nicholson, op.cit., p.15, n.5, rightly considers such attempts to reconstruct the ipsissima verba of Huldah to be highly subjective. Cf., too, idem, 'II Kings XXII 18 - A Simple Restoration', Hermathena, xcvi, 1963, pp.96-98, where he refers to "the lengthy and often arbitrary emendations" (ibid., p.98) often proposed in commentaries, and suggests that by simply inserting the preposition 'al or 'el before hadâbârim, the textual difficulty of the verse is removed and the text reads: 'Thus saith Yahweh God of Israel concerning the words which thou hast heard'.
it "may be a Deuteronomistic adaptation of Huldah's original oracle designed to fit in with the Deuteronomist's prophecy - fulfilment schema." (775) Although at first glance the second address in vv. 18-20 seems to be authentic because it does not appear to be aware of Josiah's death in battle at Megiddo, promising the king that he shall die 'in peace', Gray, followed by Nicholson, suggests that ṣālôm here may not refer to the nature of Josiah's death but, rather, to the fact that the state would still be intact, bêšālôm, at the time of his death. (776) Hence, the second address may also be "a Deuteronomistic creation based upon the original oracle and intended to reflect what the ideal king's reaction to the law of Yahweh was." (777)

Be that as it may, the original oracle probably endorsed the demands of Urdeuteronomium and included a threat, in keeping with the curses of the book, because the reform measures which were implemented prior to the discovery of the law book "were largely of a political nature and did not satisfy the more radical and drastic requirements of the law book". (778)

Having concluded that Urdeuteronomium was the book of the law found by Hilkiah in the Jerusalem temple and that this book provided the principal motivation for the majority of the most significant of Josiah's reforms, including, above all, cultic centralization, attention will be focused in the next chapter on the problem of the ultimate background of the demand for the centralization of sacrificial worship to a sole sanctuary and on the consequences of Josiah's implementation of this demand for the religion of ancient Israel.

CHAPTER THREE

THE ULTIMATE BACKGROUND OF THE DEMAND FOR CULTIC CENTRALIZATION AND
THE CONSEQUENCES OF JOSIAH'S IMPLEMENTATION OF THIS DEMAND FOR
THE RELIGION OF ANCIENT ISRAEL

E.W. Nicholson thinks that "the simplest solution...is to interpret the centralization law in Deuteronomy as referring to Jerusalem and as having its origin within the context of the Jerusalem cult traditions." (1) That the authors of Deuteronomy had Jerusalem in mind when they formulated their demand for cultic centralization is almost certain, but how valid is Nicholson's statement that "it is...scientific to explain the demand for centralization in Deuteronomy as having as its background the claims of the Jerusalem Temple to a position of primacy and, by the time of Hezekiah, to absolute and exclusive cultic centrality"? (2) Granted that Jerusalem-Zion came to be regarded as "the city of Yahweh", (3) to what extent is it true that "there is no evidence in the Old Testament that any other sanctuary ever claimed the sole monopoly of Israel's worship of Yahweh"? (4)

Zion-Jerusalem: Holy Mountain and Civitas Dei (5)

In order to understand why Jerusalem came to enjoy a unique and privileged position in ancient Israel and why the Jerusalem temple,

---

more than any other institution of ancient Israel, was the centre of
the Yahwistic faith which asserted that the God of Israel was sovereign
of the whole earth, it is necessary to examine briefly a major aspect
of the Canaanite religion which greatly influenced worship in ancient
Israel.

The most widespread attitude adopted by the religions of the
Ancient Near East towards the problem of the divine presence was to
gregard earthly sanctuaries as symbolizing, or representing the cosmic
divine abodes. (6) Each sanctuary was understood as the microcosm of
the macrocosm. (7) Throughout the ancient Near East certain mountains
were given religious veneration and each local sacred mountain was
"the symbol, or representation, of the cosmos which formed the true
abode of the deity whom men worshipped." (8) In Canaanite-Phoenician
territory, a local mountain or hill was associated with the shrine
and in the case of Jerusalem the temple of Yahweh was closely related
to Mount Zion, while in Ugarit the temple of Baal was connected with
Mount Zaphon, which was situated several miles farther north in Syria. (9)

In the Old Testament, Mount Zion, a "low and undistinguished
mound", (10) is referred to as the highest mountain in the world, the
place chosen by Yahweh for his dwelling place, an inviolable place where

Mountain in Canaan and the Old Testament, Harvard University Press,
Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1972.

Temple in Palestine-Syria', BA, vii, 1944, pp.66-77, ref. p.72;

8. Clements, op.cit., p.3.

9. Ibid.

10. Clifford, op.cit., p.3.
God's enemies will be defeated, a place from which fertilizing streams flow forth. For many years it has been recognized that mythic language has been used in these descriptions of Mount Zion, and, since it is becoming increasingly apparent that the channel through which the wider Near Eastern culture reached Israel was through the Canaanites, it is instructive to examine the ideas of the divine dwelling-places which were current in Canaanite mythology. The mythological texts from Ugarit, although redacted about 1400 B.C., contain ancient material and ideas relating in particular to the activities of the gods of the Canaanite pantheon and they give a clear picture of the religious beliefs of the people of Syria-Palestine regarding the sacred mountain Zaphon. (11) Although the Old Testament speaks of many Baals, this is probably the result of a process of development and splintering whereby a multiplicity of local gods was developed out of one high-god, for, while many local sanctuaries for Baal were established and became his dwelling-places, "in origin it is clear that all Baals were forms of the one god." (12) Baal-Hadad, the young warrior god, lord of storms and


thunder, although not the head of the pantheon - a title which belonged to El - was the most active of the gods venerated at Ugarit and figures prominently in the Old Testament as a god of the Canaanites.

According to the Ugaritic myths, Baal, and no other deity, dwelt on Mount Zaphon\(^\text{(13)}\), which, in the Old Testament, is associated with a divine abode. That Baal dwelt on the highest peak in Syria corresponds to his exalted position among the gods, although El was the titular head of the pantheon, as is evidenced by the fact that Baal had to

\(^{13}\) Clements, op.cit., p.5; A.S. Kapelrud, Baal in the Ras Shamra Texts, Copenhagen, 1952, pp.57ff., contra T.H. Caster, Thespis, New York, 1950, pp.138, 447, who argues that Zaphon was also the dwelling place of El and the Mount of Assembly. Clements, op.cit., p.7, n.1; Kaiser, Die mythische Bedeutung des Meeres in Ägypten, Ugarit und Israel, BZAW, lxxviii, Berlin, 1959, pp.53ff., and W. Schmidt, Königstum Gottes in Ugarit und Israel, p.24, argue that in the Ugaritic texts Zaphon, the Mount of Assembly, and the abode of El seem to be three separate mountains. Eissfeldt, Baal Zaphon, Zeus Kasios und der Durchzug der Israeliten durchs Meer, Halle, 1932, pp.5ff., identifies Mount Zaphon with Jebel-el-Agra, (known as Mons Casius in Greek and Roman times), the highest mountain in Syria, situated 25-30 miles north-north-east of Ras Shamra. Both Clements, op.cit., p.5 and Clifford, op.cit., p.57, maintain that spn is best derived from a root (spy) meaning "to look out" (as ḥázōn is derived from ḥzy). The usual biblical meaning of spān is "north" but this is secondary. Since the mountain lay to the north of Palestine, the direction north was derived from the name of the mountain in the same way that negēb came to mean "south" and "west" was derived from yām. See Clements, op.cit., p.5 and n.3; Clifford, op.cit., pp.57f. Clifford, op.cit., p.58 lists four meanings of spn in Ugaritic: (i) the mountain known today as Jebel 'el-Agra; (ii) the mountain dwelling of Baal (particularly in the mythic texts); (iii) the deified mountain spn (particularly in liturgical texts and proper names); (iv) part of the epithet B'l spn, (often in extra-Ugaritic texts, but never in the mythic texts). J. Morgenstern, 'Psalm 48', HUCA, xvi, 1941, pp.1-95, ref. p.78, note, maintains that Mons Casius is not far enough north to have been the original Zaphon of north Semitic mythology. The original Zaphon, which can be traced back to a period very much earlier than the Ras Shamra texts, was probably much further north in the Caucasus mountains in the region of the Black Sea. W.F. Albright, 'Baal Zephon', Festschrift für Alfred Bertholet, Tübingen, 1950, pp.1-14, argues that "it is a plausible assumption that the Baal of Mount Casius was originally simply a terrestrial reflexion of the Baal of the holy mountain in the northern heavens" (ibid., p.11).
seek El's permission to build a palace for himself. (14) Although, ultimately, Baal's power was regarded as cosmic in extent, embracing the entire universe, Mount Zaphon probably symbolized for the worshippers of Baal the land which Baal owned and the area where his power was operative. (15)

There are a number of changes from the ideas evidenced in the Ras Shamra texts in a later tradition of Canaanite mythology given by Isa. xiv:12-15. The most significant changes in Isa. xiv:12-15, are that Mount Zaphon is described as the abode of 'Elyon, a deity worshipped in pre-Israelite Jerusalem, and also as the Mount of Assembly, where the court of the gods was held. Of special significance in Isa. xiv:13f. is that Zaphon was considered to be of cosmic proportions for its summit is said to tower above the stars of El and above the heights of the clouds. In a lament for the king of Tyre in Ezek. xxviii:12-19 certain allusions are made to the same group of mythological ideas deriving from the beliefs about Mount Zaphon and, although the mountain is not specifically named, being referred to as 'the holy mountain of God', the close similarities to the ideas of Mount Zaphon indicate that this passage contains "the same basic stock of mythological imagery." (16) The stories of fire in vv. 14 and 16 and

15. Ibid.
the jewels of v. 12 may indicate either stars, in which case the poet echoes the thought in Isa. xiv:13 that the mount of God towers above the stars, or the 'thunderstones' used by the god as flints to make lightning. However, the most significant aspect of this poem, which is based on an old Canaanite myth, "is the identification of the mount of god with Eden, the garden of god." These references indicate that Mount Zaphon was believed to be a world mountain and Baal's domain was understood as being cosmic in extent. There is evidence that other places were identified with Mount Zaphon and partook of its holiness and at these sanctuaries, or sacred mountains, the divine presence could be manifested. The symbolism of temple or mountain established a connection between the cult-site and the mythological abode of Baal. Since Baal was the rightful owner of the land, symbolized by the sacred area, correct worship had to be established in order to maintain the right to continue as his tenants. The dedication of all the crops to the divine giver was symbolized by the offering of tithes. It was the symbolism of the cult, therefore, which overcame the problem of locating the divine presence.

20. Ibid., p.9. There was a temple for Baal at Ugarit, a place called Baal Zaphon, or Zaphon, situated north east of the Nile delta (Exod. xiv:2, 9; Num.xxxiii:7), and Mount Zion is referred to as Mount Zaphon in Ps. xlviii:3 (EVV. 2).
presence and this explains why the presence of Baal was so much associated with specific sites and sanctuaries.

Although El was on the decline and Baal on the ascendant as the chief god, (21) El was the head and father of the Canaanite pantheon, even if his headship of the pantheon was a very nominal matter, and he was described as the 'Father of mankind'. (22) The ideas associated with the manner and effect of the presence of El were very similar to those about Baal. In Ugaritic mythology, El's abode, like that of Baal, was situated on a mountain which was regarded as encompassing the entire universe. El's abode was on ḫršn which G.R. Driver, (23) followed by Clements, connects with the Akkadian ḫuršânu, 'mountain of trial after death, ordeal', and which may be translated as 'world mountain'. (24) This remote mountain (25) was situated at the very edge of the earth and it held earth, sky, land, and underworld together, thus forming a link between the realm of the gods and the dwelling-place of men. (26) Like Baal, El was a god of the land and his worshippers sought his blessing and the privilege of remaining as his tenants. The sanctuaries and temples which were

21. The reason for this is obscure but Clements, op.cit., p.10, makes the plausible suggestion that the relations among the gods reflected the relations of social groups among the Ugaritians. However, another factor "may be the circumstance that with few exceptions the mythical tablets and fragments were discovered in the library of the temple of Baal" (Karl-Heinz Bernhardt, 'Ugaritic Texts', in Near Eastern Religious Texts relating to the Old Testament, ed. W. Beyerlin, London, 1978, pp.185-226, ref. p.190).


25. Contra M.H. Pope, El in the Ugaritic Texts, SVT, ii, Leiden, 1955, pp.61ff., who argues that El dwelt in a subterranean watery fastness. According to Pope, El is the prototype of the fallen angel (e.g. in Isa. xiv and Ezek. xxviii) for he was banished from his mountain height into the subterranean depths.

dedicated to El "were symbolic of the world-mountain where El ruled, and by this symbolism the divine presence was thought to be revealed among his worshippers, which procured the blessing of El in the land." (27)

Thus, the Canaanites, among whom the Israelites settled and established their own distinctive Yahweh worship, worshipped gods at shrines in special places which were identified with the cosmic dwelling-places of these deities in such a way that the respective deities tended to be identified as gods of the land. By the use of mythology and the symbolism of the cult, the presence of the god was thought to be manifested in the special, sanctified part of the land, the sacred area which symbolized the dedication of all the land to him, its rightful owner, while the performance of the correct worship guaranteed that the divine blessing would flow out through all the land. Undoubtedly the Israelites must have used many Canaanite sanctuaries and altars and claimed them as legitimate shrines for the performance of the worship of Yahweh and Exod. xx:24 gives Israel the assurance that Yahweh will appear to his people at every altar which he has appointed. (28)

Before David became king, Israel suffered two severe setbacks at the hands of the Philistines. Firstly, there was the destruction of the sanctuary of Shiloh and the capture of the ark of Yahweh (I Sam. iv:22) and, secondly, there was the defeat of Israel and the death of Saul at the battle of Mount Gilboa (I Sam. xxxi). David was determined to unify Israel and strengthen its resources in order to subjugate the neighbouring states and incorporate them into an Israelite empire.

27. Ibid., p.11.
In establishing this Israelite state, the separate religious and national groups of Canaanites were broken up and the whole population was assimilated into one national entity under David. Joab's capture of Jerusalem not only removed a pocket of resistance but also provided David with an ideal site for the capital city of his new empire. Having had no previous connection with any of the Israelite tribes, Jerusalem seems to have been the personal holding of the king (29) and its title "the city of David" marked its unique relationship to David. Moreover, situated geographically between the two states of Judah and Israel, it made the perfect royal capital and seat of government from which David could rule his ever-growing and ramifying kingdom. When David took over Jerusalem he does not appear to have expelled or repressed the Jebusite population but, rather, to have integrated the Jebusites into the Israelite state and, as frequently happened in ancient Israel whenever a Canaanite sanctuary was taken over by the devotees of Yahweh, there was a fair amount of borrowing by Israel from the religious traditions of the vanquished god(s). (30)

In order to help determine what exactly was borrowed by Israel from the Jebusites, it is first necessary to examine the evidence available concerning the pre-Israelite cult in Jerusalem and the deities venerated there before Yahweh supplanted them. Two deities probably revered at Jerusalem were Shalem-Shulman, as suggested by


30. Cf. Clements, op.cit., p.42, who points out that this was particularly true with regard to the idea of Yahweh as creator and sustainer of the world of nature. It was, says Clements, "the very aggressiveness and buoyancy of Yahwism" (ibid) which led to Israel's adoption of many features of the Canaanite religion. It was only natural that Israel should have borrowed from the much more elaborate cult and liturgy of Canaanite religion but "Israel did not feel that its faith was threatened by what it borrowed, nor that Yahweh was rivalled by the old gods of Canaan" (ibid).
the city's name, (31) and Zedek, (32) as indicated by the names of Melchizedek, king of Salem (Gen. xiv:18; Ps. cx:4), Adonizedek (the original form of Adonibezek, Judg. i:5-7), and Zadok, the chief priest of the temple in the time of Solomon. However, Gen. xiv:18-24, which describes how Abram, having defeated a coalition of kings, offered tithes to Melchizedek, king of Salem, is the most significant clue to the identity of the deity or deities worshipped in pre-Israelite Jerusalem and the best indication as to the nature of that worship. (33) Melchizedek is said to have blessed Abram in the name of 'El-Êlyon, maker of heaven and earth (Gen. xiv:19, 22) and in v. 22 'El-Êlyon is identified with Yahweh. Since Salem is Jerusalem, the present form of the story is to be dated after the Israelite capture of the city and, while the exact significance of the story is debated, it was very probably "an adaptation of traditional material used to explain and legitimate certain developments in David's reign."(34) 'El-Êlyon was undoubtedly the chief god of pre-Israelite Jerusalem and Yahweh was endowed with this god's name and authority after the Israelites captured the city.

There is debate about how 'El-Êlyon fits into what is known of the Canaanite pantheon. Nyberg (35) thinks that 'Al, 'El-Êlyon, El-Shaddai, Shalem and Zedek were all titles of the same god.

34. Ibid., p.43.
Widengren (36) argues that 'El-'Elyon and Shalem were one and the same god. H. Schmid (37) suggests that Zedek was an alternative name for 'Elyon. E. Voegelin (38) thinks that Shalem and Zedek were hypostases of 'Elyon. Mowinckel (39) maintains that Melek, Zedek, and Shalem were probably to a certain degree conceived as manifestations of 'El-'Elyon. However, Clements rightly points out that while deities of the Canaanite pantheon were sometimes identified with one another, or with others of the west-Semitic pantheon, Canaanite pantheons differed from area to area and, more importantly, in Israel the titles of many deities were claimed for Yahweh, "so that the particular developments in Israel cannot be taken as general for the Ancient Near East." (40) Rejecting G. Levi Della Vida's view that 'El- 'Elyon arose out of the fusion of two distinct deities, of whom El was originally the god of the land while 'Elyon was the god of the sky, (41) Clements points out that the prominent fertility aspect is sufficient to explain the unity of sky and land as the sphere of a single god's activity, since the fertility of the fields is dependent on the rain from the sky. (42)

40. Clements, op.cit., p.44.
42. Clements, op.cit., p.45.
Moreover, 'Elyon is not an independent name but, rather, an epithet 'high, exalted' qualifying the generic title El and Clements is probably correct when he says that it implies that such a god was the head of the pantheon. In view of the conflicting evidence regarding the nature of 'Elyon, Clements concludes that while 'Elyon was a manifestation of the god El, his particular cult celebrated in ancient Jerusalem had applied to him some aspects of the mythology of Baal, particularly the idea of his dwelling-place on Mount Zaphon. The form of the name 'Elyon suggests a connection with El. However, certain extra-biblical references, notably the Sujin inscription and the Phoenician genealogy of gods found in Philo Byblius, seem to refer to El as a deity distinct from 'Elyon, while Isa. xiv:13f. implies that 'Elyon dwells on Mount Zaphon (the abode of Baal-Hadad in the Ugaritic myths) which is situated 'above the stars of El' (v.13), and Ps. xlviii:3 (EVV 2) identifies Mount

43. Ibid. Cf., too, Eissfeldt, 'El and Yahweh', JSS, i, 1956, pp.25-37, ref. p.28, n.1, who writes: "In Gen. xiv. 18, 19, 22 'Elyon is either an adjectival apposition following El or an appellative with the meaning "god" preceding 'Elyon understood as a proper name, probably the former. At any rate, the two concepts refer to the same one divine figure."

44. Clements; op.cit. The formation of such a divine name is very similar to El-Roi, El-Shaddai, and El 'Olam, who were all manifestations of the one god El.


Zion with Mount Zaphon. (47) Clements rightly argues that the probability remains that El-CElyon was originally a form of the great Semitic high-god El since the extra-biblical evidence distinguishing him from El is not strong (48) and, anyway, there was not one fixed, unchangeable pantheon, but, rather, "a multiplicity of deities arranged in different degrees of pre-eminence and variously identified at each local shrine." (49) Thus, in view of the Canaanite tendency to identify gods with one another and to merge their various attributes with those of other gods, it may be concluded with Clements that in Jebusite Jerusalem some features had been borrowed from the cult of Baal and applied to El-CElyon, who was a form of the god El.

By far the most important concept borrowed from the cult of Baal was the idea of the deity dwelling on Mount Zaphon, for it was probably shortly after El-CElyon was believed to have Mount Zaphon as his abode that Mount Zion came to be identified with Mount Zaphon, and so came to be regarded as a divine dwelling-place. (50) The identification of El-CElyon with Yahweh in Gen. xiv:22 is clear indication that it was under the influence of this Jebusite belief that Israelites came to assert that Mount Zion was Yahweh's dwelling-place.

47. In view of the evidence that El-CElyon bore some relationship to Baal, some scholars have identified the two gods. See A. Vincent, La religion des Judéo-Araméens d'Éléphantine, Paris, 1937, p.127; J.A. Montgomery, 'The Highest, Heaven, Aeon, Time, etc. in Semitic Religion', HTR, xxxi, 1938, p.145. Clements, op.cit., p.46, n.1, points out that Baal is described in the Ugaritic myths as ELY, 'exalted' which is cognate with ELYON. On the other hand, Pope, El in the Ugaritic Texts, p.58, argues that ELYON may have been a deity quite distinct from either El or Baal, and he suggests that he might have been the grandfather of El.

48. Clements, op.cit., p.46, points out that many late Hellenistic features have been introduced into Philo Byblius so that it cannot be regarded as a reliable account of the early Phoenician pantheon. Cf., too, Eissfeldt, 'El and Yahweh', JSS, i, 1956, p.28, note 1, who says that this genealogy "may not readily be used as an argument that in the Old Testament El and ELYON are originally different gods".

49. Clements, op.cit., p.46. This probably explains the distinction between ELYON and El in the Sujin inscription.

The adoption and re-interpretation by the Israelites of the religious tradition inherited from the Jebusites when Yahweh replaced 'El-'Elyon and was vested with the latter's titles and property, helped to endow Jerusalem with a unique status among all the shrines of Israel and to associate Yahweh's presence with this city in a very special way. (51)

A second feature of David's Jerusalem which combined with the strong influence of the mythological belief in Mount Zion as a divine dwelling-place to give Jerusalem a position of pre-eminence, was the presence of the ark, the traditional Israelite symbol of the divine presence. Both the ark and the tent of meeting were portable holy objects which were connected with the presence of Yahweh. However, "the whole question of the original significance of the ark and of its connection with the tent of meeting is still a matter of debate." (52)

The question of the nature and function of the ark is "one of the most vexing problems in the history of Israel's religion." (53) The name of the ark, 'ārôn, implies that it was a box but in view of its intimate connection with Yahweh's presence a number of scholars have claimed that the ark came to be regarded as the throne of Yahweh on which he was believed to be invisibly seated. W. Reichel seems to have been the first to propose this view and apparently he based this suggestion largely on parallels from popular cults of pre-classical

51. Ibid., p.48.
52. Clements, op.cit., p.28.
culture. (54) The theory was elaborated by M. Dibelius who made a careful examination of the evidence of the Old Testament. (55) Four pieces of evidence are brought forward. Firstly, the ark is inextricably connected with the presence of Yahweh (1 Sam. iv:1-vii:2; 2 Sam. vi). Secondly, the ark is associated with Yahweh's enthronement upon the cherubim (1 Sam. iv:4; 2 Sam. vi:2; 2 Kgs. xix:15; 1 Chron. xiii:6). Thirdly, Dibelius argues for the throne conception from Num. x:35f. in which, on Dibelius' interpretation, Yahweh is understood to be present with the ark. Fourthly, in Jer. iii:16f. the parallelism of thought seems to indicate that the whole of Jerusalem is to replace the ark and to fulfil its former function as the throne of Yahweh.

Anticipating the objection that the ark is simply called a box and is never once explicitly referred to as a throne, Dibelius suggests that the name הֶרְון derived from the box-like form of the ark. (56)

Several criticisms have been levelled against this theory that the ark was regarded as the throne of the invisible Yahweh. (57)

Clements adduces six arguments against the theory. (58) Firstly, the ark is simply called a box and not only is there no parallel for assuming that thrones were box-like in form, but there is also no

54. W. Reichel, Über die vorhellenischen Götterkulte, Vienna, 1897; idem, Theologische Arbeiten aus dem Rheinischen wissenschaftlichen Predigerverein. Both these works are cited by Clements, op.cit., p.28, n.2 and were unavailable to the present writer.


56. Ibid., pp.95ff. Von Rad, Old Testament Theology, I, p.237, n.110, argues that the remarkable fact that the ark is never called throne but 'casket' "indicates that the ancient Israelite idea of a throne displaced an even older one which conceived the Ark as really a container."


reason for assuming that the title 'throne' was avoided for some hidden motive. Secondly, the fact that Yahweh is said to be 'the enthroned one of the cherubim' forced Dibelius to resort to the unsubstantiated hypothesis that there were cherubim carved upon the sides of the ark.\(^{(59)}\)

Clements argues that Yahweh's enthronement is related primarily to the cherubim and he produces evidence to suggest that originally the cherubim and the ark were unrelated. Thirdly, the fact that the ark was located lengthwise in the temple militates against the view that it was regarded as a throne for it is "exceedingly improbable" that Yahweh was understood to be seated sideways on to the congregation.\(^{(60)}\)

Fourthly, the most the evidence of Jer. iii:16f. can prove is that the ark was associated with a throne. Fifthly, although it would be wrong to claim too much for the Priestly Document as a witness to the pre-exilic period, it is interesting to note that the Priestly writer did not regard the ark as a throne, for he related Yahweh's enthronement primarily to the kappōret, and the cherubim which flanked it.\(^{(61)}\)

---


61. Cf. M. Haran, 'The Ark and the Cherubim: Their Symbolic Significance in Biblical Ritual', IEJ, ix, 1959, pp.30-38, 89-94, ref. pp.32ff., argues that in Solomon's Temple, "it is clear that the cherubim on the one hand and the ark on the other served... as two distinct symbols, even if there was...a certain connection between the two" (ibid., p.32). Since the two cherubim of Solomon's debir were the exact counterpart of the two cherubim on the kappōret in P, "this analogy proves sufficiently that the position of the two cherubim of P on the ark-cover is a purely technical matter, and that the ark and the kappōret are separate and distinct objects" (ibid., p.33). The two cherubim of P, like the two in Solomon's Temple and the four in Ezekiel's vision, were intended to represent "nothing less than a throne for God" (ibid., p.35). Having established that the kappōret with its cherubim is God's throne, Haran argues that "the ark itself is the footstool of the throne" (ibid., p.89). Cf., also, H. Schmidt, 'Kerubenthron und Lade', Eucharisterion. H. Gunkel Festschrift, ed. H. Schmidt, I, Göttingen, 1923, pp.120-144, ref. pp.131ff., 143ff. I Chron. xxviii:2 suggests the interpretation of the ark as a footstool.
According to Exod. xxv:10-22, the ark is to be a box 2\(\frac{1}{2}\) x 1\(\frac{1}{2}\) x 1\(\frac{1}{2}\) cubits overlaid with gold and a kappōret, is to be placed on top. The fact that the presence of God is located above the kappōret (e.g. Exod. xxv:22) indicates that the Priestly writer regarded the mercy-seat as fulfilling the purpose of a throne. Sixthly, while the evidence of 1 Sam. iv:1-vii:2 does witness to the presence of Yahweh with the ark, this merely indicates that "the ark was a potent 'extension' of Yahweh's person"(62) and not that it was regarded as a throne.

Clements argues that the question of the ark's meaning and significance cannot be solved without examining the question of the nature and significance of the cherubim. Observing that the cherubim are heavenly creatures of the storm-clouds which represent Yahweh's cloud-chariot on which he rides through the skies (1 Chron. xxviii:18; Pss. xviii:11 (EVV.10); xcix:1 and cf. Deut. xxxiii:26; Ps. lxviii:5, 34 (EVV.4, 33); Hab. iii:8), Clements concludes that these heavenly beings so intimately connected with the divine presence are Yahweh's servants who inhabit paradise, or heaven (Gen.iii:24; Ezek. xxviii:16). Clearly, in ancient Israel, Yahweh was understood to be the God of the skies who came to his people from heaven or Sinai, and the cherubim were regarded either as forming or as drawing his chariot. Albright and de Vaux regard them as a form of the winged sphinx. (63) While


63. W.F. Albright, 'What were the Cherubim?', BA, i, 1938, pp.1-3; R. de Vaux, 'Les chérubins et l'arche d'alliance'. Les Sphinx gardiens et les trônes divins dans l'ancien Orient', Mélanges de l'université Saint Joseph, Beirut, xxxvii, 1960-1961, pp.91-124. M. Haran, 'The Bas-Reliefs on the Sarcophagus of Ahiram King of Byblos in the Light of Archaeological and Literary Parallels from the Ancient Near East', IEJ, viii, 1958, pp.15-25, ref. p.22, stresses that "it can be proved from the Old Testament itself that the cherubim were envisaged as upright figures...and not four-legged creatures" and "moreover it can be shown that in the biblical sources the appearance of the cherubim is not fixed as regards every detail."
their origin may go back to ancient Egypt, (64) they were popular throughout the ancient Near East. In Syria, there were sphinxes which guarded the sacred tree and sphinxes of judgment which were associated with a throne. (65) The bulk of evidence available seems to indicate that the concept of a throne supported by sphinxes on each side originated in Phoenicia. (66) The fact that the idea of the cherubim in the form of winged sphinxes supporting a throne was especially widespread in Phoenician-Syrian circles makes it very probable that the cherubim were adopted into the religious symbolism of Israel from a Canaanite source. (67)

When the Israelites adopted the cherubim, they associated them with their own ideas of the presence of Yahweh and of the theophany in which he revealed himself. A Sinai-theophany tradition was already well established in Israel and the concept of the cherubim was merely an embellishment of an already fixed feature of Israelite worship. The old rubric of Num. x:35f. is of great significance for understanding

64. Albright, op.cit., considered the cherubim to be of Canaanite origin. Haran, 'The Ark and the Cherubim: Their Symbolic Significance in Biblical Ritual', IEJ, ix, 1959, pp.30-38, 89-94, ref. p.94, thinks that the biblical cherub has real parallels in Assyria but says that "this should not be taken simply as an indication of direct and unilateral dependence of Israel on Assyria". Haran maintains that "the concept of the cherub...certainly reached Israel indirectly, out of that ethnic group of nomadic tribes which, prior to its settlement in Canaan, roamed within the confines of the Mesopotamian culture" (ibid.)


66. De Vaux, op.cit., p.113; Clements, op.cit., p.32.

67. De Vaux, op.cit., p.113; Clements, op.cit., p.32.
the way in which Yahweh was thought to manifest his presence with the ark, for, rather than implying that Yahweh was permanently present with the ark, it seems to imply that Yahweh who rides on the storm-clouds, characterized as cherubim, appears from his heavenly dwelling, or from Sinai, to manifest his presence over the ark. (68) The original significance of the ark, which most probably goes back to the period spent by the ancestors of Israel at Kadesh, was not that of a throne but probably that of a container which housed the law-tablets of the covenant, and in this respect the view of the Deuteronomic writers may well rest on a genuine recollection. (69) The ark may have been thought of as a pedestal for the invisible Yahweh who guarded the covenant-law at his feet. (70) As for the period in which it came to be associated with the cherubim-throne, Eissfeldt has conjectured that some representation of cherubim existed in the sanctuary of Shiloh and that these furnished the prototypes for the great carved cherubim of Solomon's temple. (71) Clements thinks that this suggestion has "a good measure of probability" and he maintains that it was probably during the period the ark was at Shiloh that the idea of Yahweh's cherubim-throne became connected with it. (72)


69. Clements, op.cit., p.35.

70. Ibid.


72. Clements, op.cit., p.34. Clements, op.cit., p.34, n.6, argues that it was at this time that the title Yahweh Zebaoth came to be associated with Yahweh (cf. Eissfeldt, 'Jahwe Zebaoth', pp.139ff.) and that it was very probably also at this time that Israel adopted the idea of Yahweh's divine kingship. The cherubim, then, formed Yahweh's royal chariot-throne. Cf. W. Schmidt, Königtn Gottes in Ugarit und Israel, BZAW, lxxx, Berlin, 1961, p.78.
As regards the original relationship between the ark and the tent, this whole question "is a very vexed one, in which absolute conclusions are not possible." (73) The Old Testament traces the tent back to the wilderness and Beyerlin argues that "if the Ark existed in the wilderness (apart from the cherubim...) to which there is no really valid objection..., then it could hardly have existed without the protection of a tent." (74) According to 2 Sam. vi:17, David immediately prepared a tent for the ark and Beyerlin considers that this "was probably a return to older usage." (75) On the other hand, von Rad argues that "for weighty reasons, we must call seriously in doubt the relationship between the ark and both Moses and the religion of Sinai." (76) Von Rad detects tensions between the tent and the ark which were not fully reconciled in the religious heritage of Israel even in the time of the Chronicler. From the point of view of the history of the traditions of the two palladia, the divergences "are evidence of theological distinctions and compromises". (77) In his attempt "to disentangle the jumbled strands and so gain an understanding of the complex of religious thought which finally arose from these various elements," (78) von Rad concludes that at one time the ark was separated from the tent

73. Clements, op.cit., p.38.
75. Ibid.
77. Ibid., p.103.
78. Ibid.
of meeting. There is no mention of the making of the ark in the ancient sources. It is named in only two passages throughout all the pre-Deuteronomistic writings of the Pentateuch, and neither passage can be adduced as proof of the historicity of the tradition that the tribes already possessed the ark when they came out of the desert. (79)

The real palladium of the desert period was the tent (80) and the purpose of the tent as a meeting-point for Yahweh and Moses is wholly incompatible with the theology of the ark to which God was thought to be inseparably attached. (81) Firstly, therefore, the notions of 'meeting' and of 'being enthroned' are mutually exclusive. Secondly, the oldest accounts know nothing of any association between tent and ark. Thirdly, the fact that both passages which do depict the ark as already extant in the desert period mention it along with, but totally unrelated to, the tent is a sure indication of the secondary nature of both texts. For these three reasons, von Rad concludes that the ark cannot have originated in the desert and he argues that the two palladia "were inevitably mutually repellent by virtue of the radically divergent

79. Ibid., p.114.

80. Ibid., p.116. Von Rad, op.cit., p.121, writes: "The ark is a cultic object originating in settled territory". However cf. idem, Old Testament Theology, I, pp.234ff., ref. p.235, where he says that "there is good reason to believe that Ex. XXXIII.7-11 derives as a tradition from a very early period, perhaps even from the period before Israel settled in Palestine", but then goes on to say that the ark "was in existence in the 'wilderness period'' (ibid., p.236). Cf., too, ibid., p.235: "Tent and Ark were two cult objects existing independently of each other in the earlier period as the cultic foci of two completely distinct groups". M.L. Newman, The People of the Covenant: A Study of Israel from Moses to the Monarchy, New York and Nashville, 1962, pp.55ff., accepts that the tent and the ark belong to two separate cultic streams but he differs from von Rad by arguing that both are Mosaic. Newman, who claims that from the days when the covenant community was at Kadesh there were two covenant traditions in Israel, one northern and one southern, argues that the ark was the cult-symboll of the northern tribes and the tent was the cult-symbol of the southern tribes.

81. Ibid., p.117.
ideas associated with each of them." (82) The ark was a cultic object which originated in settled territory. Yahweh was not native to the land and, while he was believed to appear from the south in times of great extremity, his remoteness was a serious problem (83) which could only lead to a crisis in the religion of Yahweh for there were gods in the land who were much easier to find. It must have been "a matter of inestimable moment" when Israel received an assurance with the ark of the continual presence of Yahweh. (84) Moreover, Yahweh had revealed himself to, and made a covenant with, certain of the tribes in the desert and when Israel settled in the land and other tribes which had not been at Horeb joined themselves to Israel, thus forming a nation, the problem was whether they still remained under the protection of Yahweh or whether they had moved outside the jurisdiction of the God of Sinai. (85) The ark provided the focal point at which Yahweh could be understood to be present as the nation's divine protector. (86)

When David set up a tent for the ark, his action does not imply a fusion of the old ideas associated with the tent and the ark since David intended to replace the tent by a temple and he takes no account

82. Ibid., p.118.
84. Von Rad, op.cit., p.122.
85. Ibid., p.123.
86. Ibid. Cf. P.D. Miller, The Divine Warrior in Early Israel, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1973, pp. 37, 78, 104f., 107, 145f., et passim. Miller argues that the Ark was "perceived as a type of palladium in battle, embodying the presence of Yahweh as he marched to fight for Israel and acting as a security for victory over her adversaries" (ibid., p.145).
of the ideas connected with the tent of meeting. On the other hand, "Nathan's protest against the building of a temple must be understood as a vindication of the tradition of the tent against the parallel tradition of the ark."(87)

The Deuteronomic writers regarded the ark simply as a chest. When it had been divested of all numinous associations, the time had come at last when the ideas associated with the ark could be combined with those connected with the tent, and this was the theological achievement of the Priestly Code.(88) As for the relationship between the temple and the tabernacle of the priestly writer, P stood in the 'tent of meeting' tradition and used the tabernacle tradition as a corrective to the notion of the temple which was current in his day. On the other hand, the Chronicler took the ark seriously and, being "more decisively a supporter of the temple than was P", he regarded the temple as the house of the ark.(89)

Ultimately, the theology of the tent, which was originally unconnected with the ark "and at times certainly eclipsed by it", gained the ascendancy, and the ark was accepted into the tent only when it had been divested of its characteristic associations.(90)

Clements, too, observes that while the tent is mentioned in Exod. xxxiii:7-11 (E) and the ark in Num. x:33-36 (JE), xiv:44 (JE), the two

87. Von Rad, op.cit., p.119.
88. Ibid.
89. Ibid., p.121.
90. Ibid. Other writers who have argued that the ark and the tent of meeting were separated at one time include R. Hartmann, 'Zelt und Lade', ZAW, xxxvii, 1917/18, pp.209-244, ref. pp.213ff.; M. Haran, 'The Nature of the "Ohel Mo'edh" in Pentateuchal Sources', JSS, v, 1960, pp.50ff.; M. Noth, Exodus, London, 1966, pp.254ff.
institutions in the earliest sources, are not said to have been related to each other. However, Clements rightly refuses to concede von Rad's rigid distinction between a theology of Yahweh's dwelling and a theology of his epiphany, since the presence of Yahweh over the ark was thought of in terms of a theophany in which Yahweh came and appeared to his people. (91)

This is borne out by Num. x:35f.; Ps. lxviii:2 (EVV.1); lxxx:2 (EVV.1); and cxxxii:8.

Was the ark from the first placed in the tent of meeting? De Vaux, who thinks that the ark and the tent date back to the nomadic period of Israel and that the ark, the resting place of Yahweh, was housed in the tent which, as a result, was the location for meetings with Yahweh, seeks positive proof of the presence of the ark in the tent from Exod. xxxiii:7, which begins: לֹֽא־יָאָכֵל אֱלֹֽהִים לְשֵׁם יִשְׂרָאֵל. The third person masculine singular suffix appended to the preposition 'for' is often taken as referring to Yahweh or Moses, but de Vaux argues that, since סָרָן is also masculine, "it is possible that the pronoun refers to the Ark, which might have been mentioned in the immediate context from which Ex. 33:7-11 was lifted." (92) De Vaux then interprets 2 Sam. vi:17 in a different way from von Rad.

91. Clements, op.cit., p.37. Cf., too, de Vaux, 'Ark of the Covenant and Tent of Reunion', The Bible and the Ancient Near East, p.147, who points out that Num. x:35f. indicates that the ark was not thought of as the permanent seat of the presence of Yahweh from the very beginning but rather as the place where God would become present in a special manner when he thought it necessary, or in response to the call of his people. This is indicated by the use of סָרָן in verse 36.

Whereas von Rad argues that David "in no way takes into account the ideas connected with the tent of meeting, since the temple is expressly a dwelling for Yahweh," (93) de Vaux maintains that the fact that David sheltered the ark in a tent specially set up for it, rather than in a constructed sanctuary, "was not a temporary measure" and "was in fact a definite wish to establish continuity with the cult of the desert, the memory of which still survived." (94)

As Clements points out, this argument "is weighty, but not absolutely compelling", since, if the ark were present in the tent, it seems odd that the cloud should appear at the door of the tent rather than over the ark. (95) In view of the paucity of information concerning how and where Yahweh was thought to appear by the ark in early times, it is exceptionally difficult to determine whether the two institutions were at one time unrelated to each other. Certainly, the Priestly writers maintained that the cloud of the divine glory appeared immediately above the ark (Exod. xxv:22; xxx:6; Lev. xvi:2, 13), "but this may be only their interpretation." (96) At any rate, the important thing in this context is that both objects witnessed to a very similar view of the divine presence which was manifested in a

96. Clements, op.cit., p.38. On the other hand, cf. F.M. Cross, 'The Priestly Tabernacle', Old Testament Issues, ed. S. Sandmel, London, 1969, pp.39-67, who, while agreeing that "an Exilic date for the major Priestly work seems almost certain now" (ibid., p.53), argues: "While the Priestly account is schematized and idealized, and while the Priestly writers read the theological interpretations and historical developments of later ages into their system, nevertheless, Priestly tradition must be deemed an important historical witness to the Mosaic Age" (ibid., p.47).
cloud theophany and both were important for the receiving of oracles. The primary Israelite conception of the presence of Yahweh was of his coming to them from Mount Sinai. When the Israelites moved into the land of Canaan one of their greatest problems was undoubtedly how to keep contact with the God of Sinai. It may be said with considerable justification that "the ark was...a kind of portable 'Sinai'," (97) in the sense that theologically the ark bore witness to Yahweh's revelation of himself on Mount Sinai and to the origin of the people of Israel as the covenant people of Yahweh. At some date after settlement in Palestine, when the ark came to be associated with the cherubim-throne, it would have borne witness "to the Mosaic experience of the immanence of God." (98)

By transferring the ark of Yahweh to his city, David not only gave the sanctuary in Jerusalem religious significance for the Israelite tribes but also insinuated himself into the cultic traditions of Israel. David's transfer of the ark, "an astute royal manoeuvre of very questionable legitimacy" which was undertaken "from considerations of political astuteness", provided his royal seat with a link with the cultic life of the Israelite tribes and "the transferred Israelite cult of the Ark became blended with the political arrangements of the Davidic monarchy in Jerusalem." (99) In this way, Jerusalem, the

98. Newman, op.cit., p.58, following Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament, I, pp.107ff., who argues that "the ark, as the throne of the invisible Yahweh in the midst of his people, bore witness to the Mosaic experience of the immanence of God". Eichrodt, op.cit., p.110, argues that, because it was the throne of the invisible God, the ark emphasized the nearness of God and his abiding in the midst of his people.
royal city, became a prominent cultic centre of Israel. (100)

Thus, from its very beginnings, Jerusalem possessed a unique importance for Israel because of its possession of the ark and its special association with David, the founder of Judah's dynasty. However, there is another factor which contributed greatly to the aura of Jerusalem and helped to make this shrine attain an unrivalled position among Yahweh's sanctuaries. In Jerusalem the mythological idea was taken over from the cult of 'El-'Elyon that Mount Zion was to be identified with Mount Zaphon and constituted a divine abode. Thus, Mount Zion came to be regarded as Yahweh's abode. Although this innovation was subordinated to the traditional Israelite belief in Yahweh as the God of Sinai, the adoption by Israel of this concept had far-reaching significance for the religious and political changes which took place in the reigns of David and Solomon.

The fundamentally mythological character of the belief in Mount Zion as Yahweh's divine dwelling place ought not to be underestimated. Kraus maintains that the mythological tradition inherited from the Jebusites was completely reminted in Israel and that it was the transference of the ark to Jerusalem which originated the belief in the divine election of Mount Zion, and not any mythical notion. (101) However, Clements adduces four reasons to support the view that the doctrine of Yahweh's

100. Rowley, 'Zadok and Nehushtan', JBL, lvi, 1939, pp.113-141, ref. p.126, who maintains that Zadok was originally a priest of the Jebusites who was confirmed in office by David, argues that David did not destroy the Jebusite shrine of Jerusalem and that at some time during his reign he placed the ark in this shrine over which Zadok officiated as priest. As Clements, op.cit., p.42, rightly says, this is a possibility but "there is insufficient evidence to build any certain reconstructions of the history of Israel's priesthood and cult upon it."

election of Mount Zion "was the Israelite expression of a belief which was ultimately mythological in its origins." (102) Firstly, the fact that it is Mount Zion that Yahweh has chosen and not Jerusalem indicates a dependence on the general Ancient Near Eastern attachment to sacred mountains. Secondly, it is clear from Ps. xlviii:3 (EVV.2) that Mount Zion was identified with Mount Zaphon. Thirdly, in the Old Testament, Mount Zion is invested with a cosmic significance which is only explicable on the basis of a mythological association. Fourthly, while the fact that the Psalter venerates Mount Zion as a source of blessing for Israel (103) could be merely a consequence of the belief in Yahweh's presence there, "it is more natural to regard it as a result of the belief in Yahweh's presence, mediated through his sacred mountain; i.e. there are features of 'myth' which cannot be overlooked." (104)

While the concept of Yahweh's dwelling in Jerusalem was essentially a mythological idea, it came to be expressed in terms of Yahweh's 'election' of Mount Zion (Ps. lxxviii:68; cxxxii:13), "so that history rather than myth was looked to as the justification of his abode there." (105) The election of Mount Zion was inextricably linked with the divine election of David and his dynasty to be rulers of Israel (cf., e.g., Pss. ii:6; lxxviii:67ff.; cxxxii:11-14; 1 Kgs. viii:25ff.). (106) Rohland's argument that the doctrine of the election of

103. Cf., e.g., Pss. xiv:7; xx:3 (EVV.2); liii:7 (EVV.6); cxxviii:5; cxxxii:13-15; cxxxiii:3; cxxxiv:3.
104. Clements, op.cit. Cf., too, E. Rohland, Die Bedeutung der Erwählungstraditionen Israels für die Eschatologie der alttestamentlichen Propheten, Dissertation, Heidelberg, 1956, pp.119ff., who also brings out the mythological character of the doctrine of the divine election of Mount Zion and maintains that it was borrowed by the Israelites from the Jebusites' worship of *El-Ẹlyon.
Mount Zion was originally separate from the tradition of the election of David and that the two were only connected at a fairly late date (107) must be rejected, for it is almost certain that the two doctrines were indissolubly connected at an early period, probably during David's reign. (108) The doctrine that Yahweh had chosen the Davidic dynasty was unquestionably a piece of political theology which served as a divine authorization for David's descendants to occupy the royal throne in Jerusalem. The allied doctrine that Yahweh had elected Mount Zion "sanctioned the installation of the ark in the new cult-centre of Israel" and, as well as establishing Jerusalem as Yahweh's chosen sanctuary, it signified Yahweh's right of possession of the land of Canaan and, thereby, Israel's entitlement to dwell there. The twofold assertion that Yahweh had chosen Mount Zion to be his dwelling-place and David to rule over the land constituted the entire religious basis of the Davidic empire and, as Clements rightly says, "it is not too much to argue...that the doctrine of the joint election of David and Mount Zion was nothing short of a divine authorization and sanction for the whole Davidic state." (109)

Confirmation of the view that Mount Zion's significance as Yahweh's dwelling place was that it represented the land of Canaan, thereby entitling Israel to dwell there, is provided by two early Israelite psalms, Exod. xv:1-18, the Song of Miriam, and Ps. lxxviii. Both of these psalms, which were probably written during the period of the Davidic-Solomonic empire, trace Israel's origins as a divinely guided pilgrimage of Israel which finds its climax in the establishing

109. Ibid., p.50.
of Mount Zion as Yahweh's dwelling place and Israel's possession of the land. In both of these psalms, the land of Canaan is closely identified with Yahweh's holy mountain (Exod. xv:13-18; Ps. lxxviii:51-55) and there can be little doubt that Yahweh's holy mountain in these psalms is Mount Zion (cf. Pss. ii:6; iii:5 (EVV.4); xv:1; xliii:3; xlviii:2 (EVV.1); xcix:9). When David established Jerusalem as his royal seat and installed the ark there, Mount Zion became the mountain of Yahweh's inheritance (Exod. xv:17) and the real significance of Mount Zion as Yahweh's dwelling-place was that it represented the land of Canaan and thus gave Israel entitlement to dwell there. In Exod. xv:1-18 and Ps. lxxviii, the cultic tradition of Israel's right to possess the land of Canaan through divine ownership of that land, which really has its origin in Canaanite religion, is welded to the more genuinely Israelite 'historical' tradition, in which Israel's entitlement to the land was won by right of conquest. In both of these psalms, Yahweh's choice of Mount Zion, which signified his ownership of the land of Canaan, is described as having come about through the conquest of that land by the Israelites whom Yahweh had redeemed out of Egypt.


111. Cf., e.g. Clements, op.cit.; Pedersen, Israel III-IV, Copenhagen, 1940, pp.407f.; H. Wildberger, Jahwes Eigentumsvolk, pp.21f., note; J. Schreiner, Sion-Jerusalem, p.209.


Thus, Jerusalem came to have a unique importance for Israel because of its unique association with David, its possession of the ark, and the adoption by Israel of certain mythological ideas, chief of which was the belief that Mount Zion was the dwelling place of the deity. Mount Zion did not become Yahweh's abode because the temple was built there. Rather, the temple was built there because Mount Zion had become Yahweh's abode. (114) Why was David refused permission to build a temple for Yahweh? The divine refusal is expressed in the oracle of Nathan (2 Sam. vii), (115) which provided the foundation for the belief in the divine authority of David's dynasty to rule over Israel. (116) Verse 13a, which contains a promise that David's son will build a temple, is generally regarded as an interpolation and the original prophecy seems to have rejected completely the idea of a temple for Yahweh. Yahweh prefers a tent, but he will build a house (i.e. dynasty) for David (2 Sam. vi:5-7, 11). However, this seems odd in view of the fact that a temple of some description had existed at Shiloh. Moreover, Solomon does not seem to have met with any opposition when he built the temple. (117)


115. The original form of Nathan's prophecy is usually limited to vv. 1-7, 11b, 16, 18-21, 25-29. Of the additions made to the original oracle, the most significant is v.13a. Cf. L. Rost, Die Überlieferung von der Thronnachfolge Davids, BWANT,III:vi, Stuttgart, 1926, pp.47ff. (who discerns a primary kernel of the oracle in vv. 11b and 16); Noth Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien, 1957, pp.64ff.; idem, 'David and Israel in II Samuel VII', The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Essays, pp.250-259; E. Kutsch, 'Die Dynastie von Gottes Gnaden. Probleme der Nathanweissagung in 2 Sam. 7', ZTK, lvii, 1961, pp.137-153 (who thinks that 11b contains a primary kernel of the oracle); Clements, op.cit., p.56, n.2.


117. It was David who acquired the site on which the temple at Jerusalem was built (2 Sam. xxiv:15ff.). According to 1 Chron. xxii:1ff., David made all the preparations required for the building of a temple but it is difficult to determine the historicity of this idealized account. Cf. Clements, op.cit., p.57.
J.W. Flight (118) suggests that it was the 'nomadic ideal' which prevented David from constructing a permanent shrine for the ark but against this view Clements argues that "nomadism never provided Israel with its norm of orthodoxy". (119) R. de Vaux (120) understands Nathan's prophecy as reflecting the desire to maintain the desert customs which was shared by certain Israelites who viewed the building of a 'house' for Yahweh as an act of infidelity, a dangerous concession to the influence of Baal's religion. G.W. Ahlström (121) maintains that Nathan's oracle reflects the opposition of Nathan, not Yahweh, to the idea of building a temple, for Nathan was a Jebusite who opposed the erection of a temple which would have vied with the older ʾE1-ʾElyon temple of the Jebusites. Nathan and the Jebusite 'party' supported Solomon's accession to the throne (1 Kgs. i:8ff.) so that when Solomon became king, the opposition to the building of a temple ceased. Against this view, Clements correctly points out that there is a paucity of information about the motives for political dissension in the time of David and that the main controversy seems to have been between Judaean-Jerusalem elements and the older traditions of the northerners. (122)

120. De Vaux, Ancient Israel2, pp.329f. De Vaux, op.cit., p.14, says that "nomadism itself is not the ideal; rather, it is that purity of religious life and that faithfulness to the Covenant, which was associated in Israel's mind with its former life in the desert."
J. Schreiner (123) maintains that Nathan's oracle does not express an absolute rejection of a temple but only the idea of Yahweh dwelling in a temple, for Yahweh cannot be confined to any earthly dwelling. Against this view, Clements argues that an explicit contrast is made in the oracle between a tent and a house of cedar and if the oracle were opposed to the idea of Yahweh's dwelling in a shrine, "then the tent ought also to have been rejected, since this was connected with Yahweh's dwelling in Israel." (124) Seeking to explain why a temple was regarded as incompatible with the worship of Yahweh, Clements rightly maintains that this prophecy has not been expanded to make it express a later theological viewpoint opposed to temples as such but presents a contemporary attitude. Having established his royal seat in Jerusalem, David quite naturally wanted to build a temple to the God who was believed to have established his right to rule. In the ancient Near East, king and temple belonged together as the pillars of state and the earthly throne was believed to be linked to the divine throne from whence it derived its authority. (125) The building of a temple would have provided "the divine foundation of the state and the sacred authority of the Davidic dynasty." (126) However, this would have represented a far-reaching change in Israel's religious and political thinking for such a divinely authorized state and monarchy "was virtually a claim to a feudal structure for society, in which the king held an especially exalted place under

123. J. Schreiner, Sion-Jerusalem, pp.90ff.
125. Ibid., p.59.
126. Ibid.
Tensions must have occurred in this period. There was certainly a very real tension between the ideas connected with the ark, and its tradition of Yahweh's mighty acts in history, and the basically mythological character of the belief that Mount Zion was a divine abode. Hence, Nathan's oracle may well reflect the opposition of certain Israelites to David's plan to build a temple because of its far-reaching political and religious implications.

There was much political unrest during David's reign, particularly from the northern tribes, and the fact that David did not build a temple was probably a concession to them. By the time Solomon became king, however, the revolts had been quelled and no formidable opposition could be raised to the building of a temple.

When Solomon built the temple, there were far-reaching changes in the nature and character of Israel's worship for it introduced a new kind of ideology and a much greater elaboration of the cultus and ritual.

127. Ibid.
128. Ibid., p.48.
129. Ibid., p.60. With regard to Shiloh, Clements points out that no opposition was raised to the ark being placed in the temple there because that temple was never linked to a political claim to kingship and was probably of local significance only. Moreover, the fact that the Shiloh temple continued to be referred to as 'the tent of meeting' (1 Sam. ii:22; Ps. lxxviii:60) may reflect an aversion to regard it as a temple after the Canaanite pattern.
130. Clements, op.cit., p.60, finds a parallel in the administration of Israel, for, while David's census (2 Sam. xxiv:1ff.), which can only have been for administrative and tax purposes, was condemned as a sin against Yahweh, no effective opposition was raised against Solomon's using the census reports when he reorganized the administrative system.
Yahweh's house in Jerusalem was full of cosmic symbolism since it was intended to be a copy, or symbol, of his cosmic 'house'. The temple signified the cosmic rule of Yahweh and "far from conveying the belief that Yahweh was an earth-bound God, tied to his abode in Jerusalem, the whole outlook and purpose of the temple was to stress his creative and universal action." Yahweh's earthly abode was a counterpart of his heavenly abode and, originally, the belief in Yahweh's earthly dwelling-place on Mount Zion presupposed that his true dwelling was in the heavens.

The major festival of the religious calendar in the Jerusalem temple was the Feast of Tabernacles which combined a recollection of the establishing of the covenant on Mount Sinai with a declaration of Yahweh's power in the creation of the world. Yahweh's power in creation was related to his purpose in and for Israel to such an extent that the whole festival was directed not merely towards the blessing of a new year, but towards securing a new world order when the divine gifts of righteousness and peace would be fully realized on earth.


133. Ibid., p.68. See, e.g., Pss. xi:4; xiv:2 and 7; xx:3 and 7 (EVV.2 and 6); lxxv:3 and 9 (EVV.2 and 8); lxxvi:2 and 15 (EVV.1 and 14).

Thus, the declaration of Yahweh's presence in Jerusalem became the basis of a hope of a transformed world. Yahweh, the heavenly king, would come from his heavenly abode to appear in glory in the temple on Mount Zion where he would pass judgment on the nations (135) (cf. e.g., Pss. xcvi:10-13; xcvii:1-5). The doctrine of Yahweh's presence in the temple on Mount Zion not only became the basis of the belief that Yahweh would judge the world from there but it also led to the idea that the city was inviolable (136) (cf., e.g., Pss. xlvi, xlviii; lxxvi). Yahweh's presence in the Jerusalem sanctuary also guaranteed the bestowal of all blessing and fertility (cf., e.g., Pss. xxiv:5; xlvi:5 (Evv.4); lxv:5 (Evv.4); lxvii:10f. (Evv.9f.); cxxviii:5; cxxxii:15; cxxxiii:3; cxxxiv:3).

While the doctrine of Yahweh's presence in Jerusalem was particularly prominent in connection with the Autumn Festival, the worship of the temple was centred on the belief that Yahweh was present during all its festivals and ceremonies and would confer practical and spiritual blessings on all those who worshipped in his house (cf., e.g. Pss. xxxvi:8-10 (Evv.7-9); lxv:5 (Evv.4). The temple cult was directed especially towards acquiring fertility of crops and herds and deliverance from pestilence, war and from everything which jeopardised the enjoyment and security of the land. The entire ideology of the Jerusalem temple centred on the belief that Yahweh had chosen Mount Zion as his dwelling-place and Yahweh's presence on his holy mountain

135. Ibid., p.70.

was understood to provide a firm guarantee of his goodness, kindness, and protection (cf., e.g., Pss. xxiii:6; xxvii:4; lxi:5; xcii:13-15 (EVV.12-14). Participation in the temple worship came to be regarded as vital for every true Israelite (137) and by sharing in its corporate worship the individual Israelite gave true expression to his faith and identified himself as a member of the community of Israel. As Clements writes: "The cult, therefore, especially in its most elaborate expression in the Jerusalem temple, served as a unifying influence within the nation, creating a sense of nationhood and oneness, which, without it, would have been lacking." (138)

From the time of David, therefore, Jerusalem, as a result of its unique association with the founder of Judah's dynasty, its possession of the ark, and its inheritance from the 'El-Elyon cultus, unquestionably enjoyed a prestige which surpassed that of any other Yahweh sanctuary and was raised above the level of all other shrines. (139) Although the united empire was short-lived, Jerusalem's pre-eminence continued and after the disruption of the state into the two separate kingdoms of Israel and Judah after the death of Solomon, there was no northern shrine which could rival Jerusalem. Jerusalem's claim to precedence over all other Yahweh sanctuaries was so strong even after the schism that Jeroboam I feared it might wrest his kingdom from him (1 Kgs. xii:28). Conscious of the danger of pilgrimages by his subjects to

137. See Clements, 'Temple and Land: A Significant Aspect of Israel's Worship', TGUOS, xix, 1961-62, pp.16-28, who points out that the cult was intended to actualise the divine activity on earth and the cult which was enacted on Mount Zion, in accordance with the symbolism of the sacred mountain and of the temple, sought essentially to secure the reality of the divine blessing upon the entire land and people of Israel.

138. Clements, God and Temple, p.76.

Jerusalem, Jeroboam made the shrines of Bethel and Dan his own royal sanctuaries, and set up bull-calves there in, an attempt to counter any attachment that his subjects might have felt towards Jerusalem.

The very special significance of Mount Zion, with its tradition of Yahweh's dwelling there is very evident in the prophecies of Isaiah. The particular prominence of Jerusalem and its temple in his prophecies can be traced back to his inaugural vision in the temple in which "Isaiah saw the reality for which the Jerusalem temple existed."(141)

The full meaning of Mount Zion as the chosen place where Yahweh's presence was to be found and where he revealed his will and poured out his blessing, becomes explicit in Isa. ii:2-4, where Jerusalem is to become the spiritual centre of the entire universe.(142) This oracle is a Yahwistic re-interpretation of the mythological concept identifying Mount Zion with Mount Zaphon, so that it was regarded as a cosmic mountain. In Isa. ii:2-4, the presence of Yahweh in Jerusalem as the divine king has become the basis of a hope of a transformed world in which all nations would acknowledge the lordship of Yahweh, and the exaltation of Mount Zion would introduce a new age of peace and happiness for all mankind. Here, the unique size and significance of Mount

140. These bull-calf symbols were probably meant to be pedestals on which the invisible Yahweh was thought to stand. Cf. H.T. Obbink, 'Jahwebilder', ZAW, xlvii, 1929, pp.264-274, ref. p.268; Clements, op.cit., p.77.

141. Clements, op.cit., p.81.

142. This oracle also occurs in Mic. iv:1-4 but authorship is better ascribed to Isaiah than to Micah because Micah vigorously challenged the excessive assurance that Yahweh could be relied upon to defend Zion irrespective of the conduct of its citizens and he foretold that Jerusalem would be destroyed owing to the injustice and avarice of its rulers, priests, and prophets (Mic. iii:12). At the same time, however, it is difficult to determine the extent to which Isaiah may have been quoting from older material. Cf. von Rad, 'The City on the Hill', The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays, p.234; H. Wildberger, 'Die Völkerwallfahrt zum Zion. Jes. ii, 1-5', VT, vii, 1957, pp.62-81; Clements, op.cit., p.81, n.3. On Zion in the cult language of the Psalms, see Clifford, The Cosmic Mountain in Canaan and the Old Testament, pp.141ff. De Vaux, 'Jerusalem and the Prophets', Interpreting the Prophetic Tradition, pp.296f., argues that Is. ii:2-4 expresses that Jerusalem is the new Sinai (because Yahweh resides in the city and because the temple shelters the ark of the covenant containing the Ten Commandments) and the mountain of God.
Zion are pictures of a future hope when Yahweh's torah would be proclaimed from Zion to all peoples, resulting in the introduction of a new manner of life for all nations.

Isa. xi:9, which is most probably not from Isaiah but from a later writer, is another instance where traditional mythological material has been fashioned into a prophecy of future bliss and 'my holy mountain' must refer, here, to the whole land of Palestine, if not the entire world, which is signified by Mount Zion as a world-mountain (143) (cf. Ps. lxxviii:54; Isa. xiv:25; lvii:13.

In his interpretation of the political events of his day, Isaiah adopted another major theme of the Zion traditions which reappears several times in pre-exilic prophecy, namely, the defeat of the nations outside Jerusalem. The belief in Yahweh's presence in the Jerusalem temple implied judgment of evildoers, which in Israelite faith meant especially the destruction of all the forces of hostile foreign nations. Isaiah describes how the Assyrian armies would march victoriously as far as the city walls of Jerusalem but then Yahweh himself would 'punish the arrogant boasting of the king of Assyria and his haughty pride' (Isa. x:12) and would direct his anger to the destruction of the Assyrians (Isa. x:25ff.). The manner in which the personal intervention of Yahweh was to secure the victory and guarantee the protection of Jerusalem is vividly described in Isa. xxxi:4f. The hostile foreigners will be defeated and Jerusalem will be inviolate because Yahweh is in the midst of his city, guaranteeing its protection. Significantly, this belief dominates the prophet's message in the biographical narrative of the part played by Isaiah during Sennacherib's siege of Jerusalem (2 Kgs. xviii:13-

143. Cf. Clements, op.cit., p.82.
144. Cf., e.g., Mic. iv:11-13; Zeph. iii:8-13; Ezek. xxxviii:17-23.
Isaiah is said to have given Hezekiah the solemn assurance that Yahweh would protect Jerusalem and prevent the Assyrians from entering the city. It is difficult to determine the actual course of events but unquestionably the last minute reprieve from the assault of Sennacherib's besieging armies was interpreted as an historical vindication of the traditional hope of Jerusalem. Thus, in spite of the fact that Isaiah strongly opposed a faith which placed more trust in Yahweh's dwelling-place than in Yahweh himself, this prophet is associated with the vindication of the belief in the city's safety through its divine protector.

Does the demand for the centralization of the cult in the book of Deuteronomy have as its background the claims of the Jerusalem temple to a position of primacy? The answer must be in the negative. The Deuteronomic writers were concerned to reinterpret the meaning and significance of Jerusalem and its worship in accordance with the ancient tradition of the covenant on Mount Sinai. This is not to say that after the schism the Sinai covenant tradition was confined to the northern part of the kingdom and that it was exclusively the Davidic covenant which was celebrated in the south. However,

145. The accounts of what happened have been coloured by the traditional belief that Yahweh directly intervened to save his dwelling-place. However, the doctrine of the inviolability of Jerusalem did not arise out of the events of Sennacherib's campaign but originated in the ancient Zion cult. Cf., Schreiner, Sion-Jerusalem, pp.219ff., 236ff.


in Judah, the Sinaitic covenant was pushed more and more into the background by the Davidic covenant. This is borne out by an examination of the election tradition used by the pre-exilic canonical prophets. (148) The appeal back to the exodus complex of events, with its theological interpretation as Yahweh's election of Israel to be his people, was of fundamental significance for Amos, Hosea, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel and their entire understanding of Yahweh is coloured by it. In marked contrast, there is hardly any reference at all to the exodus in the books of Isaiah and Micah. There are some references to the exodus in the prophetic collections of Isaiah and Micah, but their authenticity is contested. (149) In both Isaiah and Micah, the whole understanding of Yahweh is dominated by the distinctive Jerusalem cult-traditions and by a concern with Yahweh's promises to the Davidic dynasty. (150) Isaiah, who has been called "the messenger of Jerusalem" (151) and "the prophet of Mount Zion", (152)


149. Isa. iv:2-6; x:24-26; xi:16; Mic. vi:4. Rohland, op.cit., pp.113f., 116f., dismisses the Isaiah references as being unauthentic but the genuineness of the references to the exodus tradition in Micah is defended by Beyerlin, Die Kulttraditionen Israels in der Verkündigung des Propheten Micha, FRLANT, lxxii, Göttingen, 1959, pp.29ff.

150. Cf., e.g., Clements, Prophecy and Covenant, p.49.

151. Clements, God and Temple, p.80.

152. Clements, Prophecy and Covenant, p.49.
used this election tradition as a motive to establish the unfaithfulness of the people and to proclaim judgment on sinful Jerusalem, but he also saw in Yahweh's presence in Jerusalem the guarantee of Jerusalem's protection and the hope of a glorious future for Israel and all nations, and he believed that on Mount Zion Yahweh would manifest his power and victory over all nations. Micah contended vigorously against the belief in Jerusalem's inviolability because it was Yahweh's dwelling-place and condemned it as a false faith which had come to obscure the true nature of Yahweh's covenant with Israel, neglecting the moral obligations on which the continuance of the covenant relationship depended. Micah foretold that Yahweh was about to destroy Jerusalem and thereby terminate his particular relationship with his people, since it meant the termination of the election of Mount Zion which was the whole religious foundation on which the State of Judah rested. (153) Both Micah and Isaiah make prominent use of the tradition of a covenant between Yahweh and the Davidic dynasty. Both pointed beyond the coming destruction to a time when Yahweh would begin again, and would raise up a true heir to David, when at last the expectations of peace and happiness contained in Yahweh's covenant-promises to David would be fulfilled (154) (Isa. vii:14ff.; viii:23-ix:6 (EVV.ix:1-7); xi:1-9; Mic. v:1-5 (EVV.2-6).

The other Southern prophets, Amos, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, show a considerable familiarity with both the exodus election tradition and the tradition of a covenant between Yahweh and the Davidic house. While the tradition that Israel had become the people of Yahweh

153. Cf., e.g., Clements, Prophecy and Covenant, p.50; idem, God and Temple, p.84.

through divine election at the exodus dominates Amos' understanding of Yahweh and of his relationship to Israel, this prophet may well have made some use of the distinctive Jerusalem cult-traditions and the tradition of Yahweh's covenant with the Davidic dynasty.\(^{(155)}\)

Jeremiah was fully cognizant of the exodus tradition and lays great emphasis on it, but he was also familiar with the popular beliefs about Jerusalem and the Davidic dynasty, with the result that alongside of his appeal to the exodus election tradition, there are promises which are derived from the belief in Yahweh's covenant with the house of David\(^{(156)}\) (Jer. xxiii:5f.; cf. xxii:30). However, like Micah before him, Jeremiah was vigorously opposed to the Jerusalem cult-tradition, because it had resulted in a false and immoral trust being placed in

155. There are allusions to the Zion traditions in Amos i:2 and ix:11f. both of which are widely regarded as the result of editorial expansion and revision of the text. However, while Amos i:2 may be the work of a later redactor, Rohland, op.cit., pp.59, 231f.; von Rad, The Message of the Prophets, London, 1969, pp.108f.; H. Graf Reventlow, Das Amt des Propheten bei Amos, FRLANT, Neue Folge, lxxx, Göttingen, 1962, pp.91ff.; and Clements, Prophecy and Covenant, pp.44, 49 (n.1), 111f., have made a good case for the authenticity of Amos ix:11f. This passage is usually regarded as a post-exilic addition to the prophecies of Amos in order to alleviate the unremitting insistence on judgment. However, it may be understood to be authentic and to refer, not to the experience of the exile, but to the schism and disruption of the Davidic empire after the death of Solomon. Following this line of interpretation, Amos would have been thinking in terms of the end of the division into two separate kingdoms and the return to one united Israelite kingdom under a Davidic head. Thus, for example, Clements, op.cit., p.112, arguing that Amos very probably shared much of the distinctive religious outlook and ideology of Jerusalem, maintains that "as a Judean Amos thought of Israel's future happiness in terms of the Jerusalem-David tradition". Cf., too, von Rad, op.cit., p.104: "Since Amos was a Judean, we must assume that he took his stand on the election traditions of the South, those attaching to David and Zion".

the actual building of the temple (Jer. vii:1-15; cf. xxvi:1-24). Zephaniah, Jeremiah's contemporary, also employed themes from the Zion-tradition to express Yahweh's purposes for his people (157) (Zeph. iii:6-8, 9f., 11-13).

Ezekiel clearly regarded the exodus tradition as determinative of Israel's position before Yahweh (Ezek. xx:1-44) but, while the exodus election tradition was for this prophet the fundamental fact about Israel's existence, he also employed the traditions of a covenant between Yahweh and David, with the promises it contained for the Davidic dynasty (Ezek. xxxiv:23-30; xxxvii:15-28; cf. xvii:23f.). In Ezek. xl-xlviii, the Programme of Reconstruction, many features have been drawn from the Zion cult-traditions.

While the three themes of exodus, desert sojourn and conquest constituted the central core of Israel's faith in its divine election and made up the tradition of the Sinai covenant, this covenant tradition was extended and altered in Judah by the addition of the belief in the election by Yahweh of Mount Zion and the Davidic house, thereby carrying the conquest theme up to the age of David and the formation of the Israelite State. (158) While the Northern Kingdom appears to have rejected the belief in a covenant between Yahweh and David and denied the unique claims of Jerusalem in favour of the Sinai tradition, the memory of Moses and the covenant on Mount Sinai was not wholly absent in the Judaean cult. A relationship between the Sinai-covenant tradition and the tradition of Yahweh's covenant

157. Ibid., p.52.
with David can be traced back to David's own reign, as is evidenced by certain temple psalms, most probably associated with the Jerusalem Autumn Festival which contain allusions to the covenant on Mount Sinai (cf., e.g. Ps. lxviii:8-11, 18 (EVV.7-10, 17). (159) Moreover, the Yahwist's epic history of Israel's origins, which was probably composed in the reign of Solomon, attaches great significance to the exodus events and the making of the covenant on Mount Sinai. (160)

Clearly, the Judahite tradition of Yahwism interpreted the election of Jerusalem and the Davidic dynasty "as a legitimate development and goal of the covenant made between Israel and Yahweh on Mount Sinai" and "the ideas and hopes which were associated with Yahweh's promises to David had as their indispensable presupposition the covenant of Sinai". (161) The use made by the prophets of these traditions about Israel's election was determined, to a large extent, by the particular traditions which they inherited. (162) Thus, while Isaiah and Micah, particularly, made little reference to the exodus tradition, this can in no way be taken to mean that these prophets were either ignorant of, or indifferent to, the earlier Sinai covenant tradition of Israel.

159. This psalm is undoubtedly ancient and probably dates from the Davidic-Solomonic era. Cf. Clements, Prophecy and Covenant, pp.63f.; Mayes, 'The Covenant on Sinai and the Covenant with David', Hermathena, cx, 1970, p.43. Newman, The People of the Covenant, p.164, n.23, argues that while the renewal of the Sinaitic covenant figured in the Autumn Festival in Jerusalem at the time of Josiah's festival (2 Kgs. xxiii:1-3), "there is little evidence that this was the case before the fall of the northern kingdom and the northern traditions were brought to Jerusalem." However, this goes too far, for aspects of the Sinaitic covenant were certainly present in the Jerusalem cult from the time of David. See Mowinckel, The Psalms in Israel's Worship, I, pp.155ff.; H.J. Kraus, Die Königsherrschaft Gottes im Alten Testament, Tübingen, 1951, pp.45ff.; Clements, op.cit., p.63, n.1.


The traditions of the exodus and of Yahweh's choice of David, therefore, "were mutually related stages in the development of Israel's covenant faith." (163)

It cannot be denied that these two election traditions were never wholly independent and that much of the Sinai covenant religion continued to exert a strong influence in Judah. Nevertheless, in Judah, the Sinai covenant tradition became increasingly subsumed by the new covenant ideology centring on the divine election of David and Mount Zion and a political theology developed in the court circles of Jerusalem which radically altered, and partly replaced, the Sinai covenant religion. Not only were many innovations introduced by the sacral kingship ideology and the temple cult, but, also, some features of the Sinai covenant religion were suppressed. (164) Although the concept that Yahweh was present in the Jerusalem temple "was dominated by the idea of Yahweh as the God of the exodus and Mount Sinai" (165) and while, too, the daily sacrifices in the Jerusalem sanctuary may well have been thought of as a renewal of the sacrifice on Mount Sinai, so that daily worship was linked to Yahweh's covenant with the entire people, (166) the Jerusalem temple had not easily been assimilated by the Yahwistic faith, with its tradition of the covenant on Mount Sinai. The Jerusalem temple had its roots in a polytheistic religion, with its distinctive religious symbolism, and this endangered some of the most vital aspects of the Israelite religion. Inevitably, a tension arose between, on the one hand, the understanding of the temple, with

163. Ibid., p. 68.
165. Clements, God and Temple, p. 76.
its claim that Yahweh's presence unconditionally guaranteed blessing and protection for Israel, and, on the other, the knowledge of Yahweh as the God of the Sinai covenant who had promised to be with his people so long as they fulfilled the obligations which had been laid upon them. Thus, while the concept that Mount Zion was Yahweh's abode was originally subordinated to the traditional Israelite belief in Yahweh as the God of Sinai, the Jerusalem temple eventually became the object of a false faith, "a kind of substitute for the living God", and the popular cult "lapsed into a self-assured formality, confident in the eternal bond between God and his people expressed in the temple worship". (167)

In short, the Jerusalem cult became divorced from the tradition of the Sinai covenant. Although the Sinai-covenant tradition was originally an important interpretative factor in the cultic manifestation of Yahweh's presence, (168) there was an increasing tendency to forget the true significance of the temple and to regard Yahweh's presence there as fixed and static. The danger of this happening was present from the very start, because the idea of the divine presence in the cult was explained and justified on the basis of a symbolism which originated in Canaanite mythology and such cultic symbolism was bound to foster the idea that Yahweh's gifts to Israel were unconditional, irrespective of the people's conduct and loyalty to him. (169) The Jerusalem temple became a token of an unconditional divine guarantee to bless Israel and the cult came to obscure the fact that Yahweh was Lord of the covenant who had laid stipulations on

168. Ibid., p.64.
169. Ibid., p.79.
Israel as well as having offered benefits. Many Israelites began to feel so confident of the immanent presence of Yahweh that they forgot his transcendent lordship (170) and this had a deep and harmful effect on the popular attitude of Israel. Worship at the Jerusalem temple did not serve the true interests of Yahweh's covenant with his people for, instead of proclaiming the demands of the covenant law and revealing the nature and purpose of Israel's election, the Jerusalem cult obscured the Sinai covenant tradition "by promising a false security which knew nothing of the moral conditions of fellowship between Israel and Yahweh" (171).

Moreover, not only did the belief that Yahweh was present in the Jerusalem temple come to be regarded as permanent, but the covenant promise of Yahweh to David was understood to mean that David and his descendants would rule 'for ever' in Jerusalem (172). This was an everlasting covenant which guaranteed not only the perpetuation of the Davidic dynasty in Jerusalem, but also the father-son relationship between Yahweh and each Davidic king. The Davidic king was regarded as the son of Yahweh by adoption (173) at his accession to the throne.

170. Ibid.
171. Ibid., p.87.
172. Cf. Clements, Prophecy and Covenant, p.61, who rightly says that the temple "served as a symbol of the divine pleasure at the new political situation, and of the permanence of the covenant between Yahweh and David".
(cf. Ps. ii). The king was the son of Yahweh through election and he stood in a particularly intimate relation to Yahweh (cf. Ps. lxxxix:20-38 (EVV.19-37)). It was this close relationship between himself and the Davidic king which Yahweh was believed to have guaranteed to maintain for ever. An individual king who might perpetrate evil would be punished, but this would not invalidate the covenant promise which Yahweh had made (Ps. lxxxix:31-38 (EVV.30-37)). The action of an individual member of the Davidic line could affect only his own particular standing before Yahweh but not that of the dynasty as a whole, for the nature of Yahweh's covenant with David was promissory and the promise was that David's line would endure for ever. That the Davidic king was supremely confident of his election and of Yahweh's promise is well indicated by Ps. lxxxix:50 (EVV.49): "Yahweh, where is thy steadfast love of old, which by thy faithfulness thou didst swear to David?" Yahweh's steadfast love, or devotion, refers here to his loyalty to those promises which he had bestowed on the Davidic dynasty. Thus there was the belief that Yahweh had chosen David and his dynasty and had made a covenant promise that the Davidic line would occupy the royal seat in Jerusalem for ever, which was coupled with the doctrine that Yahweh's presence in Jerusalem was eternal and unconditonal.

Deuteronomy is a profound and thoroughgoing attempt to re-interpret the Jerusalem temple in such a way that it might truly serve the will of Yahweh and no longer engender a false and immoral promise of salvation. The Deuteronomic writers stressed that the Sinai covenant was the foundation of all Israel's life and worship and that


175. Cf., particularly, N.H. Snaith, The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament, London, 1945, pp.98ff., who says that "the original use of the Hebrew chesed is to denote that attitude of loyalty and faithfulness which both parties to a covenant should observe towards each other" (ibid., p.99) and that "unless this close and inalienable connection with the idea of the covenant is realized, the true meaning of chesed can never be understood" (ibid., p.98). Cf., too, Mayes, 'The Covenant on Sinai and the Covenant with David', Hermathena, cx, 1970, p.40.

Israel had forfeited its privileged position by its disobedience to the covenant law. Only by coming back to a right understanding of the covenant and its demands and by returning to a true Yahwistic cult might the nation be saved from the threatened judgment.

The pre-exilic canonical prophets also protested against false ideas of Yahweh's presence in the Jerusalem temple and insisted upon the observance of the demands of the covenant law. Amos seems to have accepted that Yahweh dwelt on Mount Zion (Amos i:2) but he insisted that Yahweh's presence with Israel could only be a reality if the people sought good and rejected evil (Amos v:14). In view of Israel's misconduct, Yahweh's presence would mean judgment and not blessing (Amos v:17). The day of Yahweh would bring disaster, not joy (Amos v:18-24), and Yahweh's intervention would result in the punishment of evil. Hosea too proclaimed that Yahweh was "the Holy One in your midst" (Hos. xi:9) but he inveighed against the worship of the sanctuaries (Hos. iv:15-19; viii:5; x:1f., 5; xii:12 (EVV.11); xiii:2) and he rejected the entire Israelite cult which had degenerated to such an extent that it had been virtually indistinguishable from the immoral cult of Canaan. The ambivalence in the preaching of Isaiah (cf., e.g., Isa. i:27-31; iii:1-8, 16-26; v:1-7; xxix:1ff.) has already been referred to, and it is difficult to determine how his hope of Yahweh's triumph over Judah's enemies was reconciled with his


proclamation of judgment upon Jerusalem. (180) Micah strenuously contended against the notion that Yahweh's presence in Jerusalem was unconditional, thereby guaranteeing the city's safety, and he repudiated any idea that Yahweh was subject to the profane control of his people through cultic rites and offerings. As Lord of life and history, Yahweh was at liberty to destroy both temple and city if the injustice and avarice of rulers, priests and prophets within the city continued. Yahweh would have to destroy the temple in order to abolish the people's false confidence in the eternal bond linking him with the nation, which was expressed in the temple worship, and in order to re-establish the moral and spiritual demands of the covenant. Jeremiah was even more forcibly opposed to the temple and its cult than Micah. Jeremiah was adamant that the temple was a superstitious fetish which was no guarantee of Yahweh's presence and favour (Jer. vii:3f.). Yahweh had set his holy presence in Jerusalem as an act of grace and the continuance of his presence in the midst of his people was contingent on their obedience to the covenant demands. Just as in the past, Yahweh, Lord of all sanctuaries, had punished the sins of the people by destroying their sanctuary at Shiloh, so now he would destroy the Jerusalem temple. The destruction of the temple and the withdrawal of Yahweh's presence inevitably would mean the removal of Judah from the land of Canaan, since it was the possession of the temple as Yahweh's dwelling-place on Mount Zion which was believed to be Israel's entitlement to the whole territory. (181)

180. Isa. xxxvi-xxxix. Although the historical nucleus of these appendices to the book of Isaiah's prophecies is uncertain, "they undoubtedly represent authentically the attitude of the great prophet to Jerusalem" (Clements, Prophecy and Covenant, p.50, n.4. Cf., too, Eissfeldt, The Old Testament: An Introduction, pp.328f.)

It would be wrong to argue that the prophetic view of God was completely distinct from that of the cult, (182) for the Jerusalem cult, originally at any rate, did proclaim both in word and act that Yahweh would come to punish evildoers and to vindicate the righteous. Nevertheless, the cult had been abused and there was an ever increasing tendency to regard Yahweh's presence in Jerusalem as static and relatively permanent, an unconditional guarantee of divine protection against all disasters, irrespective of the people's conduct. It was against this popular belief in the temple that Micah and Jeremiah contended, asserting that the temple must be destroyed because it had become a positive hindrance to the covenant faith. (183) The Jerusalem cult had become so overloaded with features drawn from the Jebusite ḫE1-Ḥelyon cult that the genuinely Yahwistic covenant tradition was being preserved only in a very imperfect and fragmented way in the temple worship. The prophets proclaimed that Israel had broken the covenant by its persistent failure to fulfil its obligations, so that Yahweh had no alternative but to abandon his temple and people.

The prophets, therefore, criticized and attacked the Jerusalem cult because it did not serve the true interests of the covenant. The Deuteronomic legislators sought to implement a similar criticism but whereas Micah and Jeremiah had proclaimed that Yahweh would destroy his temple in Jerusalem, the Deuteronomic writers sought to save the temple by re-interpreting its meaning and by rejecting the symbolism of the cult which had originated in a mythological and

182. M. Schmidt, Prophet und Tempel, Zürich, 1948, pp.9ff., et passim, argues that the prophetic idea of Yahweh's presence was active and dynamic whereas the temple tended to project the notion that Yahweh's presence was static and virtually passive. However, Clements, God and Temple, p.86, rightly points out the danger of raising Schmidt's distinction into a general principle "as though the prophetic view of God were inevitably distinct from that of the cult."

polytheistic milieu. The prophets declared that the covenant was the foundation of all Israel's life and worship and that Israel had forfeited its privileged position by its perpetual disobedience to the covenant law. The authors of Deuteronomy also stressed that, far from being unconditional and eternal, Yahweh's covenant relationship was contingent upon the people's obedience. However, the aim of the Deuteronomic movement was to prevent the State of Judah from suffering the same fate which had befallen the Northern Kingdom and they hoped that it was not too late to introduce a form of worship in Jerusalem which would be more truly expressive of the will of Yahweh. They attempted to provide a truly Yahwistic interpretation of the cult in a number of ways. Firstly, they 'demythologised' Jerusalem, Mount Zion, the temple, and the ark, and they laid special stress on Yahweh's transcendence, thereby countering the prevalent one-sided doctrine of immanence which reduced Yahweh to the level of a nature-spirit. (184) Secondly, they gave absolute priority to the Sinai-Horeb covenant as the fons et origo (185) of the nation's existence, stressing that it was a gift of grace. Thirdly, they insisted that Israel's obedience ought to be motivated at all times by gratitude and love to Yahweh. Fourthly, they demanded the centralization of sacrificial worship to a single sanctuary, thereby removing the menace of the Canaanite high-places and ensuring that the cult was controlled and the covenant tradition maintained. There can be little doubt that Jerusalem was the sanctuary selected by the authors of Deuteronomy, but they re-interpreted the Jerusalem sanctuary,

185. Cf. Clements, Abraham and David, p.82.
abolishing the ideas and symbolism which had been adopted from the Jebusites, and they offered a new and effective theology of the temple and its meaning. (186)

In their desire to emphasize the transcendence of Yahweh, the Deuteronomic writers laid special stress on Yahweh as the God of heaven to whom 'belong heaven and the heaven of heavens, the earth with all that is in it' (Deut. x:14; cf. iii:24; iv:39; xxvi:15).

Whereas the JE narrative of the theophany on Mount Sinai describes how Yahweh came down from his heavenly abode in order to converse with Moses on Sinai (cf. Exod. xix:9, 11, 20; xxxiv:5), the Deuteronomic account of these events makes no mention whatever of a descent by Yahweh from heaven to the mountain, but only of the appearance of fire and of a voice out of the midst of the fire. According to Deuteronomy, 'Yahweh spoke to you out of the midst of the fire; you heard the sound of words, but saw no form; there was only a voice' (Deut. iv:12; cf. iv:36; v:4, 22f., 26; ix:10).

The Canaanite-mythological aspect of the Jerusalem cult tradition which regarded the Jerusalem temple and Mount Zion as the symbols of Yahweh's cosmic abode, with all that this entailed, was abhorrent to the authors of Deuteronomy who had a completely different understanding of the nature of Yahweh's relationship to Israel. The Deuteronomic writers repudiated the notion that Mount Zion was 'the Mountain of Yahweh's inheritance', so that it provided Israel with a 'cultic' entitlement to dwell on Yahweh's territory, and they replaced this idea with the purely religious notion that Yahweh had given the land as Israel's inheritance through the events of history, by means

of a divinely guided conquest (187) (Deut. vii:1ff.; ix:1ff.). In place of the mythological notion that Yahweh's earthly abode was united to his heavenly abode, the Deuteronomic writers expressed the reality of Yahweh's presence within Israel by introducing the strictly theological concept of Yahweh's name which was set in the place which he had chosen. The name of Yahweh was made the vehicle of his presence and the means by which he made himself present to men, without ever leaving his dwelling-place in heaven.

The Deuteronomic understanding of the temple is brought out very clearly in the Deuteronomistic dedicatory prayer of Solomon (1 Kgs. viii:23-53). Although this prayer was composed at a time subsequent to the Josianic reformation, "its teaching is consonant with the whole Deuteronomic attitude to the cult, and its main features derive from this". (188) In this passage, the temple no longer symbolises the land, thereby providing a link with Yahweh through which his blessing might be poured out upon his land and people. Rather, the temple is a house of prayer and the link is a spiritual one, "made effective by the sincere cry of humble men, who turn to Yahweh". (189) Superior to the natural order, Yahweh is transcendent and his only abode is in heaven: "But will God indeed dwell on the earth? Behold, heaven and the highest heaven cannot contain thee; how much less this house which I have built!" (1 Kgs. viii:27; cf. 1 Kgs. viii:30, 32, 34, 36, 39, 43, 45, 49).

187. Cf. Clements, op. cit., p.94; idem, God's Chosen People, p.54.
188. Clements, God and Temple, p.90, n.3.
189. Ibid., p.92. The Deuteronomic writers make a distinction between yāḥāb, which they use of God's heavenly dwelling, and šākan, which they use for his presence on earth. Cf. G.E. Wright, Biblical Archaeology, p.145; Clements, op. cit., p.92, n.2.
The ark had been very significant as a symbol of Yahweh's presence but in Deuteronomy it is divested of any connection with Yahweh's presence and with his heavenly cherubim-throne, (190) and is described as a container (191) for keeping the tablets of the law, which constituted the ethical basis of the covenant relationship between Israel and Yahweh. Deut. xxxi:24-26 demands that the Deuteronomic elaboration of the law is to be placed beside the ark "that it may be there for a witness against you" (xxxii:26). Thus, in Deuteronomy, the ark has been stripped of its former mysterious significance as a symbol of Yahweh's presence on earth.

Dumermuth (192) argues that much of the Deuteronomic material originated at the sanctuary of Bethel and that the Deuteronomic name theology was originally applied to Bethel by the priests of this sanctuary who were opposed to Jerusalem but who wished to replace the bull-calf images with the spiritual concept of Yahweh's name. While much of Deuteronomy is certainly based on older northern traditions, there is no evidence that the priests of Bethel ever did reject the


191. G. Henton Davies, 'Ark of the Covenant', IDB, i, pp.222b-226a, argues that the idea of the ark as a container was simply a divergent cult tradition from its interpretation as a symbol of the divine presence. He maintains that it is wrong to suppose that the Deuteronomic writers were introducing a new, demythologized, interpretation for "such a view involves setting aside the tradition that the ark, whatever else it was, was a container from the beginning. Again, it is likely that to oppose the container and the presence conceptions is to make a distinction not made by Israel itself" (ibid., p.225a). However, as Clements, God and Temple, p.96, n.2, rightly says, while the ark very probably was a container of some kind, and may even have had such a function alongside its place as a symbol of Yahweh's presence, "it is hardly conceivable that the Deuteronomists could have ignored its interpretation as a symbol of Yahweh's presence unless they deliberately intended to do so."

bull-calves of their sanctuary and it is eminently more probable that the Deuteronomic name theology was formulated with Jerusalem in mind and with the intention of re-interpreting the significance of Mount Zion in such a way as to emphasize the transcendent nature of Yahweh. (193) The ancient claim of Jerusalem to be the chosen sanctuary was conceded by the authors of Deuteronomy, but only when Jerusalem, Mount Zion, the temple, and the ark had been 'demythologized' and the cult had been submitted to a new theological interpretation. (194) Jerusalem was the obvious, indeed the only sanctuary which the Deuteronomic writers could have chosen, for it would have been unrealistic to have attempted to abolish the Jerusalem cult and to establish a centralized worship of Yahweh elsewhere. (195) Moreover, in order to bring the nation back to a right understanding of the Yahwistic cult and of the covenant relationship, it was imperative to exercise control over the principal Judaean sanctuary. Thus, it was inevitable that the Deuteronomic authors sought to introduce their reforms at Jerusalem, and this resulted in the substitution of the mythological understanding of Israel's cult with a new theology of the temple and its meaning for Israel. In place of the magico-religious way of relationship to

193. Cf. Schreiner, Sion-Jerusalem, pp.159ff.; Clements, op.cit., p.95, n.1. As Clements, op.cit., p.97, rightly points out, the fact that some aspects of the Deuteronomic demands were not acceptable to the Jerusalem priests "does not preclude that the centralization demand was formulated with Jerusalem in mind." On Deuteronomy's connection with the north, C.F. Burney, The Book of Judges, London, 1918, p.xlvi, note, seems to have been one of the first to put forward the view that the traditions upon which Deuteronomy was based arose in the Northern Kingdom.


God, which thought in terms of a natural link between God and his world, which was made effective by the temple and its symbolism, Deuteronomy puts forward the ethical demands of the covenant as the basis of Israel's relationship to Yahweh and "all stress is laid upon the moral and spiritual factors which condition Israel's communion with Yahweh." (196)

It has been said that "the fact of Yahweh and his relationship to his people formed the two foci of the entire Deuteronomic idea of religion and worship". (197) The entire book of Deuteronomy is dominated by the concept of Israel as the holy people of God. The authors of the book used bāḥar of Yahweh's covenant relationship to Israel, which they set forth as a doctrine of election (cf. Deut. vii:6ff.). (198) Mendenhall argues that this distinctive election terminology to express Yahweh's action, by which he brought Israel into a covenant relationship to himself, may well have originated among a now unknown circle from whom the Deuteronomic party derived it. (199) However, Clements rightly points out that bāḥar "had already been given a strong religio-political colouring by its use in Jerusalem circles as an expression of Yahweh's will for Jerusalem and

199. Mendenhall, op.cit., p.79a.
the Davidic dynasty." (200) Clements puts forward the plausible suggestion that the Deuteronomic reformers deliberately adopted this verb in order to counterbalance the claims of the Jerusalem court and temple. By insisting that Yahweh had not chosen a state but, rather, a people, "they replaced a theo-political notion, by a purely religious one, as they did also in the case of the term 'inheritance'." (201) Antecedent to Yahweh's choice of the sanctuary, "and as the primary ground which made such a sanctuary necessary, he had chosen Israel to be his people". (202) The Deuteronomic writers retained the terminology of Yahweh's election of his sanctuary, but Mount Zion was never referred to by name, and the whole idea was greatly modified by the further definition that it was to be the place where Yahweh elected to set his name (203) (Deut. xii:5, 11, 21; xiv:23, 24; xvi:2, 6, 11; cf. 1 Kgs. viii:15-21).

In the light of this examination of Deuteronomy's treatment of Mount Zion and the Jerusalem temple, what conclusion may be drawn about the suggestion that the Deuteronomic demand for the centralization of the cult has been influenced by the traditional claim to primacy of the Jerusalem sanctuary and by the traditions centring on Mount Zion? A. Bentzen asserts that the major shrines inevitably made certain


201. Clements, God and Temple, p. 98, n. 2.

202. Ibid., p. 98.

203. Ibid., p. 94.
monopolistic claims (204) and Clements, who thinks that this suggestion is "assuredly correct", points out that "this was especially true of Jerusalem" (205) for this city "had always maintained a claim to absolute precedence over all other Yahweh sanctuaries on the grounds of its royal associations with David and his empire, and its place as the successor of the old amphictyonic order of worship." (206) However, while it may be granted that Jerusalem was the only Israelite sanctuary in the seventh century B.C. which possessed a status commensurate with the requirements of the Deuteronomic demand for cultic centralization, (207) Nicholson's assertion that "it is...scientific to explain the demand for centralization in Deuteronomy as having as its background the claims of the Jerusalem Temple to a position of primacy" (208) must be rejected. What, then, is the ultimate background to the Deuteronomic demand for cultic centralization?

Deuteronomy and the Covenant of Horeb-Sinai

The demand for cultic centralization must be in accord with the overall aim of the book of Deuteronomy. (209) Deuteronomy is obviously intensely concerned for a pure cult, untainted by the evil influences of Canaanite religion. However, its principal, overall, aim, is to bring the people back to a right understanding of Yahweh's

204. A. Bentzen, Die josianische Reform und ihre Voraussetzungen, Copenhagen, 1926, pp. 69ff., 83ff.
205. Clements, God and Temple, p. 92, n. 5.
206. Ibid., p. 96.
207. Ibid., p. 92.
covenant with Israel and to stress that the Horeb covenant was contingent upon the people's obedience, not unconditional and eternal. The description which Deuteronomy gives to its contents is derived from its relationship to the Horeb covenant. Deuteronomy describes its contents as תּוּרָה (Deut. iv:44; xvii:18f.; cf. xxxi:9) and in the book there is a close identification of legal statutes with religious instruction, the basis of which goes back to the Elohist tradition of the Sinai covenant, which asserted that the Decalogue (Exod. xx:2-17) and the Book of the Covenant constituted the legal requirements of Yahweh's covenant with Israel.\(^{(210)}\)

Deuteronomy provided Israel with an interpretation of the meaning and obligations of its religion. Every Israelite, including the king (Deut. xvii:14-20), must submit to the demands of the law. Whereas previously the Davidic king had been regarded as uniquely God's 'son' (cf. Pss. ii:7; lxxxix:26; 2 Sam. vii:14), in Deuteronomy the king is an ordinary Israelite, who has been selected by God and people for a special administrative task, and who is expected to set a good example by his dedication to upholding the covenant law. Moreover, in spite of the interval of time separating those who came out of Egypt from the people living in the land of Canaan in the seventh century, the day on which Moses delivered his speech to Israel, prior to its entry into the promised land "passes almost imperceptibly over into the day when his words were read and reaffirmed to generations of Israelites long afterwards".\(^{(211)}\) Deuteronomy, therefore, presupposes the unity of the people of Israel as the covenant people of God, and this unity extends across its history as well as throughout the variety of its individual members. The people of Israel are

\(^{(210)}\) Cf. Clements, God's Chosen People, p.17.

\(^{(211)}\) Ibid., p.31.
unique because they are a holy people in a sacred relationship to Yahweh (Deut. vii:6; cf. iv:20; xiv:2; xxvi:18f.). Israel is holy because of the link forged by Yahweh at Horeb and the laws contained in Deuteronomy serve to indicate the way in which the nation is to express its holiness, and to enable Israelites to live up to their privileged position. The Deuteronomic laws "point out the way by which Israel can become, in practical expression, what it already is in theological affirmation". (212)

Deuteronomy's assertion of Israel's holiness can be traced back to Exod. xix:5f. which is the earliest tradition of the Sinai covenant and which forms a basic foundation of the theology of Deuteronomy. (213)

The existence of Israel as Yahweh's holy people is a basic presupposition of everything which Deuteronomy has to say, and has certainly influenced the form of the book as an address to the nation. (214) The fact that the pre-Israelite inhabitants of the land are threatened with extermination while participation in their beliefs and practices is made a capital crime (Deut. vi:14; vii:1ff., 25f.; viii:19f.; xiii:1ff.) indicates the hatred of the Deuteronomic writers of false religious teachings and practices and their strong desire to eradicate any source which might undermine Israel's covenant relationship with God. Deuteronomy has been described accurately as

212. Ibid., p.33.
213. H. Wildberger, Jahwes Eigentumsvolk, ATANT, xxxvii, Zürich, 1960, separates Exod. xix:5f. from an original location on Sinai and maintains that it took its basic form at Gilgal. However, Clements, God's Chosen People, p.33, n.7, rightly points out that while it is uncertain to what extent Exod. xix:5f. records the original terms of the Sinai covenant, "there is no doubt that this section is pre-Deuteronomic, and forms a basic foundation of the Deuteronomic theology."
214. Cf. Clements, God's Chosen People, p.34.
"a last great attempt to call Israel to national reform", (215) and the basic conviction which underlies the book's appeal to repentance and renewal is that Israel is the holy covenant people of God.

Deuteronomy places all its emphasis upon the Horeb covenant and the book is even presented as a document containing additional laws given by Moses after the making of this covenant (Deut. iv:44ff.). Deut. v:6-21 contains the primary stipulations of the Horeb covenant, and the Deuteronomic code, as a later revelation given in the plains of Moab prior to entry into the promised land, is a document of the Horeb covenant. (216) Deut. v:1f. shows the concern of the Deuteronomic writers that each generation should stand before Moses to hear his word declaring them to be the people of Yahweh's covenant.

In Deuteronomy, then, the Horeb covenant is presented as central to Israel's life and the Deuteronomic writers stressed that the covenant and law on which Israel's very existence depended had been given by God on Horeb. The Deuteronomic writers regarded the patriarchal covenant as a covenant made with all three major patriarchs (Deut. i:8, 11; iv:31; vi:10; vii:12; viii:18; ix:5, 27; xi:9) and they related the patriarchal and Horeb covenants to each other in a scheme of promise and fulfilment in that they saw Yahweh's promise to the patriarchs as having been brought to fulfilment in Israel's becoming a nation and taking possession of the land of Canaan. The

215. Ibid., p.37.

216. The covenant made in the land of Moab referred to in Deut. xxix is a relatively late tradition which arose out of earlier Deuteronomic material. It did not form part of Urdeuteronomium. Cf. von Rad, Deuteronomy: A Commentary, pp.178ff.; Wright, 'Deuteronomy', IB, ii, pp.501ff.; Clements, God's Chosen People, p.44; idem, Abraham and David, p.65. A detailed examination of this Moab covenant has been carried out by N. Lohfink, 'Der Bundesschluss im Land Moab. Redaktionsgeschichtliches zu Dt. 28, 69-32, 47', BZ, vii, 1962, pp.32-56, who discerns a cultic ceremony underlying Deut. xxix and who connects this with the form of vassal treaties.
patriarchal covenant does not represent an independent covenant tradition but is, rather, "one which affirms the centrality of God's revelation through Moses." (217) The law of the king in Deut. xvii: 14-17 has a polemical intention and completely rejects the view that the Israelite king was uniquely God's 'son'. (218) The authors of Deuteronomy deliberately introduced this law to repudiate one of the foundation stones of the religio-political state of Judah and they purposefully avoided any reference to the covenant with Yahweh on which this royal Davidic ideology was based (219) because, for them, the belief that the Davidic dynasty was based on a separate, permanent, and unconditional covenant was an unacceptable interpretation of Yahweh's relationship with Israel. The Jerusalem cult tradition had regarded the election of Israel as mediated by, and dependent on, the joint election of the Davidic monarchy and the Jerusalem temple. However, the authors of Deuteronomy repudiated any notion that a permanent and unconditional bond linked Yahweh to Israel through the Davidic covenant and they emphatically declared that Israel's relationship to Yahweh, which was the very foundation of the nation's life, had been established in the Horeb covenant with its law. As Clements writes: "There was no other covenant which obviated this, or which lessened the stringency of the demand for obedience to the law's demands." (220) In Deuteronomy, grace and law have been

217. Clements, God's Chosen People, p.40.
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inextricably linked and "each pointed in its own way to the same central reality of a divine purpose involving the history and destiny of Israel". (221) Israel's election and its covenant status were not in doubt so that the law was a consequence, and not a condition, of this election. (222) It was the covenant bond which Yahweh established at Horeb which conferred upon Israel its status as a holy people and which provided guidelines as to how this holiness was to be expressed. The Davidic king and the Jerusalem sanctuary were the consequences, but not the guarantees of Israel's election. (223) Throughout Deuteronomy there is an urgent insistence that the fate of the nation depends on its attitude to this covenant law and this reflects the crisis situation of the seventh century B.C. in which the authors realized that Israel's very existence might be brought to an end.

The authors of Deuteronomy stressed that the true basis of worship is gratitude to Yahweh who brought Israel into existence, who bound the people to him by covenant, and who gave his people innumerable gifts. All of Israel's life, political and religious, is regarded as being dependent on what God has given to Israel. (224) The land is conceived as a sacred trust granted to Israel on condition that the nation will obey the laws of the Horeb covenant. Israel has no natural right to this land but she has been granted the land in fulfilment of Yahweh's promise to the patriarchs (Deut. ix:4f.). In place of the former magico-mythological association between the land of Canaan and the people of Israel, Deuteronomy stresses that

221. Ibid., p.49.
Israel's land is a God-given gift which is related to the moral demands of God, so that breach of the covenant will result in expulsion from the land.

The law is another major gift of Yahweh to Israel and its purpose is not to bind the nation to a series of arbitrary restrictions but, rather, "to reveal to men the nature and reality of Yahweh's grace, and to show the quality of life which this demands" (225) (cf. Deut. v:32f.). The law is intended to guide Israel to the fullest enjoyment of life and, while not a counterpart to divine grace, it is "a very important expression of it". (226) Deuteronomy avoids the assertion that Yahweh's covenant with Israel is 'for ever'. (227) The book emphasizes that Yahweh's covenant has no unconditional guarantees, but is morally conditioned by those demands which God has laid upon his people. The Deuteronomic writers "regarded the law as facing Israel with a decision of life or death" (228) (cf. Deut. xi:26ff.; xxviii:1ff.; xxx:15).

The religious institutions and ministers of the nation were also regarded by the Deuteronomic writers as Yahweh's gifts. The prophets had been given by Yahweh to confirm the truth and authority of the Mosaic revelation by maintaining a continuing source of divine tóra-h through which

225. Ibid., p.59.
226. Ibid.
227. In Deut. iv:40 the phrase 'for ever' is used of Israel's possession of the land, but this passage is an exilic/post-exilic addition. Later disciples of the authors of Urdeuteronomium who sought a more positive assurance of God's destiny for Israel during the exile were responsible for Deut. iv:27-40. The promise of land is conditioned in xii:28. Cf. Clements, op.cit., p.62 and n.16.
Israel would know the will of God (Deut. xviii:18). The Levites had been given by Yahweh to serve at the altar and as well as being officers of the cult, they may also have had a teaching role. (229) In Deuteronomy, the knowledge that Yahweh the God of Israel is unique dominates the entire character of Israel's worship (230) (Deut. vi:4f.). Israel is a people uniquely chosen by Yahweh and hence he is entitled to the undivided loyalty of his people's devotion (Deut. x:14, 15, 17). Although the abstract notion that only one God exists is not made in the book (cf. Deut. iv:19), Deuteronomy makes the strongest theological assertion of the incomparable nature of Yahweh and demands that all Israelites should yield a total allegiance to him alone. The Deuteronomic writers attributed Israel's very existence as a nation to its religious relationship to Yahweh so that to have worshipped any other god, or to have identified the manifestation of any other god with that of Yahweh, "would have been tantamount to selling its birthright among the nations of the world." (231) In the seventh century B.C. Israel was faced with the searching question of whether it could survive as a nation if its religious relationship to Yahweh were brought to an end.

It is in the light of this crisis situation of the seventh century that the demand for cultic centralization and formulation of the name theology must be understood. By restricting sacrificial worship to the Jerusalem sanctuary, the authors of Deuteronomy obviously sought to

229. That the Levites were teachers and preachers as well as officers of the cult is, of course, particularly stressed by von Rad, Studies in Deuteronomy, pp.13ff., 66ff. and Clements, God's Chosen People, p.68.
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exercise the closest vigilance over the operation of the cult and to ensure its orthodoxy. However, this was only part of the reason for demanding cultic centralization. The most pressing urgency on the minds of the Deuteronomic writers was the very survival of their people. They formulated Deuteronomy at a time of political and religious disintegration "when Israel's existence as Yahweh's covenant people was threatened with nothing less than extinction". Here is to be found the principal motive for the demand for cultic centralization. Intensely aware of the threat of the impending disruption of the nation's life, the Deuteronomic writers not only made an urgent appeal to remember the nation's origin but insisted that the people should identify themselves again as the people of the Sinai covenant, the elect people of Yahweh. The people of Judah had lost their identity and Deuteronomy attempted to ensure that Israel should identify itself once again as the people of Yahweh by its strong insistence that the moral and spiritual demands of the Sinai covenant be re-acknowledged. W. Schottroff points out that twelve of the sixteen occurrences of the verb 'to remember' in Deuteronomy refer to the recalling of past events, particularly the deliverance from the slavery of Egypt. The authors of the book


interpreted the Feast of Unleavened Bread in such a way that it became an act of remembrance for the deliverance from Egypt (Deut. xvi:2f.). The command that Israel should remember its own slavery in Egypt and the fact of Yahweh's deliverance have been inserted into the motive clauses which introduce certain of the laws (Deut. xv:15; xvi:12; xxiv:18, 22). Deuteronomy's insistence that Israel should remember was not simply "to actualize the past for a generation removed in time from those former events in order that they themselves can have an intimate encounter with the great acts of redemption." (236) In the crisis situation in which Israel found itself in the seventh century the insistence of Deuteronomy was that Israel regain its identity and become again the people of the Sinai covenant.

Although the conditions in which Israel lived in the seventh century were completely different from the conditions of those who experienced the Sinai event, in terms of culture, economy, and politics, yet the Deuteronomic writers identified seventh century Israel with the ancient people that stood once at Sinai. (237) The fact that Yahweh had chosen Israel and bound this people in covenant to himself at Sinai is what gives to this nation an extraordinary solidarity which extends across history and throughout the variety of its members, even binding together the succession of generations. The people of seventh century Israel and the people who had participated in the making of the Sinai covenant are one and the same: "Yahweh

236. Childs, op.cit., p.56.

237. As von Rad, Old Testament Theology, I, Edinburgh, 1968, p.231, writes: "Deuteronomy wipes out some seven centuries squandered in disobedience, and places Israel once again in the wilderness, with Moses speaking to her...Nowhere else does the impassioned endeavour to make the commandments given at Sinai relevant for its own time find such a clear expression as in the endless variations played upon the word 'today', which the preacher drums into the ears of his audience. This 'today' means both the time of Moses and that of Deuteronomy taken together".
our God made a covenant with us in Horeb. Not with our fathers did Yahweh make this covenant, but with us, who are all of us here alive this day" (Deut. v:2f.; cf. iv:8, 20, 38ff.). Seventh century Israel is the people of the covenant of Sinai. This Israel is one people; Yahweh is one God; and when Israel originated as the people of Yahweh's covenant, Mount Sinai was the religious centre where the people came to worship their God. Thus, the Deuteronomic demand for a completely unified cult at one single sanctuary must be interpreted in the light of the Deuteronomic theology with its insistence upon one God, one nation, and one cult, all defined and interpreted through one tôráh, which Deuteronomy claims to be. (238) The authors of Deuteronomy accepted Jerusalem as the site of the sole legitimate sanctuary for the worship of Yahweh, but "such acceptance is set within the context of an overall focus on the Mosaic covenant made on Mount Horeb." (239)

Hilkiah described Deuteronomy as 'the book of tôráh' (2 Kgs. xxii:8) but its description later as 'the covenant document' (2 Kgs. xxiii:2) fits Deuteronomy perfectly for it "shows that it is neither a law code in the traditional sense, nor a book of priestly instruction, but a document which sets out the terms and conditions of the covenant between Yahweh and Israel which was made on Mount Horeb." (240) The function of Deuteronomy was to provide a continuing standard of interpretation for the cult which it authorized, and the covenant which it recalled. (241) Deut. xxxi:24-26, an appendix to the original work,

238. Cf. Clements; op.cit., p.89.
239. Clements, op.cit., p.91.
hints at this function of the book as a standard of faith for Israel, when it demands that Deuteronomy should be placed beside the ark containing the tablets of law. Thus, "the central object of the cult and the törän which interprets that cult belong together". (242) Deuteronomy provided Israel with a unified and unifying religious tradition and the unique authority of the book lay in its historical connection with Moses and the Sinai covenant basis of Israel. The authors of the book claimed to present to Israel a unique statement of the intention and requirements of Yahweh which were derived from Moses and the covenant which was mediated by him. From the very earliest period of the Sinai covenant's existence, it was accepted that its stipulations were written down on tablets and preserved as a witness to future generations (243) and, while there is uncertainty about whether the actual laws in Exod. xx:2-17 represent the original demands made upon Israel on Mount Sinai, strong arguments have been made for the Mosaic origin of this Decalogue in its original terse form. (244) Leaving aside the difficulty of determining precisely its nature and contents, the fact remains that, from its inception, there was a basic code of law contained in the institution of the covenant by Yahweh, and this law expressed the obligations which the covenant relationship imposed on each Israelite. Deuteronomy gives the Decalogue a primary significance (Deut. v:6-21) and its contents

242. Ibid.


were designed as a supplement to the original covenant law in order to expand this law to cover the essential bases of Israel's political and religious life.

Thus, the relationship of Deuteronomy to the Horeb covenant which it was designed to serve is "central to an understanding of Deuteronomy, both in its form and the authority which it claimed to possess". (245) Deuteronomy declared to Israel the will of Yahweh expressed in the Horeb covenant and just as "the prototype of Deuteronomy as a covenant document is to be found in the Decalogue, written on two tablets, and preserved in the ark", (246) so also the prototype of the Deuteronomic demand for cultic centralization was Mount Sinai. Just as originally Israel's communion with God was mediated through the central holy place of Sinai, so now the memory of Sinai was linked to Jerusalem in such a way that the Jerusalem sanctuary took over the former rôle of Sinai as the cultic centre of the covenant between Yahweh and Israel. In order to ensure that Israel would not again lapse into a false magico-mythological understanding of Mount Zion with its belief in the presence of God in the Jerusalem temple, the Deuteronomic writers endeavoured by interpretation and exhortation to elicit the true theological significance belonging to the cult, to provide a markedly new theology of the temple and its meaning for Israel, and to set the whole cult within the context of personal communion with God.

The authority of Deuteronomy as a canonical document was dependent on the authority attaching to the Horeb covenant. A
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The central holy place of Sinai, as the central holy place of Israel, has been the focal point of Yahweh's revelation. This sacred place served as Yahweh's altar during the formative period of the people's existence, when Israel worshipped Yahweh at the central holy place of Sinai and this is the background against which the Deuteronomic demand for cultic centralization is to be understood. Israel's communion with God was originally mediated through the central holy place of Sinai, which was the cohesive force and rallying point of the covenant people.


The central holy place of Sinai, which was the site of the inaugural consecration of Israel as the covenant people of Yahweh (249) and the mountain of God par excellence, (250) was the prototype of the Deuteronomic demand for cultic centralization, and, in Deuteronomy, Jerusalem has become the new Sinai, the heir of the original mountain of God. Jerusalem had tended to obliterate the memory of Sinai (251) and the true nature of Israel's covenant relationship with Yahweh.

The Deuteronomic writers, recognizing the pre-eminence of the Jerusalem sanctuary in Judah and being fully aware that Israel's worship of Yahweh had always been expressed by the offering of sacrificial gifts, accepted Jerusalem as the site of the sole legitimate sanctuary for the sacrificial worship of Yahweh. However, they reinterpreted the Jerusalem sanctuary by abolishing the ideas and symbolism which had derived from the Jebusites, and, by offering a new and effective theology of the temple and its meaning, they effectively repudiated the mythological understanding of Israel's cult which had developed at Jerusalem and which had obscured the fact that Israel's relationship to Yahweh was "an ethical and spiritual


250. Cf. E. Nielsen, 'The Site of the Biblical Mount Sinai', JPOS, vii, 1927, pp.187-208, ref. p.203. Cf., too, H. Wheeler Robinson, Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament, Oxford, 1967, p.41: "At Sinai occurred the cardinal theophany which set the pattern for so many others, experienced or imagined. Sinai, wherever it lay, was, until Zion usurped its place, the mountain of God, par excellence, the mountain of which Yahweh could say, 'I brought you unto myself.'"

251. This is also suggested, tentatively, by de Vaux, The Early History of Israel: From the Beginnings to the Exodus and Covenant of Sinai, (translated by David Smith from the original French edition, Histoire Ancienne d'Israel, Paris, 1971), London, 1978, p.427, in his attempt to explain "why the Deuteronomist seems to have avoided the word 'Sinai'."

Cf. Nicholson, Deuteronomy and Tradition, p.93, who rightly points out that in Jerusalem the Davidic covenant traditions "overlaid to a large extent the older Sinai traditions" and "eventually took precedence over the older Sinai tradition and developed it in such a manner as to alter its normative form and reduce it to a secondary position in the Jerusalem cult." With the appearance of Deuteronomy and the implementation of its demands, "the older Sinai covenant tradition which had been overshadowed by the Davidic covenant tradition in the Jerusalem cult rose once again to a position of priority" (ibid., p.123).
relationship grounded in a covenant of grace". (252) As well as demythologizing Mount Zion, Jerusalem, and the temple, and emphatically placing the king under an obligation to maintain the Mosaic covenant by which alone Israel must live, the Deuteronomic writers fully integrated Jerusalem into the Sinai covenant tradition by, in effect, making Jerusalem the new Sinai. It was the authors of Deuteronomy who made Jerusalem the "repository of the traditions of the past" (253) so that this holy place became the new Sinai and, thereby, a principal unitary factor in the life of the people of the Sinai covenant.

It was at Kadesh, a sanctuary in the desert region south of Palestine, that the proto-Israelite community lived together as the covenant people of Yahweh, (254) but it was at Mount Sinai that these people who had been delivered out of Egypt experienced a theophany of Yahweh and encountered his sovereign will. (255)

---


253. De Vaux, 'Jerusalem and the Prophets', Interpreting the Prophetic Tradition, pp.275-300, ref. p.278, who, however, argues that Jerusalem became the repository of the traditions of the past, and, hence, the new Sinai, with David's introduction of the ark into the city: "In receiving the ark Jerusalem had become the heir of all this past" (ibid., p.281). The thesis presented in the present study, however, is that Jerusalem only became the true heir of Sinai when it was re-interpreted by the authors of Deuteronomy.


255. The question of the relationship between Kadesh and Sinai, in both the literature and the history of tribal movements in the area, is too complex to embark on here. Moreover, the precise location of Kadesh and Mount Sinai is not really of great importance in this context. On Kadesh and Kadesh-Barnea, see H. Bar-Deroma, 'Kadesh-Barnea', PEQ, xcvi, 1964, pp.101-134 (see, too, the literature cited by Weippert, The Settlement of the Israelite Tribes in Palestine, p.31, n.86). As for Sinai: traditionally, the mountain has been identified with Jebel Musa in the south of the Sinai. Against this it has been argued that this would have taken the Israelites perilously close to the route used by the Egyptians to reach their
copper and turquoise mines in that area. Another view is that the mountain was situated in the northern part of the peninsula, fairly close to the oasis of Kadesh. Against this, it is stated that Sinai and Kadesh were far apart (e.g. Deut. i:2). The account of the happenings at the mountain has suggested, to some, volcanic activity and H. Gressmann, Mose und seine Zeit, FRLANT, xviii, Göttingen, 1913, pp.29, 112f., 192f., 416ff., (followed by W.J. Pythian-Adams, The Call of Israel, Oxford, 1934, pp.141ff., 166ff.) has attempted to locate Mount Sinai in a volcanic region in north-west Arabia, on the eastern side of the Gulf of Akaba. Against this is the fact that the distance between this region and Egypt or Kadesh is too great to make it the likely destination of slaves who were escaping from Egypt. Although this volcanic region was inhabited later by the Midianites, it is perfectly feasible that Israel could have encountered this nomadic people far removed from that district (cf. Clements, God and Temple, p.19, n.2.). While the traditional location seems to be more satisfactory than alternative suggestions, "the Old Testament records do not provide clear evidence on the subject" (G.W. Anderson, The History and Religion of Israel, p.24; cf. Noth, Exodus, p.160). C. Westphal, Jahwes Wohnstätten, BZAW, xv, Giessen, 1908, pp.8, 11, maintains that Yahweh was a storm god and that the designation 'mountain of God' (Exod. iii:1(E)), implies that the mountain was Yahweh's dwelling-place, where he could normally be expected to appear. Alt, 'The God of the Fathers', Essays on Old Testament History and Religion, pp.1-77, ref. p.7, is of the opinion that Mount Sinai was an ancient holy place on which Yahweh had been venerated as the local numen. Cf., also, J. Gray, 'The Desert Sojourn of the Hebrews and the Sinai-Horeb Tradition', VT, iv, 1954, pp.148-154.

Noth, Exodus, pp.159f., maintains that the E stratum of Exodus xix witnesses to the belief that Yahweh dwelt permanently on the mountain. Cf., too, H. Wildberger, Jahwes Eigentumsvolk, ATANT, xxxvii, Zürich, 1960, p.10. There is no certainty about whether the name Yahweh already belonged to the god of Mount Sinai, or whether it was previously used by the Hebrews either as a name or as an invocation. Cf. Clements, op.cit., p.19, n.2. J. Barr, 'The Problem of Israelite Monotheism', TGUOS, xvii, 1959, pp.52-62, ref. p.61, maintains that 'Yahweh' was used in pre-Israelite times, not as a name, but as a phrase which expressed the divine presence and action. On the name Yahweh, see, also, W.F. Albright, From the Stone Age to Christianity: Monotheism and the Historical Process, 2 New York, 1957, pp.15f., 259ff.; D.N. Freedman, 'The Name of the God of Moses', JBL, lxxix, 1960, pp.151-156. On the occurrence of the names 13-ra-11/13-ra-Ya in the Ebla tablets, see G. Pettinato, 'The Royal Archives of Tell Mardikh-Ebla', BA, xxxix, No. 2, May, 1976, pp.44-52, ref. pp.48ff. M. Weippert, The Settlement of the Israelite Tribes in Palestine, p.105, thinks that at the end of the second millennium and the beginning of the first, Yahweh was 'not a 'God of the way' but a 'God of the place' who had his dwelling and also a cultic centre, or cultic centres, in the mountains of Seir, in Edom, in Sinai." On the so-called 'Kenite hypothesis', see the literature cited by Weippert, op.cit., pp.105f. n.14. As de Vaux, The Early History of
was at Sinai that Israel originated as the covenant people of Yahweh. (256)

The Israelites were certainly not the first to use the name Yahweh and probably Mount Sinai had for long been venerated as a place where a god would manifest himself. However, neither of these facts are of any consequence for this study. What is of central significance

255. (contd.) Israel, p. 438, rightly points out, "we shall never know what really happened at Sinai" and "we shall also never know where Sinai was situated" (ibid., p.439). However, the important thing in this context is that "Israel traced the origin of its distinctive religion, cult as well as torah, to the period which immediately followed the Exodus" (Welch, Prophet and Priest in Old Israel, London, 1936, p.41) and it was undoubtedly at Sinai that the covenant people of Yahweh came into existence.

256. As regards the question why the Deuteronomic writers seem to have avoided the word 'Sinai', de Vaux, The Early History of Israel, p.427, suggests that either the memory of Sinai was obliterated at Jerusalem, or possibly the name Sinai gave rise to unfortunate associations with the name of the Assyro-Babylonian god Sin. The first conjecture is most improbable. Certainly, the Jerusalem cult came to obscure the true nature of the covenant relationship with Yahweh and, in this sense, obliterated the memory of Sinai, but it is highly unlikely that the authors of Deuteronomy would have avoided using the name Sinai for this reason. On the contrary, the whole emphasis in their work is on identifying seventh century Judah with the covenant people whose relationship with Yahweh was established on this mountain of God. De Vaux's second suggestion is more plausible. Could another reason for the Deuteronomic preference for the name 'Horeb' be a further attempt by the writers to demythologize the Jerusalem cult tradition? If 'Horeb' were derived from hárēb, 'to be waste, desolate' (cf. BDB, p.352a), then the Deuteronomic writers may have wished to emphasize that the elaborate cult of Jerusalem was both unnecessary and undesirable, since, at the time of its inauguration as the covenant people of Yahweh, Israel's worship was conducted in a straightforward manner, uncluttered by elaborate rites and ceremonies. On this subject, see also, Clifford, The Cosmic Mountain in Canaan and the Old Testament, pp.107-120 (Sinai), 121f. (Horeb). Clifford, however, comes to a different conclusion from the one arrived at in the present study for he maintains that "Horeb...is not simply the Elohist and Deuteronomic counterparts of Sinai in the Yahwist and Priestly traditions. It does not appear to be a mountain at all. It is rather an indefinite location which has gathered certain traditions of the wandering to itself" (ibid., p.122).
is the fact that it was at Mount Sinai that Israel was inaugurated as the covenant people of Yahweh, the God, who, out of sheer grace, had delivered them out of bondage and called them to be his people. (257)

Yahweh, the God of the exodus and the Mosaic covenant, was the God of Mount Sinai.

It is impossible to determine precisely what transpired on Mount Sinai. Yahweh's theophany became a central act of the covenant renewal celebration. When the founding of the covenant was recalled by ensuing generations of Israelites, it was always associated with a manifestation of Yahweh as the God of Sinai. In the Israelite cultic festival, the recalling and re-affirming of the making of the covenant on Sinai included a re-enactment of Yahweh's theophany when Yahweh would appear again in Israel's midst as he had appeared to their ancestors when the covenant was first established. (258) For this reason, it is impossible to reconstruct accurately the events that took place at Sinai, because the later traditions and cult-practices


258. Cf. Clements, op.cit., p.20. S. Mowinckel, Le Décalogué, Paris, 1927, pp.114ff., maintains that the entire pericope dealing with Sinai reflects the cultic background of the autumnal Enthronement Festival as it was celebrated in Jerusalem. Von Rad, 'The Form-Critical Problem of the Hexateuch', The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays, pp.13ff., argues that the 'Sinai tradition' was celebrated at the Feast of Tabernacles at Shechem. Both Beyerlin, Origins and History of the Oldest Sinaitic Traditions, and Newman, The People of the Covenant, stress that the account of what transpired at Sinai has undergone a protracted period of preservation in the cult before being written down in its present form. See, too, K.H. Walkenhorst, Der Sinai im liturgischen Verständnis der Deuteronomistischen und Priesterlichen Traditions, BBB, Band xxxiii, 1969, who summarizes the views of Wellhausen, Mowinckel, von Rad, Noth, Dummermuth, Koch, and Kraus on the liturgical understanding of the Sinai tradition (pp.7-32), carries out a literary analysis of the Priestly tradition of the institution of the cult at Sinai, with a detailed investigation of Exod. xxxix and Lev. viiif. (pp.33-115), and then briefly compares the liturgical understanding of Sinai in the older Priestly tradition with that of the Deuteronomic and Deuteronomistic writers (pp.116-170). Walkenhorst points out that in Deuteronomy, the Sinai event is regarded, as in the Priestly tradition, as constitutive for the cult. In the introductory paraenesis the memory of the Sinai event serves to create the right disposition within the listener for the reading of the law. To the listener of the law, the Sinai event becomes present, here and now, and as he listens to 'the word from the fire', the Sinai event becomes present.
of Israel have influenced the record of the event. (259) Exod. xix: 2b-xxiv:14, which is the oldest Sinai-narrative, "is the literary deposit of a cultic tradition which originally formed the festival legend of Israel's covenant renewal celebration". (260) At first, this covenant ceremony, the central act of which was Yahweh's self-revelation to Israel, was celebrated in the vicinity of Kadesh, and regular pilgrimages to Sinai may have been made before the migration to Canaan. In the sanctuaries of Canaan, the idea of Yahweh's presence with Israel was both cultic in its expression as well as being grounded in a unique historical event when the covenant was inaugurated. Yahweh's presence with Israel was an inseparable feature of the covenant faith. As Clements writes: "Yahweh was the God of Mount Sinai, but he was also the Holy One in the midst of Israel". (261)

Was Yahweh thought to dwell permanently on Mount Sinai? Originally, Mount Sinai seems to have been regarded as Yahweh's abode, "but this belief was never allowed to obscure his transcendent nature". (262)

Evidence of the close relation which was believed to exist between Yahweh and Mount Sinai is provided by a number of early poetic


261. Ibid., p.22.

262. Clements, God and Temple, p.136. On the basis of his research on Num. xxxiii:3-49, Noth, 'Der Wallfahrtsweg zum Sinai', PJB, xxxvi, 1940, pp.5-28, ref. p.8, points out that "Sinai not only was the fixed point of a worthy tradition out of olden days but also for the later period, signifying something concrete for its belief and life; and that it could only do if it did not exist merely as a holy mountain but if it also remained for the Israelite tribes
descriptions of Yahweh's self-revelation to Israel in Canaan, which, with one exception, may be assigned to the tenth century B.C., or even earlier. (263) The first of these passages is contained in the Blessing of Moses (Deut. xxxiii):

"Yahweh came from Sinai, and dawned from Seir upon us; (264) He shone forth from Mount Paran, He came from the ten thousands of holy ones, (265) with flaming fire at his right hand." (266) (Deut. xxxiii:2).

Verse 26 describes how Yahweh was thought to come:

"There is none like God, O Jeshurun, who rides through the heavens to your help, and in his majesty through the skies."'

The second passage, which may be assigned to the latter half of the eleventh century B.C., is the Song of Deborah (Judg. v). Here, too, Yahweh is the One from Sinai:

"Yahweh, when thou didst go forth from Seir, when thou didst march from the region of Edom, the earth trembled, and the heavens poured, yea, the clouds poured water. The mountains quaked before Yahweh, Lord of Sinai, Before Yahweh, the God of Israel." (Judg. v:4f.)

what it probably had been for ages for the wandering tribes of the time of Moses, namely a place of pilgrimage to which the crowds of pious pilgrims constantly pressed at given opportunities". At the same time, however, Walkenhorst, op.cit., pp.3f., rightly cautions that there is no evidence of a pilgrim's sanctuary of Israel in existence on Sinai in the period of the monarchy and there are no biblical sources which teach that Yahweh lives, static, on the holy mountain. Exod. xxix:45; xxxiii:15ff.; xl:34; Lev.ix:23; 1 Kgs viii:10; and Ezek.x:18ff., make it clear that Israel left nothing behind on Sinai and these passages also represent the dwelling of Yahweh as very dynamic.

264. Reading lamū instead of lāmō with LXX, Syr., and Vulg.
265. Possibly 'from Meribath Kadesh'. Cf. LXX.
266. Reading ḫēḏelqet instead of ḫēḏelqâ lāmō.
267. The interpretation of zeh sinay is accepted by W.F. Albright, 'The Names Shaddai and Abram'. JBL, 1iv, 1935, pp.173-204.
The third passage, Ps. 1xviii:8f. (EVV. 7f.), which was used in the Jerusalem temple (see vv. 16f., 30 (EVV. 15f., 29)), is probably to be assigned to the tenth century B.C. Here Yahweh, the 'rider of the heavens' (v.34 (EVV. 33)), comes riding through the deserts as the leader of his people. In this context, vv. 8-11 (EVV.7-10) are most significant:

'O God, when thou didst go forth before thy people, when thou didst march through the wilderness, Selah
the earth quaked, the heavens poured down rain, before Yahweh, Lord of Sinai;
before Yahweh, the God of Israel.
Rain in abundance, O God, thou didst shed abroad;
thou didst restore thy heritage as it languished;
thy flock found a dwelling in it;
in thy goodness, O God, thou didst provide for the needy.'

Verse 18 (EVV.17) explicitly states that Yahweh comes to Jerusalem from his home on Mount Sinai: 'Yahweh came from Sinai into the holy place.' (268)

Finally, Hab. iii:3f., (269) which is probably to be assigned to the late seventh century B.C., but which contains features which derive from very early ideas of Yahweh's epiphany, also describes Yahweh's arrival from what seems to be his home in the south:

---

ref. p.204; idem, 'The Song of Deborah in the Light of Archaeology', BASOR, 1xiii, 1936, p.30; and Clements, God and Temple, p.24. This interpretation is rejected by H. Birkeland, 'Hebrew Zāê and Arabic  Dön', St.Th, ii, 1948, pp.201f., who argues that zeh cannot bear this meaning in Hebrew. However, see J.M. Allegro, 'Uses of the Semitic Demonstrative Element Z in Hebrew', VT, v, 1955, pp.309-312, who dismisses Birkeland's claim.

268. Reading bā³ missinay instead of bām sinay.

269. Albright, 'The Psalm of Habakkuk', Studies in Old Testament Prophecy, ed. H.H. Rowley, Edinburgh, 1950, pp.1-18, and Mowinckel, 'Zum Psalm des Habakuk', Thz,ix, 1953, pp.1-23, defend the place of the psalm in Habakkuk's prophecy. Albright maintains that the psalm is composed of four separate units of very much earlier origin which Habakkuk re-arranged and reworded. Mowinckel dates the psalm between 625-601 B.C. and argues that Habakkuk was a temple prophet. Clements, God and Temple, p.25 and n.1, agrees with Mowinckel that the psalm is to be assigned as a unit to the late seventh century B.C., but thinks that it ought probably to be detached from the prophecy of Habakkuk as a separate composition, since it is not included in the Qumran commentary on Habakkuk.
'God came from Teman, and the Holy One from Mount Paran. His glory covered the heavens, and the earth was full of his praise. Selah. His brightness (270) was like the light, rays flashed from his hand; and there he veiled his power. (271)'}

In Judg. v, Ps. lxviii, Hab. iii, and perhaps also in Deut. xxxiii, the description of Yahweh's theophany suggests storm phenomena, and Clements may be correct in thinking that the belief in some relationship between Yahweh and the southern thunderstorms may have helped to form the tradition. (272) At any rate, all of these passages, apart from Hab. iii, where ancient traditions have been incorporated into a later composition, antedate the earliest connected histories dealing with the founding of the covenant on Mount Sinai. They all reflect a belief that as Yahweh had appeared to their ancestors on the sacred mountain, so, in their time of need, he came to them in their worship, for his presence was not bound to Mount Sinai. (273) In the course of time, as the inauguration of the covenant of Mount Sinai was regularly relived and renewed during the covenant festival, the language and ideas used to describe the theophany began to assume a fairly fixed form. However, it is clear that, from a very early period, Yahweh was regarded not as confined to Mount Sinai but, rather, as present in the united worship of his people, and at each celebration of the covenant festival it was proclaimed that 'Yahweh came from Sinai

270. Reading wenogho with LXX and Syr.

271. Clements, op.cit., p.25, and n.3, reads wesam for wesam and translates: 'And he made his power a covering'.


into the holy place' (Ps. lxviii:18 (EVV.17)). (274) While there may have been some who felt that Yahweh was bound to Sinai, the belief was very strong in early Israel that Yahweh had promised to come to his people in this way, as is evidenced very clearly by Exod. xxxiii:12-17 (J):

'Moses said to Yahweh, 'See, thou sayest to me, 'Bring up this people'; but thou hast not let me know whom thou wilt send with me. Yet thou hast said, 'I know you by name, and you have also found favour in my sight'. Now therefore, I pray thee, if I have found favour in thy sight, show me now thy ways, that I may know thee and find favour in thy sight. Consider too that this nation is thy people.' And he said, 'My presence will go with you, and I will give you rest'. And he said to him, 'If thy presence will not go with me, do not carry us up from here. For how shall it be known that I have found favour in thy sight, I and thy people? Is it not in thy going with us, so that we are distinct, I and thy people, from all other people that are upon the face of the earth?'

Then Yahweh said to Moses, 'This very thing that you have spoken I will do; for you have found favour in my sight, and I know you by name'.

It was in the cult and worship of Israel that this promise was fulfilled and given outward expression.

Prior to the appearance of Deuteronomy, Mount Zion had become the new Zaphon, (275) and the belief had become prevalent in Israel that Yahweh's presence in the temple was static and relatively permanent.

In the present study it has been argued that the Deuteronomic writers re-interpreted Jerusalem in such a way that Jerusalem became the new Sinai. How, then, did these reformers conceive the nature and mode of God's presence on earth and what was their attitude toward the...

sanctuary which in Israel, and throughout the ancient Near East, was pre-eminently the point of contact between the divine and human worlds? Yahweh had not only called Israel to be his people, and bound them to himself by a covenant, but he had also promised to dwell among them, so that his presence with his people would distinguish Israel from all other nations (Exod. xxxiii:16; cf. Ezek. xxxvii:28). Deut. iv:7 affirms the immediacy of Yahweh's presence as the principal constitutive factor in Israel's uniqueness as a people: 'For what great nation is there that has a god so near to it as Yahweh our God is to us, whenever we call upon him?' Throughout Deuteronomy 'proper', however, there is a strenuous effort to protect the transcendence of Yahweh and "the fullness of his being is removed from the terrestrial realm and enthroned in the heights of heaven."(276) Significantly, the theophanous fire at Sinai no longer conceals Yahweh's descent upon the mountain, but simply functions as the awesome accompaniment of his words which he speaks to Israel from heaven (Deut. iv:11f., 36). (277) By the introduction of their name theology, the Deuteronomic writers were able to maintain their stress on Yahweh's transcendence and freedom without having to preclude the possibility of Israel serving their God through the cult and there seeking his favour. The $\text{שֵׁם}$ theologumenon and the demand for cultic centralization are, therefore, integrally bound together.

Name theology, as Wright correctly points out, was "a clear rejection of the whole attempt to localize God or to consider his


temple as a dwelling". (278) By asserting that the Jerusalem temple was the place where Yahweh's name, a dynamistic counterpart of the divine being, was set, the Deuteronomic writers were able to affirm the absoluteness of Yahweh's transcendent majesty, while claiming at the same time the certainty of his nearness and his accessibility to those who sought him in worship. The Deuteronomic theologumenon of the name of Yahweh is a theological corrective. As von Rad writes: "It is not Jahweh himself who is present at the shrine, but only his name as the guarantee of his will to save....Deuteronomy is replacing the old crude idea of Jahweh's presence and dwelling at the shrine by a theologically sublimated idea." (279) The Deuteronomic name theology was formulated to assure Yahweh's accessibility through the cult while avoiding any suggestion that he was localized there.

McBride sets the Deuteronomic name theology into its ancient Near Eastern context and, having surveyed the relevant comparative evidence available from ancient Near Eastern sources, he concludes that "this material...reveals beyond any doubt that the Deuteronomic šām theologumenon, though distinctive, was both in origin and implication no less 'paganizing' than the view of divine immanence with which it is most often contrasted." (280) McBride maintains that "biblical Name Theology appears to be an example of what Albright has called '...a paganizing prototype of Philonic hypostatic speculation'." (281)


281. Ibid., citing Albright, From the Stone Age to Christianity, 2 p.373.
However, while it is both worthwhile and interesting to examine the relevant ancient Near Eastern data, and while, too, it is perfectly feasible that the Deuteronomic writers adopted and refined an idea widely attested throughout the ancient Near East in order to make a sophisticated theological point, there is really no need to trace the Deuteronomic name theology further back than Exod. iii, a passage of decisive import, in which Yahweh discloses his divine name. It was at Mount Sinai that Israel became the covenant people of Yahweh and it was at Sinai that the God who had delivered this people from bondage revealed to them his identity. Just as the purpose of Exod. iii "is to establish the identity — or, to be more exact, the historical continuity — of experiences of the divine which exists between the faith of the patriarchs and the God who manifests himself to Moses", so, in Deuteronomy, the setting of Yahweh's name on Jerusalem fully integrates this sanctuary into the Sinai covenant tradition while, at the same time, expressing the reality of Yahweh's dynamic presence within Israel without throwing into question his heavenly and transcendent nature. Whereas Exod. xx:24 had asserted: "in every place where I cause my name to be remembered I will come to you and bless you", the Deuteronomic writers regarded cultic centralization as the ideal, since, at the inauguration of Israel as the covenant people of Yahweh, Sinai was the central holy place of Israel's communion with their God. In formulating the name theology and applying it to Jerusalem, the Deuteronomic writers effectively transferred the mantle of Sinai to Jerusalem. In Deuteronomy, Jerusalem has become the new Sinai.

283. S. Herrmann, Israel in Egypt, p.53.
An essential part of the thesis presented above is the argument that Israel's really formative period was the pre-settlement period at Kadesh/Sinai where contact was established between those who were later to become inhabitants of the northern and southern parts of Palestine and where faith in Yahweh, which was the constitutive factor of the people of Israel, originated. Attention must now be directed to the theory that 'Israel' was a federation of twelve tribes, constituted on the pattern of the later Greek amphictyonies, centred on a common sanctuary, which only came into existence in Palestine, in the period of the Judges.

Amphictyony and Covenant

Towards the end of the nineteenth century, scholars, notably Freeman and Cauer, were studying information from classical sources on the existence of leagues in Greece and Italy which were connected with temples and the maintenance of their cults. Each league usually consisted of twelve members loosely joined together in a religious and political alliance. Although the association was a loose one, membership of a league involved certain obligations. Few regulations governing the mutual relations of the members of such leagues have been preserved, but it is known that the transgression of such regulations would lead to a declaration of war against the


offending member by the rest of the league. The focal point of each league was a major central sanctuary, and the Greek name which is typical for these confederations, "amphictyony", from ἀμφικτύνοις (287) "those who are settled, or dwell, around", expresses the territorial relationship of the members of the league to the central sanctuary. (288) One of the principal tasks of the amphictyony was the care and maintenance of the central sanctuary and it was largely for practical reasons that there were normally, but by no means always, twelve members in an amphictyony, for each assumed the responsibility for the upkeep of the sanctuary for one month of the year. (289) The central sanctuary formed the cultic and administrative centre of the amphictyony. It was here that the periodic festivals were held; here that the representatives of the members assembled; and here, too, that the amphictyonic law was promulgated. The central sanctuary adopted by an amphictyony served to exercise a unifying influence on its members. Although there is no certainty about what originally provided the stimulus for the foundation of an amphictyony, it would appear that the main reason was common historical experiences and perhaps also the desire for military stability.


289. In the case of an amphictyony with six members, each took care of the central sanctuary for two months of the year. Noth thinks that the basis of the federation of the triginta populi Latini would have been the number of days in the month. Cf. Noth, Das System der zwölf Stämme Israels, pp.52f.
Ewald (290) seems to have been the first to suggest that an amphictyonic arrangement existed in a period of Israel's history, although he did not actually use the word 'amphictyony'. Concentrating on the patriarchal period, Ewald drew possible parallels from the literature and history of ancient Greece and Italy, (291) and laid great stress on the numbers twelve, six, and the multiples of twelve. Later, scholars, including Sayce, Szanto, Meyer, B. Luther, and Gunkel made similar observations, (292) but at this stage only the patriarchal period was involved.

It was Max Weber who first proposed that Israel constituted an amphictyonic confederacy in the period of the judges. (293) Weber emphasized the military and legal functions of this confederacy but practically ignored the question of cultic activities and a possible central sanctuary. However, in 1929, Alt made passing reference to


291. Ewald noted the Etruscans (Livy, i, 8); the twelve Phaeacian princes (Homer, Odyssey viii.390f.); the Thracians (Homer, II.x. 488-495); the Ionians and Aeolians (Herodotus, i.145f., 149); and the alleged twelvefold division of ancient Attica (Philochorus, ap. Strabo, ix, p. 396).


an amphictyony in early Israel (294) and in the following year one of his most brilliant students, Martin Noth, published the most complete and most influential theory of an Israelite amphictyony. (295) Noth argues that in the period of the judges Israel was a federation of twelve tribes constituted on a pattern similar to that of the later Greek amphictyonies, a sacral confederacy of twelve tribes united in the worship of Yahweh at a common sanctuary. Noth's classical treatment of this subject has influenced a great many scholars and although there is a growing number who reject his theory, (296) it has been accepted in one form or another by most. That Israel constituted an amphictyony in the period of the judges is, according to


Bright, "beyond question", (297) while Weippert asserts that "the increasing criticism of the theory that the ancient Israelite tribal confederacy was an amphictyony analogous to the Greek and Italian sacral confederacies...hardly affects Noth's original assessment." (298)

The theory of the Israelite amphictyony has an important bearing on this study of cultic centralization for there are many scholars who, accepting the amphictyonic theory, maintain that the ultimate roots of the demand for cultic centralization are to be traced back to the period of the judges, to a sacral union of twelve Israelite tribes whose focal point was a central sanctuary. (299) Certainly it can be argued that the demand of Hezekiah, Josiah, and Deuteronomy was for the limitation of all sacrificial worship to one, sole, sanctuary whereas an amphictyonic central sanctuary was simply the main sanctuary among other local tribal shrines. (300) Nevertheless, the question


still remains whether the alleged Israelite amphictyonic central shrine may not have been the prototype, so to speak, of the later demand for only one place of sacrificial worship. (301)

Clearly, then, it is necessary to test the evidence for the theory that in the period of the judges the communal and cultic life of 'all Israel' had its focal point in a central sanctuary. Before embarking on this task, however, two points should be made. Firstly, in what follows, only Noth's theory will be examined: the numerous ramifications of the theory which have appeared since Noth's treatise was published will have to be ignored. Secondly, having described Noth's theory, attention will be directed primarily, but not exclusively, on the question of the possible existence of an amphictyonic central sanctuary in the period of the judges.

Noth's theory of the Israelite Amphictyony

According to Noth, Israel was a confederacy of twelve tribes which came into existence in Palestine in the period of the judges. Prior to this, no twelve-tribe confederacy called Israel existed; not even the tribes as such existed before the settlement in Palestine. Before the settlement there were separate, independent semi-nomadic clans and families moving around on the desert fringes. In a long, protracted process, these clans and families began to settle in Palestine where they eventually joined together to form tribes. It was only when these tribes came together to form a twelve-tribe confederacy that Israel, properly understood, became an historical reality. (302) Drawing evidence from a variety of sources both within and

outside the Old Testament, Noth attempts to show that the organization of the Greek amphictyony is a valid parallel by which to elucidate the structure of this early Israelite tribal federation.

The basis of Noth's entire theory is his examination of the varying forms of the twelve-tribe system. He draws attention to the fact that the Old Testament depicts Israel as a community of twelve tribes descended from the twelve sons of Jacob, the eponyms of the Israelite tribes. There are several lists of these sons of Jacob/Israelite tribes, which differ in some respects. The most important variation is that in some of the lists Levi is included and Joseph appears as one tribe, while in others Levi is omitted but the number twelve is retained by replacing Joseph with Manasseh and Ephraim, the subdivisions of Joseph, which appear as independent tribes. On the basis of this variation the lists may be classified broadly into two main groups: on the one hand, there are those lists which include Levi, and, on the other hand, there are those lists which omit Levi. Of those lists which include Levi, Noth focuses his attention on Gen. xlix:1b-27, the Blessing of Jacob, and of the lists which omit Levi, he selects Num. xxvi:4bß-51 as the most important. He dismisses all the other lists as being of secondary importance, either because they are literary creations designed to give variation and interest to the list (e.g. Gen. xxix:31-xxx:24), or because they are of late origin and incomplete (e.g. Deut. xxxiii). According to Noth, therefore, Gen. xlix:1b-27 and Num. xxvi:4bß-51 are the most important and original groupings of the tribes.

Noth then attempts to establish the time of origin of these two lists. From the fact that Levi is included in Gen. xlix and omitted

in Num. xxvi, he concludes that the system of tribes represented by Gen. xlix is older than that represented by Num. xxvi. (304) It is only in Gen. xlix and Gen. xxxiv that Levi is reckoned as a 'secular' tribe alongside the other tribes: everywhere else Levi is solely a priestly tribe with no land holding. Thus, the Gen. xlix list must presuppose conditions of a very early time whereas the Num. xxvi list reflects the prevailing conditions of a later time. (305) Having thus established the relative dating of the lists, Noth moves on to determine their absolute dating. Although the earliest literary form of the Gen. xlix list is probably the work of a collector in the time of David or Solomon who has amassed originally independent sayings about the individual tribes, (306) Noth insists that this list accurately reflects a system of tribes which goes back ultimately to the early period of the judges. He assigns Num. xxvi, on the other hand, to the second half of the period of the judges. (307) In dating this list, Noth takes the Song of Deborah as the terminus a quo since Num.xxvi refers to the tribe


305. Noth does not commit himself on the question of whether or not there is an historical connection between the old 'secular' tribe of Levi and the priestly tribe, or merely an identity of name. Cf. Noth, Das System, p.25, note 3; idem, The History of Israel, 2 p.88, note 2. Weippert, The Settlement of the Israelite Tribes in Palestine, p.43, note 139, thinks that originally the 'secular' tribe of Levi had nothing to do with the Levitical priesthood. According to Weippert, the two entities were not equated until a considerable time after the tribe disappeared from history. Cf., too, G. Fohrer, RGG3, iv, 1960, pp.336f. s.v. Levi und Leviten (lit.).


of Manasseh whereas in Judg. v Manasseh is still not an independent tribe. In view of the fact that Num.xxvi mentions only a few of the Canaanite cities of the mountains and contains no reference to any of the powerful Canaanite city-states of the plains, Noth takes the formation of the Israelite state under David as the terminus ad quem for this list, since it was only in this period that these city-states were brought under Israelite control. Thus, according to Noth, these two lists, Gen. xlix and Num. xxvi, reveal the structure of the Israelite tribes in the period of the judges and reflect the change in form occasioned when Levi was no longer considered to be on the same footing as the other tribes.

Both lists share a quite definite grouping of tribes. They both begin with six Leah tribes. In Gen. xlix this group consists of Reuben, Simeon, Levi, Judah, Zebulun, and Issachar (308) but in the Num. xxvi list Gad is transferred to the place formerly occupied by Levi. The second group of tribes in the lists is the Rachel tribes, consisting of Joseph and Benjamin in Gen. xlix and of Manasseh, Ephraim and Benjamin in Num. xxvi. The third and final group of tribes, and the most fluid in form, consists of Dan, Gad, Asher, and Naphtali in Gen. xlix, and of Dan, Asher, and Naphtali in Num. xxvi.

Noth points out the striking concern to preserve the number six of the Leah tribes, (309) and, since the existence of a fixed group of

---

308. The sequence Zebulun-Issachar occurs in Gen. xlix whereas in Gen. xxix:31ff. and in Num. xxvi, Zebulun follows Issachar. However, according to Noth, this is of no historical importance.

309. Noth, Das System, pp.75ff.; idem, The History of Israel, pp.88ff. Noth insists that this group of six Leah tribes comprising Reuben, Simeon, Levi, Judah, Issachar, and Zebulun, was not the product of artistic systematization but represented an historical reality, regardless of the fact that they are represented as being descended from the same mother, Leah. Noth arrives at this conclusion from the fact that in the earliest references the Leah tribes appear, in stereotyped fashion, in this order (Das System, pp.7-13), and from the fact that the need was felt to preserve the number six when the tribe of Levi was removed (Das System), pp.14-21).
Leah tribes within the organization of twelve tribes cannot be explained from the conditions in the period of the judges, he concludes that the Leah tribes must have formed a fixed group in the land, organized in an amphictyony, before the Rachel tribes entered the land. Noth thinks that this six-tribe amphictyony may have been the original bearer of the name Israel, and may also have been the subject of the reference to Israel on the victory stele of Merneptah. (310) Later on, the clans which constituted the tribe of Benjamin entered the land, followed subsequently by 'the house of Joseph'. The fact that Joseph and Benjamin are known as 'the sons of Rachel' leads Noth to suggest that Benjamin may have been connected in some way with the settlement of Joseph, (311) although the title may simply reflect the proximity of these tribes in central Palestine. (312)

The third group of tribes - Dan, Gad, Asher, and Naphtali - entered the land after the Leah tribes but before 'the house of Joseph'. (313)

Noth thinks it was probably the entry of 'the house of Joseph' into the centre of the land which provided the stimulus for the foundation of the twelve-tribe amphictyony, which consisted of the six-tribe Leah confederacy, 'the house of Joseph' and some other groups which were already resident in the land and which were included

310. Noth, Das System, pp.83ff. Noth argues that since the name 'Israel' includes the element 'Baal', it is most unlikely that 'the house of Joseph' would have used this name before uniting with the Leah group.

311. Noth, Das System, pp.82f.


313. Noth, Das System, pp.83ff. However, Noth later changed his mind about the tribe of Gad for in The History of Israel2, p.75, he assumes that the Gadite clans carried out their occupation of the land as part of the same migration as 'the house of Joseph'.
in order to make up the numbers to twelve. He further suggests that the appropriate occasion for the formation of this twelve-tribe amphictyony was the assembly at Shechem described in Josh. xxiv. (314) In Josh. xxiv, Joshua as leader of 'the house of Joseph', which had already previously acknowledged Yahweh as their God at the covenant ceremony at Sinai, now confronted those tribes which had settled in Palestine relatively early and had never been in Egypt. However, according to Noth, Josh. xxiv not only reflects the 'diet' of Shechem which established the twelve-tribe amphictyony; it also preserves the memory of the foundation of the cultic worship of Yahweh by all the tribes, in a lasting, institutional form. This form of worship was the celebration of the covenant between Yahweh and the twelve tribes of the Israelite amphictyony, (315) and seems to have been a regularly recurring cultic event. (316)

It is at this stage that Noth draws parallels between the Israelite amphictyony and the amphictyonies of Greece and Italy, especially those of Greece. (317) Because most information has been preserved about the amphictyony centred on the two sanctuaries of Demeter at Pylae and Apollo at Delphi, Noth takes this amphictyony as the pattern. He explains that originally this amphictyony had only one sanctuary, that of Demeter at Pylae. Later, however, the

315. Noth, Das System, pp.72f. Noth thinks that Yahweh became the God of the amphictyony under the influence of 'the house of Joseph'.
sanctuary of Apollo at Delphi also came under its jurisdiction and eventually, because of the fame of Delphi as a place of oracle giving, the sanctuary of Apollo became more important than that of Demeter. (318)

As in the Greek and Italian tribal associations, the essential feature of the Israelite amphictyony was the central shrine. Shechem was the first central sanctuary of the Israelite amphictyony. Noth thinks it most probable that the divine throne of the sacred ark (319) formed the centre of worship. Although there is no reliable information about its origin, Noth thinks the ark may originally have been a travelling shrine of wandering clans, (320) but, because all ancient traditions concerning it have vanished, it is completely unknown who brought the ark into Palestine or why it became the sacred object of the Israelite amphictyony. At any rate, the ark was the common cult object which united the association of the twelve tribes of Israel. The ark was no longer a real travelling shrine when the tribes became established in Palestine, but, although it had no permanent resting place until the time of David, it was set up in one place for a certain period of time and this place then formed the central place of worship, "the geographical centre of the ancient Israelite amphictyony." (321) It was at the central sanctuary that the twelve tribes of Israel united periodically in covenant worship

318. Noth, Das System, p.48. One of the best studies of the amphictyony of Pylae-Delphi is that of H. Bürgel, Die pylaeisch-delphische Amphiktyonie, München, 1877.

319. Num. x:35f. and Jer. iii:16f. suggest to Noth that the ark was probably originally conceived as the empty throne of the invisible deity. Cf. Noth, The History of Israel², p.91, n.1.

320. Noth, The History of Israel², p.91 and note 2.

321. Noth, The History of Israel², p.91.
of 'Yahweh the God of Israel'.

It was here, too, that the tribal representatives came together to debate matters of general concern. In the Israelite amphictyony the tribal representative was the nāsi', corresponding to the Greek ἔρωμησις, and a list of the twelve Israelite nēzā'im is preserved in Num. i:5-15.

Again, as in the Greek and Italian amphictyonies, so, too, in the Israelite amphictyony each tribe was responsible for the oversight and maintenance of the central sanctuary for one month of the year.

Noth thinks that the Israelite amphictyony also parallels the Greek amphictyonies in the matter of law. In the Greek amphictyonies

322. Noth, Das System, pp.93ff., links this formula, 'Yahweh the God of Israel', specifically with the ark, thus accounting for its later use in the sanctuary of Jerusalem where Solomon deposited the ark.

323. Cf. Noth, Das System, p.97. Noth bases his argument that the word nāsi referred to an amphictyonic tribal representative on the use of the word in late passages which, he maintains, reflects the original technical sense of the word in the period of the Israelite amphictyony. According to Noth, the name nāsi may have been based on the phrase nāsi qōl or on the phrase nēzi pānim. Favouring the former derivation, he concludes that the term may be taken to mean 'speaker' or 'spokesman'. Noth points to Exod. xxii:27 (EVV.xxii:28) as evidence that the nāsi had a sacral function. The fact that this passage forbids the cursing of a nāsi in direct connection with the injunction not to curse God himself, indicates that the nēzi were given the protection of divine law because they were officials in a sacral institution. Noth draws support for his argument from a Phoenician inscription of 96 B.C. which records that a nā'si was appointed for the upkeep of the community sanctuary (Das System, pp.160ff.).

324. Noth thinks that a reference to twelve nēzi who belonged to the Ishmaelite twelve-tribe system is recorded in Gen. xxv:16.

325. Noth, Das System, p.86.
there were two types of law — the written and the ὑμὸν ἔγραφον (326) — both of which carried an equal amount of authority, and violation of either category resulted in the punishment of the refactory member(s) by the concerted action of the other tribes. According to Noth, the members of the Israelite amphictyony were also governed by written and unwritten law. As far as the written law is concerned, Noth thinks that the cultic and moral stipulations of the Book of the Covenant formed part of the amphictyonic law (327) and that the Book of the Covenant as a whole may have had its origin within the framework of the amphictyony. As regards the unwritten law, Noth alleges that Judg. xix-xxi records an amphictyonic war which took place when the unwritten law was transgressed by the Benjaminites of Gibeah. The phrase used to describe this type of crime ἐβάλαν ἔναν Ἰσραήλ (Judg. xx:10; cf. Judg. xix:23), was a special technical term signifying a violation of the unwritten, customary law of the Israelite amphictyony, and the Levite's message to each of the twelve tribes, "Consider it, take advice, and speak your minds" (Judg. xix:30, LXX) was a special formula used to summon the tribal association in cases of this kind. Noth parallels this incident recorded in Judg. xix-xxi with the Amphissa war of 339 B.C. which took place when the inhabitants of the city of Amphissa committed a cultic offence. When the Locrians, in whose territory Amphissa lay, were ordered to punish the inhabitants of the city, they, like the tribe of Benjamin in the case of Gibeah, refused. This resulted in an amphictyonic war and the Locrians were expelled from the amphictyony.


According to Noth, Israel's distinctive character consisted not in a special form of worship at the central shrine, but in the fact that it was subject to a divine law which was regularly proclaimed and to which the tribes regularly committed themselves at the tribal gatherings. Noth maintains that the task of imparting and interpreting the divine law was the responsibility of the šōpet yisrä'ēl which, he claims, was the central institutional office of the Israelite amphictyony. (328) The term šōpet yisrä'ēl occurs only once in the Old Testament, in Mic. iv:14 (EVV.v:1), and Noth argues that it probably refers not to the king but to the holder of an amphictyonic office which survived from the time of the judges through the period of the monarchy. Noth further maintains that in Judg. x:1-5; xii:7-15 there is a list which records, in chronological order, the names of the men who held this office. (329) Noth believes that, apart from the occasional anecdotal remark, the information given in this list about each man - his name, descent, native place, and duration of office - is based on official records. He thinks, too, that the office of judge was so important that in the period of the amphictyony, chronological records may have been based on the period of the judges' years of office. (330) It was the responsibility of the 'judge of Israel' to


329. The men in this list are called the 'minor judges' to distinguish them from the 'major judges' who are described, in considerable detail, in the book of Judges. According to Noth, the term šōpetim properly belongs to the minor judges alone because the major judges were not judges at all, but charismatic deliverers who arose to lead their particular tribe in time of conflict. The major judges were only incorporated into the list of judges by the author of the Deuteronomistic History because one of them, Jephthah, was also included in the list of the minor judges. Cf. Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien, I: die sammelnden und bearbeitenden Geschichtswerke im Alten Testament, Tübingen, 1957, pp. 47ff.; idem, The History of Israel2, p. 101.

know and interpret the divine law to which Israel was subject and to ensure that it was correctly observed. Perhaps, too, the judge may have had to proclaim the divine law at the tribal assemblies. Finally, Noth thinks that the judge may have had the task of settling border disputes between the individual tribes, and he suggests that the present system of borders in Josh. xiii-xix may originally have been drawn up by one of the holders of this office. (331)

In arguing thus for the existence of an Israelite amphictyony, Noth maintains that Israel enjoyed cultic, legal, and administrative centralization in the period of the judges. If an examination of the evidence were to support the amphictyonic theory, then it would be perfectly legitimate to trace back the origins of the demand for cultic centralization to this period. As it is, however, an examination of the evidence reveals quite the opposite, for much of Noth's theory is based on mere assumptions and doubtful parallels rather than on fact.

If early Israel did constitute an amphictyony then it is very hard to explain why there is no Hebrew word corresponding to the Greek ἥμφακτονία when the Hebrew language contains such a wide range of words to describe all the various family, social, and national groups. The Old Testament has three terms which express Israel's self-understanding as the people of Yahweh - כָּמ, qăhăl, and כֶּדָּה - and it has been shown that none of

these has any necessary reference to an amphictyony.\(^{332}\) Without any definite evidence, Noth assumes too readily that a social and religious phenomenon of Greece and Italy also existed in the ancient Near East. In actual fact there seems to be no evidence for the existence of an amphictyony in any of the ancient Near Eastern communities surrounding Israel, either as a borrowing or as an independent development. The Old Testament certainly contains lists of other Semitic groups of six or twelve tribes: the twelve sons of Nahor, the ancestors of the Aramaeans (Gen. xxii:20-24); the six sons of Abraham and Keturah, the ancestors of the Arabians (Gen. xxv:2); the twelve sons of Ishmael, the ancestors of the Ishmaelites (Gen. xxv:13-16); the twelve descendants of Esau, the ancestors of the Edomites (Gen. xxxvi:10-14); and the six ancestors of the Horites (Gen. xxxvi:20-28). But these lists are simply bare lists of names and they contain no reference to any of the characteristics or activities of amphictyonies.\(^{333}\)


\(^{333}\) Cf. Orlinsky, op. cit., pp. 382ff.; G. Fohrer, 'Altes Testament-ʾAmphiktyonie' und 'Bund', TLZ, xci, 1966, cols. 807-808; idem, History of Israelite Religion, p. 91; G.W. Anderson, op. cit., p. 144. B.D. Rahtjen, 'Philistine and Hebrew Amphictyonies,' JNES, xxiv, 1965, pp. 100-104, argues that the Philistine Pentapolis was the only phenomenon in the land of Canaan which resembled an amphictyony. In common with most of the Greek amphictyonies, it consisted not of tribes but of cities. Rahtjen also alleges that the Philistine Pentapolis had a central sanctuary which was a temple, first at Gaza, then, later, at Ashdod. However, although the five Philistine city-states probably acted together in times of military conflict (1 Sam. xxix:2), there is no evidence that they held a regular festival at a common central sanctuary. Thus, while the Philistine Pentapolis may resemble an amphictyony much more closely than the Israelite tribes in the period of the judges, there is no real, conclusive evidence that the Philistine city states formed an amphictyony. W.W. Hallo, 'A Sumerian Amphictyony', JCS, xiv, 1960, pp. 88-114, also fails in his attempt to produce evidence of a Sumerian amphictyony. All that was involved here was an obligation on several cities to provide for the temple at Nippur.
The Central Sanctuary

According to Noth, the essential characteristic of the Israelite amphictyony, as in the case of the Greek amphictyonyes, was the central sanctuary. While there is some dissension among those who support the theory of the Israelite amphictyony as regards which of the Israelite sanctuaries were adopted as the central sanctuary, Noth thinks that four sanctuaries in succession occupied this position: the first was Shechem, then Bethel, then Gilgal, and, finally, Shiloh. Noth stipulates that a sanctuary can only qualify as the central sanctuary of the Israelite amphictyony if there is evidence that it fulfils the following three requirements: (334)

(a) the ark was lodged there;
(b) the festival of covenant renewal was celebrated there;
(c) the sanctuary was acknowledged and visited by all the tribes or their representatives.

With these criteria in mind, however, an examination of the records connected with these sanctuaries reveals that none of them ever fulfilled all three requirements which, together, characterized the alleged central sanctuary. (335)

Shechem

In the case of Shechem there is evidence that the covenant festival was celebrated there but as regards the other two conditions there is much less certainty.

(335) For criticism of these criteria as qualifying a sanctuary as a central sanctuary, cf. especially the following: R. Smend, Jahwekrieg und Stämmebund, Göttingen, 1963, pp. 56-70, who, while accepting the theory of a central sanctuary, argues that the ark need not have been present; W.H. Irwin, 'Le sanctuaire central israélite avant l'établissement de la monarchie,' RB, lxxii, 1965,
(a) The Presence of the ark

There are two passages to which appeal could be made to show that the ark was present at Shechem: Josh. xxiv:1 and Josh. viii:30-35. In Josh. xxiv:1, Israel is said to have presented itself at Shechem: הֲ//================================================ //ְּ[הָאֶvision] (336) This phrase may mean 'before the ark' when it occurs in some of the psalms, (336) this is by no means a necessary interpretation of the phrase in Josh. xxiv:1. (337) According to Josh. viii:30-35, the ark was in the Shechem area. This passage describes how, in fulfilment of the command of Moses (Deut. xxvii:1ff), Joshua erected an altar on Mount Ebal with stones on which the law of Moses had been written, while 'all Israel' stood on either side of the ark. This passage, however, is obviously secondary, and its intrusion into the text clearly interrupts the account of the settlement. Originally, there was no break between Josh. viii:29 and Josh. ix:1. Furthermore, although Josh. viii:30-35 deals with the Shechem area, there is no evidence that the tribes had reached this area at this stage of the settlement. Added to this is the fact that in Josh. viii:30-35, the Levites are the bearers of the ark, and this function is assigned to the Levites only in passages that are very late. Above all, however, this passage concerns the execution of a command given by Moses which is


337. Contra Noth, The History of Israel, p. 97, who maintains that the words 'before Yahweh' mean before the ark as the place of God's presence.
recorded in Deut. xxvii:1ff, and must, therefore, be regarded as a late composition by the Deuteronomist, since Deut. xxvii:1ff is a Deuteronomistic passage which originally had no connection with the old series of curses contained in that chapter. Although these late passages may preserve fragments of a pre-Deuteronomistic tradition when they speak of an altar outside Jerusalem, they must nevertheless be judged as Deuteronomistic in their present form. Moreover, in view of the fact that no mention is made of the ark in Deut. xxvii:1ff, the appearance of the ark in Josh. viii:30-35 may well be a still later addition to this section, perhaps a second Deuteronomistic editing, which has been introduced under the influence of Josh. iii, iv, and vi, where the ark does have an important role. Thus, there is no evidence that the ark was ever deposited at Shechem.

338. Josh. viii:30-35 was probably inserted in this particular place because the Deuteronomist wanted to record the fulfilment of Moses' command by Joshua as soon as possible, and he may have felt that the conquest of Ai described in the earlier part of Josh. viii, opened up the way to Shechem.

339. In Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien², p. 43, Noth takes Josh. viii:30-35 as being entirely Deuteronomistic with no older source. In Das Buch Josua², HAT, Tübingen, 1953, however, Noth argues that since Josh. viii:30-35 concerns an altar outside Jerusalem, the passage contains fragments of a pre-Deuteronomistic historical tradition which, however, is only to be found in a Deuteronomistic context. Cf. J.A. Soggin, 'Zwei umstrittene Stellen aus dem Überlieferungskreis um Schechem' ZAW, lxxiii, 1961, pp. 78-87, ref. pp. 83ff.


(b) The festival of covenant renewal

Josh. xxiv shows that the covenant festival was celebrated at Shechem. (342) There are many literary-critical and traditio-historical problems involved with Josh. xxiv. (343) The most fundamental problem is the present position of the chapter. Clearly, Josh. xxiii, which takes the form of a final plea by the ageing Joshua (Josh. xxiii:1) who is about to die (Josh. xxiii:14), constitutes the Deuteronomistic conclusion to the history of the conquest of Palestine, and Judg. ii:6ff. is the continuation of Josh. xxiii in the Deuteronomistic historical work. (344) Josh. xxiv, which depicts Joshua at a relatively early stage of his career, when he was a vigorously active man, is clearly awkward in its present position. The tradition of the 'diet' of Shechem is quite unsuitable as the final act of Joshua: verse 15 certainly does not envisage his imminent death. However, since there are signs of

Deuteronomistic editing (345) in Josh. xxiv, it would appear that this chapter is a separate tradition which has been inserted in its present position.

342. K. Möhlenbrink, 'Die Landnahmesagen des Buches Josua', ZAW, lvi, 1938, pp. 238-268, ref. pp. 254ff, prefers the LXX reading in Josh. xxiv:1 (cf. also verse 25) which would locate this event at Shiloh. However S. Holmes, Joshua. The Hebrew and Greek Texts, Cambridge, 1914, pp. 8, 78, is surely correct when he says that the LXX is clearly a harmonistic alteration with reference to xviii:1, 10; xix:51; xxi:2; xxii:9,12. Cf., too, Mayes, Israel in the Period of the Judges, p. 119, n. 85.

343. For an examination of Josh. xxiv from both a literary and an historical point of view, cf. A.D.H. Mayes, Amphictyony and Covenant, pp. 167-205. Mayes discusses the form of the covenant expressed in Josh. xxiv on pp. 206-238.


position by a secondary Deuteronomistic redaction. However, although Josh. xxiv has certainly been heavily edited by the Deuteronomist, it does, nevertheless, preserve ancient elements which reveal that the covenant ceremony was practised in Shechem in the period of the judges.

Doubt has been cast on the historicity of Josh. xxiv on the grounds that in this chapter the people of Israel are asked to put away foreign gods and to serve Yahweh and they are given statutes and ordinances, when, according to the tradition of Exod. xix-xxiv, the people had long before at Sinai become worshippers of Yahweh. In an attempt to overcome this problem, some scholars have denied the historicity of the Sinai covenant in favour of the Shechem covenant. However, following Sellin, many scholars maintain that what is attributed to all Israel in Exod. xix-xxiv and Josh. xxiv really concerned only a part of the people.

346. It is most unlikely that either J or E is present in Josh. xxiv. Cf. Noth, Das Buch Josua, p. 137; W. Rudolph, Der "Elohist" von Exodus bis Josua, EZAW, lxviii, 1938, pp. 244f. However, this does not necessarily mean that old tradition is also absent from Josh. xxiv. Cf. A.D.H. Mayes, Amphictyony and Covenant, p. 198; idem, Israel in the Period of the Judges, p. 35.


349. Cf., for example, L'Hour, op. cit., p. 26; de Vaux, 'La thèse de l'"amphictyonie israëlite"', HTR, lxiv, 1971, pp. 415-436, ref. pp. 423ff. In Das System, pp. 65ff., Noth also accepted this view but, later, he regarded it as too simple a solution, and in A History of Pentateuchal Traditions, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1972, he maintains that those who experienced Egypt and the Exodus were later incorporated into various tribes and tribal groups. Similarly, Noth says it is impossible to know exactly what group was at Sinai.
They argue that in fact it was only the Rachel tribes (Joshua and his 'house') which had experienced Egypt and the Exodus and that in Josh. xxiv these tribes were now introducing the worship of Yahweh to those tribes which had settled in Palestine relatively early and had never been in Egypt. However, there are serious objections to this theory. Although in Josh. xxiv there is certainly a contrast between the house of Joshua and the rest of the people, there is nothing to suggest that this covenant conclusion really involved the fusion of two different tribal groups, when the Yahweh faith of the one was accepted by the other. Indeed the people's reply in verse 16: 'Far be it from us that we should forsake Yahweh, to serve other gods; presupposes that the people addressed here were already Yahweh worshippers. The Yahweh covenant of Josh. xxiv does not found the unity of the people; it presupposes it. As to the choice laid before the people by Joshua, it seems most probable that the putting away of the foreign gods, with which the choice of the people is here and elsewhere connected, was a rite practised at Shechem, and that this rite and the choice set before the people were both symbolical gestures of the rejection of foreign worship, and the acceptance of the Yahweh faith. It would appear, therefore, that in Josh. xxiv, Joshua is merely urging the people to re-affirm their acceptance of Yahweh worship.


351. Cf., also, Noth, Das System, pp. 54ff., who draws attention to the fact that an alliance of tribes was not formed simply to take care of a common sanctuary; the common sanctuary presupposes such an alliance.

352. For example, in Judg. x:10-16.

The problem of the historical background of Josh. xxiv has been approached from a different angle. Some scholars argue that Josh. xxiv:1-28 corresponds in form with the Hittite vassal treaties and that since none of these treaties is later than the thirteenth century B.C., Josh. xxiv reflects covenant practice in Israel at a very early age. (354) However, as Mayes points out, not only is the parallel between Josh. xxiv and the Hittite treaties very doubtful, but this is a form-critical observation from which no positive historical conclusions can be drawn. (355) The historical background of Josh. xxiv must be deduced from an examination of the chapter within the Israelite and Old Testament context.

Von Rad (356) maintains that Josh. xxiv:2-13, an historical review of Yahweh's dealings with Israel up to and including the conquest of the land, is an extended version of the brief credo found in Deut. xxvi:5-9, with parallels elsewhere, which contains statements of faith which form the basis of the Pentateuchal presentation of Israel's history. However, this view is untenable. In the first place, it is very doubtful if Deut. xxvi:5-9 is an early creed which forms the basis of the Pentateuch. (357) Indeed its language and expression closely


parallel Deuteronomistic literature (358) and this would indicate that it is most probably a comparatively late composition. Secondly, even if Deut. xxvi:5-9 were an early creed, Josh. xxiv:2-13, far from forming the basis of the Pentateuchal account of Israel's history, seems to presuppose the Pentateuchal presentation. (359) Josh. xxiv:1-13, the historical review, leads up to the choice set before the people by Joshua as to which god they wished to serve. Many scholars argue that the period immediately after the conquest is the best context for this choice offered by Joshua, because then the people would have had to make the decision whether to accept the worship of the deities of the land they had entered, or to remain loyal to Yahweh the God from Sinai. (360) However, this suggestion fails to account for the reference to the gods of Mesopotamia in verse 14, a feature which makes it difficult to see the text as reflecting early conditions. A more suitable background for this text would be a time when there was a struggle to maintain the worship of Yahweh over against the Mesopotamian gods, and this would indicate either the period of Assyrian domination in the late stages of the monarchy, or the exilic


359. Verses 2-4, at any rate, presuppose a time when the various traditions concerning the patriarchs had been brought together and when the patriarchs themselves had been arranged in the chronological order in which they are now to be found in the Pentateuch. Cf. Mayes, Amphictyony and Covenant, pp. 182f.; idem, Israel in the Period of the Judges, p. 37. On the original home of the Abraham stories and on the fusion of the different patriarchal traditions, cf. Alt, 'The God of the Fathers', Essays on Old Testament History and Religion, Oxford, 1966, pp.1-77, ref. pp. 54f.; and especially Noth, A History of Pentateuchal Traditions, pp. 46, 54ff., 79f., 82, 110f, 198ff.

Mayes argues convincingly that Josh. xxiv:14ff. belong closely with the preceding verses and that the first eighteen verses of the chapter should be seen as a unit, since the historical review leads up to the demand which follows, and the worship of the gods of Mesopotamia figures in both Josh. xxiv:1-13 and Josh. xxiv:14ff. Since this whole section presupposes the Pentateuchal presentation of history, probably has as its background the late monarchy or exilic period, and contains much Deuteronomistic language, Mayes thinks it should probably be treated as a Deuteronomistic composition. Nevertheless, as has been pointed out already, in one respect this section may possibly reflect ancient practice because connected with the choice set before the people is the summons to put away foreign gods, and this may well have been an ancient cultic rite practised at Shechem. In Gen. xxxv:2ff. reference is made to the same ritual and here, too, it is connected with Shechem. Thus, although the origin of this rite is obscure, it seems to have been associated with Shechem and, when it was taken over into Israelite religion, it was used as a symbolic gesture to express total obedience to Yahweh and the rejection of all other deities.


363. See above, page 478, note 353.


365. E. Nielsen, 'The Burial of the Foreign Gods', ST, viii, 1955, pp. 103ff., thinks it was a magical rite of Canaanite origin before it was taken over into Israelite religion. Originally the ritual involved the burying of images which represented either the enemies of the Canaanites or their gods thus consigning them to the world of the dead. According to Nielsen, this burial
There are many problems with the next section of the chapter, verses 19-24, and there are strong arguments against taking this section as an original continuation of the preceding verses.\(^{(366)}\) In the first place, Joshua's statement to the people that they cannot serve Yahweh is very peculiar coming after verses 14ff. Secondly, there is much repetition of phrases and ideas already used in this chapter and elsewhere.\(^{(367)}\) Thirdly, the idea of the people being witnesses against

...took place near the patriarchal grave (cf. Josh. xxiv:32) and so the ancestor prevented the enemies from rising again. Nielsen concludes from Gen. xxxv:5 that Jacob used this rite against the Canaanites. However, even if Gen. xxxv:5 were originally connected with what precedes, it is just as likely that it should be interpreted in the sense that God helped Jacob and his household after they had renounced all foreign worship. G. Schmitt, Der Landtag von Sichem, Stuttgart, 1964, pp. 49ff., thinks that the ritual had its origin in the custom of burying images, not those of enemies or their gods, but as guards for protection against an enemy. Schmitt believes that later on this was regarded as offensive and so the custom was re-interpreted. A more probable theory is that of Mayes, Amphictyony and Covenant, p. 187, n. 142, who suggests that the rite may have had its origin on the occasion when those who had experienced Yahweh's action in the exodus introduced the worship of Yahweh to those groups that had settled in Palestine relatively early and had never been to Egypt. Mayes also conjectures that this act of renouncing foreign gods soon became a regular rite repeated at every covenant festival. Later on, in order to account for and to justify this rite, it was derived from an action of Jacob.


367. Cf. ta'azeth yhwh in verse 20 with mezaheb yhwh in verse 16. The use of negark in verse 20 and in verse 23 instead of saherim as in verses 2, 16 may be due to the influence of Gen. xxxv:2 of which verse 23 is here almost a verbal repetition. Furthermore, the chronological sequence of the periods of good and evil in verse 20b is very reminiscent of Deut. xxviii:63 (cf. also Deut. xxviii:21). Cf. Mayes, Amphictyony and Covenant, p. 191, n. 156.
themselves contradicts verse 27, where the stone is witness. (368)

Finally, the terminology used in this section indicates a late date. (369)

These verses seem to be a product of general experience and religious reflection. (370) At any rate, this section is a late addition to Josh. xxiv.

In view of the fact that in the next section, verses 25-27, the actual covenant making ceremony is completely contained, and because, too, there is some tension between these verses and the rest of the chapter, (371) it seems best to take this section as a complete, independent unit. (372)

Although there is some late terminology in these verses, (373) an older layer is clearly discernible. (374) Within this section there is mainly the making of the covenant and the stone as witness to it. It is most probable that haddešaš há-élleḥ and kol ñimrê yhwh refer to some body of law regarded as the words of Yahweh, in this case the covenant law, (375) and that the stone is to be witness to the proclaimed law of

368. The stone as witness is definitely an ancient conception. The fact that in verse 22 the people are witnesses against themselves is a much later conception which can be paralleled in the prophetic literature. There are also parallels in the prophetic literature to the declaration 'You cannot serve Yahweh'. Cf. D.J. McCarthy, Treaty and Covenant, Analecta Biblica,xxi, 1963, pp. 149ff.


371. For example, as already indicated, in verses 25-27 the stone is witness, whereas in verse 22 it is the people who are witnesses against themselves.


373. The combination hōq ūmîšpāt occurs mainly in post-exilic passages. Cf. L'Hour, op. cit., p. 30. On the relationship between verse 25b and Exod. xv:25b, cf. Nielsen, Shechem. A Traditio-Historical Investigation, pp. 108ff. In the case of ḫēsēp tōrat ñîyā̄hîm, the phrase ḫēsēp hattōrah has a Deuteronomistic character, but with ñîyā̄hîm or yhwh it only occurs in Nehemiah and Chronicles. Finally, the expression 'to deal falsely with God' is also late terminology.


God which the people acknowledged. (376) The declaration of divine law is clearly presupposed.

Thus, the criticism of Josh. xxiv shows that in all parts of verses 1-28 there has been redaction and editing. Nevertheless, although this chapter has undergone considerable editing at the hand of the Deuteronomist, it does preserve ancient elements - the putting away of foreign gods, the making of the covenant, the declaration of divine law, and the stone as witness to the covenant - which were the constituents of the covenant ceremony practised at Shechem (377) in the earliest pre-monarchy period.

376. Although it is quite uncertain, there is a degree of probability that the stone, as well as being a witness, was also a stele on which the divine law was inscribed. Cf. L'Hour, op. cit., p. 32; K. Koch, The Growth of the Biblical Tradition, London, 1969, p. 29; K. Baltzer, The Covenant Formulary, Oxford, 1971, p. 27. Cf. too, Mayes, Amphictyony and Covenant, p. 194, n. 165; idem, Israel in the Period of the Judges, p. 39, note 82, who draws attention to the fact that the Targum reads: 'this stone is to us like the two stone tablets of the covenant... for the words which are inscribed on it are like all the words of Yahweh which he has spoken with us' (quoted in Schmitt, Der Landtag von Sichem, p. 9). Deut. xxxi:26b shows that such a written record could also be a witness. Cf. Beyerlin, Origins and History of the Oldest Sinaiitic Traditions, Oxford, 1965, pp. 44, 60. However, Beyerlin is of the opinion that in popular piety the stone was thought of as Yahweh's dwelling place (ibid, p. 61), and he also thinks that verse 26a is "the aetiological explanation of a corresponding document in Shechem" (ibid, p. 43).

377. As well as reflecting a covenant ceremony practised at Shechem (cf. M. Newman, The People of the Covenant, p. 112 and the literature cited there), there is no doubt that Josh. xxiv also preserves the memory of an historical event at Shechem. As regards the position which the chapter assigns to Joshua in this ceremony, it cannot be proved that this is historically accurate. However, there are no grounds for the view that Joshua was made to occupy the place he now has in Josh. xxiv simply so as to legitimize a Shechemite cultic ceremony, as proposed by H.H. Rowley, From Joseph to Joshua, Schweich Lectures 1948, London, 1950, pp. 127ff. The sanctuary itself was situated outside the city of Shechem, (cf. Nielsen, Shechem. A Traditio-Historical Investigation, p. 34, n. 4, and p. 125 n. 2; Mayes, Amphictyony and Covenant, p. 205; idem, Israel in the Period of the Judges, p. 39; though cf., also, Noth, Das System, p. 94) and the city was probably autonomous at least until the time of Abimelech (cf. Alt, 'Josua', Kleine Schriften, I, pp. 176-192, ref. p. 191; Schmitt, Der Landtag von Sichem, p. 84. Kaufmann, The Religion of Israel, p. 250, n. 6, however, maintains that Shechem had been taken over by Israel during the conquest.) Mayes, Amphictyony and Covenant, p. 205; idem, Israel in the Period of the Judges, p. 39, thinks that during this period there was a peaceful relationship between the Israelites and Shechem which helped to establish regular worship of Yahweh in the vicinity of the city.
(c) The acknowledgement and visitation of the sanctuary

Although Josh. xxiv:1 states that all the tribes were present at Shechem, this cannot be taken as a reliable indication of the number of tribes actually involved. References to 'all Israel' and 'all the tribes of Israel' are notoriously unreliable. Thus, for instance, Judg. xx:lf. states that 'all the people of Israel' and 'the chiefs of all the people, of all the tribes of Israel' gathered at Mizpah to decide what action to take against the tribe of Benjamin. Clearly, however, the tribe of Benjamin was neither present nor represented at this assembly (378) (cf. Josh. xx:3,12ff.). Furthermore, it is quite possible that Josh. xxiv:1 may have been copied from Josh. xxiii:2 (379).

Although it is impossible to determine exactly which group or groups were involved in this covenant ceremony, because the group which Joshua is addressing is unspecified, it seems reasonable to assume that since Shechem lay within the territory of Machir (Manasseh), (380) then Machir (Manasseh) at least was involved in this ceremony with Ephraim, the tribe of Joshua. (381) There is no evidence that any other tribe was present.

In Deut. xxvii Moses instructs the people that when they enter the land, six tribes are to stand on Mount Gerizim to bless the people and six tribes are to stand on Mount Ebal to curse the people. However,


Deut. xxvii cannot be held to show a connection of the twelve tribes with Shechem in the period of the judges for it is manifestly a secondary addition. (382) Deut. xxvii is cast in the third person and not in the second person form of address characteristic of Deuteronomy as the direct speech of Moses, and it clearly breaks the connection between Deut. xxvi:19 and 28. Although a list of curses is given, ten of which are undoubtedly very old, no blessings are enumerated. Moreover, the original series of ten curses does not seem to have had any connection with either Israel or Yahweh. In verses 15-26 there are twelve curses but the first and the last curses are quite clearly secondary additions (383) and it is most probable that the first curse, which deals with a fundamental concern of Yahwism, has been deliberately placed at the head of the list in order to bring the original series of ten curses into the context of Yahwism. Deut. xxvii has probably been constructed by the Deuteronomist on the basis of older materials.

For the sanctuary at Shechem, therefore, there is firm evidence that the covenant festival was celebrated there, but there is no reliable indication either that the ark was lodged there, or that the sanctuary was acknowledged and visited by all the tribes. Although it was undoubtedly an important sanctuary, the traditions associated with Shechem do not on their own account suggest that Shechem was a central sanctuary of an Israelite amphictyony.


383. Although the first and last curses both begin like the other ten with "ärür, they continue with a relative clause introduced by "asıer instead of a participial construction. Cf. E. Nielsen, The Ten Commandments in New Perspective, London, 1968, p. 16; Mayes, Israel in the Period of the Judges, p. 40, n. 88.
Bethel

According to Noth, the central sanctuary was transferred from Shechem to Bethel. (384) Noth suggests that this transfer was occasioned either by a breakdown in the peaceful relations between the tribes of Israel and the city-state of Shechem, or because the ark, the chief cult object of the central sanctuary was formerly a travelling shrine and it was undesirable that it should become the object of a local cult.

Bethel is mentioned explicitly only in Judg. xx:18, 26-28; xxi:2, passages which belong to the narrative describing the action taken by Israel against the tribe of Benjamin for its refusal to punish the inhabitants of its city Gibeah for a crime they had committed against a Levite. Although Mizpah was the gathering place of the tribes when they met to decide what to do about Gibeah (Judg. xx:1), they went to Bethel to seek an oracle of God before going out to battle, and, when they had been defeated by the Benjaminites, they returned to Bethel to lament and to seek a fresh oracle from Yahweh, 'for the ark of the covenant of God was there in those days' (Judg. xx:27). Finally, when Benjamin had been punished, the tribes went again to Bethel to lament once more and to discuss how to rebuild the tribe of Benjamin 'that a tribe be not blotted out from Israel' (Judg. xxi:17).

384. Noth, Das System, pp. 66ff., 92ff.; idem, The History of Israel, pp. 94ff. However, some advocates of the amphictyony theory argue that Shechem was replaced as central sanctuary by Gilgal which, in turn, was superseded by Bethel. Kraus, 'Gilgal. Ein Beitrag zur Kultusgeschichte Israels', VT, i, 1951, pp. 181-199, ref.p. 193; idem, Worship in Israel, Oxford, 1966, pp. 164f., argues that Gilgal replaced Shechem as central sanctuary at a very early stage, and he thinks that there may be a hint of this change in Deut. xi:25-30. However, this passage is much too obscure to bear this interpretation and, anyway, the words מְהל הַגִּלְגָּל are very probably an addition. Cf. Noth, Das System, p. 146; Nielsen, Shechem. A Tradition-Historical Investigation, pp. 42f.; Mayes, Amphictyony and Covenant, pp. 38ff., n. 65; idem, Israel in the Period of the Judges, p. 47, n. 111. As regards the supersedence of Gilgal by Bethel, a concealed reference to the transfer of the ark from Gilgal to Bethel has been seen in Judg. ii:1a, 5b, (for references cf. H.J. Zobel, Stammmespruch und Geschichte, BZAW, xcix,
In view of the fact that Judg. xix-xxi, together with Judg. xvii-xviii, were not originally part of the Deuteronomistic historical work, an examination of the structure of Judg. xix-xxi is essential. The fact that Judg. xix-xxi constitute a separate tradition which has been handed down independently of those traditions which are included within the Deuteronomistic historical work, does not automatically mean that these chapters are without historical foundation or that the story was composed at a late time, but it does necessitate an examination of the traditions within Judg. xix-xxi, before a proper evaluation of the references to Bethel in this story can be made.

Taking Judg. xxi first, there are four elements which have contributed to the present form of this chapter. There is a section consisting of verses 2-4 and then there are three separate traditions which describe how the survivors of Benjamin acquired wives. Although not wholly independent of their context, since they do refer to the cutting off of one tribe from Israel, verses 2-4 do seem, nevertheless, somewhat out of place in their present position. Their main concern is neither the battle which is described in Judg. xx, nor the problem of supplying wives

1965, p. 109). Irwin, op. cit., p. 175, who argues against the amphictyony theory, also thinks that Judg. ii:1a,5b reflect the transfer of the ark from Gilgal to Bethel and he suggests that this transfer took place in order to protect the ark from forces such as the Moabites (cf. Judg. iii: 12-30) who were invading from the east. However, essential for this interpretation of Judg. ii: 1a, 5b is the identification of 'Bochim' with Bethel and, although this identification has been current since Wellhausen, Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte, Berlin, 1914, pp. 88ff., it is not beyond dispute. Cf. G.A. Danell, Studies in the Name Israel in the Old Testament, Uppsala, 1946, p.68 and n. 60; M.H. Woudstra, The Ark of the Covenant from Conquest to Kingship, Philadelphia, 1965, pp. 130f. Furthermore, as Woudstra points out, there is no adequate support for the view that the expression 'angel of Yahweh', which occurs in Judg. ii:1-5, stands for the ark of the covenant.


for the survivors of Benjamin described in chapter xxi. The meridian of Judg. xxi:2-4 is, rather, the information that at Bethel an altar was erected on which were offered burnt offerings and peace offerings. As regards the three independent narratives dealing with the theme of how wives were supplied for those Benjaminites who had survived the battle with the rest of Israel, two refer to Jabesh-gilead and the third refers to Shiloh. According to Judg. xxi:1, 6-8, 12-13, Jabesh-gilead was able to supply wives for the Benjaminites because it was the only place which was not bound by the oath taken by the rest of Israel at Mizpah that they would not give their daughters in marriage to the Benjaminites. On the other hand, according to verses 5, 9-11, 14a, Israel had taken an oath to kill anyone who had not come to the assembly at Mizpah, and, since Jabesh-gilead had been absent from this assembly, a force was sent to destroy that city and all its inhabitants, with the exception of the unmarried women who were saved to be wives for the Benjaminites. In verses 15ff. there is a third tradition according to which the 'daughters of Shiloh' were taken for the Benjaminites. Whereas Judg. xx is concerned with the destruction of the town of Gibeah and the defeat of the army of Benjamin, these three traditions in Judg. xxi presuppose the complete destruction of the tribe of Benjamin save for a very small number of survivors. In the narrative preceding Judg. xxi only Judg. xx:48 alludes to the complete destruction which is presupposed in chapter xxi. However, this verse, which is a very generalized summary of the results of the battle, is very probably an addition which has been inserted in order to provide the foundation for the traditions which follow in chapter xxi. These traditions of chapter xxi, therefore, are an addition to the original story of Judg. xix-xx. All three are aetiological stories: the first two dealing with Jabesh-gilead provide an explanation for the close connection existing between this city and
the tribe of Benjamin which was particularly manifest in the time of Saul (387) (cf. 1 Sam. xi:1ff.), while the third tradition in verses 15ff. provides an explanation for an otherwise unknown cultic custom at Shiloh.

As regards Judg. xix—xx, the basic text of both chapters has been supplemented. Chapter xix has received only a few minor glosses and contains an otherwise uniform narrative, but with Judg. xx the story has been supplemented with material which has probably been borrowed directly from other passages in the Old Testament. (388) Judg. xx:18, which contains the first reference to Bethel in this narrative, is one of these additions. This verse describes how Israel sought an oracle at Bethel and Judah was commanded to go up first against Benjamin. However, no reference is made to Judah in this rôle anywhere else in the account of the battle and, furthermore, this oracle is quite unsuitable in the context. Verse 18, therefore, is an addition which is based on Judg. i:1ff. This in turn makes it very probable that the words 'and came to Bethel' in verse 26 are also an addition which has been inserted by the editor responsible for verse 18. Judg. xx:23, which is parallel to verse 26, would seem to confirm this because it contains no reference to Bethel. (389) Originally, therefore, Bethel had

389. According to G.A. Danell, Studies in the Name Israel in the Old Testament, p. 68, n. 60 and pp. 71ff., Bethel belongs to the basic story because elsewhere in the Old Testament Bethel is associated with weeping and is, therefore, to be understood in verse 23. However, the texts on which Danell relies are unreliable (thus, for example, in Hos. xii:5 (EVV.4) it is uncertain whether the weeping of Jacob belongs to Penuel or to Bethel, while in Judg. ii:4f. the identification of Bochim with Bethel is questionable), and, in any case, Bethel was not exclusively the place for lamentation. Cf. Mayes, Israel in the Period of the Judges, p. 44, n. 100.
no place in the narrative of Judg. xx. The editor responsible for the addition of Bethel in chapter xx would also have been responsible for the addition of verses 2-4 in chapter xxi. This provides a vital clue as to the reason for the addition of Bethel in these chapters, for, since Judg. xxi:2-4 presupposes the complete destruction of Benjamin, the references to Bethel must have been inserted after the aetiological stories in chapter xxi had been added to Judg.xix-xx. Furthermore, the sections dealing with Bethel reach their zenith in Judg. xxi:4 where the editor depicts Bethel as a sanctuary in the period of the judges which had an altar on which sacrifices were offered. It would appear that these references to Bethel are additions which derive from the time of Bethel's elevation to the position of a royal sanctuary during the reign of Jeroboam I, and which were designed to show the pre-eminence of Bethel. After Solomon's death, the Northern Kingdom acquired political independence. In the religious sphere, however, many northerners still went on pilgrimages to Jerusalem and, in an attempt to counteract the influence of Jerusalem, Jeroboam I made Bethel and Dan royal sanctuaries (1 Kgs. xii:26ff.)

An examination of the treatment of the sanctuary of Dan in Judg. xvii-xviii would appear to confirm this assessment of the references to Bethel in Judg. xix-xxi. Judg. xvii-xviii are closely linked to Judg. xix-xxi. Like Judg. xix-xxi, chapters xvii-xviii were not originally part of the Deuteronomistic historical work, and they


share with Judg. xix-xxi a common theme - a Levite connected with both Bethlehem and Ephraim - and a common formula - 'In those days there was no king in Israel; every man did what was right in his own eyes'.

Judging from the use of this formula in Judg. xvii-xviii, the author of these chapters seems to have had a high opinion of the monarchy and since these chapters deal with the northern sanctuary of Dan, the monarchy in view is probably that of the northern kingdom. Dan was also one of the two royal sanctuaries which were set up by Jeroboam I. Clearly, the denigrating description in Judg. xvii-xviii of how the sanctuary at Dan was established was designed to discredit the old foundation and thereby to justify Jeroboam's action of turning this sanctuary into a royal sanctuary. Thus, although they differ in method, both Judg. xvii-xviii and Judg. xix-xxi have the aim of justifying the establishment of Dan and Bethel as royal sanctuaries in the time of Jeroboam I. The story of Judg. xix-xxi, therefore, must be used with great caution when determining the position of Bethel in the period of the judges.

(a) The Ark

Judg. xx:27b, 28a locate the ark at Bethel. It has been shown above that the words 'and came to Bethel' in verse 26 are an addition based on verse 18, which means that the original form of verse 26, like verse 23,

396. According to Soggin, 'Zwei umstrittene Stellen aus dem Überlieferungskreis um Schechem' ZAW, lxxiii, 1961, pp. 78-87, ref. p. 80, the terror of God, referred to in Gen. xxxv:5, is often associated with the ark which means that the ark was at both Shechem and Bethel and that its transfer is reflected in this passage. However, as Mayes, Israel in the Period of the Judges, p. 46, n. 109 points out, the word hittat in Gen. xxxv:5 only occurs in this passage, while cognate words occur in contexts which are totally unconnected with the ark. Cf., too, Smend, Yahweh War and Tribal Confederation, p. 95.
must have referred to Mizpah, the only alternative gathering place given for the Israelites in the narrative. However, this does not mean that verses 27b, 28a originally located the ark at Mizpah, for it has been shown that these two half-verses are themselves an addition which break a connection in the text, and which were probably inserted by the editor who introduced the references to Bethel or by some redactor at a later stage. Since the information that the ark was located at Bethel would not have furthered the editor's aim to portray Bethel as the site of an ancient sanctuary, it seems reasonable to conclude that Judg. xx:27b, 28a are based on an old tradition indicating that at one time the ark was lodged at Bethel.

(b) The festival of covenant renewal

Following Alt, Noth maintains that Gen. xxxv:1-5 not only reflects a pilgrimage from Shechem to Bethel, but also derives from a time when Bethel had surpassed Shechem in significance for Israel. Noth then argues that the putting away of the foreign gods which, according to Gen. xxxv:2, 4, was carried out in an actual ceremony at the shrine near Shechem, is textually related to Josh. xxiv:14, 23. From this he concludes that the pilgrimage from Shechem to Bethel must have

---


398. Contra Newman, The People of the Covenant, p. 60, n. 32; Clements, Prophecy and Covenant, p. 91, n. 2. It has been argued by Zobel, Stammesspruch und Geschichte, BZAW, xv, 1965, p. 118, n. 223, that Bethel must have been the original place of the assembly of the tribes in this story. There is no explanation why it should have been added into the text secondarily, since it only became important in the time of Jeroboam I and then a reference to the ark would be anachronism. However, as Mayes points out, Israel in the Period of the Judges, p. 46, n. 109, one must distinguish between the information that Bethel was the gathering place of the tribes, which is intended to portray Bethel as an ancient sanctuary, and the information that Bethel was where the ark was lodged, which is simply supporting information which is probably based on historical tradition. Smend, Yahweh War and Tribal Confederation, pp. 93f., although he distinguishes between these two items of information, maintains that Judg. xx:27b, 28a have no historical value.


400. Cf. Noth, The History of Israel, pp. 94f.
been occasioned by the transference of the amphictyonic central shrine from the one place to the other. Noth also maintains that after Bethel replaced Shechem as central sanctuary, most of the cultic rites and ceremonies which formerly had been practised at Shechem were also transferred to Bethel, although Shechem still retained a little of its covenant ceremonial. However, while Gen. xxxv:1-5 may indeed reveal the practice of a pilgrimage from Shechem to Bethel, these verses alone cannot bear the weight of Noth's interpretation. To support Noth's view that Gen. xxxv:1-5 also reflects the transfer to Bethel of cultic ceremonies previously associated with Shechem it would have to be shown from other texts that those ceremonies, in this case the covenant festival, which had been observed at Shechem were later practised at Bethel. (401) Since this cannot be established, it must be concluded that there is no indication that Bethel was a sanctuary where the covenant festival was celebrated.

(c) The acknowledgement and visitation of the sanctuary

There is no tradition which shows Bethel as a sanctuary acknowledged by all the tribes of Israel. The only text to which appeal could have been made in this connection is Judg. xix-xxi but, as has been shown above, this tradition is unable to survive examination from this point of view.

Thus, all that can be conjectured for the sanctuary at Bethel is that the ark was probably lodged there at one time in the pre-monarchy period. There is no reliable indication that the covenant festival was celebrated at Bethel, or that all the tribes of Israel ever visited the sanctuary. It is most unlikely, therefore, that Bethel was an important sanctuary, let alone a central sanctuary, in the period of the judges.

Gilgal

According to Noth the central sanctuary was, sooner or later, transferred from Bethel to Gilgal. While there is some dispute among advocates of the amphictyony theory as to which position it may have occupied in the succession of these sanctuaries, Gilgal is widely understood to have been an amphictyonic central sanctuary. However, when the texts which are used to support this view are examined, it would appear that Gilgal fulfils only one of the requirements necessary for it to have qualified as a central sanctuary.

(a) The Ark

According to Josh. iii-iv, the ark was at one time lodged at Gilgal in the pre-monarchy period. A literary-critical and traditio-historical analysis of these chapters reveals that the narrative consists of several aetiological fragments in which the ark has little or no place, and which have been supplemented by a number of redactors. Nevertheless, the ark does now occupy a prominent place in these chapters, and, in view of the fact that its introduction would have served no essential purpose from the redactors' point of view in the development of the originally independent aetiological stories basic to the narrative,
it would seem reasonable to conclude that the references to the ark in
the present form of the narrative presuppose that at one time the ark
was indeed lodged at Gilgal. (405)

(b) The festival of covenant renewal

The texts to which appeal is made in connection with the celebration of
the covenant festival at Gilgal are to be found in Josh. v; ix:1-15;
Judg. ii:1-5; 1 Sam. xii. To show that the covenant festival was
celebrated at Gilgal there must be evidence in these passages that a
ceremony took place in Gilgal similar to that practised at Shechem,
described in Josh. xxiv, in which the people were bound to the declared
will of Yahweh. However, when these texts are examined from this point
of view, it becomes clear that none of them can be used as evidence of
the celebration of the covenant festival at Gilgal. In Josh. v, verses
2-9 which describe how the people were circumcised at Gilgal, are a simple
record of the practice of the ritual means of admittance into the
Israelite community; (406) verses 10-12 are concerned solely with the
celebration of the Passover, and may well be late anyway; (407) and
verses 13-15 would appear to be a foundation saga or legend explaining

405. Cf. Smend, Yahweh War and Tribal Confederation, p. 92; Mayes,
Amphictyony and Covenant, p. 41 and n. 66; idem, Israel in the
Period of the Judges, p. 50.

406. Cf. Mayes, Amphictyony and Covenant, p. 41; idem, Israel in the
Period of the Judges, p. 47. Mowinckel, Tetrateuch-Pentateuch-
Hexateuch. Die Berichte über die Landnahme in den drei alt-
Israelitischen Geschichtswerken, BZAW, xc, 1964, argues convincingly
that verse 9 in this passage may point to an aetiological element
in the story, but in this case the aetiological factor is probably
secondary. Cf. Bright, Early Israel in Recent History Writing, p. 97.

407. Cf. Mowinckel, op. cit., pp. 36, 58; Mayes, Israel in the Period
of the Judges, pp. 47f.
why the worship of Yahweh was practised at Gilgal. (408) Josh. ix:1-15, which records a covenant made with the Gibeonites at Gilgal, reveals nothing more than that the Israelites knew of, and were able to use, the idea of the treaty as this was widely employed between peoples. (409) According to Judg. ii:1-5, 'the angel of the Lord went up from Gilgal to Bochim' and there accused the people of having failed to obey the covenant demands. In view of the fact that concise reference is made here to Yahweh's saving deeds, as in Josh. xxiv:2ff, and since, too, there is a parallel between this passage and Exod. xxiii:20ff, which is a covenant text, Judg. ii:1-5 has been interpreted as an accusation against Israel for ignoring the implications of the covenant festival which had been celebrated at Gilgal. (410) However, quite apart from the fact that no conclusions can be drawn from the parallel with Josh. xxiv:2ff which, as shown above, is late, an examination of Judg. ii:1-5 reveals that this passage cannot be used to show what form of worship was practised at Gilgal. Not only would it appear on literary-critical grounds that the original passage probably consisted only of verses 1a, 5b, (411) but the rest of the passage, whether original or not, is clearly an aetiological story providing an Israelite-Yahwistic interpretation of the name Bochim. (412)

408. Cf. Mowinckel, op. cit., p. 36; Mayes, Israel in the Period of the Judges, p. 48. The parallel which Irwin, op. cit., pp. 172f., draws between this passage and Exod. xxiii:20ff. does not constitute evidence of the celebration of the covenant festival at Gilgal.


It has been suggested that 1 Sam. xii reflects a covenant ceremony celebrated at Gilgal which marked the end of the old amphictyonic order and the establishment of the monarchy under Saul. (413) However, this passage cannot be used as evidence of the celebration of the covenant festival at Gilgal in the period of the judges for it is clearly a Deuteronomistic composition set as a speech in the mouth of Samuel. (414) Noth has shown that the Deuteronomist inserted such speeches into the text in order to mark what he considered to be the crucial transitional periods of Israel's history, (415) and this device is used here to mark the introduction of the monarchical system into Israel.

There remains one other argument, put forward by Irwin, (416) to show that the covenant festival was celebrated at Gilgal, and it is the most ingenious. Following von Rad (417) in maintaining that since the 'cultic credo' of the form of Deut. xxvi:5-9 (cf. Deut. vi:20-24, Josh. xxiv:2b-13) had its Sitz im Leben at a sanctuary where the

---


414. Cf. Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien², p. 5, n. 2; Mayes, Amphictyony and Covenant, p. 42, n. 68; idem, Israel in the Period of the Judges, p. 48. The fact that the speech uses covenant language (cf. Muilenburg, loc. cit.) does not constitute any evidence against the Deuteronomistic character of the chapter, as Weiser argues, Samuel, Seine geschichtliche Aufgabe und religiöse Bedeutung, FRLANT, lxxx, Göttingen, 1962, pp. 82ff.

415. Cf., for example, the speech by Joshua in Josh. xxiii, and the speech by Solomon in 1 Kgs. viii.


question of ownership of the land was a live issue, it probably belonged in the context of the Feast of Weeks celebrated at Gilgal, Irwin then argues that since this creed in fact forms the historical prologue of the covenant form, the covenant must, therefore, have been celebrated at Gilgal. However, this argument has many weaknesses. In the first place, ownership of the land is certainly no live issue in the creed. Deut. xxvi: 5b-9 is only concerned to incorporate an agricultural rite which originated in an alien religion into the sphere of Yahweh worship, by providing an 'historicizing' reason for it, (418) while in Deut. vi:20-24 and in Josh. xxiv:2b-13 the recital of the saving acts of Yahweh serves simply as motivation for obedience to the commands of Yahweh. (419) Secondly, even if the ownership of the land were a matter of pressing concern in the creed, this would not necessarily mean that the creed belonged to the sanctuary at Gilgal. Ownership of the land could have been an issue at any sanctuary, not only at Gilgal, (420) and, anyhow, Noth (421) has shown that Gilgal was probably the home of the conquest narratives in Josh. ii-ix. Thirdly, even if the creed did belong to Gilgal, this would not constitute evidence of the celebration of the covenant festival at Gilgal. As C.H.W. Brekelmans (422) has pointed out, von Rad has not proved the existence of the "historical Credo" as an independentGattung. Von Rad has taken the passages to which he gives this name out of their


419. Cf. Mayes, Israel in the Period of the Judges, p. 49.


421. Cf. Noth, Das Buch Josua ², pp. 11f.

context. When put into context, these passages must be considered as belonging to other Gattungen. It would appear that what von Rad calls a creed is in fact simply an historical summary, (423), a literary form which could be used on different occasions and for different purposes. (424)

Finally, the weakest link in Irwin’s argument is his acceptance of von Rad’s claim that Deut. xxvi:5b-9 is an early creed which forms the basis of the Pentateuch, a theory which is far from convincing. (425) Had this passage been of such basic importance, then it would be most difficult to explain why it should have been relegated to such an obscure position. (426) Moreover, in its language and expression this passage strongly resembles Deuteronomistic literature, which would suggest that Deut. xxvi:5b-9 is very probably a comparatively late composition. (427)


426. Cf. J. Barr, Old and New in Interpretation, pp. 65ff., 74 and n. 1; Mayes, Israel in the Period of the Judges, p. 49.

Thus, none of the texts advanced in support of the claim that Yahweh was worshipped at Gilgal in the form of a covenant festival succeeds in establishing this contention.

(c) The acknowledgement and visitation of the sanctuary

According to 1 Sam. xi:14ff, 'all the people went to Gilgal, and there they made Saul king before Yahweh in Gilgal.' However, quite apart from the fact that very little weight can be laid on the reference here to 'all the people', this passage throws no light on the status of the sanctuary at Gilgal before the enthronement of Saul. The fact that it was at Gilgal that Saul was elected as king does not necessarily imply that Gilgal was an amphictyonic sanctuary acknowledged by all twelve tribes. (428)

There are two reasons why Gilgal was chosen for this ceremony. In the first place, Gilgal was, at that time, one of the few places that remained outside Philistine control and, secondly, Gilgal lay in the territory of Benjamin, the tribe to which Saul belonged. (429)

The text to which appeal is most often made to support the claim that Gilgal was a central sanctuary acknowledged and visited by all the tribes is Josh. iii-iv. According to this narrative, Joshua chose twelve men, one from each of the Israelite tribes, to remove twelve stones from the middle of the Jordan and to set them up in 'the place where they lodged' as a memorial of the miraculous crossing of the Jordan.

---

428. Cf. Mayes, Amphictyony and Covenant, p. 43, n. 69; idem, Israel in the Period of the Judges, p. 50.

429. Cf. H. Wildberger, Jahwes Eigentumsvolk, ATANT, Zürich, 1960, pp. 65ff; Mayes, Amphictyony and Covenant, p. 43, n. 69; idem, Israel in the Period of the Judges, p. 50. Wildberger, however, because of the twelve stones element in the story of Josh. iii-iv., does think that Gilgal, while not an amphictyonic centre, nevertheless had significance for all Israel. But, as will be pointed out below, the twelve stones element in the story of Josh. iii-iv. does not have the significance which Wildberger attaches to it.
In one tradition, twelve stones were set up in Gilgal (Josh. iv:8), and, in another tradition, they were set up in the middle of the Jordan (Josh. iv:9). According to Kraus, the twelve men and the twelve stones are an integral part of the narrative of the crossing of the Jordan, which, he maintains, is the description of a regularly repeated cultic act in which the ark was carried through the Jordan in order to 'actualize' or 're-present' the crossing of the Reed Sea and the entry into the land. While there seems little doubt that the tradition of the crossing of the Reed Sea has influenced the presentation of the story of the crossing of the Jordan, Kraus' view that Josh. iii-iv is the description of a regularly repeated cultic act fails to take account both of the literary-critical difficulties of the text, and of the real nature of the traditions which constitute the present narrative. In point of fact, the story of the actual crossing of the Jordan is completed in Josh. iii, and that part of the narrative which deals with the choice of twelve men and the erection of twelve stones is confined to Josh. iv which, from a literary point of view is totally


433. Cf. Mayes, Israel in the Period of the Judges, p. 51 and n. 138. Maier, op. cit., p. 23, thinks that the original conclusion of the tradition of the crossing of the Jordan was Josh. iv:9, but it is much more likely that Josh. iv:9 is an independent stone etiology. Cf. Mayes, loc. cit.
different from Josh. iii. Whereas in Josh. iii there is a fairly
uniform narrative recounting a particular event, in Josh. iv there are,
basically, two aetiological tales, one dealing with the erection of
twelve stones at Gilgal and the other with twelve stones set up in the
middle of the Jordan. (434) Originally, the aetiological stories of
Josh. iv formed no part of the tradition of the crossing of the Jordan,
but they are now loosely connected with the narrative of chapter iii
by the late insertion in chapter iii of verse 12, a verse which has no
affinity either with what precedes or with what follows in that chapter. (435)
The primary element of these aetiological stories is the existence of
twelve stones at Gilgal, whose original significance seems to have been
connected with astral phenomena, (436) and the existence of another group

Israels, SAT, I, ii, 1922, seems to have been the first to
recognize the complex of aetiological legends in Josh. i–vi and,
later, Alt, 'Josua', Kleine Schriften I, pp. 176ff., also drew
attention to them. Then Noth, in the first volume of his
Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien and his Das Buch Josua,
illustrated that the legends in the first chapters of the book
of Joshua were ancient local traditions which were first taken
up by the Deuteronomistic historian who edited them slightly and
then inserted them into the historical framework, (cf. Noth,
Das Buch Josua², pp. 27ff.) The Deuteronomist had before him a
whole complex of aetiological legends and separate themes, basic
narratives and local traditions, (cf. Noth, op. cit., pp. 33ff.) In
Josh. iii–iv, four main original elements have to be distinguished:
(1) the narrative of the miraculous crossing of the Jordan; (2)
the presence of the ark in the region of Gilgal; (3) the aetiology
of the twelve stones on the bed of the Jordan; (4) the aetiology
of the twelve stones at Gilgal. Mayes, Israel in the Period of the
Judges, p. 51, n. 139, may well be right in thinking it likely that
the group of stones set up in the Jordan did not number twelve, and
that this number has been carried over from the aetiology of the
stones at Gilgal.

435. Cf. Mayes, Amphictyony and Covenant, p. 44, n. 72; idem, Israel in
the Period of the Judges, p. 51.

436. So Maier, op. cit., p. 24, n. 159. See also G.R. Driver, 'Sacred
Numbers and Round Figures', Promise and Fulfilment, Essays
p. 66; Mayes, Amphictyony and Covenant, p. 44, n. 72; idem,
Israel in the Period of the Judges, p. 51.
of stones in the river Jordan. (437) The secondary element is that which attempts to explain and account for the existence of these stones at these particular places by linking them with the twelve tribes of Israel and the crossing of the Jordan. These aetiological stories, therefore, presuppose simply the existence of these stones and the present connection with the twelve tribes of Israel and the crossing of the Jordan is a secondary one which was made possible by, on the one hand, an acceptance of the conquest traditions of Josh. ii-ix, which probably had their focal point at Gilgal, as the conquest tradition of all Israel, and, on the other hand, the prevalence of the view that Israel consisted of twelve tribes. The association of Gilgal with the twelve tribes of Israel in Josh. iv is, therefore, a secondary one which presupposes only that at some time or other, and not necessarily in the period of the judges, Israel was thought of as consisting of twelve tribes. Thus, that part of Josh. iii-iv which deals with the twelve men and the twelve stones cannot be used as evidence that the sanctuary at Gilgal was acknowledged and visited by all twelve tribes in the period of the judges.

While, then, there is evidence of the presence of the ark at Gilgal, there is no reliable indication either that the covenant festival was celebrated there or that the sanctuary was acknowledged and visited by all the tribes. Thus, the traditions associated with Gilgal do not on their own account suggest that Gilgal was a central sanctuary of an Israelite amphictyony in the period of the judges.

437. For what follows, cf. Mayes, Israel in the Period of the Judges, pp. 51f.
Shiloh

According to Noth, Gilgal was in time succeeded as central sanctuary by Shiloh, where the ark was to be found at the end of the period of the judges. (438) Many scholars have stressed the importance of Shiloh as an amphictyonic central sanctuary and indeed some have argued that passages such as Josh. xviii:1 indicate that Shiloh alone was the central sanctuary. (439) However, when the relevant texts are examined, it becomes clear that although there is firm evidence of the presence of the ark at Shiloh in the period of the judges, (440) there is no reliable indication either that the covenant festival was celebrated there, or that the sanctuary was acknowledged and visited by all the tribes or their representatives.

(a) The Ark

There is sound evidence that towards the end of the period of the judges, the ark was brought to Shiloh (441) and lodged in a temple there (1 Sam. iii:3) until it was taken out to battle against the Philistines

438. Cf. Noth, The History of Israel\(^2\), pp. 95f.

439. W.F. Albright, Archaeology and the Religion of Israel\(^5\) Baltimore, 1968, p. 103; idem, From the Stone Age to Christianity\(^2\), New York, 1957, pp. 285f., seems to have been the first to argue that Shiloh alone was the central sanctuary. This is followed by E. Nielsen, Shechem. A Traditio-Historical Investigation\(^2\), Copenhagen, 1959, p. 36, n. 1; J. Bright, A History of Israel\(^2\), pp. 161f.; G.E. Wright, Shechem. The Biography of a Biblical City, London, 1965, pp. 140f.; M.H. Woudstra, The Ark of the Covenant from Conquest to Kingship, Philadelphia, 1965, pp. 126ff., 133.

440. Cf. Maier, op.cit., p. 43; Mayes, Amphictyony and Covenant, p. 45; idem, Israel in the Period of the Judges, p. 52.

who succeeded in capturing it. (442)

(b) The festival of covenant renewal

Judg. xxi:15ff. refers to a festival at Shiloh which seems to have taken place in the autumn, at the time of the vine harvest. However, as mentioned above, (443) the purpose of Judg. xxi:15ff. is to provide the aetiology of a cultic custom at Shiloh. This passage, therefore, cannot be used to show that the covenant festival was celebrated at Shiloh, or that the sanctuary was used by all Israel. (444)

442. Until recently, there has been some confusion as to the history of Shiloh itself from this time on. The results of the Danish excavations at Shiloh in 1926 seemed to indicate that Shiloh was destroyed by the Philistines on the occasion of the battle at Aphek. It was also thought that Jer. vii:12 alluded to this destruction and that Shiloh remained unoccupied through the monarchy period, cf. H. Kjaer, 'The Danish Excavation of Shiloh', PEO, 1 ix, 1927, pp.202-213; idem, 'The Excavations of Shiloh 1929. A Preliminary Report', JPOS, 1930, pp.87-174; Albright, Archaeology and the Religion of Israel3 p.104; Irwin, op.cit., p.177; Mayes, Amphictyony and Covenant, p.46, n. 77. However, the latest series of Danish excavations show that earlier conclusions were based on a false chronological reckoning, and that the destruction layers at Shiloh which were previously associated with the Iron I age, actually date from the time of the Assyrian conquest. It would appear, therefore, that there is no archaeological, or biblical, evidence for a destruction of Shiloh in the pre-monarchy period and that Jer. vii:12 must refer to a more recent event. Cf. M.L. Buhl and S. Holm-Nielsen, Shiloh. The Danish Excavations at Tall Sailun, Palestine, in 1926, 1929, 1932, and 1963. The Pre-Hellenistic Remains, Publications of the National Museum Archaeological-Historical Series I, xii, Copenhagen, 1969; G.J. Wenham, 'Deuteronomy and the Central Sanctuary', TE, xxii, 1971, pp.107ff., n.19; R.A. Pearce, 'Shiloh and Jeremiah VII 12, 14 and 15', VT, xxxii, 1973, pp.105-108; Mayes, Israel in the Period of the Judges, p.52, n.143. However, for a different view, cf. Bright, A History of Israel2, p.181, n.5.

443. See above p.490. Cf. Mayes, Israel in the Period of the Judges, pp.44, 52. The reference to Shiloh in Judg. xxi:12 was probably inserted after the aetiological story in verses 15ff. had been connected with what precedes. Cf. Mayes, Israel in the Period of the Judges, p.52, n.146.

444. Neither this festival nor the one described in 1 Sam. i:1-18 are covenant festivals and both are best understood as having been purely local affairs, cf. Irwin, op.cit., p.176; Mayes, Amphictyony and Covenant, p.46; idem, Israel in the Period of the Judges, pp.52f. Contra Noth, The History of Israel2, p.98; Bright, A History of Israel2, p.164; Newman, The People of the Covenant, p.123; Nicholson, Deuteronomy and Tradition, p.61.
According to 1 Sam. i:3, Elkanah 'used to go up year by year from his city to worship and to sacrifice to the Lord of hosts at Shiloh'. There is a certain ambiguity as to the precise nature of this festival. On the one hand, the fact that Eli suspected Hannah of being drunk (1. Sam. i:12ff.) would seem to indicate a vintage festival. (445) On the other hand, it may well have been simply an annual family festival. (446) However, there would appear to be no grounds for treating this festival as a covenant festival, or for attributing to it a national character. (447)

c) The acknowledgement and visitation of the sanctuary

Although there are three passages at the end of the book of Joshua, Josh. xviii:1; xxi:2; xxii:12, which would appear to imply that all Israel had periodically assembled at Shiloh, these passages are late and probably to be assigned to the P source, (448) which makes their historicity extremely doubtful. (449)

1 Sam. iv relates how it was from Shiloh that the ark was brought to the battle with the Philistines. However, this passage cannot be used to show the presence of all Israel at Shiloh for, quite apart from the fact that it is not clear which tribes were involved in the battle, Shiloh was not the place where the Israelite forces assembled. (450)


447. Cf. above, page 506, n. 444.


449. Mowinckel, Tetrateuch-Pentateuch-Hexateuch. Die Berichte über die Landnahme in den drei altisraelitischen Geschichtswerken, BZAW, xc, 1964, p. 74, argues that Shiloh was substituted for Shechem in the P source because Shechem was the Samaritan centre at the time of the composition of P and it would have been politically inexpedient to concede that Shechem had been the central sanctuary of Israel in the earlier period of national history. Cf. also, Smend, Yahweh War and Tribal Confederation, pp. 95f.

For the sanctuary at Shiloh, therefore, it may be concluded that, while there is evidence for the presence of the ark, the traditions associated with Shiloh do not substantiate the remaining two essential criteria used in determining a central sanctuary of an Israelite amphictyony.

This application of the criteria suggested by Noth to the records connected with and deriving from the various sanctuaries which have been proposed as central sanctuaries, has shown that none of the sanctuaries suggested could have occupied the position of central sanctuary in the period of the judges. Furthermore, as Mayes argues, (451) even if the first two criteria laid down by Noth, namely, the presence of the ark and the celebration of the festival of covenant renewal, were set aside, the conclusion that none of the sanctuaries proposed were central sanctuaries is still valid, since there is no clear and unambiguous evidence in the records at our disposal that any of the sanctuaries suggested was maintained and visited by all the tribes or their representatives. Mayes points out that if any of these sanctuaries had been acknowledged as central sanctuary then there would be evidence that it had been the meeting place of tribal representatives, that it had been maintained by the tribes, and that it had been regularly visited by the tribes on festival occasions. However, it is clear from the records that none of these sanctuaries was the meeting place for tribal representatives, that each sanctuary was maintained by the particular tribe in whose territory it was situated and not by a number of tribes, and that while some sanctuaries may have constituted a

temporary attraction for pilgrims on account of the presence of the ark, (452) "there is no sign that any sanctuary was a focal point for regular visits by members of a federation which was responsible for the maintenance of that sanctuary." (453) It would appear, therefore, that there were a number of sanctuaries throughout the land, all of which were of more or less equal status, and that each tribe maintained and worshipped at the particular sanctuary, or sanctuaries, which lay within its own territory.

Thus the traditions which describe the period of the judges and the religious conditions prevailing at this time fail to support Noth's claim that the Israelite tribes had a common central sanctuary. Furthermore, a brief examination of the other points advanced by Noth in support of his theory of an Israelite amphictyony serves to confirm that there was in fact no cultic, legal, or administrative centralization, in the period of the judges.

The nāšî’.

The term nāšî’ was used to designate a leader of some kind, but, apart from the late P passages, there is no indication that the nāšî’ was the representative of an individual tribe. (454) Furthermore, there may have

452. In view of the fact that, before its capture by the Philistines, the ark's movements were confined to the territory of Ephraim, Mayes is probably correct in thinking that, in this time, the ark may have been a particularly Ephraimite cult object which was only visited by pilgrims from the tribe of Ephraim. Cf. Mayes, Amphictyony and Covenant, p. 47; idem, Israel in the Period of the Judges, p. 54, n. 150.

453. Mayes, Israel in the Period of the Judges, p. 53.

been a number of \( n^\text{31} \) in one tribe, as Num. xxv:14 would seem to indicate. As regards Noth’s emphasis on the sacral responsibilities of the \( n\text{32} \), Irwin rightly argues that anyone who occupied a position of authority was regarded as exercising a sacral function.\(^{455}\) Although Noth draws attention to the fact that in a Phoenician inscription of 96 B.C. the term \( n\text{32} \) is used to describe a person who had charge of the temple\(^{456}\), there is no record in the Old Testament of a biblical \( n\text{32} \) fulfilling a role of this nature. Finally, as Orlinsky observes, it is surely most significant that the word \( n\text{32} \) does not occur anywhere in the Book of Judges, the most important single source for the period of the judges.\(^{457}\)

**The Judge of Israel**

According to Noth, the central institutional office of the Israelite amphictyony was the office of \( \text{šōpēt yišrā'ēl} \),\(^{458}\) a title which occurs only once in the Old Testament, in Mic. iv:14 (EVV. v:1). Noth argues

\[ p. 18, n. 57; Mayes, Amphictyony and Covenant, pp. 48f.; idem, Israel in the Period of the Judges, p. 55. There is uncertainty about the precise nature of the office of \( n\text{32} \). H. Cazelles, Études sur le code de l’alliance, Paris, 1946, pp.81f., 137f., thinks that the office of \( n\text{32} \) was that of judge. It was a position similar to that of the nomadic sheikh (cf., too, de Vaux, op.cit., p. 432) who was responsible for making decisions regulating the life of the clan. With the rise of the monarchy, this institution disappeared but was revived in Ezekiel’s time because this was a period of restoration and of high regard for ancient ways. On the other hand, J. van der Ploeg, ‘Les chefs du peuple d'Israel et leurs titres’, RB, lvi, 1950, pp.40-61, thinks that the \( n\text{32} \) was simply a leader who had raised himself above his fellows, while E.A. Speiser, ‘Background and Function of the Biblical \( n\text{32} \)’, CBO, xxv, 1963, pp.111-117, maintains that the title stands for a duly elected leader of a tribal alliance.

\[ 455. \text{Cf. Irwin, op.cit., p. 169.} \]

\[ 456. \text{Cf. Noth, Das System, pp. 160f.} \]


\[ 458. \text{Cf. Noth, 'Das Amt des "Richters Israels"', Festschrift Alfred Betholet, 1950, pp. 404-417; idem, A History of Israel \( ^2 \), pp. 10f.} \]
that the prophet was not referring here to the king, but, rather, to the holder of an amphictyonic office which survived through the monarchic period. However, while it is undoubtedly the case that the present context of this verse does not mention the Davidic king, it is most unlikely that Mic. iv:14 originally formed the immediate continuation or conclusion of the verses preceding it. The most natural conclusion to the unit formed by Mic. iv:11-13 is Mic. iv:13. Of the many different proposals made concerning the original context of Mic. iv:14, there are two which commend themselves. On the one hand, Beyerlin (459) argues that Mic. iv:14 originally belonged at the end of the song of lament in Mic. i:8-16, and, on the other, Willis (460) maintains that the verse should not be separated from Mic. v:1ff.

Although it is difficult to decide whether Mic. iv:14 originally formed the conclusion of Mic. i:8-16 or the beginning of Mic. v:1ff, it is

459. Beyerlin, Die Kulttraditionen Israels in der Verkündigung des Propheten Micha, FRLANT, lxxii, 1959, pp. 18f., puts forward six arguments to support his conclusion that Mic. iv:14 (EVW v:1) originally belonged at the end of the song of lament in Mic. i:8-16: (1) Mic. i:16 and iv:14 refer to different mourning customs which are treated together in Lev. xix:27f.; xxii:5; Deut. xiv:1, (Mic. i:16 refers to the custom of shaving the head bald, while Mic. iv:14 refers to the custom of making a cut); (2) both Mic. i:8-16 and iv:14 are in the Qinah metre; (3) both passages contain word-plays; (4) Mic. i:16 and iv:14 both use feminine forms; (5) i:15b and iv:14 are both to be understood as referring to Jerusalem; (6) the historical background of both passages is Sennacherib's invasion in 701 B.C. Beyerlin thinks that there were two reasons why Mic. iv:14 was transferred to its present position. In the first place, this verse begins, like most of the verses in iv:8-v:1, with 'cattāh, and, secondly, the defeated 'judge of Israel' was the perfect foil to the successful 'ruler in Israel' who is described in Mic. v:1ff. (EVW v:2ff.)

460. J.T. Willis, 'Micah iv:14 - v:5 - a Unit', VT, xviii, 1968, pp. 529-547, ref. pp. 532f., maintains that iv:14 should not be separated from v:1ff. because, together, these verses make up a particular unit in which a short section dealing with doom is followed by a long section dealing with hope, a form which is also to be found in iii:9 (or 12)-iv:5 and iv:11-13, slightly different forms being found in iv:6-8, 9-10; v:6-8, 9-14. However, as Mayes, Israel in the Period of the Judges, p. 63, points out, it could be argued that the present arrangement of these sections with their alternating themes of doom and hope, is the work of the collector of the prophetic sayings who, to suit his own purpose, transferred iv:14 from its original position at the end of the song of lament in Mic. i:8-16.
quite clear that in both these contexts the verse would refer to the
Davidic king and not to an occupant of an independent office of
'judge of Israel'.\(^{461}\) Moreover there are several passages which
clearly indicate that the responsibility for administering justice
lay with the king.\(^{462}\) In 1 Sam. viii:20, the people request from
Samuel a king who 'will judge us', while 1 Kgs. iii:9 describes how
Solomon prayed for an 'understanding mind to judge thy people'. 1 Sam.
viii:3ff, 20 and 1 Sam. x:25 seem to suggest that when Samuel anointed
Saul to be king, the judicial functions previously exercised by Samuel
were transferred to the king.\(^{463}\) 2 Sam. xv:1-4, which describes how
Absalom tried to win support for himself from disgruntled claimants,
clearly presupposes that the administration of justice was the re-
ponsibility of the king. It is most unlikely, anyway, that David, or
any other king, would have tolerated the existence of a powerful rival
office and, indeed, there is no record of a סֵפֶט יִשְׂרָאֵל in the list
of David's officers in 2 Sam. viii:15-18. On the contrary, it is David
himself who is said to have administered 'justice and righteousness' to
all the people (2 Sam. viii:15), and in 2 Kgs. xv:5 and Isa. xvi:5 the
Davidic king is actually designated as סֵפֶט. In the monarchical period,

461. See also, Beyerlin, Die Kulttraditionen Israels in der Verkündigung
des Propheten Micha, FRIANT, lxxii, 1959, pp.19f.; Kraus, Worship in
Israel, pp.188f.; O. Bächli, Israel und die Völker, ATANT, xii,
1962, pp.187,189f. N.W. Porteous, 'Actualization and the Prophetic
Criticism of the Cult', Tradition und Situation, Arthur Weiser
Festschrift, 1963, pp.93-105, ref. p.96; D.A. McKenzie, 'The Judge
of Israel', VT, xvii, 1967, pp.118-121, ref. p.121; J.T. Willis,
'Micah iv:14-5:1a Unit', VT, xvi, 1968, pp.529-547, ref. p.533;
Mayes, Amphictyony and Covenant, pp.55ff.; idem, Israel in the
Period of the Judges, pp.63ff.; A. Phillips, Ancient Israel's

462. Cf. A.R. Johnson, Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel\(^2\), 1967, p.116,
n.1; idem, 'Hebrew Conceptions of Kingship', Myth, Ritual and
Kingship, 1958, pp.204-235, ref.pp.206f.; F. Horst, 'Recht und
Religion im Bereich des Alten Testament, Gottes Recht, Theologische
Bücherei, xii, 1961, pp.260-291, ref. pp.264f.; R.E. Clements,
Prophecy and Covenant, p.73; Mayes, Amphictyony and Covenant, pp.55ff.;
Idem, Israel in the Period of the Judges, pp.61ff.

121, ref. p. 121.
therefore, while the elders at the city gate must have been involved in the local administration of justice, the supreme judicial authority undoubtedly lay in the hands of the king and there is no evidence of the existence of an amphictyonic office of ]**opê t yišrâ'ēl. As regards the pre-monarchy period, although all the judges of the list in Judg.x:1-5; xii:7-15 are said to have 'judged Israel', there are no grounds for concluding, as Noth does, that these men occupied an office of ]**opê t yišrâ'ēl which had significance for all Israel. While the present form of Judg. x:1-5; xii:7-15 is of no help in determining the sphere of activity of these judges, this can be deduced in the light of what is known about Samuel, for it has been shown that of all the individuals outside the list of 'minor judges', Samuel has most claim to having originally been a member of this list,(464) and he has been treated in much more detail by the tradition. It is clear from the tradition that Samuel's office of administrator of justice was of strictly local significance, for 1 Sam. vii:16 records that he went on a circuit each year to Bethel, Gilgal, and Mizpah,(465) where he 'judged Israel', and

464. Schunck, 'Die Richter Israels und ihr Amt', VTS, xv, 1966, pp.252-262, ref. p.255, has shown in detail how the literary form which is used of Samuel in 1 Sam. vii:15-16a; xxv:1 is very similar to that used of the 'minor judge'; cf. also, W. Richter, 'Zu den "Richtern Israels"', ZAW, lxxvii, 1965, pp.40-72, ref. pp.47f. Furthermore, the details provided by the tradition conform well with Samuel's representation as a judge. Cf. Weiser, Samuel. Seine geschichtliche Aufgabe und religiöse Bedeutung, FRLANT, lxxxi, 1962, pp.10ff.; Mayes, Amphictyony and Covenant, pp.59ff.; idem, Israel in the Period of the Judges, pp.56ff. On the other hand, the representation of Samuel as a deliverer, in 1 Sam. vii; xii:11, must be judged a Deuteronomistic construction. Cf. Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien², pp. 55,59.

465. Of the several places in Palestine called Mizpah, or Mizpeh, the one mentioned here in 1 Sam. vii:16 is probably to be identified with Tell en-Nasbeh, approximately seven miles north of Jerusalem, or with Nebi Samwil, approximately five miles north of Jerusalem. Cf. Noth, The Old Testament World, p. 137; Mayes, Israel in the Period of the Judges, p. 66, n. 197.
these three places all lay within the territory of the mid-Palestinian tribes. In reality, therefore, the 'Israel' which Samuel judged was the local population who lived in the immediate vicinity of the places mentioned in his circuit. Moreover, it would appear from 1 Sam. viii:2, which may well be part of the same old Samuel tradition, that Samuel's sons were contemporary judges operating south of the province covered by their father. In view of the fact that Samuel should probably be considered as one of the judges of the list in Judg. x:1-5; xii:7-15, it seems fair to conclude that, like Samuel, these judges exercised their judicial functions within a limited area, and the majority of them probably worked in the territory occupied by their respective tribes. Furthermore, although in the present form of the tradition these men are said to have occupied a particular office in succession, Richter argues convincingly that some of them may have been contemporaries operating in different provinces. As in the case of Samuel, the sphere of influence of these judges has been subsequently extended to cover all Israel.

466. It is most unlikely that the references to these three places should be ascribed to the Deuteronomist or some other editor. As Mayes, Israel in the Period of the Judges, p. 65, points out, the only reason for preserving this information is that Samuel's circuit of these places formed part of the old Samuel tradition.

467. Cf. Smend, Yahweh War and Tribal Confederation, p. 70.

468. According to 1 Sam. viii:1, Samuel was old when he appointed his sons 'judges for Israel', which implies that they followed Samuel in a position of significance for all Israel. However, it seems best to ascribe this verse to the editor who understood these judges to have more than a local sphere of influence. Cf. Mayes, Israel in the Period of the Judges, p. 66, n. 200.

469. Tola, however, belonged to the tribe of Issachar, but lived, and presumably also judged, in Ephraim.

Unfortunately, the exact functions of the judges remain very obscure, but they must have been judicial in some sense. The judge may have represented the court of appeal, or he may have been the one to whom particularly difficult cases were brought. On ceremonial occasions the judge may also have had the task of proclaiming law. It is perfectly clear, however, that none of these judges occupied an office of significance for all Israel. The judge was simply a local official who was appointed for the judicial administration of a limited area.

The Tribal Borders

Noth suggests \(^{(471)}\) that one of the functions of the 'minor judges' was to establish the tribal borders, and he also claims that the present system of borders in Josh. xiii-xix may ultimately derive from a document drawn up by one of these judges. Noth follows Alt \(^{(472)}\) in arguing that the border descriptions in Josh. xiii-xix are to be derived from the pre-monarchy period and that they represent a combination of the actual and the ideal, in that they describe the territory each tribe actually possessed in the period of the judges along with the territory which it thought it should possess but which was, then, under foreign control. If it could be demonstrated that


these boundary descriptions do derive from the period of the judges, then this would presuppose the existence of some form of central authority in this period which had the power to settle border disputes and to establish tribal borders, and this in turn would constitute some evidence in favour of the existence of an amphictyony.

An examination of these boundary descriptions reveals two types of material which have been combined to form the present structure of Josh. xiii-xix. On the one hand, there are the tribal boundaries proper, and, on the other hand, there are the city-lists of Josh. xv:21-62; xviii:21-28; xix:2-7, 41-46. It is very probable that the four city-lists represent a secondary disintegration of what was originally a single list presenting those cities which belonged to the kingdom of Judah. The remaining material is far from uniform, but Josh. xv:1-12; xvi:1-3, 5-8; xvii:7-10; xviii:11-20 do constitute genuine border descriptions for Judah, Ephraim, Manasseh, and Benjamin, and they certainly reflect conditions of early post-settlement times, or at least of a time before Solomon's administrative division of the kingdom.


475. There are several points which indicate that these border descriptions are genuine and that they reflect real conditions of settlement. Cf. Alt, 'Das System der Stammesgrenzen im Buche Josua', Kleine Schriften, vol. I, pp.194ff.; Mayes, Israel in the Period of the Judges, pp. 70ff.
areas west of the Jordan which were certainly not occupied by Israel until the time of David. Clearly, the aim of this border system is to treat all the land west of the Jordan as Israelite. However, the suggestion that the border system is founded on a combination of claim and reality and comes from the period of the judges is made very doubtful by the fact that the boundary descriptions themselves do not deal with the whole land west of the Jordan. It is only through the editorial combination of the city-lists with the boundary descriptions that all the land west of the Jordan is covered. Indeed, the border system as such really concentrates in detail on the southern part of the land west of the Jordan, incorporating Judah and Benjamin, and including Ephraim only in so far as it affected the southern area.\(^{476}\)

This fact is best explained by taking the boundary system as a product of the Judaean part of David's empire, which, as early as the time of David himself,\(^ {477}\) began to develop into a separate entity within the kingdom until the formal division of the kingdom after Solomon's death. It is very probable that the boundary system comes from the time of the early monarchy and that it is based, on the one hand, on the actual territory which had long been in the possession of the individual tribes, and, on the other hand, on the assignment to the tribes of those areas which were only incorporated within Israel by David. The present picture of territory being assigned by Joshua to all twelve tribes is the work of an editor who has combined city-lists with this boundary system in order to provide a fitting conclusion to the narrative in the first half of the Book of Joshua which deals with the conquest of all the land by the united Israelite tribes under the leadership of Joshua.


The War Against Benjamin

According to Noth, the account of the war between Benjamin and the rest of the Israelite tribes in Judg. xix-xxi is one of the few direct amphictyonic traditions preserved in the Old Testament. (478)

Arguing that the vocabulary used in these chapters, which is found otherwise mainly in late texts, (479) derives from the amphictyony, Noth maintains that this is a record of the disciplinary action taken by the members of the amphictyony against a fellow-member, Benjamin, for a breach of amphictyonic law. According to Noth, this incident is closely paralleled by a war waged in 339 B.C. by a Greek amphictyony against one of its members, the Locrians, for a breach of amphictyonic law committed by the inhabitants of the city of Amphissa. If it could be demonstrated that on occasion in the period between the settlement of the tribes in the land and the rise of the monarchy (480), the tribes combined forces in battle, then this would offer some support to the theory that the Israelite tribes constituted

---

478. Cf. Noth, Das System, pp. 102f., n. 2

479. In view of the prevalence of the words qāhāl and ʿEdāh in Judg. xx and the fact that in Judg. xix-xxi Israel is portrayed not as a political community but as a centralized, ecclesiastical assembly, Wellhausen, Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments, 1899, p. 236, doubted the possibility of recovering the veritable historicity of the story; cf. too, G.F. Moore, Judges, ICC, 1895, p. 405.

480. Since the amphictyony is supposed to have been established only after the settlement had taken place, the event of the actual settlement itself is of no concern here. For a recent critical survey of theories regarding the course of the settlement of the tribes, cf. M. Weippert, The Settlement of the Israelite Tribes in Palestine.
an amphictyony. (481) However, an examination of the records of those battles which the tradition places in this period indicates that the events recorded were of local significance only. Leaving aside the literary-critical problems of Judg. xix-xxi, it must be determined what tribes were involved in this incident and what the nature of the dispute was. As regards which tribes were involved in this event, the fact that the Levite is said to have divided his concubine into twelve pieces which he sent throughout all Israel (Judg. xix:29), together with

---

481. The Greeks referred to their amphictyonic wars as 'holy wars' and, because of the way in which wars were conducted in Israel in the period of the judges, they, too, are commonly referred to as 'holy wars'. Cf. especially, von Rad, Der heilige Krieg in alten Israel, ATANT, xx, 1951; and also, de Vaux, Ancient Israel², pp.258ff.; Weippert, "Heiliger Krieg" in Israel und Assyrien, ZAW, lxxxiv, 1972, pp.460-493; F. Stolz, Jahwes und Israels Kriege, ATANT, lx, 1972. In the case of Israel, however, the designation 'holy war' obscures the essentially Yahwistic-Israelite nature of these wars and encourages comparisons to be made between these wars and holy wars which were practised elsewhere. Cf. W. Richter, Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Richterbuch,² BBB, xviii, 1966, p.186. 'Wars of Yahweh' is perhaps the most suitable designation for the wars in Israel in the period of the judges. Cf. Mayes, Israel in the Period of the Judges, p. 74, n.240. Smend, Yahweh War and Tribal Confederation, pp.33ff. et passim, argues that a sharp distinction should be made between 'holy war' and 'amphictyonic war'. According to Smend, these were two originally distinct institutions, the 'holy war' having its origin with the Rachel tribes coming out of Egypt, while the amphictyony belonged with the Leah tribes which had never been to Egypt and which were already settled in the land (ibid., 98ff.) These two institutions were eventually fused, because, when the Rachel tribes settled in the land, they became members of the amphictyony and the God of the holy war, Yahweh, was accepted by the Leah tribes as the God of the amphictyony (ibid, pp.39,117ff). If the distinction advocated by Smend were to be accepted, then the holy war is really unrelated to the question of the existence of an amphictyony and even if it could be demonstrated that there was no occasion when all the tribes joined forces in a particular action, this would not constitute evidence against the existence of an amphictyony. Nevertheless, if it could be shown that the tribes did join together in battle, then this would give some support to the theory of the amphictyony. Cf. Mayes, Israel in the Period of the Judges, pp. 75f. (Smend, op.cit., pp.20ff., 32, thinks that the fact that in the holy war the tribes could appeal for help from one another, clearly indicates an Israelite unity in this period which fits best within the context of an amphictyony.)
the general references in Judg. xx:1f. to 'all the people of Israel',
and 'the chiefs of all the people, of all the tribes of Israel' who
gathered at Mizpah, would lead the casual reader to think that all
the Israelite tribes were involved. In fact, however, it is very
probable that Judg. xix-xxi preserves a tradition which told originally
of a dispute involving only two tribes, Ephraim and Benjamin. In
the first place, apart from the fact that it is most unlikely that a
piece would have been sent to Benjamin, the phrase 'into twelve
pieces' should be omitted both on literary-critical grounds, because
it is an unsuitable antecedent to the object of 'sent' in the following
phrase, (482) and because there is a parallel formula in 1 Sam. xi:7
which makes it improbable that a reference to 'twelve pieces' con-
stituted a part of the original text in Judg. xix. (483) Secondly, as
has already been noted, references in the text of the Old Testament
to all Israel or to all the tribes of Israel cannot be taken at their
face value, and indeed this is actually borne out in this instance
by the fact that Benjamin was not present at this gathering (cf.
Judg. xx:3, 12ff.)

482. Cf. Schunck, Benjamin. Untersuchungen zur Entstehung und
Geschichte eines israelitischen Stammes. EZAW, Ixxxvi, 1963,
p.64. However, Schunck's own conjecture that the tradition
knew of the existence of a federation of ten tribes on this
casion is very weak and must be rejected. Schunck bases
his argument here on Judg. xx:10 where the number ten is
used as the basis for the formation of an army.

Apart from Benjamin itself, only three tribes, Gilead, Judah, and Ephraim are specifically mentioned. Gilead is named specifically in Judg. xx:1 but Mayes argues convincingly that since Gilead is otherwise mentioned only in the two fused aetiological traditions in Judg. xxi:1ff. which were inserted late into their present context, the reference to Gilead in Judg. xx:1 may well be a late addition also which has been introduced here to strengthen the authenticity of the place it subsequently occupies in the aetiological ending of the narrative. Judah figures in the tradition as the tribe in whose territory Bethlehem, the home town of the Levite’s concubine, was situated, and in Judg. xx:18 as the tribe which was commanded to go up first against Benjamin. However, the connection with Judah through the mention of Bethlehem is probably a late element which has been introduced both into this tradition and into the preceding one in Judg. xvii-xviii, and, anyhow, even if he were only a ḫār in Ephraim, the responsibility for the Levite’s welfare would have lain with Ephraim. As for Judg. xx:18, it has already been noted that, not only is this command unsuitable in its context, but it is

486. Cf. Schunck, Benjamin, p. 66; Mayes, Israel in the Period of the Judges, p. 81.
487. Cf. Mayes, Amphictyony and Covenant, p. 82, n. 145.
not fulfilled, which makes it more than likely that this verse is an addition which is dependent on Judg. i:lf. (489) From the emphasis which the tradition lays on the fact that both the Levite and the man of Gibeah who gave him lodging for the night, came from Ephraim (Judg. xix:1,16), it is obvious that Ephraim is integral to the tradition, and it seems fair to conclude that this story originally recounted a dispute which concerned only Ephraim and Benjamin, without any part being played by the other tribes. At a later date, however, the significance of this dispute was extended to embrace the whole of Israel. There were several indications that Benjamin formed a particular, warlike, group within Ephraim and lived in the southern part of the territory occupied by Ephraim, and that Judg. xix-xxi refers to an unsuccessful attempt by Benjamin to shake itself free from Ephraimite domination and establish itself as an independent tribe. (490) At any rate, the parallel which Noth draws between the episode recounted in Judg. xix-xxi and the Greek amphictyonic war of Amphissa in 339 B.C. is invalid, because, quite apart from the fact that there is no indication that Benjamin was excluded from associating with the rest of the tribes, which was the penalty incurred by the Locrians, there is no evidence whatever of an amphictyonic war against Benjamin or of any breach of amphictyonic law by that tribe.


As for the other battles which the tradition places in the time between the settlement of the tribes in the land and the rise of the monarchy, an examination reveals that the present form of the Book of Judges, which depicts these battles as the combined efforts of all Israel, is the work of a later editor, and that originally most of the stories told of quite local events. (491) There is no evidence of any communal activity by the tribes of Israel to support the view that in the period of the judges conditions were favourable to the existence of an amphictyony.

The Tribal Lists

The conclusions which Noth draws from his study of the tribal lists are also open to question. Mayes puts forward cogent arguments that the two types of tribal list probably come from a time after the battle against Sisera, which he dates in the latter half of the eleventh century B.C., which would mean that if there were an amphictyonic federation of Israelite tribes corresponding to either or both of the groups of lists, arranged in the way which Noth describes, then it must have existed in the period between the battle against Sisera and the rise of the monarchy. However, while it is quite evident that the compilers of these tribal lists had the ideal before them of preserving the number twelve of the Israelite tribes, there is no justification for concluding from this ideal that the tribal lists presuppose the actual, independent existence of twelve Israelite tribes united in an amphictyony in the period of the judges. In fact, there seems to have been no period in which there were twelve co-existing, independent Israelite tribes corresponding to the tribal lists. Even

491. On these battles, cf. especially Mayes, Amphictyony and Covenant, pp. 70ff; idem, Israel in the Period of the Judges, pp.76ff.

492. For what follows, cf. Mayes, Amphictyony and Covenant, pp.19-35; idem, Israel in the Period of the Judges, pp.16-34.
Noth himself is of the opinion that at no particular time did all twelve Israelite tribes enjoy contemporaneous, independent existence. Thus, for example, Reuben, Simeon, and Levi cannot be considered as independent tribes on an equal footing with the other tribes, while it appears that Dan, even if it remained independent, was of little significance. The fact that the number twelve, which is consistently preserved in the lists, is unreliably schematic is a serious weakness in the case for the existence of an Israelite amphictyony, and Noth is unconvincing in his attempt to explain it away by arguing that it in no way disproves the general historicity of the system of twelve tribes as an actual institution. Moreover, Noth's insistence on the importance of the numbers twelve and six appears to be exaggerated. The number twelve is particularly associated with the constitution of an amphictyony because of the importance placed on the league at Delphi, about which there is more


496. On this, cf. Mayes, Amphictyony and Covenant, pp. 31ff.; idem, Israel in the Period of the Judges, pp. 32f.

information than any other, but it seems that the Greek and Italian amphictyonies were not characterized by any specific number. Thus there were seven members in the Calaurian league (Strabo 8.6.14), while the Lykian league consisted of twenty-three cities and the Boetian league seems to have fluctuated and is variously reported as having had ten, eleven, and twelve members. The compilers of the Israelite tribal lists who aimed at preserving the number twelve in reference to the Israelite tribes were probably motivated in this simply by the desire to designate the totality of Israel. (498) It is an accepted fact that the figure twelve had a special significance of completeness for many ancient peoples as a numerical device for expressing totality. (499) Thus, the existence of an Israelite amphictyony cannot be assumed or denied on the basis of the numbers of tribes considered to be Israelite in the tribal lists.

Having examined the arguments advanced by Noth, the evidence in favour of the theory of an ancient Israelite amphictyony would appear to be slight and inconclusive. Before the battle against Sisera there is no evidence of any communal activity by the tribes of Israel. As regards the date of this battle commemorated in the Song of Deborah, it is widely held that the battle against Sisera took place circa 1125 B.C., (500)

498. Cf. Eissfeldt, 'The Hebrew Kingdom', in CAH (revised edition), II, chapter xxxiv, 1965, p.17, who argues that twelve was the conventional number to designate the Israelite tribes although, in reality, the number fluctuated.


500. This view seems to have originated with Albright, 'Further Light on the History of Israel from Lachish and Megiddo', BASOR, lxviii, 1937, p. 25.
a date which is based on an attempted correlation of literary and archaeological evidence. According to Judg. v:19, the battle took place 'at Taanach by the waters of Megiddo' and this is understood to imply that Megiddo itself was unoccupied at this time. Then it is held that there is archaeological evidence of a decisive gap in the occupation of Megiddo between strata VII and VI, that is between 1150 B.C. and 1075 B.C., and the conclusion is reached that the battle must have taken place sometime between these dates. However, this argument is weak on both accounts because there is uncertainty as to the precise date of the gap in occupation at Megiddo,\(^{(501)}\) in addition to the fact that Judg. v:19 can be taken to mean only exactly what it says, for there is nothing in this verse which implies or precludes Megiddo's having been unoccupied at this time.

To date the battle against Sisera circa 1125 B.C. leaves it as an isolated event which has neither cause nor effect and which presents countless problems. However, Alt and Mayes have attempted to provide an historical context for this battle by connecting it with the battle at Aphek which took place towards the end of the eleventh century B.C.\(^{(502)}\)

---

501. Cf. Mayes, Amphictyony and Covenant, pp.91f., 163; idem, 'The Historical Context of the Battle against Sisera', \(\text{VT, xix, 1969, pp. 353f., n. 3.}\)

502. This is the date suggested by Noth, The History of Israel\(^{2}\), p. 165. Bright, A History of Israel\(^{2}\), p. 181, puts the battle about 1050 B.C. One of the problems in connection with the dating of this event is the length of Saul's reign. The duration of his reign is given in 1 Sam. xiii:1 as two years, and this is probably reliable. Cf. Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien\(^{2}\), pp. 24f.
Alt (503) maintains that if the chronology of the pre-Sisera period can be reconstructed in relation to the Plain of Megiddo, then, by assigning a relative dating to Shamgar and Sisera, and perhaps also Jabin, an absolute dating might be arrived at by correlating this with the time that the Philistines arrived in this area of northern Palestine. According to Alt, Shamgar was a Canaanite ruler in the second half of the twelfth century B.C. who governed a large territory which extended into the Plain of Megiddo and who was opposed to the Philistines. The fact that the Song of Deborah portrays Sisera, a Philistine, as the leader of a Canaanite-Philistine coalition in this same area indicates that a significant change in power had occurred since the time of Shamgar. Alt concludes that since Shamgar belongs to the second half of the twelfth century B.C., such a shift in power which resulted not only in a Canaanite-Philistine coalition but also in Philistine leadership of that coalition, could not have taken place before the eleventh century B.C. which, in turn, suggests that the Israelite victory over Sisera's coalition should be connected with the Philistine defeat of Israel at Aphek in the second half of the eleventh century B.C. Alt's arguments rely heavily on a conjectured position and sphere of influence of Shamgar which cannot be demonstrated with any certainty, and the reference in the Song of Deborah to Shamgar occurs in what is probably a secondary addition to the Song. Nevertheless, Alt's conclusion that the victory over Sisera should be connected with the defeat of Israel by the Philistines at Aphek, is probably correct.

The most convincing arguments for this view are those put forward by Mayes. Just as in the case of the victory against Sisera, no context is given for the battle at Aphek which is described in 1 Sam. iv. According to Mayes, the fact that the battle at Aphek took place a century after the Philistine had entered the land, coupled with the fact that Aphek lay some distance north of the Philistine city-states, make it improbable that the battle at Aphek was the result of Philistine expansion, for, if it had been, it would have been fought much earlier, and in an area where border incidents between Philistines and Israelites are known to have occurred. (504) Rather, the battle at Aphek should probably be seen as a direct result of Israelite attempts at expansion and the victory over Sisera is the only major advance of Israelite tribes into the Palestinian plains which could form the background to the battle of Aphek. The battle at Aphek, therefore, should probably be seen as swift retaliation by the Philistines for the Israelite defeat of Sisera, because, regardless of whether or not Sisera was a Philistine (505) and regardless, too, of whether or not his army was a Canaanite-Philistine coalition, the Israelite victory over Sisera would


have been seen by the Philistines as a serious threat to their domination of the plains. Mayes draws support for this argument from the fact that Megiddo appears to have remained a Canaanite settlement after the victory over Sisera.\(^{506}\) In view of these arguments, it seems best to see the victory over Sisera in the general context of Israelite expansion into the plains of Palestine and to date this victory in the latter half of the eleventh century B.C.

The battle against Sisera was unique in the respect that it was the first occasion in the period of the judges that a wide alliance of tribes took part in a concerted action, and the alliance would have been wider still if other tribes had fulfilled what the poet clearly considered to have been their duty. That it should be towards the end of the period of the judges that the northern tribes of Issachar, Zebulun, and Naphtali first appear in common action with the mid-Palestinian tribes, while Asher and Dan were clearly also free to have participated, is easily explainable. In Judg. i:27ff. there is a list of those city-states which the Israelite tribes had been unable to conquer when they entered the land. These city-states formed a line from Dor on the coast, through Megiddo, Taanach, and Ibleam to Bethshean near the Jordan, which constituted an effective barrier between the Galilean

\(^{506}\) On this subject, cf. Weippert, The Settlement of the Israelite Tribes in Palestine, pp.133ff. Albright, 'Further Light on the History of Israel from Lachish and Megiddo', BASOR, lxviii, 1937, p.25, and Aharoni, 'New Aspects of the Israelite Occupation in the North', Near Eastern Archaeology in the Twentieth Century, pp.263ff., argue that Megiddo VI was an Israelite settlement, but this is contradicted by Judg. i:27f. Furthermore, the archaeological fragments which have been taken for Israelite pottery were already found in Megiddo VII, (cf. Alt, 'Megiddo im Übergang vom kanaanäischen zum israelitischen Zeitalter', Kleine Schriften, I, pp.264f.).
and the mid-Palestinian tribes.\(^{507}\) In view of the fact that the city-state of Taanach seems to have been destroyed towards the end of the twelfth century B.C. and since, too, there is archaeological evidence of a great decline in the strength of the city-state of Megiddo from the second half of the twelfth century on, it seems very likely that the battle against Sisera was deliberately undertaken by these Israelite tribes with the intention of weakening still further the strength of this chain of city-states and so to put an end to their divisive influence. At any rate, this line of city-states effectively separated the Galilean tribes from contact with the mid-Palestinian tribes for most of the period of the judges. It was only towards the end of the eleventh century B.C. that the strength of these city-states declined sufficiently to make possible common activity between the Galilean and mid-Palestinian tribes.

Ten tribes, Ephraim, Benjamin, Machir, Zebulun, Issachar, Reuben, Gilead, Dan, Asher, and Naphtali, are named in the Song of Deborah. Six of these tribes took part in the battle against Sisera, while the other four were clearly expected to have participated. There are five tribes which are not mentioned in the Song: Levi, Gad, Manasseh, Judah, and Simeon. The tribe of Levi is probably not mentioned either because it was a priestly tribe at this time, or because it was a landless group which was in the process of becoming a priestly tribe.\(^{508}\)


In the case of Gad, although this tribe does not appear in the Song, the name Gilead is found. While Gilead is usually a district name, it is very likely that in this context it is the name of a tribe used with reference to those inhabiting that area of east Jordan.\(^{509}\) However, Gilead is not to be identified with Gad\(^ {510}\) because Gad and Gilead were separate parts of east Jordan. But, since Gilead is referred to in the Song of Deborah while Gad is completely un-noticed, the inevitable conclusion is that at the time of the battle against Sisera there existed no Israelite tribe of Gad.\(^ {511}\) As for Manasseh, it would appear that this tribe was not yet in existence at the time of the battle against Sisera. The most likely chain of events leading to the formation of Manasseh would seem to be as follows.\(^ {512}\) Just after the battle against Sisera, Philistine pressure was exerted on the mid-Palestinian tribes, forcing a part of the tribe of Ephraim to migrate northwards into territory occupied by the independent tribe of Machir. Although there was some inter-mingling of Ephraimites and Machirites, the pressure exerted by these


510. Cf. Noth, Das System, p. 36, note 1; J. Hoftijzer, 'Enige Opmerkingen rond het israëlitischen 12-Stammensysteem,' Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift, xiv, 1959-1960, pp.241-263, ref. pp. 244ff. Noth, 'Gilead und Gad', ZDPV, lxxv, 1959, pp. 14ff., argues that the name Gilead belonged to an area just south of the Jabbok, while Gad which settled north of the Arnon, was the most southern Israelite settlement east of the Jordan. One of the most detailed examinations of Gilead is that of M. Ottoson, Gilead, Coniectanea Biblica, Old Testament Series, iii, 1969.


512. For what follows, cf. Mayes, Amphictyony and Covenant, pp.25ff., n. 40; idem, Israel in the Period of the Judges, pp. 28f.
Ephraimites caused most of Machir to migrate to east Jordan, where the tribe seems to have stayed. Those who remained behind in the territory formerly inhabited by Machir, formed themselves into a tribe which was independent of, and yet, related to, both Ephraim and Machir. This new tribe called itself Manasseh, perhaps in honour of an ancestor, (513) or after the name of its leading family. In the case of Judah and Simeon, (514) however, it would appear that although these Israelite tribes were in existence at the time of the battle against Sisera, they were unable to participate because of some obstruction recognized by the poet of the Song of Deborah. The absence of these two tribes from the Song of Deborah has wrongly been construed as implying that the poet did not intend to give a complete list of the tribes. (515) Equally unconvincing is the proposal that the Song presupposes the existence of a ten tribe amphictyony comprising those tribes which are mentioned in the Song. (516) Rather, there is strong evidence that Judah and Simeon were separated from the rest of the tribes in the north by the historical and geographical


514. Simeon seems to have been absorbed into Judah at a very early date. According to Josh. xix:1-9 only a few cities within Judah were regarded as Simeonite territory.


conditions prevailing at this time. (517) In the first place, it is known that the Judaean tribes entered and settled the land independently by migrating directly from the south into the hill country which lay to the south of Jerusalem. (518) Secondly, Judg. i:34ff. records that the cities of Har-heres, Aijalon, and Shaalbim (519) remained under the control of the 'Amorites', (520) and there is evidence elsewhere that Gezer and Jerusalem also remained under foreign control until the monarchic period. (521) This means that there was an unconquered strip of land under Canaanite control between Judah and the rest of the


521. Cf. Mayes, Amphictyony and Covenant, pp.106ff.; idem, Israel in the Period of the Judges, p.101. On Gezer, cf. Judg. i:29; 1 Kgs. ix:16. Judg. 1:8, which states that the men of Judah captured Jerusalem, is probably a reflection of conditions from the time of David onwards, because Judg. i:21 records that the Jebusites were not dislodged from Jerusalem, and Judg. xix:10ff. portrays Jerusalem as a Jebusite city still. Furthermore, according to 2 Sam. v:6ff. it was David who captured Jerusalem.
tribes to the north, which prevented the Judaean tribes from participating in the battle against Sisera. Judah's isolation from the northern tribes was ended at the latest during Saul's monarchy, and, in fact, it was probably ended as a result of Saul's early military victories. (522)

Thus, for most of the period of the judges, the Israelite tribes were separate, independent units, whose independence was to a very large extent forced on them as a result of the conditions in which they settled. It was only in the time of Saul that those obstacles which separated the tribes were finally overcome, and Israel is found acting as a single unit. The battle against Sisera in the second half of the eleventh century B.C. was the first occasion when a wide alliance of tribes took part in a concerted action and this was made possible by the decline in power, which began in the second half of the twelfth century B.C., of those Canaanite city-states which had until then separated the mid-Palestinian from the Galilean tribes.

The second stage in the coming together of the tribes was when Saul defeated the Philistines and drove them from the mountains in the southern part of the land, because this removed the obstruction caused by those southern Canaanite city-states which had for so long prevented Judah from taking part in communal undertakings with the northern tribes.

The period of the judges was for Israel a period of divisions in which communal action either in politics or in cult was made impossible by force of circumstances. When stripped of their schematic framework,

522. Cf. Mayes, Amphictyony and Covenant, p.113; idem, Israel in the Period of the Judges, pp.102f. As in the north, so, too, in the south the Philistines probably supported the Canaanites against the Israelites, and the end of the power of the Canaanite city-states would have required also the defeat of the Philistines. Such a victory over the Philistines is ascribed to the early part of Saul's reign in 1 Sam. xiv:31 where it is recorded that the Philistines were struck down 'from Michmash to Aijalon' and this would have marked the end of Canaanite-Philistine obstruction between Judah and the rest of the tribes in the north and allowed Saul to include Judah within his kingdom. Cf. C.E. Hauer, 'The Shape of Saulide Strategy', CBQ, xxxi, 1969, pp.153-167.
the traditions dealing with this period are undoubtedly historically accurate in their portrayal of the practical disunity of the Israelite tribes before the rise of Saul. There is no evidence of the existence of a common, central sanctuary where the tribes or their representatives regularly met to participate in common worship. There were many sanctuaries throughout the land, all of which were of more or less equal status, and there is no evidence that any particular sanctuary attained a position of prominence over the others. The presence of the ark probably conferred, temporarily, a special status on the sanctuary where it was deposited and during its possession of the ark that sanctuary probably formed the object of pilgrimage, perhaps even from outside the territory in which it lay. However, there is no evidence whatsoever that a sanctuary which was in possession of the ark was the central sanctuary of an amphictyony at which regular festivals were held and which was maintained by the members of the amphictyony. It has already been noted how the tribes in west Jordan were divided by two lines of foreign city-states into three groups and since it is very probable that the sanctuaries mentioned in the Old Testament served the particular tribe, or tribes, in whose territory they lay, the Galilean tribes would have worshipped at the sanctuary on Mount Tabor which lay on the border of Zebulun, Naphtali, and Issachar; the sanctuaries of Shechem,

523. Cf., for example, Mayes, Amphictyony and Covenant, pp.108ff.; idem, Israel in the Period of the Judges, pp.103ff.
Bethel, Gilgal, Shiloh, and perhaps also Mizpah would have served the mid-Palestinian tribes; and for Judah, there was the sanctuary of Mamre near the Calebite city Hebron. (525) Furthermore, it seems more than likely that the Transjordanian tribes would also have had their own sanctuaries. (526) The barriers which separated the tribes were not totally removed until the time of Saul. The first step in this development was the battle against Sisera which was the first occasion that the Galilean tribes took part in a common enterprise with the mid-Palestinian tribes. The second step was Saul's expulsion of the Philistines from the southern mountain range which ended Judah's enforced isolation from the rest of the tribes in the north.

There is no evidence, therefore, of any centralization or unity in the period of the judges. As G.W. Anderson rightly remarks: "centralization was a problem or an elusive ideal during the period of the judges rather than a dominant factor in the life of the Israelite tribes.... The indications are not so much of centralization and unity as of the fragments of a unity not yet realized, or rather of a lost unity surviving as an ideal." (527) The search for the roots of the

525. Hebron/Mamre was of great importance for the southern tribes, especially in connection with the Abraham tradition, (cf. particularly R.E. Clements, Abraham and David, Genesis xv and its Meaning for Israelite Tradition, SBT, Second Series v, London, 1967, pp.25ff.)

526. Joshua xxii describes the establishment of such a sanctuary but the story is late and may not be historically reliable. Wildberger, Jahwe Eigentumsvolk, ATANT, xxxvii, 1960, p.68, thinks that Josh. xxii may have an historical basis, but J.L. McKenzie, The World of the Judges, p.7, thinks that the chapter is almost midrash.

demand for cultic centralization is inextricably linked to the search for the origin of that entity called Israel, an entity which, in spite of its outward political divisions, is the one people of Yahweh. (528) This entity did not originate in the period of the monarchy. The narratives describing the rise and early history of the monarchy presuppose an already existing consciousness of Israel's unity. At least from the time of Solomon, the northern and the southern kingdoms were two separate and independent political entities, but the fact that the prophets treated both kingdoms as the one people of Yahweh reflects a traditional religious unity which undoubtedly reaches back before the time that the separate states were founded. Israel's constitutive factor was its faith (529) and the unity of Israel as the people of Yahweh, is a religious unity. The prophets used the designation 'Israel', (530) in a strictly religious way, of all the people of Yahweh, regardless of whether they lived in the northern or the southern kingdom. Furthermore, Yahweh is not known as the God of Judah, or the God of Ephraim, but as the God of Israel, the Holy One of Israel, and this Israel is the people of both the northern and the southern tribes united together by their


529. Cf. especially, Bright, Early Israel in Recent History Writing, pp.84ff., 113f.

530. Where this name 'Israel' originated and how it came to be applied to the people who worshipped Yahweh are still unsolved questions. Cf. Mayes, Amphictyony and Covenant, pp.126ff.; idem, Israel in the Period of the Judges, p. 2 and n. 6. On the meaning of the name Israel, cf. R.C. Coote, 'The Meaning of the Name Israel', HTR, lxv, 1972, pp.137-142.
common allegiance to Yahweh. The period of the monarchy of David and Solomon does not provide the historical conditions in which the unity of Israel as the people of Yahweh could have been founded. The Davidic empire was not a national but a territorial state consisting of heterogeneous elements and united only in the person of the king. It is also doubtful that the period of Saul's kingship should be considered as the time of origin of Israel as the people of Yahweh, in spite of the fact that Judah almost certainly formed part of Saul's kingdom at least some time during his reign. Saul's reign, which seems to have lasted about two years, was probably too short a period for the unity of this Israel to have been founded and for it to have become so firmly established that it could survive the division of the monarchy and not only reappear in the words of the classical prophets, but also dominate the present form of the Pentateuchal traditions. Moreover, Saul's kingship over the Israelite tribes seems to presuppose that unity which is manifest in the way the prophets address Israel as the people of Yahweh. As has been shown above, the period of the judges certainly cannot be considered to present the historical conditions necessary for the foundation of the unity of Israel as the people of Yahweh.

The origin of the unity of Israel as the people of Yahweh, and the roots of the demand for cultic centralization, can be traced back to "where so much ancient Israelite tradition would lead us to expect to find it," to the period before the settlement and, more specifically, 

---


533. G.W. Anderson, op.cit., p. 149.
to the establishment of the Sinai covenant between Yahweh and the Israelite tribes. The Old Testament traditions are quite unanimous that worship of Yahweh was founded outside the land of Palestine and, furthermore, many Old Testament passages proclaim Yahweh as the God from Sinai. Kadesh is the focal point of the traditions of Israel's wilderness wandering and it formed an important centre of wandering groups of tribes or clans which worshipped Yahweh. Unfortunately, the relationship between Kadesh and Sinai in both the literature and the history of tribal movements in the area is a very complex problem. But, even if one were to accept that the Sinaitic traditions are an intrusion into the Kadesh cycle of traditions, (534) there must have been some historical connection between Kadesh and Sinai (535) because Kadesh was a centre of wandering tribes which worshipped Yahweh, and Sinai, apart from being the mountain of Yahweh's revelation, was also the central holy place of Yahweh to which regular pilgrimages were made. (536) That the unity of Israel was indeed founded at Kadesh/Sinai is supported by the fact that both Judah and the northern tribes can be shown to have had connections with Kadesh. Num. xiii-xiv preserves a tradition which describes how the Calebites, who were worshippers of Yahweh, migrated directly from the south northwards.

into the region of Hebron. The starting point of this movement of
the Calebites northwards is said to have been Kadesh and it was from
here that the Calebites, as worshippers of Yahweh, probably ultimately
derive. They migrated from Kadesh settling eventually in the region
of Hebron and they introduced Yahwism to this area. The mid-Palestinian
tribes had an equally direct connection with Kadesh. Yahweh was
worshipped at Shechem in the form of a covenant ceremony. In view of
the fact that the mid-Palestinian tribes were separated from both the
tribes to the north and those to the south for most of the period of
the judges, it can only be concluded that Yahwism came into this area
independently of its appearance in Judah. Some part of the later mid-
Palestinian group of tribes, therefore, must also have been at Kadesh
and then migrated, arriving eventually in the region of Shechem.
This fits in well with the Old Testament tradition which describes a
wandering from the region of Kadesh into the southern part of Trans-
jordan and then northwards, ending with entry into west Jordan from
the east, opposite Jericho. Undoubtedly there were a number of
movements into Palestine which first began from the region of Kadesh,
but the two most significant were the migration led by Caleb which
went directly north to settle in the southern part of Palestine, and
that movement which went round the borders of the land, eventually
entering west Jordan from the east. From the two centres of Hebron
and Shechem, the worship of Yahweh radiated to embrace both northern
and southern tribes. Although there is no certainty as regards the
chronological relationship of these movements, they definitely
derived from Kadesh and it was in this district that the various clans
and tribes involved first acknowledged Yahweh as their God. At some
stage, which must have been after the battle against Sisera, the
extended people of Yahweh was defined in the form of the descendants
of twelve brothers, the sons of the patriarch Jacob.
Thus, it was at Kadesh/Sinai that Israel, the people of Yahweh, came into existence. It was at Kadesh/Sinai that contact was established between what were to be later northern and southern elements in the land of Palestine after the settlement, and here, too, that these two parts of the later Israel received their fundamental unity in the worship of Yahweh. It was Sinai, the original mountain of God, which was the prototype of the Deuteronomic demand for cultic centralization. The sacral traditions which underlie the book of Deuteronomy can be traced back to the events at Sinai which marked the sequel to the election of Israel by Yahweh in the exodus and which inaugurated Israel's relationship with Yahweh in terms of covenant. (537)

537. Cf. Nicholson, 'Deuteronomy and Tradition', p. 121. One of the most crucial, and certainly one of the most controversial, problems in current Pentateuchal research is the relationship between the Exodus and Sinai traditions and the events to which they witness. Von Rad, 'The Form Critical Problem of the Hexateuch', The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays, pp. 1-78, argues that the exodus-conquest tradition and the Sinai tradition were originally separate and were joined together by the Yahwist. Cf. too, H.J. Kraus, 'Gilgal: ein Beitrag zur Kultusgeschichte Israels', VT, i, 1951, pp.181-199; idem, Worship in Israel, pp. 152ff.; H. Wildberger, Jahwees Eigentumsvolk, ATANT, xxxvii, Zürich, 1960 (who advances conclusions which are similar to those of von Rad but on the basis of different evidence). Noth, A History of Pentateuchal Traditions, specifies five major themes which, listed in order of their traditio-historical priority, were already present in G: 'Guidance out of Egypt', 'Guidance into the Arable Land of Palestine', 'Promise to the Patriarchs', 'Guidance in the Wilderness', and 'Revelation at Sinai'. Since Israel, according to Noth, did not exist prior to the settlement in Canaan, the traditions which go back beyond the settlement once existed separately as the traditions of different tribes, clans and groups of clans of semi-nomads which only later coalesced into the national entity 'Israel'. Moses probably did not belong originally to any of the major themes, but, because his grave lay in the traditional path of the 'Israelites' on their way into Palestine, he was incorporated by later narrators into the theme 'Guidance into Palestine', and hence into the other themes. It was the amphictyonic community which was responsible for most of the process in which themes and individual traditions
stream of tradition was transmitted for centuries until the seventh century when it was formulated into the book of Deuteronomy, "the


De Vaux rightly points out that Yahweh was both the God of the exodus (Exod. xvi:21) and the God of Sinai (Deut. xxxii:2; Judg. v:5; Ps. lxviii:8f., 18) and that "the theme of the exodus-conquest was associated with the theme of the law and the covenant in the confessions of faith of Deut. 6:20-24 and Jos. 24 as well as in 1 Sam. 12" (ibid., p. 410). In Deut. xxxi:10-13, the idea of keeping the law is linked to the possession of the land and in Ps. lxxx there is evidence of the unity of the two traditions in worship. The Exodus narratives are orientated towards Sinai and the Sinai stories refer to the exodus-conquest. De Vaux, op.cit., p. 412, is certainly correct when he writes: "The law and grace are the two poles of the religious life of the people of the Old Testament and there was constant tension between those poles because of Israel's lack of submission. The two traditions of the exodus-conquest and of Sinai are meaningful only if they are combined." (Cf. Myers, Grace and Torah, p. 17: "Deliverance and covenant belong together. Both are acts of divine grace").

Nicholson, Exodus and Sinai in History and Tradition, rightly maintains that there was an original relationship between the Exodus and Sinai traditions and that the figure of Moses is original to both of them, but on the basis of an examination of the Sinai tradition in Exod. xixff. he considers it possible that the belief in the making of a covenant between Yahweh and Israel at Sinai "emerged and was incorporated into the Sinai tradition only at a secondary and late stage in the development of this tradition" (ibid, p. 76). Nicholson concludes that Exod. xxiv:9-11 embodies a tradition which is independent of, and almost certainly older than, the descriptions of the theophany in Exod. xix. The inconspicuous rôle of Moses in Exod. xxiv:9-11, compared with the dominant position he has in the narratives of Exod. xix and elsewhere in the Sinai complex, "evidences that the tradition in Exodus 24:9-11 is
deposit of the authentic Mosaic faith"(538) and "the classic expression of the theology of the ancient Mosaic covenant."(539) Working at a time when the Judaean kingdom was faced with the threat of a fate similar to that suffered by the Northern Kingdom, the authors of

of greater antiquity than these other descriptions of the theophany at Sinai in which he stands unrivalled as the only one who can approach the nearer presence of Yahweh on the holy mountain" (ibid., p.81). Exod. xix, however, cannot be regarded as having been developed secondarily on the basis of the former. Rather, the tradition in Exod. xix "is, like that embodied in Exodus 24:9-11, sui generis" (ibid.). Exodus xix and the Exodus tradition were interrelated from the beginning and Moses was integral to both the Exodus and the Sinai traditions from the beginning. Exod. xxiv:9-11 originated quite independently of the Exodus tradition and the mention of Moses is secondary. At an earlier stage, this tradition referred to only Nadab, Abihu, and the seventy elders. Exod. xxiv:9-11, Nicholson argues, originated in the period before the Exodus, and it may have arisen as the hieros logos of the cult of Yahweh at Sinai (cf. Eissfeldt, The Old Testament: An Introduction, pp.42ff.). Clearly, neither Israel nor the worship of Yahweh came into existence suddenly. On the contrary, "behind both there is a long and complex history and development, the ramifications of which we shall probably never uncover with any degree of certainty or detail" (ibid, p.83). Yahweh was probably worshipped in the pre-Exodus period and a community with the name Israel may have existed in the pre-Mosaic period, and may already have been a Yahweh-worshipping community. Nicholson then thinks it possible that the two Sinai traditions which he isolates in the Sinai pericope "belong to separate stages in the history of early Israel, the one (Exod. 24: 9-11) to the period before the Exodus and the other (Exod. 19 and related texts) to the period after it presupposing and developing alongside the Exodus traditions" (ibid, p.83). Nicholson rightly stresses that the origin and history of the Exodus, wilderness and Sinai traditions are so complex "that any attempt to reconstruct the historical events underlying them is at best tentative" (ibid., p.84). What is of crucial importance for this study is that Israel's consciousness of itself as a unity (a union of tribes) dates from the period before the settlement and "to look for the establishment of that unity elsewhere than in the institution of the Sinai covenant is to disregard the testimony of tradition in the interests of airborne guesswork" (G.W. Anderson, 'Israel: Amphictyony: כָּמ; KAHAL; כָּדָּע, Translating and Understanding the Old Testament, eds. H.T. Frank and W.L. Reed, p.150).


539. Bright, Covenant and Promise, p. 129.
Deuteronomy were attempting to revive the nation and to ensure its future as Yahweh's covenant people.\(^{540}\) It was Sinai, the original mountain of God, which was the prototype of the Deuteronomic demand for cultic centralization \(^{541}\) and Josiah's implementation of cultic centralization at the new Sinai was a momentous event which made the Jerusalem cult virtually synonymous with the Israelite religious faith\(^{542}\) and which re-established the people of Judah as the true Israel, the people whom Yahweh had chosen 'to be a people for his own possession' (Deut. vii:6).


541. The Deuteronomic transfer of the mantle of the sacred mountain of the Mosaic covenant to Jerusalem may be paralleled with Elijah's flight to Mount Horeb which was a symbol of the prophetic spirit in the Northern Kingdom. Cf., e.g., B.W. Anderson, The Living World of the Old Testament\(^2\), p. 293.


543. Rowley, Worship in Ancient Israel, pp. 318ff. On the wilderness cult, see also McKay, Josiah's Reform.

544. B.W. Anderson, op.cit..

545. Myers, 1 Chronicles, p. 303.


547. Cf. G.W. Anderson, The Religion...
The Consequences of Cultic Centralization

According to Rowley, the demand for the centralization of sacrificial worship to a central sanctuary was "the cardinal mistake" of the authors of Deuteronomy, for, in their efforts to suppress all the abuses of the country shrines, "they made no provision for worship anywhere but in the single permitted shrine, which could not be the resort of the whole nation for regular worship." (543) B.W. Anderson maintains that cultic centralization simply increased the tendency of people to feel secure because Yahweh was dwelling in their midst. (544) In similar vein, Myers is of the opinion that Deuteronomy, albeit unwittingly, may have contributed to the rapid decline of Judah "by the creation of a misdirected sense of security on the part of officials who trusted in externals to the exclusion, or nearly so, of a deep inner commitment to the will of God." (545)

However, while Josiah's reform failed, "the finding of the book and the work of the reformers meant that the exiled community had standards other than those of Manasseh's reign." (546) While many of the immediate effects of the reform were cancelled after the death of Josiah, its influence continued in important ways. (547) The teaching of Deuteronomy survived among the exiles and in the returned community. The influence of the book is evident in many parts of the Old Testament, particularly in the historical narrative of Joshua - 2 Kings, (548) where it provided standards by which Israel's history was interpreted. The

545. Myers, I Chronicles, p.XXIII.
reassertion of the ancient standards of Yahwism in the highest circles of Judah so shortly before the fall of Jerusalem meant a great deal for the future of Israel's religion and Deuteronomy became a foundation document of the Judaism which survived the Exile. (549) The centralization of the cult was a far-reaching event which led ultimately to the elevation of the canonical written tradition to a position of greater authority than the established centralized cult. (550) With the acceptance of the book of Deuteronomy, the torah of the covenant was "interposed between Yahweh and Israel as the mediating agent of the divine will" so that "the covenant document, rather than the chosen monarchy or the chosen sanctuary, has the pre-eminent role as the testimony to Israel's election." (551) However, it was really only after the destruction of the Jerusalem temple in A.D. 70 that there was a formal recognition of the scriptures as canonical so that Judaism ceased to be the religion of a cult, and became the religion of a book. (552) Attention must now be focused on the re-interpretation of the cult which took place in the exilic and post-exilic periods.

The twin pillars of Judah's religious life had been the belief in a covenant between Yahweh and the Davidic dynasty, and the special position of Jerusalem as Yahweh's chosen dwelling place. With the removal of the Davidic monarch and the destruction of the temple Judah's political and religious existence was terminated for a considerable period. Israel's political and religious aspirations were ruined and a

551. Ibid.
552. Obviously, for many Jews who lived outside Jerusalem this had long been the practical reality. Cf. e.g., Clements, op.cit., p.111; D.S. Russell, Between the Testaments, second impression of revised edition, London, 1966, pp.41ff.
great crisis of faith engendered (cf. Lam. ii:15). R. de Vaux rightly describes the destruction of the Jerusalem temple as "an agonizing trial for Israel's faith."(553) That some of the people were able to interpret these events not as a denial, but, rather, as confirmation of Yahweh's presence with and his purpose for his people (cf. Lam. ii:7) is indeed "a miracle of faith."(554) The restoration of Judah owes its being to those who accepted these events as a divine judgment and who sought to rebuild and reconsecrate the nation in accordance with the will of Yahweh. The Restoration Programme in Ezek. xl-xlviii pointed the way.

Jeremiah does not seem to have forseen any need to remake the ark or to rebuild the temple. He promised that the throne of the cherubim would be replaced by all Jerusalem which would take over the role of Yahweh's throne (Jer. iii:16f.). The influence of the Deuteronomistic editors, who shared in the compilation of the book, is evident in the promise that Yahweh's presence would be realized by his name being set there.

Ezekiel : Yahweh-Šammāh

Ezekiel has been referred to as 'the priest in the prophet's mantle', (555) the 'founder (or father) of Judaism', (556) 'the morning star of apocalyptic', (557) 'one of the founders of Hebrew theocratic eschatology', (558) the

553. R. de Vaux, Ancient Israel, pp.327f. Cf. too, Noth, 'The Jerusalem Catastrophe of 587 B.C., and its significance for Israel', The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Essays, pp.260 - 280. See, also, Phillips, God B.C. , p.xii, who writes : "Unarguably the experience of the destruction of Jerusalem and the exile in Babylon was the most cataclysmic event in ancient Israel's history, for it questioned her continued existence as the chosen people of God."


556. G.W. Anderson, The History and Religion of Israel, p.145, calls Ezekiel "the founder of Judaism". Clements, God and Temple, p.107 describes the prophet as "the father of Judaism."


'pioneer of legal and ritualistic Judaism', (559) a 'day-dreamer par excellence', (560) 'the most practical of reformers', (561) 'a fanatic', (562) and one critic has gone so far as to suggest that the prophet was afflicted with catatonic or paranoid schizophrenia. (563) Ezekiel was "prophet, priest, moralist, ecstatic, legalist, apocalyptist" (564) but, above all, he was a priest - theologian and the temple stood in the forefront of his thought. For Ezekiel, the most serious result of the exile was not the human suffering which it caused but the fact that the sin for which it was the punishment had caused the glory of Yahweh to quit the temple (Ezek. x).

Ezekiel's call vision, which came to him in exile in 593 B.C., took the form of a manifestation of Yahweh coming from the north and riding on his celestial chariot/palanquin drawn by four wierd celestial beings (Ezek. i:1 - iii:15). From this vision it may be deduced that the prophet did not conceive Yahweh to be merely the God of Jerusalem, or of Palestine; rather, Yahweh is effortlessly mobile and his power extends throughout the entire universe. (565)

Ezekiel condemned the wickedness and idolatrous practices of Israel which were driving Yahweh from his sanctuary (cf. Ezek. viii:5-15). After Jerusalem had fallen, Ezekiel explained to his fellow exiles that Yahweh himself had instigated the destruction of the city and temple (Ezek. ix:7). Prior to the destruction wrought by the six executioners

559. Eissfeldt. The Old Testament: An Introduction, p.382 records Hölscher as having said this of the prophet.
whom Yahweh had sent, 'the cherubim lifted up their wings, with the wheels beside them; and the glory of the God of Israel was over them. And the glory of Yahweh went up from the midst of the city, and stood upon the mountain which is on the east side of the city' (Ezek. xi:22f.).

In this manner, Yahweh had withdrawn his presence from the temple.

Whereas Deuteronomy had spoken of Yahweh's name as the vehicle of his presence, Ezekiel protects the notion of Yahweh's transcendence by speaking in terms of Yahweh's glory, (566) which has a human form. (567)

Yahweh will return, but, in the meantime, those in exile who worship him sincerely will know something of the divine presence:

"Son of man, your brethren, even your brethren, your fellow exiles, the whole house of Israel, all of them, are those of whom the inhabitants of Jerusalem have said, 'They have gone far from Yahweh; to us this land is given for a possession.' Therefore say, 'Thus says the Lord God: Though I removed them far off among the nations, and though I scattered them among the countries, yet I have been a sanctuary to them for a while in the countries where they have gone.' " (Ezek. xi:15f.)(568)

Ezekiel asserts that Yahweh will bring his people back from exile and will crown this saving activity by re-establishing his dwelling-place in his people's midst and by returning to dwell permanently in his rebuilt temple:

"I will make a covenant of peace with them; it shall be an everlasting covenant with them; and I will bless them and multiply them, and will set my sanctuary in the midst of them for evermore. My dwelling place shall be with them;

566. It was an ancient belief that Yahweh's glory was made manifest in the temple service (cf. Isa. vi:3) but the idea is referred to in the pre-monarchic period (cf., e.g., Exod. xxxiii:18, 22; Num. xiv:21f.; Deut. v:24; cf. 1 Sam. iv:21f.) and the origins of the doctrine of the glory have been traced back by von Rad, 'Doxa', ThWzNT, ii, Stuttgart, 1935, cols. 240-245, ref. col. 242, to thunderstorm phenomena. Later, the glory concept came to have a wider and more spiritual content (cf. Ps. xix:2(EVV.1)). Cf. Clements, God and Temple, p. 104.

567. As J.B. Taylor, Ezekiel, London, 1971, p.59, rightly argues, this is not a crude anthropomorphism for, "given the possibility of a theophany, no form but the human form could conceivably have been used to represent the Deity." Moreover, 'it was...no mere human that Ezekiel saw" (ibid.). On Ezekiel's use of demüt in the description of his vision of God, see J. Maxwell Miller, 'In the "Image" and "Likeness" of God', JBL, xci, 1972, pp.289-304.

568. On the interpretation of 'a sanctuary...for a while' or 'a sanctuary...in small measure' (Ezek. xi:16), see Ackroyd, Israel under Babylon and Persia, OUP, 1970, pp.26f.
and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. Then the nations will know that I Yahweh sanctify Israel, when my sanctuary is in the midst of them for evermore." (Ezek. xxxvii:26-28).

Here, "the promises of the cult-festivals have been transformed into an eschatology," for the belief in the divine presence, which was formerly the basis of a cult-prophetic future hope, has become an object of that hope itself. (569)

Ezek. xl - xlviii contain a detailed programme for the restoration of the community, outlining the essentials of its social and cultic organization, and these chapters describe what Yahweh's return would mean and how it would come about without Yahweh 's holiness being profaned. In this vision of the restored community, a purified cult stands at the centre of a purified community and the glory of Yahweh which had departed from the temple because of the cultic abominations which had been performed in the holy city, returns to the rebuilt temple of the restored community (Ezek. xliii : 4f.), a community where the presence of Yahweh is assured by a pure cult. This elaborate description of the reconstructed temple has been described as "the plan for 'Jerusalem Phoenix' "(570) and it has also been called, by the same writer, "a Utopia that never could be realized."(571) Ezek. xl - xlviii are open to at least four different interpretations. (572) The first may be termed the literal prophetic interpretation which views these chapters as a building specification, the blueprint of a temple which Ezekiel intended should be constructed when the exiles returned to Jerusalem. This theory has in its favour the fact that Ezekiel confidently expected a literal return from exile. Moreover, as a priest, Ezekiel might well

569. Clements, God and Temple, p.106.
570. G. Neville, City of Our God, p.28.
571. Ibid. p.25.
have exhibited an interest in the construction of the new temple in Jerusalem. Against this interpretation, however, is the fact that while many detailed measurements are given in these chapters, there are far too many details lacking, especially in the groundplan, for this to have been an architect's specification and too little detail is furnished about the materials to be used. Moreover, there are physiographical difficulties concerning the impossible source and course of the river (Ezek. xlvii : 1-12) and the unreality of the tribal boundaries do not inspire confidence in a completely literal interpretation of the vision. (573)

The vision in Ezek. xl – xlviii has been regarded as having been fulfilled symbolically in the Christian church. However, while the language of these chapters has been taken up by the author of the book of Revelation, where the picture of the new Jerusalem has been modelled on Ezek. xl-xlviii, it is clearly dubious methodology to ignore the original context of these chapters and to refer this vision directly to a Christian fulfilment. (574)

The third line of interpretation is the literal and futurist dispensationalist approach which regards Ezek. xl-xlviii as prophecy and insists on a literal fulfilment of it, either in the past or in the future. This view is arrived at through similarly faulty hermeneutical principles as those employed by commentators favouring the symbolic Christian interpretation. (575)

The fourth way in which commentators have sought to interpret Ezek. xl-xlviii is to regard these chapters, not as prophecy, but as apocalyptic and to interpret them according to the canons of this style of Hebrew writing, the features of which are symbolism, numerical symmetry, and futurism. (576) According to this view, these chapters represent Ezekiel's pattern for the Messianic age that was to come.

574. Cf. Taylor, op.cit.
Though expressed in tangible terms, yet these were merely the forms in which the general principles of God's activity were enshrined. The vision of the temple is to be seen, therefore, as "a kind of incarnation of all that God stood for and all that He required and all that He could do for His people in the age that was about to dawn." (577) In spite of Fohrer's confident assertion that "Ezekiel exhibits nothing of apocalypticism", (578) the prophet's imagery, which is often artificial and even bizarre, has more in common with the symbolism of apocalyptic than with the simpler and more natural symbolism of earlier prophets and Ezekiel is also nearer to the apocalyptists than to the pre-exilic prophets in his prophecies of restoration because in these the miraculous element is very prominent. (579) It seems best, then, to interpret Ezek. xl-xlvi as a detailed description of an ideal future in which the author has combined the grandiose symbolism which was later developed in apocalyptic literature with a priestly interest in laws and regulations, which was a characteristic of post-exilic Judaism. The author of this apocalyptic sequence seems to be expressing five major themes. (580) Firstly, the perfection of God's plan for His restored people is symbolically expressed in the immaculate symmetry of the temple building. Secondly, the author stresses the centrality of worship in the new age, which is expressed in the scrupulous concern for detail in the performance of rites. Thirdly, the author emphasizes the abiding presence of Yahweh in the midst of His people. Fourthly, the writer describes how blessings will flow from Yahweh's presence to the barren places of the earth. Finally, there is the orderly allocation of duties and privileges to the entire people of Yahweh, as is evidenced both in the temple duties and the apportionment of the land.

577. Taylor, op.cit.


Is this section to be assigned to the prophet Ezekiel? Hölscher, Herntrich, Irwin, Harford, and Noth have denied in toto Ezekiel's authorship of this section. On the other hand, J. Smith maintains that Ezekiel did write these chapters but, according to Smith, the prophet wrote this sketch of the restored temple during the reign of Manasseh, and with a northern sanctuary in mind. At a later date, Ezekiel's work was revised and his ministry was transferred by the reviser to a later age. G.A. Cooke believes that there exists a kernel of genuine material in these chapters which leads up to the climax of the whole book. C.H. Cornill refers to Ezek. xl-xlvi as the spire by which the whole cathedral is crowned and Stalker maintains that these chapters "form the climax of all that has gone before." Pfeiffer considers these chapters as "the prophet's most original and most influential legacy to his people."

The cultic regulations in Ezek. xl-xlvi seem to be an exilic programme which belongs to the period between the Deuteronomic code and the Priestly legislation, for they presuppose the laws of Deuteronomy but


show no knowledge of the Priestly laws where these differ. (587) It has often been pointed out that there are special similarities between Ezek. xl-xlvi and the so-called Holiness Code (588) which was incorporated into the Priestly legislation, but which was probably of independent origin. The Holiness Code is generally thought to be older than the Priestly legislation. Unfortunately, its date relative to that of Deuteronomy is exceptionally difficult to determine. The Holiness Code seems to be entirely independent from Deuteronomy and to have issued from quite a separate 'circle'. (589) Oesterley and Robinson have pointed to the fact that the Holiness Code specifically forbids secular slaughter (Lev. xvii: 3f.) whereas Deuteronomy permits this, and they conclude that the Holiness Code must have been written before Deuteronomy. (590)

587. For the main grounds for placing Ezek. xl-xlvi in the period between the Deuteronomic laws and the Priestly legislation, see, e.g., W.F. Lofthouse, Ezekiel, CB, Edinburgh and London, 1907, pp.29f.

588. It is, however, worth noting the similarities between Ezek. xl-xlvi and the Holiness Code. There is very much in common between the language of the two and the subject matter is also, to a large extent, the same. In both, for example, the following features are prominent: the importance of the Temple as the center of the holiness of the land and the nation; the importance of the land to Yahweh even when the nation is removed from it; the representation of idolatry as 'whoredom'; the tracing back of national disobedience to Egypt; explicit references to the sacrifice of children; emphasis on the sabbath; and the view that the transgression of commands, whether moral or ritual, defiles the land. It should also be noted that there are certain features in each which do not appear in the other. In the Holiness Code, for instance, the distinction between priests and Levites does not appear, although the high-priest is mentioned in Lev. xxii:10-15. Cf. Lofthouse, op.cit., pp.30f.


However, as Rowley points out, this is a two-edged argument for it could be maintained just as easily that the very emphasis of the Holiness Code's rejection of secular slaughter was due to some recent challenge to the hitherto invariable rule that all slaughter must be sacrificial. (591)

Josiah's centralization of sacrificial worship did not last and the Holiness Code may have been a fresh attempt to tackle the problem of religious impurity, but in a different manner from that of Deuteronomy. At any rate, it is sufficient to note that Ezek. xl-xlviii is most probably to be assigned to the period between the Deuteronomic code and the Priestly legislation which means that these chapters could have been written during the time of Ezekiel's ministry. (592)

591. Rowley, op.cit., p.36. Lev. xvii gives general directions for the slaughtering of animals and the eating of meat. Referring to the idealized situation with Israel encamped at Sinai and the tent of meeting in the centre of the camp, Noth, Leviticus : A Commentary, London, 1965, p.129, argues that while the tent of meeting (v.4) definitely belongs to the original substance, the express reference to 'the camp in v.3 seems to be a later clarification, which "would mean that one single place of worship for Israel might be presupposed and mirrored in the one tent of meeting for Israel encamped at Sinai." Noth argues that the Law of Holiness is "a preserver of ancient cultic traditions, and ... concerned to renew their validity in the time after 587B.C., over against the Deuteronomic innovations" (ibid., p.130). L.E. Elliott-Binns, 'Some Problems of the Holiness Code', ZAW, lxvii, 1955, pp.26-40, places H before D. On the difficulty of determining whether or not Lev. xvii : 1 - 9 is post-Deuteronomic or not, see Eissfeldt, The Old Testament : An Introduction, pp.237f.

That Ezekiel himself wrote at least a part of chapters xl-xlvi
seems very probable since this section balances certain features found in Ezek. i-xxix. The temple is always in the forefront of the prophet's thought. Moreover, there seems to be in the book a continuous development in those passages which are couched in the first person form (593), in which chapters xl-xlvi provide the perfect climax to all that has gone before. Assuming that most of the passages which employ the first-person form derive from the prophet himself, then it may be argued that these passages constitute a framework which reveals itself as a planned entity not only by the datings of its individual sections, which are generally in correct chronological order, but also by the fact that the call vision of i:1-iii:15, the removal vision of viii-xi, the sharp rejection in xx of the plan by some of the exiles to build a cult-place in their present settlement, and the vision of Yahweh's re-entry into the renewed Jerusalem temple in xl-xlvi, "all present in a sense a continuous development". (594) According to Ezek. i:1-iii:15, Jerusalem is the place of Yahweh's throne-chariot; according to viii-xi, Yahweh leaves Jerusalem on his throne-chariot before handing the city and temple over to destruction; in xx, the prophet rejects the erection of a cult-place in another centre because he expects the Jerusalem temple to be rebuilt in the coming age of salvation; in xl-xlvi, the rebuilding of the Jerusalem temple is proclaimed. (595) It seems most probable, therefore, that "the sequence of the dated sections, and among them in particular the arrangement of these four which refer to the fate of the Temple, can only be ascribed to Ezekiel." (596) In his message of salvation and his exhortation to the exiles to repent, to return to Yahweh and to live a life according to his will (Ezek. iii:16b-21; xxxiii:1-20),

594. Ibid.
595. Ibid.
596. Ibid.
Ezekiel realized that what was required of the exiles surpassed human ability. Consequently, he envisaged a new period of salvation in which there would be a reunited Israelite kingdom in a flourishing Palestine (Ezek. xxxvi-xxxvii) made possible by Yahweh's return to the rebuilt temple, from which streams of blessing would flow (xl-xlviii). The climax to the whole book, then, lies in the prophet's closing words in which he gives to the restored central city of the community its new name, Yahweh Šāmāh (Ezek. xlviii :35). The purpose of this visionary plan was to guard the people from the sins and defilements which had formerly brought disaster on the nation and which had driven Yahweh's presence from them.

The new community is to be resettled in the land of Israel and its centre is to be located in a city built on a very high mountain. Yahweh's glory is to enter through the eastern gate of the temple and the gate is to remain perpetually shut thereafter so that Yahweh's glory will dwell in the midst of his people for ever. Detailed regulations of ministry and worship are stipulated to ensure that no occasion could possibly arise when Yahweh's holiness might be profaned and in this way the prophet sought to avert another outbreak of the divine anger (Ezek. xliii : 8) which would result in Yahweh quitting the temple once more. (598) Radical measures are prescribed to eradicate intolerable profanations and to isolate the temple from both external and internal defilement. It is interesting to note that one of the measures introduced to preserve the sanctity of the temple concerns the Levites.

597. This may well be a pun on the name Yərūšālaim. Cf., e.g., Ackroyd, Exile and Restoration, p.112.

Only the priests are allowed to serve in the temple, while the Levites, who, in Deuteronomy, were equivalent to priests, are now simply the assistants of the priests: they are allowed to minister to the people (Ezek. xlv : 10-14), but not to Yahweh. The reason for the downgrading of the Levites so that they occupy a menial position is probably to be found in the fact that shortly after Josiah's death the local shrines were re-opened and Ezekiel regarded the worship at these high-places as idolatrous and the provincial priests, whom he calls Levites, as unfit to minister to Yahweh. In Ezek. xl-xlviii, the priesthood is reserved to a single family, the sons of Zadok.

599. In the Priestly legislation (Num. iii : 5-10; xviii : 2) the Levites are likewise the assistants of the priests. Noth, 'The Laws in the Pentateuch: Their Assumptions and Meaning', The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Essays, p.68, n. 162, maintains that while the separation of the priests from the minor clergy or Levites first appears in legal formulation in Ezek. xl-xlviii (xlv : 9ff.), this is only the explicit recognition of a practice which, according to 2Kgs. xxiii : 9 was actually operative in the pre-exilic temple.

600. The Priestly legislation extends the priestly office to all the sons of Aaron (Lev. xxii : 1), not only to the Zadokites descended from Aaron's son Eleazar, but also to the descendants of Aaron's fourth son Ithamar (Exod. vi : 23). However, even in the Priestly legislation, as 1 Chron. xxiv:1-4 reveals, the Zadokites retained a certain superiority, for the high priest belonged to their line. Pfeiffer, op.cit., p.557, refers to Ben Sira (Ecclesiasticus xv:12) who, long after Ezekiel, still identified the priests with the sons of Zadok. He further points out that the later term 'Sadducees', which indicates the followers of the priestly aristocracy, still bears witness to the abiding prestige of the name of Zadok when the high priests were no longer descendants of his.
The purpose of sacrifices in the Restoration Programme is either to pay tribute to Yahweh, or to expiate unwitting transgressions.

The result of Yahweh's presence in the temple is graphically described in Ezek. xlvii:9 which uses imagery which probably goes back to the earlier mythological idea of the river of paradise to describe the richness of the divine blessing in the land which Israel is to experience because of the divine indwelling in its midst.

The basis of the new theocracy is the presence of Yahweh. The promise that Yahweh, by means of his glory which is the vehicle of his presence, will return to Israel and once again make his abode in Jerusalem, is the central feature of Ezekiel's hope of restoration.

Deutero-Isaiah: Israel/Jerusalem/Zion

The presence of Yahweh with his people is also at the centre of Deutero-Isaiah's message of hope. This prophet pictures the exiles being led triumphantly by Yahweh along the desert road, miraculously made straight and level (Isa. xl:1ff.), back to their homeland (Isa. lli:12). Deutero-Isaiah has a deep faith in Yahweh's presence with his people. Although this prophet regards God as the Creator of all things and the Lord of all history, he envisages the rebuilding of the temple as one of the principal objects of the return home (601) (Isa. xliiv:28), and the return of Yahweh to Jerusalem as the supreme blessing when this city would become the centre of revelation and worship for all nations. According to Isa. lvi:7, the new temple will be 'a house of prayer for all peoples'. Just as the destruction of the sanctuary exemplified the plight of Israel (Isa. xliii:28), so the rebuilt temple will be the visible sign of the fullness of Israel's salvation and the centre where all the peoples of the world will come to pay homage to Yahweh's chosen people (Isa. xlv:14-17; xlix:18, 22f.).

It is very significant that Deutero-Isaiah frequently refers to the nation which had survived the exile as 'Jerusalem' or 'Zion'. As Clements writes: "The entire nation is meant, but both by reason of the narrow geographical limits of the land, and also because of the immense theological significance of the city, the name of the ancient city and sacred hill have become synonymous with the nation itself." (602)

The Priestly Writing: 'let them make for me a sanctuary, that I may dwell in their midst.'

In the Priestly Writing, the belief in Yahweh's dwelling in Jerusalem forms a presupposition which governed the aim of the moral and cultic regulations which it contains. (603) The aim of the Holiness Code, (604) a continuous block of material inherited by the Priestly writers, was to create the necessary conditions to ensure Yahweh's continued dwelling with Israel. Yahweh's presence, which is the supreme blessing for Israel, resulting in benefits for the people, is made conditional on obedience to the commandments (Lev. xxvi: 3, 11, 12), which ensures the holiness of Israel (Lev. xix: 2). The Priestly writers inherited this doctrine and in their restoration programme they attempted to re-fashion the life and worship of Israel in order to create the right conditions for the return of Yahweh's presence which had been withdrawn because of the people's disobedience. The Priestly Writing has been described as "a theological reconstruction of the temple, as distinct from its purely material refurbishing." (605)

The Priestly Writing (606) had a threefold aim which was to show how Israel might again become a nation, possess its land, and receive Yahweh's


606. Many commentators assign P to the fifth century B.C. Cf., e.g. Pfeiffer, op.cit., p.188. However, Noth, Exodus, p.17, argues that the work was substantially complete before the dedication of the rebuilt temple of Jerusalem in 515 B.C. Noth is followed by Clements, God and Temple, p.111.
presence in its midst. (607) This threefold aim of the Priestly authors for the restoration of Israel is strikingly evident in the Priestly account of the Abrahamic covenant in which the threefold basis of the nation's existence is God's triple promise of the nationhood of Abraham's descendants, the possession of the land of Canaan, and the divine presence in Israel. By the disasters of 597 and 586 B.C., Israel had been dispossessed of its land, the temple had been destroyed, and Yahweh's presence had been withdrawn. In P, Israel is a people only when Yahweh dwells in its midst and this explains the significant addition which the Priestly writers have made to the account of the Abrahamic covenant. The divine promise 'I will be their God' (Gen. xvii : 8) has crucial importance, for it refers, not so much to a formal covenant relationship, as to the fact that Yahweh will himself dwell in the midst of Israel. (608)

As in the case of Deuteronomy, the Priestly Writing attempted "to get back to the true origins of Israel, and to lay bare the real basis of the nation's life". (609) The Priestly Writing is constructed on the theory of two covenants, the first being God's covenant with mankind through Noah (Gen. ix : 8-17) and the second a covenant of promise with Israel through Abraham (Gen. xvii : 1-14) which finds its fulfilment in the existence and nationhood of Israel. However, since Israel only becomes Israel when Yahweh dwells in its midst, the birth of the nation is traced back to Mount Sinai, for it is only when Israel's cult is functioning properly and Yahweh's glory is present with them, that Israel becomes in reality the people of Yahweh. The Priestly Writing attaches


the greatest importance to both the work of Moses, who is the mediator of the divine will to Israel, and to the Sinai event, which is not described as a new convenant, but as the ratification and fulfilment of the Abrahamic covenant. (610) It was on Sinai that Yahweh, whose presence on earth is always presented in P as a cloud which contains his glory, (611) met with Moses (Exod. xxiv : 15-18a) and, speaking out of the midst of the cloud (Exod. xxiv : 16), issued him with instructions for Israel's cult (Exod. xxv :1-xxxvii : 18a), which chiefly concern the design, construction and furnishing of a miškān and the consecration of this tabernacle's priesthood from the sons of Aaron. In their account of the tabernacle, the Priestly writers draw on memories and traditions associated with Solomon's temple and, falling back on the tradition of the portable tent of meeting, they present a detailed description of a richly furnished temple under the guise of a portable tent sanctuary. (612)

This shrine, which is sometimes called the tent of meeting and sometimes the tabernacle, is the place where Yahweh's glory will take up its abode:

"And let them make me a sanctuary, that I may dwell in their midst. According to all that I show you concerning the pattern of the tabernacle, and of all its furniture, so you shall make it." (Exod. xxv : 8f.)


611. Exod. xvi : 7, 10 ; xxv : 16 ; xxix : 43 ; xl : 34ff. ; Lev.ix : 6,23 ; Num.xiv : 10 ; xvi : 19 ; cf. Lev. xvi : 2.

612. G. Henton Davies, 'Tabernacle', IDEB , iv, pp. 498a-560b , ref.pp. 504a ff., argues that the tabernacle in P is not the projection of an ideal into the past behind Solomon's temple but is, rather, an ideal elaboration of an ancient doctrine and its accompanying institutions. He maintains that P's tabernacle may well be an elaboration of E's tent, which itself was the model from which Solomon in part drew the design for his temple, and that P's account may well reflect features of the sacred tent set up by David (2 Sam.vi:17) He concludes that if these suggestions are valid, "then...P's tabernacle will not be an idealized copy of the temple of Solomon, but not less than one of its actual prototypes"(ibid.,p.506a). M.
Yahweh is the God of Israel when he dwells in their midst and the construction of the tabernacle will ensure his presence with his people:

'And I will dwell among the people of Israel, and will be their God. And they shall know that I am Yahweh their God, who brought them forth out of the land of Egypt that I might dwell among them; I am Yahweh their God'. (Exod. xxix : 45f.)

As Clements rightly points out: "These verses are in fact the motive clauses for the entire cult and worship of Israel, which exists simply that Yahweh might dwell with his people, and that by doing so he might bless them."(613) When Yahweh's instructions have been carried out and the work is completed (Exod. xxxv :1-xl : 33), then Israel's cult begins to function correctly, Yahweh's glory comes to dwell in the midst of his people (Exod. x1 : 34-38), and Israel becomes the people of God.

For the exiled Judaeans, who knew that Yahweh's glory had departed and that the temple had been destroyed, this description of the tabernacle was intended as a building programme by which Israel could once again become the people of God.(614)

The Priestly writers were concerned to show that Yahweh's presence was never committed irrevocably to remain in Jerusalem but was the gift of his grace to Israel which depended on their obedience to three principal conditions, which were: the right sanctuary, the right cult and cult-furnishings, and the right priesthood.(615) When these three conditions were met then Israel would again become a nation, possess the land, and have Yahweh's glory dwelling in their midst. Thus, in P, cult and divine presence are inextricably linked and the foundation pillar of the entire cult is the promise that Yahweh will tabernacle with Israel.

612. Continued. Haran, 'Shiloh and Jerusalem : the Origin of the Priestly Tradition in the Pentateuch', JBL, lxxxi, 1962, pp.14-24, maintains that the tabernacle, together with the entire Priestly tradition, derive from the sanctuary of Shiloh. However, as Clements, God and Temple, p.114, n. 5, rightly points out, this is going far beyond the evidence.


Deuteronomy had preferred the verb סָגַן to describe the dwelling of Yahweh's name on earth, (616) reserving יָשָׁב for his dwelling in heaven, (617) and this special theological sense of סָגַן is used by the Priestly writers to eliminate any idea that there exists a permanent bond between Yahweh and his people. The Priestly authors stress that the manner of Yahweh's presence with Israel is by his glory 'tabernacling'in their midst and the shrine where this occurs is appropriately called a tabernacle and takes the form of a tent.

From the Priestly viewpoint, the temple at Jerusalem was the heir of the old Mosaic tent and in order to explain why the temple had been desolate for almost three-quarters of a century and why Yahweh's glory had not 'tented'there, the Priestly writers endeavoured to show that the glory of Yahweh was not permanently located at any one place, but only settled impermanently on earth. (618)

The Priestly writers synthesized earlier ideas of the divine presence on earth, for, by setting the idea of the theophany in the forefront of its doctrine of the divine presence, they have made it into a semi-permanent phenomenon, referred to by Clements as a 'sustained theophany' (619) (Exod. xl : 38). However, although the cloud of the theophany is a permanent mode of Yahweh's being and activity, rather than a temporary manifestation of his glory as previously, this abiding is only a 'tabernacling' which is conditional on the nation's obedience. (620)


619. Ibid., p.118.

If 'testimony'in the phrase 'the ark of the testimony',(621)(Exod. xcv :22 ; cf. xxx : 36) refers to the law tablets which the Deuteronomic writers claimed were placed in the ark, then there is in P a synthesis of interpretations of the ark, for the Priestly writers connect the ark with Yahweh's cherubim-throne, but they also describe it in the Deuteronomic way as a container for the law tablets. In P the ark is overlaid with gold and it has a golden cover which is the place where Yahweh's glory is located. The cherubim, which are wrought of gold, are positioned on this cover over the ark, placed at its two ends, and the presence of Yahweh is located between them (Exod. xcv : 22 ; cf. xxix : 42, 43 ; xxx : 36 ; Lev. xvi : 2). On the other hand, Rost, comparing the Egyptian royal protocol, suggests that the 'testimony' refers, not to the law-tablets, but to some written seal of the divine promise to dwell with Israel.(622) If this suggestion were accepted, then the Priestly writers have re-interpreted the tradition of the law-tablets and it is to the divine presence that the whole weight of their theology is directed.(623)

621. Cf. Noth, A History of Pentateuchal Traditions, p. 245, n.641 ; Zimmerli, The Law and the Prophets : A study of the Meaning of the Old Testament, Oxford, 1965, p.91. The Priestly writers have a particular fondness for words derived from yâcad and cûd. Because Israel was not regarded as a nation whilst in exile and because also they wished to stress the nature of the community centred on the encounter with Yahweh who tabernacled in their midst, the Priestly writers describe Israel as an cûdâh. (See, L. Rost, Die Vorstufen von Kirche und Synagoge im Alten Testament, EKANT, IV : xxiv, Stuttgart, 1938, pp.38ff. ; Clements, God and Temple, p.113). The tabernacle is pîhel môcûd. The ark is prûn ha cûdâh where Yahweh 'meets' with Israel. Cf. Clements, op.cit., p.119, n.4.


624. Ibid., p.120.


At any rate the fact that the Priestly writers describe the ark as being set inside the tabernacle indicates that the ark and the tent of meeting were considered to be inseparable. In Exod. xxx: 26 a new feature is introduced for it is ordered that the ark, like the tabernacle, is to be anointed with oil. While not holy in itself, the ark must be consecrated for its sacred purpose because, while it is a material object, it is through it that the holiness of Yahweh's glory is to radiate out to the people. This concept of holiness which radiates out from Yahweh's presence over the ark affecting both persons and objects which come into contact with the sanctuary is the marked feature of the whole Priestly approach to the cult and, as Clements writes: "Everything is part of a single unified whole, and the foundation pillar of the entire cult is the promise of the divine tabernacling over the ark." (624)

In the Priestly Writing there is a distinct change of emphasis in both the doctrine of Yahweh's presence with Israel and in the attitude to the cult. Deuteronomy had spoken of 'the place where Yahweh will choose to set his name' and Ezekiel thought in terms of a new temple in Jerusalem, as the abode of Yahweh's glory. In P, however, Yahweh's presence is not linked with a place at all but is, instead, related to a cultic community, for the ark, with its cover and cherubim, is not a place, but a portable piece of cult-furniture which enables Yahweh, the God of heaven, to send forth his glory to tabernacle among his people and to sanctify and bless them from the centre of their camp. (625)

As well as this change of emphasis in the doctrine of Yahweh's presence, the Priestly writers have 'theologized' the different aspects of Israel's cult to make them fit into one unified whole. (626) The extent to which features have become symbolic of theological truths is evident in the disposition of the sanctuary and its furnishing, in the

---

624. Ibid., p.120.
rituals, and in the need to anoint with oil the tabernacle, its furnishings and its priesthood before they can be used (Exod. xxx : 22-33). All these measures are designed to ensure that the holiness of Yahweh's glory may be protected from any profane contact. This 'theologizing' of the cult is also apparent in the Priestly writers' stress that the instructions for the tabernacle were given to Moses directly from Yahweh and that these instructions were meticulously observed (Exod. xxv : 8f.; xxxix : 32,43; xl : 16). Yahweh alone knows the true sanctuary and the true way of worship and Israel's worship has a twofold purpose. Firstly, it is a response to Yahweh's grace for revealing these to Israel and, secondly, it is the means by which they can make possible his supreme act of grace which is to let his glory tabernacle in their midst. (627)

The cult, the temple, and the presence of God in the post-exilic community and beyond

The Priestly Writing was intended as a paradigm of the future, a programme which, when fulfilled, would enable Israel to re-enter its ancient heritage. (628) However, this programme remained largely an

627. Cf. Clements, op.cit., pp.121f. On the sacrifices mentioned in P, see von Rad Old Testament Theology, I, pp.250ff., who thinks that "a great deal of cultic material was incorporated into it secondarily, probably very soon after its composition, the intention of which is obviously to ground sacrifices also in the great inauguration of the cult at Sinai" (ibid., p.250). Von Rad rightly points out that it was not P's intention to suggest any specific understanding of the sacrifices. Rather, P was much more concerned with the correctness and orderliness of the outward aspects of the observances of the cult. Where sacrifices were offered, P's concern is that there should be strict observance of the ritual traditions.

628. Cf. Clements, op.cit., p.122. Noth, A History of Pentateuchal Traditions, pp.242ff., focuses attention on the fact that "in the priestly presentation the sacrificial cult at the single cultic site is held to be the central and vitally necessary realization of Israel's bond with God, as grounded by the Abrahamic covenant" (ibid., pp.242f.). Noth argues that while "P was neither willing nor able to conceive of the arrangement of the central sanctuary except in terms of the facts, conceptions, and cultic requirements of his own time"(ibid., p.243), it would be wrong to see in all of the details of the Sinai order of P simply one great aetiology
Continued. Of the post-exilic Jerusalem cult with the occasional concession to the historical situation as described by the older Pentateuchal tradition. P's purpose in this portrayal "was not simply to give an etiology of existing institutions, but rather to present a program for the future, or else to offer a corrective of prevalent views with the object of helping to bring about a reform or in the expectation that such a reform would one day take place. If that is right, then this corrective must have involved an important concern - not just this or that cultic detail - and this concern could have occasioned the composition of P's great work" (ibid., p.243). Like Clements, Noth thinks that "it can only be the conception of the sanctuary itself, and of God's relation to the sanctuary, which theologically was so important for P that he oriented his work toward this object" (ibid.).

Noth argues that, in stressing the ḫôhel mōçâd, P wanted to supplement and correct the views of the Jerusalem priests concerning Yahweh's presence in the temple, views which had been greatly influenced by Canaanite traditions. P appealed to the numinous element of the God of Sinai who does not in fact dwell in the tent sanctuary, but only appears in the cloud with his glory. Although very heavily dependent on the conceptions of his own time, P attempted to validate the ancient Sinai tradition in opposition to the cultic traditions of the arable land. It is interesting to observe that Noth, The Laws in the Pentateuch: Their Assumptions and Their Meaning, The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Essays, pp. 1-107, argues that in later literature there was a weakening of the concepts of 'covenant' and 'election' and that this is clearly reflected in P, in which the concept 'covenant' survives only as a decorative feature. In P, Noth maintains, the law is no longer tied to the covenant, but has become an absolute and stands upon its own feet as an independent entity. However, Clements' argument that the Priestly writers deliberately make the Abrahamic covenant the basis of Israel's relationship with Yahweh precisely because this covenant contained no proclamation of law but was a complete gift, proclaiming an election of grace, is very convincing. Moreover, not only does the Abrahamic covenant contain no proclamation of law, but in P "the two tablets which Moses received on the mountain are mentioned only incidentally, and .... no longer have any threatening power, but have become a sacramental guarantee" (Zimmerli, The Law and the Prophets, p.91). In P, the importance of Sinai lies in the inauguration of the cult, the correct performance of which, makes possible the fulfilment of the promise made to Abraham. Cf. Zimmerli, 'Sinaibund und Abrahambund', Gottes Offenbarung. Gesammelte Aufsätze, München, 1963, pp.205-216; Phillips, Ancient Israel's Criminal Law, p.183. Israel's existence is attributed solely to the timeless and continuing election of Yahweh and "it is through this that she reappears not as a political group, but as a worshipping community whose raison d'être is her central sanctuary and cult in which Yahweh's presence might be made real" (Phillips, op.cit., p.183). The Priestly writers were concerned to show that Yahweh's relationship to Israel should exist irrespective of the law and that the cult, functioning properly, should provide "the means whereby Israel might ever renew and reform herself" (Phillips, op.cit., p.184). At the same time, however, the cult must not be abused and the priestly legislation was designed to ensure the proper ordering and purity of the cult which, in turn, would ensure the continuance of the tabernacling of Yahweh's glory, which is neither unconditional nor unchangeable.
unfulfilled hope of Israel, and the longing for Yahweh's presence with his people began to assume an eschatological dimension, but, alongside this development, there was a deepening sense of spiritual communion with Yahweh in the present, apart from the temple and the cult.

As Snaith writes: "The story of post-exilic Jewry is the story of dreams that faded one after the other, dreams that never materialised except in fitful promise". The actual circumstances in Jerusalem for the homecoming exiles were vastly different from the rich promises made by Deutero-Isaiah of a glorious future in which all nations would flock to Mount Zion to share with Israel in the salvation of the one true God. Although the account of the edict of Cyrus (Ezra i) had made the restoration of worship in Jerusalem the basic motive of the return, the desire to build a new temple seems to have been overwhelmed by the depressing conditions of Judah and the arduous struggle just to make a living. However, the hope of Yahweh's glorious return, and of a

628. Continued. but which may be withdrawn in the face of disobedience (cf. Clements, God and Temple, p.118). Israel stood between the promises made to Abraham and the fulfilment which would come when the cultic regulations given at Sinai were carried out. Thus, while "no uncertainty in regard to Israel's obedience to the laws of Sinai could nullify the continuing validity of the Abrahamic covenant, and of Israel's election which this guaranteed", there is in the Priestly Writing "a subtle tension between law and grace which does not deny the significance or reality of either" (Clements, Abraham and David, p.76).


miraculous transformation of conditions in Judah, was not abandoned, but only deferred. (631)

The situation in Judah at this time is vividly portrayed in Hagg. i : 1-11. As well as drought, bad harvests, and inflation, there was friction between the returned exiles and their neighbours (Ezra. iv : 1-5) and any attempt to restore either the political importance of Jerusalem or to reconstruct the temple was liable to arouse jealousy and suspicion in other quarters. (632) It did not seem a propitious time to reconstruct either the city walls or the temple.

The upheavals which followed the death of Cambyses sent a shock wave through the great Persian empire and it revived in Israel the expectation of the last decisive crisis in history, the final cataclysm foretold by the prophets, which would restore Israel and the Davidic house to unchallenged pre-eminence. (633) In a whole year of unremitting, intense, but largely successful, battles, Darius subjugated the rebellious areas and, towards the end of 521 B.C., his position as sole ruler was fundamentally secure. It was probably in the second half of 520 B.C. that the prophet Haggai spoke in Jerusalem, and the nocturnal visions recorded in Zech. i:7-vi:15 may be assigned to the beginning of 519 B.C. (634)

Although Haggai may appear pedestrian and prosaic, he was able to rouse the despondent and indifferent community of Jerusalem, under the leadership of Zerubbabel-ben-Shealtiel and Joshua-ben-Jehozadak, to take steps to rebuild the ruined temple. Haggai promised that when the temple was rebuilt, the glorious presence of Yahweh would return to bless the people (Hagg. i:8 ), prosperity would return (i:3-11), the


633. Cf., e.g., G.W. Anderson, op.cit., p.155, Noth, op.cit., p.311 ; Bright, op.cit., pp.369f. ; Myers, 1 Chronicles, pp.XXVIff.

temple would be enriched by the tribute of the nations (ii : 1-9), and Zerubbabel would become Yahweh's chosen servant, His 'signet ring', the heir of David (ii : 20-23), who would carry out Yahweh's decisions. As well as the expectation of a catastrophe of universal range (cf.ii:6), followed by the establishment of a new order, and the figure of Yahweh's royal representative, there is in this short collection of prophecies a close relationship between national religious loyalty and prosperity, along the lines of Deuteronomic teaching, together with a positive attitude to the cult which is characteristic of post-exilic prophecy. (635)

Disrespect towards the cult "is not important for its own sake but because it is a symbol of a general indifference toward God. It is an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual dis-grace." (636) Haggai envisages a restored community, centred on the temple "and needing to know itself as the people of God". (637) The temple is the centre where God reveals himself, "a centre therefore both to the life of the world and to the total action of God." (638)

In thought and style, Zechariah is very different from Haggai, but he presents the same situation and similar aspirations. Zechariah proclaimed a similar message assuring that in the near future the promise would be fulfilled and Yahweh would return to Jerusalem (Zech.ii:14f.(EVV.10f.)). This promise is reiterated in Zech.viii:3:

'Thus says Yahweh: I will return to Zion, and will dwell in the midst of Jerusalem, and Jerusalem shall be called the faithful city, and the mountain of Yahweh of Hosts, the holy mountain' (Zech.viii:3; cf. also Zech.i:16). (639)

636. R.C. Dentan, 'The Book of Malachi: Introduction and Exegesis', IB, vi, pp.1115-1144, ref.p.1119b. Although this is a reference to Malachi, it is a comment which is equally relevant to Haggai and Zechariah. Cf. Ackroyd, Exile and Restoration, p.170, n.77.
639. It is interesting to note that Zech.ii :11 (EVV.7), where the promise to Jerusalem and of rebuilding is linked with a summons to the people still in exile to join the community at home, may be translated: 'Ho there, O Zion, escape, you who are dwelling in the realm of Babylon'. According to this translation, therefore,
Both Haggai and Zechariah promised that when the temple was rebuilt and true worship restored, then the glowing promises of Deutero-Isaiah would be fulfilled. The approaches of these prophets to the restoration of the temple have been described as the obverse and reverse of the same coin. (640) Both prophets stress that the rebuilding of the temple will be brought about by the spirit of God, but whereas Haggai emphasises the need for rebuilding because only then can the community appropriate Yahweh's willingness to bless, "Zechariah's stress lies upon the reality of God's intentions, which find their correlative in the rebuilding which is made possible by his will." (641)

Thus, the temple is central to the thought of both Haggai and Zechariah and the major theme of their message can be summed up as a call for a holy temple, a holy city, and a holy land.

When the rebuilding of the temple was completed in 515 (Ezra v,vi), there was no miraculous transformation of conditions in Judah, no miraculous return of exiles, and Zerubbabel, on whom such high hopes had been pinned (Hagg.ii : 23), disappears from history. In spite of the fact that a new temple had been constructed, the return of Yahweh was still delayed. However, as Clements writes, although some may have abandoned all hope of it, "the promise of the fullness of the divine presence on earth remained a central feature of the eschatological hopes of the post-exilic community." (642) One who steadfastly kept faith that the promise would be fulfilled was Malachi who, having denounced the


641. Ackroyd, op.cit., p.177.

slovenly, half-hearted and unworthy worship of his contemporaries, assured the people that Yahweh would come to his temple (Mal.iii : 1). Whereas the pre-exilic canonical prophets had denounced the cultic practice of their people as an offence to Yahweh, Malachi exemplifies the increasing emphasis on the temple and the law by castigating his countrymen for their neglect of the appointed ways of worship and offering. (643) Malachi warns that Yahweh's coming will not bring blessing but, rather, confusion, for his presence will mean the purging of his people from sin. The prophet envisaged only a group of faithful Jews whom Yahweh would acknowledge as His own, when He came in judgment (Mal. iii : 16-18).

Thus, in spite of the rebuilding of the temple and the implementation of the programme outlined in the Priestly Writing, the crowning promise that Yahweh's presence would settle in Israel's midst had not been fulfilled and remained in the realm of eschatological hope. (644) In the book of Joel, however, the prophet asserts categorically that Yahweh is in Zion, dwelling in the temple (Joel ii : 27 ; iv : 16f. (EVV.iii : 16f.)). This is such a complete return to the pre-exilic attitude to the temple that it is scarcely surprising that Kapelrud maintains that although the book was written down in the fourth to the third centuries B.C., it contains pre-exilic prophecies (circa 600 B.C.). (645) The balance of evidence seems to favour a post-exilic date for the book. (646) Clements rightly points out that after the rebuilding of the temple, some Jews probably resurrected the old attitudes and ideas and this would have been facilitated by the fact that the psalms of the first temple were still


644. Clements, op.cit., p.126, n.1, draws attention to the fact that many features connected with the celebration of the Autumn Festival in pre-exilic Jerusalem re-appear in the eschatological hopes of Judaism (cf. Zech.xii-xiv.)


being sung, albeit in a different context of worship. (647)

In the Chronicler's work, the ideas which the author drew from his sources concerning Yahweh's presence and his abode on earth re-appear in what has aptly been described as "virtually a synthesis of earlier thought and doctrine on the subject, without any attempt being made to resolve the tensions, or to eliminate the difficulties." (648) The Chronicler recognized one central sanctuary at Jerusalem and he regarded the cardinal elements in the reciprocal relationship between Israel and Yahweh as blessing and worship - blessing from Yahweh and worship from the people. (649) It is scarcely accidental that frequently when the house of Yahweh is mentioned, the words 'in Jerusalem' or 'at Jerusalem' are added (2 Chron. vi : 10, 32; x Chron. i : 13; iii : 1; vi : 6; xxx : 1; xxxiii : 4, 7, 15; xxxvi : 14, 23; and many times in Ezra). (650)

In this period, other religious centres, notably at Samaria and Elephantine were regarded as highly illegitimate "because of the precedents of revelation and history." (651) The Chronicler regarded David as the progenitor of both the royal and the cultic traditions of Israel, but the cultic traditions were more immediately important for the Chronicler, largely because of external conditions. As Moses had once received plans for the tabernacle, so David, according to the Chronicler, received plans for the temple from Yahweh (1 Chron. xxii : 1; xxviii : 19) and the actual

---


649. Cf. Myers, I Chronicles, p.LXVII.

650. Cf. Myers, op.cit., n.85, who points out that the name Jerusalem occurs two hundred and thirty-five times in Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah, as against only one hundred and twenty-three times in Samuel and Kings.

651. Myers, op.cit.
site for the temple was designated by Yahweh's angel (1 Chron.xxi : 18ff.). Yahweh's house signified his presence at the seat of Israel's government and its precincts became the place of worship whenever Yahweh desired or the needs of his people dictated. (652) The temple "was the eternal trysting place between the Lord and his people.... the heart of the nation's life.... the life center of the people of God, the hub of the Lord's kingdom on earth." (653) It was largely the fact that Judah was, in a sense, reverting to a theocracy, in which the ecclesiastical element was predominant, that so much emphasis is laid by the Chronicler on the origin of Jerusalem as the centre of Israelite sacrificial worship and on the cultus established there by David. (654) There was a return to the old ideal of revelation/direction through the purely cultic institutions with God's will being made known or applied in and through the religious officials. The Chronicler dwells on the ark and the temple and favours the Levites as the chosen ministers of Yahweh (cf. 1 Chron.xxiii : 27-32), the Aaronites fading into the background. (655)

Great emphasis is placed upon the work and direction of David with regard to cultic matters and the Chronicler draws on David's authority for worship arrangements to substantiate the order and practice of the cultus of his own time. Israel's relationship with Yahweh revolved around the cultus, and worship was a means of maintaining a healthy and vital rapport with Yahweh. As Myers writes: "The cult-centered community in living fellowship with him was the saved community in which the will of the Lord was done and his blessings enjoyed." (656)

(652) Myers, op.cit., p.LXVIII.
(653) Ibid.
(654) Cf. Myers, op.cit., p.LXXXIII.
(655) On the Chronicler's enthusiasm for the Levites, see Myers, op.cit., pp.LXVIII-LXXI.
(656) Myers, op.cit., p.LXXXIV.
on the cultic arrangements instituted by David and Solomon, there is a very strong emphasis on Moses and on the Torah as an instrument of instruction for the guidance of the community, principally in worship. The Torah ideal was deeply imbedded in the Chronicler's whole religious outlook and he applied it rigorously to all life and conduct, scrutinizing every phase of politics and religion for possible violations of its demands. (657)

The tensions in the Chronicler's work concerning the temple as the divine dwelling place (658) can be seen in the fact that while Yahweh is a God who is in heaven (2 Chron. vi: 18, 21 etc.; cf. 2 Chron. ii: 6; xx: 6; xxx: 27), the temple is still the place which was constructed as his dwelling place (2 Chron. vi: 2; xxxvi: 15), and Yahweh is called the God of Jerusalem (2 Chron. xxxii: 19). In the section dealing with David receiving the plan of the temple 'from the hand of Yahweh', the temple is never once referred to as a place for Yahweh to dwell in. (659) Mount Moriah is said to be the site of the temple (2 Chron. iii: 1; cf. Gen. xxii: 2), and, following the Deuteronomic expression, it is to be a house for the name of Yahweh (2 Chron. ii: 4; vi: 6, 10, 20; vii: 16; xxxiii: 4, 7). Once the temple has been dedicated, Yahweh's glory fills it (2 Chron. v: 14; vii: 1, 2).

In his presentation of the ark, the Chronicler again re-echoes different views which he has inherited. In some passages the ark is related to the presence of Yahweh who is enthroned on the cherubim (1 Chron. xiii: 6; cf. 1 Chron. xvii: 5; 1 Chron. xv: 1; xvi: 1) while in other passages it is said to have contained solely the law tablets (2 Chron. v: 10; vi: 11) and in 1 Chron. xxviii: 2 it is described as the footstool of Yahweh.

657. Cf. Myers, op. cit., p. LXXX.
The exile has rightly been described as the water-shed in Israelite-Jewish history and thought and one of the most important convictions which the years of exile served to strengthen was that the sacrificial cultus was not essential for the worship of Yahweh and that Yahweh was not limited to one country or to one place, but, as the only God, Creator of both the heavens and the earth, was able to manifest his presence with his people wherever they were, even when no temple existed. Jeremiah had promised that this would be the case (Jer.xxix : 13f.), and, during his call-vision, Ezekiel had seen the glory of Yahweh by the river Chebar (Ezek.i : 1 - iii : 15). For over fifty years, the expatriated Jews in Babylon had learned to worship to the best of their ability far away from the Jerusalem temple. It was most probably in this period that the Synagogue originated. C. Sigonio, in 1582, seems to have been the first to suggest that the Synagogue arose among the exiles in Babylon. Although it is impossible to say just how old this institution was, this period certainly presents the most favourable conditions under which the birth of this institution can be most easily explained and Sigonio's view is followed by, among others, Wellhausen.

662. C. Sigonio, De republica Hebraeorum, 1582, cited by Rowley, Worship in Ancient Israel, p.225, n.5 (unavailable to the present writer).
664. Wellhausen, Israelitische and Jüdische Geschichte, 1904, pp.198f.

Being separated from the one legitimate centre of sacrificial worship, the exiled Jews met at the Synagogue for prayer, for the reading of the Scriptures and instruction in religious truth, and for business transactions. (670) The Scriptures and the Synagogue played a decisive part in the survival of the Jewish faith throughout the centuries, providing the means by which Jews could maintain their distinctiveness and cohesion as a religious community and preserve and apply their inherited religious teaching. (671) Rowley stresses the tremendous significance of the institution of the Synagogue, where worship was wholly spiritual, and he writes: "In the synagogue religion was not only discussed, but practised, and it fostered not merely an intellectual understanding of the faith of Judaism, but the spirit of humble obedience to the demands of the faith. For it was essentially and fundamentally the organ of spiritual worship, the united outpouring of the spirit before God in prayer, the united attention to the Word of God, and the united acceptance of the claims of the faith....Here attention was directed to no ritual act of sacrifice which might be supposed to have validity in itself, but to the lifting of men's thought to God and his Word and the prostrating of the soul before him in adoration and prayer." (672)


670. Cf., e.g., G.W. Anderson, The History and Religion of Israel, p.176, who rightly draws attention (op.cit., n.1) to the fact that while the Synagogue was probably brought into existence by the Dispersion, in later times, at least, there were Synagogues in Palestine, and even one within the temple precincts.


672. Rowley, op.cit., pp.239f.
Marcel Simon points out that while the destruction of the temple in A.D. 70 was resented by the Jews as a national and religious catastrophe, this event did not fundamentally alter the conditions under which they practised their religion, precisely because the Synagogal system was already there and could assume the rôle then played by the temple, which, to the vast majority of Jews living far from Jerusalem, never had been more than a symbol. (673)

A prominent feature of the post-exilic community is the emphasis upon the divine transcendence which is particularly expressed in the assertion that Yahweh dwells in heaven (Is.lxvi :1f. ; Ezra i : 2; Neh.i : 4f. ; ix : 12f.,27f.; cf. also, Dan.ii : 18f., 28,37). While there may be some foreign influence behind this attitude, it is a natural development within Judaism from earlier assertions of divine transcendence in the Deuteronomic and Priestly circles. (674) However, alongside this emphasis upon Yahweh's transcendence, there went an assurance that he would always be present in and with those who loved him:

'Whither shall I go from thy Spirit? Or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend to heaven, thou art there! If I make my bed in Sheol, thou art there!'(Ps.cxxxix : 7f.) (675)

The experience of the exile taught many Jews that the divine presence could be with them without the mediation of either a temple or any of the usual cult apparatus. (676) Evidence in the belief that Yahweh was to be found wherever sincere men sought him is to be found in the fact that in Hagg. i : 13 Yahweh assures the prophet that he is with his people,

675. That this is a post-exilic psalm, see Clements, op.cit., p.132.
before the reconstruction of the temple has commenced, and in Hagg.ii: 5 Yahweh asserts: "My Spirit abides among you; fear not."  
Similarly, in Zech.iv: 6, Yahweh proclaims that the work of restoring the temple will be accomplished "by my spirit." 
Thus, faithful Jews of the post-exilic community knew that Yahweh was neither restricted in location, nor governed by spatial limitations, but was present with all who were sincerely humble, and this experience of Yahweh's presence "was not essentially different from the experience of God on Mount Zion". (677) However, alongside this spiritualizing of the idea of Yahweh's presence which arose directly from experience and which was sharpened and clarified by the destruction of the temple in A.D.70, there was the belief in a future coming of Yahweh in supernatural power and splendour which would fulfil the imperfect experience of Yahweh in the present. (678) The dissatisfaction with the second temple led to the doctrine that five things were lacking in the second temple that had existed in the first, and, while these five things varied slightly in Rabbinic belief, the two most constant and significant were the Shekinah and the holy spirit. (679) Thus, although the temple played a considerable rôle in post-exilic Jewish life and became a symbol of hope and loyalty in Palestine and in the diaspora (cf. Dan.vi: 11(EVV.10)), (680) "it stood as a witness to a promise that had not yet been fulfilled." (681) The belief developed that men's present experience of God with them was as nothing in the face of the

678. Cf. Clements, op.cit., pp.133f. Cf. L.H. Brockington, 'The Presence of God,' ET, lvii, 1945/6, pp.21-25. On the eschatological rôle of Jerusalem in various post-exilic oracles which describe the decisive rôle that the city will play with regard to the heathen at the end of the present dispensation, see R. Martin-Achard, A Light to the Nations, Edinburgh and London, 1962, pp.71ff. On the Jewish legends surrounding the great rock in the Jerusalem temple, see R. Patai, Man and Temple, London, 1947, pp.85ff., who points out that this rock was adorned by Jewish legends with all the peculiar features of an Omphalos so that it was regarded as the centre of the earth.  
ultimate reality when there would be a supernatural transformation of the world as the expression of Yahweh fully coming to them. Not surprisingly, some Jewish and Christian writers transferred the whole hope of the presence of God in a perfect temple on Mount Zion to the realm of heaven. (682) It was only in heaven that the true Jerusalem existed, with the true temple and ark. With the development of the doctrine of a heavenly Jerusalem and of a heavenly temple, (683) Jerusalem became a symbol of faith, a symbol of the ultimate fulfilment of the religious aspirations of Judaism. (684)

Gradually, there developed a belief in mediating powers, either in the form of angels, or as personified divine attributes which were regarded hypostatically (e.g. Word, Wisdom, and Spirit) and these "were called in to help bridge the gulf created by too great a stress on the divine dwelling in heaven, and a corresponding weakening of the sense of his dwelling on earth" in "an attempt to keep a strict monotheism and yet to provide an adequate basis for worship in the belief in the proximity of God." (685) Later Rabbinic theology resorted to the doctrine of the Shekinah in an attempt to define theologically how Yahweh may be other than the world and yet be present in the world.

The Qumran sectaries, with their three major concepts of the new temple, the new covenant, and the new Israel, described their community as a 'sanctuary' and a 'holy of holies'. (686) The Shekinah of God had abandoned the Jerusalem temple because of its defilement and God's


presence had now taken up its abode in the Qumran community itself, which thus represented the eschatological new temple. Moreover, the sacrifices of blood offerings were now replaced by the life of the community which was the 'sweet smell of sacrifice' of the new temple and which worked atonement for the entire people of Israel (IQS viii:4-10; ix:3-6). (687)

The claim of Christianity to be the true Israel of God and the heir of the Old Testament promises resulted in the earlier Israelite notions of the divine presence taking on a new meaning and significance in the New Testament in the light of the Incarnation and the gift of the Holy Spirit. (688) With the Incarnation of God in Christ, the central assertion of Christianity, God had indeed dwelt, or 'tabernacled', on earth as a full revelation of his being (John i:14). Here, at last, the tension between divine immanence and transcendence was resolved "in the person of one who is the perfect union of the human and the divine." (689) Jesus was the true temple in which the fullness of God dwelt on earth. Significantly, a leading feature of the criticism which was levelled at Jesus by his Jewish contemporaries was his claim to build a new temple, (690) and Stephen's insistence upon a Christian understanding of the temple provoked extreme hostility against him by the Jewish authorities, which led to his martyrdom. (691) Christians took up the ancient promises that God would dwell with his people and applied them to the Church, the Body of Christ, in which God dwelt by the Holy

689. Ibid.
Whereas the Old Testament had spoken in terms of a dwelling of God among men, the New Testament doctrine of the Trinity proclaims that God took human nature and dwelt among men and that He continues to indwell human life, through the Holy Spirit given through Christ.

By the formulation of its trinitarian faith, Christian theology resolved the tension between divine transcendence and immanence and the doctrines of the Incarnation and the Trinity completely superseded any need for a material temple and a sacrificial cultus.
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