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The Introduction opens with a definition of terms (section A), and an explanation of the method to be employed (section B).

The connection between Old Testament and Qur'ān is understood to be basically linear.

Since the deuteronomistic literature marks the decisive stage in the process of Scripture-formation, the Introduction includes a sketch of the provenance of this literature.

The body of the thesis consists of four chapters. Chapters 1 – 3 concern the traditions of early Israel:

1. The Theophany Tradition in Early Israel,
2. Theophany and Covenant,
3. Theophany and Torāh.

Chapter 4 concerns the Qur'ān:
Chapter One.

Section one. The Sinai-theophany tradition, which crystallised round a genuine historical core, comprises the constitutive nucleus of Israel's religious traditions.

Section two. Sinai-theophany- and Patriarchal-theophany-traditions were early recognised as essentially congruous, and combined in a promise-fulfilment pattern. There follows a survey of the J. and E. patriarchal-theophany accounts, with a summary of the characteristics peculiar to, and common to, the J. and E. theophany descriptions.

Section three surveys the post-Mosaic patriarchal-type theophanies, from Joshua to Solomon.

Section four: the outworking of the Sinai theophany tradition in the cult and literature of pre-exilic Israel.

Section five deals with theophanic elements in the call-experience of the prophets (Samuel to Ezekiel), and in their subsequent reception and recording of revelation.

Chapter Two.

Section one. The roots of Israel's covenant theology are to be sought in primitive nomadic-Semite covenant practice, with its strongly religious-numinous and personalistic ethos.
Section two examines the primitive Israelite core of the Sinai-covenant tradition and its first accretions.

Section three: the development of the tradition, at the pre-disruption shrines of Shechem, Gilgal, Shiloh, and Jerusalem; and the beginnings of scripturisation in the work of the Yahwist.

Sections four and five: The development of the separate, though not isolated, Northern and Southern Covenant traditions, and their literary expressions.

Section six: The reunification of the Northern and Southern strands of tradition in the deuteronomistic literature. Summary of the characteristic emphases of the Deuteronomistic History.

Chapter Three.

A survey of the development of the stipulational element in Israel's faith from its primitive numinous-theophanic roots, to the finished Deuteronomistic Code.

A. The development of the content of the Deuteronomistic Torah. The formation of the Book of the Covenant, and its expansion into the Deuteronomistic Code.

B. The development of the terms used to describe the Deuteronomistic Torah. קֶרֶב , קְרֵבָה , קְרֵב , לָהַו , מַשְׁפֵּט . The use of the term קֶרֶב to set forth the Deuteronomistic Code as the content of the divine address at
Chapter Four

Initially Muhammad underwent a theophanic call-experience analogous to that of the prophets in early Israel. During the course of his subsequent ministry, his understanding of this experience, and of the revelation-process in which it involved him, was moulded through contact with contemporary Judaism.

Section one traces the progression whereby the revelational terms dhkr, āya, bayyina, qur‘ān, kitāb, move (in Qur‘ānic usage) from an original concern with 'free proclamation of a divinely-inspired message', to an emphasis on 'deliverance of excerpts from a divinely-revealed Book'.

Section two: Theophanic elements in Muhammad's religious experience.

Section three: Qur‘ānic treatment of material that is theophanic in its Old Testament form.

Section four: Relevant developments within Judaism, from the fifth century B.C. to the sixth century A.D.: the concepts of Torah, prophecy, and angelology.

Section five: Equivalent concepts in the Qur‘ān, and the influence of the Judaean-Christian tradition on their development:

The Book and its relation to the Torah;
Prophecy - Christian, native Arab, and Judaistic influences;

Angelology - Qur'anic concepts of the Spirit (ar-rūḥ), "suggestion" (wahy), and angel; culminating in the acceptance of the doctrine of angelic mediation of the Book.

Conclusions.
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INTRODUCTION.

A. Definition of Terms.

It will be useful at the outset, to define the sense in which the terms in the title are understood in the body of this thesis.

The following definition of theophany is based on the Old Testament and Qur'anic theophany material surveyed below:— Theophany is the religious moment in which the experience of the numinous presents itself, normally in a cultic setting, to the chosen individual (or group) in vision and audition, unexpectedly, intimately, and overpoweringly; thereby invoking his fear and dread, and the convulsion of his environment, and convincing the experi ent of his personal enlistment in the service of the divine word and will. The relevance and appropriateness of the details of this definition will, I trust, become clear as we proceed to detailed examination of the Biblical and Qur'anic material.

The phrase 'formation of Scripture' is intimately related in meaning to the concept of 'canonicity'. In the case of the Old Testament the phrase is susceptible of different interpretations, depending largely on our decision as to which period of the history of Israel we regard as most crucial for the emergence of the concept of canonicity. If the decisions of the Synod of Jamnia (c.100 A.D.) represent the "defining of the circumference of the canon" of the Old Testament, yet the tendency to regard certain written


2) A. Bentzen, Introduction to the Old Testament, p. 28.
corpora as 'canonical' began much earlier. From one point of view, as we shall see (p. 268f), the beginnings of canon are to be found in the work of the Yahwist, and even in the oral and written sources upon which the Yahwist drew. Judaism on the other hand has traditionally dated the beginnings of canon from the post-exilic law-promulgations of Ezra (Neh. 8-10). While acknowledging the importance of both the Yahwist and Ezra in the formation of the canonical scripture, in the following surveys we have taken the deuteronomic-deuteronomistic literature as constituting the crucial stage in the formation of scripture - principally for the reason that in this literature we witness the emergence of the concept of 'The Torah' as the definitive and sufficient corpus of divine revelation. "Deuteronomy is ordered to be deposited in the holy place, and it is prohibited 'to add unto it, or diminish ought from it' (Dtn. 4:2, 12:32) ... This seems to indicate that the seventh century has been especially important for the formation of the idea of a holy written law".

This thesis, then, will seek to determine (in the case of the Old Testament) the influence which theophany has had on the formation of Scripture, up to that point; and the term Early Israel, consequently, is taken to mean 'Israel up to the completion of the deuteronomic-deuteronomistic literature'.

By The Qur'ān is meant the Islamic written corpus according to the recension ordered by 'Uthmān c. 650-656 A.D., which may be accepted as

3) A.Bentzen, op. cit., p.23.
preserving substantially unaltered and complete the body of revelational material received by Muhammad\textsuperscript{4}) from his prophetic call in 610 A.D. till his death in 632 A.D.

B. Apologia pro modo operandi.

The impulse to pursue the line of study presented here, arises from the awareness, born in converse with thoughtful Muslims, that theophany is an essential common factor in the 'religions of the Book'; and from the hope that an exploration of this common ground may eventually open up new possibilities for dialogue and communication between the Biblical and Qur'ānic communities / between Christians and Muslims.

In setting about this comparative study, I have not found it possible to arrange the material concerning the two traditions in a strict parallelism. For while theophanies, being strongly existential in character, may lend themselves to this 'parallelistic' treatment, the other pole of our study, i.e., that concerning the formation of scripture in Old Testament and Qur'ān, involves a linear rather than a juxtapositional connection between the two traditions. The concepts of canon, and of the mediation of revelation, set out in the developed Qur'ānic corpus, can be adequately understood only when they are seen in the light of the seventh century Judaism which was the major influence shaping their form. Hence from the point of view of the formation of scripture, the deuteronomistic-deuteronomistic literature and the Qur'ān stand, albeit more than a millennium apart, within the one historical progression. It has seemed to me therefore, that I might best

\footnote{4) W.M.Watt, \textit{Bell's Introduction}, p. 56.}
do justice to the material as a whole, by describing these two theophany-
scripture traditions according to the sub-division of materials most
naturally suggested by the peculiar genius of each, — while at the same time
emphasising the linear connection between them.

As regards the Old Testament material, then, our discussion of the
relation of theophany and scripture falls under three heads: —
First, we shall make a general survey of the theophany tradition in
early Israel, down to the point where it assumes literary or scriptural
form;
Secondly, we shall examine the role of theophany in the developing
covenant tradition; and
Thirdly, we shall trace the development of torâh, down to its inclusion
in the covenant document as the verbal, stipulational content of the
theophany.

As to our terminus a quo, we have in each case taken the Mosaic Sinai-
theophany tradition to be the crystallisation-point around which the
peculiarly Israelite concepts of theophany, covenant, and torâh have grown
up; but in view of the 'inter-faith' orientation of the thesis as a whole,
I have also sought in each case to see how the material which progressively
attached itself to this Sinai-theophany core was originally rooted in the
general religious heritage of the Ancient Near East.

In our definition of terms we have selected the completion of the
Deuteronomistic History as the terminus ad quem, down to which we trace the
development of our three concepts: accordingly, in the final section of
this introduction, we offer a preliminary account of the provenance and development of this deuteronomistic-deuteronomistic tradition.

Chapter one, 'the Theophany Tradition in early Israel', begins, in keeping with what has been said above, with an examination of the Sinai-theophany tradition. (In this opening chapter we confine ourselves to the JE Sinai-theophany account, postponing attempts to probe behind the literary sources to the historical core of the tradition, till the more detailed discussion of covenant and torah in chapters 2 and 3.) We then seek in section two to show that Sinai-theophany and patriarchal-type theophanies were regarded as essentially congruous, from the earliest stages of Israelite tradition; and we proceed to a discussion of the patriarchal-type theophanies in the E. and J. sources of Genesis, seeking on the one hand to uncover genuine pre-Mosaic theophany traditions, and on the other to isolate peculiarities of treatment in J. and E., which would illuminate the peculiar emphases in the ongoing Northern- and Southern-Sinai-theophany traditions into which the pre-Mosaic theophany narratives were integrated. In the third section of the chapter we examine the post-Mosaic patriarchal-type theophanies, - their origins, their place in the early traditions, and their significance in the Deuteronomistic History. The fourth section contains a discussion of the specifically Sinai-theophany terminology as it developed in the shrines of all-Israel, and especially in the Jerusalem temple cult: we shall seek to show how Canaanite theophanic terminology was utilised in the cultic expression of the Sinai theophany-covenant tradition, and this enriched cultic language then reflected in the literary deposit of the 'writing prophets'.
In the final section of the chapter, we discuss the theophanic call-experiences of prophets from Samuel to Ezekiel, and the developing literary tradition accompanying and embodying these experiences.

One of the striking features illuminated by this survey of the theophany tradition in early Israel is the close connection between theophany and sanctuary. Now the cult practised at the sanctuaries in Israel was always more or less intimately concerned with the celebration of the covenant bond between Yahweh and Israel. In our second chapter, therefore, we consider in detail the relation between theophany and covenant. We begin by noting the essentially religious character of the covenant concept from nomadic times, and the emergence in the patriarchal age of a specific God-man covenant concept. This leads, in section two, to a discussion of the Sinai covenant in its primitive historical core, in which we note the centrality of the theophany. In section three, we then trace the development of the Sinai-covenant cult on the soil of Canaan, from settlement to disruption, at the sanctuaries of Shechem, Gilgal, Shiloh, and (pre-disruption) Jerusalem; and we conclude the section with a sketch of the Yahwist's work, which seeks to present in systematic form the religious traditions of Israel as they had developed up till the time of the disruption. In sections four and five, we then trace the separate, though not isolated, development of the Northern and Southern covenant traditions and their literary expressions. Finally, we consider the reunification of the Sinai- and Davidic-covenant streams, as the deuteronomistic school moved South and set out its version of the reintegrated traditions, first in the Deuteronomistic-Code corpus, and then in the Deuteronomistic History.
Chapter 3 deals with the development of Israel's covenant-stipulation tradition, from its primitive numinous-theophanic roots, and its earliest attachment to the covenant tradition, down to its inclusion in developed form in the framework of the elaborated covenant document, as the articulated content of the theophanic qōl. We trace this development along two lines:

a) The development of the content of the deuteronomistic tōráh. Since the Deuteronomic Code, which forms the substance of the deuteronomistic tōráh, is developed from the Book of the Covenant, we discuss first the way in which the B.o.C. has been constructed from a variety of primitive legal and paraenetic elements, and then we consider the concerns emphasised in the expansion of the B.o.C. into the Deuteronomic Code.

b) The evolution of the terms used to describe this deuteronomistic tōráh. We examine: the primitive roots of these technical terms in personalistic and/or numinous, near-theophanic contexts; the early use of יְהֹוָה and פִּית to designate the B.o.C. in its role as stipulational content of the covenant; the use, by the late eighth century, of the term יהוה to designate the still-developing B.o.C. corpus as royal covenant-commands; and finally, the application of the ancient term tōráh to the augmented B.o.C., whereby the Deuteronomic Code-corpus is presented as at once the definitive direction concerning the will of the covenant-God, and the very content of His direct address to His covenant-people.

This account of the convergence of the three strands, theophany, covenant and tōráh, in the deuteronomistic-deuteronomistic literature completes our
survey of the Old Testament theophany-scripture tradition.

In chapter 4, we turn to an examination of the theophanic element in the Qur'ān. We start from the proposition that Muhammad underwent a theophanic call-experience analogous to that of the prophets of Israel. As a result of this call, he began to deliver his divinely revealed message in free charismatic preaching. Over a period of time, and under the influence of the 'religion of the Book', however, this free preaching activity was gradually transformed into the reception and deliverance of the divine Book. In the first section of chapter 4, therefore, we trace this development from 'free proclamation' to 'deliverance of excerpts from the Book', by examining the evolution of the terms used to describe the message divinely revealed to Muhammad, — dhkr, āya, bayyina, Qur'ān, kitāb. Having thus examined the growth of the concept of 'scripture' in the Qur'ān, we turn in section two, to examine the role of the theophanic element within the revelation; Muhammad’s own theophanic experiences, at his call and subsequently; and also (section three), the Qur'ānic treatment of material which is theophanic in its Old Testament form. The results of this survey suggest that, though originally important, the theophanic element in Muhammad’s mission and message was quickly subordinated to the verbal and the 'scriptural'. Evidence of progressively greater Judaistic influence on Muhammad’s theological thinking suggests that the reason for this eclipse of the theophanic element is to be sought mainly in the theological outlook of seventh century Judaism. To verify this hypothesis, it has been necessary to examine briefly the developments within Judaism in the period between the exile and the call of Muhammad, which resulted in the eclipse of the theophanic. We
have in the main drawn the materials for our reconstruction from the 
Babylonian Talmud, which was completed about the end of the fifth century 
A.D., and widely disseminated; and therefore close enough to Muhammad's time 
and environment to provide an accurate picture of the Judaistic thought with 
which Muhammad came into contact. On the basis of the Talmudic evidence we 
suggest that three significant and closely-interrelated developments took 
place within Judaism, viz.:-

The emergence of the concept of Torah as the definitive body of timeless, 
revealed truth;
The eclipse of the living voice of prophecy consequent on this exaltation 
of Torah; and
The stress on divine transcendence, leading to a denial of the possibility 
of theophany proper, and a corresponding growth of the concept of angelic 
mediation of revelation.

We then proceed to examine the influence of these three Judaistic 
concepts, on the formation of Qur'anic scripture and on the Qur'anic evaluat-
on of theophany. The examination leads us to conclude that the influence of 
Judaism in these three respects was decisive, eclipsing earlier insights 
concerning the relationship of theophany and revelation, which had come to 
Muhammad from native Arab and from Christian sources.

Finally, we seek to draw together the threads of the whole discussion 
by setting down the conclusions that may legitimately be drawn from the 
lines of enquiry we have pursued.

The Hebrew text used throughout is that of the third edition of the
Biblia Hebraica ed. Kittel, and all citations from the O.T. are according to the numbering of this edition. Where direct citations are made from an English translation, that of the RSV, is followed. In cases where there is a discrepancy of more than one in the numbering of the English version as against the BHK3, the English numeration is added in brackets after the citation.

The Qur'anic text used throughout is the Egyptian; and the English translation, except where otherwise stated, is that of Richard Bell. For convenience, citations are made according to Bell's numeration which follows that of Flügel's Corani Textus Arabicus.


C. The Provenance of the Deuteronomistic Literature.5) Insofar as it is necessary in an enquiry of this kind to adopt some historical reconstruction of Israel's beginnings as a working hypothesis,

5) M. Noth's view, now generally accepted, is that Deuteronomy is not to be regarded as a strand woven into the developing pentateuch, but rather as a separate work which was subsequently taken up by member(s) of the same school, and embodied in an historical work stretching chronologically from "Sinai" (i.e. approx. 1450-1250 B.C.) to the year 561 B.C., and as literature from Dtn 1 - 2 Kings 25. In the outline offered below, it is argued that this school has its roots in the Book of the Covenant tradition as preserved in Northern Israel, but that on the fall of Samaria, the tradition moved South and became indigenised in Jerusalem - adapting its emphases somewhat to the religious climate of Jerusalem and to the temple-cult, but even more firmly moulding that cult in the light of its own peculiar insights and emphases.
my general preference is for that outlined by H. H. Rowley\(^6\);—A fifteenth
century penetration of Canaan from the South by the Judah-group. At the
period of maximum advance, Judah reached mid-Palestine, and had contacts with
Zebulun, Asher etc., in the North, while still retaining contact with the
Southern mountain-theophany tradition, presumably around Kadesh. Two
centuries later, (c. 1230 B.C.) the Joseph-group emerged from Egypt\(^7\) under
the leadership of Moses, experienced the Red-Sea deliverance and the Sinai
theophany, and penetrated mid-Palestine from the East.

The various elements which came together as Israel in Canaan, and these
two major groupings of 'Judah' and 'Joseph' in particular, had probably
already over a considerable period shared much in the way of common ancestry
and common or comparable traditions. Cf. their consciousness, throughout
their subsequent history, of their distinctiveness over against the Canaanite
population of Palestine\(^8\). This common heritage would almost certainly
include:

- Common or comparable legends of theophanies to the clan ancestors, and
  acquaintance with mountain-theophany traditions at similar if not
  identical sites;
- Common rudiments of 'legal' principle and practice, and of cultic
  procedure;

\(^6\) H. H. Rowley, From Joseph to Joshua. For alternative reconstructions, see
ch. one, 'Theophany Traditions', n. 2).

\(^7\) For a discussion on the duration of the sojourn in Egypt, whether 400
years or four generations, see W. Noth, History of Israel, p. 114.

\(^8\) This is stressed by W. Noth, "The Laws in the Pentateuch", The Laws in the
Pentateuch and Other Essays, pp. 33, 46ff., et passim.
Alliances or covenants may well have existed among the larger or smaller groups that subsequently came together as Israel; though whether the deity was thought of as a partner in any of these covenants is doubtful.

From settlement to disruption.

The precise history of Israel's coming together as a nation remains somewhat problematic. But it seems certain that for a period of approx. 300 years (the period of the judges and the united monarchy), the religious traditions of the various clans, tribes, and groups of tribes (preserved initially at separate local sanctuaries, and drawing to a greater or lesser extent on a common stock of tradition, but at the same time being variously enriched by the incorporation of specific local pre-Israelite traditions), were increasingly united in a unified Yahwistic tradition. About the time of the disruption of the united kingdom, this common tradition received the literary impress of the Yahwist, and was thus well on the way to becoming an integrated whole. The process of growth and development, however, was not yet concluded: subsequent to the disruption, North and South continued to develop this common tradition each in its own way (though not without continual cross-fertilisation).

A major contributing factor in this divergent development was the

9) M. Noth, Das System der zwölf Stämme Israels, pp. 29ff.

10) For the ambiguous evidence bearing on possible God-man covenants in pre-Mosaic times, see 'Theophany and Covenant', note 28.
different political climate in north and in south. Conditions in the South favoured the emergence of a dynastic pattern of kingship, i.e. the rise of the house of David - a pattern which throughout the history of Judah was never seriously threatened. In the North, however, a more charismatic tradition prevailed - Each successive ruler was, ideally at least, designated by God via prophetic oracle, and acknowledged by popular

Among the factors contributing to the growth of the peculiarly Southern tradition, the following are particularly significant:

1. The fact that Jerusalem, after its capture by David, became the personal territory of the Davidic line, unabsoorbed into any of the twelve tribes: A. Alt, "The Monarchy in the Kingdoms of Israel and Judah", Essays on Old Testament History and Religion, pp. 252, 255.

2. The Jebusite dynastic traditions inherited at the conquest of Jerusalem: "In the Canaanite city-states, succession by heredity had long been the normal custom", W. Noth, History of Israel, p. 226.

3. David's Southern ancestry, (1 Sam. 16:1, 2 Sam. 5:1, 2 Sam. 19:42-3).

The following factors may also have played some part:

4. The geographical and political isolation of the Southern highlands, which helped to keep Judah as a district apart until the time of the monarchy, - See A. Alt, "Settlement of the Israelites in Palestine", op. cit., pp. 168f.

5. The pre-Davidic history of the South as a self-enclosed alliance of clans, or as a block within such an alliance, - See W. Noth, Das System der zwölf Stämme Israels, p. 34.

M.L. Newman, The People of the Covenant, has worked out in detail this contrast between Northern and Southern traditions, and on its basis propounded an interesting (if somewhat too neat) theory of the origins of Israel as a nation.
The consensus of modern scholarship is that the Deuteronomic literature had its rise within this Northern \textsuperscript{13} milieu.

**Arguments supporting the Northern origins of the deuteronomio-deuteronomistic traditions.**

The main arguments pointing to a Northern provenance of the deuteronomio-deuteronomistic tradition are as follows:

1. The close affiliations of Deuteronomy with the Elohistic tradition, and with the Book of the Covenant embedded in the E. strand of the pentateuch.

2. The concern of Deuteronomy with the charismatic and the prophetic.

3. Affinities with the thought and language of Hosea.

4. The ‘name’ theology, so characteristic of Dtn-Dtr., seems to have its roots in Northern tradition.

\textsuperscript{13} A.C. Welch, *Deuteronomy. The Framework of the Code* (1932);  
K. Galling, "Das Gemeindegesetz in Dtn. 23", *Fast. Bertholet*, (1950);  
"Das Königsgesetz im Deuteronomium", *ThLZ 76*, (1951);  
A. Alt, "Die Heimat des Deuteronomiums", *Kleine Schriften II* (1953);  
H.W. Wolff, "Hoseas geistige Heimat", *ThLZ 81* (1956);  
G.v. Rad, *Deuteronomy* (1964);  
R.E. Clements, "Deuteronomy and the Jerusalem Cult Tradition", *V.T. 15* (1965);  
E.W. Nicholson, *Deuteronomy and Tradition*, (1967);  

N. Lohfink, "Die Bundesurkunde des Königs Josias. Eine Frage an die Deuteronomiumsforschung", *Biblica* 44, 1963, pp. 261-288, argues that the Dtn. Code was the Josianic recension of a covenant document which had long been preserved in Jerusalem, and revised periodically. Thus it was of Southern origin. Lohfink’s view, however, has found few supporters.
1. **Links between Dtn. and the Elohist.**

   a) The account of the Sinai theophany in Dtn. 5 corresponds closely in order and essential content to the Elohistic account in Ex. 20. The following verbal and sense correspondences emerge:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v.18</td>
<td>הראגון (حياة...את-כחזר)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>הקדחת ראת-הלפידם ראת</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>קורל חמש</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ראת-הוד עשת</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.19</td>
<td>ריבא ריו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ריעמר גורמר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ראות-'&gt;{405} אל-משה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ברר-אתו עמור</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>רמשמה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.19</td>
<td>גואל-דיבור עמון אלוהים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.19</td>
<td>פן-כמור</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.20</td>
<td>ויהיה יראתו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>לבלטי החשאו</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Admittedly the correspondence in several individual cases is only approximate, but the cumulative effect is sufficient, I think, to
demonstrate that Dtn. 5\textsuperscript{14) and Ex. 20 belong to the same specific stream of theophanic tradition\textsuperscript{15).}

b) Lohfink\textsuperscript{16) has drawn attention to the interesting parallels between Dtn. 7 and Ex. 23:20-33. Direct literary dependence between the two is unlikely; yet their obvious kinship indicates that they derive from a common root. Ex. 23:20-33 as the conclusion to the Book of the Covenant, is usually ascribed to E.\textsuperscript{17)}

\textsuperscript{14) The case of Dtn. 4 is rather different, in spite of the resemblances in style and content between Dtn. 4:10-40 and Dtn. 5:1-32; for the dependence of the core verses 4:10-12a seems to be on JE. (Ex. 19:17-19) rather than on E. alone. This is consonant with the view (see further p. 414) that Dtn. 4 is a later stratum, intermediate between Dtn. 5-26 + 28 and Dtr., if not from Dtr. itself.}

\textsuperscript{15) At what stage the decalogue was inserted in this framework, is impossible to say with certainty, but it would seem probable that it was already in place when Ex. 20:1-21 was used as the model for Dtn. 5.}

\textsuperscript{16) N. Lohfink, Das Hauptgebot, p. 170. H. Cazelles, Études sur le Code de l'Alliance, p. 21, notes that the relationship between the two texts had already been pointed out by Karge, Geschichte des Bundesgedanken im A.T., 1910.}

\textsuperscript{17) M. Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch, p. 39, n. 139, abandons the attempt to determine the source into which the Book of the Covenant was inserted:- "Dieses (das Bb.) ist zwar von E.-Elementen eingerahmt, gehört aber nicht zum ursprünglichen E., ja vielleicht nicht einmal zum sekundären Gut dieser Quelle. In welchem Stadium der Entstehungsgeschichte des Pentateuch es an seiner jetzigen Stelle eingeschaltet wurde, ist schlechterdings nicht mehr zu ermitteln."

cf. A. Weiser, Introduction, p. 121, regards the Book of the Covenant as originally inserted in E. This is the position we adopt here.
c) The essential relationship between the Book of the Covenant (Ex. 20:22-23:19) and the Deuteronomic Code (Dtn. 12-26) has long been recognised. A detailed table of correspondences is to be found in S.R. Driver's commentary. A comparison of the two codes reveals that, apart from one major block of exclusively casuistic law (Ex. 21:17-22:15), all but four of the provisions of the Book of the Covenant have parallels or approximations in the Deuteronomic code. The details of this correspondence and its significance fall to be discussed below, in our consideration of Deuteronomy as Torah: It is sufficient here to note the fact.

d) Similarities in phraseology between Dtn. and E. have often been noted.

2. The concern of Deuteronomy with the charismatic and prophetic.

The prime responsibility for upholding Israel's covenant with Yahweh seems to have passed from Moses and Joshua to the charismatic judges of Israel, and thence, in the time of Samuel, to the kingship. In the South, the peculiar political structure in which the city-state of Jerusalem and the province of Judah were united in the person of the Davidic monarch, made this royal responsibility for the maintenance of the covenant well-nigh absolute, and resulted in a variant form of covenant-doctrine which gave preeminence to the bond between Yahweh and the royal Davidic line. In the North, however,

20) G.E. Wright, "Deuteronomy", The Interpreter's Bible, 2, p.318.
the prime responsibility for upholding the covenant lay rather with the 'free', non-hereditary, charismatic leadership, represented notably by the prophets. They acted as king-makers under Yahweh's inspiration; and they jealously guarded the traditions of the Sinai covenant, as being the cornerstone of the Yohwistic faith. Corrosive syncretism seems to have constituted much more of a danger in the North, where agriculture with its accompaniment of ancient Canaanite baalistic rites was more widespread than in the pastoral South; and where society was more cosmopolitan, and consequently more open to the influence of foreign cults. Elijah and Elisha are typical of the uncompromising champions of Yohwism which the northern prophetic movement produced. As we shall see, the Elohist shows marked affinities with this prophetic tradition; and Deuteronomy's stress on the utter centrality of the Sinai covenant indicates its origin in the same milieu.

3. Affinities with the thought and language of Hosea.

The links between Dtn. and Hosea, too, have often been noted. While it is likely that some of the minor correspondences in style and vocabulary are the result of later editing, yet there are other theological emphases which must be held to be integral to Hosea, and to Dtn. also:

a) Love (בָּֽרֶם) as the ground of Israel's election by Yahweh, and the proper motive for Israel's obedience. In the pre-exilic literature, this stress on 'love' as the bond of the covenant is found only in Ex. 20:6 (which is usually considered part of a Dic. expansion of the second commandment\(^{21}\)), then in Hosea, Jeremiah, and in Dtn-Dtr.

\(^{21}\) So e.g. J.C. Rylaarsdam, The Interpreter's Bible, 1, p. 982.
(Jeremiah, as v. Rad 22) so aptly describes him, is the pupil of Hosea.) As A. Alt 23 points out, this stress on the bond of 'love' between Yahweh and Israel is not something to be taken for granted; for the characteristic emphasis of the O.T. literature is not on 'love', but on the 'fear of the Lord', cf. Dtn. 10:12.

b) Attitude toward kingship.

It would seem that kingship in the North was never regarded as integral to the divine economy, as it was in the South. Hosea's critical attitude toward the institution is well-known. H. W. Wolff 24 summarises his position by saying that for Hosea, the subservience of the kingship to the covenant law is as essential to the covenant as is the prohibition of idolatry 25. A. Alt goes further, and states that Hosea anticipates the disappearance of the monarchy as a precondition of Israel's renewal. The passages in Hosea which bear on kingship are as follows:

Hosea 1:4f.: the end of the house of Jehu, and of the Northern kingdom, is predicted;

Hosea 8:1-10: the apostasy of the nation is blamed on the kings, whom the people chose for themselves in their wilfulness (v. 5: cf. the later

---

22) v. Rad, Old Testament Theology, II, p. 44.
deuteronomistic emphasis on the 'sin of Jeroboam who made Israel to sin', and the deuteronomistic verdict that the monarchy is to blame for the disaster that has befallen Israel);

Hosea 10:3:
Israel in her panic will depose king Hoshea as she deposed his predecessors (Hosea 7:3-7): "aber es wird nicht noch einmal eigenwillig einen neuen König bestellen. Denn in der Katastrophe wird ihm die Einsicht zuteil, dass nur ein charismatisches Königstum, nur einer von Jahwewort designierter König helfen könnte."

Hosea 13:10-11:
the meaning is similar to Hosea 10:3: the rapid dynastic changes of Hosea's own day constitute signs of Yahweh's wrath against kingdom and people.

Hosea 3:4-5:
The phrase, 'and David their King' is clearly a later gloss. If it is ignored, the remaining text constitutes a powerful prediction that the end of the monarchy is a necessary prelude to the nation's repentance and restoration.

Deuteronomy's attitude to the kingship is milder than Hosea's, in that he sees the institution of the monarchy as an actuality with which he must come to terms: "Er kann es nicht einfach verneinen, aber ebenso wenig uneingeschränkt bejahen."

Experience has taught him that the institution jeopardises his ideals. His description is modelled on conditions experienced under the monarchy in his own

environment, though the Mosaic fiction of the Deuteronomistic framework precludes any specific references. The model used is generally assumed to be that of the Solomonic regime; and this in fact would fit excellently with a Northern origin of the deuteronomistic tradition, as it was precisely the excesses of Solomon's regime which provoked the disruption, and the secession of the North. A. Alt remarks, however, that the references may equally well apply to conditions in the North under the dynasties of Omri or Jehu, about which our sources unfortunately leave us in ignorance. There are, indeed, indications that this negative attitude toward kingship, which Hosea and Deuteronomy have in common, rests back upon a much older Northern

27) A. Alt, "Heimat", op. cit., p. 264.

28) The prohibition in Dtn. 17:15 of choosing as king "a foreigner ... who is not your brother", is interpreted by R. E. Clements (God's Chosen People, pp. 21, 41f.) as a polemic against the concept of sacral kingship as it had grown up in Judah, under the shadow of the Davidic -covt. theology. This would imply that the Dei. tradition had already moved South before it received this impress; and that the passage represents the attempts of the Dei. school to conciliate Judahite tradition by making a place for kingship within the divine economy while at the same time democratizing that kingship ("one who is your brother") so as to counteract 'exaggerated' Southern emphases which were felt to be inimical to a true understanding of the Sinai-covenant tradition. It seems more likely, however, that the reference is specifically to experiences of kingship sustained in the Northern kingdom, and that the emphasis was embodied in the tradition during its Northern period. Cf. A. Alt, "Heimat", op. cit., p. 266, note 1.


A. C. Welch, The Code of Deuteronomy, p. 129f., draws attention to the Northern prophet Hosea's equating 'foreigner' with 'heathen' - a suspicion of the 'outsider', born perhaps of bitter experience under the syncretising Northern kings.
tradition. The principal evidence for this is the material in 1 Sam. 8:1-22 and 10:17-27, which in its present form is Deuteronomistic, but undoubtedly rests on more ancient tradition. G.B. Caird comments: "It is likely that this (negative) view of the monarchy prevailed in prophetic circles both before and after the destruction of Samaria ... The possibility is not to be excluded that these speeches ... incorporate an early tradition, ... and that Samuel really felt more doubts and reluctance about the anointing of Saul than would appear from the early narrative." 29)

c) Centralisation.

H.W. Wolff 30) notes that for Hosea, the multiplying of shrines means the multiplying of temptations to apostasy, (Hosea 8:11); and this is linked with the increasing luxury and sophistication of Northern society under Jeroboam II, under whom a resurgence of paganistic cults gave rise to a proliferation of non-Yahwistic altars, (Hosea 10:1-2). The implication is that in former days, the shrines where Yahweh was worshipped in truth, were few: "Wenn Hosea die Vermehrung der Schlachtopferstätten erwähnt, ist zu erkennen, dass er den Ausbau der Opferstätten als Neuerung empfindet." 31) Admittedly this attitude of Hosea's is still far removed from the deuteronomistic demand.
that no shrine be permitted save the central place where Yahweh has set His Name, but it does seem to point back to the days of the judges, when the shrines at which the ark successively resided were accredited as Yahweh's shrines par excellence; - and we may reasonably assume that the particular shrine at which the ark was currently sited was accorded a certain pre-eminence. Thus the deuteronomic demand for centralisation at a sole shrine had at least a fore-shadowing in the pre-monarchic, and subsequent Northern traditions.\(^{32}\)

This is not to deny that the immediate background to the deuteronomic demand for complete centralisation (e.g. Dtn. 12:1-14) is to be found in "the political necessities of the seventh century B.C., after the Northern Kingdom had been swallowed up in the Assyrian Empire".\(^{33}\)

But our contention is that a related concept already lies latent in the older strata, and that this derives from the typically Northern tradition which we have seen to be reflected in Hosea.

d) Moses as a prophet.

The intimate concern of Deuteronomy with prophecy (Dtn. 18:9-22; 13:2-6) is universally acknowledged, though the precise significance of that concern is not so easily or unanimously interpreted. Crucial to the whole question is the interpretation of Dtn. 18:9-22 (see further below), in which Moses is portrayed as the first in a line


\(^{33}\) R.E. Clements, God's Chosen People, p. 74f. Clements' view agrees with v.Rad's (Studies in Deuteronomy, p. 67), i.e., that these uncompromising demands for centralisation belong to the comparatively late strata of the Deuteronomic Code.
of prophets charged with mediating the essential content of the Sinai covenant to the successive generations of Israel. Now it is interesting that the only other pre-exilic passages in which Moses is explicitly described as a prophet, are Hosea 12:14 and Numbers 11:26-29; 12:6-8, (which v. Rad ascribes to E.). It is reasonable, then, to suppose that this Die, emphasis on Moses' prophethood also derives from the Northern tradition.

e) The use of the term תּוֹרָה in the singular as a comprehensive description of the covenant materials. As we shall see below, the use of תּוֹרָה in the singular as a comprehensive term denoting the totality of Yahweh's declared will is characteristic of the later strands of Deuteronomy, and virtually unique in the Old Testament. It is interesting then, that one of the main precursors to this Die, usage is Hosea:

Hosea 8:2 - אָבְרָם בְּרֵית יְהֹוָה תּוֹרָה

The text is disputed, but it seems best to read the Qere תּוֹרָה, which implies that תּוֹרָה indicates a comprehensive whole.

Hosea 4:6 - כִּי אָבְרָם בְּרֵית מְאֹד...רְשָׁבָה תּוֹרָה אֲלֵיהֶם

The usage here stands somewhat closer to the meaning 'instruction'; but the parallel with תּוֹרָה (with the article) points to a specific body of instruction, and may well be intended as a synonym for תּוֹרָה.

34) v. Rad, O.T. Theology, I, p. 293.
in the comprehensive sense as the 'legal' corpus.

In Dtn., as we noted, this comprehensive use of הָלֹא is confined to the later strata (Dtn.4:8; 4:44; 17:18,19; 27:3,8,26; 28:58,61; 29:20,28; 30:10; 31:12,24,26; 32:46), and thus presumably represents editorial reworking of the material after the tradition had been carried South to Jerusalem. Probably, then, Hosea's use of הָלֹא was transmitted to the later Dic. school via the prophet Jeremiah (Hosea's influence on Jeremiah is widely recognised.)

f) Finally it is noteworthy that many phrases which are characteristic of Deuteronomy are prominent also in Hosea, though seldom exclusive.

35) A. Alt, in addition, mentions two more general considerations which do something to consolidate the case for a relationship between Hosea and Deuteronomy. The first is that the Northern tradition, as represented both by the Elohist and Hosea, lacks the broad universalist sweep that is to be traced both in the Yahwist and in the Southern prophets, and which may therefore be considered characteristic of the Southern traditions. ("Heimat", op. cit., p.271). But cf. also the qualification, p.115f below.

The second consideration concerns an argument intended to minimise the connection between Hosea and Dtn., i.e. the fact that Hosea betrays little or none of that passion for social justice which is so characteristic of the whole of the Dic. corpus.

But Alt counters this by arguing that ethical concern is fundamental to the groundstock of Israel's ancient common tradition, and is presupposed whenever the prophets address a Northern audience on the righteousness of Yahweh, - e.g. Amos at Bethel ("Heimat", op. cit., pp.268f.). We may add that the paraenetic sections of Dtn., with their ethos of strong social concern, are rooted in the 'compassionate' sections of the Book of the Covenant (to which we shall have reason to refer below). Hosea's silence on such issues, therefore, is not a Northern characteristic, but concerns the peculiar circumstances of Hosea's own nature, life and mission.
to him among Deuteronomy's predecessors). Such parallels serve to strengthen the impression of relatedness between Hosea and Deuteronomy gained on other grounds, though in themselves they are scarcely compelling.

36) The relevant words and phrases are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>אלָהִים אָוָרִים</td>
<td>Hosea 3:1. Elsewhere, except for the sing. פָּרָן לָי in Ex. 34:14 the phrase occurs only in the Dic. literature (17 times).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הָמָה מַצָּרָא יִשְׂרָאֵל</td>
<td>Hosea 8:13; 9:3; 11:5; cf. Dtn. 17:16; 28:68.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נָּשָׁה as description of a fellow-Israelite</td>
<td>Hosea 2:3(1); Typically Deuteronomic, passim.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E.W. Nicholson\textsuperscript{37}) sees the 'name'-theology as arising in Northern Israel during the eighth century B.C., but as ultimately grounded in the circumstances of the Disruption in the tenth century: Jeroboam, as king of the newly-seceded Northern state, realising that the religious magnetism of the ark-shrine in Jerusalem constituted a danger to the independence of his kingdom, provided a substitute symbolism, in the bulls of Dan and Bethel, to assure the people of the unseen presence of Yahweh, even without the ark\textsuperscript{38}) (1 Kings 12:25-30). By the time of Hosea, however, the bulls, through their similarity to the bull-symbolism in the Canaanite fertility cults, had opened the way to the crassest syncretism. They came therefore under the scathing attacks of Hosea (Hosea 8:5-6; 10:5; 12:2), and of the 'prophetic' figure responsible for the polemic in Ex.32\textsuperscript{39}). With the bull-symbol thus discredited, the old question presented itself again with renewed urgency: 'How may Israel be assured of the unseen presence of Yahweh, without the ark?' The answer given by the spiritual leaders of the eighth century was that Yahweh was present through the power of His name, which he had placed at the sanctuaries of His choice. This emergent 'name'-theology was then adopted and elaborated by the Dtr. school - and, we may

\textsuperscript{37}) E.W. Nicholson, Deuteronomy and Tradition, p.71f.

\textsuperscript{38}) Bulls and ark alike, seem to have represented a type of pedestal on which the unseen God stood. It seems likely that the bull-symbolism was indigenous to one of the groups which came together to constitute historic Israel - though the concrete identification of this primitive tradition with that of the ꝏمنتجات, is to be viewed with scepticism. See further p. 86f.

\textsuperscript{39}) Following the judgment, that Ex. 32 belongs substantially to the E. tradition: Hempel, Die Schichten des Dts., p. 115f. cf. M. Noth, Exodus, p. 246, regards Exodus 32 as a subsequent literary addition to J.
add, after the transfer of the tradition to the South, used as a polemic against the over-stress on the sanctity of the Jerusalem temple.

It should be stressed, however, that in fact the roots of the 'name'-theology reach back into much more ancient times than the above might suggest:

Ex. 20:7, the third sentence of the ethical decalogue, seems originally to have prohibited the use of the Name Yahweh in magic. Significantly, this prohibition stands as one of the 'Words' which form the ground of the Sinai Covenant; the implication being that in the covenant Yahweh Himself has placed His powerful Name at the disposal of Israel, i.e., for purposes of life and salvation, but not for death and destruction (cf. Exodus 3:14; Exodus 33:19). Thus the concept of the Name stands close to the central core of the covenant tradition; and it seems certain that in the cultic re-presentation of covenant theophany, the invocation of the name of Yahweh played an important role. It is significant that Ex. 3:14 and Ex. 20:7 were preserved in the E. tradition (Ex. 33:19 is probably J., though the chapter as a whole is very complex, and includes Elohist elements).

40) V. Rad, O.T. Theology I, p.184.
41) V. Rad, O.T. Theology I, p.183.
Ex. 20:24, which sets out the ancient law of the altar, is also to be
ascribed to E. - "in every place where I cause my Name to be remembered". In
its present context, this verse also is intimately related to the covenant,
with its gracious revelation of the divine Name. God who took the decisive
initiative in appearing at Sinai, will also take the continuing initiative
in revealing Himself at the places which thereby become His sanctuaries.
Those who gather at these chosen places are granted the right to call on the
Name of Yahweh, and are assured that the power inherent in the Name will
thereby be released for their help and salvation.

Ex. 23:21, guarantees the continuing personal presence of Yahweh with
his people both in the land of Canaan and on the journey from Sinai to
Canaan: - "Behold I send my angel ... hearken to his voice ... for my Name is
in him."

This passage too, belongs within the Elohistic tradition;
though it would be difficult to say by how much it ante-dates Deuteronomy.
The spirit of the passage is similar to that of Deuteronomy (cf. above on
Dtn. 7); the difference being that whereas the presence of the Name here is
in the context of a transient situation, with the Deuteronomic central-
isation, the 'Name' becomes the permanent Representative of Yahweh.

43) O. Grether, Name und Wort Gottes im A.T., p. 28, comments that the 'Name'
here implies the personal presence of Yahweh with full divine authority:
"Der schem ist Offenbarungsform für Jahwe." Yet in the identification
there is a distinction too: Yahweh is truly present in revelation to
His people, yet not Yahweh's very self as He is in actuality, but the
form in which He reveals Himself.

44) O. Grether, op. cit., p. 35, comments that formerly, with the multiplicity
of shrines, the omnipresence of Yahweh was obvious; whereas after
centralisation the need to guard the truth of His omnipresence stimulated
the formulation of the concept of the 'Name' - God is in heaven, but He
has given His name to abide in the earthly sanctuary.
Whether or not we accept Nicholson’s reconstruction of the role of the ‘Name’ in eighth century Northern theology, then, it is surely no accident that the important uses of the ‘Name’-motif in the pre-Deuteronomic material group around the E. tradition.

The Deuteronomistic Tradition and Jerusalem.

If the Northern affinities of Deuteronomy are clear, so too are its Southern connections. Most concrete of these is the historical connection with the reform movement under King Josiah, and the finding of the book of the law in the Jerusalem temple, 621 B.C. – a connection now conceded by almost all modern scholars. 45) As to the process whereby this Northern tradition was eventually found in codex-form in Jerusalem, amid much that must

45) cf. H.H. Rowley, "The Early Prophecies of Jeremiah", Men of God, p. 161: "That Josiah's lawbook was Deuteronomy in some form, though not wholly identified with the present book of Deuteronomy, seems to be one of the most firmly established results of Old Testament scholarship." (Rowley quotes J.P.Hyatt with approval, to the same effect.) E.W. Nicholson, Deuteronomy and Tradition, p. 7, n.2, notes (with bibliography) that "attempts to equate Josiah's law with the Holiness Code, or with the entire Pentateuch, have been considered as unsuccessful by the majority of scholars." Nicholson, op. cit., p. 3, lists the generally acknowledged correspondences between Josiah's reform as recorded in 2 Kings 23, and Dtn.

A. Alt, "Heimat", op. cit., p. 252f., however, argues that the correspondence is much narrower than is frequently supposed, and that the only action of Josiah's compellingly traced to Deuteronomy is the celebration of the centralised Passover (2 Kings 23:21-23; cf. Dtn. 16:1-6). He shows that the move to political independence preceded the cultic reform; and that only the latter could have been on the basis of Dtn.

C.A. Simpson, "The Growth of the Hexateuch", I.B., 1, p.198, goes further than Alt, by suggesting that Dtn. did not move South until the time of the exile, and that Josiah was not influenced by the written code, but by verbal reports of the renewal programme carried through by Northern leaders following the fall of Samaria. There is, however, no evidence for such a renewal-movement in the North at this time.
remain obscure, this at least may be safely assumed, that refugees from the fall of Samaria carried the traditions South in the conviction that Yahweh’s continuing purposes for Israel would in the foreseeable future centre on Jerusalem and Judah. It is not unreasonable to see their influence as one of the factors in Hezekiah’s policy of reform, and rebellion against

46) G.v.Rad, Deuteronomy, p. 26f.: "We could make a considerable advance if we knew in what shape and at which stage in the history of its tradition Deuteronomy reached Judah from the Northern Kingdom. Was it actually already in the shape in which we have Deut. 4:44 – 30:20 before us today? ... The only conjecture which we may allow ourselves to accept is that the internal growth of the book in essence came to an end when it was incorporated into the great Deuteronomistic historical work, that is to say, at least fifty years after the death of King Josiah."

A. Alt, "Heimat", op. cit., p. 275, argues that the tradition was carried South in written form: "Wie es dann dazu kam, dass das Original oder eine Abschrift des Werkes durch seinen Autor oder einen anderen so- gleich nach seiner Abfassung oder später nach Jerusalem gebracht und dort im Tempel Jahves deponiert wurde, lässt sich natürlich nicht ermitteln."

47) A. Alt, "Heimat", op. cit., p. 274, considers it unlikely, and against the whole tenor of history, that the Northerners should thus place their hope in the South as the focus for Yahweh’s continuing activity. Accordingly he opts for the Northern composition of Dtn.
the overlordship of Assyria (begun in 703 B.C.\(^{48}\)). It is psychologically in keeping, that they who had just experienced the fall of Samaria, which they attributed to Northern Israel's rebelliousness against Yahweh, should become extremely sensitive to the dangers - national, political and religious - involved in apostasy, and should urge that so-called 'political expediency' be abandoned in favour of a whole-hearted endeavour to re-establish a pure Yahwism.\(^{49}\)

Whatever the extent of Hezekiah's reforms, their effect was short-lived. For in 696 B.C. Hezekiah was succeeded by Manasseh, who reversed his father's independent policy by reverting to a pro-Assyrian stand. The old religious compromise and syncretism returned, and the stream of uncompromising

\(^{48}\) Accepting the suggestions of H.H.Rowley, "Hezekiah's Reform and Rebellion" Men of God: - Hezekiah's accession was in 727;

The rebellion began in his "24th year" (amending the text of 2 Kings 18:13), i.e. 703 B.C.;

The acts of reform described in 2 Kings 18:1-6 were intimately interwoven with the moves toward political independence - hence the overthrow of the non-Yahwistic shrines would include those of the state deities of the Assyrian Empire.

As to the historicity of Hezekiah's reforms, Rowley remarks: - "It is quite unnecessary to suppose that the author of Dttn. must have been the first person to think of the suppression of the high places, and the centralisation of worship." But may it not be that the impetus to abolition and centralisation in Hezekiah's case came precisely from the Dtc. thought which had so recently been carried South? If this is so, the weight of probability supports the view that the idea of centralisation already existed in embryo in the tradition which moved South - developing a much more rigorous and exclusive form in its new soil, in keeping with the needs of the new conditions in Jerusalem.

\(^{49}\) Cf. the later sensitivity to sin evinced in the Priestly theology - the stress on atonement and substitutionary propitiation sacrifices - reflecting the reaction of the Priestly theologians, to the bitter lessons of the exile.
Yahwism went underground. It is plausibly suggested that on the collapse of
Hezekiah's adventure into reform and independence, the Deut. school opted to
bide their time, and used the interval to commit their traditions to writing
so as to safeguard them for the future\(^{50}\). Their time came, eventually,
with the accession of the young king Josiah, who in his twenty-sixth year\(^{51}\)

---

50) R.E. Clements, "Deuteronomy and the Jerusalem Cult Tradition", V.T. 15,
1965, p. 301, maintains that the tradition as carried South was not yet in
its literary form, but received its definitive form in Jerusalem.
Deuteronomy was probably composed in Jerusalem by descendants of the
priesthood of the Northern shrines, but with the specific intention of
introducing their tradition to Jerusalem, (op. cit., p. 310).

E.W. Nicholson, Deuteronomy and Tradition, p. 121, "This stream of
tradition was ... in the seventh century and under the shadow of the
destruction of the Northern tribes and the threat of a similar fate for
the remaining Judean kingdom ... formulated into the book of
Deuteronomy."

51) The effect of the narrative in 2 Kings 22 is to ascribe the whole
impulse toward reform to the book of the law thus rediscovered. The
account of the Chronicler, on the other hand, describes the bulk of the
reforms as preceding the discovery of Dtn. (2 Chron. 34:3ff; 34:8ff.).
The Deuteronomist has probably exaggerated the role of the Deut. code
in his narrative, but the Chronicler on the other hand seems deliberately
to have minimised its importance. Probably the discovery of the
code gave religious impetus to cultic reform already begun on the basis
257: Alt concludes that 2 Kings 23:4-8; 23:9-15; 23:19-20, are
excerpts from the royal chronicles of Josiah, but are now not in their
correct chronological sequence; and that rejection of the cult of
Assyrian deities probably preceded the finding of the book of the
law.

(The trend of modern scholarship is to treat the testimony of the
Chronicler more seriously than was once the case, allowing that
genuinely ancient traditions may have been pressed into the service of
his peculiar theological emphases.)
gave orders for the restoration of the temple of Yahweh in Jerusalem, during the course of which the book of the law was found in the temple. That reform and national assertiveness were again inextricably interwoven, need not be doubted. Once again, however, the reform was short-lived, for Josiah was killed at Megiddo. 52) His intervention in the Assyrio-Babylonian power-struggle enmeshed his tiny kingdom in the power game between Egypt and Babylon, - an involvement which led eventually to the final overthrow of the Southern kingdom in 586 B.C., and to the deportations of 597 and 586 B.C.

The Deuteronomistic history (see note 5) seeks to review the history of the covenant people from Sinai down to this final catastrophe, (imminent, or already realised53), and to assess the significance of covenant and catastrophe each in the light of the other. The failure of Israel to live by her covenant with Yahweh is blamed primarily upon the monarchy, whose duty it had been to order the national life in keeping with the conditions of the covenant. Though individual kings of Judah may have acted with integrity, the institution as a whole had proved disastrous for the people of God.

Parallel with this negative attitude toward the monarchy, and closely

52) Josiah’s action at Megiddo was an attempt to intercept Pharaoh-Necho’s army as it marched to the relief of the tottering Assyrian power, against the emergent Babylonian kingdom.

53) 2 Kings 25:27 gives us the final date “37th year of king Jehoiachin”, i.e. 561 B.C. From the tone of this concluding passage, a composition-date shortly after 561 B.C. is indicated. But it is possible that 2 Kings 25:22-26, and 2 Kings 25:27-30 form two fragments subsequent to the main body of the work, which may therefore be earlier - perhaps late pre-exilic. cf. John Gray, Kings, regards 2 Kings 24:8 onwards as the work of a redactor.

See also E.W.Nicholson, pp. 114, 123. (Deuteronomy and Tradition.)
related to it, is the pattern of prophecy-fulfilment. It is significant that so large a proportion of the prophecies whose fulfilment is specifically noted by the Deuteronomist, concern the monarchy, both in the South and in the North:

- the secession of the ten tribes (I Kings 11:29ff., fulfilled I Kings 12:15);
- the fall of the house of Jeroboam (I Kings 14:6ff., fulfilled I Kings 15:29);
- the fall of the house of Baasha (I Kings 16:1ff., fulfilled I Kings 16:12);
- doom against the house of Ahab (I Kings 21:21ff., fulfilled 2 Kings 9:27ff.);
- prophecy against Manasseh (2 Kings 21:10ff. - the decisive sin that finally sealed the fate of Judah and Jerusalem - fulfilled 2 Kings 24:2).

Yet in spite of the all-pervasive note of doom sounding through these passages, we may fairly discern an overarching promise of grace enclosing the whole. The promise made to David through the prophet Nathan, of a house, a throne, and a kingdom made sure for ever before Yahweh (2 Sam. 7:11b-17) finds its echo and (albeit tragic) fulfilment in the concluding

54) G.v.Rad, Studies in Deuteronomy, p. 79ff. lists the examples of this prophecy-fulfilment pattern.
The bitter experience of the investment and fall of Jerusalem, and the deportations of 597, 586, have vindicated and confirmed the prophetic message. Hence the resurgent emphasis here on the power of the prophetic word. But it is also interesting to note the bearing of the prophecy-fulfilment schema on the development of scripturisation. There is a certitude about the word of Yahweh, the nearest analogy to which is the fixity of a written document; and this shared quality of fixity helped facilitate the fixing of Yahweh's word in written form.

In the three chapters that follow, we shall attempt to trace three closely interwoven strands of Israel's thought, from their beginnings down to their

---

55) Agreeing with v. Rad, who speaks of the "theological dilemma in which the deuteronomist is caught at the end of his work": On the one hand he must acknowledge the severity of the judgment that had befallen Israel, but on the other, "he could not ... believe that the promise of Yahweh might fail and that the lamp of David would be finally extinguished, for no word of Yahweh pronounced over history can ever fall to the ground." Hence 2 Kings 25:27-30 "must be of particular theological significance ... since it provides a basis on which Yahweh could build further if he so willed; ... the fact that the line of David has not come to an irrevocable end." The problem of the Hexateuch and other essays, p. 220f.

Noth, on the other hand, insists that the intention of the deuteronomist is to declare the covenant to be at an end, annulled. Hence he sees in 2 Kings 25:27-30 only the faithful recording of the last bitter scrap of 'doom-news':

M. Noth, The History of Israel, pp. 283, 290;

Überlieferungs geschichtliche Studien, p. 108. (This and subsequent references to Ub. Stud. cite the square-bracketed page numbers in the edition used - see bibliography.)
fusion in the deuteronomical-deuteronomistic literature; i.e., Theophany, Covenant, and Torah. For Deuteronomy itself may be regarded, in its various aspects, as: -

- The detailed documentation of a theophany;
- A covenant document, on analogy with the Ancient Near Eastern vassal treaty texts, defining the relationship of grace and dependence between God and Israel, and the conditions governing its continuance;
- A developed, unified, comprehensive Torah, personally addressed by God to Israel as the full and sufficient statement of His will for His covenant people.

We shall see that the concepts of covenant and Torah are so strongly imbued with the theophanic as to constitute in effect, modes of the theophanic tradition; and that the concepts of theophany, covenant and Torah together determine the development of the concept of revelation in Early Israel, and of canonical, written revelation in particular.
CHAPTER ONE

THE THEOPHANY TRADITION

IN EARLY ISRAEL.
Recent Old Testament scholarship is generally agreed as to the formative role of the deuteronomistic literature in the fixing of Israelite tradition and the growth of canon. In the following summary of this literature, M. Noth carries us to the heart of our theme, by stressing the importance of theophany in the deuteronomistic material:

"It has generally been assumed that Moses' historical work had its real centre on Sinai; whatever judgment may be passed on the content of the Moses tradition, that he was the leader of the people on Sinai, the interpreter of what took place there, and the organiser of the people of God on the basis of more or less firmly defined formulations of the divine will, seems to be more or less established. This view of Moses has its ultimate source in the deuteronomistic literature of the Old Testament, in which Moses' role as mediator at the giving of the law on the holy mount is regarded as the decisive element in his work; and this is connected with the fact that it considered the theophany on the mountain, and the legislation enacted there, as the most important of the traditional events of Israel's pre-history." 1)

Considerations of space preclude an examination of the various descriptions of the growth and development of the Mosaic tradition, to which

1) M. Noth, *The History of Israel*, p. 135.
Noth alludes. It will be sufficient for our purposes to take this consensus as a working basis: i.e., the central importance of the Sinai-event as the theophany par excellence, a motif powerful enough to attract and integrate to itself a wealth of diverse material, and a historical memory persistent enough to have influenced decisively the subsequent course of the stream of revelation in Israel. Of the various methodological procedures open to us it seems best, then, to begin by considering the earliest Sinai

2) The following representative views may be noted: -

a) M. Noth (The History of Israel), G. v. Rad ("The Problem of the Hexateuch"): - Both stress the post-Conquest period (late 13th Cent.) as the formative period for Israel's nationhood. The mid-Palestine Conquest, the Exodus, and Sinai, are regarded as separate traditions originating in separate strata of what later became Israel.

b) U. L. Newman (The People of the Covenant): - The primitive core of all twelve tribes experienced both Exodus and Sinai. A division occurred at Kadesh, leading to separate penetrations of Canaan, by 'Judah' from the South and by 'Joseph' from the East.

c) 1) H. H. Rowley (From Joseph to Joshua): - A 15th Cent. penetration of Canaan by Judah from the South. At the period of maximum advance, Judah reached mid-Palestine, and had contacts with Zebulun, Asher, etc. in the North, while still retaining contact with the Southern mountain-theophany tradition, presumably around Kadesh. A 13th Cent. penetration of Canaan by 'Joseph', the experiencers of Exodus and Sinai, from the East.

ii) R. de Vaux ("The Settlement of the Israelites in Southern Palestine, and the Origins of the Tribe of Judah"), like Rowley favours a penetration by 'Judah' from the South (pp. 131, 124), but considers that this was approximately contemporary with the entry of 'Joseph' into Canaan (p. 124), dissociating the traditions of Gen. 34 from the conquest).

iii) J. Gray's view is intermediate between that of Rowley and de Vaux, in that he concludes for a 15th Cent., presence of Jacob-el and Joseph-el groups in central Palestine (cf. Gen. 34), and a (presumably) 15th Cent. independent penetration by Judah from the South; followed by a 13th Cent. entry by 'Ephraim', the experiencers of the Exodus, into mid-Palestine: (A History of Jerusalem, p. 74ff.)

Some form of the general position outlined in c) seems best to fit the facts.
tradition in its theophanic aspects, to proceed from there to an examination of the patriarchal theophany narratives which became attracted and integrated to the Sinaitic tradition, and finally to trace the persisting influence of the Sinai theophany tradition in the remaining literature of early Israel.

The Oldest Sinai Theophany Tradition, Ex.19-24, 32-34.

In the chapters on 'Theophany and Covenant' and 'Theophany and Torah' we shall examine this block of material from the traditio-historical viewpoint, and attempt to achieve some understanding of that historical core around which the developed concepts of covenant and of torah have crystallised. In this overall survey of the theophany tradition of early Israel, we shall confine ourselves in general to an examination of the Sinai theophany as presented in the Pentateuchal literary sources.

Literary analysis of these chapters is in fact problematic, and both the J. and E. sources present us with highly composite material. But the following broad pattern may be seen to emerge in both:

1. Preparation for theophany: J. Ex. 19:9-16aa E. Ex. 19:2b-8

3) E.A. Speiser, Genesis, p. xxi, comments on the documentary theory: - "The critics of the nineteenth century may have felt that they had all the answers that really mattered. But fresh discoveries and more refined tools of analysis have made twentieth-century students at once more sophisticated and less sanguine." Again, scholars such as Noth grant the relevance of the documentary theory for the analysis of Genesis, but are rather more cautious of its application to the book of Exodus, (though they continue to use it). With due modifications to allow for modern insights into the role of oral tradition, and into traditio-historical and form-historical processes, however, the documentary theory is used throughout this thesis as a useful tool in helping to trace the development of Northern and Southern Israelite traditions. For a further useful survey of current scholarly attitudes toward the documentary hypothesis, see now R. Davidson, Biblical Criticism, pp. 72-84. - "On the whole, the documentary hypothesis, though battle-scarred ... still holds the field, ...", (op. cit., p. 84)
2. The Theophany:
   
i) The Trumpet summons to appear before God:
   
   J. Ex. 19:13 
   E. Ex. 19:16ab-17
   
ii) The Theophany proper:
   
   J. Ex. 19:18, 20 
   E. Ex. 19:19, 20:1
   
3. Declaration of the divine demands:
   
   J. Ex. 34:10-28 
   E. Ex. 20:2-17, Ex. 20:22 - 23:33
   
4. Sacrifice and covenant solemnisation:
   
   J. Ex. 24:12-15a, Ex. 34:10. 
   Ex. 24:3-8 (originally introduction to B.C.)

It will become at once apparent, however, that the interest in theophany is not confined to no. 2. of the above schema, but infuses every part of the cycle.

1. The Preparation.

   Ex. 19:2b-6 (E),

   the introductory section clearly purports to describe an audition: the voice of the Lord who calls to Moses is conceived in concrete local terms, as emanating from a specific area on the mountain. Though the unit perhaps evidences Deuteronomic retouching 4), this

"theophanic" element\(^5\) is undoubtedly primitive.

Ex. 19:2-16aa (J)\(^6\) is probably conceived in the same way, for in its present context it follows an audition, and also makes promise (v.9) of a further one. The theophany promised is for Moses alone (in the direct sense), and is to consist of vision and audition. The phrase 1171'1 : I. 3, (v.9) implies that the cloud is a veil preserving the mystery of God in the act of self disclosure (cf. Jer. 4:29 ; עַלְכִּי related to 'hiddenness').

2. The Theophany.

i) The Trumpet summons:

Ex. 19:13 (J) בֵּמֶשֶׁל הַיָּבֵל
Ex. 19:16b(E) כֵּלֶל שִׁפְרָת תָּוִי מַכָּא

References to both בֵּמֶשֶׁל and כֵּלֶל appear to have originated in the use of these instruments in the developed cult of later times, where they marked liturgically the moment of the theophany\(^7\). They thus represent a cultic imitation of the קָרַך primitively heard on Sinai, which in (J)E signifies the thunder of the storm-theophany; i.e., as a natural storm-phenomenon pregnant with divine revelatory significance.

---

5) 'Theophanic' here, as throughout, is used in the broad sense, including both vision and auditionary content. cf. E.Pax, Epiphania, p. 111: - "Gott erscheint in erster Linie, um zu sprechen, nicht um gesehen zu werden. Wenn somit das Hören den Vorrang vor dem Sehen hat, so bilden doch beide eine unentrennbare Einheit und machen so erst das eigentliche Wesen der Epiphanie aus."

6) vv.9b, 11b, 13b, are later additions.

7) See also on לֵפִידָם, (p.136f).
ii) The Theophany proper.

M. Noth and others have noted that the J.-account, Ex. 19:18, 20, conceives the theophany in terms of Yahweh's coming down (יְלַלְגּוּ) on the mount, whereas for E, the mount appears to be conceived as Yahweh's permanent earthly abode. Further, J. probably describes the theophany in terms of volcanic phenomena, whereas the E-account is of a storm-theophany. Such a distinction is, admittedly, tentative, for both accounts have doubtless been coloured by the incorporation of 'conventional theophanic language'. 9) That we are dealing not with straight description but with theologically-moulded narrative, is evident too in the linking of the יַלְגּוּ motif with the volcanic: for volcanic fire can scarcely be said to 'descend' (כֹּלַי שלחֵת יַלְגּוּ ו. 18). Beyerlin has stressed this theologising, cultic influence on the material, pointing out that Ex. 24:1-2, 9-11 apparently knows nothing of a cloud on the mountain, and suggesting that the thick-cloud tradition may have originated in the cultic use of incense as a liturgical veiling of the theophany. Such an argument from silence, however, is precarious; it seems preferable to regard the cultic use of incense as arising out of

8) M. Noth, Exodus, p. 159.
11) Beyerlin seems rather inconsistent in his dating of this passage. In making the deductions cited here, he seems to regard the verses as primitive: see on p. 31 of his book, he suggests that Ex. 24:9-11 originates in cultic appearances of Yahweh above the אָבִּי of the ark, and therefore presumably at a relatively late date.
the historical circumstances of the primitive theophany.

Scholars have remarked on the similarity of the imagery here with that of Gen. 15:17 \( \text{יהוה, כבש} \) \(^{12}\) resembled a volcano both in shape, and in intensity of smoking heat.) Some have argued that the choice of terms in Genesis 15 is deliberate \(^{13}\), and intended to stress the essential congruity of the two covenants; and we might add, also the theophanic unity underlying the covenants.

In E. only one theophany is recorded; a theophany addressed specifically to Moses (Ex. 19:19) in the presence of all Israel. (Ex. 20:18f. strengthens this emphasis on the role of the covenant-mediator by relating how the people, in fear, request Moses to act permanently as mediator, so as to relieve them of the necessity for direct encounter with the theophanic Presence.)

In J., there are two distinct accounts of theophany.

Ex. 19:18, 20, the first, like the Elohistic account, describes a theophany witnessed by all the people, but specifically addressed to Moses their representative. The promise in Ex. 19:9 (which is part of the J.-account) is in the first instance an individual one: \( \text{כֹּל בָּנָי, בְּעַל הָעָם, יַעֲבֵרָה יַעֲבֵרָה} \) : the people are to stand afar off, prevented by barriers from approaching the actual site of

---

12) See p. 95.
theophany. Presumably they hear the theophanic קָנָא, but do not apprehend the קָנָא enslrained in the קָנָא. Though vv. 20-24 are a later addition, they serve to confirm the importance of the mediator's role. The second J.-theophany-account is in

Ex. 33:18-23 and Ex. 34:5-8 (probably to be classed as later portions of J.). Here the theophany is clearly a personal one to Moses. The emphasis on the mortal danger which is involved in beholding the face of God is reminiscent of the patriarchal-type theophanies; (see below, p. 124). The danger is here mitigated, however, in two distinct ways:

a) Not the לְאָדָם but the לֶאֶס is revealed (33:19, 34:5-8). Yet it is noteworthy that when the proclamation of the לֶאֶס is made from the cloud (34:5), Moses' spontaneous reaction is to prostrate himself in worship. Thus it is apparent that the proclamation of the name is regarded as a numinous, "theophanic" experience no less vivid than the appearance of the קָנָא

b) By comparison the disclosure of the קָנָא לֶאֶס betrays a much less sophisticated pattern of thought. Aubrey Johns remarks that "in human intercourse, the face is found to be extraordinarily revealing in respect of man's various emotions, moods, and dispositions"; so that when applied to God the term לְאָדָם implied a vision

of the divine nature overpowering in its very intimacy. The revelation of the ידנה ר"מ is conceived still as a vision of the personal form of God, yet not a confrontation of such directness and intensity as to devastate the beholder.

3. Declaration of the divine demands.

The view adopted in this thesis is that neither the ritual decalogue (Ex. 34:10-28), the ethical decalogue (Ex. 20:2-17), nor the Book of the Covenant (Ex. 20:22-23:33) are integral to the primitive theophany-covenant event, (see further, p. 224 ). In the present form of the JE-material, however, all three are presented as elaborations of the imperative contained within the divine self-disclosure on Sinai. Our prime concern at this stage of our investigation is to note the close connection obtaining between stipulation and theophany, both in the J.- and the E.-account: —

Ex. 34:10-28 (J), is set in close relation to the two-fold theophany described above: having been summoned, in the course of the 'volcanic-theophany', to ascend the mountain, Moses is there vouchsafed a further, personal experience of the person (Ex. 33:23) and name (Ex. 33:19, 34:5) of Yahweh; and it is in process of the intimate dialogue surrounding this theophany, that the covenant-demands are enunciated. That the Yahwist intended to take 'stipulation' up into 'theophany' seems clear from the way in which the two aspects of the narrative are dovetailed together: — The command to prepare the two stone tablets on which the 'words' are to be inscribed is actually inserted between the two halves of the narration of the personal-theophany. Also, the natural flow of the narrative through vv.6,8,10a,11a,27, together with the fact that the whole code is presented
as direct divine address (apart from a few minor lapses: 10b, 14, 23, 24b, 26a), shows that Ex. 33:17 – 34:28 is deliberately presented as a single theophany-narrative.

Ex. 20:2-17(E) is even more obviously integrated into the theophany-narrative as a whole. It is generally agreed that Ex. 20:18 originally constituted the continuation of the E-narrative broken off at Ex. 19:19 -

האלהים יעננו בק 😉, כל-הענה לא-הכרות... (1)

The insertion of Ex. 20:1-17 into the midst of this E-theophany-narrative, then, makes it plain that the ethical decalogue is to be regarded as the articulated content of that awesome, numinous qōl. (See further, pp. 399ff.).

Ex. 20:22-23:33, at a more developed stage of the Northern tradition, has been incorporated into the total theophany-narrative by an extension of the same principle: The decalogue, which was uttered in the theophanic qōl in the hearing of all Israel, is now expounded in detail privately to the covenant-mediator, on the mount of theophany. As with Ex. 34:10-28, the B.o.C. is presented in the form of direct divine address – though, unlike Ex. 34:10-28, it is unaccompanied by a second, personal theophany to Moses.

4. Sacrifice and covenant solemnisation.

Ex. 24:3-8. We shall examine this composite tradition in greater detail below, (pp. 251f. ). Though in its more developed form (it probably entered E. as the ratification-rite of the B.o.C.)¹⁵ the passage is not directly

¹⁵) So, tentatively, W. Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch, p. 33, n. 115; Exodus, p. 198.
theophanic, yet in its basic elements it represents a very personalistic view of divine-human relationship. This will become apparent in our discussion of the significance of sacrifice in primitive Semitic covenants. (See below, pp. 211, 216f.).

**Ex. 24:1-2, 9-11.** This passage, by contrast, is unambiguously theophanic, with its two-fold assertion: יִרְאֵה דֵּין אֶלֶּה שָׁלוֹם (v. 10) and רְאוּת דֵּין אֶלֶּה (v. 11). Again there is a sense of wonder that man has seen God and remained alive: "He did not lay His hand on them" (v. 11). According to this account, the covenant is solemnised in a sacral meal; and though it is not stated that God partook of it, the possibility is not specifically excluded. 17)

I am unconvinced by Beyerlin's suggestion that v. 10b originated in a cultic theophany above the נודל of the ark. His argument depends to a great extent on referring the term ספל to the metallic lustre of the נודל rather than to the specific 'blueness' of lapis lazuli. The closest parallels however, (Ezek. 1:26, 10:1) seem to associate the word רִבְדֹּם with the firmament of the heavens, and thus with 'blueness'. Hence the imagery of Ex. 24:9-11 seems to describe participation in a sacral meal within the celestial throne-room. Whether the picture draws upon natural

---

16) The attempt made by Baudissin to distinguish יָרָא = 'see with the physical eye', and בָּלַע = 'see with the inward eye', has been rejected by most modern scholars. A.R. Johnson offers an alternative suggestion (see note 256), that בָּלַע includes a stronger auditional aspect than does יָרָא. It seems wiser, however, not to press the distinction.

17) The passage reflects the ancient West Semitic 'secular' covenant practice, cf. Gen. 26:30. Beyerlin, however, (op. cit., p. 33) suggests that 'they ate and drank' may be a technical term for covenant-making.
observation of a mountain against a background of blue sky, or is derived from specific Canaanite mythology, is impossible to determine. 18)  

The 'Migration' of the Theophanic Presence from Sinai to Canaan.

Before leaving this account of the primitive Sinai tradition, we must note the complex of material in Ex. 32:30 - 33:17. Though of diverse origin, these traditions witness to a common concern, i.e., that the relationship with Yahweh established at Sinai should remain valid in Canaan, specifically, that His presence-in-theophany experienced at Sinai should continue to be vouchsafed at His shrines in Canaan. The historical basis on which these traditions rest, is presumably Moses' request for a guide to lead the people through the wilderness, and Hobab son of Reuel's agreeing to accompany him 19) (Ex. 33:12a, Num. 10:29-33) 20). Later generations, concerned to justify the Yahwistic cult in Canaan, spiritualised this historical core in their various efforts to round out a theological assurance that Yahweh had in fact accompanied Israel from His primaeval shrine to the promised land. These traditions are as follows: -

18) Such 'mythology', whether Canaanite or Israelite in origin, did not arise in vacuo, but doubtless had its roots in the observation of spectacular natural phenomena. In the absence of specific evidence of borrowing from a Canaanite source, then, it is just as inherently likely that this particular theologisation of natural phenomena had its independent origin in Israel.

For a Canaanite (Ugaritic) picture of the heavenly palace, cf. W.H.Pope, El in the Ugaritic Texts, p. 100.

19) W.Beyerlin, OST., p. 100ff.

20) Ex. 33:12a and Num. 10:29 were presumably continuous, prior to the insertion of the Priestly block Ex. 35:1 - Num. 10:28.
a) Ex. 33:1-3a: "I will send an angel before you, and I will drive out ..." Whatever the precise pattern of inter-dependence, it is plain that these verses are closely related to the epilogue of the Book of the Covenant (Ex. 23:20ff. - see 'Theophany and Torah', p. 333). As in the patriarchal theophanies, Yahweh Himself is conceived as active through the angel; though what visible form he was to adopt (if any) is unspecified.

b) Ex. 32:30-34 and 33:12-17: "My Presence (הﬠניך = 'face') will go with you, and I will give you rest."

The close connection which we have just noted, between Ex. 23:20ff. and Ex. 33:1-3a, would suggest that the concept of the accompanying הﬠניך here in Ex. 33:14f. is likewise related to the B.C.C. epilogue; cf. the phrase in Ex. 23:21 - הﬠניך בלעדיותך (Dtn. 4:37), which is dependent on Exodus at this point, stresses the close relation between the 'Face' of Yahweh and the Sinai theophany-phenomena.)

Beyerlin, in seeking to define the usage more closely, adduces evidence to show that 'Yahweh's face' is generally spoken of in the context

21) J. Hempel, Die Schichten des Deuteronomiums, holds that Ex. 23:20ff. is dependent on Ex. 33 (op. cit., p. 138). M. Noth, Exodus, p. 254, however, regards Ex. 33:1-3a as deuteronomistic addition.

22) The unit is regarded by Beyerlin as J. Hempel ascribes it to B. Noth seems to regard it as a fairly early accretion to the J.-tradition of Ex. 34, (Exodus, p. 256).

of cultic theophany\(^\text{24}\), and that, specifically, 'Yahweh's face, his epiphany, and his ark, are closely connected with each other' in a number of passages\(^\text{25}\). This connection with the ark is exemplified in the present context, in that the original sequel to Ex. 33:17 was Num. 10:29-33, which describes the role of the ark as the numinous guide through the wilderness. In the later development of theophanic terminology at least, the 'Face' of God was conceived as being revealed in light (\(\text{ךלֹּם} \)), brightness (\(\text{תּוּבֵּץ} \)), glory (\(\text{תֹּכְלָה} \)); - see further below, p. 140f.

\(^{24}\) G. v. Rad, Old Testament Theology, I, p. 285, suggests that the term 'face of God' may originally have been used to designate the cultic masks used to symbolise the presence of deity.

Beyerlin, The Oldest Sinaitic Traditions, p. 105, cites Akkadian and Egyptian parallels to show that in the Ancient Near East the phrase originally concerned the image of the deity. He stresses, however, 'that the corresponding Israelite term is based on the cultic event of the theophany, not on an image of Yahweh'.

\(^{25}\) Ps. 80:2,4, Ps. 68:2f., Ps. 24:6f., Num. 10:35f., 2 Sam. 6:2,5,14, 17,18,21.

\(^{26}\) On the provenance of Ex. 33:7-11 -

v. Rad, ('Tent and Ark', The Problem of the Hexateuch and other Essays, p. 116) considers it uncertain whether the source is J. or JE.

Noth (Exodus, p. 255) : an independent tradition later incorporated into J.

R.K.Clements, (God and Temple, p. 35, n. 3), ascribes to E.

Beyerlin, (OCT, p. 23), ascribes to E.

K.L.Newman, H.-J.Kraus, Kuschka, Morgenstern, Gressmann, all ascribe to J.
The passage raises a number of problems on which no scholarly consensus has yet emerged: Was v. 7 once preceded by an account of the constructing of the ark? What was the original position of the tent in relation to the encampment? Does v. 11b imply that Joshua was ministering before the ark? Do tent and ark represent independent traditions, or did they belong together from the beginning? On the whole, I incline to the view that ark

27) G.v.Rad, "Tent and Ark", p. 116: There are "all the signs of a major lacuna in the text at this point". Similarly R.E.Clement, God and Temple, p. 37: it is "reasonable to regard (16) as referring to an antecedent mention of the ark, which has fallen out". Similarly O.Kissfeldt, "Lade und Gesetztafeln", Th.Z., 16, 1960, p. 283. More cautiously R.de Vaux, Ancient Israel, p. 302: "16" may refer either to Moses, Yahweh, or the ark. The solution offered by the Syriac and LXX, reading Ex. 33:7 as לֹחַ-יִשָּׁר מִשְׁרָס , and thus making the tent Moses' personal tent, is unlikely to be historically reliable, yet it is interesting in that it underlines the importance which the versions attached to Moses' mediatorialship.

28) G.v.Rad, "Tent and Ark", Pp. 116f., holds that the tent was originally outside the camp.

Beyerlin, OST., p. 113, however, suggests that an older tradition in which the tent stood in the centre of the camp, has been altered by the Elohist in order to suit E's. leading theological concepts.

29) So Beyerlin, OST., p. 118; and Rylaarsdam, Interpreter's Bible, 1, pp. 107ff.

30) Most scholars assign the ark to the Northern traditions, and the Tent to the South. So:

W.L.Newman, The People of the Covenant, pp. 55ff,
A.Kuschke, "Die Lagervorstellung der priesterschriftlichen Erzählung", Z.A.W., 63, 1951, p. 103,
E.Kutsch, "Lade", R.G.G.3, 4, col. 198,

The tent is ascribed to the Northern traditions by M.Haran, "The Nature of the "'Ohel Ko'edh" in Pentateuchal Sources", J.S.S., 5, 1960.

and tent did originally belong together\(^{32}\), but that in specific historical circumstances one and the other have been reinterpreted, for the peculiar theological needs of the times.

The specific purpose for which the tent-tradition is utilised in this case, is to stress Moses' special role as mediator between the people and their covenant-God. Whether the location of the tent outside the encampment is original, or an Elohist adaptation of the tradition for theological ends, the theological point is the same: the encampment polluted by the people's apostasy is no longer a fit locus of revelation, nor are the people themselves fit for theophanic encounter.\(^{33}\) Membership in Israel does not automatically guarantee participation in the theophanic moment: on the contrary, those who conscientiously sought\(^{34}\) Yahweh did so by the deliberate act of going out from the camp - the remainder of Israel watched and worshipped from a distance, (i.e. mediate participation).

(Such a picture accords very well with the situation obtaining in the

---


33) J.Barr, "Theophany and Anthropomorphism in the O.T.", V.T.S. VII, p. 35, stresses the predominance of sin and atonement as the real problematic behind the theophany.

34) י(interp) probably implies a seeking of 'theophany' rather than 'oracle'. Only in 2 Sam. 21:1-2 is י used in a context indicating an oracular enquiring of the Lord; elsewhere in religious contexts it means to seek the person of the Lord, rather than to seek information from Him. cf. the common phrase י י ה י י י Hos. 5:15, Ps. 24:6, Ps. 27:8, I Chron. 16:11.
Northern kingdom during the ninth and eighth centuries, when the authentic Yahwistic traditions were preserved by a loyalist prophetic-levitic alliance, in opposition to the official royal cult, (see pp. 275ff. ); and thus supports the view that this material is from E. 

As such, the passage sheds valuable light on the importance which these Northern circles continued to attach to theophany, within the Sinai covenant tradition).

d) Num. 10:33. Whichever source this verse derives from, the Jehovistic form of the narrative clearly intends to link the promise of the accompanying 'angel' and 'Face' of Yahweh, with the guiding role of the ark. In a later section, (p. 246f), I shall adduce reasons for concluding that the ark was originally the theophoric symbol of the Benjamite clans, consisting primitively of a simple chest which presumably contained numinous stones. In the present context, this primitive numinous element is plainly present.

35) The Elohistic narrative in Ex. 32 which introduces this series of 'theologies', arises from the same milieu, constituting as it does a polemic against the official Bethel cult.

36) Num. 10:33 is ascribed to J. by:

- Beyerlin, OST., p. 100,
- W. Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament, I, p. 38,
- U. Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch, p. 223.

- v. Rad, "Tent and Ark", p. 114, however, ascribes to E.

The Massoretic signs indicating that Num. 10:35f. is out of place in its present context, do not necessarily indicate that the verses are not extremely ancient. E. Nielsen, "Some Reflections on the History of the Ark", V. T. S., 7, p. 67, however, assumes that the unit had its origin in the Jerusalem temple cult; so that in its present form and setting Num. 10:35f. represents a "kind of reinterpretation of liturgical texts". Others would assign the tradition to the context of the holy war, in the period of the conquest.

36a) If, the mingled JE traditions.

37) cf. G. Reer, Steinverehrung bei den Israeliten. (Not sighted personally)
dominant: 'The ark is clearly addressed as Yahweh, if not identified with Him.' 38) In some sense, then, the presence of the ark in the midst of Israel was regarded as 'theophanic', even before its combination with the Canaanite cherubim-throne at Shiloh. "Wesentlich für die ältere Zeit ist die Anschauung, dass mit der Lade Jahwe selbst in nicht näherr beschriebener, fast magischer Weise, Heil oder auch Unheil wirkend, Freude oder Schrecken verbreitend, gegenwärtig ist." 39)

The Theophanies in the Patriarchal Narratives.

As a preliminary to examining the patriarchal theophany narratives, we must note a caveat entered, amongst others, by Jörg Jeremias:

In his monograph Theophanien, Jeremias insists on a fundamental separation between the patriarchal- and the Sinai-type theophanies, on the grounds of their quite disparate origins: — "In the neueren altlichen Wissenschaft ... der Terminus Theophanie denjenigen Erscheinungen Gottes vorbehalten bleibt, die nur an den Begleitumständen seines Kommens erkannt werden, ohne dass seine Gestalt und sein Aussehen beschrieben werden. Die "Theophanien" reden etwa vom Kommen Jahwes in Sturm, Gewitter, Feuer, etc. zum Gericht und zur Vernichtung. Man hat nun aber gelegentlich auch in neuerer Zeit mit dem Begriff Theophanie noch ganz andere Erscheinungen Gottes bezeichnen wollen, die von den oben genannten streng zu scheiden sind, weil sie in einen anderen Traditionszusammenhang gehören; Erscheinungen bei denen Jahwes Aussehen, seine Gestalt erkennbar werden ... mit den Sinnen, vor allem Augen und Ohren, fassbar werden." 40) He would reserve the term Theophany specifically for the

E. Pax on the other hand, stresses the common ground existing between the two types, distinguishing them as 'partial epiphanies' and 'total epiphanies'. That the two are conceived in J. and E., and in the edited form of the pentateuch, as belonging inseparably together, seems to me inescapable. Though admittedly of disparate origin, they nevertheless become one, both in that numinous immediate awareness of the presence of the divine which is the essence of both, and in the unity of the Heilsgeschichte. In confirmation of this, it is interesting to note how in the Sinai-theophany passages already reviewed, the combination of volcanic-storm-type theophany and patriarchal-type theophany is in fact characteristic of the cycle as a whole:

a) Ex. 24:9-11 is in fact more akin to Gen. 18 and Jud. 6 (see below, Ex. 24:9-11 is in fact more akin to Gen. 18 and Jud. 6 (see below),

---

41) E. Pax, *Epiphaneia.*

42) Pax states that 'theophany' normally refers to an O.T. record of an appearance of the divine, and 'epiphany' to a N.T. record. For his purpose, therefore, the meaning of the terms is virtually identical: he uses 'epiphany' throughout for the sake of convenience.

43) The terms 'partial epiphany' and 'total epiphany' seem to me to import a value judgment that is of no benefit to our enquiry. I prefer some such neutral terms as 'patriarchal-type theophany' and 'Sinai-type theophany' or 'volcanic-storm-type theophany'.

44) E. Pax, *Epiphaneia,* p. 144, stresses that the function of O.T. theophanies is to set forward the Heilsgeschichte, - in contrast to the individualistic, incidental epiphanies of classical antiquity: - "Anders der Hebräer; er steht in einer Entwicklung, die von der Vergangenheit Über die Gegenwart in die Zukunft reicht ... Die Erscheinungen Gottes dienen einzig und allein diesen Zweck; sie sollen den Weg ebnen und den Blick immer freier werden lassen."
than to Exodus 19, yet it stands quite unequivocally within the Sinai cycle. And since there can be no serious question about the antiquity of Ex. 24:9-11, it is clear that the basic affinity of the two theophany types was recognised at a very early stage.

b) Ex. 33:18-23 and Ex. 34:5-8 represent an intermediate type, in that on the one hand the Lord appears in the cloud (34:5), yet on the other hand a manifestation of His form is also involved (33:23).

c) Ex. 19:3-6, 19:20-24, 32:30-34, 33:1-6, etc., exhibit the same tendency to extended monologue which we shall see below (p. 114.4) to be typical of J's theologised patriarchal-type theophanies. Thus a primary function of both types of theophany is to become a vehicle for the divine word.

This combination of patriarchal-type theophany and Sinai-type theophany is also a striking feature of the crucial passage Ex. 3:1-14. Indeed it would be true to say that both by its form and by its position in JE, Ex. 3:1-14 constitutes the link between the patriarchal tradition and the Sinai tradition. On the one hand, it is probable that (as Noth suggests) its original was a patriarchal-type saga relating to some well-known location where an 'tR-theophany had once occurred, or was held to occur periodically. On the other hand, in its present context the passage constitutes a 'pre-view' of the Sinai theophany. It was presumably a very early accretion to the core Sinai tradition, displacing or anticipating the

45) M. Noth, Exodus, p. 32.
revelation of the name now preserved at Ex. 20:2 -

אֲגֻבֵּךְ הָיוֹת אָלֹהִים אֲשֶׁר חָיָיתְךָ

By thus placing this patriarchal-type theophany narrative as a prelude to the Sinai-theophany proper, the Elohist has emphasised several important points:

a) He has underlined the vital role of the individual in experiencing theophany and receiving revelation⁴⁶), thus linking the Sinai-event back to the experiences of the patriarchs, and forward to those of the prophets.

b) He has also stressed that theophany is a vital link, connecting the Sinai event with the religious traditions that preceded it.

c) He has offered a theological exposition of the Name revealed in the Sinai theophany, interpreting whatever previous significance the name Yahweh had for pre-Israel or their kinsmen-neighbours, in the light of the Sinai event.

It may be in order to digress a little here, and expand somewhat on the last point. There has of course been wide and long discussion as to the

⁴⁶) G.A. Barton, The Religion of Israel (1918), p. 62f., "If the tradition of Ex. 3 may be taken as a guide, Moses in his experience of Yahweh at the burning bush gained a personal impression of the power and awe of Yahweh that possessed his whole being ... Thus in the person of the great founder of Israel's religion there became effective, we cannot but believe, those forces which arise from a personal experience of God ... in lesser degree the experience was probably shared by his followers."
ultimate origin of the name Yahweh. I, personally, incline to the view that the name has developed from an 'ekstatische Urlaut', ejaculated as an instinctive response to the presence of the numinous. Others regard the name as a contraction of a primitive Semitic descriptive sentence-name.

47) See R.de Vaux's recently published survey of the latest studies on the origins of the name Yahweh, and the exposition of Ex. 3:14-15: "The Revelation of the Divine Name YHWH", Proclamation and Presence, ed. J.I.Durham and J.R.Porter. De Vaux considers it likely that some form of the name was known outside Israel in pre-Mosaic times, and favours the meaning 'I am He who exists' for יְהֹוָה יָהָג יְהֹוָה הָיָה יְהֹוָה

M.Buber, Moses, p. 50.

49) F.W.Cross, "Yahweh and the God of the Patriarchs", H.T.R. 55 (1962): - "most Semitic names normally begin in transparent appellations or sentence-names, which then shorten or disintegrate." It would seem precarious, however, to argue in this way from proper names in general, to names of deity. cf. the notorious difficulty in tracing the etymology of the other common Hebrew names for deity, יְהֹוָה and יְהָב

cf. also, E.Jacob, Théologie de l'Ancien Testament, p. 39.
50) The following are cited by R. Mayer, "Der Gottesname Jahwe im Lichte der neuesten Forschung", B.Z. NF 2 (1958) pp. 26ff:

N. Walker: Egyptian origin - Jach = Moon god, and We⁴ = one.

E. Littman: Aryan root 'Djau'.

B. Hrozny: Hittite root Jaja.⁵


Authorities are divided on the question, as to whether the divine name Yahweh occurs independently outside Israel:

Pro: G.R. Driver, "The original Form of the Name Yahweh", Z.A.W., 45, 1928, pp. 7ff.


Others conclude that the independent occurrence of the Name is likely, but not yet conclusively proved:


that the worship of Yahweh was practised among the early Kenites\textsuperscript{51}),

\begin{itemize}
\item[a)] The tradition preserved in Ex. 18:5-12 probably indicates a recurrent pilgrimage to some Midianite mountain sanctuary, in which certain groups at least of pre-Israel participated, and a cult regulated by a Midianite priest.
\item[b)] It is difficult to imagine how the tradition of Ex. 18:13-24, basing Israel's 'civil' and 'religious' judicial system on Midianite principles, could have arisen unless it had some factual ground in the events of the Kadesh period.
\item[c)] Exodus 3 locates the theophany in Midianite territory.
\item[d)] Numbers 10:29-34 resumes the J.-narrative from Ex. 33:12-16; thus implying that the companionship of the Midianites on Israel's onward journey in some sense constituted an answer to Moses' request for a divinely-appointed guide who would lead Israel through the wilderness.
\item[e)] Gen. 4:15 tells how Cain, the eponymous ancestor of the Kenites, was sealed with the mark of Yahweh. This seems to be more than simply an example of J's universalist outlook, and to imply a special primitive connection between the sons of Cain and the worship of Yahweh.
\end{itemize}

It is well to remember, however, that apart from these few hints we know 'almost nothing' about the Kenites and their religion (Ride Vaux, Ancient Israel, p. 479; E. Würthwein, art. "Gott" II, R.C.V. 3, 2, col. 1706). Scholars are divided as to whether the actual Name Yahweh, or a form of it was known to the Kenites: --


M. Buber, \textit{Kogen}, p. 52.
presumably in relation to a mountain theophany-site\(^{52}\), and that it was through these kinsmen of his that the knowledge of Yahweh was mediated initially to Moses.

Whatever its primitive origins, however, it is certain that the pre-Mosaic form of the Name Yahweh became little more than 'raw material', which then emerged from the crucible of the Mosaic Sinai-theophany experience glowing with new form and filled with new significance and vitality. Yet it is worth noting that (especially if we accept the 'ejaculatory' and Kenite origin of the name, as suggested above) the name probably arose in a theophanic milieu; - in which case the new 'Mosaic' significance of the name would be in some sense a renewal upon a higher level, of that primaeval numinous quality which it possessed from the beginning.

What then is the precise import of the sentence \(\text{אֲשֶׁר הָיָה} \text{אָדוֹן} \text{אֱלֹהִים} \text{אָדָם} \text{אֶלְוַי} \text{אֵל} \text{אֲשֶׁר הָיָה} \text{אָדוֹן} \text{אֱלֹהִים} \text{אָדָם} \text{אֶלְוַי} \text{אֵל}\) Ex. 3:14, which E. puts forward as the significant form of the divine name?

---

52) The narrative of Ex. 19 reveals two strands of theophanic description: vv. 16b, 17, 19, describe storm-phenomena, and are usually ascribed to E., whereas vv. 16a, 18, 20 employ volcanic imagery and are normally ascribed to J. Strictly speaking, this volcanic terminology is not appropriate to the Sinai peninsular, but to the area N.E. of the Gulf of Aqabah. It must of course be recognised that both the J. and E. traditions in their present form are highly composite and sophisticated, each having borrowed imagery from the other, as well as from extra-Israelite sources (M. Noth, The History of Israel, p. 131; R.E. Clements, God and Temple, p. 22). Yet having made due allowance for this development and cross-fertilization of traditions, it is still possible that the distinction 'storm-phenomena' v. 'volcanic-phenomena' has an historical basis; i.e. that the house of Judah during their stay in Kadesh had some acquaintance with a mount of theophany at Aqabah and/or its related traditions (M. Noth, The History of Israel, p. 131). The location of the mount of God according to the E.-source may be left indeterminate; identification of 'Mount of God' and 'Sinai' doubtless took place early, and is probably already assumed by the Elohist. But the tradition locating 'Sinai' on the Sinai Peninsula is late, and only documented from the sixth century A.D.
The first point to be noted is that the name is understood as verbal in form. Whatever its antecedents may have been, it seems certain that the verbal form of the name was new and unique to the Mosaic-Sinai theophany. Scholars are agreed furthermore, that the force of the verbs is active and concrete, not abstract and philosophical: "Die Antwort Gottes an Moses unterstreicht seine Aktualität, seine Existentialität ... Er bedeutet nicht: Ich bin Der Daseiende, ohneweiteres; sondern es gilt ganz bestimmt diesem Name Moses und dem Volke: Ich bin da!" Thus the theophany here recorded is not a moment of mystic abstraction, but is intimately related to the politico-historical condition in which the chosen people found themselves. The first-person form of the name is probably to be regarded as a secondary adaptation: the words are cast in the form of direct divine address in order to enhance the solemnity of the etymology, and to heighten the total theophanic impact of the passage.

As to the closer interpretation of the verbal form, the derivation from Arabic hawā, ahwa = 'be passionate', 'desire', has found little favour with recent scholarship and may be discounted. This leaves two main possibilities: Qal of לֶב = 'be', or Hiphil of לֶב = 'cause to be',


54) R.Mayer, ibid, p. 29.

"create'. The latter is in fact not grammatically impossible, and has had its advocates. But the matter in this case is to be decided from context, i.e. the wider context of the JE. Exodus-Sinai tradition. On this N.Predman remarks aptly:

"While the creator God figures prominently in biblical as well as N.E. religion from patriarchal times on, and is of course not out of place in the Mosaic age, nevertheless the principal emphases of the book of Exodus are upon the merciful intervention and saving action of the God of the Fathers. ...";

in which case some dynamic interpretation of the name based on the qal-form of יְהֹוָה is most appropriate to context.

Some recent scholars, including E.Schild and Joh. Lindblom, have argued from the qal-form for the rendering, 'I am the one who is! Bertil Albrektson, however, has clearly refuted the case for this interpretation by

56) R.Abba, 'The Divine Name Yahweh', J.B.L., 80 (1961), argues that there is no known occurrence of יְהֹוָה in the Hiphil form, the Piel form being used to represent the causative.


63) Idem, pp. 24ff.
pointing out the inadequacy of its syntactical base. Even within the traditional translation, however, there are still a variety of shades of meaning. Apart from variations based on tense, Th. C. Vriezen finds four nuances in the paranomastic construction of which Ex. 3:14 is an example, context alone determining which of these is uppermost in the case in question. They are as follows:

a) General indefinite, e.g. 2 Sam. 15:20

רָאָניָּ הָוָלֵל עַל אָשָר-אֵנָי הָוָלֵל

b) The precise intention is unspecified in context, but is clear to the mind of the hearer, e.g. Ex. 16:23

אֶת אָשָר-הֹאָפָר אַפָּר אָשָר-הָבָשָלָר

c) Intensive indefinite, e.g. 1 Sam. 23:13

רִתִּהלֵלָר בָּשָר יֵיתִהלֵל

d) Total and absolute, e.g. Ezek. 12:25

אֶטֲיָה יֹהָה אָדָם אָת אָשָר אָדָם דָּבָר

- on which last Vriezen comments, "the meaning is secret, yet portentous and certain." It is within the fourth shade of meaning that Vriezen would place Ex. 3:14, and the closely parallel Ex. 33:19

רַבּוּנִיָּ אָת-שָרוּשׁ אָת-שָרוּשׁ He would see in Ex. 33:19 a stress both on divine sovereignty and on unlimited grace; so that from the latter point of view, the meaning would be, "I will surely be gracious and


merciful". This seems to me to be valid, pace Albrektson, since the text presumably stood originally as a close parallel, in meaning if not precisely in syntax, to Ex. 32:34, "when I visit, I will visit their sin upon them", i.e. "I will certainly visit ..." (I take the point of the contrast to be not, 'visitation of the people' as against 'grace for Moses', but the momentariness of visitation as against the persistence of divine grace.) On the basis of this analogy, then, Vriezen would interpret Ex. 3:14 as "an indefinite merging into a superlative"; signifying both the mystery and the unswerving faithfulness characterising the God who thus revealed Himself.

We may summarise this short discussion, then, on the relation of the name to Moses and the Sinai theophany, with the words of G.R.Driver:

"The old 'Ya', or one of its extended forms, was recognised on the principles of popular etymology as closely resembling the imperfect tense of a defective verb, and rapidly became fixed in the imagination of the people as 'Yahweh'. The origin and meaning of the old name, whether ejaculatory or not, had without doubt been long forgotten; the new name, whether it was explained as predicating being or bringing into being, was so pregnant with meaning that it would readily be accepted by a people groaning under foreign bondage."

66) B. Albrektson, "On the syntax of in Exodus 3:14", p. 27, n. 3: "It is doubtful if Vriezen is right in making the paranomastic construction yield an 'intensive' meaning. Paranomastic sentences of this type usually express indetermination, and there is no reason to try to avoid this shade of meaning in Ex. 3:14."


The Linking of patriarchal- and Sinai-traditions of the divine Name
in the Pentateuchal Sources.

The precise progression in the history of the name יהוה must remain largely conjectural, in the absence of direct biblical-textual evidence for its occurrence, form, and usage in pre-Mosaic 'Israel'. Added probability, however, is lent to the picture just sketched, when we compare it with the pattern of continuity-innovation evidenced in the treatment of the divine Name in each of the separate pentateuchal sources. Each of the main streams of tradition in the pentateuch presents this relation between innovation and continuity in its own specific way. The Priestly source does so by designating God 'El Shaddai' in the pre-Mosaic traditions, and 'Yahweh' after Moses' commissioning. We shall be returning to the name El Shaddai, pp. 89f.: suffice it here to say that the name represents a genuine element of the ancient tradition, selected however from a wealth of terminology, and exalted to a position of exclusiveness which it did not originally enjoy 69). Interesting for the line of thought that we are pursuing, however, is that the priestly source makes its integration of Mosaic and pre-Mosaic material here in the context of theophany: the new name 'Yahweh' is revealed to Moses in a theophany, (Ex. 6:2-3), just as the old name had been confirmed to

69) R. Kittel, The Religion of the People of Israel, p. 62, and A. Alt, The God of the Fathers, p. 6. S. Kowinokel, "The Name of the God of Moses", p. 121, is too sweeping when he claims that Ex. 6:2-3 quite clearly reflects an "unhistorical theological theory of P's", contradicted by what the sources show us about the use of the tetragrammaton in old Israel.
Commenting on Ex. 6:3, R. Abba argues that pre-Mosaic ignorance of the name 'Yahweh' is not necessarily implied, but that the stress is rather on the capacity or character in which God made Himself known in the different epochs. The strength of such a contention is that it underlines the strong emphasis on personal relationship which lies at the heart of the theophany-revelation.

But the question inevitably arises: In what respects, then, did P. conceive the character of Yahweh to differ from that of ? The answer would appear to be that for P. there is no clear differentiation, but that the difference between the names concerns only the concrete historical circumstances in which the identical God appeared to His people from crisis

70) F. Michaeli, Genèse, on ch. 17. Michaeli, following J. Wellhausen, Die Composition des Hexateuchs, p. 1, sees the whole of P's work as structured on this same pattern: - four epochs of history, demarcated by four divine covenants, each with its own sign and its own specific revelation of God - to Adam, the sign of the sabbath and the name רכז , to Noah the prohibition of blood and the name נזק , to Abraham circumcision and the name יוהו , to Moses the torah and the name מזא .


71) R. Abba, "The Divine Name Yahweh", p. 323.
The Elohist's device for relating the pre-Mosaic to the Mosaic is similar to P's., except that the generic "God of the Fathers" is used rather than 'El Shaddai'. Once again, these titles represent a selection from the rich treasury of ancient tradition; and once again the link is made (very forcefully in B's case), by means of a theophany, Ex. 3:1-16. Reference has already been made (p. 57) to the probable origin of this particular piece of tradition, and the function it fulfils in the present context.

In the case of the Yahwist, the matter is not so clear because, on the basis of his own peculiarly universalist theological position, he has conceived the name 'Yahweh' as being in use from creation onwards.

---

72) Contra R.Kittel, The Religion of the People of Israel, pp. 52, 64: - "This God whom Moses had come to know in Egypt was different from the God of the Fathers": the latter was approached in 'quiet worship', the former in a 'passion of emotion'.

O. Bissfeldt, "El and Yahweh", J.S.S. 1 (1956), quotes with approval, p. 37: "El is the special contribution of Canaan to the world. He is fused with the stern God Yahve, and thus he has become the expression of all fatherliness, being mild and stern at the same time." (F. Løkkegaard, Studia Orientalia Ioanni Pedersen dicata, 1953, p. 232.) The distinction, however, is sharper than the biblical evidence justifies.

73) A composite Alt-Noth source division of the passage is as follows: - J: vv. 2-4a, 5, 7-8a, 16-17aa. E: vv. 1b, 4b, 9-15.

74) The difference between the J. and E. treatment at this point in fact probably reflects the actual historical development of the traditions, cf. notes 51 and 52 above. So H.H. Rowley, From Joseph to Joshua, p. 144: "The tribes that were not with Moses at the time of the Exodus ... did not ascribe the beginnings of their Yahwism to him, while those who were with him did."

A. Alt, The God of the Fathers, p. 6, links the difference with the 'universalist' outlook of J.
Yet, as N. Freedman points out, even in the J. stratum, the name which otherwise is traced back to earliest times, is given special emphasis in its Mosaic setting, for here the proclamation of the name is the essential prologue of the Sinai covenant-making (Ex. 34:5,10). Moreover, since in all probability it was J. who first constructed the genealogical framework of the patriarchal narratives and set the whole as a prelude to 'Sinai', it is worthwhile noting his procedure: He relates Isaac to Abraham by means of a theophany of the God of Abraham, (Gen. 26:3, 25), and Jacob to Isaac by a theophany of the God of Isaac (Gen. 28:13, 32:9). These linking theophanies are in all probability J. compositions in the sense that they do not reflect any specific ancient tradition. But the question poses itself: 'Why did J. select just this literary device to make his transitions?' At first glance at least, there would seem to be a certain tension between this theophanic stress and the atmosphere of 'Solomonic enlightenment', that has been noted in the work of J. (in common with his contemporaries) Is the theophanic element merely a conscious archaising on J's part, and thus without vital significance for J's thought? Or does it imply that J. sees the theophanic as in some sense definitive for revelation, and that he understands his own role as that of literary systematiser of the definitive events of revelation which had

75) The point emerges even more clearly if we accept the view that Gen. 4:25-6 originally belonged to an ancient tradition parallel to Gen. 2:7ff, in which קָּנָּה replaced קְנָה as the first man.
77) The phrase is v. Rad's.
reached their climax in the theophany par excellence at Sinai? The thought will at least bear keeping in mind when we come to examine the growth of the idea of canon in detail.

We turn now to a detailed examination of the theophanies in the patriarchal tradition, as recorded in the J. and E. strands of Genesis. A convenient method of procedure will be to divide the material into the following categories:

I. Narratives which occur in both J. and E.
II. Narratives peculiar to J.
III. Narratives peculiar to E.

79) It would lead us beyond the scope of our present enquiry, to discuss recent research into the historicity of the patriarchs. The following works provide useful summaries of findings in this field:

- G.E. Wright, Biblical Archeology, pp. 40-84;
- H.H. Rowley, From Joseph to Joshua;
- W. Noth, The History of Israel, pp. 121ff.
- R. de Vaux, "The Hebrew Patriarchs and History", T.D. 12 (1964);
- W. Albright, From the Stone Age to Christianity;
- John Bright, History of Israel.

Suffice it to say here that recent literary criticism has been more firmly grounded in the findings of biblical archeology; and that the interaction of these two disciplines has made it unnecessary to regard the patriarchal traditions as fantasia spun around the names of primitive deities (cf. Gunkel, Genesis, pp. LIIIf) or primaeval folk-lore themes (cf. H. Gressmann, "Sage und Geschichte", Z.A.W., 30, 1910, pp. 14, 23.)

"We shall probably never be able to prove that Abraham really existed ..., but what we can prove is that his life and times, as reflected in the stories about him, fit perfectly within the early second millennium, but imperfectly within any later period." - G.E. Wright, Biblical Archeology, p. 40.

80) See note 3 above.
I. Narratives which occur in both J. and E.

(i) The call of Abraham: Gen. 12:1-3 (J) and Gen. 15:1-6 (E).\(^{81}\)

In general, the greater vividness attaches to the E. narrative: it is vision (וָאַנֵּף, 15:1; and וָבָשֵׁם, 15:5) over against the bare word (וְיָאֳמֹר הַגֵּדָה, 12:1), and dialogue over against divine monologue. The exhortation (וַיֹּאמֶר הַנַּחַל, 15:1), indicates the proximity of the numinous and theophanic.\(^{82}\) The use of the prophetic formula..וַיֹּאמֶר הַנַּחַל, 15:1, is a first indication of the affinities between E. and the older prophecy of Israel.\(^{83}\)

Both J. and E. imply a pattern of command and response, (cf. 15:1)

---

81) Assuming with v. Rad, (Genesis, p. 179) that כבַּכֹּל הָיוֹלֵךְ (Gen. 15:2) refers to the same setting as כְּבַכֹּל (Gen. 12:4), i.e. the call to set out from Mesopotamia.

82) A. Alt, The God of the Fathers, p. 66, note 179, suggests that there may be a further theophanic ref. in the phrase כְּבַכֹּל מִצְבָּה (15:1b), which perhaps reflects the proper name, otherwise lost, of the God of Abraham, i.e. כְּבַכֹּל מִצְבָּה - an ancient title commemorating a primitive numinous encounter in which Abraham was made decisively aware of the shielding presence of his God. W. Kaessler, however, in "The Shield of Abraham?" V. T. XIV (1964), p. 494f., considers it precarious to argue from this first-person ref. to a fixed third-person title. He himself argues for an original reading כְּבַכֹּל = give, holding that the pointing כְּבַכֹּל gained ground under the influence of later cultic usage (Ps. 3:4, 28:7). Kaessler's arguments are inconclusive, but he has demonstrated the need for caution.

83) See O. Grether, Name und Wort Gottes im A.T., p. 66. F. Michaeli, Genese, Pt. II, p. 31. cf. also the remark of v. Rad, Genesis, p. 25: "Much can be said for the conjecture that the entire work" (E) "arose in old prophetic circles." Noth, Exodus, p. 15f., and Gunkel, Genesis, p. LXIII f., stress that such a connection would not be with 'classical prophecy'.

invariably has the connotation of hire, wages, reward for a commendable action or attitude, hence Abraham's prior obedience is implied. J. is richer than E., however, in respect of the universal reach which he ascribes to the divine blessing - "all the families of the earth", (12:3).


These three passages are obviously variants of a single ancient saga. v.Rad \textsuperscript{84}) considers the whole style of representation in 12:10f. to be by far the most ancient and difficult of the three versions, whereas Noth \textsuperscript{85}) following Wellhausen, tends to place 26:6-11 earlier. Certainly 26:6-11 is 'secular' in form, and in this probably reflects the original shape of this particular saga. But it should be noted of course that J. has already made his theological point as regards this material, in dealing with the parallel passage 12:10ff., and so avoids repetition by leaving this later passage untheologised. (See further on Gen. 26:1-5, II (vii), p.100).

v.Rad \textsuperscript{86}) in commenting on J's handling of saga in general, argues that the individual units, divorced from their original saga-setting and integrated into the new whole of the J.narrative, are now to be interpreted from

\textsuperscript{84}) v.Rad, \textit{Genesis}, p. 163. But cf. p. 266: "Perhaps this version" (i.e. Gen. 26:6-11) "of the narrative really is the oldest of the three."

E.A.Speiser, \textit{Genesis}, p. xxxii, believes that "two original incidents branched out into three".

\textsuperscript{85}) Noth, - ref. in v.Rad, \textit{Genesis}, p. 266.

the standpoint of their role within that new whole. Thus the point of 12:10ff. in its present setting, is the dramatic divine intervention on Sarah's behalf: for, "the jeopardising of the ancestress called into question everything that Yahweh had promised to do".\(^{87}\) 12:17-18, interestingly, implies a divine revelation to Pharaoh, though whether through dream or oracle is left undefined - if the latter, it would be interesting to know the channel by which J. conceived the oracle as being conveyed. The E. version, 20:1-17, describes at this point an explicit theophany-in-dream (20:3,6.), an approach which is in harmony with the 'visual' concept of revelation noted in a number of E. passages.

Further, E. here too casts the verbal content of the theophany in the form of a lively dialogue; and there are, once again, affinities with the prophetic outlook: - prophecy and intercession are linked in the portrayal of Abraham (20:7,17).

(iii) Theophany to Hagar: Gen. 16:1-2,4-14(J), and Gen. 21:8-24(E).

The general atmosphere of these passages, and the strength of the aetiological motifs embedded in the former at least, witness to their high antiquity\(^{88}\). Certain unevennesses in the style of ch.16 led the older literary critics to see traces of E.-influence in vv. 7-10; and the presence of dialogue, which we have seen to be characteristic of E. would tend to

---

87) v. Rad, Genesis, p. 164.

88) F. Michaeli, Genèse, Pt. II, p. 38, argues from the name יִשְׂרָאֵל that יְהִי primitively stood in the text instead of the present יהוה.
support this - as also the role of the here: from the frequency of its repetition within vv. 7-11, it is apparent that the phrase is intended as a theological corrective (Elohistic?) to the primitive Yahwistic narrative. Yet while the visible form is described as מֵלָאָל יְهوֹת, the encounter is an encounter with Yahweh Himself. (vv. 11, 13)

This 'refining' tendency is even more apparent in the E. version proper: the angel no longer finds Hagar in the wilderness (16:7), but calls to her from heaven (21:17). Yet the אל נִהיָן (21:17) shows that the experience still has something in it of numinous awe, though somewhat attenuated when compared with 15:1 - (the reference of the phrase is beginning to shift from 'fear of God' to 'fear of the physical consequences of Ishmael's suffering'.)

The E. narrative has become detached from its presumed original etiological reference to Beer-lahai-roi 89), and has taken on a more general reference: this would be natural on its removal from its original Southern setting.

(iv) The origin of the name Isaac: Gen. 18:1-6 (J) and Gen. 21:6-7 (E), (of. Gen 17:17 (P))

The fact that three differing etiologies are put forward by J, E, and P. for the name Isaac suggests that we are dealing here with material whose origins had already become obscure by the time of the earliest literary traditions. It seems reasonably certain in fact, that פֶּן אוֹלָחָה was original-

89) Gunkel, Genesis, traces the process much further back still: - that originally the ref. was to the numen located in the spring, לַאָל רָא; subsequently אל רָא was identified with הַגָּוָה, and then אל רָא was substituted as a reverential refinement.
ly a shortened form of יָהֲנָא (the god laughs)\(^{90}\). The full name יָהֲנָא has been interpreted:

a) as an expression of the parents' hope and confidence that the divine favour would rest upon their child; or

b) an apotropaic euphemism, in face of the awesomeness of a primitive numinous encounter.

The first of these interpretations is the more likely; but it is interesting that the dual possibility corresponds to the alternative explanations offered for the related ancient divine title יָהֲנָא, used for the God of the Fathers in Gen. 31:42,53. This ancient title has been interpreted as:

a) Kinsman of Isaac - the Presence who claims a special propriety over the Isaac-clan's life and welfare; or

b) the Fear of Isaac - the Presence before whom Isaac shuddered with dread.\(^{91}\)

On either interpretation, the picture of deity that emerges from the aetiology is a very personalistic one, in which the numinous aspects are very

\(^{90}\) Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, p. 185.

\(^{91}\) For the interpretation 'kinsman', see W.F.Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, p. 188f.
The evidence concerning 'patriarchal religion' from the Egyptian exeratory texts, i.e., of the deity's being regarded as kinsman of the worshipper, (cited by J.Gray, "Cultic Affinities between Israel and Ras Shamra", *Z.A.W.*, 62, 1949, p. 209), may be taken to support Albright's view.
much to the fore.

Gunkel\textsuperscript{92}) is no doubt right in tracing the origin of this J.-saga in 18:1-16 to the theme widely known in antiquity, of divine visitants travelling incognito, and repaying their host and hostess with the promise of the birth of an heir. But granted that such was the (Canaanite) origin of the story, whence it ultimately became available to the Yahwist; what was the purpose to which J. adapted it, and what was the significance which he intended it to convey in its present context? The answer is twofold: first, the weak link in the patriarchal chain\textsuperscript{93}) is strengthened by means of a theophany, and the succession of the promise to Isaac guaranteed by direct divine intervention. And secondly the lack of precision in the form of the theophany is deliberately used to emphasise the mystery inherent in Yahweh's self-manifestation.\textsuperscript{94)}

\textsuperscript{92}) Gunkel, Genes\textit{is}, p. 176f.

\textsuperscript{93}) H. Gressmann, "Sage und Geschichte", p. 15, "Isaac had no independent existence, but was always the son of his father." This probably overstates the case, however. See note 95 below.

\textsuperscript{94}) v. Rad, Genes\textit{is}, p. 200.

The oscillation between sing. and plural forms has often been noted: 'The Lord appeared' (18:1), 'three men stood' (18:2), 'My Lord' (18:3), 'So they said' (18:5), 'He said' (18:10), 'The Lord said' (18:13), 'The men set out' (18:16). This fluctuation is superficially explained as 'unevennesses resulting from imperfect adaptation of polytheistic materials'. But the essence of J's. intention has been well marked by v. Rad: "One must ask whether this lack of precision is to be attributed only to a certain bondage to the oldest pre-Israelite tradition, or whether it did not really lend itself to the narrator's intention of veiling Yahweh with incognito."
In contrast with the J. narrative, little can be said about the E. parallel, (21:6-7). It contains no theophanic element; but then, it is obviously a mere surviving fragment, the bulk of the E. narrative at this point having become redundant on conflation with J.

Thus from the intricacies of the history and explication of the name Isaac, we may note the following points: - An originally polytheistic theophany-legend has been pressed into service as the explication of a name originating in very different circumstances, yet sharing originally in that atmosphere of numinous awe which is the concomitant of theophany. Furthermore, the numinous subject of this reorientated legend has been identified with Yahweh; so that the whole is taken up and worked into the patriarchal narrative as a prelude to the account of theophany par excellence, Yahweh's self-disclosure on Sinai. J's. success in this ambitious venture is testimony both to his skill as a craftsman, and to the basic spiritual affinity in the materials he used.


These traditions which set out the various aetiologies for the name Beersheba need not detain us long, as their connection with the theme of theophany is comparatively slight.\(^95\) Two features, however, are of special

---

95) Scholars are now generally agreed that the name of Isaac was primitively connected with the shrine of Beersheba, and that only secondarily did the name of Abraham become established there. Gen. 26:15,18, are harmonising additions reconciling the older J.-tradition with the younger E.-tradition, (Gen. 21:22-32a).
a) Gen. 26:23-25, which is probably a J.-composition, the genealogical structure of the patriarchal narrative is strengthened by reference to a theophany of the God of the Fathers, (see p. 69f. above).

b) Gen. 21:32b-33, though younger than Gen. 26:22f. as literature, probably reflects older cultic elements - the tree-shrine at Beersheba was no doubt pre-Israelite and had at some time been dedicated to the worship of El (El 'Olam),\(^{96}\) though the precise ref. of this divine title is quite problematic.

All that can be said with certainty is that in the present form of the JE-tradition four elements have been brought together in a process of progressive enrichment:

- the primitive numinous experience associated with the sacred terebinth and its indwelling numen,
- the pre-Israelite worship of El 'Olam,
- the patriarchal worship of the God of the Fathers, and
- the worship of Yahweh, the covenant-God of Sinai.

The E₆-narrative in Gen. 21:22-32a has little to add to the picture.

(vi) Jacob at Bethel: Gen. 28:13-16 (21?), 19 (J) and Gen. 28:10-12, 17-18, 20 (21?), 22 (E).

As we move from Abraham and Isaac to the Jacob narrative, we are conscious of a heightened sense of immediacy in the traditions. This is partly due to

\(^{96}\) El 'Olam: See R. de Vaux, Ancient Israel, p. 293.
the more active contribution of the Elohist to the whole, and partly to the 
more intensely theophanic tone. v. Rad⁹⁷ has remarked that Bethel and Peniel 
form the two pillars on which the bridge of the Jacob narrative is construct-
ed, and it is noteworthy that both are vivid theophanic descriptions. The 
form of the narrative as it stands in ch. 28 is meant to imply that here for 
the first time, Jacob encounters personally the God of his Father. (v. 21)

"Jacob had been accustomed to associate Yahweh's presence with 
the sacred spots at which his father had dwelt and worshipped, 
and is surprised to find him here as well." (v. 16)⁹⁸

In its present form the J.-narrative implies that the Bethel shrine was 
founded by Jacob⁹⁹ (v. 19), whereas E. still contains hints of an older 
worship at the spot (v. 17). Indeed the J.-narrative comprises little more 
than one of those constructional links referred to on p. 70, "lacking almost 
all the characteristic features of the old cultic saga of 'El Bet 'El', 
which the Elohist preserves almost intact."¹⁰⁰ Yet it is significant, as 
we stressed above, that J. makes his transitions precisely by means of 
theophanies. In the present context, יָּבֵן in v. 13 refers to נֵבִית in v. 12, but originally the ref. was to Jacob, "God stood beside him".

God's self-revelation as God of the Fathers is obviously closely related 
to the enduring covenant-promises of land-inheritance and posterity. The

---

⁹⁷) v. Rad, Genesis, p. 38.
⁹⁸) S.R.Driver, Genesis, p. 265.
⁹⁹) In view of the conflated nature of the present text, however, it is 
unwise to press the distinction too far.
passage from K. Elliger, quoted by v. Rad, finely catches J's. theological intention: -

When Jacob is ready to leave the promised land ... God reveals Himself to him for the first time. There is no word of judgment on the human, all too human, behaviour of the crafty man, and all that is given is the unbreakable assurance that the promise holds: the land is to become Israel's land, and this Jacob will grow to a nation so that all families of the earth may receive the blessing. For this simple purpose Jacob will not be forsaken by his God even in strange territory.

By contrast with J., the E. account exhibits more ancient features - the anointing of the pillar and the practice of tithing were probably native to the Canaanite Bethel cult. The ladder too may reflect the architectural symbolism of ancient Near Eastern shrines. But the setting (dream, v. 12) and form (וֹלְאָכִים, אלָכִים v. 12) of the theophany proper have been impressed with the characteristic E. stamp. The 'dialogue' takes place afterwards in Jacob's mind, befitting the trance-like quality of the dream described here. The centrality of Bethel in E's. whole picture of Jacob is witnessed to in Gen. 31:13, 35:1, 7.

Commenting on v. 17 v. Rad says: -

"The immediate effect of this bewildering experience is a feeling of pious shuddering. The narrator has preserved here a tone of original ancient piety, the effect of whose cogent simplicity is timeless."

102) In the architectural form of the Ziggurat, a distinction seems to have been made between the actual (heavenly) abode of the deity, symbolised by the highest level of the tower, and the place of his earthly appearances. The lower shrine and upper 'dwelling' were connected by a long ramp-like structure.
103) v. Rad, Genesis, p. 280.
Precisely this abiding impact of the primitive theophany witnesses to the core of essential spiritual affinity which made it possible for this ancient material to be woven into the developed account of Yahweh's self-revelation at Sinai.

(vii) God's command to Jacob to return home:

Gen. 31:3 (J) and Gen. 31:11-13 (E).

Once again the J. account is rather colourless compared with E.: the tone is theological and the effect diffused. The divine promise נֶאֱמָר יִבְרָא (31:3) has been seen as reflecting a tradition similar to that embodied in Ex. 3:14.

The Elohist version again features dialogue; also 'dream' and 'angel' (v. 11) which show affinity to the 'visual' features noticed above (15:1, 5), and which we shall see to be characteristic of E. F. Michaeli 104) notes: - "As several times before, the angel of God appears, but the words are those of God Himself." In E. there is stress on Jacob's relation to the covenant-promise of land-inheritance (v. 13) as there is in J.; but the intensely personal nature of Jacob's underlying relationship with God is made to emerge more vividly in E. than in J., by reference back to the theophanic experience at Bethel, which was Jacob's personal Call.

104) F. Michaeli, Genese, ad loc.
(viii) Jacob's covenant with Laban:

Gen. 31:46-50 (51-53a)\(^\text{105}\) (J) and Gen. 31:41-45 (51-53a), 53b-55 (E).

Although neither source records a theophany here, yet each contains material illustrating the development of the theophanic tradition: each records the sealing of a covenant in a sacral meal, in accordance with the primitive W. Semitic usage (E. also adds sacrifice); each mentions the setting up of stones of witness - לוחות in J., מנרי in E. (In the mists of antiquity such stones were no doubt literally regarded as witnesses in that they were believed to be infused with the numinous, but in the Pentateuchal sources the function of witness has been transferred to Yahweh - directly in J.'s case, indirectly in E.'s).

Jacob swears by the Fear of his father Isaac ( פחד ). We have already referred above, (p. 76) to the possible origins of this awesome title, and have inferred its great antiquity. It may seem strange that this divine title became detached from the Isaac-saga proper, and adhered instead to the Jacob narrative-complex; but the transference may have been due to the fact that its closest affinities lay in the Jacob-cycle. For the two most numinous of all the patriarchal theophanies are found within this cycle (Gen. 28:10ff. and Gen. 32:22-32) - cf. in particular the phrase at Gen. 28:17

\(^{105}\) Gen. 31:51-52 obviously represents a careful harmonisation of two divergent traditions.

A. Alt, The God of the Fathers, p. 17, notes 43 and 44, finds an original plurality of Gods in v. 53a: אלוהי אלהים אלהים, but cf. Gesenius-Kautzsch, Grammar, par. 145, I Rem., where the occurrences of אלהים with a plural verb are described as a peculiarly Elohistic idiom.
"How awesome is this place!": One could almost say that at that moment of Jacob's cataclysmic encounter with deity (now recorded in the ancient account of the 'El Bet'el), the נְעֹר הַר הָעָלָמִים became by personal experience the רָאָב יִגְדֹּל. v.Rad\(^{106}\) has underlined this same principle of spiritual affinity between previously disparate materials when he points out that in the present rounded structure of the patriarchal tradition, the title נְעֹר הַר הָעָלָמִים serves to recall that other awful 'theophanic' moment, i.e., on Mt. Moriah, where the God of the Fathers makes a fearful claim on Abraham, calling him radically to renounce his future as well as his past, and offer up the child of promise as a sacrifice.\(^{107}\)

(ix) **Aetiology of Mahanaim**:

Gen. 32:4-13 (J) and Gen. 32:2-3 (E)\(^{108}\).

The E.-account is terse and concrete:

לָבֶל עָלָיו בִּנְאָכָה אֲלָהֵהּ לִמְסִי מִקְוֹכֶל... The emphasis is entirely on the numinous moment of the encounter, with no verbal revelational content, and no theological reflexion on the significance of the event\(^{109}\). v.Rad remarks interestingly:

---

\(^{106}\) v.Rad, Genesis, p. 306.

\(^{107}\) v.Rad, Genesis, pp. 234, 239.

\(^{108}\) v.Rad, (Genesis, p. 312), would add Gen. 32:14-22, on the grounds of phonetic resemblance between מֹעָז and מֹעָז, but this would seem to be dubious.

\(^{109}\) מֹעָז אֲלָהֵהִים is obviously more interested in aetiology than theology: significance for Jacob, of the word מֹעָז is left unexplained.
"One can only say that when Jacob approaches the Promised Land, he also approaches God's realm again. Outside in foreign territory with Laban, his life lacked such appearances almost completely."[110]

By contrast, the J. account appears much younger: the visual element has faded altogether, and (typically) the emphasis rests on the verbal content of the God-Jacob relationship. The prayer forms a bridge between the divine command in Gen. 31:3 on which it is based, and the account of the night-encounter at the Jabbok ford, which is its answer. Strong stress is laid on the God-of-the-Fathers theme, and once again we see a close connection between this title and the patriarchal-covenant promises, (Gen. 32:13, cf. 21:17 and 13:16). By comparison with E., J's. etiology of the name Mahanaim, although in fact grammatically more credible than E's., is yet given in an allusive, off-hand manner, which shows that for the Yahwist etiology has become completely subordinate to the theological function which he gives to the passage.

(x) Jacob's Testament : Gen. 49:2-27 (J) and Gen. 48:8-22 (E).

Strictly these two passages are not parallels, since they are obviously of quite disparate origin; but because the present form of the Pentateuch holds them in juxtaposition, it is convenient to treat them together. In both cases the interest lies in the titles used of God.

The text of the blessing on Joseph, Gen. 49:22-26 is difficult, but the designation of Joseph's divine Helper, vv. 24b-25a, which is our main concern,

is bound only loosely to what precedes, and may be treated separately. One
is immediately impressed by the piling up of names for God in these verses. Gunkel 111) explains that as the polytheist sought to call down divine favour
by naming every deity whom he worshipped, so the primitive monotheist names
all the names and attributes of God that he knows. However that may be, the
effect here is of a vast drawing together of strands: all the diverse
experiences of Godhead represented by this diversity of names, are in fact
experiences of the one God, Yahweh.

Gen. 49:24b is obviously a parallelism in which מִדְיָה אֱלֹהֵי עַכְּבֶּב stands parallel to מְשֵׁמֹת רְאוֹעֵל אֱלֹהֵי עַכְּבֶּב, so that we can expect
each phrase to shed light on the interpretation of the other.

This is the only early use ofьер וֹלְעַב: the four later occur-
rences (together with the related יֵלְעַב יַעֲרָאִיל, Isaiah 1:24) all refer
to Zion and its cultic worship. But since the material in Gen. 49 fairly
certainly antedates the Yahwist by a considerable period, it is unlikely that
the occurrence of יֵלְעַב יַעֲרָאִיל in Gen. 49:24 derives from the
Jerusalem cult. If, as seems reasonable, we assume that the combination of
וֹלְעַב with ‘עַכְּבֶּב is itself very ancient, then Alt 112) is probably

111) Gunkel, Genesis, p. 428.

right in including it among the titles of the God of the Fathers.\textsuperscript{113) - }

Originally it will have described and commemorated a concrete experience in which the Hebrew patriarch became convinced that he had been sustained and saved by the powerful intervention of a numen, who thereby became peculiarly 'the Mighty One of Jacob', and was subsequently revered as such by Jacob's descendants. How far back in history this numinous encounter lies is of course impossible now to judge; but it seems certain that for the Yahwist and the JE. redactor, the title בֵּית עַזְיָזֶל was inevitably associated with the theophany of Bethel, for according to the J. patriarchal narrative, it was preeminently at Bethel that the God of the Fathers revealed himself to Jacob as the One mighty to fulfil all the promises made to Abraham (Gen. 28:13-14), and mighty to extend concrete guidance and protection to Jacob throughout all the exigencies of his wanderings. (Gen. 28:15). Thus once again we see the theophanic element, common in this case to the cult of בֵּית עַזְיָזֶל and the Bethel saga, easing the fusion of the formerly disparate elements.

The second half of the parallelism presents difficult textual problems.

\textsuperscript{113) It has been argued on the grounds of identity of consonantal form that the title בֵּית עַזְיָזֶל derived from a primitive cult in which the God of the Fathers was worshipped under the symbolism of a bull ( יָזָל ). While it may be conceded that the pointing was originally identical, and that יָזָל was adopted 'um jeden Gedanken an Stierverehrung fernzuhalten', it must also be stressed that יָזָל has the primary meaning 'mighty' in O.T. usage, and that the meaning 'bull' is secondary. In spite of the possibility of an ancient bull-cult at Bethel (revived by Jeroboam), it is inherently more likely that the title בֵּית עַזְיָזֶל meant 'Mighty One of Jacob' from the beginning. See A. Alt, The God of the Fathers, p. 25f.}
The most satisfactory reading seems to be מָשָׁה רַעְוָה אָבִּן יִשְׂרָאֵל 114), which Gunkel 115) interprets, "Der im Israel-Stein wohnende Hirte". The thought is thus that the numen who revealed himself so overwhelmingly at Bethel, and is consequently thought of as domiciled there in the sacred stone, is nevertheless also Jacob's ever-present guide throughout all the vicissitudes of his exile and resettlement (Gen. 33:20; 35:1, 7).

Gen. 49:25 comprises a further parallelism: 116) מַעְלָא אֲבֵכִין רַעְוָה רְאָל שָׁדֶי רִבְרְכָה In this context אֲבֵכִין takes up the two related titles just discussed, the one of Hebrew and the other basically of Canaanite origin, and unite them both firmly with the tradition of the God of the Fathers. And on the other hand, the parallelism runs on to equate the God of the Fathers with אֱלֹהֵי אָבִין (cf. the remarks on P's. use of the name, p. 67).

114) אָבִין , (following the Syriac) is preferable to אֱלֹהִים on grounds both of sense and of parallelism. It has been argued on metrical grounds that the line is too full, but this is inconclusive - there is at least one other 3:4 line in the section. אָבִין is difficult as a divine title, for denotes a small rock that can be manhandled, not a cliff or living rock (滚动 , אָזְרִי ), and is therefore less appropriate as a symbol of strength and durability - it is not so used elsewhere in the O.T. On the other hand, אָבִין seems integral to the text ('the one word that should not be eliminated', Skinner), and probably gave rise to the LXX reading ὁ κατασχεύας 'Ισραήλ , (ex. רַעְוָה , cf. 1 Sam. 4:1, 5:1, 7:12). אֱלֹהֵי however, also has many parallels, the closest being Gen. 48:15 - אֱלֹהִים יְרַעְוָה אָבִין . It seems best, therefore, to retain the M.T., repointing מָשָׁה.


116) This reading is well supported by the versions, and fits the parallelism. It is preferred by most modern commentators.
Discussion has been widespread as to the origin and etymology of the name יְהוָה יָבִיא. Without examining the arguments in detail, we may take the following as a summary of the general consensus:

'Shaddai' is probably of Mesopotamian origin, and meant 'He of the Mountains'. It is inherently probable that the patriarchs brought the name with them from their ancestral home. At what stage 'shaddai' became an epithet of El is uncertain, whether at a very early stage, in the setting of the primitive Mesopotamian mountain-cult, or later, after the entry of the patriarchal clans into Canaan. But in any case, the available evidence would seem to support the P.-tradition, viz. that the name was a most important, if not the most important, title of the pre-Mosaic Hebrew deity.

It is generally assumed that the name יְהוָה had long since lost its original meaning by the time of the Yahwist, and had become a traditional title with the general significance of 'Almighty'. But as Rémi Lack points out, there are traces in the earliest Pentateuchal sources of a very ancient and deeply-rooted 'theology of the mountain', antedating that of the Zion sanctuary, and probably that of Sinai too.

A contrary opinion is expressed in Kautzsch, E.B. iii, 3326f.
remnants of this ancient sub-stratum still retain something of their vitality for the Yahwist (or for the traditions he utilised), (e.g. Ex. 15:17)\(^{122}\), then it is not unlikely that the title הֵרְשָׁע still retained some overtones, however indistinct, of its original connection with the cosmic mountain. In that case the usage of the P.-tradition (see p. 67 above) is seen to be peculiarly appropriate: the revelation of אל שָׁרֵע at a mythical mountain far back in a dim numinous past, is now integrated with the revelation of Yahweh, in fresh and more powerful theophany, on the historic mountain of Sinai. "The theophany of Sinai then represents the end of the domination of the shaddai concept, and the beginning of the rule of Yahweh."\(^{123}\)

The text of Gen. 49:26 is suspect.\(^{124}\) If however the MT. is allowed to stand, it is possible that ברכה אליעזר is a contraction for ברכה אליעזר אֱלֹהִי.\(^{125}\) We should in that case perhaps be justified in seeing a latent contrast between the blessings of the dimly remembered cultic past on the שֹׁכֶן, and the blessings of Yahweh on Sinai, in whose self-manifestation all the strands of tradition are gathered together. (It is

---

122) The mountain as God's divine שֹׁכֶן: cf. also the references to the cosmic mountain in the North: - Isaiah 14:13, Psalm 48:3.


124) The arrangement of the BHK^3 text destroys the parallelism between דָּרוּ הָעָלֶים and בָּרוּךְ הַעֲלֵה. Skinner remarks that what is necessary is a rearrangement of the text of v. 26aa that would provide a parallel to v. 25bb, and he accordingly accepts (though hesitantly) Gunkel's amendment: בָּרוּךְ אל עָלֶים בַּהַלָּה

125) cf. Ps. 24:6: נָכֹםֵשׁ עִלְיוֹנִי.
interesting to note that in the Deuteronomic version of the Joseph blessing, (Dtn. 33:13-17), all the blessings are specifically traced to their source in Yahweh (v. 13) נברע גלגל (v. 16), thus making explicit the point which we have seen to be hinted at by the Yahwist.

**Gen. 48:8-22 (E).** In v. 15, Gunkel prefers the reading הגמל as better suiting the context. But the text as it stands is supported e.g. by the parallelism of Gen. 15:2. The text as it stands is supported e.g. by the parallelism of Gen. 15:2 and should probably be retained. The point in any case is clear: the God of the Fathers will continue His grace to Joseph's children, even though born outside the land of promise, just as he did to Jacob in his wanderings outside Canaan, in Aram Naharaim and in Egypt.

Characteristically E. refers to the divine guide as הגמל - a description which we have come to recognise as focussing attention for the most part on the visual, theophanic aspect of the divine presence. "The angel is God himself in human form." A new element here is that the angel is further termed גמל, i.e. Jacob's kinsman-redeemer, pledged by the very (self-imposed) ties of kinship, to act on Jacob's behalf whenever the latter's freedom and safety were in jeopardy, - a strongly

---


127) Gunkel suggests that the change was made from reverential motives. cf. also Gen. 18:22, etc. The more primitive usage is reflected in Gen. 24:7, 40, 16:7.


129) If W. F. Albright is right in his translation of רעב הָעִבָּד = 'kinsman of Isaac', the idea would relate closely with that expressed here. cf. note 91.
On the concrete personalistic character of the divine invocation in Gen. 48:15-6 as a whole, v. Rad remarks fittingly:— "These predications are intended to identify the divinity and define it exactly according to its revelation. For the believer can never speak generally and abstractly about God, but only about definite revelations and experiences that exist in his own sphere of life." 130)

 Helpful note: see on Gen. 49:24.

II. Narratives peculiar to J.


This passage forms part of a chain, (i.e. together with 13:18 and 21:33) the theological intention of which is clear. Treating the intervening passages as digressions 131), a product of the present extremely composite nature of the J.-narrative as a whole, we see Abraham in four gigantic strides covering the whole length of the promised land (cf. Gen. 13:17) and staking his claim to the whole by setting up the markers of his God at every strategic point: at Shechem (12:7), Bethel (12:8) 132),

130) v. Rad, Genesis, p. 412.

131) e.g. 13:3-4 appears to have been inserted as a resumptive, following the digression in 12:10 - 13:1.

132) Adopting the suggestion that an original ref. to Bethel has here been harmonised with the other tradition (Gen. 28:10ff.) which makes Jacob the founder of Bethel. cf. Oesterley and Robinson, A History of Israel, (1955), p. 50f.
Hebron-Mamre (13:18)\(^{133}\), and Beersheba (21:33)\(^{134}\). These altars set up by the Hebrew nomad in a land occupied by aliens (12:6) are, as v. Rad suggests,\(^{135}\) symbols of Abraham’s faith in the covenant-promises of Yahweh. Gen. 12:7 is thus normative for all four steps in the progression:

\( \text{רְפָאָה יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים} \). It is in response to this initiatory self-manifestation of Yahweh that Abraham performs his acts of faith. But the dynamic of the theophany rests not in its visual impact, but in its verbal content: \( \text{רְפָאָה לְדָרְעָן אֱלֹהִים - הַיָּדֶּרֶךְ הַיָּדֶרֶךְ} \). The phrase \( \text{רְפָאָה בֵּטְשָׁא יְהוָה} \) (12:8) has in this context an immediate sense of invoking the divine presence-in-power: in other words, a plea that the theophany of Shechem may be valid also for Bethel.

(ii) **God’s covenant with Abraham**: Gen. 15:7-18.

The passage is uneven, and consists of later accretions around the original core, vv. 9-12 and 17-18. A. Alt\(^{136}\) and G. v. Rad\(^{137}\) have argued that this primitive core constituted an ancient pre-Mosaic Hebrew saga originally attached to the worship of the God of the Fathers. The absence of any specific location of this tradition is held to confirm the argument that the Gods of the Fathers were originally attached to peoples (e.g. פֹּתְחֵי הַנָּחָל as the tutelary deity of the Isaacite clan(s), etc.) rather than places (as in the case of the Canaanite deities, located at specific shrines).

\(^{133}\) Mamre: See further on II (iii), p. 95f.

\(^{134}\) Beersheba: See further on I (v), p. 78f.


\(^{136}\) A. Alt, The God of the Fathers, p. 65f.

\(^{137}\) v. Rad, Genesis, p. 184.
The argument, though attractive, is inconclusive; for in its present position in the Pentateuch, Gen. 15:7-18 has a location, i.e. at Mamre (cf. 13:18, 18:1). And in any case the obviously abrupt transitions between v. 8 and v. 9, and again between ch. 15 and ch. 16, suggest the possibility that some details of the primitive material have been omitted. However that may be, our prime concern is with the theophanic picture presented here.

J. Lindblom commenting on the structure of ch. 15 as a whole, remarks that the Abrahamic covenant, (vv. 7-11 and 17-18) has been deliberately connected with the vision at Mamre-Hebron (vv. 1-6) so as to make the covenant part of the visionary experience. The piling up of numinous words in vv. 12, 17 is obviously a deliberate effort to heighten the awesomeness of the account. נראת is used sometimes to imply an extraordinary, divinely-induced sleep by means of which direct apprehension of God's activity is rendered impossible, and the mystery of the divine activity is therefore preserved, (cf. Gen. 2:21). In other instances, however, it is precisely this quenching of the natural activity of spirit and mind which is regarded as rendering the subject receptive to revelation (e.g. Job 4:13, 33:15). נברשת too, when cast in apposition with


creates an impression of awesomeness. 140) The occurrence together of the words יַעֲנָה יְחֵן יְהוָה, all of which feature in the theophanic descriptions of the JE. Sinai tradition (Ex. 3:2, 13:21, 19:9, 20:18) makes one suspect a deliberate selection of terms calculated to draw attention to the essential congruity of the two covenants. This suspicion is confirmed, it seems to me, by the wording of v. 7, which acts as a constructional link between vision- and covenant-narratives—the parallel with Ex. 20:2 appears unmistakable, and is even more exact in the LXX. rendering:

This conscious parallelism, not only covenantal, but also theophanic continuity is established between Abraham and Moses. It is noteworthy that here for the first time the verbal content of the theophany is designated הָיוֹת 141. In general the later accretions around the vivid theophanic core of Gen. 15 serve to illustrate the progressive movement towards verbal content, reflection, theologising, rationalising (cf. vv. 13-16).

(iii) Theophany to Abraham at Mamre: Gen. 18:1-8.

This section has already been discussed, I (iv), pp. 75f. under one of its twin aspects, i.e. as introduction to the etiology of the name Isaac. Its other aspect remains to be noted here, i.e. as a legend of the institution

140) Note also the impression made by the action, in the covenant solemnisation:—"Die hier vv. 9, 10 vorausgesetzte Art der Bundes- schliessung ist—die feierlichste und schauerlichste" (Gunkel, Genesis, p. 156), i.e., a ritual of provisional self-excoriation. The brevity of the divine speech arises from the fact that the action has already expressed something which it is inadmissible for men to say about God; hence the fewer words added, the better.

141) See also note 138. Gunkel traces the use of the word הָיוֹת to deuteronomistic influence, but this seems unnecessary. See further, p. 215f.
of the shrine at Mamre. The process by which this 'international', timeless, placeless, theophany-legend came to be attached both to Abraham and to Mamre, is impossible to trace with certainty. But it seems likely that the ancient material had first become associated with the name of the patriarch, and that it was the Yahwist who then tied this Abraham-legend to Mamre by means of the superscription Gen. 18:1a. Such a conjunction reinforces the pattern which J. has been at pains to establish, i.e. of Yahweh revealing Himself in theophanies to the patriarchs at the key sanctuaries throughout the land of promise: it also gathers up all the cultic usage that has grown up at the 'oak' of Mamre from time immemorial, and offers it unequivocally to Yahweh. This succinct superscription cuts short all discussion about the prior history of the Mamre cult, as well as all speculation as to the identity of the mysterious visitors in the traditional material he is about to represent: — הָלַךְ שֵׁלָי הָלַךְ לְמֶלֶךְ — "for the God who visited Abraham could for Israel" — and, we might add, for the Yahwist in particular — "only be Yahweh". 142)


The passage is a moving combination of theological profundity with unsophisticated directness. In 18:17 Abraham is pictured as standing, overhearing Yahweh's soliloquy. Abraham's very role in the Heilsgeschichte necessitates that he be admitted into the inner councils of Yahweh and

142) v.Rad, Genesis, p. 200.
granted deep insight into the divine mind and intention.\textsuperscript{143) The theophanic setting is vividly stressed in Gen. 18:22b - 12Dý '7737 12117 ONTINI 1111117 1 even more so if we read CINTIN 13M5 IM7 13117 as v.\textsuperscript{Rad is clearly tempted to do.\textsuperscript{144)}

Here more than in any other passage that we have examined so far, the verbal content of the theophany is decisive (see the thorough exposition offered by v.\textsuperscript{Rad}\textsuperscript{145)}. All the more interesting, then, that in such a passage, where the Yahwist is free to express his theology unfettered by the restrictions imposed by the traditional materials, he does not discard the theophanic setting but on the contrary carefully preserves it. This is clear from the way in which he rounds off his exposition with concrete theophanic language: רילות יוהה קאשה לותר יוה - אברוה, even though such language is in no way necessary as a transition to what follows.


The concept of the מלקין in this narrative stands at farthest removed from the concept as encountered in Gen. 24 below. If there the מלק is "almost a personification of God's providence",\textsuperscript{146} here their

\textsuperscript{143) It would seem that J. has thought deeply here about the vital role played in the Heilsgeschichte by prophetic figures with a deep immediate knowledge of God. One is reminded of Moses' speaking with God 'face to face'. In J's. estimate, Abraham was such a figure. See also on 1 K. 22, Isaiah 6, below, pp. 171f., 185ff.\textsuperscript{144) v.\textsuperscript{Rad, Genesis, p. 206.\textsuperscript{145) v.\textsuperscript{Rad, Genesis, pp. 204-210.\textsuperscript{146) Skinner, Genesis, p. 342.}
semblance of humanity is so concrete that the inhabitants of Sodom take them for mere men (Gen. 19:5). They may well in fact have been men in the original form of the saga; yet in the present unified structure of chs. 18-19, their identity is already known to the reader from what has preceded. Their presence in Sodom is the presence of Yahweh Himself (18:21), and in the judgment which they will execute on Sodom (19:13) Yahweh Himself is active (19:14,24). The same lack of precision as to the form of the theophany, viz. the oscillation between singular and plural, which we noted in the earlier part of the unit, is in evidence here also, \(^{147}\) cf. especially vv. 17,21 \(^{148}\). The phrase מאת קרה (v. 24) appears to be a doublet of מואת אלוהים and is probably a later addition. One recalls the Elohist tendency to describe the 'angel' as 'speaking from heaven'.


This is another of the J. passages which is unlikely to have existed independently of its present setting, but was probably composed by J. \(^{149}\) in order to carry the line of the divine purpose (cf. v. 7) across the breaks in the traditional material. Yet the method employed in this chapter is in marked contrast to that of the passage just discussed. Here there is no theophany, but a hidden guidance, in which "no causal connection is broken, but the miracle takes place in a concealed, quite unsensational management of

\(^{147}\) v. Rad, Genesis, p. 215.

\(^{148}\) V.17, the versions read מַעַל, but the MT. is to be preferred.

\(^{149}\) See Gunkel, Genesis, p. 225f., for detailed source-criticism of the text.

cf. v. Rad, Genesis, p. 248f.
the events.150) That there was specific management, however, is clear from
לָרֵעַת הָבְלֵאָה הִיוָה רַבְרָבָא וְרָבָאָה וְרָבָאָה וְרָבָאָה (vv. 7-40). However, it is
and in v. 21 this guiding מֵלָאָה is identified with Yahweh himself.
Furthermore the working out of the sign in answer to the servant's prayer is stated to have been a
'word' from God (v. 51). "'Gesprochen' hat Jahwe durch das Zeichen."151) The
comparatively minor emphasis on theophany here should therefore neither be
ignored nor overemphasised.

It should be noted, in the first place, that the tone of indirectness in
the description of the revelatory process is probably intended to convey
that the revelation vouchsafed, is not given primarily for the sake of the
recipient himself, but for his master(s), the specific heir(s) of the divine
promises. This seems clear from the choice of divine titles throughout:152)
(vv. 3, 7), which
according to Gunkel153) is an ancient Babylonian title, and is therefore of
more general reference than the name 'Yahweh' standing alone. Similarly the
title (vv. 12, 27, 42, 48)
stresses the servant's subordinate role in the proceedings. It is signifi-

150) v. Rad, Genesis, p. 255.
152) The titles in their present form may be the result of conflations but
it is their impact in the present narrative which is our concern here.
precisely at vv. 26, 52, where the servant himself has direct experience of Yahweh's working, in that he sees the signs which he stipulated fulfilled before his eyes.

Secondly, it is worth recalling v. Rad's remark quoted above (p. 85, note 110) to the effect that the vivid theophanies are for the most part concentrated within the borders of the land of promise, so that it is consistent that this revelation at Haran should be unmarked by theophany.

Thus whilst duly noting the more 'providential' aspect of revelation in this chapter, we should nevertheless beware of assuming that a 'providential' concept of revelation was somehow more significant for the Yahwist than the theophanic concept inherited with his traditional material, and which he used himself in building up the structural lines of his work.

(vii) Theophany to Isaac : Gen. 26:1-5.

There is a harmonistic tone about this passage which suggests an original composition by the Yahwist, e.g., the phrase "besides the former famine ..." (26:1). Theologically also the passage forms a link between the parallels Gen. 12:10 - 13:1 and Gen. 26:6-11, which we have discussed above (I, (ii), p. 73). The purpose of the theophany would appear to be, negatively, to restrain Isaac from visiting the scene of Abraham's 'fall from grace', and thus to prevent a similar 'fall' on Isaac's part. (But the outcome shows that the danger of fall lies not in the locality, but in the heart of the patriarch himself.) Positively, the careful and elaborate reiteration

154) With retouchings from later hands; as in v. 5, but also in the details of vv. 3 and 4.
of the divine promises (cf. Gen. 12:1-3, 13:14-17, 15:5, 22:15-18) is a call to Isaac to emulate the faith of Abraham, and in times of famine to choose the unknown future of the promise in preference to the known security (cf. Gen. 42:1) of Egypt.

The location of the theophany is uncertain, but the most likely of the alternatives is Beer-lahai-roi, where 25:11b locates Isaac. In that case 26:1 would read as a preliminary outline of the following theophany narrative and v. 6 as a summing up and transition to Gen. 26:7-11.

Once again, though the form of the theophany is concrete, the interest focuses not on the divine appearance but on the content of the word. It is worth noting, too, that though the precise title does not occur, its sense is implicit in the form of the divine speech and in the structure of the narrative (parallel experiences of father and son); and as we have noted in other cases, this (implicit) is connected specifically with the promise of land-inheritance.

(viii) Jacob at Peniel: Gen. 32:23-33.

Commentators are agreed that this passage embodies extremely ancient materials which have been constantly shaped and reshaped during an exceedingly long period of transmission.

Gunkel is probably right in his assertion that originally the heroic
figure attacked by the night-assailant had nothing in common with the Jacob
(characterised by puniness and craftiness) of the Esau-saga; rather the
original was a hero of prodigious strength, able by his tremendous physical
prowess to overcome his demonic adversary and wrest a blessing from him.
If so, then we are faced with two apparent incongruities:

a) that material which was primitively descriptive of a demon should
eventually be used to describe a theophany of Yahweh, and
b) that a demon should in any sense be a source of 'blessing'.

The point, however, is that in seeking to examine the most primitive
roots of the legend, we are carried back toward that primaeval twilight where
the numinous is an intuition of awesomeness, dread, and power, undifferenti-
ated morally. v.Rad speaks of a "clutching at" the divine and its power
of blessing which is "so elemental that it goes beyond what we understand by
piety or impiety". Only a tremendous inner vitality could enable this
primitive material to survive such a lengthy process of radical change and
adaptation; and the secret of that vitality is surely precisely the
elemental nature of that numinous experience which forms its core. This is
the primitive root from which springs, eventually, all that we have been
describing under the term 'theophanic'; and it is this basic theophanic
element which makes possible the radical transference we have noted, i.e.,

156) cf. the similar account of a night-assailant, Ex. 4:24-26.
157) "Blessing" signifies in essence, access to the power inherent in the
name of the Blesser. cf. Gunkel, Genesis, p. 327: — "Das 'Segnen'
hat hier keinen geistlichen Inhalt. 'Segnen' heisst ein wirkendes
Wort sprechen, wie es nur die Gottheit sprechen kann."
158) v.Rad, Genesis, p. 316.
that material originally descriptive of the 'demonic' could be utilised in the revelation of Yahweh.

We may note some of the stages in that transition from primitive tale to the story in its present form:

a) The night-assailant becomes וַיַּעֲלָן - i.e. a deliberately neutral term is used: the reader who recalls its use in Gen. 18:2 will not assume that its use must imply a merely human antagonist, but will be alert to the possibility of an encounter with the numinous and the divine.

b) The crippling of the wrestler's thigh destroys the straight 'heroic' dimension of the story, and humbles the subject before the numinous power with which he is dealing.

c) Not only so, but Jacob is compelled to make a unilateral declaration of name or disclosure of identity, i.e. to expose his secret being, his motives and inner rationale, and thereby give his assailant power over his whole nature. The name of the assailant, on the contrary, remains undisclosed, inviolable.

d) Finally this awesome, numinous experience is presented as Jacob's direct, personal experience of Yahweh: He has seen God עַד יְהֹוָה - a phrase which carries the material forward and sets it on the threshold of the prophetic (cf. Dtn. 34:10, Ex. 33:11).

Thus in its present setting Gen. 32:23-33 presents the theophany at Peniel both as the answer to Jacob's fear-inspired prayer, and as the prelude to his reunion with the brother whom he had once wronged and cheated.
Through the exposing, judging, and reassuring content of this theophany, Jacob's need is met in concrete, and at the deepest level.

III. Narratives peculiar to E.


It seems certain that beneath the polished surface of this the most finished of all the Elohist patriarchal narratives, there lies a whole series of earlier strata. In its primitive original it certainly reflected the etiology of some now-unknown

159)

The name (22:2) is generally held to be a late addition (the purpose of which was to provide a grounding for the Jerusalem cult in the patriarchal traditions):

1. Had in fact been primitively rooted in the patriarchal sagas, it is most unlikely that 2 Chron. 3:1 would have by-passed this ancient theophanic ground in favour of the much more recent theophany to David at the threshing-floor of Ornon, (2 Sam. 24:16-25).

2. It is unlikely that the district would have taken its name from the mountain, and that the mountain itself should then be referred to in such general terms, of the

3. The present order of the text implies that an original definition of the location of the cultic place, promised in v. 2 (בֵּית אָבִּיחַ) and assumed in vv. 3, 9 (לַחַיְם לֵית), once stood between v. 2 and 3. This definition was omitted, presumably because of its incompatibility with the subsequent identification with Moriah.

Various attempts have accordingly been made to restore the original ref. of the passage:

Skinner mentions the Samaritan tradition which associates the legend with Shechem, cf. the at Shechem, Gen. 12:6. Other ancient versions seem to have read (אֵל הָאָרֶץ) and assumed in vv. 3, 9. Gunkel argues from three related word assonances in the passage to an original , a town near Tekoa referred to in 2 Chron. 20:16. A. Alt suggests Name (The God of the Fathers, p. 43, note 151). Dillmann and others have suggested (claiming support from the Syriaco). Skinner and v. Rad favour this suggestion: would be a natural designation for Palestine in E.

One is tempted to wonder whether in this context had not been a surviving trace of ancient usage denoting the ancestral (Mesopotamian) home from which Abraham derived. would then in the dimly-remembered past, perhaps have belonged to the same context as and the mystic mountain of the far North.
shrine 160) where animal sacrifices had been substituted for child sacrifices 161). Equally certainly, in its present position its concern is totally different, i.e. to portray Abraham as a man of faith, stubbornly trusting in the integrity of the divine intention (and vindicated at last), even when God was commanding a line of action whose effect would be to annihilate everything that had so far seemed to be the fruit of that divine intention 162).

The characteristics which we have learned to associate with Elohist theophany-descriptions are well represented in the form of this narrative:—
v. 3. גְּפֶנֶּה ... דָּרָק implies that the revelation was given by night, presumably in the form of a dream; the revelation is conceived in dialogue form (vv. 1-2); and again the angel calling from heaven (v. 11) is identical with God Himself (v. 12 'You have not withheld ... from Me.' But the prime interest of the passage is in the new reflective, evaluating light which it brings to play upon the account of theophany. The keynote for the whole is struck in the phrase לַחֲכָלָיוֹן בַּסַּאֲרָה-אַבְרָהָם (v. 1), which serves the dual purpose of directing attention away from the primitive child-

160) For the cultic orientation of the passage, cf. v. 4: מְקוֹם = the (well-known) cultic place.

161) Child sacrifice became an urgent problem in Israel for a comparatively short period, i.e. 8-7th Cent., under the influence of alliances with pagan neighbour-states. But at an earlier period the offering of the first-born may well have been practised as part of the common Semitic heritage, until animal-sacrifices were substituted.

162) v. Rad; in its present setting, the passage "Describes an event that took place in the sacred history which began with Abraham's call, and whose enigmatic quality is qualified only by this realm." (Genesis, p. 239).
sacrifice motif by stating at the outset that such a sacrifice was not in fact the divine intention, and on the other hand pointing out that the revelational content of theophany may be different from what it appears superficially to be.

Commentators have remarked on the reticence of the legend to comment on the mental states of the participants. One could assume that in the original purpose of the story the question of 'mental state' was not urgent, for at that primitive stage the legitimacy of such child-sacrifices was unquestioningly acknowledged. It is precisely as the material is placed within the context of the patriarchal narrative that the problem becomes acute, for it is the child of promise and heir of the covenant who is thus jeopardised - the tension of the E.-narrative is heightened in this regard by the deliberate juxtaposition of this account with ch. 21, where stress is laid on the miraculous aspect of Isaac's birth (vv. 1-7) and his unique, indispensable place within the Heilsgeschichte. cf. v. Rad: - "the account concerns something much more frightening than child-sacrifice - a road out into God-forsakenness." 163) In this context, then, the need for light on Abraham's mental state becomes imperative, and here the phrase פְּשֵׁת לְעֵילָה (v. 8) becomes peculiarly relevant (whatever its significance in earlier forms of the legend may have been). By itself the sentence would mean, 'God will choose out a lamb for himself', i.e. the stress is on divine sovereignty (cf. the use of הָאָלָה in Gen. 41:33, Dtn. 33:21, I. Sam. 16:1, 17). Or, shifting the emphasis somewhat, the meaning could be, 'God will see about a lamb for himself', i.e. it is His concern, the responsibility

163) v. Rad, Genesis, p. 239.
is His (cf. Gen. 39:23, 2 Chron. 10:16). The sentence as it stands in context is certainly not the expression of a consciously-formulated hope; but neither is it intended as a mere evasion of Isaac's question. Rather it reflects Abraham's inner soliloquy, "God has the sovereign right to choose His sacrifice from wherever He wishes, even if that choice apparently jeopardises the fulfilment of His promises. This command of His seems to me to obliterate everything He led me to hope for; yet I must retain my conviction as to His integrity, and leave the responsibility entirely with Him."

The phraseology of v. 8 is then taken up in v. 14, yet in the transition from v. 8 to v. 14 there is a significant shift of meaning and emphasis: from, 'on the mount of God, He will assume responsibility for what He commands', the stress shifts to 'on the mount of God, He will be seen'. i.e. the accent shifts from 'sovereignty' to 'theophany'. The implications of this juxtaposition of vv. 8 and 14 appear to be twofold:

1. There is an essential connection between theophanic insight, obedience, and prophethood. As Abraham proves himself faithful to (his understanding of) the first theophany (vv. 1-3) a renewed theophany is given to clear the mists of dubiety and misconception arising from the first. In other words, by his obedience Abraham has demonstrated his openness to, and his capacity for receiving, theophanic revelation, and thus his fitness to stand in the line of prophetic figures to whom and through whom God may reveal Himself. For a similar example of the relation between capacity for prophethood and theophanic vision, cf. 2 Kings 2:10.
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2. Theophany is itself the ultimate answer to the ambiguities that arise in the course of revelation (vv. 11-14). It is justifiable to see here a dim foreshadowing of the insight with which the book of Job concludes, i.e. that problems of theodicy etc. find their only answer in the immediate presence of theophany, (Job 42:5-6). Gen. 22:15-18 are generally agreed to be a later addition to 22:1-14 ; they comprise a solemn reaffirmation of the promises, again in the theophanic form. The phrase is most emphatic language, underlining God's inflexible faithfulness to His obedient servant. The effect of the whole is to confirm the above interpretation of vv. 1-14, and to stress the close relationship between obedience, revelation-in-theophany, and capacity to be a bearer of Heilgeschichte.

(ii) Jacob returns to Shechem : Gen. 33:18-20.

Although the passage does not record a theophany, it probably implies one. The purpose of these verses is to strengthen the structure of the Heilgeschichte: as Abraham marked out the promised land with altars at successive sites where the Lord appeared to him (see II (i)), so Jacob's first act on his return to the land of promise after so long an absence is to reaffirm his dependence on the covenant made with his fathers, by erecting an altar that would be symbolic of God's presence at this new stage. The altar, however, is not identified in a merely general way with , but is dedicated specifically to the God of Bethel (Gunkel following Wellhausen, underlines this by reading for and assuming that the stone thus set up is 'naively identified', like the

165) Gunkel, Genesis, p. 333.
stone at Bethel, with the deity held to be residing in it. The passage would then provide an aetiology for the sacred stone at Shechem (Jos. 24:26-7). The suggestion is attractive, but unsupported by any substantial evidence.)

(iii) Jacob's journey from Shechem to Bethel: Gen. 35:1-8.

In its present context this passage serves as a transition, linking Jacob's return from Padan Aram (33:18-20) and his descent into Egypt (46:1-5). At an earlier stage, together with ch. 34, it concerned the (presumed) repulse of certain clans from Shechem c.1360 B.C. 166), and told of the numinous נִינָח which befell their enemies and rescued the tribes from obliteration. Other commentators have seen traces of an ancient ritual pilgrimage from Shechem to Bethel, including a ceremonial purification in the form of the discarding of ornaments. 167)

Several points of interest arise in connection with the theophanic language used here:

1. The transition is once again made by means of theophany: דָּרָשׁ הַלֵּאָלִים (v. 1) is comparatively colourless, but is probably intended to imply a (dream) theophany. The section marks an important stage in the Jacob saga (and hence in the Heilsgeschichte) and the implication is that such an important step was not to be taken on Jacob's own initiative, but in response to a divine directive.

2. The three-fold reference to Jacob's personal experience of God at Bethel

166) See H.H. Rowley, From Joseph to Joshua, pp. 8ff., 113.

167) See below on Judges 2:1-5, p.121ff, also Theophany and Covenant, p.220. of. A. Alt, "Die Wallfahrt von Sichem nach Bethel."
(v. 1, 3, 7) is probably from the Elohist, and demonstrates how crucial the concept of personal encounter was for his understanding of revelation. See further (iv) below.

3. נֵלֵלָה אלֶהֶם (v. 7) is unique in the older sources; if there is any shade of differentiation between נֵלֵלָה and רַחַל, it would be that the former emphasises the objective element of the experience whereas the latter proceeds from the standpoint of the human subject.

(iv) Theophany to Jacob at Beersheba: Gen. 46:1-5.

Some commentators[169] have seen in this section an Elohistic variant to the Isaac-Beersheba narrative in Gen. 26:12-33. It is argued that originally 46:1-5 referred to Isaac, but that in the process of redaction it was utilised to mark the important transition of Jacob's descent into Egypt.[170] Closer and more vital, however, is the parallel between 26:1-5 and 46:1-5. Each records a theophany, and each reiterates the twin promises of land and posterity. But the contrast is also striking: 'Do not go down to Egypt',

[168] For the plural form נֵלֵלָה, see note 105 above.


[170] 46:5 gives the impression that prior to this revelation Jacob had been domiciled in Beersheba. (The E.-narrative which breaks off at 35:20 is consistent with this: it leaves Jacob still en route to the South, after his return from Padan Aram.) The point of the theophanic message אל תירא מרדכי כל ענパイ, is stronger on this assumption. The conflated JE.-narrative, however, which assumes that the descent began from Hebron (37:14), would make the Beersheba incident a pause in the already-begun Southward journey - the patriarch does not wish to leave the promised land without the assurance of divine favour; so he seeks out the Southernmost shrine, hallowed by memories of his father's worship there.
(26:2), cf. 'Do not be afraid to go down to Egypt' (45:3). This illustrates that the revelation conveyed in the theophanies is not a static thing comprising a set of unalterable principles, but rather a concrete and ongoing communion with God requiring successive acts of obedience along a concrete historical line of development.

Once again, in this section specifically Elohist modes of expression come to the fore, giving the impression that here we have an ancient scrap of tradition, which is nevertheless being handled with great freedom. The dialogue (vv. 2-4) is vivid, and somewhat more literary than usual, and the dream aspect is expressed in an unusual and striking turn of phrase:

The phrase אֱלֹהֵי הָאָרֶץ אֲלֹהֵי אָבִיכֶּם is interesting; הָאָרֶץ with the definite article is intended to recall Jacob's fundamental experience of God at Bethel; cf. Gen. 35:1 (לֵאל הָהָרֶשׁ), 35:3 (לֵאל הָהָרֶשׁ אַתָּה), and also 35:7 (לֵאל וַעֲהֹנָה אָתָּה) and 48:15 (הָאָלֹהִים וְרֹדֵעַ אָתָּה). Just as 'the God' (לֵאל) of Bethel was with Jacob going to Aram Naharaim and returning, (28:20-22 and 31:5, 42) so He promises to accompany the sojourner in his descent to Egypt and his return:

Thus the stress is on Jacob's personal experience of God: yet the place of that personal experience within the scope of the Heilsgeschichte is also

171) cf. Gunkel's attractive suggestion of reading לֵאל קָנָה for לֵאל הָאָרֶץ (Genesis, p. 418).

172) The return envisaged is surely that of Jacob's descendants, not of his corpse - 'im Sarge', according to Gunkel, Genesis, p. 419.
underlined, for אלוהים is also equated with אלים (We have noted above that JE. is very conscious at this point that an important transition in the Heilsgeschichte has been reached.)

SUMMARY.

The following summary can claim to describe general tendencies only, rather than invariable and exclusive differentiating features marking J. and E. off from each other. For it is clear that both draw upon a 'gemeinsame Grundlage' of oral tradition, and that in the course of their development each was constantly being influenced by the other. Certain trends are, however, discernible.

1. Specific emphases in Elohistic material.
   a) Whilst E. is younger chronologically than J., on the whole E. preserves the ancient material in the more primitive, 'unworked' form.
   b) E's emphasis is on the visual aspects of the theophanies, whereas J. is more interested in their verbal content.

   (i) The details of a dream-setting are normally carefully noted by E., whereas for J. the mode of contact is a matter of comparative indifference.

   (ii) E's preference for the term נָבָאָלָהֵי הָאֲלוֹהִים has also been frequently noted; by contrast J's use of the term is strikingly sparing. - In the passages which we have assumed to be substantially J.-compositions, the only references to the נָבָאָלָהֵי הָאֲלוֹהִים are 24:7, 40 (יְהוָה ... נָבָאָלָהֵי הָאֲלוֹהִים), where in any case
is depicted in a subordinated role as the instrument of Yahweh's will, not His visible Self, as usually in E. In the older J.-material the only occurrences are in 16:7-11 (where we have in fact suspected Elohistic retouching), and 19:1 (which occurs at a suture of the fabric of the narrative and thus may well be the result of redaction). 173)

This frequent Elohistic use is normally described as an attempt at theological refinement. While this view contains a measure of truth especially where the phrase מִלְּאכָה is added (21:17, 22:11, 15, 28:12); yet it should also be noted that the term forms part of E's preference for the visual as over against the verbal aspects of theophany. 174) This becomes obvious when we remember that the מִלְּאכָה in E. is not a subordinate 'vehicle of revelation', but is conceived as Yahweh's visible Self.

c) Consistent with this 'visual' stress, too, is E's preference for dialogue in theophany. Commentators have remarked 175) that these Elohistic dialogues between God and man are conceived as being the more or less exact counterpart of human conversations, (e.g. 22:1-2 cf. 22:7-8). As such they bear witness to E's unformulated

---

173) The peculiarly non-committal, open use of וְזַח instead of מִלְּאכָה in chs. 18 and 19, and 32:23-33 was probably already a feature of the material as J. inherited it.

174) cf. J. Barr, "Theophany and Anthropomorphism in the O.T.", V.T.S. VII, stresses that the use of מִלְּאכָה can be seen not as a diminution but as an accentuation of the theophanic.

assumption that there exists between God and man a certain affinity of nature which renders such dialogue credible.  

The positive value of this outlook lies in the intensely personalistic conception of revelation which it presupposes. And when this personalistic emphasis is set in relation to that elemental impulse to shuddering awe which the ancient materials re-present, a combination is thereby formed which is pregnant with rich possibilities for theological development. Indeed it may very well be claimed that this is the nexus in which the prophetic element in O.T. faith is nurtured.

d) On the whole E. shows more affinities with the prophetic tradition than does J. This is especially marked, as we have seen, in such passages as Gen. 15:1-6, and Gen. 22, but 'prophetic' nuances can be traced throughout the Elohistic material. The difference from J. at this point, however, is only one of degree; cf. such Yahwistic passages as Gen. 18:17-19 and Gen. 32:23-33. See also the closely related point concerning the emphasis of J. and E. on Heilgeschichte, 3. b) below.

2. Specific emphases in Yahwistic material.

a) J., as we have remarked, stresses the verbal rather than the visual aspects of theophany. Consequently, the speech in his theophanic descriptions tends to lengthen into monologues that extend over two or three verses. Especially is this the case in those sections

176) cf. also the concept of God as יִצְוָא (see note 129 above), and the idea of sacral-covenant meals partaken of together with deity, or at least in the divine presence. (See p. 48 above, on Ex. 24:11.)
which are substantially J.-compositions rather than re-presentations of older material. Most of the monologues are from the divine side (12:1-3, 12:7, 13:14-17, 18:17-19, 26:2-5, 28:13-15) but some are human addresses to God (24:12-14, 32:10-13).

b) It will be seen that this tendency to expansion and monologue is bound up with the theologising, reflective character of the Yahwist's work. (The Elchistic source also evidences deep theological reflection, e.g. Gen. 22; but whereas in E. these instances tend to remain isolated units, in J. the trend is toward collating and systematising on the basis of reflection.) The reflective tendency has presumably been enhanced by the JE. redactor (e.g. Gen. 18:17-19, 26:2-5) and developed still further by subsequent annotators and revisers, (e.g. Gen. 15:13-16). The more "systematic-theological" character of the Yahwist, is evidenced supremely in two factors which we have noted:

c) It was he who was responsible for knitting the bewildering variety of patriarchal (and potentially-patriarchal) tradition which he inherited, into a connected and chronological sequence. This he has done with consummate skill; and, important for our theme, he has made extensive use of theophanies in the process.

d) The Yahwist has also conceived the divine purpose in the Heilsge- schichte as possessing a universalist sweep: כל-משפות הנבואה (12:3) and כל-эрרי ישראל (26:4) are included within the ultimate scope of the covenant blessing. Yahweh's self-revelation is conceived as extending to Pharaoh (12:17), Hagar (16:11-12), and Laban (24:31), whilst the fate of Sodom engages the deep concern both
of Yahweh and of Abraham (18:23-33). (This universalist element is.
this last is a later addition to the text of ch. 22 as we have seen,
and may reflect Yahwistic influence; - but the element is lacking in
those Elohistio passages where the J.-parallel might lead us to look
for it - e.g. 15:5, cf. 12:3 and 46:3-4, cf. 26:14 - and it cannot be
said to be typical of E.)

3. Emphases common to J. and E. Material.

a) Materials from the most varied sources, and of widely differing age,
have been worked into a surprisingly unified and polished whole. It
seems clear that the numinous theophanic element which was present
in the bulk of the material (though in differing ways and with varied
intensity) was one of the main integrating factors in the total
process. 177)

b) Both J. and E. show that their prime concern is with the Heiliges-
schichte. We have noted many examples of how individual texts take
on new significance when set within the Heilgeschichte (see note 86,
v. Rad on J.). J.'s deliberate constructing of a unified framework for
the patriarchal traditions is part of the same emphasis. cf. also

---

177) One of the striking features of both J.- and E.-patriarchal material is the
prominence of the 'God of the Fathers' theme, with its deep concern with
the covenant-promises of land and posterity. What is supremely attrac-
tive about Alt's discussion of the subject (The God of the Fathers), is
his contention that behind the ancient titles of the God of the Fathers
lie specific numinous experiences which were so dynamic in their impact
as to give rise to special cults - cults which persisted beyond the
life-time of their founders and were perpetuated by their descendants.
Thus the 'God of the Fathers'-tradition is in essence a theophanic
tradition.
the recurrent stress on the divine promise of land-inheritance and posterity, common to J. and E.

c) Closely akin to the 'prophetic' emphasis, noted above with particular reference to E., is the stress on the role of the individual as the experient of theophany and the bearer of Heilsgeschichte; of especially Gen. 12:1-4a, Gen. 28:10-22, Gen. 32:23-33, Exe. 3:1-14, etc. This is intimately related to the role of the covenant-mediator in the development of the Sinai-covenant tradition.

d) Both the J. and E. materials stress the connection between theophany and the cultic centres. In the J. material which we have reviewed, there are 18 theophanic references. Of these, 7 are in the older material utilised by J., and 11 in passages substantially J.'s own composition. Of the seven references in the older material only three do not associate the theophany with a sanctuary 178), and in each case there is good reason for the omission: 12:17-18 implies a theophany to Pharaoh, i.e. one who stands outside both the promised land and the patriarchal line; 19:1-28 similarly, describes a theophany to Lot at Sodom; whilst 15:7-18, as we have seen, is assumed by modern scholars to be a saga of nomadic Hebrew origin, and so by definition, without attachment to any particular locality.

(It is worth noting, however, that in the present form of the Pentateuch, even this saga is attached, viz, to the Mamre sanctuary.)

More interesting still is the fact that of the 11 passages classified as

J.-compositions only three of the theophanies are unattached to sanctuaries; and again there are good reasons for the omission: 12:1-3 describes Abraham's call while he was still outside the promised land, in Mesopotamia; 31:3, Jacob is at Haran when called by God to return home; only 13:14-17 is sited in Canaan, and here the context connects the description loosely at least with the sanctuary at Bethel (13:3-4).

J. then has apparently drawn the assumption from his inherited material, that a close connection exists between theophany and sanctuary. In fact he has not only faithfully reproduced this traditional emphasis, but seemingly gone out of his way to reinforce it. For in the absence of specific tradition he has on his own initiative created theophanic links between the patriarchs and specific sanctuaries - e.g. Abraham and Shechem, 12:6-7; Isaac and Beer-lahai-roi, 26:1-5; Jacob and Beersheba, 46:1. In 18:1 we even have an example of traditional material, which was probably unlocalised previously, being attached by J. to a specific sanctuary, i.e. Mamre. We may thus assume that J., whose prime interest lay in plotting the course of the Heilsches, was personally convinced as to the closeness of the relationship between cultic worship and theophany-revelation, and the important bearing which both had on the total process of the Heilsgeschichte.

E's. contribution, by comparison, stands out much less clearly than J's. Of the 11 Elohistic references to theophany, 8 occur in earlier material utilised by E.: and, as in the case of J's. traditional material, all these

179) Assuming a cultic centre at Mahanaim, Gen. 32:4-13.
are related to sanctuaries (except 31:29, which describes a revelation to Laban at Haran; and 20:6-7, a revelation to Abimelech at Gerar). Of the three instances which seem to be substantially E.-compositions, 31:11-13 is set at Haran, i.e. outside the borders of the promised land; and similarly 15:1-6 refers to Abraham's call from Mesopotamia (though in the JE. redaction the passage is linked to the Mamre sanctuary by means of 13:18); thus 33:18-20 is the only passage where the Elohist can be seen to have exercised initiative in using theophanic language to associate a patriarch with a specific sanctuary. (But even here, E. seems to have woven his composition out of shreds of earlier tradition, so that it is impossible to assert dogmatically that the initiative in relating theophany and sanctuary is entirely the Elohist's.)

Post-Mosaic Patriarchal-type theophanies.


Though recent scholarship is more hesitant than the older literary critics in assigning this section of Joshua to a precise literary source, it nevertheless seems clear that 5:13 - 6:27 as a whole belongs to an early stratum closely akin to the older pentateuchal sources.

The figure who appears to Joshua is described as לֹאָלָל (v. 15) — the usage is similar to that in Gen. 18:2ff and Gen. 32:25. It is interesting that the comparable figure who appears in Num. 22:23-31 'with a drawn sword in his hand' also, is there designated מַלְאָךְ הַלֵּוָה. The phrase in

180) Assuming a sanctuary at Mahanaim, Gen. 32:2-3.
Joshua's uninhibited approach to the 'man'; followed then by reverential awe as he realises 'the man's' relationship with the divine. And it is possible that the imagery of the drawn sword (Joshua 5:13) is related to that of the of Exodus 3:2, via some such intermediate link as in Gen. 3:24.

The contrast between Joshua's willingness to undertake the divine commission (Jos. 5) and Moses' reluctance (Ex. 3) perhaps stems from the fact that in the finished structure of the books, Ex. 3 marks the beginning of Moses' leadership (and indeed of the crucial chapter of the Heilsgeschichte), whereas at Jos. 5, Joshua is already aware of, and acquiescent in, his role within the Heilsgeschichte. More important, however, is the function of the theophany at this point:

1. The parallelism with Moses indicates that Joshua is marked out as Moses' God-appointed successor. Further, the occurrence of the theophany here indicates that the drama of redemption begun at Ex. 3:1-6 (where the theophany is a prelude to Exodus-Sinai) is now entering its final chapter (theophany as prelude to land-possession).

2. Just as Horeb-Sinai was holy, as peculiarly the dwelling-place of God on earth (Ex. 3:5), so Canaan has become God's holy mountain, God's . The urgent plea in Ex. 33, that Yahweh go with His people from Sinai onwards has thus been answered. That the declaration is made before Jericho, is connected with the idea of Jericho's being 'devoted', as a special first-fruits-offering to Yahweh, as a token that both the battle
for the land, and the land of Canaan itself, are His.

(ii) The angel of the Lord goes up from Gilgal to Bochim: Judges 2:1-5.

This section, too, is generally held to belong to the older stratum of the material, and perhaps concluded the earlier account of the conquest. It seems probable that Bochim (2:1) is to be identified with Allon-bacuth (Gen. 35:8), and that in fact Gen. 35:1-8 and Jud. 2:1-5 are variant traditions of the one historical event, viz., the annexation of the Bethel shrine for Israelite worship. Not only are the points of departure (Shechem-Gilgal) related and the points of arrival virtually identical (Bethel-Bochim), but both migrations result from incurrence of guilt in relations with the Canaanite peoples (Gen. 34, deception of the Shechemites; Joshua 9:13-15a, treaty with the Gibeonites in contravention of the ban), and both accounts involve repentance (Gen. 35:4, Jud. 2:4) and pledges of renewed devotion to Yahweh (Gen. 35:3, 7, Jud. 2:5). Whatever the precise background of this tradition, it seems certain that the הַנְִלֶּּי of Exodus 23:23 and Ex. 33:1-3a, 14, and closely related to the

181) According to J. M. Myers, (Judges', Interpreter's Bible, 2, p. 679), Jud. 1:1-2:15 represents the earlier, pre-deuteronomic account of the Conquest, and dates perhaps from the tenth Century. It was probably inserted in its present position after the completion of the deuteronomistic Book of Judges. cf. M. Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien, p. 47.

182) cf. the early intermingling of Shechem and Gilgal traditions, noted by H.-J. Kraus, Worship in Israel, p. 153. See also the chapter 'Theophany and Covenant' below, Ps 242.

183) The LXX reading at Jud. 2:1 is: καὶ ἀνέβη ἄγγελος Κυρίου ἀπὸ Γαλγάλ ἐπὶ τὸν κλαυμόμενα καὶ ἐπὶ Βαδιθαλ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἱκετῶν Ἰσραήλ. cf. also the virtual identity in meaning of Bochim (weepers - Jud. 2:1) and Allon-bacuth (oak of weeping - Genesis 35:8).
promise of the accompanying מְדִינַת הָאָרֶץ, which is regarded as identical with Yahweh Himself, (Ex. 34:9-10a). Thus the theological concern of the passage is closely similar to that of Exodus 33, i.e., the concern to guarantee the continued presence-in-theophany of Yahweh amongst Israel, both on the journey from Sinai, and in the new land. 184)

(iii) Theophany to Gideon: Judges 6:11-24 and
(iv) Theophany to Samson’s parents: Judges 13.

The obvious relatedness of these two stories makes it convenient to treat them together. Although Jud. 6:11-24 stands within the Deuteronomic book of Judges, it bears all the marks of earlier material taken over by Dtr., and we may assume that its rise and development were approx. contemporaneous with that of the older pentateuchal source material. Jud. 13 appears to be dependent on Jud. 6: an originally independent Samson cycle, Jud. 14:1-16:31, has been adapted for incorporation into the book of Judges (or its primitive sources) 185) by addition of the theophany in Jud. 13. The editor has sought to whiten over the evident ill-discipline and sensuality of Samson as portrayed in chs. 14-16 by making him a Nazirite. This is achieved by prefacing the cycle with an account of a theophany to his parents (ch. 13). The apologetic strain in ch. 13 is apparent in the three-fold insistence on

184) It is surely significant that Ex. 33:4-6 records the same type of purification ritual in this context as does Gen. 35:2-4.

185) M. Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien, p. 61, inclines to the view that the addition is post-Deuteronomic, but admits that the evidence is slight. Burney, Judges, p. 338f., holds that the cycle was originally inserted in the early source, removed as inappropriate (by Dtr.?), then reinstated at a later date because of pressure from popular attachment to the cycle.
Samson's being a Nazirite from birth (Jud. 13:3-5; 13:7; 13:12-14), and the literary form of the theophany has presumably been influenced by the need for this three-fold reiteration.

A comparison of the relevant theophany-accounts reveals a detailed correspondence between Jud. 6 and Jud. 13, and of both with Ex. 3, as well as points of contact with several other patriarchal-type theophanies which we surveyed earlier:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jud. 6</th>
<th>Jud. 13</th>
<th>Ex. 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>דֶּרֶךְ אלֶפֶּר מלאך יְהוָ֥ה</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>רֹדְרֵיהת רֶּפֶלֶדֶת בן</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>יְהוָ֣ה...כַּל-כְּפָלַ֣תָיו</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>אָלָּהֶת אָבוֹת</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>שָׂרָם</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>רוֹדְרֵּֽפֶּת אֲתֵי-יִשְׂרָאֶ֣ל</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>שֵּׁלָח</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>מֵתֶרְפִים והָעֹלָבְרֵי יִהוָ֣ה</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>רֵטִיקנס</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>יָדְּיהָ עַמִּ֝</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>יָד</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>&quot;Do not depart&quot;</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>רִיבִּים...רֵ֔ז</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>מָגָה</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19,23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>הֶזְדָּר (rock-altar)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>לַמְּנָה זֶז חָשָׂאֵל לְשֵׁנִי</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gen. 32:30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a) The original theophany may have served as an aetiology of the rock-altar at Ophrah, and so have preserved the tradition of a local numen (cf. Ex. 3, Gen. 28:1 iff.) - Jud. 13 on the other hand, takes place in the open field (v. 9), and no specific location is named. The 'rock' (13:19) is therefore a detail probably borrowed from Jud. 6. -

b) As in the Elohist patriarchal narratives, so here the angel is virtually identical with Yahweh. Even if the occurrence of the name Yahweh in vv. 14, 16 is the result of later re-touching (LXX has ἀγγελος Κυριου) the fear (v. 22) shown at the sight of the angel points to a practical identification of the angel with God. Similarly in Jud. 13:22 possibly denotes 'divine being' rather than 'Godhead' in the full sense, but the fear of death expressed implies a specific encounter with deity. This impression is strengthened by the use of the phrase (13:18), which in Gen. 32:30 is an important factor in identifying the assailant as being in fact Yahweh.

c) Commentators have noted here a progressive 'refinement' in the description of the theophanic setting: - Gen. 18:8 describes the visitants as

186) Jud. 6:23-4 is probably a later insertion. For the naming of the altar cf. ἀγαλματις του θεου (Gen. 22:14), etc.

187) Burney, Judges, p. 36.
partaking of a meal;

Jud. 6:18-21: what begins as a meal becomes in fact an offering;

Jud. 13: the offer of a meal is deliberately rejected in favour of a sacrifice.

d) The difference in setting between Ex. 3 and Jud. 6:11-24 makes the similarities between them all the more impressive. Thus, remembering the strong bond which we traced above as existing also between Ex. 3:1ff. and Jos. 5:13-15, the conclusion seems inescapable that this early material has been so arranged as to present a succession of theophanically inspired and commissioned leaders: Moses, Joshua, Gideon, (Samson), and, we may add, Samuel. 188 It surely cannot be fortuitous that the promise יְהִי נִמְנָךְ is given to each of these men in turn. (It is implicit in the account of the theophany to Joshua: the angel's reply to Joshua's question is equivalent to an יְהִי נִמְנָךְ 189)

e) On the other hand there is in Jud. 6 a half-expressed feeling that the Heilstaten of the past already form a definitive deposit of revelation (6:13); an impression which we have already noted on occasion in J. These indications no doubt form the first beginnings of a trend which emerges in more developed and coherent form in the 'thou shalt remember' stress in Deuteronomy. Of. also Ps. 78:3, Ps. 44:2 (post-exilic).

188) The clarity of the pattern has been somewhat obscured by the intrusion of large blocks of later material in Joshua 10-24 and Judges 17-21. David and Solomon may also be added to the list of theophanically inspired and commissioned leaders.

189) Interestingly, the Deuteronomist has reinforced the verbal correspondence by adding a specific יְהִי נִמְנָךְ in Joshua's case (Joshua 1:5), but in the context of extended theologised speech, not of theophany.
Theophany to David at the Threshing-floor of Araunah: 2 Sam. 24:10-25.

The material of this section is again early, although in its present position it forms part of an addendum (i.e. 2 Sam. 21-24) attached to 2 Sam. subsequently to the separation of 2 Samuel and 1 Kings. Its purpose is to show that the divinely chosen site of the Jerusalem Temple was revealed in theophany. The assertion that 'Yahweh incited David against Israel' (2 Sam. 24:1) stresses the element of essential mystery and incomprehensibility permeating the whole incident. The phrase כהה קלח (v. 1) may be intended simply as a description of David's interior thought-processes, the results of which he ascribed to Yahweh; but the pervading stress on the incomprehensibility of the incident, and the theophanic context, seem to imply that a divine word of incitement came to David directly in an audition or mediated through a prophet. (The fact that Joab, who is hardly noted for his spiritual sensitivity in other contexts, opposes the census (vv. 3-4)

190) O. Eissfeldt (Die Komposition der Samuelisbücher), p. 52ff., suggests that 2 Sam. 24 and 2 Sam. 21:1-14 were companion pieces prior to their forming part of this addendum (i.e., 2 Samuel 21-24); and that, since 2 Samuel 21:1-14 originally stood before 2 Samuel 9, 2 Sam. 24 will have stood immediately after 2 Samuel 9. The reason why the passage was transposed to its present position, Eissfeldt suggests, was in order to create thereby a sequence: 'rebellion' (2 Sam. 13-18), 'famine' (2 Sam. 21:1-14), and 'plague' (2 Sam. 24), and this sequence was then viewed as the three-fold divine punishment on David for his sin against Uriah the Hittite. (cf. the three-fold choice of punishment offered to David in 2 Sam. 24:13). Subsequent editing, however, inserted 2 Sam. 22 and 23, in order to throw 2 Sam. 24 into relief for a different theological purpose, i.e., to serve as an etiology for the choosing and purchase of the Jerusalem Temple site. Thus the passage becomes a sanctuary theophany.

(R. E. Clements, God and Temple, p. 61, suggests that the site was already a shrine in pre-Davidic times, and that Araunah originated in the primitive cult-legend, as the founder of this ancient Jebusite sanctuary.)
makes David's 'obtuseness' the more inexplicable.) In addition to its primary function as foundation-theophany of the temple, then, the tradition presents the following motifs relevant to our discussion:

1. Theologically, the passage raises the issue of theodicy in an acute form; - the alteration made by the Chronicler (1 Chron. 21:1) witnesses to the difficulties that later generations found with the text. We may say, in fact, that 2 Sam. 24:10-25 represents the zenith of that process (discernible in Gen. 32:23-33), whereby every numinous experience is subsumed under the Name and character of Yahweh: - after the watershed is passed, the reflective element increasingly moulds the understanding of the theophanic (cf. the book of Job), and a redifferentiation of the various aspects of the numinous develops. (A qualification needs to be added from the literary point of view, however: there are signs that the census-narrative has been deflected from its original intention, to serve as the basis for the new theophany-aetiology - the census is throughout all Israel (vv. 2, 9), yet the theophany-threat concerns Jerusalem alone. The 'incomprehensibility' may be due in part to this adaptation of sources.)

191) Is David's action to be attributed to 'hubris'? - cf. 2 Kings 20:16-19. But if so, it is strange that the later Priestly legislation legitimises David's action by providing for the taking of the census (Ex. 30:12) - though admittedly hedging it round with precautionary measures.

192) Further unevennesses are apparent in the record: - David's spontaneous repentance prior to judgment (v. 10) v. David's repentance at the sight of the slaughter (v. 17); - The Lord repents of the evil before Jerusalem is attacked (v. 16) v. the Lord heeded the supplications offered at the new altar (v. 25); - The angel is stayed (v. 16) v. the angel still smites (v. 17).

Taken cumulatively, these minor discrepancies point to some redactional process having been carried out on the material.
2. David, faced with the choice between defeat, famine and pestilence, chooses the last, on the grounds that pestilence most directly involves the action of Yahweh (v. 14). (The version in 1 Chron. 21 heightens this by contrasting specifically רות ויהוה - v. 12). See below, the section on Yahweh's weapons in the psalm theophanies, where pestilence features as a divine weapon, p. 139f.

3. The concept of the destroying angel is undoubtedly ancient, cf. its role in the Passover legend, Ex. 12 - a passage which became attached to the Sinai theophany tradition at an early period. The provisions of Ex. 12:22 specifically preclude the possibility of men seeing the destroyer, cf. here it is only a very fleeting reference that alludes to David's vision of the angel. (In 1 Chron. 21, however, the angel figures much more prominently as the mediator of revelation and destruction, and appears not only to David but to Ornon also.)

4. Theophany and prophetic word (vv. 18-19) combine in this section - a feature which emerges here for the first time. The passage falls at a point of transition, where the theophanic emphasis begins to be replaced by the prophecy-fulfilment pattern which v.Rad has shown to be so characteristic of the Deuteronomist,193) and which has such a formative role in the process of canon-formation.


These theophanies are interesting in that, though their basic tradition

193) v.Rad, Studies in Deuteronomy, pp. 78ff.
is undoubtedly old, yet their present form and setting show traces of the
Deuteronomist's work. Like the preceding passage, these texts are concerned
with the founding of the Jerusalem sanctuary. Dtr. then, for whom the temple
was of prime importance, has asserted the supremacy of this sanctuary par
excellence precisely in theophanic terms. Thus the thread of continuity
running through all the sanctuary-theophany material so far considered,
finally leads to the theophany of Yahweh at the founding of the Jerusalem
Temple.  

1. The suggestion made in 2 Chron. 1:3-4, that Solomon experienced this
theophany at the Mosaic tabernacle, is most unlikely to have any historical
foundation. Rather, 1 Kings 3:2-3 notes specifically that in the period
before the temple was built, both Solomon and the people worshipped at the
вал; and this is regarded as a point to their discredit, yet at the same
time an action which could be condoned in the historical circumstances.
Could Dtr. conceivably have passed such a judgment if the shrine at Gibeon
were in fact the site of the authentic Mosaic tabernacle?  

2. The dream-aspect of the theophany is reminiscent of the Elohistic
patriarchal theophanies. Here Solomon follows up the dream by presenting
himself in Jerusalem,  ולעב יא רחל בריה קדש. Thus it is implied

194) According to M. Noth, Überlieferungs geschichtliche Studien, p. 67f.,
the theophany-account in 1 Kings 3:5-15 was originally a local Gibeon-
sanctuary tradition, which Dtr. then adapted to the peculiar
deuteronomistic theological outlook by: -
  a) making the efficacy of the divine promise conditional upon
     obedience, (3:14), and
  b) transferring the site of Solomon's votive sacrifice from Gibeon
to the central shrine at Jerusalem (3:15a).
that henceforth the new temple is to be the place of meeting with Yahweh; and this, it would seem, is also the main point\textsuperscript{195} of the theophany narrative in 1 Kings 9:1-9. He whom Solomon sought at Gibeon (v. 2) is now to be sought on Zion. From this point of view, then, we are justified in placing 2 Sam. 24, 1 Kings 3:5-15 and 1 Kings 9:1-9 together as the final point of the patriarchal theophany narratives. It is significant that Solomon's is the last theophany experienced by a 'civil' leader in Israel: henceforth revelation is preeminently through the prophets.

The further out-working of the (Sinai) theophany-tradition in the pre-exilic literature.

Jürg Jeremias\textsuperscript{196} treats these theophany-passages as belonging to a formal Gattung, the prototype of which was a short two-member unit describing:

\begin{itemize}
  \item [a)] the advent of Yahweh from his place, for his people's help,
  \item [b)] the tumult of nature at his appearing.
\end{itemize}

He finds the primitive Sitz im Leben of the Gattung not in the Sinai-theophany and its cultic re-presentation, but in a prophetic victory-song celebrating Yahweh's saving intervention in battle. Jeremias concedes that the first member (a) of the unit must relate indirectly to the Sinai

\textsuperscript{195} of. M. Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien, p. 70f., notes that there are two judgments on Solomon's reign inherent in Dtr.'s material, one positive and the other negative. Dtr. has presented both traditions, setting them side by side, and introducing each with a theophany. Thus, in addition to the purpose noted above, (i.e. to exalt the status of the central sanctuary), 1 Kings 9:1-9 is also introduced in order to stress the dangers attendant upon apostasy, and so preface the negative traditions concerning Solomon's reign.

\textsuperscript{196} J. Jeremias, Theophanie, p. 9f.
tradition (since there are no real parallels from Israel's environment), but he also finds differences which preclude the possibility of direct dependence. The second member, on the other hand, derives from Israel's environment - though he does acknowledge that "diese Übernahme nicht ganz unvorbereitet geschah"; for the God-of-the-Fathers tradition, antedating the texts we are concerned with, already knew the might of God and the numinous fear it induced; and this same numinous fear was reflected for later generations in the Sinai tradition. These elements in the Yahweh tradition, then, formed a basis for the borrowings from Israel's environment, whereby the numinous side of Yahweh's nature was portrayed in richer detail. \(^{197}\)

Jeremias' careful analysis and classification of the material certainly brings to light several points of real significance:

a) the concept of Sinai as Yahweh's (earthly) abode is very ancient,

b) the wide importance of the concept of "nature's trembling before Yahweh" in the pre-exilic literature,

c) the strength of the theophany-tradition, evidenced by its persistence into late exilic times even though (according to Jeremias) it has already become loosed from its "Gattung" \(^{198}\) by the Davidic era.

\(^{197}\) J. Jeremias, Theophanie, p. 152.

\(^{198}\) In view of the notorious difficulty experienced in setting a precise date to most of the material involved, it would seem that Jeremias' structure is more rigid than the data warrants. P. S. Childs, Isaiah the Assyrian Crisis, p. 49, queries the propriety of speaking of a "theophany-form". It would seem to him more likely that there is a theophany tradition, "which very early accommodated itself to different forms". Childs offers examples of the wide variety of forms in which the theophany tradition occurs.
Jeremias' approach, however, in spite of his conceding a preparatory role to 'Sinai', has the unfortunate effect of obscuring the central importance of the Sinai-theophany tradition for the development of Israel's faith. The following analyses therefore, while accepting the principle that Canaanite borrowings have greatly influenced the development of Israelite theophanic tradition, nevertheless seek to redress the balance by suggesting a rationale of the way in which this extra-Israelite material was able to crystallise around the Sinaitic core-theophany, without usurping its primacy.

A. The Abode of Yahweh.

We have noted the twin strands in the oldest Sinai tradition:

a) Yahweh's abode is on Sinai (E) - Ex. 19:17, 19.

b) Yahweh comes down on Sinai (J) - Ex. 19:11, 18, 20; Ex. 34:4-5.

Both these lines are developed in the pre-exilic literature:

a) Jud. 5:5; Dtn. 33:1-5; Ps. 68:18; Hab. 3:3.

199) Burney, Judges, p. 113, treats the phrase as a gloss, meaning, "i.e., 'Sinai'". Most modern commentators, however, interpret it to mean 'Lord of Sinai' (cf. Arabic dhū'), and this seems preferable. Thus it is implied either that a) Yahweh's connection with Sinai at the time of the Exodus was not incidental but already of ancient standing, or b) the Sinai-event was so definitive for Israel's knowledge of Yahweh that the locus of the event naturally incorporated itself into Yahweh's essential title: Yahweh must forever be 'He of Sinai'. cf. also the use of the phrase in Ps. 68:9.

200) Burney, Judges, p. 110, reads שֶׁלֶק הַבָּרוֹנָ工程机械 (following Dillmann). Wellhausen had suggested the reading 'came from Sinai to Meribah Kadesh'. The Dillmann-Burney reading would locate Sinai in the region of Kadesh; cf. note 52 above.

201) MT. reads קַדְשִׁי בֵּין סֵינָאִי, which Weiser translates: "The Lord is with them, Sinai is in the holy place." The RSV. emends the text: קַדְשִׁי בֵּין סֵינָאִי. The emendation seems unnecessary.
We have noted above the strong concern expressed in the early accretions to the core Sinai tradition (i.e. in Ex. 32+3) for a firm guarantee of the continuing theophanic presence of Yahweh with his people in their ongoing journey and subsequent settlement, and in the developing cult within the land of Canaan. One form of this guarantee is the assurance that Yahweh has transferred His abode from Sinai to Canaan, so that Canaan as a whole (and its Yahwistic sanctuaries in particular), becomes the mountain of Yahweh, (Ex. 15:17, etc.)\(^2\). During the monarchic period the concept of God's dwelling on Mount Zion and in the Jerusalem Temple assumes increasing importance; i.e., God has transferred from Sinai to Zion, (Ps. 68:16f.), or from heaven to Zion, (Ps. 93: - הניהם יוהנה , v. 4; cf. ליבתך קדש - קדש יוהנה , v. 5; Ps. 20: - עזרון משמי קדש , v. 7; cf. - שלח , v. 3). The same pattern is implicit in Pss. 96 - 99.

Obviously, then, there is a certain ambivalence latent in the concept: both Sinai and heaven are regarded as the original abode of God, and He who continues to dwell in this original abode has nevertheless also descended to make Zion His home. It is impressive that no sense of incongruity is evidenced by the psalmists in presenting this double-stranded

\(^{202}\) נלוכל (v. 7) correspondingly has the meaning ('heavenly) palace'.

\(^{203}\) cf. the remarks on p.120f., re the theophany to Joshua before Jericho.
B. Fire and Lightning.

These terms are indigenous to the Sinai theophany, and in view of their central place in the early pentateuchal tradition, it is reasonable to assume that it was from the primitive Sinai tradition that they entered the other pre-exilic literature, and became the nucleus around which a more varied fire-light imagery was built up. (This is not to deny that a large proportion of the material so added, was in fact of Canaanite origin; but we would maintain that this material was integrated into Yahwism in such a way as to enrich but not deflect the stream of Sinai tradition.)

The first extension of the וק-imagery is into the 'plague-narrative' (Ex. 9:23): the proximity of נָחַלֶּה (Ex. 9:23, 28, 29, 33, 34) would support the assumption that we have here an intrusion of the Sinai-theophany motif into the Exodus prelude, 205) (though Jeremias 206 rightly reminds us that the equation of thunder with the Voice of deity is not unique to Israel). וק as symbolic of the divine anger is intimately related to the Sinai

204) This latent ambivalence is later worked out with precision in the Deuteronomic doctrine of the temple as the earthly shrine of the divine וֹ, Yahweh Himself dwelling in heaven. Thus the Deuteronomic doctrine was not an absolutely new departure, but had its roots far back in the past. cf. the remarks of v. Rad, Studies in Deuteronomy, p. 38: - "What is decidedly new is the assumption of a constant and almost material presence of the Name at the shrine ... not Yahweh himself ... but only his name, as the guarantee of his will to save."

205) The plague-narrative is probably a secondary attachment to the Passover-narrative, but still very early, probably pre-J. See McNoth, Exodus, p. 69.

206) J. Jeremias, Theophanie, p. 89.
a) God's coming at Sinai is to vindicate and confirm his election of Israel. This vindication flows over into wrath against those who oppose His purpose, and the wrath is symbolised by images taken from the heart of the Sinai-phenomenon itself. We have noted above the וק of the plague-narrative, expressing Yahweh's wrath against Egyptian opposition: so by extension, Ps. 18:9; Is. 30:27; Ps. 97:3.

b) By further extension, וק is made to symbolise God's vindication of His holiness even against His own recalcitrant people, (cf. Ps. 50:3). We should note also the close proximity of the idea of 'divine fire of anger' to that of Yahweh's 'breaking forth' in fire on the presumptuous who dared to infringe the bounds of the theophany-site (Ex. 19:21-22). Since this concept of bounds is generally acknowledged to be a primitive element in the J. tradition, it is reasonable to conclude that the use of וק in relation to 'wrath' has at least one of its roots here.

The symbolism of 'fire melting wax' (Micah 1:4, Nah. 1:5-6) is sufficiently mundane not to require any extra-Israelite origin. Its point of contact or attachment could well be in the לא -motive to which we have already referred. cf. Micah 1:3-4: 

הוֹרָה צַנָּה מַכְּכֹר רַבּ הָӘָרַץ עַל-כְּבָרָה תָּאָרץ

(sequential) (cf. Ex. 19:18, with its similar description of the mountain's smoking at Yahweh's descent.) Interestingly, Nah. 1:5-6 links the 'melting' with the 'fire of anger' which we have just referred to.

---

207) cf. Jürg Jeremiaes, Theophanie, p. 108: "Diese Deutung des Feuers" (i.e. 'Vermuthung seines brennenden Zornes') "kann unmöglich aus der Sinaitradition stammen, nach der doch Jahwe zum Heilshandeln an seinem Volke kommt."
The various phrases referring to 'flame of fire' (שֶׁנֶּק לְהָבָלִים etc.) are probably rooted in Ex. 3:1-14 - a passage which, as we have seen, has influenced the development of other patriarchal-type theophany-narratives, as well as becoming intimately associated with the Sinai-tradition proper. cf. Deut. 33:2, Ps. 29:7, Ps. 104:14.

'Coals of fire' (שֶׁנֶּק לְהָבָלִים Ps. 18:9, 13; cf. שֶׁנֶּק לְהָבָלִים Ps. 11:6) are acknowledged by Jeremias to be directly connected with the phenomena of volcanic eruption. If not a primitive term of the core Sinai description, then, it is nevertheless probable that the imagery was attracted to the volcanic language of that core tradition. Once the term was established in the Sinai-tradition, the use of שֶׁנֶּק לְהָבָלִים on the sacrificial altar would facilitate a spread in the application of Sinaitic imagery; e.g. Is. 6:6, cf. Lev. 16:12 - late (P), but probably reflects earlier usage.

Torches (תְּמוֹר), in the context of Ex. 20:18, refer to the Sinaitic lightning. cf. Gen. 15:17 (J): we have noted already that the

208) MT. תאריש נים emended: - הַדָּק, שֶׁנֶּק לְהָבָלִים S.R.Driver.
209) The text is uncertain, but proposed emendations do not affect the phrase we are considering.
210) Reading שֶׁנֶּק לְהָבָלִים, following C, (πυρος φλέγω).
211) Jürg Jeremias, Theophanie, p. 37.
212) cf. Mauchline, Isaiah, (Torches), ad loc.
213) The variations in the LXX text may indicate that this is a later intrusion into the context.
language of Gen. 15 seems to have been made deliberately to reflect the
imagery of Sinai proper, thus underscoring the essential oneness of Abrahamic
and Sinaitic covenants. H.P. Müller\textsuperscript{214}) suggests that the reference to
trumpets and torches in Jud. 7:15ff. and related passages may reflect a re-
presentation of the Sinai-theophany in the amphictyonic cult, arising out of
concrete situations wherein the presence and power of the Lord of Sinai was
invoked in battle.\textsuperscript{215}) This suggestion if accepted would point, then, to a
mutual influence between Sinai-theophany and cult: the Sinai event set the
pattern for the cultic re-enactment, while the re-enactment in turn influ-
enced the terminology of the Sinai tradition.\textsuperscript{216})

Lightning (םילא) belongs to the core of the Sinai-(storm)-theophany
tradition, (Ex. 19:16). Yet it is clear that the term has very early become
the attachment-point for secondary additions; for מים in the pre-exilic
literature are almost invariably conceived as Yahweh's weapons.\textsuperscript{217}) (The


\textsuperscript{215}) Jeremia\textsuperscript{3} disagrees with Müller's arguments, and proposes that the
influence was from Holy War, to the Sinai tradition, and not vice
versa. \textit{Theophanie}, p. 148, n. 3.

\textsuperscript{216}) Nowinckel, \textit{The Psalms in Israel's Worship}, finds a probable allusion
to a torch-light procession in connection with the cult, in Ps. 118:27
(\textit{op. cit.} I., p. 120). But these are
probably later features (\textit{op. cit.}, I., p. 131), whereas the מים seem to have entered the Sinai tradition at an early stage.

\textsuperscript{217}) For Ugaritic parallels, see: -
G. R. Driver, \textit{Canaanite Myths and Legends}, p. 97, (Baal II v 9); p. 87
(Baal V iii 41), where Baal-Hadad appears as the wielder of lightning;
J. B. Pritchard, \textit{Ancient Near Eastern Pictures}, plate 490;
J. Jeremias, \textit{Theophanie}, p. 86f.
only exception being in Ps. 97:4, which in its finished form at least, is considered to be comparatively late). י獅 are equated with כז 18
in: Ps. 18:15 = 2 Sam. 22:15; = Ps. 144:6; Hab. 3:11; Ps. 77:19.

The concept of the forces of nature as Yahweh's weapons is obviously early, cf. its entry into the 'plague-narrative', Ex. 9:13-35 (see p. 134 above), where כז מלח ; בְּרֵד 219) 220) are instruments of Yahweh's power and purpose. Jeremias 221) is probably correct in his suggestion that the overall imagery and terminology has roots in the primitive Chaos-Conflict myth as reflected in Enuma elis: our concern is to locate the point at which this material became attached to the 'Sinaitic' core. The following primitive aspects of the Sinai tradition are worthy of consideration in this regard:-

a) Yahweh's vindication of His oppressed people, which is integral to the whole concept of Sinai covenant-election, implies that His wrath is turned against those who oppose His covenant-purpose; - 'wrath' and 'weapons' are clearly proximate ideas here.

218) נֶפֶל (spear, Hab. 3:11), וְצֵכֶר (staff, Hab. 3:14) and נֶשֶׂפ (bow, Hab. 3:9, Ps. 7:13) as Yahweh's weapons are of minor importance: they may be explained in a way similar to the terms already discussed.

219) The phrase כִּימָקָם לכלש (late: Ps. 135:7, Jer. 10:13, Jer. 51:16) presumably pictures the lightning as a sharp instrument piercing the waterskins of the clouds, and so releasing the rain. It is perhaps derivative from the idea of lightning as a weapon. For further discussion of 'rain', see below, p. 152.


221) J. Jeremias, op. cit., pp. 33, 91f., 146.
b) Yahweh's vindication of His own holiness results in His breaking out in fire on the presumptuous, (Ex. 19:21-22)\(^{222}\); an idea which is also close to that of 'weapons'.

Once the concept of 'Yahweh's weapons' (initially 'lightning' and 'thunder') had attached itself to the core Sinai tradition, the broadening of the range of imagery to include 'hail' and 'rain' is readily understandable.

'Pestilence' as a divine weapon also appears first in the early additions to the Sinai-core; the general term יָשִׁיר occurs in the plague-narrative (Ex. 8:2), in the Passover-narrative (Ex. 12:23), and the sequel to the apostasy of the golden calf (Ex. 32:35 – this latter being an addition to the E.-narrative). יָשִׁיר occurs in the plague-narrative, Ex. 9:1-7 (in a passage which M. Noth\(^{223}\) regards as a secondary addition to J.); Num. 14:12 (J), where Yahweh threatens punishment for Israel's covenant-rejection; and then in 2 Sam. 24:13, Amos 4:10, Ps. 78:50, Hab. 3:5. יָשִׁיר\(^{224}\) according

222) The passage is secondary to the core of the J.-record, but still very early.

223) M. Noth, Exodus, p. 79.

224) In the Keret-Epic, Resheph is named as one of the gods (Keret III 11 6), who is presumably responsible for death-dealing pestilence (Keret I 19), - G. R. Driver, Canaanite Myths and Legends, pp. 37, 29. See also J. Gray, The Legacy of Canaan, pp. 96, 202.

J. Jeremias, _op. cit._, p. 46ff., cites Syrian and Egyptian evidence for Resheph as the god or daemon of war and/or lightning; and Ugaritic evidence for his function as guardian of the threshold of the sun (Ug. Text 143:3f.). He suggests that in their most primitive role within Yahwism, Plague and Pestilence were daemons subservient to Yahweh, whence they became depersonalised, as weapons in Yahweh's hand. The title 'Lord of the arrow' applied to Reshef in one Ugaritic text (J. Gray, The Canaanites, p. 123) may have suggested this depersonalised function for reshef.
to BDB. means basically 'flame, fire-bolt', and thence, derivatively, 'Yahweh's fire bolt bringing pestilence and death'. This being so it is easy to envisage how the term could become attached to the Sinai theophany tradition via the concept of וְהָנֵא ; כִּנְגָּר , as divine weapons. Examples of usage: Ps. 76:4, Ps. 78:48, Dtn. 32:24, Hab. 3:5.

The term יִנְגָּר 225) as Yahweh's 'instrument', so characteristic of the Deuteronomest and Second-Isaiah, has its roots in the Exodus narrative rather than that of Sinai proper, but occurs also in contexts where the Reed-Sea crossing is described in theophanic language dependent on the Sinai tradition: - Ps. 77:15, Dtn. 33:2, 26-7; Isaiah 30:30; Dtn. 4:33-36.

Several advanced developments of the fire-lightning motif remain to be noted: - יִנְגָּר is generally held to be a 'comparatively late decoration to the theophany' 226) - and it is to be admitted that Persian thought-forms 227) and imagery influenced the language of developing apocalyptic (into which theophany tended to merge) in the post-exilic period. But there are also passages from 8th-7th Cent., connecting יִנְגָּר with the traditional Sinai-type theophanic circle of concepts. As with וְהָנֵא, the usage indicates Yahweh's activity in vindication of his purposes: on the one hand intervention on his people's behalf (Is. 9:1), and on the other the silent inevitability of judgment against a recalcitrant Israel (Is. 18:4, Hos. 6:5).

225) For the place of יִנְגָּר within the general anthropomorphic language of the O.T., cf. F. Michaeli, Dieu à l'Image de l'Homme, p. 20.
227) Pax, Epiphaneia, p. 141.
cf. also Hab. 3:11 (יהי in relation to מִשְׁמַר as a divine weapon), Hab. 3:4 (a clear reflection of Sinai), Ps. 78:14 (יהי in specific reference to the Sinai storm-theophany).

In addition to these Sinai-affiliations, however, there is a strand running through: - Is. 2:5, Ps. 89:16, Ps. 80:4, Ps. 4:7, Ps. 104:12, in which יהי appears as more nearly an extension of the patriarchal-type theophanies than of the Sinai type. The coming of Yahweh brings the light of a new dawn, 228) His face will be seen, and His form resplendent in light.229)

230) (shine) exhibits the same double thread: Dtn. 33:2 represents a mellowing of the Sinai-tradition, in that joy rather than awesomeness emerges as the keynote of the theophany; whereas in Ps. 80:2 יהי relates to an expectation of a 'theophany' of the מִשְׁמַר (v. 4).

Ps. 50:2 also stands close to Sinai, but the stress is on the judgment of covenant-breakers within Israel. 230) Ps. 94:1 (usually regarded as late). יהי. The developed doctrine of the יהי יהלום belongs to the post-exilic period; but as v. rad points out, the Priestly יהלום-theology

228) cf. also יהי , Dtn. 33:2, Mal. 3:20 (4:2).

229) Pax, Epiphania, p. 139, has a certain justification, though he overstates his case, when he stresses the ambivalence of Light-Fire symbolism in O.T. theophanies: "Das Feuer repräsentiert die dunkle Seite, die sich übermächtig-erschreckend und unheilvoll auswirkt, das Licht aber die helle Seite Jahwes."

230) S. Nowinckel, The Psalms in Israel's Worship, I, p. 131, traces a connection between the light-motif of the theophany and the fire-light symbolism of the rejuvenation rituals carried out throughout the Ancient Near East, and subsequently incorporated into the Israelite Autumnal Festival. cf. notes 216 and 226 above, on the relatively late emergence of light-symbolism in O.T. theophany tradition.
is not an absolute innovation, 'but only the reintroduction ... of a very old sacral tradition.'

Gathering together the allusions to the כבֹּלֶל יהוה as they appear in theophanic contexts in Is. 6:1-8, Ezek. 1:14-14, Ex. 40:34-8, we see that in effect all the wealth of Sinai-theophany terminology is here utilised to the full: - שָׁם (Ex. 40:34); בְּרֵכֵיעוֹנָה (Ezek. 1:13); מַעֲרָר (Ezek. 1:7); לֶשֶׁנְיָהוּ (Ezek. 1:13); מַעֲרָר (Ex. 40:34); etc. (Ezek. 1:4, 7); לֶשֶׁנְיָהוּ (Ezek. 1:13); מַעֲרָר (Ex. 40:34); יְשָׁע (Is. 6:4). Allowing for the long process of development, we may nevertheless safely assume that the roots of the concept are firmly set in the Sinai tradition. Points of attachment in the secondary material of the Sinai tradition are indicated at Ex. 33:18, and in the concept of the גֵּרֵר (see below); and these in turn are intimately related to the core Sinai imagery. cf. also Ps. 29:3, 9.

---


232) G.A.Cooke, *Ezekiel*, p. 22, distinguishes between Isaiah's and Ezekiel's understanding of the term כבֹּלֶל יהוה. To the former was 'the power and majesty of Jahveh displayed in nature and history', whilst to the latter it was 'an outward manifestation of the divine presence, seen by the prophet in ecstasy, but invisible to the natural eye.' Granted the distinction is valid, yet since both nature and history are pregnant with the possibility of theophany (cf. supremely the 'natural' phenomena of Sinai through which Yahweh altered the whole course of subsequent history) the two concepts of כבֹּלֶל may be held to converge in the theophany tradition.

233) Ps. 29 is generally conceded to be ancient, perhaps an original Jebusite hymn adapted for the worship of Yahweh. The mention of Kadesh in v. 8 makes the Sinaitic reference of the Psalm almost certain.
C. Cloud.

1. יִעָשׂ. Together with יִעָשׂ, יִתְנָא 235) is probably primitive to the Sinai theophany tradition 236) in the same way as יְנֵם and וה : Ex. 19:9, 16; Dtn. 4:11; Dtn. 5:22; Ps. 97:2; Nah. 1:3.

(i) The first extension of the יִעָשׂ-image, is into that of יִתְנָא

a) Ex. 34:5: The scene is still on the Mount: the language and thought are close to Ex. 19:18, yet it is clear that the reference is to יִתְנָא.

b) יִתְנָא is connected with the Reed-Sea crossing and the wilderness-journey: - Ex. 13:21-2; Ex. 14:19, 24; Num. 14:14;237) Dtn. 1:33; Ps. 78:14; Ps. 99:7.

c) יִתְנָא is related to the tent. Ex. 33:9-11; Num. 11 and 12; Dtn. 31:15.

(ii) Next, a group of passages picture the clouds as the divine chariot on which Yahweh draws near in theophany: - Is. 19:1 (יִתְנָא לָכוּב)

234) The Sinaitic orientation of the imagery here is obvious from the relation of v. 32 to Ps. 18:7-16 and to Ps. 144:5.

235) יִתְנָא. BDB suggests an affinity with Ar. 'anna = 'appear before', 'obstruct'.

236) Con. the view of W. Beyerlin and R. E. Clements - see note 10 above.

237) M. Noth, Das vierte Buch Mose - Numeri, p. 96, classifies the passage as a later addition to the J.-narrative, deuteronomistic in tone.
Thirdly, in Jer. 4:13, Zeph. 1:15, Joel 2:2, refers specifically to the "Day of the Lord". Jürg Jeremias regards the "Day of the Lord" as a specific tradition independent in origin from the theophany tradition, recounting the awesome coming of Yahweh;
either in person, or in the 'apocalyptic' hosts of Israel's enemies exalted in the imagination till they assume 'theophanic' proportions. There is no insuperable difficulty, however, in regarding the concept of the 'Day of the Lord' as springing out of the kind of emphases which we have traced through the Sinai core-tradition and its secondary accretions, i.e. Yahweh's coming in vindication of His people, purposes, and holiness, 241) and the trembling awe which His coming engenders.

2. יָעֹר (Ex. 20:21), according to the evidence adduced by BDB, 242) should mean 'rain-cloud'; and it is interesting that in Ps. 18:10-12 = 2 Sam. 22:10ff. (probably the oldest of the extant occurrences) it actually has this context of reference. Elsewhere the term is used more generally to mean 'cloud', 'darkness', 'gloom' - perhaps by assimilation of meaning to the dominant יָעֹר . cf. 1 Kings 8:12 (יער in contrast with שמש); Dtn. 4:11 (לעלות יָעֹר - a harmonistic usage); Dtn. 5:22 (למעלה יָעֹר); Ps. 97:1 (למעלה יָעֹר). This term too, is used in connection with the "Day of the Lord"; Zeph. 1:15; Joel 2:2. It is interesting that יָעֹר the regular word for 'darkness' as the antonym of 'light' does not occur

241) G.v.Rad, "Origin and Concept of the Day of Yahweh", J.S.S., 4, 1959, p. 104, concludes for the Israelite origin of the 'Day of Yahweh' tradition, and traces it specifically to its Sitz im Leben in the concept of the Holy War, with its twin themes of: - a) Yahweh's rising in might against His enemies, b) The trembling of man and nature at His coming. However, v.Rad's view of the separate origins of the Exodus and Sinai traditions (cf. "The Problem of the Hexateuch") prevents him from going on to trace an otherwise obvious connection between these twin emphases and the Sinai theophany tradition.

242) cf. EDB's suggested etymology: יָלָע = 'drip', 'drcp', cf. Arabic 'arafa = 'ladle water'. The Arabic derivatives are all related to the theme of water.
in the earliest Sinai core-tradition: its first appearance is in Ex. 14:20(243), in a reference to the עָזָּב הָעָבִּר (see above, p.143).

Interesting too is the occurrence of עִנְנֵה in Gen. 15:12 - we have already noted the probability that the details of Genesis 15 represent a deliberate reading back of the Sinai theophany and covenant into the earlier covenant tradition. Other uses of עִנְנֵה: Psalm 18:12 = 2 Sam. 22:12; Dtn. 4:11; Dtn. 5:22; Amos 5:18,20 (where the reference is to the "Day of the Lord", as also Zeph. 1:15; Joel 2:2). On the whole the use of עִנְנֵה seems to represent a theologising tendency, and was probably influenced by cultic usage at an early stage. 244)

3. עָזָּב הָעָבִּר occurs only at Hab. 3:4, referring to the theophanic light-fire in a veil of cloud.

4. עַשָּׁה (Ex. 19:18). The earliest parallel is probably Gen. 15:17 (see the remarks above). Then Ps. 104:32, which is comparatively early, recalls Ex. 19:18: עַשָּׁה עִנְנֵה יִשְׂרָאֵל. עַשָּׁה עִנְנֵה יִשְׂרָאֵל; and the closely related Ps. 144:5 makes the parallel even more clearly by underlining the עַשָּׁה- motif: עִנְנֵה יִשְׂרָאֵל יְשִׁירֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל. In Is. 6:4 the smoke of the sacrifice or incense is taken up into the

243) The older literary critics found early references in the plague-narrative, in that they ascribed Ex. 10:20ff. to the Elohist. W. Noth, however, ascribes the variants throughout the plague-narrative to P. (Exodus, pp. 67ff.)

244) 1 Kings 8:12, which is cultic in setting, is obviously ancient. Wellhausen suspected that יִשְׂרָאֵל, from which the lines were taken according to LXX, was in fact the יִשְׂרָאֵל.
visionary theophanic experience. (see further below)

On the other hand a chain of references stretching from earliest times to the exile, treat 'smoke' as the symbol of Yahweh's anger: -
Ps. 18:9 = 2 Sam. 22:9; Ps. 80:5; Dtn. 29:19; Ps. 74:1. Mythological parallels abound, but the imagery could equally well originate within the Sinai tradition itself. cf. -

a) The concept of Yahweh's vindicating activity already noted;
b) The concept of Yahweh's 'breaking out' on the transgressors, Ex. 19:20-21;
c) The visual and auditory impact made by an active volcano would in itself be powerfully suggestive of the latent possibility of divine wrath against covenant infringement.

(In Joel 3:3 an original reference to the smoke of a city sacked by hostile armies, has been exalted into an awesome eschatological symbol.)

D. Thunder.

1. The contention that in the Elohist Sinai-theophany account 'thunder' is invariably הַלַע whilst ישפן means 'voice' exclusively, and that this distinction of usage is foreign to the other theophany-texts, does not seem to stand against detailed scrutiny. It is generally agreed that the thread of Ex. 19:19 is picked up in

which means that קָרָךְ (Ex. 19:19) is equated with קָרָךְ (Ex. 20:18). Indeed the effect of the Elohistic narrative would seem to be precisely to blur the sharp distinction between the 'natural' and the 'revelational' קָרָךְ, and to stress that the natural phenomenon was pregnant with a numinous, revelational quality, of which all the people had a general awareness, whilst Moses the mediator had concrete specific awareness. Hence an understanding of the narrative depends precisely on this inter-margine of 'natural', 'revelational', and, we may add, 'cultic' aspects: קָרָךְ קֶרֶן יְהוָה קָרָךְ יְהוָה קָרָךְ.

The crucial point here is that in the subsequent development too, this ambivalence persists.

- 1 Sam. 7:10 (דִרְשֵׁה יְהוָה בְּקָרָךְ יִבְרֹל בִּיְרָס הָהוֹרָא):
  The verb indicates that literal thunder is meant, yet thunder pregnant with the accents of divine rebuke.

- 1 Sam. 12:17-18, would seem at first glance to refer to specifically natural phenomena; yet the close parallel between the language of 1 Sam. 12:18b-20a (the fear of the people, etc.) and that of Ex. 20:18-20a, would indicate that the natural phenomena are conceived as theophanic.

Jeremias holds Ex. 20:18 to be secondary linking material, but this seems to me unnecessary.

The plague-narrative in Ex. 9:23-5 comes nearest to being an exception here. In Ex. 9:23-5 describes specifically natural phenomena; yet even here the natural phenomena are conceived as weapons in the hand of Yahweh.
- Ps. 29: The קָרָאו which is conceived in vv. 3, 7 as thunder, is yet raised in blessing over the people (v. 11).

- Ps. 18:14: רֵידַע עִIslam (thunder) is paralleled by יְתֵן קָרָאו interpreted in terms of personal 'rebuke' (v. 16, בָּרָעֵה) i.e. Yahweh's personal, corrective intervention.

- Cf. similarly Ps. 46:7; Ps. 77:19; Is. 29:5 (טָפַק דִּרְעָם) implies personal divine intervention.

- Ps. 68:34: רֶבוֹעַ בּוֹשָׁת שְׂמִי-כְּבוֹד וּזָה יְתֵן קָרָאו קָרָאו: Here the קָרָאו is associated both with the cloud-chariot (thunder), and with the personal intervention of Yahweh (Voice).

- In Amos 1:2 קָרָא is detached altogether from the natural phenomena, and is used of Yahweh's purpose of judgment as revealed through prophetic inspiration.

- קָרָא - see above, p. 42.

2. יָשָׁר, is a natural extension from the concept of thunder as the divine voice, stressing the power and suddenness of the divine intervention for judgment: - Amos 1:2; 3:8; Hosea 11:10; Joel 4:16.

We may conclude then, that when the usage of קָרָא, קָרָא in the oldest Sinai tradition is compared with that in the pre-exilic literature in general, there is discernible on the one hand a progressive enrichment of imagery, yet on the other hand a basic unity which is best explained on the hypothesis that later terminology has crystallised around a 'Sinai'-core:

E. Trembling, Quaking, Fear, etc.

We have seen in our survey of the patriarchal narratives that numinous awe was the essential common element in those materials from various strata
of primitive religion which collected around the core patriarchal-theophany tradition. This same element of numinous dread is expressed in the oldest Sinai tradition by the terms קָדוֹשׁ (Ex. 20:18, 20); יָדוֹ (Ex. 20:18); and יָדֹ (Ex. 19:16, 18). Now it may be freely acknowledged at the outset that these specific terms do not feature prominently in the treatment of theophanies throughout pre-exilic literature in general:

kerja, apart from the Deuteronomic re-presentation of the Sinai event in Dtn. 4:10, Dtn. 5:5, 29, sits somewhat loosely in the theophanic contexts where it occurs. Passages such as Ps. 76:8, Hab. 3:2 resemble reminiscences on theophany, rather than direct, living, theophanic description. 248)

ירה, too, has only a circumscribed use: it is confined in later occurrences to Isaiah (chs. 6:4; 19:1; 24:20).

ירה, occurs only in Hosea and Isaiah (Hos. 11:10-11, Is. 19:16 and 10:29).

By contrast, new terms occur with frequency and in wide variety:

שַׁעֲק (noun and verb, 11 times), הָדַע (8 times), חָרֵל (6 times), העָד (4 times), לָעֵד (3 times);
and several other terms less frequently - שָׁמַע (2 times), אָרִיל (2 times), נָחַח (once), נִצְּפָּה (once), צַלְלָ (once).

248) On the other hand, קָדוֹשׁ is the common term in descriptions of patriarchal-type theophanies (Gen. 15:1, 18:15, 21:17, etc.) Thus the use of the term tends to underline the essential unity of the two theophany-types. Further, the fact that הָדוֹ יָדוֹ developed into an all-embracing concept meaning practically "religion", underlines once more the fact that the numinous-theophanic forms the essential root of Hebrew religion.
On the face of it, this discontinuity of terminology would seem to support the argument against the dependence of these later accounts of theophanic awe on the Sinai tradition. Yet the very richness and diversity which we have noted raises a query. If the 'trembling of nature' represents a specific borrowing from a concrete Canaanite source, would the terminology not in fact be more uniform than it is? On the other hand, the three terms used in the core Sinai tradition already represent considerable diversity within a narrow compass: נין referring to human emotion, דְּמָמַי to the physical manifestations of the inner feeling, 249) and מַמָּגָד to more extreme physical manifestations (instability, tottering). It is natural that as the awesomeness of the primal Sinai encounter passed into the somewhat calmer category of theophanic tradition, the emphasis would shift from inner trembling of spirit to the outward trembling of flesh and of nature. The presumably symbolic texture of the cultic re-presentation would naturally lead to accentuation of the volcanic-storm phenomena, for outward manifestations are more easily symbolised than inner feelings, and the need to impress succeeding generations with the awesomeness of Sinai would result in borrowings of terminology over a wide range of analogy. Hence מָפָרְל, a basically seismological term; מִי with its overtones of trembling from rage; מַמַּל, associated with writhing in labour-pangs; מַמָּרְל, connected with the skipping of young animals, etc. It is noteworthy that the widest

249) Jeremias, Theophanie, p. 102, suggests that דְּמָמַי in the O.T. is used only for human trembling, and hence he follows the LXX reading in Ex. 19:18 (דְּמָמַי כָּל) against the וּת. (דְּמָמַי כָּל). But Is. 10:29, 41:5, and Ezek. 26:18 at least leave open the possibility that דְּמָמַי may be used to describe the trembling of nature.
range of terminological diversity occurs in Habakkuk 3, i.e., towards the end of the tradition's development, at a time when Israelite borrowings from Canaanite sources were no longer likely to be absorbed into the core tradition.

It is interesting to note that the falling of rain at Yahweh's theophany has its point of contact in the concept of the trembling of nature. That the imagery has been borrowed from Canaanite sources need not be denied; but the resultant picture is not primarily of 'Yahweh the Raingiver'. Rather, the fact that the clouds drop water is a secondary effect of their trembling awe at Yahweh's appearing. Cf. Judges 5:4-5, where the falling of rain (v. 4b) is both preceded and followed by descriptions of nature's quaking before Yahweh's greatness. Similarly Ps. 68:9-10, Ps. 77:17-19.

In conclusion then, the wide variety of theophanic imagery in use throughout the pre-exilic literature falls into a general pattern of unity, on the assumption of a 'Sinaitic' thread running through the whole. It is this Sinaitic thread that determines the rich development of the individual

250) Assuming here that Hab. 3 is integral to the book of Habakkuk. J. Gray notes, however, that it has long been suspected that Hab. 3 constitutes an independent tradition, or at least rests on very old materials, and therefore "authenticates the tradition of the sojourn of the Hebrews in Northern Sinai, and their vital experience of Jahweh there", (J. Gray, "The Desert Sojourn of the Hebrews and the Sinai-Horeb Tradition", V.T., 4, 1954, p. 152). If this assessment of Hab. 3 is correct, it provides powerful support for our thesis concerning the primacy of the Sinai-theophany tradition.

Thus on either count, Hab. 3 tells against the theory of the Canaanite origin of the basic elements in Israel's theophany tradition.
motifs. Let us reiterate that extensive borrowings of imagery, and indeed of whole complexes of imagery, did take place. Yet it seems clear that these borrowings were integrated into the Sinai tradition, and not vice versa.

Theophany and the Prophets.

1. Theophany to Samuel: 1 Sam. 3 - 4:1.

The passage marks the transition from 'traditional' theophany to the prophetic call-experience: whereas Eli was primarily the priest-guardian of the shrine at Shiloh, Samuel is here pictured as a

251) Cf. the useful tabulated summary in J. Jeremias, Theophanie, pp. 88ff.


253) It seems certain that before the advent of Samuel, Shiloh had had a history as a 'theophanic' sanctuary, and that these theophanies occurred before the ark-throne of Yahweh.

R. E. Clements, Prophecy and Covenant, p. 58, suggests that the identification of ark and cherubim-throne may originate from Shiloh. Hence the theophany above the throne may represent an ancient tradition of the Shiloh sanctuary, integrated into Yahwism by means of the ark.

See further in 'Theophany and Covenant', pp. 258ff., 260.
The section is concerned preeminently with the
and a certain shift of balance becomes evident as between

and . 1 Sam. 3:21 seems to imply that the previous

The portrait of Samuel in the books of Samuel is obviously composite:

a) As priest-prophet: 1 Sam. 1:1 - 4:1 - an old Samuel-source. (See further note 266.)

b) As Seer and Kingmaker: 1 Sam. 9:1 - 10:16. A tradition concerning an unknown local seer has here been conflated with the portrayal of a judge-like Samuel, presumably from an old Saul-saga.

c) As 'Saviour': 1 Sam. 11:1-15 - old Saul-saga.

d) As priest: (1 Sam. 13:5-15, cf. Dtn. 20:2ff.), and as prophet: (1 Sam. 15) in the context of holy war. This seems to be old Saul-saga material revised in a pro-Davidic interest.

e) As judge: 1 Sam. 7:2 - 8:22, 10:17-27, 12:1-25. Many scholars (Fuilenburg, McCarthy, E.R. Driver, O.Bissfeldt, A.Welser) trace a separate (Elohist, anti-kingship) strand here, but Noth argues that the passages do not form an independent whole, and are probably the work of the Deuteronomistic compiler of the books of Samuel (Urberlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien, p. 57f.).

See Introduction, C. pp. 21f.

Our examination of the theophanic tradition has made it clear that vision and auditory elements are inextricably interwoven from the beginning. - cf. Num. 24:4 (J), Gen. 15:1 (E), 2 Sam. 7:4, 17 (early material bearing a Deuteronomistic impress). It is particularly interesting to note the development evidenced in the last reference: the content of the oracle has become so all-important that attention focuses on the verbal aspects; yet context makes it clear that the oracle is imparted in vision, cf. Hosea 12:10, Micah 3:6-7, Jer. 14:14, 23:16, Hab. 2:3, consciously base the prophetic word on 'vision'. Other references, however, betray a formalising tendency: Micah 1:1, Isaiah 1:1, Amos 1:1, Isaiah 21:1, 13:1, Isaiah 22:1, Nah. 1:1 are clearly the result of editorial reworking, and stem from a later period when had lost its 'visional' connotation and come to mean virtually 'scripture'. But formal, technical terms do not of course develop in vacuo, but fossilise out of living experience: hence even this formalised usage witnesses to the primitive inter-relatedness of and . The painstaking identification of also witnesses to the same effect: 2 Sam. 24:11, 2 Kings 17:13, Isaiah 29:10-12, Amos 7:12-15, Micah 3:6-7.
tradition at Shiloh had been primarily one of visual encounter with Yahweh; and 3:1b, if it is not to be attributed to later redaction, would support the impression. On the other hand, however, it is clear from vv. 9, 17, that Eli is accustomed to receiving דבר יהוה at the shrine. Conversely there are indications of visual aspects in Samuel’s meeting with God: the experience as a whole is described as (v. 15), and the phrase ריבא יהוה רחייסב (v. 10) probably implies vision (cf. Gen. 28:12). Yet on the whole Samuel is portrayed first and foremost as a recipient of the word. Cf. the thrice-repeated דיבר יהוה, which, with its suggestion of audition, sets the tone for the whole incident; and the rather fulsome conclusion in 3:19–4:1 seems designed to stress a pattern of continuity-in-change – revelation continues at Shiloh through the person of Samuel, but becomes now preeminently a revelation of the word. Certainly, the verbal-auditional element had not been lacking

256) The phrase דיבר יהוה כי יקר בית יהוה may simply reflect in general terms the contrast in the frequency with which revelations were received, pre- and post-Samuel, without casting any light on the specific processes of revelation at the pre-Samuel Shiloh sanctuary. The words פבש פבש פבש may imply that פבש was the typical pre-Samuel mode of revelation; or the phrase may also be a later intrusion. To take פבש in the sense of ‘general’, ‘widespread’, is ‘impossibly forced’ (G.R. Driver), and in any case the use of the Niphal form of פבש is late. The proposed emendation פבש would bring the form into line with earlier usage, but is “too violent in meaning for the context”, (H.P. Smith, Samuel, ad loc.). G.R. Driver, “Some Hebrew Roots and their Meanings”, J.T.S. XLI, 1922, p. 72, suggests a derivation from the Assyrian parasu III - decide, command; which would give the meaning, ‘there was no vision ordained’.


258) Retaining the MT יהוה and transpose the phrase to the end of 1 Sam. 4:1 seems unnecessary.
prior to the call of Samuel (as the visional element was not lacking in the new order); but what had formerly been a spasmodic erratic irruption into Israel's life, here becomes a comparatively settled institution.

The effect of the verb הָנָה (vv. 7, 21) too, is on the whole to stress the primacy of the word. The reflexive use of the Niphal form of הָנָה in v. 21 (cf. also 1 Sam. 2:27) is reminiscent of the ולָנוּ הַנָּה imagery, and would seem to have implied initially a drawing aside of the veil of cloud so as to reveal the person of Yahweh (cf. also Gen. 35:7, which undoubtedly implies visual revelation). But that this vision-orientated imagery subsequently became adapted to a verbal concept of revelation, is clear from Isaiah 22:14 (וַיָבֹל הַנָּהָ הַיְוָה). And that such a shift had already begun in the sources utilised in 1 Sam. 3 is rendered probable by the frequency with which the idiom יָהַנָּה occurs, both in secular and revelational contexts, throughout the books of Samuel — 1 Sam. 9:15, 2 Sam. 7:27; cf. 1 Sam. 20:2, 12, 13, 1 Sam. 22:8, 17. 262)

259) The reference is probably to Ex. 24:9-11, where it is stated of Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu: לָנוּ הַנָּה. 260) Gen. 35:7 refers back to Jacob's experience at Bethel. 261) Yet even here the 'verbal' is grounded in the visional: cf. Is. 22:5 where Jerusalem is described as תשע. 262) The emphasis here falls not on the willingness of Yahweh to 'unveil' Himself to human apprehension, but on the initiative of Yahweh in capacitating the human faculties for apprehension of Himself. cf. also Num. 24:4, 16 — the opening of the eyes to apprehend revelation.
It is noteworthy too, that revelation is conceived here in 1 Sam. 3 as being primarily a disclosure of the being of Yahweh, and only derivatively a disclosure of His specific purposes for the future. (v. 21) is a surprisingly bold use of metaphor when one considers that has associations with 'uncovering ones nakedness'. In v. 7, is paralleled by 263)

A further aspect of this personalistic understanding of revelation shows through the detail of the incident itself. For deliberate stress is laid on the fact that Yahweh called three times, but that the disclosure of His person and purpose was reserved until Samuel showed some awareness of being addressed by Yahweh, and some personal response to that address. The climax of the theophany comes at vv. 10-11: The - and significantly, Samuel's response is embedded in the notice of

263) In view of the later ethical and 'wisdom' overtones which the term acquired (cf. also 1 Sam. 2:12, where the essential connection between moral behaviour and is underlined), it is significant that here is used in a personalistic sense, interpreted as it is in the light of Samuel's call experience. Cf. also the use of meaning 'choose': - Genesis 18:19, Amos 3:2. Similarly Ex. 33:13, 18, where Moses requests a 'knowledge of God': - v. 13 and v. 18. Here the answer comes by way of theophany (Ex. 33:21-23). Cf. also Num. 24:16, where three phrases are placed side by side as parallels: - 264) The phrase is usually taken to mean, 'according to the normal pattern prevailing at Shiloh'. A study of parallel usages, however, would seem rather to support the meaning, 'as at the other stages of the incident under discussion'. See Num. 24:1, Jud. 16:20, Jud. 20:30-31, and possibly 1 Sam. 20:25.
The theophany proper: (v. 10b). The pattern is reminiscent of Ex. 3, for there too, it is when Moses 'turns aside to see' that the divine voice calls to him (העשתו.firebase the בְּלָעָר שְׁם יְהוָה - v. 4), and it is only then that the flame of fire in the midst of the bush is known in fact to be the angel of Yahweh. The phenomena are merely latent with the possibility of revelation until the attention and personality of the recipient of the revelation have been engaged.

The question of the relationship between the call of Samuel and the presence of the ark at the Shiloh sanctuary has engaged the attention of scholars. (See further, 'Theophany and Covenant', pp. 258f. 260). Whatever may have been the pattern of revelation at the sanctuary prior to Samuel, it seems clear that in the present form of the narrative a contrast is intended: 'the ark' 265) and 'prophecy' are set over against each other as being typical of successive eras. Whereas the word of the Lord had previously been 'rare' in Shiloh in spite of the presence there of the ark (1 Sam. 3:1), with the advent of Samuel the word of the Lord came to all Israel, (1 Sam. 4:1) in spite of the loss of the ark. It is interesting that in the subsequent history of Samuel, he is nowhere connected with the ark. 266)

265) Cf. H.W. Hertzberg, I. and II. Samuel, pp. 41, 42: "Samuel's ordination to his later office is not a consequence of service in the sanctuary, but a special calling. Shiloh now becomes a place for the revelation of God. This however, is not because of the ark of God, but by virtue of the person who is considered worthy of so great a gift of the word (1 Sam. 4:1)."

266) It is likely that the material about Samuel was preserved at one of the local sanctuaries visited by Samuel, (1 Sam. 7:15f.) and thus escaped being assimilated to the ark tradition, as presumably would have happened had the material been taken over by Davidic-Solomonic literary- and sanctuary-circles. See also H.W. Hertzberg, I. and II. Samuel, p. 42.
Theophany to Elijah on Carmel and Horeb: 1 Kings 18-19.

The passage forms part of an Elijah-block of material, chapters 17-19 which was already available to the Deuteronomist as a source, and which the latter incorporated into his work with only minimal alteration. Three sections are of special concern for us here:

a) The contest on Carmel with the priests of Baal, 18:20-40.
b) The transit to Horeb, 19:4-7.


Indications are that the incident on Carmel is conceived in theophanic terms, or at least recounted with intentionally theophanic overtones:

1. The drought is conceived as a divine scourge (17:1) inflicted as a punishment for Israel's apostasy (18:17-18), and release is granted at the shrine of Yahweh (18:30) to the accompaniment of fire, cloud, wind, and rain. Instructive parallels occur at 2 Sam. 21:1-14 and 2 Sam. 24:10ff. In 2 Sam. 21 the drought reaches its climax and release in a cultic theophany (v. 1)

- a phrase which we saw in note 34 to possess theophanic overtones).

In 2 Sam. 24:10ff. the climax and abatement of the plague is marked by an angel-theophany. It seems reasonable therefore to assume that the

267) M. Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien, p. 82.

fire (תורמל ע-יהוה - 1 Kings 18:38), and cloud (עַל), wind (רוֹתֵב), and rain (גָּשֶׁם גַּלְגָּל) - 1 Kings 18:45 - are consciously-intended theophanic references.

ii. It is suggested that the ridicule employed in v. 27 is in fact a parody based on the titles of the Tyrian Baals and of liturgies designed to invoke his presence: In these liturgies: "Melqart dieu de la nature était censé se reveiller au début du printemps, après le long sommeil de l'hiver." By contrast the realistic presence-in-power of Yahweh is visibly demonstrated.

iii. רַהֲלֵי ע-יהוה (v. 38) recalls the theophany in Jud. 6:21 where the sacrifice is consumed by divinely-kindled fire. Cf. also Ex. 19:18, והpleasant בָּרוּךְ. Later traditions stress the theophanic content of the imagery: 1 Chron. 21:26, Lev. 9:24 (P).

iv. The sentence used to describe the reaction of the people has theophanic significance: רַהֲלֵי כָל-הָאָרֶץ רַעְפֵל ע-יהוה The phrase בָּרוּךְ על-כֹל is used in 1 Sam. 25:23, 1 Kings 18:7 to express extreme reverence for an earthly dignitary. But normally it is used with reference to God: -

(a) indirectly, expressing the dismay and prostration of the leader because of the people's sin - Jos. 7:6, Ezek. 11:13, Num. 14:5, Num. 16:4, 22, 270) Num. 17:10 (16:45). These texts, though not

269) Elie le Prophète, I, p. 61, (Etudes Carmélitaines)

270) This section is usually ascribed to P., but v.Rad considers it 'probably J.'
making direct reference to theophany, are nevertheless closely akin to the texts cited below, and merge as it were into the field of direct theophany.


The journey southward is marked by a patriarchal-type theophany in the wilderness: ראהוּן-הֶזָּה מִלְאַךְ נָבָע בּ-רִי-אֱ-וֹ-רָ-לָה - 19:5. The force of מִלְאַךְ נָבָע-לָה is probably that it indicates a visible apparition, who in v. 7 is identified as מִלְאַךְ יְ-וָהוֹ. Vv. 7–8 imply that the journey is prosecuted with the active encouragement of the angel. It would seem, then, that we are presented here with the reverse of Ex. 23:20–23 and Ex. 32:34: That extension of the divine personality who ensured the presence of Yahweh with His servant Moses from Sinai to Canaan, now ensures Yahweh's presence from Canaan to Sinai as His servant Elijah returns to the scene of the Ur-theophanies, seeking renewal of that primal powerful revelation.

c) Theophany to Elijah on Horeb: 1 Kings 19:9–18.

Commentators have stressed that this theophany-account is unique and sui generis;271 i.e., we have here nothing stereotyped or merely inherited, but

a conscious original attempt dating from the end of the 9th cent., or the
beginning of the 8th cent., to think through the theological significance of
the Sinai-theophany tradition for the religious, political, and social
changes of the times. The issue which the author sees to be crucial is that
of the preservation of the essential Sinai-Yahwism, within the life of
Israel. The parallel between Elijah’s experience and Moses’ is clearly quite
deliberately drawn: the same mountain location, the same storm-phenomena,
the same cleft-cave, the same covenant-relation with Yahweh. Yet at the
same time a clear contrast is drawn when it comes to describing the specific
vehicle of revelation on the two occasions: whereas for Moses it was the
Voice of the thunder, the cloud and lightning, that
was pregnant with revelatory significance, for Elijah the significant Voice
was subsequent to the storm-phenomena and quite independent of them: a
thin voice of silence. Jürg Jeremias
points the contrast forcefully: “Die merkwürdige Theophanieschilderung
1 Kös. 19:11ff. ... die Elemente des Sturmes, Feuers und Erdbebens zu

272) The use of the definite article in the phrase -the
 transfers that the cave in question was
already well-known to those to whom the tradition is addressed. This
would indicate that Sinai was a pilgrimage site at the time when the
Elijah-cycle was crystallising, and that the cave had been associated
with the Moses-Sinai tradition, presumably as the cleft of the rock
from which Moses witnessed the epiphany of Yahweh’s glory, (Ex. 33:22).

273) Some have seen a note of polemic in the text: the Lord was not in the
earthquake, wind, and fire. But this contention is scarcely borne
out by the syntax: rather throw the emphasis forward in a
positive way to the final member of the series.

Contrast there certainly is, but not necessarily polemic.
Jahwe's Kommen einleitenden Naturschauspielen degradiert; Jahwe selbst naht in der '(Wind-)Stille'.

When we are pressed for a closer definition of the nature of this קול דמעת רוחה and the specific mode of its impingement on human perception, we shall probably be safe in replying that it represents graphically that elusive experience in which the prophets of Israel were directly and intuitively aware that they were being addressed by Yahweh. It is not a concrete replete with specific exhortation and command for prophet and people, but rather the numinous, intuitive root-awareness, in the power of which such concrete words of Yahweh are apprehended. Note that having perceived the קול דמעת רוחה, Elijah wraps his face in his mantle and stands in the mouth of the cave, presumably expecting some visual manifestation of Yahweh's presence; and it is here, consequent upon and stemming from that primal awareness, that the concrete, practical word of Yahweh is given:

We conclude, then, that the purpose of the theophany to Elijah is to

---

274) The קול דמעת רוחה is obviously conceived as an audition.

275) Cf. Ex. 3: 6. It seems possible that Elijah expected to encounter the י Omnul הילול. His standing in the mouth of the cave recalls Moses' custom of standing in the door of the tent of meeting in order to commune with Yahweh in the pillar of cloud. Cf. M. Haran, "The Nature of the 'Ohel Mo'edh" in Pentateuchal Sources", J.S.S., 5, 1960, who sees the tent as representing "a kind of permanent image of the revelation of Mount Sinai". Interestingly, just as מ is not listed.

It seems possible that Elijah expected to encounter the י Omnul הילול. His standing in the mouth of the cave recalls Moses' custom of standing in the door of the tent of meeting in order to commune with Yahweh in the pillar of cloud. Cf. M. Haran, "The Nature of the 'Ohel Mo'edh" in Pentateuchal Sources", J.S.S., 5, 1960, who sees the tent as representing "a kind of permanent image of the revelation of Mount Sinai". Interestingly, just as מ is not listed.
mark the transition to 'classical' prophecy, 276) with its uncompromising note of judgment against covenant-rejection. In a sense the narrative stands (in the present structure of the books) together with 1 Sam. 3, marking the end of the charismatic era, typified by the judges and 'charismatic' kings, and the older type of charismatic prophecy. Just as Samuel had designated David by anointing, and thus in a sense ended the older charismatic era in Judah by establishing an hereditary monarchy, so Elijah is here commissioned to anoint Jehu as king in the north - an anointing which will in fact end the 'charismatic' era in the north, for Jehu is the last northern king so to be designated by anointing in the name of Yahweh. 277)

More important, the religious situation in Elijah's day is analogous to the political situation which faced Samuel in his day. Just as the incident-al, spasmodic, charismatic leadership of the judges had proved insufficient in face of the Philistine onslaught, and must perforce give way to the more ordered and permanent economy of the kingship, 278) so that older spasmodic prophetic endowment was inadequate to meet the challenge of Baalism, and must give way to the more regular order of classical prophecy. The strong threat of Baalism required correspondingly strong insistence on Yahwism and on the covenant - and this is in fact what emerged with classical prophecy.

Both the setting-in-context of this Elijah-theophany and its content

---

276) This is not contradicted by the fact that Elijah is nowhere called a prophet: (ץֶלַל, in 1 Kings 18:36 is regarded by most scholars as editorial).


278) Ideally the kingship was still charismatic, but in practice the institutional increasingly predominated.
serve to highlight the inauguration of this new era in prophecy within
Israel. The progression which we have noted in 1 Kings 18-19 underlines
this transition. The contest on Carmel with the forces of Baalism is
typical of the older charismatic methods; and its failure to trigger off
the necessary national reform and revival of Yahwism underlines the urgency
of a new break-through on different lines. Horeb's 'thin voice of silence'
was the answer.

Three further remarks on the nature of the קוקס דמעמה דקק may
be in order here: -

1. The phrase is not to be interpreted as a transition to an abstract,
immanent, or hidden mode of divine revelation and revelatory activity -
there is nothing abstract or hidden about the programme commanded in 1 Kings
19:15-17. Rather the significance is that, "ce vent léger symbolise
l'intimité avec laquelle Dieu s'entretient avec ses prophètes."[279]

2. E. Pax[280] argues that an essential element in genuine theophany is its
Überraschungs- und Zwangscharakter, and that this essential characteristic
is not eliminated by the transition which we have discussed, but rather
enhanced. The impingement of the ֶל is just as decisively 'other' in
Elijah's case, as it was in Moses' or the patriarchs'.

3. The Elijah theophany marks a passing beyond the point of balance in the

relative weight of visual and verbal in the theophanic experience: "Allmählich treten die sinnlichen Vorstellungen zurück - der Prophet sein Gesicht verhüllt, um dem Anblick Gottes zu entgehen; die Epiphanie selbst aber nicht als Vision sondern als Audition auftritt." Yet as Pax is careful to point out, this transition from the 'patentness' of vision to the relative 'veiledness' of the 'thin voice of silence' does not mean the emergence of something different in kind, for 'veiledness' is an element essential to the theophany concept from the very beginning. - cf. Ex. 19: 21ff., Ex. 33:17, and cf. also the remarks of v. Rad on Gen. 18. (See on p. 77 and note 94). The auditional concept of revelation, then, is not a developed, philosophised concept akin to that of the ἄρωτος θεὸς, but is implicit from the beginning in the direct, intuitive theophanic experience.


The primary interest of this passage from the 'theophanic' point of view, lies in Micaiah ben Imlah's description of the way in which the word of God came to him.

Presumably ch. 22 originally constituted an independent unit of tradition, within which v. 17 formed an oracle based on vision, similar in type to Amos 7:1-9, 8:1-2. It may be that the king's question as to whether or not

281) E.Pax, Epiphaneia, p. 135.

282) To be strictly accurate, 1 Kings 22:19-23 should rather be described as an extension of the theophanic idea, for the appearance is set not on earth but in heaven. Nevertheless its relatedness to the theophanic circle of ideas is obvious.
Yahweh sanctioned his purpose of leading an army against Syria, was couched in terms that recalled for Micaiah the traditional picture of the ruler as a shepherd and his subjects as a flock. Once recalled, the metaphor would have created in the prophet's inner vision a picture so compelling in its clarity that he intuitively acknowledged and declared it to be from Yahweh. There seems no reason to doubt that when the prophet says מִֽכְּהַיָּהוּ , he is not consciously resorting to metaphor, but describing a visionary experience. Whether v. 17b: מִֽכְּהַיָּהוּ הַכּוּבֶּרֶד לָא לָאֵרֶב לָאָרֶב לָאָרֶב לָאָרֶב , however, implies an accompanying vision of Yahweh, is more doubtful. The phrase is perhaps better taken as representing the intuitive understanding which flashed into the prophet's mind, and was grasped by him as the divinely-given interpretation of the picture of the shepherdless sheep.

Faced with the necessity of vindicating this vision, Micaiah proceeds to place it in an absolute setting. To the accusation that his solitary vision is incompatible with the prophetic consensus of four hundred of his fellow-prophets and must therefore be the deviant word as over against theirs, he replies that he has stood in Yahweh's heavenly council and witnessed there things that both authenticate his vision and explain the discrepancy between it and the word of the four hundred. While he cannot deny that the four hundred have prophesied under the ultimate direction of Yahweh, yet he would assert that they have not stood in Yahweh's council as he has, but have

282a) Although it is not expressly stated that the vision of v. 17 was itself imparted in the heavenly council, and thereby stamped with the seal of ultimate authority, nevertheless this would seem to be the logical inference from the structure of the context.
been unwitting instruments of Yahweh's veiled intention. The implications of this claim have been greatly widened, in the present structure of the Deuteronomistic History, by the juxtaposition of chapters 20 and 22: - the spirit by which the four hundred have prophesied is Yahweh's Spirit, operating through them to bring about the fulfilment of Yahweh's prophetic word, (1 Kings 20:42). The directive and prediction which מִית (v. 21) working in their spirits, prompted them to utter in Yahweh's name, bore a simple, unambiguous meaning that was clear both to prophets and hearers. But Yahweh's true purpose was in fact opposite to the plain tenor of the spoken word. Unbeknown to the prophets who uttered it, the spoken word was an 'enticement' (v. 20), designed by its very utterance to achieve the opposite of its verbal content.

Several important points emerge from this: -

1. Taking chapters 20 and 22 together, the pattern of prediction and fulfilment emerges with awesome intensity. The judgment passed in 20:42 cannot but come about, and to this end even the prophets become unwitting instruments, through whom Yahweh with seeming inconsistency fulfils His word.²⁸³ What we have here, however, is not an

²⁸³ The intimate relation between the prophecy-fulfilment theme and the theme of judgment is well illustrated in v.Rad, Studies in Deuteronomy, p. 78ff., on the Deuteronomistic theory of history. Of eleven examples of prophecy-fulfilment quoted, only two, 2 Sam. 7:13 and 2 Kings 22:15ff., are not concerned with a prophecy of judgment or doom.
inscrutable pitting of word (20:42) against word (22:12), which reduces the whole chain of events to an impossible, a-moral enigma. Rather, the context makes it clear that the overarching purpose of Yahweh is morally grounded. For Ahab's case is similar to that of Saul; whose repeated disobedience resulted in rejection by Yahweh (1 Sam. 15:26-29), and for whom, as a consequence, the normal channels of revelation were no longer open (1 Sam. 28:5ff.). Ahab's failure to vindicate the honour of Yahweh against His detractors (1 Kings 20:28, 42), has sealed his doom, and henceforth his recourse to the media of revelation has something presumptuous about it, which vitiates from the outset his appeal for guidance.

2. As we noted earlier in connection with Gen. 22 (p.106 ) there is a strand in the early theophanic tradition which warns that the actual import of the theophany-revelation may be different from the meaning which superficially appears. Cf. Gen. 22:1ff., where the clear command to offer Isaac as a sacrifice was given as a 'test' (v. 1), and was countermanded as soon as the test was completed. That the divine intention is not immediately perspicuous does not, however, result in a fatal ambiguity. For, as we have repeatedly noted, the process of revelation is morally conditioned—cf. p. 107, where we noted that in

284) It is noteworthy, too, that 1 Kings 22:28 utilises the Deuteronomistic 'test' of authentic prophecy, i.e. 'the word that comes to pass' (Dtn. 18:22).

In the narrower context of 1 Kings 20 and 22, this one action is presented as the reason for Ahab's downfall; but in the wider context of the Deuteronomistic History, Ahab is depicted as typically 'the troubler of Israel', (1 Kings 18:18).
Abraham's case the ambiguities of the revelation were resolved as Abraham exhibited his willingness for wholehearted obedience. In Ahab's case his rejection by Yahweh (noted above) is matched by his lack of moral earnestness as evidenced in the details of 1 Kings 22 - his initial unwillingness to take up Jehoshaphat's suggestion by consulting Micaiah, and his subsequent failure to take Micaiah's advice in any case. To this extent, then, Ahab disqualified himself from receiving further elucidation of the divine word.

3. Even having made due allowance for these factors, however, a problem of theodicy still remains: viz. how could act as . 285) We drew attention earlier (p. 127) to a process running through the theophanic tradition, whereby every numinous experience, positive and negative, is subsumed within the concept of Yahweh's nature; and we suggested that 2 Sam. 24 stands at the apex of that process, while the parallel account in 1 Chron. 21 represents a redifferentiation of the positive and negative numinous,

285) According to Noth (Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien, p. 79f.), 1 Kings 22 had already been united with 1 Kings 20, prior to the incorporation of both in the Deuteronomistic History. This link with ch. 20 (forged by means of 22:1-2a), enhances the prophetic promise-fulfilment theme, and does something to modify the harshness of the concept of .

Noth further suggests that the two chapters may in fact have formed part of a wider cycle, (1 Kings 11*, 12*, 14*, (20), 22, 2 Kings 9:1-10:27), built around the theme of the role of the prophets in the royal succession. The suggestion is attractive (cf. also the emphasis in the chapters named, on prophecy-fulfilment), but incapable of proof. - The passages evidence no specific literary links, but only this unity of emphasis and theme.
resulting from reflection on questions of theodicy. If this is so, then 1 Kings 22 occupies an intermediate position between the two. According to 2 Sam. 24 Yahweh Himself incites David to create the conditions which will bring down Yahweh's wrath upon Israel; whereas in 1 Chron. 21 it is stated emphatically that Satan incited David to number Israel, and all suggestion of divine instrumentality through Satan is eliminated. In 1 Kings 22 the agent is מַעַרְת (v. 21). That he is the instrument of Yahweh's active intention is clear from the fact of his membership in the heavenly council, and from the fact that it is not he but Yahweh who initiates the plan for incitement. Yet just as clearly he is a servant-being, who 'stands before' Yahweh in a subordinate status (in contrast to the virtual identity of מַלְאֵךְ הַוָּה and מַעַרְת which we have seen to be typical of the patriarchal-type theophanies).

4. We may note in conclusion, the light which this passage throws on

286) A further shift towards the position of 1 Chron. 21 is seen in the prologue to the book of Job. As compared with the present passage, Job (chs. 1 and 2) exhibits the following differences:

1) The name מַעַרְת (the adversary) though not yet sinister in a thorough-going sense, nevertheless places a distance between its bearer and Yahweh, in that what was at most a secondary attribute of the divine, has now been differentiated out and exalted to independent existence as the prime characteristic of the satan's being.

2) The satan appears among the members of the heavenly court almost as an intruder, — רֵיקָּא בֵּן-אָדָלָה וְרֵיקָּא בֵּן-הָאָדָלָא (1:6, 2:1). He is differentiated from the בֵּן-אֲדָלָא, though the divorce is obviously not absolute.

3) The initiative that leads to Job's testing is taken by the satan (though bounded by Yahweh's permission); whereas in 1 Kings 22 it is Yahweh Himself who initiates the incitement and fall of Ahab.

On the other hand, when 'the satan' in the Job-prologue is compared with Satan in 1 Chron. 21, it is obvious that in the latter the differentiation has become complete, and that Satan now stands as the adversary of Yahweh Himself.
the understanding of prophetic inspiration. We have noted above that
the distinction between Micaiah and the four hundred was that he could
say .... whereas they presumably could not. We have noted too, the similar thought expressed in
Gen. 18:17-19 -J (see p.96f.), where it is stated that Abraham's role in
the Heilsgeschichte makes it appropriate that he be admitted into a deep
and intimate communion with Yahweh, and thereby not only perceive the
outward form of Yahweh's activity in the world but also share an insight
into the rationale of Yahweh's purposes and intentions. Again the por-
trait of Moses in Dtn. 34:10 (J?), Ex. 33:11, and Num. 12:6-8 (E), is
along the same lines:-
Ex. 33:11 implies a theophanic experience including both
vision and intimate exchange of thought; Num. 12:7 implies a comprehensive responsibility for practical govern-
ment, based on insight into Yahweh's purposes; Moses is differentiated
from the ordinary run of prophets in that the
issues not in more-or-less obscure oracles, but in lucid understanding
of the divine intention (Num. 12:7-8a); and he is set apart from the mass
of Israel in that (Num. 12:8b), i.e. his
relationship with Yahweh, in contradistinction to theirs, is one of
unmediated intimacy.287) (The same concept, we may note, lies behind

287) It is interesting to compare here, the use of in Dtn.
4:12-18 to stress a doctrine of mediation: it is because Israel
did not see the on Sinai that their relationship with
Yahweh is henceforth to be characterised by an unquestioning
obedience, which does not penetrate into the inner rationale of the
covenant-bond, but simply accepts its mediated givenness.
the use of the term "דָּרוֹן ה'" 288), Amos 3:7 and Jer. 23:18, 22.

It is clear from Jeremiah in particular that what is envisaged here is not a mere preview of the outward aspects of the divine activity, but an insight into the inner purposes which motivate that activity. This impression is reinforced by those occurrences of the phrase "דָּרוֹן ה'" which stress that the way to intimate personal communion with Yahweh lies through humble obedience and striving after uprightness. Cf. Ps. 25:14:

And Prov. 3:32: Those who have a deep sense of Yahweh's passionate concern for righteousness, and who are themselves passionately committed to this concern of His, i.e. those who have some insight into Yahweh's motives and think His thoughts after Him, these are they who are initiated into His. 289.

And it is within this circle that the prophetic call and ministry operates.

(iv) Theophanic emphases in Amos.

Our prime concern here is with the series of five visions recorded in Amos 7:1-3, 7:4-6, 7:7-9, 8:1-3, 9:1. Certain ambiguities in the text make it difficult to attain complete certainty as to the precise form of theophany envisaged in each case:

288) The range of the word "דָּרוֹן" (advice, consultation, intimate circle, secret, etc.) is perhaps illuminated by the usage of the Arabic sāda (rule, be glorious, be fertile, black, dark, secret).

289) The extremely compact nature of this sentence obviously arises from the desire to preserve a strict parallelism between its two parts - 'the "דָּרוֹן" (friendship) of Yahweh is for those who fear Him, and His covenant is for those whom He instructs (in the knowledge of Himself?)'. It is interesting, then, that "דָּרוֹן" is interpreted in terms of intimacy, and close personal relationship with Yahweh.
Amos 7:1 - Here could mean either 'Yahweh was forming ...', or 'One was forming ...'.

Amos 7:4 - as it stands is a clear reference to a vision of Yahweh Himself. But some scholars discount as a gloss, and if this is so, the participle is again ambiguous.

Amos 7:7 - (MT.); but G reads implying an angelic apparition (cf. the frequent use in the patriarchal-type theophanies to describe the ).

Amos 9:1 - clearly describes a vision of Yahweh; in which, according to the MT. Yahweh is heard commanding an angelic being to begin the judgment ... . A suggested amendment, however, reads ... which makes Yahweh the direct agent in judgment. But in view of the obvious ambiguity which characterises the language of the series as a whole, it seems unnecessary to make an emendation at this point. It is of course not necessary to assume a uniform pattern of wording or of conception throughout the series, as some commentators do (8:1 does not conform to the general pattern in any case); yet the overall impression is that 7:1, 7:4, 7:7, 9:1 all involve the vision of an apparition, which is conceived as Yahweh manifesting Himself in angelic form.
A number of scholars have suggested that this series of visions in fact constituted the call of Amos: faced with these visions of imminent judgment, set in absolute terms over against the moral corruption of Israel's life, Amos is stirred with a pity (which in fact derives from the divine pity) which involves him in intercession (7:2, 7:5), and seals his commission to preach (3:7-8). If this is so, then Amos shares with Isaiah and Ezekiel a theophany-type call-experience.

We have already referred (n. 255) to the long and developing relation between נביה and נביאה, and the related equation of נביא and קבילה. Cf. Amos 7:12ff., on which R.S. Cripps remarks: "It is noteworthy that though Amaziah addresses Amos as 'Seer', Amos argues upon the word 'prophet' as if they were identical terms." Many scholars see in Amos 7:12ff. a strong rejection by Amos of the title נביא , and thereby of the title נביאה also, with their presumed associations with the ecstatic ethos of the prophetic schools. But the sentence may be translated alternatively, "I was not a nabī ... but Yahweh took me ... and said 'Go, prophesy!'" Interpreted in this way the passage would mean, "Do not hinder me from discharging my prophetic call, for the compulsion of Yahweh is upon me" (3:8). This would in fact be a strong affirmation of his call to be a nabī, and seems to me to give the

290) On קבילה as a metaphor of the נביאה see p.149 above.


better sense in the context. Thus Amos asserts his prophetic call, and at the same time his tacit acceptance of the title קֹהֵן suggests the close correlation which Amos understood to obtain between prophecy and vision.

Discussion has been voluminous as to the precise significance of the phrase שֶׁהָרָאשָׁיִין אֲדוֹנֵי הַלּוֹוָה, which introduces the individual visions. Do the words imply inner vision that is 'wholly other', free from any perceptible relation to the objects of natural ocular vision? Or is the reference to an object seen with the natural eyes, and under the concentrated attention of the prophet becoming redolent with analogy of such overwhelming significance as to convince the prophet that this deeper awareness did not and could not have arisen from his own mind or imagination, but must have been 'given' by Yahweh? We should confess frankly that the nature of the evidence does not permit of dogmatic conclusions. The Überraschungs- und Zwangscharakter which we have seen to be typical of the patriarchal-type theophanies in particular, and indeed of all O.T. theophanies, is consonant with the first alternative. Yet on the other hand, the firmness with which the Sinai theophany is seen to be rooted in observable natural phenomena, would support the second of the alternatives. Ultimately, however, the distinction must be adjudged an artificial one. For obviously even the most 'given' of all 'given' perceptions must still find its point of contact in the mind and spirit of the prophet through analogous natural experiences, however remote in time or space these may be.


It is generally agreed that Is. 6 records a theophany, and that this
theophanic vision constituted Isaiah's call to prophethood.²⁹³

That the יִלְפִּי , mentioned as the locus of the vision, was not Yahweh's heavenly palace (cf. Ps. 11:4, Ps. 18:7, Micah 1:2) but the Jerusalem temple, seems clear from the details of the narrative²⁹⁴: - the

²⁹³ Two difficulties have been felt in this regard: -

1. The account does not stand at the beginning of the Isaianic corpus, as a call-narrative presumably should. But this objection is easily disposed of on the assumption that ch. 6 once introduced an independent collection of sayings/oracles, presumably 7:1 - 9:7, which was subsequently included in the total Isaianic corpus.


2. Many scholars have felt a difficulty about the strong note of pessimism which characterises the commission given in vv. 9ff. It seems to them inconceivable that a ministry as long as Isaiah's (1:1) could have been sustained, if the prophet knew from the outset that his preaching would be ineffectual (and worse). Hence it is assumed that the form of the narrative was finalised some years post eventum, and that the shape of vv. 9ff. in particular has been influenced by the actual experiences of Isaiah's ministry. So Ewald, The Prophet Isaiah, chap. I - XXXIII; T.K. Cheyne, The Book of the Prophet Isaiah; J. Skinner, The Book of the Prophet Isaiah. One of the most radical in this line of thought is M.M. Kaplan, "Isaiah 6:1 - 11", J.B.L. XLV, 1926, who argues on the basis of parallels between Is. 6 and 1 Kings 22, that the notion of 'divine hardening' had already become a set theological concept prior to Isaiah's time, and that the theophany-account is merely a rationale in pictorial form, of Isaiah's experience as a preacher, framed in terms of this theological concept - the 'hardening' has come about because ordained by Yahweh in consultation with His royal court.

The following writers, however, judge it unnecessary to assume traces of later disillusionment in Is. 6, and treat the whole chapter as a unity which accurately reflects Isaiah's commissioning and subsequent message: -

J. Pedersen, Israel, its life and culture, III-IV, p. 114, and J.P. Hyatt, Prophetic Religion, p. 34; both of whom are quoted in I. Engnell, The Call of Isaiah, p. 26.

V. Henrtrich, Der Prophet Jesaja, p. 108.

²⁹⁴ R.E. Clements, God and Temple, pp. 80f.
mention and position of the altar; and the phrase 'v. 10, which, whatever other nuances it may contain, certainly implies that Yahweh is present and dwelling among the people. Isaiah "sees in vision no strange and unfamiliar scene, but the long-familiar scene transfigured"; for the glory of the Lord as Isaiah perceives it has its focus within the temple precincts, and yet is seen at the same time to supersede the bounds of the physical temple and fill the whole earth. This fact then, that the vision is conceived as 'localised' in the Jerusalem temple rules out the more extreme descriptions of the theophany-experience in terms of literal 'ecstasy'. Indeed the use of such terms as 'psycho-pathological condition', and 'prophetic trance' are rendered inappropriate by combination of this 'earthly' setting with the direct,

295) of. Amos 9:1. The idea of the heavenly altar found in later apocalyptic, does not occur in the canonical books of the Old Testament.

296) As guardians of the threshold of the divine presence-chamber, the seraphim would pass the altar on their way to cleanse Isaiah, who is presumably worshipping in the temple fore-courrt.

297) G.B.Gray, Isaiah, ICC, p. 104. Gray adds: - "It is indeed the very fact that" Isaiah "sees Yahweh holding court in Jerusalem that gives full point to his alarm - It is the actual presence of the Holy One of Israel in the midst of Israel and not remote in heaven, that spells doom to the unclean people."

298) S.R.Cripps, Amos, p. 98.

299) J.Skinner, The Book of the Prophet Isaiah, I, p. 44.
uncomplicated manner in which the vision is introduced\textsuperscript{300}) : The phrase

is reminiscent both of the 'unpremeditated-

ness' or unexpectedness which is so characteristic of the patriarchal-type

theophanies\textsuperscript{301}), and also of the 'objective', outwardlooking ethos of the

Sinaï-theophany narratives.

Reminiscent too of the patriarchal-type theophanies is the reticence

\textsuperscript{300}) On the whole one feels that the reaction of modern scholars against

the over-psychologised approach to the prophetic phenomena is a

healthy one, (I.Engnell, The Call of Isaiah, p. 26; R.E.Clements,

Prophecy and Covenant, p. 7). For the prophetic texts (here, Isaiah

6) are not in fact concerned to provide the kind of data that would

enable us to make an impartial, balanced reconstruction of the

prophets' mental states:

"It is characteristic of the narrative that, like narratives of

old, it does not give psychology but facts", (A.Bentzen, Jesaja

I, p. 46; - cited I.Engnell, op. cit., p. 27.)

"Über die Art des Sehens reflektiert er nicht. Alles kommt auf

den Inhalt, nichts auf den psychischen Vorgang an", (Otto Kaiser,

Der Prophet Jesaja, p. 58).

This being so, the attempt to reconstruct the prophets' mental states

in fact commits us to the doubtful expedient of projecting our own

psychical states and structures on to the prophetic experiences:

"Uebrigens ist's unnütze Kunst, sich in den inneren Zustand der

Propheten hineintaumeln oder hineingrübeln zu wollen, nachdem

sich die Zeiten so sehr geändert" haben. (J.G.Herder, Vom Geist
der ebräischen Poesie II, p. 77, quoted by I.Engnell, op. cit.,
p. 27.)

301) The remark of S.R.Cripps, Amos, p. 85, to the effect that the

difference between the patriarchal theophanies and prophetic vision

is that the former are not history but folk-lore, betrays a lack of

appreciation of the theophany-tradition. For one must surely go on

to ask why such 'folk-lore' was preserved and integrated into the

very core traditions of Israel's faith, in particular by such not-

unsophisticated traditionists as the Yahwist and the Elohist. At the

very least such material served J. and E. with what appealed to them

as an appropriate vehicle for conveying their convictions about the

essential ethos of divine-human revelational encounter - presumably

also their convictions as to how this 'revealing' process took

place, or had taken place at least on occasion.
which is brought to the description of the theophanic figure of Yahweh, and
the economy of detail employed. The prophet's eyes "cannot linger on the
divine face; they fall instinctively to the skirts of His robes which fill
the temple." 302)

The concentration on the role of the seraphim, too, is part of this same
pattern of reticence. The description of these ministers of Yahweh, who
form as it were the 'fringes' of the total theophanic encounter, is in fact
an indirect description of Yahweh Himself. For, whatever the religio-
mythological background of the seraphim, 303) in Is. 6 they are conceived
as entering to some extent into the moral purposes of Yahweh: they form
part of Yahweh's heavenly court (v. 8), they reveal His secret cosmic
purpose (v. 3), they mediate His purifying grace (v. 7), and they are
associated with His very being (v. 8 - of the force of הַלְּלָה). Yet they
are nevertheless not Yahweh, and concentration upon them facilitates a


303) Many scholars, connecting נַעֲרֵי מִדְאָם (only here in the O.T. with
reference to supra-natural beings) with המלך יִשְׂרְאֵל מֵעֲנַיִם
of Num. 21:6, have deduced that the seraphim were originally serpent-
beings guarding the threshold of the shrine. The figures entered
Canaanite myth and cult from Asia via Egypt - cf. the relevant
archaeological material adduced by T.K. Cheyne, The Book of the Prophet
Isaiah, p. 140. It is suggested by G.B. Gray, Isaiah, p. 105, and
V. Hernrich, Der Prophet Jesaja, p. 96, that Isaiah's vision was
influenced at this point by the sight of 'Nehushtan' which was still
in the temple at the time of Isaiah's call since it was destroyed by
Hezekiah only toward the end of Isaiah's ministry, (2 Kings 18:4).

In Is. 6, however, the seraphim are composite figures, influenced
also by the towering cherubim in the inner shrine (assuming that the
Deuteronomistic picture of the cherubim in 1 Kings 6:23-8 is accurate
for Isaiah's day), and by the concept of the מִן בְּרֵית in the
patriarchal-type theophanies.
seemly reticence as to the Person of Yahweh Himself.

Isaiah's vision does not of course stand in isolation, but is integrally related to the long theophanic tradition in Israel.

1. The influence of the Sinai theophany tradition is plainly discernible here:

a) V. Herntrich makes the attractive suggestion that as the cherubim represent a personification of the theophanic storm-cloud, so the seraphim represent a personification of the theophanic lightning; and Otto Kaiser sharpens the point by adding: "Da die Blitze zu den Begleiterscheinungen der Theophanie gehörten, liegt die Beeinflussung des Gesichtes durch die Tradition auch in diesem Zuge auf der Hand."

It is thoroughly in keeping with the 'numinous-theophanic syncretism' which we have traced in the earlier theophanic tradition, that primitive mythological elements such as the seraphim (see note 303), having been integrated into the Yahwistic tradition, should then be used here to pick up symbolically the motifs of the Sinai-theophany tradition and apply them in this later theophanic setting.

b) The description in v. 4 of the trembling of the foundations - 

 Uses terms and concepts which we have seen (p. 148f.) to be rooted in the oldest Sinai tradition.

304) V. Herntrich, Der Prophet Jesaja, p. 97.
305) Otto Kaiser, Der Prophet Jesaja, p. 60.
2. It is evident, too, that within the broad theophanic tradition, a specific tradition of a prophetic theophanic call-experience has already emerged by Isaiah's time. Several modern scholars have drawn attention to the seeming indispensability of a call-narrative in the records of the great prophetic ministries, and have taken this to indicate that the reality of the prophets' call had come to be regarded as requiring a more-or-less theophanic experience for its authentication and legitimation. This means that a recognisable pattern of theophany-call description had emerged. Kaplan, in the work already referred to in note 293, has approached the same question from a slightly different angle, seeking to show by a comparison of 1 Kings 22 and Isaiah 6, that the two passages stand in an already rather well defined literary and theological continuum which had been shaped by cultic influence. He notes, for example, the following points of resemblance:

306) V. Herntrich, Der Prophet Jesaja, p. 93.
In both passages, Yahweh sits enthroned (1 Kings 22:19a, Is. 6:1a) and surrounded by His heavenly court (1 Kings 22:19b-22; Is. 6:2, 8).

- In both cases, Yahweh calls for a volunteer to expedite the conveying of His word: in 1 Kings 22:21 it is מַלְאֹךְ; in Is. 6:8 it is Isaiah himself.

- Yahweh in both cases effects the doom of the guilty by the word which He places in the mouth of His messenger. (1 Kings 22:22b, Is. 6:10).

In both passages, according to Kaplan, the theme is the 'despair of the prophet', which has been born out of the prophets' experience of the seeming incapacity of their message to change a recalcitrant nation; and on the basis of this bitter experience, the concept of 'divine hardening' has taken shape as an explanatory theological principle - the message has been rejected because it was already decreed in the divine council that this should be so.

Kaplan probably overstates his case, but however that may be, the presence of traditional literary patterns in Is. 6 does not imply that the theophany-account itself is a literary fiction. As I. Engnell aptly remarks: "The alternative, 'literary form' or 'genuine vision' is wrongly put. It is a question of 'both ... and', not 'either ... or'. Thus we have no reason to doubt the genuineness of Isaiah's visionary experience." 308)


That a close relationship exists between theophany and cult, is sufficiently obvious from the earliest theophanic traditions onwards (cf. pp. 117-119, etc.). W. Eichrodt\(^3\) has pointed to the strong influence which temple furniture and liturgy have had on the symbolism of Isaiah's vision: the ark-throne, the towering cherubim, the coals glowing on the altar, the antiphonal singing of the temple choirs. And S. Mowinckel\(^4\) adds: "This vision contains so many elements which are actual features from the Temple and the service there, that we may take for granted that the song of the seraphim in form and substance, is an echo of the hymns of the cult."

\(^3\) W. Eichrodt, Der Heilige in Israel, p. 22.
\(^4\) S. Mowinckel, The Psalms in Israel's Worship, II, p. 147.

Interest in the cultic influences behind Isaiah 6 has also shown itself in attempts to prove that the vision had its Sitz im Leben in the New Year Enthronement Festival at the Jerusalem temple. (e.g. J. Morgenstern, "The King-God among the Western Semites, and the Meaning of Epiphanes", V.T., 10, p. 159.) The case rests on two main arguments:

a) The phrase הָעַשְׁבָּב מִדַּיְתָה (Isaiah 6:1), is taken as a technical term, for which Accadian parallels are cited: since the state chronology was reckoned from the New Year Enthronement Festival, the 'year that King Uzziah died' would signify in general the last year of Uzziah's reign, and in particular the New Year Festival from which that year was dated. This is somewhat speculative, however - cf. Isaiah 14:28, 'In the year that King Ahaz died', where there is even less positive support for such an interpretation.

b) The kingship-motif which runs through Isaiah 6, is held to confirm the hypothesis based on a), (see I. Engnell, The Call of Isaiah). It seems to me, however, that the stress on the kingship of Yahweh in Isaiah 6 is at least as adequately accounted for by the disturbing effect of Uzziah's death upon Isaiah. Given the situation of the times, the end of a 52-year reign would naturally give rise to apprehension for the continuing stability of government and state; - "It was the end of an era of peace, the beginning of a momentous epoch for both Judah and Israel ... The shadow of the mighty Empire of Assyria was already spreading over the hitherto independent kingdoms of Syria". (E. Kissane, The Book of Isaiah, p. xi). This trepidation would be especially understandable in one who stood close to court circles, as Isaiah presumably did.
As to the light which the passage sheds on the nature of the prophetic call and inspiration as such, it is interesting to see that the close correlation between moral sensitivity and receptivity to revelation, which we noted in 1 Sam. 3, 1 Kings 18f. and 1 Kings 22, features here also. The prophet is again portrayed as one privileged to stand in the divine council; and while this 'status' is not conceived as a reward for prior merit but rather as conveyed in an Überraschungsmoment, it nevertheless carries with it weighty moral and spiritual conditions. From the ground of this his co-option into the divine council, the prophet hears the seraphim's hymn, the theme of which is the essential oneness of the divine holiness with the divine glory - "Ist Gottes Heiligkeit seine 'innerste Natur', und damit der Welt verborgen, so ist seine Herrlichkeit die 'Sichtbarkeit' seines Wesens." 

312) The prophetic corollary to this would seem to be that the man who would perceive (and continue to perceive) the glory of Yahweh, i.e. attain and maintain a deepening insight into God's spiritual purpose for the whole of existence, must be in some sense a partaker of the divine holiness. 313) Capacity for revelations or insight into the divine will and purpose, advances pari passu with moral insight and commitment.

The obverse of this lies in the fact that the numinous fear invoked by the vision of God (which we have seen to be a constant feature of all theophany) is here raised to a new degree by being specifically related to

312) V. Herntrich, Der Prophet Jesaja, p. 98 (Quoting O. Procksch).

313) i.e. 'Holy' in the sense of 'belonging peculiarly to God', 'owing prime allegiance to the Other, rather than to the this-worldly.'
an explicit confession of sinfulness.\textsuperscript{314}) This consciousness of sinfulness testifies to the growth of reflection on the phenomenon of theophany - both Isaiah's personal reflection,\textsuperscript{315}) and a process of 'group' reflection,\textsuperscript{316)} in which the 'otherness' and 'Lordliness' of the fear-inducing theophanic

\textsuperscript{314}) \textit{K\textsubscript{3}N\textsubscript{3}D\textsubscript{3}}, the regular word for ritual uncleanness. The concept is rooted in primitive ideas of taboo and mana. It is noteworthy that in the O.T. the concept of \textit{K\textsubscript{3}N\textsubscript{3}D\textsubscript{3}} is connected with those areas where the temptation to apostasy is strongest: -

a) It is used of sexual impurity : cf. the fertility rites of Baalism;

b) Impurity in connection with blood : cf. the use of blood, as the source of life, in Canaanite divine-resuscitation rites;

c) Unclean foods : it may be assumed that all 'unclean' animals were primitively connected, as totems or numina, with non-Yahwistic cults;

d) Uncleanness in connection with death : cf. the stringent rules in the O.T. forbidding any contact with the cult of the dead.

e) Leprosy : The liberation of the live bird in the cleansing-ritual (Lev. 14:4-7) may be the relic of a propitiation-offering for the demon responsible for the leprosy, (cf. the offering for Azazel, Lev. 16:8-10). Leprosy was therefore unclean, as indicating the activity of a numinous power other than Yahweh.

Thus the 'unclean' represents that which is not dedicated to Yahweh, and even given over to the honouring of His 'rivals'. In Is. 6, the enormity of this non-dedication and false dedication is made apparent by the vision of Yahweh's glory, in which it is revealed that everything that exists falls within the realm of the divine \textit{YHWH}, and is Yahweh's by right. The expression \textit{Q\textsubscript{3}M\textsubscript{3}D\textsubscript{3}-K\textsubscript{3}N\textsubscript{3}D\textsubscript{3}}, will then refer to Isaiah's and the people's failure, in cult and life, to offer Yahweh the praise and recognition which is His due. It cannot be a specific depreciation of Isaiah's worthiness to prophesy, since at v. 4 he has not yet been called or sent.

\textsuperscript{315}) Cf. G.B.Gray, \textit{Isaiah}, p. 101: "We may somewhat safely assume that the vision of Yahweh, bringing with it the clear apprehension on the prophet's part of Yahweh's purpose concerning him, was the culmination of a longer experience: not, we may well believe, for the first time on that day had" Isaiah "felt his own unworthiness, or contrasted the moral uncleanness of his people with the ethical holiness of God."

\textsuperscript{316}) i.e., primarily the group responsible for preserving and transmitting Israel's religious traditions.
Presence have received greater and greater recognition. The portrayal of
the enormity of human sinfulness here reaches its climax in vv. 6-7. We saw
above that the role of the seraphim includes mediation of Yahweh's purify-
ing grace; and this is closely related to their function as guardians of
the threshold, charged with excluding or expelling everything inimical to
Yahweh's holiness. We have spoken of Yahweh's 'purifying grace', but in
fact the appropriateness of the word 'grace' is apparent only in retrospect:
In the Überraschungsmoment, the approach of the burning coal more nearly
resembles judgment and destruction than grace, and those commentators who
interpret this part of the vision in terms of a death-resurrection
experience are so far justified. 317) The oracle of doom in vv. 9ff. de-
rices in logical sequence from the overpowering vision of Yahweh's holiness
and glory, for in the light of this overwhelming insight the very existence
of sinful Israel is seen to be in jeopardy; and with it, Isaiah's own
existence, for he too is a member of Israel. Hence the burning coal is a
symbol, as it were, of grace-through-destruction. And significantly it is
only in his cleansed, "resurrected" state that Isaiah hears the concrete
word of Yahweh, 318) with its commission to Isaiah himself and its specific
revelation of Yahweh's purpose for Israel - a purpose which likewise
involves the death and resurrection of the nation. 319)

317) cf. W. Eichrodt, Der Heilige in Israel, p. 15.

of his lips having fitted him for personal converse with Jehovah,
and spiritual sympathy with His purposes."

319) Accepting I. Engnell's unitary approach to the text of Isaiah 6,
(op. cit.)
(vi) Theophanic elements in Ezekiel.

The Structure of the Material.

The material in the book of Ezekiel that concerns our theme is found in three large blocks: chs. 1-3, 8-11, and 40-44. Any useful discussion of this material, however, is inevitably bound up with the larger questions of the structure and authorship of the book as a whole. It seems necessary, therefore, to pay some attention to these problems before proceeding further.

Three main types of solution to the special problems posed by the book of Ezekiel have been put forward.

1. A substantial body of scholarship has continued to accept the prima facie account which the book gives of itself (while allowing for more or less widespread redaction): i.e. that the book is in the main the authentic work of the prophet Ezekiel, whose whole ministry is to be placed in Babylon among the Judaean exiles, from the year 593 (Ez. 1:2) till at least 571 (Ez. 29:17). Of the difficulties involved in this view, one seems to me insurmountable, i.e. that preaching which is obviously directed against the inhabitants of Jerusalem (chs. 4-7, 12:1-7 etc.) and fraught with dire warnings of imminent disaster for the addressees is thereby conceived as delivered five hundred miles away in

Babylon, to those who had already passed through those fires of overthrow and deportation. 321)

321) H.H. Rowley, The Book of Ezekiel in Modern Study, p. 173f., discounts this difficulty by citing as parallel the oracles against foreign nations in Amos 1-2, etc., which were presumably addressed not to the nations concerned, but to Israel alone. But the parallel is not compelling; for those oracles concerned Israel at least as much as the nations against whom they were ostensibly directed, whereas Ezekiel's Jerusalem oracles are not nearly so apposite to the condition of the exiles in Babylon.

W. Eichrodt, Der Prophet Hesekiel, has argued that, "Gerade das Schicksal Jerusalems, seines Tempels und seiner Bevölkerung bildet die Kardinalfrage für die Exulanten" (op. cit. II, p. 7*) and that "Israel bleibt als seelische Ganzheit in Palästina wie in Babylonien existent (op. cit. II, p. 8*), since the city and temple represented their 'assurance in stone' that Yahweh's purpose of election still stood. But on these very grounds, it would be strange if the prophecies of Jerusalem's doom were addressed to the exiles, utterly unrelieved by any ray of comfort or hope. (We suggest below that the essential purport of the call-vision in Ezekiel I is reassurance for the exiles, i.e. that the (threatened) destruction of Yahweh's earthly sanctuary does not mean the dissolution of His rule, or the end of His purpose for Israel.)

W. Zimmerli, Ezechiel I und II, has also stressed the continuing unity of Israel through the exile, as the theological basis of Ezekiel's ministry: "... Ez oft dieses in seinen Tagen gar nicht mehr an einer Stelle vereinigte 'Haus Israel' als sein Gegenüber anredet. Die gewisse Allgemeinheit und Distanziertheit mancher Stücke seiner Verkündigung wird sich von daher erklären. Er weiss sich als Prophet 'Israels.'" W. Zimmerli, Ezechiel I, p. 33; II, pp. 125ff. He suggests that at the time of Ezekiel's call, the hope of speedy restoration through rebellion against the Babylonians and alliance with Egypt, was providing a concrete rallying-point for this national unity; and that Ezekiel's message was concerned with exposing the falsity of this hope (Ezechiel I, p. 22*).

One of the most striking features of the book of Ezekiel is its close agreement at so many points with the teaching and outlook of Jeremiah, (noted also by W. Zimmerli, Ezechiel I, pp. 67ff., p. 87*):-

- Call experience: Ezek. 2:3-3:9 Jer. 1:4-10;

- The/...
Continuation of note 321)

- The uselessness of intercession on Israel's behalf : Ezek. 14:12-23 Jer. 7:16-20 15:1-4;

- Attitude toward Babylon and Egypt : Ezek. 17 Jer. 27, 2:16ff.;


In addition many phrases and figures of speech in Ezekiel, are taken from Jeremiah, or from a source in common.

In view of this wide and detailed agreement, then, it is reasonable to assume that Ezekiel also shared Jeremiah's views as to the relative place of exiles and Jerusalem-remnant within the continuing purpose of God. Cf. Jeremiah's description of the two groups as 'good figs' and 'bad figs' respectively (Jer. 24). If the parallel holds, the implication would be that Ezekiel saw it as his mission to prepare the 'good figs' for their future role, - a mission in which the note of comfort and reassurance would necessarily be prominent.

But more compelling even than the question of appropriateness of Ezekiel's Jerusalem-oracles to the setting in which they were delivered, is the impression gained from the content of the passages. The prophet seems in fact to be face to face with his Jerusalem addressees; the messages have the same cogent directness as the words of Jeremiah to which they bear such close resemblance. Their sustained quality, the accuracy of detail they evince, and their very quantity place them in a different category from the shorter, more literary oracles against foreign nations referred to above.

The efforts made by W. Zimmerli to explain this quality of direct address in terms of 'Fernschau' (Ezechiel I, p. 65*), and reference to the "autodramatische Komponente' in Ezekiel's psychological make-up (op. cit., pp. 25*, 29*), appear to me unconvincing.
2. A second line of approach is that the historical Ezekiel carried on his ministry entirely in Judaea, and that shortly afterwards his material was taken over and adapted to a Babylonian setting by a second author, working in Babylon during the exile. The remarkable unity of outlook and spirit which pervades the whole book is explained, on this view, by the assumption that the second author was a disciple of the older Ezekiel, who had "so assimilated the messages and writings of the earlier prophet, that they have become part of his inner mind and life."

3. H.W. Robinson, following A. Bertholet, has maintained that the historical Ezekiel prophesied both in Judaea and in Babylon.

A thorough discussion of the relative merits of these last two views

---


323) It is argued for dual authorship that the prophetic and the priestly emphases evident in the book are in too great a tension for them to have coexisted in the mind and spirit of the one man. But W. Richrodt, Der Prophet Hesekiel II, p. 17*ff., has argued strongly for the possibility of their coexistence.

See also H.W. Robinson, Two Hebrew Prophets (1948), p. 94: "The most likely theory would be that Ezekiel's intensity in denunciation passed into equal intensity in reconstructing the future. The catastrophe of 586, for such a man, is probably enough to explain the transition from the earlier to the later phase of his prophetic consciousness."


would carry us beyond the scope of the present study. But as a provisional basis for approach to our relevant texts, I am inclined to agree with H.W. Robinson when he says of the view he has elaborated: "This is the most likely of all the theories; whilst it certainly provides the best working hypothesis, so long as critical uncertainty remains."[327]

Proceeding to an examination of the theophanic material, then, we find that it treats of two main topics:

A. Ezekiel's prophetic calls,

### A. Ezekiel's Prophetic Calls.

On the basis of the account of the composition of the material as outlined above, we may accept Bertholet's ground-principle that Ezek. 1 - 3 in fact represents the conflated records of two distinct call-experiences [328]:

i. (Ezekiel 3:22-23a, and) Ezek. 2:3 - 3:9: a call to prophesy in Jerusalem and Judaea, received (according to Bertholet), in the year 593 (Ez. 1:2).

ii. Ezekiel 1:4-28b: a call to prophesy in Babylon, received some time after 586 B.C.

---

327) H.W. Robinson, Two Hebrew Prophets, p. 75.

328) A. Bertholet, Hesekiel, pp. 40ff. For a critique of Bertholet's view, see W. Zimmerli, Ezchiel I, pp. 14f., 16ff., 21, 35.
1. The Judaean Call.

One is immediately struck by the similarities between Ezek. 2:3 - 3:9 and Jer. 1:329; -

- the vision of a hand put forth to impart the word;
- vision passing into exhortation;
- the exhortation not to be dismayed (Ezek. 2:6, Jer. 1:17);
- the 'hardening' of the prophet against the people (Ezek. 3:8-9, Jer. 1:18-19);
- the command: 'speak my words to them' (Ezek. 2:7, Jer. 1:17);
- the tone of both foreshadows doom, imminent but still future.

Interesting, too, is the visualising of Yahweh's word as a written scroll, in contrast to Jeremiah's account of a direct touch of Yahweh's hand on his mouth. The imagery is undoubtedly influenced by the impetus given toward 'scripturisation' by the promulgation of the Deuteronomic Code, and by the recording of Jeremiah's message in a scroll, (Jer. 36). Yet there is as yet no implication of a static fixity. For Ez. 3:10 ('all my words ... receive in your heart and hear with your ears') and many similar passages obviously envisage an ongoing process of revelation. The eating of the roll does not dispense with the necessity for constant dependence on, and listening for, the word. The significance of the symbolism is rather as Eichrodt puts it:- "By eating the word in the form of a scroll, Ezekiel learns that a power existing objectively over against himself, is now effective within him, to kill and make anew, in order that the 'rebellious house' may be

329) These similarities would tend to support the impression gained above, that both prophets lived and worked within the same milieu.
fashioned into a people of God." Thus the emphasis of the vision is not on a 'word in a book' as implying an eternally fixed body of revelational truth, but is rather akin to prophetic symbolism - the act of digesting the word initiates the process of prophetic enduement and empowerment as Yahweh's emissary.

The core of Ezek. 8:5 - 9:11 in all probability also belongs to the account of the Judaean call. In contrast to the 'realistic' atmosphere of chs. 4-7, 12:1-7, etc., (which marks these passages out as direct sermon material), the core material of chs. 8-10 (see n.334) exhibits a visionary quality. That the four scenes depicted in ch. 8 do not describe Ezekiel's actual real-life experiences seems evident from the complete absence of human dialogue - one would not expect a prophet of such intensity as Ezekiel to witness in silence the perpetration of such abominations within the temple of Yahweh, if this were in fact an actual physical encounter.

Accepting that the origin of the passage is in vision and reflection-

330) W. Eichrodt, Theology of the O.T., II, p. 73.

331) For the 'hallucination' of taste; cf. G. Widengren, Literary and Psychological Aspects of the Hebrew Prophets, p. 29ff. See also W. Eichrodt, Hesekiel I, p. 13; and W. Zimmerli, Ezechiel I, p. 78.

332) Similarly in Ezek. 11:1-13, which most modern scholars agree to be a later insertion in its present context, though probably genuine Ezekielian material: (G.A. Cooke, op. cit., pp. 121; J. Battersby Harford, op. cit., p. 56; W. Eichrodt, Hesekiel I, 53). There is a peculiar indirectness in Ezek. 11:1-13: At v. 5 the Spirit gives instructions as to what the prophet is to say, but only at v. 13 does it become clear that he is actually delivering the message; and even here, there is a lack of dialogue which lends a dream-like quality to the whole.
upon-visions W. Zimmerli suggests that these four episodes may not in fact have been contemporaneous but together may comprise a composite picture of Jerusalem's persistent sinfulness, (Ezechiel I, pp. 90*, 224).

The visionary quality of Ez. 9*, and 10:2a, c, 7b, is obvious. We should probably not be wrong, therefore, in assuming a rather close link between this core of Ez. 8 - 10 and the call-vision of 2:3 - 3:9. Indeed it is likely that chs. 8* - 10* and 2:3 - 3:9 together preserve the prophet's account of his call to his Judaean ministry. 333)

11. The Babylonian call : Ezek. 1:4 - 28b. 334)

Ezekiel in Babylon had no doubt been wrestling and agonising with the

333) Assuming that 8:1-3, which sets the vision in Babylon, is a literary link composed on the model of 40:1-2.

334) Ezek. 1:4-28b is paralleled in considerable detail in the second block mentioned above, viz. Ezek. 8:1-4, 10:1-22, 11:22-24. (There are also brief references in Ezek. 43:1-5 and Ezek. 44:4-7:23 Ezek. 43:4: the derivative status of these latter, seems clear from Ezek. 43:3, 4 - כַּמְלָא אֱלֹהִים לְרָאוּתֵנוּ יָדָתוּת הָעָלָּמִים (following the BHK3 text). The point in Ezek. 9-10 is not that Yahweh came to judgment, but that He whose dwelling was in the sanctuary from of old, withdrew in wrath.)

On the question as to whether Ezek. 1 or Ezek. 8f. is the more original, Eichrodt (Der Prophet Hesekiel I, p. 50ff.; Theology of the Old Testament II, p. 194) has shown convincingly that both passages as they now stand are the product of a complicated literary and theological process, in the course of which each has so influenced the other that it is now well-nigh impossible to reconstruct the original structures of the two blocks. It would seem, however, that the original core of chs. 8 - 11 described a visionary experience revealing the apostasy prevailing in the Jerusalem Temple (worship of Ashera, Egyptian cults, Tammuz and Marduk-Shamash (Ezek. 8)), and the judgment that must certainly follow such apostasy (the linen-clad scribe sealing the righteous, the six heavenly slayers putting the remainder of Jerusalem to the sword, the scribe taking coals of judgment from the temple altar and scattering them over the apostate city (Ezek. 9*, and 10:2a, c, 7b)). This strand therefore belongs to the Judaean-call complex, (see p. 194 above). The strand describing the cherubim and the glory of Yahweh gradually withdrawing from the de-consecrated temple, represents a subsequent theologising trend (whether from the hand of Ezekiel or/...
problems posed by the despoliation of the sanctuary which was the earthly dwelling-place of the divine Name, and the imminent destruction\(^\text{335}\) of sanctuary, city, and nation. Did the destruction of His earthly seat mean that God's purpose of election was nullified, or His power overthrown? While in this state of perplexity, Ezekiel witnessed a dramatic electric storm, which assumed for him theophanic proportions as he watched. W. Zimmerli, *Ezechiel I*, p. 50, considers it more likely that the storm was itself part of the visionary experience. In either case, the language in which the theophany-description is clothed clearly derives from Israel's theophany tradition:

a) The cloud (\(\text{לֶאַי}\)) and fire (\(\text{יָאַר}\)) relate directly to the Sinai theophany tradition; and we have seen that the coals (\(\text{לְֹנֱא}\) \(\text{יָאַר}\)) and torches (\(\text{לְֹנֱא}\) \(\text{לְֹנֱא}\)) are early elaborations of the same theme. The wind (\(\text{רֹמָל} - \text{v. 4}\)) which seems to have had

\[\text{Continuation of note} \text{334}\) -

.../a later disciple need not concern us here), material for which was drawn from Ezekiel I. Conversely, however, the section about the wheels which accompany the cherubim, seems to have originated in the additions to chapter 10, whence it was transferred to ch. 1:15-21, (W. Eichrodt, *Der Prophet Hesekiel II*, p. 33\(^*\), and I, p. 7).

W. Zimmerli, *Ezechiel I*, pp. 28f., 202f., agrees that Ez. 1:15-21 is secondary, but regards Ez. 10:9-12, 16-17 as even later, and dependent on 1:15-21. He also regards 1:7-11a, 13a\(\beta\), 23-25, 27a as expansions by the Ezekielian school, (op. cit., pp. 25f., 27, 30. 33\(^?\))

\[\text{335}\) Assuming that the date in 1:2 refers to the second or Babylonian call-experience, and that Ezekiel went into exile in 597. Others would refer 1:2 to the first or Judaean call-experience; and this would accord with the view that all the material in Ezek. 4-24 belongs to the Judaean ministry. In view of the reworking that has obviously taken place, however, it seems unwise to insist on this - It seems preferable to assume that chs. 4-24 represent a fusion of materials delivered in Judaea and Babylon.
such a formative influence on Ezekiel's thought (cf. 'the spirit caught me up' etc.) evokes memories of Elijah's experience on Horeb.

b) The vision of 'the likeness of the glory of the Lord' enthroned above the cherubim,\(^{336}\) derives no doubt on the one hand from the cultic theophany tradition, with which, as a priest, Ezekiel would be intimately acquainted; and on the other hand from the literary-theophanic tradition whose rise and development we have referred to in connection with 1 Kings 22 and Isaiah 6.\(^{337}\) (In contrast to these two passages, however, we may note here the more elaborated description of the appearance of the Presence of Yahweh: "No doubt in Hebrew religion God was thought of as wearing a human form, supernaturally glorified"\(^ {338}\) - and here we meet the most concrete description of that form which occurs in the literature of Early Israel. Yet even here, a certain reticence is to be noted.)\(^ {339}\)

---

336) See notes on the cherubim and seraphim, p.180. Here in Ezekiel the cherubim seem less intimately involved in the purposes of Yahweh than is the case with the seraphim in Isaiah 6. They are symbols of Yahweh's cosmic power, rather than conscious participants in His judging and saving activity. G.A. Cooke, The Book of Ezekiel, p. 112, has a special note on the cherubim.

337) See here W. Zimmerli, Ezechiel I, pp. 18ff., pp. 35ff., p. 50f. In 1 Kings 22, and Is. 6, there is a further common element, viz. the messenger to whom Yahweh entrusts His doom-dealing word. In the present state of the text of Ezek. 1, this note is present too. But we have reason to believe that initially Ezek. 1 was not predominantly a call to a ministry of judgment and doom, but that the whole vision was suffused with hope and reassurance.


339) It is reticence that lies behind the use of 'like', 'as it were', etc. Eichrodt, Theology of the O.T., p. 423, suggests that the glory was not seen directly, but reflected in a sheet of electrum (cf. the fear of beholding God, a motif common in the theophany tradition).
c) The fact that the throne is of sapphire, standing on the firmament of heaven stresses the world-sovereignty of Yahweh, and so answers the doubts with which Ezekiel had been struggling. The four cherubim together probably symbolise the totality of animate existence\(^{340}\) as subservient to Yahweh's purpose. And it seems likely that the theophany's appearing from the North relates to the concept of Yahweh's 'mountain in the far North'\(^{341}\) whence he had descended to Zion, and where He re-established His home after the desacralisation of Zion.

We may conclude then that the vision stresses Yahweh's world-sovereignty, with its twin corollaries of warning and hope: -

- warning that Yahweh is not bound to Israel and Zion, to the point where their election compromises His holiness, but that He is free to judge and reject His chosen people;

- hope, in that Yahweh's power is not diminished nor His purpose frustrated by the fall of Zion.\(^{342}\) And the fact that He appears in order to re-commission His prophet for a continuing ministry among the 'good figs' of the exile, means that Israel is not ultimately


\(^{342}\) "For the priest who has had to live through the destruction of the temple, the transcendence of God is an anchor for his faith," W. Eichrodt, Theology of the O.T., II, p. 194.
(Supremely, the note of hope is struck in Ezek. 43:1-5. Here the divine withdrawal from the deconsecrated sanctuary is reversed, and the temple becomes once more the dwelling place of the קָבֹד :— נְאֻם ה' שָׁם. The language here recalls the consecration of the Solomonic temple, as recorded in 1 Kings 8:10-11; and that the reminiscence is intentional is confirmed by the way in which Ezek. 43:6-9 echoes the Deuteronomic terminology, of the temple as the dwelling-place of the Name.)

B. Ezekiel's Visions of the Imparter of Revelations.

1. The Imparter of Revelation whom Ezekiel saw in Jerusalem.

The Guide in Ezek. 8:5 - 9:11, who conducts Ezekiel through the Jerusalem Temple is none other than Yahweh Himself (8:17-18, 9:8-10); the subsequent editor who inserted 8:1-2 stresses this by adding a description of the Guide drawn from the description of the 'glory of Yahweh' in 1:26b-27. In the company of this Heavenly Being, the prophet conceives of himself as being filled and possessed by נְבָע, and under his control, as are the cherubim in 1:12, etc. What is designated נְבָע here is the numinous wind-breath of Yahweh, as distinct from the more 'angelic' conception of נְבָע in 1 Kings 22. On the other hand, the heavenly priest-scribe and the six destroyers (9:2, 3b-7, 11) represent a development in the

343) The imagery is converted to a different use in chs. 9 - 11.

344) 'The hand of the Lord was upon me', and, 'The Spirit lifted me up', are probably to be taken as equivalent expressions; cf. W. Zimmerli, Ezechiel I, p. 49; Ezechiel II, p. 1264.
opposite direction: in contrast with the of the patriarchal-type theophanies (virtually identical with Yahweh), and the intermediate figures such as 'the spirit' (1 Kings 22), seraphim (Isaiah 6), and cherubim (Ezek. 1), the scribe and destroyers are clearly distinct from the being of Yahweh. Their unambiguously subordinate role is stressed by their human, servant appearance.

11. The Imparter of Revelation whom Ezekiel saw in Babylon.

'The man like bronze' (Ez. 40:3) who acts as Ezekiel's guide throughout the vision of the future temple (Ez. 40:4ff., 17, 20, 28, etc., 41:1, 3, 42:1, 43:1, 44:1, 46:19f., 47:1) shows a subordination to the being of Yahweh similar to that of the servant-beings described in ch. 10.

It is presumably in context of the vision of the future temple that the 'levitational' experiences recorded in Ezekiel 40:1-2 and 8:1-3 have their origin: we have already noted (note 333) that Ezek. 8:1-3 is probably a secondary literary link, modelled on Ezek. 40:1-2.

On the phenomenon, G. Widengren (Literary and Psychological Aspects of the Hebrew Prophets, pp. 94-120) remarks: "In his description it is quite obvious that Ezekiel feels that he is elevated in the air and carried away to Jerusalem. But it is surely a real crux that he claims it to have happened in the 'visions of God' (וְנִרְאָה יָהָוֶה) ... It is a difficulty for the very reason that Ezekiel would in this way seem to leave it in suspense as to whether he was really transported to Jerusalem" (i.e. in Ezk. 8:1-3), "or whether he had only a vision in which it seemed to him as if he were removed there. Anyhow the expression, 'lifted me up between the heaven and the earth' clearly speaks of the phenomenon of levitation." (op. cit., p. 105f.) "Now when the phenomena of levitation are felt extremely strong, the prophet or seer must have had the feeling that he was not experiencing a vision where he imagined himself to be carried away, but that he was subjected to a real transportation," (op. cit., p. 110). The appositeness of Widengren's remarks is borne out by a comparison of Ezek. 40:1-2 and Ezek. 8:1-3; for it is plain that the original (Ez. 40) is much more restrained in its description of the phenomena than is the copy (Ez. 8).
For the most part he observes the silence appropriate to his servant status. Yet at the same time his 'bronze-like' appearance would underline the closeness of his relationship to Yahweh (cf. the 'bronze-like' appearance of the glory of Yahweh at 1:27); and by implication it is stressed that the disclosures he makes, emanate from Yahweh Himself. On two occasions, however, the hitherto silent guide suddenly gains added stature, and speaks out the word with the full authority of Yahweh (43:18ff., 47:8ff.). This is presumably due to the expansion process to which the book has been subjected. Similarly with the blocks of legislative material, 44:4 - 46:18 and 47:13 - 48:35, which are set forth as the direct speech of Yahweh. (It is noteworthy here that this legal material is deliberately set within a context of theophany, for the vision of the 'glory' in 44:4 is obviously inserted expressly for the purpose of introducing the following legal provisions.346)

SUMMARY:

The following general points present themselves, in the light of the above survey:

1. The book of Ezekiel in its final form demonstrates the growing tendency for the theophany to settle into literary form. Engnell's remark (quoted p.183 ) that "it is a question of 'both (literary form) and (genuine vision)' , not 'either ... or'" , is somewhat less appropriate to Ezekiel, at least in the later strata of the book, than it was to Isaiah 6. The stark actuality of the direct numinous encounter, tends

347) See further the chapter on 'Theophany and Torah', pp. 414ff.
to soften into the metaphorical and the figurative. G. Widengren notes that the detailed, dream-like account in Ezekiel 1 is of the type that requires written form in order to achieve clarity, and to avoid dissolving into obscurity. 346)

2. The moralising and theologising process (the beginnings of which we noted in Is. 6) whereby the intuitive fear evoked by theophany becomes a specific consciousness of sinfulness, is maintained in Ezekiel - Ez. 1 with its note of warning that God is world sovereign, and therefore not bound to His elect people in such a way as would obviate the necessity for moral response on their part to His covenant; cf. Ez. 10, with its description of the phased withdrawal of Yahweh's glory from the morally and spiritually polluted sanctuary.

3. The legislative material in chs. 40-48 is set firmly within a theophanic context: both the wider context of the whole book, and the more immediate context of the final section. In this, the material is reminiscent of the Book of the Covenant which is deliberately set within the theophanic context of Ex. 19 - 24, (see p. 47 ); and as we shall see in 'Theophany and Torah', the same pattern is evinced by the Deuteronomio Code within the setting of the book of Deuteronomy, (see pp.406ff).

4. The universalist picture of Yahweh, enthroned upon the world-firmament,

346) See further the chapter on Theophany and Torah, p. 386, on the Ezekelian concept of Torah, as elaborating the details of cultic regulations (and hence demanding written form).
and attended by creatures symbolic of the totality of animate existence, is not completely new; for similar ideas were probably expressed in the Chaos-Creation liturgy in the context of the New Year festival. But when these universalist concepts expressed in Ezek. 1 were given a futuristic bent by being related to the vision of the temple of the future, the ground was thereby prepared for the emergence of apocalyptic, with the attendant polarisation of the theophanic and the legislative aspects of revelation.

**SUMMARY.**

Thus we have surveyed the development of the theophany tradition in Early Israel; we have considered its focus in the Sinai tradition, its extension back into the patriarchal traditions, and forward into the period of the judges and of the monarchy. We have seen the importance of theophany in the cultic traditions of Israel and Judah, and in the experience and message of the prophets.

As we shall see, Deuteronomy also has a firm place within this theophany tradition. But the concept of theophany in Deuteronomy is inextricably bound up with the concepts of covenant and of tōrāh. We shall therefore postpone discussion of this topic till the conclusion of the chapter on 'Theophany and Tōrāh', pp.404ff.
CHAPTER TWO


THEOPHANY AND COVENANT.
CHAPTER TWO

THEOPHANY AND COVENANT.

One fact that emerges with sufficient clarity from the survey of the Israelite theophany tradition in the previous chapter, is that of the close connection obtaining between theophany and sanctuary. It is now our task to examine the Israelite concept of covenant; which may be said to have provided the cultic and institutional framework for the theophany tradition.

The origins of the הֵרָע -concept.

Recent scholarship generally acknowledges the impossibility of reaching a firm conclusion as to the etymology of the word הֵרָע.1) But if the

1) The etymology of הֵרָע: For full discussions as to the various suggestions, see

E. Nielsen, Shechem, pp. 110 - 118;
G. Östborn, Tora in the Old Testament, p. 44, note 4;

Nielsen prefers the suggestion of Noth, "O.T. covenant making in the light of a text from Mari", The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Essays, that הֵרָע stems from a borrowed Accadian preposition (ina bīrīt) meaning 'between'. Pedersen favours a derivation from cf. 1 Sam. 17:8 "םָּקַּנְתָּל לְָּכָּנַּת הִלְָּכָּנַּת - 'covenant with a man to become your representative'. (But others consider the hapaxlegomenon לְָּכָּנַּת to be a corruption from לְָּכָּנַּת.) Pedersen concedes: - "Absolut sicheres lässt sich kaum sagen. Nur soviel kann man bemerken, dass die beiden Bedeutungen 'essen' und 'festsetzen' dem Begriff des Bundes nahestehen ... Aber das heisst natürlich nicht, dass das Wort erst das Essen, danach den Bund bezeichnet habe."
linguistic origins of the term are obscure, study of the biblical and extra-biblical material relating to covenant has led to a general consensus as to the root significance of the concept: - i.e., the unification of two spheres of life\(^2\) formerly independent, with a resultant total or partial\(^3\) sharing of resources and obligations between the parties. Both the size of the uniting spheres, in themselves and relative to each other, and the apportionment of obligation and privilege, may vary according to the concrete circumstances in each case. Thus four main types of covenant appear\(^4\), both in the biblical and the extra-biblical material: -

A. Parity between the partners:

- Gen. 21:27, 32; Gen. 26:28;\(^5\) Gen. 31:44; 1 Sam. 23:18; 1 Kings 5:26(12); 1 Kings 15:19;\(^6\) Obadiah v. 7; Is. 33:8.

\(^2\) J. Pedersen, Der Eid bei den Semiten, p. 47, "Wenn Leute einen Bund schliessen, werden ihre Sphären vereinigt."

\(^3\) E. Gerstenberger, Wesen und Herkunft des "apodiktischen Rechts", p. 108, "Der Bund ... eine enge Gemeinschaft, eine 'fiktive Blutsverwandtschaft' stiftet, die gegenseitige Verpflichtung und gegenseitige Rechte einschliesst."

\(^4\) Cf. J. Pedersen, Eid, p. 28: The Arab hif as a covenant concluded for a limited object.

\(^5\) In the following references, we confine ourselves to examples of man-man covenants in the O.T. literature, as a means of laying a foundation for an understanding of the concept of God-man covenant.

\(^6\) There is a numinous quality of 'blessing' residing in Isaac, the potentialities of which, both for good and ill, are enormous. Yet on the other hand, Isaac is a stranger in a strange land and therefore needs protection. Basically, therefore, this is a treaty of mutual advantage. (It is the religious orientation of the narrative which makes the granting of the covenant a gracious act on Isaac's part.)

\(^6\) Reading with J. Gray, 1 and II Kings, p. 319: "There is a covenant between me and thee, and between my father and thy father."
B. The weaker party seeks the protection of the stronger, and pledges himself to undertake such obligations as the stronger may impose:
Josh. 9:1-15a; 1 Sam. 11:1-3; 2 Sam. 5:3; 1 Kings 20:34; 7
Is. 28:15, 18; (Hosea 7:11: the word הַלְּכַל does not occur, but Hos. 12:2 shows that it is implied.)

C. The stronger party offers his protection to the weaker, with or without conditions:
1 Sam. 18:1-4; 1 Sam. 20:8 (no conditions attached);
2 Sam. 3:12 (There are hidden conditions here. Abner confronts David as a self-styled king-maker, with the unspoken demand that when the kingdom is established, Abner will be accorded fitting status.)

D. The covenant between two parties is established by mediation of a third party:
There are no strict parallels to this usage among the 'secular' covenants recorded in the Old Testament, though 2 Sam. 3:21; 5:3 offer a close approximation. M. Noth 8) draws attention to the type, in his discussion of Mari text II/37, and suggests 2 Kings 11:17 and 2 Kings 23:3 as Biblical parallels. H. W. Wolff, 9) however, disallows Noth's parallels, and suggests instead Hos. 2:20(18); Ezek. 34:25; (Gen. 9:1-17).

7) 1 Kings 20:34: - Reading לַאַלְכָּה בִּרְאֵי תַּשְׁלִיחוֹת.
It will be seen that the demarcations of these four groupings are flexible. Within group A, there are variations in the strictness with which the word 'parity' is to be interpreted; and in other cases, several different 'types' successively emerge in the description of a single covenant relationship. See for example the covenant between David and Jonathan:

1 Sam. 18:3 - רֵיכַרְתָּ הַהוֹרֵגָה רוֹדְרֵה בָּרִית בְּאָבָהָיו אָחָה בְּבֵיתוֹ
1 Sam. 20:8 - רֻפֶּלֶת הַחֲמִישָׁה עַל-עַבְדֶּךָ כִּי בָּרִית הַהוֹרֵגָה בָּרִית הַבָּכָה עַבְדֶּךָ עַפָּר
1 Sam. 23:18 - רֵיכַרְתָּ שְׂכֵינָה בָּרִית בָּרִית לְפֶנּי הַרוֹדֶה - 18:18

The sense of 1 Sam. 18:3 would lead us to expect some such expression as לָדוֹר, indicating Jonathan's dominant status 10) : 1 Sam. 20:8, which recalls this initial act of covenant-making, clearly attributes the initiative to Jonathan's act of בָּכָה. The change of terminology at 1 Sam. 23:18 is deliberate, as emphasising the change in relative status of the two men. For David is now manifest as crown-prince designate, and in the coming kingdom Jonathan is to be subordinate to him.

This flexibility in usage, then, should warn us against attempting to deduce too firm a chronological pattern of development from the use of the various prepositions, 11) or from the succession of the various 'types' of

10) That such a phrase does not in fact occur, is perhaps due to the reticence of the pro-Davidic narrator.

11) So J. Pedersen, Eid, p. 47; Con

covenant listed above. 12)

The references to the covenant between Abner and David illustrate the same flexibility:

2 Sam. 3:12

In 2 Sam. 3:12 Abner, conscious that he is the stronger party, offers to accept David into an alliance-relationship in which he undertakes to establish David's claim to the kingship, whilst David would undertake to accept the hidden condition referred to above. V. 13 however, shows David asserting that the initiative in the covenant lies rightly with himself (cf. the stipulation backed up by the strong 'you shall not see my face unless' 14) ...). 2 Sam. 3:21 shows Abner virtually as covenant-mediator, in the preparations if not in the actual rites of solemnisation. It is not

12) H.W. Hertzberg, I and II Samuel, p. 92: "The berit is a solemn agreement between two partners, but it is not in the first place made by parties of equal standing; it is a matter of the terms of a settlement being dictated by the stronger party ... A second element is however, also important. The stronger party puts himself under an obligation as well, thereby providing the weaker party with a sacred sphere of rights."

13) 2 Sam. 3:12: - H.W. Hertzberg ingeniously emends the text, לאורמך לעברך אריך כך הוהינך אָל. This would sharpen but not alter the meaning of the passage.

14) Here too (cf. 10 above) we should perhaps allow for the reticence of the pro-Davidic narrator.
necessary to assume that these various covenant-'types', successively emerging to prominence, indicate successive literary strata; rather they witness to the breadth and flexibility of the covenant conception.

**General observations on the 'secular' covenants in the O.T. literature.**

1. **There is a close relationship between 'covenant' and 'oath'**\(^{15}\): -

   Gen. 21:22-32\(^{16}\) (עָבֹר); Gen. 26:28 (׃ לַחֶק); Gen. 26:31 (׃ עָבֹר);

   cf. Ezek. 17:13, 18 (׃ לַחֶק). J. Pedersen\(^{17}\) cites Arabic parallels to show that the covenant is substantially a form of oath; so that he who breaks the oath is henceforth without the circle of the pact-relationship ('ahd) and consequently in the realm of curse and death.

   Cf. the later development of the covenant curse in the Deuteronomistic-Deuteronomistic literature, Dtn. 26:28, 30. The obverse of this is of course the concept of blessing: Gen. 21:22b-23a tells how a covenant is sought with the patriarch, precisely because he is one in whom blessing inheres, i.e. a resource which can then be shared by all who belong with him in the communion of the covenant.

---

15) D. J. McCarthy, *Treaty and Covenant*, p. 169, comments on the treaty-form in the Ancient Near Eastern materials: - "The very designation of the treaty" (rikṣu u māmītū) "implies an obligation assumed under oath." (McCarthy goes on however, - unnecessarily - to distinguish "treaty" and "covenant" at this point.)

16) The passage is of course already theologised. The implied status of Abraham as a ger, and the 'buying' of the well as a future possession, emphasise both the faith of Abraham, and the divine initiative in the gift of the land.

2. Blessing and curse were originally conceived as independent forces; but in the Old Testament examples, the concept has invariably been adapted to Yahwism by means of the theophany motif. In Gen. 31:48-9, the stone was originally the repository of the curse, and thus guardian of the covenant-oath and punisher of the transgressor; but subsequently Yahweh Himself has become the witness of the oath.

3. The primitive concept of covenant or oath seems to be intensely personalistic: It is concerned with the establishment of וְיָ֖דִיתֶּ֗ם in the sense of unity based on integrity (Gen. 26:31; 1 Kings 5:26(12)) and brotherhood (Gen. 26:31; 1 Kings 20:32-33; Gen. 31:46, 54(18)). The rites by which peace and brotherhood are inaugurated are also intensely personalistic - partaking together in a common meal (Gen. 26:30; Gen. 31:46, 54(19); Josh. 9:12, 14(20)), exchange of clothing(21)

---

18) Jacob's 'kinsmen' in these verses are probably Laban and his household.


20) V. 12 seems to imply that the food was proffered by the party seeking to be taken into covenant. Acceptance of what is proffered means ratification of the covenant, and willingness to undertake its obligations.

21) J.Pedersen, Eid, p. 24, notes that a man's personality is believed to inhere in his clothing. Cf. H.v.Hertzberg, I and II Samuel, p. 155, "Exchange of clothing is a recognition of the alter ego in the covenant of friendship" - giving away one's clothing is equivalent to giving away oneself. Cf. also the Ras Shamra text referred to in note 48.
and weapons (1 Sam. 18:4), the proffering of gifts 22) (1 Kings 15:19; Gen. 21:30), handshake (Ezekiel 17:18). In effect covenant creates a bond of kinship, a 'blood-brotherhood'.

4. Sacrifice or sacrificial ritual played an important part in primitive covenantal thought and practice. Assuming that the primitive sacrifice was regarded as a means of communion between worshipper and deity, the connection of sacrifice with covenant implies that the lesser party, who is taken by covenant into the sphere of the greater, is thereby brought into communion also with the tutelary deity of the host-party. This concept is important, for we are probably justified in seeing here the primitive root to which the idea of a God-man covenant relationship is ultimately traceable.

5. To what extent was a stipulationary element essential to the primitive covenant concept? From the biblical examples under review, it would seem that the stipulationary element was secondary and comparatively unimportant. The primary theme is 'reception into the family', 'unification of spheres'; so that the obligation undertaken is a general one - loyalty (יְדֹעֵן - Dtn. 7:9, 1 Sam. 20:15; מְשַׁפְּד - Isaiah 38:3, 18, 19; מַלְשָׁנָה - Ps. 89:34), mutual defence and respect (Gen. 26:28f.; Amos 1:9), kindness (1 Sam. 20:8), preservation of life (Josh. 9:15) and of peace (Ob. v. 7). These provisions are

22) On the ancient significance of a gift, see Pedersen, Eid, p. 49:- "Endlich finden wir die Gabe .. gebraucht, nämlich zur Vereinigung der beiden Parteien dadurch, dass etwas von der Sphäre des einen in die des anderen übergeht."
scarcely describable in terms of specific stipulations. As we saw above, 'externalising' and 'legalising' tendencies set in, in the course of time: the 'gift', which symbolised self-giving and fusion of personality, becomes a legally-fixed exaction or tribute, a price (Gen. 21:27, 32), a fee (1 Kings 15:19), a barter (1 Kings 5:24-26) (EV. 5:10-12). But in the primitive roots of the covenant concept, it is clear that the personalistic predominates over the stipulationary aspects:—cf. 1 Sam. 18:1-4, 1 Sam. 20:8, 2 Sam. 5:3. It would thus seem that in seeking to elucidate the beginnings of covenant-making.

23) Cf. 1 Kings 20:34. Here 'gift' has definitely become 'tribute'—a clear example of a 'stipulation' incorporated into covenant-making. Similarly 2 Sam. 3:13. Both these texts, however, establish a precondition, to be fulfilled before the covenant comes into being; whereas stipulations in the strict sense set out duties that recur within the covenant sphere, and the non-fulfilment of these at any time effectively ends the covenant-relationship previously established.

Cf. also 1 Sam. 11:1-3. Here too the stipulations laid down are preconditions of covenant-solemnisation, not covenant stipulations as such. More radically, it may plausibly be argued that these preliminary stipulations run counter to the essential purpose and significance of 'covenant', i.e., the preservation of well-being, and hence in fact amount to a cynical rejection of the request to be taken into covenant-relationship.

24) 1 Kings 5:24-26 (10-12) is rather in a class by itself. It describes a trade treaty, presumably involving stipulations from both sides. But even here, the stipulations are secondary to the already-existent friendship, on the basis of which the trade pact becomes possible. The passage is in any case late; cf. M. Noth, Uberlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien, p. 68, concludes that the whole of 1 Kings 5 is undoubtedly deuteronomistic, and is based on deductions from 2 Sam. 5:11 and from records of Solomon's building enterprises (1 Kings 9:27; 1 Kings 10:11, 22).

25) 2 Sam. 5:3: David takes a pledge of the elders' loyalty to himself; for what is envisaged in the text is not a united political state but a personal union, based on common commitment to David as king.
ant thought in Israel by use of analogy from extra-biblical materials, we
should think in terms of pre-Israel's sharing in the more personalistic,
dynamic forms of covenant rooted in the nomadic or semi-nomadic sphere,
rather than in terms of conscious dependence upon the patterns of the more
formal, sophisticated state-treaties of the Accadians and Hittites. \(26)\) We
should, however, note a factor which complicates comparative study in this
area; i.e. that the O.T. examples concentrate on describing the circum-
estances of covenant-making rather than an actual formal covenant content, and
that this emphasis may in fact be rather one-sided (e.g. 1 Kings 5:12 and
Hos. 12:2 imply a covenant document with a specific content). The relevant
Ancient Near Eastern texts, on the other hand, provide us only with the
documents, and tell little or nothing about the circumstances and accompany-
ing rites of the covenant-making.

The religious element in the primitive covenant concept.

It is sufficiently clear from the examples we have examined so far, that
religious ideas in fact permeate all concepts of covenant. At a very early
stage the curse, which was originally conceived as operating 'an sich', is
connected with the notion of divine retribution against the oath-breaker.
The covenant is made 'before God', and gains in power and efficacy from its
being solemnised in a holy place, (i.e., a place with a numinous-theophanic
history). Also, the solemnising of covenant in sacrifice means that the
two parties which are made one in the new sphere of the covenant, are brought
into communion with the tutelary deity of the new whole. \(27)\) It is therefore

\(26)\) See further below, pp. 233, 300, 312, 314f.
\(27)\) See H.-J.Kraus, Worship in Israel, p. 118.
likely that the concept of a God-man covenant relationship occurred at a very early stage. 28)

The covenant with the patriarchs.

The first specific reference to covenant in the patriarchal narratives is in Genesis 15. (It should be noted, however, that the idea of covenant lies close beneath the surface in Gen. 12:1-8; 13:1-4; 13:14-18 29). These passages recount the divine invitation to Abraham to enter into a specific relationship, and give an account of the blessings that are thereby to accrue. Abraham's acceptance of this divine offer is seen in his obedient setting out, and in his offering sacrifice to Yahweh, Gen. 12:8; 13:4, 18.

28) A possible Sumerian example of a God-man treaty is cited by D.J. McCarthy, Treaty and Covenant, p. 17: "Urukagina made this covenant with Ningirsu", whereby "the powerful" were restrained from "oppressing the orphan and the widow". Similarly, S.N. Kramer, From the Tablets of Sumer, 1956, p. 45f. The translation, however, is uncertain: "It may be that the text is to be interpreted in the sense that the god aided in or agreed to the reformed order", (McCarthy, op. cit., p. 17).

The Handbuch der Alterarabischen Altertumskunde, Band I, (herausgegeben von D. Nielsen), pp. 119, 236; also cites Sabean inscription, Glaser 484: "... he established the whole community (united) by a god and a patron, and by a pact and a (secret) treaty." But cf. A.N.E.T., J.B. Pritchard, p. 506: "This formula ... does not prove that the organisation of the Sabean community was a theocracy."

Martin Buber, Kingship of God, p. 90, also cites the same examples.

If these examples are not conclusive evidence that the deity was conceived as a covenant-partner, they at least attest the deity's intimate involvement as the guardian-preserver of the covenant bond; and so help to prepare the climate of thought in which the specifically God-man covenant concept could emerge.

29) The material in these verses may have been formulated at a later stage than the tradition recorded in Gen. 15:1-6, but they no doubt accurately reflect the same basic ancient tradition, viz. the divine choice of the fathers. - See W. Zimmerli, "Promise and Fulfilment", Essays on O.T. Interpretation, ed. C. Westermann, pp. 89ff.
Some scholars have questioned the antiquity of the Gen. 15 tradition, and of the concept of patriarchal covenant in general on the grounds that

a) the word נֵרֵי ה' (v. 18) occurs elsewhere exclusively in passages of Deuteronomistic composition or editing; and

b) that the passage Gen. 15:7-20 as a whole bears the marks of heavy editing and adaptation to the old Sinai tradition (see above, pp. 44, 95).

Against this, two observations are relevant:

1. M. Noth has shown that, the rite involving the slaughtering and halving of animals is undoubtedly ancient, and that the term בֵּית (with the probable meaning 'mediation') was anciently attached to the rite. Further, A. Alt has argued convincingly that this ancient rite formed part of the pre-settlement Israelite God of the Fathers tradition.

2. We have suggested above that the covenant theme is clearly implicit in material such as Gen. 12:1-8 etc., whatever the terminology employed.


31) H. Gunkel, Genesis, p. 167, reviews the evidence for deuteronomistic influences in the passage. See notes 138 and 141 in ch. one, "The Theophany Tradition".


W. Zimmerli and A. Alt have both stressed that the 'promise of the land' is a theme ancient and crucial to the patriarchal traditions; and the 'promise' is intimately related to the whole covenant concept.

Therefore, whatever processes of redaction the material has undergone, there seem to be no good grounds for denying that the concept of a God-man covenant had already emerged in the pre-Mosaic Israelite period.

Opinions are also divided as to the significance of the rite described in Gen. 15. E. Nielsen connects the rite with the purification element that undoubtedly constitutes an ancient feature of the religious covenant concept (Gen. 35:1ff; Ex. 19:10, 15). He holds that the participants were supposed to have all their impurity absorbed by the corpses of the animals. H.-J. Kraus relates the cutting of the animals' flesh to the practice of seeking sacrificial omens, suggesting that in some sense the ritual was a preparation for experiencing a theophany. For Robertson Smith, the

---


36) E. Nielsen, Shechem, p. 117, suggests that the Accadian concept of 'birit' was carried West by wandering tribesmen, and 'took root' at the caravan-centre of Canaanite Shechem centuries before the incursion of the Israelites. But there is no reason why Abraham himself may not be considered part of that migration of wandering tribesmen, and therefore a bearer of the ancient covenant rites and terminology. The non-occurrence of the term ל"ו ל"י outside Gen. 15 does not prove it to be a post-settlement borrowing from the Canaanites.

37) E. Nielsen, Shechem, p. 114f.

38) H.-J. Kraus, Worship in Israel, p. 119.

laying out of the pieces of flesh means the sanctification of the area thus enclosed, and that the participants enter into communion within the enclosure, being made one within the parts of the victim which, though dismembered, still remains one. 40)

J. Pedersen 41) prefers to think of the ceremony as an oath-taking rather than a covenant proper; his reason being that for him, mutuality is of the essence of covenant, whereas here it is Yahweh alone that is bound, (similarly with Jer. 34:18). The preponderance of scholarship, however, would explain the rite in terms of provisional self-cursing (1 Sam. 11:7; Jud. 19:29) 42), and this seems the most probable explanation. Whichever of the alternatives we adopt, however, the meaning of the passage is clear in essence; i.e. Yahweh's promise of land and posterity is affirmed in the strongest possible terms - v. 18, 'To your descendants I give this land'. Whether or not we are prepared to call this a 'covenant' in the technical sense (of the type C. as described above), it is clear that the concept of covenant in embryo at least, is already implicit in the tradition. But if, as the foregoing discussion suggests, we are dealing with the gradual emergence of a concept rather than with the occurrence of a sudden blinding insight to an individual, then the attempt to draw a sharp line between pre-covenant promissory oath, and covenant proper, appears rather academic.

40) cf. 1 Cor. 10:17 : the loaf of which all partake remains one, and hence all the partakers are thereby bound into a union through the bread and what it connotes.

41) J. Pedersen, Eid, p. 49.

42) cf. the A.N.E. parallel cited by D.J. McCarthy, Treaty and Covenant, p. 70f.
Pedersen would presumably argue from his criterion of two-sidedness, that only with the Sinai event does covenant in the true sense appear. But his criterion is rather more rigid than the evidence seems to warrant. The essence of the matter is that the patriarchs believed themselves to be under the protection and guidance of a tutelary deity who had chosen them, pledging himself to lead them into possession of a land-inheritance. The evidence shows that this tradition is genuinely ancient and independent, not simply an adumbration of the Sinai tradition but its authentic precursor. We have seen in our chapter on theophany that this pattern of 'the promise of an inheritance' is worked out through the whole JE. patriarchal tradition, and is constantly strengthened by being set in contexts of theophany. In this, JE. is followed by both D. and P.: -

In the paraeneses of Deuteronomy (e.g. Dttn. 9:5) the settlement is represented as the fulfilment of the promise made to the fathers; and that 'promise' is understood as 'covenant' is clear from the close relationship drawn between this 'promise' and the Sinai accounts. - "Es musste natürlich ein Grund angegeben werden, warum Jahwe als Richter im heiligen Krieg für Israel entscheidet, obwohl sich keine Aussage der Gerechtigkeit Israels formulieren liess. Dieser Grund liegt in den den Patriarchen gegebenen Verheissungen, die sich damit als etwas den Sinaibund und auch dessen Bruch (mit Nichtbeobachtung des Gesetzes) Umfangendes erweisen."43)

And in the Priestly tradition, the covenant concept is retrojected from the patriarchal period into the pre-history, (see ch. one, 'The Theophany

43) N. Lohfink, Das Haarwerk, p. 204.
Tradition', n. 70), so that 'Sinai' is no longer the covenant par excellence but becomes a mere confirmation of the established with Adam and Noah, and particularised with Abraham and his seed for ever.44)

The Sinai Covenant Tradition.

In ch. one, (pp.402), we traced the broad pattern of the Sinai tradition as found in E. and in J.:-

1. Preparation for theophany.
2. The theophany.
   (i) The trumpet summons to appear before God.
   (ii) The theophany proper.
3. Declaration of the divine demands,
4. Sacrifice and covenant solemnisation.

Our first task will be to seek to determine to what extent these basic elements can in fact be traced back to that definitive Sinai event which marks the beginnings of Israelite Yahwism. Let us look at these elements one by one:-

1. Preparations for Theophany.

Scholars who assume that the Sinai tradition is dependent on the Shechem covenant tradition, and a retrojection of this into Mosaic times,45) have

44) W. Zimmerli, "Promise and Fulfilment", op. cit., p. 94.

45) See E. Nielsen, Shechem, pp. 347f. J. Hempel, "Bund", R.C.G. 3 1, col. 1513 - 1516 mentions this as a possible explanation of the origins of the covenant concept in Israel.
argued that the preparations for theophany in the Sinai account are dependent on the "putting away of foreign gods" which is prominent in the Shechem cult\(^\text{46}\) and no doubt represents an essential and pre-Israelite element there. According to Gen. 35:2f. the Shechem purification-rite consisted in: burying the image-deities that were in the possession of the worshippers, together with the gold and silver from which fresh images could have been fashioned, 'purification' of the worshippers themselves, (יָרָה v. 2), and changing of garments. It is interesting, however, that the description of the people's response (v. 4) mentions only the handing over of idols and ornaments. It is possible, therefore, that this alone is the original element of the Shechem tradition, and that 'self-purification' and change of clothing are later embellishments. The description of the preparations for the Sinai encounter, on the other hand, mentions nothing of 'putting away idols'\(^\text{47}\), but only 'self-purification' (מְנַשֶּׁה וּמַעְרָק Ex. 19:10), and changing of clothes, (v. 10). Probably both וּמַעְרָק and מְנַשֶּׁה in these contexts signify sexual abstinence, of the regulation for the holy war concerning a three-day abstinence (לְתַנּוֹן) before engaging in battle (1 Sam. 21:5). The most likely account, then, of the relation between Shechem and Sinai traditions at this point, is that Gen. 35:1-5 represents a conflation of original Canaanite-Shechem tradition with the more general type of 'purification', which in this case was probably original to the Sinai tradition. Sexual abstinence (and

\(^{46}\) A. Alt, "Die Wallfahrt von Sichem nach Bethel", Kleine Schriften I, p. 81f.

\(^{47}\) The intrusion of idols made from ear-rings and ornaments (Ex. 32) is a later elaboration of the Sinai tradition, almost certainly influenced by the Shechem 'purification' tradition.
the washing of clothes as a closely-related idea) is intimately concerned with the concept of 'holiness', with the preservation of the psychic potential at its maximum. This is well illustrated from the holy war ideology: "For the army to preserve its concentrated strength it is necessary that every man in it should possess absolute purity. We know that purity is consistent with the integrity of the soul; impurity destroys its integrity, and therefore impairs the strength of the soul." These concepts are so elemental that there is no need to posit a Canaanite influence on Israelite thought at this point; rather, 'purification' may be assumed to have formed part of Israel's common Semitic inheritance from pre-Mosaic times. According to v.Rad, the concept of holy war, with which these ideas are intimately connected, is rooted in the pre-Canaanite outlook of 'Israel', an aspect of the genuine old Yahweh-faith, before its combination with Canaanite mythological cult-traditions.

The most probable account of the relation between Gen. 35 and Ex. 19, then, is that during the process whereby the Shechem tradition was being

---

48) J.Pedersen, *Israel*, III, p. 8. - Among the things which cause impurity are the issues of the body, especially such as belong to the sexual life. For a Canaanite example of clothes-washing, with a somewhat different, but related significance, see Ras Shamra text Aqhat II 1 34; references in: -
G.R.Driver, *Canaanite Myths and Legends*, p. 48f.;


incorporated into the Yahwistic tradition, the account of the formerly Canaanite rite has been enriched by details drawn from the originally independent pre-settlement Sinai tradition. 52)

2. The Theophany.

(i) The trumpet summons to appear before God.

We suggested in chapter one, (p. 42) that the trumpets first entered the Sinai tradition through their use in the later cultic re-presentation of the theophanic qāl, which was in turn grounded in the volcanic-thunder phenomena of the original Sinai event. 53) (The mention of trumpets in the Holy War tradition suggests that they may have been adopted into the Sinai ritual-tradition at an early date.)

(ii) Theophany proper.

We have already seen that theophany is firmly rooted in the pre-Mosaic traditions.

a) The 'God of the Fathers' tradition has its roots in patriarchal experiences of theophany, 54) however much Canaanite theophanic material has crystallised round this primitive core in the course of the tradition's development.

52) Cf. E. Nielsen, Shechem, p. 18:— "It is certain that the ritual of the abolition of foreign gods is deeply rooted in Shechem. But it is just as certain that the O.T. account of that ritual represents an Israelite interpretation."


b) Sinai in all likelihood was already in pre-Mosaic days a theophanic sanctuary55) and centre for the ancient worship of Yahweh. We suggested, chapter one (notes 51, 52, and 74), that the older elements of Israel had a long-standing acquaintance with the theophanic tradition at this mountain sanctuary, and that the Joseph tribes through their leader Moses, had similar links - links which in their case led them to the dramatic experience on the mountain, en route from Egypt, which became definitive for the specifically Israelite Yahwism on the soil of Canaan.

Theophany, then, is an essential element in the historical core of the Sinai tradition.

3. The declaration of the divine demands in the Sinai covenant tradition.

Our survey of the accounts of man-man covenants in the Old Testament showed that the inclusion of specific stipulations within the actual framework of the covenant (i.e., as distinct from the enunciations of conditions to be fulfilled preparatory to covenant solemnisation) was exceptional; at most, the covenant included the statement of some principle-of-relationship in general terms - loyalty, mutual respect and protection, faithfulness, truth, etc. As Noth remarks on the covenant ratification in Ex. 24:9-11 :

"The content of this covenant is now binding on both sides without the need for formulated clauses which regulate the relationship which is so formed, just as there is no mention of any such conditions in the present

55) M. Noth, Exodus, p. 43.
context." It would be consonant with the examples from O.T. man-man covenants, if initially the stipulational element in the Sinai covenant consisted solely in an unelaborated declaration of the Hauptgebot. We suggest below, chapter 3, 'Theophany and Torah', p. 331, that the Mosaic-decalogue tradition may have originated with those commandments most characteristically expressing the Hauptgebot, (i.e. prohibition of other gods, prohibition of images, sabbath-command); to which Mosaic core there eventually became attached the ancient Kenite-Kadesh(?) decalogue on the one hand, and the later Israelite ethical provisions on the other. That even these Hauptgebot clauses were consciously framed on the 'day of assembly' as integral to the covenant, is impossible of proof. It is sufficient if we assume that prior to the settlement with its consequent Canaanite influences, 'covenant' meant "a relationship with Yahweh, initiated in theophany, and summed up in the conviction that Yahweh has become 'Israel's' God, and that 'Israel' has become Yahweh's people." (We ought, certainly, to leave open the possibility of an early accretion of pre-settlement legal material through Israel's early contacts with Kadesh. (See chapter one, n. 52) But it is on the whole unlikely that such material would have been immediately integrated with the theophany-covenant core. Such an integration is more likely to stem from subsequent theological reflection.)


56a) The term Hauptgebot is used throughout as a convenient short-hand expression to denote those commandments requiring exclusive loyalty to Yahweh, i.e., practically, the first table of the Ethical decalogue.

4. Sacrifice and Covenant Solemnisation.

If man-man covenants solemnised by the partners' participating together in a covenant meal were part of 'Israelite' culture in patriarchal times (Gen. 31:46, 54), and if on the other hand the concept of God-man covenant emerged as early as we have suggested, then there is no inherent improbability in ascribing the ancient ceremony described in Ex. 24:9-11 to Mosaic times. Of the strands represented in Ex. 24:5-8, it is probable that the twelve pillars (v. 4) reflect the form of the covenant cult as it was practised at Gilgal (see below, p. 251f), whilst the references to the 'book of the covenant' probably imply an even more developed view of the cultus. The offering of מים (v. 5), and the sprinkling of blood on altar and people (vv. 6, 8), however, are undoubtedly ancient covenant-forms - cf. their kinship with the rite described in Gen. 15; so that again there would be no inherent improbability in ascribing either of the rites to Mosaic times. Whether one or any of these three ceremonials (sacral-meal, sacrifice, blood-sprinkling) in fact dates from that original theophany-covenant encounter experienced by 'Joseph' en route from Egypt, it is of course impossible to prove.59 But all three, by their very antiquity, lie close enough to that primal event to be taken as evidence for the fact that some such solemnisation rite did in fact belong to the Sinai tradition from its inception. It is most unlikely that such a ritual element would adhere to the tradition, if there were no point in the original event to

58) מים - See M. Noth, "O.T. covenant making in the light of a text from Mari", The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Essays.

59) W. Beyerlin, The Oldest Sinaitic Traditions, p. 36f.

The Early Centres of Israelite Covenant Tradition.

In this section, we shall attempt to trace the development of the covenant tradition, from the Ephraimite Conquest to the dedication of Solomon's temple. Of primary importance for this survey are the cultic traditions of Shechem, Gilgal, Shiloh, and (pre-disruption) Jerusalem.\(^61\) The major texts which furnish the relevant material, however, are the end-product of at least 700 years' growth; in the course of which process earlier and later strands have become inextricably intertwined. The earlier period, therefore, cannot be viewed in isolation, but only as the groundwork of the developed whole. Thus while we shall confine ourselves as strictly as practicable to the pre-disruption period, it will be necessary to take some note of the Deuteronomistic (and Priestly) elaborations of these early traditions.

1. Shechem.

(a) Pre-Israelite Shechem.

The simplest interpretation of the evidence is that in pre-Israelite days, there were already two shrines at Shechem (though the primitive

\(^61\) Leaving Bethel out of account: since Jud. 20:20-28 is generally agreed to be late, and not reliable from the strictly historical viewpoint, little is known about the pre-Jeroboam cult at Bethel. Jud. 2:1-5 is sometimes held to indicate that Bethel was once a station of the ark, but it is unwise to reconstruct a covenant ceremony on such a slender basis.

relationship between them is necessarily obscure): -

a) a sacred oak, situated outside the city (Gen. 33:18-20),

b) a temple dedicated to the אל ברית / בּעל ברית within the city (Jud. 9:46ff.).

Of these, the former soon became Israelite, but the latter remained in Canaanite control until the city was captured by Abimelech in the twelfth century, (and subsequently incorporated into Manasseh.) It seems certain that both these shrines, whatever their mutual relationship, included ritual aspects which were subsequently adopted and incorporated into Yahwism: -

(i) The rejection and destruction of foreign gods, attested by Gen. 35:2-4; Josh. 24:23; (cf. Jud. 10:16; 1 Sam. 7:3ff.; 2 Chron. 33:15; and also Dan. 31:16). 62) This rite would seem originally to have possessed apotropaic significance, ensuring inviolability against the invasions of foreign powers and their attendant deities. But in Israel the rite has been given a new significance, in the context of the Sinai covenant tradition: it has been related to the Sinai pre-covenant purification (see p.220f above), and it has been made to represent the rejection of other gods, as a prelude to the positive oath of loyalty to Yahweh alone. (It is possible of course that the original Canaanite rite may also have involved the taking of an oath of loyalty to the בּעל ברית of Shechem, but

62) The bracketed verses are actually closer in tradition-history to Josh. 24:20 than is Gen. 35:1-4. — So, M. Noth, Das Buch Josua, p. 106.
(ii) That the cult of the בֵּית יהוּדָה of Shechem has in some way influenced the Sinai covenant tradition, seems conclusive; but to what extent, or in what precise way, is impossible to determine. For in fact we know very little about the nature of the Canaanite-Shechem. נֵר מַדִּיר. Was the בֵּית conceived as the guardian and guarantor of man-man treaties, or as an actual participant in covenant with a human partner? But whichever of the alternatives is nearer the truth, there is no reason on its basis to deny the originality and independence of the connection between Sinai-theophany and the concept of covenant between Yahweh and Israel.

As we shall see below, (chapter 3, 'Theophany and תּוֹרָה', p.320) some scholars have supposed that Israel encountered the Canaanite legal tradition specifically via Shechem, in connection with the sanctuary of נֵר מַדִּיר, and thence incorporated it into the Yahwistic covenant tradition; and even that the tradition of the two stone tablets of the law originated in tablets set before the Canaanite shrine at Shechem, and inscribed with some form of entry-תּוֹרָה. It seems more likely, however, (see chapter 3, 'Theophany and תּוֹרָה', note 2), that the Canaanite law was commonly available throughout the land at the time of the settlement, and is unlikely to have been adopted from any one shrine. It is wiser, therefore, to leave open the whole question as to the relationship between נֵר מַדִּיר and the Canaanite legal traditions.
Both the J. and E. traditions attest that Shechem was the site of the first 'Israelite' shrine within the promised land. According to Gen. 12:6ff., Abraham built an altar at Shechem, to Yahweh who had appeared to him - subsequently he established (and revisited) the shrine in Bethel, before finally settling at Hebron. The Elohisto tradition records of its hero Jacob that on his return from Padan-Aram he purchased the site of the Yahwistic shrine at Shechem, and built on the site an altar to יהוה. (Jacob's first contact with Bethel (Gen. 28:18-22) is chronologically prior to the founding of the Shechem-shrine, but it is only later (Gen. 35:7-8) that the Bethel sanctuary is in fact consecrated to the God of Jacob, יהוה. It is possible, indeed, that the sequence 'Bethel visit', 'Shechem shrine', 'Bethel shrine' may be a conscious harmonisation of two acknowledged traditions, viz., the great antiquity of the Bethel sanctuary, and the priority traditionally conceded to Shechem.) One might go further, and say that in the final polished form of the tetrateuch, there is a conscious correspondence between : Shechem, first patriarchal shrine, at which the fathers received in theophany the covenant promise of a land inheritance; and Shechem, first Israelite shrine at which the tribes remembered the Sinai theophany and the covenant based thereon.

Shechem and Israel.

In tracing the establishment and development of the Sinai covenant tradition at Shechem, the following texts fall to be considered: -
Joshua 24:1-28; Dtn. 11:29-32 and 27:1-26; Joshua 8:30-35.

(i) Josh. 24.

According to M. Noth, Josh. 24 and Jud. 2:1-5 were inserted into their present context by a late, post-Deuteronomistic editor (Jud. 1 inserted even later). These insertions clearly break the original Deuteronomistic connection between Jos. 23 and Jud. 2:6. Thus originally Josh. 24 was not a 'last testimony of Joshua', but comprised an independent Shechem-covenant tradition, neither traceable to any of the 'Hexateuch' sources, nor related to the pre-Dnc. material in chs. 1-12.

As to the reliability of the passage as an historical source, A. Alt concludes that the core of the complex of material is an

63) M. Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien, p. 9.

64) We saw, chapter one (p. 121) that Jud. 2:1-5 is possibly a parallel to Gen. 35:1-5 (an original Shechem reference, transferred to Gilgal), and hence concerned also with the tradition of the 'renunciation of foreign gods', which we have seen to be embedded in Josh. 24.

65) Josh. 24 in its present position is obviously later than Dtr., as it introduces a division into books which is different from Dtr's. (The same is true also of the present concluding chapters of Judges and 2 Samuel). The sections of the Distic. History in its original form are marked by: - Josh. 23 (conclusion of the conquest), 1 Sam. 12 (end of the period of the Judges), 1 Kings 8:14ff. (end of the first half of the period of the kingdoms).

66) Most scholars have ascribed Josh. 24 to the Elohist; cf. v. Rad, "The Problem of the Hexateuch", The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays, p. 32.

aetiology of the great stone of Shechem, set up at the ancient
numinous tree-sanctuary there (Jos. 24:27b-28). Joshua, by virtue
of his reputation as hero-leader of the Ephraimite conquest-settle-
ment, is then connected with this memorial stone at this first
Yahwistic sanctuary in the land; and by virtue of his position as
arbitrator in the land-settlement (Jos. 17:14ff.) is made judge and
law-giver of Israel, and thereby attracts to himself the subse-
quently developing legal traditions of Shechem. M. Noth 68), as we have
just seen, however, denies that Josh. 24 is an expansion based on
materials drawn from the book of Joshua as a whole, and argues that
the chapter is an independent tradition, the core of which is
concerned with a cultic act of covenant solemnisation and proclama-
tion of covenant law. Noth's interpretation of the passage is con-
firmed, it seems to me, by Dtn. 11:29-32 + Dtn. 27:1-26 (see further
below), which is not derived from Josh. 24 but constitutes an
independent yet closely related witness to an ancient ceremony of
covenant renewal at Shechem.

As to who the covenant-partners were in the historic Shechem
covenant, Noth considers that the event recorded here is the founding
of the twelve-tribe Israelite amphictyony. By means of a solemn
ceremony, those tribes which had not experienced the bondage in
Egypt and the Red-Sea deliverance were initiated into the sacred
tradition, and pledged their loyalty to Yahweh and their willingness
to join the league of His covenant people. 69) In this covenant-

69) M. Noth, Das System der zwölf Stämme Israels, pp. 65ff.
solemnisation Joshua, as 'judge' of 'Joseph', acts as mediator between the two groups of tribes and Yahweh. (This is in fact the original setting of Joshua, whence he intrudes into the narratives of chs. 1-12). An alternative suggestion, however, has been put forward by E. Nielsen. 70) He argues that 'Joseph' was not an original unit which subsequently divided into the sub-divisions Manasseh and Ephraim, but rather that 'Joseph' first came into union in their early settlement period; and that Josh. 24 in fact contains the deposit of testimony to this coming together of Ephraim and Manasseh in the Joseph-union. The phrase 'Me and my house' (v. 15) would then indicate 'Joshua and Ephraim'. This suggestion of Nielsen's is attractive: It explains more clearly:

a) the integration of the Jacob (Manassite) sagas with the Joseph traditions,

b) the fact that the ark (of Benjamite origin - see below, p. 247) appears only subsequently in the covenant tradition,

c) the fact that Judah was comparatively late in being drawn completely into the circle of the twelve.

The form of the covenant ceremony as outlined in Josh. 24 is as follows:

1. 'Previous history', or recital of Yahweh's gracious dealings with the assembled people, (vv. 1-12, 13);

2. Preparation for covenant ceremony (vv. 14, 23);

3. Declaration on the part of the tribes that they choose Yahweh as

their God (vv. 16-18, 21, 24);
4. The solemnisation of the covenant (v. 25);
5. The witnesses of the covenant solemnisation (v. 22, vv. 26b-27).

Beyerlin sees the influence of the A.N.E. Vassal Treaty form here. While such an influence may be traceable in the finished form of Josh. 24, it is probably the result of an eighth-century impress upon the material (see p. 314f.), and is unlikely to have been present in the primitive core of the tradition. For it is obvious that the material of Josh. 24 does not all belong to a single stratum of the following unevennesses:

- the gods to be rejected in the preparatory purification come from various stages of the national history (Egyptian, Mesopotamian, Canaanite gods, popular Israelite idols - vv. 14, 15, 23);
- the record of the people's covenant-declaration has been embellished and edited, (vv. 16-21, 22b, 24);
- the covenant witnesses: on the one hand, the people themselves (v. 22b); on the other, the great stone (vv. 26b-27);
- the covenant solemnisation: v. 26a is normally regarded as a Deuteronomistic addition; and probably vv. 25a and 25b also represent two distinct stages in the growth of the tradition:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{v. 25a) } & \text{ ריהמט ויורטש ברידט ליעמ בירטמ הורזא} \\
\text{v. 25b) } & \text{ ריהמט ליר חק רמשמט בשבכמ} \\
\end{align*}
\]

It is therefore not necessary to suppose that a fully elaborated formed part of the historic ceremony which inaugur-
ated the Shechem covenant, but that with the growth of theological reflection on the significance and scope of Israel's covenant with Yahweh, legal materials essential for the ordering of life within the community increasingly adhered to the central covenant core.\(^{71}\)

Noth\(^{72}\) points out the striking absence from the 'previous history' of any reference to the Sinai event. One might expect such a reference, between vv. 7 and 8, especially so in view of the fact that the purpose of the ceremony is to draw into the Yahweh-covenant those tribes who had not experienced Egypt, or the Red-Sea deliverance, or the Sinai theophany-and-covenant. But other elements also are lacking - e.g., there is no mention of the rite of covenant-solemnisation, though some such rite must certainly have attached to the occasion. We may safely conclude that we have before us only a part of the total ceremonial (possibly that part which was regarded as most significant by the post-Deuteronomistic redactor): it may well be that in conjunction with the basically paraenetic material now preserved in Josh. 24, there was also a dramatic re-presentation of the Sinai theophany, such as our examination of the oldest Sinai tradition would lead us to expect. This suspicion that the theophanic

---

71) How soon this development began is uncertain, but probably it was rather early. cf. our suggestion in ch. 3, 'Theophany and Torah', p.355f. that the use of the sing. composite term UBBYBY, Pn is comparatively ancient (con. J.L'Hour, op. cit., p. 30, who regards it as post-exilic). M. Noth, Das Buch Josua, p. 109, remarks that the 'words' witnessed by the stone (Josh. 24:27) are, according to the present context, the content of vv. 2-13; but that originally "im vorliegenden Bestand nicht mehr erhaltene Jahwe-Worte gemeint waren".

was once more strongly represented in the tradition, gains support from the fact that throughout Josh. 24:1-16, Joshua is portrayed as the covenant-mediator, and that as such he speaks as the mouth-piece of God, in the prophetic-oracle form (vv. 2b-13). The presentation of the utterance of God in the first person "makes it clear that Yahweh's cultic epiphany is presupposed here also".


A survey of the overall structure of the book of Deuteronomy makes it plain that these two passages are relatively late insertions: Deuteronomy 11:22-8 reads as a climaxing peroration (vv. 16-18, curse; vv. 22-5, blessing; vv. 26-28, the alternatives) which leads naturally on to the material in Dtn. 26:16-19, and then to Dtn. 28, with Dtn. 27:9b-10 as a bridge (cf. ch. 3, p. 412). (The insertion of Dtn. 27 with its introduction in Dtn. 11:29-32 had taken place before the Deuteronomist reworked the material into his history, for Josh. 8:30-35 is obviously dependent on Dtn. 27 and Dtn. 11:29-32.) Yet though the material is late in its present context, the evidence supports the conclusion that we are here dealing with a formulary which in its basic core, was used at a very early period in the covenant-festival at Shechem - a festival commemorating the

---


74) Beyerlin, OST., pp. 122, 153.

75) M. Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien, pp. 16, 43. J. L'Hour, op. cit., pp. 161ff., deduces (less convincingly) from the same evidence, that Dtn. 11 and 27 are post-Deuteronomistic, - so that the secondary Josh. 8:30-35 is even later.
covenant solemnised in the time of Joshua. 76)

On the structure of Dtn. 27, there is general agreement as to the following division into sub-units:

- Dtn. 27:2-4, 7b-8 form a unit of tradition; though in its present form the text is either heavily expanded, or comprises a conflation of doublets. 77) - vv. 2-3a constitute the central core, which is expanded and repeated in the remainder of the section. The unit describes the setting up of an unspecified number of white-washed stone tablets on which a copy of the divinely stipulated covenant-content (presumably here Dtn. 12-26) 78) is to be inscribed. In the present context these stones are located on Mount Ebal (v. 4), but probably this is the result of harmonisation with the altar-tradition (vv. 5-7a). The most likely explanation of the plurality of stone stelae, is that the ancient Shechem-stone (Josh. 24:26b-27) has become twelve, under the influence of the Gilgal tradition 79) (see further below).

---


77) So J. Hempel, Die Schichten des Deuteronomiums, p. 87ff. S. R. Driver, Deuteronomy, p. 295, sounds a note of caution: "the repetition may be due to the diffuse character of the Deut. style."

78) So S. R. Driver, Deuteronomy, p. 296: concerning the original wording on the stones, Driver (and most scholars) consider it futile to speculate. A. C. Welch, The Framework of the Code, p. 51, however, suggests the decalogue.

b. Deuteronomy 27:5-7a.

If the stone pillars were originally at home in Gilgal, the stone altar seems to have been native to Shechem; vv. 5-7a make it virtually certain that in the primitive covenant-solemnisation at Shechem, offering of sacrifice and/or participation in a sacral meal were the outstanding features.

Commentators have noted two striking features in these verses:

i. whereas vv. 2-4 + 7b-8 show evidence of heavy deuteronomistic editing and reworking, such traces are absent from vv. 5-7a;

ii. there are obviously close links between vv. 5-7a, and the Book of the Covenant tradition: Ex. 20:25 reads like a concessive addendum to the law of the earth altar, added to harmonise this with the stone-altar tradition here assigned to Shechem (Dtn. 27:5); and the phrase מִתָּכֵן נַעֲמָת (Dtn. 27:7a) recalls the covenant-solemnisation of Ex. 24:1-11, especially vv. 4ba, 5, 11b.

These two factors together suggest that vv. 5-7a constituted a widely-acknowledged tradition, which the compiler of Dtn. 27:1-8 inherited as a fixed datum, to which variant traditions must be adapted. And an examination of vv. 1-8 shows that such an adaptation has been attempted; i.e., the impression is given that the white-washed stones were in fact used in the construction of the altar. (The secondary text Josh. 8:30-35 obviously understood this to be

the intention of Dt 27:1-8). But in that case the altar itself
is inscribed with the divine law.

We know too little about the process by which the strands of
Dt 27 came together, to be able to discern the redactional motives
more clearly. Obviously the stone stele had become an embarrassment
as a 'pagan remainder'; and the altar\(^{81}\) in turn is subordinated to
'the words of this law' (vv. 3, 8).


As noted above, the verses are generally regarded as having
originally constituted the link between Dt 26:17-19 and Dt 28.\(^{82}\)


This passage also bears the marks of fusion of two traditions,
or stages of tradition\(^{83}\): vv. 12-13 envisage two semi-choruses
(either the whole people or their representatives) ranged on the
slopes of the two mountains, and presumably proclaiming the blessings
and curses antiphonally. In vv. 14ff., however, only curses have
been recorded; and these are proclaimed by representative Levites,

\(^{81}\) The fact that the altar, which originally stood on Gerizim (most
scholars now follow the Samaritan text at Dt 27:4) has been trans-
ferred to Ebal, the mount of cursing, is interesting:
- Is there implied a Yahwistic polemic against an ancient pre-Israel-
ite altar shrine?
- Or is this a late Massoretic alteration, stemming from anti-Samar-
itan polemic?

\(^{82}\) v.Rad, Deuteronomy, p. 165;
S.R.Driver, Deuteronomy, p. 297f.

\(^{83}\) v.Rad, Deuteronomy, p. 166.
while the whole assembly of Israel assents to each in turn by pronouncing the 'amen'. Some scholars in fact find a third variation in the words of Dtn. 11:29: "You shall set the blessing on Mt. Gerizim and the curse on Mt. Ebal", envisaging a scene in which the semi-choruses turn their backs on each other, and shout the blessings and curses at the mountains. But this seems unnecessary; the explanation of Dtn. 11:29 offered by H. Cunliffe-Jones is sufficient: - "It means to have the blessing and curse proclaimed there, and thus to have the mountains associated in imaginative feeling with what has been solemnly affirmed upon them." So that on the whole it seems best to regard Dtn. 11:29-32 as introductory to Dtn. 27, but not setting out an independent witness to the tradition.

Assuming then, that Dtn. 27:11-13 and Dtn. 27:14-26 represent two stages in the development of the same tradition, we may safely conclude, that the second version is the younger, and that the more ancient version (vv. 11-13) has been conformed to this. (Note the rising importance of Levites within the Shechem traditions, as the officials of the cult.)

84) H. Cunliffe-Jones, Deuteronomy (Torch), p. 82.

85) E. Nielsen, Shechem, p. 70, finds influence from the Southern tradition in vv. 11-13, in that the arrangement of the tribes in these verses places the Southern tribes and those geographically strategic from a Southern viewpoint, on the mount of blessing, whereas the 'fringe' tribes are placed on the mount of cursing. S. R. Driver's view, however, seems preferable (Deuteronomy, p. 298): - The 'concubine' tribes are placed on the mount of cursing, together with Reuben who forfeited his birthright (Gen. 49:4) and Zebulun, the youngest son of Leah (Gen. 30: 19f.). Similarly, G. E. Wright, "Deuteronomy", The Interpreter's Bible 2, p. 491. There are therefore no grounds for doubting the early Northern provenance of these listings.
Clearly the list of curses has not been reconstructed so as to have special reference to the provisions of the Deuteronomic Code, and is therefore of independent origin, and may well be descended directly from an ancient liturgical office. In seeking to trace a connection between this ancient liturgy and the Sinai-event, the question arises as to why the Hauptgebot-clauses, which we have taken to be the probable Mosaic core of the decalogue, are not all four represented in this cursing list. 66) In order to examine this question accurately we would need a great deal more knowledge as to the development and inter-relation of the various apodeictic series than in fact we possess. But the explanation would seem to lie within the area described by the following:--

a) The account of the cult which we have in Dtn. 27 is incomplete, even fragmentary. 87) There may therefore have been a place for a stronger Hauptgebot stress, either in a more complete curse-series of which the present series may be only an abridgement, 88) or more likely, at another place in the total liturgy. 89)

---

86) Cf. v. Rad, O.T. Theology, I, p. 203f: - The absence of the first commandment from the Shechemite decalogue "does not mean that the first commandment as such is later than the others. On the contrary, there can be no doubt that this coefficient of intense intolerance was a characteristic of Yahwism from the very beginning."

87) G. Henton Davies, "Deuteronomy", Peake's Commentary on the Bible, p. 281.

88) Cf. G. E. Wright's suggestion, ("Deuteronomy", The Interpreter's Bible, 2, p. 491) that the core of blessings and curses in Dtn. 28 (i.e., vv. 3-6, 16-19), was taken over from the old Shechem ceremony.

89) E. Gerstenberger, Wesen und Herkunft des "apodiktischen Rechts", pp. 91, 104, in a critique of Alt's methodology in beginning a study of apodeictic series from Dtn. 27:15-25, points out that 'curse series' and 'decalogue' are not exactly analogous.
b) The above conclusion that vv. 11-13 and vv. 14-26 represent two versions from different stages in the development of the one liturgy, would favour the suggestion that the curse-series may represent an adaptation of the most primitive forms to later historical circumstances; e.g., omission of the Sabbath command would simply imply that the question of the Sabbath was not an urgent one at that particular historical moment.

c) It has been pointed out that a large proportion of the curses are directed at 'sins committed in secret'. In the primitive society, then, such actions as would infringe the Sabbath-taboo would not fall within this category of 'secret sins', but would be openly observable by all (e.g., gathering sticks on the Sabbath).

There are therefore no grounds for denying the probability of close connection between the core of the oldest Sinai tradition as preserved in Ex. 19-24, and the material in Dtn. 27:11-26.

(iii) Joshua 8:30-35.

This passage is now generally agreed to be deuteronomistic, and dependent on the passages already discussed. It therefore provides


91) So M.Noth, üb. Studien, p. 43. Cf. E.Nielsen, Shechem, p. 300; finds no grounds for supposing that the ark was ever at Shechem. M.Noth, The History of Israel, p. 93, however, deduces (from his 'amphictyonic' standpoint) that the ark 'must' have stood at Shechem, though he concedes that there is no direct evidence of this.
us with no further primitive data concerning the pre-disruption Shechem cult.

2. Gilgal.

The preceding survey of the Shechem traditions has shown that a great deal of conflation and cross-fertilisation of traditions has taken place, as between Shechem and Gilgal - and, we may add, between both these, and the Shiloh tradition. This process of mutual adaptation has made it extremely difficult to isolate the peculiar emphases individual to the respective shrines and their cults; and this difficulty is especially marked in the case of the Gilgal traditions. The following outline of the tradition-history of the Gilgal sanctuary, however, may be said to command wide assent: -

1.) Origins of the sanctuary.

Noth is probably correct in assuming, on the ground of general principle, that Gilgal was already the site of a shrine in pre-Israelite days: - "According to the ancient world, it was impossible to make any place at all a place of worship; it had to be hallowed by some event or other, or be traditionally holy. Thus the central place of Israelite worship could only be established in some place that was already holy, i.e. some Canaanite place."\(^{92}\) The name "Gilgal" would seem to confirm Noth's assumption; suggesting as it does a circle of massebōth (cf. Jud. 3:19, 26 : p'ēsīlim) which already marked out the confines of a sanctuary in Canaanite times.\(^{93}\) Similarly the name "Gibeath

92) M. Noth, The History of Israel, p. 110, n. 1.
Haaralōth" is probably pre-Israelite, and may imply Canaanite cultic activity on the site.

2.) The Benjamite Shrine.

Even the pre-Deuteronomistic material in Jos. 2-11, 16, 18 is obviously a compilation from various sources and strata; due in large measure to the fact that an originally Benjamite shrine subsequently acquired an important role in the Israelite confederacy as a whole. To the primitive, specifically Benjamite tradition presumably belonging the crossing of the Jordan under the numinous guidance of the ark, and the encampment at Gilgal; the alliance with the Gibeonites, and probably also the campaign in their defence, (Jos. 10:1-15).

3.) The Shrine of the Israelite Confederacy.

If the ark had already been transferred to Shiloh before the birth of Samuel (c. 1060 B.C.), then Gilgal with its ark-tradition must have been a shrine of the confederacy long before that date.94) Gilgal's rise to pre-eminence in 'all Israel', however, is probably to be traced to the time of Saul: The tradition of 1 Sam. 11 depicts the Benjamite Saul, as the last of the 'Judges', exercising his office over an unprecedently wide group of Israelite tribes; so that with the leadership of the confederacy located in Benjamin, it was natural that the chief Benjamite sanctuary should assume pre-eminence in the cultic life of the confederacy. As such, and in the light of Saul's military successes, Gilgal attracted to itself the wider conquest traditions of

94) A. Kuschke, "Gilgal", R.G.G. 3, 2, col.1577, suggests a date c.1100 B.C.
'all Israel', in which the name of Joshua inherea, (Jos. 10:16 – 11:14)

95) Probably, too, the pre-Deuteronomic tradition remembered Gilgal
as the site of some form of land-distribution.

Further, whether or not we accept H.-J. Kraus' detailed recon-
struction of the Gilgal cult-liturgy, it seems clear that the aetiological-coloured accounts of the conquests of Jericho (Jos. 2, 6) and

95) R.de Vaux, "The Settlement of the Israelites in Southern Palestine and
the Origins of the Tribe of Judah", Translating and Understanding the
O.T., ed. H.T. Frank and W.L. Reed, p. 129, suggests the possibility that
the Southern campaign (Jos. 10:29-37) represents the increase in the
territory of Judah under David or Solomon.

96) H.-J. Kraus, Worship in Israel, pp. 157ff.; "Gilgal, ein Beitrag zur
Kultusgeschichte Israel", V.T., 1, 1951, pp. 181ff.

97) The evident liturgical colour of Jos. 6:4, 6, 8f., 15f., etc., indicates
an embellishing of the narrative in the light of later cultic procedure,
(though not necessarily a cultic circumambulation of Jericho). Similarly
the phrase 'to this day' in Jos. 6:25b and in 7:26 suggests the presence
of aetiological motifs. More radically, M. Noth regards the core narrat-
ives of Jos. 6-7 as aetologies of the pre-settlement ruins of Jericho
and Ai, (M. Noth, The History of Israel, p. 82, n. 2; p. 149, n. 2.)

In general, however, it may be argued that the presence of aetiological
features does not necessarily discredit the substantial historicity of
the narratives as a whole.

On Jericho, see:

J. Gray, Archeology and the Old Testament World, pp. 93f. (sympathetic to
Noth's aetiological explanation), and "The Archeology of Palestine - II",
Peake's Commentary on the Bible, ed. M. Black and H. H. Rowley, p. 51,
(acknowledging the possibility that Jericho was overthrown in a 14th
Cent. attack by Jacob- and Leah-tribes.);

H. C. May, "Joshua", Peake's Commentary on the Bible, p. 194, (possibility
of a 13th Cent. overthrow of a small fort on the old Jericho site);

J. Bright, "Joshua", The Interpreter's Bible, 2, p. 557, (= the archeological
evidence neither requires nor precludes a 13th Cent. overthrow of
Jericho by Ephraim).

On Ai, see:

W. F. Albright, "Israelite Conquest of Canaan in the Light of Archeology",
B.A.S.C.R. 74, p. 16f., (Albright suggests that reminiscences of the 13th Cent. /...
of Ai (Jos. 7, 8) were shaped and preserved in the cult of Gilgal as a sanctuary of the confederacy. 98)

4. Gilgal as a Northern-Israelite shrine.

Gilgal seems to have retained under David something of the importance it enjoyed under Saul and Samuel (2 Sam. 19:41f.) and to have remained a prominent centre of Yahwism in the North during the ninth Century (2 Kings 21:1, 4:38), though officially displaced by the royal shrine at Bethel. By the eighth Century, however, Gilgal was coupled with Bethel in the censures of the prophets Amos (4:4, 5:5) and Hosea (4:15, 9:15, 99) 12:12).


Deuteronomistic editing has obviously taken place in several stages, reflecting theological emphases suited to the changing circumstances which successively confronted the Distic. school: -

Continuation of note 97); - /overthrow of Bethel have been transferred to Ai);

J. Gray, Archeology and the O.T. World, p. 94, (Gray is sympathetic to the etiological explanation, but concedes that Ai may have been an outpost of Bethel, or that the fall of Bethel has been transferred to Ai.)


99) J. Mauchline, "Hosea", The Interpreter's Bible, 6, pp. 666f., sees a double significance in the condemnation of Gilgal in Hosea 9:15: - i.e., as a sanctuary where baal-worship had been practised (cf. Hos. 4: 15, 12:12), and as the site of the institution of kingship (1 Sam. 11:15; cf. Hos. 7:3-4, Hos. 8:4).

Só also, H.W. Wolff, Hosea, p. 217.
(i) The insertion of Dtn. 11:29-32 and Dtn. 27:1-26 was intended to incorporate the Shechem- into the Gilgal-tradition: in Dtn. 27 a key phrase is '(the day) when you pass over Jordan' (vv. 2, 4, 12); and in Dtn. 11:29f. the references to the geographical location of Shechem are at first deliberately vague, but then climax (v. 30b) in an explicit transference of Gerizim and Ebal to Gilgal. 100)

(ii) The later hand(s) which inserted Jos. 8:30-35 and Jos. 24:1-28 likewise seek(s) to conflate the Gilgal-Shochem traditions, but in the opposite way, i.e., by subsuming the Gilgal- within the Shechem-traditions.

(iii) Jos. 18 - 22 has been edited in an effort to minimise the importance of Gilgal by transferring the bulk of the land-distribution to Shiloh.

Against the background of this traditio-historical development, then, the following theological emphases are to be considered:

(a) **Gilgal and the Ark.**

The position adopted here is that the ark is too deeply rooted in the tradition of the Jordan-crossing to be regarded as secondary. 101) The reconstruction that best does justice to the bewilderingly diverse data

---

100) The phrase, "who live in the Arabah over against Gilgal" (v. 30b) may be even later than its present context, but it completes the intention of vv. 29-30 as a whole.

concerning the ark is probably as follows: - the ark originated in the semi-
omadic pre-history of the Benjamite clans, so that its role in the Jordan-
crossing (Jos. 3 - 4) probably reflects accurately the circumstances of the
Benjamite incursion into Canaan. 102) By conflation of the Gilgal-Shechem
traditions, the ark became the possession of all-Israel, and its traditions
were shaped by the Israelite cult at Gilgal. Subsequently the ark was
moved to Shiloh, where it became combined with the Canaanite cherubim-throne.

The following references describe the significance of the ark in the
primitive Gilgal cult setting: -

Jos. 3:4b, 6. 103)

The ark is here described in terms similar to those of Num. 10:33, i.e.
as a numinous guide and path-finder, whose presence actualised and guaranteed
the divine Presence. (Jos. 4:13 accentuates this stress: - to pass over
before the ark, is to pass over before the face of Yahweh.)

Jos. 7:12.

Although there is no explicit mention of the ark, 'I will be with you..' here is probably a reference to the guiding and empowering activity of the

102) The attractive suggestion has been made that Jos. 3:16 conflates
reminiscences of two Jordan-crossings; that of Benjamin at Shittim-
Gilgal, and that of Ephraim at Adamah (cf. Hosea 6:7). Cf. W.F. Albright,
"The Administrative Divisions of Israel and Judah", J.P.O.S., Y, 1925,
p. 33, n. 37, emends the text to yield the meaning, "as far from Adam
as beside Sarethan". In the harmonisation of Gilgal- and Confederacy-
traditions, the Gilgal-crossing tradition predominated; so that the
ark-crossing was ascribed to "all Israel".

103) Jos. 3:4b, 6 - ascribed to the early source by:
K. Noth, U.B. Stud., p. 42;
J. Bright, "Joshua", The Interpreter's Bible, 2, pp. 543, 564.
ark; (cf. Num. 14:44, which though probably a late gloss,\textsuperscript{104}) reflects accurately the primitive conception of the ark.) - a concept which is integral to the ideology of the Holy War, and hence of the conquest. In this connection, too, we should note the interesting suggestion of Nielsen,\textsuperscript{105) that in this early period the ark was carried in procession by the Benjamites round the borders of their actual or claimed territory in order to secure their frontiers against the incursions of rival groups and their tutelary deities.\textsuperscript{106) This suggestion sheds added light on the undoubtedly intimate connection obtaining between 'ark' and 'promise of land-inheritance'. On the other hand 'promise of land inheritance' was at least implicit also in the Sinai-covenant tradition from its inception, - (this is implied in our assumption that the Joseph group were the exponents of a unitary chain of events comprising Exodus-Sinai-Conquest). Hence, even if Benjamin had had no connection with the Sinai tradition prior to their entry into Canaan, - and this is by no means certain\textsuperscript{107) - nevertheless from the beginning ark-tradition and Sinai-covenant tradition at least constituted the respective


\textsuperscript{105) E.Nielsen, "Some Reflections on the History of the Ark", V.T.S., 7, 1959, p. 63.}

\textsuperscript{106) This apotropaic use of the ark is intimately related to its role in the holy war, - cf. G.v.Rad, Studies in Deuteronomy, p. 67.}

\textsuperscript{107) W.Beyerlin, OST., pp. 146f., 151, stresses the importance of Kadesh as a centre where some at least of the tribes and clans who became Israel entered into association. Similarly R.de Vaux, "The Settlement of the Israelites in Southern Palestine and the Origins of the Tribe of Judah", p. 118, suggests that there were several 'descents into' and 'departures from' Egypt, and that the groups under Moses entered into contact, or renewed contact, with the other groups at Kadesh.
centres of widely-overlapping circles of ideas. Hence it was virtually inevitable that, with the conflation of Benjamite and Josephite traditions, the ark should assume great importance in the Sinai-covenant theology.

Jos. 7:16.

This text again links the ark with the Presence of Yahweh; יְהֹוָה הָעַנטָן is virtually synonymous with יְהֹוָה יַעֲקֹב - but here the guidance sought is not 'topographical' but oracular, i.e., the ark is conceived as a worship-centre. The same stress appears also in Jos. 9:23, 27. There is no reason to doubt that this text originally referred to a 'house of my God' with its attendant altar, situated at Gilgal, and with the ark as its cultic centrum.

Clearly then, these early descriptions of the ark are concerned with a numinous presence, which may be said to verge upon the theophanic. The Dist. then redefines this near-theophanic tradition in 'scriptural' terms, by interpreting the ark as the container of the written documents of the covenant.

108) There is no need to regard the phrase 'for the house of my God' as a late gloss: the terms 'tent' and 'house' were frequently interchanged in the early traditions. LXX avoids the difficulty by reading εἶμι οὖν θεὸν μου = יְהֹוָה הָעַנטָן.

109) The tradition in 1 Sam. 6:20 - 7:2, which also commits the ark to the care of members of the Gibeonite League, i.e., the inhabitants of Kirath-Jearim, may be related to the etiologically-coloured account here. If so, the connection would give added grounds for believing that the 'house' served by the Gibeonites, in fact contained the ark, (also served by Gibeonites).
The form of the narrative in Jos. 3–4 indicates that the original Benjamite material has been augmented and structured, so as to harmonise as closely as possible with the forms of the Sinai covenant tradition. This shaping no doubt took place in the cult of the 'confederate' Gilgal sanctuary.

i. Preparations for encounter with Yahweh, Jos. 3:5a.

This ritual purification, as we have seen, is at home in the most primitive stratum of the Sinai-covenant tradition (Ex. 19:10–11a). It may also have roots in the specifically Benjamite Gilgal tradition, of course, but in the present context it probably reflects the influence of Shechem. The Dist. has stressed the covenantal significance of the rite by strengthening the verbal correspondence with Ex. 19:10–11a (Jos. 3:2, 1:11).

ii. The 'theophany', Jos. 3:5b, etc.

The term נַגֵּל (3:5b) normally occurs in covenant and theophany contexts, in descriptions which see the natural phenomena of Exodus, Sinai, and Jordan-crossing as suffused with theophanic significance, (Ex. 3:20, Jud. 6:13, Pss. 78:4, 96:3, 98:1, 105:2, 5, 106:7, 22.

110 The narrative in Jos. 3–4 has obviously been constructed in such a way as to stress the parallel between Red-Sea crossing and Jordan crossing. Indeed it has been suggested that the Red-Sea tradition is a secondary elaboration of the Jordan crossing, and that only the latter is historically grounded in the strict sense. So R.de Vaux, "The Settlement of the Israelites in Northern Palestine", - lecture delivered in Edinburgh, 1970. This seems unlikely, however.
its use here presents the Jordan-crossing as an extension of the Exodus-Sinai event, and of the covenant-theophany experienced therein.

iii. Covenant solemnisation.

The present narrative includes interwoven accounts of two (and possibly three) sets of Gilgal-stones. We have already noted reasons for believing that the stones were of pre-Israelite origin, but their being twelve in number certainly reflects the cult of the Israelite confederacy.\(^{111}\) (Probably the stones in the Jordan stream, whether originally a causeway or series of markers\(^{112}\) or, as the text rather indicates, a single marker-cairn in mid-stream, will have adopted the number twelve from the confederacy-shrine at Gilgal\(^{113}\); but whether they too reflect a specific cultic activity\(^{114}\) seems to me more dubious.)

We have noted above (p. 225) the correspondence between the twelve stones of the Gilgal sanctuary and the twelve massēbōth which Ex. 24:4 records as part of the Sinai covenant-solemnisation. The structure of the text at Ex. 24:4 suggests that this mention of the pillars is a secondary insertion into an account primarily concerned with the blood-ritual at the altar. If, as seems likely, this altar

\(^{111}\) W. Beyerlin, OST., p. 46.


\(^{113}\) J. Gray, Joshua, Judges and Ruth, pp. 59, 65.

\(^{114}\) H. -J. Kraus, see note 96.
corresponds with that at Gerizim-Ebal, then the intention of the editor of Ex. 24:3-8 was to subsume the Gilgal—within the Shechem-tradition (as in Jos. 8:30ff. and Jos. 24). However that may be, this undoubtedly ancient material certainly connects the Gilgal-stones with the Sinai covenant-solemnisation.

(We have no concrete evidence concerning the stipulational elements of the covenant tradition at Gilgal. Alt, 115) however, suggests that one of the apodeictic lists may have developed within the Gilgal cult.)

(iv) Covenant witness.

We may note that the Shechem-stone was primitively described as ליל to the covenant (Jos. 24:27); whereas in Jos. 4 the more sophisticated terms נק (v. 6) and תין (v. 7) are used. The total context, however, indicates that the stones are to be regarded as witnesses to Yahweh's covenant faithfulness, and therefore to the abiding relationship with Him which is the ground of Israel's conquest and possession of Canaan.

Jos. 3-4, then, as a tradition-unit, has obviously been formed within the covenant cult of the Israelite confederacy.

(c) Circumcision, Passover, and Angel-Theophany at Gilgal.

It is convenient to bracket these three short sections, since, as we shall see, they are deliberately related in the tradition as a whole.

(1) **Circumcision, Jos. 5:2-9.**

As we mentioned earlier, the name Gibeath Haaraloth is probably an adaptation of a Canaanite name, indicating the customary site of a Canaanite circumcision ceremony. The fact that care was taken to historicise the name and incorporate it into Israelite conquest tradition presumably indicates that the Benjamites continued the customary usage at the site. Vv. 4-7, which are generally agreed to be a Distic insertion, reinterpret the account to bind it more closely into the covenant theology: whereas in the older version 'rolling away the reproach of Egypt' probably meant the demonstration of Israel's independent and civilised status among the nations, Dtr. stresses rather the reconsecration of the covenant people after their apostasy. The reiteration that it was 'the men of war' who were circumcised (Jos. 5:4, 6) may indicate a puberty rite in which the young men were admitted to the full rights and obligations of the covenant people. This in turn may be connected with the statement in Ex. 24:5 that 'young men of the people of Israel' were assigned a part in the Sinai covenant solemnisation; perhaps it was a feature of the Gilgal cult that the newly-circumcised were so drawn into the covenant ritual.

---

116) E. Nielsen, Shechem, p. 296.

117) Circumcision was still a puberty rite in early Israel. Practice of it was common (though not universal) among the West Semites. Perhaps it was in contrast to the Philistines that the rite first assumed theological significance. The first explicit references to circumcision in connection with covenant, however, seem to have been those made by Jeremiah. So R. Meyer, "Περιτέμνω", TNT, 6, pp. 73ff.

118) See W. Beyerlin, OST, p. 39.
(ii) The Passover at Gilgal, Jos. 5:10-12.

This fragment is difficult to place: it has been variously ascribed to the older source, Dtr., and P.: as Noth\(^{119}\) observes, these verses sit very loosely in the conquest account. Whatever their origin, however, their twofold function in the present form of the narrative is clear:—i.e., to underline the regulation (cf. also Ex. 12:48) that only the circumcised share in the passover, and in the covenant of which the passover is a rite; and to enhance the parallelism between Sinai prelude and postlude, (see further below).


In the previous discussion of this passage (see chapter one, p.119f.,) we concentrated on its role in the finished Distic. History. As regards its specific relation to Gilgal, it has been suggested that in its original form, this may have been the inaugurating theophany of a sanctuary, either at Gilgal, or in the neighbourhood of Jericho.\(^{120}\) However that may be, the original core has been thoroughly re-worked, in order to stress the parallelism between Joshua and Moses, and to mark the inauguration of the Holy War in West Jordan. There are indications in the text (אַיֵּה יְהוָה, v. 14) that in tailoring the account to serve this dual purpose, a longer angelic speech containing detailed instructions or revelation, has been excised.\(^{121}\)

\(^{119}\) M. Noth, Ub. Stud., p. 183.


\(^{121}\) M. Noth, Das Buch Josua, p. 4; J. Gray, Joshua, Judges, and Ruth, p. 74.
To draw together the threads of this unit: it is interesting that Jos. 3 - 5, with its sequence of 'Nature-theophany' (Jos. 3 - 4), circumcision (5:2-9), passover (5:10-12) and angel-theophany (5:13-15) repeats the content, if not the order, of the JE. narrative in Ex. 3 - 20: angel-theophany (Ex. 3:1-4:17), circumcision (4:24-26), passover (12:21-27), nature-theophany (19 - 20). The correspondence is sufficient to prove that the two series are intended as prelude and postlude to the account of theophany and covenant-making; and the effect is to set the Sinai theophany-covenant forward as the central core of Israel's religious traditions.

(d) Gilgal as the Place of the Camp, and of the Land-Distribution.

We have already referred to the connection between land-inheritance and the Sinai covenant on the one hand, and between land-inheritance and the ark on the other. The Gilgal-camp tradition, as shaped in the cult of the Israelite confederacy, serves in a sense to form a link between these two strands of tradition; i.e., through its insistence that the land became the possession of Israel not by military prowess, but by the initiative of Yahweh - grounded in His election of Israel. This is underlined by the strong stress on the concept of herem throughout Jos. 6 - 8; the total

122) E.J. Joyce, "Joshua", op. cit., p. 286, draws attention to the further parallelism between the warrior angel of Josh. 5:13-15, and the Agent of destruction in Ex. 11-12. Significantly this Agent, which is regarded as 'angelic' in the later tradition (Ps. 78:49-51) is identified in Ex. 11 - 12 as the Lord Himself, (11:4, 12:23, 27, 29).

123) The expansion into Gibeonite territory, which we have assigned to the original Benjamite stratum of tradition, was obviously peaceful; only with the attachment of confederacy traditions to Gilgal was it necessary to justify the 'conquest' of Gibeon in the light of the herem-principle.
dedication of the conquered cities and their wealth is an acknowledgment that the victory is Yahweh's, and everything His by right of conquest; and failure to execute the herem is conceived as a rupture of the previously-established relationship between Yahweh and Israel, and a forfeiture of His conquering Presence.

Whatever our conclusions about the historical basis of the Gilgal land-distribution, the theological intention of the developed concept is clear: the casting of lots before the Lord (Jos. 18:8, 10), which may be assumed to lie close to the historical core of the tradition, was an

124) The phraseology of Josh. 7:11a and 15b has a deuteronomistic ring; and the verb יְזַדֶּה (Josh. 7:11) may be the result of a late gloss (so J. Gray, Joshua, Judges, and Ruth, p. 83). But the concept of a covenant relationship is implicit in the passage as a whole, which is ancient (Noth, Ub. Stud. p. 42), and does not depend on these isolated phrases.

125) J. Bright, "Joshua", Peake's Commentary on the Bible, argues, on the basis of his belief in a "concerted attack ... against the land of Canaan" under Joshua, that "only some form of allotment would have sufficed to prevent quarrels among the tribes in the scramble for land", (op. cit., p. 624f.).

A. Alt, however, concludes for a more piecemeal form of conquest: he suggests therefore that the land-distribution by lot, was originally a fairly circumscribed local practice, only later applied to all Israel; but that the historical Joshua had a role as arbiter in inter-tribal border disputes, (A. Alt, "Josua", Kleine Schriften I, pp. 189f.)

Similarly J. Gray, Joshua, Judges, and Ruth, pp. 44f.

M. Noth agrees that the delineation of tribal boundaries is a secondary role, not original to the historical Joshua (M. Noth, Das Buch Josua, pp. IXf.)

126) Scholars are generally agreed that this land-distribution tradition was originally at home in Gilgal: - H.-J. Kraus, Worship in Israel, p. 154, n. 91, p. 177. G. v. Rad, "The Problem of the Hexateuch", op. cit., p. 46. M. Noth, Das Buch Josua, p. 80.

Con.: - E. Nielsen, Shechem, p. 303.
oracular procedure, the results of which were accepted as a declaration of Yahweh's will; thus Yahweh was the real distributor of the land, and He did so on the basis of His covenant with Israel.

3. Shiloh.

(a) The Canaanite shrine.

It seems reasonably certain that, as at Shechem and Gilgal, so at Shiloh too, the invading Israelites found an already-established sanctuary and cult, which they incorporated into their own religious tradition. We have already expressed our view (chapter one, p. 55) that the cherubim-throne, which in post-exilic times was to be represented by the kapporeth of the ark, formed part of the pre-Israelite cultic apparatus at Shiloh. Presumably therefore, the שילה (1 Sam. 3:3) or שלם (Jud. 18:31) in which the ark-throne stood was either a converted Canaanite shrine or its natural successor. As to the identity of the deity or deities worshipped at Canaanite Shiloh, two slight pieces of textual evidence are used by some scholars to support the view that El 'Elyon was the principal god, while

127) See n. 134, below.
129) On the archeological evidence for the occupation of the Shiloh site during the first phase of the Iron Age, see J. Gray, Archeology and the C.T. World, p. 127; and "The Archeology of Palestine - II", Peake's Commentary on the Bible, p. 52; E. Nielsen, Shechem, p. 316, states, "Excavations carried out at Seilún have proved that Shiloh was inhabited already during the Middle Bronze age" - though he does not name his authority. The Canaanite influence on the Israelite Shiloh cult, however, is itself sufficient proof for the existence of some form of Canaanite sanctuary on the site.
130) a) The name 'Eli suggests a connection with 'Elyon; b) The M.T. הַלּוֹי 1 Sam. 2:10 is probably either a shorter variation, or a corruption of הַלּוֹי, (BHK). It should be noted, however, that the poem 1 Sam. 2:1-10 sits loosely in its present context, so that its relation to the Shiloh traditions may not be primitive.
others posit a Canaanite god El-Sebaōth.\textsuperscript{131}) On the whole the former suggestion is the more convincing, though there can be no certainty on the question.

The reference to the Shilonite maidens' dancing in the context of a vintage festival (Jud. 21:21) suggests that Israel adopted a Canaanite autumnal festival (such as that attested in Jud. 9:27) already established at Shiloh.

\begin{itemize}
\item[(b)] \textbf{The ark at Shiloh : 1 Sam. 3; 1 Sam. 4:1 - 7:2.}
\end{itemize}

The process by which the ark reached Shiloh is quite obscure, - though there is some evidence of Benjamite connections with Shiloh,\textsuperscript{132}) which may have eased the transition. It seems certain, however, that at this stage the itinerant and desert symbol became (temporarily, i.e. until the advent of the Deuteronomist) attached and subordinated to the cult object of a sedentarised agricultural society. It is in connection with Shiloh that the phrase ָנְפֹּר הַכְּלַלְכֵּל הַנִּשְׁכָּרָתִי is first used in relation to the ark.\textsuperscript{133}) We may assume then that in Gilgal and throughout its

\textsuperscript{131}) R.de Vaux, \textit{Ancient Israel}, p. 304, offers the suggestion, though diffidently; R.E.Clements, \textit{God and Temple}, p. 34, n. 4; p. 40, more confidently.

The textual evidence certainly seems to make it clear that the title 'Yahweh Sebaōth' originated in the Shiloh cult, but its use does not necessarily imply that the term Sebaōth was adapted from the name of a Canaanite deity. More probably the reference is to the heavenly host (cf. Josh. 5:14), and belongs to the theophanic ethos of the Shiloh cult-tradition.

\textsuperscript{132}) See E.Nielsen, \textit{Shechem}, p. 317.

prior history, the ark had been specifically a box ("ark"), but that by union with the Shiloh cult-object it became a throne ("throne").

It is worth noting here that primitive 'box' and 'throne' shared a common feature which would certainly ease their amalgamation; i.e., both were highly numinous objects, - loci of theophany, one might fairly say. We have already noted that the oldest traditions virtually equate the presence of the ark with the Presence-in-power of Yahweh; and on the other hand, we have mentioned the strongly visional revelation-tradition at the Shiloh sanctuary prior to Samuel, with the probability that this pre-dates the Israelite conquest (see note 131 above).

(c) The Shiloh Festival.

From the material in 1 Sam. 1 - 2, it seems likely that the Israelite autumn festival at Shiloh preserved the general outward form of its Canaanite predecessor. The zebah-sacrifice, with its characteristic burning of a portion on the altar, seems to have been Canaanite in origin; and the sacrificial family meals within the sacred precincts (1 Sam. 119f., 18b)

134) G.v.Rad, "The Tent and the Ark", The Problem of the Hexateuch and other Essays, p. 113: - "The purpose of an object which is known as a chest must be to contain something." Many suggestions have been offered as to what this 'something' may have been; the most likely being that the ark contained fragments of (Sinai) stone which represented and guaranteed the presence of the deity with His wandering people, - a little fragment, as it were, of the peculiar dwelling-place of God. It is probable, too, that these stones also had some connection with the 'lots' used in the process of seeking oracles. - See H.-J.Kraus, Worship in Israel, p. 176.


were no doubt an ancient feature of the Shiloh cult.\textsuperscript{137)} There is, however, no reason to doubt that the Israelites consciously celebrated these family meals in the context of the Yahweh-covenant, and that they were seen as intimately related to the primitive covenant-meal of the elders, before the Face of Yahweh (Ex. 24:11). The context does not make clear whether the prayers of the common people were offered before the ark-throne (1 Sam. 1:12, 19), or whether the sacred object was accessible only to the priests (1 Sam. 2:18, 30), but 1 Sam. 1:19 may possibly imply a theophanic expectation on the part of the ordinary worshippers, after a night spent in the sacred precincts. However that may be, the theophanic emphasis in the Shiloh shrine appears to have continued strong (1 Sam. 3).

On the evidence available it is difficult to assess the importance of such rites as the harvest dance (Jud. 21:19ff.) within the total context of the festival; H.-J. Kraus\textsuperscript{138)} may well be right in suggesting that it was peripheral to the main themes. As to what those main themes were, we are reduced to speculation. S. Mowinckel\textsuperscript{139)} suggests, on the strength of ancient Near Eastern parallels, that an 'enthronement of the god as king' upon the cherubim-throne formed part of the Shiloh cult. If this surmise is correct, then the amalgamation of Gilgal ark-symbol and Shiloh throne-symbol provided the main basis on which the concepts of covenant and enthronement became united - a combination of prime importance for the subsequent

\textsuperscript{137)} On the evidence from Ras Shamra, for sacral meals held in the presence of deity, see J. Gray, Archeology and the O.T. World, p. 117; "Social Aspects of Canaanite Religion", V.T.S., 15, 1966, pp. 171, 174.

\textsuperscript{138)} H.-J. Kraus, Worship in Israel, p. 174.

\textsuperscript{139)} S. Mowinckel, The Psalms in Israel's Worship, I, p. 125.
development of the Jerusalem temple cult. If, as suggested above, 'Elyōn was the principal deity worshipped in both Shiloh and Jerusalem, the fact of this ancient cult-in-common would undoubtedly have facilitated the transfer of the ark and its associated cult to Jerusalem.

Though there are no explicit references to a specific covenant-affirmation ceremonial at Shiloh, several scholars have conjectured that one of the streams of apodictic law did in fact develop in Shiloh, within the framework of such a covenant-cult. Beyerlin suggests that the 'ritual decalogue' series in Ex. 34:14-28 may have been preserved in the context of an ancient Israelite covenant-pilgrimage to Shiloh, designed to conserve the essential character of Yahwism in the Canaanite environment. Such speculations are incapable of proof, but are marked by an inherent probability.


(a) The pre-Israelite shrine.

Whatever the status of 'Elyōn at the pre-Israelite Shiloh shrine, it seems clear that he was the principal deity in the Canaanite pantheon honoured at Jebus at the close of the second millennium B.C. If, as we suggested, the Shiloh and Jebus shrines were already linked in Canaanite

---

140) W. Beyerlin, OST., p. 85ff.

141) R. E. Clements, God and Temple, p. 43, adduces evidence for the worship also of Shalem-Shulman and of Sedeq in pre-Israelite Jerusalem.

J. Gray, A History of Jerusalem, finds that Shalim was particularly associated with Jerusalem in the early 2nd Millennium, but is rather more cautious about positing a specific god Sedeq. Cf. also J. Gray, The Legacy of Canaan, pp. 136f.; and "Cultic Affinities between Israel and Ras Shamra", Z.A.W., 62, 1950, p. 219.
times in a common cult of El 'Elyôn,\footnote{E. Nielsen, Shechem, p. 318f.} it is likely that the enthronement-motif was likewise common to both.\footnote{S. Mowinckel, The Psalms in Israel's Worship, I, pp. 125, 139.} When David, then, installed the Shiloh ark in Jerusalem, this ancient connection of the shrines would be an important factor serving to ease the transition.

Another important element in the Jerusalem cult which was already prominent in Jebusite times, was the Saphôn-tradition\footnote{H.-J. Kraus, Worship in Israel, pp. 201f., 169.} in which Zion was in some sense equated with the numinous 'mountain of the far North' that was regarded in general ancient Near Eastern tradition as the primitive home of the gods.\footnote{The existence of this Saphôn-Zion tradition does not, of course, rule out the possibility mentioned in chapter one (p.89f.) of a primitive link between Saphôn and the El Shaddai of the patriarchal traditions.} It would seem that this identification of Zion with Mt. Saphôn is rooted in the worship of 'Elyôn.

There has been a great deal of discussion about the extent to which David and his successors integrated the ark-shrine with the already-existent Jerusalem cult. The suggestion has been made, indeed, that Zadok (who appears in the narrative as priest in Jerusalem at 2 Sam. 8:17 following the account of David's transferring the ark there, and who rose to preeminence after Solomon's dismissal of Abiathar) was in fact the last of the old line
of Jerusalem priest-kings. 146) If this were so, we could expect that the basic pattern of the old Jebusite cult would continue virtually unchanged by the advent of Yahwism and the ark. But the role of David and Solomon in the Jerusalem cult tells against this; for it is clear that David and Solomon took upon themselves the dignity of the priest-king; appointing, supporting, and commanding the temple officials, and personally assuming important liturgical functions.

(b) The entry of the ark to Gihon: 2 Sam. 6:1-19.

The 'History of the Ark', 147) of which our text forms a part, was not originally concerned directly with the more formal aspects of the covenant theme, but rather with underlining the crucial importance of the numinous presence of Yahweh among the tribes owing allegiance to Him. 148) This emphasis as we have noted, is consonant with the primitive significance of the ark in its Benjamite origins, but also reflects the influence of the 'numinous' Shiloh cult. In its present context, however, 2 Sam. 6 is given


G. v. Rads, Old Testament Theology, I, p. 249, rejects the idea: "Zadok ... comes on the stage in the time of David quite out of the blue ... A novus homo". But that the riddle is solved by supposing as Mowinckel, Rowley, and others do, that Zadok was the former priest-king of Jerusalem whom David conquered, is very dubious."

H. J. Kraus, Worship in Israel, p. 187.

147) 1 Sam. 4:1b - 7:1 with 2 Sam. 6:1-16a, 17-19, constitutes "an old story about the fate of the sacred ark, deriving roughly from the time of David", - N. Noth, The History of Israel, p. 165. Similarly H. W. Hertzberg, I and II Samuel, p. 47.

a new orientation by being set in relationship with 2 Sam. 7. This new combination reaffirms the connection between ark and covenant, - not this time the broad, basic covenant of Yahweh with Israel, but the specific inner covenant of Yahweh with the house of David.

That this event described in 2 Sam. 6 was not simply a once-for-all historical happening, \(^{(149)}\) seems clear from the parallel account preserved in lyrical, liturgical language in Ps. 132. The conclusion seems inescapable, that during the period of the Southern monarchy, the entry of the ark into Jerusalem was periodically re-presented; and that \(\text{vis-

\text{à-vis 2 Sam. 24)}\) 2 Sam. 6 represents an alternative or complementary cult-legend of the founding of the Jerusalem temple.

(c) The Dedication of Solomon's Temple, 1 Kings 8:1-66.

It is likely that, as with 2 Sam. 6, so also in 1 Kings 8, the form of the narrative has been influenced by the cultic re-presentation of the entry of the ark into Jerusalem. The passage has been heavily expanded by the Deuteronomist, and again by members of the Priestly school, but a primitive core may be isolated: \(- 1 \text{ Kings 8 : vv. 1a, 2ab, 3, 5, 6, (7, 8), 12, 13.}^{(150)}\) Noth is probably correct in his conclusion that vv. 15-20 are a free deuteronomistic development of the Nathan oracle, "ohne Bindung an einen vorliegenden Text". \(^{(151)}\) This distinctive rationalisation of the Nathan

\(^{(149)}\) E.Kutsch, "Lade", R.G.C. 3, 3, holds that 2 Sam. 6 is an historical, and Ps. 132 a liturgical document. A.Bentzen ("The Cultic Use of the Story of the Ark in Samuel", J.B.I., 67, pp. 37-53) and J.R.Porter ("The Interpretation of 2 Sam. VI and Ps. CXXXII", J.T.S. 5, pp. 161-173) regard the narrative in 2 Sam. 6 as "a sort of "translation" of the "historification", i.e. of the cultic ritual. There is no compelling reason, however, for rejecting the view that the narrative records, in all essentials, an historical event which preceded the ritual re-presentation.

\(^{(150)}\) M.Noth, \text{Üb. Stud.}, p. 70.

\(^{(151)}\) M.Noth, \text{Üb. Stud.}, p. 70.
oracle, whereby prohibition of temple-building is commuted to postponement, nevertheless accurately represents an older tradition; for the very fact that the temple was actually built indicates that some such rationalisation was already being made in Solomon's day, 152)

From an examination of this ancient core-tradition, then, four points emerge as to the nature of the Solomonic temple-dedication, and its relation to the covenant:

a) There is no reason to doubt that the dedication took place within the framework of the Autumnal festival, whatever the relationship between 1 Kings 6:38 and 1 Kings 8:2. Whether or not the Autumn festival in Jerusalem had included covenant reaffirmation in pre-Solomonic times, the entry of the ark and the relating of the ark to the Nathan oracle would undoubtedly mean that the Sinai tradition which had passed from Shechem to Gilgal, from Gilgal to Shiloh, and now from Shiloh to Zion, would permeate the Jerusalem festival from Solomonic times onward.

b) Sacrifice almost certainly played an important part in the Solomonic dedication as in the Sinai covenant-tradition, though it is obvious that the number of the victims has been exaggerated in later efforts to enhance the splendour of the occasion, (vv. 5, 62-63).

c) The temple as dwelling-place for Yahweh and the ark; vv. 6, (7-8), 12-13. Vv. 7-8 have been strongly moulded by distico polemic against

152) R.E.Clements, God and Temple, p. 57.
sixth century understanding of the theology of the ark, but vv. 12-13 are 'undoubtedly genuine', and may be used to illumine the Solomonic understanding of the role of the temple. Yahweh and the ark are so intimately related that where the ark is, there Yahweh is also, (cf. the ancient numinous quality of the ark, described above, pp. 247-249). Hence the bringing of the ark to its place (v. 6) symbolises and guarantees the coming of Yahweh from the darkness (عالم) of His former home on Sinai (Ex. 20:21; cf. Dt. 4:11, 5:22) to dwell in the thick darkness in the inner sanctuary (1 Kings 8:12). Not the 'Name of Yahweh', as the later distic. refinement would have it, but Yahweh Himself, dwells in the temple above the ark (v. 13).

 Arab ידמיא " (1 Kings 8:13) connects with the בֹּרֵיחַ עָלְמָיו by which Yahweh upholds the Davidic dynasty. Yahweh's dwelling 'for ever' in the temple that 'David' has dedicated to Him, is the guarantee that His covenant with 'David' will stand for ever. Thus the foundation is laid for a very 'high' doctrine of covenant, unqualified by the conditional elements with which Dtr. later sought to

153) If the ark was placed lengthwise in the holy of holies, as Dtr. records, it would be difficult to envisage it as a throne; and the added note that the poles remained in place and protruded forwards, makes the matter even more difficult. We may safely conclude that Dtr. intended this to be so; i.e. that the description is a polemic against the concept of the ark as a throne.


155) Cf. the close connection in ancient Near Eastern thought, between 'temple' and 'dynasty' or 'rule': -

R.E.Clements, Prophecy and Covenant, p. 57; God and Temple, p. 59.
safeguard it.

The Yahwist.

It seems fitting to close this account of the pre-disruption period with a reference to the Yahwist, whose composition, dating from about the time of the disruption,\(^{156}\) gathers together some of the significant threads of the development thus far. We have already noted (p. 114ff) some of the important aspects of his work: - It was the Yahwist who impressed the genealogical structure upon the patriarchal traditions, enriching historical traditions with cultic, mythological, and saga material, and weaving all together along the line of the Heilgeschichte, by setting patriarchal promises and Sinai covenant together in a relation of promise and fulfillment.\(^{157}\) Further, it was he who gave the Heilgeschichte a wider setting still by prefacing the patriarchal material with an account of creation and of the pre-history of the world.

Among the reasons which prompted the Yahwist to set the material in written form, we may mention the following:

1. It has frequently been observed that the impetus to preserve and codify tradition is strongest at those points of history where an older order is breaking down before the impact of the new.\(^{158}\) The establishment of the

\(^{156}\) On the dating of J., see E.A. Speiser, Genesis, p. XXVIII; G.v. Rad, Genesis, pp. 23f.

\(^{157}\) R.E. Clements, Prophecy and Covenant, p. 64f.

kingship in Israel, and in particular the spectacular growth of empire under Solomon, constituted such an occasion. Cultic material which had been passed down orally at local shrines now tended to recede from the focus of attention with the establishment of the royal and national shrine at Jerusalem. Local religious leaders, and sensitive court personnel, may have foreseen the danger of the disintegration of the ancient oral forms, and hence the necessity of compiling a permanent record. 159)

2. With the growth of empire, Judaean society became more cosmopolitan and sophisticated. Wider contacts introduced Israel to art- and culture-forms previously only vaguely sensed, and this led to the growth of an interest in literature as an exciting expression of culture. Such delight in literary form is exhibited by the Yahwist and his contemporaries, e.g., the authors of the 'History of the Ark', and 'History of the succession to the throne of David'. 160)

3. The Yahwist seems to have had an awareness that the period normative for Israel's life already lay in the past - the deliverance from the bondage in Egypt, the definitive covenants on which God had established nation and kingdom, the conquest and settlement of the land up to and beyond the boundaries that God had promised. Henceforward there remained only the challenge of maintaining and preserving what had already been given. Thus a certain 'canonicity' already inhered in these definitive events. Their oral record had been shaped and polished in the cult, so that the time was

ripe for them to precipitate as literature. The social change which marked
the period provided the necessary catalyst.

4. It has been suggested that the Yahwistic source (at least in the later
recension) had an eirenic intent. 161) By setting out in concrete form the
traditions common to South and North, and by stressing the importance for
all Israel of those elements most precious to the North (i.e. preeminently,
Sinai) the Yahwist was making a plea for the restoration of the shattered
political unity of Israel, or at least inculcating and stressing the basic
unity of all twelve tribes in the cult of Yahweh.

The Northern covenant tradition.

1. The overt cause of the disruption lies in the chafing sense of injustice
felt by the North against the increasing centralisation of political power
and privilege in Jerusalem. 1 Kings 11:28 notes significantly that Jeroboam
the Ephraimite was in ... "charge of all the forced labour of the house of
Joseph." We may safely conclude that 1 Kings 9:20-22 is a Judaean white-
washing of the actual state of affairs, (cf. 1 Kings 12:4), and that in the
work-levies 'Israel' bore a heavier burden than 'Judah'. 162)

But the disruption also had its cultic background: It has been suggested
that there was in Shiloh, and generally in the North, a feeling of resent-
ment at the growing cultic dominance of Jerusalem. But the traditions relat-

161) C.A. Simpson, "The Growth of the Hexateuch", The Interpreter's Bible 1,
p. 194f.

162) Cf. 1 Kings 4:7-19: the areas assigned to these twelve officers are
all in the Northern kingdom.
ing to political and cultic unrest have now been interwoven. 1 Kings 12 probably represents an originally separate tradition in which the assembly of the Northern people, under leadership of their elders (1 Kings 12:3), in effect call upon Rehoboam to re-negotiate the basis of his kingship over them as a pre-condition of their entering into covenant with him, and thus renewing their covenant with the house of David. Subsequently this tradition of 'political protest' has been united with the Jeroboam-Ahijah tradition, by ascribing the leading role in the insurgent assembly to Jeroboam, and basing the whole on the prophetic prediction of Ahijah, i.e., fitting the disruption into a promise-fulfilment pattern.

The 'deliverer', however, did not measure up to expectations - as the 'Ahijah-Jeroboam history' makes plain (1 Kings 11-12, 14:1-20).

---

163) The story of Jeroboam's background and call affords several interesting parallels to that of Moses. Like Moses he is:
   a) brought up in the palace of the 'oppressor',
   b) intercepted in the desert by the מִרְאֵץ, וִינָשׁוֹן,
   c) given a tangible sign of his call,
   d) forced to flee from the wrath of the 'oppressor' until God's time was ripe.

One cannot be certain that the parallelism is intentional; but the whole outlook of the Northern Yahweh-loyalists, i.e., that they were the true adherents of the Sinai-Mosaic tradition, would accord well with such a supposition. Jeroboam may well have appeared initially to certain contemporary Northern circles as the second Moses, re-establishing the pure Sinai-tradition.

164) M. Noth, Ŭb. Studien, pp. 79f. For a summary of the growth of the 1 Kings 12 tradition, see E. Nielsen, Shechem, p. 186.

165) It is impossible to trace exactly the age of the various strata within 1 Kings 12:25-33. There are certainly signs of Judaean and ūtistic influence; but it would nevertheless seem certain that this critical assessment of Jeroboam did not originate in Southern polemic, but has its roots in the Sinai-Yahwistic tradition of the North.
Several interesting deductions may be made from these verses:

Jeroboam's apparently rapid withdrawal from his original capital at Shechem to Penuel, may indeed have been dictated in the first instance by politico-military strategy (Penuel straddles the great Eastern caravan route), but probably also reflects the religious tension he encountered at Shechem. It is plausibly suggested that the Sinai tradition was too strongly rooted at Shechem (under a powerful Levitical priesthood who refused to be intimidated) to allow theology to be adapted to separatist politics. Hence eventually it was Bethel which was chosen as the chief Northern sanctuary, and it would seem that it was the Levitical priesthood of Bethel (primarily if not exclusively) who were replaced by non-Levitical priests (1 Kings 12:30-33). This action of Jeroboam's would confirm that he had found himself in tension with the intransigent Yahwism of the Levitical priests. While it is probable that the 'calf' which

---

166) E. Nielsen, Shechem, p. 191.

167) Accepting Nielsen's suggestion, Shechem, p. 196, that there was only one 'calf' set up at Bethel, but carried in a kind of Presentation procession throughout all the borders of the Northern kingdom.

168) E. W. Nicholson, Deuteronomy and Tradition, p. 74f., finds it unlikely that this dispossession of the Levites is historical, on the grounds that Jeroboam would not needlessly have antagonised the Yahwist-traditionists. The argument, however, is not compelling.

169) H.-J. Krauss, Worship in Israel, p. 151. The rejection of the Levites at Bethel, etc., was probably for the same reason that Shechem was not chosen as the official Northern sanctuary; i.e. a refusal on the part of the strong local (levitical) priesthood to countenance the cultic separatism of Jeroboam.
Jeroboam installed at Bethel was in fact a re-instatement of an ancient symbol\(^{170}\) representative of invisible deity, and thus approximately equivalent in significance to the ark, yet in the Canaanite context of the cosmopolitan Northern kingdom the symbol was dangerous as a potential incitement to syncretism with the Canaanite fertility cults.\(^{171}\) By the time of Hosea and his contemporary, the author/compiler of Ex. 32, it was rejected on these grounds.

2. Preservation of the Sinai tradition in the North.

The tendency noted in Jeroboam, to allow political considerations to lead him into apostasising and syncretistic innovations, comes to full fruition under the Omrides, who increasingly succumbed to foreign domination, notably through their alliances with the Phoenician dynasty of Tyre. Thus they came increasingly into conflict with the authentic tradition of Israel.\(^{172}\) Under Omri the change is evident from charismatic to dynastic pattern of kingship, caused primarily through pressure from the Canaanite section of the population whose aristocracy grew closer and closer to the kings as time passed, and through whom the kings became acquainted with the traditions and institutions of the previous Canaanite system of government, including the concept of dynastic monarchy which had formed its nucleus.

---

\(^{170}\) E. Nielsen, *Shechem*, p. 195, however, is inclined to regard the 'calf' as original to Jeroboam I.


\(^{172}\) M. Noth, *The History of Israel*, p. 243.
As the syncretistic influences increased, so too the Yahwistic opposition bent on preserving the authentic Sinai traditions. Whilst the records draw no clear connecting line between the various 'protest' groups and figures of the North, yet it is reasonable to assume that they in fact stand within the one broad continuum, and are at least to that extent interrelated: - The Levitical priesthood of Shechem, Jonadab b. Rechab, Elijah, Elisha, the Elohist, (Amos), 173) Hosea, Deuteronomy. Some of these we have already considered; others require a brief consideration at this point:

(a) Jonadab b. Rechab.

In his militant piety (2 Kings 10:15ff.) Jonadab is akin to the Levites (see below). On the other hand he is closely connected with Jehu, that representative of uncompromising Yahwism whose hand is stretched out to slaughter even Israelites who apostasise. Jehu in turn rose to kingly office through the support of the (b) Elijah-Elisha circle (1 Kings 19:16, 2 Kings 9:1-10); and this fact would suggest that Jonadab too was somehow related to these same prophetic circles. That Jonadab was not an isolated phenomenon, but represented a persistent line of Yahwistic tradition, is clear from Jer. 35: - a tradition exalting the simplicity of nomadic times as the period in which Israel had lived closest to the divine purpose as set out in the Sinai revelation. cf. Hosea's attachment to the same tradition; and Elijah's flight to the Sinai desert sanctuary, in search of a renewal of authentic Yahwistic faith (see chapter one, 'The Theophany Tradition', p. 161).

That these circles adhered not only to the simpler standards of the past

173) On the inclusion of Amos among the Northern prophets, see below, p.274.
in general, but specifically to the Sinai covenant tradition, seems clear from 1 Kings 21 where the concern is with preservation of covenant law. The accusation includes charges of false witness, murder, theft, covetousness (v. 19); and these charges are set in the light of the Hauptgebot by the distico editor (vv. 21-2, 25-6).\(^{174}\) "... wirft die Erzählung von Naboths Weinberg ein Schlaglicht auf den Kampf eines Propheten von der Größe Elias um die Geltung des alten Reiches Jahwes im Reiche Israel."\(^{175}\)

(c) Amos.

What were Amos' motives as a Southerner, in preaching at Bethel, the royal sanctuary of the Northern kingdom? At the very least he was testifying to his conviction that Israel was still one, and that the prophet of Yahweh had a message to the whole nation. But more than this, it may well be that Amos believed the traditions preserved among the Yahwistic circles of the North to be closer to the authentic Israelite faith than those obtaining elsewhere, and he may have felt, therefore, that hope for the future lay in seeking to re-command this original tradition to the North, where it seemed to have a better chance of acceptance than in the South.

(d) Hosea.

Like Amos, Hosea also addresses his message to the whole of the nation. H.W. Wolff\(^{176}\) has shown that Hosea sees himself as part of a Yahwistic pro-

---

175) A. Alt, "Die Heimat des Deuteronomiums", *Kleine Schriften II*, p. 270.
phetic tradition running right back to Moses and Sinai, and in Hosea's own day represented by a prophetic circle sharing a common opposition to the syncretism prevalent in the Northern sanctuaries. Like Jonadab, Hosea idealises the desert period, Hos. 2:16-17 (14-15); 9:10; 12:10; 13:4-5; and like Elijah he insists on that moral integrity, the demand for which he sees to be integral to the Sinai covenant; (1 Kings 21:17ff., cf. Hosea 4:1-6 (וֹלָה יִתְנָהָאנה)). Wolff draws particular attention to Hosea's interest in, and knowledge of, the ancient Israelite traditions and their contemporary cultic developments. He maintains that such knowledge cannot really be traced to the Northern prophetic circles of Hosea's time, but must have been preserved by contemporary Levitical circles. This being so, Hosea must have been dependent on levitical traditions, as well as prophetic; i.e. his background is in a prophetic-levitic opposition-alliance.

In a sense, Jonadab b. Rechab stands as an intermediate link between the...
Levites and the Northern prophets, sharing the militant piety\textsuperscript{181}) of the former, and the desert-idealisation of the latter. That 'prophetic' and 'levitic' qualities can be thus seen to meet in an individual of the ninth century, lends colour to the suggestion that these same qualities met also in Hosea himself.

(e) The role of the Levites in the Northern covenant tradition,\textsuperscript{182}) calls for somewhat closer examination.

The origins of the Levites are obscure.\textsuperscript{183})

\textsuperscript{181}) v.Rad, Studies in Deuteronomy, p. 67.

\textsuperscript{182}) It seems likely from the evidence that: a) the Levites did not form a homogeneous class, and b) that their role varied from South to North. But at least certain circles of Northern Levites seem to have been especially concerned with the support and preservation of the primitive Yahwistic tradition.

\textsuperscript{183}) For a discussion of the etymology of the name Levi, see E. Nielsen, Shechem, p. 265f.

Important to the problem of origins is the unresolved question as to the relation between the secular tribe of Levi, and the priestly levites:

(i) Some scholars follow the prima facie testimony of Old Testament literature, and regard the priestly class as developing from the secular tribe, (J. Pedersen, Israel III, p. 157; R. de Vaux, "Settlement ... of Judah", op. cit., pp. 114ff.

(ii) Others doubt the existence of the secular tribe altogether (E. Nielsen, Shechem, p. 280);

(iii) Others again hold that the two groups have been linked, simply on the basis of fortuitous similarity of name; (H.-J. Kraus, Worship in Israel, p. 94f.; M. Noth, Ub. des Pentatsuch, p. 197, note 503). This last view depends rather heavily on the parallels to the name levi in the priestly sense, traced in Minaean inscriptions (see Pedersen, Israel III, p. 170, re these ANE parallels). R. de Vaux, Ancient Israel, p. 369f., however, maintains that these 'parallels' are borrowings from the Jews, and therefore dependent on the O.T. literary usage.

On the whole, the first suggestion as to the relation between Levi and the levites would seem the most probable - though the evidence for a/...
W. Eichrodt puts forward the attractive suggestion that the Levites were in fact the primitive priesthood of Kadesh; so that they were from the beginning concerned with the preservation of sacred (נַע) tradition, especially that of the דֵּדַשְׁנָן (Gen. 14:7; Ex. 15:25), as well as being acquainted with the worship centred on the Horeb theophany-sanctuary, (whether or not they possessed, in the pre-Mosaic age, any specific tradition relating theophany and דֵּדַשְׁנָן).

As stated above, the possibility that the Benjamite ark may have been connected with Sinai-Kadesh at this early stage, and hence with the Kadesh levites, is best left an open question. It is certain, however, that ark and levites did become closely associated at a comparatively early period, presumably at Gilgal. (We have also referred to the affinities between the apotropaic border-securing rite presumably practised in Benjamin, and the concept of Holy War: on this basis the involvement of both ark and levites in the holy war becomes explicable.)

Continuation of note 183):

A clear decision is simply not available.

184) W. Eichrodt, "Theology of the Old Testament," I, p. 394. J. Pedersen, "Israel," III, connects the Levites with the South (p. 170) and with Kadesh (p. 172). R. de Vaux, "Settlement ... of Judah," concludes that Levi originally settled the Southern part of Judah, and that part of the Levi-group came to Kadesh after participating in an expulsion-Exodus from Egypt, but holds that the tradition "which put Levi in a special relation to Kadesh ... is perhaps not a primitive one" (op. cit., pp. 115ff.).

185) Cf. v. Rad, Studies in Deuteronomy, p. 67: "The Levites had a close connection with the Holy War, for the Levites and the ark belong together, and the ark was plainly the palladium of the Holy War". v. Rad is here presupposing a Southern setting for ark and levites, however, whereas we have placed both among the Northern elements.
The fanatic Yahwism of the Levites which has been mentioned above, is exemplified in several ancient passages:

**Ex. 32.**[186]

The Levites are conceived as having earned their rights to the office of priesthood by their vigorous defence of Sinaitic Yahwism - even to the point of slaying their own kith and kin. [187]

**Gen. 34.**[188]

In its earliest form, this tradition probably praised Simeon-Levi as the

---

186) The source- and tradition-analysis of Ex. 32 is complicated and obscure. M. Noth, *Exodus*, traces at least four strata:

a) a primitive account of an apostasy, in which neither Levites nor Aaron had part;

b) the insertion of the levites as defenders of the faith;

c) Aaron acquiesces in the people’s determination to apostasise;

d) Aaron takes the initiative in the apostasy.

Noth finds the basic core of the passage to be Yahwistic.

J. Hempel, *Die Schichten des Deuteronomiums*, p. 115f., on the contrary, ascribes the whole chapter to different ‘hands’ of E. This seems more probable.

Some scholars assume that the ‘calf’ intruded into an early ‘apostasy story’ only in polemic against the ‘calf’ of Jeroboam I, at Bethel, (see note 170). Cf. M. Noth, *Exodus*, considers it more likely that there was a pre-Jeroboam Yahwistic ‘calf’-tradition, which was only subsequently exploited for polemical purposes.

187) J. Pedersen, *Israel III*, p. 174, concludes that there was strife even among the levites themselves as to the correct attitude that should be taken toward the Canaanite cult.

188) The passage is a late insertion in its present context (E. Nielsen, *Shechem*, p. 281). In itself it also bears the marks of re-editing: a pro-Simeon/Levi (anti-Canaanite) account has been annotated later, to stress the honourable intentions of Shechem b. Hamor, and therefore presumably to denigrate Simeon/Levi.
upholders, by force of arms, of Israel's honour and purity, in face of Canaanite (cultic) defilement.

J. Pedersen draws Gen. 49:5-7 into this same circle of ideas, and stresses its close connection with Gen. 34: He comments: "That mixture of respect and antipathy with which holy men are often regarded in the East was experienced by the levites too... The scattered life of the Levites is here regarded as a punishment from Yahweh... The punishment befalls Levi for violent conduct which, however, was regarded by others as especially pleasing to Yahweh. The victims of the violence of Levi were the Canaanites... and it may be assumed that cult controversies have been the cause."

Dtn. 33:8-11.

(See chapter 3, 'Theophany and Torah', p.373f.) In its present form the tradition locates the Levitical struggle for dominance at Massah and Meribah, the satellite cases of Kadesh, i.e. in the pre-settlement period. Here too, the Levites have proved by their vigorous action that loyalty to Yahweh is dearer to them than the ties of kinship. V. 11 indicates that subsequently this Levitic pre-eminence was being challenged, and the vehemence of the language shows the bitterness of the struggle. Who the challengers were is uncertain, but Jeroboam's non-Levitic priests are the most likely candidates, (1 Kings 12:31f.; 13:33). It is interesting

189) Pedersen, Israel III, p. 171.

190) The aetiologies in Ex. 17:1-7; and Num. 20:1-13 are probably later than our passage.

that the later additions to the Levi-oracle (Dtn. 33:9-10) validate the levitical teaching ministry (impartation of ṭörāh) on the grounds of this ancient fidelity which Levi showed to the Sinai covenant tradition. From the tone of Dtn. 33 as a whole, we may assume that the series of oracles was assembled in the Northern kingdom.

As regards the teaching ministry of the Levites, the probability is that their concern with ṭörāh has its main roots in these early struggles:

If the levites had become widely established at the Northern shrines in the period between the settlement and the disruption, then Jeroboam's displacement of part of them from Bethel (and possibly from other shrines as well) would create redundancies similar to and foreshadowing the later situation created by the Josianic cult-centralisation. It is likely therefore that these Northern Levites, from the disruption onwards, began to interest themselves in the preservation of the authentic traditions, not only through the cults at the still orthodox sanctuaries such as Shechem, but also by means of a more widely diffused teaching and preaching ministry, which may even have included paraenetic and catechetical instruction centring on the Levitical cities. Thus the emphasis on collation and recording of traditions, which became so important during the exile was not a new departure, but had its roots far back in the history of Israel's struggle against Canaanite influences infiltrating the Sinai tradition.

3. The development of the Sinai-covenant tradition within the Northern cult.

In our account of the pre-disruption period we traced: -

a) the establishment of the covenant cult at Shechem-Gilgal;
b) the linking of this covenant tradition with that of the ark, at Gilgal; and
c) the accretion at Shiloh of an enthronement motif, under Canaanite influence.

This latter development was in line with the subsequent royal cults of Bethel and Jerusalem; but from the viewpoint of the strict Yahwistic strain with which we are primarily concerned, it no doubt represented a deviation fraught with the greatest possible danger.

We therefore naturally look to Shechem (cf. above: the intransigence of the Shechemite levites in face of Jeroboam's cultic innovations), as the place at which the Yahwistic-Sinai tradition is most likely to have been preserved.  

Dtn. 31:9-13 relates covenant reaffirmation and the reading of the covenant-law to the institution of the Year of Release ( ). In its present position the passage is a late insertion. It does not mention the location of the central shrine at which the covenant-rite is to take place, and is presumably intended to be taken as a reference to the temple at Jerusalem. But by analogy with Dtn. 27 and Josh. 24, we may infer that the original venue was Shechem.

The original institution of the Release probably involved leaving the

192) Cf. E. Nielsen, Shechem, p. 352: "No other Israelite sanctuary (except Jerusalem) at which covenant-making and law-recital were of decisive importance."
land fallow every seven years (Ex. 23:10), thus symbolically acknowledging Yahweh's ownership of the land, handing it back to Him, and receiving it anew from His hand. Such symbolism is intimately related to the covenant theme, with its stress on the promise of land-inheritance. The changed social circumstances of the eighth and seventh centuries, however (land tenure stable, but a rising proletariat prone to debt and consequent enslavement), resulted in a re-application of the institution of the Release to questions of debt and slavery, (Dttn. 15). But the very impulse to re-apply the ancient law would imply that the old tradition was still living, and the continued vitality of the tradition shows that it was still being kept before the attention of the nation, by repetition in the cult. And in spite of this re-application to the economic situation in the period of the late monarchy, the Release obviously still retained its strong covenant associations, cf. Jer. 17:14, 193) where the exile is interpreted as an enforced observance of the ancient נשק - the land, which is Yahweh's, will enjoy rest, because Yahweh's covenant-breaking people are no longer there to defile it.

We are therefore justified in using Dtn. 31:9-13 as evidence for a continuing cult of covenant-reaffirmation, down to the time when the Die* tradition was carried South.

Noth 194) has rightly stressed that in this covenant-reaffirmation ceremony, the 'legal' element became increasingly preponderant. In ch. 3 we shall trace the development between decalogue and Book of Covenant, and

194) M. Noth, The History of Israel, p. 100f.
again between B.o.C. and Deuteronomic Code. And we shall review evidence which suggests that prohibition- and curse-series were at home in this cultic setting from a very early period. But the subsequent development of the legal element within the cult is obscure. Did the ethical decalogue ever stand as part of the liturgy, or is it basically a literary creation modelled on covenant-cult usage? Was the Book of the Covenant ever recited as such within the cult? Dtn. 31:9-13 (especially, v. 12) implies that the Deuteronomic Code is intended for cultic recitation; and if the passage may be regarded as authentic reminiscence of an actual periodic happening, then there would be good grounds for holding that it was the B.o.C., as the predecessor or 'ancestor' of the Deuteronomic Code, that was actually used in the cult. There is nothing inherently improbable in such an interpretation of Dtn. 31:9-13; but further than this we cannot safely go. If Noth\textsuperscript{195} is correct in his assumption that the covenant-reaffirmation was held annually, but that the seven-yearly celebration in the Year of Release was an especially solemn occasion, then it is possible to speculate that a decalogic form was used annually, and the fuller exposition and code at the Release.

\textbf{The Elohist.}

As the Yahwist gathered together the traditions of the pre-disruption period, so (most scholars agree)\textsuperscript{196} the Elohistic material represents the

\textsuperscript{195} K. Noth, \textit{The History of Israel}, p. 101.

\textsuperscript{196} M. Noth, \textit{Üb. des Pentateuch}, p. 249, argues for the Southern provenance of E. In this he is followed by A. Kuschke, "Die Lagervorstellung der priesterschriftlichen Erzählung", \textit{Z.A.W. 63}, 1951, p. 91, note 108/...
crystallisation of that stream of tradition which flowed in the North from
the time of the disruption till the eighth cent. The Elohist material
is marked by 197): -

a) reaction from the Southern tradition; leading to an exclusion of
nearly all the Southern saga-material that the Yahwist had included
in his work, and a greater emphasis on the central Sinai tradition
of the covenant with its attendant legal provisions. This can be
seen as an attempt to safeguard authentic Yahwism in an era of
apostasy.

b) Allied to this, the Elohist exhibits a greater stress on the
uniqueness of Israel among the nations, and the need to separate
from the heathen in order to preserve Israel's peculiar heritage.

c) The links between the Elohist and the prophetic movement have often
been noted.

d) Elohistic description tends to incorporate a certain element of
exhortation, which we may fairly conclude to be rooted in the cult,
and which attains its full flowering in the Deuteronomistic paraenesis.

Continuation of note 196):-
..."Wir folgen der Ansicht Noths, dass E. südisraelitischer Herkunft
ist: 'Die Tatsache, dass E. erzählende Tradition wiedergibt, wie
sie zunächst in Mittelpalästina gebildet, und dann im Kreise der
Südstämmte weiter ausgebildet worden ist, und der ausgesprochen süd-
palästinische Charakter des E.-Sondergutes Gen. 22:1ff. und Ex. 18:
1ff. sprechen dagegen, dass E. "nordisraelitischer" Herkunft ist.'"
But against this last point, cf. A. Weiser, Introduction to the O.T.,
p. 124.

197) On the characteristics of E., see further A. Weiser, Introduction to
The Southern Covenant Tradition.

The establishment of the Davidic dynasty represents the Southern development of the charismatic succession of leadership. In the North, the succession of charismatic judges was replaced officially by a succession of kings, each prophetically designated and popularly acclaimed; but in practice, as we have seen, the charisma passed to the levitic-prophetic circles where the authentic covenant traditions were preserved. But in the South, the prophetic designation and popular acclaim rested upon the Davidic line as a whole rather than on its individual representatives. The concept of 'dynasty' was of course already deeply-rooted among the Canaanites, and the pattern of the old Jebusite kingship will undoubtedly have moulded the Davidic pattern. Nevertheless the prophetic oracle was still considered essential to the establishment of the monarchy. Hence Nathan's oracle to David was greatly stressed from Solomonic times onward as the once-for-all decision of Yahweh, whereby He took the Davidic line into a covenant of grace with Himself.

Thus ideally, the Davidic covenant was seen as a special provision within the more general framework of the Sinai covenant. God who called Israel to be a people under His own divine kingship, made this specific

---


199) A. Alt, "The Monarchy in the Kingdoms of Israel and Judah", Essays on Old Testament History and Religion, pp. 257f., concedes that the Davidic covenant was a legitimate growth from the ancient common Yahwistic tradition. Yet in practice, the 'Davidic' aspects of the Yahwistic covenant tradition, seen in the Jerusalem cult to have overshadowed the primitive Sinai tradition.
provision for their concrete governance by adopting one family from among Israel to be His 'sons', and through whom He might make His divine kingship tangible. Stress is laid constantly on the fact that the bond between king and Yahweh is essentially analogous to that between people and Yahweh. The king emphatically belongs to the human side of the covenant partnership, even in his most exalted moments. "Within the nation the king is the representative of the whole: Israel is his 'house' and he is its father. The covenant between Yahweh and Israel and between Yahweh and David is one and the same thing."  

2. The Jerusalem Covenant Cult.

In our discussion of the pre-disruption period we referred to 2 Sam. 6, and we decided, on the basis of comparison with the parallel text in Ps. 132, that the passage constitutes the account of a periodic cultic re-enactment, rather than a factual historical record of a once-for-all happening.  

What then was the cultic occasion referred to? An analysis of the Psalm (132) may throw light on this question. Psalm 132 comprises the following elements:

a) The solemn recalling of David's desire to build a house for Yahweh, and the plea that Yahweh may remember this in "David's" favour, (vv. 1-5);

b) Account of how the ark was sought and found at Kirjath-Jearim (v. 6);

200) S. Mowinckel, The Psalms in Israel's Worship, I, p. 44.
c) Summons to the congregation to worship before the ark in Jerusalem, (v. 7);

d) The cry to Yahweh to arise and enter with the ark into the Jerusalem shrine, (v. 8);

e) The plea that divine favour to monarchy and people will be sealed in the granting of a theophany before the ark, (v. 9-10);

f) Recollection of the election of David, (vv. 11-12);

g) Handing over of the 'covenant and testimonies', (v. 12), - (see below, p. 294);

h) Recollection of the election of Zion, (vv. 13-18).

That some such festival was observed in Jerusalem, and that it involved some form of covenant reaffirmation, seems certain. But scholars vary as to the detailed interpretation of its significance. Mowinckel finds his key to interpretation in the 'enthronement psalms'\(^{203}\) with their jubilant shout of \(יְהוָה מלך\) - translated by Mowinckel, "Yahweh has become King",\(^{204}\) (Ps 93:1; 97:1; 47:8; 96:10). He argues that on the last, climatic day\(^{205}\) of the Autumn-New Year festival, Yahweh having representationally defeated the forces of chaos enters the temple in triumph, enthroned

\(^{203}\) S. Mowinckel, \textit{op. cit.}, I, p. 107.

\(^{204}\) The 'actualisation' of the salvation-moment in the cult is of cardinal importance for Mowinckel. So here, the moment of proclamation is treated utterly seriously as the actual moment of manifestation of Yahweh's saving power and rule. See, G. E. Wright, "Cult and History - A study of a current problem in Old Testament Interpretation", \textit{interpretation}, 16, 1960, p. 16.

\(^{205}\) S. Mowinckel, \textit{op. cit.}, I, p. 124.
upon the processional ark: thus He re-affirms His kingship over Israel and over all creation. In the temple Yahweh remains 'enthroned upon the praises of Israel' (Ps. 22:4); "von den Wolken des Raucheraldarfeuers vor profanen Augen verhüllt, gelegentlich aber dem 'geöffneten' Auge des in Anbetung versunkenen Propheten sichtbar".\(^{206}\)

Divine enthronement had formed part of the Canaanite Harvest and New Year Festival cult in Jebuss, and presumably also in Shiloh (see above). It had signified that the dying god of fertility had been restored to life and supremacy, and that thereby prosperity was guaranteed for the ensuing year. On mounting his throne the god established the tables of destiny, so settling the events for the following year.\(^{207}\)

According to Mowinckel's interpretation, Ps. 132 represents an adaptation and historicising of this Canaanite rite.\(^{208}\) Yahweh has not been resuscitated by men, but on the contrary has vindicated Himself by rescuing His ark from ignominy,\(^{209}\) and in the person of His representative the Davidic king has symbolically, in ritual combat,\(^{210}\) overcome the forces of

---

206) S. Mowinckel, "Gottesdienst II. Im A.T.", R.G.G.\(^3\). 2, col. 1754; The Psalms in Israel's Worship, I, p. 94.

207) S. Mowinckel, op. cit., I, pp. 95, 136f.

208) S. Mowinckel, op. cit., I, p. 177.

209) S. Mowinckel, op. cit., I, p. 175; "... when David introduced the holy ark" (to Jerusalem) "as the centre of the cult, and the symbol of the personal presence of Yahweh ... David could not have indicated more clearly that his new kingdom was to be based on the traditions of the old Israel."

210) Ps. 46, 48, and 149 may contain allusions to ritual combat. Note the stress on visual experience of Yahweh's salvation-deed, Ps. 46:9, ("come and see what the Lord has done" - N.E.B.); Ps. 48:9, ("as we have heard, so have we seen").
man and nature 211) ranged against Him. The ark, Yahweh's cherubim-throne on which He is invisibly seated, is borne triumphanty up the via sacra (Ps. 84:6; Is. 35:8) to the temple mount, amid the welcoming shouts of the worshippers. Where the ark is, there Yahweh is; so that this ark-procession re-presents Yahweh's theophany, His coming to dwell and reign in the midst of Jerusalem and of Israel. But though the ark is borne by the priests, His 'appearing' is not thereby controlled by them: His coming is an act of divine grace in which He freely confirms the election of 'David' and of 'Zion', and thus reaffirms the covenant with Israel.

In Mowinckel's view, an element of proclamation of the law occurs at two points 212) within the framework of this enthronement cult. As the procession reaches the doors of the sanctuary, the priests from within expound the entry-torah setting out the moral conditions to be fulfilled if a worshipper is to be considered worthy to partake in the temple cult; and later, at the climax of the installation of the ark, the divine stipulations are proclaimed in decalogic form; - stipulations the observance of which is essential for the maintenance of the covenant between Yahweh, King, and people.

Mowinckel, then, has a comparatively high estimate of the influence of the old Canaanite cult on the development of the Jerusalem temple cult. The

211) S. Mowinckel, op. cit., I, pp. 108, 154, argues that 'Creation' and 'Exodus' were closely related themes in the enthronement festival; the Exodus being viewed as Yahweh's struggle against chaotic powers (Pharaoh and Egypt) in the process of 'creating' His people Israel.

fundamentals of the festival are the divine theophany, and the myth of creation,213) (Ps. 74:12-17; Ps. 104:5-9; Ps. 93:1b-4). "The Yahweh ... of the cult of Jerusalem is the God who has taken over everything of value, everything great and elevated in the whole previous religious development, all the ideas of the divine, and all the higher feelings among the people whose culture Israel took over; ... in so far as this culture could be united ... with the historical traditions about Yahweh."214) On the one hand, the Sinai-covenant theology which adhered to the ark, entered Jerusalem along with the ark; and on the other hand the historical fact of David's succession to power, in politics and cult, undergirded and theologised by the Nathan-oracle, introduced the theme of the Davidic election. The election of Zion, which already had roots in the Saphôn-tradition, then became subordinated to this Davidic-covenant tradition.

For H.-J. Kraus, the cult described in Ps. 132 etc. is essentially the 'royal festival of Zion'. The significance of the ark-procession is not 'enthronement' - to stress 'enthronement' is to place undue emphasis on the influence of the old Canaanite cult.215) For Israel, Yahweh's kingship was manifested decisively in the Exodus-Sinai event, and it is this historical and ancient manifestation of His kingship that is joyfully acknowledged in

213) S. Mowinckel, The Psalms in Israel's Worship, I, pp. 143ff.
the cry 'יָהָה מָלֵךְ ', i.e. in language now borrowed from the Canaanite cult. \(^{216}\) The festival cult-narrative is fundamentally concerned not with 'enthronement', but with justifying the action of David; that on succession to power in Jerusalem he moved the ark, the ancient symbol of Israel's covenant with Yahweh, to his new royal/national shrine. Justification for David's decision is found in the Nathan oracle, whereby Yahweh declares His purpose of entering into everlasting covenant with David. It is by virtue of the authority vested in him as Yahweh's 'son', then, that David chose Zion; and for that reason, the choice of Zion is Yahweh's choice. (Only secondarily is the ancient Saphon-tradition woven into the basically Israelite material). Thus with the annual re-enactment of the entry of the ark into Jerusalem, the founding of the Jerusalem shrine as the place of Yahweh's presence among His people is re-presented, and its basis in the Davidic covenant recalled.

As to the place of the legal elements of the covenant tradition within the Autumn Festival, Kraus assigns the same role to the entrance הָרָע הָרָע as does Mowinckel; but for the rest he is content to stress that "the ancient legal traditions came to Jerusalem with the ark"\(^{218}\) (cf. Psalm 50; Mic. 4:2; Is. 1:26; 2:3), without attempting to define more exactly the

\(^{216}\) Cf. S. Mowinckel, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*, I, pp. 50, 114: "The ... statement" ("that Yahweh had, according to the Israelite view, always been king") ... "is correct enough". The difference between Mowinckel's and Kraus' position lies in the utter seriousness with which Mowinckel treats the idea of the re-actualisation of the salvation-deed in the cult.

\(^{217}\) H. -J. Kraus, *Worship in Israel*, p. 211f.

\(^{218}\) H. -J. Kraus, *Worship in Israel*, p. 189.
place of these traditions within the ritual of the 'royal festival'.

In a fine statement of the role of theophany in the Jerusalem cult, Kraus stresses that "revelation is not cultically 'manipulated' but belongs to the sovereign freedom of the God of Israel". He would therefore reject any interpretation implying that theophany may be commanded, by means of an ark-procession, the sounding of trumpets, or the burning of incense, but he would relate it to the 'prophetic visionary perception': "We must distinguish ... between the faith in the presence of God in the sanctuary, which is basic to all worship, and the expectation of his manifestation in the theophany, as proclaimed in prophecy."

A. Weiser insists, even more emphatically than Kraus, on the centrality of the peculiarly Israelite traditions, within the Autumn-New Year Festival. This festival he regards as essentially a festival of the renewal of the Sinai covenant, and as built around the cult-theophany of Yahweh. The twin pillars of the self-revelation of God as preserved in the covenant-tradition and celebrated in the cult, are History and Law. The core of the History is the Sinai theophany as celebrated in the tribal confederacy of Israel, and recorded in the 'cultic-narratives' (Festperikopen) belonging to that celebration. These cultic narratives include the recitation of the saving deeds of Yahweh from the Exodus to the land-distribution. (Weiser also underlines the note of judgment in the Psalms, and relates this too to the festival, tracing it back, through the entrance-torōth, to

219) H.-J. Kraus, Worship in Israel, p. 216.
220) A. Weiser, The Psalms, p. 49.
its ultimate source in the blessing-and-curse formulations of the ancient Shechem covenant ceremony (Deut. 27, 28)). In the further development of the cult, this basic 'Sinai' core is extended and elaborated: the line of the Heilsgeschichte is extended back to include Yahweh's deeds in creation, and forwards to include the election of David and of Zion within the framework of the covenant-cult.

As regards the form of the cult, Weiser is sceptical about the suggested ark-procession, preferring to concentrate on a ritual within the Jerusalem shrine itself (Ps. 132:7), where by means of trumpets and incense the action of God in the Sinai-theophany is re-presented, and evokes the reaction of Israel's worship. Presumably the reactualisation of 'Sinai' induces such intense participation that the worshippers may themselves experience the theophany, and 'behold the face of God'. (Weiser's stress on the sovereignty of the divine initiative in theophany would imply that the contemporary theophanic experience was not confined to the official cult personnel, but was in principle open to the devout worshippers of all ranks.)

The declaration of the divine name and the divine will (cf. the decalogue) are closely bound up with the theophany; indeed the proclamation of

---

221) For a different emphasis as to the place of the judgment-motif in the Psalms, cf. S. Nowinckel, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*, I, pp. 103f., 146f. The two are, of course, not mutually exclusive.


Weiser's exposition of Psalm 132:8, in which he seeks to exclude reference to ark-procession, is however not very convincing.
the divine word by cultic priest or prophet seems to have marked the climax of the theophany and of the cult.

A detailed comparison of the work of these three representative scholars would take us too far afield. Suffice it to point out that on two cardinal questions they are in general agreement:

1. All three are agreed that the stipulational content of the covenant, in so far as it had developed up till the disruption, moved South and became incorporated in some way, in the covenant-ceremonial of the Jerusalem Autumn Festival. Here we should note the fruitful suggestion of J. Grayg, that the 'testimony' ( Nikol ) handed to King Joash at his coronation (2 Kings 11:12) is probably to be identified with the 'testimony' ( Nikol ) mentioned in Ps. 132:12; and that it contained the nucleus of the covenant-stipulations in decalogic form. If we are justified in our assumption that Ps. 132:12 indicates a concrete ritual act in the course of the autumn festival, in which the testimony was annually re-presented to the king, then this ritual act would clearly constitute a powerful link, connecting the annual covenant celebration described above, with the occasional covenant renewals described below. The existence of such a link would help to emphasise the essential congruity of Davidic- and Sinai-covenant traditions.

2. All three are agreed, too, that the theophany is not a matter of cultic manipulation, but is a revelation of Himself which God grants, in the course of the cultic celebration, to those of His devout worshippers whom He has freely chosen.
The essential difference between the work of Mowinckel, Kraus, and Weiser, is in their varied estimates as to the influence of the Jebusite cult on the Israelite covenant tradition. The line of approach indicated by Weiser would seem to be the most compatible with the findings of our discussion thus far, (though in details he may do less than justice to the viewpoint represented by Mowinckel, cf. his interpretation of Ps. 132:8). Certainly we seem justified in insisting that it is the Sinai covenant tradition which forms the dominant element in the Jerusalem cult tradition, and that the contributions of the Jebusite cult have been subsumed within the Sinai cult, rather than vice versa.

3. The continuing 'Sinai' influence in the South.

Support seems indicated for Weiser's view, as outlined above, in that, alongside the evidence for covenant reaffirmation offered by the reconstructions of the Autumn-New Year Festival, there is also a strand of clear evidence from the Southern kingdom that even in the period before the Northern traditions moved South (c. 722 B.C.), periodic covenant renewal ceremonies, closer in form to the pre-disruption Sinai-covenant pattern did in fact take place.


The passage has been edited by the deuteronomist, but there seem to be no grounds for doubting that vv. 12-13, 15 derive from authentic chronicles of Asa's reign. Though there is no specific reference to covenant renewal, the passage has obviously been interpreted as such by the Chronicler, (2 Chron. 15:12-15), and the stress on Asa's 'putting away of foreign gods'
(v. 12b) and his purification of the cult (vv. 12a, 13), confirm the interpretation - cf. p. 233 above, on Jos. 24:23-25. It is noteworthy, too, that the reform movement described in 2 Kings 11 (see below), which undoubtedly involved covenant renewal, was also concerned with purification of the cult, (2 Kings 11:18).

(b) Coronation of Joash (839-800 B.C.) 2 Kings 11:12-20.

With the bracketing of vv. 13-16 which form a digression, the passage clearly stands as a unitary narrative in which coronation and covenant-renewal are parts of a single whole. (This, however, does not necessarily imply that covenant-renewal was a regular part of every coronation ceremony.)

2 Kings 11:17 seems best taken as describing a two-fold covenant renewal:

1. The covenant between Yahweh, king and people,

2. The covenant between the king and the people.

223) Coronations seemingly took place at the time of the Autumn Festival, and were conducted according to a special coronation liturgy; cf. H.-J.Kraus, Worship in Israel, pp. 222ff. Any relation to the annual covenant re-affirmation would be of a secondary nature. 2 Kings 11, then, describes an exceptional case, viz. the renewal of the covenant at a time of crisis, not the normal annual ceremony.

224) Following Baltzer, Das Bundesformular, p. 85; and H.-J.Kraus, Worship in Israel, p. 194, note 35.

G.v.Rad., Studies in Deuteronomy, p. 64, note 1, regards v. 17b as a dittography. M.Noth, "Old Testament covenant making in the light of a text from Mari", op. cit., p. 115, on the other hand, regards the reference to the covenant between king and people as the original form of the text.
1. The phrase לְהַעֲלוֹת לַיְבָם לְיִהוֵה expresses the very essence of the Sinai covenant tradition, and underlines the fact that the covenant between Yahweh and the king is identical with the covenant between Yahweh and the people. The king is the representative and spokesman of the people before Yahweh. It is significant that though this essential unity of Sinai- and Davidic-covenant may at times have been obscured in the Jerusalem cult, yet in the day of national and political crisis, it emerges clearly.

2. The renewal of the covenant between king and people, recalls the abortive negotiations whose breakdown led to the secession of the Northern kingdom in 926 B.C. (1 Kings 12:1-16). At that juncture, the men of Israel had insisted that the relation between king and people, which had been initiated in a voluntary, two-sided covenant (2 Sam. 5:3), should be renegotiated in the face of changing circumstances and of political insecurity. Similarly the accession of Joash occurred at a time of political upheaval involving the murder of the seed royal and the rule of a usurper. "It is conceivable that the conservative sections of the population sought a new formulation of the basic covenant in ... the unusual situation. "The meaning of the ceremony therefore would be that after the reign of the foreigner Athaliah Jerusalem and Judah bind themselves again to the dynasty of David ...""

(As we noted above, the covenant renewal is accompanied by the 'putting away of foreign gods' (2 Kings 11:18), an ancient element in the Sinai covenant tradition.)

Assuming, therefore, that 2 Kings 11:17 describes a double covenant renewal, the passage affords strong testimony to the virility of the basic Sinai covenant tradition, in Judah as well as in Israel; so that in times of crisis it could break through the more sophisticated, aesthetic forms of the Jerusalem cult, and reassert itself in its primitive essentials. 

v.Rad 226) has argued that these authentic traditions were preserved by the Southern Levites in coalition with 'the people of the land'. We have suggested above that it was the levitic-prophetic circles of the North who were the guardians of the basic Sinai tradition. But may there not have been in fact a continuing intercourse between loyal Yahwist Levites of North and South, which helped to keep the more primitive Sinai tradition alive in both parts, throughout the period of the divided monarchy?

As to the stipulational content of the Southern Sinai-covenant tradition, the position is obscure. That there was some development along this line seems virtually certain, in view of the important place which Ex. 34 occupies in the J. tradition. But on the whole the growth of legal corpora within the covenant framework seems to have been peculiarly at home in the North. Part of the reason may be that, unlike the position in the North, the king of Judah occupied a position of unrivalled supremacy in the Jerusalem cult, so that 'Yahweh's law' was never formulated in detail over

against the 'king's law'. (On the other hand, the king's law never qualified for inclusion in the content of the divine word.)\textsuperscript{227}

The reintegration of the covenant tradition.

We have argued that the Deuteronomistic tradition moved South about the time of the fall of Samaria, and we have suggested that the influence of the Dic. school was an important factor in the reform movement under Hezekiah. \textsuperscript{228}

The fact that reform under Asa and Joash had already displayed evidence of strong influence from the basic Sinai covenant tradition, however, should warn us against an exaggerated estimate of the role of the Dic. school in the reform movements in the South; important it certainly was, but it was not the sole impetus to reform.

\textbf{1. 2 Kings 18.}

Noth\textsuperscript{229} considers that the core of this passage consists of direct

\textsuperscript{227} M. Noth, "The Laws in the Pentateuch", The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Essays, p. 20.

\textsuperscript{228} The striking emphasis laid on Hezekiah's reform by the Chronicler, 2 Chron. 29-32, may reflect the historical circumstance of the coming South of the Northern Levites about the time of Hezekiah's reform. The 'levitical' sympathies of the Chronicler are well known. It may well be, then, that the Chronicler highlights Hezekiah's reform, because this was the point at which the bearers of the Northern tradition first sought to exert their influence in the South.

\textsuperscript{229} Noth's analysis of sources in 2 Kings 18 is as follows:-

\begin{itemize}
  \item v. 4b - probably a direct extract from the Judaean chronicles, (\textit{Ub. Studien}, p. 85);
  \item v. 4a - a generalising summary of the contents of the relevant entry in the chronicle;
  \item vv. 9-11 - direct extract (\textit{Ub. Studien}, p. 78);
  \item vv. 13-16 - direct extract (\textit{Ub. Studien}, p. 76).
\end{itemize}
extracts or summaries drawn from the 'chronicles of the kings of Judah'.

As in the case of the reforms under Asa (1 Kings 15:9ff.) there is no explicit reference in the text to covenant-renewal, though 2 Chron. 29:10 interprets in that sense: The 'putting away of foreign gods' (2 Kings 18:3-4) once again supports the Chronicler's interpretation. H.H. Rowley has drawn attention to the intimate connection between reform and rebellion, and it is reasonable to suppose that the breaking of the Vassal Treaty with the Assyrian overlord would be followed by a renewal of the covenant-treaty with Yahweh.

If there are some reminiscences of the Sinai covenant tradition in 2 Kings 18, however, 2 Kings 20:1-7 connects Hezekiah with the Davidic covenant. 20:1b is probably to be interpreted as a command to order the succession of the kingdom - an important matter in relation to the Nathan-oracle and so to the Davidic covenant. 20:6 again refers explicitly to the Nathan oracle as the basis of the covenant (cf. also 18:3). Yet it is significant that in the Hezekiah-block as a whole, the Davidic covenant is presented as subsidiary to the Sinai covenant. This is primarily due, no doubt, to the present deuteronomistic arrangement of the material, but it is conceivable that the typical deic. insistence on the priority of the Sinai covenant was already beginning to be voiced in Hezekiah's day, though the deuteronomistic school had so recently moved South.

On the chronology of the cultic reform in relation to the political independence movement, see Introduction, note 51.

Accepting Noth's thesis as to the structure of Dtn. 1 – 2 Kings 25, it is sufficiently obvious that the Deuteronomist intends us to conclude that the book found in the treasury (2 Kings 22:7-8) was indeed the dic. code. The phrases which recall the dic. provisions most emphatically are almost certainly distinct additions to the basic source of 2 Kings 22 – 23:

2 Kings 22:13b  cf. Dtn. 26, 28
2 Kings 23:3a8  cf. Dtn. (passim)
2 Kings 23:3b  cf. Dtn. 29:20b, etc.
2 Kings 23:9  cf. Dtn. 18:6-8
2 Kings 23:21-23  cf. Dtn. 16:1-6
2 Kings 23:24  cf. Dtn. 18:9

The covenant-affirmation in 1 Kings 23:1-3 is therefore intended to be understood as standing in the Shechem tradition of covenant-renewal, cf. Dtn. 27 and Dtn. 31:9-13. Yet the emphasis of 2 Kings 23:1-3 is basically 'Southern' and 'Davidic': it is the king who reads the covenant document to the people, (v. 2), and the covenant itself is in the first instance a covenant between the king and Yahweh (v. 3) – the role of the people may be

said to be secondary, (וְיִקְרָא לֵלָה לְהָלָה בְּרֵיחַ, v. 3b) in the sense that their direct voice is only heard confirming the covenant that the king has already made; yet the king is of course acting as their representative. It would seem then that the 'amtliche Denkschrift' (2 Kings 22:3 - 23:3) composed presumably between the years 621 - 608, evidences little trace of the deuteronomistic theology, even though it records the official introduction of the deuteronomistic corpus into the Jerusalem cult. Later, the deuteronomist altered the force of the passage by setting it in a new context, i.e. by reading it as a conscious carrying out of the provisions of the Deuteronomistic Code, with its known attitude of reserve toward the monarchy (and the monarchic covenant tradition), and its strong preference for the Sinai covenant tradition.

3. The Deuteronomistic History.

With the advent of the Deuteronomistic history, the reintegration of the covenant traditions may be said to be complete. We have already alluded briefly (Introduction, p.34ff.) to some of the specific characteristics of the distic. history, but it will be useful at this stage to draw the threads together in somewhat more detail.

233) M. Noth, Üb. Studien, p. 86, gives the following source analysis of
2 Kings 22-23,
2 Kings 22:1-2 - Preface by Dtr.,
2 Kings 22:3 – 23:3 - based on an official memorandum (amtliche Denkschrift), a separate source from the Chronicles of the kings of Judah,
2 Kings 23:4-20 - Excerpt from the Chronicles of the kings of Judah,
2 Kings 23:21-27 - Postscript by Dtr.
A. The aim of the Distic. History.

The Dist. seeks to understand the purposes of God working out in the history of Israel from Settlement to Exile,\textsuperscript{234} and to understand the situation of his own times in the light of this purpose. According to Noth,\textsuperscript{235} the Dist. regards this history as finally closed; whereas other scholars\textsuperscript{236} hold that the work constitutes an attempt to learn the causes of past failure, in order that Israel may yet repent and thus face the possibility of restoration of the covenant relation between herself and Yahweh. Whichever view we adopt, - and the second seems the more likely, - it is clear that the Distic. History sets out to be 'canonical', i.e., a definitive history of God's dealings with His people, in redemption-covenant and in land-inheritance.

B. The conditional nature of the Covenant.

The prime conclusion of the Deuteronomistic analysis of Israel's history is that the Exile highlights the conditional nature of the covenant, and puts out of court all complacent reliance on an automatic salvation guaranteed by an inviolable covenant bond. It would seem that the conditional element was, in fact, indigenous to the Northern covenant tradition, - shaped and defined no doubt under prophetic influence in conflict with the Baalising tendencies exemplified in the Northern 'royal' cult, and it is

\textsuperscript{234} E.W. Nicholson, Deuteronomy and Tradition, p. 114, summarises the arguments for pre-exilic versus exilic dating of the composition of the Distic History.


clearly traceable in the core deposit of Deuteronomy. But Dtr.'s urgent insistence on the conditionality of the covenant is not merely a conventional reiteration of the ancient 'Northern' theological position, but a lesson drawn from the painful experience of contemporary events, i.e., the exiles of North and South. Hence the Dist. goes beyond Dtn. in the emphasis placed on this point. The Dist. Code is basically optimistic - "You have received so great benefits at the hand of Yahweh; therefore it behoves you to show your gratitude by living in willing submission to the requirements of that covenant which Yahweh has granted you." In Dtr., however, this order is reversed: "Yahweh offers you the secure possession of the land promised to your fathers, on the pre-condition of obedience to the covenant law which He revealed through Moses." As we shall see below, this reversal, in the interests of greater emphasis on the necessity for obedience, leads to a certain 'legalising' tendency, which was little in evidence in Dtn., but becomes a marked feature of Dtr. Cf. the remarks of Minette de Tillessé: "L'auteur ... met en tête de son ouvrage en guise de thèse à démontrer la 'Loi de Moïse' (notre Dtn.). C'est elle qui commande l'histoire; si les Israélites observent cette loi, ils conquerront la Terre que Yahweh leur a promise et y habiteront toujours; s'ils la violent, ils en seront bien vite expulsés. Toute la grande histoire qui suit n'est qu'une vérification de ce postulat."237)

Equally marked is the way in which Dtr. has consistently modified his citations of the Nathan-oracle, on which the Davidic covenant is based, by

the insertion of conditional clauses. (The urge to make these modificat-
ions, we may conclude, arises partly from Dtr.'s inherited Northern theology,
and partly also from the lessons which it drew from the political situation
of the times.) 1 Kings 6:11-13; 1 Kings 9:4-9; 1 Kings 11:32-35;
2 Kings 21:8b.

C. The attitude of the Deuteronomistic History to the kingship.

Dtr.'s attitude to kingship may be described as a restatement of the
Northern tradition under the influence of the Jerusalem cult. We have seen
above that the Northern attitude, inherited and shared by Dtn., is marked
by profound misgivings as to the role that the kingship had in fact played
in the history of the covenant people. Dtn. 17:14-17 represents the king-
ship as an actuality with which Yahwist traditionists must come to terms,
but which must be hedged around with restricting safeguards. This fundamen-
tally negative assessment of the kingship in the North corresponds with the
fact that from the time of Jeroboam I onwards, the king seems to have played
no part in the recurrent Sinai-covenant cult - the role of covenant-mediator
passing to prophetic-levitic figures - and indeed the monarchy was increas-
ingly associated with the syncretistic, Canaanised cult of the Tyrian Baal,
which was anathema to the preservers of the authentic Yahweh traditions.

In the South however (as we have seen) the king played an essential
role in the covenant-reaffirmation cult. Indeed the Davidic covenant,
ideally a specific extension of the over-arching Sinai covenant, came
eventually to occupy the dominant position. The covenant came to be regarded
as essentially between the Davidic house and Yahweh; the people being
represented by, and subsumed in, the monarchy and hence involved only secondarily (2 Kings 23:1-3). We have already adduced examples of the way in which Dtr. has taken over these Davidic traditions, and with very little alteration of their internal structure has changed their significance by setting them once more within the wider framework of the Sinai covenant. Clear evidence of Dtr.'s deliberate policy in this regard is provided by a consideration of the central place accorded in Dtr. to Josiah. Josiah is represented as the pattern of what the kingship ought to have been throughout its history; i.e. in his undertaking the solemn obligation to live and rule in accordance with the demands of the law of Moses, and to ensure the obedience of the nation to that same law. Thus the Dist. "has arrived at a really exalted concept of the true functions of monarchy," 238) and each member of the monarchy in turn is judged according to that ideal standard which Josiah is supposed to have exemplified, 239) i.e. obedience to the Mosaic law 240) - in particular, observance of the Hauptgebot, and the centralisation of the cult. Thus in effect, Dtr. virtually shifts the responsibility for maintenance of the covenant from the people to the monarchy; and in this he may be said to reflect 'Southern' theology. Yet the 'Mosaic law' which for Dtr. forms the verbal content of the covenant is

---


239) Minette de Tillesse, op. cit., p. 60, suggests that even the portrait of Moses in his reaction to Israel's idolatry of the 'calf' (Ex. 32) has been influenced by the account of Josiah's reforming zeal.

the Deuteronomio Code, i.e. the old Northern Book of the Covenant tradition in its most developed form.

Finally it should be noted that though Dtr. has found an assured place for the monarchy within the re-integrated covenant theology, yet in the final analysis it is the negative assessment of the kingship that is characteristic of the work. Of all the post-Davidic kings, in North and South, only Hezekiah and Josiah are unreservedly commended for their faithfulness to the covenant. All the others in varying degrees abetted that trend towards apostasy which was characteristic of Israel's whole history. This fact is firmly underlined in 1 Sam. 8 and 12 (earlier traditions, heavily expanded, and thereby confirmed, by the deuteronomist.) Indeed 1 Sam. 12 comprises one of the four retrospective-and-prospective speeches which mark out the framework of the Deuteronomistic History, \(^{241}\) and which may therefore be taken as peculiarly significant for assessing Dtr.'s theological standpoint.

D. The covenant curse and its relation to the prophecy-fulfilment pattern.

One way in which the deuteronomistic stress on 'conditionality' shows itself is in the heightening of the minatory, curse elements in the covenant pattern, Dtn. 28:47-68; 30:9-11, etc. The exile is seen as the fulfilment of the covenant curse; for the covenant is seen as having set forth as equal alternatives the possibility of blessing (abiding possession of the land) or of curse (ejection from the land), the issue being decided

\(^{241}\) The four speeches which form the framework of the Distio. History: - Josh. 1, Josh. 23, 1 Sam. 12, 1 Kings 8.
on whether Israel chose to obey or disobey the covenant conditions. This pattern of blessing-inheritance over against cursing-ejection is emphasised by the framework in which Dtr. sets its historical material:—

a) The account of the Mosaic age stresses the fact that through their disobedience at Kadesh Barnea the first generation under Moses were excluded from the inheritance which had been promised to them in the covenant.

b) Joshua 23 represents Dtr.'s summary of the conquest-settlement period. Vv. 9-10 which recall the successes that Israel has experienced, echo in general terms the covenant blessing of Dtn. 28:7, with the implication that Joshua's generation have in fact taken to heart the lessons of the desert wanderings, and shown obedience (Josh. 24:31). But the recital of their successes is immediately followed by the stern reminder that continued blessing is contingent upon continued obedience (Josh. 23:11-16).

c) The book of Judges, which more than any other part of the deuterohistory evinces distic. structuring, gives repeated illustrations of this obedience-blessing/disobedience-curse pattern: - apostasy, - affliction, - repentance and new obedience, - deliverance and peaceful enjoyment of the land; e.g. Jud. 2:18-23.

d) The whole history of the kingship is divided into two parts in pursuance of this same theme. The period of obedience and attendant blessing

242) M. Noth, Uber die Studien, pp. 21f., 50f.
climaxes in the dedication of the temple (1 Kings 8) which symbolises the full and complete possession of the land, for Yahweh has promised to dwell there in the temple for ever, in the midst of His people and His land, (1 Kings 8:13). But 1 Kings 9 immediately follows, preluding the period of disobedience and attendant disaster: the contingent nature of the 'everlasting covenant' is expressed in the strongest terms (1 Kings 9:1-9), and the theme is then traced in detail through the histories of North and South, down to the exiles of Samaria (2 Kings 17:7-18) and of Judah (2 Kings 24:3-4, 20).

Closely analogous to this pattern of the working out of blessing/curse pari passu with the obedience/disobedience of the covenant people, is the pattern of prophecy-fulfilment to which v.Rad has drawn attention. Indeed, as we shall have cause to note below, Dtr.'s stress on the definitiveness of written tōrah implies that the prophetic word is subordinated to tōrah or subsumed within tōrah. Hence we may say that this prophecy-fulfilment pattern is the tracing, in concrete historical circumstances, of the covenant's outworking. For Dtr. the prophetic word is a prolongation or extension of the Mosaic tōrah; so that each fulfilment serves as a miniature of the 'fulfilment par excellence', i.e., the exile.

E. Dtr.'s 'legalising' of the concept of covenant.

As we noted above, Dtr. betrays a certain legalising tendency in its use of the terms 'covenant', (and tōrah). The word ḫבנ occurs only rarely

---

in the basic core of Deuteronomy, and where it does, it has strong
personalistic overtones:

Dtn. 7:9  - "... the faithful God who keeps covenant and steadfast
love with those who love Him and keep His commandments..."

Dtn. 7:12 - "... the Lord your God will keep with you the covenant
and the steadfast love which He swore to your fathers
to keep."

Dtn. 8:18 - "... it is He who gives you power to get wealth, that
He may confirm His covenant which He swore to your
fathers, as at this day." 244)

Dtn. 17:2 - "... who does what is evil in the sight of the Lord
your God in transgressing His covenant, and has gone and
served other gods ..." 245)

Dtn. 7:9, 12 exhibits this personalistic emphasis by linking וָלֵבָלֶב
and מִדְבַּרְאֶה; and Dtn. 8:18 likewise emphasises that it is the undeserved
grace of God which initiates and sustains the covenant relationship. Dtn.
17:2 introduces a more 'legal' note (cf. the term עֲלֵי בְּרֵי נָו):
the Hauptgebot is presented as the legal obligation on which the covenant
rests; and yet the personalistic emphasis on covenant relationship has not
been completely eclipsed.

244) Minette de Tillesse, op. cit., p. 50, note 5, considers it probable
that the reference here and in Dtn. 5:2 is to the patriarchal covenant.
This would seem justified if the fiction of Mosaic speech is regarded
as being applied throughout Dtn. with strict consistency. But this
is obviously not the case. In most cases, therefore, the 'promise to
the fathers' is open to a double interpretation: the 'patriarchs',
or the 'Sinai generation'.

245) It is tempting to follow S. Lehming, "Versuch zu Ex. 32", V.T. 10,
1960, p. 35, here, and regard the verse as a Distinct addition. There
is however, no compelling evidence for such a judgment.
In the later strata of Dtn., the occurrences of the term מְצָאָב are much more frequent, and the legalizing tendency increasingly apparent: –

Dtn. 4:13 - "... He declared to you his covenant which he commanded you to perform, that is, the ten commandments, and he wrote them..."

'Covenant' is here identical with the 'ten words' written on the stone tables.

Dtn. 4:23 - "... lest you forget the covenant of the Lord your God, which he made with you, and make a graven image..."

As in Dtn. 17:2, 'covenant' is equivalent to 'prohibition of taking other gods'. The 'legalism' is if anything stronger in Dtn. 4:23 than in 17:2.

Dtn. 4:31 - "The Lord your God ... will not fail you, or destroy you, or forget the covenant with your fathers..."

The stress here is on covenant as gracious relationship, as in the core Deuteronomic traditions.

Dtn. 5:2-5 - "The Lord our God made a covenant with us ... while I stood between the Lord and you at that time, to declare to you the words of the Lord."

Dtn. 5:1 - 6:1 is probably an intermediate stratum, younger in its present position than Dtn. 6:4-26, but prior to the Distinct additions. Dtn. 5:2-5 is similar to Dtn. 4:13, in that 'covenant' is virtually identified with the 'ten words'.

246) Following the suggestion of O. Grether, Name und Wort Gottes im Alten Testament, p. 64, n. 1, and reading מְצָאָב in Dtn. 5:5.
Dtn. 9:9, 11, 15 - "... to receive the tables of stone, the tables of the covenant, which the Lord God made with you..."

"He gave me the two tables of stone, the tables of the covenant..."

"I turned and came down from the mountain,... and the two tables of the covenant were in my two hands."

Here again, 'covenant' means 'the ten words'.

Dtn. 28:69 (Evv. 29:1) - "These are the words of the covenant which the Lord commanded Moses to make ... besides the covenant which he made with them at Horeb."

Dtn. 29:8 - "Therefore be careful to do the words of this covenant."

Scholars are generally agreed that Dtn. 29 once formed a separate cultic framework for the proclamation of the covenant law. Whether the proclamation comprised a decalogue or a longer code, a strong 'legal' stress is obviously lent to the word 'covenant'.

Dtn. 29:11 - "... that you may enter into the sworn covenant of the Lord your God (לְבֵּרָיִת יִֽהְוָה רְבוּךָ) which the Lord your God makes..."

Dtn. 29:13 - "... Nor is it with you only that I make this sworn covenant..."

The phrase לְבֵּרָיִת יִֽהְוָה רְבוּךָ may reflect the ancient Accadian designation of treaties as 'riksu u māmītu' (bond and oath), and may thereby provide a clue as to the stage at which the ancient Vassal Treaty form was re-impressed on the Israelite covenant tradition (see further below). In any case the phrase implies a formalised, 'legalised' emphasis, in the concept of the covenant.
Dtn. 10:8; 31:9; 31:25, 26 - "... the ark of the covenant of the Lord..."

The term נְדוֹרֵי יָהלֵם probably originated with Dtr., being inserted into Dtn. 10:8 as an introduction to a theme important throughout the Distios History, and added to Dtn. 31 in the process of Distios editing. Note the frequency with which the term נְדוֹרֵי יָהלֵם occurs in the remainder of the Distios History: - Josh. 3:3, 6, 8, 11, 14, 17; 4:7, 9, 18; 6:16, 8; 8:33; Jud. 20:27; 1 Sam. 4:3, 4, 5; 2 Sam. 15:24; 1 Kings 3:15; 6:19; 8:1, 6, 21.

The phrase is akin to the above-noted equations, 'covenant' = 'the ten words', 'covenant' = 'the contents of the stone tables', and the effect of its use is to shift the emphasis from נְדוֹרֵי יָהלֵם as the characteristic expression of the covenant's significance, to סְדוֹרֵי יָהלֵם (not that the two are mutually exclusive, of course.)

The 'legal' aspect of covenant is also stressed in the use of the phrase נְדוֹרֵי יָהלֵם, and its variations: - Josh. 7:11; Jud. 2:20; 1 Kings 11:11; 2 Kings 17:35; 2 Kings 18:12; 2 Kings 23:3. Sometimes the reference is to the Hauptgebot, and sometimes to the whole Deuteronomic Code; but it may be said that in general the 'covenant' has been virtually identified with the Deuteronomic Code. On the other hand, as we shall see in chapter three, 'תּוֹרָה' and 'Deuteronomic Code' were also virtually identical terms for the Deuteronomist. Hence 'תּוֹרָה' and 'covenant' become

247) 2 Sam. 15:24. On the difficulties of the text (which do not, however, affect our enquiry), see H.W. Hertzberg, I and II Samuel, pp. 339, 343.
equivalent terms in the Dtric. History.

If we may be allowed to venture a speculation as to why this tendency towards 'legalism' emerged so clearly in Dtr.: a fundamental factor may have been the renewed influence of the Vassal Treaty form. As we noted above, the V.T. form is most clearly discernible in the structure of Dtn., and we have suggested that its emergence is connected with the resurgence of Assyrian power during Hezekiah's reign. Vassal Treaties which may have been allowed to lapse or fall into obsolescence for many decades were now revived and reinforced, so that vassal-treaty imagery and terminology became contemporary. The fact that these treaties were considered valid only when they had been set out in permanent records may well have influenced the process of 'scripturising' the traditions of Israel's covenant with Yahweh — though it should also be remembered that that process was already under way centuries earlier, before the time of the Yahwist. The annual or periodic reading of the covenant code may also have been influenced by Vassal Treaty practice; though the cultic proclamation in Israel originated centuries before the reign of Hezekiah, and is unlikely to be directly dependent on the vassal-treaty form. Likewise the similarity between the Hauptgebot of the covenant and the Vassal-Treaties' demand for absolute loyalty to the Great King does not prove any form of direct dependence. As we shall see in chapter 3, the Hauptgebot was probably Mosaic in origin; and certainly there is the possibility that the international treaty tradition may have influenced the Mosaic formulation of that definitive Sinai experience and its significance for Israel. But it seems clear that the Vassal Treaty imprint so plainly discernible on the
Dtn.-Dtr. material is not the result of a gradual and unimpeded development over the six centuries intervening between the Mosaic age and the Deuteronomic; rather, it represents a fresh impression or re-impression of this ancient form on the developed Sinai tradition.

We must close this section on the 'legalising' tendencies of Dtr. with a qualifying observation: though Dtr. 'legalises' the concepts of covenant and torah by virtually equating both with the Deuteronomic Code, yet it does not regard every individual provision of the code as equally definitive, binding, and significant. It concentrates almost exclusively on what it considers to be the essential aspects of the Dic. Code: - Dtr.'s frequent references to 'the stone tables', 'the ten words', "לאלוהי ישראל", make it plain that the decalogue is considered to be the quintessence of the code. And further still, the recurrent stress on the Hauptgebot shows that for Dtr. the essential of essentials, in code and decalogue, is the exclusive whole-hearted worship of Yahweh and allegiance to Him. To this prime concern even the stress on centralisation of the cult is subordinate; given the conditions of the times, 'centralisation' is a necessary corollary to the demand for exclusive worship of Yahweh. 248) "Parmi les lois, seules l'intéressaient celles sur l'unité du sanctuaire, et celles condamnant

248) M. Noth, "Ub. Studien", pp. 6, 102 - 104; Minette de Tillessé, op. cit., pp. 40f. This does not of course exclude the possibility that the idea of 'centralisation' had deep roots in the history and traditions of both North and South: -

in the North, cf. the circles aware that the multiplication of shrines meant the multiplication of idols (see the Introduction, p. 22f.);

in the South, cf. the influence of the old Zion-election tradition, with its roots in the pre-Israelite Jebus cult.
Thus Dtr.'s 'legalism' is not bondage to a plethora of greater and lesser individual commands and prohibitions, but utter fidelity to the one great command on which Israel's whole life and salvation depend.

F. The attitude of the Deuteronomistic History to the cult.

In Dtr.'s attitude to the cult, as in other aspects of his total theological outlook, a twofold approach is traceable. On one hand there is the conciliatory element, as Dtr. seeks to adapt Northern traditions to the more highly sophisticated cultic traditions of Jerusalem. On the other hand, there is the strong pastoral element: In view of the national catastrophe, in which familiar cultic patterns have been swept away, it was essential to offer the people a new framework to support their faith. One way in which Dtr. did this, may be seen in its attitude to the ark.

Our earlier survey suggested that the ark gathered Canaanite mythological accretions to itself during its stay at Shiloh; and that the kinship long-existent between the pre-Israelite shrines of Shiloh and Jebus facilitated further development along these lines after the installation of the ark in Jerusalem. Whatever the precise facts concerning an annual procession with the ark, the ark itself would certainly seem to have symbolised the presence of Yahweh regnant in Jerusalem both over His covenant people and (ideally) over all the nations. It would seem, too, that the ark must have had some role in the ceremonial acknowledgment of the Davidic king as Yahweh's adopted son; but again the connection between 'enthronement' of

249) G. Minette de Tillesse, op. cit., p. 40.
Yahweh and enthronement of the Davidic king is obscure.

The Deuteronomist's thoroughgoing reshaping of the ark-tradition is striking:

a/. 'Ark' is consistently represented as part of the mere technical apparatus of the covenant, and is thus deprived of its former mythological, culto-dramatic function.

b/. The cherubim are detached from the קדש (Holy of the ark, and are thus 'demoted' from their position as 'guardians of the divine throne' to that of 'guardians of the covenant-tables and their container'.

The vigour with which Dtr. makes these points indicates that he is consciously combatting the older view of the ark, hitherto dominant in the Jerusalem cult, and considered by Dtr. to be fraught with danger to the faith of Israel. No doubt the ark had symbolised the abiding presence of Yahweh in the temple, and hence was popularly assumed to guarantee the inviolability of shrine and city, even independently of the people's obedience to the requirements of Yahweh's תּוֹרָה. But there may also have been a more pastoral concern in Dtr.'s demoting of the ark. Writing after the fall of the city and temple (and therefore presumably the destruction of the ark), he is in fact arguing: "Do not mourn for the lost mystique of the ark. Nothing essential has in fact been lost, for the ark contained nothing but the תּוֹרָה (the decalogue on the stone tables); and both תּוֹרָה and decalogue have been safely preserved through the holocaust. These alone are
what secure blessing, i.e., as we obey their injunctions, for these are
the written embodiment of the covenant."
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THEOPHANY AND TÖRAH.

In seeking to trace the development of Töräh in Early Israel, we shall need to consider two aspects in turn:-

A. The development of the content of the Töräh, and
B. The development of the terminology employed to describe this content.

A. The development of the content of the Töräh.

We have already referred to the clear genealogical relationship traceable between the Book of the Covenant and the Deuteronomic code. We must begin our task, then, by examining the structure of the Book of the Covenant, and trying to trace the roots from which it sprang.

As it now stands, the B.o.C. comprises the following main elements:


1) This division agrees substantially with the analysis offered by R.H.Pfeiffer, "The transmission of the Book of the Covenant", H.T.R.24, 1931. The general lines of this analysis seem to be confirmed by a comparison of the B.o.C. with the A.N.E. texts.

A.Jepsen, Untersuchungen zum Bundesbuch, p. 54, prefers a four-fold division, exclusive of the paraenetic conclusion of the B.o.C.:


H.Cazelles, Etudes sur le code de l'Alliance, divides:

- Casuistic sentences;
- Participial curse sentences, (attached to the casuistic);
- Direct address-form : "If you ...", (originating in wisdom instruction).

The whole code is dressed as direct address in the second per.,pl., thus presenting the B.o.C. as religious address to Israel as a whole.
iii. A framework of cultic and ritual regulations encloning the body of the
\(\text{הַשַּׁדַּד}^{1}\): Ex. 20:23-26 and 23:10-19: - Ex. 22:18-31, though inserted
in the \(\text{הַשַּׁדַּד}^{1}\), belongs with the material of the cultic
framework;


1. The body of civil laws names itself \(\text{הַשַּׁדַּד}^{1}\) (which is in fact the only
technical legal term occurring in the entire B.o.C.); and the term is taken up in
the covenant-solemnisation text Ex. 24:3-8, in order to stress that Ex. 20:21 - 23:33
in fact constitutes the Sinai-covenant document. Internal evidence indicates
that this B.o.C. \(\text{הַשַּׁדַּד}^{1}\)-code has its roots in a primitive but sedentary society;
cf. the value placed upon oxen, the emergence of trade, the knowledge of a monetary
system, etc. Hence it is generally agreed that the code was adopted by Israel
subsequent to Israel’s incursion into Canaan2).

---

2) Some scholars connect the emergence of the embryonic B.o.C. with Israel’s
sojourn at Kadesh (En mishpat), - cf. Gen.14:7; Ex.15:25 (these two references
occur in late passages, but the names Kadesh and En mishpat imply ancient
religious associations with the locality.

M. Caselles, op. cit., has a helpful historical survey of scholarly views on
the provenance of the B.o.C.

A. Jepsen, op. cit., argues that Israel adopted the mishpatîn from Shechen;

Caspari, "Heimat u. soziale Wirkung des alttestamentlichen Bundesbuchs",
Z.D.N.G., 83, 1929, favours an East-Jordan provenance.

A. Alt, "The Origins of Israelite Law", Essays on Old Testament History and
Religion thinks that the material of the code was probably widely known over
the whole Canaanite area.
Alt’s view seems to us the most likely.
A comparison of the detailed provisions of this E.O.C. mishpatin-code with those of the other Ancient Near Eastern codes or law corpora, reveals a large measure of agreement. Indeed we may claim that approximate parallels at least:

3) A. Jepsen, op.cit., p. 58, sets out the closest of these correspondences, but an examination of the relevant A.N.E. texts shows that Jepsen's list is by no means exhaustive, (see J. B. Pritchard, Ancient Near Eastern Texts relating to the O.T.):

The prohibitions of false witness (Ex. 23: 1-3) correspond in content if not in form to the provisions concerning penalties for unproven charges in Codex Hammurabi (1-4).

The prohibitions against corrupt judicial procedures (Ex. 23:3, 6); cf. penalty for the judge who alters a sealed decision (Cod. Ham, 5).

The penalties for killing, selling, or hiding a stolen animal (Ex. 22:1, 4); cf. the laws against theft (Cod. Ham, 6-12); and the penalty for selling a stolen animal (Mid. Assyrian corpus, C5).

Penalty for the negligent use of fire (Ex. 22:6); cf. the penalty for negligence with water (Cod. Ham 53-56, and Hittite Code II 106).

In a suspected abuse of trust, where clear evidence is lacking, the suspect is to prove his innocence before God by ordeal (Ex. 22:9); or by oath (Cod. Ham, 103).

Where a borrowed or entrusted animal has allegedly been torn by wild beasts, the remnants of the carcass serve as evidence (Ex. 22:13); cf. (Cod. Ham, 266).

Penalty for sorcery is death (Ex. 22:13); cf. trial by water, in which death is assumed to prove guilt (Cod. Ham 2); and, use of magical preparations punishable by death (Mid. Assyrian A47; Hittite Code II 4, II 5, II 170).

Obligation to return a strayed animal (Ex. 23:4); cf. penalty for selling an animal that has been found (Mid. Assyrian C6; and Hittite Code I 45).

Death penalty for bestiality (Ex. 22:19); cf. (Hittite Code II 187-8, II 201).

(The compassionate prohibition of interest on loans to the poor (Ex. 22:25); cf. the special provisions concerning loans given as a favour (Cod. Ham, 102).)

It might of course be argued that the great majority of these laws concern matters which are universally regarded as blameworthy, and that therefore nothing less than a precise parallelism in language and form can be taken to indicate relatedness - stealing, bestiality, misappropriation, sorcery, etc., so patently constitute anti-social behaviour that any society concerned for self-preservation must inevitably take action against such corrosive practices. Such an argument, of course, is a healthy caution against a too-ready tendency to trace dependence; yet where the similarities are of such wide extent, their cumulative weight is impressive. (The examples cited here are merely supplementary to the long list of more obvious correspondences cited by Jepsen).
may be adduced for every civil and moral provision of the B.o.C. The relatively small number of unparallelled and intrinsically distinctive sentences, fall within the following groupings:

- the Hauptgebot: Ex.20:23 ; 22:20;

In other words, the bulk of the B.o.C. code comprises material not peculiarly Israelite, but adapted to the needs of the covenant people in these specific ways:

- an insistence that the divine power in whom the authority of the code is grounded, is Yahweh, and Yahweh alone;
- the combination of the mishpatim with material designed to regulate Israel's approach to Yahweh;
- the addition of the first hints of exhortation and persuasion, based upon a growing understanding of the gracious moral character of Yahweh.

Two further comments should be added:

1. Jepsen has pointed out that the correspondences between the B.o.C. and Ancient Near Eastern law are not confined to individual clauses, but extend to the broad order in which topics are treated 6) In particular he cites correspondences between

---

4) A few 'civil sentences have no proper parallel in the A.N.E. texts, but this may be simply fortuitous, as these sentences are similar in tone and content to much other material, and offer no distinctive marks that would argue for their uniqueness to Israel. We must suppose that much relevant A.N.E. material has not so far been recovered; so that it is precarious to argue for the uniqueness of a text solely on the absence of extant parallels.

5) In the one instance quoted above of a parallel to a 'compassionate' provision, (Ex.22:25), the correspondence is approximate only.

6) A. Jepsen, Untersuchungen, p.78f.
the order of the B.o.C. and the Cod.Ham; and again between the B.o.C. and the Kid.
Ass. code. He interprets this as an indication that all the corpora rest back in
a common ancient source of legal tradition; so that the relatedness is not that
of direct linear descent, but rather that of a common rootage in the primitive
"Amorite Law"?

2. Following the publication of Alt's "Ursprunge des israelitisichen Rechts",
attention tended to concentrate on the classification of the B.o.C. material under
the headings 'casuistic' and 'apodictic' law. The former was held to have been
borrowed more or less wholesale from A.N.E. sources, whereas the latter was
regarded (by Alt) as a peculiarly Israelite development. But detailed examination
of the codes shows that as regards content, the area of similarity with the A.N.E.
texts includes not only the casuistic-form material, but also much that in the
B.o.C. appears in apodictic form. For example, a detailed comparison of Exodus

7) A. Jepsen prefers the term "Amorite Law", as differentiating the common
Ur-Semitic legal stock from the Sumerian (of which also he finds traces in
Codex-Num.) - Untersuchungen, p. 80.
21:22-5 with the corresponding section in the Codex Hammurabi shows that the content of the Lex Taliônis is already embedded in the casuistic provisions of the Cod.

It is, then, both the apodictic and the casuistic sentences of the E.o.C.

8) The growth and structure of Ex.21:22-5 emerge more clearly when the block Ex.21:18-27 is compared with the block Cod.Ham.196-214:

Ex.21:18-27;

vv.18-19 Injury to a free man to be redressed with monetary and medical compensation;
vv.20-21 Injury to a slave is to be punished if he dies immediately, otherwise not.
vv.22-25 Injury causing miscarriage: loss of the foetus requires monetary compensation; **death of the pregnant woman brings the talion into operation.**
vv.26-27 Injury to the eye or tooth of a slave to be redressed with restoration of the slave's freedom (i.e. monetary compensation).

Codex Hammurabi: 196

Injury to a free man's eye involves the loss of an eye as retribution;
197 Breaking a free man's bone involves the breaking of the offender's bone as retribution;
198-199 Injury to a commoner requires monetary compensation;
200 Loss of a free man's tooth is to be compensated for with the loss of the offender's tooth.
201 Loss of a commoner's tooth involves monetary compensation.
202 Striking a free man is punished by imposition of sixty lashes (i.e. retribution).
203-204 Striking an equal to be atoned for with a monetary compensation.
205 A slave striking a member of the upper class is punished by loss of an ear (retribution).
206-203 A free man who unintentionally strikes a free man: injury redressed with monetary and medical compensation: death brings the talion into operation.
209-214 Injury causing miscarriage: death brings the talion into operation (Daughter for daughter).

This comparison of contexts throws light on Ex.21:22-5. The unevennesses of Ex.21:22-25 have often been noted; and the explanation has been offered that an ancient Near Eastern casuistic text has been truncated at Ex.21:23a, and the torso then rounded out with a statement of what is assumed to be the specifically Israelite talion-principle (which is in fact imperfectly suited in its details to the specific case of injury causing miscarriage).

The above comparison tells against this rigid distinction of A.N.E.-casuistic-law and Israelite-talion, however, by showing that the talion is already embedded in the parallel section of the Cod.Ham., both in the specific sentence dealing with miscarriage (daughter for daughter), and in the general context (eye for eye, bone for bone, tooth for tooth).
show similarities with provisions of the older codes, it would seem that Israel
drew upon this common stock of "Amorite Law" not once for all, but recurrently.
Thus in pre-Mosaic times the tribes who were to become Israel had already inherited
from the common stock, legal material which they developed within their own
peculiar religious and social environment, and framed in apodeictic form. Then
at a later date, viz. at the time of their entry into Canaan, this more-anciently-
possessed law was already available to modify, interpret, and supplement the fuller
body of civil law which they found ready-fashioned to the cultural and social
situation which they inherited in the new land.

The content of the apodeictic sentences then, can no longer be regarded as
peculiarly Israelite; and even in regarding the apodeictic form as specifically
Israelite, we do well to proceed with caution. For the Hittite Vassal Treaties
(though not the Hittite legal codes) while predominantly casuistic, show an
admixture of apodeictic sentences\(^9\). And Gerstenberger\(^10\) suggests that many of
the casuistic forms in these treaties may in fact derive from an original apodeictic
form, (cf. the combination of the 'if'-form with direct second person address,
which seems to indicate a transitional style).

Jepsen is thus basically correct in distinguishing two types of mishpatim —
presumably an Israelite and a non-Israelite (his use of the term 'Hebrew mishpatim'
is perhaps more precise than the evidence warrants). One would merely wish to add
that both types of mishpatim have their roots ultimately in the common A.N.E.
customary law, though the former became integral to Israel's heritage at a much
earlier stage than the latter.


It is important to note that although the mishpatim are 'secular' in the sense that they concern the ordering of man-man rather than man-God relationships, nevertheless they are regarded, from a very early period, as being promulgated on divine authority, and upheld by divine sanctions. This is dramatically illustrated by the form of the shaft on which the principal extant copy (found at Susa) of the Code of Hammurabi is inscribed - the text of the code is surmounted by a two-feet high relief depicting Hammurabi receiving the sentences from the enthroned sun-god\(^1\). This idea of divinely-revealed law was certainly not unique to the Code of Hammurabi, and was presumably common to the Ancient Near East, and therefore well-known to Israel. Israel, however, set her own unique impress on the material by placing it in the mouth of her covenant-God Yahweh, and enriching it, as we have seen, by sentences setting forth:

- the exclusiveness of Yahweh's claims upon his covenant people;
- the peculiar rites belonging to His worship; and
- the moral-social disposition required of his worshippers.

\(\text{ii. The compassionate and moral precepts of the Book of the Covenant.}\)

It is an open question whether these sections are additions to the 'Ritual Decalogue'\(^2\) to the mishpatim, or to the combined corpus. Perhaps the last of these alternatives is the simplest. We have already suggested that these sentences contain the seeds which later blossomed into the deuteronomistic paraenesis. Such 'compassionate' moral concern is early in Israel; cf. 2 Sam 12:1-10.


\(12)\) So R.H. Pfeiffer, "The transmission of the Book of the covenant", op. cit., p.101, who maintains that the humanitarian material arose as a result of 7th Century editing of the Ritual decalogue. The late date, however, seems unnecessary.
iii. The cultic framework, Ex. 20:20-26; 23:12-19.

The origin of this series poses very complicated questions. Clearly a close relationship exists between this series and Ex. 34:17-26(13), and various theories have been put forward in explanation of this. The most likely of these solutions seems to be that both descend from a common tradition(15).

The closeness of the relationship between Ex. 20:20-6 + 23:12-19 and Ex. 34:17-26 is presumably such that findings on the origin and structure of Ex. 34:17-26 will cast light on the origins and structure of our cultic framework here. Now, in spite of opinions to the contrary(16), it seems certain that at least the redactor

13) A useful comparative table is found in A. Jepson, Untersuchungen, p.103.


15) So Jepson, Untersuchungen, p.94.

responsible for the present order of Ex. 34:10-28, regarded Ex. 34:14-26 as a
decalogue (or as capable as being construed as one). Further than this, we may

17) There are three possibilities as to the outline of the decalogue referred to in Ex. 34:28bb, (Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch, p.33 is probably correct in regarding v.23bb. as a later gloss to J.):-

A. The text as it now stands may have been regarded by the glossator as a
decalogue. If that is so, its structure is probably to be understood as follows:-

1. Worship no other God (v.14)
2. Prohibition of molten gods (v.17)
3. The feast of unleavened bread (v.18)
4. Offering of the first-born (v.19-20a)
5. None are to appear 'empty' (v.20b)
6. The Sabbath (v.21)
7. The feast of weeks, or wheat-harvest (v.22a)
8. The feast of ingathering (v.22b)
9. Three times a year .... appear before Yahweh (v.23)
10. The Passover not to be left till morning (v.25b)
9a. Prohibition of mingling sacrificial blood with leaven (v.25a)
10a. Firstfruits of the ground (v.26a)
10b. Prohibition of boiling a kid in its mother's milk (v.26b)

It will be seen that the above list in fact includes thirteen sentences; but it is possible to regard it as a decalogue by:
a) regarding v.23 as a resumptive or summarising gloss on the Feasts of unleavened bread, weeks, and ingathering;
b) regarding the sacrificial blood (v.25a) as the blood of the paschal lamb, and the prohibition of leaven as a reflection of the post-settlement development, when Passover and unleavened bread had been united as one festal complex;
c) interpreting v.26b. as a magical-fertility rite (cf. the Ugaritic parallel cited in W. R. Driver, Canaanite Myths and Legends, p.121); so that v.26 would mean; "Acknowledge by your offering of firstfruits that Yahweh alone is the Giver of fertility, and shun any compromise with alien powers that claim rule in this field.

B. The glossator may have inherited a shorter text containing only ten sentences: this would then have been expanded by later hands into its present form.

C. The glossator himself may have received what he considered a less-than-ten series, and made up the number at the same time as he added his note, v.23bb.

Noth's analysis, op.cit., p.33 assumes possibility B. above.

E. Nielsen, The Ten Commandments in New Perspective, p.32, argues that vv.14-26 were inserted into the context in order to support the Josianic centralisation-reform, and that v.23bb originally belonged to the older context which had previously framed the now displaced Ethical decalogue. Even if this view be accepted, the implication would be that the reviser who inserted vv.14-26 regarded this 'new' material as a decalogue.
doubt whether the redactor would have presumed to put the series forward as a
decalogue, if a firm tradition to this effect were not already attached to the
material. For if the Ethical decalogue alone had the right to be considered a
decalogue; and the material here was merely an anonymous assemblage of hetero-
genous materials displacing the legitimate original content of the "stone tables",
then the reviser who made the displacement was bold indeed. We may safely assume,
then, that Ex.34:14-28 (and hence Ex.20:20-6 + 23:12-19 too) has in fact a long
decalogic history behind it, and that therefore an original and more primitive
decalogue lies behind the present text. Many attempts have been made to recover
this original\textsuperscript{13}, of which two in particular commend themselves:—

a) the elimination of the specific references to the three festivals,

Unleavened bread, Weeks, and Ingathering\textsuperscript{19}, thus leaving a decalogue
comprising — vv.14, 17, 19-20a, 20bb, 21, 23, 25a, 25b, 26a, 26b.

— thus possibly a nomadic (or Kenite) decalogue adapted to life in
Canaan by the addition of references to the agricultural feasts.

\textsuperscript{13} A full list of these attempts is provided in H.H.Rowley, "Moses and the

\textsuperscript{19} This view is offered by H. Roth, Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch,
p.33. So also Beer, Berry, Kovincek, Gray, Rowley (according to H.H.
Rowley, "Moses and the decalogue", op.cit., p.9)
b) the elimination of v.14 (Worship no other god), v.17 (no molten images), and v.21 (the Sabbath); thus leaving a purely cultic decalogue: -

Any attempt to understand the Ritual Decalogue must take into account the undoubted link between the Ritual decalogue and the Ethical decalogue. This link is obvious, both from the point of view of content, and from the history of their respective roles within the Sinai tradition. As regards content, the two series have at least three sentences in common: the prohibition of gods besides Yahweh,

Against this view it may be argued that the three commandments so eliminated are extremely ancient, and should be ascribed to the most primitive stratum of Yahwism, (inherited presumably from the Kenites?). While we have declared ourselves sympathetic to the 'Kenite hypothesis', nevertheless there is wisdom in R.de Vaux's warning, "We should beware of attributing too many things to the Qenites, of whom we know almost nothing" (Ancient Israel, p.479). Even assuming that the name and cult of Yahweh were borrowed from the Kenites, we cannot necessarily infer from this that Kenite Yahwism was marked by the same exclusiveness as the Israelite, or that images were rigorously prohibited.

Moreover the sentence prohibiting images sits loosely in its B.o.C. context, (Ex.20:23); and that the prohibition of gods besides Yahweh sits loosely in the Ex.34-decalogue. As regards the theory of the Kenite origin of the Sabbath, de Vaux continues; "If the Qenite hypothesis looks the least unlikely, this may merely be because we have no documents at all which contradict it. Obviously the Sabbath day may have originated outside Israel, but we cannot prove this." (Op.cit. p.480) It is interesting that the B.o.C. makes a close link between the Sabbath year and the Sabbath day (Ex.23:10-12). If, as seems likely, the Sabbath year is conceived as an acknowledgment that the land is Yahweh's, his gift to Israel at the Exodus-Conquest, then it may well be that the Sabbath is a weekly memorial of the same fact (cf.Dtn.5:15). This would mean that the Sabbath takes its Yahwistic colouring from the Exodus-Sinai-Conquest tradition.

It is now generally recognised that Israel probably had some contact with agricultural communities, and knowledge of agriculture, during this early period.

"Thou shalt not take the name ... in vain", and "Thou shalt not boil a kid in its mother's milk", also show a general correspondence, in that the stress of both is on Yahweh's implacable opposition to all forms of magic-practice.
the prohibition of (molten) images, and the Sabbath command; i.e., virtually the first table of the Ethical decalogue. Now there are grave difficulties in believing that either the Ethical or the Ritual decalogue stems from an original Mosaic decalogue. Nevertheless it seems equally unlikely that the tradition ascribing the decalogue to Moses should be entirely without historical foundation. The solution therefore would seem to be that the original Mosaic core of commandment consisted of the above-mentioned three commandments-in-common; i.e., prohibition of worshipping gods other than Yahweh, prohibition of images, and the command to keep the Sabbath. From this primitive Mosaic core, two decalogues then developed: on the one hand, this Hauptgebot-core was combined with an ancient (Kenite?) decalogue, which set out the lines of the Yahwistic cult; while on the other hand (presumably in the North) the same core was developed into a decalogue by the

---

23) H.H. Rowley, "Moses and the Decalogue", and others, have examined the individual 'words' of the Ethical decalogue, and concluded that there is nothing intrinsically improbable in dating any particular sentence to Mosaic times. But the crux of the problem lies not in the antiquity of the individual 'words', but in the emergence of the decalogue-series. It seems impossible that a genuinely Mosaic decalogue (whether the Ethical or the Ritual series) should have failed to exert and maintain its unique position within the common traditions of Israel down to the disruption, and subsequently in the developing Yahwist and Elohist traditions.


25) The urge to form precisely a decalogue in the north, would no doubt stem from the analogy with the old (Kenite) decalogue, which, though cherished most tenaciously in the south, would nevertheless be known and respected in the north, and consequently preserved, as we have seen, in the B.o.C.
addition of the basic ethical and moral principles which were already embedded in
the common heritage of the past, but which now commended themselves with more
urgency, in the light of the revelation of Yahweh. Thus both decalogues could,
in a sense, claim to be Mosaic.

Summarising, then, we may say that the process whereby the Book of the Covenant
came into being, rather resembles that synthesising process which we have already
traced, wherein numinous and theophanic material from a variety of sources, has
been woven around 'Sinai' as the theophany par excellence. For the B.o.C. as it
now stands is a speech of God given in the course of the theophany to Moses. The
context seemingly conceives the entire code as having been delivered in an audible
voice from the 'thick cloud'; and Moses, in mediating the code to his people
Israel, is instructed to stress its theophanic context (Ex.20:22b), so that the
people shall be aware, as he himself is presently being made aware, that these
sentences embody the personal will of the God who appeared to them on Sinai. One
cannot help being moved with admiration at the theological boldness of this
conception: not only the ancient Kenite-Yahwistic decalogue is drawn into the
circle of Israel's definitive theophany (as Mosaic Israel experienced it), but
the entire sweep of A.H.E. customary law is also put into the mouth of the Lord of
Sinai.

26) The argument put forward by H.H.Rowley (op.cit.) J.J.Stamm, The Ten Commandments
in Recent Research, p.39, and others, has a measure of force, viz. that such
a succinct and comprehensive statement of religio-moral obligation as the
Ethical Decalogue, betrays the work of a master prophetic spirit rather than
that of an anonymous succession of legislators. There are, however, factors
which weaken the force of this as an argument for the Mosaic authorship of
the Decalogue, i.e.:-
1. The fact noted above, viz. that the Ethical Decalogue did not enjoy an
unrivalled status in the traditions of all Israel;
2. The fact that no reasonably certain quotation from the Ethical Decalogue
occurs before Hosea.

In the period between 1250 - 750, Israel produced a number of prophetic
spirits, who, given the three Hauptgebot-clauses and the ancient and
developing ethico-legal tradition, could plausibly be credited with the
formulation of these into the basic Ethical Decalogue.
iv. The paraenetic conclusion to the Book of the Covenant, Ex. 23:20-33.

The effect of this conclusion, which rounds off the code, is to underscore the
theophanic emphasis that we have been noting. For its theme is Israel's impending
transition from the mount of theophany to the land of promise, where they are to
live in Yahweh's presence as his covenant people. Yahweh himself will be
personally present in Canaan as he is on Sinai—feeding and healing (v.25),
granting long life (v.26), driving out the enemy (v.29), setting the national
boundaries (v.31). But what of the intervening journey? Will this mean a
temporary deprivation of the presence of Yahweh? On the contrary, an assurance
of Yahweh's continuing presence is given: for during the interim the מָכָּא קֵלָם
will precede them—his 'face' they must respect, and his 'voice' they must heed,
for the מַמֵּא אָצֹנַי is in him. Whether the concrete image in the mind of the
writer was the ark of Yahweh (Num.10:33) or the cloud of Yahweh (Num.10:34), or
both, need not detain us here.27) But obviously it is some visible sign which not
only symbolises but actually mediates the presence of Yahweh, and may therefore
justly be called theophanic. The statement that the 'Name of Yahweh' is in the
'angel' recalls those theophanic passages in which we saw that the form was that
of the מָכָּא קֵלָם, but the voice was that of Yahweh.

27) Cf. our earlier discussion of "The 'migration' of the theophanic Presence
from Sinai to Canaan", pp. 49-55.
We have already noted that the Deuteronomic code incorporates virtually all this B.o.C. material, (with the exception of the large casistic block Ex.20:21-22:15).23

On the other hand the Deuteronomic code also introduces new material not included in the B.o.C. A comparison with the A.N.E. texts provides some interesting parallels with this new material. It would seem, then, that we have in these additions, ancient material from the common A.N.E. legal stock, presumably long known in Israel in oral form, but only now incorporated into the written code29.

23) R.H. Pfeiffer, "The Transmission of the Book of the Covenant", op. cit., p.106f., explains the failure to utilise this casistic block, by assuming that Ex.20:21-22:15 was preserved as a separate unit in some obscure setting, and only about 450 B.C. incorporated in its present context. (He acknowledges that the material itself is ancient, dating perhaps from the thirteenth Cent. B.C.) A more simple explanation seems preferable however: viz. that the circumstances in which the deuteronomie code arose were very different from those of the B.o.C.:

i. It may well be that the circles responsible for the final shaping of the deuteronomie code were urban, so that detailed provisions regarding the handling of oxen, etc. (Ex.21:23-22:1; 22:4; 22:10-15) may have been remote from their immediate concerns;

ii. Deuteronomy displays a tendency to eliminate material already dealt with in his other sources. Thus he may well have felt that one comprehensive law on slavery (Dttn.15:1-13) was sufficient, and that further details on the subject from the B.o.C. could safely be omitted (Ex.21:20-21, 26-27).

iii. As V.Rad remarks (Studies in Deuteronomy, p.15), Deuteronomy is not so much a legal code, as preaching about the commandments. As such his prime concern is not with legal minutiae, but with the necessity of concerning the Hauptegebot.

29) It is also possible that at the time of Dtn's. compilation, its author(s) had become acquainted once again with A.N.E. codal and Vassal-treaty forms, whence he a) borrowed material, and b) impressed the vassal-treaty pattern on his total assemblage of stuff.
Perhaps one reason for the introduction of this additional matter would be to heighten the flavour of antiquity in the corpus as a whole. But it is also noticeable that in most cases the old material has been given a new slant, in keeping with Deuteronomy's peculiar interests:

Holiness of land and people as Yahweh's possession.

Dtn.21:18-21 (concerning the disobedient son), also has an approximate parallel in Cod.Ham.23,168-9, which states that a disobedient son is to be warned at the first offence, and disinherited if he persists.

In Dtn. the passage is concluded by the phrase, "So you shall purge the evil from your midst"; thus stressing the holiness of Yahweh's land and people. cf. also Dtn.21:9 etc. (יִּיָּט occurs ten times in Dtn. with this meaning).

Dtn.21:23b.

The Necessity for Sexual purity among the people of God:


Dtn.25:11-12 cf. Mid.Ass, AB.

Holy War:

The importance of this concept for the thought of Deuteronomy is expounded by V. Rad. 30)

Dtn.20:19-20 (prohibition of cutting fruit-trees in the course of a siège) cf. Lipit Ishtar 10 (fine for cutting trees in another man's orchard)

Hittite laws 104 (penalty for cutting pomegranates)

113 (penalty for cutting vines)

Dtn.23:10-11 (purification in case of seminal emission, in order to safeguard the purity of the camp) cf. the Hittite priestly purification instructions.

Here regulations that in the A.N.E. texts do not apply specifically to the conduct of war, are adapted to stress this particular Israelite concern with the

30) See G.V.Rad, Studies in Deuteronomy, pp.60ff.
Wars of Yahweh.

Concern for the Levitical priests:

Dtn. 21:1-9 has an approximate parallel in Cod. Ham. 23, which provides that in a case of robbery where the culprit is not apprehended, the matter is to be laid before the 'god', and the civic authorities whose jurisdiction is nearest to the scene of the crime, are to assume responsibility for the loss.

This provision, which originally concerned the local city elders (Dtn. 21:3-4, 6) has been adapted to provide a role for the Levitical priests (Dtn. 21:5) who had been rendered redundant by the law of centralisation.  

Humanitarian stress.

As we have already suggested, the deuteronomistic preaching-style represents a development of the 'compassionate' sentences already embedded in the B. o. C., and taking as its inspiration the covenant mercy which Israel herself enjoys from the hand of Yahweh:

Dtn. 23:15-16 (obligation to protect the escaped slave) is contrary to the relevant provision in Cod. Ham. 15-19, which prohibits the harbouring of an escapee, and stipulates penalties in such a case.

Dtn. 25:1-3 (limitation to 40 lashes, in the case of corporal punishment): cf. Cod. Ham. 202, which stipulates 60 lashes for striking a superior, and has no compassionate overtones.

Dtn. 25:5-10 (Levirate marriage commanded - out of concern, partly at least, for the widow); cf. Hittite laws, II 193, in which Levirate marriage is permitted, but not enjoined.

31) Similarly with Dtn. 17:8-13; which was, however, already represented in the JE tradition, (Ex. 18:13ff), though not in the B. o. C. - Here too an original reference to the 'judges' has been widened to provide a place for the Levitical priests as well. (Further discussion on this text follows below)

32) There is this difference, however, between the two texts: that the slave referred to in Dtn. is probably an Israelite, i.e. a 'brother' in the covenant community, whereas the slave in the Cod. Ham. would be a foreigner.
It is interesting that in each of these cases, the relevant A.H.E. text provides not so much a direct parallel as a contrast. A growing social conscience is emerging in Israel, primarily under the influence of the prophetic movement; and in the service of this emphasis, ancient legal material has been adapted and inserted into the Dic. corpus.

Still other deuteronomistic material is paralleled neither in the E.O.C. nor in any extant A.H.E. text. It falls under the following main heads:


a.1) Centralisation of the cult, in the interests of maintaining a pure Yahwism:

b) Laws concerning Holy War: 23:9-14 (the camp); 23:1-8 (the assembly);
20:1-9 (conduct of campaigns); 20:10-13 and
21:10-14 (treatment of captives); 25:17-19 (Command to annihilate Amalek).


24:5,6,14-5,19-22.


As to the purpose which this additional material is intended to serve; a brief glance back over our survey of the development of the Sinai covenant tradition in the previous chapter will show that these additional materials all concern themes central to the covenant tradition. The Hauptgebot is the core of the stipulational element in the covenant; purification is the indispensable preparation for entering the covenant relationship; the Levites are the guardians and officers of
the covenant tradition, in its Northern form at least; growing social concern reflects the developing awareness of the social and community implications of the covenant bond; prophet and king come under consideration, specifically in regard to their role within the economy of the covenant in the peculiar circumstances confronting Israel in the seventh century. Thus those responsible for the insertion of this additional material clearly stand in the line of the Elohistic tradition, sharing the view that Israel's inherited legal traditions in toto constitute the elaborated declaration of the will of Israel's covenant God.

B. The development of the terminology which Deuteronomy employs to describe its own content.

In this section we shall discuss the terms פסים, הרוב, זכאות, המ焖 in the developing awareness of the social and community implications of the covenant, bon4; prophet, and king come under consideration specifically in regard to their role within the economy of the covenant in the peculiar circumstances confronting Israel in the seventh century. Thus those responsible for the insertion of this additional material clearly stand in the line of the Elohistic tradition, sharing the view that Israel's inherited legal traditions in toto constitute the elaborated declaration of the will of Israel's covenant God.

In this section we shall discuss the terms פסים, הרוב, זכאות, המ焖, as they are used in the deuteronomio-deuteronomistic literature to describe the stipulation-content of the covenant. Our method will be to trace the development of each term, from its earliest occurrences in Israelite tradition through to its deuteronomio-deuteronomistic usage.

**In the earliest Traditions**

O. Grether is no doubt correct in asserting that the plural פסים (as denoting a chain of individual sentences) is the most primitive description of the stipulational content of the Sinai covenant. It occurs in both J. (Ex.34:1, 27,27,28,28) and E. (Exodus 20:1) in contexts which now frame the covenant decalogues. By whatever processes of editing Ex.20:1-21 and Ex.34:1-28 have reached their present form, - and the indications are that they were extremely complicated - it seems clear that the term פסים belonged in the 'gemeinsame Grundlage' upon which J. and E. both rest, as the description of the primitive covenant-Hauptgebot.

We confine ourselves here to a discussion of פסים as a 'legal' term. On the relation between 'legal' and prophetic - פסים see O. Grether, *Name und Wort Gottes im Alten Testament*, pp.30f.

Lohfink seeks to trace the term even further back by suggesting that it may be rooted in the ancient Near Eastern vassal treaty form: "Die einzelnen Bedingungen der hethitischen Vasallenverträge hiessen akk. amatu 'wort'." 35) The evidence is extremely tenuous; however, Alt and Grether 36) are on safer ground when they conclude that the technical term is an Israelite development from an originally non-technical usage. It is, indeed, relevant to our concern with the theophanic tradition, to note the strong personalistic understanding which lies behind this development: the core of the covenant relation is described by analogy with the 'word' of direct address uttered in the most solemn I-Thou human relationships.

We have already noted that the Book of the Covenant describes its own contents as mishpatim (Ex.21:1). But Ex.24:3, which in the present form of the material functions as a sign-post pointing to Ex.20:21 - 23:33 as the תֵּפֶל הָבְרִית כָּל-דָּבְרֵי יְהוָה רַאֲהֵל חֹלֶּשֶׁטִים This phrase is obviously composite: רַאֲהֵל חֹלֶּשֶׁטִים constitutes a gloss 37) inspired by Ex.21:1, and added to underscore the editor's intention, viz. that Ex.20:21 - 23:33 in its entirety be now regarded as תֵּפֶל הָבְרִית. Originally, then, כָּל-דָּבְרֵי יְהוָה stood alone in Ex.24:3. Varying suggestions have been offered as to what its precise original reference may have been: 38)

35) N. Lohfink, *Das Hauptgebot*, p.58 note 10. Lohfink also appeals to the examples of sentences from the A.N.E. vassal treaties, cited by Beyerlin; noting their extreme brevity as a factor which they have in common with the sentences of the decalogue. See W. Beyerlin, *The Oldest Sinaitic Traditions*, pp.55ff.


1. It may have referred to the ethical decalogue, standing formerly in the context as the original book of the covenant. In that case, the phrase in its present position would be merely a redactional remainder, with only secondary reference to the block Ex. 20:21-23:33.

2. It may have referred to the non-mishpatim sections of Ex. 20:21-23:33, i.e. to the ritual decalogue.

3. It may have referred to a body of 'legal' material now eliminated from the context.

Whatever the truth in these suggestions, it seems clear that with the insertion of Ex. 20:21-23:33 into its present covenant-theophany context, the whole block is deliberately presented as דָּרַכְיָם. No differentiation of the various types of sentences within the R.o.C. is therefore intended by the use of the composite phrase כל-ברך ה' על כל-המשמשים. If this is so, then the use of "ברך ה'" here forms an extension of the usage otherwise universal in the older pentateuchal tradition, in which the term "ברך ה'" (in the 'legal' sense) is reserved for the sentences of the decalogue(s), - Ex. 20:1, Ex. 34:1, 27, 27, 23, 23 (39).

39) Ex. 12:24, which uses רַבּ (singular) in reference to the prescriptions for the Passover rite, is regarded by Noth, (Exodus, p. 97f) as a deuteronomistic addition to the J. narrative.
Deuteronomy in some cases follows the older JE. practice, using לְבָנִים to signify the individual sentences of the decalogue, which together constitute the content of the 'Voice' heard by Israel out of the theophanic fire on the day of assembly:— Dt. 4:10, 13, 36; 5:5; 5:22; 9:10; 10:2, 4.

In other cases, however, לְבָנִים is used in a wider, more inclusive sense:— Dt. 12:29: "Do careful to do all these words which I command you". The reference here is to the specific sentences concerned with the centralisation of the cult, a theme which we have classified as an extension or application of the Hauptgebot.

Dt. 23:14: "... if you do not turn aside from any of the words which I command you this day ... to go after other gods. The reference is specifically to the Hauptgebot, but also more generally to the totality of commands in Deuteronomy (לְבָנִים, 23:14 is parallel to נְזֵק נְזֵק 28:13).

Dt. 1:1, 31:1: "These are the words that Moses spoke ...." It could be argued that the usage is non-technical. More likely the reference is deliberately undifferentiating; it refers equally to the Mosaic prophetic-exhortation and to the 'legal' sentences delivered through Moses. (Cf. Grether, who sees the inter-merging of prophetic - and 'legal' - לְבָנִים as characteristic of Deuteronomy).

40) Dt. 4 is best regarded as a later appendix to Dt. 5 and therefore subsequent to the main body of Deuteronomy.
42) J. Hempel, Die Schichten des Dtms., considers the verse a gloss.
43) O. Grether, Name und Wort Gottes im A.T., p.121, regards the verse as a gloss. Similarly J. Hempel, Die Schichten des Dtms., p.163.
44) Dt. 10:1-5 is generally regarded as belonging to a late stratum of Deuteronomy.
Dtn.1:11:45) "I commanded you at that time all the things that you should do". The clause probably refers to the 'things' concerned with the concrete ordering of justice, Dtn.1:9-19, rather than to the 'legal' - הָעֵדֶת. The usage, then, is non-technical.

in Deuteronomy.

Dtn.15:2: "This is the manner of the release (הָעֵדֶת דָּבָר)". Here דָּבָר is synonymous with the individualising sense of וְיֵשָׁה (Ex.21:31; 1 Sam.8:9,11) and of נַעַרָה (Lev.6:9,14 ; Lev.7:1,7,11,37) - see further below.

Dtn.13:1 (12:32): "Everything that I command you, you shall be careful to do". The clause sits loosely in the present context, so that it may be taken either as a rider to the law of centralisation, or as a prelude to chapter 13, with its warnings against infringing the Hauptgebot. In either case, the effect is to combine exhortation and commandment in a manner similar to that noted above, (Dtn.1:1,31:1). Similarly Dtn.15:15 and Dtn.24:18,22.

Another significant development of the singular form דָּבָר is its use as a comprehensive term to describe the total Deuteronomic corpus:

Dtn.4:12: "You shall not add to the word which I command you". The 'word' in this case is the total word of Yahweh through Moses, and is equated with מִדְּרֶשֶׁת (Dtn.4:12) and מִלְּתֵךְ וּמִשְׁפָּטִים (4:1).

Dtn.30:14: "The word is very near you, in your mouth and in your heart, so that you can do it." Obviously the meaning here is 'the totality of the deuteronomic code'. Yet the fact that it is said to be 'in the mouth' and 'in the heart' places the stress on the content rather than on the writtenness of the material.

45) Dtn.1:11, "I commanded you at that time all the things that you should do", is closely bound up with its context by the vocabulary it employs; Dtn.1:9, "I said to you at that time, 'I am not able to bear ...' ", relates to the structuring of the judicial system. So also Dtn.1:14, "The thing that you have spoken is good ...." ; and Dtn.1:16, "I charged your judges at that time". The reference of Dtn.1:18, therefore, is also to the structuring of the judiciary.
The use of דַּרְכֵּי (plural construct), in the deuteronomio-deuteronomic literature.

The move toward the unitary, comprehensive usage is quite apparent here:

1. דַּרְכֵּי-הָתֹרָה: Dtn. 17:19; 27:13, 18, 26; 28:28; 29:28; 31:12, 24(46); Jos. 8:34; 2 Kings 23:24;

2. דַּרְכֵּי-הַעֲרָיָה: Dtn. 28:69; 29:8; 2 Kings 23:3;

3. דַּרְכֵּי-םַפְרִי-הָתֹרָה: 2 Kings 22:13, 16; cf. דַּרְכֵּי-םַפְרִי-הָתֹרָה 2 Kings 22:11; and


In the last-mentioned at least, we have reached the concept of דַּרְכֵּי יְהוָה as definitive Scripture.

The other term used by the earlier pentateuchal sources with reference to the Book of the covenant is (as we have seen)

דָּרְכֵי (Ex. 21:1; 24:3).

We have already seen that the bulk of the material described in the B.C.C. as דָּרְכֵי was taken over about the time of the conquest, probably from a Canaanite source. Yet at the same time we suggested that in pre-Mosaic times, the tribes that were to become Israel must already have possessed some rudiments of social regulation; and it was probably to this indigenous root that the term דָּרְכֵי originally applied. (The body of mishpatim properly begins at Ex. 21:2; the phrase "these are the mishpatim ..." is editorial, though at what stage in the growth of the tradition it became attached to the mishpatim code, it is now impossible to say).

In the earlier traditions.

From the material in the older pentateuchal sources, four main points emerge regarding the primitive meaning of דָּרְכֵי in the O.T. tradition:

46) All these passages belong to the later strata of Deuteronomy.

47) Again, late passages. Cf. also the late דַּרְכֵּי הָרֹאֵל Dtn. 29:18.
1. The root מָשָׁת has the double reference 'rule' and 'judge'; and of these 'rule' appears to be the more basic and inclusive term. One exercises מָשָׁת by virtue of an already-possessed authority. Thus the tradition of Ex.18:13ff. ascribes the administration of מָשָׁת to Moses, plainly as a derivative function implicit in his total leadership-role. Similarly, in order to elevate heads of tribes to become dispensers of מָשָׁת, Moses begins by giving them the status of מִשָּׁת. This implies that מָשָׁת is not a narrowly 'judicial' term concerned merely with the crystallisation and preservation of case-law, but in the primary sense bears the impress of the personal will of the ruler. This personalistic concept of the ruler as the fountain-head of מִשָּׁת undoubtedly arose in Israel at an early stage; Noth suggests that it was already operative under the 'Judges of Israel', (cf. Jud.10:1-5; Jud.12:7-15)\(^{48}\), and we may hazard the surmise that it in fact forms part of Israel's pre-settlement heritage.

Seemingly from a very early era, too, מִשָּׁת was connected with the personal will of Yahweh. Cf. Gen. 18:25וַיִּשָּׁת מִשָּׁת מִכָּל לֵילָה מִשָּׁת (It is, indeed, possible that the concept of the kingship of Yahweh was bound up from early times with the Sinai-covenant tradition\(^{49}\)- cf. Dt. 33:5; - if so, then by definition, Yahweh as king would exercise the function of מָשָׁת / מָשָׁת.

2. Though מָשָׁת in the 'profane' sense is the expression of the personal will of the (secular) ruler, it is not thereby based on arbitrariness or caprice, and that for two reasons:

a) On the one hand מָשָׁת is broad-based on the customary pattern of life (and

\(^{48}\) U. Noth, Exodus, p.150. He advances the positive attitude towards Midian which is reflected in this tradition, as an argument for its early origin, viz., in the period soon after the settlement.

\(^{49}\) Cf. Martin Buber, Kingship of God, p.126, et passim.
indeed of nature) conceived as having existed from time immemorial. Cf. the following passages:

Ex 21:9  "If he designates her for his son, he shall deal with her as a daughter ( נושה נסיגת מינו )." This refers to the relationship between father-daughter which is so anciently established in universal customary usage that it is assumed to be part of the basic order of human existence - a father-daughter pattern characterised by a certain 'rightness'. On the basis of this pattern which is of universal and unquestioned validity, then, a daughter has certain 'rights' to which she may lay claim - 'rights' which constitute her claim on her father and on the society of which she and her father are members.

Similarly, the poor are acknowledged to possess certain basic rights.

Ex 23:6  "לא תוש הנשים איכן بلاבון".

From time immemorial it is part of the tribal ethic and existence, that the poor have a claim on the protection of the tribe (cf. also the rights of the נ下載).

1 Sam 10:25  "Samuel told the people the rights and duties of the kingship ( karşינט ימלהל) and wrote them in a book".

The king, too, has his דומא ; the rights inhering in royalty as they appeared, from the concrete examples of kingship in the nations round about Israel, to be universally accorded to kings. Thus Israel's acceptance of kingship automatically entails acknowledgment of this 'natural' pattern of kingly 'right', inherited in the very concept of kingship.

1 Sam 2:13  "The דומא of the priests with the people was that when any man offered sacrifice..."

50) Cf. Isaiah 28:26. Though late 8th Century, this text probably reflects, or is at least consonant with, a much more ancient way of thought. דומא ימלהלו"' ; the דומא here referred to is probably the characteristic growth-or culture-pattern of the various plants listed in the passage. So דומא here means almost, 'the order of nature as grounded in the divine'. 
The priest, also has his **عناד**, acknowledged from ancient times, and hence regarded as of 'natural' validity. The verse quoted best refers to the standing practice and long-acknowledged right of the priest to take for himself a portion of the sacrifice offered by an individual worshipper to Yahweh.\(^{51}\)

When these 'rights' - whether of son, daughter, poor, stranger, priest, king, are formulated as principles on the basis of which the **عناד** may decide in specific disputes, then the meaning of **عناד** shifts from 'custom' or 'right' to 'regulation', e.g. Ex. 21:9.

b) On the other hand, **عناד** may mean not a standing regulation, but an ad hoc decision on a matter for which ancient custom provides no concrete precedent. Hence the decision rests more directly on the authority of the **عناד** (king, judge, elder). But once again the decision is made not in an arbitrary fashion, but in dependence on divine sanctions and guidance. A clear example of this is seen in 1 Kings 3:10-28. The account of Solomon's **عناד** in the case of the two harlots is framed by two sentences (vv.11,28), and is obviously intended to be interpreted in their light:

v.11 "And God said, 'Because you have asked for yourself ...understanding to discern what is right ( לעמ נפשי ) ... I give you a wise and discerning mind.'\(^{52}\)

v.28 "They perceived that the wisdom of God was in him to render justice ( ענוה נפשי )."

It is clear here that the ability to make right decisions rests on the inspiration of God.\(^{52}\) Indeed one may say that the **عناד** rests ideally on

\(^{51}\) J. Skinner's translation (The books of Samuel), brings out the fact that the **عناד** referred to is an acknowledged priestly right, and not a deviant practice confined to the sons of Eli. H.W. Hertzberg, I and II Samuel, however, prefers the meaning 'practice', 'behaviour' for **عناד** here, implying that the passage is a condemnation of the way in which the priests took their portion, (v.15ff). The two meanings of **عناד**, however, are not mutually exclusive.

\(^{52}\) This passage may show Dic. influence, but the basic concept is undoubtedly primitive.
the characteristic bent of the divine will, which is to uphold the good and destroy the evil.

3. It has already become clear that מושל is not a purely 'juridical' term, but always has greater or lesser ethical overtones. The decision (מושל) is seen to be the right, just, decision. This stress comes to its full flowering in the prophets of the eighth Cent. onwards, e.g. Micah 3:1,9, where מושל is equated with 'the love of the good and the hatred of evil' (v.1.) or 'the love of equity' (v.9), based upon the righteous character of Yahweh. But although the flowering of the concept is eighth Cent., its roots are traceable in the passages already discussed. Cf. Gen.18:19, where מושל=יהורחני klik 53).

4. It needs to be stressed again that from the beginning, מושל is religiously grounded. For example, Ex.18:22ff to which we have already referred, draws a close connection between 'enquiring of God' and 'pronouncing מושל (v.16). The phrase 'רשות' in the period of the Judges consistently implies recourse to the oracular, so that we may safely assume that here too, an oracular process (casting of lots, perhaps) is intended. Cf. Jud.4:6, where Deborah dispenses מושל under an 'oracular' tree. Similarly the identification of En Mishpat and Kadesh (Gen.14:7) 55 shows that it was a case of 'judgment' being dispensed at a 'sacred' place, presumably a spring where certain numinous-theophanic phenomena had been observed. From the general pattern of the development of holy places on the one hand, and of מושל on the other, we may safely conclude that the authoritativeness of the מושל derives from the holiness of the place from which they are delivered, and not vice versa.

53) M. Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch, p.29, brackets the verse as a later addition to J.

54) See R. de Vaux, Ancient Israel, p.278f.

55) The passage as a whole is probably late, but it may safely be assumed that this verse preserves a genuinely ancient reminiscence.
It seems likely, too, that the Priestly description of the 'breastplate of judgment' (םָבֶּשֶׁת יִצְרָה) containing the Urim and Tummim stones, rests on ancient tradition concerning an oracular process for seeking the will of God in specific questions. Hertzberg suggests that the precise reference of the tradition may have already become obscure for P., but that it preserves authentic reminiscences as to the primitive use of Urim and Tummim.

Num. 27:5-11 is interesting, in that it combines a description of the lot-oracle, with inherited casuistic tradition: Moses brought the daughters of Zelophehad's case (םָבֶּשֶׁת) before the Lord (v.5) and received an answer presumably by lot (v.7) - cf. Num. 27:21. But the detailed law of inheritance which follows (v.8-11a) resembles rather those sentences of A.N.E. law which we reviewed above, and could not have originated from the sacred lot, which presumably responded either 'Yes', 'No' or 'No answer'. (1 Sam.14:37,41-2). The two types of המומא are linked in v.11b: "it shall be to the people a statute and an ordinance (מקים הַנְּגָה), as the Lord commanded Moses." The general principle, binding for all time, is deliberately related to the concrete ad hoc decision pronounced by Moses in the name of Yahweh (On the phrase המומא see further below).

Thus we may conclude that in Israel, divine inspiration is not simply ascribed to the end-product, the finished and codified המומא, but is regarded as the essential element at every stage of the development.

םָבֶּשֶׁת in Deuteronomy.

When we turn to Dt., we find most of the older strands of meaning represented in the usage of המומא:

56) Cf. Dt.33:8-11. On the date and possible significance of this passage, see p.373f. below.

Dtn.16-17

58) "I charged your judges (תımızים) at that time, saying, 'Hear the cases ... and judge (דין) righteously between a man and his brother. You shall not be partial in judgment: you shall hear the great and the small alike ... for the judgment is God's'" (תימיק לאלוהים ה.'ות). Dtn.17:8ff

Here it is a question of the customary rights of the 'small' and the 'great' as representing the various social classes within Israel. These 'rights' become set out in 'regulations'; the concrete 'decision' is based upon these 'regulations', and the whole is regarded as ultimately grounded in the divine will to righteousness (תימיך לאלוהים ה.). Dtn.17:8ff is similar to the passage just discussed, except that here the emphasis is more specifically upon the concrete decision in the individual case. The case which is too difficult to be decided locally (תים ממלך בר) is referred to the personnel at the central shrine. Disregard of the verdict (תימיך וידם בר) given there is punishable by death, for the sanctuary is Yahweh's chosen place (v.8b, 10a) the_are his ministers, (v.12), and the verdict from their mouth is therefore Yahweh's decision.

Dtn.19:6 "ריבי אלים תם ממלך בר" The phrase refers to behaviour, or suspected behaviour, which is customarily regarded as death-deserving; while

Dtn.21:22 "ריבי אלים יתוי" shows this same customary assessment now expressly formulated in a specific regulation.

Dtn.18:3 "תימיך הבניאיתיים מכניק" reflects a customary usage which has come to be regarded as a 'right', and then formulated in specific regulations. Similarly,

Dtn.21:17 "לפי שמי הבכור" - the 'right' of the firstborn.

58) The passage is of course based on Ex.18:13ff, to which we have already referred. If we follow U. Neth ('Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien') in ascribing Dtn.1-3 to the compiler of the Deuteronomic History, then the text here will be later than the main body of Dtn. Nevertheless it reflects accurately the Dio. thinking in this regard.

59) The piling up of legal terms (תירוה; ידה; דרומ יהושע; משים) and the duplication of officials (כּהנים; שרים), points to a conflation here of two traditions: the שרים concerned with pronouncingחפשים and the כּהנים handling והלוהים.

60) with this usage, cf. also 1 Kings 20:40. Here שמי means the decision in the individual case of one who has failed to obey the prophetic word.

61) Cf. also here 1 Sam 10:25, חפשים והלוהים,(see page 345 above)
As in the older tradition, so too in Dtn., the hardships suffered by the fatherless, widows, strangers, etc., commend them to the יִשְׂרָאֵל, whose character it is to raise up the oppressed, and to humble the proud oppressor. This character of Yahweh’s is so constant that on the basis of it one can speak of the ‘right’ ( יִשְׂרָאֵל ) of the fatherless; i.e., their right to succour is based on this settled divine character. And it is part of the loyalty of the יִשְׂרָאֵל to Yahweh, that they administer the regulations in harmony with this basic fact of the divine character. Cf.

Dtn.10:17; 24:17; 1 Sam.9:3; 2 Sam.8:15.

I Kings 10:9 “... the Lord has made you king, that you may execute יִשְׂרָאֵל and righteousness.”

This verse underlines the character of the earthly ruler, as minister of the יִשְׂרָאֵל. This is made clear by the equation of יִשְׂרָאֵל and יִשְׂרָאֵל in which a prophetic influence is traceable. 62)

We see, then, that Dtn. picks up the strands of the older usage. Nevertheless it is not those that are typical of the deuteronomistic usage: the typical usage is the plural combination יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל which occurs no fewer than fifteen times in Dtn., and seven times in the Distico history. 63)

62) Cf. Is. 1:26; Is.9:6(7); Is.33:5; Jer.22:3,15; Amos 5:7; Micah 7:9.

63) Occurrences of יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל in Dtn. - Dtn.4:1,5,8,14,45; 5:1,31; 6:1,20; 7:11; 11:1,32; 12:1; 26:16; 30:16.

Occurrences of יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל in Dtn. - 1 Kings 2:3; 6:12; 8:58; 9:4; 11:33; 2 Kings 17:34 (reading יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל, as N.E.B.)

2 Kings 17:37; 2 Sam.22:23 (Ps. 18:23) should probably be included also.
This use of מַשְׁמֵרָה מִקְּרָאִים corresponds closely to that of the B.O.C., Ex.21:1:—

a) It concentrates on the status of the material as judicial sentences - 'regulations laid down' - and overshadows the ethical aspects of מַשְׁמֵרָה which had been emerging in the work of the prophets;

b) Whereas in Ex.21:1, the extent of the body of מַשְׁמֵרָה is only loosely defined, so that it remains an open question whether the cultic provisions and the postlude are included, in Deuteronomy the total contents of the corpus are explicitly represented as מַשְׁמֵרָה מִקְּרָאִים.  The differences between the various types of material, still discernible in the B.O.C., are effaced in Dtn.

We have already noted Lohfink's suggestion that Dtn.7, which represents an expanded version of the tradition preserved in the B.O.C. postlude (Ex.23:20-33), may have been the original introduction to the Deuteronomic code, and therefore the core around which the paraenetic material has crystallised. Dtn. specifically describes this paraenetic material as מַשְׁמֵרָה מִקְּרָאִים (Dtn.7:11, 11:1, 11:32), thus setting paraenesis on a par with the casuistic מַשְׁמֵרָה. (For the specific force of מַשְׁמֵרָה in the combination term, see further below.)

c) It is noteworthy that the greatest concentration of occurrences of the combination term is in chs.4 and 5; the chapters which deal most specifically with the Sinaitheophany as the fountain-head of Israel's law. It would seem that the compiler(s) of Dtn. 4 and 5 considered the combination מַשְׁמֵרָה מִקְּרָאִים to be the most accurate description of the deuteronomic corpus, and of the B.O.C., its source. Indeed it may well have been the compiler of Dtn. 4 or of Dtn. 5 who was responsible for impressing the מַשְׁמֵרָה מִקְּרָאִים structure on the whole corpus.

64) Lohfink (Das Hauptgebot, p.56) speaks of the use of the combination-term מַשְׁמֵרָה מִקְּרָאִים as a 'structure'sign'; the paraenetic section is bracketed by the phrase מַשְׁמֵרָה מִקְּרָאִים (5:1, 11:32), as is also the legal code proper (12:1, 25:16). Once again, the use of the identical term to delimit both paraenesis and code-proper has the effect of placing the two on a par.
The phrase נבוק ולולא יסוע stands five times in apposition: three times to דנה (Dtn.5:31; 6:1, 7:11), and twice to דנה (Dtn.4:45, 6:20).

According to Lohfink\(^{65}\) נבוק is related to the Accadian covenant-term אככ, and probably implies the writtenness of the covenant document\(^{66}\) (Cf. here P's. penchant for the phrase נבוק מות as a term for the tables of the covenant.) The apposition of נבוק וילוא with נבוק may therefore indicate that (at least at Dtn.4:34 and 6:20) נבוק וילוא are regarded as constituting a veritable document of the covenant. (On the appositional use of נבוק see further below).

In the earlier tradition the occurrences of this root in the noun-form are comparatively infrequent. The general meaning is "a settled or fixed statute". The verbal root means 'inscribe' or 'carve', but since it is not attested earlier than the eighth century, it seems unwise to insist that the concept of 'writtenness' 'engraveness' was integral to נבוק from earliest days - the more so since the Arabic יאקה does not include 'inscribe' in its basic range of meaning.

Gen.47:22 נבוק לבלובינו מעת פארת. The meaning here is 'a right or due established by royal decree'. Cf. here the similar use of יבכומ in 1 Sam.2:13 and Dtn.18:3, to describe the priestly dues: the difference would seem to be that נבוק lays added emphasis on the fixity of the regulation.

Gen.47:26 יבכומ יבוגה ירוב קלינ ויהי ויהי. The meaning here is 'statute'.

Ex.5:14 נבוק יבוגה ירוב קלינ והיה. Here נבוק may signify either a prescribed task, or a prescribed quota of bricks to be produced. In either case the meaning is the same - a 'limit fixed by authoritative pronouncement'.

---

\(^{65}\) Lohfink, Das Hauptgebot, p.57. See also McCarthy, Treaty and Covenant, p.143.

\(^{66}\) יבכומ as implying written tables, cf. 2 Kings 11:12. See G. Ostborn, Term in the O.T., p.76f.
Ex. 18:13ff has already been discussed above. I feel that Noth\textsuperscript{67} is somewhat overstating the matter when he says: "It rests on a division between sacrificial and 'civic' justice, viz. on a separation of 'civic' justice from the sacrificial sphere." For there is no indication in the text that the 'great matters' which are still to come before Moses may not include complicated civil cases, or that the 'small matters' may not include minor infringements of sacrificial law (v.22). Yet it is true that vv.16b, 20, link סדרה and תהלת rather closely, and thus tend to draw into the priestly sphere, as distinct from the jurisdiction (משנין) of the שופט. It seems to me, however, that to draw a rigid distinction between סדרה and תהלת as representing apodictic-sacrificial law and casuistic-civil law respectively, is to go beyond evidence\textsuperscript{68}. The text would rather imply that (prior to Jethro's intervention) Moses' total activity, (i.e., a) 'enquiry,' (לֵבָ Assy.), b) making known the סדרה and תהלת of God, and c) giving decision in the simpler cases for which precedent was already available), is all included in the bracket-term מָשָׁע (vv.9,16), and that the sum of decisions in these various cases together constitutes מָשָׁע. Under the new (post-Jethro) order, however, סדרה and תהלת would seem to refer especially to those cases for which precedent was either ambiguous or non-existnt, or those serious cases whose penalty required divine sanction in its imposition. מָשָׁע on the other hand, would signify the unambiguous decisions, where customary judgment is unanimous.

Judges 5:9:14. The nouns מַעֲקֵמוּ וְחֵקַקְיוּ and מַעֲקֵמוּ מַעֲקֵמוּ מַעֲקֵמוּ mean in general 'commanders.' V.9 is clear.

Jud.5:14: מְנֵי מְכָיר מַעֲקֵמִים וְרָמוּ בִּינָל מְשָׁכִים בְּשַׁבְּשׁ בְּשַׁבְּשׁ מְשָׁכִים (bearers

\textsuperscript{67} H. Noth, Exodus, p.150.

\textsuperscript{68} A. Alt. "The Origins of Israelite Law," op. cit., p.123f, note 106, remarks that סדרה is more likely than תהלת to have constituted the primitive terminus technicus for the apodictic sentences: But he adds that even so, the term תהלת is wider than the field of the apodictica proper. Cf. Hentschke, \textit{Satzung und Setzende}, BWANT V.3, pp.28, 112f.
Now since the root ידב means 'number', 'count', it has been suggested that the
was an officer, in the context of the Holy War, who had special
responsibility for enrolling or 'inscribing' the names of clan-members. On the
basis of these lists, it is claimed, contingents were marshalled for the Holy War,
and land distributed. In later times, the lists would become the basis for assessing
property-tax, levies, etc., and hence became possible instruments for exploitation in
the hands of corrupt officials, (Is.10:1-4). This reconstruction, then, has been used to stress that the connection between רן and 'writtenness' is of ancient standing.

But since, as already mentioned, the use of רן with the sense 'inscribe' is unattested before the 8th century, it seems precarious to base too much on this argument. It is safer to rest content with Burney's more general conclusion: the רנן "are the imposers of bukkîm, 'statutes' or 'enactments'."

 Judges 11:39  רנהי רן ביבושאליל The reference of רן is to the mourning-custom described in the following verse; therefore 'custom' rather than 'statute' is the more appropriate meaning.

 רן in the earlier traditions. The evidence shows that there is a close and primitive correlation between the terms רן and רנן :

 (i) רן in the sense of 'custom' just noted (Jud.11:39) is paralleled by the usage of רנן (1 Sam.27:1(71) ; Jud.18:7, etc.)

 (ii) We have noted above that both רן and רנן are used in the sense of 'right' (Gen.47:22 and 1 Sam.2:13). In the later sources, further parallels occur in the

69) Burney, Judges, ad loc., acknowledges that the phrase gives good meaning in the context, but eliminates רנן on the grounds of metre. Even if this is correct however, the fact that the glossator (probably working at an early period) added ידב to the line, shows how he interpreted the text. The occurrence of רנן with the meaning 'ruler's staff', Gen.49:10 ; Num.21:18 ; Ps.60:9, confirms the accuracy of the parallelism in Jud.5:14.

70) Hentschke, Satzung und Sitzender, pp.11-20 (Summary, p.18f)

usage of the two terms:

(iii) and are both used to signify the settled order of nature and the cosmos (Jer. 31:35,36; Prov. 8:27b, and Isaiah 28:26); and the roots

(iv) and are both used in the sense 'rule', 'judge' (Prov. 8:15, and Prov. 8:16). The cumulative weight of these parallels points to a very early approximation of the two terms. It is interesting, therefore to consider the combination-term in the light of this supporting evidence:

The combination occurs in the singular four times in the O.T. literature, and the evidence suggests that it is an ancient usage.

Joshua 24:25 "So Joshua made a covenant with the people that day, and made statutes and ordinances for them at Shechem (לְוֵיָה לְעִם לָמָּשֵׁש בְּשֵׁם).

The verse is generally agreed to be old, though as we suggest on p.233 , v.25b. probably represents a more developed stage of tradition than v.25a. (Verse 26a. is a later interpolation) Many scholars have suggested that the B.o.C. (perhaps in embryonic form) once belonged in this setting, as the content of the יִשְׁבֵּי עַמּוּדֶים. Hentschke argues that here is to be connected especially with 'Kultordnung', and that implies 'bürgerliche ... Recht' - though he later modifies this somewhat (op.cit. p.112). We have expressed ourselves above as cautious of this over-clear distinction.

72) Accepting the LXX reading for the M.T. יִשְׁבֵּי עַמּוּדֶים.

73) M. Noth, Das Buch Josua, p.XIV, agrees that the passage is old, at least pre-Deuteronomistic.

74) O. Grether, Name und Wort Gottes, p.61, note 7.

Hentschke, Satzung u.Setzender, however, retains the verse, arguing from it that in Joshua's day already signified a block of material fixed in literary form, and constituting a covenant document. But our study of the development of the covenant form shows that this is unlikely.

75) Hentschke, op.cit., p.29, note 4, suggests this, if somewhat cautiously.

G.v.Rad (O.T. Theology I, p.16f) sees the passage as preserving "a very ancient memory of the founding of the old Israelite Amphictyony."

76) Hentschke, op.cit., p.28f.
1 Sam. 30:25 "And from that day forward he made it a statute and an ordinance for Israel (ריכשה לוח להלכות לישראל) to this day".

Hentschke discounts this passage, unnecessarily it seems to me, on the grounds of its 'anthropological colouring'⁷⁷ There seems no reason to doubt that the tradition genuinely reflects the origin of this particular military regulation: so Hertzberg: he regards the usage as illustrative of the development of יבשות from an ad hoc decision to the status of a legal principle - "Denn aus solchen rechten Einzelentscheidungen wächst schliesslich ein 'Recht' heraus". The binding nature of the principle is naturally enhanced by the personal authority of the one making the original pronouncement. "Den Begriff

⁷⁷) Hentschke, op.cit., p.32.
⁷⁸) Hertzberg, "Die Entwicklung des Begriffes יבשות" op.cit., p.271.
nimmt er, um damit eine objektiv geltende, den kertz einer Bestimmung
denzende Regel zu bezeichnen, wie ja auch das Synonym פִּנְיָב beweist".

(Perhaps 'synonym' is not quite accurate, however; better, the two
terms largely overlap, but the emphasis of נָשִּׁים is on the original
ad hoc decision whereas פִּנְיָב tends to emphasize the binding nature of
the resultant law).

Ex. 15:25b. "There he made for them a statute and an ordinance (פִּנְיָב לְךָ נֶשֶׁר
), and there he proved them ...."

Vv. 25-26 are often regarded as a later deuteronomistic interpolation?

But while this is probably true of v. 26, v. 25b seems from its similarity
in tone to Josh. 24:25, to be genuinely ancient. In particular the use of
נָשִּׁים פִּנְיָב in the singular marks the verse off both from v. 26 and from
the deuteronomistic usage in general ( פִּנְיָב לְךָ נֶשֶׁר ).

79) M. Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch, p. 32.
80) Hentschke, op. cit., p. 29, note 4.
What then is the precise reference of מְשָׁמְשָׁה הָרָעָה in Ex. 15:25b, when divorced from v. 26? Was the term originally comprehensive, describing a body of legislation (as Josh 24:25); or particularising, describing a single regulation (as 1 Sam. 30:25)? Whatever the answer, v. 26 at least interpreted the term as a comprehensive.

One further example of מְשָׁמְשָׁה הָרָעָה in the singular occurs in the O.T. literature: it is from the post-exilic period, but may well witness to a more ancient usage:

Ezra 7:10 "For Ezra had set his heart to study the law of the Lord (תֵּרָה הַקְּדוֹשָׁה) and to do it, and to teach His statutes and ordinances in Israel" (מִצְוֹת וָלֻּמָּה).

Here the combination מְשָׁמְשָׁה הָרָעָה is used in its comprehensive sense as the equivalent of תֵּרָה הַקְּדוֹשָׁה.

Taking these three or four instances together, then, they would seem to offer grounds for believing that already in the pre-deuteronomic period, a singular comprehensive term designating the totality of the divine law, was already beginning to emerge. If, as has been suggested, the term מְשָׁמְשָׁה הָרָעָה was connected with the B.C.O.-tradition, then it would seem reasonably certain that the usage was known to the early Deuteronomic school. We are justified, therefore, in asking why Dtn. preferred to set aside this comprehensive term that had already developed (within the Northern tradition), and to choose a new term for himself, i.e. מִצְוֹת הָרָעָה. (In the later strands of Dtn. מִצְוֹת הָרָעָה is also used in the comprehensive sense). That this was a deliberate choice seems the more probable when we recall that the plural combination מְשָׁמְשָׁה לְכִי רָעָה is a deuteronomic innovation - i.e. the developing

61) G. Ostborn, "Tora in the O.T.," p.68, suggests מְשָׁמְשָׁה as a possible early comprehensive terms for law. This seems unlikely, however. (see ch.2, 'Theophany and Covenant'.)
comprehensive term has been 're-particularised' into the plural. Obviously in order to be replaced by a more telling, more satisfactory comprehensive singular, -.

The occurrences of the verbal stem הָלַךְ in the older pentatouchal sources are surprisingly few. A classification results as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>הָלַךְ used with the subject</th>
<th>God</th>
<th>Moses (as God's servant)</th>
<th>King</th>
<th>King's vice-gerent</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Master to servant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14 times (7 in 1st pers. 7 in 3rd P.)</td>
<td>1 time</td>
<td>3 times (3 pharaoh; 1 Abimelech)</td>
<td>4 times (Joseph)</td>
<td>3 times (Abraham, Rebecca, Jacob)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus we may conclude that the root means generally, 'an order expressing the personal will of one in high authority'. It would seem to have been used of God from the beginning as a natural anthropomorphism, requiring no specifically cultic

82) The reference of מִדְנָכָה would seem to have been primarily to the diecode proper (as the representative and successor of the B.o.C.), but was then expanded to embrace the whole diecorpus. Cf. the reference of the conflated term מִדְנָכָה, Ex.24:3.

83) There is little to be added concerning the use of הָלַךְ/הלַךְ outside the combination-term מִדְנָכָה. The two forms, הָלַךְ and הָלַךְ, are varied apparently indiscriminately, and are evenly distributed from Dtn. 4:6-30:16. It is interesting that הָלַךְ occurs two times standing alone (6:12; 6:24); once with הָלַךְ (17:19); and three times with הָלַךְ, (4:20; 6:16; 27:10). הָלַךְ, in all eight instances of its occurrence, is linked with הָלַךְ. Possibly the fem.pl.form מִדְנָכָה originates through attraction to the grammatical form of מִדְנָכָה. There may also be a connection between the fact of this close association of הָלַךְ/הלַךְ with הָלַךְ and the above-mentioned possibility that מִדְנָכָה consciously replaces מִדְנָכָה as the developing comprehensive term.

84) The same pattern of usage can be traced in classical and Hellenistic Greek, and rests seemingly on the pattern of primitive patriarchal society, rather than on any special 'theological' basis.
characteristic of the profane uses for this early period is that in the parent-child context. This no doubt mirrors the nomadic clan-structure, and would apply equally to the relationship of members of the clan to their elders, whose directions would be expressed likewise in terms of הַלֵּם. Thence the term would transfer to the Judges of Israel (cf. the ruler as father: Jud.17:10; 18:19; Job 29:16; 2 Kings 2:12; 2 Kings 6:21; 2 Kings 13:14) and with the rise of the monarchy, to the kingship (kingly figure as father: Is.22:21). Already, before the mention of the first Israelite king, הַלֵּם is regarded as the appropriate term for Pharaoh's and Abimelech's commands; and in the narratives of Samuel and Kings, the term is increasingly applied to the monarchy. An analysis of Josh.-2 Kings results as follows:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Number of Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joshua הַלֵּם used with subject:God</td>
<td>16 times (3 in 1st p.; 13 in 3rd p.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses, servt.of Lord</td>
<td>9 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>14 times (dual capacity as Judge and divine representative).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers under Josh</td>
<td>2 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God</td>
<td>3 times (1 in 1st p.; 2 in 3rd p.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angel of the Lord</td>
<td>1 time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Congregation)</td>
<td>2 times.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Samuel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God</td>
<td>4 times (1 in 1st p.; 3 in 3rd p.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>3 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>1 time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brother</td>
<td>1 time (as head of family)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

85) Cf. Lohfink, Das Hauptgebot, p.56: "Vermutlich waren die Vordersätze von Segen und Fluch des Bundesformulars die Heimat des Begriffs (und zwar des Plurals). Von da ist er auch an andere Stellen der Predigt gedrungen, speziell der vor-ätschen. Predigt." The parallels which Lohfink quotes, however, are all from P.
The only occurrences of שִׁלֹם which have any claim to be early are Ex.16:28 and Ex.20:6\(^{86}\), and even these are too uncertain to be used as evidence for the early period. Ex.16 is an interweaving ofJE and P, and it is impossible to say categorically that Ex.16:28 is uninfluenced by priestly terminology; and Ex.20:6 is almost certainly part of a deuteronomistic expansion. Of the examples of שִׁלֹם in Josh.1-1 Kings 2\(^{87}\), none can with any confidence be regarded as pre-deuteronomistic\(^{83}\) and the 8th century prophets are also silent, except for Is.29:13 (a human commandment masquerading as a genuine word of Yahweh), and Isaiah 36:21\(^{89}\).

It would seem, then, that the use of שִׁלֹם / שֵׁלֶם for the commandments of Yahweh in general, and the body of legal sentences in particular, certainly originates with Deuteronomy. The even spread of the term throughout the book indicates that it belongs to the earliest stratum of the tradition. We shall be safe, therefore, in assuming that this innovation originated in Northern Israel.

---

86) The relevant phrase in Ex.24:12 is usually regarded as a deuteronomistic gloss.
87) Josh.22:3,5,5 ; Jud.2:17 ; Jud.3:4 ; 1 Sam.13:13 ; 1 Kings 2:3,43.
83) The possible exception, 1 Kings 2:43, refers to the king's שלם, not Yahweh's.
89) This prose passage appears again in 2 Kings 18:36, so that שלם here may be Deuteronomistic. In any case, the reference is to a שלם of the king, not of Yahweh.
Indeed we may go a step further, and suggest that its adoption is connected with the critical attitude toward kingship which we have seen illustrated in the Northern prophet Hosea, and in the Northern tradition generally. This would mean, that, over against the corrupt and apostate monarchy, the deuteronomistic school polemically asserted the kingship of Yahweh, — taking up a term typically descriptive of royal decrees, and applying it to the decrees of Yahweh which that monarchy has rejected and despised. Admittedly a number of scholars interpret the evidence differently, tracing the use of the term נְלֵיָּה to the positive influence of the kingship. B. Lindars argues that the intention of " נְלֵיָּה " is to place all aspects of law on a single level, (cf. our remarks above, p. 342 on the emergence of a singular comprehensive term), and to present it as the commandment of the king in his capacity as executive officer of the covenant.) Similarly G. Östborn suggests that Ex.24:12 introduces a 'royal' proclamation of law, in which the king promulgates the law on behalf of the deity (after the manner of the Codex Hammurabi). The interpretation based on the negative influence of the concept of kingship, however, accords better with our conclusions as to the provenance of Deuteronomy in prophetic-levitic 'protest' circles (Ex.18, 273f.) and is to be preferred.

We shall see that נְלֵיָּה is most commonly in apposition or in series with מְלָיָּה - a term that may fairly be described as the most authoritative and 'royal' of the traditional legal terms. This serves to heighten the impression of the majesty of Yahweh's kingly decrees.

**Nelai in Deuteronomy.**

A survey of the usages of Nelai in Deuteronomy confirms the impression that these are the characteristic dic. terms for the legal material. Nelai occurs

---

90) B. Lindars, "Torah in Deuteronomy", Words and Meanings, p.135. G. Östborn, Torah in the Old Testament, p.43. Against Östborn's view of Ex.24:12, however, it should be noted that here Yahweh Himself is the promulgator of the code, and the kingly Figure; in contrast to Him the human intermediary plays a passive and insignificant role.
some thirty times in Dtn.4:2 - 30:16 - eighteen times standing alone and twelve times in series. It is interesting that these series are, with one exception91) qualified by the phrase הַיּוֹם הָיוּ עַלְיָהּ thus stressing that הַיּוֹם is intended to be the dominant member of the series. Where הַיּוֹם stands alone, this qualifying phrase is unnecessary, and in fact occurs in less than half of the instances. (The same qualifying phrase occurs, incidentally, with every instance of הַיּוֹם in the singular, except Dtn. 17:20).

The precise reference of הַיּוֹם in individual contexts throughout Dtn. are as follows: -

1. **Individual sentences of the law described as הַיּוֹם:**

Dtn.8:26. The suspicion that Dtn.8:2 is related to Ex.16:29, is confirmed by the reference to the feeding with manna, Dtn.8:3. The immediate reference of הַיּוֹם in this context is therefore to the specific sabbath commandment(s) (Ex.16:29).

2. **The Deuteronomic code:**

Dtn.5:10,19. The primary reference here would seem to be to the contents of the two tables (Dtn.5:22). This would imply that הַיּוֹם and מְדַרְשָׁנָה are equivalent terms; the equating of the two terms, however, is hardly deliberate, but rather the secondary result of the recurrent editing and re-editing to which Dtn.5 has been subjected.

3. **The Deuteronomistic code:**

Dtn.6:2 Note here the close relation in context to Dtn.5:31, which in turn is based upon Ex.20:20-21, i.e. the Elohist introduction to the Deo.C. It would seem best then to interpret הַיּוֹם here as meaning the specific sentences of the Deo. code. Similarly, Dtn.4:40 and Dtn.7:19, which relate closely to the release from Egypt, and, by implication, to the law given at Sinai, i.e. the Sinai code.

91) Dtn.11:1.
4. The Hauptgebot.

Dtn.6:17 is in the context of Israel's testing Yahweh at Massa (Dtn.6:16), and may therefore most suitably be regarded as an adjuration to keep the Hauptgebot by showing wholehearted loyalty to Yahweh.

Dtn.8:11 is in a context of warning against the dangers of forgetting the Lord, i.e. decline from the spirit of grateful dependence on Him.

Dtn.10:13 The Hauptgebot - tone of the context is set by v.12 - "Fear ..., walk ..., love ..., serve, Yahweh". Similarly,

Dtn.11:13 - "... love ..., serve ...."

Dtn.13:5(4) - "... walk ..., fear ..., obey ..., serve ..., cleave ...";

Dtn.13:18 - the context concerns the exclusive worship of Yahweh, - worship only at his shrine.

5. The whole deuteronomio corpus as מלחם

Dtn.11:27-28 is in the context of covenant-solemnisation; so that the מלחם may be interpreted as comprising a contrast: v.12 referring to the Hauptgebot, and v.13 to the Dei. code. But the above interpretation seems preferable.

Dtn.4:2 (the first mention of מלחם in the finished form of Deuteronomy), with its stringent prohibition of adding to, or subtracting from the words. This implies a written document, embracing presumably the whole corpus Dtn.4-30.

מלחם in Deuteronomy.

Approximately the same pattern of usages in the occurrences of מלחם (sing) as in מלחם (plural), is apparent throughout.

92) Alternatively, Dtn.10:12 and 13 may be interpreted as comprising a contrast: v.12 referring to the Hauptgebot, and v.13 to the Dei. code. But the above interpretation seems preferable.

93) On the so-called 'canonical formula', with its ancient parallels in the A.N.E., see G.v.Rad, Deuteronomy, ad loc: In its Dei. use, the phrase is not far from implying, "complete doctrine with binding force".
1. Individual sentences of the law described as נלוד

Dtn. 25:13 is a reference to the law of the tithe;

Dtn. 8:1 is connected, if somewhat loosely, to Dtn. 8:2, 6, already discussed under נלוד above, and therefore involves a reference to the sabbath-law.

Dtn. 31:5. The reference is clearly to the specific regulation of the ban.

2. The Deuteronomistic Code.

Dtn. 5:31; 6:1, as we have noted above, are based on Ex. 20:20-21, which introduces the B.O.C.; so that נלוד here properly refers to the deuteronomistic code, as the representative of the B.O.C. tradition. More hesitantly, we may interpret Dtn. 6:25; Dtn. 7:11 in the same way. Both are in contexts relating to the release from Egypt and to the covenant consequently given by Yahweh (Dtn. 7:9); so that the primary reference of נלוד would seem to be to the Sinai covenant-document, i.e. here, the deuteronomistic code.

3. The Hauptgebod as נלוד

Dtn. 11:8. The verse is resumed in Dtn. 11:13, where the series, "...obey, .... love .... serve ...." indicates that the reference is to the Hauptgebod rather than to the deuteronomistic code proper. So also with,

Dtn. 11:22: "...walk ..., love ..., cleave ....";

Dtn. 19:19: "...loving ...., walking ....".

4. The Whole Deuteronomistic Corpus as נלוד

Dtn. 15:15(95). The verse links with Dtn. 15:16, which constitutes an excerpt from the covenant-solemnisation formula of Dtn. 28. Therefore the נלוד referred to is most probably the total dic. corpus, conceived as the document of the Moab/Shechem covenant.

The fact that נלוד נלוד, here in apposition to נלוד, is repeated at Dtn. 11:32; 21:1, i.e. at the point of transition to the dic. code proper, confirms the impression.

Several commentators regard Dtn. 15:4-6 as a later insertion in the context. Cf. J. Hempel, Die Schichten, p. 226, note 2.
Dtn. 17:20. As the text now stands, דְּמָרָא here refers to the content of the נִהֲרָא in the charge of the Levitical priests, i.e. the total doc. corpus.

(If however, as seems likely, vv. 18-19 are a later interpolation into the context\textsuperscript{96}) the original reference of הנִהֲרָא will have been rather to the Hauptgebot, — Compare v. 17, with its fear that the foreign wives will turn away the king's heart from exclusive loyalty to Yahweh, and lead him into apostasy.)

Dtn. 27:11\textsuperscript{(97)} The context concerns covenant-solemnisation, so the ref. is to the complete covenant document.

Dtn. 30:11 Ch. 30 is usually regarded as a later appendix to the covenant-solemnisation formula in ch. 28. The reference of הנִהֲרָא here, then, is to the total doc. corpus as a covenant document.

It would appear, then, that the use of הנִהֲרָא in the singular to signify the totality of Dtn., is a rather late development, (On the other hand נִהֲרָא (בַּיִהל) as a comprehensive term for Dtn. is firmly rooted in the earlier strands.) But the development of this comprehensive singular is not a radically new departure, for הנִהֲרָא has already been used for the Hauptgebot in the earlier strands. Hence it may be claimed that the unitary concept is implicit in the core of the Doc. corpus. It's concrete emergence correlates with the relatively formed concept of Dtn., as a fixed written entity.

The main role of the series, and of הנִהֲרָא in particular within those series, is to indicate the main structural lines of Deuteronomy. After the deuteronomistic introduction, Dtn. 1-3, a four-fold set of series, Dtn. 4:1-8, serves to introduce the first sermon on the theme of the Hauptgebot — a sermon whose message is the illegitimacy of visible images of Yahweh. This sermon is rounded off by the

\textsuperscript{96} Dtn. 17:18-19 as a later interpolation, see G. E. Wright, "Deuteronomy," The Interpreter's Bible 2, ad loc.

\textsuperscript{97} Dtn. 27:1 is a late editorial note. Dtn. 27 as a whole contains early material, the remains of the covenant-solemnisation ceremony at Shechem. But the edited version as it stands is a late insertion into the doc. corpus. G. v. Rad, Deuteronomy, p. 165; G. E. Wright, "Deuteronomy," I.e. 2, p. 483f.
series אֹּלֵּךְ מִּצְרַתְךָ אֶלְכִּי מַעֲלֵךְ (Dtn.4:40). After two short interpolations, Dtn.4:41-43 ; 4:44-49, (the latter with a double introduction: "ָּנָּאָו" and a series), the second sermon begins, introduced by בִּקְרָא נִקְרַת , (Dtn.5:1). The theme of this second sermon is Moses' mediatorship in the covenant. Again the section is closed by a series (5:32), and by the double use of the verb נַעֲמַת , (5:33).

Ch. 6 again opens with a double series 93), which forms the introduction to the doc. corpus proper. 99) Chs. 6-11(100) expound several interwoven themes:

a) Remember the goodness of the Lord, and teach your children about His salvation and His covenant (Dtn.6,8.);

b) The fertility of the land that Yahweh has promised his people (Dtn.6:10-13 ; Dtn.3:7-10);

c) The Canaanite inhabitants to be driven out, and their practices uncompromisingly rejected (Dtn.7);

d) Israel must beware of becoming stubborn in face of the Lord's grace and command (Dtn.9,10).

93) The prevalence of double openings seems to suggest that the sections were originally more or less self-contained units with their own openings and conclusions. Then, on their incorporation into the larger whole, further small series etc. were used as sutures. This explains, too, the peculiar double-sidedness that marks so much of the paraenetic material (e.g. 7:11 ; 8:1 ; 11:8, etc.), which on the one hand gives a sense of preparation for the proclamation of the law, while on the other hand assuming that the laws are already known, i.e., already proclaimed. This is undoubtedly due to the nature of Dtn.5-11 in particular, as the end-deposit of preaching activity in which the doc. code has been repeatedly expounded.


100) Dtn.6:16-17 ; 6:20b, would seem from the sudden change in number, to indicate later insertions, designed to enhance the legal-hortatory effect. Similarly the change of number at Dtn.7:12 may indicate a suture in the material, implying that the series at Dtn.7:11 was once the hortatory conclusion to the preceding fragment.
In general these sections have been marked off by legal series, whose affect is to underline the paraenetic, sermonic, hortatory nature of the material:

Ch. 7 is preceded (6:24-5) and concluded (8:1) by such hortatory legal series; The transition from ch. 8 to ch. 9 lacks such a series, but serves the same purpose (see further below);

Dtn. 11 closes the warnings against stubbornness, and introduces a summary of the various matters treated in Chs. 6-10. The structure of Dtn. 11 is as follows:

vv. 1-7: Beware of stubbornness, - opened by an elaborate series;
vv. 8-12: The richness of the land, - opened by שמאי אתי כל-המשтяה אשר נכרי מתורא;
vv. 13-17: Loss of fertility will follow upon disobedience, - opened by a similar legal phrase;
vv. 18-21: Remember God's covenant-words, and teach them to the coming generation,
- no series, but the word דברי serves the same purpose;
vv. 22-25: Drive out the Canaanites, - opened by.SetActive
vv. 26-32: Climactic pericope describing the covenant-solemnisation, and building up to the same point as Dtn. 26:16-19 ; 27:1-9 ; 30:1-45 ; 30 ; 31.

The section 11:26-32 is marked by a double series:

Throughout the code proper, מרצות, מרצות, מרצות, מרצות occur in exhortations rather than in structure-signals; but there is a remarkable proliferation of both the noun and verb-forms in the chapters dealing with covenant-solemnisation (as Lohfink101 has noted), which emphasises that the whole block (4) 5-28,30 is to be viewed as a covenant document, and that this covenant is to be seen in terms of divine kingly-decree.

101) N. Lohfink, Das Hauntsgebot, p.55.
In general these sections have been marked off by legal series, whose effect is to underline the paraenetic, sermonic, hortatory nature of the material:—

Ch.7 is preceded (6:24-5) and concluded (8:1) by such hortatory legal series; The transition from ch.8 to ch.9 lacks such a series, but serves the same purpose (see further below);

Dtn.11:1 closes the warnings against stubbornness, and introduces a summary of the various matters treated in Chs. 6 - 10. The structure of Dtn.11 is as follows:—

vv.1-7: Beware of stubbornness, — opened by an elaborate series;
vv.8-12: The richness of the land, — opened by שומע עלי עלי צדו;
vv.13-17: Loss of fertility will follow upon disobedience, — opened by a similar legal phrase;
vv.18-21: Remember God's covenant-words, and teach them to the coming generation, — no series, but the word מִלְּאֹת serves the same purpose;
vv.22-25: Drive out the Canaanites, — opened by פָּרָה נַעֲרֵיהֶם;
vv.26-32: Climactic pericope describing the covenant-solemnisation, and building up to the same point as Dtn.26:16-19 ; 27:1-9 ; 23:1-45 ; 30 ; 31.

The section 11:26-32 is marked by a double series:
(ו.הנוזמ את כל היהודים של ופָּרָה נַעֲרֵיהֶם; v.31)
Throughout the code proper, מָצָא occurs in exhortations rather than in structure-signals; but there is a remarkable proliferation of both the noun and verb-forms in the chapters dealing with covenant-solemnisation (as Lohfink has noted), which emphasises that the whole block (4) 5-28,30 is to be viewed as a covenant document, and that this covenant is to be seen in terms of divine kingly-decree.

101) H. Lohfink, Das Haustrebot, p.55.
Ex. 24:12 "...I will give you the tables of stone which I have written for their instruction (הָלַוחַר).

Jud. 13:8 (106) "... let the man of God ..... teach us (לְלַעֲלָה) what we are to do with the boy that will be born".

The most concrete of these early usages, and therefore likely the most primitive, is in Ex.15:25, where the meaning 'show', 'point out', 'indicate', is the most suitable to the context. By what precise process the 'indication' was given, we are not told: presumably a heightening of Moses' perceptive capacities, akin to 'intuition' or 'illumination'. The thought of Ex.4:12 (15) is closely related to this:-- appropriate words (and actions) urge themselves upon Moses from a kind of inward prompting. Jud.13:8 Uses 'show' in the sense of 'advise', 'instruct', not yet in the formal sense of laying down regulations, but within a personalistic framework (The theophanic figure who is to give the 'instruction' is, as we saw earlier, the visible representative of Yahweh himself).

Ex.24:12. The reference to the written tables shows that the verbal, propositional element predominates here. The meaning 'instruction' is the most appropriate, but again in the personalistic sense, comparable to the guidance imparted by the parent to the child.

It is obvious, then that even these earliest verbal uses are already 'theologised'; but that the root meaning is to be sought in 'show', 'indicate'.

(106) For the origins of this passage, see p. 122f. above, and ch. one, note 185.
Gen.12:6 "Abraham passed through the land to the place at Shechem, to the oak of Moreh (עֵד מָקוֹם שְׁכָם עָלָיָם מָוֹרָה) 107"

Jud.7:1 "And the camp of Midian was north of them, by the hill of Moreh in the valley (לְבָנַת הָמוֹרָה בְּעֵמֶק).

The appositional structure of Gen.12:6 consciously equates מָקוֹם שְׁכָם with קַרְחַת מָוֹרָה indicating that קַרְחַת is being used in its technical sense of sacred place; and that the קְרָחַת מָוֹרָה had sacred significance. We have already noted the reverence accorded to springs, trees, etc., in patriarchal times, as the seats of the numinous or divine, and the consequent connection of these sacred places with the oracular. 2 Sam.5:22-25 affords an example of the way in which such sacred trees may have given 'indication' in earliest times. According to the text, when David enquired (וַיֹּאמֶר) of the Lord, he was told that the sound of marching in the tops of the balsam trees would indicate that Yahweh was already preceding the armies of Israel into battle against the Philistines. This account probably adapts and incorporates a primitive description of oracular guidance through the rustling of leaves. Thus probably in ancient times the balsam trees would have marked a sacred place at which 'directions' were given. The direct 'indication' by the numen of the tree or grove has now been elevated into a sign of the historical intervention of Yahweh.

107) Presumably it is the same 'oak' at Shechem which is referred to in Deut.11:29-30 - "You shall set the blessing on Mt. Gerizim, and the curse on Mt. Ebal .... over against Gilgal, beside the oak(s) of Moreh", M.T. reads the plural, מָוֹרָה.

108) We are not told where or how David enquired; - presumably not at the ark, for according to the present chronology of the narrative, the ark was still at Kirjath-Jearim, 2 Sam.6:2f. (This chronology is presumably correct, in that it was the victory of 2 Sam.5:25 which left the way open for the ark to be brought from under Philistine surveillance to David's new capital at Jerusalem). It may be, therefore, that the 'balsam trees' even in David's day marked the site of a shrine where oracles were delivered. If this was so, there was undoubtedly also a priest by this time, to mediate the oracle.
The palm-tree of Deborah between Bethel and Ramah (Jud. 4:4f) is another example of an 'oracular tree'; a primitive numen-shrine, taken up in the present text into Yahwism. It is interesting that Deborah is described as a prophetess (v.4), and that her utterances are termed ספenzeו (v.5). We are reminded of the similar combination in Ex. 18:13ff., where in the process of judging (ספנוז), the prophet-figure Moses receives those who enquire (נונכק) of Yahweh, and dispenses קואסי or נונכק in the name of Yahweh.

Summarising our results so far: in the most primitive records, indicates; a) approach to a divine presence for guidance, b) granting of guidance through outward sign or inner illumination, or through an oracular word delivered by the permanent custodian of the shrine. It would be fair to say that the primitive roots of what developed into the priestly, and of what developed into the prophetic strand of Israel's faith, are both visible here. We have already seen that there is a close connection between numinous-theophanic occurrences, and the founding of shrines. From this root develops on the one hand the vivid prophetic awareness of God-in-revelation (as, exemplified most dramatically in the prophetic call-experience); and on the other the institution of the priesthood, as guardians of the shrine's traditions. We shall see that the noun נכק too, develops in this two-fold way: expressing on the one hand the verbal content of living religious encounter, and on the other the verbal expression (oral or written) of the growing body of civic and cultic regulative traditions.

109) In view of the geographical proximity of the_place mentioned and the name Deborah (Rebecca's nurse), Gen. 35:3, some scholars are inclined to identify the two (cf. the note in V. Rad, Genesis, p.333). But while it is possible that Gen. 35:8 also represents the incroporation into Yahwism of a primitive tradition attaching to an oracular tree, it is safer to regard Jud. 4:4f and Gen. 35:8 as referring to two separate locations.
"The people come to me to enquire of God... and I decide between a man and his neighbour, and I make them know the statutes of God and his decisions, (הַקֵּֽעֲרִיָּ֖תָּהּ יְהוָֽהּ וּרְאֹתָ֖ם וּרְאוֹתָ֑ם)."

v. 20 "You shall represent the people before God, and you shall bring their cases to God; and you shall teach them the statutes and the decisions (משפטים-תורה תורה-תורה), and make them know the way in which they must walk, and what they must do."

The here are linked on the one hand with שָׂרָּה and מַדְּעָה, thus underlining the factor of personal communication from Yahweh, and on the other with סֵפֶּר thus introducing a more legislational aspect, or quality of fixity, to the material. We should also note here that the reference to the giving of תורה is complemented by the clause, "make them know the way in which they must walk." This addition is consonant with the root-meaning 'guidance', 'direction', which we have found to underly תורה and thus represents a 'spiritualising' of an original usage where תורה meant pointing the way in the concrete topographical sense. Added in this way, the clause serves to modify any notion of static fixity that might be imported into the term תורה by the juxtaposition of ספר.

Dtn. 33:8-11. "And of Levi he said, 'Give to Levi thy Tummin, and thy Urim to thy godly one ..... They shall teach Jacob thy ordinance, and Israel thy law (משה-תורה ותָּהֳ֑וָה לְיִשְׂרָאֵ֤ל); they shall put incense before thee, and whole burnt offering upon thine altar."

110) See references to this passage; pp. 344 and 353 above, and p. 386f.
As we have noted, Dtn.32-4 does not belong to Dtn. proper, but to the edited pentateuch. The material of Dtn.33:8-11 as a whole probably dates from the latter part of the period of the Judges, i.e. 11th Cent. B.C., but vv.8-10 seem to be either a revision of the primitive blessing, or an addition to it. When those adaptations were made is difficult to determine, but there are indications that they are comparatively early: Vv.9-10 ascribe three main functions to Levi:

- a. custody of the sacred lots,  
- b. teaching וזכור and חתניה to Israel,  
- c. offering incense and sacrifice.

The equating of יומין and חתניה (v.10) probably implies that they are to be regarded as the specific answers to the individual enquiries, while the collected corpus of these divine rulings is termed חתניה. This would suggest that the Tummim and Urim are here not merely symbolic of priestly office, as in the later Priestly writings, but that their function in the process of 'enquiry' is still living and meaningful. (Further, the order in which the functions of the priesthood are listed, suggests a comparatively early date - sacrifice has not yet assumed the predominant role.)

וּזֵכֶד and חָכְמָה in the 8th Cent. prophets.

ישעיהו 23:9 "whom will he teach knowledge (יִנְתַּה בְּיָעָה), and to whom will he explain the message?"

The context describes Isaiah’s indictment of profligate contemporary priests and prophets: Drunkenness causes the prophets to err in vision, and the priests to stumble in giving judgment (v.7). V.9-10 then represent the scoffing retort of these two groups: 'Does Isaiah take them for his kindergarten class, that he presumes to instruct them זִכְוַחְו וְזִכְו קֵר וְכֵר כָּל כְּו: -
i.e. with tedious and pinpricking repetition of the religious and moral
A.B.C.? As to the content of Isaiah's prophetic the reference
is probably to the central burden of his message - i.e. a summons to return
and to the cultivation of that
disposition to which is the ground of all righteous deeds. This
'indication of the right way' in free preaching, rather than some formal
instruction based on a decalogic catechism, constituted Isaiah's

Isaiah 28:26. "He is instructed aright, his god teaches him (רָמָה לְמַכֵּס אוֹלָהִים)
In accordance with the meaning reached for here (see note 50, ch.3.)
would imply understanding of the correct agricultural procedures and of
the underlying order of nature, imparted by the Creator either directly in the

111) For other possible interpretations of this phrase, see R.B.Y. Scott,
"Isaiah", I.B.5, p.316.
112) G. Ostborn, Torah in the O.T., p.137: "It is natural to assume that some
sort of instruction in 'law' took place in prophetic circles"; hence
the use of the term Torah.
form of an innate awareness, or indirectly through the weight of long-standing agricultural tradition.\(^{113}\)

\[\text{\scriptsize Isaiah 1:10} \]

"Hear the word of the Lord ( שביער רבד רבים ) you rulers of Sodom! Give ear to the teaching of our God (רהב חכמים) you people of Gomorrah!"

The parallelism implies that the here is a typical לָעָר here is a typical נַעֲרוֹ here is a typical נַעֲרוֹ i.e., the emphasis is on the central burden of the prophetic message.

\[^{113}\] Isaiah 2:3 and Is. 9:14(15) are probably post-Isaianic:

Is. 2:3: "Come let us go up to the mountain of the Lord ... that he may teach us his ways (IBLEE מִלְתָּנוּ) and that we may walk in his paths. For out of Zion shall go forth the law (מִלְתַּנוּ מִצְוָנוֹ) and the word of the Lord (parable יִלְלָו מִלְתַּנוּ) from Jerusalem. He shall judge among the nations (מַעֲלָה מִלְתַּנוּ)."

The exalted tone of the oracle indicates that what is hoped for is the personal presence of Yahweh in his temple, drawing all nations to himself. So the editor understood, when he juxtaposed v. 5, with its overtones of theophany and מַעֲלָה מִלְתַּנוּ . Thus the 'teaching', whether given through a human intermediary or not, is essentially regarded as personal guidance and direction from Yahweh himself. (Cf. the parallelism between מַעֲלָה מִלְתַּנוּ - without the article, andמַעֲלָה מִלְתַּנוּ).

The authenticity of the passage is questioned on the grounds that:

1) it occurs again at Micah 4:1-4;
2) it fits only imperfectly in both these contexts.

There are indications that it sat first in Isaiah, and only subsequently in Micah. Some scholars regard it as late Isaianic, but most believe it to be post-exilic.

Isaiah 9:14(15): "The elder and honoured man is the head, and the prophet who teaches lies (לָעָר מִלְתָּנוּ אֲשֶׁר) is the tail."

Is. 9:13-17 as a whole is Isaianic, but as R.B.Y. Scott concludes, "V.15 is almost certainly a later reader's mistaken comment on v. 14." It is nevertheless interesting to note that here too, מַעֲלָה is regarded as a prophetic function. מַעֲלָה implies preaching false hopes of safety, and inciting to apostasy; i.e., the concern is with the Hauptgebot, rather than with formulations drawn from a legal catechism.
"Bind up the testimony, seal the teaching among my disciples."

The text records Isaiah’s decision to withdraw from public proclamation of Yahweh’s word, after the rejection of his message concerning the Syro-Ephraimitic War (738-4 B.C.). Without the article implies ‘teaching’, ‘instruction’ in the ongoing sense, in contradistinction to a process of inculcating a fixed corpus of catechetical material. The content of the ‘teaching’, here again, is the principal burden of the prophet’s own message. This is confirmed by,

"To the teaching and to the testimony."

The force of the phrase is that authentic contact with the divine is to be had, not by recourse to the occult, but from the word of Yahweh declared through his prophets (cf. here Dtn. 18:9-18).

"For they are a rebellious people, lying sons, sons who will not hear the instruction of the Lord."

R.B.Y. Scott suggests that Isaiah 30:8ff. is the prologue to a book of oracles written to be laid up for the future, after the rulers had rejected the prophet’s advice against the Egyptian Alliance (cf. the previous withdrawal period after 734 B.C.). If this is so, then (v. 9)

---

114) The phrase is best taken as an imperative. R.B.Y. Scott, "Isaiah", I.B.5, p. 229, takes it as a marginal gloss, intended to show that v. 20b refers to (א) the testimony and teaching mentioned in v. 16. This seems unnecessary, however.

115) R.B.Y. Scott, "Isaiah", I.B.5, ad loc.
is, here too, the burden of Isaiah's preaching\textsuperscript{116}. But even if Isaiah 30:8-17 is an independent unit, rather than the prologue to a larger block of material, v. 15 makes clear that the \( מַלּוֹחַ \) referred to is the prophet's message of calm reliance on Yahweh in the midst of political crisis. V. 10, too, describes Israel's attempt to stifle the living voice of prophecy in the contemporary situation. (On the \( מַלּוֹחַ \) as 'way' (\( דּוֹרוֹת \)) and 'path' (\( מִינָה \)) - v. 11, see p. 373 (on Ex. 18:20), and note 132\textsuperscript{117}).

It is striking, then, that Isaiah uses \( מַלּוֹחַ \) and \( מַלּוֹחַ \) throughout, to refer to the content of the prophetic message, rather than to a fixed corpus of traditional sentences.

Hosea's use of the term \( מַלּוֹחַ \), has already been considered (see 'The provenance of deuteronomistic-sectarianism literature', p. 24f. above).

\textit{Micah 3:11}

"Its heads give judgment (\( יָדְפָע \)) for a bribe; its priests teach (\( לְכוּנָה \)) for hire, its prophets divine (\( לָמַדְתָּה \)) for money."

This is the first instance in which the handling of \( מַלּוֹחַ \) is specifically described as the characteristic function of the priests, over

\textsuperscript{116) The 'wisdom' colour of the passage does not militate against its prophetic origin or import.\textsuperscript{117) The following passages are probably late: - \textit{Is. 5:24b}: "For they have rejected the law of the Lord of hosts, and have despised the word (\( יַעֲכֹב \)) of the holy one of Israel." The authenticity of the verse is at least doubtful. R.B.Y.Scott comments: "If Isaiah, it is out of context" ("Isaiah", I.B.5, p.203). The parallelism with \( יַעֲכֹב \) would point to a more formal, legal meaning for \( יַעֲכֹב \); for \( יַעֲכֹב \) normally occurs in late poetical contexts, as the equivalent of \( יַעֲכֹב \) conceived as a body of legal sentences. \textit{Isaiah 24:15}: "... for they have transgressed the laws, violated the statutes, broken the everlasting covenant." R.B.Y.Scott, "Isaiah", I.B.5, p. 298: "The almost universal judgment of scholars is that all of chs.24-7 is post-exilic in date."
against the מְשִׁים of the prophets, and the מְשָׁמְרֵי of the rulers-judges.

The reference may be either: to cultic rulings (the priests expounding the sacrificial requirements to the individual worshipper in an accommodating sense, for a consideration); or to ethical instruction. The general tenor of Micah's message may be taken to support the second of these alternatives.

Jeremiah.

Handler does not occur in Jeremiah, but נוֹרֵךְ is an important concept for him.

Jer. 2:8: "The priests did not say 'where is the Lord?'. Those who handle
the law did not know me, (לָדִישֵׁי הַנּוֹרֵךְ לֵא אָדַרְבֵּנִי); The rulers
transgressed against me; the prophets prophesied by Baal ..."

נוֹרֵךְ (with the article) would seem to imply the fixed corpus of sentences - the more so if, as Östborn suggests, והנה here refers to a literal handling of the codex in book-form. Who these 'handlers' are, is not certain:

Jeremiah 2:8 is divided by the copula ....ו.....ו.....ו.....ו into four clauses, referring to: 'the priests' (נכבדי יפים), the 'handlers' (לדישי נוֹרֵךְ),
'the shepherds' (נכולי נוֹרֵךְ), and 'the prophets' (נכבדי יפים).

Insofar as we are dealing here with four identifiable and distinct classes of officials, the 'handlers of תָּרָא' can most naturally be equated with 'the wise' (Jer. 8:9, 8:19), or with the possibly related group of 'scholarly

---

118) The word מְשִׁים is no doubt intended to have a derogatory tone: the living voice of נוֹרֵךְ 'נורה has been replaced by mere 'oracle-
mongering.'

119) G. Östborn, תָּרָא in the O.T., p.141. The contention is supported by the fact that elsewhere in the O.T. literature, והנה is always used concretely: 'handle' (cf.Gen.4:21), or more normally, 'lay rough hands on', 'adze'.

120) J.P. Hyatt, "Jeremiah", J.B.S., p. 965: "By the time of Jeremiah, the 'wise' must have been recognised as a separate class of spiritual leaders."
levites' who, according to v. Rad, were emerging by this time. As we shall see, however, Jeremiah's use of the term tōrāh exhibits a flexibility which should warn us against defining the category of 'handlers of tōrāh' too rigidly or exclusively.

Jer. 6:19: "I am bringing evil upon this people, because they have not given heed to my words (כְּלֹהוֹל); and as for my law (תּוֹרָה) they have rejected it."

The injunction (v.16) to 'stand by the roads', 'ask for the ancient paths', 'the good way', takes up a motif which we have seen to be anciently connected with הנポイント 122 so that הנポイント here referred to is the body of traditional ethical guidance ascribed to Moses, though not necessarily confined to the contents of a fixed written code. V.17 goes on to describe the voice of contemporary prophecy in terms of the watchman's trumpet - a voice which, it is implied, is entirely consonant with the content of that traditional הנポイント. V.19 then juxtaposes רְבָּעָה (the prophetic word) and תּוֹרָה (the ancient path), on the obvious assumption that the two constitute complementary aspects of a single whole. It seems implicit in the context (cf. v.13) that on the whole, the mediation of the 'word' is the function of the prophet, whereas the handling of tōrāh is the more priestly function. But Israel's

---

121) G.v. Rad, Studies in Deuteronomy, p.67f, suggests that a scholarly class originated from dispossessed or redundant Levites, who had formerly served at the local shrines. Possibly there is a connection between these Levites, busy with the "scholarly preservation and transmission of the old traditions", and the 'wise men' who now begin to emerge as handlers of tōrāh.

122) See p. 378 above, on Isa.30:9f.

123) J.P. Nyatt, Op.Cit., p.863 states that הנポイント signifies for Jeremiah, "primarily the ethical law given in the time of Moses."

124) If not original to the context (cf. its repetition in Jer.3:10b-12), Jer.6:13-15 is nevertheless appropriate to the context of ch.6, accurately reflecting the two differing types of instruction referred to in vv.16 and 17. Its assumption that the one is 'priestly instruction' and the other 'prophetic' is therefore almost certainly valid.
neglect of dabhar and of töràh here form together the subject of a single oracular rebuke; thus emphasising that the developing deposit of divine direction (töràh) and the contemporary, situational word of direction (prophetic dabhar), together constitute the veritable and unitary declaration of Yahweh’s intention for His people.

Jer.8:8 “How can you say, ‘We are wise, and the law of the Lord is with us?’ But behold the false pen of the scribes has made it into a lie.”

The verse is a well-known crux interpretationis. The reiteration of וַיֹּאמֶר הָעָם: הִנֵּה וְהָבְנוּ נִבְעֵי חָמָס אֲבָנְרֹר (Jer.8:9a, and v.9b) seems to indicate that חָמָס means ‘instruction’, dispensed by (self-styled) ‘wise men’. But the content of the ‘instruction’ is in the sense of the fixed corpus of sentences. The ‘wisdom’ tone of the passage is enhanced by the juxtaposition of v.7 which is cast in typically ‘wisdom’ terms. Who the חָמָס are is, once again, not stated explicitly (but see below on Jer.18:18). The חָמָס are probably the promulgators of the Deuteronomistic code, and presumably related to the חָמָס.

Those commentators are probably right who see v.9b as Jeremiah’s protest against the effects which the promulgation of the Deuteronomistic code has had: By placing all types of law on a common level, and promulgating the whole as חָמָס, Dtn. is having the effect (opposite in fact to that intended) of dulling the people’s moral sensitivity to the חָמָס, which was the burden of the prophetic message. A certain smugness has been engendered:

125) G. Ostborn, תונא in the O.T., p.112f.

126) J. P. Hyatt, op. cit., ad loc., holds that there is no organic connection between Jer.3:17 and 8:8: they are merely linked by the fact that they treat of two legal terms, חָמָס and חָמָס.
the totality of the divine demand has been encompassed within this concrete deuteronomistic formulation, and placed within Israel's power of performance. (cf. Deut. 30:14: "... so that you can do it"). Thereby has been reduced to a power of performance (cf. Deut. 30:14: R9,94, so that you can do it"). Jeremiah's criticism of this 'biblicism' would therefore imply that in the prophet's own view, Yahweh's Torah was too dynamic and sovereign to be contained by this single definitive formulation.

Jer. 18:18: "Come, let us make plots against Jeremiah, for the law shall not perish from the priest (תורת שלם), nor counsel from the wise (יעצמ), nor the word from the prophet, (וOracle מוכים)".

Here a three-fold division of function among religious leaders is apparent. The absence of the article (תורת) implies instruction in the broader sense, rather than catechising on the basis of תורת הלתך. Hyatt suggests that this instruction was probably concerned with making the proper distinctions between the holy and the profane, the clean and the unclean (cf. Haggai 2:11) - "chiefly therefore with matters of the cult, and very little with ethical principles". This is an overstatement however. It is clear that the (later) Priestly school, whose work constitutes the developed deposit of this Torah-inculcation, were seriously concerned with ethical principles; and in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, it is natural to suppose that this concern was already important for the priestly guardians of Torah whom Jeremiah specifies here.

Jer. 31:31-34.129)

127) See J.P. Hyatt, op. cit., ad loc.

128) J.P. Hyatt, op. cit., ad loc.

129) The passage is generally accepted as authentic, though perhaps with some later recasting of the written form.
... I will make a new covenant ... I will put my law within them, and write it upon their hearts; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. ... They shall all know me ..."

"For Jeremiah the law was the moral law, perhaps primarily the ethical decalogue, certainly not the ceremonial prescriptions" (130). 'Writing on the heart' recalls the stone tables of the covenant, with the ethical decalogue as their content. But, as the whole concept of the new covenant makes plain, the concern is not merely to secure obedience to the sentences as such, but rather a deep apprehension of that ethical and moral עֲ֖בַדְנֵ֣ו which is the settled character of Yahweh Himself, and which is enshrined in the נְֽגַ֣שׁ which he gave to Israel for this very reason, viz., that the נְֽגַ֣שׁ עֲ֖בַדְנֵ֣ו might in turn be reflected in the character and bearing of His people. Thus here again the body of traditional teaching, and the living content of prophecy, are interwoven. For Jeremiah the two are obviously aspects of a single whole.

From these five passages generally recognised as Jeremianic (131), then, we

130) J.P. Hyatt, op.cit., p.1037.

131) The following passages are probably post-Jeremianic:

Jer. 9:13. Jer. 9:9-16 are probably an addition by a later editor, designed to explain the destruction of Jerusalem in 586, and the subsequent exile. Jer. 16:10-13, also seems to reflect the exile. נְֽגַ֣שׁ here refers primarily to the Hauptgebot, with its insistence on exclusive worship of Yahweh. Jer. 26:4. The passage as a whole is considered by Hyatt to be a reworking of older (Baruch?) material, but the sermon-summary in vv. 4-6 is probably Deuteronomic. (Hyatt, op.cit., p.1005) נְֽגַ֣שׁ here probably focuses on the prophetic word, as seems plain from the appositional clause, "if you will not listen to me, to walk in my law, to heed the words of my servants the prophets." Jer. 32:16-25. The passage is generally considered secondary - with the possible exception of vv. 24-25; the terminology and ideas are Deuteronomic. The context of Exodus-conquest-lawgiving, suggests that נְֽגַ֣שׁ here refers to the Decalogue as the successor of the ב.כ. Jer. 44:10; 44:23. The chapter is generally agreed to be secondary. The equation of נְֽגַ֣שׁ and מִשְׁרֹ֣פָה shows that נְֽגַ֣שׁ refers to the dec. code.
may reasonably conclude that for Jeremiah, tōrāh signified on the whole the
developing deposit of cultic and ethical guidance and instruction, which was
tending to be regarded as the priests' 'Vocational-knowledge', and for the
impartation of which the priests were specially responsible. Yet it is
plain that there was no rigid compartmentalisation of tōrāh, prophecy and
wisdom: all three represented complementary aspects of, and methods of
imparting, the self-consistent and mutually-coherent self-revelation(s) of
Yahweh. Within this overall concept of revelation, then, it is clear that
tōrāh for Jeremiah did not imply a static corpus of definitive teaching:
rather, tōrāh and the contemporary prophetic proclamation together constituted
a continuum; of which the dominant feature was its dynamic, existential
character.

Habakkuk.

Habakkuk 1:4: "For the law ( הָלְוָה ) is slackened, and justice ( כָּחַ֣ד )
ever goes forth; for the wicked surround the righteous, so justice
( כָּחַ֣ד ) goes forth perverted".

In this context כָּחַ֣ד obviously means, 'right dealings between Israelite
and Israelite, based on the moral character ( כָּחַ֣ד ) of Yahweh, the God of
Israel'. The parallelism of הָלְוָה and כָּחַ֣ד then, indicates that הָלְוָה
stands for that wholesome 'instruction' or 'guidance' given by Yahweh
(pro-eminently through the prophets), whereby human life may be ordered
aright. The root הָלְעָה (perverted) elsewhere signifies the narrow winding
road as against the broad, straight highway\(^{132}\) which again relates to the
concept of הָלְוָה as 'indication' of the right road.

Hab.2:19: "Woe to him who says .... to a dumb stone, 'Arise'. Can this

\(^{132}\) Cf. Jud.5:6 ; Ps.125:5.
This last phrase is best taken as a scornful question\(^{133}\) 'Can a stone give tōrāh?' Vv.19b-20 make it plain that the would-be worshipper is in search of a personal encounter with deity. In tone, the passage is close to the early accounts (or traces) of numinous-theophanic encounter at oracular shrines. Therefore נָהַל here means virtually, 'direct oracular response from the deity'. We have seen that the roots of later prophetic and priestly function intertwine in this primitive stratum of thought; and the context in Hab.2 makes it clear that Habakkuk's use of נָהַל in this way is coloured by his own prophetic experience of direct contact with Yahweh in the inspiration of his message.

Zephaniah.

Zeph.3:4. "Her prophets are wanton, faithless men: her priests profane what is sacred, they do violence to the law (נְאָדַר נִשְׁמָתָו). The Lord within her is righteous .... Every morning he shows forth his justice (נְאָדַר נִשְׁמָתָו)." The charge against the priests is that they manipulate and wrest to their own advantage the 'instruction' of which they are custodians, (cf. Micah 3:11). The contrast between the rapacity and corruption of the rulers (vv.3-4), and the אַשְׁרֵי and נָהַל of Yahweh (v.5), highlights the strongly ethical-moral tone of נָהַל in the context. It signifies (as in Hab.1:4) that righteousness which is at once the essence of the 'instruction', and its ideal end-product in the lives of those instructed.

Habakkuk and Zephaniah, then, use the term נָהַל in a sense broadly

\(^{133}\) Biblia Hebraica Kittel, 3, interprets the phrase as a gloss.
similar to that in Jeremiah.

Ezekiel.

Ezek.7:26: "They seek a vision from the prophet, but law (דְּרָשֶׁת) perishes from the priest, and counsel from the elders."

There is an implicit parallelism between the three clauses yielding a tripartite division of function similar to that in Jer.18:18. Similar, too, is the use of הִלָּחָה without the article, in the meaning 'instruction'.

Ezek.22:26: "Her priests have done violence to my law, and profaned my holy things".

The resemblance to Zeph.3:4 is striking, but the elaboration that follows imparts a new meaning: "they have made no difference between the holy and the common, nor taught the difference between the unclean and the clean..." There emerges here a concern for the minutiae of cultic regulations which is foreign to the tone of Zeph.3:4. And it is noteworthy that here for the first time the priestly תּוֹרָה is specifically defined in such terms (cf. Haggai 2:11).

The remaining occurrences in Ezekiel are almost certainly later than the strands of Deuteronomy which treat of הַלָּחָה, and so shed no new light on the subject of our enquiry.

ירוחם / הַלָּחָה in Deuteronomy.

It is against this background, then, that the use of ירוחם / הַלָּחָה in Dtn. is to be discussed.

Dtn.17:8-12. "If any case arises requiring decision (מֵעֵבֶד) ... any case

134) B.H.K., 3, suggests that the parallelism may be perfected by reading לָשָׁנָה for לָשָׁנָה. This seems dubious, however, as לָשָׁנָה is nowhere else in the O.T. literature used in the figurative sense required by this emendation.

135) Ezek.43:11-12 ; 44:5 ; 44:23-24. In so far as these texts differ from the Ezekiel passages already discussed, they approximate to the Priestly usage of the term הַלָּחָה.
which is too difficult for you, then you shall go ..... up to the place which
the Lord your God will choose, and coming to the Levitical priest and to the
judge ... you shall consult (דְּרָשׁוּה), and they shall declare to you the
decision (דִּבְרֵי הַלָּשׁוֹנָה). Then you shall do according to what they declare
to you ..... according to all that they direct you (יָדוֹלָה
), according to
the instructions (עֹלֶּה פֶּנָי הַלָּשׁוֹנָה אֶל הַדּוֹרֵל), and according to the
decision which they announce to you (הַלָּשׁוֹנָה אֶל הַדּוֹרֵל), you shall do. You
shall not turn aside, to the right hand or the left;"

It is obvious that the text is related to Ex.18:13-20 (already discussed above);
but that it has been revised in the interests of centralisation of the cult.
According to Ex.18:13ff., Moses (under the Jethro scheme) is to bring the
people's cases before God, then declare the divinely-in spired verdict in the
form of מָרָדְת and מַעֲרָדְת, while regional judges dispense מַעֲרָדְת at the
local level. In Dt.17:8-13 the regional judges (cf. Dt.16:18; 17:8) are
now supplemented with a single head-מַעֲרָדְת who is henceforth to remain at the
central shrine, presumably in charge of the weightier matters requiring civil-
decision (מַעֲרָדְת). The cultic and sacrificial aspects of Moses' jurisdiction,
however, now fall to the Levitical-priests (v.9a) or priest (v.12). It is
presumably to these priests that the functions connected with מַעֲרָדְת are
ascribed, (vv.10b, 11a). The מַעֲרָדְת thus dispensed are obviously the
sacrificial counterpart of the civil מַעֲרָדְת delivered by the judge; - i.e.
questions of a cultic order which are not made sufficiently clear either in
the written codes, or in the commonly available oral tradition, and which must
therefore be answered from the body of oral lore which constitutes the priests'
vocational-knowledge.

It is interesting that in Ex.18:13ff, the priest-like Moses must bring
the cases to God (v.19b), and receive an appropriate נורא from God (v.16b) – perhaps the process includes both recourse to the oracular, and the exercise of Moses' prophetic intuition. In Dtn. 17:8-13, however, there is no mention of this: נַעֲרִי (v.9b) implies man-to-man enquiry, not man-to-God. Apart from the fact that the oracular had been demoted by this time, and its mention therefore to be avoided, it would seem that a sufficient body of priestly תּוֹרָה had accumulated, adequate for all eventualities. The living voice now came through the prophetic dabhar; the priestly תּוֹרָה, as here, was concerned with the accumulated priestly traditions. 136)

Dtn.24:8. (137) "Take heed in an attack of leprosy, to be very careful to do all that the Levitical priests direct you (נַעֲרִי): as I commanded them, so shall you be careful to do."

The נַעֲרִי referred to here is a specific directive concerning a specific case of sickness; thus the usage is similar to that just discussed. Note here the emphasis that the leprosy-נַעֲרִי was (initially) a direct divine command to the priesthood, rather than an indirect excerpt from the mass of tradition. No such command is in fact preserved either in JE, or in Dtn., but is fully treated in Lev.13-14 (P). Either this נַעֲרִי had remained in oral form until P., or has been eliminated from JE, during redactional processes.

136) Whether this vocational-knowledge was in any part committed to writing at this stage is difficult to say. Cf. the suggestion by J. Weingreen, "Oral Torah and Written Records", Holy Book and Holy Tradition, ed. F.F. Bruce and G. Rupp, p.56f., that perhaps in pre-exilic times teachers of תּוֹרָה were already making notes for purely private and personal use, as tools for the preparation and delivery of their oral תּוֹרָה.

137) Dtn.24:8 is probably a later insert into its present context: it fits imperfectly; it is couched in the 2nd p.pl.; it includes direct divine address. Cf. v.Rad, Deuteronomy, p.151.
...statutes and ordinances so righteous as all this law (הכלי התורה) which I set before you this day."

According to V. Rad, 139 Dtn. 4:1-4; 4:5-8 form two hortatory formulae which look back on a promulgation of the law already completed. The passages may therefore have originated as liturgical formulae in connection with a ceremony of covenant-renewal. But assuming that the law so promulgated was the deuteronomic code, then Dtn. 4:1-3 in its present position at least, is later than Dtn. (5)6-25,28, and probably also later than Dtn. 4:9-40 (139). The equation of נָהּמָרָוּ and מְלַשׁנָה, and also the use of the article, make it plain that the reference is to the whole body of Dtn. which follows.

Dtn. 4:44. "This is the law (הכלי התורה) which Moses set before the children of Israel."

Here again, Dtn. 4:44 and 4:45-9 constitute two headings, referring to the whole deuteronomic corpus which follows them. The juxtaposition of these two headings equates "הכלי התורה (with the article) with נָהּמָרָוּ thus showing that נָהּמָרָוּ is a comprehensive term embracing the sum-total of the deuteronomic provisions.

In neither of these sections of ch. 4, however, does נָהּמָרָוּ specifically imply a written code. Indeed the fiction of Moses' address is strongest at this point, and consequently places the stress on oral proclamation and recitation.

139) V. Rad, Deuteronomy, p.49.

139) Some scholars find indications in Dtn. 4:27ff. that the passage is exilic: So A. Weiser, Introduction to the O.T. Others are more cautious: G.E. Wright, "Deuteronomy", J.B.2, ad. loc. Cf. A.C. Welch, Framework of the code, p.42, comes to the opposite conclusion: "the author is unacquainted with the actual conditions of the exile." The evidence is insufficient to support firm conclusions either way.
Dtn. 17:18-19: "...He shall write for himself in a book a copy of this law (תורה) from that which is in the charge of the Levitical priests, ....... that he may learn to fear the Lord by keeping all the words of the law and these statutes, and doing them (כל-דברי תורתו阪את התורהמצה)."

V. Rad (140) suspects that Dtn. 17:18-19 may be a later addition, on the grounds that the concept of תורתה as a book occurs elsewhere only in the later strands, or in the appendices to Dtn. proper. G. E. Wright (141) concurs, though with hesitation.

Dtn. 27:3-8: "...you shall set up large stones and plaster them with plaster; and you shall write upon them all the words of this law (כל-דברי תורתה阪את).

"And you shall write upon the stones all the words of this law very plainly (כילה-דברי תורתה阪את)

According to V. Rad, (142) there is strong support for the suggestion that an early Shechem tradition of covenant-solemnisation lies behind Dtn. 27:1-8, 11-25 (143). (See above, ch. 2, 'Theophany and Covenant'). But the provisions of this covenant were presumably known simply as דברי בנים; the qualifying תורתה would then stem from the hand which inserted ch. 27 in the deuteronomistic corpus, i.e. at a comparatively late stage in the development of Dtn. According to this usage, תורתה signifies the totality of the covenant-terms inscribed on the Shechem-stones; and no doubt the editor intended it to be understood that this was the dic. code.

140) G. V. Rad, Deuteronomy, p.119.
141) G. E. Wright, op. cit., p.442.
142) G. V. Rad, Deuteronomy, p.165.
143) A detailed examination shows the text to be highly composite, and to include an interweaving of several different traditions. G. V. Rad, Deuteronomy, ad loc; J. Hempel, Die Schichten, p.84ff.
Dtn. 27:26

"Cursed be he who does not confirm the words of this law (ברל הַתָּורהָה הָיָה ) by doing them."

The reference of הַתָּורהָה is the same as that in Dtn. 27:3, 8. Dtn. 27:26 is probably a later hortatory addition \(^{144}\), added when the primitive decalogue was expanded to a dodecalogue.

Dtn. 28:58

"... if you are not careful to do all the words of the law which are written in this book (כָּל הַבְּרֵי הַתָּורהָה הָיָה ) ."

The context of covenant-solemnisation shows that כל הַבְּרֵי הַתָּורהָה refers to the entire deuteronomistic code, conceived as the stipulations of the covenant. As we noted in connection with Dtn. 27:3, 8, the ancient term for the stipulations (ברל ) has in the latest strata of Dtn. been qualified by the comprehensive singular הַתָּורהָה . The continuation הנַתְרֵי המֶסֶר בְּנֵי הָיוֹלֶּךְ marks the whole as "a very late stratum" \(^{145}\), in that Dtn. is now regarded as fixed in writing. Note that the concept of 'writing' is introduced here both abruptly and prematurely; it is only in Dtn. 31:9 that the narrative reaches the point where Moses sets down the spoken material in writing. Driver \(^{146}\) remarks, "The expression ... betrays the fact that Deuteronomy was from the first a written book."

Scholars have long recognised that Dtn. 28 contains much secondary expansion, and it seems certain that 28:58-68 at least, belong to this category.

\(^{144}\) v.Rad, Deuteronomy, p. 167.
\(^{145}\) v.Rad, Deuteronomy, p. 165f.
\(^{146}\) S.R.Driver, Deuteronomy, p. 316.
Dtn. 23:61. "...... every sickness also which is not recorded in the book of this law (אָכַל לָא כֵּתְבָּב בְּמֶפֶר הַתּוֹרָה הוֹדָאָה).

The wording implies that certain sicknesses and afflictions are described in the book of the law. The reference may be to the paraenxeses in general, - Dtn. 4:25-31; 6:10-17; 7:3-4; 8:19-20; 9:6-19; 11:16-17; 11:26-23; or to the curses of the covenant-solemnisation in particular. In any case, in this context focuses attention on paraenesis, warning, etc., rather than on the actual sentences of the covenant-code.

Dtn. 29:20(21). "...... the Lord would single him out for calamity, according to all, the curses of the covenant written in this book of the law (כָּכֵל-אֲלַלוֹת), (הַבְּרִית הַמַּחְתָּב בְּמֶפֶר הַתּוֹרָה הוֹדָא).

It is now generally agreed that Dtn. 23:29 (29:1) constitutes a forward reference rather than a conclusion to the preceding covenant-code; i.e. that ch. 29 (and 30?) forms an originally separate liturgical framework, in which the proclamation of the covenant-code took place. That the code so proclaimed was in fact some form of Dtn. may be safely assumed.

It is noteworthy that throughout ch. 29, the characteristic term is 'covenant' rather than 'תּוֹרָה'; (v.19), (v.1); (v.12, 14); (v.20), (v.19), (v.19), (v.19) - in this last case מתור means 'covenant curse'. By contrast התור is mentioned only in Dtn. 29:20(21) and 29:28(29). In 29:20(21) התור is in fact quite incidental to the sense; the emphasis falls on הנבירה הכתובה בכסף הוהי.

147) Some scholars regard Dtn. 29-30 as a unit. Others, rightly I think, tend to link Dtn. 30 with Dtn. 23.

148) There are various suggestions as to the precise position in the text at which the proclamation is held to have taken place. G.E. Wright places it before v.1; Puukko, after v.9.
Thus has become a formalised, honorative term attached to without any regard for its root-meaning 'guidance' or 'direction'. This usage witnesses to the fact that a long history of 'torah' as 'fixed written corpus' already lies behind this text. Cf. V. Rad's verdict that this text belongs to 'the latest stratum'.

Dtn.29:28(29). "... but the things that are revealed belong to us and to our children for ever, that we may do all the words of this law (לעשות את-כל-דברי התורהodosa).

As in Dtn.23:58, here signifies the deuteronomistic code in its unity. Interesting is the implicit equation of חֹדוֹת הנְבֵלָה and חֹדוֹת הָנָבֵלָה. Our earlier discussion of חֹדוֹת הָנְבֵלָה showed that the term has its roots in the visual aspects of theophany (See 'theophany', p. 110 on Gen.35:1-3), whence it became increasingly adapted to the verbal concept of revelation (see 'theophany' p. 156, on Sam.3-4:1). We may claim that the equation noted here in Dtn.29:28(29) brings that process to its climax. Yet the personalistic emphasis which is essential to theophany never disappears from the usage of חֹדוֹת הָנְבֵלָה; so that even here, where חֹדוֹת הָנְבֵלָה has come to mean virtually 'Scripture', the words of the book remain the direct address of Yahweh.

Dtn.30:10. "... if you obey the voice of the Lord, ... to keep his commandments and his statutes, which are written in this book of the law, (מצותיו וchersחיטיו במשה התורה)."

Again as in Dtn.28:58, the emphasis is on the sentences of the Deic.Code, (מצותיו וchersחיטיו ), conceived as a definitive written corpus.

31:9-11. "And Moses wrote this law (תניא תודעה תוא רמאי), and gave it to the priests the sons of Levi who carried the ark of the covenant. 

... when all Israel comes to appear before the Lord, you shall read this law before all Israel in their hearing." (תניא תודעה תוא רמאי)."

V. Rad remarks that here we have the first beginnings of the canon, in that what was formerly carried in Moses' head is now set down in book form. We noted earlier that the abrupt introduction of the concept of writtenness in Dt 28:58 etc., betrays the hand of later editors, for it is only now that the narrative moves to the description of how the material was written down.

The Torah which Moses is said here to have written is probably regarded as comprising Dt 4-30. Whether this entire block was conceived as being read at the seven-yearly ceremony at the Feast of Booths, has been debated. But there is nothing inherently improbable in supposing that during the course of a seven-day festival, large blocks of material should have been read and expounded. (See further p. 283).

31:12. "... they that may hear, and learn to fear the Lord your God, and be careful to do all the words of this law (כל-דבורי תודעה תוא )".

The meaning of here is similar to that in vv. 9-11. It may be added that the context of the Feast of Booths emphasises both the joyful recalling of the events of the Heilageschichte, and the awesome renewing of the covenant-solenmnisation. The use of the term here is thus coloured by the context, so that it includes within its range of meaning both the narrative and exhortation that centres on the Heilageschichte, and the covenant-stipulations with their threatening sanctions.

150) G. V. Rad, Deuteronomy, p. 189.

151) G. V. Rad, Deuteronomy, pp. 18, 189.

Dtn. 31:24-26 "Then Moses had finished writing the words of this law in a
Book (לכתב את דבריו слова תורה וידאת) .... 'Take this book of the law
(/if you have) and put it by the side of the ark .... for a witness'".
The passage is a continuation of Dtn. 31:13, and therefore reflects the same
shades of meaning in its use of תורה as the passages just reviewed.
There is a strong stress on the fixity and definitiveness of this written
תורא, as may be seen from a comparison with Dtn. 10:1-5. This late passage
at once demythologises and elevates the ark, by describing it on the one hand
as a (more) container, while on the other hand enhancing the prestige of
the thing it contains: the stones contained in the ark were inscribed by
Yahweh Himself, with the very words which He had uttered during the theophany
on Horeb which formed the crux of Israel's history. And now, in Dtn. 31:26,
the deuteronomistic code in its written form is laid alongside the ark - which
is tantamount to saying that its contents are placed on a par with the 'words'
inscribed on the stone tables: Decalogue מִקְלֹה, והושמ הם, paraenesis,
Heilageschichte-narrative, solemnisation-formulae; all these are equally the
words of God, and together constitute His תורה.

It is clear, then, that those occurrences of תורה which belong to
the early deuteronomistic core, refer to the oral guidance and direction given
by the priests in cultic matters, on the basis of their vocational-knowledge.
It is only in the later strands of Dtn. that the stress on comprehensiveness,
writtenness, definitiveness of תורה emerges.

In the Deuteronomistic History,

Minette de Tillesse has made a comparison of the plural-sections of Dtn.
and Dtr., from the point of view of literary style and theological content;
and comes to the conclusion that the plural-sections are on the whole later strands of Deuteronomy, and are to be ascribed in general to Dtr. In particular, "le mot tôrah est employé avec prédilection par Dtr. et par les sections-Vous, pour désigner Dtr. D'autre part, nous ne trouvons aucune mention certaine de Tôrah en ce sens dans les sections-Tu. Il semble donc que la mention de la Tôrah trahisse la main de Dtr."152)

In broad outline, Minette's argumentation of his thesis carries conviction: Dtn. 17:18-20; 23:53,61; 30:10 may with a fair degree of probability be ascribed to Dtr., whilst the usages in Dtn. 27:3,8,26 and 29:20,23 may either represent the work of Dtr. or, more probably, of intermediate members of the Deuteronomic school, during the century and more that elapsed between the composition of Dtn. and Dtr. All the passages, however, imply the existence of a written, definitive Deuteronomic Code. The same concept obviously underlies Dtn.4:18,44,153) though here the fiction of the Mosaic speech precludes open reference to 'writtenness'. An identical assumption of 'definitive writtenness' also underlies the other references to tôrah in Dtr.: Josh. 1:7-8; 8:31,32,34; Josh.22:5 (the reference to writtenness here is not explicit); 23:6; 24:26; 1 Kings 2:3; 2 Kings 10:31 (cf. Dtn.17:18-20); 2 Kings 14:6; 2 Kings 17:13,34; 2 Kings 21:8 (implicit); 2 Kings 22:8,11; 2 Kings 23:24-5.

That the Deuteronomic History regards tôrah as a closed and definitive entity may be seen also from the way in which it subordinates the prophetic word to the written tôrah. Of the passages just cited, Josh.1, Josh.21, and

152) G. Minette de Tillessen, "Sections-‘Tu’ et sections-‘vous’ dans le Deuteronome", V.T.12,1962, p.49.

153) Noth, Üb.Stud., p.14, regards Dtn.4:1-40(41-43) as a 'besonders Stück', but holds that its affinities are with Dtr. rather than Dtn.
2 Kings 17 are of peculiar importance for assessing Dtr's theological viewpoint, for these three chapters are the free summarizing compositions of the historian himself, inserted in order to strengthen and highlight the framework of the whole, and its peculiar theological standpoint. As we have noted, the guiding principle of the history is 'obedience to the law of Moses'; significantly, then, 2 Kings 17 makes the prophetic word entirely subordinate to this 'Mosaic law'. The core of the chapter, vv.12-16, is obviously an elaboration of Dtn.18:15-22, but the copy goes further than the original. For Dtn.18:15ff. allows much more charismatic freedom to the succession of 'prophets-after-Moses', and does not yet imply that the Mosaic töräh is a definitive text which henceforward requires only commentary, not supplementation; whereas Dtr's emphasis virtually implies this concept of a closed töräh.

Before concluding our discussion of Deuteronomy as Töräh, one further term must be examined, i.e., לְעֹלָם.

לְעֹלָם in the early traditions.

We have already seen that לְעֹלָם is a basic term in the theophany tradition; describing in the first place the thunder of the Sinai-theophany, and thence also the revelational content with which the theophanic phenomena were pregnant; and in the cultic setting describing the sound of the trumpet which served as the liturgical re-presentation of the theophanic thunder.

A glance at the older pentateuchal traditions shows that from earliest times the concept of 'obedience' became related to the concept of שָׁמַע לְעֹלָם : שָׁמַע בְּקֵול לְעֹלָם easily passes over into 154) like מָזוּזָה זָאָד / מַשָּׁה, the

154) The English translation 'obey the voice' is accurate as far as it goes, but misses the shades of meaning conveyed by the Hebrew. לְעֹלָם seems to imply, 'effective hearing that issues in appropriate action'. It obviously has affinities with the concept of לְוָד as both word and deed, whereby the spoken לְוָד may actually inaugurate the action it describes.
phrase  שמע בקורת has a broad basis in ancient profane usage: it is normally used of the obedience due to one in high authority, e.g. Gen. 27:8, 13, 43; Ex. 18:19, 24. (The opposite case, in which the greater heeds the voice of the lesser, is an act of grace so unusual as to call for special note, e.g. 1 Sam. 8:7, 9, 22; 1 Sam. 12:1). It is therefore theoretically possible that even without the influence of theophany, this profane usage would have found its way into religious vocabulary, and been used to express the obedience which Israel owed toward the revealed will of Yahweh. Nevertheless, it is significant that from the beginning, the phrase שמע בקורת is intimately related both to the patriarchal-type theophany and to the Sinai-theophany:

Gen. 22:18 "By your descendants shall all the nations of the earth bless themselves, because you have obeyed my voice שמע בקורת." The phrase forms the conclusion to a passage whose theophanic overtones we have already traced. (See ch. one, p.108 on Gen. 22:1-18).

Gen. 26:5 "... because Abraham obeyed my voice שמע בקורת ..., and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws."

The words are spoken to Isaac during the course of a theophany, (Gen. 26:2ff.). Their purpose is to urge the need for obedience upon Isaac (see ch.1, p.100ff.), by citing the example of the way in which Abraham had responded to his theophanic call (see ch.1, p.72, on Gen. 12:1-3). Thus the passage has a double theophanic reference.

Ex. 3:18 "And they will hearken to your voice שמע בקורת, and you and the elders of Israel shall go ... and say, 'The God of the Hebrews has met with us'."

The promise, 'They will hearken to your voice' is given to Moses in theophany, and the context makes it clear that the elders are to regard Moses as their theophany-mediator. They themselves have shared in the theophany
which Moses their representative has experienced (וֹלֵךְ בְּקַלָּת אַלְיוֹן). Therefore obedience to Moses' voice as he relays the word received at the burning bush, is equivalent to obeying the Voice-in-theophany itself. Cf. Ex. 4:1: "They will not listen to my voice (רָאָה שָׁמַע בְּקָרָל), for they will say, 'The Lord did not appear to you!'"

Ex. 23:21-22 "Behold I send an angel before you.....Hearken to his voice (שָׁמַע בְּקָרָל), for my name is in him. But if you hearken attentively to his voice (אֵין שָׁמַע תַשְׁמִיע בְּקָרָל), and do all that I say...."

For this text, see p. 333 above.

Num. 14:22 "None of the men who have seen my glory and my signs ..... and have not hearkened to my voice (רָאָה שָׁמַע בְּקָרָל), shall see the land."

The theophanic reference here is perhaps not so direct as in the other cases, but the וֹלֵךְ בְּקַלָּת undoubtedly includes the theophanic phenomena at Sinai as well as the Exodus signs in Egypt, so that שלג בְּקָרָל in the context is related to the theophanic שלג.

As to the occurrence of the term שלג in the older Sinai tradition proper, we have already discussed the place of the covenant-document within the E-account, and we have noted the suggestion that originally the decalogue (which is now at Ex. 20:2-17) once constituted the מַלְמוֹרָל דַּנְדַנְד, but that with the insertion of the present 'Book of the Covenant' (Ex. 20:21-23:33) it was this latter block of material that became the מַלְמוֹרָל דַּנְדַנְד: The decalogue, displaced thereby from its original function, was inserted between Ex. 19:19 (Moses spoke, and the Lord answered him בְּקָרָל) and Ex. 20:18 ("Now when the people perceived the שלג and the lightnings and the שָׁמַע שלג ..... the people were afraid"155). However that may be, the decalogue in its

present context has plainly become the actual content of the מִרְכָּבָה which Moses and his people heard on the mount. Whether this apocalyptic content of the מִרְכָּבָה is regarded as being immediately comprehensible to the hearers, is uncertain. But the strong contrast between the people's shrinking fear at the sound of the מִרְכָּבָה on the one hand, and the intimacy with Yahweh displayed by Moses as the divine-human mediator on the other hand, implies that the voice was addressed primarily to Moses — מָשָׁה מְבֹרָךְ וּסְגַּלָּחָיו יְהוָה בָּרוּךְ.

Exodus 20:18-21 shows that Moses is aware of the significance of the theophany; hence he draws near, while the people on the contrary shrink back. It would therefore seem most likely that the content of the מִרְכָּבָה was incomprehensible to the people, but was apprehended by Moses from the first. In any case, these primal theophanic words were subsequently inscribed by God Himself, and handed to Moses as the perpetual witness of the covenant, (Ex.31:18b).  

156) That E. included a description of the decalogue inscribed on stone tables seems reasonably certain, — otherwise it is difficult to see whence the tradition in Dtn.5:22 ; 10:4-5 could have arisen. For it is improbable that the Deic school would have innovated on such a fundamental point. Thus the E. tradition exhibited a certain double-sidedness in its attitude to the decalogue, regarding it on the one hand as the content of the מִרְכָּבָה at the living moment of theophany, and on the other hand as the graven sentences on the stone tables.

Further, the same double-sidedness is evident in E's attitude to the בּוֹכֵר. On the one hand it is regarded as the content of the continuing theophany to which Moses is called in Ex.20:21-22a, and on the other hand it becomes the written covenant document (Ex.24:3-4a). Thus E. presents two documents, each representing the content of the theophanic מִרְכָּבָה and each constituting the permanent documentation of the covenant. This double-sided approach of the Elohist's forms the groundwork for Deuteronomy — a Book of the covenant laid up beside the ark (Dtn.31:26), and a stone-table-decalogue within the ark itself (Dtn.10:5); each of which represents the document of the covenant, and each of which records the content of the theophanic מִרְכָּבָה.
We have maintained that it was the Elohist who first incorporated the B.O.C. into his account, and set it in its present position. That being so, it was the Elohist also who made this clear connection between this theophanic \( \text{\textit{credible}} \) and the 'legal' sentences; thus beginning the process (climaxing in the work of Dtn.-Dtr.), whereby the whole legal corpus came to be regarded as the content of the \( \text{\textit{credible}} \) and thus effectively subsumed within the theophany. For the Elohist, the B.O.C. itself was also related, if rather more indirectly than the decalogue, to the theophany. For the code is seen as the elaboration and expansion of the decalogue (Ex.20:19, 22-23f ; Ex.24:3); and it is conceived as being given to Moses in the course of a continuing theophany (Ex.20:21-22). In Dtn. the integration is more complete.

The use of \( \text{\textit{credible}} \) by the Eighth-Cent. Prophets.

In the main, the emphasis is on the theophanic:

Isaiah 6:4,8. "... The posts of the door moved at the voice of him that called...." "I heard the voice of the Lord...."

We have already seen (see ch. one, p. 181f.) that the Sinai-theophany tradition has at several points influenced the account of Isaiah's call. This being so, it is probable that the use of \( \text{\textit{credible}} \) at the opening and conclusion of the narrative has at least theophanic overtones. The idea of obedience to the voice is implicit in Is.6:8; though in the prophetic, not the legislational sense.

Isaiah 30:30-31. "... the Lord will cause his majestic voice to be heard...."

Here Yahweh's intervention against the Assyrians is described in terms borrowed from that theophanic tradition which we have seen to stand related
intimately to the Sinai tradition proper. 157)

Similarly, Joel 2:11; Joel 3:16; Amos 1:2.

The use of יִמְלָל in Jeremiah.

The usages fall under the following heads:

1. יִמְלָל כְּפָרוֹנִי in reference to the הָעַצְמָפּוֹת:—
   Jer. 3:13 "...you rebelled against the Lord ... and scattered your favours among strangers ... and that you have not obeyed my voice, says the Lord."

   The text comprises a direct address of Yahweh (יהוה) to his people, in which Israel is indicted for her apostasy. Similarly, Jer. 9:12(13) 159; 22:21.

   Jer. 3:25 "We have not obeyed the voice..." — A confession of apostasy.

2. יִמְלָל כְּפָרוֹנִי in reference to the contents of the code.
   Jer. 7:23 "... but this command I gave them, 'Obey my voice, and I will be your God, and you shall be ...

   The principal reference of יִמְלָל כְּפָרוֹנִי here is to the ethical content of the legal code, as vv.5-10 show. But the context is a prophetic sermon, indicating that the stress is not on the ethical sentences as code, but rather as living command, proclaimed by the voice of contemporary prophecy.

   Similarly, Jer. 11:4,7 (159); Jer. 26:13 (160).

---

157) The only other examples in Isaiah (28:23; 32:9, יִמְלָל כְּפָרוֹנִי) are clearly imitative of the early wisdom tradition; so that יִמְלָל כְּפָרוֹנִי here probably stems from that primitive profane use of the phrase to which we referred earlier. The connection with theophanic usage is therefore only remote. Similarly Micah 6:9.

158) Jer. 9:13. The passage 9:12-16 is regarded as secondary.

159) Jer. 11:7, does not occur in the LXX, probably from accidental omission.

3. יובע 'םוי in direct reference to the word delivered by contemporary prophecy.

Jer. 6:17 "I set watchmen over you, saying, 'Give heed to the sound of the trumpet'...".

The prophets are described as watchmen (מגש המים) and the voice of their proclamation as רועש הבשן. Given Jeremiah's understanding of prophecy as a delivering of Yahweh's own message, it is justifiable to see in the לאיליל השורש not merely the voice of Jeremiah as a war-trumpet sounding the alarm in Yahweh's name (Jer. 4:19, 21), but the theophanic voice of Yahweh himself, uttered this time not for the destruction of Israel's enemies (cf. Isaiah 30:30-31), but for the overthrow of Israel herself.

Jer. 39:20. "Obey now the voice of the Lord in what I say to you".

Zedekiah is to heed Jeremiah's voice, for the advice he offers does not originate in his own thought-processes, but stems from his having stood in the counsels of Yahweh, and heard (or overheard) the divine voice enunciating Yahweh's purposes. This divine word Jeremiah now echoes; its authority is therefore the authority of Yahweh. Similarly,

Jer. 42:6. "we will obey the voice of the Lord to whom we are sending you."
Jer. 42:13. "... if you say, 'We will not remain...' disobeying the voice of the Lord" ;
Jer. 42:21. "... have not obeyed the voice of the Lord, in anything that He sent me."
Jer. 43:4,7 "... did not obey the voice of the Lord to remain in the land."
"... came into the land of Egypt, for they did not obey the voice of the Lord." (161)

Thus the Jeremianic use of הָלַע shows a move toward the equation of the content of הָלַע with the entire legal corpus; but this end is nowhere reached, in the strict formal sense. Even in the most proximate examples, the primary stress is on the prophetic proclamation, and only derivatively and secondarily on the ethical sentences as the content of that proclamation. Theophanic overtones are in evidence throughout.

The use of הָלַע in Deuteronomy.

Turning to Deuteronomy, we find that the interplay between the legal and the theophanic which is elsewhere (apart from the Elohistic Sinai tradition) somewhat incidental, is here consciously and deliberately worked out.

A survey reveals that the occurrences of הָלַע in Dtn. are most frequent in:

1. the descriptions of the theophany (Dtn. 4 and 5);
2. the descriptions of the covenant-solemnisation, (Dtn. 26-28, 30).

161) Jer. 42:13, 21; 43:4, 7, stand in contexts which betray secondary influences, but their use of הָלַע is similar to that in Jer. 42:6, and probably perpetuates a genuinely Jeremianic usage. The following late passages have a direct theophanic reference:
Jer. 10:11 = Jer. 51:16 "then he utters his voice, there is a tumult of waters in the heavens."
The passage is probably based on an exilic poem, with later expansions and glosses, reminiscent of 2-Isaiah, and Dtn. 4:23.
Jer. 25:30 "The Lord will roar from on high, and from His holy habitation utter His voice."
This passage is also probably secondary. It is imitative in style; influenced by apocalyptic; and has affinities with the later poetry.
I. **The theophany-descriptions**, as we have seen, depend on the Elohist Sinai-tradition. A comparison between E. and D. at this point reveals that a theologising process has been going on in the interval. Whereas the Elohist account is seriously concerned with the observable phenomena of the theophany, as rooted in the meteorological world, D's. interest can be seen to have shifted. יִלּוּ may be descriptive of the natural phenomenon, thunder, but the attention is now primarily upon the theological significance of the phenomenon. Here, as in other parts of Deuteronomy, the phrase יִלּוּ has become almost a terminus technicus for 'theophany'. And the phrase יִלּוּ gives the impression of stemming from a literature that has undergone more prolonged or thorough-going shaping in the cult than was the case with the Elohist account.

We have already noted that the Elohist deliberately inserted the decalogue between Ex. 19:19 and Ex. 20:18, thus establishing the decalogue as the content of the priyal יִלּוּ. A comparison of Ex. 19:17-19; 20:1-21 and Dt. 4:11-12(13); 5:4-29, indicates that Deuteronomy has sought to confirm and enhance this Elohist equation. In E. the narrative is simple and brief: the people, on hearing the יִלּוּ, are moved with fear, and request that Moses mediate for them, (Ex.20:18-19). In Dt. 5, however, the brief request is elaborated into a lengthy speech (vv. 24-27) in which the changes are rung on the relationship between יִלּוּ and יִרְאָה. The style is of course sermonic, and one gains the clear impression that the aim of this paraenetic preaching is to insist on the

162) The E. tradition itself is already substantially theologised, of course. Cf. the phrase יִרְאָה יִלּוּ which is associated with every reference to the theophanic יִלּוּ and which is obviously rooted in the cultic re-presentation of the theophany.
theophanic-origin of the whole Dtn. code. Part of that code, i.e. the
decalogue, has already been given in the hearing of the people, in circumstances
that unequivocally attest its divine origin; but the experience is so awesome
that the people beg Moses to mediate in the reception of the remainder of the
code. Their request, and the reverential motive behind it, is commended by
God; thus indicating that it is indeed God's purpose to mediate his law to
Israel through Moses, and at the same time confirming that the deuteronomic
code in its entirety is of theophanic origin, equally with the decalogue.

These emphases are, as we have seen, implicit in the E. account (cf. E's
placing of decalogue and B. of. relative to each other and to the theophany.)
But Dtn. is concerned to urge and impress the sublimity of Yahweh's Torah upon
the people in a time of decadence and of imminent disaster; hence what is
left implicit in E's straight-forward narrative, is here explicitly drawn out
and expounded.

Similarly Dtn. 4, which may best be described as a later appendix to Dtn.
5(164), represents a paraenetic expansion of Ex. 19:16-19. Whereas Ex. 19:16-19
is a simple and direct (if somewhat liturgically coloured) narration of the
Sinai-theophany tradition, Dtn. 4 is a sermon or pair of sermons, whose object

163) Note that whereas in the E. narrative, the content of the ḫĕḇ was
probably incomprehensible to the people at first, in Dtn. the decalogue
is immediately comprehensible, (Dtn. 4:36; 5:4; 5:24b, 26.) Having been
vouchsafed this one authentic experience of immediate revelation, the
people should henceforth receive on trust the words and commands conveyed
to them by their divinely-appointed mediators.

164) It is difficult to state the precise relationship between Dtn. 4 and Dtn. 5.
The fact that the core of Dtn. 4 depends on Ex. 19:16-19 would lend some
colour to the theory that Dtn. 4-5 as a whole depends on Ex. 19:16-20:21,
(with very substantial sermonising expansions in Dtn. 4.) Whatever the
precise explanation, the two chapters display an evident affinity in
thought and content.
is to relate the theophany to the necessity for obedience, a) to the Hauptgebot, and b) to the entire corpus of Yahweh's revealed will:

a) A deduction is made from the fact that the primal theophany was in terms of הָלַע without הָלַע וּמִית וּוֹסֵפָה viz. that the use of representational forms ( הָלַע וּמִית וּוֹסֵפָה ) in worship constitutes apostasy. And since all the known non-Yahwistic faiths did in fact make use of some visible representation of deity, this circumstance of the theophany (viz. 'voice' without 'form') becomes tantamount to an insistence on the exclusiveness of Yahweh's worship, i.e., an insistence on the Hauptgebot. Deoclension from this exclusive loyalty to Yahweh means annulment of the covenant, and exclusion from Yahweh's inheritance 165).

b) Deut. 4:13-14 These verses represent a digression from the strict line of thought running through Deut. 4:12-15; hence some have assumed a later interpolation. This however, is probably unnecessary. Important for our discussion is the fact that vv.13-14 in their present context equate the ten words of the decalogue with the content of the הָלַע וּמִית וּוֹסֵפָה and also place the 'statutes and ordinances' on a par with the decalogue, and within the orbit of the הָלַע וּמִית וּוֹסֵפָה (v.15). Thus the passage underlines the necessity for single-minded obedience to the totality of Yahweh's revealed will.

Deut. 4:32-40 These verses do not explicitly equate the deuteronomistic code (v.40) with the content of the הָלַע וּמִית וּוֹסֵפָה (v.36); but that such an equation is at least consonant with the thought of the passage is clear from Deut. 4:13-14

165) Cf. Deut. 4:21-24. If Moses the mediator was himself excluded on the grounds of his disobedience, let not Israel imagine that they will be immune from Yahweh's jealous wrath.
above. The passage stresses the uniqueness of Israel's awesome theophanic experience (the לְפִי from heaven, and the words from the midst of the fire on earth), and on this basis urges that the unique power and awesomeness of the theophany implies the unique power, being, and existence of the God who so revealed Himself (v.35). By all practical considerations, then, Yahweh and Yahweh alone is He with whom Israel has to do. (v.39) Therefore it is imperative to observe the totality of His revealed will (v.40—'His statutes and His commandments').

One further theophany-description requires to be dealt with here, i.e. Dtn.18:15-22. Whereas in Dtn.5 the word to be mediated is the נִשָּׁפֶת הָעֹלָה of the deuteronomistic code, here it is the prophetic word. This may include exposition of the ethical content of the code, but vv.20-22 make it plain that the emphasis is rather on the 'contemporaneous' and forward-looking element in prophecy. Moses, who, at the first decisive encounter with Yahweh, declared the content of the לְפִי in terms of covenant sentences, is to be succeeded by a whole chain of mediators, who will each declare in his contemporary situation (whether by command, promise, or threat) the bearing of that historically-grounded לְפִי upon the peculiar circumstances of his own day.

The question arises as to the relation of Dtn.18:15-22 (the mediation of living, prophetic דָּבָר) to Dtn.5:22-31 (the mediation of traditional, 'legal' תּוֹרָה). Were these two emphases contemporaneous within the Deuteronomistic school, or do they belong to successive strata? Several

166) G.E.Wright, "Deuteronomy", I.B.2, p.360: "Israelite monotheism cannot be interpreted here or elsewhere in terms of philosophical monism (cf.v.19). The thought is not that no other divine beings exist, but that Yahweh alone is sovereign Lord. There is no other Lord, no other power or authority in the universe, who rules the destinies of earth."
indications seem to favour the latter possibility, though it must be freely acknowledged that the question is still an open one.167)

167) The following evidence suggests that Dtn.18:9-22 is earlier than Dtn.5:22-33:—
1. In conciseness of style and in choice of terminology, Dtn.18:16 stands closer than Dtn.5:24ff, to the LXX account (Ex.20:13-19).
2. Dtn.5:28ff seems to represent an elaboration of Dtn.18:17.
3. There are no substantial grounds for holding that Dtn.18:15ff, at least in its essential core, is later than the body of the Dtn.code. But Dtn.5., on the other hand, may well be a later addition; for Dtn.6:1-4 indicates that the Dtn. corpus once began with Dtn.6.

We have already seen, however, that Dtn.5 is patently related to the E. tradition; so it is clear that the strata represented by Dtn.18:9-22 and by Dtn.5, are both of northern provenance.

As to the intention of the two passages; it is reasonable to suppose that, as Dtn.18:9-22 is concerned to root the prophetic word in the primitive Sinaitheophanico נַעַר, so Dtn.5:23-27 seeks to utilise the old E. tradition in order to trace the Levitical teaching back to the same theophanic נַעַר.

Now it is significant that it is the later strata of Dtn. which entrust the Dtn. code to the custody of the Levitical priests. It has usually been assumed (and no doubt correctly) that the stress on the functions and needs of the Levitical priests is closely connected with the centralisation of the cult; and further that this centralisation (in its present form of presentation) concerned Jerusalem, and therefore represents a later stratum of Dtn., (after the tradition moved South). But it seems clear that the Levitical priests as a scribal class had already begun to emerge long before this, while the Dtn. school was still working in the north, and that at a comparatively early stage, the Dtn. tradition began to be accommodated to the emergent teaching role of this class:—

1. There is an interesting similarity between Dtn.18:19 (sanctions against those who reject the prophetic word), and Dtn.17:12 (sanctions against those who reject the priestly word). Is the latter modelled on the former?
2. Many passages bear the marks of revision in the Levitical priestly interest:
   a) Dtn.17:1-13: The earlier half of the passage (vv.1-7) describes an administration of justice without Levites; whereas the latter part (vv.8-13) consists of a primitive stratum concerning the duties of the 'judges', to which additions have been made attributing similar functions to the Levites. Thus the overall impression gained from Dtn.17:1-13 is of originally non-Levitical material being revised in a Levitical interest.
   b) Dtn.17:18-20 is generally held to be a late addition.
c) Dt.13:1-8 gives the impression of having been added at a comparatively late date, in connection with the centralisation of the cult.

d) In the passage concerning the Holy War, Dt.20:1-9, the verses describing the role of the Levitical priest (vv.2-4) belong to the latest stratum (So V. Rad, Deuteronomy, ad loc.)

e) Similarly in Dt.21:1-9, the Levitical priests have been introduced (v.5) into a situation which seems originally to have concerned the elders alone.

We seem justified in concluding, then, that in the later phases of its sojourn in the north, the Dio. tradition, with its strong prophetic affinities, began to adapt increasingly to the emergence of the Levites in the role of guardians of the Sinai traditions.
It is noteworthy that Dtn.18:9-22 is deeply concerned with the Hauptgebot:

Resort to the occult is a peculiarly heinous form of apostasy, for it strikes at the very roots of Israel's faith, by seeking to by-pass the primal revelation-in-theophany, i.e., the ה'והי ל"ע which sounded at Sinai. The content of that ל"ע was expounded to the first generation of Israel by Yahweh Himself through the chosen mediator Moses; and Yahweh Himself has also provided the means for its continued elucidation from generation to generation; i.e. the transmitted tradition, and the living prophetic exposition of that tradition.

Divination, etc. set the Sinai revelation-in-theophany on one side, by professing to open up alternative possibilities for penetrating the mystery of the divine intention, and the divine will. This claim, and the practice based upon it, constitutes the ultimate apostasy.

2. The descriptions of the covenant-solemnisation.

The other main concentration of occurrences of ל"ע in Deuteronomy is within the descriptions of covenant-solemnisation:

**Dtn.26:17** "You have declared this day concerning the Lord that He is your God, and that you will walk in His ways, ....... His statutes, His commandments, and His ordinances, and will obey His voice; and the Lord has declared this day concerning you, that you are a people for His own possession".

The very length of the deuteronomical code, with its commandments, preaching, and exhortation obscures an important fact, viz. that this verse Dtn.26:17 is actually the logical continuation of Dtn.5:27:

**Dtn.5:27** "Hear all that the Lord our God will say"; cf. Dtn.26:17 "You have declared this day concerning the Lord, that He is your God".

**Dtn.5:27** "All that the Lord our God will speak ... we will hear and do";
cf. Dt. 26:17, "You have declared this day that you will ... obey His voice (יִשְׁמַע בקול)."

Therefore, since Dt. 5:27 is a description of the people's reaction to direct confrontation with the theophanic קֵול it is obvious that the term Кֵול in Dt. 26:17 has the same theophanic reference. But at the same time דברי here is equated with other legal terms in the series (דברי, מְצוּיָה, משפטים) so that the effect is to take up the whole of the intervening deuteronomistic code as the content of the קֵול heard on Sinai on the 'Day of assembly'.

Dt. 27:9b-10 "Keep silence and hear (הָעַשֵׁנָה) O Israel. This day you have become the people of the Lord your God. You shall therefore obey the voice of the Lord (דברי, בֹּקֶר וְלֹא) your God, keeping His commandments and His statutes which I command you this day."

G.E. Wright comments on these verses, "The words here spoken in Dt. 27:9b-10 sound liturgical, and probably belong with the fragment Dt. 26:16-19, perhaps form a continuation of it. As a result of the covenant ceremony, it is formally stated that the participants have become the people of Yahweh. This being so, קֵול will have the same theophanic reference here as in the passage just examined.

There is a solemnity about the phrase יִשְׁמַע בקול which is more than a simple call for attention; almost certainly the utterance of the phrase

will have coincided with a numinous-theophanic moment in the cultus *(169)*, in which it is emphasised that it is by virtue of Yahweh's self-manifestation that the covenant has been inaugurated and established. The niphal-form emphasizes that it is Yahweh who is the active initiator of the covenant, and Israel the recipients of His grace. That this solemn is immediately followed by *underlines the essential relationship between the theophanic and the covenant code.*

The same significance attaches to the occurrences of *throughout chs. 28 and 30.* Dtn.29:1,2,15,45,62 ; 30:2,8,10. Their reference in each case is to the blessings and curses consequent upon obedience/disobedience to the divine *The context of the covenant-solemnisation makes it plain that the total code is the content of the.*

**Dtn.30:19-20** This passage forms a moving climax to the section on covenant-solemnisation in which solemn adjuration and warm entreaty are interwoven. While the word *here doubtless includes the whole code, yet the emphasis lies on the Hauptgebot (...loving, ...obeying,...cleaving,...). This is of course in keeping with the exhortatory tone of this concluding sentence.*

The remaining occurrences of *i.e., in the intervening material between theophany-accounts and covenant-solemnisation, add little to the picture we have been sketching. Their use is in keeping with the pattern we have already found, though less directly and dramatically related to the theophanic :- Dtn.8:20 , 9:23 , 13,5,19 , 15:5 , 26:14.*

*169) Cf. the classical expression, 'favete linguis' = 'be propitious with your tongues', i.e. 'Do not profane or jeopardise the numinous moment by the utterance of mortal words. (See Lewis and Short, Latin Dictionary, favoe II A ). For the corresponding usage in the O.T., cf:- Job.4:16 ( ) Hab.2:20 ( ) Zechar.2:17(2:13) ( ) 2Sa.4:12 ( ) *
In the preceding section we have in fact already dealt with texts which are deuteronomistic rather than deuteronomic. The following may provide a useful summary review, in the light of this concept of 'deuteronomic corpus as content of the theophanic qūl', of the stages by which the book of Deuteronomy reached its present shape:-

1. Already in the Elohistic tradition the Book of the Covenant was effectively inserted into the framework of the Sinai theophany, as the content of the divine qūl. This pattern was reproduced in the earliest draft of the substantially complete Deuteronomy (Dtn.5:25,28), in which code and paraenesis were enclosed in a theophanic framework (Dtn.5:1-27 and 26:17-19), so as to present the entire deuteronomic code as the content of the theophany.

2. At a later stage this strong theophanic pattern was to a certain extent obscured by the provision of a 'new' framework for the code, i.e., Dtn.11:26-29 and 27:1-3,11-26. This 'new' framework laid the stress on the writing of the law, and on the solemn covenant sanctions; so that the numinous, theophanic element receded somewhat from the centre of attention.171

3. Later still Dtn. has (deliberately, it would seem) reinstated the original Sinai-theophany emphasis: Dtn.4 and Dtn.9:7ff. reiterate the awesomeness of that theophanic experience in which Israel heard the very פָּרוֹת הַשָּׁמַיִם (Dtn.4:12,30,33,36), and use it to impress upon Israel the necessity for absolute obedience to the word so awesomely revealed. The latter part of

170) i.e., an ancient text, adapted by the post-deuteronomic editor for this new purpose.

171) The theophanic element was undoubtedly important in the ancient Israelite cult at Shechem; but what concerns us here is the more formalistic use which the post-deuteronomic editor made of the ancient materials.
Dtn. 23, and Dtn. 30, are also probably from Dtr: (\text{קְרָאָבָן} \text{כַּפֹּרִים} : Dtn. 23:45, 62; 30:2, 3, 10, 20).

The difference between the first draft of Dtn. and the later Distic. version, is that Dtr. presents the \text{הַגִּיא} \text{פִּילָמָּה} as having been preserved in a written code (Dtn. 23:53, 61; 30:10-14) whereas in the first draft the fiction of Mosaic address was maintained.

This stress on the \text{קְרָאָבָן} was no doubt intended as a theological corrective: it aimed to correct what must have been to Dtr. the dangerously mythologised view of theophany that prevailed in the Jerusalem cult (cf. the strong Canaanite influences which we traced through the theophanic Psalms); and it did this by insisting on the intimate relation of theophany to \text{תּוֹרָה}. God appears in order to speak, i.e., to reveal His will for His people\footnote{172}, and the definitive setting forth of this will of God is in the written \text{תּוֹרָה}.

On the other hand, the stress is also designed to serve a pastoral need. The setting forth of the \text{תּוֹרָה} as the content of the divine \text{פִּילָמָּה} is intended to assure the exilic generations of Israel that even though the cult as they had known it in pre-exilic days, with its theophanic reassurance of Yahweh's saving presence, has ceased, yet nothing essential to their faith has in fact been lost. For the very content of Yahweh's \text{פִּילָמָּה} has been safely preserved in the written \text{תּוֹרָה}.

Thus in one sense Dtr. stands at the head of that development which eventually gave to Scripture its pre-eminent place in the religion of Judaism. But on the other hand, it is extremely important to underline the essential

\footnote{172} We saw in our survey of the J. patriarchal-narratives (ch. one, 'The Theophany Tradition'), that the Yahwist was already stressing the essential place of the Word of Yahweh in the patriarchal theophanies.
connection which Dtr. saw between töräh and theophany. It was first and foremost the theophanic element which prevented Dtr's stress on the 'legalising' and 'Scripturising' of töräh and covenant from producing a hard, quid pro quo legalism, according to which righteousness would consist in giving implicit obedience to a closed body of definitive moral and religious regulations. The theophanic emphasis ensured that the vital, personalistic essence of religion, permeated the written record.
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THE THEOPHANIC ELEMENT IN THE QUR'ân.

The Terms of the Enquiry.

All the available analogies from the field of religious consciousness in general, and the realm of prophetic consciousness in particular, would suggest that Muhammad's call was, on the one hand, sudden and dramatic, but that on the other hand, it did not come totally unsought, or as something alien to his previous interests and temperament. 1)

In seeking to determine the precise nature of this call experience, we must first and foremost examine the problem of the interrelatedness of "vision" and "book-consciousness" in Muhammad's experience. In the period prior to his call, he must already have been acquainted with, and attracted to, monotheism; for there is evidence to suggest that "among the Arabs of Muhammad's time there were many who believed that above the deities represented by the idols, there was a 'high god' or supreme deity, 2) Allâh (S.29:61, 63, 65). 3) Whatever the origins of this trend toward monotheism, it would certainly be furthered by the presence of Jews and Christians 4) in and around Arabia.

1) That the hadîth purporting to describe Muhammad's call are not historically reliable as they stand, (R. Bell, "Mohammed's Call", M.W. 2k, 1934, pp.13-19; and Introduction, pp.21, 105) is reasonably certain. This is not to deny, however, that they reflect a basic core of fact, i.e. that Muhammad, prior to his call, was marked by religious earnestness, and (perhaps) was given to meditation.

2) W.K. Watt, Bell's Introduction, p.116f.

3) For the sake of convenience, Qur'ânic references are cited throughout according to the numbering in Bell's Translation.

4) R. Bell, The Origin of Islam in its Christian Environment, pp.16f., argues that it was a question of Christian communities on the borders of Arabia, rather than of a native Arabian Christianity. J.C. Archer, Mystical Elements in Mohammed, pp.61f., stresses the influence of Christian hermits, of whom Muhammad would become aware in the course of his trading activities, in the period prior to his call. Similarly, he would be in contact with Jews in the trading towns in and around Arabia.
Hence the possibility presents itself that early in his thought on the matter, "bookness" and "monotheism" came to be seen as closely related concepts. (cf. the native religion in Mecca, which, for all its belief in a supreme "high god", compromised strict monotheism by associating subordinate deities with Allāh; and which, significantly here, was without a sacred scripture).

Whatever the details of his earlier religious background, however, the decisive factor moving Muḥammad to the conviction that he himself was personally commissioned to be a messenger of monotheism, was his distinctive call experience. There are two main possibilities as to the "cause" and nature of this call experience:-

1. He may have been so fascinated by this phenomenon of "monotheism enshrined in a Book", and have so coveted an access to this closed source of religious knowledge, that his mind and spirit were conditioned by these desires, until finally he heard the call addressed to him personally, "Arise! Recite!"

2. Conceivably it was not exclusively the concept of "the Book" that absorbed Muḥammad's attention; but rather, thoughts about the grandeur and awesomeness of the supreme deity so played upon his imagination, that in vision he saw Allāh and knew himself to be commissioned to a teaching, preaching, and warning ministry.

Of the two possibilities, the second is the more likely:

There is no mention of a written scroll in the inaugural vision (as parallels from the field of comparative religion would lead us to expect, had "Bookness" in fact been the focus of his attention). Further, Muḥammad's earliest preaching seems to have been preoccupied with the bounty and greatness of God, and with man's debt of gratitude to Him. It is consonant with this, then, that Muḥammad's call experience should have consisted in a vision of this God, included in which was a commission to summon men to gratitude and worship.

---

5) Ezekiel 2:3 -3:3 : Revelation 10:8-11 : and cf. also the modern examples cited by J. Lindblom, Prophecy in Ancient Israel, pp.15f,18,23.
The Development from Free Proclamation to Written Deliverance.

Probably in the period following his call, Muhammad was concerned mainly with "proclamation" and "warning"; seeing himself in the line of Shu‘aib, Salih, Noah, etc. As a result of this preaching ministry, the beginnings of a congregation emerged, as the first followers attached themselves to Muhammad; and in this early community the practice soon arose of repeating at least the most exalted of the prophet's utterances in set forms, on the pattern of the Christian and Jewish liturgical use of Biblical lections. (The probable derivation of "qur‘ān" is from the Syriac Christian term "qeryānā" = "reading". These "qur‘āns" gradually became collated into larger blocks of material, which in turn coalesced into a unity. In dialogue and controversy with the People of the Book, the concept of "Qur‘ān" hardened into that of "Kitāb".

The truth of this thesis as to the general line of development in Muhammad's attitude to Book-revelation is borne out by an examination of the characteristic Arabic terms employed throughout the revelation period; viz. dhikr, āya, and baytīna.

Usages of the root dhkr. 8)

It is significant that only rarely is dhkr used in a technical sense, with specific reference to the Qur‘ān as a scripture, or to the Book. (Examples of these exceptional usages:--

Noun-form: 3.16:45; 21:7 - "ahl a dh-dhikr" as a term for the "people of the Book" ; 9)

6) R. Bell, "Muhammad and Previous Messengers", M.E.24, 1934, points out that the accounts of these previous messengers' ministries, as given in the Qur‘ān, reflect Muhammad's own early experiences of opposition and rejection.

7) W. W. Watt, Bell's Introduction, pp.136f.

8) For the wide semantic range of the root dhkr, see W.W.Watt, Bell's Introduction, p.27.

9) 3.81:11,13 - "No, but it is a reminder (tadhkira) in pages honoured", verges on this technical usage.
Verb-form: S.50:45 - "fadhakkir bi-l-qur'ān";
S.3:5 - "He hath sent down to thee the Book ... but no one takes warning (yādakkaru) but those of insight". Cf. here also; 87:10, 38:28, 17:43, 25:52, 24:1.

Apart from these exceptional usages, the earliest occurrences of ḥakr refer not to the recitation of the Qur'ān, or a scripture, but to the urgent, free-formulated preaching and entreaty, addressed by Muḥammad and his predecessors to their reluctant and sceptical peoples.

**ie. Meccan uses of the noun-form:**

The following usages of the noun-form are typical for the Meccan period:

7:61 - "Does it astonish you that a reminder from your Lord should come to you upon a man from amongst yourselves, in order that he may warn you...?"

Here the preacher is Noah (as also in 10:72) 10. Similar reminders are delivered by Hūd (7:67), ʿAṣūl (54:25), and Moses (20:44). (It is noteworthy that neither Noah, Hūd nor ʿAṣūl are considered to have received a scripture, and Moses' warning ministry in 20:44 is to Pharaoh, i.e. before Moses received the Tūrāh.)

All the former towns have in fact been sent a messenger, before their judgment befell them:

26:209 - "We destroyed not any town without its having warners, a reminder, and We have not been wrong-doers."

Muḥammad stands within this line of 'reminders':

21:24 - "Say, 'Bring your proof' (of the existence of Gods besides Allah)!
'This is the reminder (given) to those who are with me, and to those before me'"

Initially he is charged with a reminder to the men of Mecca:

74:50 - "What is the matter with them that they from the reminder turn away as if they were startled asses fleeing from a lion?"


But ultimately, Muḥammad's reminder is for "the world": 12:104; 80:27; 33:87.
On the day of judgement, the supreme indictment will be that men rejected the reminder which came to them:

18:100f - "On that day we shall set Gehenna for the unbelievers in array, whose eyes have been blindfolded from the remembrance (chikr) of Me". Cf. also 20:123; 23:112; 37:3. 11)

b. Early usages of the verb-form, follow the same pattern:

6:80f - "(Recall) when Abraham said, "Do ye dispute with me in regard to Allah ....... I fear not what ye associate with Him ........ will ye not then be reminded (tadadhakkārūn)?"


Muhammad's early ministry also consists of urgent pleading of a similar quality:

52:29 - "Warn, then! by the grace of thy Lord thou art neither soothsayer nor madman."

6:69 - "Remind thereby that a person is laid in pledge by what he has piled up, ...."


2. The Late Meccan and Early Medinan Period.

The term now begins to be used more of the Qur'ān (or former scripture) than of the free exhortation; yet even here the stress is on the exhortatory content of the material rather than on its Qur'ānic (or codex) form. In the following examples, the 'Qur'ānic' emphasis is still indirect and implicit.

a. The Noun-forms:

87:6,9 - "We shall cause thee to recite, without forgetting... and We shall make it very easy for thee. So remind, if the Reminder profits."

10) Here the word for "reminder" is tādhkīr.

11) The reference here may be to the angels who on the day of judgment reiterate the warnings previously delivered by the prophets.
Similarly, 15:6,9 - "They have said, 'O thou upon whom the reminder has been sent down, thou art possessed,' ..... It is We who have sent down the reminder, and We, verily, shall look after it."


In the following, however, the Qur'anic or 'scriptural' reference is explicit:

40:56 describes the Mosaic Torah as a reminder:-

"We gave Moses the guidance, and caused the children of Israel to inherit the Book, as a guidance and a reminder ....."

Muhammad, too, receives the reminder in fixed, settled form:-

54:17 - "We have made the Qur'an available for the Reminder". Cf. also 20:99,112; 21:105; 33:1; 43:14; 54:22,32,40; 57:15.

b. The verb-forms of the period follow the same pattern of usage:-

69:40ff - "It is the speech of a messenger honourable, not ... the speech of a soothsayer ..... little do ye let yourselves be reminded" 12

Cf. also 3:5; 6:153; 7:2; 14:5; 35:34; 39:12; 44:53; 45:22; 51:55; 69:42.

23:43 describes the Book given to Moses as a reminder:-

"We gave Moses the Book after We had destroyed the first generations .... a guidance and a mercy mayhap they might be reminded."

38:28, the Book as given to Muhammad is likewise a reminder:-

"(It is) a blessed Book which We have sent down to thee .... that there may be reminded those of intelligence."

3. Later Redactions.

Those passages where "shkr" and "Qur'an" are virtually equated, seem in general to be later recensions, in which earlier preaching material has been modified for inclusion in the Qur'an. Examples with the noun-form are as follows:-

41:41f is a clear example of this process:-

"Verily those who have disbelieved in the Reminder when it came to them ..... verily thy Lord yields ..... punishment painful."

And verily it is a Book sublime; Falsehood comes not to it ..... A revelation from One wise ....

12) The body of the passage is early, but the clause containing the verb tachakkarun is a later addition.
The specifically "Book" reference on the right, has clearly been inserted in the older material on the left. (See previous page) Cf. also 16:45-46 ; 21:7,10,51 ; 36:69 ; 38:7.

A similar trend can be traced in passages employing the verb-form:—

19:16,42,52,55,57 - "make mention in the Book..." This is clearly a structuring phrase, designed to draw what was originally freer, more exhortatory material, into an ordered literary unity.

50:45 is, similarly, a summarising formula:—

"Remind by the Qur'an whoever may fear my threat". Cf. also 17:43 ; 24:1.

The development traceable in the use of the term dhkr, then, would seem to indicate that much at least of the material originated in free preaching, and was only subsequently given the stamp of 'qur'anicity'.
B. **The usages of the Term Ḥya.**

A survey of the usages of the term Ḥya confirms the impression gained from the term dhkr.

1. **Ḥya in the Meccan Period.**

   In this early period, Ḥya most frequently indicates:—

   (a) An appeal to the order, beauty, and power of nature, as pointers to the divine creativity, love and might. The term\(^{13}\) occurs in the following contexts:

   - heaven and earth as signs: 6:1, 10:101, 12:105, (41:14);
   - light and darkness: 6:1;
   - Lightning and thunder: 13:13, 14;
   - day and night: 10:6, 68, 16:12, 17:13, 27:88, 36:37, 41:37-39, 45:34;
   - birds in flight: 16:81;
   - ships at sea: 10:23, 16:14, 31:30;
   - creation of man: (15:26), 16:4, (22:5);
   - sleep and death: 39:43.

   (b) Frequently, too, the reference is to extraordinary natural events (usually catastrophic), interpreted religiously as signs of divine intervention against a recalcitrant people:—

   - the two gardens over which the dam burst: 34:14;
   - the she-camel: 17:71, 11:67f;
   - the passage of the Red Sea: 10:92, 26:67, (44:32):

---

\(^{13}\) We confine ourselves here to a survey of the occurrences of the actual term Ḥya. As W.M. Watt notes, however (Bell's Introduction, p.122), there are a great number of passages which are similar in tone to those considered here, even though they do not contain the word Ḥya.
the overthrow of Sodom: 15:75.


general references to this-worldly judgment on scoffers: 20:123, 21:5, 32:26, 34:13.

(c) Once or twice, a theophany is referred to as a sign: 53:18, (17:1.)

(d) āya in the sense of 'miracle' occurs comparatively rarely in the Meccan period; and where they do occur, all the references are to the Mosaic 'signs' before Pharaoh: 17:103, 20:23, 27:12f, 43:46, 79:20.

It is evident that Muhammad felt the importance of miraculous attestation, (7:202), and expectantly awaited the granting of such to himself (10:21). But always closely associated with this hope is the awareness that the giving or withholding of miracles is the divine prerogative (6:37, 13:27, 38, 40:79), and that miracles are not in any case infallible in their power to convince the obdurate (17:61, 37:14, 45:34, 54:2).

(e) Verses which explicitly link āya with 'Scripture' (the givenness of the revelation) are still infrequent in the Meccan period:—i.Such references as do occur, most commonly indicate the recounting of former signs in the context of warning and preaching:—7:62, 70, 10:7, 15:81, 18:54, 106, 20:126, 20:134, 21:77, 22:50, 23:107, 24:34, 45, 28:47, 34:42, 73:23, 90:19. ii. The recitation of older, formed narratives, as 'signs': 15:81 (men of al-Hijr);

12:7 (Joseph and his brethren);
13:8 (the men of the cave).

111. The recitation of matter newly suggested to Muhammad: 7:3, 34, 38, 49, 202, 19:74, 80.

1111. One or two passages imply that Scripture is itself the greatest 'sign', and that the advent of the Qur'ān obviates the need for further signs: 20:133 "Why does
does he not bring us a sign...? Has there not come to them ..... the former leaves?" 26:197 in effect makes the Tôrâh a 'sign' for the truth of the Qur'ân. And the repudiation of Muhammad's 'signs' (recitations?) as 'magic' (37:14, 54:2) may be a reference of his claim that the 'poetry' of the Qur'ânic verses was of a supernatural quality.

2. Na in the early Medinan period.

The same basic categories are found, though their relative importance has changed somewhat:-

(a) Appeal to the order, beauty, and power of nature:-

creation of heaven and earth: 3:187, 6:97, 7:56, 13:2, 21:33,
ships on the sea: (31:31), 42:28, 31; 
Creation of man: 6:98, 30:27;

(b) Extraordinary natural events as 'signs':

destruction of Sodom: 15:77, 26:174, 29:34, 51:37;
houses destroyed: 27:53;
drowning of Noah's generation: 25:39, 26:121;
floods, locusts, lice; 7:129f.

In the general references to divine judgment on the disobedient, there is a shift towards the eschatological.

(c) The emphasis on 'straight' miracle increases; again almost exclusively concerned (2:68 is the sole exception) with the Mosaic 'signs':- 7:101,103f, 123, 132, 8:54,56, 10:74,76, 11:99, 14:5, 20:24,44,53, 23:47, 25:33, 26:14, 28:35,36, 40:24, 43:45f, 54:42.

Again (though perhaps less frequently) we meet the qualification that 'signs' are in Allâh's power (6:37,109, 26:3), and that mere signs are not infallible (7:129,143, 10:97, 30:53).
(d) The trend towards some sort of equation of 'sign' with 'scripture' is becoming more pronounced. Very often (as indeed in the examples already cited from the Mosaic period) there is a certain ambivalence in the use of the term, so that it is difficult to determine whether the primary reference is on 'sign' as a natural (or para-natural) phenomenon or on that phenomenon as utilised in 'scriptural' warning, entreaty, and recitation: 6:126, 7:33, 143f, 174, 16:106f, 23:60, 36:46, 39:63, 40:65, 45:5, 46:25. On the whole, however, the impression is that the message is no longer in free form, but fixed (and written).


ii. The recitation of older, formed narratives as 'signs': (10:72), 18:16;


iv. 'Sign' is increasingly equated with a specific verse or passage of scripture, i.e. either the former Scriptures or the Qur'ān:

the former scriptures as 'signs': 3:193, 7:144 (the Mosaic Tablets)
32:24 (the Torah)
the Qur'ān, or part thereof: 6:21, 46, 55, 65, 7:30, 16:103, 41:28;
the message is self-authentifying, and obviates the need for the more spectacular miracle-signs:

6:7f - "If we were to send down to thee a book written on parchment ... they would say, 'This is nothing but magic manifest'. They say 'Why has not an angel been sent down...?' But an angel would necessarily appear in the form of a man (messenger)."
3. **āya in the Later Medinan period (Year II onwards):**

āya approximates more and more closely in meaning to 'scripture'.

(a) Appeal to the order, beauty, and power of nature has become rare: 2:159;

(b) Extraordinary natural events as signs:

- destruction of former towns: 11:105;
- the events of the battle of Badr: 3:11;
- promised spoils from battle: 48:20;
- resuscitation of a man dead 100 years: 2:261;
- Zachariah dumb for three days: 3:36, 19:11;
- Unspecified natural disaster: 2:268, 6:159;
- Israel's Exodus from Egypt: 14:5.

(c) 'Straight' miracles are still stressed, though interestingly, mention of
the Mosaic 'signs' is now studiously avoided: (the only reference, 3:9, is indirect):

- the Ark and the Sākīna: 2:249;
- Jesus' creation of clay birds, healing, cleansing, raising the dead: 3:43;
- the Table from heaven: 5:114;
- Joseph's 'angelic' appearance: 12:35.

(d) Most of the references now equate āya with 'Scripture' in some form
(though there are still examples of the ambivalence noted above, in which it
is difficult to decide whether 'sign' denotes primarily 'phenomenon' or
'phenomenon as described in scripture': 2:112, 140).

---

14) For the evidence that the victory at Badr was regarded as a vindication
of Muhammad's prophethood, and of the truth of his revelation, see the
extended note on al-furqan, in Bell, Introduction to the Qur'an, pp.136ff.
Badr is the 'Day of the furqan' (S.8:42); and the furqan in turn is
associated with ideas of: - reception of Book-revelation (especially 3:2,
25:1), and election to be the people of Allah, based on forgiveness and
deliverance (especially S.8:29) - 2:50, 181, 21:49, reflect both these
aspects, of revelation and election.
1. Muhammad's preaching, with its warning content, as a 'sign': 3:96, 6:33, 39, 30:52, 58:6.

The preaching of earlier messengers as a 'sign': 4:154, 6:49, 54, 30:9.

Preaching as a 'sign' that will be determinative at the eschatological judgment: 4:59, 5:13, 88, 27:86.

2. The recitation of older, formed narratives as 'signs':

In 83:13, 68:15, and 8:31 those older narratives are scornfully rejected as 'old-world tales'. The former scriptures are also cited as signs: the Torah (2:38, 5:48, 9:19), and the 'Book and Wisdom' (2:123, 2:146, 3:158, 62:2).

3. 'Suggestions', both in the intimate process of their reception by Muhammad (2:253, 3:51, 104, 28:87), and in their public recitation (3:17, 63, 93, 114, 6:158, 18:55, 29:48, 45:7f.) are referred to as signs. And in some passages at least, the 'suggestions' are clearly being recited from an already-fixed body of material (whether written or oral is uncertain, and relatively unimportant): 3:96, 109, 5:79, 8:2, 33:34.

4. Āya is frequently equivalent to 'verse', passage of scripture, or scriptural injunction: 2:93, 183, 217, 221, 231, 3:5, 9:11, 66, 11:1, 22:16, 24:1, 57, 61, 33:34, 41:2, 44.

5. Finally, āya refers to the linguistic signs, the mysterious letters which constitute the hall-mark of a consciously formulated scripture 10:1, 12:1, 13:1, 15:1, 26:1, 27:1, 28:1, 31:1.

Summary:

In the Meccan period, the stress is thus on the 'signs' inherent in natural phenomena, straight miracle being relatively unimportant. (The ophary is tentatively put forward as constituting the great sign.) 'Sign' in the more 'scriptural' sense is concerned principally with exploiting the significance of these natural phenomena, for the purposes of warning and entreaty.
In the early Medinan period, increasing knowledge of the Jewish scriptures influenced the increasing prominence accorded to the straight miracles, i.e. the Mosaic 'signs'. Warning, and preaching are still important, though āya in the 'scriptural' sense is becoming more and more closely associated with the idea of writtenness.

In the later Medinan period, interest in natural phenomena as 'signs' has almost ceased, though the 'sign'-significance of historical events is still stressed. Concern with the Mosaic miracle-signs ceases abruptly, coincident with Muhammad's break with the Jews, and though a few other miracle-signs are introduced in their stead, yet the important trend is in the direction of the equation of āya with 'Verse of the Book'.

C. The Usages of the Term bayyina.

A process of development similar to that outlined for dhkr and āya, may be traced in the use of the term bayyina.

1. The Meccan period: bayyina is used with reference to:

   (a) Extraordinary historical events: 7:71;
   (b) Miracles: 11:56, 17:103;
   (d) The recitation of divine 'suggestions': 6:57, 11:30, 66, 90.
   (e) In 20:133, the reference is to a fixed corpus of (former) scriptures: "Has there not come to them the evidence of what is in the former Leaves?"

2. The early Medinan period: The trend is toward a greater approximation of 'evidence' and 'written scripture', though usages parallel to those listed above are still found:

   (a) Extraordinary historical events as evidences: 29:34, 40:36;
(b) The miracles—signs of Moses: 7:103, 20:75, 23:36, 29:38, 40:29


(e) The following passages are best interpreted as referring specifically to a scriptural corpus:— 3:181, 35:23, 38, 43:63, 57:25.

3. The later Medinan period: This trend toward the more specifically 'scriptural' meaning of bayyina is enhanced:

(a) Extraordinary historical events: 3:91, 4:152, 8:44 (probably denotes 'a divine decree determining historical events').

(b) No emphasis on miracles.

(c) The messengers' warning and preaching as evidence: 3:80, 30:46.


(e) Bayyina as specifically referring to a scriptural corpus:—

- the Qur'An: 2:205,
- the former scriptures: 2:154, 181, 209, 254,
- the Mosaic tables: 2:86, 4:152,
- the Torah: 2:154, 207f,
- the Injil: 2:81, 254.

15) Another interpretation is that this verse is a reference to the Mosaic Tables.

16) Another interpretation is that the reference is to divinely inspired warnings delivered by Moses.
It would seem clear, then, from these three word surveys (dhkr, ḥya, bāyyina) that Muḥammad's overpowering concern with 'scripture', 'bookness', is not something which appeared full-grown at the time of his call, but which developed over the years, and reached its full maturity about the Year II;III A.H.

D. The development of the concept of Qur'ān.

(a) The (relevant) occurrences of the verb qara'ā. The following references may safely be regarded as Meccan:— (10:94), 16:100, 17:47,106-107, 26:199, 96:1,3.

It is noteworthy that in all these cases the recitation is addressed, not specifically to the congregation of believers, but to the unconvinced in general. Thus the act of qara'ā is closely related to the free preaching and warning, which we have found good reason to regard as the first stage of Muḥammad's public ministry. The question arises as to the chronological relation between these two aspects: are warning in the 'free' sense, and qara'ā (deliverance of a received message in set form) contemporaneous, or does the latter represent a sophisticated version of the former, based on reflection? In this regard, 17:106b-107 is interesting. Here we have a 'double-ending' rounding off the passage 17:103-106a, which is a report of Moses' warning ministry. Of this pair of endings, the most natural is that which draws the parallel between Moses' warning ministry and Muḥammad's:— "We have not sent thee but as a bringer of good tidings and a warner". This would seem, therefore, to have constituted the original ending. Later, the second ending is added, in which the 'warning' is more closely defined—

17) In many cases (though not all), it can be established with reasonable certainty which of the alternative continuations is the earlier. On the other hand, "a revelation may be repeated, perhaps in slightly different terms", and the alternative continuation may (sometimes) result from a conflation of versions, in an effort on the part of the collectors not "to omit any smallest scrap of genuine revelation". W.M. Watt, Bell's Introduction, p.107.
the 'free proclamation' is redefined in terms of a 'set revelation', sent down and delivered piecemeal to the people as occasion demands. Such examples may be multiplied, and would seem to indicate a definite if unspectacular progress from 'free proclamation' to 'recital of fixed deliverances' (The chronology of the suras is too problematic to warrant a conclusion in more than general terms). We may assume then, that after becoming overwhelmingly aware of God in the personal sphere, and of his personal commission to be God's messenger, Muhammad began (after an interval) to urge on his fellows the insights which had crystallised for him via this divine encounter. The passion and fervency with which he spoke impressed even himself, so that in continuing meditation and communion, the conviction was born in upon him that the burning words were in fact not his own, but were conveyed to him from God Himself. Here his acquaintance with Jewish and Christian custom in liturgically reciting texts of scripture would provide him with a suitable analogy and explanation of the phenomenon of which he found himself to be a part. Cf.10:94 - "Ask those who recite (yaqra'Una) the Book before thee".

18) This fascinating power of the word is deeply rooted in the Semitic way of thought. Cf. D.B. Macdonald, The Religious Attitude and Life in Islam, p.26, "It is well known how among primitive peoples there has always been supposed to lie in words a certain fetish-power". Concretely, the pro-Islamic poets, feared because of their expertise in taunts (mathālīb) and satire (hijā'), are examples of the power of the spoken word. - I. Goldziher, Islam Studices, p.48f. Cf. also J. Pedersen, Der Eid bei den Semiten.

In spite of the fact that Muhammad seems to have insisted vigorously on the discontinuity between his divinely-inspired messages and this primitive background, yet the background must certainly have had some influence in shaping his attitude to his own ecstatic deliverances.

19) The early use of this analogy does not, of course, imply the early emergence of written Qurʾānic texts: it is likely that the Islamic corpus was transmitted orally during a considerable portion of the revelation-period. Cf. the probability that it was about the time of the Hijra that the term sura came into use, - probably from a Syriac root signifying 'writing'. See W.M. Watt, Boll's Introduction, pp.58,138.
The Uses of the Noun-form qur'ān.

Much the same pattern obtains for the noun as for the verb:

1. Meccan passages.

In the following passages, generally agreed to be Meccan, the 'codex' nuance of meaning, though certainly present in embryo, is still minimal:

3:10:62 - "thou art not engaged in any business, nor dost thou recite any qur'ān of it (wa yatilū minhu min qur'ān), without Our being witnesses of you ....."

The precise grammatical antecedent in minhu is difficult to determine; probably it refers to the general sense of the preceding material, which is noticeably "warning", "persuasion", in character.

3:13:30 - "if only by a qur'ān the mountains had been moved, or the earth been cleft."

Again the context draws a close parallel between Muḥammad's mission and the warnings delivered by earlier messengers. Qur'ān here implies not 'codex', but a single urgent proclamation, which works miracles by its thunder-like quality as living voice.

3:46:28 - "...We turned to thee a band of jinn to listen to the Qur'ān..." (cf. also 72:1). The reference originally was probably to a single recitation; though in its present Medinan setting the recitation is regarded as an excerpt from a self-contained Book (v.29).

In 8:42:5, (26:195ff, 44:53), the delivery of 'qur'ān' is closely associated with the commission to 'warn', 'remind', and one gains the impression that these warnings were delivered in free spontaneous speech rather than in set forms.

Further, many passages give clear indications that an original 'warning' passage has been subsequently converted into a reference to the Qur'ānic corpus by the addition of specific phrases:
(10:38), 13:37-39, (here, a 'warning' passage has been enclosed in Qur’ān-codex refs.), 15:87, 27:94, 36:1, 38:1, 41:1, 2, (46:28), 50:1, 45, 55:1, 54:17, 22, 32:40 (note in this last reference, the regular refrain 'We have made the Qur’ān available for the reminder' which serves to bind the 'warning' passages into a stricter, more literary unity). In all these instances, the 'Qur’ān' reference can be lifted out with comparative ease, leaving a primitive description of Muhammad's urgent preaching. 17:43, 91, 13:52, (39:28) "... We have turned about in this Qur’ān...": the phrase implies presentation and re-presentation of material, in order to enhance its persuasiveness, and is thus close in spirit to warning, pleading. If the phrase is to be interpreted as implying a definitive corpus of material already emergent, then at most it is the exhortatory content of the material rather than its codex-form that is stressed.

Bell 20 is probably correct in his assertion that the word "Qur’ān" most frequently implies a block of stuff, of greater or lesser extent, in process of coming together as sui generis material. Nevertheless one has the impression, on considering the early Meccan examples, that the emphasis is not on the codex-like form of the material, but rather on its stuff, its content, or at least on its at-the-moment oracle-quality. For example, 3:5:101 advises the believers to ask their questions "while the Qur’ān is being sent down" - i.e. not while the codex is being delivered, but while Muhammad is in the spirit, i.e. in process of receiving revelational matter.

Cf. 25:32 - "... my people have taken this Qur’ān as a thing to be shunned,"; i.e. 'this received communication with which thou hast inspired me.'

17:49 - "... When thou mentionest in the Qur’ān thy Lord alone..."; i.e. in the elucidation and exposition of the newly-apprehended divine message.

17:47 - "when thou recitest the Qur’ān, We place between thee and those ... a curtain."; i.e. the divinely inspired material that is being expounded

20) R. Bell, Introduction, p. 129
at that particular moment (v. 50 gives the impression of unbelievers, rather than a direct address to the uncommitted.)

73:4-6: 'Qur'ān' here seems to mean primarily the sūra in hand, and only secondarily the whole body of such sūras; and even so, the content, rather than the sūra-forms.

41:44. "If we had made it a foreign Qur'ān...." The passage implies that a considerable body of material has been amassed; but the stress is on its nature as 'guidance and healing', rather than on its codex-form.

2. Late Meccan or Early Medinan Usages:

Other passages, late Meccan or Early Medinan, clearly presuppose a larger block of material than a single sūra or group of oracles. For example, 17:62 - "the tree cursed in the Qur'ān." There are in fact several references to the 'tree of Zaqqum' (37:60, 44:43, 56:52) in the Qur'ān, so that the phrase in 17:62 implies 'the tree frequently referred to in Qur'ānic material', rather than to one particular oracle.

Similarly 25:34 - "thy has not the Qur'ān been sent down to him all at once?", implies that a substantial body of recognisably distinct material has already begun to appear, and was already being thought of as a definitive whole. Cf. also 27:73, 43:30.

In 3.15:87, the phrase 'the mighty Qur'ān' has almost a technical ring about it, implying that the process of codex-formation is well advanced. Yet at the same time, 'Qur'ān' is presumably still distinguished from the 'seven repetitions' (following Bell's interpretation of this last phrase) - the

21) 15:87 - "we have bestowed....the repetitions, and the mighty Qur'ān".
   But cf. 5:110 - "I taught thee the Book... and the Qur'ān", where the use of 'and' presumably does not imply two separate entities.

integration of the 'repetitions' into the Qur'ān is not yet complete.

3.47:22 - "Why has not a sura been sent down?", seems to Bell to suggest a distinction between Muhammad's ordinary 'warning' speech, and the definitive 'received' revelation.

3.11:16 - "Bring ten suras like it": Obviously at this stage a considerable number of suras must have been already in circulation, but it is not yet implied that they are conceived as together comprising a single codex-like whole.

3.4:84 - (Early Medinan or Makkah scrap) - "Do they not then consider the Qur'ān? If it were from any other than Allah, they would find in it many a contradiction." Obviously it is a substantial block of material that is in mind here.

Other specifically Medinan passages show the process of the formation of the Qur'ān-codex to be even further advanced:


3. A Later Medinan Usage.

Finally, Bell notes a series of passages in which something, presumably the Qur'ān in some form, is said to have been sent down as a single whole:

44:2a, 3 - "We sent it down on a blessed night, ... in which is separated out (yufraqu) each wise affair.";

97:1 - "We have sent it down on the Night of Power...";

8:42 - "...if ye have believed in Allah, and what We sent down to Our servant on the day of the furqān, the day the two parties met."

23) R. Bell, Translation, p.516.

24) 85:21-22 - "It is a glorious Qur'ān, in a Tablet preserved." Bell, Translation, p.647, suggests a reference to the heavenly original of the Qur'ān. But the 'tablet' is better interpreted to mean the former Scripture, whose revelation the Qur'ān republishes.

25) 43:1,2 : There are signs, however, that v.2 may have had a less technical connotation before undergoing its final revision.

26) 59:21 : In its present Medinan context, the reference is probably to the Qur'ān-codex, but the verse itself seems to have originated from an earlier period, (cf.13:30).
Bell suggests that, having been received piecemeal over a considerable period, the Qur'an was at the time of the battle of Badr, (some eighteen months after the Hijra) republished in some more unitary, definitive form, and perhaps within the space of a very few days. This suggestion very neatly unifies the diverse strands of evidence concerning the giving of the Islamic corpus, and has much to commend it.

4. To whom were the Qur'āns addressed?

(It may be apposite to add a note here concerning the circle of reference in which the occurrences of 'Qur'ān' as reviewed above, are used. We noted on p.419 above the probable derivation of the noun-form 'Qur'ān' from the Syrian Christian 'qer'ān' = reading; and hence the probability that the preservation and recital of Muhammad's most exalted deliverances in set form as 'Qur'ān' was connected with the need felt for incorporating liturgical reading into the developing salāt. As the beginnings of the salāt were presumably very early, so, it is assumed, were the beginnings of the liturgical reading of 'Qur'ān'. A review of the references to 'Qur'ān' listed above reveals in fact that the great majority of the examples occur in contexts describing Muhammad's preaching to the (largely unbelieving) community as a whole - approx. 40 examples in all; whereas references to the process of Muhammad's personal reception of the Qur'ān and to the Qur'ān as addressed to the believing community29) are quite sparse - only five or six of each.

27) See W.H. Watt, Bell's Introduction, p.139.

23) The references are: 73:1-6 (basically Meccan); 10:62, 5:101, 25:34 (all late Meccan or early Medinan); 12:3 (early Medinan); 23:85 (Yr. II A.H.)

29) References: 5:101; "Ask while the Qur'ān is being sent down" (Early Medinan) cf. 47:22 (Yr. II A.H. - the word here is jāra, not Qur'ān) 73:20 - concerning night prayer (Medinan), cf. 73:4-6 (earlier material, adapted to refer to night prayer); 27:1-6 - the Qur'ān as the authoritative source of the community's religious practice (Yr. II A.H.), cf. 2:181 (Yr. II or III A.H.).
This does not disprove the suggested derivation (the absence of early references to the use of the qur'āns in the salāt may be fortuitous), but it does suggest that the term 'qur'ān' already had a double reference in the early period. On the one hand, it was used of the rather more fixed forms in which the message of faith, repentance, and submission was urged upon the community at large by the prophet; and on the other hand, it was used of the qur'āns as liturgical material within the worship of the believers. That the latter usage influenced the form of the former seems probable, but both were clearly in operation at an early period.

The Development of the concept of Kitāb.

According to Bell, the Qurʾān period gave way to the Book period about the end of Yr. 1 A.H. Bell's theory of a definitive Qurʾān which was replaced by a definitive and more inclusive Book, is attractive; but even if the theory be rejected in its concrete form, Bell's dating of the materials in general, which reveals a shift of emphasis at this time from qurʾān to kitāb, need not be questioned.

(a) The verbal forms of kītāb.

Four main usages are discernible in the occurrences of the various verbal forms:–

1. The recording of men's words and deeds against the day of judgment:
   - Meccan: 10:22; 19:82; 43:18; 82:10f;
   - Early Medinan: 21:94; 43:80;
   - Later Medinan: 3:177; 4:83; 9:121,122;

30) This is confirmed by the probability that the verbal form qara'a is itself a borrowing, and was adopted, on analogy with qurʾān, as a synonym for the more common verb talā. See Bell, Introduction, p.129

31) R. Bell, Introduction, p.134f.
2. **A provision in the Book of divine decrees**

   Early Medinan: 6:12, 54; 7:155; 9:51;

   Later Medinan: 3:139, 148; 5:24; 58:21; 59:3; 2:183;

3. **A provision of scripture.**

   a) the former scriptures:
      - Early Medinan: 5:35; 7:142; 21:105;
      - Later Medinan: 5:49; 57:27;

   b) Qur'anic provisions and commands:
      - Early Medinan: 2:173, 176, 179; 4:79;

   It is obvious that these four usages cannot be arranged in any strict chronological series. But the material may be held to substantiate the following general conclusions:

   a) The recording of men's deeds in a sort of heavenly ledger would seem to be the earliest usage. We are reminded of the importance which trading procedures assumed in Mecca and Medina at the time of the birth of Islam, and of Muhammad's early involvement in that sphere. 'The keeping of heavenly accounts' is therefore most likely a borrowing from this trading ethos.32

   b) There is a rather close relationship between the concept of the 'book of divine decrees', and that of the 'provisions of the written Qur'ān', so that it is sometimes difficult to decide whether a particular reference is to 'God's eternal decree' or to 'His will revealed in Qur'ānic scripture'. This relationship would not appear to be so close, however, as to imply the identity of the two, and thus set out a doctrine of the eternity of the Qur'ān. This is a later development, though it need not be denied that the raw material for such a doctrine is latent in the Qur'ānic material.

---

(b) The Noun-forms of Ktb.

(1.) The recording of men's words and deeds against the day of judgment:


Probably all these references are Meccan.

(2.) A provision in the book of divine decrees:

Late Meccan or Early Medinan: 17:60, 13:33\(^{34}\).

Early Medinan: 9:36 (according to Bayḍawī, the reference here is to the preserved tablet).


(3.) The book of divine knowledge, universal.


The ideas expressed in these three groups of passages are intimately related. It would seem that the references to the record of men's words and deeds are the earliest; that by extension, from God's knowledge of human words and deeds, the notion of divine omniscience emerged\(^{36}\) and by further extension omniscience came to be understood in terms of eternal pre-determination. It is significant that the thought of eschatological judgment, which is integral to the first group

---

33) Held by Bayḍawī to refer to the individual account books, the word used here is ḍhufūf.

34) Book in the sense of divine decree (ḥukm) - Bayḍawī.

35) Either, God's foreknowledge and decree in the preserved tablet, or, what God has given in the Qur'ān, e.g. 23:101. The first of these alternatives seems preferable.

36) The concept both of the book of deeds, and the book of divine knowledge, are pre-Islamic, . . . to judge by the excerpts from the poets Zuhayr and Labīd, cited by Bell, Origin, p.48.
of references, is also prominent in the references to divine knowledge (10:56, 50:4, 20:54, 22:69), and divine pre-determination (17:60, 15:4)\(^\text{37}\).

Interestingly, the only passage which specifically relates the Qur'ān to this book of eternal knowledge-decrees is 10:62 - a passage which shows heavy Medinan adaptation of earlier Heccan material. It is possible, therefore, that the connection of the two concepts in this verse is not entirely intentional, but constitutes the by-product of an editing process.

We would seem justified, therefore, in concluding that this concept of 'book of divine knowledge-decrees' was originally a metaphor drawn from the world of commerce, and that only subsequently was it harmonised with the concept of book as the source and deposit of revelation, to form a unitary concept of all divine knowledge (including the scriptures and the laws of nature) as inscribed in an eternal book.

(G. Widengren\(^\text{38}\)) and others\(^\text{39}\) have sought to trace the Islamic concept of the Heavenly Book back to the ancient Sumero-Assadian concept of the Tablets of Destiny, in which the annual fate of men, nations, and nature was infallibly pre-

\(^{37}\) The judgment referred to here is this-worldly, but has eschatological overtones.


(Gf. also J. Obermann, "Islamic Origins", *The Arab Heritage*, ed. N. A. Faris, pp.58-120.)

\(^{39}\) J. Pedersen, in *Der Islam V*, 1914, pp.113-115.
He would argue that such ideas remained common property throughout
the Ancient Near East, and reached Muhammed through Manichaean influence on popular
Arab thought. Widengren, however, tends to read later Islamic tradition and
theology back into Muhammed's lifetime; and consequently to leave little room for
the development within Muhammed's understanding of revelation (which Bell has
stressed so finely), and for the influence of Jewish thought on this development.
On the whole, it seems safer to conclude that the concept of the Heavenly Book in
its explicit form emerged in Islam after Muhammed's death; that it found its
fundamental data in the Qur'an, but developed in its more sophisticated form under
continuing Jewish influence.

The first beginnings of such a harmonisation, or more accurately, pregnant
Qur'anic sentences in which such a harmonisation could subsequently be rooted,
occur in:

18:109 - "If the sea were ink for the words of my Lord, the sea would give
out before the words of my Lord would give out."

The clearest account of the basic data is to be found in the Assyrian
Creation Epic, Enuma Elish, which probably dates back to approx. 2000 B.C.,
although the extant texts are from c.900 B.C. The epic was apparently
recited annually at the Akitu (New Year) festival in Babylon, and celebrates
the victory of Marduk over Tiamat, order over chaos. Each major
Babylonian temple had its Chamber of Destiny, representing the Heavenly
Court where the chief deity of the pantheon issued the annual decree (Enuma
El.I:78f.) with the approbation of all the gods (En.EL.III:137; IV.20).
The ruling deity wore the "Tablets of Destiny" on his breast—presumably
these were a badge of supreme rule, symbolic of his power to issue the
annual decree, or, more concretely, symbolic of the decrees themselves
in their written form (En.El.I:155 IV:120).

See J. B. Pritchard, Ancient Near Eastern Texts, p.67 (Text of En.EL.)
A. Deimel, Enuma Elish, pp. 32, 37, 42, 44, 46f., 52f. (Text and Commentary)
31:26 - "If all the trees in the earth were pens, and the sea with seven seas after it to swell it, the words of Allah would not give out".

What is described here is obviously not the Qur'ān or the totality of divinely given scriptures, but the totality of divine knowledge, of which that actually revealed to mankind forms only an infinitesimal fragment.\(^1\)

Cf. 45:27 - "One will see each community kneeling, each community called to its Book".

Does 'Book' in this context mean 'the revelation as delivered to them' (Bell\(^2\)), or the divine decree as established concerning that community? Probably no sharp line is to be drawn between these two possibilities.

\(^4\) The Book as Scripture:

1. Meccan period:

   \(1\) *The Book' in the meaning of the Tūrāf as rooted in the eternal communica-
   tiveness of God:

   42:52 - "Thus we have suggested to thec a spirit belonging to our affair.
   Thou didst not (formerly) know what the Book and the Faith were..." (Cf. also 10:94)

   'The Book' here is not to be understood in the sophisticated theological sense
   as the uncreated, heavenly source of all revelatory books, but as the concrete
   divine Book with which Muhammad had become acquainted, viz. the Tūrāf.

   \(11\) The Qur'ān is seen as the clarifying repetition of that one Book:

   10:38 - "This Qur'ān is a confirmation of what is before it, a distinct
   setting forth of the Book in which there is no doubt" (tafṣīl a l'kitāb lā raybā fīhi.)

   13:56 - "Those on whom we have bestowed the Book rejoice in what has been
   sent down to thee".

\(^1\) Bell suggests (Introduction p.19) that originally 13:109 (and 31:26?) was Muhammad's retort to a jibe of his opponents about the 'verbosity of Allāh'.

\(^2\) R. Bell, Translation, p.505.
23:52 - "Those to whom We have given the Book before it - they believe in it."

2:115 - "Those to whom We have given the Book, and who recite it as it should be recited - they believe in it."

Here belong also the early, Meccan references to the 'Arabio Qur‘ān' :-

26:192ff - "...it is the revelation ... with which hath come down the Faithful Spirit upon thy heart, that thou mayest be of those who warn, in clear Arabic speech. Verily it is in the scriptures of the ancients."

41:44 - "If We had made it a foreign Qur‘ān, they would have said, 'Why are not its signs made distinct?' (la fassilat ayātuhu.)

44:58 - "We have made it available in thy tongue - mayhap they will be reminded."

43:1ff - "By the Book that makes clear, lo, We have made it an Arabic Qur‘ān, mayhap ye will understand. And lo, it is in the mother of the Book (ummu l’kitāb), in our presence, exalted, wise."

As in 42:52 above (the Book), so here the phrase 'mother of the Book' is not to be understood as a sophisticated theological concept, equivalent to the 'preserved tablet' of the later theologians, but quite concretely as a reference to the former scriptures, of whose divine origin there was no shadow of doubt, and whose monolithic unity (in all their various rescripts) Muhammad regarded as axiomatic. This interpretation would seem to be confirmed by the use of the cognate term imām with reference to the Tūrān:
46:11 - "And before it is the Book of Moses as a model and a mercy (kitābu Mūsā imāmān waraḥmatan), and this is a Book confirming it in Arabic speech, that it may warn those ......

In this Maccan period, then, the 'mother of the Book' is for all practical purposes the Tūרāh, as the concrete scripture of which Mūhammad knew directly (though still mysterious in its Hebrew inaccessibility).42a)

(iii) The Qur'ān is acknowledged by the people of the Book as being qualitatively of a kind with the rescript in their hands:


(iv) The 'Bookness' of the Qur'ān regarded as the guarantee of its authenticity:

The cynics among the Maccan pagans are referred to the people of the Book in the expectation that the latter will confirm the validity of Mūhammad's claim to prophethood (13:43); and Mūhammad impresses upon them the danger of rejecting a message which is nothing less than a rescript of the divine Book (21:10).

2. Early Medinan period:

(1) ——

(ii) The Qur'ān as a clarifying repetition of the once Book—

2:146 - "We have sent among you a messenger, one of yourselves, to teach you the Book and the Wisdom, to teach you what you did not use to know".

The force of the phrase 'One of yourselves' is that the Book is now imparted

42a.) The concept of the 'Heavenly Tables', as we have noted elsewhere, was of course rooted in antiquity, and it had already become current (or recurrent) in Judaism by the second half of the second century B.C. (Jubilees 6:31). Subsequently it was widely developed in Jewish apocalyptic, in early Christian sources and in Christian heterodoxy from the second century A.D. (See the details in J. Daniélou, Theologie du Judeo-Christianisme, pp.151ff). It is possible that later Muslim theology was influenced, in its development of the concept, by these streams of tradition. But the Qur'ānic usages suggest that the source upon which Mūhammad drew in this regard, connected 'the heavenly Book' in its revelatory aspects, very closely with the Tūrāh.
in their own Arabic language, and is thus accessible to all. Cf. also 62:2.

4:130 - "We have charged those who have been given the Book before you, and you too, that ye show piety."

i.e. All the rescripts of the Book partake in a common content, and are essentially one.

6:114 - "... sent down to you the Book distinctly set forth (mufassalān) and those to whom We have given the Book know ...." mufassalān, whatever other shades of meaning it may imply as well, at least stresses the comprehensibility of the Qur'ānic language, and the consequent accessibility of the message. (Cf. also 46:28-29.)

Thus far the tone is cirenio. One or two verses, however, convey the first hints of awareness that there are divisions among the People of the Book, both in regard to their understanding of the Book they received (16:66), and in their acknowledgment of the 'Bookness' of Muhammad's message (42:15f).

In view of this, the need for a re-clarification of the contents of the Book is the more pressing:-

16:66 - "We have sent down the Book to thee only in order that thou mayest make clear to them that in which they differ."

Cf. 27:73;

42:15f - "But those who argue about Allah .... Allah it is who hath sent down the Book with the truth and the Balance......"

The Balance here is normally interpreted as referring to the laws of the Qur'ān. Hence the verse implies that the Qur'ān is intended to clarify for the Jews points in the Torah on which their understanding is imperfect.

(iii) The 'bookness' of the Qur'ān is acknowledged by the People of the Book:

6:20 - "Those to whom We have sent the Book recognise it" (the Qur'ān)"as they recognise their own sons, but those who have lost themselves do not believe."

74:31-2 - "We have stated their number simply that those who have been given the Book may be convinced ...... and that those who have been given the Book ... may not be suspicious."
The tone is still sirenic, but there is a growing awareness that a section of the people of the Book are sceptical about the 'Bookness' of the Qur'an.

(iv) The 'Bookness' of the Qur'an is asserted as the guarantee of its authenticity.

18:1, 33:23, 7:50f - "We brought them a Book which we set out distinctly... Do they expect anything but the interpretation of it (ta'wilahu)?"

i.e. because of its 'Bookness', the message is so clear and self-authenticating that nothing can be added to it except the actual fulfilment of its predictions on the day of Judgment.

3. Later Medinan period:

It is generally agreed that by the year III A.H., Qur'anic teaching on revelation had reached its rounded, definitive form. Thus although the material from this period falls naturally into the same general groupings as we have used for the two earlier periods, there is noticeable in this later period a hardening and consolidation of the positions that were formerly fluid.

(i) 'The Book' as virtually identical with the Törāh, the concrete expression of God's will to self-disclosure:

2:123 - "O our Lord, raise up also amongst them a messenger, one of themselves to recite to them thy signs, and to teach them the Book and the Wisdom, to purify them..."

This is Abraham's prayer for his posterity; so that 'Book' here virtually means 'Törāh', as the concrete Book in fact delivered to Abraham's posterity. But the concept shows an advance on the parallel expressions from the earlier periods; for the Törāh is to be received by 'one of themselves' - i.e. it is not a universal Book in the fullest sense, but especially intended for the people of Israel. Hence it is implied that similar rescripts of the Book will be made available for other peoples.

(ii) The revelation received by Muhammad is the clarifying repetition and republication of the one Book.
These passages are eirenio in spirit; but display a growing independence of the Islamic corpus over against the former rescripts of the Book:

"Dispute not with the people of the Book, and say, 'We believe in what has been sent down to us, and sent down to you.'" (29:45)

"...say 'I believe in whatever Book Allah hath sent down .... Allah is our Lord and your Lord: we have our works and ye have yours, and there is no argument between us and you'." (42:14)

Again as in the earlier periods, stress is laid on the need for an Arabic recension of the Book:


Here again, there is a stronger feeling for the independence of Qur'ān over against earlier rescripts:

"...In every community,... a witness from amongst themselves; We have brought thee as a witness .... and have sent down to thee the Book as an explanation of everything." (16:91).

Every community has its own witness, and, by implication, its own rescript of the Book. This growing sense of independence would seem to have three main roots.

First, there is the natural growth in confidence as Muḥammad's mission is seen to succeed, and as the number of the devout becomes larger and more influential. Thus the early diffidence and tender sensitivity toward the opinion of the People of the Book progressively drops away, leaving the Muslims as an independent community standing on the basis of their own scriptures (see further, (iv) below).

Secondly there is the growing awareness that earlier hopes of acknowledgment by the people of the Book are not materialising; so that Muḥammad's conviction of his own divinely-given mission compelled him to find the cause of this rejection in the people-of-the-Book's faulty appreciation of their own spiritual heritage (see further (iii) below).

Thirdly, there is Muḥammad's increasing knowledge about the former scriptures; the growing realisation that the 'Book' as already delivered to the People of the Book is not all of a piece, but is to be differentiated as 'Tūrān, Injīl, Purqān'.
The People of the Book differ among themselves to the reverence given to these various rescripts, and the interpretation of the 'Book', (2:107, 171, 4:15ff, 5:17(43)).

This awareness of disagreement among the People of the Book themselves, leads to the explicit assertion of something that was formerly implicit—see on 16:66 and 42:15 above, viz., that the Qur'an as a republication of the 'Book' is intended not only for the enlightenment of the Arabs, but for the benefit of the Jews as well: 5:18—"O people of the Book, our messenger has come to you, making clear to you much of what ye have been concealing of the Book, and dispensing with much..."

Similarly 5:22, 2:209.

Even further, there is probably a note of latent universalism in 39:42—"Verily We have sent down upon thee the Book for the people (li-n-nās) with the truth".

The attitude of the People of the Book towards the claim that the Qur'an is a rescript of the One Book:

Here we notice a marked shift, as compared with the earlier periods. If there were faint hints of opposition, here the opposition has become open and general. Some still acknowledge the 'Bookness' of the Qur'an (2:141(45), 2:115 3:109), while 2:139 implies that others, while inwardly aware that the Qur'an is of divine origin, nevertheless repress this conviction from ulterior motives. The majority however, now openly reject the claim: 2:83, 95, 99, 103, 140.

43) The sentence "they did not divide into parties until after the knowledge had come to them", most probably refers not to knowledge of the Qur'an, but knowledge as contained in their own scriptures. Cf. 4:16-17—"Afterwards We set thee upon an open way of the affair..."

44) Pickthall translates li-n-nās, 'for mankind'. This would seem appropriate in the light of the passages cited above.

45) This passage may in fact be Early Medinan; cf. 6:20.
This opposition ran counter to Muhammad's most firmly-rooted convictions:

a) He himself was undoubtedly the bearer of a revelation from God himself. There could be no question in his mind but that the suggestions which he received had their source in Allāh.

b) It was axiomatic for Muhammad that Allāh is eternally self-consistent, and hence inconceivable that there should exist inconsistencies between one divine communication and another.

c) Since Allāh has willed to impart revelation to mankind, it is inconceivable that the revelation as He imparted it should be obscure in any essential detail (cf. 3:5).

Since then, Muhammad was sure that his own deliverances were untainted by any error or deviation, and since he had reiterated the contents of the former Book(s) with all clarity, there seems no alternative but to conclude that those of the People of the Book who persisted in rejecting his message and his claim to be the bearer of revelation, were being deliberately perverse, (2:103, 3:62,94). They were consciously suppressing revelational knowledge which they knew would vindicate Muhammad's claims (2:141, 3:64,184), and deliberately altering the text of scripture as they recited it:- (2:56 , 7:168).

Hence Muhammad was assured that the initiative as People of the Book would pass from these opponents to his own community:

3:6:89 - "These are they upon whom We have bestowed the Book .... so if these disbelieve, "We have already entrusted it to a people who are not disbelievers in it."

46) "As we have sent down to the dividers, who have made the Qur'ān bits" the meaning appears to be that the People of the Book accept some parts of the Qur'ān, while rejecting others on the basis of personal prejudice. (Sherry).
The 'Bookness' of the Qur'ān asserted as the guarantee of its authenticity.

As we noted above (p. 449), the earlier sensitivity towards the attitudes and opinions of the People of the Book was gradually replaced by the assertion of the independence of the Qur'ān over against the earlier rescripts of the Book. Indeed in this later Medinan period, the Book and the Qur'ān are virtually equated:

2:172 (Here conformity to the traditions of the People of the Book, in this case the Jerusalem Qibla, is contrasted with 'belief in Allāh ... and His Book ...' The former is unimportant, whereas the latter forms the ground of faith. That the 'Book' here is for all practical purposes the Qur'ān, is made even more obvious by the late revision of the verse (47) in which adherence to the Book is closely related to ḥalāt and Zakāt, and the worship of the Muslim community).

3:19 - "Say to those to whom the Book has been given, 'Have ye surrendered yourselves? (a'aslātum)"

Bell implies by his translation that a'aslātum is not used here in the fully technical sense ('Have you Islamised?'). Granted that this is correct, the verse nevertheless implies that 'Islam' (self-surrender) is the hallmark of a right understanding of the Book; and since 'Islam' is the theme of the Qur'ān, a virtual identification of 'Book' and Qur'ān is implicit. Similarly 4:106f,113f, 39:1,2,42. The many structural phrases mentioning the Book, also witness to this same practical equation of 'Book' and Qur'ān:


Here belong also those references to the use of the Qur'ān as the Book within the Muslim community, as the rule for worship and social order:


47) Following Bell's arrangement of the material.

48) In its present form, the phrase refers to the use of the Book in Muslim worship, but in an earlier form it may have referred to the reception of suggestions in the process of revelation.
Cor'anic accounts of Muhammad's theophanic experiences.

We ventured above the provisional hypothesis that it was 'the experiential awareness of God' which was the central factor in Muhammad's call experience, rather than an explicit 'Book-consciousness'.

In this section we turn to the suras generally agreed to be connected with Muhammad's earliest prophetic experience. It will be important in this regard, as far as possible, to penetrate beneath later theologising interpretations of the texts, and seek the original import of the passages.

A preliminary question, however, confronts us, before we may proceed to an analysis of the texts, viz:-

The Charge of 'Delusion' brought against Muhammad.

It is obvious that 53:2,3,17 and 81:22 are concerned to refute the charge that Muhammad in the revelational process was suffering from delusion. Now the visions may be related to the charge of 'delusion' in two possible ways:-

a) the visions may be singled out by Muhammad's disparagers as especially clear examples/proof of the prophet's delusion, or

b) the references to vision may represent Muhammad's positive attempt to refute the charge of 'delusion' and substantiate his claim to veridical revelation, i.e. by pointing out the theophanic circumstances of his inaugural call.

The Passages where the Charge is discussed.

These are as follows:-

1. (1) 26:192-195; 210-224, (Meccan).

192. Verily it is the revelation (tanzil) of the Lord of the worlds,
193. with which hath come down the faithful spirit (nasala bihi ar-ruh al-amīn)
194. upon thy heart, that thou mayest be of those who warn,
195. In clear Arabic speech.

49) VVs.193f are probably an early Medinan addition.
210. The satans have not come down with it;
211. It behoves them not, nor are they able -
212. Far from hearing (min as-sam') are they removed.
213. Call not (singular) then, along with Allah on any other god 

211. Shall I tell you upon whom the satans come down?
212. ... upon every liar guilty (afâkin atham)
213. They listen (yalqun as-sam'), but most of them speak falsely.
214. And the poets - they follow the beguiled.

V.212: as-sam' according to Baydawi refers to the talk of the angels, i.e. in their reception of the revelational material in the heavenly council. Baydawi argues that the exclusion of the satans is on moral grounds - their nature and deeds preclude the possibility of their contact with the matter of revelation, whose nature is wholly different from theirs. This interpretation is confirmed by what follows: Muhammed is warned to worship Allah exclusively (v.213), and to guard his integrity (v.222) if he himself would avoid falling prey to delusion.

V.223: (50) yalqun as-sam'. The subject of the participle is probably 'the satans'; they succeed occasionally in stealing a word of the revelation by eavesdropping, but all that they can gain and impart in this way is only a garbled version of the truth.

Thus the passage is a transcript of the spiritual dialogue - between Muhammed's spirit and the spirit of revelation - in which an answer to the charges of

50) Baydawi also mentions the interpretation which makes 'the liars' subject of yalqün. Blanchère treats the verse as parallel with 15:18, and this would seem to be correct.
'delusion' is hammered out 51).

1. The prophet's own integrity is the best proof and safeguard against satanic insinuation into the revelatory process, (vv. 213, 221.)

2. The satans cannot stand in the divine council; for Allâh's wisdom perceives their subversion, His holiness repels it, and His power overturns it (vv. 211, 212).

3. The message delivered by Muhammad is diametrically opposed to the satanic intention; for the message consists of warning, aimed at man's salvation (vv. 194, 203f, 214), whereas the satanic intention is to lure man to destruction; 2:163f.; 16:65f.; 17:64f.; 25:31.

Thus it is clear that the weight of the passage is on the verbal rather than the visionary aspects of revelation.

(ii) 37:35 (Meccan): "They say, 'Shall we abandon our gods on account of a crazy poet (li-šâ‘irin, majnûn)?' Nay, he came with the truth, and corroborated the envoys."

---

51) There is evidence that both Jews and Christians in the time of Muhammad (and later) took the disconcerting possibility of 'spiritual delusion' very seriously.

B.T., Berakoth, 55b teaches that dreams may be either genuine or false revelation and guidance, in that they may be imparted either by angels or by demons.

B.T., Ta'ánith, 24b recounts how R. Mari once saw an angel convert sand into flour, and forbade the people to buy this flour, because it resulted from a miracle: presumably there was doubt as to whether these were good or bad angels.

J.C. Archer, Mystical Elements in Mohammed, p. 63, notes: "Mohammed's fear of the jinn resembles that of the monks for the spirits, whose 'wiles and crafts' were to them so real. It is quite possible that Mohammed was much under the influence of the monkish conception of the invisible world. At any rate, both orders of beings, the jinn and the spirits, sprang from the same psychological soil."

For a description of how this disconcerting ambiguity, as to whether a particular spiritual communication was angelic or demonic, perplexed medieval Christians, see R. Bainton, Here I Stand, p. 44.
The charge that Muhammad is crazy (mājmūn) is levelled here against his speech-in-proclamation, not against any claim of his to have seen visions.

(iii) 52:23ff (Meccaan): "Worn, then, by the grace of thy Lord thou art neither soothsayer (kāhin) nor madman (mājmūn).
30. Or do they say, 'A poet (ḥāʾir), upon whom we may await the uncertainty of fate?'
31. Say, 'Wait. Lo, I am among those who wait.'
32. Or do their understandings instruct them to do this, or are they a proud, transgressing people?
33. Or do they say, 'He has vamped it up (taqawwalahu)!'...
34. Let them produce a discourse like it, if they speak the truth...
35. Or do they have a ladder on which they listen? Then let their listener bring authorisation clear (bi-muṣṭafīn ṯubīn)....
41. Or is the unseen with them, and so it is that they write?....

Again the charge (vv.29-30) is answered by an assertion of the prophet's integrity and humble submission: He too awaits the divine decision upon himself (v.31); whereas v.32 implies that his opponents, through their impious rebellion against the divine will, have laid themselves open to satanic inspiration, and that this is in fact the source of their scoffing words against Muhammad.

V.33 implies (as 26:212,223 above) that revelation has its origins in the heavenly council; hence only those who have contact with that Council's proceedings

---

52 It is interesting that whereas 26:210ff deals with the charge of satanic inspiration, (vv.210,221), here (37:35) and in 52:23ff ; 68:1ff ; 15:6ff 23; 25 ; 81:19ff ; the charge is that Muhammad is mājmūn, i.e. inspired by jinn. On the connection between the two, D.B.Macdonald, (The Religious Attitude and Life in Islam, p.135f) comments: "How he" (i.e. Muhammad) "conceived their" (the jinn's) "relations to the angels, the Messengers of Allah, on the one hand, and to the devils, especially to Iblīs ... on the other, is obscure because of his own uncertainty and lack of decision .... There are many other references in the Qurʾān to the jinn, all accepting quite simply their existence as a race on earth beside that of the Sons of Adam. With them ... Iblīs ... is curiously confused; sometimes being reckoned as a fallen angel, and sometimes one of them."
The word 'shayṭān' is obviously a borrowing from Hebrew; but that the word 'mājmūn' can be put on occasion into the mouth of Muhammad's Jewish detractors, shows that no clear and consistent differentiation was made between the two terms.
For a full discussion of the place of Jinn in primitive Arabian religion and in Qurʾānic belief, see the whole section in Macdonald, op.cit., pp.133-137.
can claim to have genuine knowledge of the unseen. (cf. v.41).

Throughout the passage, the charge of 'madness' is clearly linked with the verbal aspects of Muhammad's experience, rather than with the visional: dhikr, v.29; shā'ir, v.30; taqawwāl, v.33; ḥadīth, v.34; sultan, v.38; yaktabūn, v.41. V.34 in particular makes it clear that there is considered to be something 'miraculous' about the verbal form of the message; and would suggest that the charge of 'madness' attached at least as much to the exstatic form of the verbal presentation as to the urgent warning content.

(iv) 63:1ff (Meccan)

1. By the pen and what they write,
2. thou by the bounty of the Lord art not mad. (majnūn).
3.        
4. For thou art engaged in a mighty task.
5. So thou wilt see, and they will see, 6. which of you is the afflicted.
6. So do not obey those who count (it) false. (mukaddhībūn)

The most natural object (understood) of mukaddhībūn would be the warning; this is confirmed by the oath in v.1; and Bell's53 interpretation of v.4, if correct, would add further support, for the 'task' is that of conveying the warning.

Thus once again, the charge of 'madness' attaches to the fervent preaching rather than to any implicit visional claims.

2. (i) 15:6-18 (Late Meccan or early Medinan).

v.6 They have said, "O thou upon whom the reminder has been sent down, thou art possessed (majnūn).
7. "Why not bring angels to us, if thou art one of those who speak the truth?"
8.        
9. It is We who have sent down the reminder....
10. We have sent messengers before thee  
11. and not a messenger came to them but at him they were jeering ......

53) R. Bell, Translation, p.596.
14. If we were to open upon them a door of the heaven, and they were to go up into it continually,
15. they would say "our sight has been intoxicated; nay we are a people enchanted, (mashurīn.),"
16. we have set constellations\(^{54}\) in the heaven, and made them beautiful to look upon,
17. and have guarded them from every satan stoned,
18. except such as may listen by stealth, and then there follows a flame clear-shining.

In this passage also, the question at issue is the authenticity of the 'reminder', (vv.6,9). Presumably Muhammad's opponents are Jews, who hold that, as the Torah was mediated by angels, so angelic mediation is an essential circumstance for any genuine revelation of the divine. Muhammad is challenged to produce those heavenly beings who mediated the revelation in his case. Their implication would be that it was satans, and not angels, which had inspired him; Cf.vv.16-18, with the strong insistence that the satans have no access to the heavenly council and therefore have no authentic knowledge of the stuff of revelation; and v.9 with the emphatic reiteration that Muhammad's message is of divine origin, inānah naẓalnā adh-dhikr.

The visionary aspects mentioned in vv.14-15 are therefore secondary to the main theme of the passage. Vision, whether of the angel mediators or of the heavenly realities themselves\(^{55}\), should ideally provide the ultimate sign authenticating the truth of the verbal proclamation; but where hearts are hardened against the message, then even this greatest of all signs would produce nothing but scepticism.

---

\(^{54}\) Constellations as the stations of the heavenly guardians, protecting the inviolability of the divine council.

\(^{55}\) 'they were to go up into it continually' (v.14). According to Baydār, 'they' may refer either to the unbelievers, or to the angelic bearers of revelation.
(ii) 21:2ff (Late Meccon; with Medinan expansions).

v.2 "No renewed reminder from their Lord comes to them but they listen to it, making sport ......

v.3 And those who have done wrong have talked secretly in confidence; 'Is this anything but a human being like yourselves? Will ye then betake yourselves to magic (li-s-siḥr) with your eyes open?'

v.5 Nay they have said: 'A tangle of dreams (aṣghāthu aḥlāmin): Nay, he has invented it! (iftarayhu) Nay, he is a poet! (šā'īr)

v.7 We did not send before thee any but men to whom We made suggestions: ask the people of the Reminder if you do not know.

v.10 We have sent down to you a Book in which is your Reminder ...."  

The answer is that all signs are secondary and inessential - the reminder is the one essential function of the messenger; and the implication is that the verbal form of the message58) itself constitutes a sign.

Thus again, the charge of delusion is related to the verbal aspects of the revelatory material.

(iii) 25:5-9, 22-27 (Late Meccon or early Medinan):

5. "This is nothing but a fraud which he has devised, and others have helped him with it.'
6. 'Old-world tales' ....
7. Say, 'He hath sent it down who knoweth what is secret....'
8. 'What is there to this messenger, who eats food and goes about the market places? Thy has not an angel been sent down to him, to be

56 ) Bayyana links 21:8 with 25:8,22. See further below.

57 ) Bayyana: the leprous hand, the rod which became a serpent, raising the dead, etc.

58 ) v.10, with its explicit reference to the Book, is probably a Medinan addition, but the thought is implicit in the earlier core material of the passage.
with him as a warner?.....

9. You follow only a man who has been enchanted (rajulun mas'ûr) ..... 

22. We have not sent before thee any of the envoys but they ate food and went about the market places; We have made you a test one to the other, whether ye would endure. ..... 

23. Those who do not hope to meet Us say, 'Why have not the angels been sent down to us, or why do we not see our Lord?' Verily they have a conceit of themselves, and have behaved with insolence great. 

24. On the day when they see the angels, no good news for the sinners then! "

Once again, Muhammad has been challenged to produce his angelic intermediaries in support of his claim to convey veridical revelation. His reply is that direct vision of angels and of Allah belongs in the context of the eschatological judgment, when repentant response will come too late; in the meantime, the warning message is the one essential. Its origin is with Allah who imparts secret knowledge to and through his prophets (v.7); the implication being that the message as delivered by Muhammad is self-authenticating, so that only hardness of heart prevents its acceptance. The charge that Muhammad is a rajulun mas'ûr is thus concerned with the content of that message, and with the way in which it was conveyed.

(iv) 23:23e. (Early Meccan, based on earlier versions).

23. "We sent Noah to his people, ... 'my people, serve Allah .....'

24. 'This is only a man like yourselves ......; if Allah had willed, He would have sent angels; We never heard of this among our fathers;...

25. He is only a man possessed (rajulun bihi jinn)."

The point of the passage is similar to those already examined. 'We never heard of this (mâ samînâ bi-hâdhâ)', according to Bayqamî, may refer either to the person of Noah (this man), the office of prophethood in general, or the prophetic preaching of monotheism. The last would seem the most likely, and would underline the strong connection between the charge of delusion and the verbal message.
On the basis of this survey, we may approach the 'theophanic' suras, reasonably confident that the charge of 'delusion' occurring in them, will also be concerned primarily with the verbal aspects of the revelation.

(1) 31:19ff.

19. "It is verily the speech of a noble messenger, (la-qawl rasūlin karīm),
20. powerful, beside Him of the throne established,
21. obeyed there, and trustworthy,
22. Your comrade is not mad, (majnūn),
23. He saw him on the clear horizon,
24. Nor is he regarding the unseen uncommunicative (alā gh-shaibin bi-ṣanīn)\(^{59}\)
25. It is not the speech of a satan stoned (bi-qa wālī shayṭānīn rajīm).
26. Where then will ye go?
27. This is nothing less than a reminder (dhikr) to the worlds."

It is obvious that the primary concern of this passage is with the vindication of the verbal message delivered by Muhammad—qawl (vv.19,25), dhikr (v.27).—wamā....bi-ṣanīn (v.24), also probably implies generosity in conveying verbal revelations.

Thus the reference to the vision (v.23) is subordinate to this overall theme. The charge of 'madness' is levelled in the first instance at Muhammad's ecstatic speech; and the theophanic experience is cited in support of the assertion that the noble messenger (v.19) is indeed a member of the heavenly court (v.20), a bearer of authentic revelation from Allah's presence (v.27), and not a mere satanic eavesdropper (v.25) whose 'revelation' is at best twisted and misleading.

\(^{59}\) See the possible alternative reading, wamā....bi-ṣanīn, mentioned by Bell, *Translation*, p.639.
(ii) 53:1-12.

1. By the star when it falls,
2. Your companion has not gone astray, nor has he erred;
3. Nor does he speak (yanțiq) of his own inclination.
4. It is nothing but a suggestion suggested, (waḥyūn yūnā),
5. Taught (hin) ('allamahu) by one strong in power (shāhīd 1-quwal):
6. Forceful; he stood straight upon the high horizon,
7. Then he drew near and let himself down,
8. Till he was two-bow-lengths off or nearer,
9. and suggested to his servant what he suggested, (awḥu,...ma awḥū).
10. The heart did not falsify what it saw.

According to vv.2f, 11f., the purpose of this passage is to counter criticism.

But what form did this criticism assume? Possibly the passage as it now stands seeks to answer two relatively distinct objections:-

a) opposition to the suggestion that the verbal message as delivered by Muḥammad originated from God;

b) opposition to Muḥammad's assertion that he had seen God.

a) The dominant note of vv.1-10 is that the verbal message is indeed from Allāh:
   - yanțiq, v.3: 'allamahu, v.5. The verb awḥū, vv.4,10, probably implies verbal communication, though not necessarily so: it could conceivably be used of a gesture, drawing the messengers attention to some peculiarly significant feature of the theophany. It is safest, then, to say that awḥū here represents a bridge between the verbal and the visual aspects of the theophany.61)

b) Vv.11-12 concentrate on asserting the veridical character of the vision:
   - ma kadhāba l-fu'ādī ma rāʾ. afūtamārīnahu 'alā ma yarʿā.

Of crucial importance to the interpretation here is the amount of significance

60 ) A. Deimel, Emma Elīsār, p.73 notes that the old Babylonian gods were often considered to be of prodigious size, reaching from earth to heaven. But similar descriptions of angels are to be found:- in the Qur'ān documents (Document of Damaš, II:19); in Jewish-Christian texts (2 Enoch 2:1, Gospel of Peter 40, Testament of Reuben 5:7, The Shepherd of Hermas, Similitude 8:1,2 - See J. Daniélou, op.cit. pp.139ff, 171); and also in the Talmud.

61 ) R. Bell, Introduction, p.33, notes that 'vision' is not specifically related to deliverance of the Qur'ān, in 53:1-12. i.e. awḥū here does not imply directly a definitive verbal revelation.
which may be attached to the change of tense, from rā'a to yar'ā. If the change is deliberate, the following possible interpretations present themselves:

(i) Muḥammad continued to experience occasional theophanies throughout his ministry; and on the strength of the undoubted validity of that initial theophany, these subsequent theophanies also are to be accepted as valid, and the revelation conveyed in and through the theophany acknowledged as authentic. 'On the strength of what he saw then, do not debate with him as to what he sees now.'

(ii) It is possible that yar'ā is used somewhat loosely to mean 'revelation', verbal as well as visual: 'On the strength of that undoubted initial call-experience accept that Muḥammad has been marked out as Allāh's messenger, and receive every revelation he imparts to you, as coming from Allāh'.

On the other hand, however, it may be that: (iii) no distinction is intended between rā'a and yar'ā: 'Do not debate about this vision, for it was indeed authentic; and it therefore constitutes the permanent guarantee that Muḥammad's message originates from Allāh'.

Of these three possibilities, the strict application of the rules of grammar would support the first; and this impression is strengthened if we follow Bell's analysis\(^\text{62}\) and conclude that vv.11-12 form a later addition to the text. Such subsequent theophanic experiences may have included those referred to in 17:1, and in 48:27, (see below, pp.466ff). However that may be, it seems clear that 53:1-10 in its earliest form aimed at vindicating Muḥammad's verbal message by basing it on an initial theophanic vision. The criticism levelled at Muḥammad at that early stage was not that he claimed to have experienced visions, but that he claimed divine origin for his enthusiastic, ecstatic utterance.

Thus the original force of the theophanic vision was as follows:

\(^\text{62}\) R. Bell, Translation, p.539.
a) The appearance was for 'awāy (vv.4,10) — at the very beginning, visual and audible aspects of 'awāy may have intertwined — the manifestation of the Presence and Will of Allah.

b) The vision was recounted in order to authenticate the verbal message to Muhammad's hearers.

c) The vision may also have helped to authenticate the message to Muhammad's own mind — a crystallisation-point for his understanding of his own experience.

d) Muhammad seems at first to have interpreted the experience as a vision of God Himself63 (It is impossible that Muhammad could have been described as the 'ābd of Gabriel). Only later, in the light of theological scruples, was he led to modify this earliest impression. (See further below).

(iii)53:13-18.

13. "He saw Him too at a second descent,
14. By the sidra-tree at the boundary,
15. Near which is the garden of the abode,
16. Then the sidra-tree was strangely enveloped.
17. The eye turned not aside, nor passed its limits.
18. Verily, he saw one of the greatest signs of his Lord."

This vision is usually held by the commentators to describe an ascent to heaven, so that the 'tree at the boundary' refers either to:

a) the boundary-point of man's creaturely knowledge and attainment, or

b) the meeting-point of the divine and the creaturely — 'what descends from above

63) Baydāwl comments on v.5, "an angel of great might, i.e. Gabriel"; and on v.10, 'Gabriel suggested to Allah's servant'. The phrase 'what he suggested' may simply be a means of emphasising the importance of the revelation so given, or it may mean 'Gabriel suggested to Allah's servant what Allah suggested.' Baydāwl also notes, however, that some scholars interpret the account as describing a vision of God. He comments that in that case the terms, 'drew near', and 'let himself down', would be interpreted in a relative sense, to indicate the elimination of distance between Allah and the prophet — the exaltation of the prophet, the rapturing of his soul to the heavenly court. R. Bell, (Translation, p.540 in support of the view that the original reference was to a theophany, points out that epithets similar to the "shādīd l-qāwā" of v.5 are used of God in 51:53 — "inna llahā...dhu l-qawwādi l-matīn". To this we might add 8:54 — "inna llahā qawiyyun shādīd l-īqāb".)
it, and what rises from beneath it'; or

c) the boundary of the seventh heaven.

The phrase 'a second descent' however, would seem to imply an earthly vision^{64}
(v.13)
(unless we interpret 'descent' in a relativistic way, as described in note 63)
and Bell objects that the 'heavenly' interpretation 'robs the vision of force'.^{65}

Baydāwī, following the 'heavenly' interpretation, suggests that the phrase
'there covered it what covered it' (v.16) refers either to:-

a) something ineffable, defying description; or

b) an innumerable host of angels worshipping God, who appeared beside the
tree ('indahā).

Apart from the question of the location of the vision, v.17 parries the charge of
'delusion' by insisting that this was an actual perceptual experience, in which
the prophet's physiological eyes were performing their normal function^{66}, and
this visual apprehension of God is then used as a miraculous 'sign', authenticating
the message he bore. For the phrase "laqad ṭā'ā min ayātī rabbihi 1-kubrā", is
clearly parallel to that in 3.20:24:- "li-huriyaka min ayātīnā l-kubrā", where
the Mosaic staff-become-serpent is set forward as the visual authentication of
Moses' warning ministry^{67}.

It would seem then, that 53:13-18 is concerned to refute the charge that
Muhammad's vision was delusion. Yet even so, the vision does not stand
independent, as in itself constituting a revelation of, and insight into, the

---

64) R. Bell, "Mohammed's Visions, M.W.24,1934, p.150.
65) Translation, p.540.
66) Cf. the more sophisticated (later) phrase in v.11:- 'the heart ..... sees'; of which Baydāwī offers various interesting interpretations.
67) The corollary would be that the 'sidra-tree' was just as clearly an
object of physiological perception as was the staff of Moses.
nature of Allāh; rather, it is conceived as a sign authenticating the verbal aspects of revelation. It seems clear that this primacy of the verbal in revelation has, in general, been enhanced by the systematising of post-Qurʾānic theologians, but our survey may safely be taken as indicating that the verbal element was inherent in the vision from the beginning—even if, as we have seen, the emergence of 'the Book' is a Medinan development.

(iv) 17:1 "Glory be to him who journeyed by night with his servant from the sacred mosque to the furthest mosque, around which We have bestowed blessing, that We might show him some of our signs; verily he is the one who hears and sees."

This brief Qurʾānic allusion obviously presupposes a much fuller narration, current in Muhammad's warning-preaching but not included in its entirety in the Book (a fact which, we may note in passing, supports our earlier argument that the Book is rooted in, and arose out of, early free-preaching). There is unlikely to have been anything 'miraculous' about the physical mode or circumstances of this night-journey, as originally experienced and narrated: 'the sacred mosque' (al-masjid 1-ḥaram) is unanimously agreed to be the Kaʿba at Mecca, and 'the furthest mosque' (al-masjid 2-aqṣā) was probably originally a

---

68 Cf. Bayḍāwī's suggestion re the phrase, 'the heart ... sees' (53:11): "The sacred commands are first apprehended in the heart, and thence translated into sight". Such an interpretation in fact reverses the Qurʾānic order, in the interests of a more sophisticated theology.

69 Margoliouth, "Muhammedanism", E.R.E.-3 p.873, speculates that the fuller account once stood in the Qurʾānic material but was later expunged, presumably because of misgivings about the place of dream and vision in the economy of revelation.
place of worship at the borders of the Meccan territory. Only when a later
generation identified 'the furthest mosque' with Jerusalem was the ground
prepared for the subsequent rich development of hadith on the theme of a
miraculous night-journey to heaven.

It does seem clear, however, that once, on an otherwise quite ordinary
journey, Muhammad had an experience, probably vision, of being accompanied by

70) A. Guillaume, "where was al-Masjid al-aqsa?", al-Andalus 13, 1954,
pp.323-335 cites two historical sources to show that at al-Jirmān 0.15 km.
from Mecca, there were two mosques; the most distant of which was referred
to as al-Masjid al-aqsa, and was used by Muhammad as a place of prayer.
Contrary to the customary dating (Cf. Dell, Translation, pp.262f),
Guillaume places the incident to which 17:1 refers in Yr.VIII, i.e.
immediately prior to the visit to Mecca which resulted in the Treaty of
Hudaybiya. He holds that while lodged at al-Jirmān Muhammed, on an
impulse, completed the lesser pilgrimage secretly by night; and that
during his return from Mecca to al-Jirmān he experienced the clating
happening referred to in 17:1.

71) A. Guillaume, "where was al-Masjid al-aqsa?", favours the suggestion that
the identification of the site of 'the Furthest Mosque' with Jerusalem
was fostered by the Umayyads, who wished to make Jerusalem a rival to
Mecca as a place of pilgrimage. B. Schrick, Der Islam VI 13ff., on
the other hand argues that from the beginning 'the Furthest mosque'
signified heaven. Guillaume's view is to be preferred.

72) H. Pridoux: The Life of Mahomet, pp.53-65 gives the following account
of the hadith (based partly on western sources, and partly on the
Commentaries of Bayzīz and Zaydīz̄hāri):- While at the house of Ayesha,
Mahomet was attended by Gabriel and Alborak. Gabriel announced that he
had been sent to bring Mahomet unto God into Heaven, where he should see
strange mysteries which were not lawful to be seen by any other Man...He
carried him from Mecca to Jerusalem in the twinkling of an eye...There
he ascended a ladder of light, leaving Alborak tethered to the temple
rock in Jerusalem. Passing through seven heavens, he met successively
Adam, Noah, Abraham, Joseph, Moses, John the Baptist, Jesus Christ
(whence the other six asked for Mahomet's intercession, Mahomet himself
asked for Jesus' intercession). Thence he was sent on alone by Gabriel, till he
heard a Voice saying unto him, "O Mahomet, salute thy Creator", from whence
ascending higher he came into a place, where he saw a vast Extension of Light of
that exceeding brightness, that his eyes could not bear it; and this was the
habitation of the Almighty, where his Throne was placed; on the right side of
which he says, God's Name and his own were written in...Arabic words - which words
also, he says he found written on all the gates of the Seven Heavens which he
passed through. Being approached to the Presence of God, as near as within two
Bow-shots, he tells us he saw him sitting on his Throne, with a covering of 70,000
Veils before his Face; that on his drawing thus near, in sign of his Favour, he
put forth his Hand and laid it upon him, which was of that exceeding coldness,
that it pierced to the very marrow of his Back, and he could not bear it. That
after this, God entering into a very familiar Converse with him, revealed unto
him a great many hidden histories, made him understand the whole of his Law, and
gave him many things in charge concerning his instructing Men in the knowledge of
it... And then returning, he found the angel Gabriel tarrying for him... who
conducting him back again through all the Seven Heavens, did set him again upon
the Alborak... and then taking the Bridle in his Hand, conducted him back to
Mecca in the same manner as he brought him thence, and all this within the space
of the tenth part of one Night."

The narrative bears obvious signs of modification and expansion both in the
light of Christian and of developing Muslim theology.

Another account of the tradition is given in Ismael Abu'l Feda, trans. by
J. Gagnier under the title De Vita et Rebus Gestis Mohammedis, with certain
variant details:-

Preliminary to the ascent to heaven, Gabriel opens Muhammad's breast, extracts
his heart and washes it in a golden bowl filled with the water of faith, then
replaces it. On his journey through the seven heavens, the patriarchs are met in
this order: Adam, Yahya and 'Isa, Joseph, Edris, Aharon, Isaac, Ibrahim. Moses
weeps on meeting with Muhammad, "co quod Fuer post me missus est, ex cujus gente
plures Paradisum ingreditur, quam qui ex gente mea ingressuri sunt".

Also the account of Muhammad's standing at the Throne does not dwell on the
visonal aspects, but tells how fifty prayers per day were prescribed for the
Muslims, but how on Moses' advice, Muhammad successfully petitioned for the
reduction of the number to 40, 30, 20, 10, and finally 5.

Baybars recounts that the report of this event offended the Quraysh; and
that even some believers turned away, until Abü Bakr expressed his unconditional
belief in the prophet's account. Baybars himself accepts the hadith, on the
grounds that with God all things are possible.

The tradition tells us little about the life and thought of Muhammad,
(though as we saw above, it almost certainly has its roots in an historical
theophany-event during the lifetime of Muhammad); but the eagerness with which
it was elaborated by later traditionists, and the volume of discussion that took
place as to the precise nature of the experience, are impressive testimony to the
enduring fascination of the theophanic for religious minds of all theological
traditions.
a Presence which he believed at the time to be Allah\(^{73}\) and of being introduced by that Presence to some striking visual phenomena, which impressed themselves on Muhammad’s imagination as ‘signs’.

17:1 is obviously complex in form; for vv.1a and 10 refer to Allah in the third person, whereas in v.1b, Allah Himself speaks in the first person. (That v.1a, 10. originally referred to Allah, is the necessary interpretation of subhāna llaḏī aṣrā bi-ḥādīhi, - cf. 53:10 above.\(^{74}\)

Whatever the details of the process by which this verse was built up, it seems certain that in the original form the visual element was strong; and that in later recensions, and in the wider context in which it was eventually placed, the visual is appealed to as proof of the veracity of the verbal revelation, (vv.2f., 9f.)

\(^{73}\) J.C. Archer comments: “That he” (Muhammad) “was at prayer is highly probable. Such circumstance is demanded by the very quality of the experience” - Mystical Elements in Mohammed, p.50.

\(^{74}\) As at 53:10, Bayḍār offers the interpretation, ‘Gabriel travelled with the servant of Allah’, but this seems to strain the grammatical construction. The use of ‘subhāna’ with reference to Gabriel would also be very strange.
Hab.1:1 - "The oracle .. which the prophet say .."75) As in these Biblical examples, so in 3:48:27, all the emphasis is on the verbal content of the encounter; and the reference to the vision, even if it is to be taken literally, is quite subordinate.

(vi) 17:62. "We send not the signs except to frighten. (Recall) when We said to thee: 'Verily thy Lord hath encompassed the people'; We did not intend the vision which We showed thee to be anything but a test for the people, and the tree cursed in the Qur'ān. We frighten them, but it only increases them in arrogance great."

The theme expounded in the whole context concerns the 'signs' and the methods used by Allāh to startle or frighten men into repentance and obedience: the she-camel of Thamūd, the descriptions of the vision (ar-ru'yyūf) and of the accursed tree, the story of Iblīs' rebellion, of v.66: "Startle (istafaza) with thy voice any of them that thou canst." It is in this context, then, that the word 'test' (fitna), v.62, is to be interpreted76. The meaning best suited to the context is 'test' in the sense of 'assay', distinguishing and separating the obedient-repentant from the recalcitrant-hardened (cf. the related meaning in 37:60-1, where the tree of zaqqūm is said to be a 'fitna' for the wrongdoers - i.e. a vivid warning of the pains of the Fire, designed to encourage the wrongdoers to repent before it is too late.

The passage, then, in no sense constitutes an apology for the previous narration of visions77. rather the context includes the vision of v.1, etc.,

75) See ch.1, note 255.

76) Various renderings have been offered: - Pickthall; 'ordeal'; Sale; 'occasion for dispute'; Blachère; 'en maniere de tentation'; Gagnier; 'Disceptatio'.

77) R. Bell, "Mohammed's Visions" p.151f suggests that Muhammad was later apologetic about his claims to have heard and seen God. This seems unnecessary however.
as one among several 'signs', which Allah has vouchsafed in order to authenticate and to reinforce the Word which he sends through His prophet.

As to the actual vision referred to, many Muslim commentators link v.62 with v.1, but compare also the remark of Machere: "on peut tout aussi bien prétendre qu'il s'agit de celle si clairement décrite dans 31:19-23 et 53:1-13." If one may be permitted a speculation based on Bell's comparison of v.62 ("Verily thy Lord hath encompassed the people") with 85:20 - "But Allah from behind them doth encompass" - possibly the vision referred to here was of the calamities due to befall the recalcitrant on the day of judgment. If this were so, it would imply that Muhammad's fervid preaching of the eschatological judgment was itself rooted in vision; such an assumption would do much to explain the peculiar intensity with which this preaching is presented.

On the whole then, the passages which we have surveyed give the impression that 'vision' played a significant part in Muhammad's earliest prophetic experience. 'Vision' in general is adduced as an authenticating 'sign' validating the verbal 'suggestion'. It must be added, however, that the fact that vision is thus from an early period, regarded as the authenticating sign of (verbal) revelation, rather than as revelatory in itself, means that its role is a definitely subordinate one.

Qur'anic treatment of Old Testament theophanic material.

A. Moses' Experience at the Burning Bush. (Exodus 3).

This is the example for which the greatest wealth of comparative material is available.

The Qur'anic Parallels:

These are: 79:15ff (Meccan); 19:52ff (Late Meccan/Early Medinan);
27:7ff (cf. also 26:9-68 and 7:101-165) - Early Medinan); 20:8ff and 23:29ff (Later Medinan).
It is difficult to obtain complete certainty about the exact chronological arrangement of the series, for the individual sûras are highly composite; but the general reliability of the above order is confirmed by: (a) the developing knowledge of the Old Testament evinced by the sûras when arranged in this order; and (b) the congruity of this order with the development of the lines of theological interest which we traced in earlier sections. All the passages in this series are concerned in general with warnings as to the imminence of the day of judgment; but within this general area, certain distinct emphases appear:

1. The theophany here conveys Moses' commission to warn Pharaoh, and summon him to repentance, faith, and obedience. The 'sign' of the rod-becone-serpent (v.20) has comparatively little importance in the narrative, and the warning is conveyed in free, urgent preaching (cf. our findings above on the significance of 'Eya' and 'dhikr' in the Meccan period).

2. Also stresses the relationship between theophany and prophetic commissioning.

This stress is evident, indeed, in the structure of the sura as a whole:

Vv.7-10 : Gabriel addresses Zechariah: "Thy Lord hath said....". This implies a theophany to Zechariah - a theophany which inaugurates the prophethood of Yahyâ.

V.17 : The epiphany of the Spirit in human form to Maryam heralds the birth and subsequent prophetic mission of Jesus. V.44 : qad jâ'anî mina l-'ilm implies, if not an actual formal theophany to Abraham, at least a revelation received in the theophanic ethos. V.53 : Theophany to Moses, marking his commissioning.

V.65 : "We have not come down except with the affair (bi-ândâ) of thy Lord", implies an angelic visitation to Ijâlim.

V 79:15-23 and 19:52ff are important for our understanding of Ijâlim's prophetic self-consciousness. Since in 19:52-65 Moses' call experience (at the Burning Bush) is set in parallel to Ijâlim's own (as described in 3:53 and 91), we may safely assume that the description of Moses' experience in 3:79 takes colour from

73) Cf. the frequent use of the term "ilm" in the Qur'ân, to signify knowledge of the unseen realities granted by special divine dispensation.
Muhammad's own call-experience, and from his understanding of the commission which he received at that time. It is certain, then, that Muhammad knew the theophany to be a significant element in his calling and commissioning. Yet it is noteworthy, on the other hand, that the theophany does not colour these two suras so all-pervasively as does the theophany to Moses in Exodus 3ff. Exodus 3 forms the prelude to the theophany-par-excellence at Sinai (Ex. 19-24) and to the giving of the Torah as the verbal content of that theophany. And the narrative intervening between Exodus 3 and 19 is punctuated with theophanic references:- Moses is instructed to report to the elders of Israel, "The Lord has appeared to me" (Ex. 3:16), together they are to report to Pharaoh, "The Lord ... has met with us" (Ex. 3:18), and the request is made to Pharaoh on the grounds that "the God of the Hebrews has met with us" (Ex. 5:3). Ex. 6:3 reiterates the account of the theophany to Moses, and sets it within a chain of such theophanic appearances, which serve as markers for the course of the salvation-history. It would seem, then, that from the beginning, Muhammad regarded the visual aspects of his experience not as revelation per se, but as secondary to, and corroborative of, the verbal aspects of revelation.

3. 27:7ff.

In this (and the two companion-pieces 26:9-68 and 7:101-133, 134-165) the emphasis is on the two signs, the serpent-rod and the leprous hand, by means of which the warning message was attested to Pharaoh (and also the Reed Sea crossing v.14 - as a 'sign' to Muhammad's own generation.).

As Bell 79) has noted, there is a certain unevenness about these verses, indicating sub-strata in the material (- primitive -ū-endings reworked and expanded to -īn and -ūn endings). Verse 8 speaks of Allah in the third person, whereas vv.9ff constitute direct divine address in the first person; and the final phrase of

79) R. Bell, Translation, p. 363.
v. 8 (subḥūna ʾllāh ʾrabbī l-ʾamīn); sounds like a linking addition, intended to unite the first clause with Allāh's specific self-revelation in what follows.

The precise reference of the phrase, "burīka man fi-n-nār wamaṭ ḥawlaḥā," has caused some difficulty to commentators. Baydāwī explains "fi-n-nār" as "fi maḥān n-nār," ("in the immediate environs of the fire"); i.e. "he who is in the environs of the fire" is Moses; and ḥawlahā is the whole district surrounding the burning bush, taking in the whole land of ʿādām (Syria); so that the reference of the phrase "whoever is round about the fire" is to Moses' people throughout the land. Other commentators (quoted by Baydāwī) interpret "man fi-n-nār" as Moses, and "man ḥawlahā" as the angels. It would seem reasonable, however, to suppose that both phrases originally referred to God; implying that it was He who manifested Himself in and through the fire, but that His powerful presence was not confined to the theophany-site (fi n-nār) alone, but pervaded all things (ḥawlahā):— the blessing as a whole would be presumably pronounced by an angelic agent of revelation. This angelic 'call to worship' is then followed by direct divine self-manifestation, innahu anā ʾllāhū l-ʾazīz. The bold, unembarrassed way in which the personal Presence of Allāh is directly related to the fire-manifestation is surprising, in comparison with later passages where the 'vision of Allāh' is intentionally obscured for theological ends. Yet clear though the theophanic element may be, it obviously does not pervade the whole of the passage: the appeal to Pharaoh is not based on the fact of an experienced theophany, but rather on the compelling force of the miraculous signs. This becomes especially clear when 27:7ff is compared with its two companion pieces 26:9-68 and 7:101-133. 26:9 has a passing reference to the circumstances of the theophany (waʾidh nādā rabbuka mūsā), but thereafter it is the signs that are all-important, whereas in 7:101 even this passing reference is lacking. Cf. also 51:38-40, and 11:99ff.

One misses too, the note of direct numinous awe so evident in Exodus 3,
"Moses hid his face, for he was afraid to look upon God". The note of fear, awe, is present in this Qur'ānic passage, but it is related to the sign of the serpent-rod rather than to the theophany proper. The overall, inescapable impression is that the Mosaic theophany did not strike a completely sympathetic chord in Muhammad's spirit, no doubt because it did not correspond exactly to his prophetic call and experience.

4. In the later Medinan examples, there is reflected a much fuller knowledge of the Jewish Scripture; 20:8ff follows closely the narrative in Exodus 3, and all the essential theophanic elements are represented except the description of Moses hiding his face. The divine self-declaration (v.14) shows a greater advance toward credal formulation than in 27:7ff.

Once again the genuineness of the message is not authenticated by reference to the theophany, but by appeal to the miraculous signs: vv.13-24; 44; 49; 53-75.

23:29ff also exhibits a full knowledge of Jewish Scripture (though there are some small discrepancies30). It is all the more noteworthy, therefore, that the description of the theophany proper is confined to one verse (v.30), whereas the signs feature much more prominently (vv.30-31, 35-37). Interestingly, Hara'ah's desire to see God (v.30) is regarded as the ultimate blasphemy31.


This provides another clear example of the treatment of Old Testament theophanic material in the Qur'ān.

30) For example, there seems to be no awareness that the crux of the Israelites' problem was the fact of their enslavement in a foreign land.

31) In the context, of course, it is the cynicism behind the desire which is regarded with such repugnance, but there are overtones of the belief that the request is impious in itself.
The Qur'anic Parallels.

3.51: vv.24-37 and 3.11:72-81. Both of these suras consist primarily in a chain of warning stories, set in earlier, Meccan, free preaching and warning material.

**3.51.**

- vv.24ff: The story of Abraham (judgment follows the rejection of the message, vv.32-37)
- vv.33-40: The story of Moses (judgment follows the rejection of the message, vv.40)
- vv.43-5: Thamūd (judgment, vv.44-5)
- vv.46: Noah (judgment, v.46)
- vv.52-60: Muhammad (judgment, vv.59-60)

**3.11.**

- vv.20,24: Rejection of Muhammad’s attested message brings to the fire.
- vv.27ff: Noah (judgment follows rejection; 41,42,45,50b)
- vv.52ff: Yūd (judgment, v.63)
- vv.59ff: Salih (judgment, vv.70-71)
- vv.72ff: Abraham and Lot (judgment, 73, 84)
- vv.85ff: Shu‘aib (judgment, 97-9)
- vv.99ff: Moses (judgment, 100-101)
- vv.102-111:

120: Summary concerning judgment.

The basic message of both suras thus concerns the (eschatological) judgment certain to befall those who reject the message. It is obvious, then, that the theophanies to Abraham are in fact little more than incidental to this primary theme of judgment. (This is especially clear in 3.51, in that Lot does not appear at all—the one visit (that to Abraham) is directly related to the primary purpose of judgment. That the guests (al-mukramīn 51:24; rasūlumā 11:72) are conceived as angels in human form is clear from their refusal to eat (51:27f; 11:73); but the function they fulfill in these two suras is different from that in Gen.18-19. For though Allah is conceived as acting through them (51:35-37; 11:84, - the judgment is Allah’s) yet the messengers are clearly independent, subordinate figures, distinct from Allah, and fulfilling in fact the role of the prophets, in that they too are warners. The mysterious numinous ambiguity noted in the Genesis description, and the specific theophanic element, is lacking here.
C. The Sacrifice of Abraham's Son (of Genesis 22)\(^{82}\)

37:100-111.

The body of the sura consists of warnings of punishment following the rejection of God's message, and the account is illustrated with examples of former messengers and the fate of their disparagers. There is implicit in these tales of fiery vindication, a note of comfort for the messenger (Muhammad) facing present opposition; and this note has been strengthened by the addition of passages describing the reward and blessedness of faithful messengers. Vv.100-111 in fact form a later embellishment to one of these supplementary passages.

Such theophanic elements as the passage may contain are therefore quite incidental to the context. And in any case these elements are only minimal: - V.101 "I see in dreaming that I shall sacrifice thee", corresponds with Gen.22:1-3, where it is suggested that Abraham's conviction of being called to sacrifice his son, come to him via a dream. But whereas Gen.22 implies a dream-theophany, the Qur'\'onic passage is not specific on the point\(^{83}\). The phrase wānāDAYNūhu an y\' ibrahīm\(^{84}\) (v.104)

---

82) J. Finkel, "Old Israelitic Tradition in the Koran", M.W.22,1932, pp.169-183, doubts that 37:100ff is directly dependent on Biblical or Rabbinic sources, but makes the (unproven) suggestion that the Judaistic and the Qur'\'onic material alike stem from a common old Israelitic source. In the nature of the case, however, the evidence for such a view is insufficient.

83) According to Wherry, A Comprehensive Commentary on the Qur\'an, ad. loc., commentators say that the vision was given on three successive nights, in order to allay Abraham's suspicion that its inspiration was in fact satanic. That Abraham could have entertained such a suspicion precludes the possibility of his having experienced a direct theophany in the dream. Cf. also Bayqā\,'a \textquotedblleft an q̲ā' ilah yaqūlu lahu inna llahā ya\'muruka bi-\textdquotesingle-chabq ibnīka\textdquotesingle. The reference to Allah in the third person shows that the speaker in the dream was understood not to be Allah.

It should be noted, of course, that this evidence from the commentators tells us more about the later theologians' understanding of theophany than about Muhammad's.

84) nādā has too wide a range of usage for us to attribute a specific 'theophanic' colour to it; though it is interesting to note that it is used six times with reference to Moses' experience at the Bush, and four times re the voice of the Lord to unbelievers at the eschatological judgment (a context where the visual aspects become prominent). Elsewhere the verb is frequently used of the believers' fervent prayer to God in time of distress.
is probably to be understood as originally implying an audition, in which the
speaker is not the (visible) 'angel of the Lord' (Gen.22) but Allāh Himself,
invisible, and offering the definitive verbal explanation of the dream-experience.
i.e., the verbal increases its preponderance over the visual.

D. Jacob's Ladder at Bethel (cf. Genesis 28:10-22)

70:4: v.1 Some one has asked about a punishment about to fall,
v.2 of which for the unbelievers there is no averter;
v.3 from Allāh, Master of the stairs
v.4 on which the angels and the spirit mount up to Him in a day, the length
of which is 50,000 years;
v.5 So endure with patience becoming. V.6. Verily, they think it far-off,
v.7 But we think it near at hand.

According to Bell, vv.1-14 aim to answer the question as to when the punishment
(mentioned in 52:7-8) is due to fall. The original answer is 'soon' (vv.6-7).
But as time passed and the 'end' still did not appear, this earliest answer required
vindicating and rationalizing: 'One day with Allāh is as 50,000 years' (vv.3-5).
That the reference to this ladder of stupendous length is in fact based on the
Biblical account of the Bethel ladder (and its elaborations in later Judaism) is
clear from references in the Talmud, where the enormous width of the Bethel ladder
(and therefore its length too was presumably enormous) is calculated at 8,000
parasangs85) and where the seven heavens86) are stated each to be 500 years in
thickness, with a distance of 500 years journey between each87) (The figures
do not correspond exactly, but mathematics are obviously subordinate to the
overall impression of vast distance, which is the primary concern both in the
Jewish and in the Qur'ānic material. Cf. 32:4, where the distance between earth
and heaven is stated to be one thousand years.)

85) B.T., Hullin, 91b.
86) B.T., Yagigah, 12b.
87) B.T., Pesachim, 94b; and Yagigah, 13a.
Thus while it seems reasonably certain that the figure of speech employed in Surah 70:3-4 is based ultimately on popular Jewish accounts of the Bethel-ladder tradition as current in Muhammad's environment, it is also clear that its Qur'ānic import does not concern theophany as such. Its purpose (which it fulfills admirably) is to provide an explanation for the continued deferment of the divine judgment. If we could be sure that Muhammad knew the Bethel theophany tradition in its purer Biblical form, we should be justified in asking why this strongly numinous material found no further echo in the Qur'ān, and in drawing conclusions as to the importance or non-importance of the numinous-theophanic in Muhammad's religious experience. But such a line of investigation is closed to us; for it seems most likely that Muhammad knew the Bethel tradition only in this popular form, in which the marvellous had already replaced the numinous.

52:29-30 (especially v.38): "Or have they a ladder on which they listen? Then let their listener bring authorisation clear".

The connection of this material with popular Jewish ideas is certain, though specific reference to the Bethel ladder tradition is somewhat less sure than in the previous passage.

The implication of the verse is that the propositions of revelation are conveyed in the heavenly court, presumably by Allāh to His chosen angelic agent of revelation. All material claiming to impart genuine knowledge of the unseen, therefore, must either have been conveyed from that council by Allāh's accredited mediator, or overheard by some unauthorised eavesdropper, and passed on by him to men. On the grounds of what superior knowledge, then, do Muhammad's disparagers oppose the message which he bears? If they have in fact had access to this unique source of authentic knowledge, let them prove it by communicating the clear, authoritative propositions which they have overheard there. (fālīti musta'amūhum bi-sulṭānīn mubīn).
The point of interest for our discussion, is that the imagery of the heavenly council, which must originally have been primarily visiona in its impact, is here presented with the emphasis rather on the auditional and verbal aspect of revelation. The visual elements in the theophany are left vague and inexplicit; the importance of the council for revelation focuses exclusively on the verbal propositions that emanate from it.

The reasons for the comparatively minor role played by theophany in the formation of the Qur'ān.

Let us begin by drawing together the threads of our discussion thus far:

Prior to 610 A.D., Muhammad through contact with Jews and other seekers after monotheistic truth, had become deeply interested in religion, and had developed some awareness of the superiority of monotheism over the polytheized forms of faith current in his Arab environment. He knew that the Jews in particular possessed a sacred book which formed the source of their knowledge of God. Against this background of growing religious interest and concern, in 610 A.D. Muhammad experienced a call, in which he was convinced that he was confronted by the One God, and commissioned to call men to awareness, gratitude, and obedience. In this call-experience, visiona and auditional elements probably intertwined.

At first, Muhammad probably assumed that his urgent preaching and warning messages were related to 'the One Book' (i.e. the Tūrāh) in approximately the same way as were the current Jewish oral accounts which had so stimulated his interest. But in the course of this preaching, at times at least, the current of his emotion ran so strongly as he delivered himself of his message, that under the strong passion the language of the message fell into a pattern of rhythm and assone. It was an awesome experience to be so rapt, and the conviction was borne in upon
him that this material in fact comprised excerpts from the One Book — and so was to be preserved, (first orally as Qur'āns, and then in book form).

In the earlier, Qur'ān, period, Muḥammad vindicated the divine origin of his material by appeal to the inaugural vision — and presumably also, experiences of a similar kind which he underwent from time to time throughout the later Meccan period. But Muḥammad seems to have compared the vision(s) more with the miraculous 'signs' (the leprous hand, the rod-become-serpent, etc.) than with the theophanic experiences of Moses, Abraham, and Jacob; and by the beginning of the Book period, he had ceased to depend upon such 'sign'-authentication, and was appealing directly to the self-authenticating quality of the Book-material as the 'sign' par excellence.

What were the reasons, then, for this eclipse of the visional aspects of revelation? That Muḥammad did experience visions which he spontaneously interpreted as visions of God is certain. But had this theophanic experience been as devastating as that of Moses or Isaiah, it would undoubtedly have left a greater mark on Muḥammad's whole religious outlook than it apparently did, and would be stamped on the Qur'ānic material to a greater degree than is in fact the case.

Developments within Judaism, from the post-Exilic period till the call of Muḥammad.

We should admit freely that the intimate details of Muḥammad's psychological and spiritual make-up are inaccessible to us. These imponderables apart, however, the main reason for this eclipse of the theophanic would seem to be that Muḥammad was denied the yardstick by which he might have assessed and interpreted his visional experiences. Our assumption would seem reasonable that the psychological ground of his initial religious experience was not located in his native Arab
religious tradition\textsuperscript{33}) so much as in the monotheistic stirrings which were a feature of his time, and which had their ultimate source in the Judaeo-Christian Scripture-tradition. Muhammad, however, was not born within this religious tradition which was definitive for his religious understanding, but became grafted on to it in the seventh century A.D. By that time, the tradition had developed much further along the lines which we saw to be emerging already by the sixth century B.C., the point at which we broke off our detailed study of the O.T. literature. And in the course of this development the theophanic emphasis had ceased to be prominent.

The particular lines of development which have special bearing on our problem are:

1. **The emergence of the T\={	extbar}r\={	extbar}h as the closed and canonical body of revealed truth, definitive for the ordering of Israel's religious, moral, social and national life.**

2. **The eclipse of prophecy, and the growth of apocalyptic with its transference of the visi onal aspects of revelation to the eschaton.**

3. **The removal of angels from the sphere of the theophanic, and the emergence of a developed angelology, a hierarchy of independent but subordinate heavenly beings.**

Each of these tendencies underwent wide development during the millennium between the Babylonian Exile and the mission of Muhammad.

1. **The T\={	extbar}r\={	extbar}h.**

We have already described the historical and theological processes which led to the emergence (with the Deuteronomist) of the concept of hat-t\={	extbar}r\={	extbar}h as the

\textsuperscript{33} It is worth noting that 5.37:35, "shall we abondon our gods on account of a crazy poet (li-sh\={	extbar}r\={	extbar}h maj\={	extbar}n)?", and the similar 8.52:29f., are evidence for the belief among the Arabs of Muhammad's day, that poets were 'supernaturally inspired'. Muhammad's reticence concerning his visionary experiences is consonant with his unwillingness to be associated with these 'poets'. The more dogmatic Judaistic views, however, are the prime forces moulding Muhammad's thought concerning the process of revelation.
definitive corpus of divinely-given direction. M. Noth has summed up the crucial influence of the exile in the formation of Judaism's doctrine of the Torah: "When the edifice of the old establishment collapsed, the law, which had formed a single pillar in the framework of the whole, was the only part which finally remained erect. It then became the centre column and stay of a new edifice erected on the ruins of the old... The law became the basis not only of behaviour as determined by the relationship to God, but of that very relationship itself". The exaltation of 'the Law' as an absolute entity determining Israel's whole status before God led to its being regarded as timeless revelation, and thus to a loss of historical perspective. The law was conceived as given in toto to Moses on Sinai; so that laws embedded in the pre-Mosaic patriarchal narratives were explained as a retrojection from Sinai - e.g., Gen.32:33: "The law was given at Sinai, but was written in its present place to indicate the reason why it was prohibited". And on the other hand, the elucidatory oral tradition which, since the 5th - 4th Century B.C., had begun to collect around the written Torah was (at least from the beginning of the Christian era) stated to have been given to Moses, for oral transmission. In the late post-exilic period, the prophetic books were regarded as secondary to the Torah, and were employed by the preacher at the conclusion of the service as 'words of consolation'. Upon the Pentateuch was built up the divine service of the synagogue, as well as the whole system of communal life with both its laws and ethics. The prophets and other sacred books were looked upon only as a means of 'opening up' or illuminating the contents of the divine revelation.

89) M. Noth, "The Laws in the Pentateuch"; pp.87, op.cit.
91) B.T., Yullin, 101b.
92) "Whoever denies the divine origin of either the written or the oral law, is declared to be an unbeliever who has no share in the world to come, according to the Tannaitic code". K. Kohler, Jewish Theology, p.43.
of the Tôrêh; and declared to be inferior in holiness, so that, according to the Rabbinic rule, they were not even allowed to be put into the same scroll as the Pentateuch. Tradition claims a completely divine origin only for the Pentateuch or Tôrêh." 93)

By the time of Jesus ben Sirach (fl. 130 B.C.), the Tôrêh was identified with divine wisdom 94) (Exodus 15:1; 21:11; 24:23; 34:8); an identification which implied the instrumentality of Tôrêh in the divine work of creation 94a) and which led eventually to the doctrines of the pre-existence 95) and the eternity 96) of the Tôrêh.

93) K. Kohler, Jewish Theology, p.42f.

94) K. Kohler, " " p.45.

94a) The instrumentality of the Tôrêh in the work of creation is explicitly stated by R. Akiba in Pirke Abot, III:21: "Beloved are Israel to whom was given a precious instrument wherewith the world was created" (W.O.E. Oesterley, The Sayings of the Jewish Fathers, p.42. See also, op.cit., p.42 note 3 for a resume of the development of the concept.)

95) B.T., Pesahim, 54a "Ten things were created on the Eve of the Sabbath...the writing and writing instruments, ... the Tables (for the law)... the cave."

B.T., Shabbath, 83b: "When Moses ascended on High, the ministering angels spoke before the Holy One... 'What business has one born of women amongst us? He has come to receive the Tôrêh', answered He to them. 'That secret treasure, preserved for nine hundred and seventy four generations before the creation, Thou desirest to give to flesh and blood!' "

Beresit Rabba VIII: The Tôrêh is two thousand years older than creation.

Beresit Rabba II: "Six things preceded the creation of the world; among them were such things as were themselves truly created, and such as were decided upon before the creation; The Tôrêh and the throne of glory were truly created."

96) Baruch 4:1; "She is the Book of the commandments of God, and the law that endureth for ever." (150-60 B.C.)

Wisdom 18:4; "The imperishable light of the law..." (Latter half of 1st Cent. B.C.)

Kojjikra Rabba: "There is no way unto life excepting that of the Tôrêh."
As the pre-existent and eternal word of God, the Torah is addressed essentially to all mankind: "The Holy One ... offered the Torah to every nation and every tongue; but none accepted it until He came to Israel, who received it".\(^{97}\) Cf. G.F. Moore: "In content and intention, the law is universal; and not withstanding the collective rejection by the Gentiles, individual Gentiles who obey its commandments, share in its promises".\(^{97a}\)

And the seven Noahic commandments were enjoined upon, and accepted by, all the descendents of Noah; but "since they did not observe them, He rose up and declared them to be outside the protection of the civil law of Israel."\(^{98}\)

Another aspect of this developing concept of the timeless universality of the Torah, is its retrojection back into the patriarchal age. This trend is particularly marked in the Book of Jubilees, the prologue of which begins: "This is the history of the division of the days of the law and of the testimony ...... throughout all the years of the world, as the Lord spake to Moses on Mount Sinai ...";\(^{93a}\) and the same trend appears also in the Talmud.\(^{98b}\)

This exclusive concentration on the 'timeless' Torah resulted in a corresponding neglect of the theophanic aspects of revelation. Theophany was effectually

\(^{97}\) B.T., 'Abodah Zarah, 2b, on Habakkuk 3:3. Cf. also B.T., Megillah, 15b, on Exodus 34:6-7: "Why this difference between these and the others?" "Israel bury themselves with the Torah, the other nations do not bury themselves with the Torah." - This implies that the Torah, ideally, is given to all.

B.T., Megillah, 29a, Carmel and Tabor, (or their angelic guardians) came to Sinai at the giving of the law. Cf. also B.T., Megillah, ed. Epstein, p.176 note 6.

\(^{97a}\) G.F. Moore, Judaism I, pp.278f.

\(^{98}\) B.T., Baba Kamma, 33a, on Habakkuk 3:6. Cf. also B.T., 'Abodah Zarah, ed. Epstein, p.5 note 7. The Rabbis held that God had given Noah seven commandments, embracing the whole of natural religion: against, (i) idol worship, (ii) blasphemy, (iii) bloodshed, (iv) adultery, (v) robbery: for, (vi) the establishment of courts of justice, (vii) against eating the limb torn off a living animal. These were imposed upon all men, Jews and non-Jews alike.


\(^{98b}\) B.T. Yoma, 23b. "Our father Abraham kept the whole Torah, as it is said, "Because that Abraham hearkened to My voice (kept My charge, My commandments, My statutes, and My laws)". Tradition understood 'My laws' (plural) here to refer to the written Torah and the oral Torah.
banished from the present, and confined to the normative past or to the apocalyptic-eschatological future. The earlier theophanic narratives are re-orientated; so that whereas originally they described a theophany which had been regarded as revelational in itself, and by reason of its role within the salvation-history, now the theophanic element is made to serve and enhance the Torah, and hence to occupy a quite subordinate position.

Joshua 5:13-15: "As commander of the army of the Lord I have now come."

According to the Talmud, the apparition is made to say: "Last night you neglected the evening sacrifice, and now you are neglecting the study of the Torah."

"On account of which offence did you come?"

"Now am I come." - i.e. to rebuke neglect of the Torah."

Exodus 19:17 "...Moses brought the people out ... to meet God; and they took their stand at the foot of ('under') the mountain." The comment is:

"The Holy One... suspended the mountain over Israel like a vault, and said to them: 'If ye accept the Torah it will be well with you; but if not, there will ye find your grave.'" 101

Exodus 24:16 "The glory of the Lord settled on Mt. Sinai... and on the seventh day He called to Moses out of the midst of the cloud." The explanation is given that Moses went up in a cloud, was covered by the cloud, and was sanctified by the cloud, in order that he might receive the Torah for Israel in sanctity... There were six days waiting, that Moses might be purified and become equal to the ministering angels, and to heighten the solemnity of the occasion. He was called

99) B.T., Rosh Hashanah, 17b, on Exodus 34:6 ("The Lord passed by ...."):- "Were it not written in the text, it would be impossible for us to say such a thing." Similarly B.T., Hullin, 91b, on Genesis 23:10ff.

100) B.T., Erubin, 63b.

101) B.T., Abodah Zarah, 2b.
on the seventh day to receive the other laws (i.e., besides the ten commandments) and the oral law. 102)

Exodus 33:7-11: "Thus the Lord used to speak to Moses face to face (pañim el pani'm)."

Comment: "The Holy One ... said to Moses, 'Moses, I and thou will propound views (pañim) on the halakhah." 103)

Exodus 33:20f: "I will put you in a cleft of the rock ... then I will take away My hand, and you shall see My back." Comment:

"Ten things were created on the eve of the Sabbath: ..., the writing, the writing instruments, the Tables, the cave in which Moses and Elijah stood" 104)

i.e. the theophanic revelation at the cave (cf. also I Kings 19:12f) is intimately related to the Tables of the law, and the writing to be inscribed thereon.

Exodus 34:16: "The Lord passed by ... and proclaimed." Comment:

"The Holy One ... drew His robe around Him, like the reader of a congregation, and showed Moses the order of prayer." 105) i.e., a description of the revelation of the divine Name is hereby appropriated to become a description of the giving of oral Torah.

Psalm 68:16: "Why look ye with envy at the mount which God desired for His abode?"

Comment: "A bath kol went forth and said to them, "Why do ye desire litigation with Sinai? Ye are full of blemishes as compared with Sinai." 106) i.e., the mountain of the divine abode (primarily, the temple mount) has become the mount of the Torah.


103) B.T., Berakoth, 63b. The Halakhah; the elucidatory traditions referring to specific legal prescriptions of the Torah.

104) B.T., Pesachim, 54a.

105) B.T., Rosh Hashanah, 17b.

106) B.T., Megillah, 29a.
The theophany described in Ezekiel 1 is also linked with the law-giving; it is interpreted as "describing the heavenly hosts who also are supposed to have appeared on Mt. Sinai". And some regard the beatific vision (which as we have noted, is transferred to the eschaton) as a vision of Allāh in the role of Instructor in Toraḥ.108)

The preceding passages illustrate the way in which theophanic material is subordinated to the Toraḥ as a whole: those that follow show theophanic material being used in an allegorical way, in order to deduce or confirm specific moral, social, or ritual precepts of the Toraḥ:

Gen. 18:1: "The Lord appeared to him ... as he sat at the door of his tent ..."; is taken as illustrating the duty of visiting the sick. The Lord himself visited Abraham while he was sore from his circumcision: so believers should follow the divine example.109)

Gen. 18:3—enjoins the duty of hospitality: As Abraham entertained angels, so men should receive wayfarers.110)

Gen. 18:8: "...he stood by them ... while they ate."

The fact that angels ate, like men, on descending to earth, illustrates the principle that one should always strive to comply with local customs.111)

Exodus 19:19: "...God answered by a Voice (be-qūl)", is interpreted as meaning

---

107) B.T., Megillah, ed. Epstein, p.188 note 6; Some authorities prescribe Ezekiel 1 as the Haftorah to be read for the Feast of Pentecost, i.e. the commemoration of the giving of the law at Sinai.


109) B.T., Sotah, 14a.

110) B.T., Shabbath, 127a.

111) B.T., Baba Mezi‘a, 86b.
God answered with the same volume of voice as Moses had used (112) — from which is deduced a guiding principle for use in polite conversation.

Judges 13:19: "Manoah ... offered it upon the rock to the Lord, to Him who works wonders". The passage is used for deducing rules determining legitimate types of offerings, altars, etc. (113)

Exodus 1:7: "Their legs were straight...." — the deduction is that one should pray with straight feet. (114)

Such examples could be multiplied, but these are sufficient to show the new use to which theophanic material is put. The accuracy of these ancient accounts is not impugned; yet the material is not treated seriously for its own sake — rather the stories are regarded as pictorial illustrations, or at most confirmatory 'signs' of the validity of the Torah. The Torah itself is the revelation, to which theophany is a confirmatory adjunct.

2. The Cessation of Prophecy.

Closely related to this growing predominance of Torah is the decline and disappearance of prophecy.

By the time 1 Maccabees was composed (c.140-100 B.C.) prophecy was regarded as having long ceased (1 Macc. 9:27), its functions having been taken over by the Torah: 1 Macc. 4:45f: "they tore down the (defiled) Altar, and stored the stones in a convenient place ... until there should come a prophet to tell what to do with them. Then they took unhewn stones, as the law directs" (i.e. Exodus 20:25) "and built a new altar." Specific action was necessarily confined to those matters

112) B.T., Berakoth, 45a.

113) B.T., Zebahim, 103b, 119b.

114) B.T., Berakoth, 10b.
concerning which a clear directive could be cited or inferred from the Torah. 115)

Certainly, the hope is expressed of the return of the prophetic spirit at some later
time, "but the impression is that that hope is vague and almost formal." 116)

This confining of prophecy to a past age resulted in the loss of the present
sense of direct encounter with God. "No longer in either Maccabees or 2
Maccabees" are the leaders of Israel vouchsafed personal relations with God, as were
the patriarchs and prophets. Instead, in 2 Maccabees, men pray to God for help,
and God in return sends it in the form of a miraculous intervention through angelic
intermediaries; in 1 Maccabees on the other hand, prayer plays but a minor part...
and the normal attitude ... is that of the phrase, 'Heaven helps those who help
themselves'. 117)

This awareness of immediate personal relation with God, however, is the core
of theophanic experience; so it was virtually inevitable that the theophanic,
along with the prophetic, should be thought of as confined to the past. 118)

115) Obviously the oral Torah was not sufficiently developed at this stage, nor
its 'Mosaic' origin sufficiently widely acknowledged, for an authoritative
pronouncement about the defiled stones to be made, as purporting to be
from this oral Torah.

116) J. C. Dancy, A Commentary on 1 Maccabees, p.2.

117) J. C. Dancy, " " " " p.2.

118) Tosef Sotah, 38a, suggests that the ineffable Name could be pronounced only
when there was some indication that the shechinah rested upon the sanctuary.
When Simon the Righteous died (134 B.C.), with many indications that such
glory was no more enjoyed, his brethren no more dared to utter the
ineffable Name.
Not only was this the case, but among the accounts of past theophanies, Moses' experience, related as it was to the giving of the Toráh, became definitive for all. And in the interpretation of Moses' experience, Exodus 33:20 - "man shall not see Me and live" - is regarded as the touch-stone. Hence efforts are made to conform other more obviously visional statements to this standard. For example, on Ex.33:11 - "the Lord used to speak to Moses páním el páním" - the explanation is offered which interprets páním as meaning 'points of the halakáhah' (see above). And on Ex.33:20-24 - "you shall see my back..." - the comment: - "Had there been in the cave in which Moses and Elijah stood, a chink no bigger than the eye of a fine needle, they would not have been able to endure the light, as it says, 'For no man shall see Me and live'."\(^{119}\)

On the apparent contradiction between Ex.33:20 and Isaiah 6:1 - "I saw also the Lord" - Yeḥamoth\(^{120}\) comments that (the matter is to be understood) in accordance with what was taught (i.e. the Toráh) - "All the prophets looked into a dim glass, but Moses saw through a clear glass".\(^{121}\) i.e. the prophetic experience is to be interpreted in the light of the Kosáio, and the Kosáio in the light of Ex.33:20.

Here too belongs the prohibition against reading or expounding the 'work of the chariot' (Ezekiel 1)\(^{122}\)

---

119) B. T., Nigállah, 19b. B. T., Berakóth, 7a, is less uncompromising, but probably it does not claim to give the definitive interpretation of the passage:- "When I wanted, you did not want (to see My face - Exodus 3:6); now that you want, I do not want."

120) B. T., Yeḥamoth, 49b.

121) Rashi (Rabbi Shalomo ben Yitzchak - 1040-1105) is probably stating accurately and explicitly what the author of Yeḥamoth was hinting: "In their prophetic visions the prophets, like Isaiah, only imagined that they saw the deity; in reality they did not."

122) B. T., Nigállah, 25a; B. T., Haggájah, 11b, 13a; B. T., Shabbath, 80b. Cf.also B. T., Sukkáh, 28a; and B. T., Baba Bathra, 13a.
Part of the reason for the prohibition was undoubtedly the desire to avoid esoteric cosmological speculating on the basis of Ezek. 1; but a reticence about theophany as such is also partly responsible. Deliberate attempts were made to minimize the theophanic import of the passage. Cf. Haggigah: "All that Ezekiel saw, Isaiah saw. What does Ezekiel resemble? A villager who saw the king. And what does Isaiah resemble? A townsman who saw the king." The implication is that, beneath the accidental details of geographical setting, and of different levels of sophistication in their audiences, the two prophets' experience was similar. But we have noted above that, according to Ye'amuoth, Isaiah's vision is to be interpreted in the light of Ex. 33:20. The same, therefore, would presumably apply to Ezekiel's vision.

Thus the exaltation of the Torah and the eclipse of direct relation with God in the spirit of prophecy, evidently leads to reticence about theophany, and a reluctance to treat of its numinous inner core.

3. The growth of angelology.

The concept of subordinate heavenly creatures as mediators of revelation follows closely upon the two interrelated factors already noted; viz. the elevation of the 'canonical' Torah as the primary, comprehensive revelation; and the loss of that immediate awareness of personal relation with God entailed in the cessation of prophecy:

123) B.T., Haggigah, 13a: "There was once a child who was reading at his teacher's house the book of Ezekiel, and he apprehended what Hashmal was, whereupon a fire went forth from Hashmal and consumed him."

124) B.T., Haggigah, 13b. See also the appended note in the edition, setting out Rashi's interpretation of the saying.

125) We cannot of course simply assume that the vast mass of Talmudic material forms a homogeneous and theologically consistent whole. But in an area of thought such as we are dealing with, where the common trend is apparent, the building up of a composite picture in this way seems justified.
There were two strands in our study of the early Israelite material which are relevant to our study here:

(i) The heavenly council; and (ii) the angel of the Lord.

(i) The heavenly council.

Isaiah (Isaiah 6:1-12); Micaiah ben Imiel (1 Kings 22:22) and Jeremiah (Jeremiah 23:16-22) gained their authority as bearers of authentic revelation from their having been co-opted into the divine council, where in a deep, personal way, they entered into the intimate rationale of Yahweh’s purposes. The presence (in the divine council) of the Spirit who became the ruah sheqer (1 Kings 22:22), and of the Satan (Job 1-2) marks the beginnings of the process of individualising the members of the council (See further below). With the cessation of prophecy, therefore, (i.e. the cessation of human participation in this divine council), it is understandable that the concept should arise of heavenly beings being despatched from that council, to mediate the divine will and revelation to men. In the Talmudic literature,126 the creatures around Ezekiel’s cherubim throne, and even the great wheels, are transformed into members of the heavenly court, and the retinue is filled out with grade upon grade of angels. And from the third century A.D. the host of subordinate beings came to be termed the ‘familia’ of God127.

(ii) The angel of the Lord.

In the pre-exilic theophany narratives the mal'ak Yahweh had, for all practical purposes, represented the visible appearing of Yahweh at the crucial points of the Heilageschichte. By the later chapters of Ezekiel (chs.40-48), however, the angel had become an independent, subordinate being, still concerned with the Heilageschichte, but beginning also to be involved in imparting propositional revelation.

From post-exilic times onwards, as the heavenly messengers became more related

126) B.T., Hagigah, 13b ; B.T. Yoma, 19b.

127) For further details see K. Kohler, Jewish Theology, p.183f.
to this propositional type of revelation, the 'member of the heavenly court' and the 'angel of the Lord' increasingly approximated, until their functions were virtually interchangeable. 128)

The intention of these elaborations, no doubt, was to enhance the majesty of God by describing His heavenly court and retinue on the analogy of the splendour of oriental imperial courts; but the effect was to suggest the divine inaccessibility, the impossibility of man's enjoying direct contact with God:- "In der Periode des zweiten Tempels, herrschte die Vorstellung, dass die grossen Propheten der Vorzeit die Gunst genossen, direkt mit Gott zu verkehren, während es später nur durch die Vermittlung der Täuschen möglich gewesen sei, Geheimnisse über die Endzeit, über die Zukunft der menschlichen Geschicke usw. zu erfahren." 129)

(The other factor contributing to this belief in angelic mediation of revelation was, of course, the one already touched on; viz. the concept of the timeless Tóra as definitive and canonical: with this Tóra, revelation was in principle complete, so that henceforth God's communications to His people were confined to elaborations and elucidations of the principles enshrined in the Tóra. For such communications it was sufficient to despatch an angelic messenger. Having thus been established as the mode of revelation for the later period, angelic mediation was then read back into early Israelite times, and applied to the deliverance of the Tóra itself. See p.495 below.)

128) The marked syncretistic tendencies at the beginning of the Christian era were responsible for other elements in the growth of angelology: astrological notions and elaborate cosmologies led to the concept that stars, planets and natural elements were the locus or even the embodiment of conscious angelic beings (cf. Enoch 18:13ff., 21:3ff.; Jubilees 19): and popular 'spiritism' led to the belief that good and bad angels intervene in the trivia of human existence, moulding man's destiny. Such aspects of angelology are not of direct concern for our discussion here.

With the growth of this belief that revelation came only by the mediatorialship of angels, speculation on the being, nature, relative status and authority of angels, became increasingly absorbing and urgent. In the Talmudic literature an elaborate angel hierarchy emerged, headed by seven archangels — among them four were generally regarded as in direct proximity to God, as 'angels of the Presence'.

The specific application of this developed angelology to the Judaistic doctrine of revelation, was the assertion that the Torah itself had been received by Moses, not direct from God, but via the mediation of angels:

"Bescheiden ist, dass trotz Ex. 33:11 in den späteren Überlieferungen die Meinung vorherrschend war die Engelen seien bei der Gesetzesgebung als Vermittler zwischen Gott und Moses hervortreten (Jubilees 1:27ff; Galatians 3:19; Hebrews 2:2)."

In Daniel 8:16 and 9:21ff, Gabriel, as the messenger of the heavenly court, appears in a situation closely related to the transmission of revelation: In Daniel 9:24-7 he is the Interpreter, offering the authentic interpretation of Jeremiah 25:11-12. The Talmud furthers this trend, regarding the description

___

130) In pre-Talmudic times, this emphasis on angelology was not yet universal. The development is already under way in the apocryphal and pseudepigraphical literature of the inter-testamental period (Enoch 9:ff; 19:1; 27:2; Jubilees 10:8; 11:5; 19:23; 4 Ezra 4:1; 23:4; 32:6; 60:4ff, etc.). The mishnah, however, compiled c. 200 A.D. in general pays no attention to angels; and other Tannaitic sources refer to them by the generic term only. By the time of the completion of the Babylonian Talmud, however, (c. 500 A.D.), the interest in angelology had obviously become general.

131) Uriel; chief of the angel host and of the underworld; Jerameel; overseer of the souls in the underworld; Raphael; overseer of the spirits of men; Raguel; executor of vengeance against the world of lights; Michael; guardian angel of Israel; Sariel; function uncertain; Gabriel; overseer of paradise.

132) Uriel, Raphael, Michael, Gabriel.

133) Encyclopaedia Judaica, Vol. 6, col.635.

134) B.T., Yoma, 77a.
of the heavenly being in Dan. 10:4ff as referring to Gabriel. Thus the whole of chs.10-12, the intention of which is to reveal the divine purpose for Israel and the nations - "I will tell you what is inscribed in the book of truth" (v.21) - is put into the mouth of Gabriel. Thus he becomes not only the interpreter but also the mediator of Scripture.

Menahoth 183 comments on Numbers 8:4 ("and this was the workmanship of the lampstand..."); "the angel Gabriel girded himself with a kind of belt and demonstrated to Moses the work of the candlestick"; the implication being that Gabriel was the agent in revelation of the Torah. Relevant too is the belief that Gabriel, unlike other angels, understands all seventy languages of mankind, and hence is able to aid all men in intercession, and by extension, in revelation of the divine will.135

It is worth noting here that the tendency to identify Gabriel as the mediator of revelation, in the centuries preceding the rise of Muhammad, was not in fact confined to Judaism, Until the first half of the fourth Cent. A.D., Christian

135) Besides acquiring the specific role as mediator of revelation, Gabriel also develops an increasingly defined function as executor of the divine commands concerning earth, and guide of the Heilsgeschichte:-

B.T., Yoma, 77a: 'The man clothed in linen' who seals God's elect (Ezek.9:3,11) and initiates judgment on earth (Ezek.10:7) is identified as Gabriel;

B.T., Sotah, 10b, commenting on Gen.38:25 (Tamar said ... 'Mark I pray you, whose these are, the signet and the cord and the staff'), states that after these proofs were exhibited, Samael (the angel of evil) came and removed them, and Gabriel came and restored them.

B.T., Sotah, 12b, (On Exodus 2:5ff): the princess's maidens objected to her plan to rescue Moses, but Gabriel came and beat them to the ground,

B.T., Sotah, 13b, (On Gen.39:1ff): Gabriel came and incapacitated Potiphar, in order to frustrate his evil designs against Joseph.

B.T., Pesahim, 118a: When Nimrod cast Abraham into a fiery furnace, Gabriel said to the Holy One ...., 'Let me go down and cool the furnace'.
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orthodoxy used the term 'angel' (though with increasing caution) both of the Word/Christ and of the Holy Spirit, with subordinationist overtones but without implications of creaturaliness; and certain texts show that this 'angel' is conceived in categories borrowed from the Judaistic portrayal of Gabriel. On 'the Angel of the Holy Spirit', Cf. The Ascension of Isaiah, 3:15-16; 7:23; 9:27-36; 11:4, 32-35; these passages J. Daniélou (op.cit., p.179) compares with 2 Enoch 11:15-12:13 and 14:3-4, and reaches the following conclusion:-

"En effet nous y voyons Gabriel exercer toutes les fonctions qui sont, dans l'Ascension d'Isaïe, celles de l'Ange du Saint-Esprit, ce qui nous permet de conclure à la fois que l'Ange du Saint-Esprit dans l'Ascension est bien une christianisation du thème juif de Gabriel et inversement que c'est bien le Saint-Esprit qu'il faut reconnaître dans le Gabriel du Second Henoch."

The still-orthodox presentation of the Christ in the form of Gabriel is exemplified in The Ristle of the Apostles, 25, and in the Jewish Christian Sibylline Oracles, 8:456-461.

In heterodox Christian circles however, this terminology was utilised to imply the creaturalness of the Word/Christ and of the Holy Spirit; and it would be such heterodox Christianity which could be conceived as having influenced Muhammad's thought at this point. As we have suggested earlier, however, the extent of heterodox Christian influence on Muhammad's thought is problematic; and in any case Muhammad's contact with Judaistic sources was undoubtedly much more direct and sustained, (see note 4.)


Even such a cursory survey as we have attempted of these trends in Judaism, is sufficient to show how great a moulding influence contemporary Judaism had on Muhammad's thoughts about the process of revelation, and about the place of the theophanic within that process.
1. The Qur'ānic concept of 'the Book' as the timeless and absolute source of all revelation was not a philosophic or speculative concept, but depended concretely on the Jewish view of the Torah. (See pp. 444, 445, 446 - Qur'ānic references, 3.42:52; 43:1ff; 46:11; 2:123). Just as the theophany to Moses became in Talmudic literature a mere 'sign' appended to the revelation (i.e. the Torah), rather than a revelational event in itself, so Jewish influences encouraged Muhammad to regard his visionary experiences not as possessing independent revelational significance, but as confirmatory signs attached to that re-publication of 'the Book' with which he was entrusted.

2. Prophecy. At first sight it may seem that the fact of Muhammad's laying claim to prophethood runs directly counter to the trend we have traced in Judaism, i.e. the eclipse of prophecy in face of the definitive Torah; and that the Qur'ānic view at this point therefore represents an independent, new departure. It should be acknowledged that there is a measure of truth in this contention, for the Qur'ānic concept of prophecy is by no means a simple development. For its adequate assessment, at least three formative influences should be taken into account:

   i. The Christian influence. Tradition asserts that it was Waraqa b. Nawfal, a cousin of Muhammad's wife Khadija and a Christian, who helped Muhammad to interpret his initial religious experience in terms of a prophetic call. While

---

136) Cf. here the suggestion made above (p. 473) that even initially, Muhammad's visionary experience could not have been as devastating as that of the Hebrew prophets.

137) Ibn Ishaq (tr. A. Guillaume), *The Life of Muhammad*, p.107;
H. M. Katt, *Bell's Introduction*, p.26;
R. Bell, "Muhammad's Call", M.E. 24,1934, pp.13ff.
this tradition has no doubt been embellished by later hagiography\textsuperscript{138}, there is no reason to doubt that it contains a core of fact. This would imply then, that at the outset Muhammad\textsuperscript{139} has introduced to a Christian view of Old Testament prophecy: i.e. he was encouraged to think in terms of a series of prophets, necessarily consistent with one another in their message as spokesmen of the one God, yet relatively independent in status, and possessed of individual, though not necessarily identical, authority. The development of the concept of the Spirit in the Qur'an, to which we shall refer below, would seem to confirm that Muhammad was open to Christian influence in his early thinking about the process of revelation.

11. The native Arabic influence.

The two major Qur'anic terms for 'prophet' are rasūl, and (less frequently), nābī. The two terms are essentially equivalent and are frequently equated in the Qur'an, (4:161f ; 7:156 ; 19:52,55 ; 33:40,53). There are, however, two distinguishing points: First, according to Bell's dating the term nābī comes into usage about the time of the Hijra (earliest examples are in 17:57 ; 19:50,52,54, 55,57,59); whereas rasūl seems to have been used from early Meccan times, (early usages: 10:43 ; 19:52,55 ; 40:73 ; 69:40 ; 81:19.\textsuperscript{140}) The passage 19:50-59 (cf. also 7:156) appears in fact to have been revised, and in several phrases, the


\textsuperscript{139} Cf. Bell, (Origin, p.95) takes the view that Muhammad's prophetic consciousness gradually developed as his mission proceeded. That there was development is obvious, but this seems to have been upon a fairly firm primitive basis.

\textsuperscript{140} Rasūl at 81:19 can be taken as a reference to Gabriel, but probably Muhammad is intended.
word nabi inserted where previously rasul had stood alone. Secondly, 'nabi' is used exclusively for biblical prophets (with the addition of Muhammad), whereas rasul refers to all Qur'anic prophetic figures. These two facts suggest that the term nabi was borrowed about the time of the Hijra from biblical sources, presumably via the Jews.141

It should be noted, however, that the verbal root naba'a = 'Tell', 'announce', 'inform', and the noun-form naba' = 'Story', 'information', 'announcement', 'news', 'report', 'message', occur from early in the Hecean period. (Verb: 18:77; 35:15 54:23. Noun: 6:66 ; 9:71 ; 23:66 ; 33:67). We are therefore safe in assuming that these are pre-Islamic Arabic forms, and that they played a significant part in shaping the connotation of the borrowed form, nabi. Significantly, naba'a in Qur'anic usage has a strong propositional connotation, as compared with the more 'psychologised' tone of the Hebrew nibba', hithnabb'; witness the fact that in approximately half of its occurrences in the Qur'An, naba'a is used with God as subject:-

God pronouncing eschatological judgment, on the basis of His infallible knowledge of men's actions = 5:17,104 ; 6:60,103,160 ; 9:106 ; 10:24 ; 24:64 ; 29:7 ; 31:14,22 ; 39:9 ; 41:50 ; 53:7,9 ; or

God imparting truths about the unseen (5:53 ; 6:164 ; 26:221), and otherwise unascertainable facts (9:95).

By contrast the Hebrew verb always denotes the inspired speech of a human subject, and the emphasis is not so much on revealed propositions as such, as on the nature and character of the Revealing God by whom the prophet is inspired and commissioned. It is interesting to note that the Hebrew verb nbi is a denominative, derived ultimately from the Akkadian root nabi = 'call', 'announce',

141) Cf. W.W. Watt, Bell's Introduction, p.28
proclaim'. Scholars suggest that the oldest Hebrew usage of nabi' i.e. presumably that closest to the primitive Semitic root, may be reflected in Ex.7:1 ('I make you as God to Pharaoh, and Aaron your brother shall be your prophet.'), on which verse W.C.Klein(142) comments, "Aaron's task is to utter the words that Moses has given him. Here the term" (nabi') "is purely functional, and implies neither the existence or non-existence of special endowments in Aaron". This suggests that the Arabic naba'a is in fact closer to the primitive Semitic meaning than is the more 'spiritualised' Hebrew usage normal for 8-6th Century B.C. To this extent the Qur'anic view of prophecy represents a resurgence of the primitive Semitic concept of 'messenger bearing information, reports, and commands'. (143)

iii. The Jewish influence.

Against the background of what has been said under i. and ii., it remains true that Jewish thought represents the decisive influence shaping the Qur'anic concept of prophecy.

Parallel with the growing emphasis on the exclusive importance of the Torah, Talmudic literature reveals a corresponding emphasis on the person of Moses: just as all aspects of revelation become subsumed within 'Torah', so all the varied offices of revelation find their epitome in Moses, the bearer of that Torah. He


143) Cf. here E. Doll's remark (Introduction, p.146) on the use of rasul: "Anyone sent on a commission from one to another was, in Arabia, a rasul. if Muhammad felt himself compelled to advocate the worship of one God, Allah, he would very naturally claim to be the messenger of Allah."

W.C.Klein, (cit.p.803) also remarks: "One cannot help perceiving the intimate tie that exists between the office of prophet and the office of king. They may at one time have been identical, that is to say they may have originated, as separate offices, in a division of functions formerly combined in the same person, the charismatic head of the community, whatever the name by which he was known; hence Saul's association with the prophets and David's prophetic endowments are conceivably relics of an earlier time, when prophecy was concentrated in the king's person."

Thus Muhammad's emergence as charismatic ruler-prophet of the Muslim community is a further indication of the resurgence of the primitive Semitic concept of prophethood, over against the more specialised prophetic role typical of 8-6th Cent. Israel.
is Prince, Judge, Teacher, Sage, Miracle-worker, Mediator of all Scripture, God's Intimate, Intercessor for living and dead, Prophet.

his coming was ordained and predicted beforehand, and his return at the

144) B.T., Pesahim, 66a: Moses is the example of a sage, and Elijah the example of a prophet, who loses his special gift on giving way to anger.

145) B.T., Abodah Zarah, 25a: The sun stood still for Moses, as it did for Joshua.

B.T., Horayoth, 11b: Many miracles occurred with the anointing oil which Moses prepared in the wilderness.

146) B.T., Berakoth, 5a: The commandments, the law, the Mishnah, prophets, hagiographa, gemara, were all given to Moses on Sinai.

B.T., Rosh Hashanah, 21b: Fifty gates of understanding were created in the world, and all were given to Moses save one, as it says, 'Yet Thou hast made him but little lower than a God!'

147) B.T., Yebamoth, 62a: Moses three times anticipated the mind and thoughts of God.

B.T., Megillah, 31b: In the curses in Leviticus, Israel are addressed in the plural number, and Moses uttered them on behalf of the Almighty; in the curses in Deuteronomy Israel are addressed in the singular, and Moses uttered them in his own name.

148) The Assumption of Moses, 11:17: B.T., Sotah, 7b: "All the years that the Israelites were in the wilderness, Judah's bones kept turning in his coffin, until Moses arose and begged mercy for him."

According to R.H. Charles (The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, Vol. II, p. 112), The Assumption of Moses, 12:6 implies that Moses' relation with Israel "did not cease with death; he was appointed by God to be their intercessor in the spiritual world". This is scarcely compelling, but o.f.:--

B.T., Havikkah, 4b: (On 1 Sam. 23:13: "I see god-like beings arising..."), These beings are identified as Samuel and Moses: "Samuel went and brought Moses with him, saying to him, 'Perhaps, heaven forbids, I am summoned to judgment: Arise with me, for there is nothing that thou hast written in the Torah which I did not fulfill.'"

149) B.T., Rosh Hashanah, 21b: (On Deuteronomy 12:10: "The preacher sought to find pleasing words"), 'Koheloth sought to be like Moses, but a Bath Kol went forth and said to him, "It is written .... There arose not a prophet again in Israel like Moses'"

150) The Assumption of Moses, 1:14: "He designed and devised me, and He prepared me before the foundation of the world, that I should be the mediator of His covenant."

B.T., Hullin, 139b, and B.T., Hullin, ed. Epstein, p. 803 note 8, (on Genesis 6:3): "For He is flesh - bi-shaggam hu 'basar - but his days shall be 120 years". The numerical value of "bi-shaggam" in Hebrew is identical with that of "mish'ah" (Moses). Moses' days were also 120 years.
last day is expected\textsuperscript{151})

It will thus be seen that, though the actual word nabi occurs sparingly in Talmudic references to Moses, yet 'prophetic' features are prominent in the overall picture of him. Moses alone is credited with an immediate (if not visual) experience of God\textsuperscript{152}), in relation to which all other prophetic experience is secondary and relative. It is noteworthy, too, that the spirit of prophecy continues to inspire or prompt the sages of all ages, recalling them to the deposit of revelation given through Moses\textsuperscript{153}).

The evidence suggests that the influence of the image of Moses on Muhammad's prophetic self-consciousness is very strong. The name of Moses occurs over 130 times in the Qur'an; according to Ball's dating a few of these references may be late Meccan\textsuperscript{154}), but the vast majority belong to Years I and II A.H., i.e. the period of maximum contact with the Jews. Thus through his relations with the Jews at this crucial period, Muhammad would be confronted with a view of prophecy in which the prophet:

(a) had direct, though not visual, experience of God,

(b) became the purveyor of written and oral revelation in definitive, propositional form.

Thus the influence of Judaism is clear. It seems equally clear, however, that Muhammad never abandoned the initial insights into the nature of prophecy, which (we have suggested) came to him from Christian sources soon after his call,

\textsuperscript{151}) B.T., Nid., 70b; He replied (to a question as to whether uncleanness attaches to the dead in the hereafter), "Then they will be resurrected, we shall go into the matter". Others say, "then our master Moses will come with them, (we shall go into the matter)".

\textsuperscript{152}) B.T., Yebamoth, 49b; B.T. Menahoth, 29b; B.T., Shabbath, 83b-89a.

\textsuperscript{153}) B.T., Baba Bathra, 12a.

\textsuperscript{154}) Ball mentions 11:20; 17:103; 18:59, 65; 20:63, 70; 22:43; 27:7; 43:45; 53:37; 79:15; as well as other early Medinan passages which possibly incorporate earlier references to Moses.
nor ceded to Moses the status of prophet par excellence and primary mediator of all revealed truth\textsuperscript{155}) On the contrary he seems consistently to have regarded his own prophetic experience as parallel to that of his predecessors, including Moses, and as possessing its validity within itself. His growing self-confidence in the early Medinan period, coupled with his awareness that the Jews rejected his claim to prophethood, provided the background against which Muhammed's discovery of Abraham proved of such tremendous significance\textsuperscript{156}). His discovery that Abraham was chronologically prior to Moses, enabled him decisively to reject the close-knit 'Mosaic' structure of the economy of revelation, and to assert his independent status as a free-standing member in a line of messengers going back to Abraham. The message which he felt impelled to preserve in written form was therefore no mere secondary echo of the Mosaic Torah, but a re-publication of that essential divine truth which was the essence of the Torah, but which he believed the rigid 'Mosaic' structure of Jewish faith had distorted.

\textsuperscript{155})\textsuperscript{155f is probably the nearest approximation to such a view.\textsuperscript{156}) See R. Bell, Introduction, pp.23,165:

der Gebetsrichtung ("Kibla") nach Mekka, die mit der Theorie von der Religion Abrahams begründet wird, war einer der bedeutungsvollsten Schritte
der Verselbständigung der neuen Religion".

M.S. Seale, Editorial, M.W. 57:1, 1967, sees the discovery of Abraham as a spiritual advance of the highest significance.

A. Geiger, trans, Judaism and Islam, suggests that Muhammed saw Abraham as a type of himself: "Muhammed appears sometimes so to have confounded himself with Abraham, that in the middle of speeches ascribed to the latter, he indulges in digressions unsuitable to any but himself." (op.cit.p.99)
The mature Qur'ānic concept of prophecy which emerged from the interplay of these three factors, then, was one in which the theophanic was eclipsed by the propositional. If, as the Qur'ānic evidence seems to indicate, Muḥammad, like the Old Testament prophets of 8th-6th Century, experienced an ongoing relation with God throughout the period in which revelations were coming to him, this personalistic aspect is nevertheless subordinated to the reception of the sentences which eventually comprised the written Book - 'Prophet' comes to mean 'Recipient of the Book'.

3. Angelology.

In order to gain a clear impression as to the influence of Judaistic angelology on the Qur'ānic understanding of the transmission of revelation, three Qur'ānic concepts need to be considered in their interrelation: (a) ar-rūḥ (the Spirit), (b) wakīl ('suggestion'), and (c) malā'ika (angels).

(a) ar-rūḥ (the spirit).

From the time of the Hijra onwards, ar-rūḥ tends to be classified as an angel (16:2; 70:4; 78:33; 97:4). This, however, is probably not true of the Meccan period proper; for, as suggested below, angels are first mentioned in the Qur'ānic material about the time of the Hijra. Earlier references to ar-rūḥ, therefore, are unlikely to have implied this conscious equation with 'angel'.

26:193: "Verily it is the revelation of the Lord of the worlds, with which hath come down the Faithful Spirit (ar-rūḥ al-amīn) upon thy heart."

42:50,52: "It belonged not to any human being that Allah should speak to him except by suggestion or from behind a veil ...Thus we have suggested to thee a spirit belonging to our affair. Thou didst not formerly know what the Book and the Faith were, but We have made It a light by which We guide..."

157) Con. Blachère, Le Coran, II. p.211 who follows later Muslim theology in describing Ar-rūḥ al-amīn as the 'Angel of Revelation'.

158) According to Baydāwī "It" refers either to 'the Spirit', or 'the Book', or 'the Faith'. Probably Bell is right (Translation, p.489) in preferring the meaning 'It' = 'the Spirit' - i.e., the spirit as the mental illumination by which divine truth is apprehended.
It would seem reasonable to conclude that these original references to 'the Spirit' derived from a Christian source - presumably as part of the concept of Prophetic call and inspiration, received through Waraqah b. Nawfal. For it is noteworthy that 'the Spirit' had only a very circumscribed contemporary role in Jewish theology by the time of the Talmud, and is mentioned only rarely with a present reference. (It was believed that the Holy Spirit had departed from Israel after the time of Malachi\(^\text{159}\), since the nation, apart from a few personalities of exceptional sainthood and erudition in the Tôrâh, was unworthy of His presence\(^\text{160}\).)

Something of what had been implied by the doctrine of the activity of the Holy Spirit in early Israel, was preserved in attenuated form by the concept of the Bath Kôl\(^\text{161}\), and that of the Meâra\(^\text{162}\), (which passed over in Talmudic

\(^{159}\) B.T., Yoma, 9b.

\(^{160}\) It was believed that the Holy Spirit had been transmitted from Moses to the elders (Num.11:24ff.) by a rite of ordination, and thence in succession to the Sanhedrin, the College of Sages, and the heads of the Law Schools. This endowment of the Spirit, however, was for interpretation of Tôrâh, not for the reception of new revelations - See: Weber, \textit{Judische Theologie}, p.127,135.

\(^{161}\) The Bath Kôl is generally conceived in the Talmud as an audible Voice from heaven: its communications are not confined to elucidations of Tôrâh, but offer contemporary guidance (Yebamoth, p.14a; Sotah, p.2a,33a.). Weber sums up the difference between revelations through the Holy Spirit and through the Bath Kôl in the following way: "Jener lehrt als Geist der Weissagung oder als Führer zur Weisheit nicht bloß Einzelheiten, sondern Zusammenhängendes; diese gibt in einzelnen Orakeln gottliche Winke und Fingerzeige, Antworten auf Fragen, Entscheidungen in schwierigen Fällen, aber nicht stetige Unterweisung." - Weber, \textit{Judische Theologie}, p.194.

\(^{162}\) The Meâra is the Word as the personalised agent of God. The term is used frequently in the Targums to avoid anthropomorphisms. It had already disappeared from use by the time of the Talmud, and its functions taken over by the concept of the Shekinah.
literature to the concept of the Shekinah.\[163\]

This conjecture, that the concept of the Spirit in the Qur'\(\text{an}\) originally derived from a Christian source, is supported by the fact that many of the early Qur'\(\text{anic}\) references to "the spirit" treat of Christian topics: Mary (19:17; 21:91; 66:12); Jesus (5:109; and later, 2:81, 254; 4:169). The references to the creation of Adam through the Spirit, possibly came to Muhammad's notice through Christian sources which described Christ as the second Adam.\[164\]

(b) \(\text{Wahi}\).

The verb \(\text{am\(\text{ba}\)}\) occurs regularly throughout the revelation period, from early Meccan to late Medinan times (the noun \(\text{wahi}\), fortuitously perhaps, is infrequent and early).

**General Connotations of \(\text{am\(\text{ba}\)}\).**

Throughout the whole period, two central emphases mark the use of \(\text{am\(\text{ba}\)}\):

1. The messengers who receive the 'suggestions' are 'only men', with no inherent psychological or spiritual endowment specially fitting them for the reception of revelation - the sole condition is the moral one, of faithful obedience to the revealed word (2:26ff). (Cf. here the note on ras\(\text{uli},\) p. 501). Nor have the

---

163) The Shekinah is the inner luminous core, of which the appearance of the 'glory' (kab\(\text{ud}\)) was the visible outward expression. In the early Targums, the shekinah was an impersonal sign of God's presence, but in later Midrash and Talmud, the term took over the personal qualities attaching to 'N\(\text{emura}\)', as the latter term ceased to be used. Thus 'shekinah' assumed almost mediatorial functions.

164) Cf. also Richard Bell's suggestion (Translation, p. 669) that some account of the Eve of the Nativity may have given rise to 3:97ff:-

"The Night of Power..... in it the angels and the spirit let themselves down, by the permission of their Lord, with regard to every affair."

165) Admittedly the references are sparse in the late Medinan period; the only examples are: 6:93, 112; 35:2; 42:11.
messengers, (except in the late Medinan period\textsuperscript{166}), any permanent relation to
the divine, or permanent status within the economy of revelation. At each
successive moment, it remains the prerogative of the divine will whether or not the
messenger is to be used in imparting the specific commands, warnings and insights.
In general, the 'suggestions' are unaccompanied by 'sign' or 'miracle':
The following examples are dated by Bell as Heccan:-

\begin{quote}
12:109f 'We never sent before thee any but men to whom We made suggestions
(\textit{rijāl} \textit{mūnh ilayhim}),...until when the messengers despaired and
thought that they had spoken falsely, Our help came to them."
\end{quote}

The temptation to doubt and despair which beset the messengers is most
naturally taken as implying that theirs was a bare message, impressing itself on
their minds and unsupported by any outward sign, authenticating sign, on which the
messenger himself might stay his faith. Cf. also 6:19 ; 21:46.

21:7-9: 'We did not send before thee any but men, to whom We made the
suggestions:-

- ask the people of the \textit{Reminder}, if ye do not know. We did not
make them a bodily appearance not eating food (\textit{jassād} \textit{in ya'kulūna}),
nor were they immortal (\textit{khalīdīn});

but We spoke the promise true to them, then We rescued them, and
whom We will .........."

The original form of the passage (vv.7a,9) is similar in tone to the preceding
example. The denial that the messenger is an angel\textsuperscript{167}(v.8) is later and is
probably a rejection of the Jewish notion of angelic mediation of revelation (the
\textit{Tūrūn}): The People of the \textit{Reminder} to whom appeal is made\textsuperscript{163}(v.7b) are

\textsuperscript{166} Cf. here the late honorific titles \textit{Rasūl Allah, Hub (Allah),} which imply
permanent status as God's earthly agent. \textit{Rasūl Allah} occurs approx.120
times in this sense, in the Medinan period.

\textsuperscript{167} Cf. 6:50.

\textsuperscript{163} Cf. 16:45.
therefore presumably the Christians, whose doctrine of prophetic men inspired by
the Spirit is at this stage preferred to the concept of angelic mediation.

33:65-70: "Say, 'I am only a giver of warning; There is no God but Allah..."

Say, 'It is a message mighty... I had no knowledge of the High
Counsel when they disputed... All that is suggested to me is
that I am a warnor clear.'

Reception of 'suggestions' does not imply co-option into the Divine Council.

7:202: "then thou bringest not a sign they say, 'Why hast thou not selected
one?' Say, 'I simply follow what is suggested to me from my Lord:
This' (i.e. the message), 'is demonstrations from your Lord'."

The only sign vouchsafed is that of the inspired style and content of the
qur'ans themselves.

The overall impression then, is that the reception of 'suggestion' is a mental
experience, normally unaccompanied by vision or audition. Further examples from
the Medinan period follow the same trend:

- the messenger's lack of knowledge about the future: 46:8;
- the warning message is unadorned by 'signs': 4:161ff; 42:1,5;
- the messenger is tempted to doubt or despair, by the very bareness of this
  mentally apprehended word, with its lack of definitive signs: 10:109;
  17:75; 43:42;

reception of revelation is conditional upon faithful obedience: 17:88.

B. From the beginning, the term ṣura includes a reference to verbal revelation;
and this emphasis becomes increasingly strong, as we should expect, as the Book
period advances.

In the Second period, there is a fairly even balance between passages where ṣura
signifies 'impertation of otherwise inaccessible knowledge' (11:33; 72:1; 41:15
= 18:110), and other passages where the meaning is 'practical direction,' 'command'
(11:15; 17:41; 11:39 = 23:27). In several passages, however, these two emphases
coalesce (21:25; 34:49).

At about the time of the Ḥijra (early Medinan arrangements of Meccan material) we
have the following:-
"Is it a wonder ('ajabān) to the people that We have suggested to a man among them, 'Warn—and give good news...'? The unbelievers have said 'This is magic manifest (sāhir mutīn)'."

The reference of 'wonder', 'magic', is obviously to the costatic, exalted quality of the language in which the message is couched: the language is the authenticating sign.

In this period, 'suggestions' in the form of 'commands' (7:114,160; 10:87; 20:33,79; 21:73; 23:27; 26:52,63; 28:6) far outnumber those in the form of 'impartation of knowledge' (12:15; 20:50; 21:103) — Again there are passages where the two emphases coalesce, (20:13; 21:103).

In Medinan passages, the verbal connotation of āwāẓ is specifically linked to the production of the Book:

18:26: "Recite what has been put into thy mind (mā ʿāμiya ilayka) of the Book of thy Lord. No one can alter His words."

This growing emphasis on the production of a Scripture is reflected, too, in those Medinan passages where a whole block of narrative is said to be 'suggested':

12:3: "We shall give thee the best account, in that We have suggested to thee this Qurʾān." (169)

3:39: "This is one of the stories of the unseen which We give thee by inspiration (mūḥifi ilayka); thou wast not with them when they cast their pens...."

In the Medinan period too, 'suggestions' in the form of 'commands' (5:111; 6:116; 16:124), continue to preponderate over 'suggestions' as 'impartation of knowledge' (14:16); and again there are several examples where the twin emphases on 'command' and 'knowledge' coalesce, (6:106; 39:65; 43:42). These two central emphases in the use of the term āwāẓ, then, remain constant throughout the whole revelation period (though with the increasing stress on Book production that we have noted).

Specific Connotations of āwāẓ.

In addition to the above, there are two points in the use of āwāẓ, at which a significant shift of emphasis is to be noted:—

169) "Qurʾān" here probably means 'sūra' or 'block of narrative'. 
I. In the Meccan period the term ambū is used more flexibly and less technically than in the Medina period. God makes his 'suggestions' not only to men, but also to bees (16:70 - assigning them their habitat);

to the heavens (41:11 - assigning its office or influence to each of the seven heavens);

and to the earth (99:4f - directing the earth to reveal the deeds done in her).

It is noteworthy that in each of these early examples, the twin emphases on 'suggestion' as 'command' and as 'knowledge', which we have noted throughout section B. above, are inseparably intertwined. The reason for this close interrelatedness of 'command' and 'knowledge' is probably connected with the fact pointed out by W.M. Watt, that haste or quickness is part of the connotation of the root why.

For, an insight into the unseen or the future which impresses itself with the peremptoriness of a command, is obviously one which comes very suddenly, and seems not to have arisen within the thought-processes of the prophet's mind, but to have been injected from without.

Two interesting Meccan passages seem to throw light on this sudden incursion of insight:

20:113: "Do not be in a hurry with the Qur'ān before the suggestion of it is finished (yuqūd īlayka waḥyuhu), but say 'O-Lord, increase me in knowledge'.

170) bianna rabbaka ambū laḥā. A Yusuf Ali, The Holy Qur'ān, comments: "The 'inspiration' is the command or direction, conveyed by instruction breathed into the Earth personified: She is directed to tell the whole story of what she knows."

171) W.M. Watt, Bell's Introduction, p.19f.
Both these verses seek to inculcate in the prophet an attitude of total dependence. In the process of revelation he is to keep his mind passive, allowing the words and phrases to crystallise around these lofty thoughts and insights which his mind senses, until a connected passage finally emerges, luminous and complete. When at length the whole does thus emerge, perhaps after a considerable interval of time, it will do so with an impression of suddenness and of givenness; creating the prophet's conviction that this has not arisen from within his own conscious mind, but has been injected from without. 173)

II. *āwhā* in Relation to Theophany.

There is strand of development, important for our enquiry, which bears on the relation of 'suggestion' to theophany. The relevant passages are:-

53:2-10 (Early Meccan); 42:51 (Early Medinan modification of Meccan material);
4:161-163 (Medinan):

53:2-10 (Early Meccan): "Your comrade"... does not"speak of(his own)inclination. It is nothing but a suggestion suggested (waḥyūn yūhib), Taught(him)by One strong in power .... He drew near, and let himself down .... And suggested to his servant what He suggested (awḥā ... mā awḥā)

The heart did not falsify what it saw.
Do ye debate with it as to what it sees?"

In our earlier discussion of this passage, we suggested that awḥā here, besides its verbal connotations, quite probably includes also some visible sign or gesture designed to impress and commend the verbal content of the revelation. In any

172) 21:38 is similar in wording, but the reference may be to the coming day of judgment which cannot be hastened, but will dawn at God's appointed time. Similarly 161:1.

173) In this section, and throughout the discussion of awḥā, I am especially indebted to W. M. Watt, Bell's Introduction, p.119ff.
case, the 'suggesting' occurs in the context of a vision (vv.6f,11f) which, we concluded, was originally interpreted as a vision of God. This visional connotation of asbā in what is generally considered a very early passage, must be set alongside our conclusion on p. 509 that the bulk of Meccan-period references to asbā indicate a mental experience, normally unaccompanied by vision or audition.

Both the visional and the a-visional use of asbā are early: which would confirm our earlier tentative finding, that though Muhammad experienced a theophanic prophetic call, yet this experience did not become paradigmatic for his whole subsequent prophetic understanding, but was early overlaid by his preoccupation with what he believed to be the supernatural qualities of the language to which he gave utterance in his times of rapture.174) Probably in Meccan days he ascribed this supernatural language to the inspiration of the spirit.

42:51 (Medinan modification of earlier Meccan material):

"...or by sending a messenger (rasūl), to suggest (yūsbā) by His permission what He pleaseth."

'rasūl' here obviously signifies 'angel,'175) and the sentence was probably added in early Medinan times to make explicit what was then seen to be implied in the phrase 'from behind a veil' (min warā'ī hijāb).176) The implication seems

174) Using the word in its primitive, literal sense.

175) So Baydāwī; Bell, Translation, p.489.

176) According to Baydāwī the phrase 'from behind a veil' may refer either to:-
apprehension of revelation (ilhām) in the mind; or
moderation of the message by an angel. The second of these alternatives is to be preferred:-
a) the basic significance of the word hijāb, as it occurs in the Qur'an would seem to be not 'ambiguity' or 'obscurity', but 'separation', (7:44; 19:17; 83:15).

The point seems to be that in the revelational process God remains separate from men, imparting His word to the prophets not in direct encounter, but via an (angelic) intermediary.

b) According to Jewish tradition the throne of God is veiled from the angels by a curtain of cloud (Targum on Job 26:9). When called upon by God, the ministering angels approach the curtain, and hear the voice of God from behind it, but do not see God himself face to face: - Weber, Judische Theologie, p.163.

Cf. B.Z., Harishah, 16a. The demons are like the ministering angels, in that they know what will happen.....They know? ....Rather, they hear from behind the veil (pargod) like the ministering angels.
to be that 'suggestion' via the Spirit's illumination of the mind is either
equivalent to, or superseded by, 'suggestion' via an angel, (probably conceived as
visible and audible). Once introduced here, the concept of angelic mediation
would be read back into 3.53:1-12 under the growing influence of Judaistic
theological ideas.

4:161-163 (Medinan):

"Verily we have made suggestions to thee as We made suggestions to Noah
(saw) and the prophets after him......
to Abraham, and Ismael, and Isaac, and Jacob, and the Patriarchs, to
Moses, indeed, Allah spoke directly (kallama ilah Mink takliman)"

The meaning of the passage is, undoubtedly, that Moses was vouchsafed the highest
level of revelatory experience, so that 'suggestion' is set in contrast to
'direct speech'. We are thus at farthest remove here from the use of اضن in the
theophanic context of 3.53:1-12. It will be obvious from our earlier discussion
that this placing of Moses in a unique category over against the other prophets is
a Judaistic concept. In view of this strong Jewish influence, then, the phrase
'kallama takliman' should also be interpreted in accordance with contemporary
Jewish understanding of the equivalent Biblical phrase, 'dibbär ... pānim el pānim'
(Ex.33:11). Now we saw above that Jewish ideas related Ex.33:11 to the reception
of the Torah, and the reception of the Torah was thought of in terms of angel
mediation. Thus implicit in 3.4:161ff. above, is the concept of angelic mediation
as the highest form of revelation, surpassing 'suggestion'.

d) malāʾika (angels).

Origins of the term malāʾika.

According to Bell173, the term malāʾika (sing. malak) is probably a pre-
Islamic borrowing from Ethiopian, and thus entered Arabic from a Christian source.

177) So Bayḍānī.

178) Bell, Introduction, p.144.
In the case of such a diffused, popular borrowing, it is difficult to determine to what extent the term carried distinctive theological connotations for pre-Islamic Arabs. No doubt 'malā'ika' was regarded in the popular mind as approximately equivalent to 'jinn'. But as we note below, certain aspects of Qur'ānic angelology show rather close affinities with Christian concepts; so it may well be that in certain quarters in pre-Islamic times, the Christian theological implications of the term malā'ika were already being appreciated.

The earlier Qur'ānic occurrences:

The first Qur'ānic occurrences of the term are probably to be dated about the time of the Hijra (following Bell's dating). In the main, malā'ika has two characteristic usages in the Qur'ān, describing:-

a) the angels' role in the eschatological judgment,

b) angels as agents in the transmission of revelation.

The first of these emphases is in fact more nearly related to Christian than to Talmudic ideas; but references relating angels to the transmission of revelation clearly show Judaistic influence. The line of development in connection with this last concept is as follows:-


180) The earliest uses are: angels at the creation of Adam: 7:10 ; 38:71ff ; 17:63 ; 18:48.
    angels and spirit ascending the heavenly ladder 70:4.
    angels at the eschatological judgment: 73:38.

181) Qur'ānic references to the role of angels in the judgment:-
    angels as recorders against the day of judgment:- 13:12 ; 82:10ff ;
    Comparatively rarely are angels guides to paradise:- 13:23 ; 16:34 ; 21:103.
    25:31 ; and the Book of Revelation, passim.

The Talmud, on the other hand, is more concerned with the angel of death, and the methods by which he terminates the lives of men. (approx. 20 references in Bab. Talmud.)
Early Rejection of the Concept of Angelic Mediation.

In a series of passages\(^{182}\) dating from the time of the Hijra and the early Medinan period, the concept of angelic mediation is used by Muhammad's detractors in polemic against his prophetic claims:

15:7-9: "Why not bring the angels to us, if thou art one of those who speak the truth?"

We send not the angels down but with the truth (bi-l-\(\text{h}aqq\)), and then they would not be respite. It is We who have sent down the reminder, and We verily shall look after it."

Verse 7 is open to two possible interpretations: Muhammad may himself have claimed that his message was mediated by angels; or, Muhammad's message is being rejected on the grounds that it does not purport to have been mediated by angels. Verse 8 however, makes it virtually certain that the latter of these alternatives is the correct one: to the jibe of v.7, the answer is given, that the coming of an angel would mark the onset of the eschatological judgment; and that in the intervening dispensation God conveys His warnings to mankind via His prophet-messengers. Muhammad's opponents here are probably Jewish, for as Bell\(^{183}\) remarks, it is "unlikely that pagans were so interested in the idea (of angels) "as to demand that an angel should have been sent as messenger." The passage therefore represents an appeal back to more strongly Christian ideas, in face of incising Jewish concepts. Cf. also 25:23-26.

17:96ff: "Nothing prevents the people from believing when the guidance has come to them, but that they say, 'Hath Allah sent a human being as messenger?' Say: 'If there were in the earth angels walking about, ...We should send down to them from the heaven an angel as messenger'. Say: 'Allah is sufficient witness between you and me.'"

---

\(^{182}\) The tone of the passages is similar to that of the verses treated above under a\(\text{h}a\) section A.

\(^{183}\) R. Bell, Introduction, p.144. The opposite view is taken by G. Widengren, Muhammad the Apostle of God and his Ascension, p.93f. He dates the passages in the second Meccan period, and refers to Muhammad's opponents as 'people of North Arabia', or 'citizens of Mecca'.

The human messenger is most appropriate for human kind; and the message itself is self-authenticating, so that to the sincere it is patently from God. The passage is therefore similar in intention to 15:7-9 above.

Cf. also 21:7 (discussed above), and 6:111.

23:23ff: "We sent Noah to his people ....

But the nobility, those of his people who disbelieved said:
'This is only a man like yourselves, who wishes to gain pro-eminence over you; if Allah had willed He would have sent angels; we never heard of this among our fathers of old. He is only a man possessed ..."

He said, 'O my Lord, help me ...'

So we suggested to him, 'Make the ship ...'"

It is interesting that the prophet counters his opponents' appeal to 'angel mediation', by laying himself open to 'suggestion' with its o-visual/auditional, mental qualities which we noted above. Thus again we see Muhammad clinging to his older understanding of revelation, in face of incurring Jewish ideas.

Adoption of the Concept of Angelic Mediation:

The first beginnings of a concession to the Jewish concept are perhaps discernible in 22:74:-

"Allah chooseth messengers from amongst the angels and from amongst the people; verily Allah hears and observes."

The choice of messenger is Allah's prerogative; this is 'His proper power' (v.73). But the possibility of angel messengers' being sent is no longer ruled out a priori.

In the Medinan period proper, the concept of angels as mediators of the Book-

184) According to Bayāmī, 'this' may refer to: the person of Noah ('this man'); prophethood - a human being, sent as a messenger of God; the urgent warning message delivered by Noah.

The three, of course, are not mutually exclusive.
revelation is clearly accepted: 185.)

2:285: "The messenger has believed in what has been sent down to him from his Lord and the believers also; each one has believed in Allah and His angels, and His Books, and His messengers....."

Cf. also 2:172; 4:135.

4:164: "But Allah bears witness to what He hath sent down to thee...He sent it down with knowledge of Himself, and the angels bear witness 186) and Allah is sufficient witness."

The reference to angelic mediation of the Torah is even clearer in the following:

2:249: "Their prophet said to them, 'The sign of his kingship will be that the Ark will come to you containing a Sakīna187) from your Lord ... and the Angels will bear it; surely in that is a sign for you if ye are believers."

Whatever the precise allusion behind the sentence, it seems clear that Sakīna is closely related to the Torah 188), which was contained in the Ark according to

185) The newer concept was harmonised with the older, by regarding ar-rūḥ as an angel, (16:2; 70:4; 78:33; 97:4). This inclusion of ar-rūḥ among the angels was not, however, purely an initiative from Muhammad himself, but in fact had its precedents in Jewish thought. The Targum Onkelos on Gen.1:2; Jer.32:15; Isaiah 44:3, indicates that the Spirit was regarded already at that time as a created being. "Der heilige Geist ist der Geist der vor Gott diert, und von Ihm gesendet wird um seine Befehle zu vollstrecken", - Weber, Judische Theologie, p.191. Hence the Spirit was equated at the practical level with the highest of the ministering angels.

A Geiger, Judaism and Islam, p.61, cites Sanhedrin, paragraph 44, as identifying 'the definitely-speaking Spirit' with Gabriel.

186) The central clause, referring to angel witnesses, is a Medinan addition to early Medinan material.

187) Sakīna, an Arabic form of the Hebrew 'Shekinah' - See note 163 above. B.T., Sotah describes the ark as the 'ark of the shekinah' (13a) and as identical with the shekinah (40a).

188) Baydawi understands sakīna as 'rest', 'tranquility', in that the Torah contained in the ark is the source of Israel's 'rest' or wellbeing.
Jewish belief; and that the mention of the angels bearing the Ark includes a reference to the concept of angelic mediation of the Torah. Angelic mediation of the Book has therefore been accepted by this time.

Gabriel as the Agent of Revelation.

Finally, about the Yr. III, the angel Gabriel appears in the Qur'anic material as the angel of revelation:

2:91f The angel Gabriel appears in the Qur'anic material as the angel of revelation:

2:91f  Say, 'Whoever is an enemy to Gabriel - verily he hath brought it down upon thy heart with the permission of Allah confirming what was before it, and 92. as guidance and good tidings to the believers. Whoever is an enemy to Allah and his angels and His messengers and Gabriel and Michael - verily Allah is an enemy to the unbelievers.'

Though this is the sole Qur'anic passage referring to Gabriel as the mediator of revelation, the influence of Judaistic ideas as outlined on p. 495 above is quite clear. (The only other Qur'anic reference to Gabriel, S.66:4, which described him as the executor of God's will on earth, is also related to Jewish concepts - see note 135, p. 496).

---

189) B.T., 'Abodah Zarah, 24b, (on 1 Sam.6:12) says that the kine which bore the ark, "directed their faces toward the ark and rendered song," (like the ministering angels). This is no doubt the source of the suggestion quoted by Wherry (Commentary, Vol.I, p.380) which identifies the angels as the cattle that bore the ark.

Bayzawi offers two possibilities:- God had taken the ark to heaven after the time of Moses; and it was brought down again in the time of Saul by its guardian angels. Or; The Philistines, after the ark brought them bad luck, loaded the ark on bulls, which were then driven along by angels, till they came to King Saul. It would seem simplest to regard the account in 3.2:249 as a conflation of two traditions which had reached Muhammad orally from Jewish sources; viz. the narrative of 1 Sam.6, and the doctrine of angelic mediation of the Torah.

190) Verse 91 is a more precise, sophisticated version of v.92, and is therefore to be dated later.

191) Muslim scholars have found references to Gabriel in: 53:5 (šađīdā l-qurān); 26:193 (ar-rūḥ al-māmīn); 17:87 (ar-rūḥ); 16:104 (rūḥ l-qudus); 81:19 (rasūl); 70:4 and 97:4 (mālāʾika). "Tradition naturally and inevitably understands 'spirit', 'Angel', and 'messenger', whenever they occur in the Koran, to refer always to Gabriel, and that he is the speaker in all the revelations". - Archer, Mystical Elements in Mohammed, p.34.
In conclusion then:

1) Muhammad's early understanding of the reception of revelation, was that in a visional call-experience he had been confronted by God and commissioned to declare to the people of Mecca the divine goodness, power, and judgment. The message for whose delivery he was commissioned by that initial experience, continued to come to him at intervals, by the Spirit's suggestions to his spirit.

2) By an early stage, the majestic eloquence of his inspired language so impressed Muhammad himself, as to encourage him to seek his seal of authentication in the language of his message, rather than in his initial and subsequent infrequent visional experiences. His opponents' demand for an authenticating sign no doubt encouraged him to appeal with increasing firmness to the Qur'anic language as the 'sign' par excellence.

3) During the first three years of the Medinan period, the Jewish dogmas of the impossibility of theophany (Ex. 33:20), and of the angelic mediation of the Torah, exerted a strong influence on Muhammad's thought concerning the revelational process, leading him to accept first the role of angels generally, and then of Gabriel specifically, in the transmission of the Book.
CONCLUSIONS.

From the material considered in the course of this thesis, several salient features of the theophany tradition stand out clearly: -

1. The essential involvement with history.

a) We have concluded that the original Sinai theophany-encounter was an historical event of prime importance, which played an essential part in Israel's awareness of having been called into nationhood by Yahweh. Though this basic Sinai tradition has been enriched with material that was a-historical in its original non-Israelite form, in all cases this borrowed material has been historicised by being integrated into the H interleicht. Similarly the patriarchal theophany traditions, originally an amalgam of the historical reminiscences of the wandering clans and local Canaanite traditions with only a weak historical interest, were attached to the Sinai-theophany core in a promise-fulfilment relationship.

b) The religious traditions of Israel in general, and the theophany accounts in particular, may be said to have been preserved for the sake of the clue that they offered in the interpretation of the nation's history. The moments of theophany were the moments at which God's presence with Israel and His intention for the nation were visible at their most luminous. By re-calling and re-actualising these crisis-moments of the past, then, successive generations in Israel gained an insight into the divine intention for their present, and hence also for the future that flowed from that present.
o) We have noted that it was the historical process which was the chief factor leading to the setting down of the traditional material in scriptural form: in periods of great social and political change, the older traditions were preserved in writing lest they become lost in the transition. Thus for instance the disruption provided the historical impetus which produced the work of the Yahwist, and the (impending or realised) exile that of the Deuteronomist.

d) If the periods of crisis provided the catalyst, however, it is also true that the increasing bulk of the traditions in themselves made scripturisation inevitable. This may be exemplified by the growth of torah, from primitive individual directives, to a body of 'vocational knowledge' (Berufswissen) which it became increasingly difficult to retain in oral form. A similar development is discernible on a general scale, over the whole range of religious tradition.

e) The fact that the aim of 'scripturisation' was to preserve the insights which had long been reactualised in the oral traditions, implies that originally 're-presentation' and 'scripturisation' were considered to be highly compatible. Scripture was obviously regarded as serving the same essential purpose as the re-actualisation of the ancient moments in the oral tradition. Only when Scripture later came to be cut off from history, and regarded as timeless, a-historical truth, did a tension arise between the living moment as re-presented in the oral tradition, and the givenness of scripture. Significantly it is also at this point that theophany recedes from the centre of importance, until finally, vis-à-vis an infallible scripture, the very possibility of theophany is altogether denied.
f) We should note also the influence of history on the growth of the reflective element in the religious traditions of Israel. Traditions such as that in Gen. 22 illustrate the tendency to view individual theophany traditions not simply in isolation, but in the light of the Heilsgeschichte. The validity of the picture of God vouchsafed in any one case, must be tested against the composite picture emerging through the Heilsgeschichte as a whole. The elaboration of material which this reflective process encouraged further hastened the trend toward scripturisation.

2. Theophany and the cult.

a) We have seen that theophany is deeply rooted in the cult; which in Israel was specifically a vehicle for the Heilsgeschichte:

(i) Our survey of the patriarchal-type theophany narratives showed clearly how essential J. and E. considered the connection between the theophanies and the patriarchal shrines to be.

(ii) The great bulk of the remaining pre-exilic literature which we surveyed for theophanic traces, arose directly or indirectly from the cult.

(iii) Our whole discussion of theophany and covenant was, practically, a discussion of the cult, and of the circumstances in which it was celebrated throughout the pre-exilic period of Israel's history. As the purpose of the cult was to re-actualise the historical bond between Yahweh and His people, so it concerned the re-presentation of the
theophanies, i.e., those historical moments where Yahweh's gracious intention was most evidently declared. Thus the theophany inevitably became the high-point of the cult.

b) The fact that such a large proportion of the material which crystallised as scripture has been formed and shaped in the cult, would seem to imply that this scripture, in order to be understood aright, must be received 'cultically', i.e. read within the context of the community, and with the expectation that through the reading the theophanic moments of the past may be re-actualised, and light thereby shed upon the divine purpose for the community's present.

3. The verbal and the visional in theophany.

a) In our general survey of the O.T. theophany tradition, we noted that visional and verbal elements were closely intertwined from earliest times; but that as the tradition developed the verbal came increasingly to preponderate over the visional.

b) Our chapter on theophany and torah was basically a description of the process by which the verbal content of the theophany was increasingly articulated and enriched. With the advance of the process, we saw that the verbal content of the theophany became progressively more complex and lengthy, until eventually the disproportion caused a certain sense of artificiality in the structure as a whole, (this is becoming apparent in the theophany-structure of the final form of the Deuteronomy). Finally the unitary theophany-form breaks under the weight of the verbal-stipulative
element; so that the tōrah is conceived as standing alone, a timeless
divine word that is valid without reference to its historical, theophanic
framework. At this stage, the vision element of the theophany is
inevitably eclipsed, and the danger emerges that the 'existential' orienta-
tion of the material is replaced by a 'legalistic' one.

c) It is obvious that the elaboration of the verbal element in the
theophany tradition in general must hasten the process of scripturisation.
More concretely, the stipulational sentences which became first a part of
the Book of the Covenant, and then of the Deuteronomic Code, were from pre-
Israelite times expressed in written form; so that their inclusion as part
of the verbal element of the theophany, speeded the scripturisation of the
tradition as a whole.

4. The 'internalising' of theophany.

a) Our survey has revealed a strong individual, personalistic element
in the theophany traditions: - The patriarchal theophanies are invariably
experienced by individuals; the literary accounts of the Sinai theophany,
which undoubtedly reflect the cultic practice over many centuries in Israel,
stress the role of the individual covenant-mediator in interpreting the
content and significance of the theophany to the community; and in the case
of the prophets, each is specifically called and commissioned to his task
in a personal theophanic encounter with Yahweh.

b) The fact that the theophany is marked as an essentially personal
experience, removes it at once from the realm of bare neutral phenomenas,
and underlines the necessity for the personal involvement of the experient. We remarked in our consideration of Ex. 3, 1 Sam. 3, etc., that the given phenomena did not in fact become 'theophanic' until the personal attention of the experient had been engaged.

c) One aspect of this personal involvement of the addressee is seen in the reflective process noted above (1. f)). Cf. Isaiah's call-experience, which was obviously intimately related to the prophet's sustained preliminary reflections upon the holiness of God - a theme which impressed itself upon his mind as he considered the situation of His day in the light of the revelation of God in the Heilsgeschichte. Both involvement and reflection are in turn related to the concept of the מְנַסֵּחַ מַדְרֵשׁ, i.e. that the chosen bearer of the divine word should not only discern the outward manifestations of the divine purpose but penetrate to the inner rationale of the divine intention, in the context of intimate personal communion with God. Here the visional aspects of the communion-experience recede from the centre of importance, and the intuitional assumes prominence.

d) This internalising of theophany is clearly illustrated from the accounts of prophetic calls as recorded in the Old Testament. The call-experiences of Isaiah and Ezekiel are close to the patriarchal-type theophanies, in that they contain a strong visional element: those of Amos and Jeremiah, on the other hand, represent a more 'internalised' version of the same type of experience. It is significant that the basically visional type shades almost imperceptibly into the basically intuitional type of experience; i.e., the theophany has been internalised without thereby undergoing a change in its essential character.
e) The internalising process is also related to scripture-formation:

(i) the impetus to scripturisation provided by the reflective process, as noted above;

(ii) the prophetic word, apprehended in the הוהי הוהי, came increasingly to be formulated and understood in terms of a prophecy-fulfilment pattern. This prophecy-fulfilment structure implies a certain fixity in the material closely analogous to 'writtenness', so that the prevalence of the pattern itself encourages the process of 'scripturisation'.

5. Theophany in the traditions descendant from the Old Testament.

a) We have noted, in the Qur'anic material of the late Medinan period, theological presuppositions which excluded the possibility of direct visible encounter with the divine. This outlook we saw to be closely related to the theology of seventh century Judaism, the Qur'an's proximate theological antecedent. We have seen also, that this theological outlook stems, practically, from a three-stranded development-process in the course of which:

(i) the verbal-stipulational content of the revelation became increasingly detached from its theophanic-historic context, and endowed with independent, timeless, and unique validity;

(ii) the living voice of prophecy suffered a corresponding eclipse, being regarded as ancillary to the תורָה, and finally being considered to have ceased since the death of מגן;
(iii) The uniquely-valid Torah came to be conceived as having been
delivered, not in direct theophanic encounter, but through angelic
mediation.

b) In spite of these theological presuppositions, however, there is a
warmth in the language both of the Qur'an and of the Talmudic Judaism we have
considered, which betrays the fact that in both cases the written revelation
is not in practice regarded (merely) as a once-for-all "given" standing
thenceforth objectively independent of its divine source; but that in the
reception and reading of this written word, a real personal (if invisible)
encounter with the divine Author in fact takes place. Thus from this point
of view it may be claimed that the Qur'an, while disclaiming the direct
theophanic moment as the locus of its revelation, nevertheless stands at the
end of that process of 'internalisation', which we saw to be at work from
the earliest stages of the Old Testament theophanic tradition.

c) It is relevant to note that the visio nal-theophanic emphasis, excluded
from the finished form of the Qur'an and from orthodox Muslim theology
because of theological considerations, has reasserted itself in popular
Muslim devotion; - the material in chapter 4, note 72, provides a classic
example of this trend - (the same is true of Judaism, though we have not
had opportunity to observe concrete examples). This would seem to indicate
that there is something elemental about the theophanic experience; it is the
instinctive mode of describing that intensely I-Thou encounter which con-
stitutes the core of all spiritual religion.

d) If we may be permitted to add a comparative note, as to the role of
theophany in the Christian tradition:

In the case of Christianity, the theophanic element has remained central to the orthodox statement of the faith, in that the doctrine of the incarnation from the Christian standpoint, is regarded as the climax of the Old Testament theophany tradition:

"... the life was made manifest (ἐφανερώθη), and we saw it ... that which we have seen and heard we proclaim also to you, so that you may have fellowship (κοινωνία) with us; and our fellowship is with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ. And we are writing this that our joy may be complete."

- I John 1:2-4.

The writer states that the purpose of Scripture is to recount and to re-actualise the historic theophany. It is implied that the historic theophany (or Christophany), though now ceased in its visible form, continues 'internalised' but essentially unchanged in the experience of κοινωνία; and that through the instrumentality of the written account the circle of the κοινωνία is effectually extended, so that increasing numbers of people are drawn to participate in the ongoing 'fellowship', and thus in the essentially theophanic encounter which constitutes its core.

Thus here too, as in the Old Testament tradition, the Scripture, when read 'cultically', becomes the means whereby the luminous historic theophany-moment is re-presented and re-actualised, and thereby provides the key to the interpretation of God's present and future purposes in and through the believing community.
### ABBREVIATIONS
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<table>
<thead>
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</thead>
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<td>A.R.W.</td>
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<tr>
<td>A.T.A.N.T.</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.T.D.</td>
<td>Das Alte Testament Deutsch</td>
<td>Göttingen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>The Biblical Archaeologist</td>
<td>New Haven, Conn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A.T.</td>
<td>Die Botschaft des Alten Testaments</td>
<td>Stuttgart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.J.R.L.</td>
<td>Bulletin of the John Rylands Library</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.K.A.T.</td>
<td>Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament</td>
<td>Neukirchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.W.A.N.T.</td>
<td>Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament</td>
<td>hsgb. R. Kittel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.W.A.T.</td>
<td>Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten Testament</td>
<td>hsgb. R. Kittel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Z.</td>
<td>Biblische Zeitschrift</td>
<td>Paderborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Z.A.W.</td>
<td>Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alt-testamentliche Wissenschaft</td>
<td>hsgb. G. Fohrer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>-------------</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.T.</td>
<td>The Expository Times</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.R.L.A.N.T.</td>
<td>Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.A.T.</td>
<td>Handbuch zum Alten Testament</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.T.R.</td>
<td>The Harvard Theological Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.U.C.A.</td>
<td>Hebrew Union College Annual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.C.C.</td>
<td>The International Critical Commentary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.B.L.</td>
<td>Journal of Biblical Literature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.N.E.S.</td>
<td>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.P.O.S.</td>
<td>Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.S.S.</td>
<td>Journal of Semitic Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.T.S.</td>
<td>The Journal of Theological Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.A.T.</td>
<td>Kommentar zum Alten Testament</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.E.B.</td>
<td>New English Bible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.S.T.</td>
<td>Origins and History of the Oldest Sinaitic Traditions, see Bibliography, Beyerlin.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Publisher/Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.T.L.</td>
<td>The Old Testament Library, Student</td>
<td>Christian Movement Press London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.B.</td>
<td>Revue Biblique</td>
<td>Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.S.V.</td>
<td>The Holy Bible, Revised Standard Version</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T,D.</td>
<td>Theology Digest</td>
<td>St.Louis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T,E,D.</td>
<td>Translations of Early Documents</td>
<td>eds.W.O.E. Cesterley, G.H.Box</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThLZ.</td>
<td>Theologische Literaturzeitung</td>
<td>Leipzig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThZ.</td>
<td>Theologische Zeitschrift</td>
<td>Basel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Üb. Stud(ien)</td>
<td>Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien, see Bibliography, M.Noth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.T.</td>
<td>Vetus Testamentum</td>
<td>Leiden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.T.S.</td>
<td>Supplements to Vetus Testamentum</td>
<td>Leiden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.M.A.N.T.</td>
<td>Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament</td>
<td>Neukirchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z.A.W.</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z.D.M.G.</td>
<td>Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft</td>
<td>Leipzig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z.T.K.</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</td>
<td>Tübingen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Technical Terms.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.N.E.</td>
<td>Ancient Near East(ern)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ar.</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.o.C.</td>
<td>The Book of the Covenant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.T.</td>
<td>Babylonian Talmud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cod.Ham.</td>
<td>Codex Hammurabi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>The Deuteronomic literary source in the Pentateuch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dic.</td>
<td>Deuteronomic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist.</td>
<td>The Deuteronomist(s) — including members of the Dic. school intermediate between the Dic. Code and the Deuteronomistic History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distic.</td>
<td>Deuteronomistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dtn.</td>
<td>The book of Deuteronomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dtr.</td>
<td>The Deuteronomistic History; or the author(s) of the Distic. History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>The Elohistic literary source in the Pentateuch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fest.</td>
<td>Festschrift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G^[A]</td>
<td>Codex Alexandrinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.</td>
<td>The Yahwistic literary source in the Pentateuch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Latin (Vulgate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>The Septuagint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid.Ass.</td>
<td>The Middle Assyrian Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.T.</td>
<td>Massoretic Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.F.</td>
<td>Neue Folge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.</td>
<td>The Priestly literary source in the Pentateuch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.</td>
<td>Sura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Symmachus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.T. form</td>
<td>Vassal Treaty form</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF THE WORKS CONSULTED IN THE PREPARATION OF THIS
THESIS.

A. OLD TESTAMENT SECTION.

Abbas, R. "The Divine Name Yahweh", J.B.L., 80, pp. 320-328 1961
Albright, W.F. From the Stone Age to Christianity - monotheism and the historical process 1941 London
"The Names Shaddai and Abram", J.B.L., 54, pp. 173-204 1935
The Archeology of Palestine and the Bible 1932 New York
"The Administrative Divisions of Israel and Judah", J.P.O.S., 5, pp. 17-54 1925
"Contributions to Biblical Archeology and Philology, 2. The Name Yahweh", J.B.L., 42, pp. 370-378 1924
= "Das Königthum in den Reichen Israel und Juda", Kleine Schriften, II, pp. 116-134 1953 München
= "Das Königthum in den Reichen Israel und Juda", V.T., 1, pp. 2-22 1951
/Alt, A. "Zelte und Hütten", Kleine Schriften, III, pp. 233-242 1959 München

= "Zelte und Hütten", Bonner Biblische Beiträge, Altestamentliche Studien Friedrich Mütscher zum sechzigsten Geburtstag gewidmet 1950 Bonn

"Die Götter in den phönizischen Inschriften von Karatepe", ThLZ. 75, p. 514 1950

Mitteilungen: "Ein ägyptisches Gegenstück zu Ex. 3:14", Z.A.W., 58, pp. 159-160 1940

"Die Wallfahrt von Sichem nach Bethel", Kleine Schriften, I, pp. 79-88 1953 München

= Abhandlungen der Herder-Gesellschaft, Band 6, nr. 3, pp. 218-230 1938 Riga

"Josua", Kleine Schriften, I, pp. 176-192 1936 Berlin

= Werden und Wesen des Alten Testaments, (B.Z.A.W., 66), pp. 13-29 1936 Berlin


= "Die Ursprünge des Israelitischen Rechts", Kleine Schriften, I, pp. 278-332 1953 München

= "Die Ursprünge ...", Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig 1934 Leipzig


= "Die Staatenbildung der Israeliten in Palästina", Kleine Schriften, II, pp. 1-65 1953 München

= "Die Staatenbildung ...", Reformationsprogramm der Universität Leipzig 1930 Leipzig
"The God of the Fathers", Essays on O.T. History and Religion, pp. 3-77  
1966 Oxford

"Der Gott der Väter", Kleine Schriften, I, pp. 1-78  
1953 München

"Der Gott der Väter", (B.W.A.N.T., 3 Folge Heft 12)  
1929 Stuttgart

1966 Oxford

"Die Landnahme der Israeliten in Palästina", Kleine Schriften, I, pp. 89-125  
1953 München

"Die Landnahme ...", Reformationsprogramm der Universität Leipzig,  
1925 Leipzig

Baker, J.  
"Moses and the Burning Bush", E.T., 76, pp. 307-308  
1964-5

Baltzer, K.  
Das Bundesformular, (W.M.A.N.T., 4)  
1960 Neukirchen

Barr, J.  
"Theophany and Anthropomorphism in the Old Testament", V.T.S., 7, pp. 31-38  
1960 Leiden

Barton, G.A.  
The Religion of Israel  
1918 New York

Baudissin, N.W.G.  
Kurios als Gottesname im Judentum und seine Stelle in der Religionsgeschichte, Vols. I-IV, hsgb. O. Eissfeldt  
1929 Giessen

"El Bet-əl (Gen. 31:13, 35:17)", Vom Alten Testament (Festschrift K. Marti, q.v.),  
1925 Giessen

Baumann, E.  
"Das Lied Moses (Dtn. 32:1-43) auf seine gedankliche Geschlossenheit untersucht", V.T., 6, pp. 414-424  
1956
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beer, G.</td>
<td>Steinverehrung bei den Israeliten (Not sighted personally)</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Berlin and Leipzig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhagir, J.</td>
<td>&quot;Berit; Ein Beitrag zur Erfassung einer alttestamentlichen Denkform&quot;, Z.A.W., 60, pp. 1-11</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Die priesterliche Tora&quot;, Werden und Wesen des Alten Testaments, (B.Z.A.W., 66)</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hesekiel - mit einem Beitrag von K. Galling, (H.A.T., I/13)</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Tübingen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Tübingen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright, J.</td>
<td>A History of Israel</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Joshua&quot;, I.B., 2</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>布鲁, F.F. and Rupp, E.G., eds.</td>
<td>Holy Book and Holy Tradition - International colloquium held in the Faculty of Theology, University of Manchester.</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Burney, C.F. The Book of Judges, with introduction and notes 1918 London


Carmélitaines Etudes Carmélitaines : Elie le Prophète selon les Écritures et les Traditions Chrétienes 1956 Tournai
(P.Paul-Marie de la Croix, R.de Vaux, J.Steinmann and others)

Caspari "Heimat und soziale Wirkung des alttestamentlichen Bundesbuchs", Z.D.M.G., 83, pp. 97-110 1929

Cazelles, H. Etudes sur le Code de l'Alliance 1946 Paris

Cheyne, T.K. The Book of the Prophet Isaiah (the Polychrome Bible) 1896, London

Childs, B.S. Isaiah and the Assyrian Crisis (S.B.T., 2nd Series No. 3) 1967 London
Memory and Tradition in Israel (S.B.T., 37) 1962 London

Abraham and David, (S.B.T., 2nd Series, 5) 1967 London
"Deuteronomy and the Jerusalem Cult Tradition", V.T., 15, pp. 300-312 1965
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Edition</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clements, R.E.</td>
<td>God and Temple - The idea of the divine presence in ancient Israel</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prophecy and Covenant, (C.B.T., 43)</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooke, G.A.</td>
<td>The Book of Ezekiel, (I.C.C.)</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cripps, R.S.</td>
<td>A critical and exegetical commentary on The Book of Amos</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cunliffe-Jones, H.</td>
<td>Deuteronomy (Torch)</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver, G.R.</td>
<td>Canaanite Myths and Legends</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;The Original Form of the Name Yahweh&quot;, Z.A.W., 46, pp. 7-25</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Some Hebrew Roots and their Meanings&quot;, J.T.S., 23, pp. 69-73</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deuteronomy (I.C.C.)</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Der Prophet Hesekiel, Kap. 1-18 (A.T.D. 22/1)</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Göttingen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kap. 19-48 (A.T.D. 22/2)</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Göttingen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Der Heilige in Israel; Jesaja 1-12, Übersetzt und ausgelegt, (B.A.T., 17/1)</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Stuttgart</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Lade und Gesetztafeln&quot;, ThZ. 16, pp. 281-4</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;El and Yahweh&quot;, J.S.S., 1, pp. 25-37</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Ba'alsamem und Jahwe&quot;, Z.A.W., 57, pp. 1-31</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Die Komposition der Samuelisbücher</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Leipzig</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Der Gott Bethel&quot;, A.R.W., 28, pp. 1-30</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Die Quellen des Richterbuches</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Leipzig</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engnell, I.</td>
<td>The Call of Isaiah; an exegetical and comparative study</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Uppsala</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewald, H.</td>
<td>The Prophet Isaiah, Chs. 1-33</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedman, N.</td>
<td>&quot;The Name of the God of Moses&quot;, J.B.L., 72, pp. 151-156</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Frost, S.B.  "Eschatology and Myth", V.T., 2, pp. 70-80  1952

Galling, K.  Die Erzählungstraditionen Israels, (B.Z.A.W., 48)  1928 Giessen
"Das Königsgesetz im Deuteronomium", ThLZ., 76, cols. 133-138  1951
"Das Gemeindagesetz in Deuteronomium 23", Festschrift Bertholet, pp. 176-191  1950 Tübingen

Gerstenberger, E.  Wesen und Herkunft des "apodiktischen Rechts", (W.M.A.N.T. 20)  1965 Neukirchen
"Covenant and Commandment", J.B.L., 84, pp. 38-51  1965

Goitein, S.D.  "YHWH the Passionate. The monotheistic meaning and origin of the Name YHWH", V.T., 5, pp. 1-9;  1956

Gray, G.B.  Isaiah (chs. 1-39), (I.C.C.)  1912 Edinburgh


I and II Kings, a Commentary, (O.T.L.)  1964 London

The Canaanites  1964 London
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Legacy of Canaan : The Ras Shamra Texts and their Relevance to the Old Testament, V. T. S., 5</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Leiden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;The God YH in the Religion of Canaan&quot;, J. N. E. S., 12, pp. 278-283</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Cultic Affinities between Israel and Ras Shamra&quot;, Z. A. W., 62, pp. 207-220</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gressmann, H.</td>
<td>Mose und seine Zeit</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>Göttingen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Sage und Geschichte in den Patriarchenerzählungen&quot;, Z. A. W., 30, pp. 1-36</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Der Ursprung der israelitisch-jüdischen Rachatologie, (F. R. L. A. N. T., 6)</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Göttingen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grether, O.</td>
<td>Name und Wort Gottes im Alten Testament</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>Giessen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunkel, H.</td>
<td>Genesis, übersetzt und erklärt</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Göttingen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haran, M.</td>
<td>'The Nature of the &quot;Ohel Mo'edh&quot; in Pentateuchal Sources', J. S. S., 5, pp. 50-55</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battersby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hehn, J. Die biblische und die babylonische Gottesidee : die israelitische Gottes-Auffassung im Lichte der altorientalischen Religions-Geschichte 1913 Leipzig


Review of A. Alt, "The God of the Fathers", ThLZ., 12, cols. 266-273 1930

Die Schichten des Deuteronomiums 1914 Leipzig

Hentschke, R. Satzung und Setzender - ein Beitrag zur israelitischen Rechtsterminologie, (B.W.A.N.T., 3) 1963 Stuttgart

Herntrich, V. Der Prophet Jesaja, Kap. 1-12, Übersetzt und erklärt, (A.T.D., 17) 1950 Göttingen

Ezechielprobleme, (Z.A.W., 61) 1932 Giessen

Herrmann, J. Ezechiel, Übersetzt und erklärt, (K.A.T., 11) 1924 Leipzig


"Die Entwicklung des Begriffes ָֻּּפֶּר im A.T." Z.A.W., 40, pp. 256-287, and 41, pp. 16-76 1922, 3


van Imsehoort, Théologie de l'Ancien Testament (2 vols. in 1) 1954 Tournai P.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jacob, E.</td>
<td>Théologie de l'Ancien Testament</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Neuchâtel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jepsen, A.</td>
<td>Untersuchungen zum Bundesbuch, (B.W.A.N.T., 3 Folge, Heft 8)</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Stuttgart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremias, Jürg</td>
<td>Thaophanie ; die Geschichte einer alt-testamentlichen Gattung, (W.M.A.N.T., 10)</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Neukirchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, A.R.</td>
<td>The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Cardiff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Aspects of the use of the term מָלֵד in the Old Testament&quot;, Festschrift O.Eissfeldt, pp. 155-9</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>Halle (Saale)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaplan, M.M.</td>
<td>&quot;Isaiah 6:1-11&quot;, J.B.L., 45, pp. 251-259</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karge</td>
<td>Geschichte des Bundesgedanken im Alten Testament, (Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen, Ed. 2, Heft 1-4)</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Münster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kautzsch, E.</td>
<td>&quot;Names C : Divine Names&quot;, E.B.3, cols. 3320-3330</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Edition</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kessler, M.</td>
<td>&quot;The 'shield' of Abraham?&quot;, V.T., 14, pp. 494-497</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kessler, W.</td>
<td>&quot;Die literarische, historische und theologische Problematik des Dekalogs&quot;, V.T., 7, pp. 1-16</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kissane, E.J.</td>
<td>The Book of Isaiah, (Vols. I, II), trans. from a critically revised Hebrew text, with commentary</td>
<td>1941, Dublin</td>
<td>Dublin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kittel, R.</td>
<td>The Religion of the People of Israel</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klostermann, A.</td>
<td>Geschichte des Volkes Israel, bis zur Restauration unter Ezra und Nehemia</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>München</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kramer, S.N.</td>
<td>From the Tablets of Sumer. (Twenty-five firsts in man's recorded history)</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Indian Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Gilgal - ein Beitrag zur Kultusgeschichte Israels&quot;, V.T., 1, pp. 181-199</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>München</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Journal/Book Details</td>
<td>Page/Publication Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Die Lagervorstellung der priesterschriftlichen Erzählung&quot;, Z.A.W., 63, pp. 74-105</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Feste und Feiern, II; In Israel&quot;,</td>
<td>1958 Tübingen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R.G.G., 3, 2, cols. 910-917</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack, R.</td>
<td>&quot;Les Origines de Elyon le Très-Haut&quot;,</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.B.Q., 24, pp. 44-54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehming, S.</td>
<td>&quot;Versuch zu Exodus 32&quot;, V.T., 10, pp. 16-50</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Short, C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewy, I.</td>
<td>&quot;The beginnings of the worship of Yahweh, conflicting biblical views&quot;,</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V.T., 6, pp. 429-435</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Publication Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lohfink, N.</td>
<td>Das Hauptproble - Eine Untersuchung literarischer Einleitungsfragen zu Dtn. 5-11, (Analeota Biblica - Investigationes scientifi-</td>
<td>1963 Rome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ciae in res biblicas, 20. E Pontificio Instituto Biblico)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaag, V.</td>
<td>&quot;Erwächungen zur deuteronomischen Kultzentralisation&quot;, V.T., 6, pp. 10-18</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCarthy, D.J.</td>
<td>&quot;Notes on the Love of God in Deuteronomy&quot;, C.B.O., 27, pp. 144-147</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Treaty and Covenant - a study in form, in the ancient oriental docu-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ments, and in the Old Testament, (Analeota Biblica - Investigationes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>scientifi-</td>
<td>ciae in res biblicas, 21. E Pontificio Instituto Biblico)</td>
<td>1963 Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKane, W.</td>
<td>I and II Samuel, (Torch)</td>
<td>1963 London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Hosea&quot;, I.B., 6</td>
<td>1956 New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Meyer, R.  "Περὶ τῶν", T.W.N.T., 6, pp. 72-83, 1959 Stuttgart

Michaeli, F.  Le Livre de la Genèse. La Bible ouverte, (2 vols. in one), 1957 Neuchâtel


Minette de Tilless, G.  "Sections-'tu' et sections-'vous' dans le Deuteronome", V.T., 12, pp. 29-87, 1962

Morgenstern, J.  "The King-God among the Western Semites, and the meaning of Epiphanes", V.T., 10, pp. 138-97, 1960

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Müller, H.P.</td>
<td>&quot;Die kultische Darstellung der Theophanie&quot;, V.T., 14, pp. 183-191</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newman, M.L.</td>
<td>The People of the Covenant - a study of Israel from Moses to the Monarchy</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nielsen, D.</td>
<td>Handbuch der Altarabischen Altertumskunde, hsgb. D. Nielsen</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Copenhagen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Some reflections on the history of the ark&quot;, V.T.S., 7, pp. 61-74</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Leiden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shechem - a tradition-historical investigation</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Copenhagen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noth, M.</td>
<td>Das vierte Buch Mose : Numeri, (A.T.D., 7)</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Göttingen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exodus - a commentary, (O.T.L.), trans. by J. S. Bowden, from</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Das Zweite Buch Mose : Exodus, (A.T.D., 5)</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Göttingen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Das alttestamentliche Bundschliessen im Lichte eines Mari-Textes&quot;, (Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament, pp. 142-154)</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>München</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Handbuch der Altarabischen Altertumskunde, hsgb. D. Nielsen*
Noth, M. = "Das alttestamentliche Bundschliessen ...", Melanges Isidore Lévy, pp. 433-444 1955 Brussels

Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves, Tome 13 1953


"Die Vergegenwärtigung des Alten Testaments in der Verkündigung", Evangelische Theologie, 12, pp. 6-17 1952

"Die Vergegenwärtigung des Alten Testaments ...", Probleme alttestamentlicher Hermeneutik, pp. 54-68 1960 München


Gott, König, Volk im Alten Testament", (Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament, pp. 188-229) 1957 München

Gott, König, Volk ...", Z.T.K., 47, pp. 157-191 1950


1950 Göttingen

Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuchs 1948 Stuttgart
Noth, M. Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien, (Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft, Geisteswissenschaftliche Klasse, 18 Jahr Heft 2) 1943 Halle (Saale)

"The Laws in the Pentateuch"; (The Laws in the Pentateuch and other Essays, pp. 1-107) 1966 Edinburgh

= "Die Gesetze im Pentateuch - Ihre Voraussetzungen und ihr Sinn", (Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament, pp. 9-141) 1957 München

= Die Gesetze im Pentateuch ... (Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft, Geisteswissenschaftliche Klasse, 17 Jahr Heft 2) 1940 Halle (Saale)

Das Buch Josua (H.A.T., I/17) 1938 Tübingen

Das System der zwölf Stimme Israels, (B.W.A.N.T., 4 Folge, Heft 1) 1930 Stuttgart


Üstborn, G. Cult and Canon - a study in the canonisation of the Old Testament 1950 Uppsala

Tora in the Old Testament. A semantic study 1945 Lund

Trans. by J.W.Harvey from Das Heilige, (9th German edition)

Pax, E. Epiphaneia - ein religionsgeschichtlicher Beitrag zur biblischen Theologie 1955 München

Pedersen, J. Israel : its life and culture, I - II 1926 Copenhagen and London

III - IV 1940 "

Der Eid bei den Semiten, in seinem Verhältnis zu verwandten Erscheinungen sowie die Stellung des Eides im Islam 1914 Strassburg


"The Oldest Decalogue", J.B.L., 43, pp.294-310 1924

Phythian-Adams The Call of Israel. An introduction to the study of divine election 1934 Oxford

Pope, M.H. EL in the Ugaritic Texts, (V.T.S. 2) 1955 Leiden


Procksch, O. Theologie des Alten Testament 1949 Gütersloh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Vol. / Edition</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deuteronomy - a commentary (O.T.L.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deuteronomium, (A.T.D., 8)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Göttingen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. II</td>
<td></td>
<td>1965</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trans. by D.M.G. Stalker from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theologie des Alten Testaments,</td>
<td>Bd. I</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>München</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. II</td>
<td></td>
<td>1960</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trans. by J.H. Marks from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Das erste Buch Mose : Genesis (A.T.D., 2-4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Göttingen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Der heilige Krieg im alten Israel,</td>
<td></td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Zürich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A.T.A.N.T., 21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies in Deuteronomy, (S.B.T., 9)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>translated by D.M.G. Stalker from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deuteronomium-Studien, revised edition</td>
<td></td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Göttingen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuch", (Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament, pp. 9-86) 1958 Munich

"Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuch", (B.W.A.N.T., 4te Folge Heft 26) 1938 Stuttgart

"Die falschen Propheten", Z.A.W., 60, pp. 109-120 1933


"Zelt und Lade", (Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament, pp. 109-129) 1958 Munich

"Zelt und Lade", Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift, 12, pp. 476-498 1931 Leipzig

"Das Gottesvolk im Deuteronomium", (B.W.A.N.T., 3te Folge Heft 11) 1929 Stuttgart


Rost, L. "Sinaibund und Davidsbund", ThLZ., 72, cols. 129-134 1947


="The Early Prophecies of Jeremiah ...", B.J.R.L., 45, pp. 198-234 1962,3 Manchester


The Faith of Israel; aspects of Old Testament thought. 1956, London

"The Book of Ezekiel in Modern Study", B.J.R.L., 36, pp. 146-190 1953, Manchester


= "Moses . . .", B.J.R.L., 34, pp. 81-118 1951, Manchester

"Melchizedek and Zadok (Gen. 14 and Psalm 110)", Festschrift für Bertholet, pp. 461-472 1950, Tübingen


"Was Amos a Nabi?", Festschrift O. Eisfeldt, pp. 191-198 1947, Halle (Saale)


Schild, E. = "On Exodus 3:14 - 'I am that I am'", V.T., 4, pp. 296-302 1954


Skinner, J. 
**The Book of Samuel**
no date London

Prophcy and Religion
1922 Cambridge

**Genesis - a critical and exegetical commentary (I.C.C.)**
1910 Edinburgh

**The book of the prophet Isaiah**
1896,8 Cambridge

**The book of Ezekiel (Expositor's Bible)**
1895 London

Smend, R.
1963 Göttingen

Smith, H.P.
**The books of Samuel - a critical and exegetical commentary (I.C.C.)**
1899 Edinburgh

Smith, W.R.
**The Religion of the Semites, 3rd edition ed. S.A.Cook**
1927 London

Süderblom, N.
**Das Werden des Gottesglaubens. Untersuchungen über die Anfänge der Religion ... deutsche Bearbeitung hsgb. von R.Stübe**
1916 Leipzig

Speiser, E.A.
**Genesis. (The Anchor Bible)**
1964 New York

Stamm, J.J. and Andrew, M.E.
**The Ten Commandments in Recent Research (S.B.T., 2nd series, 2)**
1967 London

trans. (with additions) by M.E.Andrew from Der Dekalog im Lichte der neueren Forschung, (Studientage für die Pfarrer, 1)
1958 Bern

Swete, H.B.
**The Old Testament in Greek, according to the Septuagint**
Vol. I 1925 Cambridge
Vol. II 1922 "
Vol. III 1912 "
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Journal/Publication Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;The Hebrew Patriarchs and History&quot;, Theology Digest 12, pp. 227-240</td>
<td>1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vriezen, Th.C.</td>
<td>&quot;'Ehje 'asēr 'ehje &quot;, Festschrift für Bertholet, pp. 498-512</td>
<td>1950 Tübingen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1959 Göttingen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1962 London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1959 Göttingen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Welch, A.C. Deuteronomy : The Framework to the Code 1932 London

The Code of Deuteronomy - a new theory of its origin 1924 London

Wellhausen, J. Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments 1889 Berlin


Widengren, G. Literary and Psychological Aspects of the Hebrew Prophets 1948 Uppsala

Wolff, H.W. Hosea, (B.K.A.T., 14/1) 1961 Neukirchen

"Hoseas geistige Heimat", ThLZ. 81, cols. 83-94 1956

"Jahwe als Bundesvermittler", V.T.6, pp. 316-320 1956


Biblical Archeology 1957 London

"The Levites in Deuteronomy", V.T., 4, pp. 325-330 1954
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Publication Year</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wright, G.E.</td>
<td>&quot;Deuteronomy&quot;, I.B., 2</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright, G.E. and Filson, F.V.</td>
<td>The Westminster Historical Atlas to the Bible</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimmerli, W.</td>
<td>Ezechiel, I, II, (B.K.A.T., 13/1, 13/2)</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Neukirchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Promise and Fulfilment&quot; (Essays on Old Testament Interpretation, ed. C.Westermann, pp. 89-122)</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Verheissung und Erfüllung&quot;, Probleme altertestamentlicher Hermeneutik, hsgb. C.Westermann, (Theologische Bücherei Band 11), pp. 69-101</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. QUR'ĀNIC SECTION.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Publication Year</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrae, T.</td>
<td>Les Origines de l'Islam et le Christianisme</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trans. by J.Roche from, Der Ursprung des Islams und das Christentum</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Uppsala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archer, J.C.</td>
<td>Mystical Elements in Mohammed</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>New Haven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bainton, R.</td>
<td>Here I Stand: a life of Martin Luther</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Baydawi

Beidhawii Commentarius in Coranum, ed. H.O. Fleischer 1846 Leipzig

Bell, R.

Introduction to the Qur'an 1953 Edinburgh

The Qur'an translated with a critical rearrangement of the Surahs:
Vol. I 1937 Edinburgh
Vol. II 1939

"Muhammad and Previous Messengers", M.W., 24, pp. 330-340 1934

"Muhammad's Visions", M.W., 24, pp. 145-154 1934

"Mohammed's Call", M.W., 24, pp. 13-19 1934

The Origin of Islam in its Christian Environment 1926 London

Blachère, R.

Le Coran. Traduction (nouvelle) selon un Essai de Reclassement des Sourates:
Vol. I 1947 Paris
Vol. II 1949
Vol. III 1951

Charles, R.H.


The Ascension of Isaiah, with an introduction by G.H. Box, (T.E.D., Series 1:7) 1917 London

The Book of Jubilees or The Little Genesis, with an introduction by G.H. Box, (T.E.D., series 1:4) 1917 London
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Edition</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English</td>
<td>Charles, R.H.</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... notes to the several books:</td>
<td>Vol. 1 - Apocrypha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. 2 - Pseudepigrapha</td>
<td></td>
<td>1913</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Assumption of Moses, with introduction, notes, and indices</td>
<td></td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Commentary on I Maccabees</td>
<td>Dancy, J.C.</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Ennuma Eliš&quot;, und Hexaëmeron</td>
<td>Deimel, A.</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Babylonian Talmud, ed. I. Epstein</td>
<td>Epstein, I.</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seder Zera'im : I - Berakoth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II - Pe'ah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kil'ayim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shebi'ith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terumoth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma'aserot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma'aser Sheni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Orlah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bikkurim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seder Mo'ed : I - Shabbath I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II - Shabbath II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III - 'Erubin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV - Pesahim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V - Yoma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI - Sukkah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bezah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII - Rosh Hashanah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ta'anith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shekalim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII - Magillah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo'ed ḳatan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haṣigah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Seder Nashim: I - Ye'abamoth I 1936 London
II - Ye'abamoth II
III - Kethuboth I
IV - Kethuboth II
V - Nedarim
VI - Nazir
VII - Sojah
VIII - Gittin

Seder Nezikin: I - Baba Kamma 1935 London
II - Baba Mezi'a
III - Baba Bathra I
IV - Baba Bathra II
V - Sanhedrin I
VI - Sanhedrin II
VII - 'Abodah Zarah
     Horayoth
VIII - Shebu'oth
     Makkoth
     'Eduyyoth
     Aboth

Seder Kodashim: I - Zebahim 1948 London
II - Menahoth
III - Hullin I
IV - Hullin II
V - Bekoroth
   'Arakin
VI - Temurah
     Kerithoth
     Me'ilah
     Tamid
     Middoth
     Kinnim

Seder Tohorot: I - Niddah 1943 London
II - Kelim
     Koloth
     Naga'im
     Parah
     Tohoroth
     'Nikwaoth
     Makshirin
     Zabim
     'Ukzim
     Yada'im
     'Ukzim

Index Volume, compiled by J.J.Slotki 1952 London
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finkel, J.</td>
<td>&quot;Old Israelitish Tradition in the Koran&quot;, M.W., 22, pp. 169-183</td>
<td>1932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flügel, G.</td>
<td>Concordantiae Corani Arabicae</td>
<td>1842 Leipzig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corani Textus Arabicus, 3rd edition</td>
<td>1858 Leipzig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st edition</td>
<td>1834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagnier, J.</td>
<td>Ismael Abu'l-Feda, de Vita et Rebus Gestis Mohammedis, ed. J. Gagnier</td>
<td>1723 Oxford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geiger, A.</td>
<td>Was hat Mohammed aus dem Judentum aufgenommen?</td>
<td>1833 Bonn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>translated into English &quot;by a member of the Ladies' League in aid of the Delhi Mission&quot;, as Judaism and Islam</td>
<td>1898 Madras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goitein, F.</td>
<td>&quot;Koran&quot;, E.J., 10, cols. 308-323</td>
<td>1934 Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trans. by C.R. Barber and S.M. Stern, from Muhammedanische Studien</td>
<td>1889, Halle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1890 (Saale)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Where was al-Masyid al-Aqṣā?&quot;, al-Andalus, 48, pp. 323-336</td>
<td>1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guthrie, A.</td>
<td>&quot;The Significance of Abraham&quot;, M.W., 45, pp. 113-120</td>
<td>1955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kohler, K.</td>
<td>Jewish Theology, systematically and historically</td>
<td>1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>considered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindblom, J.</td>
<td>Prophecy in Ancient Israel</td>
<td>1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margoliouth,</td>
<td>&quot;Muhammadanism (in Arabia)&quot;, E.R.E., 8, pp. 883-5</td>
<td>1915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vol. II</td>
<td>1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vol. III</td>
<td>1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oesterley, W.O.E.</td>
<td>The Sayings of the Jewish Fathers (Pirke Aboth),</td>
<td>1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(T.E.D., Series 3:1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>207-238</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedersen, J.</td>
<td>Der Eid bei den Semiten</td>
<td>1914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kleine Mitteilungen und Anzeigen - Review of Ed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mayer's Ursprung und Geschichte der Mormonen,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Der Islam, 5, pp. 110-115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickthall, N.</td>
<td>The meaning of the Glorious Koran, an explanatory</td>
<td>1952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>translation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prideaux, H.</td>
<td>The true nature of imposture fully display'd in The</td>
<td>1697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Life of Mahomet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale, G.</td>
<td>The Koran : commonly called The Alcoran of Mohammed,</td>
<td>1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>translated into English immediately from the original</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Editions/Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seale, M.S.</td>
<td>&quot;Abraham&quot; - Editorial, M.W., 57/1, pp.1-2</td>
<td>1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schrieke, B.</td>
<td>&quot;Die Himmelsreise Muhammeds&quot;, Der Islam, 6, pp. 1-30</td>
<td>1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tisdall, W.St-C.</td>
<td>The Original Sources of the Qur'ân</td>
<td>1905 London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watt, W.M.</td>
<td>Bell's Introduction to the Qur'an - completely revised and enlarged (Islamic Surveys, 3)</td>
<td>1970 Edinburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber, F.</td>
<td>Jüdische Theologie auf Grund des Talmud und verwandter Schriften gemeinsam dargestellt, hsgb. F. Delitzsch und G. Schnedermann</td>
<td>1897 Leipzig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wherry, E.M.</td>
<td>A Comprehensive Commentary on the Quran:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vol. I</td>
<td>1882 London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vol. II</td>
<td>1884 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vol. III</td>
<td>1885 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vol. IV</td>
<td>1896 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muhammad, the Apostle of God, and His Ascension, (King and Saviour, V)</td>
<td>1955 Uppsala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Ascension of the Apostle and the Heavenly Book, (King and Saviour, III)</td>
<td>1950 Uppsala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Literary and Psychological Aspects of the Hebrew Prophets</td>
<td>1948 Uppsala</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>